



Newsletter

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR POPULATION STUDIES

No. 40 June 2008

The Association

Demographic developments in Europe as well as the causes and consequences of population trends are a challenging field for scientific study and debate. Scientists from a variety of disciplines are actively engaged in the study of European population trends and future prospects. Since a number of the issues addressed are common throughout the world, not only Europeans take a keen interest in European population. Next to that European population experts are also working in or on (non-European) developing countries.

In order to promote these studies and to foster the co-operation between those involved, the EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR POPULATION STUDIES (EAPS) was founded in 1983. EAPS is a scientific association of individual members and Affiliated Institutions. EAPS is an international and multidisciplinary forum for population studies with a special focus on Europe's population. It aims to stimulate the interest in population issues among governments, national and international organisations and the general public.

EAPS has several Working Groups and regularly organises conferences such as the European Population Conference (EPC), seminars, workshops and working group meetings in close collaboration with its Affiliated Institutions and other organisations. EAPS also disseminates population-related information, the most important publication being the European Journal of Population (EJP). EAPS members may subscribe at a special rate to this peer-reviewed quarterly journal. Moreover, the European Doctoral School of Demography (EDSD) is organised under EAPS auspices (see at <http://edsd.site.ined.fr/>).

Contacting EAPS:

P.O. Box 11676
2502 AR The Hague
The Netherlands
Phone: +31 (0)70 3565200
Fax: +31 (0)70 3647187
E-mail: contact@eaps.nl
Internet: <http://www.eaps.nl>

EAPS celebrates its 25th anniversary at the Barcelona EPC Genesis, origin and future of the Association

Initiated by one of the EAPS founding fathers Dirk van de Kaa former Executive Secretary Gijs Beets recently interviewed the Honorary Presidents, as well as the current President and Vice-President. One of our Honorary Presidents, Gérard Calot (EAPS President 1987-1991), regrettably passed away in 2001. Interviews were collected from all other Honorary Presidents, Dirk van de Kaa (EAPS President 1983-1987), Charlotte Höhn (EAPS President 1991-1995), Graziella Caselli (EAPS President 1995-1999), and Guillaume Wunsch (EAPS President 1999-2003), as well as from Janina Józwiak (current EAPS President, 2003-2008), and from Nico van Nimwegen (EAPS Vice-President 2003-2008). This Newsletter summarises their views on the genesis, origin and future of EAPS.



EAPS Honorary Presidents Graziella Caselli, Guillaume Wunsch and Dirk van de Kaa (from right to left)

Gunther Beyer's ECPS inspired towards EAPS

Via the European Centre for Population Studies (ECPS) Gunther Beyer inspired towards the establishment of EAPS (in 1983). Van de Kaa, Höhn, Wunsch and Van Nimwegen met Beyer several times, Caselli and Józwiak never did.

Van de Kaa vividly recalls how Beyer urged him to try and establish a demographic organisation in Europe and "it is very good, therefore, that EAPS named an important award after him. Strictly speaking, Beyer did not think of establishing a new association: he wanted me to accept responsibility for the continuation of a since 1953 existing organisation called the ECPS, the European Centre for Population Studies. He had adopted that association after a special meeting of about forty European demographers that was held during the IUSSP London-conference of 1969, in the official capacity of secretary-general/treasurer, and had kept it alive against considerable odds. (...) Beyer was warm-hearted and generous, he had an enviable joie de vivre, it was good fun to be with him, while he himself enjoyed the company of women to talk to and to exchange compliments with. But he was also quite temperamental and quick to show disapproval. I liked and admired him. He had shown great personal courage and endurance in fighting the

Nazis, but after the war had acceptable working relations with some. He had retained enough of the proverbial thoroughness and punctuality of his country of origin to make him very pleasant and easy to work with. To me he seemed fully integrated in the Netherlands and he surely was. Nevertheless, his ashes were scattered in his place of birth, then still part of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), East Germany so to speak. He allowed me a number of 'interviews' about his life and times. The tribute I wrote for him after his death and published in the first issue of EDIB thereafter (1983) was based in part on these lengthy conversations."

Höhn: "As a junior demographer I met Beyer at international meetings in the late 1970s. He at once accepted me as a colleague and even invited me to his home when in the Netherlands. His hospitality was proverbial. Also, for a native German he was remarkably charming. It is a pity that he could not see develop EAPS into a pan-European association."

Wunsch always enjoyed meeting Beyer: "He was a very nice person, very much concerned about the future of Europe and about lessening the divisions among European nations. The experiences of the Second World War and of the East-West divide thereafter were most certainly major determinants of his attitudes towards Europe."

Józwiak never met Beyer as she then was in the early stage of her research career and only knew, via her boss Prof. Jerzy Holzer, about ideas to create a European society of demographers: "I started my academic career in the late 1970s and as a young researcher I didn't have any opportunity to contact Western European scientists. Also, research cooperation within the 'Eastern block' was very limited then."

At that time Van Nimwegen was a young researcher at NIDI but he met Beyer regularly, for example to pick up at Beyer's house some

books or papers that he wanted to contribute to EAPS and/or NIDI. “Beyer liked to talk, and he had such amazing stories to share; it was always a pleasure to go there. He also provided lots of advice and information about ‘who is who’ in population and politics and how to deal with bureaucracies (mainly in Eastern Europe). Beyer was a one person bridge between East and West, respected by all. He was a true European, attended zillions of meetings and conferences that he had organised or been invited to. He had a striking memory for details and loved to talk, so talks with him were lengthy. His wife Lotte always took part in the discussions; she too had a good memory for names, places and dates. What became clear during those visits was the fact that both Beyers had a common interest and shared convictions: a great team. Lotte also made some good, old fashioned coffee, served with cookies; she was a perfect host. Sometimes the two of them reminded me of my own grandparents; indeed it was a privilege to meet both of them.”

