
STATISTICAL ATLAS

DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

POPULATION.

AREA OF ENUMERATION: 1910.

The area of enumeration in 1910 embraced the states and territories and the outlying possessions of Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. The gross area in square miles of the territory enumerated April 15, 1910, with the population as returned, is shown in Table 1. The area in square miles was 3,627,557 and the population returned, 93,402,151.

The increase in population from 3,929,214 at the census of 1790 to 93,402,151 at the census of 1910 was 89,472,937, or about 24 persons in 1910 to each person returned at the First Census. During the same period the area was extended from 892,135 square miles to 3,627,557 square miles. The area, therefore, increased only four times, as compared with a population increase of nearly twenty-four fold.

TERRITORY ENUMERATED: 1910.	Gross area (land and water) in square miles.	Population.
United States (with outlying possessions).....	3,627,557	93,402,151
United States, exclusive of outlying possessions.....	3,026,789	91,972,206
Outlying possessions.....	600,768	1,429,885
Alaska.....	590,884	64,356
Hawaii.....	6,449	101,009
Porto Rico.....	3,435	1,118,012
Military and naval service abroad.....	55,608

In Table 2 is given the gross area in square miles of the United States, including all its outlying possessions, at each enumeration from 1790 to 1910, together with the population; the area—land, water, and total—and the population of the United States, excluding the outlying possessions; and the gross area of the outlying possessions.

CENSUS YEAR.	UNITED STATES AND ITS OUTLYING POSSESSIONS.						
	Aggregate population.	Gross area (land and water) in square miles.	United States (excluding outlying possessions).				Gross area of outlying possessions in square miles.
			Population.	Area in square miles.			
				Gross area (land and water).	Land.	Water.	
1910.....	101,115,487	3,743,306	91,972,206	3,026,789	2,973,800	52,890	716,517
1900.....	77,256,630	3,742,870	75,904,575	3,026,789	2,974,159	52,630	716,081
1890.....	62,979,766	3,617,673	62,947,714	3,026,789	2,973,965	52,824	500,884
1880.....	50,180,209	3,617,673	50,155,783	3,026,789	2,973,965	52,824	500,884
1870.....	38,558,371	3,617,673	38,558,371	3,026,789	2,973,965	52,824	500,884
1860.....	31,443,321	3,026,789	31,443,321	3,026,789	2,973,965	52,824
1850.....	23,101,876	2,097,119	23,101,876	2,097,119	2,044,337	52,782
1840.....	17,069,453	1,792,223	17,069,453	1,792,223	1,753,588	38,635
1830.....	12,806,020	1,792,223	12,806,020	1,792,223	1,753,588	38,635
1820.....	9,638,453	1,792,223	9,638,453	1,792,223	1,753,588	38,635
1810.....	7,230,881	1,720,122	7,230,881	1,720,122	1,685,865	34,257
1800.....	5,308,483	892,135	5,308,483	892,135	867,080	24,155
1790.....	3,929,214	892,135	3,929,214	892,135	867,080	24,155

The gross area, land and water, of the United States at the Thirteenth Census was 3,743,306 square miles. The outlying territories had an area of 716,517 square miles, approximately one-fifth of the total area. In 1790, at the First Census, the area was 892,135 square miles, less than one-fourth of the present area, and was confined to the territory lying between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River, with the exception of the territory known as Florida. The

largest accession of territory at any decade was that of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. During the decade from 1840 to 1850 there were three accessions of territory, aggregating 1,204,896 square miles, which, with the area of the Louisiana Purchase, covered an area of over 2,000,000 square miles. The annexations made in other years, with the exception of Alaska, were smaller in area, but more densely populated.

Table 3 gives the gross area with the date of annexation of each accession of territory from 1790 to 1910. Colored Plate No. 1 shows the boundaries of the original 13 states and each of the accessions of territory.

ACCESSION.	Date acquired.	GROSS AREA (LAND AND WATER) IN SQUARE MILES.	
		Area of accession.	Total area.
Aggregate, 1910—United States and outlying possessions			3,743,306
United States.....			3,020,789
Outlying possessions.....			710,517
Territory in 1790 ¹			892,135
Louisiana Purchase.....	1803	827,987	1,720,122
Florida.....	1819	58,060	1,778,788
By treaty with Spain.....	1819	13,435	1,792,223
Texas.....	1845	389,166	2,181,389
Oregon.....	1846	286,541	2,467,930
Mexican Cession.....	1848	529,189	2,997,119
Gadsden Purchase.....	1853	29,670	3,026,789
Alaska.....	1867	590,884	3,617,673
Hawaii.....	1898	6,449	3,624,122
Philippine Islands.....	1899	115,026	3,739,148
Porto Rico.....	1899	3,435	3,742,583
Guam.....	1899	210	3,742,793
Samoa.....	1900	77	3,742,870
Panama Canal Zone.....	1904	436	3,743,306

¹ Includes the drainage basin of the Red River of the North, not a part of any accession, but in the past sometimes considered a part of the Louisiana Purchase.

Table 4 shows at each census the population, accumulative increase, per cent of increase from 1790, land area, and number of persons per square mile for the United States, exclusive of its outlying possessions.

The increase in population in 1840, after 50 years of growth, was 334.4 per cent, having increased a little over four times. The increase for 100 years, to 1890, was 1,502 per cent, or there were then in the United States 16 persons where in 1790 there was one person. The increase for 120 years, to 1910, was 2,240.7 per cent; in other words, there were 23 persons in continental United States to each person returned in 1790. The land area has increased almost three and one-half times, while the population per square mile has increased nearly seven times, the increase in density from 1900 to 1910 being greater than during any previous decade. The increase and decrease in density of population is represented by Diagram 1, Plate No. 135.

CENSUS YEAR.	Population of continental United States.	Accumulative increase.	Per cent of increase from 1790.	Land area in square miles.	Population per square mile.
1910.....	91,972,260	88,043,052	2,240.7	2,973,890	30.9
1900.....	75,994,575	72,095,361	1,834.1	2,974,159	25.6
1890.....	62,947,714	59,018,500	1,502.0	2,973,965	21.2
1880.....	50,155,783	46,226,599	1,176.5	2,973,965	16.9
1870.....	38,558,371	34,629,157	881.3	2,973,965	13.0
1860.....	31,443,321	27,514,107	700.2	2,973,965	10.6
1850.....	23,191,876	19,262,662	490.2	2,944,337	7.9
1840.....	17,069,453	13,140,239	334.4	1,753,588	9.7
1830.....	12,806,020	8,036,806	227.4	1,753,588	7.3
1820.....	9,638,453	5,769,239	145.3	1,753,588	5.5
1810.....	7,239,881	3,310,667	84.3	1,685,865	4.3
1800.....	5,308,483	1,379,269	35.1	867,980	6.1
1790.....	3,920,214			807,980	4.5

The increase in the land area of each of the states and of the entire United States is given in Table 5.

POPULATION.

LAND AREA OF THE UNITED STATES IN SQUARE MILES, BY STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1790 TO 1910.

STATE AND TERRITORY.	1910	1900	1890	1880	1870	1860	1850	1840	1830	1820	1810	1800	1790
United States.....	2,973,880	2,974,159	2,973,905	2,973,905	2,973,965	2,973,965	2,944,337	1,753,588	1,753,588	1,753,588	1,685,865	807,980	7807,980
Alabama.....	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279	51,279			
Arizona.....	113,810	113,840	113,840	113,840	113,840								
Arkansas.....	52,525	52,525	52,525	52,525	52,525	52,525	52,525	52,525	52,525	105,275			
California.....	155,052	155,092	155,900	155,900	155,900	155,900	155,900						
Colorado.....	103,658	103,658	103,658	103,658	103,658	103,658							
Connecticut.....	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820	4,820
Delaware.....	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965	1,965
District of Columbia.....	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Florida.....	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861	54,861
Georgia.....	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725	58,725
Idaho.....	83,354	83,354	83,354	83,354	83,354								
Illinois.....	56,043	56,002	56,002	56,002	56,002	56,002	56,002	56,002	56,002	56,002	192,381		
Indiana.....	36,045	35,885	35,885	35,885	35,885	35,885	35,885	35,885	35,885	35,885	42,933	252,084	
Iowa.....	55,586	55,586	55,586	55,586	55,586	55,586	55,586	101,050					
Kansas.....	81,774	81,774	81,774	81,774	81,774	81,774							
Kentucky.....	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181	40,181
Louisiana.....	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409	45,409
Maine.....	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895	20,895
Maryland.....	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941	9,941
Massachusetts.....	8,039	8,039	8,039	8,039	8,039	8,039	8,041	8,041	8,041	8,041	8,041	8,041	8,041
Michigan.....	57,480	57,480	57,480	57,480	57,480	57,480	57,480	57,480	180,052	180,052	42,025		
Minnesota.....	80,858	80,858	80,858	80,858	80,858	80,858	103,477						
Mississippi.....	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	46,302	107,611	33,310	
Missouri.....	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727	68,727			
Montana.....	146,201	146,201	146,201	146,201	146,201								
Nebraska.....	76,808	76,808	76,808	76,172	76,172	118,915							
Nevada.....	109,821	109,821	109,821	109,821	109,821	61,209							
New Hampshire.....	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031	9,031
New Jersey.....	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514	7,514
New Mexico.....	122,503	122,503	122,503	122,503	122,503	217,782	230,548						
New York.....	47,654	47,654	47,654	47,654	47,654	47,654	47,652	47,652	47,652	47,652	47,652	47,652	47,652
North Carolina.....	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740	48,740
North Dakota.....	70,183	70,183	70,183	(¹⁹)									
Ohio.....	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740	40,740
Oklahoma.....	69,414	38,624	38,624										
Oregon.....	95,607	95,607	95,607	95,607	95,607	95,607	282,257						
Pennsylvania.....	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832	44,832
Rhode Island.....	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067
South Carolina.....	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495	30,495
South Dakota.....	76,868	76,868	76,868	(¹⁹)	(¹⁹)	(¹⁹)							
Tennessee.....	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687	41,687
Texas.....	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398	262,398
Utah.....	82,184	82,184	82,184	82,184	82,184	122,887	230,610						
Vermont.....	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124	9,124
Virginia.....	40,262	40,262	40,262	40,262	40,262	64,284	64,284	64,252	64,252	64,252	64,252	64,252	64,252
Washington.....	66,836	66,836	66,836	66,836	66,836	183,254							
West Virginia.....	24,022	24,022	24,022	24,022	24,022								
Wisconsin.....	55,256	55,256	55,256	55,256	55,256	55,256	55,256	82,643					
Wyoming.....	97,594	97,594	97,594	97,594	97,594								
Territory northwest of Ohio River.....												25,855	318,107
Territory south of Tennessee.....												5,290	
Missouri territory.....									608,565	674,183	777,910		
Indian Territory and unorganized territory.....		30,700	30,700	69,414	69,414	69,414	535,063	511,967	52,750				
Dakota territory.....				147,687	147,693	312,694							

¹ Not reduction of 200 square miles due to the drainage of lakes and swamps in Illinois and Indiana (201 square miles of land), and the building of the Roosevelt and Laguna Reservoirs (30 square miles of water surface), and the overflow of the Colorado River into the Salton Sea in California (440 square miles of water surface).
² Increase of 194 square miles due to the reclamation of 2 square miles of Potomac River Flats in the District of Columbia and 192 square miles of Lake Tulare in California.
³ Includes Gadsden Purchase (29,628 square miles) in 1853.
⁴ Includes Texas annexation (385,590 square miles) in 1845; Oregon territory (282,257 square miles) in 1846; and Mexican Cession (522,902 square miles) in 1848.
⁵ Includes Florida Purchase (54,861 square miles) and territory gained by treaty with Spain (12,802 square miles) in 1819.
⁶ Includes Louisiana Purchase (817,885 square miles) of 1803.
⁷ Includes the drainage basin of the Red River of the North.
⁸ Decrease of 25 square miles due to the building of the Roosevelt Reservoir and 5 square miles due to the building of the Laguna Reservoir.
⁹ Decrease of 440 square miles due to the overflow of the Colorado River into the Salton Sea.
¹⁰ Increase of 192 square miles due to the reclamation of part of Lake Tulare, Cal.
¹¹ Area given is that in 1861.

¹² Increase of 2 square miles due to reclamation of Potomac River Flats in the District of Columbia.
¹³ Increase of 41 square miles due to drainage of lakes and swamps.
¹⁴ Increase of 100 square miles due to drainage of lakes and swamps.
¹⁵ Then part of Virginia; area given is that in 1792, when it was admitted as a state.
¹⁶ Then named Orleans territory; includes 4,611 square miles of disputed territory attached to the state of Louisiana in 1812, and excludes 1,134 square miles gained by treaty with Spain in 1819.
¹⁷ Then under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts; admitted as a state in 1820.
¹⁸ Includes 5,880 square miles of disputed territory attached to Mississippi territory in 1812.
¹⁹ Then part of Dakota territory.
²⁰ Then part of "territory northwest of the Ohio River;" area given is that in 1802, when it was admitted as a state.
²¹ Includes 314 square miles ceded to the United States by the state of New York in 1781 and sold to the state of Pennsylvania in 1792.
²² Then known as "territory southwest of the Ohio River;" includes 5,290 square miles of territory ceded to the United States by the state of South Carolina in 1787.
²³ Then named territory of Louisiana.

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS.

In making comparisons of the growth in population, manufactures, and agriculture for groups of states, it has been found of great advantage to divide the United States into certain groups termed geographic divisions. The grouping of the country by geographic divisions is a natural one, and by the aid of it certain characteristic features in the development of groups of states are brought out. At the Thirteenth Census the United States was divided into nine groups or divisions termed geographic divisions. The boundaries of these divisions are shown on Plate No. 2. The divisions and states comprised in each division are as follows:

NEW ENGLAND DIVISION.

Maine.	Vermont.	Rhode Island.
New Hampshire.	Massachusetts.	Connecticut.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC DIVISION.

New York.	New Jersey.	Pennsylvania.
-----------	-------------	---------------

EAST NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.

Ohio.	Illinois.	Wisconsin.
Indiana.	Michigan.	

WEST NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.

Minnesota.	Missouri.	Nebraska.
Iowa.	North Dakota.	Kansas.
	South Dakota.	

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION.

Delaware.	Virginia.	South Carolina.
Maryland.	West Virginia.	Georgia.
District of Columbia.	North Carolina.	Florida.

EAST SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.

Kentucky.	Tennessee.	Mississippi.
	Alabama.	

WEST SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.

Arkansas.	Louisiana.	Texas.
	Oklahoma.	

MOUNTAIN DIVISION.

Montana.	Colorado.	Utah.
Idaho.	New Mexico.	Nevada.
Wyoming.	Arizona.	

PACIFIC DIVISION.

Washington.	Oregon.	California.
-------------	---------	-------------

In the New England and Middle Atlantic divisions the predominant industry is manufactures, consequently there is a tremendous growth of the urban population, and more than half of the population in these two divisions is in cities. The predominant industry in the South Atlantic and East South Central divisions is agriculture, while in the East North Central division the development of manufactures has increased the urban element, and agriculture is not the principal industry. In the West North Central and West South Central divisions agriculture is the prin-

cipal industry. In the Mountain division mining probably is nearly as important as agriculture, while in the Pacific division, in spite of the large urban element in some of the states, agriculture is the predominant industry. A closer study of the industries in these divisions would show a greater diversity in the forms of agriculture followed, and in the Northern states an especially large increase in the dairy farming and a decrease in the area allotted to cereals.

GROWTH OF POPULATION.

Colored Plates Nos. 3 to 15 present graphically the growth of the population of the United States since 1790. These maps may properly be termed the density of the rural population, as the population per square mile, upon which these maps, except Plate No. 15, are based, was computed by dividing the population of each county, exclusive of municipalities of 8,000 or more population, by its land area in square miles. New England towns having over 8,000 population were not excluded. The density map for 1910 was prepared on a slightly different basis. The density was obtained as follows: The population of municipalities having 2,500 or more inhabitants was deducted from the total population of the county, and in the New England states the towns with 2,500 or more population were also excluded from the population of the county, the remaining population, considered as rural, being then divided by the land area in square miles. All of the maps were then shaded by groups, as follows: Less than 2 persons to the square mile is regarded as unsettled area and left uncolored; the area with 2 to 6 persons to the square mile has the first, or lightest, shade; the area with 6 to 18 persons to the square mile, the second shade; 18 to 45 persons per square mile, the third shade; 45 to 90 persons to the square mile, the fourth shade; and 90 persons or more per square mile, the fifth, or darkest shade, thus dividing the country into six groups of density. The cities with 8,000 or more inhabitants are represented by circles of solid color in size approximately proportionate to their population. The groups of density are closely related to the industrial character of the country. The lowest group, less than 2 persons to the square mile, which for census purposes is regarded as unsettled territory, is inhabited principally by hunters, prospectors, and stock raisers. The next group, 2 to 6 persons to the square mile, includes stock raisers, also an area of sparse agricultural population where irrigation is relied upon for raising crops. Agriculture is the principal occupation of the group 6 to 18 persons to the square mile. The next group, 18 to 45 persons to the square mile, includes areas which have been given up to manufactures and commerce, although agriculture is still the principal occupation. The farms, however, are smaller than in the preceding group and the cultivation of the soil is more thorough. In the two groups in which the

population exceeds 45 persons to the square mile, manufacturing and commerce are of the greatest importance and the greater proportion of the people are in cities and towns.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1790.

The First Census of the United States, taken as of the first Monday in August, 1790, under the provisions of the second section of the first article of the Constitution, showed the population of the thirteen states then existing and of the unorganized territory to be, in the aggregate, 3,929,214. This population was distributed, as shown on Plate No. 3, almost entirely along the Atlantic seaboard, extending from the eastern boundary of Maine nearly to Florida, and in the region known as the Atlantic Plain. Only a very small proportion of the inhabitants of the United States, not indeed more than 5 per cent, was found west of the Appalachian Mountains. The average depth of settlement, in a direction at right angles to the coast, was 255 miles. The most populous areas were to be found in eastern Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and about New York city. The population had also extended north up the Hudson, so that the Hudson River Valley, as far north as Albany, had become quite thickly settled. The settlements in Pennsylvania, which started from Philadelphia, extended northeast and formed a solid body of occupation from New York, through Philadelphia, down to the upper part of Delaware.

The Atlantic coast, as far back as the limits of tide-water, was well settled at this time from Casco Bay south to the northern border of North Carolina, also around Charleston, S. C. In the "district of Maine" sparse settlement extended along the entire seaboard. The greater part of New Hampshire and Vermont was covered with settlements. In New York, branching off from the Hudson at the mouth of the Mohawk, the line of population followed a broad gap between the Adirondacks and the Catskills and even reached beyond the center of the state, occupying the whole of the Mohawk Valley and the country about the interior New York lakes. In Pennsylvania population had spread northwest, occupying not only the Atlantic Plain, but, with sparse settlements, the region traversed by the numerous parallel ridges of the eastern portion of the Appalachians. The general limit of settlement was at that time the southeastern edge of the Allegheny Plateau, but beyond this, at the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, a point early occupied for military purposes, considerable settlements existed which were established prior to the War of the Revolution. In Virginia settlements extended west beyond the Blue Ridge and on the western slope of the Allegheny Mountains, though very sparse. From Virginia, also, a narrow tongue of settlement, which was almost as populous as Vermont or Georgia, penetrated into the

"Kentucky country," and down to the head of the Tennessee River in the great Appalachian Valley, where the "state of Franklin" had been for four years a political unit. In North Carolina settlements were abruptly limited by the base of the Appalachians. The state was occupied with remarkable uniformity, except in its southern and central portions, where population was comparatively sparse. In South Carolina, on the other hand, there was evidence of much natural selection, apparently with reference to the character of the soil. Charleston was then a city of considerable magnitude and about it was grouped a comparatively dense population; but all along a belt running southwest across the state, near its central part, settlement was very sparse. This area of scattered settlement joined that of central North Carolina and ran east to the coast, near the junction of the two states. Farther west, in the "up country" of South Carolina, the density of settlement was noticeable, due to the improvement in soil. At that date settlements were almost entirely agricultural and the causes for variation in their density were general. The movements of population at that epoch may be traced, in almost every case, to the character of the soil and to the facility of transportation to the seaboard; and, as the inhabitants were dependent mainly upon water transportation, the settlements also conformed very largely to navigable streams.

Outside the area of continuous settlement, which has been approximately sketched, were found a number of smaller settlements of greater or less extent. The principal one was located in the northern part of what was known as the "territory south of the River Ohio," and comprised an area of 10,900 square miles; another in western Virginia, upon the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers, comprised about 750 square miles; a third, in the southern part of the "territory south of the River Ohio," upon the Cumberland River, embraced about 1,200 square miles.

In addition to these there were a score or more of small posts, or incipient settlements, scattered over what was an almost untrodden wilderness—such as Detroit, Vincennes, Kaskaskia, Prairie du Chien, Mackinac, and Green Bay, besides the humble beginning of Elmira and Binghamton, in New York—which, even at that time, were outside the body of continuous settlement and embraced about 1,000 square miles.

The line which limited this body of settlement, following all its undulations, was 3,200 miles in length. In this measurement no account was made of slight irregularities, such as those in the ordinary meanderings of a river which forms the boundary line of population, but an account has been made of all the prominent irregularities of this frontier line, which seem to indicate a distinct change in the settlement of the country, either of progression or of retrogression. Thus the area of settlement formed that territory em-

braced between the frontier line and the coast, diminished by such unsettled areas as lay within it and increased by such settled areas as lay without it. These are not susceptible of very accurate determination, owing to the fact that the best maps are, to a certain extent, incorrect in boundaries and areas. The settled area of 1790, as indicated by the line traced, was 226,085 square miles. The entire body of continuously settled area lay between 31° and 45° north latitude and 67° and 83° west longitude. Beyond this were the smaller areas previously mentioned, which, added to the main body of settled area, gave as a total 239,935 square miles, the aggregate population being 3,929,214, and the average density of settlement 16.4 persons to the square mile.

The "district of Maine" belonged to Massachusetts; Georgia extended to the Mississippi River; Kentucky and Tennessee were known as the "territory south of the River Ohio;" and Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and a part of Minnesota, as the "territory northwest of the River Ohio." Spain claimed possession of Florida, with a strip along the southern border of Georgia, and all of the region west of the Mississippi River.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1800.

At the Second Census, that of 1800, the frontier line, as it appears on Plate No. 4, had advanced so that, while it embraced 282,208 square miles, it described a course, when measured in the same manner as that of 1790, of only 2,800 linear miles. The advancement of this line had taken place in every direction, though in some parts of the country much more prominently than in others.

In Maine and New Hampshire only a slight northern movement of settlement was apparent; in Vermont, on the other hand, while the settled area had not decidedly increased, its density had become greater. Massachusetts showed but little change, but in Connecticut the settlements along the lower course of the Connecticut River had appreciably increased.

In New York settlement had poured up the Hudson to the mouth of the Mohawk and thence westward through the great natural roadway. The narrow tongue, which before extended beyond the middle of the state, had now widened until it spread from the southern border of the state to Lake Ontario. A narrow belt of settlement stretched down the St. Lawrence and along all the northern border of the state to Lake Champlain, completely surrounding what may be characteristically defined as the Adirondack region.

In Pennsylvania settlements had extended up the Susquehanna and joined the New York groups, leaving an unsettled space in the northeast corner of the state, which comprised a section of rugged mountain country. With the exception of a little strip along the western border of Pennsylvania, the northern part of the state

west of the Susquehanna was as yet entirely uninhabited. Population had streamed across the southern half of the state and settled in a dense body about the forks of the Ohio River, where the beginning of Pittsburgh may be noted, and thence extended slightly into the "territory northwest of the River Ohio."

In Virginia there was but little change, although there was a general extension of settlement, with an increase in density, especially along the coast. North Carolina was at that time almost entirely populated; the mountain region had, generally speaking, been nearly all reclaimed to the service of man. In South Carolina there was a general increase in density, while the southwestern border of the settled area had been extended to the Altamaha River. The settlements in northern Kentucky had spread southward across the state into Tennessee, forming a junction with the little settlement on the Cumberland River, noted at the date of the First Census. The group thus formed had extended down the Ohio, nearly to its junction with the Tennessee and the Cumberland, and across the Ohio River, where the beginning of Cincinnati can be noted. Other small settlements appeared at this time on that side of the river. On the east side of the Mississippi River was a strip of settlement along the bluffs below the Yazoo bottom. Above this, on the west side, was the beginning of St. Louis, not at that time within the United States, and directly across the river a settlement in what was known as "Indiana territory," while all the pioneer settlements previously noted had grown to a greater or less extent.

From the region embraced between the frontier line and the Atlantic must be deducted the Adirondack tract in northern New York and the unsettled region in northern Pennsylvania already referred to, so that the actual area of settlement, bounded by a continuous line, was 271,908 square miles. All this lay between 30° 45' and 45° 15' north latitude and 67° and 88° west longitude. To this should be added the aggregate extent of all settlements lying outside of the frontier line, which collectively amounted to 33,800 square miles, making a total area of settlement of 305,708 square miles. As the aggregate population was 5,308,483, the average density of settlement was 17.4 persons to the square mile.

The early settlements of this period had been much retarded at many points by the opposition of Indian tribes, but in the neighborhood of the more densely settled portions of the northern part of the country these obstacles had been of less magnitude than farther south. In Georgia, especially, the large and powerful tribes of Creeks and Cherokees had stubbornly opposed the progress of population.

During the decade Vermont, formed from the New Hampshire grants, territory claimed by both New York and New Hampshire, had been admitted to the Union; also Kentucky and Tennessee, formed from the "territory south of the River Ohio;" Mississippi territory

had been organized, having, however, very different boundaries from what was known later as the state of that name; while the "territory northwest of the River Ohio" had been divided and Indiana territory organized from the western portion. The District of Columbia, comprising 100 square miles, was formed in 1791 from portions of Maryland and Virginia.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1810.

