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1. **President’s Column**

Recently I had the opportunity to attend the 5th Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime as an observer in Vienna. It took place from 18 – 22 October 2010. President Burawoy asked me to represent the ISA on that occasion. There was a lot of ideas for family sociologists in it.

The intention of the United Nations is to work together to combat international organized crime. Transnational crime is an economic issue and deals with an enormous amount of money flow. In an introductory statement the speaker talked of USD200,000 earned every minute worldwide with human trafficking. Human trafficking has an enormous impact on families. It tears them apart, it could also bring them together. At one point the statement was made that trafficking also enables migration that benefits refugees.

A few days later it happened that we had a seminar with Peace Nobel Laureates at the University. Melissa Fleming represented the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), an organization which twice won the nobel peace price. She told a story of a sixteen year old Nigerian. His father was killed and his mother spent all her savings to pay a trafficker to relocate him to a country where he could enjoy more freedom and better live chances. The trafficker placed him in the centre of Vienna and told him to ask the next black man he would meet to help him. Today, two years later, he is staying with an Austrian family and finishing school. He was lucky. Melissa Fleming said, “if he would have been left in the centre of Athens, he might have had a chance of 0.7% to be accepted as an asylum seeker”.

Of course sociologists mainly deal with structures, with underlying patterns and rules of behavior. Nevertheless the story presents issues family sociologists could be concerned with. International crime and reactions of nation states are not separated from private family affairs. The nations need data and the international community scientifically informed facts.

It might be an idea to look at UN-organizations websites, to be informed of the discussion and get in contact with local NGOs or political parties. Material for family courses with students could also be found and I find it refreshing to invite people from outside to the class to get this more practical view.

As far as this issue is concerned you might look at the webpage of UNODC to get more information: [http://www.unodc.org/unodc](http://www.unodc.org/unodc)

Rudolf Richter
2. **Honorary President’s Column**

The 18th and 19th of November 2010 *The Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship* was held in Uppsala. The background was twofold. About 20 years ago I started a seminar series for those in Uppsala who were interested in symbolic interactionism and other constructionist theoretical perspectives. This seminar needed a name and we gave it the name *Jane* after Jane Addams (1860–1935), one of the first symbolic interactionists. The seminar had meetings when it happened to be feasible or “needed”. After many years my friend and colleague Vessela Misheva took over as chair of the seminar and suddenly we had an assistant (one of the doctoral students) who now organizes meetings every three weeks.

A couple of years ago we discussed whether we should celebrate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams. So we did. Money came from various sources and a conference was organized. Among specially invited participants/speakers were Mary Jo Deegan (University of Nebraska, USA), Mark Hutter (Rowan University, USA), Andrea Salvini (University of Pisa, Italy), Robert Dingwall (Nottingham Trent University, UK), Erik Schneiderhan (University of Toronto, Canada), Rita Braches-Chyrek (Bergishe Universität Wuppertal, Germany), Miriam Adelman (Universidade Federal do Paranà, Brasil), Rudy Seward (University of North Texas, USA), and Wilfried Dumon (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium).

This conference became very successful and many were those scholars from various disciplines attending. The plans are that we will each year organize a conference in honor of Jane Addams and in honor of someone who will be awarded a Jane Addams Award.

My hope is that even more scholars within the family field would have joined us and, as the optimist I am, I am looking forward to see more family scholars among us. After all, Jane Addams was not only a sociologist but she could also be classified as a family sociologist.

JT
jan.trost@soc.uu.se

3. **From the Secretary**

Dear Members

In this issue of the Gazette we pay special attention to two of our longstanding members. Jan Trost, our honorary president, turned 75 in November 2010. Rudy Seward, CFR Vice President, attended Jan’s birthday celebrations. At
this occasion Rudy conveyed the CFR’s wishes of congratulation to Jan. In recognition of Jan’s contributions over the years, we have decided to include in this issue of the Gazette a selection of Jan’s bi-annual column as honorary president.

We salute George Kurian for his monumental contribution as founding editor (1970) of the *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. In 2009 George stepped down from the Editorship but continues his involvement in the journal in the capacity as Managing Editor. We would also like to congratulate George in being the recipient of the National Council on Family Relations’ International Section, 2010 Jan Trost Award.

For those of you who are interested to know a bit more about the profile of our membership, please see below:

**Membership as on 31 December 2010: Committee on Family Research (RC06)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular members in good standing (ISA members)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated members</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best wishes,
Ria Smit

**4. Upcoming Interim Seminar (2011)**

A Research Seminar of the Committee on Family Research on:

“Reconstruction of Intimate and Public Spheres in a Global Perspective”

**Dates:** September 12-14, 2011  *Excursion tours will be organized on 15th.*
**Venue:** Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

There have been fundamental social changes worldwide since the 1970s. As many people consider globalization and individualization as their characteristics, these changes involve transformation both on the macro- and micro-level scales. Ultimately, we are facing an overall social change that could be termed a “reconstruction of intimate and public spheres.” The family or the intimate sphere is no longer an isolated social space. It is changing within the context of population ageing, development and retrenchment of welfare states, globalization and migration, and the formation of global and regional norms and values.

The fundamental social changes are happening all over the world, but we should raise a question of whether or not the changes are mostly identical in all places. For example, Asian scholars have begun to pay attention on the regional features of their societies, such as lowest low fertility, infrequency of children born
out-of-wedlock, and the familialistic welfare regime that assumes family responsibility for the welfare of family members. The researchers in migration studies point out that family changes are observed in both sending and receiving countries but in different ways.

The aim of this seminar is to consider diverse aspects of “reconstruction of intimate and public spheres” in various places in the world. In particular, as the seminar will be held in Japan, the organizers hope that this seminar will serve as a chance for deepening discussions between Asian scholars and the scholars from other parts of the world.

The sample topics to be covered are:

- The state, market and the family/intimacy
- Welfare state retrenchment and the family/intimacy
- Community and the family/intimacy
- Globalization and the family/intimacy
- Migration and the family/intimacy
- The family/intimacy in post-communist societies
- The impact of super-national organizations on the family/intimacy
- Media and the family/intimacy
- Population ageing and the family/intimacy
- Religion and the family/intimacy

We are looking forward to receiving many good paper proposals from various areas of the world. Please send your abstract (200-300 words with your name, affiliation, address, and e-mail address) to cfr2011.kyoto@gmail.com by February 10, 2011. You will be notified by the end of February 2011 of the status of your proposal. The deadline of full paper will be July 20. The time for presentation will be 15-20 minutes. Those who would like to apply for the poster session, please write clearly on the same sheet with the abstract. Membership is not a prerequisite for the proposal submission. Prior to the final program is compiled, however, authors are required to register for RC06 (CFR) membership (http://www.rc06-isa.org/). If the membership registration is not completed by the end of July 2011, authors’ names will be deleted from the program. Four-year membership registration fees are $40 for regular members, and $10 for student members.