ECPS, the EAPS forerunner

Van de Kaa remembers that ECPS, the forerunner of EAPS, was founded during the peak of the Cold War (see Box). “As far as I am aware the initiative came from Alfred Sauvy, but he almost certainly acted in close collaboration with a number of other European scholars. They must have felt the need for greater co-operation amongst European demographers and population scientists. All this happened in 1953, over half a century ago now. Under the prevailing circumstances setting up a Centre for population studies seemed to offer the best perspectives. It would have only one member per country representing the ECPS in that country. It was thought that this would most probably allow the directors of national demographic institutes or centres to become official members and that would, in turn, enable people from the various parts of Europe to meet every now and then. The secretariat was entrusted to INED and, at least in principle, that provided the Centre with quite a solid base. Politically it remained a difficult exercise. In fact, I remember that the French statutes Beyer once gave me specifically stated that the Centre was ‘étranger aux’ political questions and that their political ideas and religion would not play any role in the selection of members. I’m not sure how these principles worked out in practice. I simply note the fact that in 1954 the ECPS

obtained consultative status, as an NGO, with the Council of Europe. That is not insignificant as later on that enabled Beyer to attend the meetings of the Council’s Committee of Demographic Experts as an observer. Many of us met him there regularly and he used it to organise seminars. I do not know the full ECPS history but it constituted an informal functioning network. From time to time Beyer would organise a meeting of its board, most commonly in the margin of an international conference, where he would be re-appointed and the president – Erland Hofsten from 1969 – and board would accept the ‘nominations’ for open vacancies. They would further endorse his carefully prepared proposals for seminars, workshops, and publications. I remember attending one seminar in Karpacz, Poland (1974), another in The Hague (1976) and also the last one in Athens (1979).”



Dr. Gunther Beyer (1904-1983)

“Beyer had very good contacts with international publishers in the Netherlands. He used these immediately to start publishing a review called **European Demographic Information Bulletin (EDIB)**. It usually carried one substantial paper and a few research notes. Moreover it contained bibliographic information. For a while two box card size references were printed on one side of each page. As the other side remained blank, these fiches could be torn out and filed away for future use. With his wife Lotte he spent a great deal of time preparing these references. Later Eric Vilquin and Guillaume Wunsch agreed to lend him a hand. Beyer’s whole study was organised around his many and varied editorial activities, with all newly arrived books and papers neatly stacked.”

Van de Kaa continues: “I do not think Beyer had explicit ideas about the further development of ECPS. His experience had taught him that it was extremely difficult to increase the number of subscriptions to the journal and to have members pay their dues. Moreover, very few new members registered, so the associations’ membership was ageing with him. His central concern was to be able to pass responsibility on to someone else; to me more in particular. Unfortunately I had to make up my mind much earlier than I had expected. Beyer, always so full of beans and initiatives, fell terminally ill. We talked a great deal, and I could see that the future of ECPS remained on his mind. I promised that I would immediately consult Hofsten, as the president, and some more of the association’s most senior members about the best course of action. At the same time I argued that continuing with ECPS probably was not the best option. Quite obviously a new start would have to be made in order to attract and actively involve new generations of European demographers. As Europe offered such unique research possibilities one would have to formulate ambitious plans and attempt to function in a way that allowed the membership to develop various initiatives and that would make attending its general conferences a must for everyone interested in the demography of Europe. Responsibility for that organisation should not rest on the shoulders of a generous and magnanimous person, but should be shared by a strong active board and by the membership at large. His immediate

reaction was to say that if that course were followed he would write to all ECPS members to suggest they join the new body. And, not long before his death in January 1983, that is precisely what he did. So, Gijs, when you called him one of the ‘founders’ of the EAPS you were not quite correct but had a good point!”

Co-operation before EAPS

At the time the ECPS flourished Van de Kaa, Wunsch and also Caselli already had contacts themselves behind the ‘Iron Curtain’, mainly in what is now called the Czech Republic.

Wunsch: “My first trip behind the ‘Iron Curtain’ was to Prague in 1965. I had met Zdeněk Pavlík in Paris and we became good friends (we still are!). He invited me to Prague and it was my first experience of crossing the East-West divide. The Czech police was quite correct at the border but they were never in a hurry to let you pass either way. The other communist country I went to, at about the same time was Poland. I was invited by the Poznan economists who were quite active in demography at that time. Another border experience: the East-German border police were quite disagreeable; it was a pleasure crossing the border by train at Frankfurt Oder and being met by the Polish border police with a ‘Bienvenue en Pologne!’ (in French!). I also had early and excellent contacts with many Hungarian demographers, including Emil Valkovics, no longer among us unfortunately, Péter Józán, András Klinger, and many others. Eventually, I went to most of the other socialist countries in Europe, including the USSR where I met marvellous people in Moscow, Saint-Petersburg, and in the Baltic countries. I still have contacts with many of them.”

And then EAPS came in 1983

Van de Kaa: “Once I had received the nod of ECPS’ elders, things went smoothly. I used coffee breaks and social occasions during international meetings, as well as the phone, to talk to the leading demographers in the various countries of Europe. To my delight there was broad and strong support. I was well aware that the composition of the first EAPS Council would be of crucial importance for its success. I was extremely happy that the first four colleagues I approached for a function in the founding Council, accepted without much hesitation. While today that may seem entirely reasonable, at the time it was not; in some cases it required a lot of

courage to say 'yes', but all did. As a council in statu nascendi Charlotte Höhn, András Klinger, Zdeněk Pavlík, Guillaume Wunsch and I met for the very first time in Strasbourg! In a traditional Wynstüb we divided functions and tasks and agreed that, given the composition of the list of prime supporters in the various countries, we should go ahead and establish EAPS officially. As its seat would be in The Hague, the statutes would have to be drafted and submitted in Dutch. Relevant materials had already been collected, so that task, as well as the translation, was completed rapidly. Now that I think of it, it most likely were bits and pieces already written in English that formed the basis of the draft statutes. After all we had already been discussing all significant points. Anyway, early in March 1983 all of us who could be present filed into the office of a notary public in The Hague and thereafter had tea at my home. We were careful to enlist two observers and as luck would have it, that brought two further European nationalities in the Council: Bill Brass (UK) for the IUSSP and Jean Bour-geois-Pichat (France), who represented CICRED. Since we were planning to have individual members and to unite institutional members in our Advisory Board, we felt we should indicate we wanted to work with rather than against these two existing organisations."

