

FERTILITY, DIVERSITY AND POLICY

IRENE B. TAEUBER

Forty years ago there was a demographic, economic and resources crisis. The net reproduction rate was below unity;¹ decline in total numbers was projected for the near future.² There were economic difficulties, with unemployment in the cities and foreclosures on the farms. Maldistributions of population were being intensified as blockages to out-migration coincided with return migrations to depressed areas of origin. The dust storms of the high plains and the gullies of the more humid regions were ecologic disaster in process.

There were also difficult problems of people, economy, society and environment in the late 1950's. The net reproduction rate was 1.7. More than four million native-born Americans and 400,000 immigrants were added to the population each year.³ If the affluent, family based and reproductively oriented society continued, there would be 350 million Americans by the end of the twentieth century.⁴ When the second decade of the twenty-first century began, the population of the United States would be 450 million. People and press joined the pundits in concern about the places and the qualities of living for the increasing people.

The problems of maldistribution were intertwined with those of growth. Long continued out-migrations of native whites from rural areas had left declining numbers and concentrations of the aging and the aged on the farms and in the towns. The exodus of blacks from the South suggested a solution to ancient problems along with a generation of new difficulties. The blacks and the peoples of Spanish origins had joined the natives and the immigrants in the migrations to metropolitan

areas. The historic problems of the deteriorating inner cities had new dimensions of intensity as color and subculture made visible differentiations between inner and outer areas. Acute social, economic, political and ecologic problems were inherent in the interrelated crises in growth and in distribution.

It is now 1971. The state of data and developments leave present and future alike unclear.⁵ In 1968, the crude birth rate was 17.4, the net reproduction rate 1.2.⁶ Continuing decline in fertility appeared to be the path of the near future. Then the crude birth rates that had declined from 25.3 in 1957 to 22.4 in 1962, 17.8 in 1967 and 17.4 in 1968 rose to 17.7 in 1969 and 18.2 in 1970. Some declines were still occurring in some age groups, but changing numbers and ages of women, changing ages at marriage and variable parity progressions complicate assessment. The rate and even the fact of future change will be determined mainly by the marriage and family patterns of youth now in transition if not in rebellion.

Current official projections discard high series once used to bracket ranges and add lower series formerly dismissed as unlikely.⁷ Replacement fertility is taken as sufficiently plausible to merit projection. This level of fertility, 2.11 births per woman, if it occurred along with continuing immigration at current rates, would result in an increase of numbers from the 205 million of 1970 to 266 million in 2000. The high projection of 1958 would have yielded a population of 450 million in 2010; this low projection would yield a population of 284 million.

The projection of a completed fertility of 2.11 births per woman at current and ongoing mortality levels and without immigration yields a population that is stationary once the disturbing effects of the age structure are eliminated. This population moving toward the stationary state would be 250 million at the end of the twentieth century. The stationary population itself would be 275 million. It would be reached in the fourth decade of the twenty-first century.

The early returns of the 1970 census confirm the continuation of rural depopulation and urban concentration. The modal populations of the contemporary United States are neither rural nor central city. They are, rather, the outer sectors of metropolitan areas.

The transformation in occupational structures, educational levels, places of living, the roles of the sexes and the generations, the ages and the stabilities of marriage and the timing and the rates of child-bearing have been interrelated throughout the nation's history. It is likely that they will remain so in the future. But the mobilities and

migrations by which adjustments proceed and the differentiations of groups and areas in the transformation continuum change over time. In broad perspective, there were consistencies of development in the nineteenth century, with major reorientation at the beginning of the twentieth century. The decade of the 1940's was another period of change, with almost unidirectional movements through the 1960's. The 1970's is likely to be another decade of critical change.

The associations of the changes and transformations in the development of the American population are little explored, whether in the longer past, the twentieth century or the present. Thus the bases for forecast and policy consideration are limited. Levels, variations and changes in fertility were not determinative in the transformations in environment, economy, milieu and the characteristics of people that were associated with altered fertility. But in the past, as in the present and presumably in the future, the levels, the variations and the spatial distributions of fertility influence environment, resources use, economy, social structure, group relations and political functioning.

The developments of the nineteenth century were heritage to the twentieth century. The developments of the twentieth century will be heritage to the twenty-first century. The dynamics of growth and distribution in the three decades that remain in this century are critical in the determination of that heritage.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC PATH

In 1790, four million Americans occupied the lands of the newly established nation. Eighty-five per cent were rural and agricultural. Girls married at early ages and bore children abundantly.⁸ Birth rates were 50 to 55 per 1,000 total population; death rates reflected the favorable living conditions of a temperate land without severe pressures on resources. Growth was 30 to 35 per cent a decade—and most of it was natural increase. The growth potential was immense, the actual growth astounding. Land was limited to that east of the Mississippi; the agrarian life did not seem adaptable to any long cycle other than that of increasing pressures and rising mortality. Diversities among regions, economic groups, subcultures and castes introduced further hazards to social integration and political cohesion. Almost one-fourth of the four million people were Africans in chattel slavery. The Indians were largely “uncivilized” and uncounted.

In the single century from 1790 to 1890, the United States secured

and occupied the lands that reached to the Pacific. The Louisiana Purchase and the Oregon Cession provided earth's greatest agricultural frontier. Florida and the midcentury acquisitions from Mexico added diversified and increasingly urban frontiers to an industrializing and politically expanding nation. The population problems were those of the sparsity rather than the redundancy of labor. The urban population increased more rapidly than the rural in almost all the states in each intercensal period. Rural migrants to urban areas were insufficient; nineteen million immigrants entered the country between 1820 and 1900.