The organizing committee will provide travel grants for a few presenters, particularly young researchers (with no tenure-track jobs) from the Asian region. If you are interested, please contact cfr2011.kyoto@gmail.com after your paper proposal is accepted.

Organizing Committee:
Emiko Ochiai
Katsuko Makino
Masako Ishii-Kuntz
Noriko lwai
Hachiro lwai
Reiko Yamato
Mieko Takahashi
5. Congratulations to Prof. Jan Trost on His 75th Birthday

From Vice President Rudy Seward’s Desk:

Jan Trost’s celebration of the 75th anniversary of his birthday party was held on Saturday, November 20th at Gästrike-Hälsinge Nation, Trädgårdsgatan 9, Uppsala. The proceeding started at 18:30 or 6.30 pm with a welcoming drink on the stairs leading up to the second floor and entry way outside the banquet hall. At around 7 pm the large gathering of over 50 people moved to the dinner tables in the large hall to start the celebration. Jan welcomed family and friends including former and current colleagues and students and explained the location of the party as a nation house.

Nations are student associations traditionally comprised of Uppsala University (UU) students who came from the same Swedish provinces. Jan being from the city of Gävle joined the Gästrike-Hälsinge (G-H) Nation when he first arrived at UU. The nations are important meeting places for new students offering study halls, housing, libraries, pubs, clubs, low cost meals, and traditional parties. The G-H Nation, founded in 1646, is housed in a beautiful late 19th century building in central Uppsala.

The toastmaster for the evening Johanna Fransson Trost used a gong to get the gathering’s attention to start the program for the evening. The gaiety of the group required the use of the gong to precede the announcement of each new part of the lengthy program. The group and presenters was very international, hence presentations were in English, Swedish, or Danish. Seating arrangements were set in order that everyone was within earshot of translators if needed.

The evening lived up to the invitation of having something to eat and to drink and to enjoy ourselves. Throughout the meal over 15 guests made presenters with and toast to Jan following each one. It was hard to believe that when the last presenter was announced it was just short of midnight. Jan’s daughters Johanna,
Maria, and Hedvig led off the presentation with skit that involving cooking the ingredient to make up their father.

Several songs filled the program, many written especially for the evening. One was written by long time CFR member and colleague of Jan’s, Bert Adams. The song entitled “Professor Jan Trost and LAT” (2010) was a tribute to Jan’s signature concept and other accomplishments. All guests were provided a copy of words with their dinner setting and were invited to sing-along with Bert, who was accompanied on piano by Diane Adams. They were present via a CD recording. Bert and Diane also recorded “If We Only Have Love,” Jacques Brel’s song about world peace and labor songs from the 1930s, including one entitled “Miss Jane Addams.” The latter was the focus of a conference completed at UU the day before on Jan’s actual birth anniversary.

Rudy’s presentation notes: Jan we first met in 1971. I had come to Sweden as a graduate student research fellow for Professor of Sociology Gunner Boalt at Stockholm University as part of an exchange program with Southern Illinois University. Family was the focus of my dissertation so I asked about Swedish scholars. Boalt recommended you without hesitation as the expert on family sociology in Sweden.

When I contacted Jan, he graciously invited me to meet with him and his colleagues at the Family Study Center at Uppsala University (UU) and talked about my dissertation research. Jan chaired and founded this group in middle 1960s. Their many questions and suggestions provided many helpful directions for my research. Consequently, I kept in contact with the research group and paid my dues regularly for many years.

I kept in touch with Jan over the years and when I was able to return to Sweden often working on some research project he always welcomed me and tolerated my constant questions. Many times, he generously provided letters of support and encouragement for many funding proposal.

At some point through the UU study group I became associated with the International Sociological Association’s Research Committee 06 or more commonly referred to the Committee on Family Research (CFR). Although I paid dues for many years it was not until 2000 that I became an active participant in CFR conferences. The conference was organized by Jan here in Uppsala. The impact of that conference on my career and life are immeasurable. First unlike most large and impersonal academic conferences, we were a small group that actively engaged in dialogue both during and between the sessions plus outside the conference. It was a very stimulating yet comfortable environment in which to try out and develop new ideas. Every evening we had a social gathering that allowed us to get to know one another on a personal level. By the end of the conference I felt that I knew a lot more about understanding and researching the family. Plus, I felt like I had found a new extended and very diverse family. As I became a regular participant and eventually started serving on the board and becoming an officer, I realized I felt closer to my fellow CFR members than colleagues at my university and neighbors back in Texas. My wife recently reported a similar feeling based on her experiences of after attending just two conferences.

As I became more active in CFR it became very clear that Jan was as one CFR member state “the heart and soul” of CFR. He was active from the beginning, served as President, and was on the board for many years. In recognition of his key and multiple roles in 1994 he was designated as CFR’s Honorary President. His key roles
past and present were made clear in the responses of CFR members to a call for birthday greetings for Jan (some of those I will share with Jan this evening).

Recognition of Jan’s scholarship and contributions beyond his lengthy list of publications include:

1) He was instrumental many times in bringing together established scholars and students in a variety of forums often providing mentorship. Besides the Family Study Center UU, in the mid 1960s he also founded the Alcohol Study Center and in the middle of the 70s started The Disaster Study Group. In the early 1990s he founded, the Nordic Family Research Network, connecting family researchers from Nordic and Baltic countries, namely, from Sweden, Norway, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

2) He has held visiting professorships appointments in universities in Belgium, Israel, and the United States

3) In 1999 the International Section of the National Council on Family Relations established the "Jan Trost Award for Outstanding Contributions to Comparative Family Studies." Jan Trost was the first recipient in honor of his contribution to family scholarship and research.

4) The number of colleagues and student that he has encouraged and mentored would be impossible to list and the list continues to grow. As a scholar, teacher, and mentor he has influenced many generations of young faculty and students.

Last Thursday at the UU’s Rector’s reception in conjunction with the Jane Addams conference, Jan’s comments about his mentor and professor Torgny Segerstedt reminded of the quote from Henry Brooks Adams’ book The Education of Henry Adams: "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops," Jan remarks made it clear that Professor Segerstedt, who was the first professor of sociology appointed in Sweden, had a great influence on him. Following that role model, Jan in turn has a great of influence on many others. He is passing that the legacy he received to other colleagues and students who will in turn pass it on as well. So I was not surprised to learn that Vessela Mishev a, who was the organizer of the just concluded Jane Addams conference on Social Entrepreneurship, had been introduce to Addams as a student in one of Jan’s classes. This introduction led to a passion for Addams’ work and contributions. This led to her taking over the courses that Jan had taught on Addams before he retired. Her passion for Addams eventually led to taking on the arduous tasks of organizing the first conference focusing on Addams. The conference would commemorate the 150th anniversary of her birth and her contributions to social entrepreneurship and the Chicago School of Sociology. Although apparently not intentionally, the dates for the conference were set to include Jan 75th anniversary of his birth.

