

III

RATIOS OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN IN CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STATES AND LARGE CITIES

As shown in Table 18 the ratio of children to women for the different nativity and marital groups is considerably lower in the large cities than in the States (Table 11). The difference is specially striking for the native population. In the United States as a whole the ratio of children to native white women 20 to 44 is 538, while in these cities the ratio for the same group is 341, or 57.8 per cent higher in the States than in these cities. For married women in the same nativity groups the ratios are 725 and 512, respectively, or 41.6 per cent higher in the United States than in these big cities. For the foreign-born white women 20 to 44 in the United States the ratio is 779, and in these cities 679, or 14.7 per cent higher in the country as a whole than in the cities. For foreign-born married women the ratios are 911 and 819, respectively, or 11.2 per cent higher in the whole United States than in the big cities. Thus it is evident that the foreign-born white women in the United States as a whole differ from the foreign born in the large cities in respect to the ratio of children by only one-fourth to one-third as much as the native white women of the same groups.

The most obvious explanation of this small difference between the United States and the big cities in ratio of children to foreign-born white women lies in the fact that these women live largely in the cities, especially in the big cities. Consequently the ratio for the United States is heavily weighted by the city-dwelling foreign-born women. Of more significance than this obvious explanation, the chief fact of social importance is that foreign-born whites, no matter where they may settle in this country, come largely from rural communities or ghetto districts where the standards of life are favorable to rearing large families. In only a small proportion of these women are these standards modified early enough in life to have much influence upon the number of children born. Hence immigrant women tend to bear children up to the limit of their capacity no matter where they live in this country. Modifications in this tendency will be pointed out later but as regards recent immigrants the statement describes the conditions quite accurately.

Another indication of the differences between the whole United States and these large cities is in the index of the ratio of children of

foreign-born white women to the ratio of children of native white women (column E, Table 18). For all women 20 to 44 this index is 1.99 in these cities as compared with 1.45 in the United States, and for married women it is 1.60 as against 1.26, or over one-third higher for all women and over one-fourth higher for married women in these big cities than in the Nation as a whole. It is the more or less vague realization that foreign-born white women in the cities have nearly twice (1.99 times) as many children as native white women that has led many people to lament the filling up of our country with the children of immigrants, not realizing that our rural population is largely native, having only 6.5 per cent* of foreign born, and that it still has a fairly high birth rate.

TABLE 18.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY AND MARITAL CONDITION; NATIVE-FOREIGN RATIO INDEX; AND PER CENT OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES IN TOTAL POPULATION, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE: 1920¹

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				INDEX, FOREIGN-BORN TO NATIVE WHITE ²		Per cent of foreign-born whites in total population
	All women		Married, widowed, or divorced women		All women	Married, widowed, or divorced women	
	Native white	Foreign-born white	Native white	Foreign-born white			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
All cities having 100,000 inhabitants and over.....	341	679	512	819	1.99	1.60	-----
New York, N. Y.....	316	610	528	769	1.93	1.46	35.4
Manhattan Borough.....	244	533	445	722	2.18	1.62	40.4
Bronx Borough.....	336	602	552	725	1.79	1.31	36.5
Brooklyn Borough.....	347	711	566	841	2.05	1.49	32.7
Queens Borough.....	404	672	581	764	1.66	1.31	23.8
Richmond Borough.....	414	818	639	954	1.98	1.49	27.1
Chicago, Ill.....	332	712	508	827	2.14	1.63	29.8
Philadelphia, Pa.....	370	737	566	875	1.99	1.55	21.8
Detroit, Mich.....	408	786	548	894	1.93	1.63	29.1
Cleveland, Ohio.....	356	810	507	895	2.28	1.77	30.1
St. Louis, Mo.....	308	579	448	670	1.88	1.50	13.4
Boston, Mass.....	304	631	585	835	2.08	1.43	31.9
Baltimore, Md.....	416	749	598	870	1.80	1.45	11.4
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	392	869	604	1,014	2.22	1.68	20.4
Los Angeles, Calif.....	234	452	319	557	1.93	1.75	19.4
Buffalo, N. Y.....	364	818	558	953	2.25	1.71	24.0
San Francisco, Calif.....	228	420	331	522	1.84	1.58	27.7
Milwaukee, Wis.....	381	755	587	849	1.98	1.45	24.1
Washington, D. C.....	240	491	469	661	2.05	1.51	6.5
Newark, N. J.....	332	828	520	939	2.49	1.81	28.2
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	336	503	510	615	1.50	1.21	10.7
New Orleans, La.....	396	544	570	677	1.37	1.19	6.7
Minneapolis, Minn.....	335	620	536	766	1.85	1.43	23.1
Kansas City, Mo.....	293	639	393	745	2.18	1.90	8.4
Seattle, Wash.....	300	430	400	523	1.43	1.31	23.4
Indianapolis, Ind.....	354	610	462	708	1.72	1.53	5.4

See footnotes at end of table.

* Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. II, Population, 1920, p. 79.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN

TABLE 18.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY AND MARITAL CONDITION; NATIVE-FOREIGN RATIO INDEX; AND PER CENT OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES IN TOTAL POPULATION, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE: 1920¹—Con.

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				INDEX, FOREIGN-BORN TO NATIVE WHITE ²		Per cent of foreign-born whites in total population
	All women		Married, widowed, or divorced women		All women	Married, widowed, or divorced women	
	Native white	Foreign-born white	Native white	Foreign-born white			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Jersey City, N. J.	381	888	603	988	2.33	1.64	25.5
Rochester, N. Y.	333	775	522	918	2.33	1.76	24.1
Portland, Oreg.	312	493	415	595	1.58	1.43	18.2
Denver, Colo.	294	510	407	608	1.73	1.49	14.7
Toledo, Ohio.	372	849	498	942	2.28	1.89	15.7
Providence, R. I.	301	737	540	924	2.45	1.71	29.0
Columbus, Ohio.	351	691	489	815	1.97	1.67	6.8
Louisville, Ky.	358	541	517	661	1.51	1.28	4.9
St. Paul, Minn.	369	626	596	760	1.70	1.28	22.0
Oakland, Calif.	307	504	407	579	1.64	1.42	20.9
Akron, Ohio.	408	847	517	905	2.08	1.75	18.2
Atlanta, Ga.	377	536	497	613	1.42	1.23	2.4
Omaha, Nebr.	332	713	474	822	2.15	1.73	18.5
Worcester, Mass.	349	764	619	928	2.19	1.50	29.7
Birmingham, Ala.	431	778	543	864	1.81	1.59	3.4
Syracuse, N. Y.	339	842	500	967	2.48	1.93	18.8
Richmond, Va.	401	608	582	730	1.52	1.25	2.7
New Haven, Conn.	326	880	546	1,033	2.70	1.89	28.1
Memphis, Tenn.	339	624	446	719	1.84	1.61	3.6
San Antonio, Tex.	389	571	517	715	1.47	1.38	22.7
Dallas, Tex.	331	593	435	696	1.79	1.60	5.5
Dayton, Ohio.	398	762	524	834	1.91	1.59	8.6
Bridgeport, Conn.	350	837	537	938	2.39	1.75	32.3
Houston, Tex.	346	612	438	696	1.77	1.59	8.7
Hartford, Conn.	292	750	496	907	2.57	1.83	29.5
Scranton, Pa.	405	990	667	1,103	2.44	1.65	20.7
Grand Rapids, Mich.	399	770	573	888	1.93	1.55	20.6
Paterson, N. J.	324	631	542	743	1.95	1.37	33.2
Youngstown, Ohio.	441	1,051	592	1,136	2.38	1.92	25.6
Springfield, Mass.	331	692	519	862	2.09	1.66	24.1
Des Moines, Iowa.	362	617	507	751	1.70	1.48	8.9
New Bedford, Mass.	342	601	571	773	1.76	1.35	40.2
Fall River, Mass.	379	784	723	989	2.07	1.37	35.1
Trenton, N. J.	364	903	541	997	2.48	1.84	25.2
Nashville, Tenn.	389	460	536	552	1.18	1.03	2.0
Salt Lake City, Utah.	498	690	660	822	1.39	1.25	16.5
Camden, N. J.	453	929	594	1,010	2.05	1.70	17.4
Norfolk, Va.	380	650	488	722	1.71	1.48	5.7
Albany, N. Y.	267	722	458	892	2.70	1.95	15.6
Lowell, Mass.	364	650	691	861	1.79	1.25	33.7
Wilmington, Del.	424	1,010	589	1,122	2.38	1.90	14.8
Cambridge, Mass.	318	644	627	853	2.03	1.36	29.3
Reading, Pa.	390	1,048	538	1,171	2.69	2.18	8.9
Fort Worth, Tex.	351	644	438	742	1.83	1.69	6.9
Spokane, Wash.	346	500	470	600	1.45	1.28	16.1
Kansas City, Kans.	458	935	573	1,012	2.04	1.77	11.5
Yonkers, N. Y.	353	760	579	893	2.15	1.54	25.7

¹ Columns A, B, C, and D from Detailed Table I; column E obtained by dividing column B by column A; column F by dividing column D by column C; column G from Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. II, Population, 1920, p. 49.

² Obtained by dividing the number of children per 1,000 foreign-born white women by the number per 1,000 native white women.

TABLE 19.—PER CENT MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED AND RANK OF WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE: 1920¹

CITY	PER CENT MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED AND RANK							
	Native white						Foreign-born white	
	Total		Native parentage		Foreign or mixed parentage		Married	Rank
	Married	Rank	Married	Rank	Married	Rank		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Cities of 100,000 inhabitants and over, average	66.5	-----	69.6	-----	62.9	-----	82.9	-----
Cities of 500,000 inhabitants and over, average	64.9	-----	67.7	-----	62.4	-----	82.3	-----
New York, N. Y.	59.9	61	61.9	63	58.7	59	79.3	67
Manhattan Borough	54.9	68	57.4	69	53.1	66	73.8	73
Bronx Borough	60.8	58	64.0	58	59.3	57	83.0	49
Brooklyn Borough	61.3	56	63.2	59	60.1	55	84.5	42
Queens Borough	69.5	34	69.8	38	69.3	24	88.0	18
Richmond Borough	64.8	49	65.4	53	64.2	40	85.7	35
Chicago, Ill.	65.3	44	68.2	43	63.6	42	86.1	31
Philadelphia, Pa.	65.4	43	67.8	45	61.9	47	84.2	43
Detroit, Mich.	74.4	21	76.9	14	71.9	11	87.9	20
Cleveland, Ohio	70.1	30	72.2	32	68.4	26	90.5	7
St. Louis, Mo.	68.7	39	70.0	37	66.9	29	86.5	28
Boston, Mass.	51.9	72	55.1	71	49.8	71	75.5	71
Baltimore, Md.	69.6	33	70.9	35	66.3	32	86.1	30
Pittsburgh, Pa.	64.9	47	67.2	46	62.3	45	85.7	34
Los Angeles, Calif.	73.4	23	74.6	23	70.7	17	81.1	58
Buffalo, N. Y.	65.2	45	66.2	48	64.3	39	85.8	33
San Francisco, Calif.	68.9	38	71.3	33	66.8	30	80.4	62
Milwaukee, Wis.	64.9	48	61.9	64	66.4	31	88.9	16
Washington, D. C.	54.7	69	55.2	70	52.2	68	74.4	72
Newark, N. J.	63.9	50	66.1	49	61.8	49	88.2	17
Cincinnati, Ohio	65.8	42	68.0	44	62.1	46	81.8	57
New Orleans, La.	69.4	35	69.3	41	69.5	23	80.4	61
Minneapolis, Minn.	62.5	54	65.9	51	60.3	54	80.8	60
Kansas City, Mo.	74.5	20	75.8	20	69.7	22	85.9	32
Seattle, Wash.	74.9	17	77.4	10	71.2	15	82.2	54
Indianapolis, Ind.	76.6	7	78.1	7	69.1	25	86.2	29
Jersey City, N. J.	63.2	53	65.5	52	61.5	50	89.8	12
Rochester, N. Y.	63.8	51	65.4	54	61.9	48	84.5	41
Portland, Oreg.	75.1	16	78.0	8	70.0	20	82.9	50
Denver, Colo.	72.2	26	74.5	24	68.0	27	83.9	45
Toledo, Ohio	74.7	18	76.6	16	71.6	12	90.1	8
Providence, R. I.	55.8	67	60.2	66	52.6	67	79.8	65
Columbus, Ohio	71.8	28	72.8	31	67.7	28	84.7	40
Louisville, Ky.	69.2	36	71.3	34	63.1	44	81.9	56
St. Paul, Minn.	61.9	55	64.4	56	60.6	53	82.4	52
Oakland, Calif.	75.5	13	77.2	13	73.6	6	87.0	23
Akron, Ohio	79.1	4	79.9	4	75.8	3	93.6	1
Atlanta, Ga.	75.9	10	76.2	18	71.4	14	87.4	21
Omaha, Neb.	70.1	31	73.4	27	65.7	36	86.8	26
Worcester, Mass.	56.4	66	62.5	62	52.1	69	82.3	53
Birmingham, Ala.	79.3	3	79.9	3	72.7	8	90.0	10
Syracuse, N. Y.	67.8	40	70.2	36	64.1	41	87.0	22
Richmond, Va.	68.9	37	69.3	42	64.4	38	83.3	48
New Haven, Conn.	59.7	62	62.8	61	57.1	61	85.2	36
Memphis, Tenn.	75.9	11	76.7	15	70.3	19	86.8	27
San Antonio, Tex.	75.2	15	75.4	21	74.6	5	79.9	64
Dallas, Tex.	76.1	9	76.6	17	72.3	9	85.2	38
Dayton, Ohio	75.9	12	77.4	11	70.3	18	91.3	5
Bridgeport, Conn.	65.2	46	69.7	39	61.5	51	89.2	15
Houston, Tex.	79.0	5	79.7	5	76.6	1	98.0	19
Hartford, Conn.	59.0	63	61.5	65	56.6	65	82.8	51

