

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SEP 17 1964

READING ROOM

203
7223
1

5 1949

Washington 25, D. C.

Series P-23, No. 1

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE URBAN-RURAL CLASSIFICATION IN THE UNITED STATES: 1874 TO 1949

By Leon E. Truesdell, Chief Demographer

Contents

Appendix tables

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Statistical Atlas, 1874.....	2
The census of 1880.....	3
The census of 1890.....	3
The census of 1900.....	4
Supplementary Analysis, 1906.....	5
The census of 1910.....	5
The census of 1920.....	7
Farm Population Monograph, 1920.....	8
The census of 1930.....	9
The census of 1940.....	11
Plans for the 1950 census.....	12
Urban and rural population in 1948.....	13

	Page
1. Population in places of 8,000 and over and in places of 2,500 and over: 1790 to 1940.....	14
2. Urban, rural-nonfarm and rural-farm population of the United States: 1920 to 1940.....	14
3. Urban population by States: 1850, 1880, 1910, and 1940.....	15
4. Changes made between one census and another in 1900 and 1910 urban totals for certain States.....	16
5. Rural population, 1890 and 1880, as defined in 1890.....	16

Introduction

The general distinction between urban and rural, as opposing concepts, runs far back into the history of civilization. Long before the appearance of any of our modern languages, that which pertained to the city (or town) was termed urban; and that was termed rural which pertained to the country, or perchance to agricultural life and activities, since agriculture was the dominant activity of those who lived in the country. The rural concept sometimes specifically included the smaller villages, especially in those countries where most of the agricultural workers lived in villages.

Against this common background, different countries have followed different procedures in setting up census classifications under which their population could be classified in statis-

tical terms as urban and rural, putting varying emphasis on size of place, density of settlement, type of political organization, or prevalence of agricultural occupations, and sometimes making provision for an intermediate semi-urban or semi-rural classification.

For the major part of the population of any country the problem is simple. The larger cities, even those with no more than 10,000 inhabitants, are definitely and without much question to be counted as urban; and the population living on farms or scattered over the countryside is just as definitely to be counted as rural. The difficulty arises with respect to the rather numerous areas which lie between these extremes.

Further, the application of any scheme for setting up a complete dichotomy and assigning all of the population or all of the area to

either the urban or the rural classification has been made more difficult by the fact that the smallest areas for which population counts were available were usually the minor political subdivisions. Thus, even though a township or commune or other minor political area was in part thickly settled, with urban characteristics, and in part thinly settled, with farms and isolated dwellings, some device had to be found under which the entire area could be counted as either urban or rural. In other words, it has not seemed feasible, until very recently, to set up artificial nonpolitical subdivisions of territory solely for the sake of making more homogeneous the urban and rural aggregates.

The classification is fundamentally a classification of areas, producing urban areas and rural areas, from which come, as secondary items, the urban population and the rural population. Its problems are therefore closely related to the political geography of the country concerned, being simpler where most of the thickly settled areas have a political status of their own, with definite boundaries to which the status applies, and more difficult where many of the smallest politically distinct units contain both thickly settled areas and much open country.

In the development of the concepts of urban and rural population which have been used in the censuses of the United States, the classification has been based mainly on size of place, as measured by population. Places with more than a specified number of inhabitants have been classified as urban and all the rest of the population has usually been designated rural. Account has also been taken of the political organization of the places in question and urban classification has been given for the most part only to those places which were incorporated as cities, towns, boroughs, or villages, and which in addition had the required number of inhabitants. This requirement of the status of municipal incorporation was perhaps not really an additional factor, though, but rather a recognition of the fact that separate counts of the compact population were made only for areas which were separate political entities and therefore had definite boundaries which could be followed by the enumerator.

Since the habit of setting up municipal governments for the larger places was fairly uniform among most of the States, the limitation of the classification to incorporated places seemed for the most part quite appropriate; nor did it result in very extensive omissions of existing compact areas having a population above the established minimum. Even the fact that in

some States the municipalities remained a part of the townships or civil districts in which they were located and in others formed independent parts of the county did not materially complicate the matter of urban-rural classification. In a few States, however, especially in New England, where the town system of local government prevailed, serious problems did arise because important thickly settled areas were not set off from the rest of the town (township) under municipal incorporation and were thus not provided with the official boundaries needed to facilitate their separate enumeration. Special provision had therefore to be made for the urban classification in some of these States, as will appear later.

Statistical Atlas, 1874

The first official publication of figures formally presenting the urban population of the United States¹ was made in a "Statistical Atlas of the United States," prepared under the direction of Dr. Francis A. Walker and published in 1874, where it appeared, not as a classification set up to meet specific needs, but as a by-product of the computations required for an elaborate series of maps showing the density of population, county by county, in the different parts of the United States. It was considered, logically enough, that the inclusion of large city populations in computing the population density of a county produced results somewhat unsatisfactory, in that if such data were plotted on a map the whole county would appear to be densely settled, whereas the city might occupy only a small fraction of the county's area. The densities were therefore computed for what was then and (solely) for that purpose termed the rural population, namely, the population of the county exclusive of any cities or towns having 8,000 inhabitants or more which might be within its boundaries; and the location of the cities was indicated on the maps by dots of varying size. Then by way of summary, as an interesting supplementary item, the population figures for these excluded places were assembled and presented under the title of "Urban population."

¹ In the Compendium of the Seventh Census, 1850, page 192, there is an expression of regret that "The census does not furnish material for separating the urban and rural population." This statement is followed by tables giving the population of individual cities of 4,000 or more, with rounded totals of the population living in these cities and in cities of 20,000 or more, but there is no suggestion that either of these figures might be assumed to represent the urban population of the country. No reference to the possibility of an urban-rural classification is made in the reports of the censuses of 1860 and 1870.

7-3-104
Since there was a map for each census, beginning with 1790, these urban population figures were also presented for all the decennial censuses back to 1790.²

There was no summary, however, of the rural population existing on the respective census dates. In fact, the word "rural" appears only in the text explaining the method of computing the density of population for the maps.

The Census of 1880

In the reports of the census for 1880 the entire series of density maps was reproduced from the Atlas, together with the major part of the text explaining the basis of the maps and a summary table giving the urban population of the United States from 1790 to 1880 on the 8,000 basis.

In this text there was comment on the difficulties encountered in making up the list of places of 8,000 inhabitants or more, usually referred to as "cities," especially in New England, where there were even then rather large population aggregates occupying only a part of the political subdivisions (towns) in which they were located and without separate population counts, since these thickly settled areas, not being separately incorporated like the thickly settled areas in most other States, had no established boundaries. One sentence in the text seems to indicate that some adjustment had been made for this situation, thus: "In cases of this kind discretion has been exercised, and after what seemed a reasonable deduction for the rural parts of a town or township, the remainder has been treated as city population."³ A careful examination of the figures presented in the 1880 report for individual places, however, indicates that all New England towns of 8,000 or more were included on the basis of their entire population.

The number of places with a population of 8,000 or more had increased from 6 in 1790, to 28 in 1880, and their population had increased from 131,472 in 1790, to 11,318,547 in 1880. Likewise, the percentage of the total population living in cities of 8,000 or more had increased from 3.3 in 1790 to 22.5 in 1880.⁴ Conversely, the percentage of the total population which might have been considered rural under this

classification had declined from 96.7 in 1790 to 77.5 in 1880, though no specific mention of these figures appears in the report.

It seemed to be the opinion of the officials in charge of the census in 1880 that the 8,000 limit was too high to include all of the population that was really urban in character. Thus while the population density maps for the earlier censuses were reproduced as they had been previously compiled and supplemented by a similar map for 1880, additional maps, on a larger scale, for sections of the country, were made up on a new basis which excluded from the rural population used in computing the density all places of 4,000 or more. The reduction of the limit from 8,000 to 4,000 added to the urban area 294 places having a population of between 4,000 and 8,000, making a total of 580 urban places, and increased the urban population in 1880 from 11,318,547, as it stood under the 8,000 limit, to 12,936,110, with a corresponding increase in the percentage urban from 22.5 to 25.8. The total urban population on this new basis was presented by States in a detailed table which gave the number and population of the urban places in each of ten size groups, 4,000 to 8,000, 8,000 to 12,000, etc.⁵ From this table the State figures for urban population on the 8,000 basis can readily be derived.