Relationships sustain us and give meaning to our lives and conversations are the life blood of relationships. Over the years Jan has provided engaging, stimulating, informative, and delightful conversations on a one to one basis and in public forum. The value of his commentaries are due to Jan’s breadth and depth of knowledge, high academic standards, originality, fairness, thoroughness, determination, and friendship sustained due to his high energy level. Others have described him as courageous for taking on tough and delicate issues and a pioneer in focusing on new developments in human relationships. These terms and others have been used by colleagues and students to describe Jan.

Toast: On behalf of myself and many others, especially CFR members, thank you colleague, wise council, mentor, teacher, advisor, and especially friend for enriching
our lives through your thoughts, deeds, and support for many years and hopefully for
many years to come.

BIRTHDAY WISHES TO JAN

Happy Birthday Jan!
I had the pleasure of meeting you at the CFR conference in Oslo. I was one of Dr.
(Barbara) Settles’ students at the time. During one of the bus trips you told me about
your plans after the conference that were filled with traveling to various cities, writing,
and presenting. I admired your commitment to CFR and international academia. I also
admired your active pursuit of enjoying life in many different places. I wish you all the
best in your professional and personal life and hope that you continue to share your
love for seeing the world with those around you. You certainly inspired me.
Happy Birthday,
Alyson Cavanaugh

Dear Jan,
You were introduced to me by Laszlo Cseh-Szombathy at the XXIIIrd Seminar of the
CFR in Balatonzamardi in 1988. Time after time since those days I have enjoyed your
nice company in Belgrade, Taipei, Lithuania, Finland, Strobl, Mexico City, Lisbon and
last time, in Budapest. Discussing that and this I always felt that you are very close to
me. Many people are thinking of you on your birthday. I just wanted to let you know I
am one of them!
Yours,
Peter Somlai

November 10, 2010
Address to Jan:
I met Jan in 1991 at the CFR conference in Norway. He invited me and my colleague
to participate. It was one of the most important and exiting event in my life. It was an
unforgettable experience for me as a person due to the possibility to “discover”
Western culture, as we used to say. At that time everything was so different from the
Soviet way of living, thinking, arranging things. It was important for me as a
researcher, as I became interested in the idea of conceptualizing family and the
dyadic approach in family sociology. Several years later Jan initiated NFRN,
connecting family researchers from Nordic and Baltic countries, namely, from Sweden,
Norway, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Since that time we have cooperated
in organizing conferences within a NFRN, in delivering lectures to the university
students, in tutoring students, etc. I dare to say that Jan brought the spirit of family
discourse to Vilnius University and introduced Symbolic Interaction in family sociology.
I know that to have Jan as a teacher is a very enriching experience. Unfortunately, I
hadn’t such opportunity. At the same time I have a feeling that since we met he
became my tutor and a part of my academic biography. It is very difficult to distinguish
what I did by myself and what is done in collaboration with Jan or, at least, under his
influence. Even the book I published a few years ago is about his contribution to family
sociology. In 1993 Jan visited Lithuania as my adviser in organizing the XXIXth CFR
Seminar in Palanga. That was his first visit.
Dear Jan,

Congratulations on your 75th birthday, which hopefully finds you in good health and future oriented spirit. We are always impressed by the creativity in your work, which shines through not only in your scientific work but also in your editorials for the Gazette. All the best and I hope you stay engaged in our research committee.

Rudolf Richter

Dear Jan

I had the pleasure of meeting you for the first time in 1996 during the CFR seminar held in the Itala Game Reserve in South Africa. As a young academic at the time I was struck by the privilege of being part of the vibrant debate during the seminar which was attended by a number of prominent family sociologists. In these discussions you stood tall. Since then my admiration for your work as an academic has increased even more. It is always a pleasure seeing you at the different CFR gatherings and having a nice conversation with you.

I wish you the very best for the years to come and may your 75th birthday be an unforgettable experience filled with wonderful memories.

Happy Birthday,

Ria Smit

Jan turns 75!

I have had the privilege to be one of his academic "compagnons de route" for more than half of this period. I have learned a lot from him. More particular two features have impressed me. A first: his democratic behaviour. As well in his academic world as in total different parts of the globe where we travelled he always treated the persons we met with great dignity: all were equal whatever position in society. The second: his courage. He dared to take stand on academic issues such as the notion of "marital satisfaction" (theory) and "family career" (methodology). On the other hand he was and still is a pioneer in recognizing new domains such as "unmarried cohabitation" and "L.A.T." relations. But this contribution is not an obituary, Jan is still very much alive and a productive scholar. To him turning 75 is not a rite of the passage but an opportunity to have a party. Let's celebrate that!

Wilfried Dumon

I have known Jan for a long time and I have always felt that he and the CFR belong organically together. Throughout the times I have appreciated his energy, originality, his sense of humour and his knowledge. I had occasion to admire his strength in hardship, when (during one of his stays in Israel) he fell and broke his arm. My husband (a surgeon) administered first aid on the spot and then sent him to a hospital. He bore it all with real strength of character. I think he is still young despite his 75 years (speaking from the height of my 90 years!). I wish him to go on for another long and fruitful period of his life.

Rivka W. Bar-Yosef, Professor of Sociology (emer.)
Dear Jan,

Ithala, Kwazulu Natal – you and Wilfried asking a black bar attendant about his daily life, salary and the like...that is how I first got to know you. That is, in person. Because I knew you even as an undergraduate student when Anna Steyn assigned us reading authored by Jan Trost. You have been, in many ways, the “father” of the international family of family scholars. As an adopted member of this family I have great respect for all the work you have done. A great big congratulations on this huge milestone in your life.

Tessa LeRoux

Dear Jan, it's been a pleasure to have known you and your work for at least three decades, if not more. We incorporated some of your work, together with Irene Leven’s in our own research and teaching. Thanks.

Your conferences were great, a mixture of learning from colleagues, good food, and social programs. You introduced us to Sweden in style. You ensured that the conference papers were of high quality, as was the total event.

Now, at the Biblical four score and ten years, we wish you a long, happy and healthy life.

Cheers, Rachel and Ben Schlesinger, Toronto

6. Jan Trost’s CFR Gazette column Contributions: A Selection

In honor of Jan Trost’s 75th birthday, we have decided to include a selection of Jan’s CFR Gazette column contributions as Honorary President of the CFR.

Vol 25, Issue 2, 1999

One of our senior members, Wilfried Dumon, retired from his position as professor at the University of Leuven, Belgium, last year. This retirement was celebrated with a two day event. Thursday December 3, 1998, a seminar was organized where each chapter of a festschrift in honor of Wilfried was discussed, most of the authors were present, for example, Joan Aldous (USA), Salustiano del Campo Urbano (Spain), Gabriel Kiely (Ireland), Barbara Settles (USA), and myself. Friday the 4th the university had organized a ceremony in the University Hall into which we, a pedell, the rector, the dean, head of department (Koen Matthijs), invited professors (the same as the authors of the festschrift), and Leuven professors came walking in dressed in academic outfit, robes. In the audience there were hundreds of people. A set of musicians played a number of pieces and speeches in honor of the newly retired were given by the rector, the dean, head of department and me, invited as representing the international scientific community. Finally Wilfried himself gave his proper thanks for the honor shown him.