The diversities within the population became increasing public issues throughout the century, despite the assimilative processes in a population consisting of immigrants and their descendants. In the years from 1820 to 1860, ninety-five per cent of the immigrants were northern or western Europeans. In the years from 1860 to 1900, one-fourth of the immigrants came from other areas—southern and eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia. The diversities thus introduced were cumulative and localized. Most immigrants lived in the great cities and the industrial regions of the North. The blacks remained in the South. The indigenous and Spanish origin peoples were concentrated in the Southwest. By 1890 only 55 per cent of the people were native white of native parentage. The immigrants and their children constituted 33 per cent, the blacks 12 per cent. In New England, 47 per cent of the people were foreign in birth or parentage. In the South Atlantic states, 37 per cent were black.

The preservation of unity, the avoidance of political fragmentation, was the greatest of the demographic achievements of the nineteenth century. Economic advances and migrant paths were generally westward, but the great midcontinent axis of the Missouri-Mississippi Valley was North-South. The free public education for boys and girls was compulsory in English. The westward migrations of the natives, the urbanward movements of the rural people and the assimilative orientations of the children of the immigrants diffused and integrated the economic orientations, the codes of propriety, the structures of motivations, the family institutions and the reproductive mores that were the early American heritage.

The diversities of color and subculture persisted throughout the nineteenth century. The Civil War preserved the Union and ended chattel slavery, but most of the blacks remained almost in peonage in depressed southern regions. Declines in the Indian population con-

tinued, with the sharp decimations of combat and epidemic yielding to slower depopulations on the reservations.

The epic of the nineteenth century was economic transformation, educational advance and demographic transition. In 1800, there were 5.3 million people in a country of 865 thousand square miles. In 1900, there were 76 million people in a country of 3.0 million square miles. Forty per cent of the people were urban. Almost three-fifths of the employed men worked outside agriculture. Three-fourths of the young adults had completed five or more years of school, and 12 per cent of the young men and 14 per cent of the young women had completed high school.

The demographic transition that was in process in the late eighteenth century continued throughout the nineteenth century. Fertility declined earlier and more swiftly than mortality. The decline was pervasive and persistent. It continued decade after decade throughout the century, in all regions and subregions, in rural and in urban areas. The birth rate that had been 50 to 55 in 1800 was reduced to 48 in 1850. It was 32 in 1900. The average woman in the birth cohort that was in its central childbearing ages in 1900 had only three children. Ten per cent of this cohort of 1875–1879 never married, and 15 per cent of those who married remained childless. The age at marriage that had been moving upward in the nineteenth century had begun its long downward movement by 1890.

CRITICAL DECADES

It is simple to describe the expansions, the transformations and the transitions of the nineteenth century. Historical perspective yields the definitions of the relevant in questions and the significant in analyses. The comparable description of the twentieth century is the task of those who will be in the graduate schools and the academic institutions in the middle of the twenty-first century. These future Americans will know which of the alternate paths from 1970 to 2000 became the actual one. In the setting of present involvement and uncertainty, a resume of seventy years as a basis for assessing thirty years yet to come would be hazardous. The transformations that have occurred, the intricacies of current changes, and the difficulties in projecting the present without assuming future changes are apparent in an examination of three critical decades—the years from 1900 to 1910, the 1930's and the 1950's.

TABLE I. POPULATION DYNAMICS AND ETHNIC STRUCTURES, STATES BY URBAN STATUS, 1900-1910¹

Variable	Per Cent Urban in 1900 ²					
	Total	Less than 15	15-29	30-34	45-59	60 and over
Children ever born, 1910 ³						
All women	3,558	4,876	4,252	3,410	3,100	2,843
White	3,450	4,752	4,116	3,415	3,103	2,854
Nonwhite	4,598	5,168	4,804	3,059	3,014	2,390
Women ever Married	4,050	5,257	4,685	3,810	3,594	3,429
White	3,949	5,148	4,566	3,817	3,601	3,443
Nonwhite	4,970	5,512	5,152	3,338	3,379	2,856
Nativity and color						
Structure, 1900 ⁴	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Native white	74.5	62.3	72.3	81.3	80.2	71.3
Foreign white	13.4	3.0	5.7	16.3	16.2	26.2
Black	11.6	33.6	21.7	1.8	3.2	2.3
Change, 1900-1910 ⁵	21.0	29.5	15.0	17.9	21.5	25.5
Native white	20.8	37.5	17.3	18.7	18.7	20.2
Foreign white	30.7	46.1	9.8	16.0	36.5	40.1
Black	11.3	13.6	8.5	3.1	13.5	23.3
Net migration, 1900-1910 ⁶						
All women	64.6	49.5	-32.9	44.6	103.6	156.2
White	64.6	62.6	-25.4	42.9	97.3	148.5
Native	0.0	45.3	-40.0	-11.6	11.0	11.4
Foreign	64.6	17.3	14.6	54.4	86.2	137.1
Black	0.0	-13.1	-7.6	1.8	6.4	7.7
Population in 1900						
Number (in 1,000s)	75,995	10,753	18,567	14,011	19,999	12,665
Per cent of total	100.0	14.1	24.4	18.4	26.3	16.7

¹ Conterminous United States. ² Urban defined as incorporated places of 2,500 or more. ³ Children ever born per 1,000 total women aged 35-44. ⁴ Total includes other nonwhites. ⁵ Change, census of the earlier date to that of the later. ⁶ Per 1,000 average total population, women aged 15 to 34 at the earlier census date, aged 25 to 44 at the later census date; estimated migration secured by aging the initial population and relating it to the midperiod population.