Also Höhn and Wunsch were EAPS founding members. **Wunsch:** "I was one of the founding members of EAPS. I had been contacted by Dirk van de Kaa because Gunther Beyer was getting older and wanted someone to take over ECPS and the EDIB he published. In discussing the issue, Dirk was in favour of doing something more than just taking over the Centre. We quickly decided that Europe needed a population association that would breach the gap between East and West. This idea was shared by several other European demographers we contacted, both from the East and West, and eventually EAPS was born. From the beginning, it was decided that EAPS would have no official language. Our paper heading still is in four languages: English, French, German and Russian. These four languages were taken as a (non-random) sample: we couldn't write EAPS on our writing paper in all European languages, for lack of space!"

Also **Caselli** has very good recollections of that period: "in

particular of the presence of the best European demographers, who were still so young then (like me too!). I have a good 'souvenir' of the founders of the Association: Dirk van de Kaa, Nora Federici, Gérard Calot, Guillaume Wunsch, and Charlotte Höhn who I met at a Helsinki meeting in 1979 where we decided to establish a European Demographic Association."

Jóźwiak remembers being very excited becoming a member: "In my opinions and expectations, it opened new perspectives for us, Polish demographers, to enter a European research network. Really, for me it was something very promising. And now →

Overview Council compositions

EAPS Council, 2003 – 2008 (sixth)

- President: Janina Jóźwiak (Poland)
- Vice-President: Nico van Nimwegen (Netherlands)
- Secretary-General / Treasurer: Francesco Billari (Italy)
- Member: François Héran (France)
- Member: Kathleen Kiernan (United Kingdom)
- Executive Secretary: Gijs Beets (Netherlands) (until 2007); Helga de Valk (Netherlands) (from 2007)
- Secretariat: Jeannette van der Aar (Netherlands)

EAPS Council, 1999 – 2003 (fifth)

- President: Guillaume Wunsch (Belgium)
- Vice-President: Janina Jóźwiak (Poland)
- Secretary-General / Treasurer: Nico van Nimwegen (Netherlands)
- Member: Tapani Valkonen (Finland)
- Member: Andrei Volkov (Russia)
- Executive Secretary: Gijs Beets (Netherlands)
- Secretariat: Jeannette van der Aar (Netherlands)

EAPS Council, 1995 – 1999 (fourth)

- President: Graziella Caselli (Italy)
- Vice-President: Tapani Valkonen (Finland)
- Secretary-General / Treasurer: Nico van Nimwegen (Netherlands)
- Member: Janina Jóźwiak (Poland)
- Member: Alexander Avdeev (Russia)
- Executive Secretary: Gijs Beets (Netherlands)
- Secretariat: Vera Holman (Netherlands)

EAPS Council, 1991 – 1995 (third)

- President: Charlotte Höhn (Germany)
- Vice-President: András Klinger (Hungary)
- Secretary-General / Treasurer: Graziella Caselli (Italy)
- Member: Patrick Festy (France) (until 1993)
- Member: Tapani Valkonen (Finland) (from 1994)
- Member: Guillaume Wunsch (Belgium)
- Executive Secretary: Nico van Nimwegen (Netherlands)
- Secretariat: Vera Holman (Netherlands)

EAPS Council, 1987 – 1991 (second)

- President: Gérard Calot (†2001) (France)
- Vice-President: Zdeněk Pavlík (Czechoslovakia)
- Secretary-General / Treasurer: Guillaume Wunsch (Belgium)
- Member: Charlotte Höhn (Germany)
- Member: András Klinger (Hungary)
- Executive Secretary: Nico van Nimwegen (Netherlands)
- Secretariat: Vera Holman (Netherlands)

EAPS Council, 1983 – 1987 (first)

- President: Dirk J. van de Kaa (Netherlands)
- Vice-President: Zdeněk Pavlík (Czechoslovakia)
- Secretary-General / Treasurer: Guillaume Wunsch (Belgium)
- Member: Charlotte Höhn (Germany)
- Member: András Klinger (Hungary)
- Executive Secretary: Nico van Nimwegen (Netherlands)
- Secretariat: Vera Holman (Netherlands)

Publications

Under the auspices of EAPS a journal and book series are published by Springer (formerly Kluwer Academic Publishers) (Dordrecht, Netherlands).

European Journal of Population (EJP)

This peer-reviewed quarterly journal addresses a broad public of researchers, policy makers and others concerned with population processes, their determinants and consequences. Its aim is to improve understanding of population phenomena by giving priority to work that contributes to the development of theory and method, and that spans the boundaries between demography and other disciplines. EAPS members may subscribe to EJP at a special reduced rate.

European Studies of Population (ESPO)

This series aims at disseminating research findings with special relevance for Europe. Its character is multidisciplinary, including formal demographic analyses as well as social, economic and / or historical population studies. Internationally relevant, European comparative, innovative theoretical and methodological as well as policy relevant studies, are particularly aimed at.

→ I know that I was not mistaken in my feelings and premonition. I do not remember when exactly I became a member but I think it was pretty soon after EAPS was established."

First EAPS Council

The composition of the first Council was a delicate one. **Van de Kaa** could have made a long list of criteria and an equally long list of considerations but: "what seemed to me to be decisive for the success of the new Association was that the members of the founding Council could trust each other and were ready to give our joint effort their best shot. As Guillaume Wunsch had already shown great commitment to Beyer and the ECPS it is highly probable that I talked to him about the best 'slate'. In any case, knowing with whom you would be working evidently would be a crucial element in everyone's decision."

