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Encouraged by her masters at the Annales School—historians Fernand Braudel and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, demographer Louis Henry from Institut National d’Etudes Démographiques (INED), and sociologist Peter Laslett from Cambridge—the author, a baby-boomer, experienced major socio-economic and cultural changes in family behavior and reproduction models induced in Europe by the revolutionary events of 1968 in Paris. In this essay, she presents a personal account of the history of historical demography in Europe, between 1967 and 1975, in other words at the end of the post-WWII Glorious Thirty period (1945-1975). She then became involved in the development of a global network that had been formed in 1960 in Stockholm, linking professional national and international associations and academic units in Historical Demography and History of the Family. This network spread quickly overseas during the following decades. The period under study was marked by the beginning of important behavioral changes in socio-economic contexts and attitudes to family life, gender and human reproduction. These major shifts were called the Second Demographic Transition by two Dutch demographers, inspired by French scholars. The year 1976 is identified as a major turning point for Historical Demography as a discipline, mostly through the creation of the Social Science History Association and the Journal of Family History, which brought new theoretical approaches and
methodologies. A generation of productive researchers appeared with the end of the 20th century and the new millennium. They took advantage of an increasingly digitalized world to widely disseminate a rich store of knowledge about past population behavior gathered since the 1960s by their predecessors.

Introduction

There is a long tradition of population studies in many countries, but Historical Demography only came to be recognized as a discipline with the creation of an International Commission of Historical Demography (ICHD/CIDH) within the International Committee of Historical Sciences (CISH), at its General Assembly in Stockholm during the 11th World History Congress of 1960. At this conference in Sweden, the French demographer Louis Henry presented new methods of Historical Demography and their potential development. He recommended that demographers and historians join in their efforts to complete systematic family reconstitutions of past populations, based on vital events registered mostly in historical parish records. Louis Henry preached for a common method across the world, based on the systematic establishment of specific Family Reconstitution Forms (FRF), and he wrote two handbooks with proper guidelines including how to analyze the quantitative data (Fleury and Henry 1956; Henry 1967). In Europe, university students of the time, including myself, were not aware of these advances among professional researchers.

In June 1967, fifty years ago, having completed my master’s degree, I visited French historian Fernand Braudel, then President of Section VI of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE), Paris, and main editor

1 For an intellectual biography of Fernand Braudel (1902-1985), see Gemelli 1990. See also the collection of Braudel’s essays translated from the French by Sarah Matthews in 1982.
He gave me a book that was on his desk, asked me to translate part of it into French and recommended that I pay a visit to the Director of the Centre de Recherches Historiques. I was holding in my hands *The World We Have Lost* by Peter Laslett (London, Methuen, 1965). This visit opened up a new academic world for me, a world of historical demography and history of the family that had no national borders, and which I never left. A few days later, Professor Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, an economist and social historian recruited me as his research assistant for a specific task, which was to study the fertility behavior of early-modern urban families in Châtillon-sur-Seine, Burgundy (Chamoux and Dauphin 1969). I soon became a permanent member of his advanced interdisciplinary research group (mostly

---

2 On the *Annales School* historiography and developments, see Clark 1999; Burke 1990 may also provide a basic approach, but the first edition of his book contains some regrettable errors (the second edition, 2015 is recommended). See below, notes 5, 13 and 14.

3 Peter Laslett (1915-2001) was Fellow of Trinity College and reader in Politics and the History of Social Structure at the University of Cambridge, and co-director of the *Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure*, jointly with Tony Wrigley and Roger Schofield. Laslett’s first book, *The World We Have Lost*, published in 1965, was a best seller. In 1964, Edward Antony (Tony) Wrigley had co-founded this *Cambridge Group*, now part of the Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, UK.

4 Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, a very productive and well-known French economic and social historian, was born in 1929. He became an active member of the *Annales* group. His doctoral thesis, *Les paysans de Languedoc* (1966), was translated into English as *The Peasants of Languedoc* (1974). His *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324* (1975) was a bestseller in France and was translated into English (1978) and other languages.
The History of Historical Demography in Europe

economic and social historians working on various periods and various countries), in the heart of what is commonly called the *Annales School*.\(^5\)

I explain in the present essay how I discovered historical demography methodology and how, through the political events and civil unrest that happened in Paris in May 1968,\(^6\) I became involved in major academic events in the field of Historical Demography, in seminal discussions and publications and consequently in the building of a strong international network, the Family-Demography network.\(^7\) This brought together historians and scholars who often came from different disciplines—demography, political economy, sociology, anthropology, medicine, geography, statistics etc.—but were interested in this budding attractive discipline that united population studies (past, present and future) and history of the family. These meetings included the *International Union for the Scientific Study of the Population* (IUSSP) general conference

\(^5\) The expression *Annales School* probably comes from the fact that the editors of the *Annales ESC* journal were attached to the *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* (EPHE). *Section VI* was the most recent sector of EPHE (founded in 1947). It was organized into seminars and research centers, receiving complementary funding from the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS).

\(^6\) For an interesting analysis of the 1968 student revolution and subsequent political events in Paris and France, see Touraine 1971; Bourg 2007.

\(^7\) A first early Family-Demography network, mostly francophone, was formed with the creation in 1960, in Stockholm, of the *International Commission of Historical Demography* (ICHD/CIDH) general assembly that took place at the 11th World History Congress of the *International Committee of Historical Sciences* (CISH) (Fauve-Chamoux 2015). In 1976, an Anglophone network was created within the framework of the *Social Science History Association* (SSHA), USA, open to non-US citizens. Another international Family/Demography network emerged in 1996, in the Netherlands, with the regular biennial *European Social Science History Conferences* (ESSHC), which attracted many European scholars, but not exclusively (Fauve-Chamoux 2016).
(September 3-11, 1969), which took place at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences, and the “Comparative History of Household and Family” international conference (September 12-15, 1969), organized by Peter Laslett in Cambridge. In Europe and America, important publications followed, particularly the 1972 *Household and Family in Past Time* (HFPT), co-edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, which is still widely used as a reference work internationally (Laslett and Wall 1972). Intense activities developed in various research centers, leading to advances in both historical demography and history of the family, with more or less friendly competition, particularly in building adapted methodologies, and taking advantage of developing computer technologies (Fauve-Chamoux, Bolovan and Sogner 2016). In summer 1967, when I first came in contact with historical demography (as described above and later on), it was expected that available quantitative tools and statistical results would allow historical demographers to provide advice concerning future trends in demographic change (particularly in terms of fertility, mortality and aging) that would be useful to policy makers and businessmen. The present essay puts in perspective the author’s experience as a young historian discovering the world of historical demography at the end of the Glorious Thirty (or 1946-1975 period) — as defined later by Jean Fourastié (1979).