Sources: Fertility: Taeuber, I. B., *Population Trends in the United States, 1900 to 1960*, Bureau of the Census, Technical Paper No. 10, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1964, Table 5. Combinations of states by per cent urban in 1900 not published. Nativity and color: *Ibid.*, Table 3. Combinations of states not published. Net decade migration: Derived from numbers of migrants and mid-period populations in the University of Pennsylvania's study of *Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870-1950*. Vol. 1. Lee, E. S., Miller, A. R., Brainerd, C. P., and Easterlin, R. A. *Methodological Considerations and Reference Tables*, Prepared under the direction of Simon Kuznets and Dorothy Swaine Thomas, Philadelphia. The American Philosophical Society, 1957, Table P-1. Populations: Taeuber, I. B., *op. cit.*, Table 1. Combinations of states not published.

Transition: 1900 to 1910

Initial diversities were compounded in the geographic expansions, the economic developments, the immigrant flows, the social advances and the regionalisms of the nineteenth century. In 1900, two-thirds of the population of the Northeast was urban and two-thirds of the gainfully occupied labored outside agriculture. Four-fifths of the population of the South was rural and three-fifths of the gainfully occupied labored in agriculture. Overall, the major differentiations were those

separating the urban and the rural people. Hence, for summary description, states were combined according to the proportions of the populations urban in 1900, without reference to geographic continuity (Table 1).

The dynamics of reproduction, the changing structures and the dispersions of the nativity and color groups, growth and internal migrations were all related to the achieved levels and the ongoing processes of urbanization. In 1910, the cumulative fertility of women was related inversely to the urbanization of the state of residence. This was true for all women and for women ever married, whether white or nonwhite. The highest fertility occurred in the more rural states where blacks were concentrated, the lowest in the more urban states where immigrants were concentrated.

In the first decade of the century, the last land frontier was being occupied. There were net movements of native white women to the most rural states. But the major movements were urbanward, and the major migrant component in the increase in the numbers of women in the more urban states was the immigrant. The classic patterns of dynamics in the black population were apparent. Fertility was far higher than that of whites in the largely rural states, but lower than that of whites in the more urban states. The women were moving from the more rural to the more urban states.

The dichotomy of native and foreign suggests but does not measure the diversities in fertility in the white population. In the rural society, fertility was higher in the frontier regions, the depressed areas and among such subcultural groups as the Mormons. The current and the cumulative childbearing of the rural women of the northern mid-continent suggests that the Hutterites simply demonstrate the persistence of levels once prevalent in wide rural areas. In the urban society, the fertility of immigrant women was related to country of origin and to subcultural group. The fertility of the Yiddish-speaking women from Poland and Russia was less than that of other groups of the same origins. The fertility of native white women of native parentage differed among regions and subregions, even within the rural population. In lower New England, traditions of decline extended back a century or more; in the Appalachian mountains limitation was minimal. The most severe restrictions of reproduction characterized the native women of foreign or mixed parentage. The postponement of marriage, the failure to marry, childlessness and severe limitations to the child-

bearing of those who became mothers all contributed to low completed fertility.

The mobilities of the first decade of the twentieth century contributed to the formation of a larger and more diversified urban population. Because fertility declined along with urbanization at rates that yielded convergences among nativity and color groups, growth itself did not seem a major problem. However, the natural dynamics and the internal migrations of the population were being recognized as national concerns. In the census of 1890 a question on marital status was not only asked but included in the processing. A question on children ever born was included in the census of 1900, but there were no general tabulations. The great population problem was immigration; the key questions were the assimilability of the "new immigrants," the urban concentrations and the social and ecologic pathologies of the cities. The 41 volumes of the *Reports* of the Immigration Commission of 1907–1910 to the 61st Congress were an extraordinary research document.⁹ They were in the direct lineage of the legislation of the 1920's that limited numbers and specified national origins.

The 1930's

The 1930's were a decade of demographic doom. The decline in fertility continued. The prevalent questions among the increasingly numerous and sophisticated demographers were not reversal, but the possibilities of slowing and muting decline. The average woman aged 35 to 44 in 1940 had borne 2.3 children (Table 2). But average numbers were successively less across the array of states by the level of industrialization. That further movement from agriculture, which was essential to economic advance, would result in further declines in fertility—and women in the most industrial states in 1940 had had an average of less than two children per woman.

The questions of replacement in the 1930's were those of native America. The problems of the increasing diversities, disorders and pathologies associated with the immigrants had been solved in the quota system and exclusion. Proportions of the foreign-born white in 1930 were below those in 1900; numbers declined a further fifth within the decade. The national population was increasingly native and the natives were increasingly white.

The mythologies of the decade of depression involved massive returns to the land, even re-agrarianization. For the decade as a whole,

TABLE 2. POPULATION DYNAMICS AND ETHNIC STRUCTURES, STATES BY AGRARIAN STATUS, 1930-1940¹

Variables	Per Cent Gainfully Occupied in Primary Industry, 1930 ²						
	Total	50 or more	40-49	30-39	20-29	10-19	less than 10
Children ever born, 1940 ³							
All women	2,318	3,150	2,901	2,513	2,229	2,103	1,850
White	2,278	3,050	2,901	2,468	2,224	2,102	1,860
Nonwhite	2,678	3,351	2,904	2,932	2,298	2,119	1,645
Women ever married	2,622	3,434	3,180	2,822	2,488	2,372	2,212
White	2,587	3,360	3,183	2,780	2,488	2,377	2,224
Nonwhite	2,928	3,580	3,160	3,197	2,491	2,307	1,963
Nativity and color							
Structure, 1930 ⁴	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Native white	78.4	63.9	79.6	82.0	86.0	80.9	72.3
Foreign white	11.4	2.2	2.9	7.0	8.3	14.1	24.0
Black	9.7	33.5	16.8	10.5	5.3	4.4	3.6
Change, 1930-1940 ⁵	7.2	5.5	9.1	5.9	8.9	7.3	5.8
Native white	10.9	7.4	11.7	8.9	11.4	11.6	11.2
Foreign white	-18.3	-29.2	-30.2	-28.3	-20.0	-19.1	-13.7
Black	8.2	4.0	4.3	5.7	14.6	14.6	28.3
Net decade migration, 1930-1940 ^{6, 7}							
All women	0.2	-116.5	-49.5	-41.9	30.6	37.6	49.9
White	0.2	-66.8	-35.1	-37.9	22.3	28.1	34.3
Native	0.0	-66.0	-30.4	-35.6	19.4	27.4	21.7
Foreign	0.2	-0.8	-4.7	-2.2	3.0	0.7	12.6
Black	0.0	-49.7	-14.3	-4.0	8.2	9.5	15.6
Population in 1930							
Number (in 1,000's)	122,775	9,623	22,891	14,888	14,949	36,764	23,660
Per cent of total	100.0	7.8	18.6	12.1	12.2	29.9	19.3

Notes 1-6. See Table 1.