Wunsch: "The original slate for the first Council was to a large extent suggested by Dirk van de Kaa. Not only is Dirk a great demographer but he is also a fine diplomat. Our original intention was to put EAPS up

as a regional association under the IUSSP banner. At that time, the IUSSP had no plans for incorporating regional associations and we had to set up EAPS as a separate institution. We kept the door open however: from the beginning, IUSSP and CICRED observers had the right to sit in the Council, though the seat remained free in most if not all Council meetings. I regret that IUSSP and CICRED did not take advantage of this situation. It would probably have stimulated stronger collaboration between EAPS and IUSSP, though both institutions have maintained friendly relations from the beginning."

Van Nimwegen was asked by Dirk van de Kaa to become EAPS' Executive Secretary. "Of course this was a great honour, and in fact one of the most important and decisive events in my professional life. I had no clue what it was all about, but jumped right in, both feet forward. Never did I regret working with and for EAPS. I guess I was among the first official members, as I had to draw up the membership list myself and keep it up to date. In the early days, the entire administration of EAPS fitted in one of the drawers of my desk at NIDI and for a long time I knew all the members' names. What became very clear from the onset, was that the Council worked in a very friendly, co-operative way; these people knew what they were talking about, respected each other and had collaborated on many other occasions too. And instead of being aloof and distant, they were open and very hospitable to their very inexperienced and junior secretary."

Höhn: "The first Council in particular was a group of friends. We worked hard, but we also had fun. Just look at my picture (see on page 8) taken in the already mentioned Wynstüb in Strasbourg in 1983!"

Did politics come into play at that stage? **Van de Kaa:** "This question deserves a 'yes' and 'no' answer. In many respects politics played no role at all: our Council always discussed population, not politics. Moreover, whatever our private thoughts about political issues, ideologies, or religion, we were careful to keep these to ourselves. There was a tacit understanding that we would do our best to avoid creating a political problem for any of us. In this respect politics did, of course, play a role. The stark reality of Europe at that time

ECPS created in 1953

Not so long ago **Van de Kaa** was rummaging in one of his bookcases when a little booklet tumbled out: "I immediately recognised the colours of the original version of the well-known journal **Population**, but it clearly was much too small to be a regular issue as its measures 19 by 12 centimeters and is not more than 5 millimeters thick. I recalled having seen it before, but did not remember still having it. It was published in 1954 as a **Numéro Spécial** on the occasion of the World Population Conference then held in Rome and provides a list of all the conferences held by a variety of bodies on problems directly or indirectly relating to population. On page 25 that very interesting publication recalls a meeting organised by an Italian committee on **Fédération européenne et le problème de l'équilibre démographique international**, held in Val d'Aoste in October 1952:

"Les 21, 22 et 23 mai 1953, à Paris, l'Institut national d'études démographiques mit en présence, au cours des **Journées d'études européennes sur la population** plus de 50 personnalités scientifiques étrangères. A l'issue de ce congrès fut créé le Centre Européen d'études sur la population."

So, that is how ECPS began! Two photographs accompany this section of the text. One shows Alfred Sauvy addressing the opening session; the other provides an overview of the people attending; I flatter myself by thinking I can distinguish Beyer's forehead, but I don't even know whether he was there. It is not unlikely, however, since Beyer with his professional interest in refugees may well have been a member of the European Association for the study of the refugee problems that regularly held meetings in these years."

was its bi-polar structure and since we wanted to be an all-European association we had to take that into account. It arose especially whenever we discussed practical arrangements regarding meetings, membership fees, and the like. We were very grateful, for example, that our Finnish colleagues had the good sense of inviting us to come to Jyväskylä for EAPS' first general conference, in 1987. Demographers from everywhere in Europe could get permission to travel there, although at great expense. The era of price fighting airlines had not arrived as yet."

Also Wunsch and Van Nimwegen admit that politics came into play. **Wunsch:** "In a sense, yes: we wanted a balanced slate between the various regions of Europe, especially between East and West, but also North and South. I believe the first and successive Councils have corresponded to that ideal. I have also tried to extend the concept of Europe to the Mediterranean region, holding later on for example a seminar in Turkey." **Van Nimwegen:** "Politics always come into play in one form or the other, also in scientific activities; politics were taken into account in EAPS, the Council was aware of politics, but they were not dominant."

The choice to have the EAPS Secretariat in The Hague was obvious. **Van de Kaa:** "Yes, absolutely. Everyone knew the chances of success were pretty slim. In honour of Gunther Beyer we, at NIDI, were prepared to take the risk and to absorb part of the unavoidable expenses. Once the NIDI Board had agreed that EAPS' Secretariat could be run from the Institute, the Council had to appoint its Executive Secretary. Well before that I had talked to Nico van Nimwegen to ascertain his interest in that function. I had the feeling that he might be, and that turned out to be the case. In order to give him an opportunity to see what it might involve my wife and I invited Nico and his wife to join a dinner party at our home where several senior demographers would be present. They appeared to enjoy themselves and I was encouraged to note that, in turn, they had a very favourable press. So, when the question of the

Executive Secretary arose in the Council, I was very happy to see Nico appointed. It has proved to be a very good thing for both EAPS and him."

Wunsch: "Yes, The Hague was an obvious choice as the idea of EAPS stems from Gunther and Dirk in the Netherlands. We were very happy that NIDI took over the secretariat. And it has managed quite well since! All thanks to NIDI."

When setting up EAPS both Wunsch and Van de Kaa did not encounter any specific resistance. **Wunsch:** "We had settled the problem with IUSSP, as said above. Some countries were however initially rather cool. We had few French members at first, because initially the French considered EAPS too English ... though we had no official language and everyone could speak the language (s)he preferred (with the risk of not being well understood, of course). The British also did not massively come in at the beginning; maybe EAPS was too European? The situation improved eventually."