8 In 1970, it was my idea to refer to the book in progress as “HFPT” (Household and Family in Past Time), once Peter Laslett had decided on its title. Peter adopted this immediately, and we have used it extensively since then, particularly in notes, to refer to various book chapters in print at Cambridge University Press: I translated into French the draft Introduction of the book, in order to transform it into an article for Annales ESC (Laslett 1972a).

9 See http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ebook.jsf?bid=CBO9780511561207

10 The post-WWII period 1946-1975 ended with major economic changes following the 1973 “oil price shock”. In 1979 Jean Fourastié called this period Les Trente Glorieuses, ou la révolution invisible [The Glorious Thirty, or the Invisible Revolution from 1946 to 1975].
This was at the very moment, in 1967-1968, when the Second Demographic Transition (SDT) was just beginning to take place in Europe (Lesthaeghe and van de Kaa 1986; Lesthaeghe 2010).

Discovering Historical Demography in Paris (June 1967)

Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie was then Director of the Centre de Recherches Historiques, EPHE, Section VI. He was looking for a research assistant. When I entered his office, following Braudel’s advice, he looked at me with icy eyes and said: “Do you know what a fiche Henry is?” This was such an absurd question that I preferred to laugh. “Not yet, Professor, but I can come back in a few days and I shall tell you!” He pointed to a huge pile of papers on his desk: “This is Châtillon-sur-Seine. Read Louis Henry’s Manuel and come back next week. Goodbye, mademoiselle.”

I had Laslett’s The World We Have Lost in my bag for urgent translation, and now I had to quickly buy and read the handbook (Manuel) of an unknown author, on an unknown subject.

In June 1967, finding (Louis) “Henry’s Manuel” in Paris was not an easy task. I visited several bookstores without success before finding that, first, Louis Henry was the second author, and second, there were two possible books with different titles! It could either be the book by Michel Fleury and Louis Henry entitled Des registres paroissiaux à l’histoire de la population: manuel de dépouillement et d’exploitation de l’état civil ancien [From parish registers to population history. A handbook for collecting and computing past vital events], 1956, Paris: INED, or the just-published Manuel de démographie historique [A handbook of historical demography] by Louis Henry, 1967, Paris/Genève: Droz.

So I finally bought both of them at Institut National d’Etudes Démographiques (INED) (Fleury and Henry 1956; Henry 1967). This was quite technical reading, but a few days later, I knew that a “Fiche Henry” was a “Fiche de famille” or Family Reconstitution Form (FRF) established from vital registration data – births/baptisms, marriages and deaths/burials
It was time to pay a second visit to Le Roy Ladurie. Le Roy Ladurie was not in his office: surprisingly, another gentleman was sitting at his desk, who offered me a one year job beginning September 1, 1967, to study the families of Châtillon-sur-Seine, following Louis Henry’s method as described in the *Manuels*. I accepted. We shook hands and he told me to see his secretary next door. I learned from this lady that Le Roy Ladurie had left for Princeton for an extended stay and that the gentleman in his office was the historian François Furet, co-director of the *Centre de Recherches Historiques*. The following day I started translating Peter Laslett’s volume for Fernand Braudel. Two weeks later, I brought him my translation of the first chapter of *Le Monde que nous avons perdu* (*The World We Have Lost*). The master took my work and put the envelope on a corner of his desk without opening it. He looked embarrassed and explained that a professional translator had just been hired by his publisher and that consequently he did not need my translation anymore. Then I told Braudel that I was going to work on family reconstitution forms at the *Centre de

---

11 Louis Henry, *Institut National d’Etudes Démographiques* (INED), Paris, one of the pioneers of historical demography, had been invited to the inaugural event of the *Cambridge Group* in 1964 and, two years later, he wrote a preface (Henry 1966, VII-IX) to Wrigley’s book presenting this new discipline to the English-speaking reader (*An Introduction to English Historical demography from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, 1966). In between, Peter Laslett had published a book entitled: *The World We Have Lost* (1965) explaining that new historical methods, based on the systematic analysis of parish registers, lists of inhabitants and other historical sources, would allow a better approach to the true realities of past conditions of living, family forms and sexual relationships. For more, see Kitson 2016.

12 The published translation would be entitled “Un monde que nous avons perdu”, which is not a strict translation of the original formulation (Laslett 1969).
Recherches Historiques. He looked much more worried and said, shaking his white hair: “Don’t do too much demography. You should learn Russian.”

In the course of two weeks I learned a lot about a strange world so far removed from the dull academic Sorbonne: I was no longer a student; I was a young woman, aged 22, now with a job, and a research schedule for one year. I understood that I had to be flexible, adapt to unpredictable events and keep cool. This world of the Annales School had nothing to do with traditional teaching and none of the polite manners that I knew applied. It was really odd, but I had nothing to lose by learning and practicing historical demography for a few months, with a salary.

Section VI of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE) was not a university. There were no multi-secular rituals or constraints. It had been founded in 1947 by Fernand Braudel with Lucien Febvre and Charles Morazé, with some help from the Rockefeller Foundation, New York (Sutton 2001; Mazon 1988). The Centre de Recherches Historiques was the largest group and it provided a unique place for collective projects and intellectual debates that were largely international and based on interdisciplinary approaches. Braudel had been seduced by Laslett’s original writing and rather rebellious mentality. At this stage, I am not sure if Braudel had met Laslett in person yet. But this happened anyway the following year, when Laslett was invited as a visiting professor for two months.

Laslett contested the monopolies of universities, as did Braudel. In a special issue of Continuity and Change, entitled “Household and family in Past Time revisited”, dedicated to Peter Laslett after he passed away in 2001, Kevin Schürer reminded us that Laslett put a lot of effort into successfully creating the British Open University in the 1960s, together with Michael Young (Schürer 2003, 10). Michael Young would be a participant in Laslett’s 1969 Cambridge Conference.

