

VII

MISCELLANEA

Several interesting points that have come to light in the course of this study which do not seem to fit into any of the preceding chapters have been brought together under this heading.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN IN UTAH

The ratio of children to native white women in Utah is so anomalous in every respect that it deserves special mention. Salt Lake City ranks highest among the cities of over 100,000 in ratio of children to all native white women and fourth in ratio of children to native white married women. It ranks 38 and 40, respectively, in these marital groups for foreign-born white women. (See Tables 20 and 21, Chap. III.) Ogden, the only city in the State having 25,000 to 100,000 population, ranks 2 in ratio of children to all native white women and 8 in ratio of children to native white married women. (Table 28, Chap. IV.) In ratio of children to all foreign-born white married women it ranks 64.

There is nothing unexpected in these rankings for the foreign-born white women so we need not consider them further. Turning to the ratios of children to native white women among the smaller communities (cities of 10,000 to 25,000, of 2,500 to 10,000, and the rural districts) we find that Utah ranks first both for all women and for married women in all these communities. (Tables 34 and 37.) Furthermore, if our comparison is by States, Utah also ranks first in the two groups of larger cities. That it does not rank first when the States, as wholes, are under consideration is due to the fact that it has a considerably larger urban population than some of the Southern States which approximate it rather closely in their rural ratios.

The difference between the cities and the rural districts in Utah is practically the same as elsewhere. In the rural districts the native whites have a ratio slightly more than twice as great as Salt Lake City and over three-fourths greater than Ogden.¹ Clearly, for all its conservative influence in Utah, religion can not stay the development of typically urban attitudes of mind in the modern city. Just as clearly, it does retard their spread. That Mormonism is the chief influence keeping the birth rate of Utah communities above that of the surrounding States can not be questioned. And Utah is the best example in the United States of a community in which religion does exercise a decided influence on the birth rate.

¹ Calculated from data in Detailed Table I.

Various studies² show that there are differences in the birth rates of groups of different religious faith, but generally religion is so bound up with other factors that the data are not conclusive. For example, most of our so-called new immigrants to this country prior to 1920 (except the Jews) came from a rural group; they were poor, they had a low social status, and they were isolated from contact with natives. They were also Catholics. So, too, the Jews have all the characteristics commonly associated with a high birth rate in the city. It is impossible, of course, to say to what extent the birth rate of these new immigrants is due to their social and economic status and to what extent it is due to religious beliefs. In Table 25, Chapter III, we find that the French-Canadians and Irish, older arrivals, have much lower ratios of children than the Poles and Italians, recent arrivals, although both are Catholic groups. The Scandinavians in this table, except in New York City (which is not a very good example in any event), exceed the Irish and French-Canadians, and, in general, the Jews also. The Scandinavians are almost wholly Protestant.

It is impossible, therefore, in general, to tell much about the influence of religion on the birth rate, but in Utah the situation is less complicated than elsewhere and the difference in ratios of children to native white women between Utah and her neighbors can only be explained as resulting from the attitudes of mind inculcated by the Mormon religion. How long this influence will endure one can not say. Already in the cities its strength appears to be waning and it seems likely that before long the ratios in Utah will not be greatly different from those in the surrounding States. It appears very doubtful, then, whether any religion can long hold its professors to a high birth rate in the face of the manifest personal advantages of small families in our present urban civilization.

It is interesting, at least, that the clearest case of the influence of religion in keeping the birth rate high, which this study affords, is to be found among the old native stock and in a native form of religion.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN AMONG MINERS

It is shown in Table A, appendix, that English and Welsh miners had a higher birth rate than the other occupational groups listed there. We found that the same was true in 1920 in the United States for miners' wives who had births during that year. (Chapter I, Table 9.)

In Table 48 will be found the ratios of children under 7 to all women 18 to 44 years of age for the leading coal-mining counties of the United States. The change in the age groups of both children and women from the groups usually used was necessary because of the form in

² Holmes, S. J., *Size of Families of California Students*, *Journal of Heredity*, October, 1924; Newsholme, Sir A., *Vital Statistics*, new ed. 1923, p. 103; Thompson, Warren S., *Size of Families of College Students*, *American Statistical Association*, December, 1925.

TABLE 48.—CHILDREN UNDER 7 PER 1,000 WOMEN 18 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE AND PER CENT OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, IN CERTAIN SELECTED COUNTIES IN THE UNITED STATES IN WHICH COAL MINING IS AN IMPORTANT INDUSTRY: 1920¹

[Exclusive of places with over 10,000 inhabitants]

STATE	Selected mining counties	Women 18 to 44 years of age	Children under 7 years of age	Children under 7 per 1,000 women 18 to 44 years of age	Percent of foreign-born whites
Total for selected counties.	-----	317, 454	358, 484	1, 129	-----
Alabama.....	Walker.....	9, 643	10, 229	1, 061	0. 7
Colorado.....	Huerfano.....	2, 964	3, 264	1, 102	16. 2
Illinois.....	Franklin, Williamson.....	20, 401	20, 205	990	11. 9
Indiana.....	Sullivan.....	6, 009	5, 094	848	2. 9
Kansas.....	Crawford.....	8, 041	7, 508	939	14. 7
Kentucky.....	Harlan, Pike, Muhlenberg.....	20, 806	25, 165	1, 210	2. 0
Ohio.....	Belmont, Athens, Guernsey.....	26, 521	26, 262	990	11. 2
	Bituminous—Cambria, Fayette, Westmoreland.....	86, 458	108, 316	1, 253	20. 2
Pennsylvania.....	Anthracite—Lackawanna, Luzerne, Schuylkill.....	80, 379	87, 945	1, 094	20. 9
Tennessee.....	Campbell.....	5, 106	5, 959	1, 167	0. 5
Utah.....	Carbon.....	2, 555	3, 286	1, 286	25. 9
West Virginia.....	Fayette, Kanawha, Logan, McDowell.....	46, 287	53, 106	1, 147	4. 9
Wyoming.....	Sweetwater.....	2, 284	2, 144	939	33. 5

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

which the data for counties are published. All cities of 10,000 and over have been omitted from these calculations because miners generally live in smaller places near their work. If the ratios for these mining counties are compared with the average for the United States, 743,³ for all classes of the population, using the age groups just given, it will be seen that the lowest of these mining counties, Sullivan County, Ind., is 14.1 per cent above the average and the highest—Carbon County, Utah—is 73.1 per cent above the average for the United States. The average for all these mining counties is 52 per cent above that for the United States.

It should be remembered that since these ratios of children under 7 to women 18 to 44 include children 5 and 6 years old, or approximately two-fifths more children and only about one-tenth more women (those 18 and 19 years old) than we have had in the other calculations, they are, of course, higher (27.9 per cent) than the under 5, 20 to 44 ratios for the white population of the entire United States (581). This gives a fairly adequate idea of how the two ratios may be compared.