There were many nice things said about Wilfried and related to the CFR are, for example: he has been an active member of the CFR for more than three decades, he was secretary/treasurer during two periods, 1974-1982, and some would say that he
"was" the CFR during that period, he started the CFR Gazette in 1974, he organized the XIXth CFR-seminar on Divorce and Remarriage in Leuven, 1981.

Those who want a copy of the *festschrift* can contact Department of Sociology, van Evenstraat 2b, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium. Price: BEF 1,800:-, EURO 45:- or USD 50.- plus postage.

**Vol 25, Issue 3, 1999**

The first international seminar of the CFR was held in 1954 in Cologne in the at that time Federal Republic of Germany. The organizer was N. Andersen and I do not know anything about what theme they had for the seminar. During the 1950s another four seminars seem to have been organized by the CFR – where and who was the organizers we do not know. Some of those who have been along for a long time might know. For example, Joan Aldous, John Mogeey, Harold Christensen and Gerrit Kooy might know. If you do: please inform us!

What we know is that the CFR officially became committee number six of the International Sociological Association (ISA) in 1959 – now there are more than 50 Research Committees of the ISA.

Since the first international seminars during the 1950s the CFR has organized five seminars as well as the sessions at the ISA world congresses during the 1960s. During the next decade we were offered six seminars and the sessions at three world congresses. During the 1980s the number of seminars had increased to even as many as eight seminars and the two ISA congresses. This last decade of the century has shown ten seminars organized by the CFR and the sessions at three world congresses.

Thus, during the existence of the CFR there has been 36 seminars, 32 during the 40 years as a committee of the ISA and also sessions at ten world congresses. Many of the committees of the ISA have been more or less asleep during their life time but the CFR has never. And I hope it will remain awake for many more years.

**Vol 26, Issue 1, 2000**

Some comments on birth rates. In 1983 Sweden faced a historically very low birthrate, only a total fertility rate (TFR) of 1.6. Politicians were upset and one could hear statements to the effect that Sweden was a society hostile to children and other unrealistic ideas. The Parliament made some changes of the social welfare system. Based upon the fact that there seemed to be no changes in the relative number of first and second children, but that third and fourth children had decreased, for example, the alimonies for the third child became 50% higher that for the first and second. The TFR increased and reached the level more than 2.1 in 1990-91.

But, there was no need for any new political decision. With the ideology about the preferred number of children, the TFR would in the long run be about 2.4 if all women would have as many children as they wanted and no more. With the new contraceptives available and used, almost no women have more children than they want. What is called delayed births, meaning few women have their first child when young, the probability for sterility among women as well as men increases. Few women want a child when the marital relationships is bad or when they are divorced and with historically many divorces and separations, some women will have fewer children than wanted.

All this means that the expected TFR in a country such as Sweden will fluctuate between 1.5 and 2.1 if my calculations are right or at least reasonable. After 1991 the
birth rate decreased and is now about 1.5. Thus, my prediction is that the TFR very soon will increase again. This will mean that the birth rate will never come up to the magic 2.1 except for occasionally and the population will decrease (immigration and emigration not considered, neither changes in mortality rates).

What about, for example, Spain and Italy with birth rates as low as just above a TFR of 1? And other countries? The Gazette might be a good forum for exchange of experiences and interpretations.

Vol 26, Issue 2, 2000

Now, when the XXXVII\textsuperscript{th} International CFR-seminar is over, it’s hard not to write about it since my thoughts for a long time have been there planning and now they are still there after some weeks. Sort of an abstinence. And here comes some notes.

Officially the seminar started June 20 in the evening – but in reality it started about two years ago when I promised to organize a second Uppsala meeting. Örjan Hultåker and I organized the first one and the theme was Family and Disaster, with our common background in family studies as well as in disaster studies. This happened in 1980 and was the XVIII\textsuperscript{th} international CFR seminar. All sessions and all lodging took place in Rosersberg’s castle outside of Uppsala.

Now 20 years later the sessions took place in one of the class rooms of Uppsala University’s Language Science Center and lodging was organized in two small hotels just five minutes walk from the sessions. My intentions were to organize a small seminar with about 25 participants but Uppsala and the theme, Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Cross-Cultural Family Studies, seemed popular: more than 50 participants from 20 countries – truly international. In order to make the seminar efficient the registration fee included lodging as well as all meals during the three days seminar.

According to my opinion, also vented in this column several times, the CFR has too few younger members and certainly too few student members. In order to change that situation at least to some extent I had applied for financial support to students for joining the seminar. Money granted helped pay the registration fee (and thus the stay) for eight students and travel costs for some. Money granted also made it possible to support travel costs and/or registration fee for nine participants from countries with problematic currency situation.

Uppsala University and it rector magnificus gave a reception for us all in the Chancellor’s room of the university building and Department of Sociology hosted one of the dinners. Support covering the mentioned subsidies came from the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation and the Swedish Council for Social Research. Due thanks to all of them.

Some of the papers from the seminar will be collected in a special issue of Journal of Comparative Family Studies after a blind review of all manuscripts in revised form submitted to me. Most presentations and most discussions were of very high quality and one can therefore presume an issue of high quality as well.

Vol 27, Issue 1, 2001

The Swedish Sociological Association has just celebrated a 40-year anniversary at Uppsala. To look at the program is kind of interesting from a family perspective. There was no session out of the 15 themes, some with several sessions, called anything with a connotation to family studies.
What does this mean? Most of the participants are colleagues with a fairly new Ph.D. or they are doctoral candidates, few full professors. Are they not interested in family studies?

When looking at the titles of the presentations in the program the picture is quite different. For example, in a set of sessions on gender perspectives one can find paper presentations like Sociological Theory on Family Cohesion and Separations, Family Life and Work Life on the “New Work Force”, and Special Money in Families’ Perceptions of Ownership, Entitlement and Ownership.

And the sessions on sociology of health one can find presentations like Reaching and Listening: Sexually Abused Street Children.

Do we have a tendency to redefine the contents of scholarly studies, research, and education in the Western world? Clearly, so seems to be the case in Sweden. If what happened in Uppsala is indicative of changes going on elsewhere and also about the future, family sociology as a scientifically labeled field might disappear. But family studies will go on to be an important field hidden under other labels.

Even if some labels are changing and some research is carried out under other umbrellas than that of family sociology, the colleagues as well as their research is welcome in the CFR. Many of the research committees, like ours, have many members who come from other disciplines than sociology. That’s excellent from my perspective – and in line with the statutes of the ISA as well as of those of the CFR. All members of the CFR do not have to be sociologists and all do not have to classify themselves as family sociologists. What’s important is that they work with and/or are interested in our field of studies.