---

13 This institute organized research seminars and published one of the more prestigious historical francophone journals, the Annales ESC.
Partly thanks to the *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations (ESC)*,\textsuperscript{14} Section VI was well known and considered as a leading institution for its international presence, its interdisciplinary approach, and its *gauchistes* (leftist) intellectuals. Braudel was a fabulous manager and fundraiser. This made traditional academics, civil servants who only had limited national state funds for research, both jealous and suspicious. While he was President of Section VI of the EPHE, Braudel created *The Fondation Maison des Sciences de l’Homme* (FMSH), an institution of “public interest” dedicated to the “Sciences of Man” (1962). He received a Ford Foundation grant and government funds to create this institution, which he directed from 1970 until his death in 1985. According to the official decree from January 4, 1963, the objective of FMSH was to “promote studies of human societies that focus on current social realities and contexts”. It was intended to have a high degree of flexibility and was actually based on a model for network project management. This was fully in line with Laslett’s strong sense of autonomy, personal conception of comparative research and observation of social phenomena over space and time. Laslett was also an excellent fundraiser and he knew how to recruit volunteer work (Wrigley 1966, XII).

Such were the circumstances that made me a permanent research member of the most prestigious French historical group. My first contacts had been rather rough, and my first months of work were quite hard: Since I had no office, I spent most of my winter days working at home on hundreds of *Family Reconstitution Forms* (FRF) from Châtillonnais,

\textsuperscript{14} The *Annales* “school” is considered an important movement in historical scholarship. In France, Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre proposed a new approach to the study of history in the late 1920s. It developed thanks to the *Annales d’histoire économique et sociale* from 1929 to 1938. In 1939, the journal was called *Annales d’Histoire Sociale* and later, in 1946, *Annales. Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations (Annales ESC)*. In 1994 the title was changed to *Annales. Histoire, Sciences sociales* (ou *Annales HSS*). It promoted a “total history” embracing all the social sciences and attracting historians worldwide (Burguière 2009).
doing statistical analysis and following Henry’s instructions, all by hand.¹⁵ At EPHE, 54, rue de Varenne, working space was very limited and office rooms small and overcrowded. To get fresh air, I followed intense Russian evening courses for beginners, as Braudel had recommended me to do.

I made quick progress in handling vital statistics because, during that academic year 1967-1968, I attended Louis Henry’s training course in historical demography, which he held every week as “chargé de conférences”. This was a seminar by Section IV of the École Pratique des Hautes Études, taking place at the old Sorbonne.¹⁶ By early spring 1968, my fertility analysis on the city of Châtillon-sur-Seine in Burgundy was ready.

Looking at my graphs and tables, Le Roy Ladurie, recently returned from Princeton, saw immediately what he had (secretly) expected: my curves were serious evidence of a general control of urban fertility before the French Revolution in 1789. Louis Henry was immediately consulted and was very surprised. He decided to recalculate all my statistical data and checked it all. There was not a single error.

Up to then, French historical demographers had mostly focused on rural communities. Consequently my results, based on urban families, represented a major step forward in understanding the pioneering role of France as an early European leader in contraceptive behavior. I was told

¹⁵ Within the framework of a CNRS interdisciplinary project called “Châtillonnais”, Cécile Dauphin had worked on Châtillon-sur-Seine, with marriages celebrated from 1772 to 1850. About 5,000 Family Reconstitution Forms (FRF) were available (Chamoux and Dauphin 1969, 662). Without any computer, doing Henry’s analysis on such a huge material was a great deal of work for a lone researcher. Cécile Dauphin was involved in other projects.

¹⁶ The fourth section of École Pratique des Hautes Études, founded in 1868, was dedicated to historical and philological sciences, while the sixth section, created in 1947, was for economic and social sciences. Louis Henry was attached to the former section, where his co-author, the historian Michel Fleury was teaching.
that these results deserved an article, and I was recommended to submit a paper to *Annales ESC*. All this was close to a dream for me.

Louis Henry corrected my draft paper as much as needed, with generosity and unexpected patience. He did not propose to publish this piece in *Population*, the INED journal. The paper was evaluated and accepted by the editors of *Annales ESC* with minor corrections. Finally, the article was in press during the 1969 September Cambridge conference where I quickly presented my main argument, which was not on household structure, but on early fertility transition in the urban context.

Meanwhile, important events had occurred in May 1968; the student revolt in the context of general social unrest led to major political and social changes. Above all, for me, I had met Peter Laslett in Paris.

**May 1968 with Peter Laslett in the Latin Quarter**

Braudel had invited Peter Laslett to EPHE as a visiting professor for two months, in May and June 1968. This meant that a total of eight seminar presentations in French were due. Laslett needed help not only to polish his talks (already basically translated by a professional), but also to answer questions and face a French academic audience. I was immediately designated as the “volunteer” in charge.

I could not escape the author of *The World We Have Lost!* In spring 1968, the translation of Laslett’s book was not yet out in French at Flammarion; it would take a few more months (Laslett 1969). When the author arrived in Paris, on the first of May 1968, I worked with him immediately for a few hours on his first presentation. Peter Laslett was looking for someone able to find the right words to translate particular concepts. It went very well and our discussions were lively and productive. The following seven presentations were all cancelled, one after the other, due to the political events and revolutionary situation in the *Quartier Latin*. As a sociologist and convinced democrat, Peter Laslett was feeling involved.
During these warm days of the Parisian students’ revolt and social unrest, I helped to finalize Laslett’s potential talks, even if, in the end, he was able to present only one because the Latin Quarter was soon disrupted by the students’ barricades and burning cars. The Sorbonne was occupied. Paris was soon paralyzed by strikes for weeks. Peter attended some general Assemblies at the Centre de Recherches Historiques and asked me to explain to him the content of these meetings. I translated various anti-authoritarian pamphlets, which he collected from gutters, and posters that he picked up in the streets. He was able to put together a valuable collection of documents that were exhibited in Cambridge twenty years later, when he made a donation. During our conversations, I told him about my translation of the first chapter of The World We Have Lost, which had disappeared in Braudel’s office forever, and he was sorry about it.

