

Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) Research Reports Online is an ongoing publication of the RAC under the general direction of James Allen Smith, Vice President and Director of Research and Education. This series of reports is intended to show the richness of the RAC's archival holdings and to foster scholarly networks in the diverse fields of research conducted here.

Research Reports are submitted by all RAC grant recipients and many others who have done research at the Archive Center. They are presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's express consent. The ideas and opinions expressed in these reports are those of the author and not of the Rockefeller Archive Center.

Note: Draft paper not to be cited or quoted

Population Control, Foundations and Development of Demographic Research Centres in Maharashtra (India): 1950-1970.

Daksha Parmar, PhD Scholar, CSMCH-JNU

In the early 1950s, the question of poverty was causally linked to India's growing population in the works of many US based demographers (Davis, 1951). The inflow of funds through the foundations for population control and for demography as a discipline substantially strengthened this understanding. During this period, number of demographic research centres were also established in India with the infusion of massive funds from the Rockefeller Foundation(RF),the Population Council(PC) and the Ford Foundation(FF)(Caldwell and Caldwell, 1986). The research emanating from this centres considered population growth as the single most important cause for the low economic development of India(Bhende, etal 1976). There was also a growing realisation among the policy makers, government officials and the middle class elites, that India rapid population growth was leading to increased poverty. Thus, the findings from the demographic studies produced a 'consensus' that India was facing an impending 'crisis' with the uncontrolled growth of population(Bose, 1970). It is in this context, that the paper aims to explore the role of the foundations in the development of the demographic research centres in India, with a focus on the state of Maharashtra. It also examines how the discourse generated from these centres increasingly began to shape the population policy of India. Finally, it tries to understand how the setting up of the demographic research centres in India enabled the foundations to collaborate with the elites in the Indian society in limiting the growing population. In short, the paper attempts to explore how the discourse generated by

foundations, in association with the regional demographic centre's interacts with the national discourse and finally how it unfolds in the local context.

The paper is divided in three sections. The first section briefly sets the background for understanding the need for establishment of the centres, the second section examines in details the records related to the three centres established in Maharashtra, followed by a conclusion. The paper focuses on three different types of demographic research centres established during the decade of 1950s in Maharashtra. This include the demographic section at the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics(GIPE)-1951, Poona the United Nations Demographic Training and Research Centre(UN-DTRC)-1956, Bombay and the Program of Demography at the Department of Economics, University of Bombay-1958. The three centres were established by the funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Population Council, with different visions and purpose. My interest in focussing on these centres is guided by exploring how they advocated and developed a particular kind of approach to the question of population in India. Though the focus of my study is the state of Maharashtra, I constantly refer to the implications the centre had on the demographic research in India. This is because the UN-DTRC, which was set up in Bombay was an 'international centre' catering to the needs of countries in the Economic Commission for Asia and Far East region including India. As a part of my PhD research, I received the grant-in-aid from the Rockefeller Foundation. I visited the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) in May-June, 2013 and spent around three weeks at the Center. At the RAC, I came across extremely useful and important archival records related to the demographic research centres established in Maharashtra. The collection of records of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF), the Population Council (PC) and the Ford Foundation (FF) from the period 1950-1970, provided critical insights and discussions on the need for demographic research. While there is tremendous volume of archives at the RAC, this paper is based on some of the important points, themes and findings emerging from the archival records. There was a predominance of the archives related to the UN-DTRC at the RAC and this is reflected also in the paper

Background: Need for Demographic Research Centres

This section very briefly discusses the context in which the need for the demographic centres emerged. In the late 1940s concerned with Cold War anxieties, American demographers primarily those based at the Office of Population Research(OPR), Princeton University

altered the classic theory of demographic transition which held that fertility declines as a result of the effects of overall development, i.e fertility was a dependent variable and development in terms of modernisation, industrialisation and urbanisation was independent variable(Furedi,1997). Frank Notestein and Kingsley Davis in order to provide immediate solution to the problem of population growth in the non-industrialised countries, reformulated theory and argued that in the non-industrialised countries high fertility was itself impeding economic development. This justified direct intervention in bringing about a fertility reduction. Hodgson(1983) argues that during this period the discipline of demography was becoming more and more policy oriented, leaving its social scientific approach in understanding the demographic phenomenon. Thus, for many demographers the theory of demographic transition was increasingly being transformed into a policy prescription. Scholars like Dennis Hodgson(1983), Simon Szreter(1993), John Sharpless(1997) and Susan Greenhalgh(1996) argues that the demographers at the OPR believed that population growth in non-industrialised countries will lead to severe resource shortage, economic catastrophe and political instability the conditions favourable to the development of communism. After, the fall of China, to Communism in 1949, India was seen as the next destination as it was precariously divided between Hindus and Muslims.

Having convinced the governments of the under-developed countries about the need for direct intervention of fertility reduction, the foundations and the demographers were looking out for a market for their ideas. By this time, India had already declared its official family planning programme was actively seeking advice from the foundations in the development of the FPP(Connelly, 2008). This led to a strong demand for both population experts and also the increasing need for demographic research. Thus, the foundations and the demographers were able to form an alliance with the elite policy makers in India This linkage between the US foundations and the elites in the Indian society becomes extremely important with the setting up of the demographic research centres. While providing a critique of the family planning programme in India, Rao(2004), argues that it is impossible to study India's FPP without discussing the role of international actors particularly from the United States who primarily set the stage with varied agendas during the early 1950s. He further states that Malthusian and Neo-Malthusian ideas have historically shaped the population policy in India. This approach is also very pervasive and most appealing amongst the elite policy makers in the Indian society. Rao(2004) notes that it is the infusion of huge amount of funds over the

past one century by the population control establishments that has led to the domination of neo-Malthusian understanding of the population issue. It is in this context that we will understand the need for setting up of the demographic research centres in India. Before this we will briefly discuss the how population studies centres developed in the US as this had remarkable influence in shaping the development of these centres in India.