A comparison of these mining counties with certain other special groups will be instructive. In Table 49 the ratios of children to women for rural counties in various parts of the United States are given. These counties were selected because they had no urban population, that is, no city of over 2,500, and because they were

³ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. III, Population, 1920, p. 34.

almost wholly of native white population. The ratios for the highest of these native white rural counties, those in Alabama, Kentucky, and West Virginia, are above the ratio of the Scandinavian counties in Minnesota, calculated on the same basis (see Table 25), so they are probably among the highest strictly rural counties in the United States. Yet the average ratio in them (997) is 11.7 per cent less than that for the mining counties, although 34.2 per cent more than the average for the United States.

TABLE 49.—CHILDREN UNDER 7 PER 1,000 WOMEN 18 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE IN CERTAIN SELECTED NATIVE WHITE RURAL COUNTIES: 1920¹

[Exclusive of places of 2,500 inhabitants and over]

STATE	SELECTED RURAL COUNTIES			Women 18 to 44 years of age	Children under 7 years of age	Child- ren under 7 per 1,000 women 18 to 44 years of age	Per cent of foreign- born whites
	Num- ber of count- ies	Per cent of Negroes in indi- vidual counties ²	Per cent of foreign-born whites in indi- vidual counties				
Total for selected counties.				223, 072	222, 470	997	
Alabama.....	7	Less than 6....	Less than 2....	31, 207	38, 232	1, 225	0. 4
	3	More than 80....	Less than 3....	13, 998	12, 930	924	0. 1
Colorado.....	7	Less than 1....	Less than 6....	11, 255	11, 925	1, 060	4. 0
Indiana.....	22						
Illinois.....			Less than 5 ³ ..	62, 573	53, 282	852	2. 4
Ohio.....							
Kentucky.....	19	Less than 4....	Less than 3....	50, 604	60, 733	1, 200	0. 5
West Virginia.....							
Kansas.....	10	Less than 2....do.....	18, 261	14, 706	805	1. 8
Iowa.....							
Maine.....	4	Less than 1....	Less than 8....	10, 793	8, 317	771	6. 0
Vermont.....							
Pennsylvania.....	9	Less than 2....	Less than 10....	24, 381	22, 345	916	2. 6

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

² Direct comparisons between ratios for whites and Negroes can not be made because the omissions in the enumeration of children are not the same for the two races.

³ With the exception of 1 county with 12 per cent of foreign-born whites.

In view of some of our other findings, for example, the relation between the proportion of women 20 to 34 and the ratio of children, it seems not unlikely that a larger proportion of miners' wives than of farmers' wives may be in the age group 20 to 34. We have no way of testing this hypothesis for these particular counties but the nature of work in mines makes it seem probable that miners and their wives will average younger than farmers and their wives. It would not take a great deal of difference in age constitution of the women in these two groups of counties (Tables 48 and 49) to account for their differences in ratios of children.⁴

⁴ See discussion in Chapter VI on birth rate as related to age at marriage.

When we try to find reasons for the high ratio of children among miners in this country two facts stand out prominently. The first of these is that a good many of our miners, particularly those in Pennsylvania, are of foreign birth. The second is that, as a class, miners live an isolated rural life. Their mode of living leads to the retention of older rural family habits, where the wife stays at home and raises a family which grows without much, if any, voluntary restriction. As a general thing (there are exceptions of course) miners' wives can not get work outside the home. The fact that they do not foregather in factories and workrooms probably has a retarding effect on the dissemination of information regarding the means of family limitation. Furthermore, housing difficulties and the burdens of raising children in congested areas are not felt as heavily in small mining camps as in cities.

TABLE 50.—CHILDREN UNDER 7 PER 1,000 WOMEN 18 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE IN CERTAIN STATES SELECTED FOR HIGH AND LOW PROPORTIONS OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES: 1920¹

SELECTED STATE	NUMBER			PER CENT IN TOTAL POPULATION	
	Women 18 to 44 years of age	Children under 7 years of age	Children under 7 per 1,000 women 18 to 44 years of age	Foreign-born white	Negro
LOW PROPORTION OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES					
Total.....	2, 094, 634	1, 662, 541	794		
Idaho.....	80, 611	75, 512	937	9.0	0.2
Indiana.....	594, 839	405, 289	681	5.1	2.8
Iowa.....	458, 301	348, 091	713	9.4	0.8
Kentucky.....	470, 032	409, 467	871	1.3	9.8
New Mexico.....	67, 225	65, 426	973	8.1	1.6
Oklahoma.....	393, 626	358, 756	911	2.0	7.4
HIGH PROPORTION OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES					
Total.....	5, 026, 149	3, 177, 205	632		
Massachusetts.....	851, 264	533, 637	627	28.0	1.2
Rhode Island.....	131, 333	85, 996	655	28.7	1.7
Connecticut.....	293, 609	211, 958	722	27.3	1.5
New York.....	2, 343, 865	1, 409, 240	601	26.8	1.9
Minnesota.....	485, 140	363, 004	748	20.4	0.4
North Dakota.....	119, 733	125, 934	1, 052	20.3	0.1
Arizona.....	66, 240	56, 769	857	23.4	2.4
California.....	734, 965	390, 677	532	19.9	1.1

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

Tables 50 and 51 are useful in comparing the mining counties and the native white rural counties. In Table 50 we have two groups of States, one with a very low per cent of foreign-born whites and very few Negroes and one with a high per cent of foreign-born whites and a few Negroes. The first group is also largely rural. The second group has both urban and rural States, the more rural being Minnesota, North Dakota, and Arizona, which are also the States with the highest ratios. When we compare these native rural States with the native rural counties in Table 49 we find that the ratio of the latter averages

25.6 per cent higher, while, as compared with the States having high per cents of foreign born, the rural counties are 57.8 per cent higher.

TABLE 51.—CHILDREN UNDER 7 PER 1,000 WOMEN 18 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE IN CERTAIN CITIES OF OVER 100,000 INHABITANTS SELECTED FOR HIGH AND LOW PROPORTIONS OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES: 1920 ¹

SELECTED CITY	NUMBER			PER CENT IN TOTAL POPULATION	
	Women 18 to 44 years of age	Children under 7 years of age	Children under 7 per 1,000 women 18 to 44 years of age	Foreign-born white	Negro
LOW PROPORTION OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES					
Total.....	233,562	109,458	469		
Columbus, Ohio.....	57,064	26,867	471	6.8	9.4
Dayton, Ohio.....	35,797	19,392	542	8.6	5.9
Des Moines, Iowa.....	31,759	15,427	486	8.9	4.4
Kansas City, Mo.....	85,106	33,509	394	8.4	9.5
Reading, Pa.....	23,836	14,263	598	8.9	0.9
HIGH PROPORTION OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES					
Total.....	1,515,403	883,818	583		
Fall River, Mass.....	26,339	18,980	721	35.1	0.3
Lowell, Mass.....	25,905	16,152	624	33.7	0.2
New Bedford, Mass.....	28,137	17,870	635	40.2	4.1
New York, N. Y.....	1,349,892	780,375	578	35.4	2.7
Paterson, N. J.....	31,237	17,944	574	33.2	1.1
Providence, R. I.....	53,893	32,497	603	29.0	2.4

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

In Table 51 we have two groups of cities of over 100,000. The first group consists of those having the lowest proportions of foreign-born whites and the second group of those with very high proportions. The latter have the higher ratios (24.3 per cent) as we should expect, but they are both low as compared with the rural counties, the mining counties, and the rural States. Again we find the large differences in ratios between urban and rural districts to which attention has so frequently been called.