Peter Laslett bought a bike to make getting around Paris easier. But the bike was shortly stolen. He already had a bunch of friends and acquaintances in town, including historians, demographers, sociologists and political economists. Given his previous studies on John Locke (Laslett and Harrison 1965), Laslett was also in contact with philosopher Raymond Polin (1910-2001) regarding his recent edition in French of Locke’s Letter Concerning Toleration, first published in 1689 (Polin 1965). Laslett had good knowledge of Raymond Boudon’s sociological work. Laslett therefore visited Boudon in order to discuss with him the fresh revolutionary events going on.17 During the long strike period that Paris experienced, Laslett asked me one day to drive him to Philippe Ariès’

17 French sociologist Raymond Boudon (1934-2013) had been a fellow at the Stanford Center for the Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences. He was well known for his work on social mobility, sociological theory, values, belief, protests, disorder and social change, structuralism and philosophy of the social sciences (Boudon 1968). He criticized the theories of social change that had dominated sociology since the early 1950s and later elaborated his own views (Boudon 1984, 1986). His discussion of the Rational Choice Theory is particularly interesting (Boudon 2009).
home, which was in an elegant suburb. I was invited for dinner. This was a fascinating evening, with two independent thinkers both with a distinctive sense of humor. For example, Laslett was claiming that the Cambridge Group was a triumvirate, with a king (Tony Wrigley), a parson (Roger Schofield) and a fool (Peter Laslett). For his part, Ariès, so often seen, from the Sorbonne, as an amateur historian, told me “I am just selling bananas”. Up to 1978, Philippe Ariès had no academic affiliation: trained as an historian, he was an independent writer and a very successful professional businessman in the food market (import/export of colonial fruits). Eventually he was elected directeur d’études at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) (this was the new name of Section VI of EPHE since 1975).

The 1968 period of unrest marked the beginning of major social changes in Europe, particularly in individual and family reproductive behavior. A Second Demographic Transition (SDT) began then, that was, for some time, masked by the 1973 economic crisis that followed. It should be stressed that demographers from the Netherlands who formulated this concept of SDT in the mid-1980s recognized that they were inspired by the analysis proposed in 1980 by the French historian Philippe Ariès, just mentioned, in his efforts to understand the consequences of the 1968 événements (events).

Philippe Ariès (1914-1984), an independent scholar, published his first major book in 1948 on the history of the French people and their attitudes to life since the eighteenth century. In 1960, another book was dedicated to the child and family life in Ancien Régime that was translated in 1962 and had quite a success under the title: Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, New York. The author already had close contact with the Annales group that was promoting a new history with a focus on mentalities. Later, in 1977, L’Homme devant la mort [Man facing death] also reached a large readership.
1968 as the Eve of the Second Demographic Transition (SDT)

The concept of the “Second Demographic Transition” (SDT), introduced in 1986 by Ron Lesthaeghe and Dirk van de Kaa, greatly influenced demographic research and history of the family at the turn of the millennium. It is considered now as a central concept for scholars dealing with demographic change in European societies. It originated from remarks made by Ariès in 1980, considering the 1968 events, and his discussions with friends and colleagues, including Peter Laslett on the changes induced by the baby-boom generation (Ariès 1980a): as early as 1959, Alfred Sauvy\(^\text{19}\) had identified the social importance of an emergent rising youth (*La montée des jeunes*, 1959) and he would comment further in 1970 in *La révolte des jeunes*, after the 1968 events. According to van de Kaa (Van de Kaa 2002, 5):

In presenting this view, Ariès refers to an observation made by Alfred Sauvy – whom he knew quite well – where the latter reportedly stated that *the* important new phenomenon involved in the renewed decline of fertility was that people refused to have an undesired child. If carelessness or an accident results in a pregnancy ‘… this triggers a violent rejection reaction; an abortion is sought’ (Ariès 1980a, 649). Anyone familiar with Sauvy’s work (1960) and his characterization of the classical demographic transition as ‘an altruistic transition’ will recognize

\[^{19}\] Alfred Sauvy (1898-1990), economist, mathematician and historian of population, founded the *Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques* (INED) in 1945, Paris, with the mission of studying demographic matters in all their aspects, although France’s falling birth rate remained the central political concern (Séguy 2016, 273). Sauvy was an alumnus of *Ecole Polytechnique*, one of the French *Grandes Ecoles*. Many INED figures recruited by Sauvy would also be alumni of this institution, like Louis Henry. Sauvy launched the journal *Population* in 1946 and remained Director of INED up to 1962. He created the *Third World* concept (1961). He published a *General Theory of Population* (1951; 1952). He wrote several books and articles on Malthus and population regulation (1958; 1960; 1981).
that in a further paragraph Ariès highlights another important contrast between the demographic situation before and after the mid-1960s. In the life plans of couples and individuals, so Ariès notes, the child is not absent, but ‘... he fits into them as one of the various components that make it possible for adults to blossom as individuals’ (loc. cit.). In our joint paper Lesthaeghe and I explicitly refer to the work of these two scholars and I paid an obvious tribute to them when in 1987 I wrote that the two keywords which best characterized the norms and attitudes behind the first and second demographic transition were ‘altruistic’ and ‘individualistic’, respectively (Van de Kaa 1987, 5).

At the same time, the proportion of non-marital births rose in France after 1968, slowly following a trend that had been initiated in northern Europe, first in Sweden and then in Denmark, as shown in Figure 1, taken from a conference paper presented in 2010 by Ron Lesthaeghe entitled “The Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition” (Lesthaeghe 2010, 12).