The Ford Foundation was largely involved in the development and funding of population studies centres in America. The Population Council supported the demographic research centres in countries like India and Chile (Mass, 1974). The most powerful centre of population studies in the US, the Office of Population Research centre at the Princeton University, which was heavily funded by the Rockefeller Foundation was known as the 'sanctuary for eugenic demographers' and Kingsley Davis, Frank Notestien, Dudley Kirk and Frank Lorimer worked here (Gordon, 1976). The fellowship programme of the PC since the early 1950s enabled individuals from India to spend a year or two at the Office of Population Research and over here they were oriented to the demographic transition theory and to the crisis of population by influential demographers like Frank Notestein. The PC fellows would then return home and head the demographic research centres established in India. This led to the process of what Sharpless (1997) calls the 'institutionalisation of demography' that determined how the 'population problems' were to be defined and solved. Further, in 1955 Government of India, invited Frank Notestein and Leona Baumgartner on a mission to India advise the Ministry of Health on family planning. In the report they submitted to the government titled 'Suggestion for a Practical Program of Family Planning and Child Care' they advocated that India needs several centres that are able to undertake advanced training and research in demography (Caldwell and Caldwell, 1986). This led to the setting up of several demographic centres in India with the financial assistance provided by the PC. While focussing on three different centres of demographic research, I plan to highlight some important episodes and process in the development of these centres in Maharashtra and in India.

Demographic Section in the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics (GIPE): 1951.

The demographic section at GIPE began functioning from 1st October, 1951 with the total grants of \$23,000 provided by the Rockefeller Foundation for a period of five years, till 1956. The main purpose of the grant was to undertake research on demographic issues in the

Poona region. In May, 1951 Dr D.R Gadgil, Director of the GIPE attended a lunch meeting in Newyork with the RF officials. At this meeting Roger. F Evans(Assistant Director of the Social Sciences Division at the Rockefeller Foundation, New York) raised a query to Gadgil about the best approach in which Rockefeller Foundation should serve India. Gadgil replied that the best way is to focus, 'regionally', as 'India is too big and diversified with too poor communication, to be served by big centralised projects from the top down.'¹ Gadgil further emphasised that, 'if possible there should be better 'station agents' suited to the Indian scene in various regions. Accordingly, Roger. F. Evans while discussing with Joseph. H. Willits (Director of the Social Sciences Division at the Rockefeller Foundation) about the reasons for recommending the grants to GIPE, makes its clear, how providing grants to GIPE, will ensure continuity of the RF policy and program in India. He urged that 'it is important to have at least some token expression of interest in India, in order to 'keep the door open.'² Further, he highlights that GIPE regards 'population as India's number one problem', and it 'enjoys the confidence of Government', but 'wisely' bases its approach on broad practical studies in rural sociology, 'by first getting the facts', and then 'developing methods and approaches for social workers.'³ In order to establish firm footing of the demographic section, the RF at the request of Dr.Gadgil, also provided fellowship to Mr. N.V Sovani, the assistant to the Director to study in the US the question of Economic Development and Population under Prof. Simon Kuznet. Thus, we can see great interests of the Rockefeller Foundation in development of the demographic research section the GIPE. From the grant provided by the RF, the section of demography, undertook several surveys and KAP studies, that aimed at collecting information regarding the fertility, morbidity, mortality and also the attitudes of population towards family limitation. It was also clear from the archives that the RF was involved in a "special sterilisation study", with the main objective of performing vasectomy operations of men in the Poona region. I will briefly discuss the study as it highlights certain important issues regarding the influence of the foundations and the way in which they formed an alliance with the elites in Maharashtra.

'The Special Sterilisation Study'at Manchar, Poona

¹ Interviews JHW/RFE and D.R Gadgil, 9th May, 1951-Luncheon, Rockefeller Foundation RG.1.2 Series 464S Box 88 Folder 840

² Comments from RFE to JHW 27th April, 1951, Rockefeller Foundation RG.1.2 Series 464S Box 88 Folder 840

³ Ibid.

In 1957 Marshall C. Balfour (Member of International Health Division-The RF based in Delhi) conceived the idea for a sterilisation study. In a letter to Mr.N.V Sovani he enquired about the possibility of a field study of vasectomy as a fertility control measure. Balfour makes it very clear that an 'outside agency might provide funds 'quietly' but should not appear as a promoter'⁴. In his reply, Sovani points out that he 'likes' the idea of a field study of vasectomy as fertility control measure in rural areas. Sovani suggested the Poona Medical Association as the right agency for this purpose as 'his father has considerable influence in the local branch of Poona as well in the regional unit (Maharashtra and Karnataka) of the association' and that he was 'willing to exert it to get them to adopt such a scheme, study, statistical advice, collection of data, analysis and reporting in such measures as may be necessary'.⁵

Balfour informed Sovani to submit a proposal to the PC and not to the RF, as by now the PC with the main objective of undertaking scientific research was established. Dudley Kirk(Director Demographic Section of the PC) informs Balfour and Sovani, that it would be easier for him to recommend a grant for the project to the Board of the PC and its President Dr.Frederick Osborn under the condition that the PC must not be listed as a sponsor of the project.⁶ Dudley Kirk makes it clear that he did not want to see the Council listed in India as a 'direct sponsor of an experiment in male sterilisation being conducted by a medical group.'⁷ Thus, the PC was cautious in not been being labelled as directly involved in the study of medical sterilisation.