¹ Columns A, C, E, and G from Detailed Table II.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN

TABLE 19.—PER CENT MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED AND RANK OF WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE: 1920—Continued

CITY	PER CENT MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED AND RANK							
	Native white						Foreign-born white	
	Total		Native parentage		Foreign or mixed parentage		Married	Rank
	Married	Rank	Married	Rank	Married	Rank		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Scranton, Pa.....	60.7	59	63.1	60	58.8	58	89.7	13
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	69.6	32	73.4	30	66.1	33	86.8	25
Paterson, N. J.....	59.8	64	64.8	55	56.8	64	84.9	39
Youngstown, Ohio.....	74.5	19	77.3	12	70.9	16	92.5	2
Springfield, Mass.....	63.7	52	67.2	47	59.9	56	80.2	63
Des Moines, Iowa.....	71.4	29	73.4	28	66.0	34	82.1	55
New Bedford, Mass.....	60.0	60	66.1	50	56.9	62	77.6	68
Fall River, Mass.....	52.5	71	54.7	72	51.8	70	79.3	66
Trenton, N. J.....	67.2	41	69.5	40	63.5	43	90.5	6
Nashville, Tenn.....	72.6	24	73.7	26	61.3	52	83.5	46
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	75.5	14	75.3	22	75.6	4	83.9	44
Camden, N. J.....	76.3	8	77.7	9	73.2	7	91.9	4
Norfolk, Va.....	77.9	6	78.5	6	71.6	13	90.0	11
Albany, N. Y.....	58.4	65	59.3	67	56.9	63	81.0	59
Lowell, Mass.....	52.7	70	59.2	68	49.6	72	75.5	69
Wilmington, Del.....	72.1	27	74.2	25	66.0	35	90.0	9
Cambridge, Mass.....	50.7	73	53.8	73	48.4	73	75.5	70
Reading, Pa.....	72.4	25	73.4	29	65.7	37	89.5	14
Fort Worth, Tex.....	80.3	1	80.7	2	76.5	2	86.9	24
Spokane, Wash.....	73.6	22	75.9	19	69.8	21	83.4	47
Kansas City, Kans.....	79.9	2	82.5	1	72.1	10	92.4	3
Yonkers, N. Y.....	60.9	57	64.3	57	58.2	60	85.2	37

We can not pass from a consideration of differences in the ratios of children to all women and to married women without calling attention to Table 19 showing the proportion of married women in the different nativity groups.

The chief reason for the greater difference in the ratios of children to all women and to married women among native white women in the large cities than among the foreign-born white women is to be found in the differences in the proportions of them who are married. This difference is very large, the average per cent of all native white women 20 to 44 married being only 66.5 per cent as compared with 82.9 per cent of all foreign-born white women.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CITIES

The differences between cities as regards the ratio of children to native white women are brought out clearly in Table 20, where the cities are ranked according to these ratios.

TABLE 20.—CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER RANKED ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, WITH PER CENTS AND RANKINGS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS: 1920 ¹

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE OF FOREIGN OR MIXED PARENT-AGE		NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED	
	All women		Married, widowed, or divorced women		Per cent of total native white women 20 to 44 years of age	Rank	Per cent of total native white women 10 years of age and over	Rank
	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	498	1	660	4	49.9	31	22.2	69
Kansas City, Kans.....	458	2	573	21	24.6	57	23.5	66
Camden, N. J.....	453	3	594	12	31.0	50	25.0	58
Youngstown, Ohio.....	441	4	592	13	44.0	36	21.3	72
Birmingham, Ala.....	431	5	543	30	8.2	71	19.1	73
Wilmington, Del.....	424	6	589	14	25.8	55	25.7	56
Baltimore, Md.....	416	7	598	10	27.3	52	26.6	52
Richmond Borough, New York City.....	414	8	639	5	51.8	28	25.3	57
Akron, Ohio.....	408	9	517	44	21.1	61	24.9	61
Detroit, Mich.....	408	10	548	28	50.4	30	28.8	51
Scranton, Pa.....	405	11	667	3	54.9	20	28.7	35
Queens Borough, New York City.....	404	12	581	18	60.6	11	27.8	44
Richmond, Va.....	401	13	582	17	8.0	72	26.9	49
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	399	14	573	20	52.0	27	29.4	32
Detroit, Ohio.....	398	15	524	39	21.1	60	23.8	64
New Orleans, La.....	396	16	570	23	26.6	53	23.6	65
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	392	17	604	8	46.5	34	26.8	50
Reading, Pa.....	390	18	538	34	12.7	65	31.5	23
Nashville, Tenn.....	389	19	536	37	8.6	70	25.0	59
San Antonio, Tex.....	389	20	517	45	28.0	51	22.4	68
Jersey City, N. J.....	381	21	603	9	58.8	16	30.5	27
Milwaukee, Wis.....	381	22	587	15	66.6	5	32.0	22
Norfolk, Va.....	380	23	488	55	9.4	68	21.7	71
Fall River, Mass.....	379	24	723	1	76.9	1	44.4	1
Atlanta, Ga.....	377	25	497	52	5.5	73	27.0	48
Toledo, Ohio.....	372	26	498	51	38.2	44	25.9	55
Philadelphia, Pa.....	370	27	566	25	41.2	39	30.1	29
St. Paul, Minn.....	369	28	596	11	64.7	6	32.7	18
Lowell, Mass.....	364	29	691	2	67.3	3	39.4	4
Buffalo, N. Y.....	364	30	558	26	54.4	22	27.7	45
Trenton, N. J.....	364	31	541	32	38.4	43	28.3	38
Des Moines, Iowa.....	362	32	507	49	26.2	54	29.3	33
Louisville, Ky.....	358	33	517	43	25.3	56	27.4	46
Cleveland, Ohio.....	356	34	507	48	53.5	25	27.9	42
Indianapolis, Ind.....	354	35	462	58	16.9	64	26.2	54
Yonkers, N. Y.....	353	36	579	19	55.0	19	29.8	30
Columbus, Ohio.....	351	37	489	54	19.2	62	26.0	60
Fort Worth, Tex.....	351	38	438	65	8.6	69	22.2	70
Bridgeport, Conn.....	350	39	537	35	53.9	24	32.8	17
Worcester, Mass.....	349	40	619	7	58.8	15	33.9	11
Brooklyn Borough, New York City.....	347	41	566	24	60.3	13	31.3	24
Spokane, Wash.....	346	42	470	57	37.2	46	28.4	53
Houston, Tex.....	346	43	438	64	21.4	59	23.0	67
New Bedford, Mass.....	342	44	571	22	66.8	4	40.1	3
Syracuse, N. Y.....	339	45	500	50	39.1	42	29.0	34

¹ Columns A and C from Detailed Table I; column E from a special tabulation, Bureau of the Census; column G from Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, Population, 1920, p. 367.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN

TABLE 20.—CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER RANKED ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, WITH PER CENTS AND RANKINGS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS: 1920—Continued

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE OF FOREIGN OR MIXED PARENT- AGE		NATIVE WHITE WOMEN 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EM- PLOYED	
	All women		Married, wid- owed, or di- vorced women		Per cent of total native white women 20 to 44 years of age	Rank	Per cent of total native white women 10 years of age and over	Rank
	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Memphis, Tenn.....	339	46	446	61	12.5	66	24.5	62
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	336	47	510	46	37.9	45	28.4	37
Bronx Borough, New York City.....	336	48	562	27	68.1	2	32.1	21
Minneapolis, Minn.....	335	49	536	36	60.6	12	32.5	19
Rochester, N. Y.....	333	50	522	40	46.2	35	33.6	13
Newark, N. J.....	332	51	520	41	52.9	26	30.3	28
Chicago, Ill.....	332	52	508	47	63.7	7	33.2	14
Omaha, Nebr.....	332	53	474	56	42.7	37	29.7	31
Dallas, Tex.....	331	54	435	66	10.6	67	28.6	36
Springfield, Mass.....	331	55	519	42	47.3	32	33.9	12
New Haven, Conn.....	326	56	546	29	54.6	21	33.0	15
Paterson, N. J.....	324	57	542	31	61.8	8	37.7	5
Cambridge, Mass.....	318	58	627	6	57.1	18	36.9	8
New York, N. Y.....	316	59	528	38	60.7	10	33.0	16
Portland, Oreg.....	312	60	415	67	36.3	47	28.2	39
St. Louis, Mo.....	308	61	448	60	41.4	38	30.6	26
Oakland, Calif.....	307	62	407	69	46.9	33	24.4	63
Boston, Mass.....	304	63	585	16	60.9	9	36.9	9
Providence, R. I.....	301	64	540	33	58.0	17	37.1	7
Seattle, Wash.....	300	65	400	70	40.7	40	28.0	42
Denver, Colo.....	294	66	407	68	35.4	48	28.1	41
Kansas City, Mo.....	293	67	393	71	21.9	58	28.2	40
Hartford, Conn.....	292	68	496	53	51.5	29	35.1	10
Albany, N. Y.....	287	69	458	59	39.4	41	30.8	25
Manhattan Borough, New York City.....	244	70	445	62	59.0	14	37.2	6
Washington, D. C.....	240	71	439	63	18.7	63	43.1	2
Los Angeles, Calif.....	234	72	319	73	32.6	49	27.4	47
San Francisco, Calif.....	228	73	331	72	54.4	23	32.2	30

FACTORS INFLUENCING RATIOS

The differences, in many cases, are very difficult to explain and the reasons that will be advanced for them will leave much to be desired. It will be of interest, however, to study a few cities in some detail. Pittsburgh, ranking 17 among cities of over 100,000 inhabitants in ratio of children to native women (392) and 10 in ratio of children to foreign-born women (869), makes an interesting comparison with San Francisco, which is lowest in ratio of children to native white women (228) and also lowest in ratio of children to foreign-born white women (420). In per cent of native white women who are of foreign or mixed parentage, San Francisco exceeds Pittsburgh, the per cents being 54.4 per cent and 46.5 per cent, respectively. According to generally accepted ideas regarding the fertility of children of immigrants, the advantage from this source should be with San Francisco. This generally accepted notion is apparently wrong, or

at least it is far from being a sufficient explanation of the ratio of children to native women in these two cities. Evidently other factors are more important.