⁷ Women aged 25-44 at end of decade.

Sources: Reference in Table 1.

though, the net movements of the women in the more agricultural states were outward. This was true for native white, foreign and black women. The highest in-migration of the decade characterized states already highly industrialized.

The seeming movement toward a declining and aging population concentrated in cities plagued by unemployment and poverty was associated with an expansion and maturing of demography. This was the decade of outstanding people who tended to be identified two by two. It was also the decade of institutional establishment—in research centers, university departments, foundation structures and government. This story and that of the learned societies have been sketched in preceding papers. The research was pioneering and problem oriented. Relevance to policy was implicit in the selection and design of the great studies of the decade and in the presentation of the results of analyses.

The thrust of government activities in the population field was migration and redistribution, along with increasing concerns about health and welfare. Differential fertility was recognized as a factor compounding the difficulties of depressed regions and particular rural areas, but direct approaches through family planning services were not in accord with the prevalent ethic or the codes of propriety. A major breakthrough occurred in public recognition and government concern in the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Committee, whose chairman was the Secretary of the Interior. Its classic report, *THE PROBLEMS OF A CHANGING POPULATION*, was published in 1938.¹⁰ This fact is significant, but so is the further fact that the conclusions and recommendations were limited to the aging and the aged; distribution and redistribution; human resources conservation; health, education and cultural progress and population statistics and research. There was silence on fertility and fertility control.

It may be added as a final comment on the 1930's that, in 1940, a bill was introduced into the Congress to provide family allowances as a means of raising birth rates.

The 1950's

The women of the 1950's were the daughters of the women of the 1930's, the granddaughters of the women of the first decade of the century. In historic consistency, theoretical formulations and demographic analyses, the pace of fertility decline should have been accentuated. Instead, age at marriage had declined along with an increasing prevalence of marriage and an aversion, not alone of childlessness but of the one or two child family. The cumulative fertility of women aged 25 to 34 and 35 to 44 in 1960 suggests the increases in fertility achieved and in process (Table 3).

Major convergences were seen in the area differences in fertility throughout the twentieth century, but the associations of levels with metropolitan status remained. Fertility was distinctly lower in states that were 75 per cent or more metropolitan, and these states included 40 per cent of the total population. Fertility was distinctly higher in states that were less than 15 per cent metropolitan, but these states included less than 3 per cent of the total population.

Nativity and color structures and dynamics were changed greatly from the early years of the century or even the 1930's. Blacks were twice as numerous as foreign whites. Among women aged 25 to 34, the cumulative fertility of blacks was above that of whites across the range

TABLE 3. POPULATION DYNAMICS AND ETHNIC STRUCTURES, STATES BY METROPOLITAN STATUS, 1950-1960¹

Variables	Per Cent of Population in SMSA's ²						
	Total	Less than 15	15-24	25-49	50-74	75-84	85 and over
Children ever born, 1960 ³							
Women aged 25-34							
All women	2,236	2,750	2,367	2,397	2,365	2,048	1,986
White	2,186	2,549	2,227	2,320	2,320	2,015	1,983
Nonwhite	2,596	3,721	3,073	2,939	2,698	2,306	2,003
Women ever married	2,447	2,926	2,559	2,578	2,543	2,281	2,244
White	2,379	2,684	2,372	2,475	2,481	2,234	2,232
Nonwhite	2,970	4,164	3,592	3,365	3,018	2,668	2,345
Women aged 35-44							
All women	2,466	3,196	2,779	2,737	2,570	2,235	2,172
White	2,422	2,922	2,605	2,646	2,535	2,228	2,183
Nonwhite	2,845	4,543	3,672	3,425	2,867	2,307	2,060
Women ever married	2,626	3,335	2,937	2,881	2,699	2,414	2,357
White	2,575	3,045	2,740	2,780	2,659	2,404	2,366
Nonwhite	3,061	4,771	3,970	3,672	3,037	2,509	2,266
Nativity and color							
Structure, 1950 ⁴	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Native white	83.6	77.8	79.7	85.7	84.9	83.9	81.1
Foreign white	5.2	2.1	1.9	1.5	3.8	6.8	10.4
Black	10.6	18.9	17.6	12.3	10.8	9.1	7.2
Change, 1950-1960 ⁵	18.8	3.9	7.6	10.3	25.9	17.0	24.3
Native white	19.9	8.2	9.5	11.2	26.7	17.4	26.2
Foreign white	-8.1	-30.2	-18.3	-15.5	-2.4	-12.7	-6.0
Black	25.4	-7.1	2.2	7.3	32.0	48.5	62.2
Net decade migrations, 1950-1960 ⁶							
All women	17.5	-211.2	-143.2	-101.1	65.0	38.3	110.5
White	17.7	-119.8	-85.6	-72.2	59.4	17.9	85.2
Native	0.0	-121.5	-89.1	-76.8	45.0	-3.9	48.7
Foreign	17.7	1.6	3.5	4.5	14.4	21.8	36.5
Black	-0.2	-91.4	-57.6	-28.9	5.6	20.4	25.3
Population in 1950							
Number (in 1,000s)	178,467	4,878	8,593	36,300	56,313	33,106	39,277
Per cent of total	100.0	2.7	4.8	20.3	31.6	18.5	22.0

Notes 1-6. See Table 1.

