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## PREFACE

This is the fifth in a series* of technical and analytical reports concerned with recent migration and urbanization in the United States and with some of the correlates of these processes.

The time reference of the first three reports was the two census years 1950 and 1960. The spatial units were the large cities (in general, those with 250,000 or more population); the standard metropolitan statistical areas in which each of these cities was located; and the residual rings within each SMSA around each central city. The purpose of these three reports was to reorganize and summarize data needed for migration analyses by adjusting unpublished tabulations from the 1960 Population Census, for area comparability, with tables available in the 1950 Population Census.

Thus, the first three reports were primarily technical in nature and provided bases for putting the most recent census data in a form suitable for historical analysis. The fourth report was the first to apply these adjustments. In it were presented estimates of net intercensal migration for cities, metropolitan areas, and rings for the 1950-1960 intercensal period and also as far as possible for the two preceding decades. Its distinctive contribution was an analytical summary of some of our preliminary findings on the role of migration in urban population change.

The present report - the fifth in our series - again takes the 19501960 decade as a focus. As indicated in the Introduction it presents two major types of estimates of net intercensal migration, with states and geographic divisions as spatial units. The first of these follows, in general,

[^1]procedures developed in our earlier studies of net intercensal migration for the eight decades, 1870-1950, by states,* and thus preserves historical continuity. The second breaks new ground, for the $1950-1960$ period, with a series of estimates based on birth-residence data. It is important methodologically and it adds another dimension to the substantive analysis of internal migration.

The whole study, of which these reports are segments, was made possible by an initial grant from the Ford Foundation and continuing generous support from the National Science Foundation. To both of these agencies and to the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania we wish to express our gratitude. We are indebted to the staff of the Population Division of the United States Bureau of the Census for their cooperation, especially to Dr. Henry S. Shryock, Jr. and Mr. Jacob Siegel who read and gave helpful comments on Section VII of the present report, as also did Dr. C. Horace Hamilton of North Carolina State University. As indicated in Section VI, Mr. Yun Kim contributed greatly to the development of the basic birthresidence series.

Of the staff at the Population Studies Center at the University of Pennsylvania, we acknowledge with especial gratitude the direction of the preparation of intercensal estimates for states by Dr. Ann Ratner Miller; the supervision of the basic statistical operations by Mr. Bension Varon; the proofreading and checking of the text against the tables by Miss Bette Neeld; the planning, preparation, and execution of the charts and graphs by Mrs. Lydia F. Christaldi; and the typing of manuscript and tables by Miss Livia Sparagna.

Dorothy Swaine Thomas Research Director

[^2]
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Historical series of estimates of net intercensal migration for states were developed by Everett $S$. Lee at the University of Pennsylvania and utilized in the three-volume study, Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870-1950. ${ }^{1}$ Estimates were derived by the use of forward census survival ratios for each intercensal period, 1870 to 1950 , with detail by age and sex for the native white, foreign-born white, and Negro population. The procedures followed in their derivation are described in Volume I of that study. Estimates for 1950-1960, which make use of data from the Census of 1960 , have recently been completed. The new figures are in general comparable with those for preceding decades, though certain changes in coverage and certain refinements of technique have been introduced. Changes in procedure were dictated by several considerations, principal among which were the addition of Alaska and Hawaii to the roster of states and the increased importance of the movement of native persons (both military and civilian) into and out of the country, that is, between the United States and Puerto Rico, and between the United States and the "population abroad". The "closed" population upon which the census survival ratios were based therefore includes not only the two new states but also Puerto Rico and the United States population abroad. The entire system will hereafter be referred to as the "expanded area". A detailed account of the procedures followed in

[^3]deriving the estimates is presented in an earlier report of this series. ${ }^{2}$ The estimates for individual states and for the other parts of the expanded area are presented in Appendix Table $A$ of the present report.

The main purpose of this report is to carry forward the major migration series analyzed in Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, and to summarize developments in 1950-1960. In the process, considerable emphasis is placed upon comparisons between 1950-1960 and 1940-1950. Because the historical data exclude Hawaii and Alaska, much of the discussion deals with conterminous United States rather than with the total United States as now constituted. In addition, estimates derived by other methods are compared with those based on census survival ratios, and some attempt is made to evaluate the merits of each and to integrate the findings.

Section II gives an overall summary of intercensal redistribution and growth between 1870 and 1960. Section III analyzes redistribution in terms of its sources = natural increase and migration - over the same period and describes the patterns of interstate redistribution in 1950-1960. Sections IV and $V$ present in some detail the findings on redistribution due to migration between 1950 and 1960 , with attention to differences by age, sex, race, and nativity. In Section $\mathrm{VI}_{s}$ advantage is taken of the new estimates of net migration for geographic divisions for the period 1950 -1960, which are based on division-specific census survival ratios and which make it possible (a) to assess the effect upon the conventional census-survival-ratio estimates of geographic variations in survival and census error and (b) to analyze the net balance of migration into its components - net change due to the migration of
${ }^{2}$ Ann Ratner Miller, Net Intercensal Migration to Large Urban Areas of the United States, 1930-1940, 1940-1950, 1950-1960, Analytical and Technical Report, No. 4. Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1964, pp. 47-59.
persons born in the division and net change due to the migration of persons born in other divisions. In Section VII, estimates of net intercensal migration for the white population as derived by the census-survival-ratio method are compared with estimates derived by the vital statistics method. Sources and possible explanations of the observed differences are explored.

## II. POPULATION GROWTH AND REDISTRIBUTION

Although the trend in the decade rate of increase of the population of the conterminous United States has been generally downward since 1870, fluctuations in the rate have produced the pattern of rise and fall shown in Table 1 and Figure 1. During the 90 -year period, the rate rose twice in consecutive decades only during the two decades between 1940 and 1960. The rate for 1950-1960 was the highest since 1900-1910. If Alaska and Hawaii are included, the rates for the last two decades are almost unchanged, being 14.5 and 18.5 as compared with 14.5 and 18.4 for the conterminous area.

TABLE 1. - RATE OF POPULATION GROWTH AND INDEX OF INTERSTATE REDISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION, CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1870-1880 TO 1950-1960.

|  | Percent Increase in Population | Iridex | Relatives | (Average $=100$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Redistribution | Increase | Redistribution |
| 1870-1880 | 30.1 | 5.36 | 161 | 144 |
| 1880-1890 | 25.5 | 4.87 | 136 | 131 |
| 1890-1900 | 20.7 | 2.72 | 111 | 73 |
| 1900-1910 | 21.0 | 4.25 | 112 | 114 |
| 1910-1920 | 14.9 | 2.55 | 80 | 68 |
| 1920-1930 | 16.1 | 3.58 | 86 | 96 |
| 1930-1940 | 7.2 | 1.97 | 39 | 53 |
| 1940-1950 | 14.5 | 3.86 | 78 | 103 |
| 1950-1960 | 18.4 | 4.39 | 98 | 118 |
| Average | 18.7 | 3.73 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Col. 1-U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960 , Volume $I$, Characteristics of the Population. Part 1, United States Summary, Table 2. Col. 2 computed from Table 9 , ibid. See text for explanation.


Figure 1

## III. COMPONENTS OF REDISTRIBUTION

Estimates of net migration and natural increase, by states, for the period 1950-1960 are presented in Table 2. Consistent with the historical series, these data refer to the combined white and Negro population. The exclusion of "other nonwhite races" cannot have much effect upon the findings, for this group has never comprised as much as one percent of the population. Its proportion was 0.6 percent of the total in 1960.

Since the standard census-survival-ratio method of estimating net migration yields estimates only for the population 10 years old and over (that is, for persons who were alive at the preceding census) it was necessary to estimate net migration for persons under 10 years of age in 1960 by other means. For decades before 1950, Lee applied state-specific fertility ratios to the net migration of females of reproductive age to obtain estimates for this group. For 1950-1960, it was possible to use a method more closely comparable with the census-survival-ratio method and one calculated to yield more accurate estimates. Survival ratios based on (a) the 1960 child population of the United States (expanded area) and (b) births occurring between 1950 and. 1960 were applied to the number of births in each state of residence to obtain expected survivors by five-year age groups, sex, and color. The differences between the numbers enumerated and the numbers expected for each state are our estimates of net migration. Both the survival ratios and the statistics of births by state of residence, the latter corrected for underregistration, were kindly provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. ${ }^{5}$

[^4]TABLE 2. - NET MIGRATION AND NATURAL INCREASE, WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY STATES; DISPLACEMENT DUE TO MIGRATION AND NATURAL INCREASE FOR CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES: 1950-1960.

|  |  | (In thou |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ( | Displacemen | t in Conte | rminous Area |
|  | Net <br> Migration | Natural Increase | Due to migration | Due to natural increase | Net displacement |
| New England |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine | -75.7 | 130.3 | -85.0 | -26.7 | -111.7 |
| New Hampshire | 4.7 | 68.6 | -0.7 | -23.2 | -23.9 |
| Vermont | -42.1 | 54.1 | -45.9 | -10.9 | -56.8 |
| Massachusetts | -151.7 | 602.0 | -199.3 | -204.1 | -403.3 |
| Rhode Island | -36.2 | 102.3 | -44.2 | -33.8 | -78.0 |
| Connecticut | 215.5 | 310.0 | 195.1 | -35.2 | 160.0 |
| Middle Atlantic |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York | 9.9 | 1,904.4 | -140.2 | -640.6 | -780.9 |
| New Jersey | 505.4 | 718.3 | 456.4 | -112.9 | 343.6 |
| Pennsylyania | -613.5 | 1,427.9 | -720.0 | -377.5 | -1,097.5 |
| East North Central |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 339.0 | 1,415.5 | 258.3 | 49.1 | 307.4 |
| Indiana | 29.5 | 695.7 | -10.5 | 19.0 | 8.5 |
| Illinois | 34.6 | 1,321.1 | -53.7 | -174.6 | -228.2 |
| Michigan | 115.9 | 1,327.4 | 51.3 | 233.0 | 284.4 |
| Wisconsin | -66.3 | 578.9 | -101.1 | -9.7 | -110.8 |
| West North Central |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | -94.7 | 520.9 | -124.8 | 10.2 | -114.6 |
| Iowa | -230.9 | 365.7 | -257.5 | -85.0 | -342.5 |
| Missouri | -157.9 | 519.1 | -198.1 | -161.1 | -359.1 |
| North Dakota | -99.6 | 111.2 | -105.8 | 6.5 | -99.3 |
| South Dakota | -87.9 | 112.9 | -94.3 | 4.6 | -89.7 |
| Nebraska | -114.2 | 197.7 | -127.6 | -29.6 | -157.2 |
| Kansas | -43.0 | 311.0 | -62.3 | -16.4 | -78.6 |
| South Atlantic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware | 58.7 | 68.8 | 55.5 | 14.2 | 69.7 |
| Maryland | 289.4 | 462.0 | 265.7 | 59.1 | 324.8 |
| Dist.of Columbia | -163.0 | 121.3 | -171.1 | -16.1 | -187.2 |
| Virginia | -4.4 | 647.3 | -38.0 | 76.8 | 38.7 |
| West Virginia | -454.8 | 309.2 | -475.2 | -35.9 | -511.0 |
| North Carolina | -316.2 | 801.1 | -357.1 | 107.5 | -249.6 |
| South Carolina | -219.6 | 484.5 | -241.1 | 120.5 | -120.7 |
| Georgia | -211.3 | 707.7 | -246.2 | 115.2 | -131.0 |
| Florida | 1,563.6 | 611.3 | 1,535.5 | 134.8 | 1,670.3 |
| East South Central |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | -406.5 | 498.6 | -436.4 | -8.0 | -444.4 |
| Tennessee | -282.2 | 555.9 | -315.6 | -10.3 | -325.9 |
| Alabama | -361.2 | 565.9 | -392.3 | 39.5 | -352.8 |
| Mississippi | -415.0 | 413.2 | -437.1 | 38.9 | -398.2 |

TABLE 2. - (continued)

|  | Net <br> Migration | Natural <br> Increase | Displacement in Conterminous Area |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Due to migration | Due to natural increase | Net displacement |
| West South Central |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | -408.0 | 284.3 | -427.4 | -44.0 | -471.4 |
| Louisiana | -46.4 | 618.2 | -73.6 | 157.2 | 83.6 |
| Oklahoma | -209.5 | 292.5 | -231.6 | -82.3 | -313.9 |
| Texas | 113.9 | 1,744.0 | 35.7 | 418.4 | 454.1 |
| Mountain |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana | -27.4 | 106.3 | -33.2 | 7.7 | -25.5 |
| Idaho | -39.6 | 116.0 | -45.5 | 15.8 | -29.7 |
| Wyoming | -19.9 | 58.5 | -22.8 | 9.1 | -13.7 |
| Colorado | 154.6 | 269.3 | 141.2 | 42.7 | 183.9 |
| New Mexico | 48.9 | 205.3 | 42.4 | 95.4 | 137.8 |
| Arizona | 324.8 | 207.7 | 317.9 | 90.6 | 408.4 |
| Utah | 10.2 | 188.1 | 3.3 | 71.2 | 74.5 |
| Nevada | 81.1 | 41.6 | 79.6 | 15.0 | 94.6 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington | 68.3 | 384.9 | 44.5 | -19.0 | 25.5 |
| Oregon | 10.5 | 231.0 | $-4.8$ | -28.6 | -33.4 |
| California | 2,942.9 | 2,018.8 | 2,837.6 | 233.2 | 3,070.7 |
| Alaska | 45.5 | 43.0 | . | 。 | 。 |
| Hawaii | 56.2 | 33.5 | - | - |  |
| UNITED STATES | 1,624.3 | 25,884.7 | 6,320.0 | 2,185.2 | 7,740.6 |

Source: Col. 1-Appendix Tables A-1 and A-2. Cols. 2-5 - see text for explanation.