Vol 27, Issue 2, 2001
The CFR has been a very calm and peaceful organization over all it’s more than 40 years. It was established as a committee within the frame of the International Sociological Association in 1959. According to my knowledge Reuben Hill (University of Minnesota, USA) was the first president of the CFR. He remained so until the World Congress in Varna, Bulgaria, in 1970.

During the last few years of the 1960s some opposition came toward the fact that the board was never elected. From 1965 John Mogey (USA) was appointed secretary of the CFR and Reuben Hill and John Mogey ran the CFR until 1970. The opposition ended in 1969 when eventually Joan Aldous (USA) and some others wrote a draft for a constitution for the CFR. This was made the constitution of the CFR in Varna – mainly the same constitution we now have. Gerrit Kooy (The Netherlands) was the first democratically elected president of the CFR with John Mogey as elected secretary/treasurer.

After them came Mogey as president and Wilfried Dumon (Belgium) as secretary, in 1978 the late Veronica Stolte-Heiskanen (Finland) came as our president, with Dumon still as secretary. Four years later Laszlo Cseh-Szombathy (Hungary) became president and Örjan Hultåker (Sweden) secretary. At the ISA Congress in New Delhi, 1986, I took over as president for eight years and Don Edgar (Australia) was secretary until 1990 when Barbara James (USA) took over for eight years. As we all know Barbara Settles (USA) has now been president for seven years and Irene Levin (Norway) is secretary.

When I became a member of the CFR in the beginning of the 1960s there were no real memberships. Invitation to attend the international seminars was on a personal level. That was changed with the new constitution aiming at guaranteeing all members
(and now we were members by registration and paying our dues) the right to be informed about all of the activities of the CFR. Not only informed but also to have the chance to attend any of the seminars.

The first international seminar that I attended was held in Oslo in 1963, when I was a new assistant professor and fairly young. The membership has grown in age, which it does in almost all organizations if members remain members and do not drop out. But we need to recruit more young members. That kind of recruitment seems to have started when more young new colleagues with a doctoral degree are invited.

As I wrote above, the atmosphere of the CFR’s seminars have been peaceful and calm – I hope we will go on like that. Another trait of the seminars has been the emphasis upon high quality of both the presentations and the discussions. Sometimes they have to be tough in order to maintain quality.

Vol 28, Issue 1, 2002

Back again to Australia! The CFR had an international seminar in Australia many years ago when, in 1984, we had the XXth seminar situated in Melbourne. The topic was *Social Change and Family Policy*. To my knowledge this was the seminar with the largest number of participants ever. Those of us presenting were literally on the stage in a big convention hall. The audience consisted of, as usual, colleagues but also lots of interested persons practicing social work, law and politics, to mention some specialties.

The organizer was *Don Edgar*, at that time Director of the Australian Family Study Center in Melbourne. The organization was perfect and beside the intellectual events we also went to a sheep farm where we ate a lot of good food and drank some delicious Australian wine, which to many of us was a new experience – now those wines are common and also fully respected as should be. We also saw a poor sheep being “freed” from all its wool.

At this seminar we introduced a new CFR-policy, which has become a tradition: all participants became members of the CFR, the four-year fee was included in the dues for participating at the sessions of the seminar. Since there were more than 200 participants a good ground was formed for the financial stability of the CFR, from which we now gain.

This World Congress is also special for some of us and I am one of them: this is the tenth time I am going to an ISA international and world congress and I have been at them all since then. My first was the VIth which was held in 1966 in Evian, France. There I met some persons who became very good friends, one of them is Wilfried Dumon. The weather was fine, the food was excellent (of course since we were in France) and the site was not crowded – just some 2,000 to 3,000 participants. I am afraid that we will be many more in Brisbane. But one issue will be the same: we will meet old friends and make new friends!

Vol 28, Issue 2, 2002

Some of us are soon leaving our home sites in order to go to Brisbane. Many of the members of the CFR don’t, but I hope that we will see many of you all and that we also will see many new members, especially younger colleagues. All over the world we, who have been along for a while, want that our various groups and organizations should grow younger and not older in composition. But with the low mortality rate most organizations grow older if we don’t fight against it. Somewhat paradoxical is that we all (or almost all) hope we will age properly and survive both as individuals and as
organizations. At the same time we are eager that the composition of the aging CFR will not increase in age – that the older members will remain and a refreshment by many new members.

I have been a member of the CFR for almost 40 years. The fascinating thing about the CFR has always been the ‘warm climate’. We have never faced any serious conflicts within the organization. A long time ago, some of us were less satisfied with the lack of democracy. However, according to my evaluation the critique was not directed at the leading “gang” (Reuben Hill, Harold Christensen, John Mogey and some others) but against the principle of a lack of statutes. There was no counter action when Joan Aldous and some others in the early 1970s presented a draft for statutes, very similar to the statutes the CFR now has.

I hope that the good morale and cooperation will continue for at least another 40 years.

Vol 29, Issue 1, 2003

A big issue in today’s Swedish mass media coverage (beside all disasters or near disasters) is connected to what nowadays is labeled “Singles” even in Swedish. Evidently the term is the same as the marital status of “single” (as if that would be a marital status – it is more like a non-marital status). To be a “Single” or one out of many “Singles” seems to be a certain kind of life style. If I have understood the phenomenon correctly, “Singles” are mainly fairly young persons living in one-person households and they seem to be fairly well off. They seem to spend a lot of time dressed up in fancy bars and discotheques. I guess they are an offspring of the Yuppie-movement some decades ago.

I know of no good studies about this phenomenon and I would be very glad to receive responses from you, the members of the CFR. Does this phenomenon exist elsewhere and is it labeled the same way or how? There are some studies about persons living alone, but what I am interested in is the life style of those labeled “Singles”. I am not sure if the labeling is an outsider labeling or if the “Singles” identify themselves as singles. We are certainly not talking about all persons living in one-person households, but only about a relatively small fraction of them.

With my perspective the life style of “Singles” and the notion by mass media that they exist is also connected to what happened some decades ago when non-marital cohabitation came. Since then the marital status of single has become meaningless since most of those cohabiting are “single” (and quite a few are divorced or widowed). Cohabitation as a social institution has made LAT relationships possible and thus also might “Singles” become a social institution alongside marriage, cohabitation and LAT relationships.

Vol 29, Issue 2, 2003

In 1991 the CFR organized (i.e. Irene Levin and I did) the XXVIth International CFR seminar on the theme of What is Family? At that time some previously suppressed countries made themselves free. As a result a couple of colleagues participated, who never had been able nor allowed attending our seminars. Their enthusiasm and curiosity was not to mistake. We therefore decided to support this enthusiasm and curiosity.

At the same time the Swedish government had decided to spend some money in order to support the scientific cooperation between the Nordic countries and the Baltic
States. In some of the discourses the term Nordic countries even included and still includes Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the three Baltic States. After some meetings we realized that a somewhat formal organization had been born and we decided to give the child a name: The Nordic Family Research Network, NFRN.

Since 1992 we have met annually in Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, and Sweden. The agenda has always been very informal and usually the participants have presented news on family matters in their home countries or anything else relevant and actual for the presenter.