It was decided by Dr. Gadgil(Director of GIPE) that the sterilisation study must be headed by Kumudini Dandekar who returned from the US as a PC fellow and was trained under Prof. Frank Notestein at the OPR, Princeton. As the project becomes her responsibility, she changed the titled of the study as 'Investigation of Rural Medical Care and Fertility Control

⁴ Letter from Dr.M.C.Balfour to Mr N.V Sovani. 30th April, 1957- PC AC2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 808 India: GIPE 1957-63 , 1965-66

⁵ Letter from Mr N.V Sovani to Dr MCB, 6th May, 1957- PC AC2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 808 India: GIPE 1957-63 , 1965-66

⁶ Letter from MCB to Mr NVS 10th October, 1957- PC AC2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 808 India: GIPE 1957-63 , 1965-66

⁷ Notes from DK to WPM 4th December, 1957- PC AC2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 808 India: GIPE 1957-63 , 1965-66

by any or All Methods'. Balfour was quite anxious with this and wrote to Mrs Kumudini Dandekar stating, 'I am sure you are aware of our concern that the 'specific object' of the study is to observe the 'practicability of sterilisations', especially of males. 'Thus, we trust that your records and eventual analysis will deal with this aspect'.⁸ There was constant reiteration on the part of Balfour to Kumudini Dandekar about the need to focus on sterilisation and not on the general medical problems. Balfour writes, 'in view of your reference to the hospital services in Manchar, I hope you are 'not swamped' by the problems of general medical care. These are of course important, but I trust the main object of your study is not lost sight of.'⁹ As can be seen Balfour repeatedly points to the urgent need to focus on the project of vasectomy rather than to divert attention to medical problems at the rural health project. The sterilisation study clearly reveals the intentions of the international agencies, in addressing India's population problem by direct intervention through vasectomy to reduce the birth rates.

In September, 1959, Prof. Frank Notestien and Dr. Marshall Balfour visited the demographic section at the GIPE and also Manchar, where the sterilisation study was being carried out. They were deeply satisfied by the developments of the study as it was remarkable influence in policy making to deal with India's population problem¹⁰. For instance, Balfour notes in his diary records during his visit to the GIPE that 'Gadgil is keenly aware of the problem of population pressure and of the need and desire of the Government to reduce births; in fact he seems to look upon 'sterilisation as the quickest and the most effective means'. Kumudini Dandekar has prepared a note for him which he may present to the Planning Commission'¹¹. However, the enthusiasm and the hopes of the officials at the PC at the demographic research section at the GIPE was short-lived, as the study was not able to find the required number of persons who would undergo vasectomy. Thus, Kumudini Dandekar informs Balfour that, 'there was only one case of vasectomy from Manchar proper during September, 1959 to

⁸ Letter from Balfour to Mrs KD 18th September, 1959- Pop Council, Accession 2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 809

⁹ Letter from Balfour to Dr Kumudini Dandekar 27th January, 1959- India: GIPE, Dandekar Kumudini, 1958-66, 1968-76, Pop Council, Accession 2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 809

¹⁰ MCB Diary notes 24th September 1959 Poona - PC AC2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 808 India: GIPE 1957-63 , 1965-66

¹¹ Ibid

March 1960 .i.e a period of seven months. This was of course due to the complications in the conduct of vasectomies. As about 20 people from Manchar have promised that they will get operated upon soon. I am gathering hopes in my Manchar project¹². Thus, the ‘special study of sterilisation’ had failed miserably.

By discussing in detail the correspondence between the officials at the RF, the PC and the demographic section at GIPE, it becomes evident how alliances and networks was developed amongst the medical doctors, administrators, local health associations, the demographers, and the private foundations. The sterilisation project was one of the most ambitious projects of the GIPE supported by the PC to limit fertility. Even though, the study was a failure it had a great influence, because those associated with the study were now involved in working with the Government of Maharashtra and providing advice on the family planning programme of the state¹³.

The United Nations Demographic Training and Research Centre (UN-DTRC): 1956

This centre was established at Bombay with the joint sponsorship of the United Nations and the PC in partnership with the Government of India. The centre is now known as the International Institute of Population Sciences (IIPS). The centre the first of its kind was established as a regional centre catering to the demographic needs of the ECAFE region, however, for the purpose of the present paper, I will focus on its contribution in India. While attempting to understand the role of foundations in the development of this centre, I also argue that the various activities initiated at the DTRC were aimed at intensifying the consensus on over-population in India.¹⁴ Thus, the archival records will attempt to understand how it was possible to consolidate the consensus on the population growth in India.