Because birth statistics were available only for all nonwhites the resulting estimates of net migration include the net migration of other nonwhites as well as of Negroes. This inclusion probably has little effect upon our all-ages estimates of net migration.

The estimates of natural increase shown in the table (column 2) are simply residuals obtained by subtracting net migration from total intercensal change. They do not therefore agree with estimates that would be obtained from vital statistics. However, as indicated above, vital statistics are not available for the Negro population separately. So far as our purpose of measuring redistribution due to natural increase is concerned, the implied patterns of shift differ very little from those implied by the official vital statistics for the total population.

In the historical study cited above, it was established that migration has been the principal direct means of population redistribution among the states of the conterminous United States. ${ }^{6}$ Not only has the contribution of geographic differentials in rates of natural increase been generally smaller than that of migration, but its importance as a source of redistribution has tended to decrease over time as interstate differentials in fertility have declined. The importance of migration can be demonstrated by comparing interstate redistribution due to migration with redistribution due to natural increase and with net redistribution from the two sources combined.

This measure of redistribution, which we call "displacement", is essentially the same as the index of redistribution except that we use a different series of calculations to derive it and we relate amounts of displacement to the average population to obtain a "rate of displacement" as distinguished from an "index of redistribution". In brief, displacement due to migration is the sum of excesses of state gains through migration over and above the amounts of gain or loss that these states would have had if they had experienced the same rate of net gain or loss as the country as a whole. ${ }^{7}$
${ }^{6}$ Eldridge and Thomas, op.cit., Chapter II.
${ }^{7}$ For strictly internal migration, i.e. . migration internal to the conterminous United States, the sum of state gains due to migration is displacement due to migration. But our data include external migration. It is therefore necessary to obtain expected values of net migration by prorating the net balance for the conterminous area among the states in accordance with the distribution of population at the beginning of the decade. The sum of excesses of the observed over the expected values, which is equal to the sum of deficits, is the measure of displacement due to migration (col. 3 of Table 2). The same procedure applied to estimates of natural increase yields measures of displacement arising from that source (col. 4 of Table 2). The algebraic sum of the two components gives total or net displacement for each state (col. 5 of Table 2). The sum of the positive (or negative) yalues gives total interstate displacement, an amount identical with that obtained by applying the index of redistribution, which is a proportion, to the population at the end of the decade. For a more detailed discussion, see Chapter II of Eldridge and Thomas, op.cit.

The results of these calculations for all nine decades are presented in Table 3 and charted in Figure 2. The close correspondence between the rate of net, or total, displacement and the rate of displacement due to migration is at once apparent. Also, we can see in these data that the 1950-1960 rise in the index of redistribution (and of course in the rate of net displacement) is accounted for by natural increase having reinforced the redistributive effects of interstate migration. The rate of displacement due to migration did not change between 1940-1950 and 1950-1960.

TABLE 3. - AMOUNTS ANB RATES OF INTERSTATE DISPLACEMENT DUE TO MIGRATION AND NATURAL INCREASE, WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATION OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1870-1880 TO 1950-1960.

|  | Displacement Due to Migration | Bisplacement Due to Natural Increase | Net Bisplacement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | mount in thousands |  |
| 1870-1880 | 2,018 | 1,460 | 2,673 |
| 1880-1890 | 2,533 | 1,320 | 2,865 |
| 1890-1900 | 2,433 | 1,565 | 2,110 |
| 1900-1910 | 4,001 | 1,700 | 3,902 |
| 1910-1920 | 3,093 | 1,496 | 2,715 |
| 1920-1930 | 4,935 | 1,938 | 4,364 |
| 1930-1940 | 2,629 | 2,154 | 2,583 |
| 1940-1950 | 5,470 | 2,134 | 5,753 |
| 1950-1960 | 6,320 | 2,185 | 7,741 |

Rate per 1,000 average white and Negro population

| $1870-1880$ | 46 | 33 | 60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1880-1890$ | 45 | 23 | 51 |
| $1890-1900$ | 35 | 23 | 31 |
| $1900-1910$ | 48 | 20 | 47 |
| $1910-1920$ | 31 | 15 | 28 |
| $1920-1930$ | 43 | 17 | 38 |
| $1930-1940$ | 21 | 17 | 20 |
| $1940-1950$ | 39 | 15 | 41 |
| $1950-1960$ | 39 | 13 | 47 |

Source: 1950-1960 - computed from Table 2 and Appendix Table A. 18701950 - Eldridge and Thomas, op.cit., Tables 1.17 and 1.18.

Since the geographic patterns of redistribution stemming from these two Sources have differed, we may examine their respective roles in total or net
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displacement by measuring the contribution of each to the combined gains of all states that gained on redistribution. The data set out in Table 4 indicate that, except for the decade 1930-1940, when economic conditions caused some sharp reversals in migration trends, the balance of displacement into the gaining states was largely determined by migration. ${ }^{8}$ In two decades,

TABLE 4. - AMOUNTS ANB RATES OF DISPLACEMENT INTO STATES THAT GAINED ON REEISTRIBUTION, BISTINGUISHING DISPLACEMENT DUE TO MIGRATION AND DISPLACEMENT DUE TO NATURAL INCREASE, WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATION OF CONTERMINOUS UNITE日 STATES, 1870-1880 TO 1950-1960.

|  | Net Displacement Duengentent | Displacement Due to Hatural Inerease migration | Displacement Due To Natura Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Amount in thousands |  |
| 1870-1880 | 2,673 | 1,655 | 1,018 |
| 1880-1890 | 2,865 | 2,406 | 459 |
| 1890-1900 | 2,110 | 2,189 | -79 |
| 1900-1910 | 3,902 | 3,743 | 159 |
| 1910-1920 | 2,715 | 2,479 | 236 |
| 1920-1930 | 4,364 | 4,369 | -5 |
| 1930-1940 | 2,583 | 1,289 | 1,294 |
| 1940-1950 | 5.753 | 5,425 | 328 |
| 1950-1960 | 7,741 | 6, 198 | 1,543 |

Rates per 1, 000 average white and Negro population

| $1870-1880$ | 60 | 37 | 23 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $1880-1890$ | 51 | 43 | 8 |
| $1890-1900$ | 31 | 32 | -1 |
| $1900-1910$ | 47 | 45 | 2 |
| $1910-1920$ | 28 | 25 | 3 |
| $1920-1930$ | 38 | 38 | $\ldots$ |
| $1930-1940$ | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| $1940-1950$ | 41 | 39 | 2 |
| $1950-1960$ | 47 | 38 | 9 |

Source: 1950-1960-computed from Table 2 and Appendix Table A. 1870-1950 - computed from Table 1.10, A1.8, A1.9, and A1.10, Eldridge and Thomas, op.cit.
$8_{\text {The }}$ contributions of migration and natural increase were determined from column 3 and 4 of Table 2 by taking the algebraic sum of migration excesses and deficits for the states that gained on redistribution and the algebraic sum of natural increase excesses and deficits for the same states.
displacement resulting from natural increase was away from the states that gained in shares of population and into the area that lost on redistribution. In 1950-1960, differentials in rates of natural increase were such as to reinforce displacement due to migration in the amount of almost 1.5 million, thus accounting for about one-fifth of total displacement into the gaining states. 9

In terms of individual states, there were 18 that gained on redistribution between 1950 and 1960 (column 5 of Table 2). Of these, 12 (Ohio, Michigan, Delaware, Maryland, Florida, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California) gained through both migration and natural increase (columns 3 and 4 of Table 2). Three states (Connecticut, New Jersey, and Washington) gained through migration only. These 15 are precisely those that gained at above the national rate of net migration. In other words, all the states that gained through migration at a higher-than-average rate also gained on redistribution. The other 3 states increased their shares through natural increase only. One of these (Indiana) gained through migration at a less-thanaverage rate and therefore lost on redistribution from that source. The other 2 (Louisiana and Virginia) 。 because of comparatively high rates of natural increase, were the only ones of the 18 states to gain on redistribution while experiencing net out-migration. In contrast, there were in the depressed decade of 1930-1940 ten states that gained on redistribution but had net out-migration.

Thirty states and the District of Columbia lost in shares of population. Of these, 11 (Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming) had

[^5]better-than-average gains through natural increase which were more than offset by migration losses. Another 4 states (New Hampshire, New York, Illinois, and Oregon) lost on redistribution from both sources, having below-average rates of both net in-migration and natural increase. The remaining 16 states had net out-migration and less-than-average rates of natural increase. Three of these (the District of Columbia, West Virginia, and Oklahoma) lost so heavily from both sources, but largely through migration, that the pppulation actually decreased between 1950 and 1960. One state (Mississippi), despite a better-than-average gain through natural increase, lost so heavily through migration that the population decreased.

The foregoing refers to the conterminous United States. For the entire country, Alaska and Hawaii are added to the list of states that gained on redistribution, Alaska gaining from both sources and Häwaif gaining from. natural increase but having a less-than-average rate of net in-migration.

## IV. REDISTRIBUTION THROUGH MIGRATION

## Patterns of Redistribution

The spatial rearrangement of population in conterminous United States since 1870 has been characterized by a westward shift of the center of population and an increased dispersion of the population about the centex. Since 1910, the outward shift from the center has been somewhat more important than the westward shift of the center itself. Thus, migration gains have been largely in states situated about the rim of conterminous United States, and were heavier toward the western rim than toward the eastern. In Figure 3, state gains and losses through migration for the period 1940-1950 may be compared with data for 1950-1960. According to these data, which refer to the population ten years old and over and which have been rounded to the nearest 25,000, the pattern of net gains and losses for $1950-1960$ was very much like that for the preceding decade. On the gaining side, the most important differences were the sharp increase of net gains to Florida, New Jersey, Ohio, and Arizona and the sharp decrease of net gains to Michigan, Washington, and Oregon. On the losing side, net outmmigration increased sharply for Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Tennessee, and decreased markedly for Oklahoma. Only three states experienced changes in the direction of net migration: Rhode Island, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. All shifted from gain to loss through migration. The net gain for Rhode Island in 19401950 was very sma11, as was the loss for Virginia in 1950-1960. It is quite possible that these estimates do not differ significantly from zero. The District of Columbia, which has the characteristics of a city rather than of a state, shared the experience of metropolitan areas in general in 1950-1960, losing through migration from the central city while the periphery in this

NET MIGRATION OF THE WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY STATES, 1940-1950 AND 1950-1960


Source: 1940-1950, Lee ef ol., op. cif, Table P-1; 1950-1960, Appendix Table A-1
case the adjoining portions of Maryland and Virginia - gained through migration. 10

California maintained its position as the leading state of net in-migrationg its gain of 2.6 million in 1950-1960 being somewhat larger than the 2.4 million of 1940-1950. Pennsylvania was the heaviest loser in both decades, with a net out-migration of almost half a million in 1940-1950 and nearly six hundred thousand in $1950=1960$. Second only to Pennsylvania in 1950~1960 was West Virginia, which had a net out-migration of about four hundred thousand. For both states, the heavy losses were no doubt due in large part to the sustained depression of the mining industry.

Patterns by Color and Nativity
Patterns of gain and loss have always differed somewhat as between racenativity groups. especially as between native whites and Negroes. The contrast between these two segments of the population with respect to prevailing patterns of shift shows up clearly in the data for the nine geographic divisions mapped in Figure 4. Along with the differences between groups, there has been a considerable persistence over time in the patterns of shift within each population group.