The sites for the meetings of the NFRN have varied a lot. We have been in a coastal resort village in Lithuania, in an ex-sanatorium for miners in Estonia, in a cottage high up in the Norwegian Mountains, and of course in various cities.

The number of members of the NFRN is small and we have no formal organization with no statutes, no by-laws and no membership fee. There is not even a roster of members. Anyone who wants to join can do so and we all bring younger colleagues whenever feasible. At the annual seminars the number of participants varies between ten and 20.

Sorry to say, the financial support from the Swedish government has disappeared, but it was very supportive during a number of years – not only supportive but also necessary during the childhood years.

Our next annual meeting will probably be over when you read this. We will meet October 11–13 in Vilnius with Irena Juozeliuniene as our host and organizer. This annual seminar will be our tenth anniversary and thus the eleventh time we meet in this group where most of us have been participants all or almost all the years.

Vol 30, Issue 1, 2004

A couple of years ago the publishing house SAGE contacted Bert Adams, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, and me for a handbook of World Families. We accepted the offer and have contacted many of our colleagues around the world for manuscripts. Many of them answered positively and have done a remarkable job in writing many excellent manuscripts.

Beside Bert and me, the following CFR-members have been supportive in preparing manuscripts for the Handbook of World Families: Fahad Al Naser, Fausto Amaro, Yu-Hua Chen, Wilfried Dumon, Hanneli Forsberg, Carol D. H. Harvey, Tomáš Katřínák, Ruth Katz, Daniela Klaus, Joav Lavee, Irene Levin, I. V. O. Modo, Ivo Možný, Bernhard Nauck, Rudolf Richter, Peter Somlai, Barbara Settles, Xuewen Sheng, Chin Chun Yi, and Susan C. Ziehl.

The finished handbook will, according to the plans of the publisher, be introduced at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations in Orlando in the middle of November this year.

All chapters will, as much as feasible, follow a specified outline made by Bert and me, which looks somewhat like the following: A description of the area covered (size, population, geography, history & varieties within the society).

"Pairing up." This is a little broader than the typical "mate selection." Fertility and socialization. This covers primarily how children are raised in that society. Gender roles. While gender is important throughout each chapter, it needs a separate section covering work, power, communication, etc.
Marital relationships. This would include non-marital cohabitation and LAT relationships, as kinds of “marital relationships”, as well as power, etc.

Family stresses and violence. A large variety of sub-categories.

Divorce/separation/remarriage. Remarriage after divorce or death.

Kinship. This includes property and inheritance.

Aging and death.

Family and other institutions. Primarily on politics and economics, but can include religion in those societies where this matters.

Special topics. This involves unique characteristics.

Personally I look forward to the book and I also hope that colleagues around the world will find this handbook worth while to be used.

Vol 31, Issue 1, 2005

A new journal of interest to man has just been launched. It is an e-journal which means that it will not at all be paper-based. The name is Qualitative Sociology Review. I include here a statement from the editor, Krzysztof Konecki, who is Polish living in Poland.

All sociologists for whom interpretative paradigm and qualitative research methodology are basic perspectives of a social world investigation, are welcomed to submit their articles and support our initiative. There will be published empirical, theoretical and methodological articles applicable to all fields and specializations within sociology. More information:

www.qualitativesociologyreview.org

Vol 32, Issue 2, 2006

Now when I have been professor emeritus for some years, I have realized that my situation is almost totally different from those who are still in active and responsible ages. However, I am still working in writing articles and books, giving some lectures, supervising a number of students. But I have no regular responsibilities.

Beside the regular responsibilities I do not have and all lectures I do not give, I am lucky in another way. The struggle to “publish or perish” and the struggle to apply for and receive research grants or perish are both gone. During all my years I have tried to fulfill the three main tasks as a university professor, the task of being at least a decent teacher, the task of publishing and thus showing attempts at trying to help science to move further, and the task of giving the surrounding community feedback via popular writing and giving answers to journalists.

I still try to fulfill these tasks, but I have no pressure from outside of doing so. In the last issue of Symbolic Interaction (29, 2006, 235 – 257) Philip Vannini has an article named Dead Poets’ Society: Teaching, Publish-or-Perish, and Professors’ Experiences of Authenticity. I highly recommend that article to all involved in the business. He has interviewed a number of professors of various ranks and shows some of the varieties he has found.

My reading is that we have not only the simple variation of those who try to see their authentic identity as both teachers and scholars and those who do not. Reality is more interesting and rich in variation.
Before non-marital cohabitation came to our cultures norms were, at least officially, very strong against any visible love relationships between adults. Young people could and should show their interest to each other. But older persons should not.

Non-marital cohabitation broke the old norm which made the four elements strictly connected: the marital ceremony should come just hours before the two were allowed to move in together and they should not have sex together before that moment. The fourth element normatively connected was the expectation of a child to be born about a month after the marriage.

When non-marital cohabitation had become a social institution LAT relationships came and after a while also became a social institution. Had non-marital cohabitation not come, LAT relationships would probably neither have come as a social institution to be recognized at the end of the 1980s and in the beginning in the 1990s. In some countries this took a couple of decades and in other countries somewhat longer a time.

Besides the breaking of the normative elements so closely connected these changes also means that now there was more of a permission to show affection openly. The non-marital cohabitants started by living together which clearly meant that they showed the sign of having sexual relations. Even if pre-marital sex among couples in love was common before the changes they were still clandestine, especially if they were made apparent by a pregnancy. Non-marital cohabitation changed all that. Couples living in LAT relationships also clearly show affection. Is this relatively more openness of showing affection visible in other respects, too?

Sadly there is no good data on couple formation, going steady and cohabiting or LAT relationships. Therefore we have to be satisfied with marital statistics. I have checked official statistics in Sweden on marriages or “family formation" (as it still can be seen to be called) among older people. If we look at marriages among people aged 60 and over where both are of that age we find that there is a remarkable increase from 1990 to 2000 from 243 to 326, an increase with 34 per cent. In 2005 the number was 703; an increase from 1990 with 189 per cent. If we would compare 2000 with 2005 we would find an increase with 116 per cent.

Since these figures are not from any sample but based upon population data there is no meaning to speak about statistical significance. However, there could be factors of chance that could influence these figures. At the same time the tendencies are so strong that I can hardly believe that so could be the case to any significant degree.

The norms were endogamous norms clear for women to the effect that they should not engage in emotional relationships with much younger men. Therefore, another indicator of the change toward more openness would be if older women nowadays marry younger men to higher an extent than previously. If we look at women 60 and above who marry men five or more years younger than themselves we find that in 1990 there were 29 marriages of that kind, ten years later the figure was 35 couples marrying – an increase with 21 per cent. In 2005 the number was 74 – an increase from 1990 with 155 per cent. And if we compare 2005 with 2000 we find an increase with 111 per cent. During these years the marriage rates have not changed much and thus there is no over all trend of increasing marriage rates.