In November-December, 1955 the United Nations Seminar on Population and the Far East took place at Bandung. In a paper presented by the Population Branch it was envisaged that

¹² Letter from Mrs KD to MCB 24th May, 1960- India: GIPE, Dandekar Kumudini, 1958-66, 1968-76, Pop Council, Accession 2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 809

¹³ Dr.Kumudini Dandekar was assisting the Government of Maharashtra on the Committee on Vasectomy Camps.- Letter from Mrs KD to MCB 24th May, 1960- India: GIPE, Dandekar Kumudini, 1958-66, 1968-76, Pop Council, Accession 2 Foreign Correspondence Box 85 Folder 809

¹⁴ The findings from the Census and subsequent studies based on census such as those of P.K Wattal(1916), resulted in the growing consensus that India was over-populated and increased population growth was a major cause of poverty.

there is a need for a Proposed Regional Centre for Demographic Research and Training, which will be set up with the cooperation of the UNs. The sponsors of the centre would include the UN, the host institution and the government of the host country where the centre would be located. The time was ripe for India as it had recently announced its national family programme and needed such an institute. Further, the GoI in collaboration with the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust had made a provisional decision to found such a centre. The PC was also ever ready to inject funds quickly as part of the international component. This led to the setting up of the UN-DTRC in 1956 at Bombay (Caldwell and Caldwell, 1986). As per the agreement, the funds for the centre were provided equally by the UN and the PC. Thus, with the support of United Nations and a grant of \$1,41,000 from the Population Council. DTRC was set up to train persons in demography from countries Asia and Far East (Connelly, 2008; Williams,2010). The Indian Government apart from providing the physical infrastructure also made substantial contribution in terms of the availability of the Indian staff. The centre now known as the International Institute of Population Sciences(IIPS) has been training Indian nationals for demographic work in the services of national and state governments and carrying out research that is of national interests especially in connection with the implementation of national population policy. The UN had signed an agreement with the Government of India to support the DTRC from 1956 until 1962.¹⁵

Strategies of ‘Consolidating Consensus’ on ‘Crisis of Population Problem’:

Experts at DTRC

The setting up of the DTRC saw the journey of many influential population experts at the centre who were stationed at the centre for a period of six months to one year to lay the foundations of the demographic centre. These experts updated the PC about the most outstanding individuals at the centre who would later be selected as the PC fellow. It was through the experts that the Council was able to monitor the activities of the DTRC. During the initial years of its establishment DTRC had the privileged of having the many experts from US. This included Dr Dorothy Thomas from University of Pennsylvania (1956-57), Mr Parker Mauldin-The Population Council UNTAO Expert 1957-58, Henry Shryock- Bureau of Census-USA UNTAO Expert 1957-58, Dr Margaret Bright-UNTAO 1957-59 and Frank Notestein in 1959. The experts at

¹⁵ Letter from Mr Henry Bloch (United Nations-TAA)and Julia Anderson(Bureau of Social Affairs) to Dudley Kirk and Dr C. Chandrasekaran, 6th April , 1961-Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files Box 111Folder 2058 UNDTTC 1958-62

the DTRC closely monitored the developments at the Centre by submitting half yearly report on the major activities of the DTRC.

Population Council Fellowships:

In the early 1950s, the PC sponsored a number of Indians who in the later years became some of the prestigious demographers that the country had. A number of persons, who were trained in these universities under Prof. Frank Notestien, came back to India and became the heads of the demographic research centres established with the funds and grants from PC and RF. For example Dr Pravin Visaria, who studied at Princeton, was head at the Program of Demography in the Department of Economics, Bombay University. Similarly, Dr Kumudini Dandekar who was the student of Prof. Notestein, at the Office of Population Research, Princeton came back to head the sterilisation study conducted by the Demographic section of GIPE.

Thus, the foundations were helping in creating a generation of experts who then become the advisors to the government officials in India. It was through the fellowships programme that the Indian scholars were trained to view fertility as variable which can be controlled by contraceptive technology (Rao, 2004). It is also important to note that the fellowship programmes of the PC enabled India to have a group of 'population experts' with a core body of knowledge, who shared a common set of assumptions about the working of the population dynamics and what intervention was to be undertaken. This led to a consistency in methodology, analysis and language by which group of scholars either in US or India worked towards highlighting the urgency of the demographic transition and the need to undertake direct intervention in fertility reduction.

Research at DTRC-Linkages with Family Planning Programmes

Within a period of three years of its establishment in 1959, the officials at the PC began emphasising the new Director, Prof. C Chandrasekaran, of the need to specifically focus actions on the question of the family planning. In a letter to the Director, Mauldin writes

‘There has been very small amount of time devoted to experiments in family planning. There has been virtually no attention devoted to the major practical problems of the control of fertility, namely problems of communication and motivation. It would be desirable to be concerned with this area as well as with the teaching of demographic

skills. I think that it would be unfortunate if we were to rely upon other groups to become interested in and contribute to the solution of some of the problems with which we are concerned'.¹⁶

This shift in the approach of PC on the urgency to deal with the questions of family planning can also be seen from the fact that there was change in the Health Minister, at the Centre. In a memo to the PC officials, Dorothy Thomas the expert at the DTRC informed that the new Health Minister Mr. Karmarkar was 'for' family planning¹⁷. The main research studies to be undertaken by the DTRC from 1959 was on fertility and family planning, studies on internal migration and urbanisation, assessment of the quality of census data, studies of demographic problems of economic development.¹⁸

In 1959 Dr C. Chandrasekaran while working out comprehensive plans for research at the DTRC, wrote to Col B.L Raina, informing how officials at the DTRC were 'motivated by the feeling that one of the important aims of the centre should be to provide the administration with information which would assist them in their effort to spread rapidly family planning practice all over the country'¹⁹. This clearly shows how demography was increasingly becoming a policy science and shedding its social scientific approach. It is quite interesting to note that there are no discussions on the development of public health infrastructure to deliver the family planning.