⁷ Women aged 25-44 in 1960.

Sources: Reference, Table 1, except net decade migrations. Eldridge, H. T., *Net Intercensal Migrations for States and Geographic Divisions of the United States, 1950 to 1960. Methodological and Substantive Aspects*, University of Pennsylvania, Population Studies Center, Analytical and Technical Reports, No. 5, 1965, Table A; Combinations of states listed in Taeuber, I. B., *op. cit.*, p. 6.

from the least to the most metropolitan states. Moreover, the blacks were distributed throughout the states, with increased proportions in the highly metropolitan regions.

The rising fertility occurred along with increasing migrations of women in the reproductive ages. Overall, there was progression from the highest losses in the least metropolitan states to the highest gains

in the most metropolitan ones. The progression was unbroken for blacks. Among native whites there was high net in-migration to states one-half to three-fourths metropolitan, net exodus from states 75 to 84 per cent metropolitan. The net migrations of the foreign born were continuous, positive and increasing across the metropolitan continuum.

The data from the census of 1970 are not yet available for the description of the population dynamics and the ethnic structures of the 1960's. There was continuity in broad processes except for the downward turn in fertility in the late 1950's. But continuity itself was yielding increasingly difficult demographic, economic, social, political and environmental relations that were stimulants to altered dynamics and changing numerical relations among the ongoing transformations. The cumulative diversities and separatisms along with the demographic inconsistencies not only blocked unplanned and unattended continuations of trends but generated the crises in consensus and development that are the problems of the 1970's.

GROWTH: DISTRIBUTION AND REDISTRIBUTION

The prevalent mythologies of the American demographic saga are simplistic and picturesque. Their prevalence deters the recognition of the realities of change. Problems that emerge from the dynamics of the decades are viewed as sudden pathologies subject to quick decisions and direct solutions. The occupation of the continent brings visions of the trek of the covered wagons across the plains and the mountains. The growth of the cities brings mingled pictures of immigrant workers who are transplanted peasants, sturdy middle classes who trace back to yeoman farmers and unlearned blacks who moved from shanties in the Deep South to tenements in inner ghettos. Elements of truth and falsity are found in all these visions of the past and in their more sophisticated interpretations as philosophies of the national development. There are dual difficulties. First, the interpretations are partial; second, they tend to become prevalent when the pace of change has made archaic the phenomena that are being dissected and interpreted.

The growth and redistribution of the nineteenth century proceeded with land and industrial frontiers alike available to the increasing numbers of youth in a society long mobile. As the century advanced, increased proportions of the youth of the agricultural areas moved to urban areas. Here they became co-residents with the increasing numbers of Europe's youth whose move to the great city involved the crossing

TABLE 4. FORMATION OF THE METROPOLITAN POPULATION: 1900-1960
(Areas of the SMSA's as of 1960, central cities as of the census dates)

Census and Color	Population (in 1,000's)	Per Cent Change			Per Cent by Residence ¹		
		Total	Total SMSA's Central City	Outside	Central Cities	Outside Central Cities	Outside SMSA'S
Total							
1900	75,994				26.0	15.8	58.1
1910	91,973	21.0	37.1	23.7	29.5	16.2	54.3
1920	105,711	14.9	27.7	19.9	32.8	16.9	50.3
1930	122,775	16.1	24.3	32.3	35.1	19.2	45.6
1940	131,669	7.2	5.6	14.6	34.5	20.6	44.9
1950	150,216	14.1	14.7	35.9	34.7	24.5	40.8
1960	178,467	18.8	10.7	48.5	32.3	30.6	37.0
White							
1900	66,809				27.6	16.3	56.0
1910	81,723	22.3	36.9	25.4	30.9	16.8	52.3
1920	94,821	16.0	27.2	22.2	33.9	17.6	48.4
1930	110,287	16.3	22.9	31.1	35.8	19.9	44.3
1940	118,215	7.2	4.4	15.0	34.9	21.3	43.8
1950	134,478	13.8	10.2	38.0	33.8	25.9	40.3
1960	158,461	17.8	4.7	49.2	30.0	32.8	37.2
Black							
1900	8,834				14.5	12.1	73.3
1910	9,828	11.3	32.6	4.6	17.3	11.3	71.3
1920	10,463	6.5	40.0	4.2	22.8	11.1	66.1
1930	11,891	13.6	52.4	16.7	30.6	11.4	58.0
1940	12,866	8.2	19.9	9.2	33.9	11.5	54.6
1950	15,027	16.8	48.1	28.5	43.0	12.7	44.6
1960	18,837	25.4	50.3	30.8	51.5	13.2	35.3

Source: United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1960, Selected Area Reports, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Final Report* PC(3)-1 D, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963, Table 1, Also: Taeuber, I. B., *op. cit.*, Table 2.

of an ocean. As cities grew and time passed increasing proportions of the nation's population became indigenous urbanites, ever further removed from the American rural areas or the European lands that were their heritages. The blacks, the Indians and the peoples of remote and disadvantaged rural areas remained largely apart, their geographic and economic mobilities limited.

The great frontier of the increasing population of the twentieth century was metropolitan. The declining increase and the depopulation that had been so feared as a consequence of declining fertility came to some half the counties of the country through out-migration. The increasing fertility that led to fears of economic, social and political deterioration and environmental disaster characterized a population that was three-fifths metropolitan.