The birth rate in different groups in the United States to-day is so largely determined by the different environmental conditions under which people live that race and nationality, except as they are intimately associated with certain environmental conditions, need not be given much thought. If environmental conditions hostile to growth, as some environments obviously are, become general, we may in the not distant future have occasion to worry over a stationary or declining population. If, on the other hand, conditions similar to those leading miners to raise large families should become general (this does not appear at all likely), then we may have to face the problem of overpopulation.

If ever we are to control population growth intelligently, it must be through the development of environmental conditions conducive to the proper rate of population growth from the right sources. More is said on this matter in Chapter IX.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN AMONG NEGROES

The ratios of children to all Negro women and to married Negro women are given in Table 52 for all States having 1,000 or more Negro women 20 to 44 years of age, and also for communities of different sizes.

The first facts to attract attention in this table are the very low ratios in practically all States outside of the South. Rhode Island is the only Northern State having a ratio of children to Negro women over 400, while in no State of the South is the ratio below 400. Clearly the Negro is not as prolific in the Northern and Western States as in the Southern States. One of the causes of this difference between the northern and southern Negro is obvious. In the North and West, the Negro is primarily an urban dweller and he has a strong tendency to congregate in the largest cities. This is seen clearly in columns A, B, C, and D of Table 52 where the total Negro population of each State and the numbers in cities of 100,000 and over, in cities of 25,000 to 100,000, and in rural districts are given. Column C of Table 53 gives the per cent of the total Negro population that is rural. The ratio of children to Negro women rises almost directly as the per cent of the total Negro population that is rural rises. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Arizona are the only conspicuous exceptions in this respect. In the two New England States the Negroes are largely urban and have fairly high ratios, while in Arizona the Negroes are largely rural and have a low ratio.

There is a very large range in the ratios of Negroes in the different States—much larger than the range among the whites of either nativity group. North Carolina ranks highest with a ratio of 798 and Minnesota ranks lowest with 242. (Table 53.) The former ratio is 3.3 times the latter. This is such a very large range that it suggests the probability of errors of considerable magnitude in reporting the numbers of Negro children and in the statement of age of Negro women. The fact that in a good many States and in the country as a whole, the number of Negro children 5 to 9 is greater than the number under 5 points to the same conclusion. But it does not seem likely that such errors are sufficiently and consistently biased in one direction in the North, and in the other direction in the South, to issue in the results we have here, for a careful inspection of the age groups among Negroes shows that the group 5 to 9 is almost consistently larger than the group under 5 in the South, while in the North it is just the other way about. The error in ages reported would, therefore, tend to minimize the differences in ratios between the North and the South rather than to exaggerate them.⁵

⁵ It is not unlikely that there really are more children 5 to 9 than under 5 among the southern Negroes in some localities due to the very rapid movement of young negro women to the cities which took place in the five or six years preceding 1920.

TABLE 52.—NEGRO POPULATION IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT SIZES AND CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, IN ALL STATES HAVING 1,000 OR MORE NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY DIVISIONS: 1920¹

[Ratios not shown where base is less than 1,000]

DIVISION AND STATE	TOTAL NEGRO POPULATION				CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE											
	Total for State	Cities		Rural districts	All Negro women						Married, widowed, or divorced Negro women					
		100,000 inhabitants and over	25,000 to 100,000 inhabitants		Total for State	Cities				Rural districts	Total for State	Cities				Rural districts
						100,000 to 25,000 inhabitants	10,000 to 25,000 inhabitants	2,500 to 10,000 inhabitants	100,000 inhabitants and over			25,000 to 100,000 inhabitants	10,000 to 25,000 inhabitants	2,500 to 10,000 inhabitants		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	
UNITED STATES ¹	10,463,131	1,684,576	726,271	6,903,658	546	257	294	388	370	743	654	316	355	410	453	875
NEW ENGLAND.....	79,051	47,730	13,219	7,635	409	375	377	484	644	552	538	480	527	658	899	744
Massachusetts.....	45,466	31,075	6,936	1,842	399	367	391	392	677	730	536	477	579	590	988	933
Rhode Island.....	10,036	5,655	2,213	326	480	431	404	739	730	680	568	568	924	928	-----	-----
Connecticut.....	21,046	11,000	3,415	4,391	392	371	327	537	444	457	490	454	407	654	-----	618
MIDDLE ATLANTIC.....	600,183	375,780	61,933	82,751	297	255	289	391	367	501	383	330	378	481	477	634
New York.....	198,483	162,996	10,129	13,271	246	229	277	331	317	464	336	313	372	425	456	646
New Jersey.....	117,132	39,343	28,220	24,804	352	345	253	345	343	540	448	416	341	449	462	673
Pennsylvania.....	284,568	173,441	23,584	44,676	319	265	352	430	406	491	393	328	434	509	497	609
EAST NORTH CENTRAL.....	514,554	301,962	75,833	65,681	296	237	324	375	409	566	344	274	374	439	493	672
Ohio.....	186,187	113,669	17,241	30,212	330	265	361	441	421	597	385	370	417	516	518	718
Indiana.....	80,810	34,678	24,959	8,997	319	282	295	369	406	532	374	331	340	437	514	637
Illinois.....	182,274	109,458	23,610	20,546	260	201	323	330	384	518	304	235	379	385	448	606
Michigan.....	60,082	41,928	9,152	5,076	281	230	352	407	483	655	315	258	395	495	551	749
Wisconsin.....	5,201	2,229	871	850	316	242	225	426	-----	571	368	273	278	473	-----	713
WEST NORTH CENTRAL.....	278,521	138,108	19,910	65,930	308	221	315	341	368	563	367	261	367	413	449	682
Minnesota.....	8,809	7,808	495	559	242	220	252	-----	-----	278	278	252	269	-----	-----	-----
Iowa.....	19,005	5,512	4,005	3,660	379	345	335	359	434	508	434	403	366	415	508	587
Missouri.....	178,241	100,573	6,614	44,074	281	200	267	312	317	576	340	240	314	397	396	695
Nebraska.....	13,242	10,315	896	1,121	270	243	296	-----	414	529	306	274	351	-----	465	626
Kansas.....	57,925	14,406	7,817	15,829	399	326	359	363	466	539	470	366	431	430	551	667