Van de Kaa: "No, I have not met explicit resistance to establish EAPS. At first there may have been reservations within the IUSSP Council. But as I had been a loyal member of that Council for eight years, knew the then president Bill Brass well, and we had invited him as an observer, good co-operation soon replaced the competition for members that some in the Union may have feared. I admit, though, that a few fairly well known demographers have done less for our association than I had hoped. But as the saying goes: 'That's how the cookie crumbles.'"

But it required special efforts to get wide support. **Van de Kaa:** "Getting a clear statement of support sometimes required a little effort. I remember, for example, that at one time I had to invite myself to a luncheon Karl Schwarz and Gérard Calot were going to have in Bad Godesberg. As you can imagine with Schwarz as the host and Calot in fine spirits and an expansive mood, it was a very nice meal and at a beautiful location to boot. But my increasingly less subtle attempts to focus the discussion on EAPS came to naught. When we were putting on our coats I saw no other choice than to block their way saying: 'Thank you for a very enjoyable lunch but you know full well what I came for: will you support me or not?' They laughed, and

then agreed I could go ahead. Given their position as directors of important national institutes that nod was quite essential for the chances of making the initiative a success. Maybe they had just wanted to see me fired up! But at the time I felt that could not quite explain their behaviour. I never tried to find out whether there had been other things on their minds. Sometimes not knowing things makes you function better. Our subsequent contacts were excellent: where necessary we tried to help each other. Both immediately came to The Hague when my minister was developing plans to change NIDI's status and charter. It helped too! Thus, when Gérard Calot became my successor as EAPS' second president, I felt free to welcome that choice without reservation. As everyone has been able to see, Gérard was a very effective and constructive president; we are clearly indebted to him."

Sauvy

Van de Kaa never discussed EAPS with Sauvy: "I had concluded that it was better not to do so. Not that I had an uneasy relation with Sauvy; on the contrary. I recall at least two official occasions when our contact was extremely pleasant. One day when I was chairing the UN Population Commission, Léon Tabah, then the director of the UN Population Division, hurried to me just before we would adjourn for lunch, and said: 'Sauvy is leaving this afternoon. This will have been his last time as the French representative on the Commission. Could you please mark that occasion; he has been such an important colleague?' In the couple of minutes left I quickly jotted down a few notes, asked for the Commission's attention and gave him a nice farewell speech: saying, for example, that flying back on the Concorde typified his youngness of heart. The members gave him a very warm applause and he left the hall bowing to all sides. At the next session he represented France again!

The other occasion was when Sauvy came to The Hague to speak for the Alliance Française. I was invited to introduce him. Gerard Frinking, still at NIDI at the time, made sure my speech was really French. After his lecture Sauvy, together with the Frinkings, came to our place for dinner. He must have enjoyed it too. He invited me to bring the whole family to his summer home in France, but we never made it that far. Several years later I happened to be at INED

for the day, and had lunch in the Institute's rightly famous cafeteria at 27, rue Commandeur, when Sauvy suddenly came in. He smiled broadly, shaking my hand, saying: 'This calls for champagne!' He ordered several bottles and even though the little group I was with had almost finished their lunch, we all joined in and spent the better part of the afternoon chatting and sipping. The recollection alone makes me smile!"



EAPS Honorary President Gérard Calot (1934-2001) addressing the 1999 The Hague EPC

Poor organisation

Van de Kaa explains why EAPS was established as a low budget organisation. "We have always tried to operate on the basis of that principle. We wanted to give all European demographers a good chance to join and to participate in our activities. I must admit, that we also felt we couldn't possibly find a source of income steady and large enough to support a sizeable bureau! For meetings we would, where possible, ride piggyback on some official intergovernmental activity or we, and if appropriate our institutes, would absorb the expenses. On the whole that went very well. Now the situation is, as I understand it, much improved, particularly in comparison with 1983. What I have always found quite funny is that the first two paid up members of EAPS were Americans: Alice and Lincoln Day. In the summer of 1983 they invited my family and me to dinner in their home in Washington DC and when we talked about developments on the European scene they immediately wrote out a check to cover their membership fee!"

Höhn: "The often ignored advantage of being a poor organization is that you have to find colleagues abroad that co-organize and ensure funds to have EAPS meetings. This definitely has strengthened EAPS."

Caselli, Wunsch and Józwiak just accepted EAPS as a relatively poor organisation and continued this deliberate strategy from its beginning. **Caselli:** "Yes, unfortunately I had to continue that strategy." **Wunsch:** "Well, it would have been easier if we had had more money. But we nevertheless managed holding conferences and seminars by shifting the costs to the organisers of these activities. We also got help from the European Union among others, and this enabled the participation from the Socialist countries during the first years of EAPS. And we did set up the European Journal thanks to a commercial publisher." **Józwiak:** "We would prefer to have EAPS wealthier, of course. But as an organisation EAPS always had the possibility to raise money for important activities or events like the EPC, basically via its members. I think it was a conscious strategy from the beginning that EAPS is a low-budget organisation." **Van Nimwegen** adds: "Making money has never been the purpose of EAPS; we are not a financial institution, although we realised from the onset that some money was needed to realise our scientific goals. One of the benefits of being a 'poor' organisation is that you are not being bothered by lots of requests for funding. In fact,

all our activities had to be self-supporting and this stimulates a feeling of ownership among organisers. But, to be honest, we could only function as a low budget organisation (some Treasurers, including me, called it a 'no budget organisation') because of the massive support that we received 'in kind' from some of our supporting institutions, like my own institute NIDI."

European Journal of Population

Was it also part of a deliberate strategy to let EAPS have its own journal?