Over the years, DTRC increasingly became a meeting point for experts and leading demographers from US and India to discuss questions about population control and family planning. The proposals for projects to be undertaken at the DTRC were being drafted in consultation with the officials from the UN, the PC and the FF. DTRC was able to quickly 'assemble a body of foreign and Indian personnel' who can mutually assist in carrying out the

¹⁶ Letter from Dr W.P Mauldin to Dr C.Chandrasekaran, 28th October, 1959(Personal) Population Council Accession 1 Series2 Grant Files Box 45 Folder 633, UNDTRC Expenses, 1959-64

¹⁷ Memo of Conversation with Dorothy Thomas, from Dudley Kirk to Fredrick Osborn, 15th October, 1957,Population Council Accession 1 Series 1 Box 41 Folder 587 UNDTRC Dorothy Thomas 1957-58 , IV3B4.2

¹⁸ A note on the DTRC for Asia and the Far East, Bombay, , Population Council Accession 1 Series2 Grant Files Box 45 Folder 633, UNDTRC Expenses, 1959-64

¹⁹ Letter from Dr Chandrasekaran to Col. Raina 4th September, 1959, Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 organisation files Box 111 Folder 2065-UNDTRC Chandrasekaran C IV3B4.5

program of the proposal.²⁰ Donald Bogue (Prof. of Sociology, University of Chicago) who was the UN expert at DTRC, describes DTRC as having certain 'unique resources and potentialities which make it a favourable site for major experimental and pilot research' i.e professional staff experienced in scientific research, group of trained research assistants and advanced students. Apart from close collaborative ties with the UN, PC and the FF, DTRC was also able to establish close 'alliance' with other organisations in the region which were interested in family planning such as the FPAI, the Family Planning Training Centre, the Ministry of Health of Maharashtra and Gujarat and the Cancer Research Centre, Bombay. DTRC also had an already established working relationship with the family planning in India, whereby the research information is 'fed' into official sources.

Apart from this, a large number of projects undertaken by the DTRC were sample surveys to estimate the demographic trends such as population growth rates. They also included studies to understand the attitudes towards contraceptives practices. Census studies constituted another category of research projects. Thus, there was continuous interaction between the experts located at the DTRC and the officials at the various funding agencies with the government officials and policy makers in India. It was in this way, the PC was very successful in producing a strong conviction among the policy makers in India, about the need to work in the field of family planning. The DTRC was increasingly seen as a place which was in a position to recommend to the official's about the necessary policy actions to be undertaken to deal with the question of population control through family planning.

Influence of Coale and Hoover study on DTRC

The Coale and Hoover (1958) demonstrated that rapid reductions of fertility in developing countries like India and Mexico could contribute to higher rates of saving, investment and capital formation. They argued that national expenditures which would otherwise be spent on consumption purposes in case of large population, could be diverted to investment when fertility declines earlier and more rapidly. This influential work was distributed as a

²⁰ A five year project proposal on family planning communications, action and research program-DTRC, 20th July, 1960, , Population Council Accession 1 Series2 Grant Files Box 45 Folder 633, UNDTTC Expenses, 1959-64

complimentary copy by the PC to all the important government offices especially to the agricultural institutions all over India²¹. The Coale and Hoover study had a profound influence in the shaping of demographic research at the DTRC and was highly appealing to the Director of the DTRC. Donald Bogue, writes to the officials at the PC about the remarkable influence the work of Coale and Hoover had in India. Bogue states that:

‘Some very powerful planners who will be helping allocate research funds for the Third Five Year Plan would like to see more of this type of thinking and analysis going on in Asia’. The Director of DTRC Chandra thinks, empirical research needed to extend this line of work will get started only if research demographers and research economists get together and he thinks the ‘centre’ is probably ‘the best place’ in India. He wants a good economist as a UN expert as soon as possible. To express Chandra’s ideas in his own words ‘he wants to get the seeds sown and by a good man so that the plant can take root and grow.’²²

Hodgson states that the findings of the Coale and Hoover study were responsible for adoption of anti-natalist policies and birth control programs in many non-industrialised countries (Hodgson, 1983:26).

Teaching of Demography at DTRC

The teaching of demography was the prime responsibility of the experts from abroad. The Indian staff was suppose to take papers related to statistics and economics but not demography. The DTRC in Bombay was established completely on the American model of population studies centres. This becomes evident when Prof. Donald Bogue suggesting Prof. David Sills who was to be the next expert at DTRC. Bogue writes, ‘the first obligation is to make sure that those students get just as much as top quality training as if they had come to Chicago, Columbia or Harvard. I and Badry thought that we gave it more efforts than we would have at home’.²³ Further, it also becomes clear from the archives that in initial years

²¹ Letter from M.C.Balfour to Dr. L.R Allen(RF, New Delhi) 11th October, 1958- PC Series 1 Grant Files Nox 27 Folder 405

²² Letter from Donald Bogue to John Durand, Frank Notestien, Dudley Kirk and W. Mauldin 4th November, 1959 , Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files Box 111 Folder 2061-Donald Bogue, 1958-65

²³Letter from Donald Bogue to Dudley Kirk and W Parker, 13th August, 1960- Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files Box 111 Folder 2061-Donald Bogue, 1958-65

of establishing the Centre 'Notestein had also proposed that the Office at Princeton should enter in a sponsoring arrangement.'²⁴ Though this idea did not materialised, we see a tremendous influence of the officials at the Office of Population Research Princeton, in setting the pace of development at the Centre.