Commenting on this graph, Lesthaeghe said that the Second Demographic Transition “was emerging as a salient characteristic of capitalist economies and of cultures that recognize the primacy of individual autonomy and that develop the higher order needs” (Lesthaeghe 2010, 12). In France, a few months before the 1968 student revolt, a law had been passed in order to legalize oral contraception (Neuwirth Law, December 19, 1967). This law was considered only as a first step, since application of the law was extremely slow and unsatisfactory, particularly for young women. The 1973 “oil price shock”, induced an economic crisis in France, as it did elsewhere in Europe and the rest of the world. This was also a time of important social changes. Thanks to feminist protests and women’s voices in general—including influential female writers like Simone de Beauvoir (1949)—French society began to take gender into account: a liberal law concerning “the Pill” was passed on December 4, 1974.
It was soon followed by a major law, defended by Simone Veil, legalizing abortion, which was finally adopted in France on January 17, 1975 (Ariès 1980a; Lesthaeghe and van de Kaa 1986; Lesthaeghe 2010). A new law on divorce was also passed, allowing divorce by mutual consent, on July 11, 1975. French citizens had certainly been pioneers in Europe in adopting family limitation in the second half of the eighteenth century (Fauve-Chamoux and Dauphin 1969), but, as Figure 1 shows (Lesthaeghe 2010), France was behind Sweden, Denmark and even Spain and Austria in accepting a high frequency of extramarital births and “families without marriage” (Fauve-Chamoux 2011b), after the 1968 events. The changing frequency of births out of wedlock is linked to many economic and socio-cultural parameters, including religious beliefs, changing attitudes toward sexuality, procreation, marriage, children, family reproduction models and marital cohabitation.
The relationships between generations had also changed in 1968. After his time spent in Paris as visiting professor, Peter Laslett encouraged me to pursue my personal work on pre-industrial early control of fertility in urban France, since I was learning a lot from my study of Châtillon-sur-Seine. I therefore worked extensively on the diffusion of Malthusianism, having to write an article about my results that showed a clear control of fertility in this town in Burgundy, before the French Revolution took place in 1789. I had also noted that a large number of children were born out of wedlock in Châtillon-sur-Seine throughout the period studied and this had also been a topic of my discussions with Laslett in May and June 1968. Through my previous reading of his book, *The World We have Lost* (see above), I knew the deep interest Laslett had for variations in illegitimacy rates (Laslett 1977; 1980a; 1980b). Once my paper was accepted by *Annales ESC*, I began working on the town of Rheims, collecting vital events in local parish registers, in order to study the process of fertility change and family limitation in this large *Ancien Régime* city of Champagne, before the French Revolution of 1789. The project was to collect nominative vital events concerning a large preindustrial population sample, following Louis Henry’s *Family Reconstitution* method.

To thank me for having given him much of my time during the Paris events in 1968, Laslett invited me to Cambridge during the following year, to the *Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure* that he directed jointly with Tony Wrigley and Roger Schofield. He was planning an international conference on the comparative structure of the family and household, a meeting from which originated the important book *Household and Family in Past Time*, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, Cambridge University Press, 1972.²⁰

---

²⁰ The fortieth anniversary of the publication of this book was celebrated at the 37th annual conference of the *Social Science History Association* (SSHA), November 3, 2012, Vancouver. A first draft of the present paper was presented at this occasion (Fauve-Chamoux 2012).
An English Academic Summer in 1969

Laslett asked me to join the organizing committee of his conference as a volunteer, and urged me to find a grant to cover all my expenses in Cambridge for two months, from July 15 to September 15, 1969. I was able to find some modest financial help, accepted the proposal, and rented a student room with a Cambridge family.

I kept the program of “the Comparative History of Household and Family” conference, September 12-15, 1969 (a preliminary working version and the final version), as well as a list of participants, a list of room reservations at St. John’s College, Cambridge, and my notes. I also have copies of the papers that were circulated, including mine. These documents attest to the wide network that Laslett had developed during the previous years and particularly among French scholars while he was in Paris in May and June 1968, as an invited professor at the EPHE, “Section VI”.

Laslett arranged his Cambridge conference for the weekend following the 1969 International Union for the Scientific Study of the Population (IUSSP) general conference, which was taking place in London, September 3-11, 1969. This was a wise move to secure a good attendance, in particular attracting historical demographers and major figures in the field, who were offered board and lodging in a lovely college, without having to cover any travel expenses. A large group of scholars (some with spouses) was accommodated, most of them coming to Cambridge for the first time. Many French colleagues would be at the IUSSP meeting in London. I already knew most of them, as well as some foreign scholars, not only because I was working at the EPHE, but because, since early 1969, I had been a member of the Société de Démographie Historique (SDH), a large French association, founded in 1963, with an international membership of 30 percent at that time (Fauve-Chamoux 2015; 2016).

Succeeding historian Pierre Goubert (1965-1968), Louis Henry, a demographer, was elected President of this professional association for three years (1969-1972) (Fauve-Chamoux 2016; 2015, 21). Since he knew me quite well as one of his students, as mentioned above, Henry asked me to become a regular SDH member. At the same time, 21

---

21 I won a research grant from the British Council.
he successfully supported my application to become a member of “The Union”, the *International Union for the Scientific Study of the Population* (IUSSP). Consequently, when I arrived in Cambridge in summer 1969, I was already a full member of two leading international professional associations of historical demographers. Laslett was aware of the importance of these networks and trusted me for my abilities to help him as a go-between in developing his projects (without paying me); this meant acting as a permanent link between the *Cambridge Group* and “the French” in preparing his conference.

**The London IUSSP General Conference (September 3-11, 1969)**

The XVIth general conference of the *International Union for the Scientific Study of the Population* (IUSSP) was held during the week September 3-11, 1969, at the *London School of Economics and Political Sciences*. According to the 1969 IUSSP membership list,²² this international association counted 45 members residing in the United Kingdom, among whom eight were historical demographers, and 73 registered French members, including 15 historical demographers (with me). The “Union” counted 49 Italian members. There were 17 Canadians and as many Hungarians and already 22 Japanese. The most represented country by far was the United States. The President was Dolfe Vogelnik from Yugoslavia; the three honorary Presidents were David V. Glass (UK), Frank Lorimer (USA), and Alfred Sauvy (France), demographers and historians of population. The president elect was C. Chandrasekaran (India).

This IUSSP General Conference was a great occasion for me to spend a few days in London. I had been in Cambridge working at the Cambridge Group since mid-July 1969. Peter Laslett asked me to attend the IUSSP conference and to meet all the participants that he had invited to Cambridge. My task was to make sure that they would find their way to Cambridge, in time for the opening session scheduled for Friday September 12, 1969.

---

²² The IUSSP *membership list* referred to here is dated Liège, March 1969. It was included in my London 1969 conference file.
Three of the registered participants for the 1969 IUSSP “Historical Demography before 1800” session organized for London by Louis Henry (Henry 1971) were coming afterwards to the Cambridge event: Louis Henry, Jean-Noël Biraben and Jacques Dupâquier. Tony Wrigley, co-director of the Cambridge Group, was also giving a paper. I have precise memories of the welcome reception on the evening of Wednesday, September 3, 1969, in the lounges of the Royal Society, 6 Carlton House Terrace, London, where I met colleagues from Section VI of the EPHE (Christiane Klapisch), researchers from INED (Yves Blayo and Chantal Blayo), and a few members of the board of the French Société de Démographie Historique (SDH) – Jean-Noël Biraben, Jacques Dupâquier and Louis Henry, the new president of this association. I also met some close Italian colleagues including Massimo Livi Bacci, Carlo Corsini, and others who had not been invited by Laslett to join the conference on the Comparative History of Household and Family in Cambridge. Three years after the conference, a book was published.