During the decade from 1800 to 1810 (Plate No. 5) great changes will be noted, especially the extension of sparse settlements in the interior. The hills of western New York had become almost entirely populated, settlements had spread along the south shore of Lake Erie well over into Ohio, and effected a junction with the previously existing body of population about the forks of the Ohio River, leaving unsettled an included heart-shaped area in northern Pennsylvania, which comprised the rugged country of the Appalachian Plateau. The occupation of the Ohio River Valley had now become complete, from its head to its mouth, with the exception of small gaps below the mouth of the Tennessee. Spreading in every direction from the "dark and bloody ground" of Kentucky, settlement covered almost the entire state, while its southern border line had been extended to the Tennessee River, into what was known as "Mississippi territory." In Georgia settlements were still held back by the Creek and Cherokee Indians, although in 1802 a treaty with the former tribe relieved the southwestern portion of the state of their presence and left the ground open for occupancy by the whites. In Ohio, starting from the Ohio River and from southwestern Pennsylvania, settlements had worked north and west until they covered two-thirds of the area of the state. Michigan and Indiana were still virgin territory, with the exception of a small strip about Detroit, in the former, and two small areas in the latter, one in the southeastern part of the territory extending along the Ohio River, and one in the southwestern part extending up the Wabash from its mouth to and including the settlement at Vincennes. St. Louis, from a fur-trading post, had become an important center of settlement, population having spread north above the mouth of the Missouri and south along the Mississippi to the mouth of the Ohio. On the Arkansas, near its mouth, was a similar body of settlement. The transfer of the territory of Louisiana to our jurisdiction, which was effected in 1803, had brought into the country a large body of population, which stretched along the Mississippi River from its mouth nearly to the northern limit of what was known as the "territory of Orleans" and up the Red and Ouachita (Washita) Rivers, in general occupying the alluvial regions. The incipient settlements, noted on Plate No. 4, in Mississippi territory effected a junction with those of Louisiana territory, while in the lower part of Mississippi territory a similar patch appeared upon the Mobile River.

During this decade large additions were made to the territory of the United States and many changes effected in the lines of the interior division. The purchase of Louisiana, an empire in itself, had added 827,987 square miles to the United States and had given to the people absolute control of the Mississippi and its navigable branches. Georgia, during the same period, had ceded to the United States about two-thirds of its territory. The state of Ohio had been formed from a portion of what had been known as the "territory northwest of the River Ohio." Michigan territory had been erected, comprising at that time the peninsula north of Ohio and the upper part of Indiana territory south of the straits. Indiana territory had become restricted in its limits to the following boundaries: Lake Michigan and Michigan on the north, Ohio on the east, the Ohio River on the south, and Illinois territory on the west, with a detached area between Lake Superior and Lake Michigan. Illinois territory comprised all territory west of Lake Michigan and Indiana territory, north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. The "territory of Orleans," which was located west of the Mississippi, had been carved out of the Louisiana Purchase. The remainder of the territory acquired from France was known by the name of "Louisiana territory."

At this date the frontier line was 2,900 miles long, and the settled territory included between this imaginary line and the Atlantic comprised 408,895 square miles. From this must be deducted several large areas of unsettled land: First, the area in northern New York, somewhat smaller than ten years before, but by no means inconsiderable in extent; second, the heart-shaped area in northwestern Pennsylvania, embracing part of the Allegheny Plateau, in size about equal to the unsettled area in New York; third, a strip along the western part of Virginia, extending south from the Potomac, taking in a part of eastern Kentucky and southwestern Virginia, and extending nearly to the border line of Tennessee; fourth, a comparatively small area in northern Tennessee upon the Cumberland Plateau. These tracts together comprised about 26,050 square miles, making the approximate area of settlement included within the frontier line 382,845 square miles. All this lay between latitude 29° 30' and 45° 15' north and longitude 67° and 88° 30' west.

Beyond the frontier there were, in addition to the steadily increasing number of outposts and minor settlements, several considerable bodies of population, which have already been noted. The aggregate extent of these, and of the numerous small patches of population scattered over the West and South, may be estimated at 25,100 square miles, making the total area of settlement in 1810, 407,945 square miles. The aggregate population was 7,239,881, and the average density of settlement 17.7 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1820.

The decade from 1810 to 1820 (Plate No. 6) witnessed several territorial changes. Florida at this date (1820) had not actually become a part of the United States; the treaty with Spain to transfer this territory to the United States had been signed, but had not gone into effect. Alabama and Mississippi, made from Mississippi territory, had been organized and admitted as states, Alabama having been made a territory in 1817. Indiana and Illinois appeared as states, with restricted limits. The "territory of Orleans," with somewhat enlarged boundaries, had been admitted as a state and was known as Louisiana. The "district of Maine" had also been erected into a state. Arkansas territory had been cut from the southern portion of the territory of Louisiana. The Indian Territory had been constituted to serve as a reservation for the Indian tribes. Michigan territory included all area east of the Mississippi River and north of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. That part of the old Louisiana territory remaining, after cutting out Arkansas and the Indian Territory, had received the name of "Missouri territory."

Again, in 1820, there was a great change in regard to the frontier line. It had become vastly more involved, extending from southeastern Michigan, on Lake St. Clair, southwest into Missouri territory; thence, making a great semicircle to the east, it swept west again around a body of population in Louisiana, and ended along the Gulf coast in that state. The area east of this line had increased immensely, but much of this increase was balanced by the great extent of unsettled land included within it.

Taking up the changes in detail, the great increase in the population of central New York will be noted, a belt of increased settlement having swept up the Mohawk Valley to Lake Ontario, and along its shore nearly to the Niagara River. A similar increase was experienced about the forks of the Ohio River, and in northern Pennsylvania the unsettled region on the Appalachian Plateau had sensibly decreased in size. The unsettled area in western Virginia and eastern Kentucky had very greatly diminished, population having extended almost entirely over the Allegheny region in these states. The little settlements about Detroit had extended along the shore of Lake Erie, until they had joined those in Ohio. The frontier line in Ohio had crept north and west, leaving only the northwestern corner of the state unoccupied. Population had spread north from Kentucky and west from Ohio into southern Indiana, covering sparsely the lower third of that state. The groups of population around St. Louis, which at the time of the previous census were enjoying a rapid growth, had extended widely, making a junction with the settlements of Kentucky and Tennessee, along a broad belt in southern Illinois; following the main watercourses, population had gone many scores of miles up the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers. The settle-

ments in Alabama, which previously had been very much retarded by the Creeks, had been rapidly reinforced and extended, in consequence of the victory of General Jackson over this tribe and the subsequent cession of portions of this territory. Immigration to Alabama had already become considerable, indicating that in a short time the whole central portion of the state, embracing a large part of the region drained by the Mobile River and its branches, would be covered with settlements, to extend north and effect a junction with the Tennessee and Kentucky settlements, and west across the lower part of Mississippi, until they met the Louisiana settlements. In Georgia the Cherokees and the Creeks still held back settlement along the line of the Altamaha River. There were, however, scattered bodies of population in various parts of the state, though of small extent. In Louisiana is noted a gradual increase of the extent of redeemed territory, which appeared to have been limited almost exactly by the borders of the alluvial region. In Arkansas the settlements, which in 1810 were near the mouth of the Arkansas River, had extended up the bottom lands of that river, forming a body of population of considerable size. Besides these, a settlement was found in the south central part of the territory, at the southeastern base of the hill region, and another in the prairie region in the northern part.

The frontier line had a length of 4,100 miles, embracing an area (after excluding all unsettled regions included between it, the Atlantic, and the Gulf) of 504,517 square miles, all lying between 29° 30' and 45° 30' north latitude, and between 67° and 93° 45' west longitude. Outside the frontier line were a few settlements on the Arkansas, White, and Ouachita (Washita) Rivers, in Arkansas, as before noted, as well as those in the Northwest. Computing these at 4,200 square miles in the aggregate, there was a total settled area of 508,717 square miles, the aggregate population being 9,638,453, and the average density of settlement 18.9 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1830.

In the early part of the decade from 1820 to 1830 (Plate No. 7) the final transfer of Florida from Spanish jurisdiction was effected and it became a territory of the United States. Missouri, carved from the southeastern part of the old Missouri territory, had been admitted as a state; otherwise the states and territories had remained nearly as before. Settlement during the decade had spread greatly. The westerly extension of the frontier did not appear to be so great as in some former periods, the energies of the people having been mainly given to settling the included areas. In other words, the decade from 1810 to 1820 seems to have been one of blocking out work which the succeeding decade was largely occupied in completing.

During this period the Indians, especially in the South, had still delayed settlement to a great extent.

The Creeks and Cherokees in Georgia and Alabama, and the Choctaws and Chickasaws in Mississippi, occupied large areas of the best portions of those states and successfully resisted encroachment upon their territory. Georgia, however, had witnessed a large increase in settlement during the decade. The settlements which heretofore had extended along the Altamaha had spread westward across the central portion of the state to its western boundary, where they reached the barrier of the Creek territory. Stopped at this point, they had moved south into the southwest corner and over into Florida, extending even to the Gulf coast. They stretched toward the west across the southern part of Alabama and joined that body of settlement which had previously formed in the drainage basin of the Mobile River. The Louisiana settlements had but slightly increased and no great change appeared to take place in Mississippi, owing largely to the cause previously noted, namely, the occupancy of this area by Indians. In Arkansas the spread of settlement had been in a strange and fragmentary way. A line reached from Louisiana to the Arkansas River and along its course to the boundary of the Indian Territory. It extended up the Mississippi and joined the body of population in Tennessee. A branch extended northeast from near Little Rock to the northern portion of the territory. All the settlements within Arkansas territory were as yet very sparse. In Missouri the principal extension of settlement had been in a broad belt along the Missouri River, reaching to the state line, at the mouth of the Kansas River, where quite a dense body of population appeared. Settlement had progressed in Illinois, from the Mississippi River east and north, covering more than half of the state. In Indiana it followed the Wabash River, thence spread toward the northern state line. But a small portion of Ohio remained unsettled. The sparse settlements about Detroit, in Michigan territory, had broadened out, extending toward the interior of the lower peninsula, while isolated patches appeared in various other localities.

Turning to the more densely settled parts of the country, it will be noted that settlement was slowly making its way northward in Maine, although discouraged by the poverty of the soil and the severity of the climate. The unsettled tract in northern New York was decreasing, but very slowly, as was also the case with the unsettled area in northwestern Pennsylvania. In western Virginia the unsettled tracts were reduced to almost nothing, while the unsettled region in eastern Tennessee on the Cumberland Plateau was rapidly diminishing.

In 1830 the frontier line had a length of 5,300 miles, and the aggregate area embraced between the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the frontier line was 725,406 square miles. Of this, however, not less than 97,389 square miles were within the included unsettled

tracts, leaving only 628,017 square miles as the settled area east of the frontier line, all of which lay between latitude 29° 15' and 46° 15' north and longitude 67° and 95° west.

Outside the body of continuous settlement large groups were no longer found, but several small patches of population appeared in the states of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and Michigan territory, aggregating about 4,700 square miles, making a total settled area in 1830 of 632,717 square miles. As the aggregate population was 12,866,020, the average density of settlement was 20.3 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1840.

During the decade ending in 1840 (Plate No. 8) the territory of Michigan had been divided; that part east of Lake Michigan and north of Ohio and Indiana, together with the greater part of the peninsula between Lakes Superior and Michigan, had been created into the state of Michigan, the remainder being known as Wisconsin territory. Iowa territory had been created out of that part of Missouri territory lying north of the Missouri state line and east of the Missouri River, and Arkansas had been admitted to the Union.

In 1840 we find, by examining Plate No. 8, that the settlements had been growing steadily and the frontier line of 1810 and 1820 advanced still farther. From Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw Indians, who, at the time of the previous census, occupied large areas in these states and formed a very serious obstacle to settlement, had been removed to Indian Territory, constituted under the act of June 30, 1834, and their country opened up to settlement. Within the two or three years which had elapsed since the removal of these Indians the lands relinquished by them had been entirely taken up and the country covered with comparatively dense settlement. The Sac and Fox and the Potawatomi tribes having been removed to Indian Territory, their country in northern Illinois had been promptly taken up and settlements had spread over nearly the whole extent of Indiana and Illinois, also across Michigan and Wisconsin as far north as the forty-third parallel. Population had crossed the Mississippi River into Iowa territory and occupied a broad belt up and down that river. In Missouri settlements spread north from the Missouri River nearly to the boundary of the state, and south until they covered most of the southern portion, connecting (on the right and on the left) with the settlements of Arkansas. The unsettled area found in southern Missouri, together with that in northwestern Arkansas, was due to the hilly and rugged nature of the country and to the poverty of the soil, as compared with the rich prairie lands surrounding. In Arkansas the settlements remained sparse, but had spread widely away from the

streams, covering much of the prairie regions of the state. There was, besides the area in northwestern Arkansas just mentioned, a large area in the northeastern part of the state, almost entirely within the alluvial regions of the Black River, and one in the southern portion, extending over into northern Louisiana, which was entirely in the fertile prairie section. The fourth unsettled region lay in the southwestern part of the state.

In the older states we note a gradual decrease in the unsettled areas, as in Maine and New York. In northern Pennsylvania the unsettled section had nearly disappeared. A small portion of the unsettled patch on the Cumberland Plateau still remained. In southern Georgia the Okefenokee swamp and the pine barrens adjacent had thus far repelled settlement, although population had increased in Florida, passing entirely around this area to the south. The greater part of Florida, however, including nearly all the peninsula and several large areas along the Gulf coast, still remained unsettled. This was due in part to the nature of the country, being alternately swamp and hummock, and in part to the hostility of the Seminole Indians, who still occupied nearly all of the peninsula.

The frontier line in 1840 had a length of 3,300 miles. This shrinking in its length was due to its rectification on the northwest and southwest, owing to the settlement of the entire interior. It inclosed an area of 900,658 square miles, lying between latitude 29° and 46° 30' north and longitude 67° and 95° 30' west. The unsettled portions had, as noted above, decreased to 95,516 square miles, although they were still quite noticeable in Missouri and Arkansas. The settled area outside the frontier line was notably small and amounted in the aggregate to only 2,150 square miles, making the approximate settled area 807,292 square miles in 1840. The aggregate population being 17,069,453, the average density was 21.1 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1850.

Between 1840 and 1850 (Plate No. 9) the limits of our country were further extended by the annexation of Texas and of territory acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The states of Florida, Iowa, and Wisconsin had been admitted to the Union and the territories of Oregon and Minnesota created. That portion of the District of Columbia south of the Potomac originally ceded by Virginia was receded to that state July 9, 1846. An examination of the map shows that the frontier line had changed very little during the decade. At the western border of Arkansas the extension of settlement was peremptorily limited by the boundary of Indian Territory; and, curiously enough, the western boundary of Missouri also put almost a complete stop to all settlement, notwithstanding the fact that some of the most densely populated portions of the state lay directly on that boundary.

In Iowa settlements had made some advance, moving up the Missouri, the Des Moines, and other rivers. The settlements in Minnesota at and about St. Paul, which existed in 1840, had greatly extended up and down the Mississippi River, while scattered bodies of population appeared in northern Wisconsin. In the southern part of the state settlement had made considerable advance, especially in a northeasterly direction toward Green Bay. In Michigan the change had been very slight.

Texas, for the first time on the map of the United States, appeared with a considerable extent of settlement; in general, however, it was very sparse, most of it lying in the eastern part of the state and being largely dependent upon the grazing industry.

The included unsettled areas now were very small and few in number. There still remained one in southern Missouri, in the hilly country; a small one in northeastern Arkansas, in the swampy and alluvial region; and one in the similar country in the Yazoo bottom lands in western Mississippi. Along the coast of Florida were found two patches of considerable size, which were confined to the swampy coast regions. The same was the case along the coast of Louisiana. The sparse settlements of Texas were also interspersed with several patches devoid of settlement. In southern Georgia the large unsettled area heretofore noted, extending also into northern Florida, had disappeared, and the Florida settlements had already reached southward to a considerable distance in the peninsula, being now free to extend without fear of hostile Seminoles, the greater part of whom had been removed to Indian Territory.

The frontier line, which now extended around a considerable part of Texas and issued on the Gulf coast at the mouth of the Nueces River, was 4,500 miles in length. The aggregate area included by it was about 1,005,213 square miles, from which deduction must be made for unsettled area, in all 64,339 square miles. The isolated settlements lying outside this body in the western part of the country amounted to 4,775 square miles.

It was no longer true that a frontier line drawn around from the St. Croix River to the Gulf of Mexico embraced all the population of the United States, except a few outlying posts and small settlements. From the Pacific a line could be made to encircle 80,000 miners and adventurers, the pioneers of more than one state of the Union soon to arise on that coast. This body of settlement had been formed, in the main, since the acquisition of the territory by the United States, and, it might even be said, within the last year (1849-50), dating from the discovery of gold in California. These settlements may be computed rudely at 33,600 square miles, making a total area of settlement of 979,249 square miles, the aggregate population being 23,191,876, and the average density of settlement 23.7 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1860.

In 1860 (Plate No. 10) the first extension of settlements beyond the line of the Missouri River is noted. The march of settlement up the slope of the Great Plains had begun. In Kansas and Nebraska population was found beyond the ninety-seventh meridian. Texas had filled up even more rapidly, its extreme settlements reaching to the one hundredth meridian, while the gaps noted at the date of the previous census had all been filled by population. The incipient settlements about St. Paul, in Minnesota, had grown like Jonah's gourd, spreading in all directions, and forming a broad band of union with the main body of settlement down the line of the Mississippi River. In Iowa settlements had crept steadily northwest along the course of the drainage until the state was nearly covered. Following the Missouri, population had reached out beyond the northern border of Nebraska territory. In Wisconsin the settlements had moved at least one degree farther north, while in the lower peninsula of Michigan they had spread up the lake shores, nearly to the point of the peninsula on the side next to Lake Michigan. On the upper peninsula the little settlements which appeared in 1850 in the copper region on Keweenaw Point had extended and increased greatly in density, as that mining interest had developed in value. In northern New York there was apparently no change in the unsettled area. In northern Maine was noted for the first time a decided movement toward the settlement of its unoccupied territory in the extension of the settlements on its eastern and northern border along the St. John River. The unsettled regions in southern Missouri, northeastern Arkansas, and northwestern Mississippi had become sparsely covered by population. Along the Gulf coast there was little or no change; in the peninsula of Florida there was a slight extension of settlement south.

Between 1850 and 1860 the territorial changes noted were as follows: The territory of New Mexico had been created, and the territory south of the Gila River, which had been acquired from Mexico by the Gadsden Purchase (1853), added to it; Minnesota admitted as a state; Kansas and Nebraska territories formed from parts of Missouri territory; California and Oregon admitted as states; while in the unsettled parts of the Cordilleran Region two new territories, Washington and Utah, had been created, the former out of part of Oregon territory and the latter from part of the Mexican Cession.

The frontier line now measured 5,300 miles and embraced approximately 1,126,518 square miles, lying between latitude 28° 30' and 47° 30' north and between longitude 67° and 99° 30' west. From this, deduction should be made on account of unsettled portions, amounting to 39,139 square miles, found mainly in New York and along the Gulf coast. The outlying settlements beyond the one-hundredth meridian were now

numerous. They included, among others, a strip extending far up the Rio Grande in Texas, embracing 7,475 square miles (a region given over to the raising of sheep); while the Pacific settlements, comprising two sovereign states, were nearly three times as extensive as in 1850, embracing 99,900 square miles. The total area of settlement in 1860 was 1,194,754 square miles, the aggregate population 31,443,321, and the average density of settlement 26.3 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1870.

During the decade from 1860 to 1870 a number of territorial changes had been effected in the extreme West. A great tract called Alaska, stretching into Arctic regions and containing few people, was purchased from Russia in 1867. Arizona, Colorado, Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming had been organized as territories. Kansas and Nebraska had been admitted as states. Nevada was made a territory in 1861 and admitted as a state in 1864. West Virginia had been cut off from the mother commonwealth and made a separate state.

In 1870 (Plate No. 11) a gradual and steady extension of the frontier line west over the Great Plains will be noted. The unsettled areas in Maine, New York, and Florida had not greatly diminished, but in Michigan the extension of the lumber interests northward and inward from the lake shore had reduced considerably the unsettled portion. On the upper peninsula settlements had increased somewhat, owing to the discovery of rich iron deposits destined to play so important a part in the manufacturing industry of the country.

Settlement had spread west to the boundary of the state in southern Minnesota, and up the Big Sioux River in southeastern Dakota. Iowa was entirely reclaimed, excepting a small area of perhaps 1,000 square miles in its northwestern corner. Through Kansas and Nebraska the frontier line had moved steadily west, following in general the courses of the larger streams and of the newly constructed railroads. The frontier in Texas had changed but little, that little consisting of a general westerly movement. In the Cordilleran Region settlements had extended but slowly. Those upon the Pacific coast showed little change, either in extent or in density. In short, everywhere the effects of the war were seen in the partial arrest of the progress of development.

Settlements in the West, beyond the frontier line, had arranged themselves mainly in three belts. The most eastern of these was located in New Mexico, central Colorado, and Wyoming, along the eastern base of and among the Rocky Mountains. To this region settlement was first attracted in 1859 and 1860 by the discovery of mineral deposits, and had been retained by the richness of the soil and by the abundance of water for irrigation, which served to promote the agricultural industry.

The second belt of settlement was that of Utah, settled in 1847 by the Mormons fleeing from Illinois. This community differed radically from that of the Rocky Mountains, being essentially agricultural, mining having been discountenanced from the first by the church authorities, as tending to fill the "Promised land" with Gentile adventurers and thereby imperil Mormon institutions. The settlements of this group, as seen on the map for 1870, extended from southern Idaho south through central Utah and along the eastern base of the Wasatch Range to the Arizona line. They consisted mainly of scattered hamlets and small towns, about which were grouped the farms of the communities.

The third strip was that in the Pacific states and territories, extending from Washington territory south to southern California and east into western Nevada. This group of population owed its existence to the mining industry; originated in 1849 by a great immigration movement, it had grown by successive impulses as new fields for rapid wealth had been developed. However, the value of this region to the agriculturist had been recognized and the character of the occupations of the people was undergoing a marked change.

These three great western groups comprised nine-tenths of the population west of the frontier line. The remainder was scattered about in the valleys and the mountains of Montana, Idaho, and Arizona, at military posts, isolated mining camps, and on cattle ranches.

The frontier line in 1870 embraced 1,178,068 square miles, between 27° 15' and 47° 30' north latitude and between 67° and 99° 45' west longitude. From this, however, deduction must be made of 37,739 square miles on account of interior portions uninhabited. What remains should be increased by 11,810 square miles, on account of settled tracts east of the one-hundredth meridian, lying outside of the frontier line, and 120,100 square miles on account of settlements in the Cordilleran Region and on the Pacific coast, making the total area of settlement for 1870 not less than 1,272,239 square miles. The aggregate population was 38,558,371, and the average density of settlement 30.3 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1880.

During the decade from 1870 to 1880 Colorado had been added to the sisterhood of states. The first noticeable point in examining Plate No. 12, showing the areas of settlement at this date, as compared with previous ones, is the great extent of territory which was brought under occupation during the decade. Not only had settlement spread west over large areas in Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Texas, thus moving the frontier line of the main body of settlement west many scores of miles, but the isolated settlements of the Cordilleran Region and of the Pacific coast showed enormous accessions of occupied territory.

The migration of farming population to the north-eastern part of Maine had widened the settled area to a marked extent, probably more than had been done during any previous decade. The unsettled portion of the Adirondack Region of northern New York had decreased in size and its limits had been reduced practically to the actual mountain tract. The most notable change, however, in the North Atlantic states, also in Ohio and Indiana, had been the increase in density of population and the migration to cities, with the consequent increase of urban population, as indicated by the number and size of the spots representing these cities upon the map. Throughout the Southern states there is to be noted not only a general increase in the density of population and a decrease of unsettled areas, but a greater approach to uniformity of settlement throughout the whole region. The unsettled area of the peninsula of Florida had decreased decidedly, while that previously seen along the upper coast of Florida and Louisiana had entirely disappeared. Although the Appalachian Mountain System was still distinctly outlined by its general lighter shade of color on the map, its density of population more nearly approached that of the country on the east and on the west. In Michigan there was a very decided increase of the settled region. Settlements had surrounded the head of the lower peninsula and left only a very small body of unsettled country in the interior. In the upper peninsula copper and iron interests and the railroads which subserve them had peopled quite a large extent of territory. In Wisconsin the unsettled area was rapidly decreasing as railroads stretched out over the vacant tracts. In Minnesota and in eastern Dakota the building of railroads and the development of the latent capabilities of this region in the cultivation of wheat caused a rapid flow of settlement, and the frontier line of population, instead of returning to Lake Michigan, as it did ten years before, met the boundary line of the British possessions west of the ninety-seventh meridian. The settlements in Kansas and Nebraska had made great strides over the plains, reaching at several points the boundary of the humid region, so that their westward extension beyond this point must be governed hereafter by the supply of water in the streams. As a natural result, settlements followed these streams in long ribbons of population. In Nebraska these narrow belts reached the western boundary of the state at two points, one upon the South Platte and the other upon the Republican River. In Kansas, too, settlements followed the Kansas River, its branches, and the Arkansas nearly to the western boundary of the state. Texas also had made great strides, both in the extension of the frontier line of settlement and in the increase in the density of population, due to the building of railroads and to the development of the cattle and sheep raising industry, and other agricultural interests. The heavy population in the prairie portions of the state is explained by

the railroads which traversed them. In Dakota, besides the agricultural region in the eastern part of the territory, may be noted the formation of a body of settlement in the Black Hills, in the southwest corner, which in 1870 was a part of the reservation of the Sioux Indians. This settlement was the result of the discovery of valuable gold deposits. In Montana the settled area had been greatly extended and, as it was mainly due to agricultural interests, was found chiefly along the courses of the streams. Mining, however, played not a small part in this increase in settlement. Idaho, too, showed a decided growth from the same causes. The small settlements which in 1870 were located about Boise and near the mouth of the Clearwater River had extended their areas to many hundreds of square miles. The settlement in the southeastern corner of the territory was almost entirely of Mormons, and had not made a marked increase.