One of these other factors undoubtedly is the percentage of native white women who are gainfully employed. Pittsburgh has only 26.8 per cent of its native white women over 10 employed, while San Francisco has 32.2 per cent. The former ranks 50 among these cities in this respect and the latter ranks 20. It is, of course, impossible to say whether the women of San Francisco have fewer children because more of them are employed or whether they are at work because they have fewer children. Probably there is some truth in both suppositions, and besides there may be some other conditions which have a causal connection both with small number of children and with a large proportion of working women. One such condition may be the nature of the industries and commerce carried on in the city. This point will not be enlarged upon here, as it will come up in another connection later, but it may be pointed out that Pittsburgh has a considerably larger proportion of its "gainfully employed" engaged in manufacturing than San Francisco has. It may also be noted that the industries of Pittsburgh are *heavy* industries needing men's labor, one reason for the low proportion of working women.

In addition to these factors we find (Table 19) that in Pittsburgh there is a smaller proportion of native women who are married (64.9 per cent) than in San Francisco (68.9 per cent). Contrary to what might generally be expected, a low proportion of married women is frequently associated with a high ratio of children. There is no very satisfactory explanation of this fact, but it may be that the proportion of women married has a pretty close relation to the ratio of males to females in the population—the higher the ratio of males to females the larger the proportion of women married—and that the ease or difficulty of getting a husband, as thus measured, has some relation to a woman's willingness to bear children.

We have seen above that the differences between Pittsburgh and San Francisco in ratio of children to foreign-born women are almost as great as in the case of native women. One reason for these differences may be found in the types of foreign born in the two places. In Table 21 we note that 40.3 per cent of the foreign born in San Francisco are of the new immigration while in Pittsburgh 60.8 per cent belong in this group. This is a significant difference and the significance is increased when we examine more in detail the composition of the foreign born in the two places. One difference is that Pittsburgh has a large contingent of Slavs while San Francisco has comparatively few. As will be shown later, the Slavs probably have the highest birth rate of the immigrant groups. On the other

hand, San Francisco has a larger Italian group than Pittsburgh¹ (over one-half larger), and Italians also have a very high birth rate. Furthermore, if the size of the foreign-born groups in a city makes any difference in their retention of Old World birth rates, it would seem that San Francisco should be at no particular disadvantage in this respect as compared with Pittsburgh, for the former has 27.7 per cent of its total population foreign born and the latter only 20.4 per cent. It would seem that the nationalities of the foreign-born groups of a city are apparently considerably more influential in determining its birth rate than the total number of the foreign born. Again, as in the case of the native women in San Francisco, a larger proportion of its foreign-born women 10 years of age and over (25.6 per cent) are gainfully employed than in Pittsburgh, where the proportion is 16.3 per cent. (Tables 20 and 21.) In this respect Pittsburgh has a large advantage.

So far, then, as we can judge, the above comparisons indicate to some extent that Pittsburgh should have higher ratios of children to women than San Francisco, but giving due allowance to all the factors mentioned it still seems that we are forced to recognize some more intangible factors of environment than those already enumerated as very important elements in the situation. Indeed, the fact that all the west coast cities keep San Francisco company with low ratios of children to women as compared with most of the other cities suggests that there are some common factors affecting the birth rates of these cities different from the factors determining the city birth rates in other parts of the country.

Comparisons for a number of other cities are as baffling as that of Pittsburgh and San Francisco, for example, those of Denver and Syracuse, and Nashville and Birmingham as regards their foreign-born population. The differences between these cities can not be fully explained by the statistical data available.

OCCUPATIONS

There seems to be some connection between the dominant activities of a city and the level of the ratio of children to women in it. Cities whose inhabitants are chiefly interested in, and work at manufacturing have higher ratios of children than cities where the people are engaged chiefly in trade and commerce. San Francisco and Pittsburgh, as already indicated, present this contrast between industry and commerce as well as, or better than, any other two of the larger cities. In ratio of children to native white women Baltimore ranking 7, and Detroit ranking 10, are somewhat higher in ratio of children to native women than Pittsburgh and, as shown in Table 22, they also rank somewhat higher as manufacturing

¹ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. III, Population, 1920, p. 51.

centers. Cleveland, on the other hand, although considerably below Pittsburgh in ratio of children to native women has a much larger proportion of its population engaged in manufacturing. In ratio of children to foreign-born white women, however, they are all considerably below Pittsburgh, although such differences as there are between these cities in respect to the proportion of foreign born who belong to the new immigration (Table 21, columns G and H) are in favor of Cleveland, with 71.9 per cent as compared with 60.7 per cent in Pittsburgh, 64.2 per cent in Baltimore, and 52.7 per cent in Detroit. In per cent of total population foreign born, also, Cleveland and Detroit lead Pittsburgh by substantial margins. None of the factors mentioned, nor all of them together, will satisfactorily explain the differences in ratios between Pittsburgh and these other manufacturing cities. We should have to go far afield to explain fully such individual differences—farther than we can go in such a study as this.

TABLE 21.—CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER RANKED ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 FOREIGN-BORN WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, WITH PER CENTS AND RANKINGS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS: 1920¹

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 FOREIGN-BORN WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				FOREIGN-BORN WHITE POPULATION		NEW IMMIGRATION ²		FOREIGN-BORN WHITE WOMEN 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED	
	All women		Married, widowed, or divorced women		Per cent of total population	Rank	Per cent of total foreign-born population	Rank	Per cent of total foreign-born white women 10 years of age and over	Rank
	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Youngstown, Ohio.....	1,051	1	1,136	2	25.6	23	72.1	6	10.9	72
Reading, Pa.....	1,048	2	1,171	1	8.9	56	74.9	2	19.9	27
Wilmington, Del.....	1,010	3	1,122	3	14.8	50	64.9	16	15.4	62
Scranton, Pa.....	990	4	1,103	4	20.7	37	57.7	27	10.6	73
Kansas City, Kans.....	935	5	1,012	7	11.5	53	64.1	18	13.5	70
Camden, N. J.....	929	6	1,010	8	17.4	45	65.8	15	15.2	64
Trenton, N. J.....	903	7	997	9	25.2	25	72.5	5	17.5	41
Jersey City, N. J.....	888	8	988	11	25.5	24	55.2	33	14.7	69
New Haven, Conn.....	880	9	1,033	5	28.1	19	64.0	19	20.1	25
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	869	10	1,014	6	20.4	39	60.8	21	16.3	57
Toledo, Ohio.....	849	11	942	15	15.7	48	54.1	35	14.8	67
Akron, Ohio.....	847	12	905	22	18.2	44	71.4	8	14.8	68
Syracuse, N. Y.....	842	13	967	12	18.8	41	50.9	42	16.8	50
Bridgeport, Conn.....	837	14	938	17	32.3	9	67.7	13	21.4	18
Newark, N. J.....	828	15	939	16	28.2	18	69.7	10	16.4	55
Richmond Borough, New York City.....	818	16	954	13	27.1	21	51.2	39	15.0	66
Buffalo, N. Y.....	818	17	953	14	24.0	29	52.4	38	15.9	60
Cleveland, Ohio.....	810	18	895	23	30.1	11	71.9	7	16.9	49
Detroit, Mich.....	786	19	894	24	29.1	16	52.7	37	16.5	52
Fall River, Mass.....	784	20	989	10	35.1	5	43.7	58	37.9	2

¹ Columns A and C from Detailed Table I; column E, Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. II, Population, 1920, p. 49; column G from figures in Bureau of the Census, Vol. III, pp. 47-52; column I, Vol. IV, p. 367.

² Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. III, Population, 1920, pp. 47-52, Old immigration comprises immigrants from England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Switzerland, France, Alsace-Lorraine, Germany, Canada (French and other), Newfoundland, and Australia. New immigration comprises all other countries and those combined in census tabulations under "All other countries" are also added in with the new immigration.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN

TABLE 21.—CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER RANKED ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 FOREIGN-BORN WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, WITH PER CENTS AND RANKINGS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS: 1920—Continued

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 FOREIGN-BORN WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				FOREIGN-BORN WHITE POPULATION		NEW IMMIGRATION		FOREIGN-BORN WHITE WOMEN 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED	
	All women		Married, widowed, or divorced women		Per cent of total population	Rank	Per cent of total foreign-born population	Rank	Per cent of total foreign-born white women 10 years of age and over	Rank
	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Birmingham, Ala.....	778	21	864	30	3.4	70	58.1	26	12.3	71
Rochester, N. Y.....	775	22	918	20	24.1	27	49.4	45	22.8	15
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	770	23	888	27	20.6	38	29.9	71	17.1	45
Worcester, Mass.....	764	24	928	18	29.7	13	42.9	61	19.9	28
Dayton, Ohio.....	762	25	834	37	8.6	59	49.8	43	16.3	59
Yonkers, N. Y.....	760	26	893	25	25.7	22	57.1	28	21.1	19
Milwaukee, Wis.....	755	27	849	34	24.1	28	52.9	36	16.3	68
Hartford, Conn.....	750	28	907	21	29.5	14	58.8	25	23.2	13
Baltimore, Md.....	749	29	870	29	11.4	54	64.2	17	19.0	33
Providence, R. I.....	737	30	924	19	29.0	17	49.6	44	26.2	9
Philadelphia, Pa.....	737	31	875	28	21.8	35	59.6	24	20.2	23
Albany, N. Y.....	723	32	892	26	15.6	49	47.6	53	19.0	32
Omaha, Nebr.....	713	33	822	39	18.5	42	51.2	39	17.0	47
Chicago, Ill.....	712	34	827	38	29.8	12	57.1	29	20.2	24
Brooklyn Borough, New York City.....	711	35	841	35	32.7	8	70.1	9	18.9	35
Springfield, Mass.....	692	36	862	31	24.1	26	43.7	59	25.9	10
Columbus, Ohio.....	691	37	815	41	6.8	62	44.9	57	16.8	51
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	690	38	822	40	16.5	46	13.8	77	18.0	40
Queens Borough, New York City.....	672	39	764	45	23.8	30	45.1	56	16.5	53
Lowell, Mass.....	650	40	861	32	33.7	6	29.4	72	37.7	3
Norfolk, Va.....	650	41	722	54	5.7	65	63.2	20	17.0	48
Cambridge, Mass.....	644	42	853	33	29.3	15	35.7	66	27.9	6
Fort Worth, Tex.....	644	43	742	50	6.9	61	74.7	3	15.5	61
Kansas City, Mo.....	639	44	745	48	8.4	60	46.0	54	17.1	46
Boston, Mass.....	631	45	835	36	31.9	10	43.4	60	27.4	7
Paterson, N. J.....	631	46	743	49	33.2	7	56.3	30	27.0	8
St. Paul, Minn.....	626	47	760	46	22.0	34	32.3	70	18.0	39
Memphis, Tenn.....	624	48	719	55	3.6	69	56.1	31	19.0	34
Minneapolis, Minn.....	620	49	766	44	23.1	32	23.7	74	20.0	26
Des Moines, Iowa.....	617	50	751	47	8.9	57	35.2	67	18.6	37
Houston, Tex.....	612	51	696	58	8.7	58	66.9	14	15.2	65
New York, N. Y.....	610	52	769	43	35.4	4	68.5	12	25.1	12
Indianapolis, Ind.....	610	53	708	57	5.4	67	34.2	68	15.3	63
Richmond, Va.....	608	54	730	51	2.7	71	54.9	34	20.7	22
Bronx Borough, New York City.....	602	55	725	52	36.5	3	73.4	4	19.1	31
New Bedford, Mass.....	601	56	773	42	40.2	2	49.0	50	44.7	1
Dallas, Tex.....	593	57	696	59	5.5	66	60.5	22	18.4	38
St. Louis, Mo.....	579	58	670	61	13.4	52	48.9	51	18.7	36
San Antonio, Tex.....	571	59	715	56	22.7	33	35.2	1	22.8	16
New Orleans, La.....	544	60	677	60	6.7	63	56.0	32	17.5	42
Louisville, Ky.....	541	61	661	63	4.9	68	26.7	73	16.4	56
Atlanta, Ga.....	536	62	613	65	2.4	72	59.9	23	17.3	44
Manhattan Borough, New York City.....	533	63	722	53	40.4	1	69.4	11	32.5	4
Denver, Colo.....	510	64	608	66	14.7	51	38.7	64	19.8	29
Oakland, Calif.....	504	65	579	69	20.9	36	38.9	63	17.5	43
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	503	66	615	64	10.7	55	36.4	65	19.2	30
Spokane, Wash.....	500	67	600	67	16.1	47	16.1	76	20.8	20
Portland, Oreg.....	493	68	595	68	18.2	43	32.4	69	20.8	21
Washington, D. C.....	491	69	661	62	6.5	64	45.7	55	29.3	5
Nashville, Tenn.....	460	70	552	71	2.0	73	51.0	41	16.5	54
Los Angeles, Calif.....	452	71	557	70	19.4	40	47.8	52	23.1	14
Seattle, Wash.....	430	72	523	72	23.4	31	21.2	75	22.4	17
San Francisco, Calif.....	420	73	522	73	27.7	20	40.3	62	25.6	11