Native whites. The movements of the native white population account for most of the redistribution of the total population. In 1950-1960, displace ment due to the migration of native whites 10 years old and over amounted to 5.0 million for the expanded area. The corresponding figure for the Negro population was 1.4 million. These figures are the sums of state gains (or losses) from the appropriate columns of Appendix Table A-1.

For native whites, as for the total population, the distribution of state gains and losses in the $1950^{\prime}$ s was very much like that of the 1940's.
${ }^{10}$ See Ann Ratner Miller, op. cit.
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Figure 4
the exceptions being in general those mentioned above for total migration.
Foreignoborn whites. There was a net gain through the migration of foreign-born whites for the United States as a whole, the balance for the population 10 years old and over having been somewhat larger in the later decade than in the earlier (for conterminous United States: 1.2 million in 1950 1960; 0.8 million in 1940-1950). In the last decade, state gains due to the migration of foreign=born whites (external and internal combined) were widely distributed geographically but were as high as 100,000 only in California, Florida. New York, and New Jersey. Fifteen states had net losses due to the migration of this group of the population (see Appendix Table A-1). All of these are states that also had net losses due to the migration of native whites.

Negroes. In 1950-1960, the movement of Negroes away from the South remained strong. The majority of this movement continued, as in the past, to find destination in the industrial states of the Northeast and North Central regions (plus Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia). The considerable movement to California that became so significant during the 1940's persisted during the $1950^{\circ}$ s. Among the states of the deep South, only Florida showed a net gain. Outside the South, only Wyoming registered a slight loss (Appendix Table A=1).

Variations by Age and Sex
Although the general pattern of state gains and losses through migration was not greatly different in the 1950's from the pattern that characterized immediately preceding decades, certain emergent conditions have disturbed the historical continuity of relationships between the age groups and between the sexes in amounts and directions of migration. These conditions are the expansion of the armed forces and the generalization of the practice of retire-
ment at age 65. Both conditions were operative to some degree in the $1940^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, but their effects were sharpened during the 1950's.

Military migration. Migration incident to military service has two asa pects: (a) "induction" migration, the movement of persons entering the armed forces, and (b) "separation" migration, the movement of persons returning to civilian life. The effects of induction migration are particularly noticeable in the data for native white males $20-24$ years old in 1960 (the probability of being in military service reaches its maximum in this age group) but are also apparent in the data for native white males 15-19 in 1960. The effects of separation migration show up most clearly in the data for native white males aged 30-34 in 1960. This cohort would have had its maximum number in the armed forces in 1950 , when the cohort was $20-24$ years old; most of them would have returned to civilian life by 1960. The data for the group $25-29$ years old in 1960 also show some effects of separation migration, but because most of this cohort were still too young for military service in 1950 (when they were 15-19) many of them would have begun their service after 1950 and come pleted it before 1960. The impact of military migration is therefore somewhat less perceptible in the data for this age group.

According to our historical series, both (a) interstate displacement due to the internal migration of native whites and Negroes and (b) net migration of foreign-born whites to the United States have quite consistently been highest for persons 25-29 years old at the end of the decade - an indication of the high propensity to migrate during the early twenties (or, in terms of five-year age groups, during the age range 20-24). In 1950-1960, the maximum for native white males shifted to the age group that was $20-24$ years old at the end of the decade; it remained at $25-29$ for the other sex-color nativity groups (Tables 5 and 6). There is plenty of evidence that the shift

TABLE 5. - INTERSTATE DISPLACEMENT DUE TO THE MIGRATION OF THE NATIVE WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN 1960, BY AGE, RACE, AND SEX, EXPANDED AREA, 1950-1960.
(In thousands. Including Alaska and Hawaii and treating the United States population abroad and Puerto Rico as additional states.)

| Age in 1960 | Native White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 10-14 | 286 | 281 | 77 | 83 |
| 15-19 | 332 | 212 | 68 | 77 |
| 20-24 | 535 | 332 | 122 | 134 |
| 25-29 | 376 | 379 | 139 | 145 |
| 30-34 | 314 | 312 | 98 | 97 |
| 35-39 | 248 | 243 | 58 | 53 |
| 40-44 | 188 | 175 | 33 | 31 |
| 45-49 | 146 | 137 | 26 | 27 |
| 50-54 | 101 | 101 | 17 | 19 |
| 55-59 | 74 | 88 | 13 | 15 |
| 60-64 | 62 | 87 | 11 | 12 |
| 65-69 | 81 | 90 | 5 | 8 |
| 70-74 | 60 | 62 | 4 | 5 |
| 75+ | 56 | 71 | 9 | 11 |
| Total, 10+ | 2,858 | 2,570 | 681 | 718 |

Source: Computed from Appendix Table A by summing state gains for each age-sex-race group.
was caused by military migration beside the fact that it is observable only for native white males, who comprise the bulk of the military population. In 1960, there were approximately 780,000 white males aged $20-24$ in the armed forces of the United States. 11 None of them had been in the service ten years earlier when their ages were 10-14. In 1950, the overwhelming majority of them were native whites resident somewhere in the United States. Although not all of them changed their states of residence when they joined the armed forces, there must have been a considerable shift in their geographic distribution. Some 220,000 of them, more than a third, were stationed overseas in 1960. Furthermore, the state distribution of the armed forces differs markedly from the state distribution of the general population. Military installations

[^6] 1960, Volume $\underline{I}_{9}$, Characteristics of the Population, Part $\underline{I}^{\text {, United States }}$ Summary, Tables 45, 67, and 194.

TABLE 6. - NET MIGRATION OF THE FOREIGN-BORN WHITE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN 1960, BY AGE AND SEX, CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| (In thousands) |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Age in <br> 1960 | Male | Fendale |
| $10-14$ | 80 | 77 |
| $15-19$ | 62 | 68 |
| $20-24$ | 90 | 126 |
| $25-29$ | 103 | 144 |
| $30-34$ | 98 | 124 |
| $35-39$ | 88 | 93 |
| $40-44$ | 58 | 54 |
| $45-49$ | 55 | 44 |
| $50-54$ | 32 | 26 |
| $55-59$ | 12 | -1 |
| $60-64$ | -10 | -4 |
| $65-69$ | -22 | -29 |
| $70-74$ | -23 | -36 |
| $75+$ | -51 | -101 |
| Total, 10+ | 573 | 585 |

Source: Appendix Table A, page for conterminous United States.
are disproportionately concentrated in parts of the South and West and along the east coast. Since young men are drawn from their states of civilian residence at a fairly constant rate, their disposition in military posts has to involve a good deal of reshuffling among the states.

Although one might expect these factors to have been more important for the decade of World War II, that appears not to have been the case. It would seem that the population movement associated with military service, which was of course enormous, did not get well under way until after Apri1, 1940, and had largely run its course by April, 1950. Because our picture of migration is based on a comparison of the situation in 1940 with that in 1950 , any intervening scrambling and unscrambling of population is not taken into account. The net increase in total military strength between 1940 and 1950 was less than that between 1950 and 1960 - about 900,000 in the first decade,
over a million in the second. ${ }^{12}$ The increase in the number stationed abroad was probably less than 200,000 in the first decade; it was over 300,000 in the second.

There are, nevertheless, indications that military migration had similar effects in both decades. The increase in military strength between 1940 and 1950 was considerable even though it was less than the increase between 1950 and 1960. Furthermore, the slackening of net migration of whites from the South and the suggestion of possible shifting of the balance in favor of that region, noted in the analysis of Volume III of Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, was no doubt partly attributable to military migration.

In this connection, it should be recalled that the migration estimates for 1940-1950 are not perfectly comparable with those for 1950-1960. For intercensal estimates up to 1950-1960, net external migration of native whites and of Negroes was assumed to be zero. The resident native population of the conterminous United States was treated as a closed population. For 1950-1960, our closed population was that of the conterminous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and it included the United States population abroad. The earlier procedure, or assumption, was probably quite reasonable for decades before 1940 and it was probably less unreasonable for the 1940-1950 decade than it would have been for the $1950^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$. Stil1, in view of the implied change in the age of maximum mobility of native white males, we are under some obligation to examine whether the change may not have occurred in the 1940-1950 decade rather than in the ensuing one.

Confining our attention to the two groups of native white males aged 20-24 and 25-29 at the end of the respective decades, we can estimate, on the one hand, interstate displacement in conterminous United States for 1950-1960

[^7]and, on the other, interstate or "interunit" displacement in the expanded area for 1940-1950. For the first, we distribute net out-migration from conterminous United States to the balance of the expanded area among the states in accordance with the 1950 distribution of the cohorts aged 10-14 and 15-19 in 1950. The differences between our "observed" estimates of net migration and the frequencies so obtained are our estimates of displacement due to migration, and they are the figures we would have obtained if we had used the same procedures for 1950-1960 as were used for 1940-1950. For the second, we compute 1940-1950 survival ratios for the expanded area and derive estimates of net migration for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Americans abroad, and so obtain the measures of displacement that would have been derived if the procedures for 1940-1950 had been the same as those followed for 1950-1960. The results are as follows, in thousands:

> 1940-1950 1950-1960

Interstate displacement, conterminous U.S.
Native white males, 20-24 295
Native white males, 25-29 322329
Interstate displacement, expanded area
Native white males, 20-24 394
Native white males, 25-29 358

According to these estimates, displacement in the conterminous area was greater for the older of the two cohorts in 1940-1950 but was greater for the younger cohort in 1950-1960. For the expanded area, displacement was greater for the younger cohort in both decades. We therefore conclude that the change did begin to take place in the $1940^{\prime}$ s, but that it was not until the 1950's that maximum interstate displacement of native white males in conterminous United States shifted from the group $25-29$ to the group $20-24$ years old as of the end of the decade. Interestingly, though, the shift does not reflect
a change in the propensity to migrate in the early twenties. The fact that the data for a ten-year interval show a shift of the peak from ages 25-29 to ages 20-24 simply reflects the temporariness of military status. During the decade of the $1950^{\circ}$ s, both military and non-military migration were undoubtedly highest for persons passing through the age range 20-24. But by 1960, the cohort $25-29$ years old had passed the "hump" of induction migration and was comparatively free of the effects of separation migration also. Meanwhile, the cohort 20-24 years old, being still in its early twenties, had many of its members still in military installations. Its /'normal" patterns of migration were therefore overlaid and enlarged by military influences.

Military migration has not only served to displace the maximum indicated mobility of native white males into a younger age group than was characteristic of earlier decades, but it has produced patterns of interstate shift that differ in a number of ways from those of other decades and other sex-color groups. In 1950-1960, the two age groups affected by induction migration (15-19 and 20-24) had closely similar patterns of interstate shift, but both the amounts and the directions of shift were quite different from those of native white females of the same ages. Not only were amounts of net gain or loss generally greater for males than for females, but states with more than their pro rata share of military population tended to gain more males than females, to gain males while losing females, or to lose fewer males than females by migration at these ages. Conversely, states with disproportionately small shares of military population tended to gain fewer males than females, to lose males while gaining females, or to lose more males than females. ${ }^{13}$
${ }^{13}$ The measure used is the number in the armed forces relative to the number of employed males. This proportion was computed for each state and compared with the corresponding proportion for the United States as a whole. The data were drawn from U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Volume I, Part 1, Table 119, and from U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Volume II, Part 1, Tabie 73.

The age groups affected by separation migration (25-29 and 30-34), while sustaining about equal amounts of displacement for the two sexes, nevertheless showed significant differences in amounts and patterns of interstate shift, differences that were opposite to those associated with induction migration. Thus, states with above average proportions in the armed forces tended to gain fewer males than females, to lose males while gaining females, or to lose more males than females at these ages. States with below average proportions in the armed forces tended to gain more males than females, to gain males while losing females, or to lose fewer males than females. These differences were more marked for the age group 30-34 years than for the one next younger.

The impact of these differences may be demonstrated by measuring the correlation of state estimates of net migration as between age groups and as between the sexes. Coefficients of correlation (Spearman's rho) are as follows between the specified age groups, by sex:

| Age group | Native white <br> males | Native white <br> females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ and $20-24$ | 0.95 | 0.88 |
| $20-24$ and $25-29$ | 0.64 | 0.94 |
| $25-29$ and $30-34$ | 0.81 | 0.90 |
| $15-19$ and $25-29$ | 0.62 | 0.89 |
| $20-24$ and $30-34$ | 0.38 | 0.76 |

Ordinarily, one should expect these coefficients to be quite high. We find that they are high for females but not so high for males, with the exception of the coefficient for the two younger age groups. Both of these, as we have seen, were strongly influenced by induction migration; hence the high association. The coefficient for the two groups of males aged 20-24 and 30-34, one affected by induction migration and the other by separation, is only 0.38. The corresponding coefficient for females is 0.76 , not extremely
high but nevertheless twice that for males. These findings suggest that although the migration of females may have been somewhat influenced by the military migration of males, the data for females furnish the better indications of the age pattern of pulls and pushes for migration that lie outside the military sphere.