Of all the states and territories of the Cordilleran Region, Colorado had made the greatest stride during the decade. From the narrow strip of settlement extending along the immediate base of the Rocky Mountains, the belt increased so that it comprised the whole mountain region, besides a great extension outward upon the plains. This increase was the result of the discovery of extensive and very rich mineral deposits about Leadville, producing a "stampede" second only to that of 1849 and 1850 to California. Miners spread over the whole mountain region, until every range and ridge swarmed with them. New Mexico showed but little change, although the extension of railroads in the territory and the opening up of mineral resources promised in the near future to add largely to its population. Arizona, too, although its extent of settlement had increased somewhat, was but just commencing to enjoy a period of rapid development, owing to the extension of railroads and to the suppression of hostile Indians. Utah presented a case dissimilar to any other of the territories—a case of steady growth, due almost entirely to its agricultural capabilities and to the policy of the Mormon church, which had steadily discountenanced mining and speculation in all forms, and encouraged in every way agricultural pursuits. Nevada showed a slight extension of settlement, due mainly to the gradual increase in agricultural interests. The mining industry was probably not more flourishing in this state than it was ten years before, and the population dependent upon it was, if anything, less in number. In California the attention of the people had become devoted more and more to farming, at the expense of mining and cattle raising. The population in some of the mining regions had decreased, while over the area of the great valley and in the fertile valleys of the Coast Ranges it had increased. In Oregon the increase had been mainly in the section east of the Cascade Range, a region drained by the Deschutes and the John Day Rivers, and by the smaller tributaries of the Snake, a region

which, with the corresponding section in Washington territory, was coming to the front as a wheat producing district. In most of the settled portions here spoken of, irrigation was not necessary for the cultivation of crops, consequently the possibilities of the region in the direction of agricultural development were very great. In Washington territory, which in 1870 had been scarcely touched by immigration, the valley west of the Cascade Mountains was fairly well settled throughout, while the stream of settlement had poured up the Columbia into the valleys of the Walla Walla and Snake Rivers and the great plain of the Columbia, induced thither by the facilities for cattle raising and by the great profits of wheat cultivation.

The length of the frontier line in 1880 was 3,337 miles. The area included between this line, the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf coast, and the northern boundary was 1,398,940 square miles, lying between 26° and 49° north latitude and 67° and 102° west longitude. From this must be deducted, for unsettled areas, a total of 89,400 square miles, distributed as follows:

STATE.	Square miles.
Maine.....	12,000
New York.....	2,200
Michigan.....	10,200
Wisconsin.....	10,200
Minnesota.....	34,000
Florida.....	20,800

To the remaining 1,309,540 square miles must be added the isolated areas of settlement in the Cordilleran Region and the extent of settlement on the Pacific coast, which amounted, in the aggregate, to 260,025 square miles, making a total settled area of 1,569,565 square miles. The population was 50,155,783, and the density of settlement 32 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1890.

During the decade from 1880 to 1890 a trifling change was made in the boundary between Nebraska and Dakota, which slightly increased the area of Nebraska. Dakota territory was divided and the states of North Dakota and South Dakota admitted. Montana and Washington were added to the sisterhood of states. The territory of Oklahoma was created out of the western half of Indian territory, to which was added the strip of public land lying north of the panhandle of Texas.

The most striking fact connected with the extension of settlement during this decade was the numerous additions which were made to the settled area within the Cordilleran Region, as defined on Plate No. 13. Settlements spread westward up the slope of the plains until they joined the bodies formerly isolated in Colorado, forming a continuous body of settlement from the East to the Rocky Mountains. Practically the whole of Kansas became a settled region and the

unsettled area of Nebraska was reduced in dimensions to one-third of what it was ten years before. What had been a sparsely settled region in Texas in 1880 became the most populous part of the state, while settlements had spread westward to the escarpment of the Staked Plains. The unsettled regions of North Dakota and South Dakota were reduced to about one-half their former dimensions. Settlements in Montana spread until they occupied practically one-third of the state. In New Mexico, Idaho, and Wyoming considerable extensions of area were made. In Colorado, in spite of the decline of the mining industry and the depopulation of its mining regions, settlement spread over two-thirds of the state. Oregon and Washington showed equally rapid progress and California, although its mining regions had suffered, made great inroads upon its unsettled regions, especially in the southern part. Of all the Western states and territories Nevada alone was at a standstill in this respect, its settled area remaining practically the same as in 1880. When it is remembered that the state had lost over one-third of its population during the decade, the fact that it held its own in settled area is surprising, until it is understood that the state had undergone a material change in occupations, and that the inhabitants, instead of being closely grouped and engaged in mining pursuits, had scattered along its streams and engaged in agriculture.

Settlement was spreading with some rapidity in Maine, its unsettled area having dwindled from 12,000 to about 6,000 square miles. The unsettled portion of the Adirondack Region in New York had also diminished, there remaining but 1,000 square miles. The frontier had been pushed still farther south, in Florida, and the unsettled area reduced from 20,800 to about 15,000 square miles.

Lumbering and mining interests had practically obliterated the wilderness of Michigan and reduced that of Wisconsin to less than one-half of its former area. In Minnesota the area of the wild northern forests had been reduced from 34,000 to 23,000 square miles.

Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but in 1890 the unsettled area had been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there could hardly be said to be a frontier line. Its extent and westerly movement can not, therefore, be further discussed.

In 1890 the total population returned by the general enumeration was 62,622,250, and the settled area amounted to 1,947,280 square miles, making a density of 32.2 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1900.

The Twelfth Census (Plate No. 14) marked 110 years of growth of the United States, during which period the population increased more than twenty-

one times, and the country grew from groups of settlements of less than 4,000,000 people to one of the leading nations of the world, with a population of nearly 85,000,000. In the decade from 1890 to 1900, Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah were admitted as states, and numerous additions of territory were made, comprising Hawaii, Porto Rico, Philippine Islands, Guam, and Samoa, covering an area of nearly 130,000 square miles, with over 8,000,000 inhabitants.

It is a peculiar fact that, in spite of the great increase in population of continental United States from 1890 to 1900, the unsettled area also increased, principally in the Western states. In these states, however, the population of the settled area increased sufficiently to balance the loss in the sparsely settled districts, and the density of population for the state or territory, as a whole, did not decrease, except in Nevada. The unsettled area materially increased in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, and Oregon, while in Nebraska, Montana, Texas, and Wyoming slight increases were also noted. The western portions of Kansas and Nebraska showed an increase in unsettled area, although the density of population of the state, as a whole, did not decrease, owing to the increase of population in the eastern portions of these states; this increase, however, was slight, being but 1 person to 10 square miles in Nebraska and 1 person to 2 square miles in Kansas.

In May, 1890, the territory of Oklahoma was created, and a month later the enumeration showed an area of settlement of 2,890 square miles, which, in 1900, had increased to 32,432 square miles, an actual increase in the settled area of 29,542 square miles, a greater increase than that of any other state or territory, due to the increase in population during the decade from 78,475 to 398,331, or 407.6 per cent.

Indian Territory also made a remarkable increase in population, but, as it was not divided into counties, no detailed computation of the density of settlement or comparison of the increase in settled area could be made. The area of settlement, computed by taking each Indian reservation as a unit, showed that every portion of the territory had a density of more than 2 persons to a square mile.

The unsettled area of Maine remained practically unchanged, although the second group, from 6 to 18 persons to a square mile, greatly increased. In northern New York the unsettled area of the Adirondack Region was entirely obliterated by advancing settlement. In Florida this area was practically unchanged. Mining and lumbering enterprises and the extension of railroads effaced the unsettled area in Wisconsin. In Minnesota the opening of Indian reservations, the growth of mining and lumbering enterprises, and the extension of railroads caused a great influx of settlement to the northern portion and the unsettled area was reduced 7,000 square miles. North

Dakota decreased its unsettled area by 18,000 square miles and extended its area of 2 to 6 persons per square mile north and west to the Canadian line and nearly to the border of Montana. The eastern part of the state, especially in the valley of the Red River of the North, made quite an increase in the area of 6 to 18 persons to a square mile. In South Dakota very little change was noted in the unsettled area, but the group from 2 to 6 increased and, in the southeastern portion of the state, the group of 18 to 45 enlarged its area. The unsettled area in Texas made a slight growth, the increase in population being principally in the eastern half. The unsettled area in the state of Washington decreased from 1890 to 1900, while in Montana, Oregon, and California an increase was noted. Nevada showed a great decrease in its settled area, the entire state having a population of only 1 person to each $2\frac{1}{2}$ square miles of area; there were, however, patches of settlement, as shown on Plate No. 14, with a population of from 2 to 6 persons to a square mile.

The total land area of continental United States, in 1900, was 2,974,159 square miles, and the aggregate population, including Indians, 75,994,575, giving a density of 25.6. Excluding the unsettled area of 1,044,640 square miles, the density of population of the settled area in 1900 was 39.4 persons to the square mile.

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION: 1910.

The returns of the Thirteenth Census measure the growth of the United States after 120 years of development. During this period the country has grown from less than 4,000,000 inhabitants to more than 90,000,000. During the period from 1900 to 1910 the Indian Territory and territory of Oklahoma were admitted as the state of Oklahoma, and the area of the Panama Canal Zone was added to the outlying possessions. The great increase in population of the United States from 1900 to 1910, as illustrated on Plate No. 15, has reduced materially the unsettled area and increased the density of the population adjacent to the great cities, due, in a measure, to the change in character of the foreign immigration which, instead of seeking the vacant lands of the West, remains in and around the large cities, the greater proportion seeking employment in manufactures and commerce. The unsettled area in Maine is practically unchanged, but the unsettled area of most of the Western states has been materially decreased, due to reclaiming arid lands by projects completed by the Reclamation Service of the United States, as well as by corporations and individuals. The extension of what is termed "dry farming" has also reduced the areas of sparse settlement.

The total land area of continental United States in 1910 was 2,973,890 square miles, and the population returned, 91,972,266. Excluding the unsettled area

of approximately 870,000 square miles, the density of the settled area is almost 44 persons per square mile, which is a little more than the density of the state of Wisconsin. There are therefore 27 states that have a lower density and 21 that have a greater density than the United States as a unit.

After studying the increase in population of the United States from 1790 to 1910, it will be of interest to compare its growth in population during the past century with that of the principal nations of Europe; Plate No. 16 represents graphically the growth in population of the United States and nine of the most populous countries of Europe, from 1800 to 1910. As it was impossible to obtain the population of European countries for many of the decades shown, this diagram has been based upon a chart prepared by Prof. Fr. von Juraschek for the "Geographisch-Statistische Tabellen, 1911." Of the 10 countries represented on the diagram, the United States was eighth in 1800, but during the century its population increased so rapidly that it passed Spain, Italy, the United Kingdom, Austria-Hungary, France, and Germany, and, at the census of 1880, and since that census, has been second, standing just below Russia.

INCREASE OF POPULATION.

Although there has been a great increase during the last decade in the population of the United States, the relative increase, as shown by the per cent of increase from 1900 to 1910, is much greater west of the Mississippi River than in the Eastern states. This was also true in the previous decade, 1890 to 1900, as will be noted on the two maps on Plate No. 17. The high rate of increase in the Western states shows that the migration which characterized previous decades has continued. The states which show an increase of more than 50 per cent are in the area west of the Mississippi River, six of them in the Mountain division. The three states with an increase of more than 100 per cent are Washington, increase 120.4 per cent, in the Pacific division; Oklahoma, increase 109.7 per cent, in the West South Central division; and Idaho, increase 101.3 per cent, in the Mountain division. In the states east of the Mississippi which increased more than 25 per cent most of the increase is due to foreign immigration, the exception being Florida, the increase in this state during this decade being principally due to interstate migration. During the decade from 1900 to 1910 the only state which showed a slight decrease in population was Iowa, in which the decrease was but three-tenths of 1 per cent.

The map on Plate No. 18 is an interesting presentation of the increase and decrease of population in smaller areas during the decade from 1900 to 1910. In preparing this map the county was used as the unit and it will be noted that, even in states like Washington, Oregon, Montana, Nevada, Wyoming, North Dakota, and Oklahoma, with tremendous

increases of population, there are counties in which the population has actually decreased. In Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, eastern portions of Kansas and Nebraska, southern Michigan, southern Minnesota, and southwestern Wisconsin, the white areas, indicating a decrease in population, are quite extensive. In fact, during the decade from 1900 to 1910 there were in the United States 769 counties that decreased in population; the land area of these counties, comprising 472,462 square miles, formed 15.9 per cent of the land area of the United States. The state of Iowa had 71 of its 99 counties decrease, embracing an area of 38,929 square miles, or 70 per cent of the land area of the state. Missouri also had 71 counties decrease, which covered an area of 42,937 square miles, or 62.5 per cent of the land area of the state. The corresponding percentage for Indiana is 59.7 per cent, for Illinois 44.7 per cent, and for Ohio 43.5 per cent. There were only five states—Rhode Island, Connecticut, Idaho, New Mexico, and Arizona—that were without a county showing a decrease in population.

The maps on Plates Nos. 19 to 66 show the increase and decrease in total and rural population by counties. The rural maps show, of course, the greater area in decreasing population. In the state of Iowa (Plate No. 32) there were only 9 of its 99 counties that reported an increase in rural population. In Missouri (Plate No. 41), of 115 counties there were only 31 that showed an increase in rural population, or 72.5 per cent of the area of Missouri decreased in rural population. The state of New York (Plate No. 48) increased its population 1,844,720, but in the rural population—that is, population outside of incorporated places having 2,500 inhabitants or more—38 counties out of 61 decreased in population. In Ohio (Plate No. 51) there were only 26 counties out of 88 that increased in rural population.

DENSITY OF POPULATION.

By density of population is meant the number of persons to each square mile of land area.

Comparing the density of population by geographic divisions, the Middle Atlantic division had the greatest density of population (193.2), with the New England division second (105.7), and the Mountain division last, having only 3.1 persons per square mile of land area. Excluding the District of Columbia, Rhode Island, with 508.5 persons per square mile, is the most densely populated, closely followed by Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Connecticut, in the order named, the only states which had more than 200 persons per square mile. There were only 10 states with a density in excess of 100 persons per square mile, but there were 11 with a density of less than 10 persons per square mile. Nevada, with 0.7 persons per square mile, or 7 persons to 10 square miles, had the lowest

density. Of the outlying possessions, Porto Rico had a density of 325.5 persons per square mile, which was greater than that of any state of the United States, except Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New Jersey; Hawaii had a density of 29.8, while Alaska had only 1 person to each 10 square miles of territory.

Table 6 shows that every state has increased in population and density except Iowa, which decreased slightly in population and decreased in density 0.2 per square mile. Excluding the District of Columbia, which is a city, the state of Rhode Island shows the greatest increase in density, having increased from 401.6 in 1900 to 508.5 persons per square mile in 1910, with New Jersey second and Massachusetts third.

Table 6 DIVISION AND STATE.	Population: 1910	Land area in square miles: 1910	POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE.		
			1910	1900	1890
United States.....	61,972,266	2,973,890	30.9	25.0	21.2
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS:					
New England.....	6,552,681	61,976	105.7	90.2	75.8
Middle Atlantic.....	19,315,862	100,000	193.2	154.5	127.1
East North Central.....	18,250,621	245,564	74.3	65.2	54.9
West North Central.....	11,637,921	510,804	22.8	20.3	17.5
South Atlantic.....	12,104,805	269,071	45.3	38.8	32.9
East South Central.....	8,400,901	179,500	46.8	42.0	35.8
West South Central.....	8,784,534	429,746	20.4	15.2	11.0
Mountain.....	2,633,517	859,125	3.1	1.9	1.4
Pacific.....	4,192,304	318,095	13.2	7.0	5.9
NEW ENGLAND:					
Maine.....	742,371	20,805	24.8	23.2	22.1
New Hampshire.....	430,672	9,031	47.7	45.0	41.7
Vermont.....	355,956	9,124	39.0	37.7	36.4
Massachusetts.....	3,366,416	8,039	418.8	340.0	273.5
Rhode Island.....	542,610	1,067	508.5	401.6	323.8
Connecticut.....	1,114,750	4,820	231.3	188.5	154.8
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:					
New York.....	9,113,614	47,654	191.2	152.5	126.0
New Jersey.....	2,637,167	7,514	337.7	250.7	192.3
Pennsylvania.....	7,065,111	44,832	171.0	140.6	117.3
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:					
Ohio.....	4,767,121	40,740	117.0	102.1	90.1
Indiana.....	2,700,876	36,045	74.9	70.1	61.1
Illinois.....	5,638,591	56,043	100.6	86.1	68.3
Michigan.....	2,810,173	57,480	48.9	42.1	36.4
Wisconsin.....	2,333,800	55,256	42.2	37.4	30.6
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:					
Minnesota.....	2,075,708	80,858	25.7	21.7	18.2
Iowa.....	2,224,771	55,580	40.0	40.2	34.4
Missouri.....	3,293,935	98,727	47.9	45.2	39.0
North Dakota.....	577,056	70,183	8.2	4.5	2.7
South Dakota.....	683,888	76,808	7.6	5.2	4.5
Nebraska.....	1,192,214	76,808	15.5	13.9	13.8
Kansas.....	1,090,940	81,774	20.7	18.0	17.5
SOUTH ATLANTIC:					
Delaware.....	202,322	1,965	103.0	94.0	85.7
Maryland.....	1,295,346	9,941	130.3	119.5	104.9
District of Columbia.....	331,069	60	5,517.8	4,645.3	3,672.3
Virginia.....	2,061,612	40,202	51.2	46.1	41.1
West Virginia.....	1,221,119	24,022	50.8	39.9	31.8
North Carolina.....	2,206,287	48,740	45.3	38.9	33.2
South Carolina.....	1,515,400	39,495	40.7	44.0	37.7
Georgia.....	2,009,121	58,725	44.4	37.7	31.3
Florida.....	752,619	54,861	13.7	9.6	7.1
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:					
Kentucky.....	2,289,905	40,181	57.0	53.4	46.3
Tennessee.....	2,184,789	41,687	52.4	48.5	42.4
Alabama.....	2,138,093	51,279	41.7	35.7	29.5
Mississippi.....	1,797,114	46,302	38.8	33.5	27.8
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:					
Arkansas.....	1,574,449	52,525	30.0	25.0	21.5
Louisiana.....	1,656,388	45,409	36.5	30.4	24.0
Oklahoma.....	1,657,155	69,414	23.9	11.4	8.7
Texas.....	3,890,542	262,308	14.8	11.6	8.5
MOUNTAIN:					
Montana.....	376,053	146,201	2.6	1.7	1.0
Idaho.....	325,594	83,354	3.9	1.9	1.1
Wyoming.....	145,965	97,594	1.5	0.9	0.6
Colorado.....	799,024	103,658	7.7	5.2	4.0
New Mexico.....	327,301	122,503	2.7	1.6	1.3
Arizona.....	204,354	113,810	1.8	1.1	0.8
Utah.....	373,351	82,184	4.5	3.4	2.6
Nevada.....	81,875	109,821	0.7	0.4	0.4
PACIFIC:					
Washington.....	1,141,990	66,836	17.1	7.8	5.3
Oregon.....	672,765	95,607	7.0	4.3	3.3
California.....	2,377,549	155,652	15.3	9.5	7.8

1 Includes population of Indian Territory for 1900 and 1890.

Plate No. 67 shows the population per square mile, by states, in 1910 and 1900. In 1900 there were six states with a density of population of less than 2 persons to the square mile, while in 1910 there were only three such states—Arizona, Nevada, and Wyoming. A number of states which show but a slight increase in their population have advanced to a higher group of density in 1910. East of the Mississippi River only five states advanced in their density group, Michigan, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina having advanced from the 18 to 45 group to the 45 to 90 group, and Illinois from the 45 to 90 group to 90 persons per square mile and over. The states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon have also advanced to a higher group in density.

Plate No. 68 presents the density of population of the United States in 1910, the county being used as a unit. The states of Nevada and Montana have the greatest area not shaded, indicating counties with less than 2 persons per square mile.

The plates from No. 69 to No. 115 show the density of population in 1910, total and rural, for each state, by counties. By comparison of the two maps of each state the location of the large urban communities is indicated by the density of population, as, in the total population, the greatest density is in the counties in which large cities with populous suburbs are located. The decrease in density of the population of many rural communities is strikingly apparent in the states of Iowa, Missouri, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and the southern portions of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The population per square mile, 1790 to 1910, is represented in Diagram 1, Plate No. 135. The change in the length of the bars shows that the increase has not been regular; for instance, from 1790 to 1800 the population increased in density, but in 1810, owing to the large annexations of sparsely settled territory, the density of the United States as a whole decreased. In 1820, 1830, and 1840 each census showed an increase. In 1850 a large decrease is noted, due to the annexation of Texas in 1845 and the territory ceded by Mexico in 1848. The population, in proportion to the area annexed, was very small and, consequently, the density showed a decrease. Since 1850 no decrease in the density of population of the United States has taken place. On the contrary it has had an almost uniform increase, as is indicated by the length of the bars in the diagram.

Diagram 3, Plate No. 135, represents the density of population of each state for 1910 and 1900. Every state has increased in density except the state of Iowa, which decreased slightly from 1900 to 1910. Rhode Island was the most densely populated state both in 1900 and 1910. The other states following in the order of their density are Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland,

Ohio, Delaware, and Illinois. These were the only states that had a population of more than 100 persons per square mile in 1910, and their rank in density was the same at both censuses.

CENTER OF POPULATION.

On the basis of the Thirteenth Census returns the center of population and the median lines for continental United States have been determined for April 15, 1910. In these calculations no account is taken of the territory and population of Alaska and of other noncontiguous territory. The location of the center at the dates of the several censuses, 1790 to 1910, and the movement of the median point from decade to decade, are indicated on Plate No. 116. The map on Plate No. 118 shows the location of the median parallel of latitude and the median meridian of longitude, also the center of area and the center of population, for 1910.

A somewhat technical significance, different from that frequently given to it, attaches to the term "center of population" as used in census publications. The center is often understood to be the point of intersection of a north and south line which divides the population equally, with an east and west line which likewise divides it equally. This point of intersection is, in a certain sense, a center of population; it is here, however, designated the median point to distinguish it from the point technically defined as the center.

The character of these two points may be made clear through a physical analogy. The center of population may be said to represent the center of gravity of the population. If the surface of the United States be considered as a rigid plane without weight, capable of sustaining the population distributed thereon, individuals being assumed to be of equal weight, and each, therefore, to exert a pressure on any supporting pivotal point directly proportional to his distance from the point, the pivotal point on which the plane balances would, of course, be its center of gravity, and this is the point referred to by the term "center of population" as here used. Continuing the above analogy, it may be noted that the median point, which may be described as the numerical center of population, is in no sense a center of gravity. In determining the median point, distance is not taken into account, and the location of the units of population is considered only in relation to the intersecting median lines—as being north or south of the median parallel and east or west of the median meridian. It is evident that extensive changes in the geographic distribution of the population may take place without affecting the position of the median point. In this respect the median point differs essentially from the center of population, which responds to the slightest population change in any section of the country. To

illustrate: Since the median point lies east of Minnesota, a million persons could move from Minnesota to Oregon without affecting the median point, while the movement of 500 persons from one town in Indiana to another, across the north and south line passing through the median point, would change the location of the point. On the other hand, a movement of a million persons from Minnesota to Oregon would have a very considerable effect on the center of population, since, in terms of the above analogy, the pressure exerted by each individual would increase in proportion to the distance traveled away from the center. If all the people in the United States were to be assembled at one place, the center of population would be the point which they could reach with the minimum aggregate travel, assuming that they all traveled in direct lines from their residence to the meeting place. No such statement holds true of the median point.

METHOD OF DETERMINING THE CENTER OF POPULATION.

In locating the center of population it is first assumed to be approximately at a certain point. Through this point a parallel and a meridian are drawn crossing the entire country. In determining the center of population in 1910, it was assumed to be at the intersection of the parallel of 39° north latitude with the meridian of 86° west longitude, which lines were taken as the axes of moments.

The product of the population of a given area by its distance from the assumed parallel is called a north or south moment, and the product of the population of the area by its distance from the assumed meridian is called an east or west moment. In calculating north and south moments the distances are measured in minutes of arc; in calculating east and west moments it is necessary to use miles, on account of the unequal length of the degrees and minutes in different latitudes. The population of the country is grouped by square degrees—that is, by areas included between consecutive parallels and meridians—as they are convenient units with which to work. The population of the principal cities is then deducted from that of the respective square degrees in which they lie and treated separately. The center of population of each square degree is assumed to be at its geographic center, except where such an assumption is manifestly incorrect; in these cases the position of the center of population of the square degree is estimated as nearly as possible. The population of each square degree north and south of the assumed parallel is multiplied by the distance of its center from that parallel; a similar calculation is made for the principal cities; and the sum of the north moments and the sum of the south moments are ascertained. The difference between these two sums, divided by the total population of the

country, gives a correction to the latitude. In a similar manner the sums of the east and of the west moments are ascertained and from them the correction in longitude is made.

CENTER OF POPULATION: 1910.

At the Thirteenth Census the center of population was in the following position:

Latitude..... $39^{\circ} 10' 12''$ N.
Longitude..... $86^{\circ} 32' 20''$ W.

This point is in southern Indiana in the western part of Bloomington city, Monroe County, as shown on the map on Plate No. 117.

During the last decade, 1900 to 1910, the center of population moved west $43' 26''$, or approximately 39 miles, while its northward movement was only $36''$, or approximately seven-tenths of a mile. The great increase in the population of New York, Pennsylvania, and certain other states north of the thirty-ninth parallel has balanced the increase in Texas, Oklahoma, and southern California. The advance toward the west is, to a large extent, due to the increase in the population of the Pacific Coast states, their distance from the center giving any increase of population in those states much greater weight than an equal increase in the populous states east, which are nearer the center. For instance, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, and Sacramento combined, with a population of 906,016, have as great an influence on the center as Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore combined, with a population of 2,778,078. The westward movement from 1900 to 1910 was nearly three times as great as from 1890 to 1900, but was less than that for any decade between 1840 and 1890.

LOCATION OF THE CENTER OF POPULATION: 1790 TO 1900.

In 1790 the center of population was at $39^{\circ} 16' 30''$ north latitude and $76^{\circ} 11' 12''$ west longitude, which, according to the best maps, is a point about 23 miles east of Baltimore. During the decade from 1790 to 1800 it moved almost due west to a point about 18 miles west of the same city, latitude $39^{\circ} 16' 6''$, longitude $76^{\circ} 56' 30''$.

From 1800 to 1810 it moved west and slightly south to a point in the state of Virginia about 40 miles northwest by west of Washington, latitude $39^{\circ} 11' 30''$, longitude $77^{\circ} 37' 12''$. The southward movement during this decade was due to the annexation of the territory of Louisiana, which contained quite extensive settlements.