Van de Kaa: "That EAPS would try to have a journal was never in doubt. A journal is the best way of communicating research findings and ideas. Moreover, we had the example of EDIB. And we found a publisher, prepared to cover some of the editorial expenses, provided the Council could identify the right editors. This implied that a decision about the language, or languages, of publication had to be taken first. On its cover EDIB had its name printed in four languages: French, German, Italian, and English. Given Europe's demographic tradition that was very reasonable, although I don't think that all four languages were regularly used. Even so, publishers always are unhappy about edited volumes or journals in more than one language, and also our publisher was unwilling to go beyond English and French. The Council decided to go ahead on that basis and from the very beginning stipulated that solely the Editorial Committee, which initially was completely Belgian (with Hilary Page, Eric Vilquin and Guillaume Wunsch), could decide on the rejection or acceptance of a paper. As against that price setting was to be, and to remain, the sole responsibility of the publisher."

Wunsch: "Yes, from the start we wanted a journal that would replace Gunther's interesting but rather confidential EDIB. I believe we have succeeded, even if the Journal remains a bit too expensive for many."

Höhn: "EJP started as a meagre, grey duckling. Although the cover is still rather grey and dull EJP developed fine."

Józwiak: "Of course. EJP has always been one of the most important undertakings of EAPS and it is hard not to appreciate its role as a platform for publication and dissemination

of scientific results of European demographers.”

Van Nimwegen: “Yes, the European Journal of Population has always been our flagship publication, and we should try to keep it that way. More members should consider subscribing to this very good journal!”

Is there any evidence that its bi-lingual character has been disadvantageous to the European Journal of Population/Revue Européenne de Démographie (EJP)?

Van de Kaa: “I find that difficult to say. It is evident that the number of papers submitted and published in French has been quite small, while it may have withheld some people or libraries from taking out a subscription. At the same time its message was important and unambiguous: There are several schools of demography influencing the thinking of European demographers and population scientists and EAPS intends to respect that fully. That EJP is one of the 17 out of a total of, I believe, 330 population serials, selected by the Social Science Citation Index as being important for the development of the discipline is no mean achievement. It makes EJP a good venue for all scholars working on Europe’s demography, that is for analysts, empiricist, historians, and theorists alike.”

Caselli: “In reality and for many years already EJP is an English Journal! To go on as younger generations do not read French.”

Wunsch: “As English happens to be presently the language of science, I have always been in favour of an English-only journal. But our French friends preferred adding French too. Actually, relatively few papers have been published in French and the Journal is mostly in English now.”

Van Nimwegen: “No evidence that it has been disadvantageous, but common wisdom is that a bilingual journal does not sell.”

Do you have any advice to the EJP editors to strengthen the journal’s position further?

Van de Kaa: “Now that Population has become available in both French and English I’m sure the Council and the EJP editors will soon come to maybe a new decision. I have frequently wondered whether some sort of joint venture between Population and EJP would not have been possible even though

the obstacles would have been formidable and, at first sight, seem quite forbidding. Let’s now hope there will remain room for both.”

Caselli realises that many young Italian researchers do not often consult and cite EJP: “That has to be changed.”



Current EAPS President Janina Józwiak with Dirk van der Kaa

Wunsch: “EJP is a good-quality journal but it is expensive and slim (in quantity, not in quality!), as it is commercially published. This issue has never been adequately resolved.”

Höhn: “All EJP editors did an excellent job. And yet, I always felt they should approach potential authors, particularly from the East, proactively to submit an article. At several occasions I proposed to offer a workshop ‘How to publish successfully’ at our general conferences (as PAA also regularly does).”

Józwiak: “We had a lot of discussion in the Council on EJP and have always been very happy with the quality of the Editors’ job. We should be very grateful to all of them for their commitment and the work they did.”

Van Nimwegen’s advice is to focus more on special issues.

EAPS working language

Once in a while the issue of an official EAPS working language comes up. How did you deal with that issue?

Van de Kaa: “In all European settings the language question is a thorny one. Even, I take it, if one has the almost unlimited funds of the enlarged European Union at one’s disposal: Imagine having to deal with more than twenty! For a low budget association as EAPS the prospects of having several statutory working languages to deal with almost drove us mad. And for a while at least we were not imaginative enough to solve it. We kept thinking of the statutes of other bodies, the practices of the UN, and so on. Finally it dawned upon us, that it would be most sensible not to have an official working language at all, but to follow the simple adagio that we would always make a deliberate effort to make it possible to understand one another. After all, that was the whole purpose of having meetings. As Guillaume Wunsch used to say: let’s leave it to the organisers and participants what languages they want to use at a particular meeting. After we reached that sensible conclusion, meetings taking place under EAPS’ auspices were conducted in the language(s) the organisers preferred and could afford. Thus, there was regional variation while on several occasions, and most notably during the General Conferences, simultaneous translation was available for part of the sessions. But I have also seen members whispering translations into a colleague’s ear. That really symbolises the right spirit for our otherwise terribly fragmented continent.”

Höhn: “You cannot understand each other if everybody speaks a different language. At Council meetings we always

spoke English, at Conferences English plus the native language if interpretation could be paid.”

Caselli judged that during her Presidency “English was already the main working language.”

Wunsch: “Yes the issue showed up, but we always stuck to our creed: no official language, but working languages of course i.e. English mainly. If money was available for interpretation from other languages (for example Russian), that was of course fine.”

Van Nimwegen: “We always had a very simple policy in EAPS regarding language: EAPS does NOT have an official language, only working languages, which may vary from event to event. My guess would be that this has always been a very wise policy, and one that actually works! So let’s keep it, would be my advice.”

Strengthening aims during Presidency

What did you do to strengthen EAPS’s position during your Presidency?

Höhn: “It was a lucky coincidence that the Iron Curtain was just down at the beginning of my Presidency. Finally, really many colleagues from Central and Eastern Europe became members and came to our conferences. We naïve Westerners learned that before that time many were simply not allowed to travel to the West. I had the privilege to welcome and integrate our new members.”

Caselli: “During my Presidency we decided to have the European Population Conference every two years. Further, we had a (successful) policy to increase the number of memberships.”