SOUTH ATLANTIC.....	4, 215, 154	279, 297	351, 233	3, 180, 749	661	289	301	369	393	828	800	365	366	458	486	989
Delaware.....	30, 335	10, 746	17, 343	477	268	295	367	410	676	616	368	522	494	523	829	
Maryland.....	244, 479	108, 322	2, 942	119, 970	484	295	399	412	794	610	380	522	494	527	963	
Virginia.....	690, 017	97, 433	68, 590	480, 883	637	306	359	431	844	799	394	450	475	554	1, 045	
West Virginia.....	86, 345	10, 266	63, 861	502	271	362	408	577	582	582	347	461	505	644		
North Carolina.....	763, 407	55, 982	608, 242	798	352	404	494	946	1, 006	922	449	518	639	1, 185		
South Carolina.....	864, 719	46, 781	748, 280	761	301	363	392	858	922	371	445	498	1, 033			
Georgia.....	1, 206, 365	62, 796	93, 947	933, 329	638	256	245	315	364	797	744	302	291	371	921	
Florida.....	329, 487	72, 725	208, 891	483	290	508	312	629	553	335	598	368	710	368		
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL.....	2, 523, 532	207, 131	90, 278	1, 952, 216	572	249	266	304	348	693	675	295	319	368	430	812
Kentucky.....	235, 938	40, 087	16, 354	180, 545	421	215	254	269	323	607	518	271	318	335	411	724
Tennessee.....	451, 758	96, 814	80, 191	281, 294	496	224	261	333	356	719	593	269	309	418	444	852
Alabama.....	900, 652	70, 230	43, 733	703, 819	611	305	274	353	395	729	724	346	327	411	471	899
Mississippi.....	935, 184	836, 558	615	836, 558	615	275	317	669	713	338	391	768	772			
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL.....	2, 063, 579	189, 150	104, 152	1, 528, 297	544	258	263	295	343	673	631	310	309	348	405	772
Arkansas.....	472, 220	21, 061	398, 628	552	250	251	312	621	621	298	296	358	693			
Louisiana.....	700, 257	100, 930	17, 485	509, 844	557	293	248	299	388	688	662	368	291	363	467	805
Oklahoma.....	149, 408	24, 314	101, 504	569	299	359	364	736	647	351	418	420	824			
Texas.....	741, 694	88, 220	518, 321	523	221	255	292	325	698	607	253	297	344	387	799	
MOUNTAIN.....	30, 801	6, 793	3, 958	14, 123	264	195	270	252	290	329	298	227	308	294	318	358
Colorado.....	11, 318	6, 075	2, 404	1, 954	258	194	297	345	441	300	228	345	373	498		
Arizona.....	8, 005	1, 075	5, 374	268	233	210	259	317	292	259	376	436	396	524		
PACIFIC.....	47, 790	28, 659	5, 755	6, 276	271	223	312	363	332	457	317	269	376	436	396	524
Washington.....	6, 883	3, 621	1, 088	1, 101	268	203	338	318	433	302	228	385	369	477		
California.....	38, 763	23, 482	4, 667	4, 875	273	227	307	339	456	322	265	374	441	409	528	

MISCELLANEA

¹ Columns E to P from Detailed Table I; columns A to D from Fourteenth Census, Vol. II, pp. 90-100.
² Total figures for the United States and the divisions are used, even though, as in the New England division, not all the individual States have enough Negro women 20 to 44 to appear separately. District of Columbia is included in the United States as a whole only.

NOTE.—The ratios given here and in the other tables in this section on Negroes are based on the actual data given in the census unless otherwise stated. They should not be compared with the ratios for whites because the omissions of young children from the census count are probably quite different in the two races. The ratios of children in different groups of Negroes can be compared, however, with a fair degree of accuracy. At a number of points, however, the data for Negroes indicate that there are omissions of children or misstatements of age of women for which we have no means of correction. The best that can be done is to make some allowances of a general nature. This is done at certain points in the text.

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN

TABLE 53.—STATES ARRANGED ACCORDING TO RATIO OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 TO NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE WITH PER CENTS AND RATIOS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS: 1920¹

[States having less than 1,000 Negro women 20 to 44 years of age are omitted]

STATE	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE		Per cent of total Negro population that is rural	Per cent of total population that is Negro	Per cent of all Negro women that are 20 to 34 years of age	Per cent of Negro women who are married, widowed, or divorced
	All women	Married, widowed, or divorced women				
	A	B	C	D	E	F
North Carolina.....	798	1,006	79.7	29.8	23.7	79.3
South Carolina.....	761	922	86.5	51.4	24.3	82.5
Georgia.....	638	744	77.4	41.7	25.7	85.8
Virginia.....	637	799	69.7	29.9	24.5	79.7
Mississippi.....	615	713	89.5	52.2	25.2	86.2
Alabama.....	611	724	78.1	38.4	24.9	84.4
Oklahoma.....	569	647	67.9	7.4	26.7	87.8
Louisiana.....	557	662	72.8	38.9	26.6	84.1
Arkansas.....	552	621	84.4	27.0	26.9	89.0
Texas.....	523	607	69.9	15.9	28.8	86.2
West Virginia.....	502	582	74.0	5.9	31.9	86.3
Tennessee.....	496	593	62.3	19.3	27.1	83.6
Maryland.....	484	610	49.1	16.9	27.1	79.3
Florida.....	483	553	63.4	34.0	28.9	87.4
Rhode Island.....	480	630	3.2	1.7	24.7	76.1
Delaware.....	477	616	57.2	13.6	25.6	77.5
Kentucky.....	421	518	55.3	9.8	26.9	81.4
Kansas.....	399	470	27.3	3.3	26.8	84.9
Massachusetts.....	399	536	4.1	1.2	30.4	74.5
Connecticut.....	392	490	20.9	1.5	30.0	79.9
Iowa.....	379	434	19.3	0.8	30.4	87.3
New Jersey.....	352	448	21.2	3.7	31.0	78.6
Ohio.....	330	385	16.2	3.2	33.9	85.7
Pennsylvania.....	319	393	15.7	3.3	34.1	81.1
Indiana.....	319	374	11.1	2.8	31.2	85.2
Wisconsin.....	316	368	16.3	0.2	35.8	85.8
Missouri.....	281	340	24.7	5.2	31.6	82.7
Michigan.....	281	315	8.4	1.6	41.8	89.1
California.....	273	322	12.6	1.1	30.7	84.9
Nebraska.....	270	306	8.5	1.0	36.2	88.1
Arizona.....	268	292	67.1	2.4	38.5	91.9
Washington.....	268	302	16.0	0.5	29.2	88.8
Illinois.....	260	304	11.3	2.8	35.4	85.5
Colorado.....	258	300	17.3	1.2	28.7	86.0
New York.....	246	336	6.7	1.9	39.2	73.2
Minnesota.....	242	278	6.3	0.4	34.0	87.0

¹ Columns A and B from Detailed Table I; column C calculated by subtraction from data on p. 88, Fourteenth Census, Vol. II; Population, 1920; column D from p. 33, Vol. II; column E calculated by addition of per cents from pp. 189-235, Vol. II; column F from Detailed Table II.

It appears, then, that in the Northern States where the Negroes are urban, they have exceedingly low ratios, much lower than the whites in the same areas (see Table 11), while in the Southern States, where most of the Negroes live in the country, the ratios are high, probably higher than those of the whites in the same area. A comparison of the ratios of children to Negro women with the ratios of children to native white women in certain areas is given in Table 54. In all of the cities listed the ratio of children to native white women is over one-third greater than the ratio to Negro women. The differences are even greater in the northern cities. The Northern States likewise show

much greater differences than the Southern States. Indeed, in several of the Southern States, considered as wholes, the differences are so slight that they have very little, if any, significance. In the rural parts of the States the Negro ratio approaches that of the native whites fairly closely except in three or four States and even exceeds it in some of the Southern States. In general, the ratio of children among the rural Negroes is fairly high except in some of the Northern States where the number of rural communities is exceedingly small, too small to be of much significance.