Salt Lake City, although smaller than San Francisco and even more dependent on trade for its existence, nevertheless exceeds Pittsburgh in ratio of children to women among the natives. Among the foreign born, however, it ranks considerably lower. As the discussion in a later chapter (Chap. VII) shows, the religious beliefs and practices of the Mormons must play an important part in determining the size of families, particularly among the natives, thus lessening the influence of the general social and economic conditions to which they are subjected in common with most other cities in that part of the country, which in comparison with Salt Lake City, have very low ratios of children to native white women.

If we take a group of cities which are distinctly trade cities we shall find that they have a good many characteristics in common. The Texas cities, Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston belong to this group of trade cities, as do Spokane, Omaha, Denver, Kansas City, Mo., Portland, Oreg., and Seattle. All of these cities have low ratios of children to native white women and also to foreign-born white married women. In this latter characteristic they are joined by some of the southern trading cities—Memphis, Atlanta, New Orleans, which are well below the median—where the foreigners are engaged in trade rather than in manufacturing. The fact that all of these cities have low ratios of children to women suggests that there is some relation between the function served by a city and the ratio of children to women. Where cities are primarily trade centers for large areas, furnish the professional service for a large population outside their own limits, provide educational and cultural facilities for this population, and also have relatively little manufacturing, they appear to have low ratios of children to women in both nativity groups. On the other hand, cities known chiefly as manufacturing centers generally have higher ratios of children to women. There are some exceptions (San Antonio) but most of the cities ranking 20 or above in ratio of children in both nativity groups are distinctly manufacturing centers. (See Tables 20 and 21.)

A word may be said about Scranton which stands high in both groups. Scranton is the only city in the United States with over 100,000 inhabitants having a considerable number of miners in its population. Of its gainfully employed, 20.8 per cent² are miners. Miners invariably seem to have large families as we shall show elsewhere (Chap. VII); hence, the ratio of children in Scranton is undoubtedly raised because of their presence.

² Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, Population, 1920, p. 1230.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN

TABLE 22.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY, AND THE PER CENT OF THE TOTAL POPULATION 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN EACH OF THE CHIEF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920¹

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE		PER CENT OF THE TOTAL POPULATION 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER EMPLOYED IN—				
	Native white women	Foreign-born white women	Manufacturing	Transportation	Trade	Clerical occupations	Professional service
New York, N. Y.	316	610	37.6	9.5	15.5	15.9	6.6
Manhattan Borough	244	533	34.2	9.6	15.5	13.0	7.7
Bronx Borough	336	602	39.0	8.0	17.8	19.5	6.4
Brooklyn Borough	347	711	40.5	9.9	15.6	17.9	5.6
Queens Borough	404	672	42.2	9.2	12.9	18.4	5.8
Richmond Borough	414	818	40.1	12.0	10.0	13.8	7.2
Chicago, Ill.	332	712	39.7	9.0	16.8	17.1	5.8
Philadelphia, Pa.	370	737	47.5	8.1	13.5	12.2	5.2
Detroit, Mich.	408	786	56.3	6.2	11.4	12.1	4.7
Cleveland, Ohio	356	810	52.9	7.3	12.5	12.4	4.9
St. Louis, Mo.	308	579	40.7	9.0	15.4	14.4	5.2
Boston, Mass.	304	631	37.0	10.0	15.1	14.4	6.6
Baltimore, Md.	416	749	42.4	10.1	14.0	11.7	5.3
Pittsburgh, Pa.	392	869	40.1	10.1	15.0	14.5	6.0
Los Angeles, Calif.	234	452	31.6	8.6	18.6	11.4	11.0
Buffalo, N. Y.	364	818	45.8	10.5	13.0	13.1	6.0
San Francisco, Calif.	228	420	30.9	10.1	16.3	14.2	7.5
Milwaukee, Wis.	381	755	51.9	7.2	12.6	12.9	5.6
Washington, D. C.	240	491	18.9	7.1	9.7	30.9	8.2
Newark, N. J.	332	828	52.5	7.0	12.9	12.6	5.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	336	603	43.8	8.8	14.3	12.4	5.9
New Orleans, La.	396	544	32.0	14.2	14.5	11.8	5.1
Minneapolis, Minn.	335	620	34.6	10.2	18.8	15.1	7.6
Kansas City, Mo.	293	639	29.1	11.3	20.2	16.0	6.8
Seattle, Wash.	300	430	36.9	10.5	16.5	11.1	7.8
Indianapolis, Ind.	354	610	43.7	9.5	15.4	12.6	5.8
Jersey City, N. J.	381	888	40.7	15.8	12.1	17.7	4.4
Rochester, N. Y.	333	775	54.0	6.4	11.5	12.2	6.1
Portland, Oreg.	312	493	35.9	10.2	17.0	12.4	8.0
Denver, Colo.	294	510	28.2	10.7	19.5	14.0	8.5
Toledo, Ohio	372	849	48.3	10.3	13.3	12.2	5.2
Providence, R. I.	301	737	53.1	7.1	12.4	10.7	5.4
Columbus, Ohio	351	691	40.1	10.9	15.1	12.0	6.9
Louisville, Ky.	358	541	39.8	9.6	15.1	12.2	5.5
St. Paul, Minn.	369	626	34.9	10.9	17.2	17.1	6.8
Oakland, Calif.	307	504	39.3	9.7	15.9	11.8	7.8
Akron, Ohio	408	847	65.9	3.7	8.9	9.8	3.9
Atlanta, Ga.	377	536	27.7	10.5	16.7	14.4	5.9
Omaha, Nebr.	332	713	34.8	9.7	17.8	16.4	6.7
Worcester, Mass.	349	764	54.0	6.4	11.3	11.2	6.4
Birmingham, Ala.	431	778	35.0	11.1	14.2	9.1	5.7
Syracuse, N. Y.	339	842	47.0	8.9	13.7	11.9	6.7
Richmond, Va.	401	608	38.7	9.8	15.1	11.9	5.2
New Haven, Conn.	326	880	46.3	8.1	12.7	14.0	6.8
Memphis, Tenn.	339	624	28.2	12.2	18.6	10.6	5.5
San Antonio, Tex.	389	571	25.1	12.3	17.5	9.9	6.9
Dallas, Tex.	331	563	24.9	9.9	21.9	17.7	6.5
Dayton, Ohio	398	762	52.8	5.6	12.9	11.8	5.9
Bridgeport, Conn.	350	837	60.3	5.1	9.7	12.0	4.6
Houston, Tex.	346	612	30.2	11.8	16.0	14.5	6.2
Hartford, Conn.	292	750	45.0	8.7	14.3	17.0	6.0
Scranton, Pa.	405	990	32.2	9.9	12.0	10.8	5.8
Grand Rapids, Mich.	399	770	49.7	7.3	15.4	11.0	6.1
Paterson, N. J.	324	631	64.0	5.6	10.2	8.8	4.3
Youngstown, Ohio	441	1,061	53.4	8.4	12.4	10.7	5.3
Springfield, Mass.	331	692	46.8	7.4	13.9	12.7	6.3

¹ Columns A and B from Detailed Table I; columns C, D, E, F, G, Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, Population, 1920, p. 131.

TABLE 22.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY, AND THE PER CENT OF THE TOTAL POPULATION 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN EACH OF THE CHIEF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920—Continued

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE		PER CENT OF THE TOTAL POPULATION 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER EMPLOYED IN—				
	Native white women	Foreign-born white women	Manufacturing	Transportation	Trade	Clerical occupations	Professional service
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Des Moines, Iowa.....	362	617	28.0	9.7	20.4	16.0	8.3
New Bedford, Mass.....	342	601	72.0	4.2	8.1	4.6	3.0
Fall River, Mass.....	379	784	71.5	4.7	8.8	4.5	3.9
Trenton, N. J.....	364	903	57.7	8.2	10.3	9.2	4.8
Nashville, Tenn.....	389	460	32.2	11.4	16.5	10.3	5.7
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	498	690	27.9	11.0	18.2	14.3	9.7
Camden, N. J.....	453	929	58.8	8.3	9.8	9.9	3.5
Norfolk, Va.....	330	650	28.3	16.3	14.6	10.5	5.1
Albany, N. Y.....	267	722	33.3	14.1	14.3	15.6	7.6
Lowell, Mass.....	364	650	67.4	4.8	9.5	6.3	4.0
Wilmington, Del.....	424	1,010	48.7	10.0	10.5	13.1	5.3
Cambridge, Mass.....	318	644	42.5	8.9	12.2	14.5	7.6
Reading, Pa.....	390	1,048	63.5	7.3	9.7	7.5	4.1
Fort Worth, Tex.....	351	644	33.8	11.6	17.0	12.3	5.6
Spokane, Wash.....	346	500	27.3	11.1	20.2	12.5	8.6
Kansas City, Kans.....	458	935	46.8	14.7	12.0	11.2	4.3
Yonkers, N. Y.....	353	760	45.3	6.7	12.0	15.3	8.4

Table 22 allows us to compare the proportions of the gainfully employed in the chief occupational groups in the large cities. It shows that the observations made above are in general justified. The predominating occupations of the people of a city are of importance in relation to their ratios of children to women. Our data here certainly appear to support those quoted from the Birth Reports in Appendix A and in Chapter I, Table 9. High proportions of people employed in the trade, clerical, and professional groups are generally found together, and as a rule the ratio of children to women in both nativity groups is low when this is the case. In general, those cities with less than 35 per cent of the gainfully employed engaged in manufacturing have lower ratios of children to women than cities with 50 per cent or more of the gainfully employed so engaged, and there is a tendency for this to be the case for both native and foreign born.³ In most of the large manufacturing cities, especially in the Northeast and along the Great Lakes, a large proportion of the workers in manufacturing are of the "new immigration." Hence, it may be that it is

³ The southern cities are something of an exception as they generally have higher ratios than northern and western cities of similar character.

the type of people drawn into manufactures as much as, or even more than, the occupation, which is the cause of higher ratios of children to women in the manufacturing cities in this part of the country.

There is also the further fact that in cities where heavy manufacturing is very highly developed there is less demand for women's work than in cities where textiles and needlework are highly developed. In cities where heavy manufacturing predominates, therefore, we find fewer women at work outside the home and consequently a higher ratio of children. This is an important element in explaining the differences between cities.

But why should hand workers engaged in manufacturing have more children than people employed in other occupations? Without attempting to answer this question in detail we may enumerate a few reasons that appear quite important in supplying an explanation of this situation.

Notwithstanding the very common belief of the better-paid classes that one of the most meritorious acts of man is to move from the hand-laboring class into the better-paid of the clean-handed jobs, there are millions of laborers who are fairly content with their position in life, or they would be if only their incomes were a little larger. Most of these millions have no ambition for themselves or their children which is not consistent with raising their children to be laborers. For this reason they do not anticipate being subjected to the expense of supporting their children for a number of years after they have finished common school, while they prepare for a business life or the professions.