From 1810 to 1820 the center of population moved west and again slightly south to a point about 16 miles north of Woodstock, Va., latitude $39^{\circ} 5' 42''$, longitude $78^{\circ} 33'$. This second southward movement was

due principally to the extension of settlements in Mississippi, Alabama, and eastern Georgia.

From 1820 to 1830 it again moved west and south to a point about 19 miles west-southwest of Moorefield, in the area now comprising the state of West Virginia, latitude 38° 57' 54'', longitude 79° 16' 54''. This is the most decided actual southward movement that it has made during any decade, owing to the annexation of Florida and the great extension of settlements in Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, or generally, it may be said, in the Southwest. The movement from 1870 to 1880 was apparently greater, but this was due chiefly to a defective enumeration in 1870, and can not be considered as an actual change in the distribution of population.

From 1830 to 1840 it continued west, but slightly changed its course to the north, reaching a point 16 miles south of Clarksburg, in the area now comprising the state of West Virginia, latitude 39° 2', longitude 80° 18'. During this decade population had increased rapidly in the Prairie states and in the southern portions of Michigan and Wisconsin.

From 1840 to 1850 the center moved west and slightly south again, reaching a point about 23 miles southeast of Parkersburg, in the area now comprising the state of West Virginia, latitude 38° 59', longitude 81° 19', the change of direction to the south being largely due to the annexation of Texas.

From 1850 to 1860 it moved west and slightly north, reaching a point 20 miles a little east of south of Chillicothe, Ohio, latitude 39° 0' 24'', longitude 82° 48' 48''.

From 1860 to 1870 it moved west and sharply north, reaching a point about 48 miles east by north of Cincinnati, Ohio, in latitude 39° 12', longitude 83° 35' 42''. This northward movement was due in part to the waste and destruction in the South con-

sequent upon the Civil War, and in part to the fact that the census of 1870 was defective in its enumeration of the southern people, especially of the newly enfranchised negro population.

In 1880 the center of population had returned south to nearly the latitude occupied in 1860, being near Cincinnati, Ohio, just south of the Kentucky boundary, in latitude 39° 4' 8'', longitude 84° 39' 40''.

In 1890, owing to the great increase of population in the cities of the Northwest and in the state of Washington, also in New England, the center moved north to latitude 39° 11' 56'', longitude 85° 32' 53''.

During the decade from 1890 to 1900 the center of population moved west 16' 1'', a little over 14 miles, to longitude 85° 48' 54'', and south 2' 20'', a little less than 3 miles, to latitude 39° 9' 36''. This is the smallest movement it has ever shown in a decade, the great increase in the population of Indian Territory, Oklahoma, and Texas being largely offset by an increase in the population of the North Atlantic states.

The movement from 1900 to 1910 has already been described.

The closeness with which the center of population throughout its westward movement has clung to the thirty-ninth parallel of latitude is remarkable. The most northern point was reached in 1790 and the most southern point in 1830, but the difference was only about 21 miles. In each decade there has been a westward movement. The greatest movement west was during the decade from 1850 to 1860, when the center advanced 81 miles; the least from 1890 to 1900, when it advanced 14 miles. The total westward movement since 1790 is 557 miles.

The following table and the map on Plate No. 116 show the location of the center of population and its westward advance during each decade since 1790.

CENTER OF POPULATION: 1790 TO 1910.

CENSUS YEAR.	North latitude.			West longitude.			APPROXIMATE LOCATION BY IMPORTANT TOWNS.	MOVEMENT IN MILES.				
								From point to point in direct line.	West.	North.	South.	
1790.....	39	16	30	76	11	12	23 miles east of Baltimore, Md.....					
1800.....	39	16	6	76	56	30	18 miles west of Baltimore, Md.....	40.6	40.6			0.5
1810.....	39	11	30	77	37	12	40 miles northwest by west of Washington, D. C.....	36.9	36.5			5.3
1820.....	39	5	42	78	33	0	16 miles north of Woodstock, Va.....	50.5	50.1			6.7
1830.....	38	57	54	79	16	54	19 miles west-southwest of Moorefield, W. Va. ¹	40.4	39.4			9.0
1840.....	39	2	0	80	18	0	16 miles south of Clarksburg, W. Va. ¹	55.0	54.8		4.7	
1850.....	38	59	0	81	19	0	23 miles southeast of Parkersburg, W. Va. ¹	54.8	54.7			3.5
1860.....	39	0	24	82	48	48	20 miles south by east of Chillicothe, Ohio.....	80.6	80.6		1.6	
1870.....	39	12	0	83	35	42	48 miles east by north of Cincinnati, Ohio.....	44.1	42.1		13.3	
1880.....	39	4	8	84	39	40	8 miles west by south of Cincinnati, Ohio.....	58.1	57.4			9.1
1890.....	39	11	56	85	32	53	20 miles east of Columbus, Ind.....	48.6	47.7		9.0	
1900.....	39	9	36	85	48	54	6 miles southeast of Columbus, Ind.....	14.6	14.4			2.8
1910.....	39	10	12	86	32	20	In the city of Bloomington, Ind.....	39.0	38.9		0.8	

¹ West Virginia formed part of Virginia until 1860.

In connection with the location of the center of population of the United States, it is of interest to note also the position of what may be termed the center of area—that is, the point on which the surface of continental United States would balance, if it were a plane of uniform weight per unit of area. This point is located in northern Kansas, 10 miles north of Smith Center, the county seat of Smith County, approximate latitude $39^{\circ} 55'$, longitude $98^{\circ} 50'$, and is therefore about three-fourths of a degree (51 miles) north and $12^{\circ} 15'$ (657 miles) west of the center of population. Its location is shown on the map on Plate No. 118, designating the position of the median lines. This would also be the center of population if the population were distributed evenly over the territory of continental United States.

MEDIAN LINES.

In connection with the definition of the median point another method of presenting facts with regard to the geographic distribution of the population has been noted, involving the location of median lines. A parallel of latitude is determined which evenly divides the population so that the population north of that parallel is the same as that south. Similarly, a meridian of longitude is determined which divides the population evenly as between east and west. In calculating these median lines it is necessary, in the case of the square degrees of latitude and longitude which are traversed by the lines themselves, to assume that the population is evenly distributed through these square degrees or to make an estimated adjustment where this is obviously not the case.

The eastern terminus of the median parallel, according to the census of 1910, is on the New Jersey coast near Seagirt. In its course west this line passes through central New Jersey, leaving the state near Burlington and entering Pennsylvania a few miles north of Philadelphia, thence passing through Norristown and continuing through southern Pennsylvania and across the northern extremity of West Virginia, leaving the latter state at a point a few miles north of Wheeling. It nearly bisects Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, crossing about 10 miles north of Columbus, Ohio, 25 miles north of Indianapolis, Ind., and about 20 miles north of Springfield, Ill. Through Missouri it runs about 30 miles south of the Iowa and Missouri

line, thence passing through Nebraska about 10 miles north of its southern boundary, and across the northern part of Colorado, passing about 5 miles north of Boulder city. Its location in Utah is about 45 miles south of Salt Lake City near Spanish Fork city. There are no large towns near its course across the northern part of Nevada and California. The western terminus of the median parallel is on the Pacific coast, in Humboldt County, Cal., about 5 miles north of Point Delgada and 20 miles south of Cape Mendocino, the point of continental United States extending farthest west.

The median meridian starts at Whitefish Point, on the northern peninsula of Michigan, near the eastern end of Lake Superior, thence passing south through the southern peninsula of Michigan about 25 miles west of Lansing and through Indiana about 10 miles west of the Indiana-Ohio boundary, and 25 miles west of Cincinnati. South of the Ohio River it bisects Kentucky about 40 miles east of Louisville, crosses eastern Tennessee, and leaves the state 20 miles east of Chattanooga. Through Georgia it passes close to the Georgia-Alabama line, about 2 miles west of Columbus, Ga., leaving the state near the intersection of the Alabama, Georgia, and Florida boundary lines. It then crosses the northwestern portion of Florida and terminates in the Gulf of Mexico at the city of Apalachicola.

During the last three decades, from 1880 to 1910, there has been little change in the location of these lines—so slight, in fact, that the changes can not be accurately shown on a small map. For this reason the median lines are not drawn on the map on Plate No. 118 for any years prior to 1910. The median parallel has moved north a distance of 11.3 miles since 1880. In the same period the median meridian has moved west 45.3 miles. Each of the three decades has shown a slight movement of the parallel north and of the meridian west. Between 1900 and 1910, however, the northern movement was only 2.3 miles, and the westward only 7.5 miles. The greatest change took place in the decade from 1880 to 1890, during which period the median parallel moved north 6.6 miles, and the median meridian west 27 miles. The location of these lines at the several censuses, from 1880 to 1910, is shown in the following table. The location of these lines in 1910 is shown on the map on Plate No. 118.

MEDIAN LINES: 1880 TO 1910.

CENSUS YEAR.	Median parallel, north latitude.	Median meridian, west longitude.	MOVEMENT IN MILES.	
			Median parallel, north.	Median meridian, west.
1880.....	39 57 0	84 7 12
1890.....	40 2 51	84 40 1	6.6	27.0
1900.....	40 4 22	84 51 29	2.4	10.8
1910.....	40 6 24	84 59 59	2.3	7.5

It may be observed that while each median line exactly bisects the population as a whole it does not at any given point or through any given section of its course necessarily bisect the population even approximately. The median parallel does not bisect even approximately the population living either west or east of the Mississippi River. Similarly, the median meridian does not bisect the population either of the northern or southern section of the country. Nor does any one of the four sections into which the intersecting median lines divide the country contain one-fourth of the total population. It is obvious, however, that the diagonally opposite sections are necessarily exactly equal in population.¹ The population of the northeastern section exactly equals the population of the southwestern; and, similarly, the population of the southeastern exactly equals that of the northwestern. The northeastern and southwestern each contain, in fact, a population of about 27,500,000, while the southeastern and northwestern sections each contain about 18,500,000.

MEDIAN POINT.

What is termed by the Census Bureau the "median point" of the population corresponds, as already stated, to a common conception of the center of population—that is, it is the junction of the median line dividing the population equally north and south with

¹ The mathematical demonstration of this is simple. If A, B, C, and D represent, respectively, the population of the northwestern, northeastern, southeastern, and southwestern sections, then:

A+B=½ population of U. S.
 B+C=½ population of U. S.
 A+B=B+C.
 Therefore A=C.
 Similarly, it may be proven that B=D.

the median line dividing it equally east and west, distance of the population from the center not being considered. As already indicated, the changes in the median point reflect only the difference between the growth of population east of the point and the growth west of it and the difference between the growth north and south of the point. Other differences in relative growth do not affect its location.

In 1910 the median point was located at latitude 40° 6' 24" north and longitude 84° 59' 59" west, practically the eighty-fifth meridian. Its location, therefore, was 3 miles south of Winchester, Randolph County, Ind.; its westward movement during the decade was 7.5 miles, and its northward movement 2.3 miles. Comparing its movement since 1900 with that of the center of population, it will be noted that the north movement of the median point was 1.6 miles more than that of the center, while the center of population moved west 31.5 miles more than the median point, showing that the increase in the population of the Pacific coast had a much greater influence on the movement of the center of population than upon the median point.

The exact location of the median point is indicated by the median lines already shown; in the following table its approximate location with reference to certain towns is described:

POSITION OF THE MEDIAN POINT: 1880 TO 1910.

CENSUS YEAR.	APPROXIMATE LOCATION BY IMPORTANT TOWNS.
1880.....	16 miles nearly due west of Springfield, Ohio.
1890.....	5 miles southwest of Greenville, Ohio.
1900.....	In Spartanburg, Ind.
1910.....	3 miles south of Winchester, Ind.

CENTER OF POPULATION OF EACH STATE: 1880 TO 1910.

STATE.	Census year.	North latitude.	West longitude.	APPROXIMATE LOCATION, BY IMPORTANT TOWNS.		MOVEMENT IN MILES.			
				County.	Nearest city or town.	Actual distance.	North.	South.	East.
ALABAMA.....	1880	32 51 9	86 43 16	Chilton.....	5.5 miles W. by N. of Clanton, Chilton Co.....				
	1890	32 54 38	86 44 46	Chilton.....	3.4 miles S. by E. of Jemison, Chilton Co.....	4.3	4.0		1.5
	1900	32 53 13	86 42 18	Chilton.....	5.7 miles SSE. of Jemison, Chilton Co.....	2.9		1.6	2.4
	1910	32 54 7	86 42 29	Chilton.....	4.7 miles SSE. of Jemison, Chilton Co.....	1.0	1.0		0.2
ARIZONA.....	1880	33 17 36	111 25 32	Pinal.....	18.7 miles N. by W. of Florence, Pinal Co.....				
	1890	33 15 51	111 25 30	Pinal.....	16.6 miles N. by W. of Florence, Pinal Co.....	2.0		2.0	0.1
	1900	33 34 20	111 15 58	Maricopa.....	9.2 miles SW. of Roosevelt Dam, Maricopa Co.....	23.2	21.2		0.3
	1910	33 24 18	110 59 38	Gila.....	12.3 miles W. by N. of Globe, Gila Co.....	19.5		11.5	15.7
ARKANSAS.....	1880	34 55 41	92 30 25	Pulaski.....	4.8 miles WSW. of Mayflower, Faulkner Co.....				
	1890	34 57 35	92 29 41	Faulkner.....	3.0 miles WNW. of Mayflower, Faulkner Co.....	2.3	2.2		0.7
	1900	34 56 18	92 28 27	Pulaski.....	3.2 miles WSW. of Mayflower, Faulkner Co.....	1.0		1.5	1.2
	1910	34 55 16	92 25 8	Faulkner.....	3.0 miles SSW. of Mayflower, Faulkner Co.....	3.3		1.2	3.1
CALIFORNIA.....	1880	37 55 55	121 27 42	San Joaquin.....	3.3 miles E. by S. of Moorland, San Joaquin Co.....				
	1890	37 25 35	121 2 20	Stanislaus.....	3.1 miles NNE. of Crows Landing, Stanislaus Co.....	41.9		34.9	23.1
	1900	37 14 26	120 53 11	Merced.....	0.2 miles NE. of Ingomar, Merced Co.....	15.3		12.8	8.4
	1910	36 42 20	120 31 23	Fresno.....	9.5 miles WSW. of Mendota, Fresno Co.....	41.8		36.7	20.1
COLORADO.....	1880	39 5 23	105 32 53	Park.....	13.7 miles ENE. of Hartzell, Park Co.....				
	1890	39 0 52	105 14 10	Douglas.....	3.8 miles WNW. of West Creek, Douglas Co.....	17.6	5.2		16.8
	1900	39 5 45	105 10 5	Teller.....	6.4 miles WSW. of West Creek, Douglas Co.....	5.0		4.7	1.7
	1910	39 11 53	105 11 28	Douglas.....	3.6 miles N. by W. of West Creek, Douglas Co.....	8.2	7.1		4.1
CONNECTICUT.....	1880	41 32 40	72 46 21	New Haven.....	2.0 miles ENE. of Meriden P. O., New Haven Co.....				
	1890	41 31 41	72 48 0	New Haven.....	0.8 mile SSE. of Meriden P. O., New Haven Co.....	1.9		1.3	1.4
	1900	41 31 23	72 49 6	New Haven.....	1.2 miles SSW. of Meriden P. O., New Haven Co.....	1.0		0.3	1.0
	1910	41 30 54	72 50 20	New Haven.....	2.5 miles SW. of Meriden P. O., New Haven Co.....	1.3		0.6	1.1

STATISTICAL ATLAS.

CENTER OF POPULATION OF EACH STATE: 1880 TO 1910--Continued.

STATE.	Census year.	North latitude.	West longitude.	APPROXIMATE LOCATION, BY IMPORTANT TOWNS.		MOVEMENT IN MILES.				
				County.	Nearest city or town.	Actual distance.	North.	South.	East.	West.
DELAWARE.....	1880	39 9 50	75 35 30	Kent.....	3.5 miles W. by N. of Dover, Kent Co.					
	1890	39 11 9	75 35 36	Kent.....	4.0 miles NW. of Dover, Kent Co.	1.5	2.5			0.1
	1900	39 11 35	75 35 9	Kent.....	4.0 miles NW. by N. of Dover, Kent Co.	0.6	0.5		0.4	
	1910	39 11 49	75 35 0	Kent.....	4.2 miles NW. by N. of Dover, Kent Co.	0.3	0.3			0.4
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.....	1900	78 ft. N. of U St., NW.	20 ft. W. of 4th St., NW.		Opposite No. 801 Fourth Street NW.					
	1910	159 ft. S. of K St., NW.	111 ft. E. of 5th St., NW.		On No. 927 Fifth Street NW.	983 ft.	743 ft.			643 ft.
FLORIDA.....	1880	29 43 40	83 17 0	Lafayette.....	1.0 mile SW. of Hines, Lafayette Co.					
	1890	29 29 15	83 3 28	Lafayette.....	7.0 miles N. by W. of Vista, Levy Co.	21.4		16.6	13.5	
	1900	29 28 40	83 7 19	Lafayette.....	7.7 miles NW. by N. of Vista, Levy Co.	3.9		0.7		3.8
	1910	29 19 30	83 0 32	Levy.....	5.0 miles SSE. of Vista, Levy Co.	12.5		10.5	6.8	
GEORGIA.....	1880	33 2 4	83 42 0	Jones.....	10.2 miles WNW. of Gray, Jones Co.					
	1890	33 0 0	83 40 17	Jones.....	8.3 miles W. of Gray, Jones Co.	2.9		2.4	1.7	
	1900	32 56 38	83 38 24	Jones.....	7.3 miles N. by W. of Macon, Bibb Co.	4.3		3.9	1.8	
	1910	32 54 25	83 37 8	Jones.....	4.5 miles N. by E. of Macon, Bibb Co.	2.8		2.5	1.2	
IDAHO.....	1880	43 59 34	114 24 4	Custer.....	19.5 miles E. by S. of Pierson, Custer Co.					
	1890	44 12 41	114 27 33	Custer.....	4.8 miles S. by W. of Clayton, Custer Co.	15.4	15.1			2.0
	1900	44 36 14	114 37 19	Lemhi.....	13.0 miles SSW. of Moyers Cove, Lemhi Co.	28.3	27.1			8.1
	1910	44 30 50	114 47 38	Custer.....	6.0 miles NE. of Sunbeam, Custer Co.	10.5		6.2		8.5
ILLINOIS.....	1880	40 26 47	88 57 44	McLean.....	2.8 miles SE. of Bloomington, McLean Co.					
	1890	40 39 14	88 44 34	McLean.....	2.0 miles E. by N. of Lexington, McLean Co.	18.4	14.3		11.0	
	1900	40 46 48	88 37 12	Livingston.....	1.5 miles N. by E. of Weston, McLean Co.	10.8	8.7		6.4	
	1910	40 51 29	88 33 18	Livingston.....	4.0 miles SE. of Pontine, Livingston Co.	6.4	5.4		3.4	
INDIANA.....	1880	39 51 33	86 13 26	Marion.....	2.0 miles SE. of New Augusta, Marion Co.					
	1890	39 52 53	86 14 16	Marion.....	0.5 mile N. of New Augusta, Marion Co.	1.7	1.5			0.7
	1900	39 54 36	86 14 3	Marion.....	2.0 miles N. by E. of New Augusta, Marion Co.	2.0	2.0		0.2	
	1910	39 56 40	86 15 47	Boone.....	0.3 mile W. by N. of Zionsville, Boone Co.	2.9	2.5			1.5
IOWA.....	1880	41 51 40	92 56 53	Marshall.....	1.8 miles S. of Laurel, Marshall Co.					
	1890	41 56 2	92 58 43	Marshall.....	2.9 miles NW. of Laurel, Marshall Co.					
	1900	41 55 45	93 15 11	Story.....	2.6 miles NE. by E. of Collins, Story Co.	5.2	5.0			1.6
	1910	41 57 43	93 15 18	Story.....	4.8 miles SE. of Colo, Story Co.	14.1		0.3		14.1
KANSAS.....	1880	38 36 11	96 41 7	Morris.....	3.3 miles SSW. of Wilsey, Morris Co.					
	1890	38 33 1	97 8 0	Marion.....	1.7 miles E. of Pampa, Marion Co.					
	1900	38 32 25	96 43 21	Morris.....	7.2 miles SSW. of Wilsey, Morris Co.	24.6		3.6		24.3
	1910	38 29 31	96 40 41	Marion.....	7.0 miles E. by S. of Lincolnville, Marion Co.	22.3		0.7	22.3	5.7
KENTUCKY.....	1880	37 42 40	85 26 30	Nelson.....	1.7 miles N. by W. of Holycross, Marion Co.					
	1890	37 42 46	85 21 52	Washington.....	1.0 mile E. of Blincoe, Washington Co.	4.2	0.1		4.2	
	1900	37 42 15	85 24 40	Marion.....	2.0 miles ENE. of Holycross, Marion Co.	2.7		0.6		2.6
	1910	37 42 20	85 21 29	Washington.....	1.4 miles E. by S. of Blincoe, Washington Co.	3.0	0.3		2.9	
LOUISIANA.....	1880	30 40 20	91 21 8	West Feliciana ¹	4.3 miles NNE. of Bayou Sara, West Feliciana Par.					
	1890	30 50 40	91 20 24	West Feliciana ¹	4.0 miles SSE. of Brandon, West Feliciana Par.	8.3	1.4			8.2
	1900	30 48 56	91 31 46	Pointe Coupee ¹	2.4 miles NE. of Racourcel, Pointe Coupee Par.	3.0		2.0		2.3
	1910	30 48 47	91 33 50	Pointe Coupee ¹	1.0 mile N. by E. of Racourcel, Pointe Coupee Par.	2.0		0.2		2.0
MAINE.....	1880	44 55 10	69 32 46	Somerset.....	4.8 miles ESE. of Athens P. O., Somerset Co.					
	1890	44 57 3	69 32 36	Somerset.....	4.7 miles E. of Athens P. O., Somerset Co.	2.2	2.2		0.1	
	1900	44 57 52	69 33 5	Somerset.....	4.3 miles ENE. of Athens P. O., Somerset Co.	1.0	0.9			0.4
	1910	44 47 2	69 20 49	Somerset.....	2.3 miles E. by S. of Canaan P. O., Somerset Co.	12.8		12.5	2.7	
MARYLAND.....	1880	39 9 4	76 41 17	Anne Arundel.....	0.8 mile SE. of Harmans, Anne Arundel Co.					
	1890	39 9 32	76 41 21	Anne Arundel.....	0.5 mile E. of Harmans, Anne Arundel Co.	0.5	0.5			0.1
	1900	39 0 36	76 42 15	Anne Arundel.....	0.4 mile W. by N. of Harmans, Anne Arundel Co.	0.8	0.1			0.8
	1910	39 10 1	76 42 36	Anne Arundel.....	0.9 mile NW. of Harmans, Anne Arundel Co.	0.6	0.5			0.3
MASSACHUSETTS.....	1880	42 22 30	71 28 15	Middlesex.....	3.0 miles W. by S. of Sudbury P. O., Middlesex Co.					
	1890	42 22 30	71 28 10	Middlesex.....	2.9 miles W. by S. of Sudbury P. O., Middlesex Co.	0.1			0.1	
	1900	42 22 19	71 28 8	Middlesex.....	2.9 miles WSW. of Sudbury P. O., Middlesex Co.	0.2		0.2	0.03	
	1910	42 22 23	71 25 8	Middlesex.....	0.5 mile SSW. of Sudbury P. O., Middlesex Co.	2.6	0.1		2.6	
MICHIGAN.....	1880	43 3 29	84 38 36	Clinton.....	5.8 miles NNW. of St. Johns, Clinton Co.					
	1890	43 15 24	84 43 38	Gratiot.....	5.5 miles N. by W. of Middleton, Gratiot Co.	14.3	13.7			4.2
	1900	43 21 0	84 46 19	Gratiot.....	9.2 miles WNW. of Ithaca, Gratiot Co.	6.8	6.4			2.2
	1910	43 19 55	84 45 0	Gratiot.....	7.7 miles WNW. of Ithaca, Gratiot Co.	1.6		1.2	1.1	
MINNESOTA.....	1880	44 47 33	93 44 41	Carver.....	1.6 miles ENE. of America, Roseau Co.					
	1890	45 5 42	93 50 36	Wright.....	3.6 miles ENE. of Montrose, Wright Co.	21.4	20.9			4.8
	1900	45 15 20	93 59 24	Wright.....	2.2 miles N. by E. of Maple Lake, Wright Co.	13.3	11.2			7.2
	1910	45 22 23	93 51 29	Sherburne.....	1.9 miles SE. of Becker, Sherburne Co.	10.2	7.9		6.4	
MISSISSIPPI.....	1880	33 2 50	89 42 6	Attala.....	4.0 miles ENE. of Sallis, Attala Co.					
	1890	32 59 52	89 43 26	Attala.....	3.5 miles SE. of Sallis, Attala Co.	3.6		3.4		1.3
	1900	32 55 37	89 44 46	Attala.....	7.0 miles SE. by S. of Sallis, Attala Co.	5.1		4.9		1.3
	1910	32 54 7	89 45 22	Attala.....	8.5 miles S. by E. of Sallis, Attala Co.	1.8		1.7		0.6
MISSOURI.....	1880	38 42 32	92 25 8	Monteau.....	2.6 miles NW. of Marion, Cole Co.					
	1890	38 38 19	92 27 57	Monteau.....	2.9 miles NW. of Centertown, Cole Co.	5.4		4.8		2.5
	1900	38 36 11	92 25 55	Cole.....	0.6 mile SW. of Centertown, Cole Co.	3.1		2.5	1.8	
	1910	38 33 0	92 18 25	Cole.....	6.5 miles WSW. of Jefferson City, Cole Co.	7.7		3.7	6.8	
MONTANA.....	1880	46 23 5	111 43 16	Broadwater.....	19.7 miles SE. of Helena, Lewis and Clark Co.					
	1890	46 31 45	111 51 22	Jefferson.....	9.3 miles ESE. of Helena, Lewis and Clark Co.	11.9	10.0			6.4
	1900	46 34 45	111 36 18	Broadwater.....	19.7 miles E. by S. of Helena, Lewis and Clark Co.	12.5	3.4		12.0	
	1910	46 41 31	110 59 49	Meagher.....	9.8 miles NNW. of White Sulphur Springs, Meagher Co.	30.0	7.8		29.0	

¹ Parish.

POPULATION.