TABLE 54.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN, FOR NATIVE WHITE AND FOR NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, AND PER CENT RATIO OF CHILDREN TO NATIVE WHITE WOMEN EXCEEDS RATIO OF CHILDREN TO NEGRO WOMEN IN CERTAIN STATES AND CITIES ARRANGED ACCORDING TO RATIOS FOR NEGRO WOMEN: 1920¹

[Ratios not shown where base is less than 1,000]

STATE AND CITY	CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE				PER CENT RATIO FOR NATIVE WHITE WOMEN EXCEEDS RATIO FOR NEGRO WOMEN	
	Native white women		Negro women		Entire State or city	Rural part of State
	Entire State or city	Rural part of State	Entire State or city	Rural part of State		
STATES						
North Carolina.....	827	910	798	946	3.5	-3.8
South Carolina.....	777	872	761	858	2.1	1.6
Georgia.....	731	869	638	797	14.5	9.0
Virginia.....	688	809	637	844	8.0	-4.1
Mississippi.....	740	813	615	669	20.3	21.5
Alabama.....	786	894	611	729	28.6	22.6
Kansas.....	574	663	399	539	43.8	23.0
Ohio.....	482	633	330	597	44.0	6.0
Missouri.....	510	685	281	576	81.5	18.9
California.....	341	501	273	456	24.9	9.9
Illinois.....	450	618	260	518	73.0	19.3
New York.....	362	494	246	464	47.1	6.5
Minnesota.....	538	687	242	-----	122.3	-----
CITIES						
Birmingham.....	431	-----	305	-----	41.3	-----
New Orleans.....	396	-----	293	-----	35.1	-----
Philadelphia.....	370	-----	259	-----	42.8	-----
Atlanta.....	377	-----	256	-----	47.2	-----
New York City.....	316	-----	228	-----	38.6	-----
Chicago.....	332	-----	201	-----	65.0	-----

¹ From Detailed Table I.

In view of the fact that the omissions of Negro children under five from the census count is probably considerably greater than that of white children, the situation can be quite accurately summed up as follows: In the South, except in the cities, the ratio of children to Negro women is probably greater than among the white women, but in the North this is not the case, except possibly in the rural population of a few States. In the cities, both in the North and the South, the Negroes have much smaller ratios of children than the whites, even when due allowance is made for omissions. City life seems to have an even more depressing effect on the Negro birth rate than on that of the whites.

TABLE 55.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, AND PER CENTS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS, IN CITIES OF 25,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER HAVING 2,000 OR MORE NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE: 1920¹

[Cities arranged according to ratios of children to negro women]

CITY	NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE			Per cent of all Negro women that are 20 to 34 years of age	Per cent of total population that is Negro
	Children under 5 per 1,000 negro women		Per cent married, widowed, or divorced		
	All women	Married, widowed, or divorced			
			A		
Miami, Fla.	442	530	83.3	39.0	31.8
Wilmington, N. C.	400	499	80.2	30.5	40.3
Portsmouth, Va.	384	454	84.5	33.7	42.7
Roanoke, Va.	376	459	77.0	34.8	18.4
Charlotte, N. C.	364	459	79.3	34.3	31.6
Lynchburg, Va.	358	490	73.1	29.4	27.7
Petersburg, Va.	355	469	75.7	32.3	43.9
Kansas City, Kans.	326	366	89.1	30.3	14.2
Newark, N. J.	323	386	83.6	35.9	4.1
Dayton, Ohio	323	366	88.1	33.5	5.9
Richmond, Va.	321	427	75.1	32.9	31.5
Charleston, S. C.	317	387	82.0	35.0	47.6
Winston-Salem, N. C.	314	404	77.8	39.2	42.8
Newport News, Va.	312	381	81.8	39.5	39.5
Beaumont, Tex.	312	353	83.4	38.0	32.7
Tulsa, Okla.	306	368	83.2	38.1	12.3
Birmingham, Ala.	305	346	88.1	35.8	39.3
Columbus, Ohio	301	355	85.0	35.1	9.4
Baltimore, Md.	295	390	77.6	34.2	14.8
New Orleans, La.	293	368	79.7	33.0	26.1
Pensacola, Fla.	291	339	86.0	32.9	33.5
Norfolk, Va.	287	356	80.7	36.4	37.5
Pittsburgh, Pa.	286	336	85.2	34.4	6.4
Knoxville, Tenn.	283	345	82.0	32.2	14.5
Indianapolis, Ind.	282	331	85.1	33.4	11.0
Mobile, Ala.	281	332	84.8	33.4	39.3
Columbus, Ga.	280	342	82.1	33.7	29.2
Boston, Mass.	276	365	75.8	33.9	2.2
Jacksonville, Fla.	270	308	87.9	36.8	45.3
Wilmington, Del.	268	368	72.9	31.6	9.8
Columbia, S. C.	266	336	79.0	36.8	38.5
Montgomery, Ala.	264	321	82.3	42.3	45.6
Washington, D. C.	263	353	74.4	32.1	25.1
Nashville, Tenn.	262	322	81.2	41.3	30.1
Lexington, Ky.	259	327	78.9	30.2	30.0
Philadelphia, Pa.	259	325	79.7	37.6	7.4
Atlanta, Ga.	256	302	84.7	37.2	31.3
Oklahoma City, Okla.	254	292	86.6	38.8	9.0
Macon, Ga.	254	288	88.1	35.3	43.6
Cleveland, Ohio	253	288	87.9	42.6	4.3
Augusta, Ga.	248	299	82.9	34.4	43.0
Shreveport, La.	248	291	85.5	37.3	39.9
Chattanooga, Tenn.	248	289	85.7	37.9	32.6
Cincinnati, Ohio	247	294	83.9	35.5	7.5
Little Rock, Ark.	244	290	84.2	36.6	28.8
Omaha, Nebr.	243	274	88.5	37.2	5.4
Tampa, Fla.	242	286	84.6	37.7	22.3
San Antonio, Tex.	242	282	85.6	37.0	8.9
Savannah, Ga.	231	278	83.1	38.7	47.1
Los Angeles, Calif.	230	269	85.6	32.6	2.7

¹ Columns A and B, Detailed Table I; column C, Detailed Table II; columns D and E, Fourteenth Census Reports Vol. II, Population, 1920.

TABLE 55.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY MARITAL CONDITION, AND PER CENTS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS, IN CITIES OF 25,000 INHABITANTS AND OVER HAVING 2,000 OR MORE NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE: 1920—Continued

CITY	NEGRO WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE			Per cent of all Negro women that are 20 to 34 years of age	Per cent of total population that is Negro
	Children under 5 per 1,000 negro women		Per cent married, widowed, or divorced		
	All women	Married, widowed, or divorced			
New York, N. Y.....	228	313	72.8	41.6	2.7
Detroit, Mich.....	227	254	89.5	47.6	4.1
Fort Worth, Tex.....	226	265	85.2	40.3	14.9
St. Louis, Mo.....	217	259	83.8	36.2	9.0
Houston, Tex.....	216	247	87.3	37.5	24.6
Louisville, Ky.....	215	271	79.2	33.2	17.1
Dallas, Tex.....	213	239	89.3	38.9	15.1
Galveston, Tex.....	208	246	84.6	38.2	22.3
Memphis, Tenn.....	205	243	84.4	37.4	37.7
Chicago, Ill.....	201	235	85.5	39.7	4.1
Atlantic City, N. J.....	177	232	76.0	35.4	21.6
Kansas City, Mo.....	162	198	82.0	38.3	9.5

In Table 55 all the cities of over 25,000 inhabitants having 2,000 or more Negro women 20 to 44 years of age are listed according to the ratio of children to Negro women. The highest ratio here is 442 in Miami, Fla., and the lowest is 162 in Kansas City, Mo.