Laborers quite generally have the feeling that the best insurance they can have against the accidents of life, unemployment, old age, disability, sickness, etc., is a family of children who can care for them if worst comes to worst. In other words, laboring people invest their possible savings in children more often than in property.

Again, in the laboring class women are expected to be homemakers. It is true that a great many of them have to go outside the home to help make a living (see columns E and G in Table 23) but they seldom do so through choice, as often happens in the upper classes. They take outside work because it is a grim necessity. For women in this class, as for the men, life takes its meaning largely from family life. It would seem quite natural therefore, that as this class formed a larger part of the population of a community the ratio of children to women should increase. Our inspection of the facts indicates that this is the case.

What has just been said applies to some of the attitudes of mind common among hand laborers, particularly those in manufacturing.

TABLE 23.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WHITE MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE AND PER CENT OF WHITE MARRIED WOMEN 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED, BY NATIVITY, WITH RANKINGS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920¹

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				WOMEN 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED			
	Native white married women		Foreign-born white married women		Native white married women		Foreign-born white married women	
	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank	Per cent	Rank	Per cent	Rank
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
New York, N. Y.	528	38	769	43	8.8	40	8.1	25
Manhattan Borough	445	62	722	53	12.8	12	11.6	7
Bronx Borough	552	27	725	52	6.8	59	5.6	62
Brooklyn Borough	566	24	841	35	7.2	56	5.3	65
Queens Borough	581	18	764	45	6.3	65	7.3	37
Richmond Borough	639	5	954	13	4.8	72	4.1	70
Chicago, Ill.	508	47	827	38	10.2	27	8.1	26
Philadelphia, Pa.	566	25	875	28	8.0	49	6.0	54
Detroit, Mich.	548	28	894	24	8.5	44	5.5	64
Cleveland, Ohio	507	49	895	23	8.9	39	7.9	28
St. Louis, Mo.	448	60	670	61	8.7	43	7.4	35
Boston, Mass.	585	16	835	36	10.8	25	7.9	29
Baltimore, Md.	598	10	870	29	6.5	62	6.8	44
Pittsburgh, Pa.	604	8	1,014	6	4.8	71	3.8	71
Los Angeles, Calif.	319	73	557	70	13.4	9	10.7	11
Buffalo, N. Y.	558	26	953	14	5.0	70	4.3	69
San Francisco, Calif.	331	72	522	73	13.2	10	12.1	5
Milwaukee, Wis.	587	15	849	34	6.6	60	6.9	42
Washington, D. C.	439	63	661	62	17.8	3	11.5	8
Newark, N. J.	520	41	939	16	6.5	63	4.7	67
Cincinnati, Ohio	510	46	615	64	6.9	57	7.8	30
New Orleans, La.	570	23	677	60	5.9	67	7.5	33
Minneapolis, Minn.	536	36	766	44	8.8	41	5.7	60
Kansas City, Mo.	393	71	745	48	12.0	18	6.3	48
Seattle, Wash.	400	70	523	72	12.4	14	8.5	17
Indianapolis, Ind.	462	58	708	57	9.9	29	6.1	52
Jersey City, N. J.	603	9	988	11	5.6	68	5.1	66
Rochester, N. Y.	522	40	918	20	12.6	13	10.8	10
Portland, Oreg.	415	67	595	68	13.6	8	8.5	18
Denver, Colo.	407	68	608	66	11.5	23	7.2	38
Toledo, Ohio	498	51	942	15	9.1	37	6.2	50
Providence, R. I.	540	33	924	19	12.2	16	10.3	12
Columbus, Ohio	489	54	815	41	8.4	45	5.8	59
Louisville, Ky.	517	43	661	63	7.8	50	5.9	58
St. Paul, Minn.	596	11	760	46	8.2	48	5.9	55
Oakland, Calif.	407	69	579	69	10.1	28	8.1	27
Akron, Ohio	517	44	905	22	9.8	31	8.2	22
Atlanta, Ga.	497	52	613	65	11.8	21	6.3	49
Omaha, Nebr.	474	56	822	39	11.6	22	6.7	45
Worcester, Mass.	619	7	928	18	9.6	33	6.1	53
Birmingham, Ala.	543	30	864	30	6.5	64	5.6	63
Syracuse, N. Y.	500	50	967	12	9.9	30	5.9	56
Richmond, Va.	582	17	730	51	7.2	55	6.9	43
New Haven, Conn.	546	29	1,033	5	8.8	42	7.1	39
Memphis, Tenn.	446	61	719	55	9.4	34	7.4	36
San Antonio, Tex.	517	45	715	56	8.3	47	8.2	23
Dallas, Tex.	435	66	696	59	13.2	11	7.8	31
Dayton, Ohio	524	39	834	37	6.9	58	8.9	15
Bridgeport, Conn.	537	35	938	17	12.1	17	11.7	6
Houston, Tex.	438	64	696	58	9.1	38	6.5	47
Hartford, Conn.	496	53	907	21	11.9	19	8.5	19
Scranton, Pa.	667	3	1,103	4	3.1	73	1.6	73
Grand Rapids, Mich.	573	20	888	27	11.0	24	7.5	34
Paterson, N. J.	542	31	742	49	14.1	7	15.6	4
Youngstown, Ohio	592	13	1,136	2	5.1	69	3.7	72
Springfield, Mass.	519	42	862	31	14.1	6	11.5	9

¹ Columns A and C from Detailed Table I; columns E and G, Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, Population, 1920, p. 801.

TABLE 23.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WHITE MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE AND PER CENT OF WHITE MARRIED WOMEN 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED, BY NATIVITY, WITH RANKINGS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920—Continued

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				WOMEN 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED			
	Native white married women		Foreign-born white married women		Native white married women		Foreign-born white married women	
	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank	Per cent	Rank	Per cent	Rank
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Des Moines, Iowa.....	507	49	751	47	12.3	15	6.7	46
New Bedford, Mass.....	571	22	773	42	21.6	2	33.8	1
Fall River, Mass.....	723	1	989	10	21.7	1	26.1	2
Trenton, N. J.....	541	32	997	9	7.3	54	7.1	40
Nashville, Tenn.....	536	37	552	71	9.3	35	8.2	24
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	660	4	822	40	7.4	53	5.9	57
Camden, N. J.....	594	12	1,010	8	7.5	52	6.2	51
Norfolk, Va.....	488	55	722	54	8.4	46	8.5	20
Albany, N. Y.....	458	59	892	26	6.0	66	4.6	68
Lowell, Mass.....	691	2	861	32	17.1	4	23.9	3
Wilmington, Del.....	589	14	1,122	3	7.7	51	5.7	61
Cambridge, Mass.....	627	6	853	33	10.4	26	9.3	14
Reading, Pa.....	538	34	1,171	1	14.4	5	10.1	13
Fort Worth, Tex.....	438	65	742	50	9.8	32	7.6	32
Spokane, Wash.....	470	57	600	67	11.9	20	8.6	16
Kansas City, Kans.....	573	21	1,012	7	9.2	36	7.1	41
Yonkers, N. Y.....	579	19	893	25	6.6	61	8.4	21

It is not impossible that laborers in manufacturing may become in time so thoroughly imbued with the religion of thrift as now being preached by industrial and business leaders that they will be quite willing to own shares or bonds rather than to raise children. Once the traditional attitudes toward the family and children were broken down in this class its members might soon become, in practice, the arch exponents of small families.

Just the opposite attitude on the points discussed above prevails in the business and professional classes and among clerical workers who have more or less hope of becoming bona fide members of these classes. It is quite to be expected, therefore, that these people would resort to more drastic limitation of the family than hand laborers, with the consequence our data show as regards the ratio of children to women, namely, a decrease in ratio as the proportion of the population engaged in manufacturing decreases.

PARENTAGE

Another factor generally supposed to be of some significance in explaining the differences between localities in ratio of children to native white women is the proportion of these women who are of foreign or mixed parentage. As a matter of fact, from an inspection of Table 20 one would say that apparently there is not a great deal of difference between the native white women of native parentage and

the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage as regards number of children. Of the 20 cities having the highest ratio of children to native white women only 2 rank 1-20 in proportion of native white women of foreign or mixed parentage, while 12 rank 50 or lower. At the other extreme, of the 20 cities ranking 54-73 in the ratio of children, only 3 rank 54-73 in proportion of native white women of foreign or mixed parentage. In the larger cities, then, the proportion of native white women who are of second generation immigration stock does not seem to play as important a part in raising the ratio of children to women as is very commonly supposed to be the case. As supporting this statement, Baltimore with 27.3 per cent of its native white women of foreign or mixed parentage ranks 7 in ratio of children and San Francisco, with 54.4 per cent of its native white women in this group, ranks 73; Youngstown, with 44 per cent of its women in this group, ranks 4 in ratio of children, and St. Louis, with 41.4 per cent, ranks 61. Several other cities with approximately the same proportions of native white women of foreign or mixed parentage are fully as far apart in ratio of children to native white women. Scranton, Pa., and Queens Borough of New York City are the only 2 cities ranking 20 or above in both respects.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

There appears to be considerable connection between the proportion of native white women 10 years of age and over gainfully employed and the ratio of children to women (Table 20, columns A and G). Salt Lake City, ranking 1 in ratio of children to women but 69 in per cent of employed women, is exceptional in many respects but most of the other cities ranking high in ratio of children to women rank low in proportion of employed women, while of the 20 cities ranking lowest in ratio of children, 11 rank in the 1-20 class in proportion of employed women. Some of the New England textile cities appear out of place near the median point in ratio of children but with very large percentages of employed women. On the whole, however, there is an inverse relationship between these two factors, the fewer employed native women the higher the ratio of children.

Of course, one can not say positively, in consequence of this relationship between a high ratio of children and low employment, that employment of women causes small families. Undoubtedly it often does so but the situation is scarcely as simple as such a statement would imply. In some cases no doubt the causal relationship is reversed and women seek employment because they have few or no children. On the other hand, many women are forced to seek employment outside the home because of the economic pressure of large families. This last condition probably explains the figures for some of the textile cities.

Some of the reasons why a large proportion of employed women should accompany a low ratio of children are not far to seek. Women who have to work, or who prefer outside work to making a home, are more likely not to marry at all, or to raise small families if they do marry, than women who devote their whole energies to making a home. Most women find that in raising children and working outside the home they are trying to serve two masters. The steadiness of the job of raising children, especially a fair-sized family, is often a strong deterrent to one who might want to do this but must work outside the home.

Again in communities where it is quite the usual thing for girls to work outside the home between the time of leaving school and getting married, the possession of a source of independent income and the complete control over one's time tend to create the desire to retain a larger amount of freedom than the raising of a fair-sized family will permit; hence the desire develops to limit the family to the size most compatible with the retention of the desired freedom.

No doubt, too, the ease with which birth-control information is secured where women work in large groups is also a factor in the situation.⁴ One might sum up by saying that women who are gainfully employed, at least those in the childbearing ages, find it decidedly to their advantage not to marry or, if they do marry, to limit the size of their families, and that girls who have worked outside the home for a few years are almost certain to develop desires and attitudes of mind which are not compatible with the raising of large families. It would naturally follow, then, that the gainful employment of women at any time before the end of their childbearing period would have a tendency to issue in the restriction of their families. So that, under present conditions, and other things being equal, those communities that employ women in gainful occupations will have lower birth rates than those which do not.