Correlating the data for males with those for females yields the following coefficients, by age:

| $20-24$ | 0.74 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25-29$ | 0.96 |
| $30-34$ | 0.73 |

The high coefficient for the age group $25-29$ years leads to the further conclusion that the data for males in this age group were considerably freer of the military influence than were those for the other age groups affected by it.

Although foreign born white males and Negro males were no doubt also directly affected by military migration, other factors obscured the evidences of such effects. For foreignoborn white males, substantial net immigration veiled the pattern of military movement of foreignoborn whites already in the United States by 1950. For Negro males, nonmilitary migration in the customary South-to North and South to West directions concealed other patterns. Another indication that military migration was comparatively unimportant for these two groups is the continuation of the tendency for the net migration of females to equal or exceed that of males. (For native whites, the small excess of males over females that has been characteristic of net migration in recent decades became a large excess in 1950-1960.) And finally, for all sex=color groups, except native white males, the maximum displacement occurred in che cohort that was $25-29$ years old in 1960 .

Retirement migration. The spread of social security and the growth of
pension systems in general have had a profound effect upon the migration behavior of the population, especially that of males. Retirement at age 65 has become extremely common. Its spread was particularly rapid between 1950 and 1960. The 1960 rate of labor force separation due to retirement was about three times the 1950 rate for males aged 65 years - 83 per thousand in 1950 , 234 per thousand in 1960. The number of retired workers receiving benefits rose from 1.8 million in 1950 to 8.1 million in $19600^{14}$ This development has been accompanied by a rise in the decade mobility of persons who were aged 65-74 at the end of the decade. Since this is the cohort whose members reached age 65 during the preceding 10 years, the major impact of retirement migration is taken by this one ten-year age cohort. Interstate displacement for native whites of these ages was 155,000 in 1940-1950; it was 293,000 in 1950-1960.

Patterns of net migration for persons reaching retirement age were different in several ways from those of other age groups. As Figure 5 shows, the prevailing shift was southward. The gaining area embraces the band of states that stretches across the southern part of the United States from coast to coast; all the states to the north of it lost by migration at these ages. California and Florida were theileading states of net in-migration, but in contradistinction to the usual relation, Florida outranked California by almost two to one as a haven for the aged (Appendix Table A).

The southward shift is considerably more characteristic of whites, both native and foreign-born, than of Negroes. Although a few of the southern states registered small migration gains for the Negro population of advanced age, the general pattern of displacement was similar to the usual one for 1900-60" S. Department of Labor, "The Length of Working Life for Males, 1900-60', Manpower Report, Number 8, July, 1963.
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that segment of the population - out-migration from the South and in-migration to the Northeast, North Central, and .West. The evidence of increased mobility at retirement age was not so pronounced as for whites, and was more noticeable in the data for females than for males. It would appear that the Negro population does not share in, or respond to, the benefits of social security in the same manner as the white population.

## V. RATES OF DISPLACEMENT AND NET MIGRATION

When amounts of displacement are expressed as rates per 1,000 average population, we have for each age-sex-color group summarizing measures of interstate redistribution due to migration relative to the population in that group, and we can compare the profiles of age-specific rates over time and among sexcolor groups of the native population. ${ }^{15}$ In examining these data, it should be kept in mind that the rates for 1950-1960 refer to displacement within the expanded area, which includes Alaska and Hawaii, and which treats Puerto Rico and the United States population abroad as additional states, while the rates for the other decades refer to conterminous United States only. Similar measures are not available for the foreign-born white population, because so much of their migration was external to the system. For this segment of the population our general measure is the balance of state gains and losses, or net migration to the United States as a whole. These balances are related to the total white population and are thus a measure of the impact of external migration upon the resident population. Information available in the Census of 1960 has made it possible to undertake estimates of displacement due to the internal migration of foreign-born whites for 1950-1960. These estimates are of dubious quality and similar estimates for earlier decades have not been attempted.

## Native Whites

Rates for the native white population, by sex, are given in Table 7 and Figure 6 for 1940-1950 and 1950-1960. In order to add some historical per-
${ }^{15}$ Each rate is the sum of state gains (or the sum of state losseqs) per 1,000 average population for the given age-sex-color group. The base of each rate is the arithmetic mean of the number in the age-sex-color cohort at the beginning of the decade and the number at the end of the decade.
table 7. - rates of interstate displacement due to the migration of NatIVE WHITES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR CQNTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1870-1950, AND FOR THE EXPANDED AREA, 1950-1960.

|  | CRates per 1,000 average native white_population) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Male |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $10-14$ | 34 | 25 | 34 | 38 |
| $15-19$ | 32 | 29 | 45 | 55 |
| $20-24$ | 54 | 46 | $* 58$ | 108 |
| $25-29$ | 68 | 53 | $* * 61$ | 79 |
| $30-34$ | 51 | 40 | 51 | 61 |
| $35-39$ | 40 | 32 | 41 | 46 |
| $40-44$ | 35 | 27 | 34 | 37 |
| $45-49$ | 37 | 24 | 29 | 31 |
| $50-54$ | 39 | 24 | 26 | 25 |
| $55-59$ | 31 | 21 | 23 | 21 |
| $60-64$ | 30 | 21 | 22 | 21 |
| $65-69$ | 24 | 20 | 23 | 34 |
| $70-74$ | 22 | 20 | 21 | 33 |
| $75+$ | 17 | 16 | 14 | 20 |
| Total, 10+ | 42 | 32 | 39 | 47 |

Female

| $10-14$ | 33 | 26 | 34 | 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 30 | 26 | 34 | 36 |
| $20-24$ | 40 | 43 | 53 | 69 |
| $25-29$ | 46 | 52 | 67 | 80 |
| $30-34$ | 40 | 40 | 51 | 60 |
| $35-39$ | 34 | 30 | 41 | 44 |
| $40-44$ | 29 | 25 | 33 | 34 |
| $45-49$ | 27 | 22 | 27 | 29 |
| $50-54$ | 25 | 20 | 24 | 24 |
| $55-59$ | 26 | 21 | 23 | 25 |
| $60-64$ | 22 | 22 | 25 | 28 |
| $65-69$ | 20 | 23 | 27 | 34 |
| $70-74$ | 22 | 20 | 21 | 30 |
| $75+$ | 16 | 17 | 15 | 20 |
| Total, $10+$ | 34 | 30 | 38 | 41 |

[^8]spective, averages of decade rates for the two forty-year periods 1870-1910 and 1910-1950 are also shown. The similarity in shape between the curves for males and those for females, with their maxima at ages $25-29$ and their convergence over time, are clearly indicated in these data. In the rates for 1950-1960, we see the impact of military migration in the higher rates of males than of females at the induction ages and in the pronounced peak at ages 20-24 for males. In contrast, the 1950-1960 rate curve for females differs little in contour from those of the earlier periods.

In the curve for males for $1950-1960$, the effect of retirement is very clear-cut, as the decline in rates with increase in age is interrupted by a rise at ages $65-69$, which is maintained at ages $70-74$ and is followed by an abrupt fall in the terminal age group. The rise in the rates for females at the advanced ages is more gradual and reaches a peak at.ages 65-69. Similar peaks, though less marked, appear in the rates of females for decades back to 1930 - an observation that leads to the guess that widowhood may be a contributing factor to the migration of women at these ages, with of course retirement of the women themselves, or of their husbands, playing an increasing part.

The data shown for 1940 . 1950 help to bridge the gap both between the prewar and the postwar eras and between the conterminous area and the expanded area. Along with the rates for the conterminous United States, we have plotted rates for the expanded area for the two age groups of rative white males most affected by the area change. (A comparable adjustment of the other age groups would probably have very little effect upon the rates.) These data make it evident that wartime and postwar expansion of the military establishment have modified the age pattern of rates for native white males to a disconcerting degree. Reasoning from the persistence of the pattern for females and from the
similarity of patterns for males and females before 1940, we infer that the current rates for females are a fair indication of the form that the rates for males would take in the absence of the military influence. This is not to say that the rates of females are unaffected by that influence, but rather that such influence has not been strong enough to disturb established patterns.

An interesting facet of these data is the fact that the impact of separation migration has not produced a sex-differential in the rates of displacement at ages 30-34 or at ages 25-29. The reason for this is that directional differences do not show up at the national level when rates of displacement are computed as we have computed them. As mentioned earlier, amounts of displacement at these ages were about equal for the two sexes, but the geographic patterns of shift differed in a number of ways that are related to the distribution of military installations.

Rates of net migration, by sex, for individual states bring out both the differences resulting from induction migration and those resulting from separation migration. There is some reflection of these differences in the rates for nearly every state. Thus, in states with above-average proportions of white employed males in the armed forces, rates of net migration for males 15-24 years old tend to be algebraically higher than rates for females (male gains larger than female gains, male losses smaller than female losses, or gains of males coupled with losses of females), whereas rates for males 25 34 years old tend to be algebraically lower (male gains smaller than female gains, male losses larger than female losses, or losses of males coupled with gains of females). These effects are illustrated in the rates for Rhode Island, Virginia, and South Carolina charted in Figure 7. For states with belowaverage percentages in the armed forces, the opposite relations quite generally exist, net rates of males $15-24$ years old being algebraically lower than those of females, and net rates of males $25 \times 34$ being algebraically higher than those of


Figure 7
females (see rates for Ohio, Minnesota, and Wisconsin charted in Figure 7). The six states included in Figure 7 represent extremes of high and low proportions of military personnel to working males, but the effects of military migration are quite visible in the data for other states also. Figure 8 presents rates for the 12 states with net migration gains or losses of 200,000 or more. One can judge from these data quite accurately whether or not a state's share of the armed forces is above or below the national average. For each state, the rates for females form a more or less "standard" curve such as we should expect for males in the absence of military migration. Inspection of these data makes it clear that conditions in the last decade were so different from those that have prevailed in the past that the data for narive white males no longer furnish the basic clues to the intensities, direction, or age-incidence of economic pulls and pushes outside the military sphere. This is not to say that military migration does not have its economic aspects, but military migration is different in character and pattern, and it quite overshadowed ordinary migration for native white males in the period 1950-1960.

In the analysis of the historical series for the period 1870 to 1950, considerable evidence of return migration was found in the data fpr native white males. When account was taken, at the state level, of differences by age in the direction of net migration, an unexpectedly large propprtion of interstate displacement at ages $35 \times 39$ was found to have been in the opposite direction from displacement at ages $25-29 .{ }^{16}$ This "reverse displacement" was interpreted as reflecting the presence of a substantial amount of return migration, a return that was in reaction from the heavy migration in the prevailing directions that the cohort had experienced during the decade when it

[^9]
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Figure 8 (Cont.)
was traversing its early twenties. In the estimates for 1950-1960, there is not much indication of a similar concentration of reverse movement at ages 35-39. There are two probable reasons for this: (a) In the historical data, evidences of return migration were much more marked in relatively depressed decades of low mobility which followed prosperous decades of high mobility. By all indications so far examined, 1950-1960 was a prosperous decade and it followed a decade that was also prosperous. Very likely, there was relatively less return migration in that decade and such as there was tended to be obscured by the waves of movement in the prevailing directions. (b) There was a good deal of reverse migration in 1950-1960 associated with detachment from the armed forces. Such movement was concentrated in the group aged 3034 at the end of the decade. Much of this reverse movement was no doubt return migration。

As a result of this combination of circumstances, most of the evidence of a concentration of return migration has been pushed back from ages 35-39 to ages 30-34, though when differences in the direction of net migration by age within the conterminous United States are examined, some indications of a concentration at ages 35-39 emerge. This somewhat delicate problem will be explored further in a later study. ${ }^{17}$

## Negroes

Some of the same qualifications and reservations that we encountered in the analysis of data for native whites are applicable to the data for Negroes. However, they apply with much less force in the present instance, partly be-
${ }^{17}$ Data on gross migration for the five-year interval 1955-1960, available in the Census of 1960, are particularly suitable for the study of the impact and importance of return migration. Analysis of these materials is now in process. A preliminary report of findings is scheduled for publication in Volume II of Demography.
cause military migration played a smaller role among Negro males than among native white males and partly because external migration was less important for Negroes than for native whites. Thus, 12 percent of white males in the United States aged 20-24 were in the armed forces in 1960, only 8 percent of nonwhite males. ${ }^{18}$ For native white males of these ages in the expanded area, net migration to the overseas segment accounted for 40 percent of all gains to gaining areas (21.4,000 out of 535,000 ); for Negroes the proportion was only 16 percent $(20,000$ out of 122,000$))^{19}$ As a result of these conditions, the age-curves of rates are much more alike for Negro males and females, and comparability between the 1940's and the 1950's is less restricted.