There appears to be a considerable difference between northern and western, and southern cities in ratio of children to Negro women. Of the 10 cities having the highest ratios, 7 are small southern cities and 3 are northern cities; of the next 10, only 1 is in the North. Thus 16 out of the first 20 are southern cities. Of the 20 having the lowest ratios, on the other hand, only 11 are southern cities. Among the Negroes as among the whites there seems to be a slight tendency for the southern cities to have higher ratios of children than the northern and western cities. How confused the situation is, however, can be shown by some concrete examples: Chicago is just barely lower than Dallas, Memphis, and Galveston; Savannah is just barely higher than Los Angeles and New York; while Fort Worth stands between Detroit and St. Louis, and Atlanta is lower than Philadelphia. Clearly urban living both in the North and the South results in a great reluctance on the part of Negro women to bear children.

Before attempting to set forth the reasons for the very low ratios of children to Negro women in the cities and to evaluate them, we shall point out their significance from the standpoint of a stationary population.

RATIOS NECESSARY FOR MAINTENANCE OF POPULATION

In Table 59 in Chapter VIII, we find that in States of the registration area having less than 4 per cent Negroes it would take a ratio of 361 children per 1,000 Negro women 20 to 44 years of age to maintain the population with its present age and sex constitution and with the death rates of 1920. By comparing this with the ratios in Table 53, column A, we find that there are 15 States having fewer than enough children to maintain their numbers with present age and sex constitution and 1920 death rates. Nearly all of these are Northern or Western States with comparatively small Negro populations, although New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, and Missouri have considerable numbers. Missouri is the only one of these 10 having over 4 per cent of Negroes in its total population. In States having over 5 per cent Negroes, on account of less favorable age and sex constitution, it takes a ratio of 418 children per 1,000 Negro women 20 to 44 years of age to maintain their numbers temporarily. All the States, except Missouri, having over 5 per cent Negroes exceed this figure. The Southern States in particular have a substantial excess over the ratio needed for temporary maintenance, and due to the considerable omissions of Negro children the margins are greater than they appear here. It is also probable that it is only because of these omissions that the ratios shown by some of the Northern States are not high enough to maintain the Negro population.

For permanent maintenance, the States with less than 4 per cent Negroes need a ratio of 572 children per 1,000 women; and no State in this group exceeds 481. The States with over 5 per cent Negroes need a ratio of 576. Only six of the Southern States exceed this figure. It is clear then that even when allowance is made for considerable underenumeration of Negro children the Negroes in the United States outside the rural South are raising only enough children to add slightly to their numbers under present conditions, but not enough to maintain them when age and sex groups become adjusted to the present birth rate.⁶

In the cities the situation is even worse. In the large cities for which life table data are available in 1920, it took 328 children per 1,000 Negro women to maintain their population temporarily. Table 55 shows that there were only seven of the cities having 2,000 or more Negro women 20 to 44 in which a ratio as high as 328 prevailed. The majority of these are rather small southern cities. For permanent maintenance in a stationary population, the ratio would be 744 and none of them exceeds 442. Thus, even taking into consideration the underenumeration of young Negro children there can be no reasonable doubt that in 1920 there were not enough Negro children in

⁶ See Chap. VIII for meaning of temporary and permanent replacement.

most of the larger cities to maintain the Negro population if migration to them had ceased at that time. In the near future the cities may be expected to show an even greater deficiency.

It will be well to call attention to the fact that since 1920 the vital statistics of the United States indicate a rise in the urban Negro birth rate for the period 1920-1924 as compared with 1915-1919, also a decline in the death rate, especially in the infant mortality rate. The decline in the death rate can be readily accounted for in view of the progress of the public health movement. The increase in the birth rate is less easily explained. One factor may be the increasing accuracy of birth registration. Of course, any rise due to this factor is purely fictitious. But probably the generally disturbed conditions of the four or five years preceding 1920 resulted in fewer births than would have taken place under more normal conditions. This deficiency would naturally be made up to a certain extent with the return to more normal times. Consequently it may well be that the ratios of children to Negro women in 1920 are too low to be considered normal at that time. The Negroes in the northern cities were particularly upset in the period 1915-1919 because of the great migration from the South, the large number of the younger men in the Army, and the general uncertainty surrounding their life in a new environment. This would undoubtedly have a depressing effect on the birth rate.

When all the various factors are taken account of it appears to be urban living rather than latitude that is playing havoc with the reproductive life of city-dwelling Negroes at the present time. This is also shown in Table 52 where the ratios of children to Negro women in communities of different sizes are given. With very few exceptions the ratio of children to Negro women rises as the size of the community decreases. Everywhere the rural population has the highest ratio; and with the exception of the Northern and Western States, where it is quite small, the rural population has an excess over the needs for permanent maintenance (576).

Thus we find that Negroes, like whites, but even more rapidly, are losing their reproductive vitality by living in cities. For the Negro to leave the *rural South* means that he has taken a long step toward becoming sterile.

SURVIVAL RATES FOR WHITES AND NEGROES

As we have shown, the ratio of children to Negro women is generally lower than among whites except in the rural South. One of the important reasons for the lower ratios among Negroes is their higher death rate. Table 56 gives data showing the differences in survival rates of whites and Negroes in certain comparable areas.

Negroes everywhere have a much higher death rate than the whites among whom they live. The largest difference in this respect appears

in the large cities group where at 7 years of age 85.4 per cent of the possible number of whites will be alive, while only 75.4 per cent of the possible number of Negroes will be living. The difference is least in the rural South. Using North Carolina as typical for the whites in the South, the per cents for the whites and Negroes are 88.9 per cent and 83.7 per cent, respectively. Parenthetically, it may be mentioned that the least difference between whites and Negroes is that between the Negroes of the rural South with 83.7 per cent surviving at age 7 and the aggregate whites in the 14 large cities with 85.4 per cent.

TABLE 56.—NUMBER OF SURVIVORS AT DIFFERENT AGES FROM 100,000 BORN AT A GIVEN TIME FOR CERTAIN COMPARABLE NEGRO AND WHITE POPULATION GROUPS: 1920¹

Item	SURVIVORS AT GIVEN AGES		
	At 1 year	At 2 years	At 7 years
Whites in 14 large cities.....	90,476	88,481	85,355
Negroes in 12 large cities.....	84,560	80,346	75,364
Whites in Original Registration States.....	90,757	89,050	86,411
Negroes in Original Registration States.....	85,505	81,494	77,109
Whites in North Carolina.....	92,730	90,876	88,947
Negroes in States having more than 5 per cent Negroes.....	89,081	86,746	83,695

¹ Bureau of the Census, United States Abridged Life Tables, 1919-20, p. 16.