As the decades of the twentieth century passed minorities of color and subculture participated increasingly in the metropolitan concentration. There was dispersion across the nation if regions, subregions or states are the bases for assessment. There was increasing diversity in metropolitan areas, increasing homogeneity in nonmetropolitan areas. Within the metropolitan areas the minorities remained concentrated in central cities as the whites of the modal culture moved to outer areas.

The numerical aspects of the metropolitan concentration present one of the great regularities of twentieth century development (Table 4). Almost two-thirds of the total national increase of the first decade of the century was concentrated in those limited areas that were the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of 1960. Four-fifths of the increase of 100 million in the population of conterminous United States between 1900 and 1960 was metropolitan. The black population in metropolitan areas in 1960 was five times that in 1900; the non-metropolitan population of 1960 was little changed from that of 1900. From the 1920's onward, metropolitan increase was far more rapid for blacks than for whites. In 1900, 44.0 per cent of the whites and 26.6 per cent of the blacks were metropolitan. In 1960, the comparable percentages were 63.0 and 64.7.

Reversal rather than persistence occurred in the growth and distribution within metropolitan areas. In the initial decades of the century, increase was more rapid within than outside central cities. Thereafter rates of growth increased for whites outside central cities and blacks within them. By 1960, more than half the whites in metropolitan areas lived outside central cities and four-fifths of the blacks lived within them. The increasing demographic diversities of the metropoli-

tan areas as entities masked the numerically increasing areas of relative homogeneity within them.

All demographic processes have been influenced profoundly by the complex metropolitan development that has been presented in broad outlines here. As the redistributions of natural increase and migrations continued almost unidirectionally decade by decade, natural increase and migrations became mainly metropolitan processes. Most births occur in metropolitan areas; most migrations are metropolitan in origin and in destination. Ancient moorings in analysis, concepts and theory seem to be losing relevance in nativity transitions as the grandchildren of the foreign born lose statistical identity among the native whites of native parentage. Something of the dimensions of the processes and the intricacies of the questions of prospect and policy emerges in a joint consideration of the ongoing redistributions of native whites and blacks and the persistencies in levels of reproduction that suggest the decline of the historic assimilative role of the metropolis.

The formation of the metropolitan population involved both the retention of the major portion of the natural increase of metropolitan people within metropolitan areas and the migration of substantial and increasing proportions of the youth born and reared outside metropolitan areas to those areas. Because the migrations are concentrated among young adults, the migrants soon contribute to the numbers of births and hence the natural increase of the metropolitan populations. This association between the migrations of youth and the redistributions of natural increase is intensified in its social, economic and political impacts by the sometimes congruent but often inverse relations between the migrations of the nativity and color groups (Table 5).

The historic regions of the United States are losing much of their ancient demographic homogeneity. In the 1950's the major net migrant gains of women in the reproductive ages occurred in Florida and in California. The highest relative increases were those of native white women in Florida and black women in California. Major net losses occurred of native white and black women in the Appalachian states and in the Deep South. In the Appalachian states losses were comparatively higher among the native white women in the younger ages. In the Deep South the rates of loss for black women were far above those for white women.

The diversification of the South and the southward expansion of the northern metropolitan nexus are alike apparent in two subregions once and partially still southern. Native white women showed substantial

TABLE 5. NET MIGRATIONS OF NATIVE WHITE AND BLACK WOMEN, 1950-1960

(Net migration per 100 women expected without migration)

Area and Group	Age at End of Decade					
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44
Middle Atlantic	2.4	6.7	6.5	3.1	1.1	-0.7
Native white	-1.7	-2.8	-3.2	-3.4	-3.3	-3.4
Black	31.5	73.4	71.0	33.1	17.0	9.2
East North Central	3.6	8.6	10.4	4.8	1.2	0.1
Native white	0.5	2.8	3.0	-0.3	-1.9	-1.8
Black	36.6	66.0	78.5	40.0	19.3	15.7
West North Central	-5.0	-8.9	-12.5	-9.2	-6.9	-5.6
Native white	-6.0	-10.8	-14.8	-10.7	-7.8	-5.9
Black	14.0	22.1	23.4	13.1	5.6	3.0
Appalachian states	-13.6	-26.1	-25.8	-18.9	-12.6	-9.2
Native white	-14.3	-27.2	-26.4	-18.8	-12.2	-9.3
Black	-8.6	-20.1	-26.0	-22.8	-17.2	-8.1
Del., Md., D. C.	12.0	27.9	26.5	8.2	1.2	1.3
Native white	8.1	21.7	17.9	1.8	-1.8	-0.8
Black	22.5	36.8	39.9	19.9	6.4	5.4
Virginia, N. C.	-2.7	-7.6	-9.9	-6.8	-3.3	-1.8
Native white	0.5	-0.1	-3.7	-2.7	-0.6	-0.9
Black	-11.6	-29.8	-31.0	-23.0	-14.0	-6.3
Deep South	-11.2	-21.3	-21.8	-13.9	-9.1	-6.3
Native white	-7.2	-13.1	-11.9	-6.9	-4.4	-3.8
Black	-18.2	-36.3	-40.7	-29.5	-20.5	-12.3
Florida	43.1	54.6	65.0	55.3	52.1	42.6
Native white	47.8	57.6	72.5	63.5	61.5	51.3
Black	20.0	31.0	24.3	14.3	8.2	2.6
Texas, Okla.	-1.5	-0.7	1.1	0.1	-0.6	0.4
Native white	-2.3	-2.4	-0.1	-0.9	-1.0	0.5
Black	-1.3	-3.7	-9.1	-6.9	-4.6	-3.2
California	26.4	53.1	62.2	44.7	29.2	21.7
Native white	21.0	40.6	47.8	35.6	24.4	18.9
Black	56.5	140.5	139.3	72.5	33.0	22.3

Sources: United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1950*, Vol. II, *Characteristics of the Population*, Washington, Government Printing Office, Various dates, Parts 2-52, table 52. *Census of Population: 1960*, Vol. 1, *Characteristics of the Population*, Washington, Government Printing Office, various dates, Parts 2-52, table 96.

migrant gains in the younger ages in Delaware, Maryland and the District of Columbia. The relative influx of black women was far higher in the younger ages, and net gains extended upward to higher ages. In Virginia and North Carolina, the exodus of black women co-existed with slight migrant losses for native white women.