Processing the Content of a Seminal Book on Household and Family (1969-1972)

The four papers on England by Peter Laslett, Richard Wall, W. Alan Armstrong and Michael Anderson were kept for the book Household and Family in Past Time (HFPT) (Laslett and Wall 1972). Anderson’s contribution was on the town of Preston in a comparative perspective (and not on Scotland). Three papers on France were kept; these were by Yves Blayo, Jean-Noël Biraben, and Jacques Dupâquier (on Corsica, with Louis Jadin as co-author). The second book section, which could have focused mainly on France, was expanded to western Europe, adding Christiane Klapisch on 1427 Tuscany, Ad M. van der Woude on seventeenth and eighteenth century Netherlands, and Etienne Hélin (who was not present at...

---

23 Jean-Noël Biraben and Jacques Dupâquier would serve later as president of the Société de Démographie Historique, the former in 1978-1980, the latter in 1981-1984 (Fauve-Chamoux 2015, 29-32).
the conference) on 1801 Liege, Belgium.\textsuperscript{24} The contribution by Valerie Smith presenting what she had done for Peter Laslett on Longuenesse, a French village in Pas-de-Calais, was not included: her data were analyzed years later in a comparative perspective by Emmanuel Todd, who in the meantime had completed his doctoral dissertation at Cambridge University, with Peter Laslett as his supervisor (Todd 1975).\textsuperscript{25}

Philippe Ariès, who was then only partly an academic (Ariès 1980b),\textsuperscript{26} appeared on the Cambridge conference program without an affiliation, simply as “author of \textit{Centuries of Childhood}” (Ariès 1962); he presented a paper in French on death and power of the \textit{pater familias} and family tombs. This could not fit in the conference publication.

The third part of the HFPT book focused on Serbia. It finally included two papers by two American scholars, Laslett’s friend and future co-author, Eugene A. Hammel, professor of anthropology, University of California, Berkeley (Hammel and Laslett, 1974),\textsuperscript{27} and Joel Halpern, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (Halpern 1958). Laslett added a new paper that he wrote from data analysed by the Cambridge group secretary, Marilyn Clarke, on eighteenth-century Belgrade. Hammel enlarged his contribution, entitled for the book “The zadruga as process”, while he had presented “Preliminary notes on the cycle of lineage fission in Southern and Eastern Yugoslavia”. Lorraine Barić, University of Salford, Manchester, UK, an anthropologist from Yugoslavia, participated in the session, but did not present a paper (Barić 1967). The Bulgarian historian, Prof. B.I. Penkov, a statistician from the University of Sofia, participated in the discussion on the zadruga family form.

\textsuperscript{24} Van der Woude and Hélin were also members of IUSSP.

\textsuperscript{25} Laslett referred to these French localities in Artois, in \textit{Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations}, comparing them to Clayworth and Cogenhoe (1977, 77). Longuenesse is a few miles south-west of the town of St Omer, and Hallines is a little further away.

\textsuperscript{26} See note 18 above.

\textsuperscript{27} See below about the maturation of the classification typology that Peter Laslett presented in the introduction of the book in 1972 (Laslett 1972b).
For the fourth section of the book, dedicated to Japan, Laslett added a chapter on “Small families, small households, and residential instability: town and city in ‘pre-modern’ Japan” by Robert J. Smith. Hayami’s chapter on “Size of household in a Japanese county throughout the Tokugawa era”, co-authored with Nobuko Uchida (1972) and Chie Nakane’s chapter (1972), interpreting size and structure of the household in Japan over three centuries, were both included. I remember how violent had been the discussion between Hayami and Nakane. Hayami’s figures showed very clearly the massive reduction in the Japanese mean household size (MHS) between 1671 and 1870 (a drop from 7.04 to 4.25 members). To what extent this could be compatible with the idea that the Japanese family of the past was an extended one and that the stem family had a long tradition in Japan, was a very serious matter. This question has always been a subject of extensive debate in Japan (Fauve-Chamoux and Ochiai 2009; Hayami 1969; 2016).

The last section of the book, the fifth one, was on North America and ended with only three chapters. Philip J. Greven Jr. provided an overview of the average size of families and households in the Province of Massachusetts in 1764 and in the United States in 1790; John Demos discussed demography and psychology in the historical study of family life, and Edward T. Pryor Jr. compared the family structure in Rhode Island in 1875 and 1960.

Edward N. Saveth, Professor of History at State University College, Fredonia, New York, had given a paper entitled “The problem of the American Family”. He said in the discussion following the presentation of his paper, on Monday morning, September 15, 1969, that he was teaching intellectual history. His main interest was to decipher political behavior, relying on history of the family (Saveth 1964). Kenneth A. Lockridge, Professor of History at Chicago Circle, in his presentation in the same session, said that he had just published a paper in Past and Present (Lockridge 1968). He was finishing a book (Lockridge 1970) and was using wills, among other sources. His book dealt with the town of Dedham, Massachusetts from 1636 to 1736, after it was founded by English Puritans. According to my notes, Lockridge was seeking private funding, trying to establish a Centre for Family Studies and Historical Demography.
in Dedham, USA. He considered that demographers and sociologists had different approaches, the former looking at how society changes, the latter at why it changes. Both Saveth and Lockridge withdrew, their work being already in press or published.

Finally, John Hajnal, Professor at the London School of Economics,\(^\text{28}\) was rather quiet during the conference. But he did speak during the general discussion, and was quite witty in his comments, bringing an unexpected gender view to debates. He said: “Cooking is difficult for a lot of people. Here, in Cambridge, each college is a zadruga. It cooks for everybody working in the college. But it is a zadruga without women. Still during the 19th century, there was only one woman in a college; this was the Director’s wife, with, consequently, a specific masculinity, a very special sex ratio”.