Wunsch: “I will focus instead on the first Council when I was Secretary-General. Taking into account the political context at that time, my main aim as SG was to bridge the East-West divide in Europe (at our small modest level, of course). We did this thanks to the important participation of many demographers from the East, and also by obtaining funds so that the ‘Easterners’ could more easily attend our meetings, as travel money was hardly available to them from their own country. When I was elected President, years later, the ‘Iron Curtain’ had become history.”

Van Nimwegen: “Speaking as the Executive Secretary of those

early days, my main task was to get EAPS organised and to help transferring all those ideas for this new organisation into practice: to facilitate and to serve (although this sounds a bit over the top). In the various positions I was so lucky to hold in EAPS in its 25 year of existence, this has always been my purpose. And to have fun, of course, and feel privileged to work up close with so many great demographers.”

Jóźwiak: “Two Council decisions have been most important in strengthening EAPS: organising the European Population Conferences every two years and establishing the European Doctoral School in Demography (EDSD) under EAPS auspices. The first means that increasingly more people are involved in activities aimed at exchanging research results and creating international networks of cooperation. The EDSD means a great opportunity for offering high quality education in Demography and preparing young people to pursue top quality research in population issues. Of course, the School is organised by several institutions (MPIDR, NIDI, INED, La Sapienza, Universities of Amsterdam, Groningen, Rostock and Lund), but EAPS came with the idea.”

Scientific coverage

Is there any field of research that is not yet covered (enough) and should be so in the future?

Caselli: “Bio-demography, population and environment.”

Wunsch: “I suppose there are many. Presently lacking for example, is a Working Group on internal (not international) migration. We should also deal more with current problems related to population like global warming, the environment, the availability of food, regional and national conflicts, ...”

Van Nimwegen: “Science, also population science, is dynamic, so there are always (new) topics that are not covered. Every new Council should take a good look at this, and actually does, in my experience. I don’t think that we systematically and consistently missed out on some topics.”

Next to EAPS there is the European Society for Population Economics (ESPE). Are you in favour of both organisations continuing to operate more or less independently or would you prefer closer co-operation, for example by merging the conferences, or maybe even a complete merge?

Höhn: “No. ESPE is a rather aloof organization. Their conferences and journal are very expensive. I think we should attract more population economists as EAPS members instead.”

Caselli: “I prefer that both organisations continue to operate independently. However future conferences could be organised in collaboration with this Society or with other European Scientific Societies.”



Nico van Nimwegen: Mr. EAPS?

Wunsch: “I am not sure economics is really a ... science. Therefore, the collaboration with ESPE would be / is difficult.”

Jóźwiak: “I would be in favour of closer scientific cooperation, like e.g. common conferences, but both organisations should operate separately since both give added value to scientific life in Europe.”

Van Nimwegen: “We have tried on several occasions to collaborate more closely, but in vain. If this is a reality, so be it. Some of my best friends and colleagues are or have been in ESPE, and tell me that ESPE is a fine organisation too. Perhaps, one day?”

Should demographers have more influence in ‘Brussels’?

Demography is playing an increasingly more important role almost everywhere in current and future European societies. Politicians are inclined ‘to change demographic regimes’, as they fear population ageing, low fertility, ethno-cultural immigrant groups, etc. Do you agree with me that we should have more influence ‘in Brussels’ but at the same time abstain from too much involvement in the actual policymaking? How can we make these two things compatible?

Wunsch: “A difficult question! Scientists and politicians live on different planets. Look for example how long it took to have the beginning of a political response to global warming. To be active in the field, a demographer can become a politician, but that is only one solution. The dissemination of good scientific information, including the possible consequences of different policies, probably remains the best tactic, but we have in many cases to improve our communication skills.”

Höhn: “The EU only recently put population issues on their agenda. We should use this momentum to receive financial support from Brussels. Our task, however, is to remain good policy-advisers and to involve policy-makers in round-tables.”

Caselli: “Confusion reigns particularly where demographic issues ask for the introduction of population policies to try to achieve a new equilibrium. The temptation for demographers to act as politicians is often very strong. As well as the tendency to ignore events because of fears to get involved too much. Not wishing to provoke discussions, I say without fear of contradiction, that one of the main tasks for demographers is to observe trends underway, by observing all aspects involved and by analysing the inherent features and trends. To play an active role, not just in the scientific domain but

also among those that make and decide on economic and social policies.”

Jóźwiak: “I believe that it’s possible to combine the two things. A precondition however is that we as much as possible confine ourselves to provide objective analysis of demographic or, more generally, population issues. As scientists we shouldn’t be involved too much in current political or ‘ideological’ discussions. On the other hand our voice in important questions should be heard ‘in Brussels’.”

Van Nimwegen: “Indeed the current political tide seems to be more in favour of demography, but we all know that this may rapidly change. My view is that, as an association, EAPS should always steer away from involvement in policy issues in the sense that policy advice of one type or the other is provided. We should promote the study of population, as it is written in our statutes, and provide a platform for scientific debate and interactions of scientists and policymakers. I am not sure whether we should have more influence in ‘Brussels’ or any other capital; we want scientific prestige; politicians and policymakers should be properly informed which is our role, the role of a scientific association; and then they should act, design policies, take decisions or whatever else politicians like to do; that is their turf, and scientists are well advised to stay away from that. Once you start confusing and mixing the roles of scientist and politician, you are entering dangerous waters. As an individual you may wish to venture here (although I personally would warn against it), but as an association, uniting scientists with widely varying (also political) views, this is a no-go area in my view.”

What are the best things you did for EAPS?