Seminars:

Often seminars were held at the DTRC to present the findings of the study to the government officials, policy makers and to the representatives of the foundations. It was also seen as a mechanism through which the DTRC would gain some visibility as some well-known professionals might attend the Seminar. Often the idea for organising the Seminar at the DTRC would come from the officials at the PC. DTRC organised a regional seminar on Evaluation and Utilisation of Population Census Results in Asia and Far East from 20th June to 8th July, 1960 with the sponsorship of UN and Government of India²⁵.

The speech of Notestein at the seminar was very appealing and it emphasised on the need to have a group of trained individuals who can advice and suggest the policy makers. He urged that it is the 'obligation of the scientist to make the issues of policy clear atleast to the educated and articulate public whose support is essential for their effective implementation. It is important to have highly competent scientists who are sufficiently free from bureaucratic and administrative control to be able to seek answers to their own questions and those asked by the administrators.'²⁶

Indian Staff at the DTRC:

It is quite interesting to study the profile of the major Indian staff at the DTRC. The linkages of the staff to the US and the enormous influence of the funding agencies in the training and recruitment of DTRC staff are clearly visible. For instance, the first Director of the DTRC, Dr. K.C.K.E Raja was not a demographer by profession. Thus, in order to improve his

²⁴ Personal Letter from Frank Notestien to Dr David Sills at DTRC 21st November, 1960- Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files Box 112 Folder 2071

²⁵ Letter from John Durand to Frank Notestien, 12th February, 1960-Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files Box 111 Folder 2064-UNDTRC Bombay Seminar

²⁶ Studies relevant to the formulation and implementation of social and economic policies-Draft presented by Frank Notestien at the Seminar on Evaluation and Utilisation of Population Census Results in Asia and Far East from 20th June to 8th July, 1960- Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files Box 111 Folder 2064-UNDTRC Bombay Seminar

demographic skills and also to ensure effective development of the DTRC in its initial years of establishment, PC provided grant to Dr. Raja to contact centres for training and research in Demography at several Universities in Europe, USA and Japan. This trip of Dr Raja was also aimed at developing active collaboration with the experts for the development DTRC. Dr Raja visited University of Princeton, Philadelphia and Washington, where he talked about the need for development of the Centre, the population problem of India and the Family Planning Programme by Government of India.²⁷ The entire plan of itinerary for the visit to USA was planned by the Population Council officials. The schedule of Rajas trip was decided by Dr Notestein and Dudley Kirk in consultation with Dr M.C Balfour²⁸. Notestein wrote to Dr Raja that 'by all means' he should meet Kingsley Davis²⁹. Apart from visiting various demographers in universities, Dr Raja was also suppose to meet leading American Demographers and experts in the field of eugenics and human genetics.

Dr Chandrasekaran had a doctorate degree in Statistics from University of London. He also studied at the School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University as a Rockefeller Foundation Fellow. While he was on that fellowship Notestein recruited him for the Population Branch of the United Nation. From 1959-65 he was the Director of DTRC.

Mrs Asha Bhende underwent training at California on a Ford Foundation Fellowship in Family Planning Communication Research. She had a Master degree in Public Health degree. She was recruited as a health educator for the Family Planning and Communications Research Project at DTRC. Dr P.N.Singh had a PhD degree specialising in Industrial and Social Psychology from Ohio State University and worked as a co-ordinator to the project on Family Planning and Communication Research.³⁰ Zachariah and Ramachandran were the PC

²⁷ Note on discussion held on 16th November, 1956 with Dr K.C.K.E Raja(DTRC) Population Council Accession 1 Series 1 General Files Box 15 Folder 234 Grants Authorized UNDTTC-1956-57

²⁸ Letter from Frank Notestein to Dr Raja July 28, 1956 - Population Council Accession 1 Series 1 General Files Box 15 Folder 234 Grants Authorized UNDTTC-1956-57

²⁹ Letter from Frank Notestien to Dr Raja, June 28, 1956- Population Council Accession 1 Series 1 General Files Box 15 Folder 234 Grants Authorized UNDTTC-1956-57

³⁰ Letter from Chandra to Mauldin 6th December, 1962, Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 organisation files Box 111 Folder 2066-UNDTTC CC 1961-1965, IV3B4.5

fellows who studied under the guidance of Prof Dorothy Thomas at the University of Pennsylvania³¹.

Apart from this, whenever there was a requirement of new staff at the DTRC suggestions would often come from the PC officials. For instance, Dr Dudley Kirk suggested Dr Raja list of names for the two posts of Statistician and a Demographer. These were the persons who have previously studied at the United States universities under the guidance of Dr Notestien with a Population Council fellowship.³²

Course on Demography at Economics Department in Bombay University:

In 1958, W.P Mauldin of the PC, during his visit to DTRC enquired if the Bombay University was interested in initiating a programme of study and research in the economic aspects of Demography³³.

After necessary formalities initiated by the Economics Department, the Population Council awarded a grant of \$5000 per annum for a period of five years from 1959-64(\$25,000 for five years) to the Department to employ personnel to carry out training and research related to the economic aspects of demography.³⁴ Thus, the Council was very much interested in promoting the 'scientific study' of population at the Department of Economics.

The enthusiasm shown by the experts at the PC in developing the course in demography, at the Economics Department was met with disappointment, when even after the provision of the funds in the first year the Department was unable to recruit a Reader.³⁵ Finally, it was Dr Pravin Visaria who was a Population Council fellow at Princeton joined the Department as a Reader in Demography in the 1960.