**Household and Family in Past Time, French Introduction in Annales ESC (1972)**

After the Cambridge 1969 conference, I went to Rheims, a main town in Champagne, in order to work on urban parish registers. This was at the time when the team of *Annales ESC* editors was revising the style of the journal. This was called “Nouvelles” [new] *Annales ESC* (Braudel 1969). My article on early fertility transition would be included in the first issue of the new series (Chamoux and Dauphin 1969).

My personal project was to collect quantitative nominative data in order to learn more about French urban contraceptive behavior (Fauve-Chamoux 2001a; 2001b; 2004). I had a busy life in the urban archives for three years, four days a week, working at the same time for the *Centre de Recherches Historiques*, where I had been promoted to a permanent position.

\(^{28}\) John Hajnal (1924-2008) was well known in the world of historical demography for his article published in 1965 on the European marriage pattern (Hajnal 1965).
research position in September 1968. To compensate for the time spent in provincial archives, I was asked to provide editorial work for Annales ESC journal. This could involve translation, copy editing (texts, graphs and figures), rewriting, proof reading and attending editorial meetings in Paris during the weekend. This is why I was asked later by Laslett and the editors of Annales ESC to translate the draft Introduction to the Household and Family in Past Time volume, before its publication in English.

After Laslett’s 1969 conference, I had kept regular contact with him and other Cambridge people, particularly Richard Wall. I managed to visit the Cambridge Group regularly, and always for Whitsun long weekend. This was a fruitful experience for several years. For his part, Laslett was often invited to Paris for conferences or other meetings. In 1972, a Laboratoire de Démographie Historique was created by Jacques Dupâquier at Section VI, EPHE. A small research group had existed previously, with a CNRS staff devoted to his historical demography projects on the Paris region. These research members also worked for the Société de Démographie Historique (a non-profit organization created in 1963) and its periodical, Annales de Démographie Historique (ADH), which at that time had its quarters on Rue de la Baume, next to the office of Annales ESC (and Braudel’s headquarters).

The academic activities of the Société de Démographie Historique (SDH) were international. The SDH published the ADH and this small laboratory unit was the best way to get professional staff and secretarial help, as well as financial support for seminars, courses, summer schools, invitations and travel funds, which a non-profit organization such as the

---

29 My promotion as associate professor in 1975 gave me independence within EHESS. My Rheims personal project was very demanding and it took years to complete, given my long-term professional commitments (Fauve-Chamoux 2001a; 2001b; 2004). From 1973 until 1977, I was director of International Cultural Exchanges at EHESS.
SDH was not able to provide. Soon, besides my own regular work, I found myself involved as a volunteer in many projects and collective publications connected to various academic networks, including the SDH association.30

Polishing Family Concepts with Peter Laslett

Translating the draft introduction of the Household and Family in Past Time book into French was in the same vein as my previous work with Laslett during May 1968. He trusted that he could discuss and elaborate with me the translation of a text that was of major importance for him. I appreciated the friendly way Laslett treated me as an independent young colleague and friend.

I had improved my knowledge of the field and finding a good translation of concepts into French was a real scholarly collaboration. It was hard to decide how to translate and identify in French “dwelling” (habitation), “inmate” (co-résident étranger), “premises” (locaux), “houseful” (maisonnée), “domestic group” (groupe familial de corésidents), etc. I kept the draft of the second part of my translation of Laslett’s Introduction to HFPT (with his many written comments), which was finally published in the well-known special twin issue of Annales ESC on “Famille et Société” [Family and Society] (Laslett 1972a).

It is important to stress how this Annales ESC 1972 article was a step forward for Laslett, a specific draft version of the Cambridge book (HFPT) Introduction (Laslett 1972a; 1972b). He traced his scholarly relationship with Louis Henry and explained the differences in his approach to the study of nominative listings. Laslett mentioned that he was expecting to work further with Eugene Hammel (Hammel and Laslett 1974). The household typology that Peter Laslett presented in his Annales ESC 1972

30 As an elected (and re-elected) board member of SDH, I was for 20 years one of the volunteers (Treasurer and later General Secretary), from 1971 to 1990. I was always affiliated with the Centre de Recherches Historiques (CRH) and was never a full member of the Laboratoire de Démographie Historique, which actually was only a small sector of the CRH, the largest research group at EHESS (previously Section VI of EPHE).
article in French was new. Since the 1969 Cambridge conference, it had already been subjected to an important maturation. Laslett explained, in a note, that much more should be done on the classification system of domestic groups:

We adopted a new classification of the households, and I here thank Louis Henry who was the first to provide recommendations to me on this matter as early as 1967 (see L. Henry, *Manuel de démographie historique* (1967), chapter 2, « Exploitation des listes nominatives », section «Les ménages», pp. 44-46). Henry considered the conjugal link as essential, but he called the conjugal family under the name of pit ("core" or *noyau*). We also use this name. But actually, the author does not classify family units but family heads, so that the very important distinction between simple households and extended families on one side and multiple households on the other depends on the number of family heads. The difference of classification would not be so serious if Henry had not considered a widower being household head as forming a pit or "core" (*noyau*) by himself, whereas for me he is only a head of the family without being a member of the family unit strictly speaking (with or without children), so that Henry sees a multiple household where we simply see an ascending extended family. Henry looks at the widowers who come to live in a household as dependent individuals and not as heads of the family. It is necessary to have this difference in mind when we read studies by European researchers who follow Louis Henry's classification (Laslett 1972a, p. 854 note 12).\(^\text{31}\)

\(^{31}\) Translated by A. Fauve-Chamoux, to be compared with Laslett, 1972b, p. 33, note 48.
Eventually, this “noyau” would later be called *Conjugal Family Unit* (CFU), becoming the basis of the Hammel/Laslett household classification (Hammel and Laslett 1974). CFUs would be formed in one of three ways: by a married couple without offspring; by a married couple with never-married offspring and/or never-married adopted/foster children; or by a lone parent with at least one never-married child. If there were more than two generations in a household, the CFU was formed from the youngest generation upwards. In his French article, Laslett added another interesting note:

In the planned publication, we intend to reach a more elaborate system and conventions which will avoid turning to language […] The whole system should remain open; the classification as well as the ideographic system should remain without any authoritarian character (Laslett 1972a, p. 860, note 25 and p. 868).