MARRIAGE

The differences in the ratios of children, among both the native and the foreign-born white women, between all women and married women (see Tables 20, 21, and 23), are due in considerable measure to the varying proportion of married women in these groups. This is readily seen in the case of particular cities. Thus Fall River, ranking 24 in ratio of children to all native white women, is 1 in ratio of children to native white married women. Table 19 shows that Fall River ranks very low (71) in proportion of native white women 20 to 44 who are married, having only 52.5 per cent of all of them in this group. It also ranks low (66) in proportion of foreign-born white married women. Lowell ranks 29 in ratio of children to all native

⁴ Elderton, Ethel M., Report on the English Birth Rate, Pt. I, England North of the Humber. Eugenics Laboratory Memoirs, XIX and XX, pp. 236, 237.

women but 2 in ratio to married women and it also ranks low in proportion of married women both native and foreign born, 70 and 69, respectively. In general, of course, if there is a large difference in ratio of children to married women and to all women a larger proportion of all women are single than if the difference in these ratios is small. Table 19 if compared with Table 12 further shows that there is a rather large difference between the States and the cities in the proportion of married women.

For all cities of 100,000 and over and for the United States as a whole, the per cents of married women in the different nativity groups are as follows:

NATIVITY	PER CENT MARRIED	
	United States	Cities of 100,000 inhabitants and over
Native white.....	74.2	66.5
Native parentage.....	77.0	69.6
Foreign or mixed parentage.....	67.3	62.9
Foreign-born white.....	85.5	82.9

It is evident, therefore, that the averages for the rural population of the United States must be about as much above the averages of the United States as these are higher than the averages for cities. City populations, which are devoted almost wholly to the service of industry and commerce, show a marked tendency to remain single or marry late. This tendency is carried to the greatest extreme in those cities where the labor of women and girls is in greatest demand. The textile cities of the Eastern States show a very high proportion of employed women and girls and a low proportion of women 20 to 44 who are married. New Bedford, Fall River, Providence, Lowell, Cambridge, and Paterson among others belong in this group, as furnishing industrial work to women. Washington, D. C., furnishes clerical work in abundance and Boston and Manhattan Borough furnish both industrial and clerical work. All these places rank high in the proportion of women employed, both native and foreign born, and low in the proportion of married women.

It is well to note in this connection, also, that everywhere the foreign born have a much higher proportion of married women than the natives. Foreign-born women come to this country largely as wives so that their place of residence does not so greatly influence their marital condition as it does that of the native women. But even in the case of the foreign-born women it is impossible to suppose that the large difference between Manhattan Borough, with 73.8 per cent of the foreign-born white women married, and Akron, Ohio, with 93.6 per cent in this marital group, is not influenced to a certain extent

by the differences in environmental conditions in these two places. In all probability the nationality groups in Akron may be somewhat more inclined to bring their wives with them than the groups in Manhattan. No doubt a considerable part of the difference in marital condition is due to the fact that Akron, as a city of rubber manufactures, offers little opportunity for women to find work as compared with Manhattan with its needle trades, its other light manufacturing work, and its great offices. Furthermore, Akron is known as a high wage city, while for the great majority of wage-earners Manhattan certainly does not enjoy such a reputation. Hence, in order to make ends meet, women are forced into wage earning jobs more frequently in Manhattan. The above explanation will go far in accounting for the fact that the difference in the ratio of children to all women and to married women is much greater in Manhattan than in Akron. It will also largely explain the fact that Akron has a ratio of 847 children per 1,000 foreign-born white women, which is considerably above that of Manhattan with 533.

It is noteworthy that a given city generally holds fairly closely to the same rank for all nativity groups. The forces, whatever they may be, determining the tendency to marry in a given locality, in this case a particular city, seem to affect all nativity groups about equally. Thus in the four nativity groups, native white, native white of native parentage, native white of foreign or mixed parentage, and foreign-born white, the respective ranks of certain cities are as follows:

CITY	RANK IN PER CENT MARRIED			
	Native white			Foreign-born white
	Total	Native parentage	Foreign or mixed parentage	
New York.....	61	63	59	67
Chicago.....	44	43	42	31
Cleveland.....	30	32	26	7
Pittsburgh.....	47	46	45	34
Boston.....	72	71	71	71
San Francisco.....	38	33	30	62
Minneapolis.....	54	51	54	60
Providence.....	67	66	67	65
Birmingham.....	3	3	8	10
Youngstown.....	19	12	16	2
Kansas City, Kans.....	2	1	10	3

There are a few cities where the proportion of foreign-born white married women is somewhat out of line with the proportion of native white married women, but the correspondence between the proportions of native whites of native parentage and the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage is especially close, and shows that the

social and economic forces at work among the older native population are speedily felt by the children of immigrants in most cities. It even seems likely from the variations in the percentages of foreign-born married women that the younger immigrant women, those who are not married when they arrive here (chiefly girls under 20), quickly feel the action of the same forces and tend to delay marriage to a slight extent.

Attention should be called to the fact that though the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage marry less frequently and later than the native white women of native parentage the difference between these two groups in this respect is less in the cities than in the States. For all these cities the proportion of married women is 6.7 points higher among the native white women of native parentage than among the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage (Table 19). The difference between these groups for the whole United States is 9.7 points (Table 12). Thus we see that the concentration of the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage in the large cities where marriage rates are relatively low tends to exaggerate the differences between these two nativity groups as regards their tendency to marry, when the States are compared with one another, and when the situation in the entire United States is considered. In the 12 cities in the United States having over 500,000 inhabitants the difference between the proportion of native white women of native parentage married and the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage married, 5.3 points, is even less than for all the cities of over 100,000.

A factor helping to account for this difference in marital condition in these two nativity groups is the general state of confusion and unsettlement of mind in which the children of immigrants find themselves. It is among the children of immigrants rather than among the immigrants themselves that we find the largest degree of mental disorganization. The immigrants come to us with certain mental attitudes, habits of thought and sentiment, fairly firmly fixed and these form "points of reference" by which most, though not all, actions can be judged. They have a scale of values, in other words, which is relatively fixed, by which they can and do govern and judge most of their conduct. So it happens that most immigrants, especially those over 25 years of age on their arrival, live out their lives more or less under the control of the customs and habits they bring with them, making only such adaptations as are absolutely essential in the new environment.

Their children, on the other hand, lack the home training in "old world" habits, customs, etc., which their parents had, and rebel against such as their parents try to inculcate. They also lack the home training of the average native of native parentage so that in

many cases they never make a very satisfactory adjustment in their mental attitudes to the conditions of everyday life here. There can be no question that the disintegration or disorganization of personality which is so prevalent in the United States is most marked in the children of immigrant parents. It is they who feel most heavily the pressure of conflicting motives to action, motives derived from living in an environment made up of many antagonistic and mutually exclusive elements. There is little occasion for surprise, therefore, when we find that as one manifestation of a disorganized life, a life in which the person finds the conflict of impulses wearying and distracting, the children of immigrants do not marry as early or as frequently as the children of natives.

TABLE 24.—PER CENT AND RANK OF NATIVE WHITE WOMEN OF NATIVE PARENTAGE AND OF NATIVE WHITE WOMEN OF FOREIGN PARENTAGE 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920¹

CITY	WOMEN 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED				CITY	WOMEN 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER GAINFULLY EMPLOYED			
	Native white—Native parentage		Native white—Foreign or mixed parentage			Native white—Native parentage		Native white—Foreign or mixed parentage	
	Per cent	Rank	Per cent	Rank		Per cent	Rank	Per cent	Rank
	A	B	C	D		A	B	C	D
New York, N. Y.-----	32.7	9	33.2	19	Akron, Ohio.....	25.5	56	22.9	64
Manhattan Borough.....	37.0	2	37.4	9	Atlanta, Ga.....	27.3	42	23.0	63
Bronx Borough.....	31.7	16	32.3	21	Omaha, Neb.....	28.4	35	31.5	24
Brooklyn Borough.....	31.3	18	31.2	28	Worcester, Mass.....	29.6	25	37.1	11
Queens Borough.....	27.1	44	28.2	40	Birmingham, Ala.....	19.1	73	18.9	73
Richmond Borough.....	24.8	62	25.7	55	Syracuse, N. Y.....	28.2	36	30.2	35
Chicago, Ill.....	32.0	13	33.9	17	Richmond, Va.....	27.2	43	23.5	60
Philadelphia, Pa.....	29.1	28	31.4	25	New Haven, Conn.....	30.1	24	35.2	13
Detroit, Mich.....	26.6	48	26.9	48	Memphis, Tenn.....	24.9	60	21.7	67
Cleveland, Ohio.....	28.6	33	27.3	47	San Antonio, Tex.....	22.8	67	21.5	68
St. Louis, Mo.....	32.1	12	28.6	39	Dallas, Tex.....	29.0	30	25.3	57
Boston, Mass.....	35.1	3	38.1	8	Dayton, Ohio.....	23.9	65	23.4	61
Baltimore, Md.....	26.4	50	26.9	49	Bridgeport, Conn.....	30.5	21	34.5	15
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	26.2	53	27.4	46	Houston, Tex.....	23.8	66	20.2	72
Los Angeles, Calif.....	27.1	45	28.0	41	Hartford, Conn.....	33.3	7	36.7	12
Buffalo, N. Y.....	27.5	39	27.9	43	Scranton, Pa.....	26.8	47	30.3	34
San Francisco, Calif.....	33.2	8	31.4	26	Grand Rapids, Mich.....	27.9	37	30.8	31
Milwaukee, Wis.....	32.7	10	31.7	23	Paterson, N. J.....	34.0	4	40.0	7
Washington, D. C.....	43.4	1	41.9	4	Youngstown, Ohio.....	21.6	72	20.9	69
Newark, N. J.....	29.5	26	30.9	30	Springfield, Ohio.....	31.0	19	37.2	10
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	28.7	32	28.0	42	Des Moines, Iowa.....	28.8	31	30.8	32
New Orleans, La.....	24.9	61	20.6	71	New Bedford, Mass.....	30.3	22	45.2	2
Minneapolis, Minn.....	29.1	29	35.0	14	Fall River, Mass.....	33.9	5	47.9	1
Kansas City, Mo.....	28.4	34	27.6	45	Trenton, N. J.....	26.5	49	30.8	33
Seattle, Wash.....	27.1	46	29.5	37	Nashville, Tenn.....	25.2	58	23.4	62
Indianapolis, Ind.....	26.3	52	25.7	56	Salt Lake City, Utah.....	21.8	70	22.7	65
Jersey City, N. J.....	29.2	27	31.3	27	Camden, N. J.....	24.5	63	26.0	54
Rochester, N. Y.....	33.4	6	33.9	18	Norfolk, Va.....	21.7	71	22.4	66
Portland, Oreg.....	27.5	40	29.7	36	Albany, N. Y.....	30.6	20	31.1	29
Denver, Colo.....	27.4	41	29.4	38	Lowell, Mass.....	31.9	14	43.3	3
Toledo, Ohio.....	25.6	54	26.3	52	Wilmington, Del.....	25.4	57	26.4	51
Providence, R. I.....	32.5	11	40.3	6	Cambridge, Mass.....	31.9	15	40.8	5
Columbus, Ohio.....	25.1	59	24.9	58	Reading, Pa.....	31.5	17	31.8	22
Louisville, Ky.....	27.8	38	26.6	50	Fort Worth, Tex.....	22.3	69	20.7	70
St. Paul, Minn.....	30.2	23	34.2	16	Spokane, Wash.....	25.6	55	27.7	44
Oakland, Calif.....	24.2	64	24.6	59	Kansas City, Kans.....	22.6	68	26.1	53
					Yonkers, N. Y.....	26.4	51	32.4	20

¹ Columns A and C from Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, p. 367.

The fact that in general there are more native white women of foreign or mixed parentage than native white women of native parentage at work (Table 24) will also help to explain the disinclination of the former to marry. This fact also fits in well with the explanation of the failure of the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage to marry advanced by Doctor Carpenter in his monograph.⁵ He says:

The explanation for this condition can only be conjectured. It may, however, be observed that the postponement or foregoing of marriage involves the deferment or avoidance of the financial obligations involved in marriage more particularly in the support of children. It may be further pointed out that the second generation immigrants are particularly likely to seek relief from financial pressure in this way, for they are passing over from the social position and economic level of the foreign to the native group and could materially accelerate their progress by keeping themselves free, temporarily or permanently, from family burdens. In other words, to many of the children of the foreign born, it seems to be of more importance to bridge the gap between the social and economic level in which they were born and that attained by the sons and daughters of the native Americans than it is to marry and have children.