CENTER OF POPULATION OF EACH STATE: 1880 TO 1910—Continued.

STATE.	Census year.	North latitude.			West longitude.			APPROXIMATE LOCATION, BY IMPORTANT TOWNS.		MOVEMENT IN MILES.				
		°	'	"	°	'	"	County.	Nearest city or town.	Actual distance.	North.	South.	East.	West.
NEBRASKA	1880	40	57	47	97	20	43	Seward	4.7 miles N. by E. of Ublea, Seward Co.					
	1890	41	5	54	97	43	34	Polk	3.5 miles ENE. of Polk, Polk Co.	22.0	0.3			19.0
	1900	41	8	43	97	42	10	Polk	0.2 miles WNW. of Stromburg, Polk Co.	3.4	3.2		1.2	
	1910	41	11	13	97	50	17	Morrick	1.7 miles S. of Clarks, Morrlick Co.	7.7	2.9			7.1
NEVADA	1880	39	41	41	117	59	22	Churchill	2.5 miles SSE. of Boyer, Churchill Co.					
	1890	39	31	55	118	1	40	Churchill	13.8 miles S. by W. of Boyer, Churchill Co.	11.4		11.2		2.1
	1900	39	51	36	117	49	23	Churchill	13.3 miles NE. of Boyer, Churchill Co.	25.1	22.6		11.0	
	1910	39	16	48	117	33	18	Lander	20.3 miles SE. of Alpine, Churchill Co.	42.4		40.0		14.2
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1880	43	26	25	71	35	50	Belknap	0.2 mile W. by S. of Tilton, Belknap Co.					
	1890	43	26	1	71	35	23	Merrimack	0.6 mile S. by E. of Tilton, Belknap Co.	0.6		0.5		0.4
	1900	43	26	1	71	34	44	Merrimack	0.6 mile SE. of Tilton, Belknap Co.	0.5				0.5
	1910	43	21	18	71	32	10	Merrimack	2.2 miles NE. of Canterbury P. O., Merrimack Co.	5.8		5.4		2.1
NEW JERSEY	1880	40	25	48	74	31	1	Middlesex	5.5 miles SW. of New Brunswick, Middlesex Co.					
	1890	40	37	19	74	30	14	Somerset	2.8 miles NW. of Dunellen, Middlesex Co.	13.2	13.2			0.7
	1900	40	27	54	74	29	37	Middlesex	3.0 miles SW. by W. of New Brunswick, Middlesex Co.	10.8		10.8		0.5
	1910	40	29	24	74	26	20	Middlesex	First ward of New Brunswick, Middlesex Co.	3.4	1.7			2.0
NEW MEXICO	1880	35	9	35	100	10	35	Santa Fe	5.0 miles SE. of San Pedro, Santa Fe Co.					
	1890	34	58	19	100	9	1	Torrance	6.4 miles W. by S. of Moriarty, Torrance Co.	13.1		13.0		1.5
	1900	34	55	0	100	0	41	Bernalillo	7.5 miles WSW. of Moriarty, Torrance Co.	3.8		3.8		0.6
	1910	34	49	5	105	43	8	Torrance	19.5 miles ENE. of Estancia, Torrance Co.	20.0		0.8		25.1
NEW YORK	1880	42	0	4	74	54	50	Delaware	3.0 miles NW. by W. of Craigclara, Sullivan Co.					
	1890	41	54	51	74	51	56	Sullivan	1.8 miles W. by N. of Livingston Manor, Sullivan Co.	0.5		0.0		2.6
	1900	41	48	0	74	45	51	Sullivan	1.2 miles SW. of Liberty, Sullivan Co.	0.5		7.9		5.2
	1910	41	30	20	74	51	50	Sullivan	0.7 mile NW. by W. of Forestline, Sullivan Co.	11.0		9.8		5.1
NORTH CAROLINA	1880	35	38	35	79	18	37	Chatham	2.2 miles NNW. of Goldston, Chatham Co.					
	1890	35	38	22	79	25	11	Chatham	2.5 miles S. of Mt. Vernon Springs, Chatham Co.	0.2		0.2		0.2
	1900	35	38	13	79	28	37	Chatham	4.2 miles SW. of Mt. Vernon Springs, Chatham Co.	3.2		0.2		3.2
	1910	35	37	23	79	29	49	Chatham	3.3 miles ENE. of Cheeks, Randolph Co.	1.5		1.0		1.1
NORTH DAKOTA	1880	47	2	3	98	0	37	Barnes	2.0 miles SW. of Matteson, Barnes Co.					
	1890	47	28	35	98	20	25	Griggs	7.2 miles SW. of Jessie, Griggs Co.	31.0	30.5			8.4
	1900	47	31	40	98	42	27	Foster	0.6 miles SW. of McHenry, Foster Co.	17.0	3.5			17.2
	1910	47	30	32	99	30	47	Wells	3.5 miles NE. of Bowdon, Wells Co.	44.7		1.3		44.7
OHIO	1880	40	20	17	82	53	48	Delaware	3.7 miles E. by N. of Kilbourne, Delaware Co.					
	1890	40	22	50	82	53	50	Morrow	4.0 miles WSW. of Marong, Morrow Co.	3.1	3.1			0.1
	1900	40	24	12	82	54	45	Morrow	5.4 miles W. of Marong, Morrow Co.	1.0		1.4		0.7
	1910	40	28	48	82	48	25	Morrow	1.5 miles E. by N. of Fulton, Morrow Co.	7.7	5.3			5.0
OKLAHOMA	1890	35	18	58	96	28	1	Seminole	5.0 miles WSW. of Beardon, Okfuskee Co.					
	1900	35	30	25	96	57	32	Lincoln	3.3 miles W. of Meeker, Lincoln Co.	30.7	13.2			27.7
	1910	35	28	19	97	5	28	Lincoln	3.0 miles NNE. of McLoud, Pottawatomie Co.	7.9		2.4		7.5
	1880	44	39	37	122	18	0	Linn	9.1 miles WSW. of Detroit, Marion Co.					
OREGON	1890	44	46	13	122	0	9	Marion	7.8 miles ENE. of Detroit, Marion Co.	16.5	7.6		14.7	
	1900	44	55	58	121	56	0	Clackamas	18.0 miles NE. by N. of Detroit, Marion Co.	11.7	11.2		3.4	
	1910	44	52	12	122	12	4	Marion	10.8 miles NNW. of Detroit, Marion Co.	13.9		4.3		13.2
	1880	40	19	55	77	11	2	Perry	0.8 mile WNW. of Shermans Dale, Perry Co.					
PENNSYLVANIA	1890	40	19	18	77	13	53	Perry	3.2 miles W. by S. of Shermans Dale, Perry Co.	2.0		0.7		2.5
	1900	40	18	0	77	16	3	Perry	3.3 miles SE. of Landsburg, Perry Co.	2.4		1.5		1.0
	1910	40	17	35	77	19	37	Perry	3.4 miles SSW. of Landsburg, Perry Co.	3.1		0.5		3.1
	1880	41	46	14	71	27	40	Providence	4.1 miles SW. by S. of Providence P. O., Providence Co.					
RHODE ISLAND	1890	41	46	40	71	27	40	Providence	3.7 miles SW. of Providence P. O., Providence Co.	0.6	0.6			0.1
	1900	41	47	5	71	27	42	Providence	3.4 miles SW. of Providence P. O., Providence Co.	0.4	0.4			0.1
	1910	41	47	24	71	27	40	Providence	3.1 miles SW. by W. of Providence P. O., Providence Co.	0.4	0.4		0.02	
	1880	33	58	47	80	58	46	Richland	3.4 miles SE. by E. of Columbia, Richland Co.					
SOUTH CAROLINA	1890	33	59	12	80	58	50	Richland	3.2 miles SSE. of Columbia, Richland Co.	0.5	0.5			0.1
	1900	34	0	18	80	59	40	Richland	1.3 miles E. by N. of Columbia, Richland Co.	1.0	1.3			0.0
	1910	34	2	2	81	4	1	Richland	3.3 miles NW. of Columbia, Richland Co.	4.5	2.0			4.0
	1880	43	59	28	98	18	4	Sanborn	5.0 miles SSW. of Woonsocket, Sanborn Co.					
SOUTH DAKOTA	1890	44	16	52	98	24	26	Beadle	1.5 miles S. by E. of Virgil, Beadle Co.	20.7	20.0			5.3
	1900	44	21	20	98	25	9	Beadle	10.0 miles W. by S. of Huron, Beadle Co.	5.1	5.1			0.6
	1910	44	19	48	98	50	6	Hand	0.9 mile NE. of Danforth, Hand Co.	20.6		1.8		20.5
	1880	35	50	0	86	38	37	Williamson	4.6 miles SE. of Arrington, Williamson Co.					
TENNESSEE	1890	35	50	7	86	35	58	Rutherford	5.4 miles NW. by N. of Rockvale, Rutherford Co.	2.5		0.03		2.5
	1900	35	50	6	86	30	10	Rutherford	5.6 miles NW. of Rockvale, Rutherford Co.	0.3		0.02		0.9
	1910	35	49	16	86	33	47	Rutherford	4.5 miles W. of Overall, Rutherford Co.	2.6		1.0		2.4
	1880	31	20	50	96	38	30	Limestone	0.4 miles SW. of Thornton, Limestone Co.					
TEXAS	1890	31	20	11	96	50	52	Falls	3.0 miles WSW. of Otto, Falls Co.	13.7	6.2			12.2
	1900	31	28	35	96	52	26	Falls	4.5 miles NNW. of Otto, Falls Co.	3.2		2.8		1.5
	1910	31	31	23	97	15	14	McLennan	7.0 miles WSW. of Waco, McLennan Co.	22.6	3.2			22.4
	1880	40	13	56	111	54	30	Utah	26.6 miles W. by S. of Provo, Utah Co.					
UTAH	1890	40	18	53	111	46	47	Utah	4.0 miles SSE. of American Fork, Utah Co.	8.9	5.7		6.8	
	1900	40	16	2	111	45	29	Utah	4.7 miles WNW. of Provo, Utah Co.	3.5		3.3		1.1
	1910	40	23	6	111	47	46	Utah	1.4 miles ENE. of American Fork, Utah Co.	8.3	8.1			2.0
	1880	44	1	45	72	43	5	Washington	3.8 miles S. by E. of Roxbury P. O., Washington Co.					
VERMONT	1890	44	2	38	72	42	48	Washington	3.0 miles SE. by S. of Roxbury P. O., Washington Co.	1.0	1.0		0.2	
	1900	44	3	18	72	39	1	Orange	2.0 miles E. by N. of Brookfield P. O., Orange Co.	3.2	0.8			3.1
	1910	44	3	0	72	44	56	Washington	2.6 miles S. by W. of Roxbury P. O., Washington Co.	4.0		0.3		4.9

STATISTICAL ATLAS.

CENTER OF POPULATION OF EACH STATE: 1880 TO 1910—Continued.

STATE.	Census year.	North latitude.	West longitude.	APPROXIMATE LOCATION, BY IMPORTANT TOWNS.		MOVEMENT IN MILES.				
				Country.	Nearest city or town.	Actual distance.	North.	South.	East.	West.
VIRGINIA.....	1880	37 29 34	78 29 51	Buckingham.....	3.2 miles NNE. of Arcanum, Buckingham Co.....					
	1890	37 28 31	78 33 29	Buckingham.....	2.9 miles NW. of Arcanum, Buckingham Co.....	3.5				3.3
	1900	37 26 19	78 32 54	Buckingham.....	1.9 miles W. by S. of Arcanum, Buckingham Co.....	2.5		1.2		
	1910	37 25 5	78 33 58	Buckingham.....	3.5 miles SW. of Arcanum, Buckingham Co.....	1.7		2.5	0.5	
WASHINGTON.....	1880	47 5 32	120 36 29	Kittitas.....	4.3 miles ENE. of Thorp, Kittitas Co.....					
	1890	47 15 44	120 52 30	Kittitas.....	5.8 miles ENE. of Roslyn, Kittitas Co.....	17.2	11.7			12.6
	1900	47 19 50	120 46 35	Kittitas.....	7.8 miles NW. of Liberty, Kittitas Co.....	6.6	4.7		4.6	
	1910	47 23 6	121 4 16	Kittitas.....	12.7 miles NNW. of Roslyn, Kittitas Co.....	12.0	3.8			11.4
WEST VIRGINIA.....	1880	38 53 20	80 37 47	Braxton.....	2.5 miles NNE. of Burnsville, Braxton Co.....					
	1890	38 49 59	80 41 26	Braxton.....	2.7 miles SW. of Burnsville, Braxton Co.....	5.1		3.9		3.3
	1900	38 48 7	80 44 22	Braxton.....	1.4 miles W. by S. of Delta or Braxton P. O., Braxton Co.....	3.3		2.1		2.6
	1910	38 45 32	80 49 12	Braxton.....	1.8 miles NW. of Chapel, Braxton Co.....	5.2		3.0		4.3
WISCONSIN.....	1880	43 44 57	89 17 6	Marquette.....	3.8 miles SE. of Montello, Marquette Co.....					
	1890	43 53 27	89 18 22	Marquette.....	2.3 miles W. of Germania, Marquette Co.....	9.9	9.8			1.1
	1900	43 57 29	89 18 43	Marquette.....	5.1 miles W. by S. of Neshkoro, Marquette Co.....	4.6	4.6			0.3
	1910	43 50 53	89 14 10	Marquette.....	2.2 miles SW. of Neshkoro, Marquette Co.....	3.9		0.7	3.8	
WYOMING.....	1880	42 10 48	106 39 14	Carbon.....	4.7 miles E. of Leo, Carbon Co.....					
	1890	42 24 46	106 36 27	Carbon.....	12.3 miles NNW. of Shirley, Carbon Co.....	16.3	16.1		2.4	
	1900	42 32 14	106 52 39	Natrona.....	7.8 miles W. by S. of Alcona, Natrona Co.....	16.3	8.6			13.8
	1910	42 42 0	107 0 7	Natrona.....	6.8 miles SE. of Oilcity, Natrona Co.....	12.9	11.2			6.4

LARGEST MOVEMENT.

STATE.	DECADE.	MOVEMENT IN DEGREES.				MOVEMENT IN MILES.				
		North.	South.	East.	West.	Actual distance.	North.	South.	East.	West.
California.....	1880 to 1890.....	0 11 27	0 30 20	0 25 22	0 11 27	41.9		34.9	23.1	
Oklahoma.....	1890 to 1900.....	0 11 27			0 29 31	30.7	13.2			27.7
North Dakota.....	1900 to 1910.....		0 1 8		0 57 20	44.7		1.3		44.7
California.....	1880 to 1910.....		1 13 26	0 56 19		99.1		84.4	51.9	

SMALLEST MOVEMENT.

Massachusetts.....	1880 to 1890.....			0 0 5		0.1			0.1	
Massachusetts.....	1890 to 1900.....		0 0 11	0 0 2		0.2		0.2	158 ft.	
Delaware.....	1900 to 1910.....	0 0 14			0 0 6	0.3	0.3			211 ft.
Rhode Island.....	1880 to 1910.....	0 1 10				1.3	1.3			

LARGEST VARIATIONS.

Arizona.....	1880 to 1890.....		0 1 45		0 0 7	2.0		2.0		0.1
	1890 to 1900.....	0 18 29		0 9 41		23.2	21.2		9.3	
	1900 to 1910.....		0 10 2	0 16 20		19.5		11.5	15.7	
	1880 to 1910.....	0 7 42		0 25 54		26.4	8.9		24.9	
Kansas.....	1880 to 1890.....		0 3 10		0 26 53	24.6		3.6		24.3
	1890 to 1900.....		0 0 36	0 24 30		22.3		0.7	22.3	
	1900 to 1910.....		0 2 54		0 5 20	6.6		3.3		5.7
	1880 to 1910.....		0 6 40		0 8 34	10.9		7.7		7.7
Nevada.....	1880 to 1890.....		0 9 46		0 2 24	11.4		11.2		2.1
	1890 to 1900.....	0 19 41		0 2 43		25.1	22.6		11.0	
	1900 to 1910.....		0 34 48	0 16 5		42.4		40.0	14.2	
	1880 to 1910.....		0 24 53	0 26 4		36.8		28.6	23.1	
New Jersey.....	1880 to 1890.....	0 11 31		0 0 47		13.2	13.2		0.7	
	1890 to 1900.....		0 9 25	0 0 37		10.8		10.8	0.5	
	1900 to 1910.....	0 1 30		0 3 17		3.4	1.7		2.9	
	1880 to 1910.....	0 3 36		0 4 41		5.8	4.1		4.1	

CENTER OF POPULATION OF STATES.

The center of population of each of the states has never been computed or published by the Census Bureau at any census, but, in response to numerous requests for such data, the location of the center of population of each state has been computed, commencing with the Tenth Census, 1880. The direction of the movement of the population of each state is shown during the last 30 years, with the exception of the state of Oklahoma. The territory which now comprises this state was not open to settlement by the whites in 1880, but was allotted to the Indians and known as the Indian Territory; no returns were made of its population at the Tenth Census, so that it is not possible to compute the center of its population for that date, but the centers have been figured for 1890, 1900, and 1910 for Oklahoma and the Indian Territory combined.

Plates Nos. 119 to 132 are made up of a series of small sketch maps showing the location of the center of population in each state. Its movement, therefore, can be readily followed on the map and its geographic location in relation to the nearest towns and railroad centers can be ascertained.

From 1900 to 1910 the center of population of the United States, exclusive of its outlying possessions, moved west and north. A comparison of the movements of the centers of population of the states during the same decade brings out the fact that the centers of 20 states moved north, and for 28 states the movement was south. The centers of population of 22 of these states moved east and of 26 moved west. The movement of the center of population of each state does not, therefore, coincide with the movement of the center of population of the entire United States.

As an analysis of the movement of the center of population for each state was deemed impracticable, only a brief description is given of the movement for a few of the states in which the variation of the movement of the center presents some exceptional features. The center of population of California from 1880 to 1890 advanced 34.9 miles south and 23.1 miles east, an actual distance of 41.9 miles; this was the greatest advance made during that decade in any state. Oklahoma held this distinction when the movement of the center from 1890 to 1900 was 30.7 miles, the north movement 13.2 miles, and the west movement 27.7 miles. The greatest movement from 1900 to 1910 was made in North Dakota, the distance the center moved being 44.7 miles, made up of a south movement of 1.3 miles and a west movement of 44.7 miles.

The greatest distance the center of population of any state advanced during the 30 years from 1880 to 1910 was in California. The center moved in a southeasterly direction 99.1 miles, the point in 1880 being located 3.3 miles east by south of Moorland, San Joaquin

County, and in 1910, 9.5 miles west southwest of Mendota, Fresno County. It is well also to note those states in which the least change occurred in the location of the center. The center of population of Massachusetts from 1880 to 1890 advanced one-tenth of a mile east; there was no north or south movement; from 1890 to 1900 there was a south movement of two-tenths of a mile and a movement east of 158 feet.

In Delaware, from 1900 to 1910, the movement was three-tenths of a mile north and 211 feet west. The smallest change in the location of the center made during the period from 1880 to 1910 was in Rhode Island; its center of population during the 30 years moved 1.3 miles directly north. The center of population of this state in 1880 was located 4.1 miles southwest by south of Providence and in 1910 it was 3.1 miles southwest by west of Providence.

The center of population of New York state in 1880 was 3 miles northwest by west of Craigeclare, Sullivan County, and in 1910 it was seven-tenths of a mile northwest by west of Forestine, in the same county. The distance traversed was 6.5 miles from 1880 to 1890; 9.5 miles from 1890 to 1900; and 11 miles from 1900 to 1910. The movement was south and east from 1880 to 1890 and from 1890 to 1900, and from 1900 to 1910, south and west.

Although Texas has the greatest area of any state, the movements of the center were not large, as the development in all parts of the state has been uniform. The center in 1880 was located 6.4 miles southwest of Thornton, Limestone County; in the 30 years, to 1910, it had shifted to 7 miles west-southwest of Waco, McLennan County. The movement from 1880 to 1890 was 13.7 miles; from 1890 to 1900, 3.2 miles; and from 1900 to 1910, 22.6 miles, the advance being north and west at each census.

The states which show the greatest variation in the location of the center are Arizona, Kansas, Nevada, and New Jersey. For Arizona the movement shown in 1890 was 2 miles south and 1 mile west; from 1890 to 1900 it reversed the direction to 21.2 miles north and 9.3 miles east, an actual distance of 23.2 miles. During the decade from 1900 to 1910 it moved 11.5 miles south and 15.7 miles east, the entire movement from 1880 to 1910 being 8.9 miles north and 24.9 miles east. For Kansas, while the movement was south at each census, from 1880 to 1890 it advanced westward 24.3 miles; from 1890 to 1900, 22.3 miles east; while from 1900 to 1910 the direction again changed to west, 5.7 miles, a net movement during the 30 years of 7.7 miles south and 7.7 miles west. From 1880 to 1890 the movement in Nevada was south 11.2 miles and west 2.1 miles; from 1890 to 1900 it changed, going north 22.6 miles and east 11 miles. The development of the mines between 1900 and 1910 in the southeastern portion of the state again changed the direction and produced the greatest advance at any decade, the

movement being 40 miles south and 14.2 miles east, an actual distance of 42.4 miles; during the 30 years from 1880 to 1910 the net movement was 36.8 miles south and east. New Jersey has also shown considerable change in the direction of the movement of its center of population. From 1880 to 1890 it was 13.2 miles north and seven-tenths of a mile east; in the next decade, from 1890 to 1900, the movement was 10.8 miles south and five-tenths of a mile east; from 1900 to 1910 it again moved north 1.7 miles and east 2.9 miles. Its entire movement from 1880 to 1910 was 4.1 miles both north and east.

The movement of the center of population of Alabama has varied in direction at each decade. From 1880 to 1890 it moved 4 miles north and 1.5 miles west; from 1890 to 1900, 1.6 miles south and 2.4 miles east; and from 1900 to 1910, 1 mile north and two-tenths of a mile west. Connecticut shows a steady movement south and west, the distance from 1880 to 1890 being 1.9 miles; from 1890 to 1900, 1 mile; and from 1900 to 1910, 1.3 miles.

In Illinois the effect of the growth of Chicago on the center of population is evident from its northeast movement at each census, the actual distance from 1880 to 1890 being 18.4 miles; from 1890 to 1900, 10.8 miles; and from 1900 to 1910, 6.4 miles.

There were only 12 states in which the center of population moved in the same general direction at each census from 1880 to 1910. These states are as follows: In the state of Illinois it moved north and east; for California, Georgia, and New Hampshire the movement was south and east; for Connecticut, Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia the movement was south and west; and for Maryland, South Carolina, and Texas the movement was north and west.

It is a matter of interest to study the movement of the center of population of the states in each geographic division, which reveals the fact that in not a single division was the movement of the center in the same general direction, showing that local conditions in each state affect the movement of population. In the New England division the centers of two states moved north and east, two moved south and east, and two moved south and west. In the Middle Atlantic division the center of population of New Jersey moved north and east, while for New York and Pennsylvania the movement was south and west. Of the five states in the East North Central division two moved north and east, two moved south and east, and one moved north and west. In the West North Central division the center of one state moved north and east, one moved south and east, three moved south and west, and two moved north and west. In the South Atlantic division the centers of two states moved south and east, three moved south and west, and three moved north and west. Of the four states in the East

South Central division one moved north and east, one moved south and east, one moved south and west, and one moved north and west. Of the West South Central division the center of population of one state moved south and east, of two, south and west, and of one, north and west. In the Mountain division the centers of two states moved north and east, in three it moved south and east, in one, south and west, and in two it moved north and west. In the Pacific division the center of one state moved south and east, for one it moved south and west, and for one it moved north and west.

A comparison of the maps on which are located the centers of population of the states will bring to our attention the fact that in only nine states are the centers of population near the state capitals. The nine states are Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Vermont. As the center of population is the point from which all the population is supposed to be equidistant, if it were necessary to assemble all the inhabitants of a state at one place, each individual to travel in a direct line from his residence to the meeting place, the center of population is the point they could all reach with the minimum aggregate of travel.

CENTER OF FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION.

The movement of the center of the total population from census to census is the result of all migration, both interstate and foreign. In view of the change in the character of the foreign immigration and the large proportion of immigrants who are settling in the cities, the location of the center of foreign-born population and its movement from decade to decade is a matter of great interest.

On the map on Plate No. 133 the position of the center of total population at each census from 1790 to 1910 is indicated, also the location of the center of the foreign-born population from 1880 to 1910. The location of the center of population and the median point were discussed on pages 26 and 29. For the first time in a census report the center of the foreign-born population has been computed and located on a map.

In 1880 the center of the foreign-born population was located in latitude $41^{\circ} 49' 52''$, longitude $83^{\circ} 44' 17''$, in Monroe County, Michigan, approximately 15.5 miles northwest of Toledo, Ohio.

In 1890 the center had advanced almost two degrees to the west. The opening of Oklahoma and the increase in the population of Texas drew the point to the south, when it was located in latitude $41^{\circ} 22' 05''$, longitude $85^{\circ} 23' 17''$, in Noble County, Indiana, approximately 54.5 miles southeast of South Bend.

The falling off in the class of immigrants who settled in the far Western states is indicated by the change in the direction of the movement from 1890 to 1900, for in 1900 the center of the foreign-born population was

located in Defiance County, Ohio, 18 miles northwest of Defiance, being in latitude 41° 22' 48'', almost the same latitude as in 1890, and longitude 84° 43' 21'', nearly a degree farther east. The eastern movement was due, as previously stated, to the newer immigration that settled principally in the large cities of the East.

In 1910 the center of foreign-born population was again located in Defiance County, Ohio, about 10.5 miles southwest of Defiance, in latitude 41° 17' 24'', showing a decided movement south, and in longitude

84° 36' 7'', showing a further advance toward the east, but not nearly as great as during the previous decade. This was undoubtedly due to the increase in the foreign-born population in Washington, Oregon, and California, which, on account of the great distance from the center, have relatively a much greater weight than the foreign born of the Eastern and Middle states. The following table gives the location of the center of foreign-born population at each census, and its movement in miles, also the location in relation to a city:

CENTER OF FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION: 1880 TO 1910.