This difference in survival rate of whites and Negroes and (taking into consideration the greater underenumeration among Negroes in the rural South) is sufficient to account for most of such differences in the ratios in these two groups as were found in this section of the country. It appears that in the rural South the birth rate of the Negroes is about the same as or even a little higher than that of the whites, but since among them fewer children survive to 5 years of age than among the whites the ratio of children to women among the latter is sometimes higher. The differences between the ratios of whites and Negroes in the cities is, however, too great to be accounted for by the differences in death rates just mentioned or by underenumeration. In the cities the Negro women do not bear as many children as the native white women.

HIGH PROPORTION OF NEGRO WOMEN GAINFULLY EMPLOYED

A number of factors help to bring about these very low ratios of children to Negro women in the cities. One of these undoubtedly is the high proportion of Negro women engaged in gainful occupations, especially in domestic and personal service. The per cent of them gainfully employed is much larger than for any group of white women. In the United States in 1920, of the native white women of native

parentage 20 to 44 years of age, 22 per cent were gainfully employed; of the native white women of foreign or mixed parentage, 30.7 per cent; of the foreign-born white women, 21.4 per cent; and of Negro women, 45 per cent.⁷ Of all the gainfully employed women 10 years of age and over in these different nativity and race groups, 9 per cent of the native whites of native parentage, 8.7 per cent of the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage, 21.1 per cent of the foreign-born whites, and 33.1 per cent of the Negroes, were women 20 to 44 years of age engaged in domestic and personal service.⁸ From this we see that the Negro women have less opportunity to keep homes of their own than any other group; hence they find children a great burden. Assuming that knowledge of the methods of birth control is more easily secured by Negroes in the cities than in the country there is little to occasion surprise at the small families among a large proportion of the Negro women in our cities.

OTHER FACTORS

Among the Negroes in the cities there appears to be a slightly inverse relation between ratio of children and the proportion of women 20 to 44 married—the more women married the fewer the children. (See Table 55.) There also appears to be a slight tendency for a small proportion of Negroes in the total population to be accompanied by a low ratio of children. But neither of these tendencies is very clearly evident and the wide variations present make it doubtful whether they represent any significant trend. It will be recalled that all of these factors appeared to be of considerable significance in explaining the differences between the ratios of children to native white women in the cities. It would seem, therefore, that in explaining the ratios of children to Negro women, emphasis must be put on somewhat different factors than in explaining those of white women in our cities. The following is offered as a possible partial explanation of the situation found among Negroes.

In the cities, the Negro is a comparatively recent arrival and has not had time yet to develop a strong feeling of belonging to a community or to make a cultural community of his own. The result is that he is in a very badly disorganized condition. Now this can scarcely be the case without undermining such ties of family life and attitudes toward raising children as the Negroes have brought to the city with them. Hence the ratio of children to women, which is a good measure of the strength of family life is somewhat lower among Negroes in the cities than among the native whites and is very much below the ratio among the rural Negroes where certain family traditions still prevail and where birth control is little known.

⁷ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, p. 377.

⁸ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, pp. 377, 404, 413, 422, 431.

The fact that the birth rate is very low among Negroes in the larger cities, so low that they are not now reproducing themselves, as has been shown, suggests certain possible results of birth control which have hitherto been very little considered. If we are right in assuming that the drastic birth restriction among urban Negroes arises largely because of their disorganized life, to which must be added the fact that they do not take much thought for the future and that they tend to prefer the present pleasure to the more remote satisfaction of home life and children, which are extremely difficult for them to attain in the cities, then what is to prevent the spread of this type of race suicide to other groups of the population whose attitudes toward life are quite similar to those of Negroes? There can not be the least question that there are a great many white people who are unable or unwilling to look ahead any great distance, who want the tangible pleasures they can see immediately ahead of them and who care little about the future or the more enduring satisfactions of life. Such people are found in every walk of life but probably they are somewhat more numerous in the lower social and economic classes. Already birth control is widely known as a means of avoiding unwelcome family responsibilities. When it has penetrated through all strata of society it may be that we shall find a considerable proportion of those people in the lower classes who now have relatively high birth rates following the path the urban Negroes appear to be pursuing and reducing their birth rates below the maintenance level as many in the upper classes have already done.

In an attempt to explain this attitude of mind one may say that people who are made to feel that they have little or no stake in the civilization of their day are almost certain to concentrate their energies on getting what they can out of life each moment. Children do not fit in with such a scheme of life and if once people have learned how to avoid them we may expect that the birth rate will become highly selective, eliminating most rapidly those who value present ease, pleasure, and personal success above any contribution they may make to the future of the race. The people, then, in all walks of life, who see a real meaning in living would be those who would contribute most to the numbers of each succeeding generation. Such a selection would be eugenic in the very best sense.

Is it possible then that we may have in the dying out or at best in the very slow growth of the Negroes in the cities, a harbinger of a new era of population growth in which selective processes will be more beneficial than ever before because really based on choice determined by essential hereditary qualities? One may not assert this, but it is worth thinking about. Such a selection, however, will by no means follow the lines which most eugenicists of to-day would consider desirable, that is, it will not follow the present lines of class cleavage on the basis of economic status.

It is quite probable, on the other hand, that there is no special significance to be attached to the apparent dying out of the urban Negroes. It may be merely the result of failure to accord them a training which will enable them to evaluate and to choose the more permanent things of life. If so, the selective value of birth control may not be eugenic. But that it is not eugenic is no reason for assuming that it is dysgenic as so many people do to-day.

After this speculative flight one should perhaps say that not very many people in any group limit births because of the consciousness of being without a stake in the future of a community or a civilization. The motives leading to birth control are generally more concrete and have direct relation to the immediate personal advantages of having few or no children. Thus the desire for good clothes, for good food, for good living quarters, for gay night life, for freedom to flit hither and thither at will, for appearing well socially, for achieving the conventional successes of one's group, etc., are usually the immediate motives for the limitation of births among all classes. But may it not be that back of these concrete desires and intensifying their urge to a definite type of conduct lies, among the Negroes, an unconscious feeling of having but little chance to participate in the more important phases of the life of the community or the age; hence, of the futility of self-sacrifice for the sake of children?

However this may be, it is certain that the city Negroes of to-day are, in many localities, not reproducing their numbers. Indeed one can not but think that if the Negroes continue to move from the country to the city as they have been doing during the last decade or two, the race problem in this country may solve itself in a way no one foresaw, by real race suicide. Of course, it is possible that as the Negroes in our cities increase they will build up a culture of their own within which it will be possible to achieve personal and biological success at the same time. This possibility seems rather remote, however, for as has been shown elsewhere, the whites, whose civilization this is, have made almost no progress in this direction as yet, in the cities, and the Negro has farther to go than the white man to attain this balance of personal and racial impulses.