In the North, a pattern of the net out-migration of native white women seemed to be emerging along with a continuing influx of black women. The losses extended throughout the reproductive years in the Middle Atlantic subregion. In the East North Central area, net migrant

TABLE 6. NET REPRODUCTION RATES IN AND OUTSIDE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY COLOR, 1960

Areas	All Groups		White		Nonwhite	
	In SMSA	Outside	In SMSA	Outside	In SMSA	Outside
United States	1.69	1.76	1.64	1.69	2.03	2.33
Regions and subregions						
Northeast	1.61	1.61	1.59	1.60	1.84	2.02
East North Central	1.76	1.78	1.71	1.77	2.10	2.20
West North Central	1.81	1.86	1.77	1.85	2.34	2.57
Mountain	1.82	2.02	1.80	1.96	2.33	2.93
Pacific	1.69	1.80	1.65	1.78	2.15	2.12
Middle Atlantic	1.55	1.70	1.52	1.69	1.82	2.09
Del., Md., D.C.	1.70	1.77	1.59	1.67	2.01	2.29
Appalachia	1.63	1.60	1.54	1.56	2.13	2.11
Deep South	1.71	1.82	1.55	1.53	2.09	2.46
States						
New York	1.52	1.80	1.49	1.79	1.75	
Ohio	1.69	1.71	1.66	1.70	1.95	
Michigan	1.77	1.89	1.76	1.88	1.90	
Illinois	1.76	1.68	1.68	1.67	2.24	
Florida	1.70	1.79	1.58	1.62	2.23	2.35
Texas	1.78	1.80	1.73	1.78	2.11	1.95
California	1.68	1.84	1.64	1.84	2.14	1.91
State, Metropolitan Status						
Less than 15	1.88	2.01	1.70	1.83	2.48	2.79
15-24	1.64	1.70	1.58	1.56	1.93	2.29
25-49	1.72	1.73	1.65	1.66	2.13	2.28
50-74	1.75	1.81	1.70	1.76	2.07	2.29
75-84	1.67	1.67	1.61	1.66	2.05	2.11
85 and over	1.64	1.61	1.60	1.60	1.93	1.95

Sources: United States National Office of Vital Statistics, *Vital Statistics of the United States, 1960*, Vol. 1, Table 2-16; *United States Life Tables, 1959-1961*, Vol. 2, Nos. 1-51; United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1960*, Vol. 1, *Characteristics of the Population*, Parts 2-52, Tables 37 and 71.

gains were still found among the younger women. The West North Central States experienced net losses at all ages. The pattern of movement for the black women was influx, massive in the Middle Atlantic and East North Central subregions, substantial in the West North Central area.

The reduction in the geographic differences in fertility was one of the most significant indicators of the formation of a national population throughout the lifetimes of the birth cohorts from 1835-1839 to 1905-1909. The variance among the states was reduced further in the cohorts of increasing fertility. The net reproduction rates of the white and nonwhite women in and outside metropolitan areas in regions, subregions and combinations of states in 1960 are neither measures of

intrinsic reproductivity nor predictors of future growth. Rather, they are standardized indicators of differentiations in natural growth (Table 6).

In the conterminous United States in 1960, the differences in net reproduction rates in and outside standard metropolitan statistical areas were slight in the total population and among the white, limited among nonwhites. The major differences were those between the color groups. There are alternate, possibly supplementary interpretations. In the one, the demographic transition with its associations of fertility and urbanization was completed. In the other, the associations between urbanization, acculturation and assimilation were broken. The difficulty with the initial interpretations is that no demographic transition can be assumed to have run its course when fertility was at the level of a net reproduction rate of 1.7. The difficulty with the later interpretation is that the historic interrelations of reproductivity and urbanization were still apparent in the nonwhite and mainly black population. The answers here lie in further analyses. The young blacks who moved from the Deep South transferred their family institutions and their reproductive mores to the inner areas of northern cities. This fact is indisputable; the question is the development, mobilities and reproductive histories of the children of the black in-migrants in the metropolitan areas. But this is also the question of the social and economic mobility of the black population and the dispersions throughout metropolitan areas that are not tied to color and subculture.

THE 1970'S AND THE 1990'S

Changes occurred in the population dynamics of the 1960's as contrasted with the 1950's, but continuities were also found. There was metropolitan concentration, with geographic and subcultural diversities accentuated by migrations. Declining fertility characterized almost all groups in almost all areas. It seemed possible that oncoming cohorts would reproduce in the patterns of their grandparents rather than their parents. Extensions of the limited dispersions and the intermediate concentrations were apparent in the 1950's. California and Florida remained the major destinations of a mobile people.

The high rates of reproduction and the major migrations of past years bar easy adjustments in the growth and distribution of population in the 1970's. The exodus of youth in the 1940's, the 1950's and the 1960's prevented rapid population increase in the states and sub-

regions of origin, but it did not solve the problems of population and employment. The dominant questions, though, are those of the continuing concentrations in metropolitan areas and the maldistributions within them. The indigenous labor force is increasing in the metropolitan areas. Areas of economic deterioration and surplus labor include great cities along with towns and farms. The migrations of depressed areas are mainly intermetropolitan.