CENSUS YEAR.	North latitude.			West longitude.			Approximate location by important towns.	Movement in miles.
	°	'	"	°	'	"		
1880.....	41	49	52	83	44	17	In Monroe County, Mich., 15.5 miles northwest of Toledo, Ohio.....
1890.....	41	22	05	85	23	17	In Noble County, Ind., 54.5 miles southeast of South Bend, Ind....	93 miles west-southwest.
1900.....	41	22	48	84	43	21	In Defiance County, Ohio, 18 miles northwest of Defiance, Ohio....	34.5 miles east.
1910.....	41	17	24	84	36	07	In Defiance County, Ohio, 10.5 miles southwest of Defiance, Ohio.	8.5 miles southeast.

CENTER OF NEGRO POPULATION.

The question of negro migration has always been one of great interest, and on the map, Plate No. 134, the location of the center of negro population of continental United States is indicated by a star. The center of negro population was computed for 1790 and for each census from 1880 to 1910, no computations being made for the censuses from 1800 to 1870, inclusive. The movement of the center of negro population is an accurate index of the direction of negro migration. In 1790 the center of negro population was located in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, 25 miles west-southwest of Petersburg, in latitude 37° 4' 8'' north, and longitude 77° 51' 21'' west. In 1880 the center was located in northwestern Georgia, 10.4 miles east of Lafayette, in the eastern part of Walker County, latitude 34° 42' 14'' north, longitude 85° 6' 56'' west, showing a movement in a southwesterly direction across North Carolina and a part of Georgia of approximately 443 miles, or an average of 49 miles for each decade. From 1880 to 1890 the southwesterly movement of the center was continued, and it advanced 20.5 miles, to a point in Walker County, Georgia, 15.7 miles west-southwest of Lafayette, latitude 34° 36' 18'' north, longitude 85° 26' 49'' west, about 4 miles east

of the Alabama line. From 1890 to 1900 its movement was greatly retarded, and it advanced only 9.5 miles southwest, across the Alabama-Georgia state line into Dekalb County, Alabama, 10.7 miles northeast of Fort Payne, in northeastern Alabama, about 4 miles west of the Georgia line, latitude 34° 31' 16'' north, longitude 85° 34' 35'' west. In 1910 the center of negro population was located 5.4 miles north-northeast of Fort Payne, Dekalb County, Alabama, in latitude 34° 30' 0'' north, and longitude 85° 40' 43'' west, its movement for the decade being 5.8 miles west-southwest. Its movement south has evidently been greatly retarded by the migration of the negroes to the Northern and Eastern states. A study of the movement from 1790 to 1910 shows a steady advance in a southwesterly direction, but the distance covered at each decade is much smaller than the movement at the previous decade; if this decrease continues during the next decade, it is probable that the direction will be reversed and that the center in 1920 will retrograde toward the North and East. In the following table is given the latitude and longitude of the centers of negro population at each census, also the distance moved during the decade, and the location of the center relative to a city or town:

CENTER OF NEGRO POPULATION: 1790 AND 1880 TO 1910.

CENSUS YEAR.	North latitude.			West longitude.			Approximate location by important towns.	Movement in miles.
	°	'	"	°	'	"		
1790.....	37	4	8	77	51	21	25 miles west-southwest of Petersburg, Dinwiddie County, Virginia.
1880.....	34	42	14	85	6	56	10.4 miles east of Lafayette, Walker County, Georgia.....	443 miles southwest. ¹
1890.....	34	36	18	85	26	49	15.7 miles southwest of Lafayette, Walker County, Georgia.....	20.5 miles southwest.
1900.....	34	31	16	85	34	35	10.7 miles northeast of Fort Payne, Dekalb County, Alabama....	9.5 miles southwest.
1910.....	34	30	0	85	40	43	5.4 miles north-northeast of Fort Payne, Dekalb County, Alabama.	5.8 miles west-southwest.

¹ Movement from 1790 to 1880.

CENTERS OF URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION: 1910.

On Plate No. 133, in addition to the centers of total and foreign-born population, are indicated the location of the centers of urban and rural population in 1910. The center of urban population has never been computed at any previous census and it was deemed of interest to do so in 1910. Not only was the center of urban population located, but the center of the rural population was also ascertained—that is, the population excluding all places with 2,500 or more inhabitants in 1910, as well as the New England towns of that size. The center of urban population is located in latitude $40^{\circ} 16' 12''$ and longitude $83^{\circ} 59' 22''$ in Champaign County, Ohio, 15.3 miles north-east of Piqua, Miami County, Ohio.

The center of rural population is located in latitude $38^{\circ} 12' 36''$ and longitude $88^{\circ} 39' 3''$ in Hamilton County, Illinois, 16.7 miles southeast of Mount Vernon, Jefferson County, Illinois.

As the centers of urban and rural population were not computed for previous censuses, no statement can be made as to the distance or direction in which these centers moved from 1900 to 1910, or during any previous decade.

The location of these centers shows strikingly the preponderance of urban population in the northeastern portion of the United States, the center of urban population being approximately 145 miles north and 250 miles east of the center of rural population. In a direct line the center of urban population is 289 miles northeast from the center of rural population.

URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION.

The change in classification of urban population from census to census renders it impossible to make a fair comparison of the growth from 1790 to 1910, as no tables have been made giving the population of the United States at each enumeration outside of cities with 2,500 or more inhabitants, including New England towns of that size. The Census Bureau classified as urban population in 1910, that part of the population in municipal corporations, including New England towns, with 2,500 or more inhabitants. At previous censuses the urban element was considered as that residing in places with 8,000 or more inhabitants, not including New England towns of that size. The diagram comparing the increase in urban population from 1790 to 1910 is made on the basis of 8,000 inhabitants or more, and is shown as Diagram 1, Plate No. 141.

Diagram 5 on Plate No. 135, urban and rural population, 1880 to 1910, represents the proportion of urban population in places of 2,500 or more inhabitants, including New England towns of that size, at each census from 1880 to 1910. In 1880, of the total population of the United States, there were in municipalities with 2,500 or more population 14,772,438; in 1890 this element had grown to 22,720,223; in 1900

it was 30,797,185; and in 1910, 42,623,383 persons were in municipalities, forming 46.3 per cent of the total population of the United States.

Diagram 4 on Plate No. 135 compares the per cent urban in the total population, by states, for 1910 and 1900, every state showing an increase. The states with the greatest per cent of increase are Oklahoma and Idaho, each increasing over 200 per cent.

Two maps on Plate No. 136 indicate the per cent which the urban forms of the total population of each state in 1910 and 1900, the increase being especially noticeable in all parts of the country, no state showing a decrease in the urban element.

The diagram on Plate No. 137 gives the per cent of urban in the total population of each state, from 1880 to 1910. There were 14 states in 1910 in which more than half the population was living in territory classified as urban. The greatest per cent urban in any state was in Rhode Island, which had 96.7 per cent, while North Dakota, with 11 per cent, had the smallest proportion of its people in urban communities.

Maps 1 and 2 on Plate No. 138 show the per cent of increase in urban and rural population, by states, from 1900 to 1910. The greatest per cent of increase in both classes is in the states west of the Mississippi River. This is especially true of the increase in rural population.

Plate No. 139 indicates, by the length of the bars, the growth in population of 36 of the largest cities in the United States from 1790 to 1910, or, in the case of a number of the cities, from the earliest censuses at which they were returned. The cities are arranged in the order of their population as returned at the Thirteenth Census. The diagram brings out strikingly the rapid growth of all the cities represented. The phenomenal growth of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia is especially noticeable. The population in 1910 of these 36 cities formed 20.3 per cent of the total population of the United States, and, if the rate of growth in both the United States and these cities continues until another enumeration, the probabilities are that the population of these large cities will be about 25 per cent of the population of the entire United States.

Plate No. 140 represents, by the difference in the shade lines, the proportion of the population in each county in municipalities with 2,500 or more inhabitants in 1910. The towns in New England with 2,500 or more inhabitants were considered as urban and classed with the urban population. At previous censuses, in computing the urban population, the New England towns were excluded and counted as rural. The darkest shade represents those counties in which 75 per cent or more of the population was urban, and are found principally in New England, with a few scattered areas near the large cities in other states. Massachusetts is almost entirely covered, showing that there

are but few counties in that state in which the urban element does not form more than 75 per cent of the population. Connecticut and Rhode Island also fall in the highest group. The small areas of this highest shade indicate the location of the counties in which are found the principal cities. The heavy shading of the New England and Middle Atlantic states shows the large proportion of the urban population in these divisions. The white area, representing no urban population, covers practically one-third of the land surface of the United States, indicating that farming is still the leading industry.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 141 shows the population in 1910 and 1900 of cities having, in 1910, 100,000 inhabitants or more. The great population of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, as compared with the other cities, is well brought out by the difference in the length of the bars. The total population of all the cities with 100,000 population in 1910 was 20,302,138, and of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, 8,501,174, or 41.9 per cent of the total for the 50 cities. Every city of this class reported an increase in population from 1900 to 1910, New York having the largest numerical increase and Birmingham the highest percentage of increase.

COLOR OR RACE, NATIVITY, AND PARENTAGE.

The composition of the population of the United States is of vital importance and Diagram 2 on Plate No. 141 is of great interest, as it shows the principal elements of the population in both urban and rural communities, by geographic divisions, in 1910.

On Plate No. 142 the population of the United States is represented by circles, proportionate to the number returned at each census, from 1850 to 1910, the divisions of the circle indicating the proportion of the population in each of the principal classes. The great increase in the foreign element, including both foreign born and the native of foreign parentage, is brought out very clearly. The proportion of colored population is practically the same at each enumeration, but the proportion of the native white of native parentage has steadily decreased.

Diagram 1 on Plate No. 143, at the first glance, appears rather complicated but, on closer inspection, one can readily comprehend the actual proportions of the various elements of population in each of the geographic divisions in 1910. The heavy black portion shown in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central divisions represents their negro population, which forms 33.7 per cent in the South Atlantic, 31.5 per cent in the East South Central, and 22.6 per cent in the West South Central division. In the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and West North Central divisions the foreign element, shown by the heavy black and white portion of the bars, is much in evidence. Where the

negro element is large the foreign element is small, and where the negro element is small the foreign element usually forms a considerable portion of the population. It is evident, therefore, that the foreign element does not locate in that portion of the country in which negroes form a large proportion of the population. Considering the natives of foreign or mixed parentage and the foreign born together, more than half of the New England and Middle Atlantic divisions are of foreign stock, the percentage in the Middle Atlantic division being 53.9 and in the New England division 59; in the East North Central division it is 44.8 per cent; in the West North Central, 41.5 per cent; in the Mountain division, 40 per cent; and in the Pacific division, 45.6 per cent. The negro and native white of native parents together form more than 88 per cent of the total population in the following divisions: In the South Atlantic division, 93.9 per cent; in the East South Central division, 96.3 per cent; and in the West South Central division, 88.3 per cent.

Diagram 2 on Plate No. 143 shows, by states, the distribution of the foreign-born population in 1910 and 1900. New York with 2,729,272 leads, Pennsylvania with 1,438,719 is second, Illinois with 1,202,560 is third, and Massachusetts with 1,051,050 is fourth. The diagram brings out the small proportion of the foreign element in the southern portion of the country, as compared with the northern portion.

Diagram 4 on Plate No. 141 presents the color or race, nativity, and parentage, of the population in those states having a fair proportion of their population Chinese, Japanese, and Indians in 1910 and 1900. Arizona had a larger per cent of Indians in its population than any other state, both in 1900 and in 1910. Although Oklahoma had a larger number, the Indians in Arizona formed a larger percentage of its population than the Indians did in any other state both in 1900 and in 1910. There were in 1910 a larger number of Chinese and Japanese in California, Oregon, and Washington than in any of the other states, although in Nevada they formed as large a proportion of the population as they did in Washington, but their numbers were comparatively small.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 143 shows, by geographic divisions, the principal elements of the population in 1910 and 1900. The foreign-born whites formed a larger proportion of the population in 1910 than in 1900 in the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, South Atlantic, and Pacific divisions, but a smaller proportion in the West North Central, East South Central, and Mountain divisions. The slight changes in the small percentages of foreign-born whites in the southern divisions, however, are not specially significant. The increase in the proportion of foreign-born whites was most marked in the Middle Atlantic division (from 21.4 per cent in 1900 to 25 per cent in 1910). The proportion was, however,

even higher in New England, although the increase from 1900 to 1910 (from 25.7 to 27.7 per cent), was less.

On Plate No. 144 the two diagrams represent the per cent of the population by principal elements, for each state, in 1910 and 1900. The great proportion of the foreign-born white element and the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage in a number of states, at both censuses, is brought out; it will also be noted that the proportion has decreased from 1900 to 1910 in a number of the states. In 1910 Rhode Island, with 32.8 per cent of its white population foreign born, leads in the proportion of that element. Combining the foreign born and native white of foreign or mixed parentage, Minnesota has the greatest proportion of the combined elements, with North Dakota second, the combination representing over 70 per cent of the population of those states at the Thirteenth Census. The state showing the smallest proportion of the foreign element both in 1900 and 1910 is North Carolina, closely followed by South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi.

The two diagrams on Plate No. 145 show the color or race, nativity, and parentage of the population in cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants for 1910 and 1900. In 1910 the city of Fall River, Mass., led with the largest proportion (86.3 per cent) of its population made up of foreign born and natives of foreign or mixed parentage; Lowell, Mass. (80.4 per cent), was second; and New York and Milwaukee third (each with 78.6 per cent). In 1900 Fall River had the greatest proportion (85.9 per cent) of the foreign element; Milwaukee (82.7 per cent) was second; and Lowell (77.9 per cent) third.

The cities with the greatest proportion of negroes, in 1910, were Memphis, Tenn. (40 per cent); Birmingham, Ala. (39.4 per cent); and Richmond, Va. (36.6 per cent), in the order named. In 1900 Memphis had the greatest proportion of negroes (48.8 per cent); with Washington, D. C. (31.1 per cent), second; and New Orleans (27.1 per cent), third. The city with the greatest proportion of native whites of native parentage in 1910 was Indianapolis, Ind. (64.5 per cent); with Columbus, Ohio (64.4 per cent), second; and Dayton, Ohio (62 per cent), third. In 1900 St. Joseph, Mo., had the greatest proportion of native whites of native parentage (66.9 per cent); with Columbus, Ohio (59.8 per cent), second; and Indianapolis, Ind. (57.8 per cent), third.

Plate No. 146 has two maps showing, by states, the per cent of native whites of native parentage in the white population, and the per cent of foreign-born whites in the total population, in 1910.

In the Southern states the white population is nearly all native of native parentage. In 1910 this element formed over 95 per cent of the population in eight of the states—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, and Arkan-

sas—North Carolina leading with 99 per cent, practically all of its white population being native of native parentage.

The lower percentages of native white of native parentage are found in the New England and North-western states. In 1910 Minnesota had only 27.9 per cent, North Dakota 28.5 per cent, and Wisconsin 32.9 per cent. In the New England states, Rhode Island had only 30 per cent of the white population native of native parentage, Massachusetts 33.2 per cent, and Connecticut and New York exactly the same proportion, 36 per cent. In these states less than two-fifths of the white population were native of native parentage. In addition, there are nine other states of the class where the natives of native parentage were less than half of the white population.

Map 2 shows the per cent of foreign-born whites in the total population in 1910. In Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the proportion of foreign or mixed parentage exceeded the proportion of native whites of native parentage. In Rhode Island the foreign-born whites outnumbered the native whites of native parentage. The Southern states, which had the largest proportion of the population native white of native parentage, show the lowest proportion of foreign birth and of foreign or mixed parentage.

Map 1 on Plate No. 147 indicates in eight groups, by the character of the shading, the percentage of the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage in the total population in 1910. The heavy shading indicates the groups from 35 to 50 per cent, Minnesota having 45.3 per cent, Wisconsin 44.8 per cent, North Dakota 43.5 per cent, South Dakota 37.2 per cent, Rhode Island 35.9 per cent, and Utah 35.2 per cent of that element of the population. The states having the smallest proportion of native whites of foreign or mixed parentage are North Carolina, with 0.4 per cent, and South Carolina, with 0.7 per cent. The Southern states, with few exceptions, fall within the group with less than 5 per cent.

Map 2 indicates, in eight groups, by the character of the shading, the percentage of foreign-born whites and native whites of foreign or mixed parentage combined in the total population in 1910. The solid black, indicating 50 per cent or more, covers 13 states, while the next group, 35 to 50 per cent, also covers 13 states, and indicates that for 26 states 35 per cent or more of the population is of foreign birth or parentage. These 26 states have 53.3 per cent of the total population of the United States. The state with the lowest percentage is North Carolina, which has less than 1 per cent. All the states of the South Atlantic and East South Central divisions, except Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Florida, and Kentucky, also the District of Columbia, have less than 5 per cent of the foreign-born element in their population.

Plate No. 148 is shaded to indicate the counties having a higher percentage of native whites of native parentage to the total population in 1910 than in 1900; 74 per cent of the total number of counties had a larger percentage of native white of native parentage in 1910 than in 1900.

The map on Plate No. 149 also shows, by counties, the per cent of native whites of foreign or mixed parentage in the total population in 1910, the counties being shaded in groups, from less than 1 per cent, to the highest group, 50 per cent and over. The shaded areas on the map indicate where this element of the population is of importance. The highest group, 50 per cent and over, is found principally in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. In three-fourths of the counties west of the Mississippi River the proportion of native whites of foreign or mixed parentage is over 15 per cent of the total population. As indicated on the state map, the county map shows that there are very few counties in the Southern states, east of the Mississippi River, which have more than 1 per cent of their population native white of foreign or mixed parentage, with the exception of Florida, and there are only a dozen counties in the entire area—that is, the states east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio River and the states of Virginia and West Virginia—where the foreign element forms 5 per cent or more of their population.

The map on Plate No. 150 is shaded to indicate the counties which had a higher percentage of native whites of foreign or mixed parentage to the total population in 1910 than in 1900. The shaded areas on this map indicate that 29.9 per cent of the counties in the United States had a higher proportion of this element of the population in 1910 than in 1900.

The map on Plate No. 151 may be considered as indicating the proportion of the foreign element in 1910, as it includes not only the foreign-born whites but the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage. The densely shaded areas indicate the counties in which the foreign element forms more than 50 per cent of the population, such areas covering all of North Dakota and Connecticut and nearly the entire states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The absence of shading in the Southern states, except Florida and Texas, shows the small proportion of the foreign element in that section.

The map on Plate No. 152 is shaded to indicate the per cent of foreign-born whites in total population, by counties, in 1910. The groups of shading are the same as on the previous map and the areas covered by the heaviest shade are almost in the same position. The absence of shaded areas in nearly all of the Southern states indicates, as on the previous map, that the proportion of foreign population in that part of the country is very small.

Plates Nos. 153 to 184 comprise a series of maps, two for each state, except the Southern states, showing for each county the per cent of the foreign-born white in the total population and the per cent of native white of foreign or mixed parentage in the total population in 1910. The North Central states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North Dakota show the highest per cent of both the foreign-born white population and the native white of foreign or mixed parentage. As the foreign element was small, no maps were prepared for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

NEGRO POPULATION.

The per cent of increase in the total population, white, and negro, from 1790 to 1910, is graphically presented on Diagram 2, Plate No. 135. The abnormal increase shown in the negro population from 1870 to 1880 is due, in a great measure, to the omission at the census of 1870 of a number of negroes in the South; in fact, the entire census of the South at the enumeration of the Ninth Census was defective, and this diagram points out the defect. The large decrease indicated from 1860 to 1870 is therefore not all accounted for by the loss during the Civil War, but is partly due to the defective census of 1870.

The map on Plate No. 185 presents, by states, the per cent distribution of the negroes in 1910, in seven groups, shaded as indicated in the legend. Mississippi and South Carolina have the highest per cent of negroes and are the only states with more than 50 per cent of their population negroes. The negroes form a very small per cent of the population, except in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central divisions, as indicated by the heavy shading.

Diagram 2 on Plate No. 185 indicates, by the length of the bars, the number of negroes in each state at the Twelfth and Thirteenth Censuses. Georgia leads, with 1,176,987, followed closely by Mississippi, with 1,009,487; Alabama being third, with 908,282; and South Carolina fourth, with 835,843, these states retaining their respective rank since 1900.

Diagram 3, on the same plate, shows the number of negroes in 1900 and 1910 in cities having 100,000 or more population in 1910. Washington leads, with 94,446; New York is second, with 91,709; New Orleans third, with 89,262; Baltimore fourth, with 84,749; and Philadelphia fifth, with 84,459; Memphis, with 52,441, Birmingham, with 52,305, and Atlanta, with 51,902, follow in order; these are the only cities in the United States with more than 50,000 negroes in 1910.

The per cent distribution of negroes in the total population in 1910, by counties, is indicated on the map on Plate No. 186, in eight groups, shaded according to the legend. The highest percentage is in the cotton-

producing sections of the South. South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi have the largest number of counties in which negroes form more than 50 per cent of the population.

Plate No. 187 indicates, by shading, the counties having at least 1,000 negroes in 1910, in which there was a higher per cent of negroes in the total population in 1910 than in 1900. With the exception of a few widely scattered counties in the Northern states, the increase in negro population is confined almost entirely to the South Central and South Atlantic states.

The diagram on Plate No. 188 represents the proportion of negroes in the total population in each of the Southern states, from 1790 to 1910, or for each census at which they were returned. South Carolina had a larger proportion of negro population than any other state at each census from 1790 to 1890, but in 1900 the number of negroes in Mississippi had increased to 58.5 per cent, while in South Carolina the per cent had fallen to 58.4. In 1910 Mississippi had the highest percentage, 56.2, and South Carolina was second, with 55.2.

On the four maps on Plate No. 189 the light shading indicates the counties in the Southern states having at least 50 per cent of their population negroes in 1860, 1880, 1900, and 1910. The heavier shaded area indicates the counties having 75 per cent or more of their population negroes. The only states having counties so shaded are South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

The per cent of negroes in the total population, by counties, in each of the Southern states in 1910, is indicated in seven groups, by the different shading, on Plates Nos. 190 to 200. The states having the greatest proportion of negroes in their population are Mississippi, 56.2 per cent, and South Carolina, 55.2 per cent. These states also have the counties with the largest percentage of negroes, Mississippi being first with 17 counties having more than 75 per cent negro, and 21 counties with 50 to 75 per cent negro; and South Carolina second, with 4 counties having over 75 per cent negro, and 29 counties with 50 to 75 per cent. Issaquena County, Mississippi, with 94.2 per cent, has the greatest proportion of negroes in any county in the United States, while Beaufort County, South Carolina, with 86.9 per cent negro, has the highest percentage in that state. There are also a number of counties in North Carolina, Alabama, and Louisiana that have a high percentage of negroes. Georgia has 66 counties in which this element forms more than 50 per cent of the population.

There were in the United States in 1910, 53 counties with 75 per cent and over of their population negro and 211 counties with 50 to 75 per cent of their population negro.

INDIAN POPULATION.

Map 1 on Plate No. 201 shows the distribution of the Indian population of the United States, by states, in

1910, and Map 2 the proportion of full-bloods in the Indian population in 1910. The state of Oklahoma has the greatest number of Indians, as it comprises the area formerly known as the Indian Territory, and, while the proportion of the Indians to the total population is not as great as in a few counties in other states, it is due to the fact that the reservations were thrown open to settlement after the Indian lands were allotted and all available land occupied by white settlers. The growth of the white population from 172,554 in 1890 to 1,444,531 in 1910 is an evidence of the most rapid settlement of a territory in the history of the United States.

SEX DISTRIBUTION.

Plate No. 202, map of the United States, presents, by the different shading, the proportion of males to females in 1910, by counties—that is, the county is taken as the unit. Females were in excess in a number of counties in the Eastern states, also in a few counties in the West, two in Utah, two in South Dakota, one in Kansas, and seven in Texas. Every state east of the Mississippi River, with the exception of Delaware, had one or more counties in which the females were in excess, while west of the Mississippi River there were only seven states that had any counties in which the females exceeded the males. In the states of Montana, Wyoming, and Nevada, in every county the males were in excess at least 20 per cent. This map is of great interest, as it indicates those portions of the country in which the males are in excess, also the states in which the females exceed the males.

Plate No. 203, Map 1, indicates the proportion of males to females in the total population at the Thirteenth Census, by states. The females are in excess in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maryland, District of Columbia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. In 1910 the states having the greatest proportion of males to females were Nevada, with 179.2, Wyoming with 168.8, and Montana with 152.1 males to each 100 females. The proportion for the United States is 106 males to each 100 females. The excess of males is due principally to the large foreign immigration, in which the males largely outnumber the females. The map brings out the fact that no geographic division east of the Mississippi River had, in 1910, more than 106 males to 100 females, the United States average, but in all of the western divisions the proportion is much higher, the Pacific division reaching a total of 129 males to 100 females. This is, undoubtedly, due to the migration of the native male population from the Eastern states to California, Oregon, and Washington. The sections which have been recently settled in that part of the country give more opportunity for the labor of men than of women.

Plate No. 204, Diagram 1, shows the number of males to 100 females in urban and rural communities in 1910,

by geographic divisions. The large proportion of males to females in the rural section of the Mountain and Pacific divisions is well brought out. In the New England, South Atlantic, and East South Central divisions, the females in urban areas, especially adjacent to the large cities, exceed the males, but in all divisions the males are in excess in the rural areas.

AGE DISTRIBUTION.

Diagram 2, on Plate No. 203, distribution by age and sex of the total population by single years of age, presents very strikingly the irregularity in the proportion of the ages of the population as returned in 1910. A normal diagram should form a perfect pyramid, each bar representing an age period being smaller than the one below it. The sexes are nearly equally divided, but the abnormal length of the bars, especially for the periods ending in zero or in 5, stand out in the diagram. These irregularities are due almost entirely to errors in the returns, and it will be noted on the diagram, particularly the length of the bar indicating 30 years of age (for both males and females), as compared with the bars for 29 and 31 years of age. The same disproportion or irregularity is shown for the ages 40, 50, 60, and 70 years. After 70 years of age the pyramid becomes nearly normal, and after 80 there is apparently no tendency to concentrate on certain ages. The disproportion in the ages below 50 years can not be charged entirely to errors in the returns, however, as the foreign immigration contains a large proportion of male adults and increases the proportion in the ages above 15.