³¹ Letter from Frank Notestien to Mr John D Rockefeller 8th January 1960, Population Council Accession 1 Series 4 Organisation Files, Box 111 Folder 2067 UNDTRC Chandrasekeran, D 1960-1963

³² Letter from Dudley Kirk to Dr Raja dated 1st October, 1956- Population Council Accession 1 Series 1 General Files Box 15 Folder 234 Grants Authorized UNDTRC-1956-57

³³ Department of Economics, Bombay University: A Report on the utilization of the population council grant during the period July, 1960-June 1969, Population Council Accession 1 Series 2 Grant Files, Bo 45 Folder 639

³⁴ Letter from Frederick Osborn to Foreign Aid Section, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi, 24th March, 1959, Population Council Accession 1 Series 2 General Files Box 45 Folder 637 IV3B43a

³⁵ Letter from Parker Mauldin to Dr M.L Dantwala, 20th September 1960, Population Council Accession 1 Series 2 Grant Files Box 45 Folder 636

Even after two years of its establishment the optional course on demography failed to attract students. Finally, in order to at least get some good students in demography it was decided to provide a scholarship of Rs 50/- to the students who opted for this paper, but the number of students who chose these paper remained very low³⁶. Thus, even the monetary scholarships did not seem to have been effective increasing the number of students. Despite its inability to attract and retain students, the experts at the PC, eventually paved the way to introduce the teaching and training of demographic research from optional paper to becoming a part of the regular curriculum at the Department of Economics. Mauldin in a letter to the Registrar of Bombay University writes, 'having in mind the importance of planning of population in India, I am sure you will agree it will be desirable for Universities to provide adequate training and undertake high quality research in this important field'.³⁷ The main research focus on the demographic course was on studies related to Maharashtra. The grant to the Bombay University was extended till 1968, as it largely remained unutilised

After few years, PC started emphasising to the Registrar the need to make the course 'self sustaining'. Mauldin writes, 'Government of India has accorded high priority to population problems and has allocated substantial funds to its Family Planning Programme. We believe that it would be consistent and in the best interest of this program and of the university to obtain financing from Indian sources for this important program'.³⁸ Over the years, it has now become a recognised course funding by the UGC thereby leading to the institutionalisation of demography in the Bombay University as well.

Conclusion: The centers of demographic research in India were seen to play an instrumental role in contributing to the development of 'scientific knowledge' to solve the population problems. It is important to note that the institution building of demographic research centres in Maharashtra and also in India was strengthened to a large extent by the provision of grants from the Population Council, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. For instance, the influence of the PC in the development of the demographic research centres in

³⁶ Letter from Dr Lakdawala to W. Mauldin, May 11, 1965 Population Council Accession 1 Series 2 Grant Files Box 45 Folder 636

³⁷ Letter from Mauldin to Registrar of Bombay University, 7th November, 1966, Population Council Accession 1 Series 2 Grant Files Box 45 Folder 636

³⁸ Letter from Dr Mauldin to Registrar of Bombay University, 12th January, 1967- Population Council Accession 1 series 2 grant files box 45 folder 638.

Maharashtra can be seen from the funding that PC made available for the three centres. For the demographic section at the GIPE, the PC provided in 1955, \$150,000 for a period of ten years till December, 1965 funds as part of general budget support³⁹. In 1958, PC provided \$19000 for field studies of fertility control in Poona region.⁴⁰ The PC provided funds to the United Nations supported DTRCs for a period from 1957-63a total grant of \$237,500 for general support, fellowships, travel and equipments (of which \$203000 was granted through the UN for and \$32500 was directly provided by the PC to the DTRC, Bombay).⁴¹ In case of Bombay University the PC provided a total grant of \$25000 for a period of five years from 1959-1964.

With the setting up of these centres of demographic research, it became possible to focus on the study and analysis of the trends and growth in population which strengthened the argument of ‘population problem’ to a large extent in India. The conferences organised by the centre, the teaching of demography, and the training in survey research led to the development and understanding of particular notion of ‘population problem’, that demanded immediate actions on the part of the government. Apart from this, the fellowship programme enabled to keep on expanding the network of connections between different individuals and institutions having great interests on the question of India’s population control both in India and the US. Sharpless (1997: 176) makes it clear that it is these linkages that provided a network for the reworking of demographic knowledge, making it more ‘user-friendly’ to policy makers. He further reveals that complex set of inter-linkages were also developed between government economic planners, foreign policy experts, corporate leaders, professional demographers and the directors of major philanthropic foundations. This led to creation of a climate in which increasing support to population control in terms of financial resources was made possible.

The studies conducted by the demographic centres resulted in the generation of a particular kind of information which also led to the development of consensus among the policy makers. The catastrophic growth of population having negative implications on the process of economic development became more strongly advocated with the studies from these centres.

³⁹ Letter from MCB to DK 14th December, 1957

⁴⁰ Letter from W. Parker Mauldin to Oscar Harkavy 30th June, 1964- PCA2 Foreign Correspondence Box 84 Folder 799

⁴¹ Letter from W. Parker Mauldin to Oscar Harkavy, 30th June, 1964- PCA2 Foreign Correspondence Box 84 Folder 799

Thus, the need for providing immediate actions in family planning was being legitimised. It is important to note that most of the top officials at the centres of demographic research were actively advocating the need for implementation of family planning programme (Dandekar, 1962). The institutionalization of these centres with the funds made available by the FF, the PC and the RF have resulted in the increase of demographic surveys and studies on understanding the attitudes of people towards family planning. Demographers argued that the increased in the number of such studies and the wide publicity which these studies received helped to keep the 'population problem in the public eye' (Hauser and Duncan, 1959). In contrast, Halfon(2007) argues that these demographic surveys were primarily undertaken to substantiate the discourse of population control approach to population policy whereby the focus was on controlling women's reproduction and fertility. These demographic surveys produced a narrow focus on contraceptive delivery in the population policy and the findings from these surveys made it essential for the government that there is demand for contraception, resulting in the provision and supply of these contraceptives through the family planning programme.