My understanding to these changes is, as shown above, connected to a prohibiting norm system that has changed from the idea that older persons should not show affection toward each other. An example is that we nowadays can see many
elderly couples walking hand-in-hand with each other – which we did not see some decades ago.

It might be worthwhile to notice that the younger generation was those fighting for the right to live together, for non-marital cohabitation, when the struggle went on. These were mainly those who belonged to the baby-boom in the 1940s. They fought for free love, for women to be equal to men, etc. They now belong to the category of 60+. Can it be so that they now have stabilized to the effect that they want more committed relationships than they fought for in their youth?

Another possible way to understand these changes could be that we now live longer and healthier and that mass media advocates for respect for elderly and their love life. The word ageism has come and shows a tendency in the same direction. Are these tendencies related? They might be.

Are the tendencies the same elsewhere?

Vol 34, Issue 1, 2008
László Cseh-Szombathy, president of the CFR 1982 – 1986, has died. He and I were good friends during many decades. I just want to tell two stories about him and me.

One is about food. During the years before 1990 the monetary situation was somewhat complicated for some of us. Without anyone of us ever saying anything about it, the following happened: When we were in Hungary together László always decided where to eat, what to eat, what to drink and he paid the bill for both of us. And he was a real gourmet. When we were together outside of Hungary the situation was reversed. I decided where to eat, what to eat, what to drink and I paid the bill for both of us. We never spoke about it. We never thought about it – I did afterwards. I don’t know if László ever thought about it. We both acted spontaneously.

The other is about stamps. László’s wife Kathy was a stamp collector. I decided to subscribe to Swedish first-day-letters for her. But when I contacted the postal system I was told that Hungary had forbidden the Swedish system to send first-day-letters to anyone in Hungary. So, my solution was to subscribe myself to these letters and then I sent them by regular mail to her. This worked perfectly until she sadly died about ten years ago.

Vol 34, Issue 2, 2008
Our international seminars are excellent fora for meeting nice colleagues and also for the official purpose of presenting ideas, have them discussed by friendly colleagues, listen to presentations and discussing them. The presentations and the discussions are all supposed to be based upon good scientific knowledge and practice.

It happens that some presentations are just of scientifically bad quality – that does not happen very often, but often enough. What should other participants do? Sit there listening without reacting? That happens very often. I guess that the silence is based upon various conscious or unconscious reasoning. One could be that the presentation is so embarrassing that some feel ashamed at being present and that they have not expected such low quality of scientific practice in our circles. Another could be that some of us are too polite to be nasty enough to criticize and discuss what is presented. A third possibility is that some believe that they have misunderstood what has been presented since “such strange things can be said and meant”.

Not reacting explicitly is on the other side also bad scientific behaviour since seminars are aimed at supporting each other. Therefore we should be more ready to
criticize and discuss. We do not have to – and we even shouldn’t – criticize in a negative tone or aggressively. But to the point and nicely. After all we are each others’ mentors and tutors. (I know that I myself sometimes, some say often, sound very aggressive in such situations. The way I see it I just sound that way by speaking loudly. Usually I do not a all intend to be seen as aggressive.)

I look forward to the next seminar and to more open discussions. And hopefully there will be time for discussions.

**Vol 34, Issue 3, 2008**

The Lisbon CFR-seminar in September was interesting in many ways. And it was very well organized. One of the really unusual issues with the seminar was the attendance – at least in some respects. I organized three sessions on the theme of “Marriage, Co-habitation and New Families”. A long time before the seminar 15 abstracts had arrived, which was surprisingly many – and they came in good time before the deadline. The organizers had announced that they wanted to give us all a CD-disc with all manuscript for the presentations in advance in case the participants to be had sent a manuscript. Of my 15 presenters to be, 14 sent their manuscripts in good time. Since I have organized many seminars and many sessions I was prepared that some of the presenters would not show up at the seminar. *They all did!* That is the first time in my professional life when so has happened. And most of the presentations were very interesting and refreshing. Another surprising occurrence: All presenters in my three sessions kept the time limits I had given them. Are we facing a new behaviour among our colleagues? Hopefully, so is the case.

**Vol 35, Issue 1, 2009**

“Who are you, Jan?”

Some time ago a person asked me that question. What should or could I answer? I would reasonably not give a lecture on identity. So, I just said that I didn’t know. The question remained unanswered and made me more and more dissatisfied. After some weeks I came to think upon what William James long time ago wrote in a letter to his wife: “This is the real me!” My understanding of his ideas is that he meant that our identity varies with the situation and thus is not singular but plural; identities.

I started writing short novels about my life, some very few pages long. They dealt with sets of occasions in my life from childhood and on. Some sets go over years, some over just an evening. They were labelled “Lennart”, “Loved to sing – couldn’t”, “The acrobat”, “The chocolate factory”, “The lumber Jack”, “The first examination at the university”, “The receptionist”, and “The lie detector” to mention some few examples.

These short novels are now collected in an unpublished book. The other day I happened to look at it when a colleague came and told me about problems with her young children. She spoke about how much better parents knew and controlled their children half a century ago. Then I told her about my book on my own identities. Had my parents known, for example, what I did at the chocolate factory or as a lumber Jack they would have locked me in.

We as family sociologists are hopefully aware of how stable some issues are generation by generation. Social change goes usually very slowly when speaking about family matters. Already Socrates claimed that the youngsters were impolite, rude and not trustworthy.
Vol 35, Issue 2, 2009
The World Congress of the ISA in 1966 was my first World Congress. Since then I have participated at all of the ISA World Congresses. Which means that the one in Gothenburg will be my 12th.

In 1966 the congress was held in Evian in France. At that time critique was raised at the CFR business meeting on the “undemocratic” system of the CFR. Claimed was, according to my memory, that there should be statutes of the CFR and that officers should be elected and not be chosen by some kind of brotherhood politics, nepotism.

Invitations to the international seminars organized by the CFR – or to be more correct: organized by the local organizers – were sent only to some of those who seemed to be of interest to the small group in power. Some of us were invited to the first seminar held in Oslo, and some to the first seminar in Japan.

A committee was formed with the task to suggest statutes and also organize a democratic election of officers for the CFR board. One of the members of this committee was Joan Aldous, at that time at the Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, where also Reuben Hill was working.

After the acceptance of the statutes all members are invited to all seminars organized under the umbrella of the CFR – in case of need for a numerous clauses, the organizer decides who to be welcomed.

The statutes were accepted and a process of election came. At the World Congress in Varna, Bulgaria, 1970, Gerrit Kooy, Wageningen, The Netherlands, took over as the first elected president of the CFR. At the business meeting in Varna a membership fee was set to the amount of US $40 per member and per four year period. We still have that membership fee (except for students who pay only 25 percent of the fee). Would we have followed the inflation the fee would now be almost US $ 300! Hopefully, the fee will go on remaining at its nominal value.