In the 1880 report, as in the Atlas, there was no specific presentation of figures for the rural population on either basis nor any discussion of the rural population as such or of the changes in it which might have been derived from the published data on the urban population, since the rural population was, by implication, that population remaining after the urban population had been taken out.

The Census of 1890

In the reports of the census of 1890 the density maps of the Statistical Atlas were again reproduced, with the addition of similar maps for 1880 and 1890. The historical table showing the urban population of the United States, defined as living in cities having 8,000 inhabitants or more, was also repeated, with a figure for 1890 which indicated that the urban population, as thus defined, represented 29.2 percent of the total population, as compared with 22.6 percent in 1880. There was no comment whatever on the assumption made in 1880 that the population living under urban conditions would be

² Statistical Atlas of the United States, 1874, chapter entitled "Progress of the Nation," page 5.

³ Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, Population, page xxix.

⁴ The figures quoted are those published in the 1880 report. Slightly revised figures are presented in Appendix Table 1.

⁵ Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, Population, page xxx. The population of individual places of 4,000 or more is given in Table IX, pages 447-456.

better represented if all places having 4,000 inhabitants or more were included.

A table was presented showing, by States, the urban population (that is, the population in cities of 8,000 or more) in 1890, with comparative figures for 1880 and columns giving the number of places at each census and the percentage urban in the total population. The total number of places of 8,000 or more had increased from 286 in 1880 to 448 in 1890, the increase being rather generally distributed over the country.

A new and independent definition of rural population was presented in this report, though the term "rural" was also used, in the introduction to the series of maps, in referring to the population outside places of 8,000 or more, as in the 1880 report and the Atlas. The new definition was much narrower even than the definition embracing only persons who lived outside places of 4,000 or more which had been suggested in the reports of the 1880 census. Figures representing the rural population under this new concept were obtained by subtracting from the total population, county by county, the population of "all cities or other compact bodies of population which number 1,000 or more."⁶ Presumably by some accident, however, the rural figures thus compiled were not included in the report, neither by States nor even the total for the United States, though a table was presented showing State by State the increase or decrease between 1880 and 1890 in this newly defined rural population; nor was there any discussion of the rural figures except in terms of gain or loss, especially loss, in rural population between 1880 and 1890. From these fragmentary figures may be gleaned two or three significant facts. Even at this early date, a considerable part of the northeastern section of the United States showed a decline in rural population as thus narrowly defined, more than one-half the area comprised in the States from Maine to Pennsylvania reporting a smaller rural population in 1890 than in 1880. The net loss of rural population in New England and New York taken together was more than 230,000; nor can this loss be explained by the growth in size of cities and consequent change of classification, since the comparisons were made between the population as classified in 1890 and the population of the same areas in 1880.

In the discussion of the problems involved in this new rural classification there is an incidental reference to the 2,500 limit which

⁶ Eleventh Census of the United States, Part 1, Population, page Lxix.

was later (1910) adopted as the dividing line between urban and rural population; and there are presented in the 1890 report a number of tables giving population characteristics for all individual places of 2,500 or more.

One of the tables in the 1890 report gives the total population of all places of 1,000 or more including New England towns of this size about 3,200 places in all, arranged in one alphabetical series.⁷ It appears certain that the places listed in this table are the places which were subtracted from the total population, county by county, to obtain data for a rather elaborate map indicating increase or decrease in rural population, as well as the unpublished rural population data by States, commented on above. The missing table has been reconstructed on the basis of these figures and appears as Appendix Table 5 at the end of this article.⁸

The Census of 1900

The reports of the census of 1900, like the 1880 reports, presented the urban population both on the 8,000 basis (for the sake of comparison with all earlier censuses) and on the 4,000 basis. Comparative figures for 1890 and 1880 were given, by States, both on the older 8,000 basis and on the 4,000 basis, which seems to have gained favor as affording a more adequate urban classification.

Urban population, defined in the older fashion as comprising the population of places of 8,000 or more, formed 33.1 percent of the total population, as compared with 29.2 percent in 1890. Urban population on the new basis, defined as comprising the population living in places of 4,000 inhabitants or more, formed 37.3 percent of the total population in 1900, as compared with 33.0 percent in 1890 and 25.8 percent in 1880.

Rural population was again given a specific definition covering only a part of the area outside the urban classification. The remainder left after subtracting the population in places of 4,000 or more was divided into two parts: One made up of all incorporated places having less than 4,000 inhabitants (not including any towns in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, or Rhode Island), which was designated semi-urban; and the residual, comprising the population outside all incorporated places, which was designated

⁷ Eleventh Census of the United States, Part 1, Population, pages 378-392.

⁸ Extra copies for insertion in existing copies of the 1890 volume may be had on request from the Bureau of the Census.

rural. A table was presented showing both the semi-urban and the rural population, as thus defined, by States, this being the first formal publication in any United States census report of figures representing the rural population.⁹ This classification was made not only for 1900 but also for the preceding census of 1890, so that figures indicating changes during the intervening decade, by States, are available.

The semi-urban population, that is, the population of incorporated places of less than 4,000, was 8,208,480 in 1900, or 10.8 percent of the total, as compared with 6,172,275, or 9.8 percent of the total, in 1890. The rural population in 1900, as defined above, amounted to 39,413,703, or 51.9 percent of the total, as compared with 36,029,465, or 57.2 percent of the total, in 1890. The percentage of increase during the decade in the semi-urban was 33.0, and in the rural 9.4, as compared with 36.8 in the urban (4,000 or over).

While the 1900 definition of rural population, as just outlined (the population outside all incorporated places) has not been used at any later census, the classification has been retained in the reports of all subsequent censuses, where it appears as a subdivision of the current rural population under the designation of population living in "unincorporated territory."¹⁰

The density maps which had been repeated from the Statistical Atlas in the reports of 1880 and 1890 were not included in the 1900 report, though there was one map constructed on the same pattern, showing population density (omitting places of 8,000 or more) for the single year 1900. The rural population concept seems thus to have been divorced from the population density program in which it had its origin in 1874.

In the reports of the census of 1900 even the total population classified as urban and rural was not given for areas smaller than States, though in the tables giving the population of individual places there was the material from which could be constructed county data for urban population comprising either places of 8,000 or more, or places of 4,000 or more, and for semi-urban and rural population as defined. Further, since population data classified in accordance with a considerable number of census characteristics (sex, color, nativity, school age, militia age, voting age and dwellings and families) were given both for counties and for

individual places down to 2,500 inhabitants, it would be possible to make up from this raw material tables showing a considerable number of items for the urban and rural parts of counties.¹¹ Incidentally, the selection of 2,500 inhabitants as the cutoff point for some of the detailed tables in the 1900 report (as well as in that of 1890) might be considered a forecast of the later adoption of this limit as the dividing line between urban and rural areas.

Practically all of the classifications used in the 1900 census were presented for individual cities of 25,000 and over; and there were more tables in which the population of counties and of the smaller individual cities was classified by various characteristics in the 1900 reports than in any of the earlier census reports.