It is important to see the establishment of these centers in furthering the agenda of the 'population control establishment'. Greenhalgh (1996) argues that the setting up of the centres for demographic research in developing countries has resulted in 'laying the intellectual foundations of population control' that 'solidify the rationale for intervention'. Thus, the foundations were able institutionalise their dominant understanding of the population question through Malthusian, Neo-Malthusian and eugenics lens in India. These centres of demographic research also enabled the international advocates of population control to successfully 'promote their cause from behind the scenes' (Donaldson, 1990 cited in Greenhalgh, 1996).

One of the major factor that shaped the family planning programme of India in a significant way, was the study of the Coale and Hoover(1958), an approach which dominated the teaching in the demographic research centres in India. Highly influenced by this study, the third five year plan (1961-66) for the first time set a demographic goal of reducing the crude birth rate to 25 by 1972. Srinivasan (1995) argues that a strong stimulus for the setting up of demographic goal for India in terms of the desired levels of crude birth rate came from the publication of Coale and Hoover.

The emphasis on studying and analysing censuses, by undertaking projections of future population growth rates and by quantifying the implications of high fertility on economic growth rate, by the officials and experts at the centres of demographic research generated a 'sense of crisis' in the policy makers. The creation of 'crisis in population growth' by the newly the established demographic research centre provided an agenda to undertake more vigorous implementation of measures to control fertility and thereby curb rising population. In the above context, it is important to note what Sen(1994) has clearly pointed out. He argues that a focus on the urgency for population control will inevitably lead to panic and to the adoption of potentially coercive measures of population control.

Acknowledgement: The paper is based on the archives collected from the Rockefeller Archive Centre, Tarrytown, Newyork, USA. I am grateful to RAC for awarding me the grant-in-award, 2013 that enabled me to access the Archives. I am thankful to all the staff at the RAC and special thanks to Bethany Antos for making available all the necessary archives.

References:

- Bose, A(1970): 'Demographic Research in India: 1947-1969' in '*Studies in Demography: Essays Presented to Prof. S Chandrasekhar on his Fifty First Birthday*', Compiled by Bose, A; Desai, P.B and Jain, S.P-George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London, pp 17-52
- Bhende, A; Kanitkar, T and Rao, R(1976). '*Teaching and Research in Population Studies 17 years of IIPS*' Published by IIPS, Mumbai.
- Caldwell, J and Caldwell, P(1986). '*Limiting Population Growth and Ford Foundation Contribution*' Francis Printer, New Haven.
- Coale A and Hoover, E(1958). '*Population Growth and Economic Development in Low Income Countries*', Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Connelly, M (2008). '*Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control Population*' Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Dandekar, K(1976). 'In Defence of Compulsory Sterilisation', *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol. 11 No 21 May, pp 772-773.
- Davis, K(1951). '*Population of India and Pakistan*', Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Donaldson, P(1990). '*Nature Against Us: The United States and the World Population Crisis, 1965-1980*', University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Gordon, L(1976). '*Womens Body Womens Right*', Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Furedi,F(1997). '*Population and Development: A Critical Introduction*', Polity Press; Cambridge, Massachusetts.

- Greenhalgh, S (1996). 'The Social Construction of Population Science: An Intellectual, Institutional and Political History of Twentieth Century Demography', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol 38 No 1 January, pp 26-66
- Halfon, S(2007). *The Cairo Consensus: Demographic Surveys, Womens Empowerment and Regime Change in Population Policy* Lexington Books, United Kingdom.
- Hauser, P and Duncan, D(1959). *The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal* (eds). The University of Chicago Press, USA.
- Hodges, S(2008). *Contraception, Colonialism and Commerce: Birth Control in South India*, 1920-1940, Ashgate, England.
- Hodgson, D(1983). 'Demography as Social Science and Policy Science', *Population and Development Review* Vol 9 No 1, pp 1-51.
- Mass, B(1974). 'A Historical Sketch of American Population Control', *International Journal of Health Services*, Vol 4 No 4, pp 651-675
- Rao, M(2004). *From Population Control to Reproductive Health: Malthusian Arithmetic* Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Sen, A(1994). 'Population and Reasoned Agency: Food, Fertility and Economic Development', in Kerstin, L and Hans, L(eds), *Population, Economic Development and Environment*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, pp 51-62
- Sharpless, J (1997). 'Population Science, Private Foundations and Development Aid: The Transformation of Demographic Knowledge in the United States' in Cooper, F and Randall, P(es), *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp 176-200
- Srinivasan, K(1995). *Regulating Reproduction in India's Population: Efforts, Results and Recommendations*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Szreter, S (1993). 'The Idea of Demographic Transition and the Study of Fertility Change: A Critical Intellectual History', *Population and Development Review*, Vol 19 No 4 December, pp 659-701
- Williams, R(2010). *The Rockefeller Foundation, the Population Council and Indian Population Control* 'available at <http://www.rockarch.org/publications/resrep/williams.pdf> accessed on 7th July, 2012