Averages of displacement rates for the two forty-year periods and rates for the last two decades are shown in Table 8 and Figure 9. The bi-modal curve for males during the period $1870-1910$ is the result principally of reverse displacement at ages above 45. A considerable part of interstate displacement at these ages was in the opposite direction from that at the young adult ages. This reverse displacement probably was caused by return migration of males to homes and families in their states of origin. This interpretation seems reasonable in light of the very much higher rates for males than females at the young adult ages. Presumably "lone" males who migrated at the younger ages had considerable incentive to return at later ages. The middleaged peak does not appear in the data for decades after 1910, presumably because, after Negro migration got under way during World War $I_{3}$ the rates of males and females.began to converge and the need or desire to return diminished,

As for most decades since 1870, the rates of Negroes for 1950-1960 were much higher than those of native whites. This differential is strictly the result of the greater predominance of onewway migration among Negroes. Avail=

[^10]TABLE 8. - RATES OF INTERSTATE DISPLACEMENT DUE TO THE MIGRATION OF NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1870-1950, AND FOR THE EXPANDED AREA, 1950-1960.
(Rates per 1,000 average Negro population)

|  | Conterminous Area |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age at <br> End of <br> Decade | Averages of decade rates | Expanded Area* |  |
|  | 1870-1910 | $1910-1950$ |  |


| Ma1e |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $10-14$ | 24 | 48 | 88 | 80 |
| $15-19$ | 32 | 60 | 83 | 91 |
| $20-24$ | 68 | 121 | 157 | 193 |
| $25-29$ | 92 | 170 | 220 | 240 |
| $30-34$ | 52 | 138 | 209 | 171 |
| $35-39$ | 40 | 95 | 155 | 100 |
| $40-44$ | 48 | 70 | 109 | 64 |
| $45-49$ | 91 | 60 | 80 | 50 |
| $50-54$ | 90 | 57 | 53 | 39 |
| $55-59$ | 80 | 50 | 39 | 33 |
| $60-64$ | 68 | 40 | 46 | 36 |
| $65-69$ | 61 | 38 | 45 | 21 |
| $70-74$ | 30 | 35 | 27 | 22 |
| $75+$ | 26 | 23 | 22 | 31 |
| Total, $10+$ | 54 | 84 | 114 | 98 |

Female

| $10-14$ | 24 | 52 | 92 | 87 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 31 | 64 | 94 | 101 |
| $20-24$ | 55 | 121 | 169 | 201 |
| $25-29$ | 59 | 157 | 220 | 228 |
| $30-34$ | 36 | 121 | 188 | 145 |
| $35-39$ | 28 | 76 | 132 | 81 |
| $40-44$ | 22 | 52 | 88 | 54 |
| $45-49$ | 27 | 40 | 66 | 47 |
| $50-54$ | 22 | 35 | 50 | 41 |
| $55-59$ | 24 | 38 | 47 | 37 |
| $60-64$ | 20 | 32 | 51 | 39 |
| $65-69$ | 26 | 42 | 64 | 31 |
| $70-74$ | 22 | 32 | 37 | 27 |
| $75+$ | 28 | 26 | 31 | 35 |
| Total, 10+ | 35 | 78 | 115 | 96 |

[^11]
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able data on gross migration indicate that rates of interstate mobility have been quite consistently higher for whites than for nonwhites. However, these data refer to fairly short migration intervals - periods of one year or five years. Data for a longer interval (1940-1947) show higher rates for nonwhites than for whites. ${ }^{20}$ One reason for the difference is the cumulative pature of Negro migration. It reflects the tendency of Negroes to stay out of the South once they have left it. Fewer of their interstate moves are cancelled by returns to the states in which they were living at the beginning of the interval. Very likely, data on gross migration for the ten-year interval 1950-1960 would indicate a higher rate of interstate mobility for Negroes than for native whites.

The profiles of age-specific rates for the two sexes are very much alike both as to level and as to shape. The rates for males were somewhat higher in the age range $25-44$ and somewhat lower at the younger and more advanced ages. The general rates for the Negro population 10 years old and over were 98 per thousand for males, 96 per thousand for females.

Comparison of these rates with those for 1940-1950 indicates that for both sexes, rates at ages 15-29 were higher in 1950-1960 than in 1940-1950; they were somewhat lower at almost all of the other ages. The overall rate decreased for each sex - from 114 to 98 per thousand for males, from 11.5 to 96 per thousand for females. It would appear that interstate displacement ac= tually was lower in the $1950^{\prime}$ s than in the $1940^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$, since an adjustment for comparability (that is, 1940-1950 rates for the expanded area) would probably raise the rates for the first decade. If the estimates may be depended upon, the decade 1950-1960 is the only one since 1870 that has seen a decrease, except the exceptionally depressed decade of 1930-1940. The rates were still high, however asecond only to those of 1940-1950. It may be that the co-

[^12]incidence of two relatively prosperous decades in succession has meant that 1950-1960 did not have the benefit of the "backed-up" or repressed migration that one would expect after a decade of low economic activity such as no doubt contributed to the very high rates of 1940-1950. In fact, this may well be the underlying reason why the general rate of interstate displacement due to migration discussed above showed so little change between 1940-1950 and 19501960.

The profiles of age-specific rates of net migration for individual states closely resemble the overall rates of displacement, and the differences between the sexes are sma11. The tendency to uniformity of contour may be seen in the rates charted in Figure 10 for the 11 states that had net migration gains or losses of more than 100,000 in 1950-1960. There are of course important differences in level and some differences in the detail for some ages, but it is obvious that there is a high correlation both between states and between the sexes.

Of particular interest are the high rates at which the southern states were being drained of their young adult population. In Mississippi, the cohort of Negro males $25-29$ years old was decimated by 80 percent of its average number, Negro females by 73 percent (Appendix Table A-4). The corresponding losses for Arkansas were 78 percent and 75 percent. Such losses were echoed by heavy relative gains in states outside the South: in California, 92 percent for males and 84 percent for females; in New York, 65 percent for males and 66 percent for females.

## Foreign-born Whites

Rates of net migration of foreign-born whites for the conterminous United States as a whole are presented in Table 9 and Figure 11: four-decade averages for 1870-1910 and 1910-1950; decade rates for 1940-1950 and 1950-1960. The
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table 9. - RATES OF NET MIGRATION OF FOR\&IGN-BORN WHITES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1870-1960.
(Rates per 1,000 average white population)

| Age at End of Decade | Averages of | cade Rates | 1940-1950 | 1950-1960 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1870-1910 | 1910-1950 |  |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 40 | 12 | 6 | 11 |
| 15-19 | 59 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| 20-24 | 120 | 33 | 12 | 19 |
| 25-29 | 161 | 53 | 14 | 22 |
| 30-34 | 120 | 32 | 10 | 19 |
| 35-39 | 66 | 14 | 11 | 16 |
| 40-44 | 44 | 5 | 11 | 11 |
| 45-49 | 29 | . . | 10 | 11 |
| 50-54 | 10 | -6 | 7 | 7 |
| 55-59 | 10 | -7 | 2 | 3 |
| 60-64 | 14 | -2 | 2 | -3 |
| 65-69 | 30 | 3 | 1 | -7 |
| 70-74 | 10 | -2 | -5 | -10 |
| 75+ | 20 | -3 | -7 | -14 |
| Total, 10+ | 69 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 40 | 12 | 6 | 11 |
| 15-19 | 60 | 15 | 7 | 12 |
| 20-24 | 103 | 35 | 18 | 26 |
| 25-29 | 110 | 46 | 21 | 30 |
| 30-34 | 70 | 26 | 12 | 24 |
| 35-39 | 49 | 18 | 10 | 17 |
| 40-44 | 38 | 14 | 9 | 10 |
| 45-49 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 9 |
| 50-54 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 55-59 | 27 | 3 | ... | . . |
| 60-64 | 32 | 11 | . | -1 |
| 65-69 | 47 | 11 | 2 | -9 |
| 70-74 | 23 | 1 | -8 | -14 |
| $75+$ | 28 | -2 | -12 | -22 |
| Total, 10+ | 59 | 18 | 8 | 9 |

Source: 1950-1960 - computed from Table 6 and Appendix Table A. 1870-1950 - computed from Table 1.40, Eldridge and Thomas, op.cit.
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Figure 11
first two sets of rates reflect the sharp decline in the importance of net immigration that began at the time of World War $I$ and the tendency for the rates of the two sexes to converge. The data for the last two decades indicate that in recent times the rates of females have exceeded those of males at the young adult ages. At the intermediate ages the rates have been about equal.

Our estimates of the net migration of foreign-born whites are open to some question, especially those for the older age groups. One of the reasons for questioning these data is that both the amounts and the rates of net loss are higher for the terminal age group, 75 years and over, than for the two next younger groups, 65-69 and 70-74. While it is not surprising in itself that there is a net out-movement of the elderly foreign born, one would expect such loss to be largely confined to the retirement ages. Because of these doubts, we shall not dwell at length upon the findings for this part of the foreign-born population. 21

Very little is known about the internal migration of the foreign born, because it has not been possible to distinguish net change due to internal migration from net change due to external migration at the state level. Opinions vary as to whether the foreign born tend to remain more or less stationary than the native population, once they have settled in the United States. Data from the Census of 1960 that refer to the five-year interval 1955-1960 indicate that while rates of interstate migration of the foreign born are somewhat lower than those of the native population at ages 20-29 and at ages 35 and over, they are somewhat higher at other ages.

The migration data of the Census of 1960 contain information on the basis of which we may attempt estimates of interstate displacement due to the inter-

[^14]nal migration of foreign-born whites who were in the United States in 1950. This information consists of a state distribution, as of 1960, of the foreign-born population who were resident abroad in $1955 .{ }^{22}$ If we can assume that this distribution gives a reasonable representation of the destination pattern of immigrants to the United States for the decade, we have a good basis for distributing our intercensal estimate of net migration to the United States among the states to obtain state estimates of net change due to external migration. The difference between this figure for a given state and our intercensal estimate of net migration of foreign-born whites for the same state would be our estimate of net gain or loss due to internal migration.

The principal objection to this procedure is the implicit assumption that immigration was distributed among the states in the same way as emigration. Probably, emigration varied more closely with the distribution of the foreign born resident in the United States at the beginning of the decade than did immigration. It is to be hoped that in-migration of the foreign born was large enough as compared with out-migration to give a fair approximation to the geographic distribution of net migration.

The statistics are given in the Census by age, sex, and color. It is therefore possible to derive estimates in some detail. Because of the uncertainty about the estimates for the older ages, we confine our attention to the population within the age range $10-54$ years. The results are presented in Table 10. They indicate that rates of displacement due to the internal migration of foreign-born whites (conterminous area) were considerably higher than those of native whites (expanded area) for every age group between 10 and 55 (see Table 7). However, these estimates are of extremely dubious quality. Furthermore, comparability is limited by the very fact that the foreign born
${ }^{22}$ U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Lifetime and Recent Migration (Final Report PC(2)-2D), Table 6.
are a group all of whom have migrated at least once, whereas many of the native group have never migrated. We know from other evidence that persons who have migrated before are more likely to migrate than those who have not.

TABLE 10. - INTERSTATE DISPLACEMENT DUE TO THE INTERNAL MIGRATION OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES 10 TO 54 YEARS OLD, BY AGE AND SEX: AMOUNTS AND RATES FOR CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950*1960.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age in } \\ 1960 \end{gathered}$ | Interstate Displacement | Average <br> Foreign-born White Fopulation* | Rate per 1,000 Average Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (In thousands) |  |
| Male |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 7 | 31 | 222 |
| 15-19 | 4 | 30 | 138 |
| 20-24 | 4 | 31. | 141 |
| 25-29 | 6 | 46 | 130 |
| 30-34 | 1.4 | 87 | 156 |
| 35-44 | 22 | 302 | 72 |
| 45-54 | 21 | 568 | 38 |
| Total, 10-54 | 78 | 1,096 | 71 |

Female

| 10-14 | 6 | 32 | 181 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | 4 | 31 | 125 |
| 20-24 | 6 | 30 | 190 |
| 25-29 | 6 | 45 | 138 |
| 30-34 | 9 | 122 | 77 |
| 35-44 | 21. | 372 | 55 |
| 45-54 | 22 | 671 | 32 |
| Total, 10.54 | 73 | 1,302 | 56 |
| *Arithmetic mean of (a) number in age cohort in 1950 and (b) number of survivors expected in 1960 . <br> Source: Computed from Table A and 1960 Census data See text for explanation. |  |  |  |

## VI. INTERNAL MIGRATION BETWEEN GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS

## The Birth-residence Approach

Additional insight into internal migration in the United States for the period 1950-1960 can be gained by exploiting the birth-residence statistics for the native population as tabulated in the Censuses of 1950 and 1960. These data have made it practicable, for the first time, to derive areaspecific census survival ratios by age and so, hopefully, to eliminate from the estimates, or at least to reduce, the errors that arise from geographic variations in mortality and in completeness of enumeration, errors that are inherent in the standard census-survival-ratio method. Whether this goal has been achieved and whether other kinds of error of a more serious nature have been introduced are questions that cannot be answered definitely. But we can at least examine the differences produced by the two methods and perhaps arrive at some appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of each. And whatever those answers may be, the birth-residence approach has the unquestionable advantage of furnishing a great deal of information about internal migration for the period 1950-1960 that is not obtainable in any other way. With these data it has become possible (a) to estimate separately, for each geographic area, the intercensal gains and losses due to the migration of persons who were born in the area and the gains and losses due to the migration of persons who were born elsewhere in the United States, and (b) to study individual intercensal streams in terms of the area of birth on the one hand and the area of 1960 residence on the other.