Supplementary Analysis, 1906

The first publication in which the population of places having 2,500 inhabitants or more was officially designated as urban was the Supplementary Analysis of the Twelfth Census (1900), prepared under the supervision of Dr. Walter F. Willcox and published in 1906. No very specific reasons are given for the choice of this limit in place of the limit of 4,000 which was presented in the regular reports of the 1900 census as forming a more realistic dividing line between urban and rural population than did the limit of 8,000 which had been used in 1890. While the population of places (including New England towns) of 2,500 or more is specifically referred to in the text of this volume as "urban,"¹² the tables in which the figures on this new basis are presented by regions and States bear the column headings, respectively, of "Cities," and "Country districts," rather than the briefer "Urban" and "Rural." In addition to a table presenting the total population in the newly defined urban and rural areas, with comparative figures back to 1880, there are tables showing population by sex and by color, with nativity and parentage for the white population, by States, for both 1900 and 1890, with a considerable amount of analytical comment; and a considerable number of additional tables presenting other population characteristics for the aggregate of all cities of 25,000 or more and the remainder of the United States, designated "Smaller cities or country districts." These figures were made up of course by consolidation

¹¹ This material was actually used in 1910 as a source for 1900 data for the urban and rural parts of States, under the new definitions established for that census.

¹² Twelfth Census, 1900, Supplementary Analysis, page 20.

⁹ Twelfth Census, 1900, Volume I, Part I, page xc.

¹⁰ See, for example, Seventeenth Census, 1940, Population, Volume I, Number of Inhabitants, page 25.

from various tables of the 1900 report in which figures were presented for the 441 cities of 25,000 or more. Presumably the task of consolidating the data for the 1,361 places having between 2,500 and 25,000 inhabitants was too burdensome to make it feasible to obtain classified figures for the whole of the newly defined urban population for all of the classifications under discussion.

The Census of 1910

For the census of 1910 the definition of urban population presented in the Statistical Analysis was adopted, again without any discussion of its merits as compared with those which had been used earlier; and this definition has been used, with minor modifications, in later censuses down to and including 1940. In the 1910 report urban population was formally defined as "That residing in cities and other incorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants or more, including New England towns of that size." There was some justification of the inclusion of these New England towns, in the form of a statement that "In most of the New England towns of 2,500 inhabitants or more, the larger part of the population is embraced in the densely settled parts."¹³

All the remainder of the population, comprising both incorporated places and New England towns of less than 2,500 and all unincorporated territory, was designated rural.

The urban and rural population in accordance with this new definition was compiled from the earlier reports showing the population of individual places for 1900, 1890, and 1880 (total population only), so that comparative figures for three earlier censuses were made available.

At the same time, slight revisions were made in the figures for the censuses of 1880, 1890, and 1900 representing the population in places of 8,000 or more; and these revisions were presented, together with the figures for censuses prior to 1880 as previously published, in a historical table giving data on this basis back to 1790.

In the discussion of the changes in the size of the urban population and of the proportions urban and rural, a rather careful analysis of two possible methods of making intercensal comparisons was presented.¹⁴ The simpler method was, of course, to compare the urban population

or the percentage urban in 1910 with that in 1900 and note the change. In this type of comparison, especially as regards the percentage urban, the urban population has a certain, one might say, unfair advantage over the rural in that the urban population may grow not only by the excess of births over deaths within the area and the in-migration of population from rural areas, but also by the annexation to existing cities of territory previously rural and the passing of specific places from the rural to the urban classification through increase in population from something less than 2,500 to something more. For many purposes, of course, this gives exactly what is wanted, namely, a picture of the actual change in the urban aggregate or the rural residual between one census and the next.

From the point of view of the rate of growth, however, comparisons made on this basis are not strictly accurate. For this special purpose it was proposed that the comparison be made between the urban population in 1910, for example, and the population at the previous census of the exact area classified as urban in the current census (or with the closest possible approximation to that area). The 1900 figure that was taken for this comparison was appreciably larger than the urban population of 1900 because it included the population of a considerable number of places still rural in 1900 which had become urban by increase in size in 1910, and the population of areas annexed to existing cities during the intervening decade (which latter item was not always available in exact terms, since annexations were often not coterminous with census enumeration areas).

On the first basis the increase of urban population between 1900 and 1910 was 38.4 percent and the increase in rural population was 9.2 percent.

On the other basis, comparing the actual urban population of 1910 with the 1900 population of the places which were urban in 1910, so far as it could be ascertained, the urban rate of growth was 34.8 percent and the rural 11.2 percent.

In the reports of the 1910 census urban and rural population figures were presented for counties, with comparative figures for 1900. The 1900 figures were presented both for the territory which was urban or rural in 1900 (corresponding to the first of the two methods of comparison outlined above) and for the population in 1900 of the places classified, respectively, as urban and rural in 1910.¹⁵

¹³ Thirteenth Census, 1910, Volume I, Population, General Report and Analysis, Page 53.

¹⁴ Thirteenth Census, 1910, Volume I, Population, General Report and Analysis, pages 53 and 60.

¹⁵ Thirteenth Census, 1910, Volumes II and III, Table I for each State.

Under almost all of the classifications of the population which were presented in the reports of the 1910 census (excepting only occupation and industry, mother tongue, and ownership of homes), data were given for urban and rural areas, both for the United States and for divisions and usually for States--often with rather complex cross-classification detail, such as marital status by sex, age, color, and nativity. Quantitatively, at least, this represented a great advance in the extent of urban-rural classification; and in many cases the urban-rural tables were accompanied by data for city size groups, as representing significant subdivisions of the urban total.

A number of compilations of data classified by various population characteristics had been made from the figures presented in the 1890 and 1900 reports for individual cities and published in the "Statistical Analysis." Comparative figures for urban and rural population on the 2,500 basis were thus provided¹⁶ for censuses prior to the adoption of the 1910 definition. These data included color, nativity, parentage (for white only), and sex for both 1900 and 1890, and males of voting age for 1900 alone. These were all the classifications presented in the earlier census tables for individual cities down to 2,500 except militia age, naturalization, and dwellings and families. In addition, perhaps following the lead of the Supplementary Analysis, there were 1900 and 1890 totals for all cities of 25,000 or more combined and for "Cities under 25,000 and rural districts" for age, and for country of birth of the foreign born, and 1900 figures for State of birth (State of residence or "other State"--percentage only).

While the 1910 reports presented more extensive population data for counties than earlier censuses had done, together with at least some classified data for even the smallest urban place, there were no detailed tables for the urban and rural parts of counties, not even such fundamental items as sex, color, or nativity--perhaps because so many counties were either entirely rural, or contained only one urban place, so that the rural population could easily be gotten by subtraction of the urban-place data from the county total.

The Census of 1920

In 1920, for the first time in our census history, the definitions of urban and rural population were maintained practically as they had

been used in the preceding census. The one change involved was that in 1920 New England towns having 2,500 inhabitants or more were classified as urban only in three States--New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island--while the urban classification in the other three New England States--Maine, Vermont, and Connecticut--was made in the same manner as in States outside New England, that is, the urban population in these three States included only the population of incorporated places having the required number of inhabitants.¹⁷ This change in method was carried back into the compilations of urban population for the censuses from 1880 to 1910 which were presented in comparative tables. The effect of this change in definition was to reduce the 1910 urban population of Maine from 381,443, or 51.4 percent of the total, to 262,248, or 35.3 percent of the total; the urban population of Vermont from 168,943 (47.5 percent) to 98,917 (27.8 percent); and the urban population of Connecticut from 999,839 (89.7 percent) to 731,797 (65.0 percent). There were no changes in the earlier figures for any other State and the sum of the three changes just listed, which was 457,263, reduced the 1910 urban population of the United States as a whole only from 42,623,383, or 46.3 percent of the total, to 42,166,120, or 45.8 percent of the total.

A similar change in the compilation of the 1910 figures for places of 8,000 or more, which classification was again presented for historical purposes, reduced the 1910 figure by 156,386 and the percentage of the population represented by such places from 38.8 to 38.7.

In the matter of the presentation of classified data for urban and rural areas, the 1920 report followed very closely that of 1910, though urban-rural data were presented in 1920 for dwellings and families, ownership of homes, and year of immigration (subjects for which there were no urban or rural figures in 1910), leaving only mother tongue and occupations as subjects without the urban-rural classification. The urban and rural population was presented, by counties, for 1920, 1910, and 1900, with revised figures of course for Maine, Vermont, and Connecticut. County figures for New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, were omitted from this table, though there had been no change in the basis of urban classification in these States, "on account of the undoubted exaggeration in certain counties"¹⁸--a reason which does not seem to be altogether satisfactory, in view

¹⁷ Fourteenth Census, 1920, Volume II, Population, General Report and Analysis, page 20.