Vol 36, Issue 1, 2010
About forty years ago we faced a decrease of marriage rates, starting in Scandinavia and historically a rapid change came all over the Western world. As you all know – which we didn’t know at that time – the decreases of marriage rates did not mean that the dyadic relationships between men and women were disappearing. Non-marital cohabitation came as a social institution alongside or parallel with marriage.

Many other family issues changed at about the same time, for example, divorce rates started increasing and the age of women at first birth of a child started increasing. To have a first child at age 30 was very unusual and surprising – now it is fairly common.

In 1980 I heard about the lat relatie in the Netherlands – couples were living apart together and had become a social institution there. Not many years later I started distributing the term LAT relationship in international media and I coined a term for the phenomenon in Swedish: särbo.

Very rapidly the term and the concept was accepted and also adopted in some countries and the term became a word in our family sociology jargon. But still the phenomenon is not made visible in many countries, while in some it is a social institution. And in many countries there is no term for it.
I have often argued that we are not very good at predicting changes in family matters. We were not able to predict the entrance of cohabitation neither of LAT relationships.

What will come next in the field of marriage and marriage-like phenomena? Maybe, what in Germany for many years has been labeled WG or Wohngemeinschaft. This means that a person has an apartment or a house big enough for more than one person. And someone else can live there, too. We are not speaking about just renting a room or so but a non-erotic living together, sharing kitchen, living room etc, but not bedroom. Could very well be the same or opposite gender. Journalists, who often are better at finding coming changes than we are, have dug up, for example, some well known media person who have “kicked out” the man and let another woman share her apartment/house instead of the man – friendship and not romantic love or shared sexuality. Will WG be the next step? Or what will happen?

JT

7. Congratulations to Dr. George Kurian, Managing Editor of the Journal of Comparative Family Studies

Congratulations to George Kurian, Founding Editor and Publisher of the Journal of Comparative Family Studies (JCFS) (1970-2009) upon the occasion of his transition to Managing Editor. George was also selected to receive the 2010 National Council on Family Relations’ International Section Jan Trost Award. This award recognizes your significant and career-long contributions to cross-cultural family scholarship.
Words of congratulations to George Kurian:

Since George Kurian established the JCFS in 1970, his name has been synonymous with the Journal. He was the founding father and guiding parent of the Journal. Consequently, it is hard to believe that George will relinquish some of his Editorship responsibilities. But true to his parental devotion to the Journal he will continue managing responsibilities.

George delivered and nurtured a Journal that met an important need. His success at meeting that need resulted in worldwide coverage and recognition. The extent of its impact is hard to estimate. He and his Journal have made many important contributions to the international family studies community. Especially significant are the activities related to providing a global perspective to complement the mission of the International Sociological Association. George’s efforts enhanced international contact and cooperation leading to his Journal successfully challenging the then predominant ethnocentric national orientations, which many family scholars proclaimed a weakness of social sciences. The Journal edited by George consistently encouraged and expanded an international comparative perspective and thus was a pioneer publication, which gave voice to comparative and international studies, sights, issues and results. The Journal provided family researchers throughout the world peer reviewed possibilities to distribute the work.

George has been a steady and supportive companion with the activities of the Committee on Family Research (CFR: Research Committee 06) of the International Sociological Association. His association with CFR has been long and very fruitful. The Journal has become a major outlet for many member’s research reports. Several issues of the Journal have consisted of a compilation of papers earlier presented at CFR conferences.

We appreciate always the presence of George and his wife Susy at our conferences adding to the friendly and cooperative atmosphere. We will be forever very grateful for George’s fulfilling work oriented life focusing on publishing comparative family social science research. For all George has done for us, we wish him some well deserved relaxation and much joy in his coming years. He will always be a welcome addition to our conferences and sessions and we hope to meet him again and again there.

On behalf of the Committee on Family Research of the International Sociological Association.

Rudolf Richter (President)
Rudy Seward (Vice President)
Ria Smit (Secretary)
8. Recent Publications by CFR Members


http://www.uk.sagepub.com/books/Book228813

http://www.wlupress.wlu.ca/Catalog/sever.shtml

Special issue of: Fathering. A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers
VOLUME 8 NUMBER 3 FALL 2010
SPECIAL ISSUE - MEN, WORK AND PARENTING - PART I
SPECIAL ISSUE CO-EDITORS: LINDA HAAS AND MARGARET O’BRIEN

LINDA HAAS AND MARGARET O’BRIEN

ARTICLES
Like Father, Like Son? The Transmission of Values, Family Practices, and Work-Family Adaptations to Sons of Work-Sharing Men
MARGUNN BJØRNHOLF
“Without Taking Away Her Leave”: A Canadian Case Study of Couples’ Decisions on Fathers’ Use of Paid Parental Leave
LINDSEY MCKAY AND ANDREA DOUCET
Post-Birth Employment Leave Among Fathers in Britain and the United States
GAYLE KAUFMAN, CLARE LYONETTE, AND ROSEMARY CROMPTON
UK Fathers’ Long Work Hours: Career Stage or Fatherhood?
LAURA BIGGART AND MARGARET O’BRIEN
“It’s a Triangle that’s Difficult to Square”: Men’s Intentions and Practices
Around Caring, Work and First-Time Fatherhood
TINA MILLER
Father Involvement Among Working-Class, Dual-Earner Couples
KAREN METEYER AND MAUREEN PERRY-JENKINS
9. **New members**

The CFR welcomes the following members:

- Randi Wardahl  
  Romeriksgata 42  
  2003 Lillestrom  
  Norway  
  randi.wardahl@gmail.com

- Rokuro Tabuchi  
  Dept of Sociology  
  Sophia University  
  7-1 Kioi-cho, Chiyoda-ku  
  1028554 Tokyo  
  Japan  
  rtab@nifty.com

- Godfrey St. Bernard  
  31 Morning Star Avenue  
  Sunrise Park, Trincity  
  Trinidad-Tobago  
  gstbiser@gmail.com

- Esther Geisler  
  MPI for Demographic Research  
  Rostock  
  Germany  
  Geisler@demogr.mpg.de

- Tim Riffe  
  Centre d’Estudis Demogràfics  
  Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
  Bellaterra  
  Spain  
  triffe@ced.uab.es

- Petteri Eerola  
  Department of Education  
  University of Jyväskylä  
  Jyväskylä  
  Finland  
  petteri.eerola@jyu.fi

- Jianghong Li  
  Curtin University  
  CHIRI Centre for Developmental Health  
  GPO Box U1987  
  Perth WA  
  Australia  
  jianghongl@ichr.uwa.edu.au

- Randi Kjeldstad  
  Statistics Norway  
  Postboks 8131 Dep.  
  0033 Oslo  
  Norway  
  rki@ssb.no

- Rima Sabban  
  P.O. Box 67397  
  St. 12 a Mizhar 2 Villa 9  
  Dubai  
  United Arab Emirates  
  rsabban@gmail.com

- Katia Begall  
  Grote Rozenstraat 31  
  9712TG Groningen  
  The Netherlands  
  k.h.begall@rug.nl

- Milos Debnar  
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