Problems and procedures. The basic ideas and the main procedures for the application of the census-survival-ratio method to areas smaller than the United States were developed in consultation with Professor Ansley Coale
of Princeton University and Mr. Yun Kim, then a graduate fellow at the University of Pennsylvania. Kim carried out the computations for native white males and described the procedures and findings in a paper (not yet published) "Some Considerations in Estimating Intercensal Migration by the Place-of-Birth Census Survival Ratio Method"。

The present analysis deals with the nine geographic divisions of the United States (see frontispiece map). The new statistics do not readily permit estimates for states. The basic data are those published in State of Birth, reports of the Censuses of 1950 and $1960 .^{23}$ They consist of a complete crossclassification of division of residence at the census date with division of birth for the native population, by sex, age, and color. ${ }^{24}$ With these data, we have a reasonably "closed" population and can calculate age-specific census survival ratios for the population native to each division, including both those living in the division and those living elsewhere at the census dates. Such ratios applied to the division's natives resident in 1950 in each of the nine divisions yield expected numbers for 1960. The differences between these numbers and the numbers enumerated in 1960 are estimates of net change due to the intercensal migration of the division's natives with reference to each of the nine divisions. Repeating this operation for the population born in each division yields nine matrices of estimates in which net changes due to the migration of each division's natives are given for that division and each of the other eight. From these may be accumulated, for each division, the net change due to migration of its own natives and that due to the migration of persons born in other divisions, or the net migration of in-born and the net

23
U.S. Census of Population: 1950 (Special Report P-E, No. 4A); U.S. Census of Population: 1960 (Final Report PC(2)-2A).
${ }^{24}$ Actually, the data are presented for each state of residence crossed with division of birth and for each state of birth crossed with division of residence. These data cannot be used for the derivation of state migration estimates of the type developed for geographic divisions without the complete cross-classification of state of birth with state of residence.
migration of out-born. The balance of the two represents net migration for the division. For a more detailed description of procedures, see the methodological note in the Appendix. 25

There are several problems connected with the preparation and interpretation of estimates of net migration based upon division-of-birth survival ratios. The first concerns persons for whom the state of birth was not reported. There were considerable numbers of these in both censuses: 1,370,000 in 1950, representing 1.0 percent of the native population; $4,541,000$ in 1960 , representing 2.7 percent of the native population. ${ }^{26}$ Because the number in 1960 was so much larger than that in 1950 and would therefore introduce substantial error of bias into the estimates, it was decided to distribute the unknowns before computing survival ratios. Although it seems probable that persons for whom the state of birth was not reported were more likely to be out-born than inborn, there was no quantitative evidence upon which to base the allocation, and it was finally decided to allocate them in accordance with the distribution of those whose place of birth was reported. The number of "unknowns" is given by age, sex, and color for the resident population of each division. These numbers were distributed proportionally among the divisions of birth for each division of residence, separately for each age-sex-color group.

A second problem is created by the absence of 1950 information on the place of birth of the population of Alaska and Hawaii. Fortunately, the 1960

25 similar technique was used by Thomas $K$. Burch on data for Venezuela in his unpublished doctoral dissertation, Internal Migration in Venezuela: A Methodological Study (Princeton University, 1962). But Burch applied area-of-birth-specific survival ratios to the in-born population and to the out-born population who were living in that same area instead of to the in-born population of that area at each area of residence. In other words, he assumed that the survival ratios computed for the total in-born of a given area were applicable to the out-born who were living in that area as well as to the in-born living there. This procedure rather violates the assumption implicit in the computation of area-specific survival ratios and results in inequality at the national level between the sums of gains and the sums of losses for component areas.
${ }^{26}$ U.S. Census of Population: 1960, State of Birth, Table 1.
data were compiled in such a way as to permit the exclusion of both (a) persons born in these states and living in conterminous United States and (b) persons born in conterminous United States and living in the two states. It was there. fore decided to confine the analyses to internal migration within the conterminous area. This means of course that, since some of the "conterminous" born" were in these states at one census and in the conterminous area at the other, the net movement of each division's in-born between the conterminous area and the two new states is assumed to reflect the 1950 division-of-residence distribution of that division's natives within each age-sex-color category. To the extent that this assumption is not met, the estimates of net migration will be in error. The census-survival-ratio estimates for 1950-1960, shown in Appendix Table A, indicate a net in-migration of 92,000 natives to Hawaii and Alaska from the remainder of the system (that is, from conterminous United States, Puerto Rico, and abroad combined). No doubt, most of this movement came from the conterminous area. The amounts are small for most age groups and some of them represent net losses from Alaska and Hawaii to the rest of the area. Where the amounts are small, it probably does not matter much if the assumption is a poor fit to the facts. The largest number $(26,000)$ is that for native white males $20-24$ years old in 1960 . It certainly contains a large proportion of military migration. For that, our "pro rata" assumption is probably not a bad one.

The problem of the overseas segment, Puerto Rico, and other outlying areas of sovereignty or jurisdiction is similar to the one just discussed. Here again, unless the assumption about the division-of-residence distribution of net intercensal migration of "conterminous" natives between these areas and conterminous United States holds, the estimates of net internal migration will be affected.

Further sources of error are sampling variability and misreporting of
state of birth. The 1950 data are based on a 20 -percent sample, those for 1960 on a 25 -percent sample. The Post-Enumeration Survey of the Census of 1950 indicated that for an estimated 4 million persons the state of birth reported in the Census differed from that reported in the Survey (see page 4 of the 1950 report, State of Birth). An estimate for the Census of 1960 is not yet available. No doubt some of both types of error is eliminated at the divisional level. However, both of them contribute to an unknown degree to limiting the accuracy of estimates of net migration.

Other types of error - misreporting of age, race, or nativity, sampling variability of statistics on nativity, etc. - are common to both methods, so presumably do not introduce an added error in the latter method. One source of difference between the two sets of estimates, however, stems from the fact that for the census-survival-ratio estimates, the state age distributions of native whites, foreign-born whites, and Negroes, which were based on sample counts, were adjusted to add (a) to the complete count countrol totals for the white and nonwhite population, by age, and (b) to the complete count all-ages totals for Negroes and other races. No such adjustment of the birth-residence data was attempted.

Census-survival-ratio and Division-of-birth Estimates of Net Migration
The survival ratios, the resulting estimates of migration, the population bases, and the rates are given in Appendix Tables $E, F, G$, and $H$. Before studying the findings for the two separate components of net migration (the out-born and the in-born) we turn to a comparison of the rates of net migration implied by the two methods: (a) the census-survival-ratio (CSR) method used for deriving the historical series of estimates for states, and (b) the division-of-birth survival ratio (DOB) method. Both sets of rates for native whites, by sex, are shown in Figure 12 for each geographic division. The two sets of data are distinctly similar in the sense that differences between di-
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Figure 12 (Cont.)
visions are more marked than are differences between methods. It is clear that both series are measuring the same basic phenomenon, though perhaps with differing degrees of accuracy.

In Figure 13, CSR rates for the Negro population are charted with DOB rates for the native nonwhite population. Despite the difference in population coverage, these data also are in general agreement. Only for the Mountain states is there a striking disparity between the two sets of rates. The principal reason is of course that, in this division, the Negro population forms a much smaller proportion of the total nonwhite population than in any of the others. In 1960, only 36 percent of the nonwhite population of this division were Negro. In no other division was the proportion as low as 50 percent; in most, it was above 80 percent. 27

In addition to the one just mentioned for Negroes and nonwhites, there are two kinds of difference between CSR and DOB rates that cannot be attributed to methodological sources. One is the finer age detail of the CBR rates. The DOB estimates had to be compiled for broader age groups because the birthresidence statistics of the Census of 1950 were tabulated for 10 -year age groups from age 10 upward, necessitating migration estimates for 10-year age groups from age 20 upward (age as of 1960), with a terminal group, 70 years and over. With our knowledge of age differentials, especially those at the young adult ages, we can see that the broader grouping creates a defifite dism advantage in the $D O B$ data as compared with the CSR data. ${ }^{28}$ However, for purm poses of direct comparison, the $C S R$ data can be consolidated into the same age grouping as that of the pOB data.

A second and more troublesome impediment to comparison is the difference
${ }^{27}$ U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Volume I, Part 1, Table 56.
${ }^{28}$ The birth-residence statistics of the Gensus of 1960 were tabulated for the finer age groups. Presumably, the age handicap will not be a factor when it comes to estimates for the period 1960-1970.
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in coverage. The CSR estimates reflect external as well as internal migration of the respective population groups; the $D O B$ estimates measure the net effect of movements within the conterminous United States only. Many of the differences in Figures 12 and 13, especially at the young adult ages, are probably attributable to this factor. In order to control for it, and so to isolate differences due to the use of national rather than divisional survival ratios, we may combine the "birth-residence populations" of 1950 and 1960 and compute "national" survival ratios for the entire conterminous area. Application of these ratios to the divisional populations of 1950 yields expected survivors for 1960 and, by differencing with the 1960 observed population, estimates of net intercensal migration We label these the "DOB-N" estimates. The only differences between them and the $D O B$ estimates will be those attributable to the use of national rather than divisional survival ratios. Yun Kim is responsible for conceiving and carrying out the operations necessary for this comparison for native white males. His results will be used in the analysis to follow.

Divisional rates of net migration for native white males as estimated by the $C S R, D O B$, and $D O B-N$ methods are shown for comparable age groups in Table 11 and Figure 14. We can see at once that regrouping the age data of the CSR estimates has brought them into closer conformity with the DOB estimates, though some rather striking variations remain at the young adult and at the terminal ages. By studying the differences among the three sets of rates; we can arrive at an appraisal of how much of the difference is due to external migration, and is therefore real, and how much is due to the neglect of geo. graphic variations in the computation of national survival ratios. The former is indicated by the difference between CSR and DOB-N rates, the latter by the difference between $D O B$ and $D O B-N$ rates.