Whether or not this deduction is correct, the phenomenon for which it seeks to account is sufficiently striking and significant to make it incumbent on students of population problems to determine its causation.

The most natural relation between marriage and ratio of children would seem to be that the more women there are married the higher the ratio of children there would be. In general this relation seems to hold (Tables 20 and 21 with the per cents in Table 19). But there are cities where marriages are relatively few but where the ratio of children is higher than where marriages are more numerous. The exceptions may possibly be explained by the fact that the personal disadvantages of marriage are greatest in those cities where family restriction is least practiced, hence, in those places marriage is more highly selective in certain respects. The women who marry are the ones most ready and willing to undertake the burdens of raising large families.⁶ If the above assumptions are correct, the general knowledge of the methods of controlling childbearing may be one of the important factors making for a high marriage rate in certain cities.

It is not unexpected, therefore, that communities where there is a widespread knowledge of birth control but where its practice is much more strongly disapproved in some groups than in others, would have low marriage rates but high ratios of children. Since, on the whole, it seems reasonable to believe that the daughters of foreign mothers are somewhat less free to put their knowledge into use (probably due to disapproval of their religious leaders) than the daughters of native mothers, as a group they exercise a measure of control over the size of their families by postponing marriage or remaining celibates. Once they are married, however, they tend to have relatively large families.

⁵ Carpenter, Niles, *Immigrants and Their Children*, Census Monograph, VII, p. 217.

⁶ See also discussion on p. 39.

FOREIGN-BORN WOMEN AND "NEW" IMMIGRATION

The type of immigrants found in particular cities is undoubtedly an important factor in determining the ratio of children to foreign-born women. The data in Tables 3 and 7 (Chap. I) and those in Table 25, showing the ratio of children in certain localities dominated by particular nationality groups, indicate that this is the case.

TABLE 25.—CHILDREN UNDER 7 PER 1,000 WOMEN 18 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE IN AREAS HAVING CERTAIN DOMINANT NATIONALITIES: 1920

DOMINANT NATIONALITY	Children under 7 per 1,000 women 18 to 44 years of age	Per cent foreign-born in total population	Per cent dominant nationality is of total foreign-born white population
FRENCH-CANADIAN:			
Holyoke, Mass., Ward 2.....	662	41.9	59.2
Lewiston, Me.....	574	32.3	73.3
Lowell, Mass., Ward 6.....	757	39.8	62.3
Manchester, N. H., Ward 12.....	728	46.8	85.2
GERMAN:			
Chicago, Ill., Ward 24.....	672	31.8	45.4
Milwaukee, Wis., Ward 25.....	566	20.2	76.8
New York City, 8 sanitary districts.....	543	21.1 to 23.5	63.2 to 72.8
St. Louis, Mo., Ward 11.....	402	12.8	61.3
Iowa, Lyon County.....	936	19.4	(¹)
Wisconsin, Dodge County.....	737	14.1	63.9
IRISH:			
Boston, Mass., Ward 4.....	610	28.0	66.7
New York City, 6 sanitary districts.....	508	30.0 to 49.9	40.2 to 46.9
ITALIAN:			
Boston, Mass., Ward 5.....	1,001	51.7	51.4
Camden, N. J., Ward 3.....	997	31.2	85.6
Chicago, Ill., Ward 19.....	1,109	47.1	65.3
New York City, 14 sanitary districts.....	1,047	40.3 to 51.8	85.3 to 98.1
Schenectady, N. Y., Ward 3.....	1,040	39.8	66.1
JEWISH:			
New York City, 7 sanitary districts.....	819	49.2 to 54.0	(²)
NATIVE WHITE OF NATIVE PARENTAGE:			
Atlanta, Ga., Ward 8.....	319	³ 84.3
Chicago, Ill., Ward 21.....	258	³ 37.9
New York City, 8 sanitary districts.....	494	³ 44.0 to 54.0
St. Louis, Mo., Ward 23.....	242	³ 61.6
NEGRO:			
Atlanta, Ga., Ward 4.....	315	³ 65.4
Chicago, Ill., Ward 2.....	254	³ 69.5
New York City, 5 sanitary districts.....	260	³ 75.0 to 96.4
St. Louis, Mo., Ward 6.....	146	46.4
POLISH:			
Chicago, Ill., Wards 16 and 17.....	1,065	44.6	65.2
Detroit, Mich., Ward 16.....	919	32.5	54.4
Hamtramck, Mich.....	1,481	47.4	67.2
Milwaukee, Wis., Ward 14.....	1,146	30.1	81.2
New York City, 4 sanitary districts.....	1,239	33.5 to 38.1	60.2 to 79.4
Wisconsin, Portage County.....	992	14.2	46.2
SCANDINAVIAN:			
Minneapolis, Minn., Ward 12.....	776	25.2	73.4
New York City, 6 sanitary districts.....	496	23.0 to 41.8	33.9 to 65.7
Iowa, Winnebago County.....	845	15.6	78.3
MINNESOTA:			
Koochiching County.....	1,057	30.7	50.5
Roseau County.....	1,125	25.0	78.2
Wisconsin, Polk County.....	970	19.3	78.5

¹ German, 38.7 per cent; Dutch, 38 per cent.

² Russian, 75.8 to 96.1 per cent; Polish and Austrian, 5.6 to 12.8.

³ Per cent of total population.

In Table 25 it appears that the Poles and Italians stand well at the top among immigrant groups. Unfortunately these different nationality groups can be identified in only a few localities; hence the data

on ratio of children in the different groups are rather meager. The data in Table 7 seem to indicate that there is little difference in number of births to Polish and Italian women and to German women. There are reasons for believing, however, that the birth reports minimize the differences between the old and new immigrants. In the first place, many of the countries of Europe contain groups of outside nationalities with different birth rates; for example, Germany in Table 7 includes German Poles as well as true Germans. In the second place, the Poles and Italians are much more recent immigrants than many from northern and western Europe and it is probable that their families are not as nearly completed as those of the earlier immigrants. The study of the "Fecundity of women of native and foreign parentage"⁷ showed that Polish women ranked highest in number of children (6.2) of all foreign-born women under 45 years, married 10 to 20 years. The Italian women, with 4.9 were sixth in this respect. The Bohemian women had 5.0, the Finnish women 5.3, and the Russian women 5.4. The Poles were certainly well ahead of all other groups in number of children in 1900 and it seems unlikely that any material change has taken place since then. But the number of Polish (1,476) and Italian (1,167) women included in the commission's report is so small that we can not be sure the sample was entirely typical. There can be no doubt, however, that the groups of newer immigrants studied by the commission are more prolific than the English (3.4), the English-Canadians (3.5), the Scotch (3.6), and the Germans (4.3), while they still further exceed the native women of native parentage, with only 2.7 children.

Meager and unsatisfactory as these data on the ratios of children and birth rates in different nationality groups are, they seem to indicate that if we could get at the details more fully we should probably have a smaller unexplained residuum of difference between cities than is now the case.

If we turn to Table 21 again we shall find additional evidence that there is some relation between a high ratio of children to foreign-born women and the proportion of them who are of the new immigration. Of the 20 cities ranking highest in ratio of children 11 rank 20 or above in proportion of the foreign born who are new immigrants. At the other extreme, among the 20 cities having lowest ratios of children there are 3 that have high proportions of new immigrants—two boroughs of New York city, Manhattan and Bronx, and San Antonio. In the case of San Antonio no doubt the very high death rate of Mexican children and underenumeration may largely account for the low ratio of children. In the New York boroughs the low marriage rate will partly account for low ratios. Of the other seven-

⁷ Report of the Immigration Commission, 1910, Vol. II.

teen, 8 are among the 20 having the lowest proportion of new immigrants and 4 others come close to this line.

The cities in which it is most difficult to establish this relation between a high ratio of children to foreign-born women and a high proportion of new immigrants are, on the whole, the southern cities and the New York boroughs. The case of San Antonio has already been discussed. No doubt the same situation exists in Fort Worth, Houston, and some of the other southwestern cities. In the other southern cities the foreign-born groups are small but they contain a high proportion of Jews. Apparently there is a tendency among the Jews to raise somewhat smaller families than other of our new immigrants, if so, this will help to account for the low ratios of children to foreign-born women in the boroughs of New York.

A comparison between Paterson, N. J., and Youngstown, Ohio, may also be of interest in this connection.

Youngstown has 72.1 per cent of new immigrants among its foreign born and a ratio of 1,051 children. Paterson has 56.3 per cent of new immigrants and a ratio of 631 children. Here, although the proportion of new immigrants in the foreign-born population is only slightly over one-fourth greater in Youngstown than in Paterson, it is accompanied by a two-thirds greater ratio of children to foreign-born women. The presence of much larger Slavic and Hungarian elements in Youngstown than in Paterson no doubt accounts for some of this excess ratio. But the difference in immigrant type is also accompanied by a difference in the type of industry in the two cities. Paterson is a textile city and Youngstown is, par excellence, a steel city. In the former a large number of women, both native and foreign born, work outside the home. In the latter very few women are gainfully employed. Paterson ranks 7 in per cent of employed native white married women 15 years of age and over, Youngstown, 69; Paterson ranks 4 in employed foreign-born white married women over 15, Youngstown, 72 (Table 23); Paterson ranks 8 in employed foreign-born white women over 10, Youngstown, 72 (Table 21); Paterson ranks 5 in employed native white women over 10, Youngstown, 72 (Table 20).

These facts seem to show beyond reasonable doubt that there is a very close relationship between the ratio of children to foreign-born women and the type of immigrant in the different cities.

PROPORTION OF YOUNG WOMEN

Another factor of considerable importance in determining the ratio of children to women, both native and foreign born, is the proportion of young women in the population. (See Table 26.) It is a well-known fact that the fertility of women diminishes rather rapidly after 35 years of age. Naturally those cities that have unusually

large proportions of women 20 to 34 would be expected to have more young children than the cities where there are more women in the age groups above 35.