If an attempt were made to sum up the difference between the whites and the Negroes, as regards their ratios of children in the cities, it could be said that the Negro has a more difficult adjustment to make in adapting his habits and customs, his actions, thoughts, and sentiments, to modern city conditions than the white man. Therefore, he is slower in making this adaptation than the white man, and it is problematical whether he can make it in time to save himself. Even the white man has not yet proved that he can, or is willing to, make the essential adjustments between personal desires and racial impulses that will enable him to survive. It seems, therefore, that

the future of the Negro in our cities is a very uncertain matter. He may perish in the attempt to make the necessary adjustments. Such an experience would not be a new thing in the history of mankind. It has happened frequently in past ages.

RATIOS OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN IN THE "OTHER COLORED"
POPULATION

JAPANESE

The ratios of children under 5 to women 20 to 44 years of age in our "Other colored" population (see Table 57) do not appear unusual, although in the Pacific Coast States where the other colored were about three-fifths Japanese the ratios are lower than we might expect. If we compare the ratio for the other colored in the Pacific States (876) with that for the Japanese in the country as a whole (856)⁹ we find that the Japanese do not have as many children as the other groups with which they are classed. This appears rather strange in view of the very high birth rate of the other colored in California, Oregon, and Washington, shown in Table 4, Chapter I. The explanation of this difference appears to lie in the fact that a considerable proportion of the Japanese women enumerated in 1920 had not been in this country long enough at the time of the census to have as many children under 5 as they would have a few years later.

It is interesting to note that among the other colored also the ratio of children to women increases as the size of the community decreases, except in cities of 10,000 to 25,000. (There are too few in this group of cities to be of much significance in any case.) In this they show the same influence of city living on the birth rate as the foreign-born whites and the natives. The depressing influence of the city on effective reproduction seems to extend to all classes and races of our population without exception. As far as the Japanese are concerned the lower ratio of children in the larger communities is entirely in keeping with what is happening in Japan, where, in 1922, the birth rate in the country as a whole was 34.16, in cities of less than 50,000 it was 29.18, and in cities of over 50,000 it was 27.87.¹⁰ This means that in Japan there is a difference of at least 10 per 1,000 between the birth rate of the larger cities and the rural districts. That there should be much the same difference in this country between the Japanese living in the cities and those in the rural districts is to be expected.

⁹ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. II, Population, 1920, pp. 166 and 287.

¹⁰ Bureau de la Statistique Générale, Résumé Statistique du Mouvement de la Population de L'Empire du Japon, 1922, pp. 4, 8, 12.

TABLE 57.—“OTHER COLORED”¹ CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 “OTHER COLORED” WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, FOR EACH STATE AND CITY HAVING 1,000 OR MORE “OTHER COLORED” WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE: 1920²

	“OTHER COLORED” POPULATION				“OTHER COLORED” POPULATION		
	Women 20 to 44 years of age	Children under 5 years of age	Children under 5 per 1,000 women 20 to 44 years of age		Women 20 to 44 years of age	Children under 5 years of age	Children under 5 per 1,000 women 20 to 44 years of age
UNITED STATES.....	60, 831	55, 610	914	MOUNTAIN.....	13, 091	11, 987	916
Cities 100,000 and over.....	9, 407	6, 963	740	Rural.....	12, 312	11, 407	926
25,000 to 100,000.....	2, 817	2, 231	792	Montana.....	1, 676	1, 763	1, 052
10,000 to 25,000.....	1, 251	899	719	Rural.....	1, 602	1, 686	1, 052
2,500 to 10,000.....	2, 730	2, 312	847	New Mexico.....	2, 913	2, 445	839
Rural.....	44, 626	43, 205	968	Rural.....	2, 862	2, 421	846
MIDDLE ATLANTIC.....	1, 678	1, 147	684	Arizona.....	5, 009	4, 710	940
New York.....	1, 459	980	672	Rural.....	4, 820	4, 555	947
EAST NORTH CENTRAL.....	2, 564	2, 298	896	PACIFIC.....	25, 674	22, 495	876
Rural.....	1, 949	1, 913	982	Cities 100,000 and over.....	7, 861	5, 937	755
Wisconsin.....	1, 354	1, 355	1, 001	25,000 to 100,000.....	2, 162	1, 760	814
Rural.....	1, 237	1, 291	1, 027	2,500 to 10,000.....	1, 436	1, 284	894
WEST NORTH CENTRAL.....	5, 629	5, 478	973	Rural.....	13, 594	12, 994	956
Rural.....	5, 256	5, 225	994	Washington.....	4, 856	4, 228	871
Minnesota.....	1, 326	1, 385	1, 044	Seattle.....	1, 869	1, 334	714
Rural.....	1, 251	1, 355	1, 067	100,000 and over.....	1, 913	1, 362	712
South Dakota.....	2, 400	2, 330	971	Rural.....	2, 450	2, 508	1, 024
Rural.....	2, 365	2, 292	969	Oregon.....	1, 546	1, 316	851
SOUTH ATLANTIC.....	2, 071	2, 421	1, 169	California.....	19, 272	16, 951	880
Rural.....	1, 980	2, 336	1, 180	Los Angeles.....	2, 691	2, 230	829
North Carolina.....	1, 727	2, 054	1, 189	San Francisco.....	1, 902	1, 352	711
Rural.....	1, 717	2, 041	1, 189	100,000 and over.....	5, 466	4, 205	769
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL.....	9, 332	9, 149	980	25,000 to 100,000.....	1, 856	1, 551	836
Rural.....	8, 293	8, 374	1, 010	2,500 to 10,000.....	1, 246	1, 131	908
Oklahoma.....	8, 709	8, 566	984	Rural.....	10, 204	9, 648	946
Rural.....	7, 830	7, 923	1, 012				

¹ Japanese, Chinese, and Indians.
² Calculated from Detailed Table I.

INDIANS

Outside of the Pacific coast and the Middle Atlantic States, the “Other colored” are largely Indians. Their ratios of children are higher in other parts of the country than on the west coast where the Japanese dominate. But when allowance is made for the short length of residence of many of the Japanese women, as was mentioned above, it seems likely that the Japanese exceed the Indians in ratio of children by a fair margin. The ratio of children to women among all the Indians of the United States is 923.¹¹ This is undoubtedly too low, for among the Indians as among the Negroes the census reports more children aged 5 to 9 than under 5. The Indians thus have quite a high ratio of children to women as compared with

¹¹ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. II, Population, p. 166.

other groups. The fact that practically all Indians are rural will undoubtedly go far to account for their relatively high ratio of children.

CHINESE

The ratio of children to women among all Chinese in the United States is 963.¹¹ This is a high ratio; especially does it appear high when we learn that practically all the Chinese in this country live in cities.

We have been accustomed to think of the orientals as having a high birth rate. These ratios show that this is the case but they also show that they are not much higher than the ratios among the foreign born from southern and eastern Europe. This would seem to be true even after the needed adjustments are made in the Japanese ratio for the short length of residence in the country of many of the women. We have also seen that there are a number of mining counties and rural counties where the ratios of the native whites exceed those of the orientals. There is nothing to indicate, then, that the Japanese and the Chinese are inherently any more prolific than other races. That they are now more fertile than the natives or even most European immigrants is readily explained by the habits of family life they bring with them and the environments in which they live in this country.

¹¹ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. II, Population, p. 166.