At the young adult ages notably the age group $20=29$ and to some degree
table 11. - Rates of net migration of native white males 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, AS DERIVED BY CSR, DOB, AND DOB-N METHODS, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.
(Rates per 1,000 average population)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } \\ & 1960 \end{aligned}$ | CSR | DOB | DOB-N | CSR | DOB | DOB -N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New England |  | Middle Atlantic |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -26 | -24 | -30 | -24 | -37 | -36 |
| 15-19 | -26 | -13 | -14 | -70 | -77 | -77 |
| 20-29 | -44 | -19 | -20 | -77 | -88 | -80 |
| 30-39 | -44 | -42 | -52 | -12 | -29 | -30 |
| 40-49 | -22 | -21 | -14 | -30 | -35 | -37 |
| 50-59 | -16 | -11 | -11 | -26 | -24 | -30 |
| 60-69 | -29 | -16 | -19 | -51 | -35 | -49 |
| $70+$ | -39 | -7 | -38 | -61 | -25 | -63 |
| Total, 10+ | -32 | -21 | -25 | -40 | -44 | -48 |
|  | East North Central |  |  | West North Central |  |  |
| 10-14 | -5 | -5 | -8 | -75 | -65 | -74 |
| 15-19 | -38 | -29 | -28 | -90 | -67 | -72 |
| 20-29 | -20 | -7 | 5 | -151 | -112 | -123 |
| 30-39 | 18 | 10 | 14 | -89 | -92 | -96 |
| 40-49 | -8 | -11 | -7 | -53 | -56 | -50 |
| 50-59 | -12 | -15 | -11 | -29 | - 30 | -22 |
| 60-69 | -40 | -34 | -29 | -15 | -24 | -12 |
| 70+ | -40 | -19 | -36 | -2 | -39 | -6 |
| Total, 10+ | -14 | -11 | -9 | -67 | -64 | -62 |
|  | South Atlantic |  |  | East South Central |  |  |
| 10-14 | 39 | 38 | 39 | -92 | -91 | -87 |
| 15-19 | 71 | 81 | 82 | -92 | -64 | -74 |
| 20-29 | 53 | 84 | 77 | -254 | -201 | -226 |
| 30-39 | 19 | 10 | 11 | -125 | -129 | -1.33 |
| 40-49 | 40 | 43 | 37 | -71 | -65 | -72 |
| 50-59 | 45 | 49 | 44 | -41 | -37 | -46 |
| 60-69 | 98 | 100 | 87 | -6 | -15 | -10 |
| $70+$ | 82 | 86 | 78 | 13 | 7 | 9 |
| Total, 10+ | 50 | 56 | 52 | -99 | -88 | -95 |

TABLE 11. - (continued)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age in } \\ 1960 \end{gathered}$ | CSR | DOB | DOB-N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West South Central |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -29 | -32 | -24 |
| 15-19 | -33 | -16 | -16 |
| 20-29 | -69 | -35 | -41 |
| 30-39 | -27 | -37 | -34 |
| 40-49 | -17 | -21 | -26 |
| 50-59 | -12 | -15 | -13 |
| 60-69 | 9 | -3 | 3 |
| $70+$ | 29 | -20 | 24 |
| Total, 10+ | -24 | -25 | -20 |
| Mountain |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 85 | 77 | 84 |
| 15-19 | 47 | 58 | 69 |
| 20-29 | 68 | 99 | 95 |
| 30-39 | 122 | 105 | 110 |
| 40-49 | 108 | 91 | 93 |
| 50-59 | 75 | 70 | 72 |
| 60-69 | 71 | 54 | 58 |
| 70+ | 56 | 22 | 62 |
| Total,10+ | 84 | 79 | 85 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 155 | 155 | 159 |
| 15-19 | 183 | 188 | 194 |
| 20-29 | 282 | 296 | 302 |
| 30-39 | 198 | 186 | 186 |
| 40-49 | 126 | 111 | 112 |
| 50-59 | 81 | 62 | 68 |
| 60-69 | 64 | 45 | 52 |
| 70+ | 57 | 36 | 60 |
| Total, 10+ | 155 | 148 | 153 |
| Source: CSR - computed from Appendix Tabl |  |  |  |
| B. DOB - Appendix Table H . DOB-N - comput ed from Appendix Tables J and G. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

15-19 and 30-39, most of the difference between the CSR and DOB rates is accounted for by external migration. Almost without exception, the DOB-N rate is closer to the $D O B$ rate than to the CSR rate. The implication is that if the CSR estimates could have been made for the expanded area using birth-
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residence data, they would not have differed much from the estimates actually obtained. Our estimate of the change that would be introduced is the difference between $D O B$ and $D O B-N$ in the direction of $D O B$ from $D O B-N$. The formula for the "adjusted" CSR would be: CSR + (DOB - DOB-N).

For the terminal age group (70 and over) and to a lesser degree for the age group 60-69, the relations are quite different. Here, the DOB-N rate tends to be closer to the CSR than to the DOB rate. The difference between the $C S R$ and the $D O B$ rates is therefore largely explained by the neglect of geographic variations that is inherent in the CSR estimates. However, one hesitates to conclude at once that the DOB estimates are necessarily superior to the CSR estimates. Demographic data for persons in the advanced ages are notoriously suspect, no matter what the characteristic under analysis, and including age itself. If persons of advanced age are more subject to misreporting of birthplace, this may be an important factor in the greater differences found at these ages. Furthermore, an open-end category such as 70 years and over is a particularly uncertain quantity upon which to base firm conclusions.

One strong implication of the differences is that geographic differentials in mortality and therefore in survivorship are greater at the older ages than at others. There is considerable support for this view in Lee's analysis of variations of life table survival ratios for the period 1939-1941. ${ }^{29}$ Examination of divisional mortality rates for 1950 and 1960 gives further substantiation. Not only were the differentials in survivorship implied by 1950-1960 death rates greater at the older ages, but the directions of difference for all divisions except one (the South Atlantic) were such as would yield the
${ }^{29}$ Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870-1950, Volume I, p. 34 ff .
kinds of difference actually found between the CSR and DOB estimates of net migration. As for the South Atlantic, the difference to be explained, though in the wrong direction, is very small. Probably other factors, such as differential census error and the possible effect of heavy in-migration at the advanced ages upon the observed mortality rates of the resident population, have come into play with greater force in that division. The weight of the evidence inclines one to the belief that the $D O B$ estimates are preferable to the CSR estimates for the population 70 and over in 1960 and no doubt also for the population $60-69$ years old.

In general, then, our findings are somewhat inconclusive though the DOB estimates perhaps have a slight edge. In any case, except for the oldest ages the CSR estimates are in fair agreement with the DOB estimates, once the effects of external migration are allowed for. In addition, the CSR estimates have the important advantages of providing finer age detail and finer geographic detail. On the assumption that differences for native white females would be patterned after those for native white males, and in recognition of the unassessable contribution of "other nonwhites" to the differences between CSR rates for Negroes and DOB rates for native nonwhites, we shall not carry the comparative analysis further.

Net Migration of In-born and Out-born
We turn now to a study of the two components of net migration (net migration of in-born and net migration of out-born) which the DOB estimates give us for each geographic division (Appendix Table F). These data are a step in the direction of measuring gross interdivisional migration, for the period 19501960, of persons born in the conterminous United States and living in the conterminous United States at both census dates, a migrant being defined as a person whose division of 1960 residence differed from his division of 1950 residence. The data give us for all divisions the net gains and losses due
to the migration of each division's inmborn natives. That portion of gross movement that is missed is the number of moves that was balanced by countermoves of persons born in the same division. Since for each division the net movement of in-born was generally outward and the net movement of out-born was generally inward, we have, by treating the two categories separately, picked up a considerable part of gross movement beyond that represented by net interdivisional shift, or displacement. Thus, for the population 10 years old and over as a group, the DOB estimate of displacement is 3.2 million (column 9 of Table 12). This may be compared with the estimate of 7.3 million for the total net in-migration of out-born, which is of course equal to the total net outmigration of in-born (columns 7 and 8 of Table 12). Some idea of the magnitude of the missing part is gained by the observation that gross interdivisional migration for the cohort 10 years old and over was 8.3 million for the five-year migration interval 1955-1960. ${ }^{30}$ A comparable figure for the decade would be considerably larger, though not, probably, anything like twice as large.

Native whites. Division rates for the in-born and out-born and rates of net balance (the last are the same DOB rates that are shown in Figure 12) are charted in Figure 15 for native whites, by sex. At all ages for some divisions and at most ages for the rest, net migration of the in-born was outward and net migration of the out-born was inward. The exceptions are confined to the older age groups which had had more opportunity than the younger to build up reservoirs of population living outside their divisions of birth and so to produce migration balances in the opposite direction. Much of this "reverse migration" probably represents return to the area of birth during old age and at retirement. So far as net in-migration of the in-born is concerned, this is certainly the effect of return migration, at least return to the division of birth if
${ }^{30}$ This figure excludes persons for whom state of birth or place of residence in 1955 was not reported. It was derived from Table 6 of Lifetime and Recent Migration (U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Report PC(2)-2D) .

TABLE 12．－NET MIGRATION OF IN－BORN AND OUT－BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION－OF－BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN 1960，BY COLOR， CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES，1950－1960．
（In thousands）

| Division | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { born } \end{aligned}$ | Out－ born | $\begin{gathered} \text { Net } \\ \text { balance } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { born } \end{aligned}$ | Out－ born | Net | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { born } \end{aligned}$ | Out－ born | $\begin{gathered} \text { Net } \\ \text { balance } \end{gathered}$ |
| New England | －401 | 223 | －178 | －2 | 46 | 45 | －403 | 270 | －133 |
| Middle Atlantic | －1，187 | 263 | －924 | －9 | 302 | 293 | －1，196 | 565 | －631 |
| East North Central | －1，230 | 983 | －247 | －17 | 412 |  | －1，247 | 1,395 | 148 |
| West North Central | －972 | 181 | －791 | －20 | 44 | 24 | －992 | 225 | －767 |
| South Atlantic | －559 | 1，414 | 854 | －390 | 33 | －357 | －950 | 1，447 | 497 |
| East South Central | －845 | 142 | －703 | －438 | －8 | －447 | －1，283 | 133 | －1，150 |
| West South Central | －624 | 346 | －278 | －220 | 18 | －203 | －844 | 363 | －481 |
| Mountain | －253 | 620 | 368 | －10 | 28 | 18 | $-263$ | 648 | 386 |
| Pacific | －113 | 2，012 | 1，899 | 3 | 229 | 232 | －109 | 2，241 | 2，132 |
| TOTAL | －6， 184 | 6，184 | － | ， 104 | 1，104 | ， | $-7,287$ | 7，287 | － |
| Sum of gains | 。 |  | 3，121 | 3 | 1，112 | 1，007 | 。 |  | 3，162 |
| Sum of losses | － | － | －3，121 | 1，107 | －8 | －1，007 | － | 。 | －3，162 |

Source：Appendix Table F．
not to the precise place of birth．As for net out－migration of the out－born， we cannot determine its destination．For any given division，it is composed no doubt of a mixture of return and non－return．

There is a striking similarity between the curves for the in－born and those for the out－born，especially in the rates of females．The differences are largely differences in the general level．Where the difference in level is considerable，as in the East South Central and in the Pacific，the basic
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form of the rates of net balance is quite suggestive of the form of its two components.

Distinctive features of the curves of male rates are associated with military migration. Induction migration appears to have prevented the rate from falling at ages 15-19 or from faltering in its upward climb between ages 10-14 and 20-29, as it ordinarily does in the rates for females and as it usually has done in the rates for males in past decades. Separation migration is reflected in a sharp decrease in the rate from ages 20-29 to ages 30-39 followed by a leveling or an increase to ages 40-49, such that the rates for the three age groups form an angle or notch convex to the zeroaxis. These departures from the usual age pattern are especially clear-cut in the rates of the in-born moving away from areas with below average shares of military population (Middle Atlantic, East North Central) and in the rates of the out-born moving to areas with above average shares (New England, South Atlantic, West South Central). The depressed rate at $30-39$ would be in large part the result of the reverse movement of persons leaving the armed forces. Such movement would tend to reduce net out-migration of in-born from areas of low military concentration and net in-migration of out-born to areas of high military concentration. To the extent that separation migration (concentrated at ages $30-34$ ) is also return migration and to the extent that nonmilitary return migration (which has a special impact. at ages 35-39) is concordant with separation migration, the 10 -year age group 30-39 is doubly affected by the factor of reverse migration. The differential effects of military migration upon rates for the age groups 20-24 and 25-29 are of course obscured in these data by the necessity to consolidate them into a single 10year age group.

The impact of retirement migration is similarly dampened by the broader age grouping. The two groups most affected (65-69 and 70-74) are divided
between the groups 60-69 and 70 and over. Nevertheless, a minor peak (or trough, depending on the direction of retirement migration as compared with the prevailing direction of migration at the other ages) often appears at ages 60-69. Some divisions - notably, the Middle Atlantic, the East North Central, and the West North Central - lost by the migration of both the inborn and the out-born at ages above 60. Others - notably the South Atlantic and the Pacific - gained by the migration of both categories.

With regard to the South Atlantic states, these data give us a particularly valuable insight into rates of net migration. For native white females, the age curve of net balance shows a marked departure from prevalent forms, the rates being low and nearly level at the young adult ages and reaching a pronounced peak at ages 60-69. The component rates, however, look quite "normal", with a maximum at ages $20-29$, followed by a regular decline with increase in age up to the retirement ages. The secondary peak at 60-69 in the rates for the out-born is of course more insistent than in most areas because of the great attraction that Florida exerts upon the elderly.

Comparable considerations apply, albeit less forcibly, with regard to the net rates of some of the other divisions: New England (native white males); East North Central (native white males); Mountain (native white males and females). In each instance, the rate curves of the in-born and the rate curves of the out-born have salient characteristics in common, but the curve for the rates of net balance is noticeably different in shape.