¹⁸ Fourteenth Census, 1920, Volume I, Population, Number and Distribution of Inhabitants, page 43.

¹⁶ The urban totals for 7 States, as shown in the "Supplementary Analysis," were revised for publication in the 1910 reports. See Appendix Table 4.

of other presentations of the urban population of these States.

Again, as in 1910, there were no tables presenting any classified data, not even sex or color, for the urban and rural parts of the counties.

Much of the discussion of the two possible methods of computing intercensal increase in urban and rural areas was reproduced from the 1910 report, and figures representing the growth of population since 1910 in the areas classified as urban and rural, respectively, in 1920, were presented by States, in addition to the simpler comparisons between urban and rural totals in 1910 and 1920, on the basis of current classifications. For counties, however, the only 1910 figures presented for comparison with 1920 were those representing the population of the urban and rural areas as they were in 1910.

Farm Population Monograph, 1920

In the census of 1920 provision was made for indicating, for each household, whether or not it lived on a farm. This supposedly new classification¹⁹ was set up at the urgent request of Dr. C. J. Galpin, Chief of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life in the Department of Agriculture, for whom very detailed special tabulations for eight selected counties were made. As a part of the regular tabulation program of the 1920 census the farm population was tabulated by sex, color-nativity, and age, for the urban and rural parts of the States, but not for counties or other significant smaller areas. These figures were not published in the general reports of the 1920 census, however, but were reserved for publication in a monograph which was prepared by the present writer and published in 1926 under the title "Farm Population of the United States, 1920." The eight-county special tabulations were included in this Monograph.

A brief statement with respect to the significance of this new classification may be summarized from the text of the Monograph:

Of all the possible classifications of the present population of the United States, none is more significant than that which separates the farm population from the city population. Farming as an occupation stands out in more

distinctive fashion than does any other important occupation. The farm, as a place of residence, presents characteristics in sharp contrast with the city--some less favorable as well as some more favorable. For many decades the decennial censuses have shown separate figures for the urban or city population and for the remainder of the population which was usually termed rural. These classifications have been made primarily to show the number and status of the city dwellers, while the rural population--the noncity dwellers--appeared as a sort of by-product, including all that was left over after the significant urban classes have been taken out. This rural population was, and still is, a heterogeneous group comprising not only farmers and their families, but also people living in small commercial centers, the population of mill villages engaged almost exclusively in manufacturing, the inhabitants of mining settlements, the people living in the outlying suburbs of cities, many of whom work in the cities, and the incidental population found in the open country but not engaged in any agricultural pursuit nor in any way directly connected with farming.

The purpose of the classification based on farm residence was to separate out from these widely divergent groups making up the rural population those persons directly connected with farming. Two possible bases for such a classification were already being discussed prior to the 1920 census, namely, place of residence (on a farm or not on a farm), and occupation (in agriculture or not in agriculture). Since farm residence was the simpler of these two criteria, especially in its application to members of the household other than gainful workers, it was selected as the principal basis for the classification. The claims of the occupational criterion received some recognition, however, in a section of the instructions to enumerators which directed them to designate as a part of the farm population those farm laborers and their families, who, while they did not actually live on a farm, did live in the open country outside any incorporated place. It is evident, however, from an examination of the returns, that the enumerators did not by any means completely report such farm laborers or families as a part of the farm population. The opinion that relatively few persons were included in the farm population of 1920 by reason of occupation rather than actual farm residence is supported also by the fact that the average farm population per farm in 1920 was only 4.90, as compared with 4.84 in 1930, when the definition was

¹⁹ The classification, so far as concerns the schedule entry, was not new, but rather restored an inquiry which had been carried in 1890, 1900, and 1910. In the tabulations of the data from these earlier censuses, however, no use was made of the farm-nonfarm distinction except in connection with proprietorship of homes, whereas the 1920 question was designed to provide farm-nonfarm classifications of the population in considerable detail.

strictly limited to farm residents--this change being materially less than the decline in the general average population per household, from 4.34 in 1920 to 4.10 in 1930.²⁰

The combination of the new farm-nonfarm classification with the older urban-rural classification produced four subdivisions with population as indicated in the following table:

Class	Population	Percent
Total population.....	105,710,620	100.0
1. Urban-farm.....	255,629	0.2
2. Urban-nonfarm.....	54,048,974	51.1
3. Rural-farm.....	31,358,640	29.7
4. Rural-nonfarm.....	20,047,377	19.0
Total farm.....	31,614,269	29.9
Total nonfarm.....	74,096,351	70.1

The first of these classifications, the urban-farm, was represented by very small numbers, and except for simple tabulations showing little more than the number of persons included, it has always been suppressed or combined with one of the other classes. In the Farm Population Monograph, since this was written primarily from the point of view of the farm population, the urban-farm was combined with the rural-farm, making three classes, as follows:

Class	Population	Percent
Total population.....	105,710,620	100.0
1. Farm.....	31,614,269	29.9
2. Village.....	20,047,377	19.0
3. Urban (excluding urban-farm)	54,048,974	51.1

The term "Village," as used in this Monograph, is identical with the rural-nonfarm of later census reports.

There is a chapter in the Monograph on persons engaged in agricultural occupations, but since the 1920 tabulation of gainful workers classified by occupation was not made separately for farm and nonfarm nor even for urban and rural population, it was not possible at that time to present in very satisfactory fashion the relation between agricultural occupation and farm residence.

²⁰ The fact that the 1920 census was taken in January rather than in April would tend to make smaller the average farm population per farm, but probably not enough smaller to offset the general downward trend in the average population per household.

In the special tabulations for the eight selected counties, the coverage was extended to include the families of all persons engaged in agricultural occupations, even though not living on farms, and many additional classifications were provided, including a distinction between farmers and farm laborers, the status of farmers as owners or tenants, illiteracy, school attendance, ownership of home, and occupation, including nonagricultural occupations reported for persons in the farm population, as defined on this somewhat broader base. The eight counties were by no means representative of the entire farm population, but these detailed classifications were nevertheless significant and suggestive as illustrations of actual relationships within specific areas.

The Census of 1930

The urban-rural classification used in the censuses of 1910 and 1920 was continued, in general, in the census of 1930, though two minor changes were made in the interest of bringing the classification into closer accord with actual conditions existing in the various areas classified as urban or rural. First, a special rule was set up under which a few townships or other political subdivisions without municipal incorporation were classified as urban provided they had a total population of 10,000 or more and a population density of 1,000 or more per square mile. Under this provision there were added to the urban classification 11 townships in New Jersey, 10 townships in Pennsylvania, 4 towns in Connecticut, 2 townships in California, and 1 town in New York. The aggregate population of these 28 places, which would have been classified as rural under the rules governing the urban-rural classification in 1920, was 573,329.

A further change was made in the classification as applied to towns in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, with the expressed purpose of making the urban classification more realistic. In place of counting as urban all those towns which had a population of 2,500 or more, as had been done in 1920 and 1910, the special rule for these States was modified so as to place in the urban classification, in addition to the regularly incorporated cities, only those towns in which there was a village or other thickly settled area having more than 2,500 inhabitants and comprising, either by itself or when combined with other villages in the same town, more than 50 percent of the total population of the town. The result of this modification was to transfer from the urban to the

rural classification 12 towns in New Hampshire, 56 towns in Massachusetts, and 8 towns in Rhode Island which would have been counted as urban under the 1920 rule. The aggregate population in 1930 of these towns was 288,621.

The net effect of the two changes described above was to increase the urban population of the United States as a whole by 284,708. With these changes, the urban population of the United States in 1930 was 68,954,823, or 56.2 percent of the total, whereas, if the 1920 methods had been followed in 1930, the urban population would have been 68,670,115, representing 55.9 percent of the total population. Contrary to the procedure adopted in some of the earlier censuses, no attempt was made in 1930 to revise the urban or rural figures of earlier years in accordance with the new methods of classification.