The resolution of the demographic difficulties of the 1970's requires economic developments and social transformations. This has been true throughout the twentieth century. The migrations to metropolitan areas were movements to areas where occupational structures were more professional and skilled, educational achievements more advanced, incomes higher and fertility lower. The transformations of the status and opportunities of disadvantaged groups involved, if they did not proceed through, the migrations of youth to urban or metropolitan centers remote from the areas of origin. The movements of the hill people from Appalachia, the blacks from the South and the Spanish-origin people from Texas are in a traditional American pattern.

In the long run, the critical question in growth and distribution is the level of the fertility. If each woman had two children in the course of her reproductive years, the population would not replace itself. If each woman had three children, population would grow quite rapidly. If the average number of children per woman was 2.45, population would be increasing about ten per cent each decade in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. If the rates of childbearing moved quickly to long-run replacement levels, growth would be very slow in the 1990's. But, whatever the future level of the fertility, the historical developments insure changes in decade-to-decade and generation-to-generation growth for the remainder of the century and beyond. Growth will differ from age group to age group; the growth of the age groups will change from decade to decade. Growth will also differ among the component groups of the population, with the most significant variations those within metropolitan areas.

A further complicating factor enters into the assessment of the future and the formulation of growth policy. If the experience from the 1930's to the 1970's is projectable, it is unsafe to assume continuity in trends in fertility from the present through the 1990's and into the twenty-first century. The 1970's are a midpoint in the long period of population transformation. There is no assurance that the nation will not move from crises in the 1930's and the 1960's to crises in the 1990's.

QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Questions of policy underlay this sketch of the continuities and diversities in population structures and dynamics in the twentieth century. The intent was an outline of the frame for policy rather than the analysis of policies or arguments concerning them.

The great policies influencing the population of the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were not explicitly demographic. The identification of these policies and the measurement of their interrelated influences on growth and distribution is a formidable undertaking. It is but a sector of the essential task of dissecting the present and prospective demographic, economic, social, political and other policies and studying their interrelated impacts.

The limitation of policy to the directly demographic would intensify the difficulties. The research approach to policies that are relevant over the time required for their effective implementation is not simple in theory, definition, design or execution. Most discussions of population policy have been based on temporally limited relations that were assumed to be enduring. When population itself or specific components in status, dynamics or interrelations was recognized as a national problem it brought about national attention in commission, committee, project or task force. The diversities of the plural society precluded an incisive focus of the levels, differentials and correlates of fertility.

The limitations to consensus, the mores of propriety and the notions of the role of government provide underlying resistances to natalist policies in either direction. The deep need that is manifest in the history of the twentieth century is regularity in growth or, more precisely, the achievement of continuity in reproduction at replacement levels. What is the approach to transgenerational stabilization? If a prevalent dynamics of replacement exists, what is the distribution of family size and how is it achieved? What are the policies that lead to equivalent participation of all the diverse groups of a plural society in the replacement of the generations? What is the role of the immigrant in a stabilizing or stable population? Is reproduction at replacement levels decade after decade and generation after generation feasible in a plural society whose tenets include individualism and democracy? If so, how is it achieved?

Questions of policy have no immediate answers. There are research approaches to specific questions and there are research bases for conceptually delineated and rationally defined policy. There can be an-

alyses of the interrelations of policies. The changing population of the United States in the first seven decades of the century and the intricacies of the adjustments in the next three decades suggest both the urgencies and the priorities of the research approach to questions of policy.

REFERENCES

¹ United States Bureau of the Census, *HISTORICAL STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES: COLONIAL TIMES TO 1957*, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 23.

² Thompson, W. S. and Whelpton, P. K., *ESTIMATES OF FUTURE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, 1940-2000*, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, for the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Planning Board, 1943.

³ United States Bureau of the Census, *ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND COMPONENTS OF CHANGE: 1940 TO 1967*, Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 368, June 27, 1967.

⁴ Siegel, J. S., Zitter, M. and Akers, D. S., *PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY AGE AND SEX: 1964 TO 1985, WITH EXTENSIONS TO 2010*, Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 286, July 1, 1964, Tables 2 and 8; Zitter, M. and Siegel, J. S., *ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY AGE AND SEX, 1960 TO 1980*, Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 187, November 10, 1958, Table 1.

⁵ The fertility tabulations of the 1970 census are not yet available. The latest published volumes of vital statistics are those for 1967. National Center for Health Statistics, *VITAL STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1967, VOL. I, NATALITY*, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1969, sections pagged separately.

⁶ National Center for Health Statistics, *VITAL STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1968, VOL. I, NATALITY*, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, to be issued, pp. 1-29. Births, Marriages, Divorces and Deaths in 1969, *Monthly Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 18, No. 12, March 12, 1970. Annual Summary for the United States, 1969; Births, Deaths, Marriages and Divorces, *Monthly Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 18, No. 13, October 21, 1970. Births, Marriages, Divorces and Deaths for 1970, *Monthly Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 19, No. 12, March 4, 1971.

⁷ United States Bureau of the Census, *PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY AGE AND SEX (INTERIM REVISIONS): 1970 TO 2020*, Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 448, August 6, 1970. These projections are updatings of those in Siegel, J. S., *PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES BY AGE, SEX AND COLOR TO 1990, WITH EXTENSIONS OF POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX TO 2015*, Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 381, December 18, 1967.

⁸ For reference to sources, documentation and further analyses see Taeuber, I. B. and Taeuber, C. F., *PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE 20TH CENTURY*, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1970, not yet available.

⁹ United States Immigration Commission, **REPORTS OF THE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION**, Senate Documents of the 61st Congress, Second and Third Sessions, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1911, 41 volumes.

¹⁰ United States National Resources Committee, Committee on Population Problems, **THE PROBLEMS OF A CHANGING POPULATION**, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1938.