Publishing produced maturation. Laslett had to trace, with me, visible household structures and we came to settle ideograms, as is common in social anthropology (Laslett 1972a, p. 860), in order to establish a system that could be universal, allowing the comparison of different societies. With Laslett, I was translating what was a version in progress of the *Introduction to Household and Family in Past Time* (HFPT) (Laslett 1972b). During this process there were long discussions and Laslett changed his mind later on some points after he corrected the *Annales ESC* proofs: in the French version, ideogram 2, p. 872 is said representing an “Extended family household extended downwards and laterally” (4d type), while it is in the English 1972 version published later (p. 42) clearly said to be an “Extension upwards and laterally”, which is conform to definitions (Laslett 1972a, 861; 1972b, 31). Such a remaining error is interesting in itself, since nobody is perfect. The Hammel/Laslett classification was then at an early stage and I

---

had the privilege of discussing concepts with the author. It would be finalized two years later (Hammel and Laslett 1974).

**Conclusion: Towards a Global Family/Demography Network**

Thanks to Fernand Braudel, when I met Laslett for the first time in Paris, in May 1968, I was already familiar with his important book *The World We Have Lost* (1965). By chance, the following political événements marked the beginning of a long, friendly and fruitful collaboration.\(^{33}\) I helped him to prepare an international event in 1969 that would be followed by the publication of a masterpiece: *Household and Family in Past Time*, Cambridge, 1972, co-edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall. Permanently contested, permanently referred to, this book remains a reference work, while the French version of its *Introduction* that I translated for Laslett is now rarely cited (Laslett 1972a). With globalization, the importance of the French language has been reduced. But in the early 1970s, being published in *Annales ESC* in Paris represented an achievement for a Cambridge scholar.

My common interest and long conversations with Peter Laslett, Richard Wall and other Cambridge group members, including Tony Wrigley, Roger Schofield,\(^ {34}\) and later Richard Smith, orientated my academic carrier, 

\(^{33}\) My subsequent and lifelong collaboration with Peter Laslett was particularly important in 1979 and 1980, when preparing for the international conference *Malthus hier et aujourd'hui* [Malthus past and present] organized in Paris, UNESCO, by the *Société de Démographie Historique*, 27-30 May 1980. The main event gathered 400 participants and included an exhibition entitled *De Malthus... au Malthusianisme* that I co-organized with Laslett (Fauve-Chamoux 1980; Fauve-Chamoux 1984; Dupâquier and Fauve-Chamoux 1983).

\(^{34}\) I also translated the article published by Roger S. Schofield, co-director of the Cambridge Group, under the title: “La reconstitution de la famille par ordinateur”, *Annales ESC*, 1972, 27, 4-5, pp. 1071-1082. I was then involved in Family reconstitution methodology, with an article in the same *Annales ESC* issue (Chamoux 1972).
encouraged my research and publications in the field of Historical Demography and History of the Family. At the same time, through the combined agency of the *Annales* School (meaning Section VI of EPHE, renamed EHESS in 1975), the *Société de Démographie Historique*, the *Institut National d’Etudes Démographiques* (INED), the *International Union for the Scientific Study of the Population* (IUSSP), the *International Economic History Association* (IEHA) and, last but not least, the *International Commission for Historical Demography* (ICHD/CIDH), I was able to participate in the formation of a large international network of historical demographers as an interface between many research groups and associations worldwide (Fauve-Chamoux 2013; 2015; 2016).

Some early individual initiatives had major consequences on the globalization of research, as, for example, Louis Henry writing on January 7, 1959 to Hannes Hyrenius, a Swedish demographer, inviting him to INED in Paris to discuss the history of changes in European marital fertility behavior. Consequently Henry came to Stockholm in 1960, where his talk, during the 11th World History Congress, had an immense impact, leading to the creation of the *International Commission of Historical Demography*

---

35 Many historical demography sessions have been held at World Economic History Congresses organized by the *International Economic History Association* (IEHA), beginning in 1960 in Stockholm (Fauve-Chamoux 2016) (see http://www.ieha-wehc.org). By contrast, very few events were held by demographers and historians of population (such as Coale 1976; Åkerman and Nordberg 1976) in partnership with the *International Economic Association* (IEA), which was founded in 1950 as a non-governmental organization, at the instigation of the Social Sciences Department of UNESCO (Maurel 2010).

36 When Louis Henry discovered the work by Hannes Hyrenius, he immediately published a note in *Population* (Henry 1959).

37 International (World) Congresses of Historical Sciences are organized every five years by the *International Committee of Historical Sciences* (ICHS/CISH). As an affiliated international organization, the *International Commission for Historical Demography* (ICHD) organizes a large conference during this global event.
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(ICHD/CIDH) (Fauve-Chamoux 2016; Tedebrand 2016). When, in 1969, Peter Laslett organized an international conference in Cambridge, the Nordic Countries were represented by Michael Drake, for Norway, and the subsequent book, a best seller in 1972, did not include any Swedish paper. Interdisciplinary and comparative studies were also encouraged by the creation of periodicals such as the *Journal of Family History* in 1976, a year marking several turning points for the discipline (Fauve-Chamoux 2016, 16). The *Social Science History Association* (SSHA) was also created in 1976, with members bringing new theoretical approaches and methodologies.

The oil economic crisis of 1973 accelerated the end of the post-WWII *Glorious Thirty* period (1945-1975). Following the 1968 events of unrest, important changes in socio-economic contexts and attitudes to family life, gender and human reproduction took place in Europe and were recognized by legislative changes. These major shifts in *mentalités* and behavior were called the *Second Demographic Transition* in 1986 by Dutch demographers, inspired by well-known French scholars, Alfred Sauvy and Philippe Ariès.

In 1996, when the First *European Social Science History Conference* (ESSHC) emerged in the Netherlands, the *Social Science History Association* (SSHA) de facto also extended its networks. The Family/Demography international community then became much more representative and English became a global common language. The Family/Demography network, born in the early 1960s, was definitely a collective long-term venture. It was time for demographers and historians to join their efforts and share their recollections, while a new generation of researchers moves forward, taking advantage of a new globalized world. This has just been done with a first anthology, a global history of Historical Demography (Fauve-Chamoux, Bolovan and Sogner 2016, 698 pages), in which more than fifty authors present the rich knowledge accumulated since the 1960s about past population continuities and changes, and the development of the field in their country. Each author
Fauve-Chamoux

had a different story to tell but all would attest, including the present author, that it is a challenge to preserve the history of humankind, respecting human values and the rich diversity of cultural flexible identities transmitted through generations.
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