The most important new feature brought into the urban-rural classification in 1930 was the adoption of the subdivision of the rural population into farm and nonfarm as an integral part of the urban-rural classification throughout. The definition of farm population was simplified, as compared with 1920, by the complete omission of the somewhat doubtful element represented by farm-laborer families not actually living on farms but living outside incorporated places, which had been nominally included in 1920, as indicated above. The basis of the farm-nonfarm classification in 1930 was a simple and direct question on the schedule, "Does this family live on a farm?" And there were no special instructions to the enumerator beyond a few sentences designed to make clear the relation between the designation of a family as living on a farm and the making out of a farm schedule. The emphasis on residence as distinct from occupation was made clear in the following paragraph:

"If the family lives on a farm, that is, a place for which a farm schedule is made out and which is locally regarded as a farm, the answer should be "Yes" even though no member of the family works on the farm. It is a question here of residence, not of occupation."²¹

It might have been suggested that this narrowing of the definition of farm population, even though the farm-laborer element of the 1920 definition had been only partially reported, would affect the comparability of the 1930 figures with those of 1920, as published in the Farm Population Monograph. Comparative figures

for the two censuses were extensively presented, however, and the assumption of reasonable comparability was supported in the text of the 1930 report by the statement that the change in the date of enumeration from January to April might well have added to the farm population at least as much as the change in definition had taken away.²²

Since the main purpose of the integration of the farm-nonfarm classification with the urban-rural was to separate at least approximately that part of the rural population directly concerned with agriculture from the other diverse elements which made up the remainder of the population living outside the urban area, rather than to stress the total farm population, a new combination of the four primary elements listed above was made in which the small urban-farm group was left as a part of the urban total (rather than as a part of the farm population total) in practically all of the tabulations and the farm-nonfarm definition was applied only to the rural population. The resulting three-way classification was as follows:

1. Urban
2. Rural-farm
3. Rural-nonfarm

This classification was very extensively used in the reports of the 1930 census. Even in the county tables fairly extensive data were presented for the rural-farm and the rural-nonfarm population, while corresponding urban data were available (though not quite so conveniently) in other tables presenting figures for individual urban places. This was the first time that any data beyond total population had been presented for rural areas in the county tables of the census reports.

In general, the presentation of data for urban and rural areas in the 1930 reports was far more extensive than in 1920 or 1910, that is, the new three-way classification was incorporated in many more tables than the simpler urban-rural classification of the 1920 or the 1910 census had been. The three-way classification was shown, by States, for every one of the major subjects of the census, including, for the first time, a classification of gainful workers as urban or rural (urban, rural-farm, or rural-nonfarm) in combination with industry group. From these tables were obtainable, among other new items, the number of persons living on farms and working in nonagricultural occupations, and vice versa, the number of persons working in agricultural occupations but not living on farms.

²¹ Fifteenth Census, 1930, Instructions to Enumerators, Population and Agriculture, page 25.

²² Fifteenth Census, 1930, Population, Volume II, page 8.

In comparison with the earlier census figures, the 1930 data indicated a continuation of the rapid movement toward urbanization, the percentage urban having increased from 51.4 in 1920 to 56.2 in 1930, while the percentage rural decreased from 48.6 to 43.8. All of the decrease in the relative importance of the rural population took place in the rural-farm element, which formed only 24.6 percent of the total population in 1930, as compared with 29.7 percent in 1920, while the rural-nonfarm percentage increased slightly, from 19.0 to 19.3. The rates of increase in the three classes are perhaps more significant than the changes in the proportion of the total. The urban population increased 27.0 percent (partly, of course, through the expansion of the urban area), the rural-nonfarm population increased 18.0 percent, or slightly more than the increase in the total population (16.1 percent), but the rural-farm population actually decreased from 31,358,640 to 30,157,513, or 3.8 percent.

The Census of 1940

In the 1940 census the methods of classification of the population as urban and rural which had been used in 1930 were followed without change except that seven places, one in Vermont and six in Maine, which had been classified as urban in 1930 but about whose status as incorporated places some question was raised in 1940, were retained in the urban classification under a third special rule. The list of urban towns in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, was identical with the 1930 list.

Five additional places, making a total of 33 in all, were included in the urban population under the rule which assigned this classification to townships and other political subdivisions without special municipal incorporation provided they had a population of 10,000 and a population density of more than 1,000 per square mile.

For use in comparative tables the 1920 urban figures for total population (which had not been revised for use in the 1930 reports) were revised²³ to conform with the definitions adopted in 1930 and continued in 1940, that is, those New England towns which did not comply with the more restrictive requirements of 1930 for urban classification were transferred to the rural group. No attempt was made, however, to carry back to censuses prior to 1930 the special rule under which 28 unincorporated places of

10,000 or more in other States were transferred from rural to urban status in 1930.

During the period between 1930 and 1940 the urban population figures for the censuses from 1880 to 1910 had likewise been revised and new figures conforming to the 1930 definition had been compiled for all censuses back to and including 1790. On the basis of this work it was possible to present in the 1940 reports comparative figures for urban population on the basis of 2,500 inhabitants or more for the entire period from 1790 to 1940. These figures being available, it was not thought necessary to repeat the historical table on the 8,000 basis which had appeared in all the census reports from 1880 to 1930.

The farm-nonfarm classification was continued as in 1930²⁴ and was used in the same way, as a subdivision of the rural category, except that the order of presentation of the three items was changed so that they might appear in decreasing order of urbanization, thus:

1. Urban
2. Rural-nonfarm
3. Rural-farm

This three-fold classification was even more widely used in the various tables of the 1940 reports than in 1930. In particular, the presentation of county data for rural-nonfarm and rural-farm population was expanded so as to include, among other things, a classification of the population in these areas by employment status and of employed workers by major occupation group. There were more extensive tabulations also for individual cities, and a new series of tables for metropolitan districts (areas set up for each city of 50,000 or more including, in general, all contiguous townships or other political subdivisions having a population density of 150 or more per square mile), which seemed for the time being to promise a new modification in the urban-rural classification in the form of a classification as inside and outside metropolitan districts. Since the metropolitan districts included both rural-farm and rural-nonfarm population, in addition to urban areas, this might have been developed into a six-way classification. In fact, some of the housing tabulations did show separately the rural-farm and rural-nonfarm outside these districts.

²⁴ While there was no change in the schedule question and no substantial change in the instructions, the number of farm households returned in 1940 was substantially larger in relation to the number of farms reported in the Census of Agriculture, the ratio being 1.18 to 1 as compared with 1.06 to 1 in 1930. See U. S. Census of Agriculture, 1945, Volume II, General Report, page 278,

²³ It was not possible to revise the figures showing characteristics of the urban population.

By way of current note on this situation, it may be said that the metropolitan district tabulations appear to have been used far less than had been expected and it seems likely that they will be very greatly condensed in the tabulations for 1950, being replaced, in part, by consolidated data for significant groups of counties and perhaps by detailed tabulations made for county groups, somewhat after the pattern of the 1940 metropolitan district tabulations.

The census of 1940 marked an abrupt (though perhaps temporary) ending of the strong trend toward urbanization which had been noted in almost all earlier censuses except that of 1820. Between 1930 and 1940, the urban population increased 7.9 percent (as compared with 27.3 in the previous decade), while the rural population increased 6.4 percent, or almost as much. In no prior census since 1880 had the percentage of urban increase been materially less than three times that of the rural, while in the decade ending in 1920 the urban population increased 29.0 percent, as against 3.2 percent for the rural, or more than eight times as much. The major part of the rural increase took place, however, in the rural-nonfarm population, which increased 14.2 percent, as against 0.2 percent in the rural-farm. The increase in the percentage urban was of course very slight, from 56.2, in 1930 to 56.5, in 1940, while the rural-nonfarm increased from 19.3 percent of the total to 20.5 percent, and the rural-farm registered a considerable decrease in proportion of the total, from 24.6 percent to 22.9 percent.