TABLE 26.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE WITH PER CENTS AND RATIOS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE		PER CENT WOMEN 20 TO 34 ARE OF		MALES PER 100 FEMALES		Per cent of total gainfully employed persons ¹ engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries
	Native white	Foreign-born white	Native white	Foreign-born white	Native white population	Foreign-born white population	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
New York, N. Y.	316	610	72.1	61.7	96.5	105.0	42.8
Chicago, Ill.	332	712	72.9	59.2	97.3	115.5	43.8
Philadelphia, Pa.	370	737	68.7	59.4	96.5	106.8	52.9
Detroit, Mich.	408	786	74.1	65.3	109.8	140.7	60.7
Cleveland, Ohio.	356	810	71.8	62.1	100.0	125.0	57.4
St. Louis, Mo.	308	579	67.5	54.3	94.6	119.8	46.5
Boston, Mass.	304	631	70.0	56.8	96.7	97.2	42.6
Baltimore, Md.	416	749	67.6	56.6	95.4	110.4	48.7
Pittsburgh, Pa.	392	869	69.1	57.0	96.0	119.1	45.3
Los Angeles, Calif.	234	452	62.8	55.5	91.7	116.0	36.0
Buffalo, N. Y.	364	818	70.7	56.9	95.9	114.0	50.1
San Francisco, Calif.	228	420	66.4	54.7	103.6	144.8	35.7
Milwaukee, Wis.	381	755	72.6	58.5	93.5	123.0	56.3
Washington, D. C.	240	491	69.2	56.8	84.8	112.9	23.0
Newark, N. J.	332	828	71.2	60.9	97.6	112.4	56.8
Cincinnati, Ohio	336	503	65.0	50.3	92.1	103.6	50.9
New Orleans, La.	396	544	67.5	53.5	94.5	147.7	38.8
Minneapolis, Minn.	335	620	73.5	54.9	92.4	122.1	38.6
Kansas City, Mo.	293	639	67.4	56.5	97.4	128.8	33.7
Seattle, Wash.	300	430	67.5	49.3	102.0	145.5	41.5
Indianapolis, Ind.	354	610	65.8	50.7	96.7	123.2	48.9
Jersey City, N. J.	381	888	72.0	58.7	96.2	112.4	43.6
Rochester, N. Y.	333	775	67.1	60.1	93.6	107.8	58.2
Portland, Oreg.	312	493	66.7	53.7	96.5	138.3	40.2
Denver, Colo.	294	510	66.5	48.0	102.5	124.9	32.4
Toledo, Ohio.	372	849	68.0	55.8	101.8	132.7	52.8
Providence, R. I.	301	737	68.0	57.1	92.1	97.7	58.5
Columbus, Ohio.	351	691	65.7	50.5	96.9	131.3	44.9
Louisville, Ky.	358	541	66.6	45.2	90.8	102.5	46.7
St. Paul, Minn.	369	626	74.3	49.6	94.9	118.7	38.7
Oakland, Calif.	307	504	64.8	52.1	97.5	129.6	44.4
Akron, Ohio.	408	847	75.0	66.3	122.1	183.3	70.5
Atlanta, Ga.	377	536	69.2	56.8	94.8	132.5	35.4
Omaha, Neb.	332	713	71.1	54.8	101.1	128.7	38.9
Worcester, Mass.	349	764	70.0	58.2	95.4	109.1	58.9
Birmingham, Ala.	431	778	70.0	54.3	100.4	135.4	43.1
Syracuse, N. Y.	339	842	66.4	57.8	96.4	117.1	51.9
Richmond, Va.	401	608	68.5	56.8	89.6	120.4	46.8
New Haven, Conn.	326	880	70.1	59.6	93.9	106.2	51.4
Memphis, Tenn.	339	624	67.9	54.2	96.7	130.2	35.9
San Antonio, Tex.	389	571	69.8	63.5	97.0	113.7	25.2
Dallas, Tex.	331	593	71.5	60.9	98.3	140.3	29.6
Dayton, Ohio.	398	762	67.7	57.1	99.2	129.3	57.9
Bridgeport, Conn.	350	837	71.6	63.6	98.8	119.6	64.2
Houston, Tex.	346	612	69.2	62.7	98.6	130.9	36.7

¹ Total for gainfully employed persons does not include persons engaged in domestic and personal service.

TABLE 26.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE WITH PER CENTS AND RATIOS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF CITY: 1920—Continued

CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE		PERCENT WOMEN 20 TO 34 ARE OF WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE		MALES PER 100 FEMALES		Per cent of total gainfully employed persons engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries
	Native white	Foreign-born white	Native white	Foreign-born white	Native white population	Foreign-born white population	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Hartford, Conn.....	292	750	72.0	61.5	95.2	111.8	49.7
Scranton, Pa.....	405	990	70.5	53.8	92.2	112.7	34.4
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	399	770	69.7	53.5	92.4	112.3	54.2
Paterson, N. J.....	324	631	71.5	56.5	94.3	105.8	67.6
Youngstown, Ohio.....	441	1,051	70.7	63.4	100.9	157.5	57.9
Springfield, Mass.....	331	692	69.2	59.6	94.2	103.2	51.9
Des Moines, Iowa.....	362	617	68.7	53.3	94.0	123.9	31.6
New Bedford, Mass.....	342	601	73.5	62.6	94.1	96.1	76.1
Fall River, Mass.....	379	784	73.3	57.2	92.5	92.4	74.8
Trenton, N. J.....	364	903	69.9	61.8	97.4	121.2	62.6
Nashville, Tenn.....	389	460	67.2	47.9	92.3	117.0	40.7
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	498	690	69.7	50.7	97.7	100.4	31.3
Camden, N. J.....	453	929	69.4	61.5	100.1	120.8	63.3
Norfolk, Va.....	380	650	69.4	61.9	105.1	206.7	35.3
Albany, N. Y.....	267	722	64.3	56.4	91.1	103.6	37.7
Lowell, Mass.....	364	650	72.0	57.4	91.7	94.3	71.3
Wilmington, Del.....	424	1,010	69.0	62.6	98.5	134.8	54.4
Cambridge, Mass.....	318	644	70.8	58.0	92.1	90.1	47.9
Reading, Pa.....	390	1,048	64.3	60.1	94.4	133.2	67.8
Fort Worth, Tex.....	351	644	70.9	65.6	109.9	180.8	39.7
Spokane, Wash.....	346	500	65.1	40.0	95.3	128.5	30.9
Kansas City, Kans.....	458	935	67.8	62.1	101.3	142.5	51.0
Yonkers, N. Y.....	353	760	69.3	58.3	93.8	102.2	49.7

The way in which age affects the birth rate is shown very clearly in the following table (see Table 27) where the number of births per 1,000 women at different ages in the United States and certain localities within the United States in 1920 are given. In the registration area at that time 1,000 women aged 25 to 29 had approximately twice as many births as women aged 35 to 39 and almost five times as many as those aged 40 to 44.

The data for England and Wales given in Chapter VI show the same decrease in birth rates as the age of women increases and indicate clearly that a difference in the average age of childbearing women of two or three years in different populations would be sufficient to account for quite a difference in the ratio of children to women.

SIZE OF CITY

A careful examination of Tables 20 and 21 fails to disclose any relation between the ratio of children and the size of the city for either the native or the foreign-born women. The larger and smaller cities seem to be scattered quite evenly over the entire range when they are arranged according to rank in ratio of children, and ranks in ratio of children seem to be mixed up without rime or reason when the cities are arranged according to size. One can only conclude that the other factors we have discussed are so decisive in these big cities that any influence size may have is effectually obscured.

TABLE 27.—SPECIFIC BIRTH RATES FOR CERTAIN GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES: 1920¹

	BIRTHS PER 1,000 WOMEN—AGE OF MOTHER									
	10-14 years	15-19 years	20-24 years	25-29 years	30-34 years	35-39 years	40-44 years	45-49 years	50-54 years	
All whites:										
United States (registration area).....	0.2	45.4	150.6	154.1	119.1	80.3	32.0	3.5	(?)	
Conn., Mass., N. Y.	(?)	30.5	134.1	151.8	117.2	73.5	27.0	2.5	(?)	
Kans., Minn., Wis.	(?)	36.1	154.5	171.0	137.4	97.2	42.2	6.0	0.2	
Eleven large cities.....	(?)	29.5	130.0	147.1	113.5	71.3	26.2	2.5	(?)	
Native whites—										
Conn., Mass., N. Y.	(?)	27.2	114.1	124.6	89.0	50.9*	18.3	1.2	(?)	
Ky., N. C., S. C.	0.4	79.5	213.8	212.2	176.7	136.6	61.2	6.6	0.2	
Kans., Minn., Wis.	(?)	35.0	150.2	167.1	132.5	91.1	37.9	4.7	0.2	
Calif., Oreg., Wash.	0.2	50.7	145.4	129.2	88.0	51.3	18.1	1.7	(?)	
Eleven large cities.....	(?)	26.2	109.8	119.9	85.7	49.0	17.7	1.2	(?)	
Washington, D. C.	0.6	43.5	78.5	82.8	68.4	40.0	10.1	1.4	(?)	
Urban United States.....	(?)	24.9	109.6	124.2	95.8	60.2	22.0	2.1	(?)	
Rural United States.....	0.2	60.6	193.4	201.3	165.0	122.8	54.4	6.6	0.2	
Foreign whites—										
Conn., Mass., N. Y.	(?)	48.0	189.3	201.1	159.4	103.4	38.9	3.9	(?)	
Kans., Minn., Wis.	(?)	60.2	223.1	205.4	165.4	122.0	55.6	9.3	(?)	
Eleven large cities.....	(?)	46.4	182.1	193.6	153.5	99.5	37.5	3.7	(?)	
Negroes:										
Seven Southern States.....	2.1	107.7	211.2	189.1	153.5	112.7	45.7	8.9	0.6	
Sixteen Northern States.....	2.5	114.3	155.1	111.9	77.7	48.6	19.8	2.9	0.2	
Twelve large cities.....	2.7	102.0	133.1	89.2	66.3	40.2	12.6	2.1	(?)	

¹ The rates for the United States (registration area) were obtained by multiplying the rates for daughters given by Dublin and Lotka (Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. XX, No. 151, September, 1925, p. 309) by 106 to secure births of sons, adding the two together to give a rate for all births, and pointing off the result to give births per 1,000 women. The rates for the different locality groups were obtained in the same way from the rates for these groups given by P. K. Whelpton (same periodical, Vol. XXIV, No. 167, September, 1929, p. 243).

* Less than 0.2 per thousand.

MASCULINITY

There seems to be little connection between the masculinity of the population of these cities and the ratio of children. The great difference between the masculinity of the native population and the foreign-born population suggests, however, that the availability of suitable men for native women may have something to do with the extent to which they marry and this may also affect the ratio of children. In only 13 out of the 68 cities in Table 26 are there 100 or more males per 100 females in the native white population. Thus some of the native women must either marry foreign-born men or remain unmarried. This situation is bound to have considerable

effect upon marriage. It is no doubt one of the important factors in producing the differences in proportion of women married to which we have already called attention. What effect it would have upon the ratio of children is impossible to say.

In closing this discussion regarding the ratio of children to women in the large cities we wish to call attention briefly to two rather intangible elements in the situation.

BIRTH CONTROL

The first of these is the extent to which the knowledge of contraceptive methods is spread in different communities. There is probably no city of over 100,000 in the United States where knowledge of some method of family limitation can not be readily secured by anyone; but there are nevertheless considerable differences in the degree of its diffusion in various cities. It has been found through careful investigation in English communities of different types, as was mentioned above, that where a large number of women are thrown together in their work, as in textile mills, stores, etc., the knowledge of the methods of family limitation is all but universal. This may, in part, account for some of the differences in ratios of children between those cities where employment of women is high and where it is low. Of course this at once leads us to ask why, if this knowledge is generally procurable, it spreads more rapidly and is made use of more generally in some communities than in others.

One answer to this question is that the social and economic conditions in some cities must put more pressure on their inhabitants to restrict the size of their families than is the case in other cities. Why this should be so only a thorough knowledge of the working and living conditions in different cities and in different parts of the same city would show. There can be little doubt, however, that the varying ratios of children to women represent, to a certain extent, varying pressure, both social and economic, urging people to the securing of birth control knowledge and to the application of this knowledge to their own family life. The differing proportions of married women in the different cities also seem to indicate much greater reluctance to practice birth control in some localities than in others.

UNEXPLAINED DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CITIES

The consideration of community differences in the knowledge and practice of birth control brings us directly to the second of the points to which we should like to call attention, namely, the differences in mental attitudes displayed by different groups and communities regarding marriage and the family. That there are such differences needs no proving: everyone is aware of them. The full explanation of them on general grounds seems impossible. Why should Baltimore

have so many more children per 1,000 native white women (416) than St. Louis (308)? The data adduced above do not seem to fully account for these differences. Nor do they explain fully why St. Paul, Minn., (369) should be so different from Kansas City, Mo., (293) nor why Los Angeles (234) differs so much from Detroit (408). It seems that we are driven to recognize that different communities have at present quite different attitudes toward life. They see a different meaning in life and as one expression of these different outlooks on the world they adopt different attitudes toward family life and the raising of children. If we knew rather fully the most significant mental currents in the different cities and in the different groups which make up a city we could probably account for some of these differences between them in ratios of children. All we can say now, however, is that there are individual mental differences between cities which result in different ratios of children to women in much the same way that personal differences between people in similar surroundings result in some remaining celibate, some marrying and having no children, some marrying and having small families, and some marrying and having large families. In other words, cities like people have distinctive individualities, only partly knowable even to their most interested and well informed students, but quite beyond the ken of the outsider. And the subtle forces that operate to make family life what it is are among the most difficult of all forces to measure and understand. A certain unexplained and perhaps unexplainable residuum of differences between communities as regards ratio of children to women must be traced to these community individualities and allowed to rest there without further explanation at present.