Van de Kaa: “One of the best things I ever did for EAPS was to insist that the President’s term would be limited to one four year term at most and later on, to refuse to consider breaking that rule in order to be able to serve another term. It would have been an unforgivable error of judgment, and quite disastrous for the growth and standing of the organisation, if I had not recognised that statutory provision as a crucial success factor. And then I come to the best thing EAPS has done. In my view the best thing is that EAPS has steered clear of the temptation of trying to offer countries

specific policy recommendations or advice. While the study of policies and their effectiveness is a legitimate research topic and demographers clearly have a task in studying likely population developments and their impact, as a professional organisation EAPS should leave the actual policymaking to those officially responsible for it in their country or, as the case may be, to an intergovernmental body."

Caselli: "The best thing that I ever did for EAPS was the decision to have conferences every two years."

Wunsch: "For me the best thing I was involved in was to improve the East-West collaboration during the 'Iron Curtain' period."

Jóźwiak: "For me personally it was a great experience: the feeling that you can do something important for other people, for the whole community, is worth of spending your time. And I really appreciate the friendly atmosphere and open discussions in the Council. I am convinced that we managed to keep and perhaps to increase the visibility of EAPS among demographers in Europe and its role in discussion on important research problems in the domain of population studies. A very good thing that EAPS has brought is the integration of the demographic research community in Europe, and bridging East and West in the 'old bad times', i.e. destroying the 'Iron Curtain in science'. However, it's difficult to assess your own activities. If I have to choose: for me the two best things are participation in establishing the European Doctoral School of Demography and the EPC2003 in Warsaw."

Van Nimwegen: "The best EAPS did is that we managed to bring European population scientists from all corners of Europe together, and include so may colleagues from outside Europe as well!"

Is there anything you regret?

Van de Kaa: "Yes, certainly. I should have danced more! But, seriously, I probably made a mistake when I insisted that EAPS' statutes should provide for the election of its officials by postal ballot only. I was afraid that we would always have a very skewed distribution of members present at our General Conferences, independent as to whether the meeting would take place to the East or the West of the 'Iron Curtain'. Thus it seemed reasonable to make arrangements that would enable all members to take part in

the vote. However, I had not foreseen its most awkward consequence: that provision would make it impossible, even in cases where there was only one candidate for each position, to declare the candidates elected by acclamation. No wonder, a later Council changed that strict provision. But in general I feel that there is not much to regret. The Councils did a fine job and adapted smoothly to rapidly changing circumstances."



EAPS Honorary President Charlotte Höhn

Caselli: "No, regrets do not come to my mind right now."

Wunsch: "Yes, the slow speed of pushing forward the frontiers of Europe and establishing more contacts with its neighbours, e.g. with population experts in Turkey, Iran, the Caucasus, and possibly Central Asia. We still have a lot to do here, also because we learned that increasing collaboration and especially the friendship among European demographers has been such a rewarding thing to do. And a completely other thing: we have been doing a bad job in trying to raise funds for EAPS!"

Van Nimwegen: "No, no real regrets. I can make a list of things that could have been done better, but it all depends on the perspective that you take, and also the historical context. Look at finance for instance: I always promoted and supported, also as Treasurer, a lenient policy to members who did not pay their membership fees (out of forgetfulness, negligence, economic hardship or whatever other reason); this was not very wise from an economic perspective, although we always managed to avoid bankruptcy! I still tend to be lenient, although I know that this may come at the expense of those members who do pay their fees. I agree that we now can be stricter, also since fortunately economic conditions, also in the Central and Eastern parts of Europe are improving; and of course EAPS is much more visible now, so members do not have an excuse to forget to pay their dues!"

Any final advice or remark?

Van de Kaa: "No, no Gijs, I have nothing to say about such topics. EAPS has an Advisory Board that comprises virtually all demographers in a responsible management position on our continent; they will give the Council all the advice needed. Moreover, while giving unsolicited and very public policy advice from the sideline may have a distinct role in national politics when you are after someone's scalp. EAPS' Honorary Presidents have a very simple task. They are there to do what the Council, or the President, asks them to do, and to do that as best they can for as long as they can. But may be I should use this opportunity to say that what EAPS has achieved so far, is basically due to the untiring efforts of an unselfish

group of people who felt that all European demographers would benefit from having an open, stimulating professional body. I'm thinking here of the successive Presidents and Councils, the members of the Advisory Board, the various editors, the chairs of Working Groups, the members of the Secretariat, the organisers of conferences and sessions, the authors of papers, and even the young students hesitantly seeking their way in the European demographic community. I hope that what they will receive in return will parallel my personal experience: professional inspiration, many rewarding discussions with contemporary colleagues, many pleasant hours of dancing, drinks, and witty conversation and, most importantly, a number of life-long friendships."

Höhn: "I wished more institutional members, not always the same, engage in organising and sponsoring workshop meetings, seminars, or the huge task to host a Conference. And finally a sincere wish: May EAPS flourish, and happy 25th anniversary to you!"

Caselli: "As said already I would really like to see that future conferences are organised in collaboration with the European Society for Population Economics (ESPE) or with other European Scientific Societies."

Wunsch: "Well, a few things. There should be more competition in the election to the Council. Just having one sole slate with one person per post reminds me of the USSR, not my favourite! But more important is that EAPS should remain a scientific organisation stressing good research and teaching (the **European doctoral program** is a very fine example of the latter). Foremost however, it should be an NGO fostering better international relations in our field. And finally, we too cannot escape the questions: What is Europe? What are its borders? Who is an European and who is not? We must remain flexible and open in these issues."

Jóźwiak: "I just want to wish a lot of success and positive energy to next Councils and next generations of 'EAPS people' (which I consider a very special category)."

Van Nimwegen: "It has always been and still is a fantastic pleasure to work with EAPS. I hope to be able to continue this, in whatever capacity, for a long time to come!"

Interviewer and Editor: Gijs Beets
EAPS, P.O. Box 11676
2502 AR The Hague
Netherlands
Phone: +31 (0)70 3565200
Fax: +31 (0)70 3647187
E-mail: contact@eaps.nl
Internet: <http://www.eaps.nl>
Photography: Wim de Jonge