Plans for the 1950 Census

For many years it had been recognized that an urban classification which included places of a given number of inhabitants provided they were incorporated, and excluded (left in the rural classification) even larger places which did not happen to have a separate municipal incorporation, was not completely satisfactory. Attempts were made both in 1930 and 1940 to have the enumerators distinguish between the population living in unincorporated villages and that in the remainder of the township or other political subdivision in which these places were located. Special effort was devoted to this matter in 1940, with the idea that, if satisfactory returns could be obtained, the urban classification would be expanded to include unincorporated places of 2,500 or more as well as incorporated. The results of these efforts, however, were so far from complete that it was not found practicable to make this change, though figures are

published in a later bulletin²⁵ for those unincorporated places of 500 inhabitants or more for which the returns were satisfactory. At the same time it was realized more and more clearly that another type of area strictly urban in its characteristics was being omitted from the formal urban classification, namely, the unincorporated suburban areas around the larger cities, which seemed to be forming a larger and larger part of the rapidly increasing rural-nonfarm totals.

Two changes are being introduced into the census program for 1950 with a view to bringing both the larger unincorporated places and the suburban areas just mentioned into the urban classification. First, boundaries (more or less arbitrary or "artificial") have been established so far as possible for all the larger unincorporated villages and these villages have been set up as separate enumeration districts, so that the separate enumeration of their population will be insured. Then the thickly settled areas surrounding the larger cities (cities of 50,000 or more) have been identified and boundaries established within which will be set up a series of enumeration districts which together will cover what is termed the "urban fringe" of a given city, comprising mainly the continuously built-up area having a population density of around 2,000 per square mile, while the adjoining territory outside this area is covered by separate and distinct series of enumeration districts. In this way the urban-rural classification can be applied to parts of the political subdivisions which have heretofore formed the smallest units for which it was practicable to make the census count, and some progress will be made toward a classification based on local physical conditions, principally density of settlement, and not involving the necessity of putting an entire township or other political subdivision into the urban classification because the major part of its population seems to be living under urban conditions.

On the basis of these special provisions, it is proposed to set up a new definition of urban population for 1950 which will include all places, whether incorporated or unincorporated, having 2,500 inhabitants or more, together with the entire urban fringe surrounding the larger cities. This definition, it is believed, will include practically the entire population living under what might be termed urban conditions and take away, in particular from the rural-nonfarm classification of 1940, a rather large element of essentially urban dwellers.

²⁵ Sixteenth Census, 1940, Unincorporated Communities.

While the closer approach to homogeneity in the urban and rural aggregates may be counted a definite improvement, in a narrow sense--a very great improvement, one might say, since the urban areas previously employed have contained considerable fractions of obviously rural character, and vice versa--the change is bound to bring with it some disadvantages. First, in that the urban area will change more extensively from one census to another, especially that part of it represented by the urban fringe; and second, in that noncensus data, such as births and deaths, will not be readily available for the newly defined urban and rural areas.

The quantitative result of this change will be to transfer large numbers of persons from the rural classification to the urban (except in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, where the change will be in reverse direction, by reason of the present special rule which puts entire towns into the urban group). The impact of this change on the various States will depend somewhat on the extent of their rural-nonfarm population under the earlier classification and somewhat on whether they contain considerable numbers of unincorporated places of 2,500 or more, or of cities of 50,000 or more with extensive suburban developments. As regards a State's percentage of the total rural population of the United States, which is used as a basis for the distribution of certain Federal funds for work in agriculture, a State which has few large unincorporated villages and few cities for which an urban fringe will be established is likely to have a larger percentage of the total rural population than on the 1940 basis, while a State with many large unincorporated villages or many cities for which an urban fringe will be estab-

lished may have a slightly smaller percentage, though the changes in either direction are not likely to be great.

For the sake of maintaining continuity with the past, it is proposed to make, in 1950, limited tabulations of urban and rural population on the 1940 basis. These figures will make it possible to bridge over the differences between the older classification and the new.

Urban and Rural Population in 1948

A sample survey of the civilian population made in April, 1948, indicated that the tendency toward urbanization, which was slowed down, presumably by depression conditions, between 1930 and 1940, had been in some measure resumed. This survey indicated an increase of 13.8 percent in the urban population between 1940 and 1948, as compared with an increase of 5.5 percent in the total rural population. The changes in the two parts of the rural population were radically different, the rural-nonfarm increasing 20.5 percent, or decidedly more than the urban, and the rural-farm showing an actual decrease of 8.0 percent. The 1948 estimates indicate an urban percentage of 58.4, as compared with 56.5 in 1940, with an even greater relative increase in the percentage rural-nonfarm and a decrease in the percentage rural-farm from 22.9 to 19.2. The survey figures probably understate the actual urban increase, since the urban figures for 1948 relate for the most part to areas classified as urban in 1940, thus omitting the urban gain usually noted as a result of the passage of areas from the rural classification into the urban.

APPENDIX

Table 1.--POPULATION IN PLACES OF 8,000 AND OVER AND IN PLACES OF 2,500 AND OVER: 1790 TO 1940

Census year	Total population	Places of 8,000 inhabitants or more			Places of 2,500 inhabitants or more		
		Population	Number of places	Percent of total population	Population	Number of places	Percent of total population
1790.....	3,929,214	131,472	6	3.3	201,655	24	5.1
1800.....	5,308,483	210,873	6	4.0	322,371	33	6.1
1810.....	7,239,881	356,920	11	4.9	525,459	46	7.3
1820.....	9,638,453	475,135	13	4.9	693,255	61	7.2
1830.....	12,866,020	864,509	26	6.7	1,127,247	90	8.8
1840.....	17,069,453	1,453,994	44	8.5	1,845,055	131	10.8
1850.....	23,191,876	2,897,586	85	12.5	3,543,716	236	15.3
1860.....	31,443,321	5,072,256	141	16.1	6,216,518	392	19.8
1870.....	38,558,371	8,071,875	226	20.9	9,902,361	663	25.7
1880.....	50,155,783	11,365,698	285	22.7	14,129,735	939	28.2
1890.....	62,947,714	18,244,239	445	29.0	22,106,265	1,348	35.1
1900.....	75,994,575	25,018,335	547	32.9	30,159,921	1,737	39.7
1910.....	91,972,266	35,570,334	768	38.7	41,998,932	2,262	45.7
1920.....	105,710,620	46,307,640	924	43.8	54,157,973	2,722	51.2
1930.....	122,775,046	60,333,452	1,208	49.1	68,954,823	3,165	56.2
1940.....	131,669,275	64,896,083	1,323	49.3	74,423,702	3,464	56.5

Table 2.--URBAN, RURAL-NONFARM AND RURAL-FARM POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES: 1920 TO 1940

Census year	Total population	Urban		Rural-nonfarm		Rural-farm	
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
1920.....	105,710,620	54,157,973	51.2	20,159,385	19.1	31,393,262	29.7
1930.....	122,775,046	68,954,823	56.2	23,662,710	19.3	30,157,513	24.6
1940.....	131,669,275	74,423,702	56.5	27,029,385	20.5	30,216,188	22.9

Table 3.--URBAN POPULATION, BY STATES: 1850, 1880, 1910, AND 1940
(Earlier census figures as revised for 1940)