Plate No. 204, Diagram 2, distribution of the total population in 1910, by age periods and by each class, shows the large proportion of adults among the Chinese, Japanese, and foreign-born white population. The heavy line in the center marked zero is the line of 15 years of age, and there are two groups to the left and four to the right of the line. The groups below 15 (under 5, and 5 to 14) are on the left. The remainder of the bar to the right of the heavy black line represents the four age groups, from 15 to 24, 25 to 44, 45 to 64, and 65 and over.

Taking up the groups under 15 years of age, in the under 5 group the smallest proportion is shown (omitting the "all other" class), in the foreign-born white, the next lowest proportion being in the Chinese, due to the fact that practically all of the Chinese immigration is made up of males of adult age. The Japanese also have a low proportion, ranking next to, but a trifle above, the Chinese. The largest proportion of children under 5 are among the Indians. The greatest number of children from 5 to 14 will be noted in the native white of mixed parentage. In the age groups above 15 the largest proportion of the 15 to 24 group is noted in the native white of mixed parentage, while

the Chinese have the smallest proportion. In the 25 to 44 group the Japanese have the largest proportion and the Indians the smallest. Of the ages 45 to 64 the Chinese have the largest proportion and the Japanese the smallest. Of the group 65 and over the foreign-born white have the largest proportion and the Japanese the smallest.

The influence of immigration on the age composition of the native population is evident, as compared with the native white of native parentage. The age distribution of the native white is affected indirectly by immigration, but the extent to which it is affected is hard to determine. A comparison of the bars for the various elements of the population with that of the total population shows that the abnormal number in certain age periods is due to the foreign immigration; if immigration were to cease for a number of years, the proportion of children below 15 years of age, as compared with the adults, would be much greater, as the age distribution of the foreign born affects materially that of the entire population.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 204, distribution by age periods of the native white, native negro, and foreign-born white population in 1910, shows in millions the total number in each age period and delineates very clearly the excess of foreign born in the age groups above 15 and below 50. The gradual reduction of the negroes and the native white of native parentage shows that in these two classes the number of persons in each age period is nearly normal. The native white of foreign-born or mixed parentage more closely approaches the normal but is somewhat affected by the other two classes.

There are certain errors in the statement of the ages of young children, especially noticeable among negroes under 5 and from 5 to 9. It is a well-grounded principle that the largest proportion of the population in any age group is in the youngest age, the bar, therefore, representing 0 to 5 should be much larger than 5 to 9, and the bars should gradually lessen for each of the higher age groups. The bars should form an almost perfect pyramid and the differences in length be nearly uniform, so far as the negro population and the native white of native parentage are concerned. The differences in the other two classes are due to the disproportionate number of the foreign born in the higher age groups. The departures from the normal in the first two classes are due to misstatements of the ages of the children and the tendency to return the age in a number ending with a zero or 5.

Diagram 4 on Plate No. 204 shows the distribution by age periods of the total population and each principal class in 1910, 1900, and 1890. This diagram presents very clearly the abnormal number of the foreign born in the older age groups, and that the same condition has existed at the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thir-

teenth Censuses. The proportions can therefore again be considered as practically the same at each of the enumerations. The greatest change shown since 1890 is the change in the age distribution of the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage; this difference is probably due to the variation in the volume of immigration during the different decades.

In Diagram 1 on Plate No. 205, the distribution by age periods of the total population by geographic divisions in 1910, it will be noticed that the three southern divisions had a very high proportion in the age groups below 25 years, especially in the West South Central division. In the West South Central division 59.4 per cent and in the East South Central division 58.5 per cent of the population was under 25 years of age, as compared with 45.5 per cent in the New England division and 42.9 per cent in the Pacific division. This is, undoubtedly, due to the large number of negroes and small number of the foreign born in the South.

Diagram 2 on Plate No. 205 shows the distribution by age periods and sex of total population for 1910. The percentages which this diagram represents are based upon the total population. The diagram also brings out very clearly the effect of the abnormal age periods of the foreign-born population, especially in the groups from 10 to 25 years of age, and particularly for males.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 205 shows, by age periods, the distribution of the urban and rural population in 1910, by geographic divisions. Only three age periods are given—under 15, 15 to 44, and 45 and over. The larger proportion of the population in rural communities in the lower age group, under 15, will be noted in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central divisions. The Pacific division has the largest proportion of its population over 15 years of age in the urban class, a higher percentage than in any other division.

Diagram 4 on Plate No. 205 shows the distribution, by age periods and sex, of the total population and of each principal class in 1910. The abnormal number of persons in the age groups above 15 years is shown for the foreign-born white, both male and female, the proportion in the female being slightly less than in the male. For the other elements the males and females for the age group 25 to 44 are almost identical in their proportion of the population in the four age groups.

The distribution of the principal elements of the population by age periods and sex is graphically presented on Plate No. 206.

Diagram 1 illustrates the proportion of the native white of native parentage; Diagram 2, the native white of foreign or mixed parentage; Diagram 3, the foreign-born white; and Diagram 4, the negro.

A comparison of these four diagrams directs the attention to the wide differences in the age distribution

of the principal classes, and, as no two of the diagrams are identical in form, it is evident that the diagram that is not affected by the abnormal grouping of the foreign-born white population is that representing the negro population, although the diagram of the native white of native parents is but slightly affected by this factor. The abnormal differences between the lengths of the bars for certain age groups of the foreign-born white population, as compared with the same ages on the other diagrams, clearly indicates the excess of the males over the females, and the preponderance of the ages from 20 to 40 years. The diagrams for the native white of native parentage and the negro should show the same proportion in each age group, but the difference is, undoubtedly, due to the erroneous statements in the ages of the negroes, especially for the children in the two groups under 5 and from 5 to 9.

MARITAL CONDITION.

Diagram 1 on Plate No. 207 presents the marital condition of the total population 15 years of age and over, by geographic divisions, in 1910. This diagram shows the proportion of the single, married, and widowed or divorced in the total number of persons 15 years of age and over, classified by sex. In the New England division there were a larger number of males reported married than females, and a larger number of females reported as widowed or divorced than males. In each division and in the United States total more males than females were reported as single, while in every division the number returned as widowed or divorced was greater for the females than for the males; for every division, except New England, there were more females than males reported as married, the percentage reported as married in the Middle Atlantic division being exactly the same for both sexes. In the Mountain division the proportion of females reported as married was 15 per cent more than that of the males; in this same division there were 20 per cent more males reported as single than females. The East South Central division had the highest proportion of widowed for both male and female, 5.1 and 11.8 per cent, respectively; the proportion in the New England division is a little lower for the females, being 11.5 per cent, and the males 5.1 per cent, exactly the same.

Diagram 2, on the same plate, shows the marital condition of principal classes of the population, by age periods, in 1910. The periods used in the preparation of this diagram may be termed "broad age periods," as there are only three groups—15 to 24 years, 25 to 44 years, and 45 years of age and over. These broad age groups are entirely satisfactory for the purpose of measuring the differences in the four classes by sex. The heavy line marked "zero" separates the diagram into two parts, the left section representing the single and the section on the right of the line the married and widowed or divorced. The classification used is native

white of native parentage, native white of foreign or mixed parentage, foreign-born white, and negro. Each class was divided into single, married, and widowed or divorced, and, as indicated on the previous diagram, each age period included in group 15 to 24 contained a large proportion of both males and females who were single, the per cent of males in each of the four classes being higher than for the females. On the right of the line the proportion of the married and the widowed or divorced females exceed the males in each class. In the next group, 25 to 44, a marked decline in the number of single persons in each class and a large increase in the number of married and widowed or divorced will be noted, the single males outnumbering the single females and the married females outnumbering the married males for each of the four classes; this is also true of the widowed or divorced. In the third age group, 45 years and over, the difference between the percentage of the single males and females is greatly reduced, and in the first class, native white of native parentage, the proportion of both sexes is nearly equal, that of the females being a little larger than that of the males.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 207 shows the marital condition of the adult population for 1910, in eight age periods, by sex. The diagram is divided into sections by the heavy line under the zero. The percentages for single persons are on the left, and for the married and widowed or divorced on the right. The ages considered were for adults 15 years and over. In the lower group, 15 to 19, a very small proportion of the males was reported as married, the females showing a much larger percentage. The proportion of females married and widowed or divorced is higher than for males in all the age periods below 65 years and over. In this group the percentage of single males and females is almost the same; in the married class the males show almost double the percentage of the females, while for widowed or divorced the percentage for females is more than double that of the males. In all the age groups below 65 years, for those who were returned as single, the males form a larger percentage than the females, the difference being greatest in the age group 20 to 24, with a gradual reduction in the higher ages to the age group 65 and over. The proportion married among the males increased from the low group to the age group 45 to 54. For the higher age groups, 55 to 64 and 65 and over, the proportion decreased rapidly. The married and widowed or divorced combined showed an increase in percentage at each age period above 15 to 19 years. The diagram brings out very clearly the prevailing difference between men and women as to age at marriage.

INTERSTATE MIGRATION.

Map 1 on Plate No. 208, per cent of the population born in each state, living in other states, in 1910.

California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida have the smallest percentage of the population born in these states who are living in other states, while New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Wyoming, and Nevada have the largest percentage of the population born in the state living in other states.

On Map 2, per cent of the native population living in each state born in other states, it will be noticed that most of the states east of the Mississippi were in the low percentage groups, with the exception of Florida, this state having the highest percentage of the native population living in the state born in other states. The Western states, almost without exception, have a large proportion of the native population living in the state who were born in other states. The marked exception is Utah, which has a smaller proportion of its population born in other states who are living in the state than any other state west of the Mississippi, except Louisiana.

On Diagram 1, Plate No. 209, is shown the aggregate migration of the native population from and to each state, as reported at the Thirteenth Census. The states are arranged in geographic order and, on the left of the diagram, the number of persons born in the state who are living in other states is shown. On the opposite side appears the number of persons living in the state who were born in other states. It is especially noticeable that for New York 1,317,398 persons were born in the state and are living in other states, and but 686,616 living in the state who were born in other states; in other words, New York has lost through interstate migration over 600,000 natives. Illinois also has lost through interstate migration, as there are 1,308,085 natives of the state living in other states. The Western states, especially those in the Mountain and Pacific divisions, have gained through interstate migration. The state of Oklahoma, with 1,092,844 persons who were born in other states, has a larger number of that class of immigrants than any other state, not excepting the more populous states of New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois. Illinois, with 997,189, ranks next to Oklahoma; Texas, with 907,908 residents who were born in other states, is third; these three states have lost a comparatively small number through migration to other states.

In Diagram 2 on Plate No. 209 net gain or net loss through interstate migration in 1910 is represented. The only state in the West South Central division which shows a net loss through interstate migration is Louisiana; the loss, however, was small. In the Mountain division Utah shows a slight loss through interstate migration. In the Pacific division all the states made great gains through interstate migration. New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee lost heavily through interstate migration. Excluding the District of Columbia, 23 states lost by interstate migration and 25 gained.

Diagram 1 on Plate No. 210 shows the per cent distribution of the natives of each state, as living in the state or living in other states, in 1910. California and Florida have the smallest percentage of persons born in the state who are living in other states, while Nevada and Vermont have the largest proportion born in the state and living in other states. There were only seven states—New Hampshire, Kansas, Vermont, Delaware, Iowa, Wyoming, and Nevada—in which the proportion of the population born in the state and living in the state is less than 70 per cent, and in 41 of the 48 states more than seven-tenths of the native population born in the state is living in the state.

Diagram 2 on Plate No. 210 is interesting in indicating the proportion of the population of each state as born in the state, born in other states, or foreign born, as returned at the Thirteenth Census. When the foreign born is considered in connection with persons born in the state, the states of Wyoming and Washington have less than 25 per cent of their total population born in the state of residence. The highest proportions of foreign-born population appear in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut, in the order named. The states which had over 75 per cent of the total population of each state born in the state are Maine, Indiana, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

The small map (3) on Plate No. 210 indicates for 1910, by the shaded lines, the states which lost through interstate migration, the unshaded states having gained.

The small map (4) on Plate No. 210 shows the states having gained or lost through all migration in 1910. Some of the states which lost through interstate migration have gained, when the foreign element is also considered. The gain for these states, therefore, is entirely due to the foreign-born population.

FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION.

Diagram 1 on Plate No. 211 indicates, by the length of the bars, the number of natives of each of the principal foreign countries that were returned at each census, from 1850 to 1910. The countries are ranked according to the number returned in 1910, the country with the largest number appearing first. The diagram presents most strikingly the change that has taken place in the character of the foreign-born population since 1850. The natives of Germany increased in numbers from 1850 to 1900, but in 1910 there was a falling off. There was a comparatively small number of natives of Russia and Finland and Austria-Hungary returned at the censuses prior to 1900. Increasing numbers of Irish are found at each census from 1850 to 1890, when the highest mark was reached; since then the number has steadily decreased. The natives of Italy,

like those of Austria-Hungary, came in great numbers to this country between 1890 and 1900, and especially between 1900 and 1910. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark combined have had a constant increase at each census since 1850, the largest number having been enumerated in 1910. Natives of England, Scotland, and Wales increased from 1850 to and including 1890; 1900 showed a slight decrease from the previous enumeration, but in 1910 an increase over the 1900 census was reported. The natives of Canada and Newfoundland increased at each enumeration from 1850 to 1910, although the increase from 1900 to 1910 was small.

Diagram 2 on Plate No. 211 shows the increase and decrease from 1900 to 1910, or the net result of the immigration from these countries. As previously stated, Germany leads at both enumerations, but shows a decrease from 1900 to 1910. Russia and Finland shows a large increase, as does Austria-Hungary. In 1900 Ireland was second in point of the number of its natives returned in the United States, but in 1910 it had fallen to the fourth place, and the number enumerated was less than in 1900. Italy, which had in 1900 the smallest returns of the eight countries shown on the diagram, was fifth in rank in 1910. England, Scotland, and Wales showed a slight increase, as did Canada and Newfoundland. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark occupied fifth place in 1900 and sixth in 1910.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 211 indicates, by the length of the bars, the number of natives returned at the census of 1910, from each of the foreign countries that were tabulated separately, the countries being arranged in the order of the total number returned by the enumerators at the Thirteenth Census. As in the previous diagrams, Germany has the largest number. There were 2,501,333 natives of Germany returned in 1910; this was over three-quarters of a million more than was returned from any other country. The smallest number returned for any country which was tabulated separately was 1,736, from Central America.

Plate No. 212, Diagram 1. The four circles are proportionate in size to the total foreign-born population returned at the censuses of 1850, 1870, 1890, and 1910. The divisions of each circle present the percentage of distribution of the foreign-born population by principal countries of birth at each of the censuses specified.

In 1850 the natives of Ireland (42.8 per cent), Germany (26 per cent), and Great Britain (16.9 per cent) formed 85.7 per cent of the foreign-born population. In 1870 the same countries furnished 77.5 per cent of our foreign born. Germany increased its proportion of the foreign-born population and was nearly equal to the Irish, the percentage being 33.3 for Ireland against 30.4 for Germany. In 1890 the Germans outnumbered the Irish at the rate of

30.1 to 20.2 per cent of the total foreign born. In 1910 Germany was again the country furnishing a larger proportion than any other, with 18.5 per cent; Russia and Finland, with 12.8 per cent, and Austria-Hungary, with 12.4 per cent, were second and third, respectively, Ireland having fallen to the fourth place, with 10 per cent. The circles present graphically the great change that has taken place in the composition of our foreign-born population since 1850.

In Diagram 2 the two circles are in proportion to the total foreign-born population returned in 1910 and 1900. They also indicate, by the size of the divisions, the proportion the foreign element from each of the principal countries of birth forms of the total. In 1900 Germany ranked first, with 27.2 per cent; Ireland was second, with 15.6 per cent; Canada and Newfoundland third, with 11.4 per cent; Great Britain fourth, with 11.3 per cent; Norway, Sweden, and Denmark combined fifth, with 10.4 per cent; Austria-Hungary sixth, with 6.2 per cent; Russia and Finland seventh, with 6.2 per cent; and Italy eighth, with 4.7 per cent. In 1910 Germany ranked first in the number of foreign born; Russia and Finland had advanced from the seventh place to the second; Austria-Hungary had advanced from sixth to third; Ireland had dropped from the second to the fourth place; Italy had advanced from eighth to fifth; Norway, Sweden, and Denmark dropped from fifth to sixth place; and Great Britain had fallen from fourth place to the seventh.

The series of circles on Plate No. 213 represent the foreign-born population of each geographic division, and the sectors of the circles indicate the proportion the natives of each of the principal countries of birth form of the total foreign born of the geographic division. For instance, in the New England division the Germans form the smallest proportion, while the natives of Ireland and Canada and Newfoundland form large proportions of the foreign element. In the Middle Atlantic division, Russia and Finland, Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Germany have the largest sectors. In the East North Central division the Germans far exceed all others, the natives of Austria-Hungary ranking next in order. In the West North Central division, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark combined rank first and Germany second. The Germans lead in the South Atlantic, the East South Central, and the West South Central divisions. The natives of England, Scotland, and Wales combined rank first in the Mountain division, and the Scandinavians rank first in the Pacific division. The countries are arranged in the same order on all the circles.

Plate No. 214 is made up of nine small diagrams, each diagram showing, by the length of the bars, the number of the natives of the principal foreign countries in that geographic division, in 1910 and 1900. The

countries are ranked according to the number of natives returned in 1910.

In the New England division the natives of Canada and Newfoundland led in the number returned at both censuses. The natives of Russia and Finland were most numerous in the Middle Atlantic division in 1910, but in 1900 the Germans were first. In the East North Central division the Germans led in both 1910 and 1900, but their number had decreased. In the West North Central division the natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark combined led in 1910, but in 1900 Germany ranked first. For the South Atlantic and East South Central divisions the Germans led at both censuses. In the West South Central division the natives of Mexico led at both censuses. In the Mountain division natives of England, Scotland, and Wales combined were in the lead in both 1910 and 1900. The natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark ranked first in the Pacific division in 1910, but in 1900 the Germans were the most numerous. Comparing all the diagrams, the largest number of the natives of Russia and Finland were found in the Middle Atlantic division, while the largest number of Germans were returned in the East North Central division. The natives of Canada and Newfoundland were most numerous in New England, and the natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark were most prominent in the West North Central division. The largest number of the natives of England, Scotland, and Wales was found in the Middle Atlantic division, and the largest number of Italians was returned in the Middle Atlantic division. There were more natives of Ireland returned in the Middle Atlantic division than in any other.

Plates Nos. 215 and 216 are composed of four diagrams each, showing, for 1910 and 1900, by double bars, the natives of certain foreign countries, by states, the states being ranked according to the number returned, with the largest first. Diagram 1 on Plate No. 215 presents the natives of Germany; Diagram 2, natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark; Diagram 3, Ireland; and Diagram 4, Austria-Hungary. Diagram 1 on Plate No. 216 shows the natives of Russia and Finland; Diagram 2, Italy; Diagram 3, Canada and Newfoundland; and Diagram 4, England, Scotland, and Wales.

A comparison of the eight diagrams on these plates, as to the states leading in the number of foreign born of each country returned in 1910, brings into relief the composition of the foreign population of those states which receive large numbers of immigrants.

New York has the greatest number of natives of Germany, Ireland, Russia and Finland, Italy, and of England, Scotland, and Wales. This state is second in the number of natives of Austria-Hungary, third in the number of natives of Canada and Newfoundland,

and fourth in the number of natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Pennsylvania leads in the number of natives of Austria-Hungary; is second in the number of natives of Russia and Finland, Italy, and England, Scotland, and Wales; is third in the number of natives of Ireland; and fourth in the number of Germans. Minnesota leads in the number of natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark; Illinois is second, and Wisconsin third. In fact, of the eight countries shown, New York leads in five; Minnesota in one (number of natives from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark); Pennsylvania in one (natives of Austria-Hungary); and Massachusetts in one (the number of natives of Canada and Newfoundland). The diagrams bring out clearly the decrease in the number of natives of Germany and Ireland in the various states from 1900 to 1910, also the great increase in the number of natives of Austria-Hungary and of Russia and Finland from 1900 to 1910. In fact, the natives of Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia and Finland in the states of New York and Pennsylvania have more than doubled in the 10 years since 1900.

Plate No. 217 is composed of six small maps, presenting graphically the percentage of the population of each state, at the Thirteenth Census, born in the foreign countries specified, and locates geographically the states that returned the greatest proportion of the natives of (1) Germany, (2) Russia and Finland, (3) Austria-Hungary, (4) Ireland, (5) Italy, and (6) Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Considering the proportion, and not the number of persons returned, the Germans form a larger proportion of the total population of Wisconsin (10 per cent) and Illinois (5.7 per cent) than of any other state. New York (6.2 per cent) and North Dakota (5.7 per cent) have the highest percentage of natives of Russia and Finland. The greatest number of natives of Austria-Hungary, also the highest percentage (4.9), is found in Pennsylvania. The highest percentage of natives of Ireland is found in Massachusetts (6.6 per cent) and Rhode Island (5.5 per cent). The greatest number of Italians, also the highest percentage, are found in New York (5.2 per cent). The largest percentage of the natives of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark combined is found in Minnesota (11.8 per cent), with North Dakota (11 per cent), South Dakota (6.4 per cent), and Washington (6 per cent) ranking in the order named. The natives of England, Scotland, and Wales, as presented by Map 1, Plate 218, are widely distributed, the highest percentage being found in Rhode Island (6.3 per cent), and the next largest proportion in Utah (6 per cent). The natives of Canada and Newfoundland form the largest proportion in the New England states of New Hampshire (13.5 per cent) and Maine (10.3 per cent), as shown on Map 2 of the same plate.

Diagram 4, Plate No. 218, is made up of two small diagrams, the one on the left representing the distribution of the Japanese in 1910 and 1900 in the cities having the largest number of that element of the population, and the diagram on the right giving similar data for the Chinese. The bars are arranged with the city having the largest number in 1910 at the top, the others following in order. As the Japanese and Chinese are largely distributed through the great cities, it is deemed advisable to simply show the population for these cities in which the Japanese and Chinese formed a fair proportion of the population. The first diagram, the Japanese, shows that Seattle had the largest number, followed by San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland, Portland, and Sacramento, in the order named. These were the only cities having more than 1,200 Japanese at the Thirteenth Census. It will be noted from the shaded bar, representing 1900, that the number of Japanese in each of these cities has increased largely since that date, Los Angeles showing the highest percentage of increase of the cities mentioned.

On the diagram representing the Chinese, San Francisco led, with Portland, New York, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Chicago, the only cities reporting over 1,200 Chinese in 1910, following in the order named. It will be noted from the difference in the length of the bars that the number of Chinese in San Francisco, Portland, New York, and Los Angeles has decreased since 1900, while in Oakland and Chicago the number has increased.

The Japanese population in the 12 cities shown in the diagram formed 33.1 per cent of the total Japanese population of the United States, and the Chinese shown in the dozen cities listed formed 47.6 per cent of the total Chinese population of the United States in 1910.

FOREIGN WHITE STOCK.

Great interest is taken, not only in the number of natives of foreign countries residing in the United States, but also in the number of persons born in the United States of foreign parentage. For brevity the term "foreign white stock" is used to indicate the combined total of three classes—the foreign-born whites, the native whites of foreign parentage, and the native whites of mixed parentage—that is, one parent foreign born and one parent native. The term "country of origin" is used not only to signify the country of birth of the person enumerated, but also the country of birth of the foreign-born parent or parents.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 218 presents the foreign white stock by principal countries of origin, for 1910, in the three classes just described. The largest number were from Germany, the bar being shaded to indicate first the number born in Germany; second, the number

born in this country, both parents born in Germany; and third, the native with one parent born in Germany and the other in the United States. The same designations are carried out through all the bars. One peculiarity will be noticed in the bars for the countries which have only recently begun to send large numbers of their natives to the United States. Of Germany, Ireland, Canada, and England, the foreign white stock includes a large number of one parent born in the specified country and one in the United States. The bar for Russia and Finland, as well as those for Italy, Austria, and Hungary, have a very small proportion in this class. In other words, the Russians, Italians, and Austro-Hungarians are not intermarrying with natives of the United States to such an extent as the Germans, Irish, Canadians, and English.

Diagram 1 on Plate No. 219 presents the percentage of foreign white stock, by eight principal countries of origin, in 1910. Germany leads with 25.7 per cent of the total, followed, in order of percentage, by Ireland, with 14 per cent; England, Scotland, and Wales combined, with 10 per cent; Canada, with 8.6 per cent; and Russia and Finland, with 8.5 per cent. These are the only countries forming 8.5 per cent or more of the foreign white stock. These five countries are followed by Austria-Hungary and Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, with 8.4 per cent. The three countries of Germany, Ireland, and England, Scotland, and Wales combined, form 49.7 per cent, practically 50 per cent, of the total foreign white stock.

MOTHER TONGUE.

The census act of July 2, 1909, was amended by Public Resolution No. 23, approved March 24, 1910, to include an inquiry as to the nationality or mother tongue. The Thirteenth Census was therefore the first enumeration to include an inquiry as to the mother tongue of the foreign-born population.

The circle, Diagram 2, Plate No. 219, indicates, by the size of the sectors, the per cent of the foreign white stock in each of the linguistic groups or mother tongues in 1910. The English and Celtic are the most prevalent, forming 31.1 per cent; with Germanic second, 28.5 per cent; Latin and Greek third, 13.3 per cent; and Slavic and Lettic fourth, 10.1 per cent.

The circles in Diagram 3 represent for 1910 the total foreign born (on the left), and the total native of foreign stock (on the right), by linguistic groups. Each circle is divided into sectors proportional to the size of the group. Comparing the circle for the foreign born with that for the native of foreign stock, the difference in size of the sectors of the two circles shows that the English and Celtic and the Germanic elements are much larger in the total native of foreign stock than in the foreign born. For the other elements, Slavic and Lettic, Latin and Greek, and Scandinavian, the sectors for the circle indicating the foreign born are larger than

those for the circle indicating the native of foreign stock.

Diagram 4 on Plate No. 219 shows the foreign white stock, by principal mother tongues, in 1910. The English and Celtic is the most largely represented of the foreign white stock in the United States, there being over 10,000,000 people in that group; it is closely followed by the Germans, with a little less than 9,000,000. The other mother tongues are much smaller, the Italians having a little over 2,000,000, followed by Polish, Yiddish and Hebrew, Swedish, French, and Norwegian, each of these having in its group more than 1,000,000 people, the total for all mother tongues being 32,243,382. The English and Celtic and Germans together contribute more than one-half of the total.