Nation, division, and State	1940				1910				1880				1850			
	Total population	Urban places of 2,500 or more			Total population	Urban places of 2,500 or more			Total population	Urban places of 2,500 or more			Total population	Urban places of 2,500 or more		
		Number	Population	Per cent of total		Number	Population	Per cent of total		Number	Population	Per cent of total		Number	Population	Per cent of total
United States.....	131,669,275	3,464	74,423,702	56.5	91,972,266	4,265	41,998,932	45.7	50,155,783	2,940	14,129,735	28.2	23,191,876	236	3,543,716	15.3
REGIONS:																
Northeastern States..	35,976,777	967	27,568,065	76.6	25,868,573	721	18,563,203	71.8	14,507,407	374	7,370,224	50.8	8,626,851	132	2,288,891	26.5
North Central States..	40,143,332	1,095	23,437,483	58.4	29,888,542	805	13,427,199	45.1	17,364,111	394	4,198,442	24.2	5,403,595	53	499,413	9.2
South.....	41,665,901	1,002	15,290,483	36.7	29,389,330	527	6,622,658	22.5	16,516,568	140	2,016,735	12.2	6,982,612	49	744,053	8.3
West.....	13,883,265	400	8,127,651	58.5	6,825,821	212	3,325,872	48.7	1,767,697	42	544,344	30.8	178,818	2	11,359	6.4
NEARLY POPULATED STATES:																
New England.....	8,437,297	231	6,420,542	76.1	6,552,681	218	4,805,791	73.3	4,010,529	143	2,102,996	52.4	2,728,116	73	784,628	28.8
Mid-Atlantic.....	27,539,490	736	21,147,543	76.8	19,315,892	503	13,757,412	71.2	10,496,878	231	5,267,218	50.2	5,696,735	59	1,504,263	25.5
WEST CENTRAL STATES:																
East North Central....	26,626,342	710	17,444,359	65.5	18,230,621	524	9,620,277	52.7	11,206,668	283	3,080,100	27.5	4,523,260	46	409,123	9.0
West North Central....	13,516,990	385	5,993,124	44.3	11,637,921	210	3,866,922	33.2	6,157,443	101	1,118,342	18.2	880,335	5	90,228	10.3
WEST SOUTH:																
South Atlantic.....	17,223,151	405	6,921,726	38.8	12,194,895	281	3,092,153	25.4	7,597,197	68	1,129,524	14.9	4,679,090	28	460,229	9.6
East South Central....	10,778,225	220	3,165,376	29.4	6,403,901	126	1,574,229	18.7	5,585,151	38	469,006	6.4	3,363,271	16	141,689	4.2
West South Central....	13,064,525	377	5,203,401	39.8	8,764,534	191	1,956,276	22.3	3,334,220	34	418,205	12.5	940,251	5	142,135	15.1
WEST NORTH:																
Mountain.....	4,150,003	159	1,771,742	42.7	2,633,517	97	944,863	35.9	653,119	18	140,760	21.6	72,927	1	4,539	6.2
Pacific.....	9,733,262	241	6,355,909	65.3	4,192,304	115	2,381,009	56.8	1,114,378	24	403,584	36.2	105,891	1	6,820	6.4
NEW ENGLAND:																
Massachusetts.....	847,226	26	343,057	40.5	742,371	24	262,248	35.3	648,936	14	146,608	22.6	583,169	9	78,925	13.5
New Hampshire.....	491,524	18	283,225	57.6	430,572	16	223,152	51.8	346,991	9	103,105	30.0	317,976	7	54,327	17.1
Vermont.....	359,231	14	123,239	34.3	355,956	14	98,917	27.8	323,296	6	34,367	10.6	314,120	1	6,110	1.9
Rhode Island.....	4,316,721	122	3,859,476	89.4	3,566,416	115	2,995,739	89.0	1,763,065	80	1,331,580	74.7	994,514	43	503,661	50.7
Isle of Man.....	713,146	19	653,383	91.6	542,610	17	493,938	91.0	276,531	14	226,616	82.0	147,545	7	82,084	55.6
Connecticut.....	1,709,242	32	1,158,162	67.8	1,114,756	32	731,797	65.6	622,700	20	260,718	41.9	370,792	6	59,321	16.0
MID-ATLANTIC:																
New York.....	13,479,142	203	11,165,893	82.8	9,113,614	149	7,188,131	78.9	5,082,871	98	2,668,529	56.4	3,097,394	16	873,414	28.2
New Jersey.....	4,160,165	178	3,394,773	81.6	2,537,167	91	1,938,612	76.4	1,131,116	37	615,311	54.4	489,555	8	86,193	17.6
Pennsylvania.....	9,900,160	355	6,566,877	66.5	7,665,111	263	4,630,669	60.4	4,282,891	96	1,783,378	41.6	2,311,766	35	544,654	23.6
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:																
Ohio.....	6,907,612	186	4,612,966	66.8	4,767,121	139	2,665,143	55.9	3,198,062	90	1,030,769	32.2	1,980,329	24	242,418	12.2
Indiana.....	3,427,796	98	1,887,712	55.1	2,700,876	88	1,143,835	42.4	1,978,301	46	386,211	19.5	968,416	8	44,632	4.5
Illinois.....	7,877,241	208	5,809,650	73.6	5,638,591	145	3,479,935	61.7	3,077,871	69	940,504	30.6	851,470	9	64,427	7.6
Michigan.....	5,256,106	123	3,454,867	65.7	2,810,173	79	1,327,044	47.2	1,636,937	44	405,412	24.8	397,654	4	29,225	7.3
Wisconsin.....	3,137,587	93	1,679,144	53.5	2,333,860	73	1,004,320	43.0	1,315,497	34	317,204	24.1	305,391	3	28,623	9.4
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:																
Minnesota.....	2,792,300	78	1,390,098	49.8	2,075,708	48	850,294	41.0	780,773	14	148,758	19.1	6,077	-	-	-
Iowa.....	2,538,268	69	1,084,221	42.7	2,224,771	69	680,054	30.6	1,624,615	34	247,427	15.2	192,214	3	9,730	5.1
Missouri.....	3,784,664	87	1,960,696	51.8	3,393,335	61	1,393,705	42.3	2,168,380	26	545,993	25.2	682,044	2	80,556	11.8
North Dakota.....	641,935	12	131,923	20.6	577,056	10	63,296	11.0	36,909	1	2,693	7.3	-	-	-	-
South Dakota.....	642,961	19	156,067	24.6	583,888	13	76,469	13.1	36,268	2	7,208	7.3	-	-	-	-
Nebraska.....	1,315,834	36	514,148	39.1	1,192,214	27	310,852	26.1	452,402	7	61,307	13.6	-	-	-	-
Kansas.....	1,801,028	64	753,941	41.9	1,690,949	53	492,312	29.1	996,096	17	104,956	10.5	-	-	-	-
SOUTH ATLANTIC:																
Delaware.....	266,505	8	139,432	52.3	202,322	4	97,085	48.0	146,608	3	48,969	33.4	91,532	1	13,979	15.3
Vermont.....	1,821,244	24	1,080,351	59.3	1,295,346	15	652,192	50.8	934,944	9	375,843	40.2	583,034	5	188,045	32.3
District of Columbia..	663,091	1	663,091	100.0	381,069	1	381,069	100.0	177,624	2	159,871	90.0	51,687	2	48,367	93.6
Virginia.....	2,677,773	53	944,675	35.3	2,061,612	32	476,529	23.1	1,512,565	13	189,079	12.5	1,421,661	9	100,690	7.1
West Virginia.....	1,901,974	45	534,292	28.1	1,221,119	25	228,242	18.7	618,457	6	54,150	8.7	-	-	-	-
North Carolina.....	3,571,623	76	974,175	27.3	2,066,287	40	318,474	14.4	1,399,750	9	35,016	3.9	869,039	4	21,109	2.4
South Carolina.....	1,699,804	50	466,111	24.5	1,515,400	25	224,832	14.8	995,577	6	74,539	7.5	668,507	2	49,045	7.3
Georgia.....	3,123,723	78	1,073,808	34.4	2,609,121	45	538,650	20.6	1,542,180	14	145,090	9.4	906,185	5	38,994	4.3
Florida.....	1,897,414	70	1,045,791	55.1	752,619	23	219,080	29.1	269,493	4	26,947	10.0	87,445	-	-	-
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:																
Kentucky.....	2,845,627	56	849,327	29.8	2,289,305	40	555,442	24.3	1,648,690	17	249,923	15.2	982,405	6	78,804	7.5
Tennessee.....	2,915,941	57	1,027,206	35.2	2,184,769	29	441,045	20.2	1,542,359	8	115,964	7.5	1,002,717	3	21,983	2.2
Arkansas.....	2,832,961	59	855,941	30.2	2,138,098	28	370,431	17.3	1,262,505	7	68,518	5.4	771,623	4	35,179	4.6
Mississippi.....	2,183,796	48	432,862	19.8	1,797,114	29	207,311	11.5	1,131,597	6	34,581	3.1	606,526	3	10,723	1.8
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:																
Arkansas.....	1,949,387	53	431,910	22.2	1,574,449	28	202,651	12.9	802,525	7	32,020	4.0	209,897	-	-	-
Louisiana.....	2,363,890	54	900,439	38.1	1,656,388	26	496,516	30.0	939,946	6	239,390	25.5	517,762	3	134,470	26.0
Alabama.....	2,336,434	74	879,653	37.6	1,657,155	46	318,975	19.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas.....	6,414,824	196	2,911,389	45.4	3,896,542	91	938,104	24.1	1,591,749	21	146,795	9.2	212,592	2	7,665	3.6
MOUNTAIN:																
Montana.....	559,456	23	211,535	37.8	376,053	14	133,420	35.5	39,159	2	6,967	17.8	-	-	-	-
Idaho.....	524,873	12	176,708	33.7	325,594	12	69,898	21.5	32,610	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wyoming.....	280,742	26	93,577	33.3	145,965	7	43,221	29.6	20,789							

Table 4.—CHANGES MADE BETWEEN ONE CENSUS AND ANOTHER IN 1900 AND 1910 URBAN TOTALS FOR CERTAIN STATES
(An asterisk indicates a change. No changes were made for States not included in this table)

State	Urban population for 1900				Urban population for 1910		
	In Supple- mentary Analysis, 1906	In 1910 report	In 1920 and 1930 reports	In 1940 report	In 1910 report	In 1920 and 1930 reports	In 1940 report
United States total.....	30,583,411	30,797,185	30,380,433	30,159,921	42,623,383	42,166,120	41,998,932
Maine.....	303,904	*337,390	*232,827	232,827	381,443	*262,248	262,248
New Hampshire.....	226,269	226,269	226,269	*192,240	255,099	255,099	*223,152
Vermont.....	91,775	*139,180	*75,831	75,831	168,943	*98,917	98,917
Massachusetts.....	2,567,098	2,567,098	2,567,098	*2,411,877	3,125,367	3,125,367	*2,995,739
Rhode Island.....	407,240	*407,647	407,647	*378,471	524,654	524,654	*493,938
Connecticut.....	680,478	*792,595	*543,755	543,755	999,839	*731,797	731,797
New York.....	5,298,111	5,298,111	5,298,111	5,298,111	7,185,494	7,185,494	*7,188,131
New Jersey.....	1,329,162	1,329,162	1,329,162	1,329,162	1,907,210	1,907,210	*1,938,612
Ohio.....	1,997,100	*1,998,382	1,998,382	1,998,382	2,665,143	2,665,143	2,665,143
Illinois.....	2,600,058	*2,616,368	2,616,368	2,616,368	3,476,929	3,476,929	*3,479,935
Missouri.....	1,128,104	1,128,104	1,128,104	1,128,104	1,398,817	1,398,817	*1,393,705
South Dakota.....	40,936	40,936	40,936	40,936	76,673	76,673	*76,469
Kansas.....	330,903	330,903	330,903	*329,696	493,790	493,790	*492,312
Oklahoma.....	58,417	58,417	58,417	58,417	320,155	320,155	*318,975
Colorado.....	260,651	260,651	260,651	260,651	404,840	404,840	*402,192
New Mexico.....	24,614	*27,381	27,381	27,381	46,571	46,571	46,571
California.....	777,699	777,699	777,699	*776,820	1,469,739	1,469,739	*1,468,419

Table 5.—RURAL POPULATION, 1890 AND 1880, AS DEFINED IN 1890

Population living outside "cities and other compact bodies of population which number 1,000 or more"

(Data compiled in 1890 and used as basis for table showing increase or decrease in rural population, by States, which appears on page lxx of Eleventh Census, 1890, Part I, Population, but for some reason not published either in that volume or elsewhere. Present table "reconstructed" from individual place data published in 1890 volume)

Division and State	Rural population		Increase*		Division and State	Rural population		Increase*	
	1890	1880	Number	Per- cent		1890	1880	Number	Per- cent
United States.....	37,250,863	33,172,441	4,078,422	12.3	South Atlantic:				
North Atlantic.....	5,971,519	6,009,460	-37,941	-0.6	Delaware.....	86,049	86,009	40	-
North Central.....	13,662,171	12,112,407	1,549,764	12.8	Maryland.....	512,285	529,505	-17,220	-3.3
South Atlantic.....	6,891,584	6,227,238	664,346	10.7	Virginia.....	1,344,451	1,299,416	45,035	3.5
South Central.....	9,055,698	7,740,725	1,314,973	17.0	West Virginia.....	658,167	543,224	114,943	21.2
West.....	1,669,891	1,082,611	587,280	54.2	North Carolina.....	1,461,562	1,304,653	156,909	12.0
North Atlantic:					South Carolina.....	996,783	888,003	108,780	12.2
Maine.....	362,482	386,873	-24,391	-6.3	Georgia.....	1,530,924	1,347,163	183,761	13.6
New Hampshire.....	184,051	192,626	-8,575	-4.5	Florida.....	301,363	229,265	72,098	31.4
Vermont.....	215,359	234,303	-18,944	-8.1	South Central:				
Massachusetts.....	235,089	241,611	-6,522	-2.7	Kentucky.....	1,446,110	1,347,123	98,987	7.3
Rhode Island.....	17,496	18,004	-508	-2.8	Tennessee.....	1,462,675	1,384,690	77,985	5.6
Connecticut.....	156,048	168,012	-11,964	-7.1	Mississippi.....	1,326,215	1,157,988	168,227	14.5
New York.....	1,873,866	2,037,042	-163,176	-8.0	Alabama.....	1,175,596	1,050,682	124,914	11.9
New Jersey.....	518,382	487,066	31,316	6.4	Arkansas.....	1,018,214	751,075	267,139	35.6
Pennsylvania.....	2,408,746	2,243,923	164,823	7.3	Louisiana.....	804,072	674,817	129,255	19.2
North Central:					Oklahoma.....	51,620	-	51,620	-
Ohio.....	1,993,291	2,006,565	-13,274	-0.7	Texas.....	1,771,196	1,374,350	396,846	28.9
Indiana.....	1,488,173	1,480,100	8,073	0.5	West:				
Illinois.....	1,866,595	1,933,336	-66,741	-3.5	Montana.....	82,079	29,594	52,485	177.4
Michigan.....	1,235,575	1,130,698	104,877	9.3	Idaho.....	80,900	30,165	50,735	168.2
Wisconsin.....	1,018,244	915,038	103,206	11.3	Wyoming.....	31,049	10,781	20,268	188.0
Minnesota.....	791,890	585,134	206,756	35.3	Colorado.....	199,393	111,875	87,518	78.2
Iowa.....	1,370,825	1,249,116	121,709	9.7	New Mexico.....	130,405	109,858	20,547	18.7
Missouri.....	1,697,315	1,521,144	176,171	11.6	Arizona.....	41,696	26,814	14,882	55.5
North Dakota.....	162,073	29,419	132,654	450.9	Utah.....	110,006	87,464	22,542	25.8
South Dakota.....	283,978	84,302	199,676	236.9	Nevada.....	37,805	37,805	-	-34.6
Nebraska.....	705,807	358,973	346,834	96.6	Washington.....	197,357	60,642	136,715	225.4
Kansas.....	1,048,405	818,582	229,823	28.1	Oregon.....	219,630	139,857	79,773	57.0
					California.....	552,656	437,756	114,900	26.2

* A minus sign (-) denotes decrease.