Diagram 5 on the same plate represents, by the different shading of the bars, the three elements of the foreign white stock, by principal mother tongues, in 1910, each bar being divided into foreign-born white; native white, both parents foreign born; and native white, one parent foreign born and one native. This diagram brings out the difference in the proportion of the above described elements—especially the native white, one parent foreign born and one native. This element has a much larger proportion in the groups of English and Celtic and Germanic than in any of the others. The Swedish, French, and Norwegian show a much larger proportion of this element than do the Italians, Polish, and Yiddish and Hebrew.

IMMIGRATION.

Plate No. 220 presents, by the length of the bars, the immigration of the foreign-born population in two divisions—those arriving in the United States before January 1, 1901, and those arriving after January 1, 1901, in each state and territory, arranged by geographic divisions.

The difference in the length of the two bars indicates strikingly the large proportion of the immigration in certain states that has arrived in this country since January 1, 1901. This is especially noticeable in the New England and Middle Atlantic states. In the West North Central division the contrary will be noted—that is, that the bars representing the arrivals before January 1, 1901, are much longer than the bars representing the arrivals after January 1, 1901. The large number of the foreign born who were returned from the state of New York, as compared with the other states, is also indicated by the length of the bars on the diagram. The large number of immigrants in the first four geographic divisions, as compared with the last five divisions on the diagram, is especially noticeable. The states of West Virginia, Wyoming, and Arizona are the only states in which the number of immigrants arriving after January 1, 1901, exceeds the number arriving before that date.

VOTING AGE, MILITIA AGE, AND NATURALIZATION.

The two diagrams on Plate No. 221 show the distribution of the males 21 years of age and over, by color or race, nativity, and parentage, for the several states, at the censuses of 1910 and 1900. The proportion in each state is almost the same as on the diagram for the total population. The largest proportion of native white of native parents at both censuses was found in West Virginia, with Kentucky second and Oklahoma third in 1910, and Oklahoma second and Kentucky third in 1900. Minnesota led in the number of foreign-born white, with Rhode Island second, and North Dakota third, in 1910; in 1900, North Dakota was first, Minnesota second, Wisconsin third, and Rhode Island fourth. In the proportion of native white of foreign or mixed parentage Wisconsin led both in 1910 and 1900, with Utah second at both censuses. The large proportion of negroes in the states of the South Atlantic and East South Central divisions is indicated by the black portion of the bars, the proportions being practically the same for both 1910 and 1900. The foreign element was small in these same divisions and formed about the same proportion of the population at each census.

Diagram 1 on Plate No. 222 shows the color or race, nativity, and parentage of males 21 years of age and over in urban and rural communities, by geographic divisions, in 1910. The large proportion of the foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over in the urban communities, as compared with the rural communities, is shown for all the divisions except the Mountain and Pacific. In the Mountain division only do the rural communities have a larger proportion of the foreign-born white than the urban; in the Pacific division the proportion is almost the same in both communities. In every geographic division, with the exception of the West North Central, the proportion of native white of foreign or mixed parentage is larger in the urban communities than in the rural, and, conversely, the proportion of natives of native parentage is much larger in the rural communities than in the urban. The New England division with 69.1 per cent, has the largest proportion of native white of native parentage in the rural communities, closely followed by the East South Central (67.3 per cent), the West South Central (65.8 per cent), and the South Atlantic (63.1 per cent). In each of these divisions over 60 per cent of the male population 21 years of age and over in rural areas is native white of native parentage.

Diagram 2 on Plate No. 222, presenting the proportion of foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over, by citizenship and country of birth, in 1910, is divided into two parts by a heavy black line in the center, the left side indicating the percentage of the foreign-born white males who are naturalized, have taken out

first papers, or the status of whose naturalization was not reported. On the right side of the diagram is indicated the percentage of the population who are alien. The width of the bars, representing each of the principal foreign countries, is in accordance with the number returned in 1910, arranged with the country having the highest percentage of foreign-born white males at the bottom. The percentage alien was highest among the natives of Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, etc., and lowest for the natives of Germany. The European countries having over 45 per cent aliens were countries of southern or eastern Europe; in the remaining European countries, except Belgium and Luxemburg, France, and Scotland, the proportion of aliens was less than 20 per cent of the total number reported. The percentage alien for natives of Mexico was 66.6, that of Cuba and other West Indies 44.2, and for Canada and Newfoundland together 28.3, while among the French Canadians it was 40.2. The large proportion of the bars on the left side of the diagram is due to the large percentage of male immigrants from certain countries who have become naturalized or have taken out their first papers.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

Diagram 3 on Plate No. 222 indicates, by the rise and fall of the curve, the percentage for single years of age of the population of school age (6 to 20 years), attending school during the school year of 1909-10. The curve, beginning at 52.1 per cent, at the age of 6, rises rapidly and reaches its highest point, 91.2 per cent, at the age of 11 years, decreasing slightly to 14, then rapidly at each age, until at 20 years of age the per cent is 8.4. The curve shows that among children from the ages of 6 to 16, more than 50 per cent are attending school.

The four curved lines on Diagram 4 on Plate No. 222 indicate the per cent attending school in the total population and in certain classes at each year from 6 to 20 years of age, during the school year 1909-10. The classes presented are the total population, native white, foreign-born white, and negro. The solid line represents the total population, the broken line the native white population, the dash and dot the foreign-born white, and the dash and cross the negro. The native white at each age has a higher proportion attending school than the foreign-born white, the negro, or the total population. The foreign-born whites have a higher proportion attending school at the ages from 6 to 12 than the total population, but after 12 years of age the percentage of the foreign born attending school decreases rapidly until between the ages of 14 and 15 it falls below the curve representing the negro school attendance. The curve representing the percentage of negroes attending school is much lower than the other classes from the ages of 6 to 14, but, after the age of 14, they have a higher school attendance than the for-

ign born. The legal age for employment in many states being 14 probably accounts for the rapid falling off in the school attendance in all classes and is strikingly apparent among the foreign-born children.

ILLITERACY.

Map 1 on Plate No. 223 presents graphically in seven groups, by states, the percentage of illiterates in the population 10 years of age and over in 1910. The highest percentage group, 25 per cent and over, applies to the states of South Carolina and Louisiana. The Southern states have a heavy rate of illiteracy for the total population, as do New Mexico and Arizona. The states of Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Idaho, Utah, Washington, and Oregon have the lowest rate, from 1 to 3 per cent, illiterate. No state shows for its total population a percentage of illiteracy of less than 1 per cent.

The percentage of illiterates among the native whites of native parentage is indicated on Map 2, Plate No. 223. For this element of the population nearly all the states in the West North Central and Mountain divisions have less than 1 per cent illiterates. In the New England division there are only two states, Maine and Vermont, which have more than 1 per cent illiterate. In the Middle Atlantic division New York is the only state whose illiteracy among the native white of native parentage is less than 1 per cent. In the East North Central division there is only one state, Wisconsin, with a rate of illiteracy among the native white of native parentage of less than 1 per cent. In the West North Central division all the states, except Missouri, have a rate of illiteracy of less than 1 per cent. In the Mountain division there are only three states—Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona—that have a rate of illiteracy of over 1 per cent. In the Pacific division all the states have a rate of illiteracy of less than 1 per cent among the native white of native parentage.

Map 1 on Plate No. 224 shows, for 1910, by states, the per cent of illiterates in the population 10 years of age and over among the foreign-born whites. Three states—Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas—have the highest percentage of illiteracy, 25 per cent and over. In the next group, 15 to 25 per cent, are found the states of Louisiana, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Mississippi. In general, it will be noted that the illiteracy among the foreign-born whites is lowest in the West North Central and Pacific divisions. The state of Washington has the smallest percentage of illiterates among the foreign born.

Map 2 on Plate No. 224 shows the percentage of negro illiterates in the population 10 years of age and over at the Thirteenth Census. In every state in the East South Central division more than 25 per cent of the negroes 10 years of age and over were illiterate.

Louisiana had the highest rate of negro illiteracy, 48.4 per cent, and Alabama was second, with 40.1 per cent. In the South Atlantic division every state, with the exception of West Virginia, with 20.3 per cent, and Maryland, with 23.4 per cent, had more than 25 per cent of the negroes illiterate. In the states in the far North, where the negro population was small, the lowest percentage of negro illiteracy was found, that of Oregon and Minnesota being but 3.4 per cent.

The four diagrams on Plate No. 225 show for (1) all classes, (2) native whites of native parentage, (3) foreign-born whites, and (4) negroes, the percentage of illiterates in the population 10 years of age and over, in each state, for 1910 and 1900 compared. Nearly all the states show a considerable reduction in the percentage of illiterates in all the elements since 1900. The reduction is especially prominent among negroes, as indicated on Diagram 4. In "all classes," Diagram 1, the proportion decreased in all the states, except New York, whose percentage (5.5) was the same at both censuses, and Connecticut, which had a slight increase in the percentage of illiterates, from 5.9 per cent in 1900 to 6 per cent in 1910. In the native whites of native parentage, Diagram 2, no state shows an increase in the per cent of illiterates. Among the foreign-born whites, Diagram 3, 24 states, including the District of Columbia, show an increase in the percentage of illiterates, but not a single state shows an increase in the percentage of illiterates among the negroes. The highest per cent of decrease in negro illiteracy during the decade was in Nevada. With this exception, the greatest decreases in the percentage of negro illiteracy were in the Southern states.

INABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH.

Plate No. 226 represents, by the length of the bars, the foreign-born white population 10 years of age and over unable to speak English, in 1910 and 1900, males and females. It will be noted that the diagram is not symmetrical—that is, there are a larger number of males who can not speak English than females in 1910; this was not true, however, in 1900, the bars being a little longer for the females, with almost the same proportions existing in regard to inability to speak English between the males and females in 1910 as in 1900. New York and Pennsylvania, with the longest bars for 1910, have a considerable preponderance of the males over the females in this class. In 1900 it will be noted that there were more females than males in New York who could not speak English, while in Pennsylvania the reverse was true. In Illinois, in 1900, there were more females than males who could not speak English; this was also true of Wisconsin and Minnesota. In fact, in a majority of the states the females unable to speak English outnumbered the males in 1900. In 1910 in all the states, except Maine, Rhode Island, Wisconsin,

North Dakota, and South Dakota, there was a larger number of males who could not speak English than females. The difference in the length of the bars shows the large number of the foreign-born population in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, and New Jersey, as compared with the small number of this element in other states, who could not speak English. In the United States the number of males who could not speak English, 1,683,949, exceeded the number of females, 1,269,062, by 414,887. West Virginia, in proportion to the size of the state and the number of foreign born, had in 1910 a larger proportion of males who could not speak English than any other state, closely followed by New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas, in the order named, each with over 50 per cent, while Arizona had the largest proportion of females (63.8 per cent), followed by Texas and New Mexico in order, each exceeding 50 per cent.

DWELLINGS AND FAMILIES PER SQUARE MILE.

The two maps on Plate No. 227 show, by states, the number of dwellings per square mile of the total land area, and the number of families per square mile of the total land area, at the Thirteenth Census. The states taken as the unit, and the number of families, also the number of dwellings, divided by the total land area in square miles, presents what might be called the map showing the density of dwellings and the density of families. The maps bring out very strikingly the peculiar fact that in the entire western half of the United States there are less than five dwellings to a square mile, also less than five families, taking the state as the unit. It would therefore seem that there is still considerable room for settlement in the West. Such states as Maine, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Iowa, with most of the Southern states, fall in the class from 5 to 10 dwellings per square mile, also the same number of families, 5 to 10 per square mile. The maps also bring out very clearly the fact that the number of families are only slightly in excess of the number of dwellings; as compared with the total area of the state, the most densely populated states have, of course, the greatest difference between the number of families and the number of dwellings. A comparison of these maps with the maps showing the density of population shows that the density of families and dwellings and the density of population are closely related.

OWNERSHIP OF HOMES.

On Plate No. 228, Diagram 1 illustrates the proportion of all homes owned free, owned encumbered, and rented, in 1910, by states. Excluding the District of Columbia, the largest proportion of rented homes is in the state of Rhode Island, with 71.7 per cent; the next states in order are Georgia, South Carolina, and New

York, each with over 69 per cent. The smallest percentage of rented homes (24.9) is shown in the state of North Dakota, and the largest proportion (66.3 per cent) of homes owned free in the state of New Mexico; this state also has the smallest proportion (4 per cent) of homes encumbered and is next to North Dakota in the small proportion of rented homes (29.7 per cent).

Diagram 2 on the sample plate shows the same distribution of farm homes, owned free, owned encumbered, and rented, at the Thirteenth Census. Maine has the smallest proportion of its farms rented, while Mississippi has the highest percentage of farms rented, followed by Georgia and South Carolina. The highest percentage of farms owned free is in New Mexico (88.9 per cent), with Arizona second, and Utah, Montana, Wyoming, and Maine following, each having over 70 per cent of their farm homes owned free. The percentage owned encumbered is highest in Wisconsin; Vermont is second, closely followed by North Dakota, Michigan, and Connecticut, in the order named. By comparing the two diagrams, it will be noted that, except for the Southern states, the states having a large proportion of urban population have the highest percentage of rented homes, while among the farm homes the Southern states, in which the tenant system is followed, have the largest proportion of rented farms.

OCCUPATIONS.

Plate No. 229, proportion of population 10 years of age and over engaged in gainful occupations for both sexes in 1910 and 1900, and for each sex in 1910, by states, is divided into two parts. The bars on the left represent the per cent of the total population 10 years of age and over—that is, both sexes, engaged in gainful occupations, in each state, in 1910 and 1900, the states being arranged in order of the percentages for 1910, with the highest percentage at the top. The length of the black bar, as compared with the shaded bar, shows the increase of the percentage of 1910 over that of 1900. In 1900 Wyoming had the highest percentage, with South Carolina second and Montana third. In 1910 Mississippi was in the lead, with South Carolina second, Alabama third, Nevada fourth, and Wyoming fifth. The bar for Mississippi indicates that 68 per cent of the population 10 years of age and over was engaged in gainful occupations in 1910. The bars on the right compare the percentage of males with that of the females engaged in gainful occupations in 1910, the black bar representing the males and the shaded bar the females. Alabama leads in the proportion of males engaged in gainful occupations, 88.3 per cent, and is third in rank for the females (40.9 per cent). Mississippi, which is second in the percentage of males employed, has a larger proportion of females employed (47.6 per cent) than Alabama (40.9 per cent). South

Carolina, which is sixth in rank in the percentage of males employed, has a larger proportion of females employed (49 per cent) than any other state. Iowa has the lowest percentage employed for both sexes and for the males, while Idaho has the lowest percentage of females employed in gainful occupations (12.8 per cent).

Plate No. 230 presents the proportion of males and females 10 years of age and over engaged in gainful occupations, by states, in 1910 and 1900. The length of the bars indicates that Wyoming leads in the percentage of males employed in 1910, also in 1900, the proportion being higher in 1900 than in 1910. There are only two states—Arizona and Nevada—that show a larger proportion of males employed in gainful occupations in 1910 than in 1900. South Carolina has the lowest percentage of males employed in 1910 (63.2 per cent), also in 1900 (68.2 per cent), with the exception of the District of Columbia, which had, in 1900, 67.6 per cent. The column on the right indicates the proportion of females 10 years of age and over engaged in gainful occupations for 1910 and 1900, the states being arranged in the same order as for the males. Comparing the bars for the males with those representing the females, it will be noted that those states which have the largest proportion of males employed have the smallest proportion of females. This is, of course, true for both 1900 and 1910. Wyoming, leading in the proportion of males employed, has the smallest proportion of females.

Plate No. 231 shows the proportion of males and females 10 to 13, also 14 and 15 years of age engaged in gainful occupations, by states, in 1910. This diagram is of great interest, in view of the agitation in regard to restricting child labor. The large proportion of children, both male and female, 10 to 13 years of age engaged in gainful occupations in the Southern states is, undoubtedly, due to the inclusion of all children employed in agriculture. Mississippi leads in the proportion of males (56.1 per cent) and South Carolina in the proportion of female workers 10 to 13 years of age (39.5 per cent), while New York has the lowest percentage of males (1.1 per cent) and Massachusetts of females (0.3 per cent). The diagram on the right shows the percentage of males and females 14 and 15 years of age engaged in gainful occupations. The states of Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina have the largest proportion of males and females for these ages, and rank in the same order as for the ages 10 to 13 years. The District of Columbia has the smallest number of males (15.5 per cent) and the state of Idaho the smallest number of females 14 and 15 years of age (3 per cent) employed in gainful occupations.

Plate No. 232 is made up of two maps, Map 1 showing, by states, the percentage of males 10 to 13 years

of age engaged in gainful occupations in 1910, and Map 2 presenting similar data for males 14 and 15 years of age.

Map 1, for males 10 to 13 years of age, presents, by the different shading, seven groups of percentages. The lowest group, unshaded, is less than 1 per cent; the next group, 1 to 5 per cent, covers the Pacific Coast states, all the New England and Middle Atlantic states, and all of the East North Central states, except Indiana, showing that but a small proportion of these young boys are at work. The highest percentage group is shaded a solid black, and indicates that South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi are the only states in which 50 per cent or more of the males 10 to 13 years of age are gainful workers. The next group, 35 to 50 per cent, applies to the states of North Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, and Texas. Florida falls in the next lower group, 25 to 35 per cent, as does Kentucky and Tennessee. The map brings out strikingly the high percentage of males 10 to 13 years of age who are employed in gainful occupations in the southern part of the United States.

Map 2, for the ages of 14 and 15 years, 14 years being the lawful age of employment in most of the states, shows a much higher percentage of boys of these two ages employed. The highest percentages are found in the Southern states. The entire Mountain division, except New Mexico, and the Pacific division, except Washington, fall in the class of 15 to 25 per cent. The two lower groups, which cover a considerable portion of the preceding map, do not appear on this map, except in the case of Washington, which is the only state that has less than 15 per cent of the males 14 and 15 years of age employed in gainful occupations. All the states in the East South Central division and the West South Central division, with the exception of Oklahoma, are in the highest group, showing that more than 50 per cent of the boys 14 and 15 years of age are at work. Mississippi and Alabama lead, with more than 75 per cent of their youths engaged in gainful occupations. The states of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, of the South Atlantic division, are also in the class of 50 per cent and over.

Plate No. 233 is made up of two maps covering the same data for the females that were shown for the males on Plate No. 232. Map 1 indicates, by the seven groups of shading, the percentage of females 10 to 13 years of age engaged in gainful occupations in 1910. The uncolored area, principally in the North and West, indicates the states in which less than 1 per cent of the females of this class are engaged in gainful occupations. The light shade, indicating the states in which 1 to 5 per cent of the females of this class are employed, together with the unshaded area, covers three-fourths of the states. The highest percentages, indicated by the dark shades, are found in the South Atlantic, East

South Central, and West South Central divisions. Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina are in the group from 35 to 50 per cent; North Carolina, Georgia, and Arkansas fall in the next lower group, 25 to 35 per cent; Texas is in the group 15 to 25 per cent; Virginia, Tennessee, Florida, Louisiana, and Oklahoma are in the group 5 to 15 per cent; all the remainder of the United States has less than 5 per cent of the females 10 to 13 years of age engaged in gainful occupations.

Map 2 indicates, by the seven groups of shading, the percentage of females 14 and 15 years of age engaged in gainful occupations in 1910. As in the preceding illustration, the highest percentages are found in the Southern states. South Carolina and Mississippi are the only states that have 50 per cent or more of the females of the ages specified engaged in gainful occupations. The next group, 35 to 50 per cent, covers North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, and Rhode Island, the latter being the only Northern state to fall in this class. The next lower group, 25 to 35 per cent, applies to the states of Louisiana and Texas only. All the Northern and Western states, with the exception of Rhode Island, fall in the groups below 25 per cent. Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have less than 5 per cent of the females 14 and 15 years of age engaged in gainful occupations. Taking up the number of states below and above 15 per cent, we find that, excluding the District of Columbia, there are 28 states that have less than 15 per cent, and 20 states that have 15 per cent or more of the females 14 and 15 years of age gainfully employed.

Plate No. 234 shows the proportion of males and females 10 years of age and over engaged in certain gainful occupations in 1910, the black portion of the bar representing the male workers and the unshaded part the female. The long black bars indicate the occupations in which males preponderate. The occupations in each grand group having the largest proportion of male workers are as follows: Stock herders, drovers, and feeders; shoemakers and cobblers (not in factory); mail carriers; commercial travelers; laborers (public service); physicians and surgeons; saloon keepers; and agents, canvassers, and collectors. Where the black bar is the smallest female workers preponderate, as in the case of laundresses (not in laundries); milliners and millinery dealers; trained nurses; housekeepers and stewards; and telephone operators. The preponderance of the black bar over the white indicates that there is a larger proportion of males engaged in that occupation than of females.

Plate No. 235 shows graphically for each state the proportion of persons engaged in each of the nine general divisions of occupations at the Thirteenth Census, 1910. The states are ranked in the order of the percentage of persons employed in agriculture,

forestry, and animal husbandry, the state with the highest percentage being first. Mississippi has the highest percentage of persons employed in the first general division of occupations. South Carolina, Arkansas, Alabama, North Carolina, and Georgia follow in order, each having more than 60 per cent of the population 10 years of age and over engaged in agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry. The states having the smallest proportion of persons employed in this general division of occupations are Massachusetts, with 4.9 per cent, and Rhode Island, with 5 per cent, all other states having more than 5 per cent of their gainful workers engaged in the first general division of occupations. The diagram shows strikingly the fact that where manufacturing and mechanical industries predominate, farming is unimportant, and, conversely, where agriculture predominates, manufacturing is of small importance. The clerical occupations, the last on the bar, are largely in those states which have manufactures and trade.

The states having the largest number of persons employed in the second division of occupations, extraction of minerals, are Nevada (21.9 per cent), Arizona (17.7 per cent), West Virginia (14.4 per cent), and Montana (10.9 per cent), Wyoming and Pennsylvania having the same percentage, 10.5 each.

The states leading in the proportion of persons engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries are as follows: Rhode Island (56.3 per cent), Connecticut (52.8 per cent), Massachusetts (50.6 per cent), and New Hampshire (49.4 per cent).

The states having the largest proportion of their population engaged in the fourth general division of occupations, transportation, are as follows: Wyoming (14.7 per cent), Montana (13.4 per cent), Washington (11.6 per cent), Oregon (11.5 per cent), and Nevada (11.4 per cent). These are the only states which have more than 10 per cent of their workers in this general division of occupations.

In the next group, trade, California leads (13.7 per cent); excluding the District of Columbia (13 per cent), New York follows (13.6 per cent), with Illinois third (12.4 per cent), New Jersey fourth (12.1 per cent), and Massachusetts fifth (12 per cent).

In public service, Wyoming leads with 6.2 per cent, and, excluding the District of Columbia (4.7 per cent), this state is followed by Rhode Island with 2.8 per cent; California and Washington are the next states in order, each having 2.2 per cent employed in this group.

In the group of professional service, excluding the District of Columbia with 8 per cent, California leads with 6.3 per cent, and Colorado is second with 6.2 per cent, followed by Iowa and Utah, each having 6 per cent.

In the next group, clerical occupations, the states, excluding the District of Columbia (15.3 per cent), are ranked in the following order: New York (8.3 per cent),

New Jersey (8 per cent), Illinois (7.3 per cent), and Massachusetts (7.1 per cent).

In the last group, domestic and personal service, excluding the District of Columbia with 25.7 per cent, Maryland leads with 14.6 per cent, followed by New York with 13.4 per cent, Virginia with 12.9 per cent, and California, Florida, and Nevada, each with 12.7 per cent.

The diagram shows that in all the states, except Arizona, California, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New York, and Wyoming, agriculture and manufacturing combined include more than 50 per cent of the gainful workers.

Plate No. 236, Diagram 1, gives the proportion of males and females 10 years of age and over engaged in each general division of occupations in 1910, the light shading on the left representing the males and the cross-hatched portion the females. The males have the largest proportion of the workers in the following occupations: Extraction of minerals, public service (not elsewhere classified), and transportation. The only division in which the females exceed the males is the division of domestic and personal service, of which they form 67.1 per cent of the total. In the remaining divisions the males form more than 50 per cent of the gainful workers.

In Diagram 2 the proportion which gainful workers, both sexes, males, and females, of each specified age group constituted of all gainful workers in 1910, is indicated. The group 21 to 44 years has a larger proportion of "both sexes" and of males and females than any of the other age groups. The first group, 10 to 13 years of age, shows a slightly smaller number for "both sexes" and those for males and females than the next group, 14 and 15 years. The age group 16 to 20 years has a much larger proportion employed than the lower age groups. It will be noted for the first three age groups that the females have a larger pro-

portion than the males; but in the last two age groups, 21 to 44 and 45 years and over, the males have a larger proportion than the females. The two groups, 21 to 44 and 45 years and over, include 80.5 per cent of "both sexes" engaged in gainful occupations; in the same groups the males form 83.6 per cent of the number of male workers, and the females form 69.3 per cent of the number of female workers.

Diagram 3 presents the proportion of each principal class of population 10 years of age and over, both sexes, males, and females, engaged in gainful occupations in 1910. For "all classes," 53.3 per cent of both sexes are engaged in gainful occupations; for the males, 81.3 per cent are workers; and of the females, 23.4 per cent. Of the four classes of population shown on the diagram, the negroes have the largest proportion of both sexes engaged in gainful occupations (71.0 per cent), also of the females (54.7 per cent). The native white of native parentage has the lowest per cent of both sexes (48.4 per cent), and of females (17.1 per cent). The foreign-born white has the highest per cent of males (90 per cent), and is slightly in excess of the negroes (87.4 per cent). Of the females in these two classes, the negroes, with 54.7 per cent, far exceed the proportion of females in the foreign-born white, which is 21.7 per cent.

Diagram 4 presents the proportion of males and females of each of five age groups engaged in gainful occupations in 1910. In the first age group, 10 to 13 years of age, the proportion of males is more than double that of the females. In fact, the proportion of males exceeds that of the females in every age group. In the age group 21 to 44 years 96.7 per cent of the males are workers. In this same group the proportion of the females at work is only 26.3 per cent. The largest proportion of females in any age group is in the group of 16 to 20 years of age, in which 39.9 per cent of the females 10 years of age and over are employed in gainful occupations.