Native nonwhites. Division rates for nonwhites, by sex, are charted in Figure 16. In these data, there is a much greater spread between the rate levels for the in-born and those for the out-born than was true of the rates for native whites. The southern divisions are characterized by high rates of net migration for the in-born and low rates for the out-born, the other divisions by high rates for the out-born and low rates for the in-born. Like the
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movements of whites, the net migration of out-born nonwhites was generally inward and the net migration of in-born was generally outward, but in the data for nonwhites there are more exceptions and they appear over a wider range of ages. This combination of characteristics reflects the disinclination of nonwhites, most of whom are Negroes, to remain in or move to the southern divisions. There was, in addition to the heavy net out-migration of in-born, a net out-migration of out-born at ages 30 and above from the South Atlantic and East South Central divisions, at ages 40 and above from the West South Central. Conversely, the divisions outside the South not only had heavy gains through the migration of out-born, but tended to gain through the return migration of in-born at ages above 30. The two extremes in this respect were the East South Central and the Pacific. For all ages combined (that is, 10 years old and over in 1960), the East South Central had a net out-migration of out-born, the Pacific a net in-migration of in-born (columns 4 and 5 of Table 12).

As a result of the kinds of relations just described, the rates of net balance are in close approximation to the rates for the component in the dominant direction. In these data, we come much nearer to measuring gross migration than was the case with the total population or with native whites. Thus, for the population 10 years old and over as a group, the sum of net changes due to the migration of the out-born (which is equal to the sum of net changes due to the migration of the in-born) is very close to the sum of net balances for the gaining divisions (which, in turn, is equal to the sum of net balances for the losing divisions) - 1,104,000 as compared with $1,007,000$ (columns 4, 5, and 6 of Table 12). The comparable figures for native whites are $6,184,000$ and 3,121,000 (columns 1, 2, and 3 of Table 12). Furthermore, comparison with data on gross interdivisional migration for the period 1955-1960 confirms that there has been relatively little lost as a result of movements in opposing directions.

The number of conterminous-born native nonwhites 10 years old and over in 1960 whose 1960 divisions of residence differed from their 1955 divisions of residence was 628,000 , a figure that is not very far above half the $1,104,000$ cited above. ${ }^{31}$ This figure is probably an underestimate because of the exclusion of "unknowns", but the predominantly one-way character of nonwhite migration is amply demonstrated nonetheless.

Although the basic form of the curves for nonwhites is according to "standard", there are certain variations that should be noted. The first is the tendency of the fall in the rate after the peak at ages 20-29 to "break" at ages $40-49$, the rates for subsequent ages either leveling off or rising. It occurs almost exclusively in the rates for the dominant component and in the rates of net balance. In the rates for the smaller component, the break generally occurs, as would be expected, in the age group $30-39$, and is suggestive of the phenomenon of return migration, as observed at ages 35-39 in the data for native white males in earlier decades and as observed in the $D O B$ rates for the same group at ages $30-39$. This peculiarity is also evident in the CSR rates for five-year age groups of Negroes (see Figure 10) It was noted in the analysis of Volume III of Population Redistribution and Economic Growth that there was some indication that the maximum effect of reverse migration occurred at later ages among Negroes than among native whites. 32 However, a convincing explanation is difficult to come by.

The rates for one division - the Mountain states - have several points of difference with the rates for the other divisions. The contrast in level between the rates for the in-born and those for the outoborn is much less

[^15]than for most divisions and the curves of rates of net balance have noticeably different shapes from those of the other divisions. It seems likely that the explanation lies in the composition of the nonwhite population of the Mountain states. In earlier discussion, it was indicated that a considerable proportion of the nonwhite population of this division are "other nonwhites", that is, are nonwhites other than Negroes. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that net gains of out-born came largely from the migration of Negroes, while net changes due to the migration of the in-born came largely from the migration of other nonwhites. We can check this possibility by comparing the CSR estimates of net migration of Negroes with the DOB estimates of net migration of the nonwhite out-born. The numbers for comparable age groups of both sexes, drawn from Appendix Tables $B$ and. $F$, are as follows, in thousands:

|  | Net migration <br> ofNegroes <br> (CSR) | Net in-migration <br> of out-born <br> nonwhites <br> (pOB) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10-14$ | 3.5 |  |
| $15-19$ | 2.9 | 4.4 |
| $20-29$ | 10.7 | 2.9 |
| $30-39$ | 4.7 | 11.4 |
| $40-49$ | 2.8 | 4.7 |
| $50-59$ | 1.5 | 2.4 |
| $60-69$ | 0.9 | 1.7 |
| $70+$ | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Total,10+ | 27.3 | 0.2 |
|  |  | 28.1 |

These figures are in such close agreement that there can be little doubt that they refer essentially to the same population group. The deviant form of the rates of net balance is possibly attributable to their being the result of the opposing movements of two quite independent segments of the population, with one segment (other nonwhites) overrepresented in the base to which the rates are related.

## Conclusion

The general import of the findings based on the division-of-birth estimates for the in-born and out-born components of net migration is that, despite the variation to which we have given considerable attention, the nearer approach to a measurement of gross migration represented by these data indicates that for component areas, as well as for internal migration in general, the underlying pattarn of association between age and the probability of migration is quite constant in space as well as in time. When these findings can be integrated with those from other studies, it should become possible to construct models that will express the underlying relationships in quantitative terms, proper account being taken of the length of migration interval and the age at time of migration.

Also, these data are helpful in laying the foundations for an understanding of the relation between age profiles of rates of gross migration and those of net migration. Through the study of such data we may eventually be able to infer a good deal about the characteristics of gross migration from data on net migration. However, generalization in this area must await further analysis.

Place-of-birth estimates of migration for 1950-1960 can be exploited for the study of individual streams of qigration between divisions. In making such use of them, it has to be kept in mind that, while each stream is specific as to division of destination (or residence in 1960), the indicated origin will be the division of birth, which is not necessarily the division of residence in 1950. This statement applies to the positive entries in a division-bydivision table - for example, a net in-migration to Division $A$ of persons born in Division B. Negative entries (for example, a net out-migration from Division A of persons born in Division B) are specific as to division of residence in 1950, or division of net loss, but are indeterminate as to division of destination.

## VII. VITAL STATISTICS VERSUS CENSUS SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR ESTIMATING NET INTERCENSAL MIGRATION

Estimates of net migration, by states, for the period 1950-1960 were published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1962. ${ }^{33}$ These estimates were derived by the so-called "vital statistics method". (Total increase minus natural increase equals net migration.) The estimates discussed in the present report were derived by the forward census-survival-ratio method. There are some disturbing differences between the two sets of results. This section will examine the differences and attempt to arrive at some explanation of them, attention being confined to the white population. 34

## Magnitude and Character of Differences

The two estimates and the deviation of the census survival (CSR) from the vital statistics (VS) estimate are shown for each state and for the United States as a whole in Table 13. It is immediately evident that, although the two sets of data are highly correlated (Spearman's rho $=+0.98$ ), the CSR estimates are generally lower, algebraically, than the VS estimates. Only 9 of the 51 states (the District of Columbia is treated as a state) show positive deviations; in each case the absolute amount involved is very small. For only two states (Michigan and Indiana) do the estimates of net migration have different signs. For both, the VS method yields a small net in-migration, the CSR method a small net out-migration.

As a result of the biased nature of the differences, the implied net

[^16]table 13. - ESTIMATES OF NET MIGRATION BY the VITAL STATISTICS (VS) AND CENSUS-SURVIVAL-RATIO (CSR) METHODS, WHITE POPULATION of the united states, by States, 1950-1960.
(In thousands)

|  | (In thousands) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | VS | CSR | Deviation of |
|  | Estimate | Estimate | CSR from VS |

New England

| Maine | -68 | -77 | -9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Hampshire | 11 | 4 | -7 |
| Vermont | -38 | -42 | -4 |
| Massachusetts | -119 | -173 | -54 |
| Rhode Island | -28 | -37 | -9 |
| Connecticut | 195 | 178 | -17 |

## Middle Atlantic

| New York | -72 | -253 | -181 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Jersey | 465 | 398 | -67 |
| Pennsylvania | -553 | -687 | -134 |

East North Central

| Ohio | 276 | 207 | -69 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Indiana | 19 | -13 | -32 |
| Illinois | -64 | -149 | -85 |
| Michigan | 30 | -15 | -45 |
| Wisconsin | -82 | -96 | -14 |

West North Central

| Minnesota | -101 | -99 | 2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Iowa | -236 | -233 | 3 |
| Missouri | -158 | -181 | -23 |
| North Bakota | -103 | -100 | 3 |
| South Dakota | -90 | -87 | 3 |
| Nebraska | -121 | -118 | 3 |
| Kansas | -49 | -46 | 3 |

South Atlantic

| Delaware | 58 | 53 | -5 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Maryland | 284 | 256 | -28 |
| Bistrict of Columbia | -213 | -216 | -3 |
| Virginia | 84 | 67 | -17 |
| West irginia | -406 | -415 | -9 |
| North Carolina | -121 | -127 | -6 |
| South Carolina | -4 | -12 | -8 |
| Georgia | -9 | -18 | -9 |
| Florida | 1,516 | 1,464 | -52 |

TABLE 13. - (continued)

| State | VS | CSR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | | Deviation of |
| :---: |

East South Central

| Kentucky | -374 | -389 | -15 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Tennessee | -216 | -228 | -12 |
| Alabama | -144 | -151 | -7 |
| Mississippi | -110 | -112 | -2 |

## West South Central

| Arkansas | -283 | -273 | 10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Louisiana | 42 | 31 | -11 |
| Oklahoma | -192 | -189 | 3 |
| Texas | 141 | 127 | -14 |

Mountain

| Montana | -23 | -27 | -4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Idaho | -41 | -40 | 1 |
| Wyoming | -19 | -19 | -0 |
| Colorado | 149 | 141 | -8 |
| New Mexico | 54 | 48 | -6 |
| Arizona | 340 | 326 | -14 |
| Utah | 9 | 9 | $\cdots$ |
| Nevada | 80 | 76 | -4 |

## Pacific

| Washington | 70 | 59 | -11 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Oregon | 10 | 7 | -3 |
| California | 2,791 | 2,665 | -126 |
| Alaska | 42 | 42 | $\ldots$ |
| Hawaii | 55 | 55 | $\ldots$ |
| NIED STATES | 2,684 | 1,591 | $-1,093$ |
| Sum of positives | 6,721 | 6,213 | 31 |
| Sum of negatives | $-4,037$ | $-4,622$ | $-1,124$ |
| Total, without | 10,758 | 10,835 | 1,155 |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Gensus, Current Population Reports, Series $\mathrm{P}=25$, No. 247, Table 2; Apperdix Tables A-1 and A-2. Differences obtained after rounding.
inmigration to the United States (the algebraic sum of state gains and losses) is very much higher by the VS method than by the CSR method: $2,684,000$ as compared with $1,591,000$. There is a net difference of $1,093,000$ that calls for some explanation.

The states are distributed by size of deviation as follows:

| Deviation of CSR <br> from VS estimates <br> (in thousands) | Number <br> of <br> states | Sum of <br> deviations <br> (in thousands) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -100 or more | 3 | -441 |
| -50 to -99 | 5 | -327 |
| -20 to -49 | 4 | -1.28 |
| -10 to -19 | 9 | -125 |
| -1 to -9 | 17 | -103 |
| 0 | 4 | 0 |
| +1 to +9 | 8 | +21 |
| +10 or more | 1 | +10 |
| United States | 51 | $-1,093$ |

The size of the deviations bears little relation to the estimated amounts of net migration, but there does appear to be some association between size of deviation and size of white population. The relevant averages for slightly different categories of deviation and without regard to sign are given below:

| Beviation of CSR from VS estimate (in thousands) | Number <br> of <br> states | Average (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bevi- | Net migration |  | White population |  |
|  |  | ation | VS | CSR | 1950 | 1960 |
| 100 or more | 3 | 147 | 1,139 | 1,202 | 11,214 | 13,399 |
| 50 to 99 | 5 | 65 | 488 | 478 | 5,353 | 6,509 |
| 20 to 49 | 4 | 32 | 123 | 116 | 3,822 | 4,493 |
| 10 to 19 | 10 | 14 | 183 | 177 | 2,640 | 3,113 |
| 5 to 9 | 11 | 8 | 96 | 98 | 1,368 | 1,563 |
| Under 5 | 18 | 2 | 85 | 84 | 1,000 | 1,100 |
| United States | 51 | 23 | 211 | 212 | 2,650 | 3,114 |

Status with respect to gain or loss by migration does not appear to be an important factor. Of the 22 states that gained through migration according to the VS estimates, 19 show negative deviations and 3 show no difference.

The 19 states together account for somewhat less than half the sum of negative deviations. Of the 29 states that lost through migration, 19 show negative deviations and together account for a little more than half the sum of the negative differences, 9 show positive deviations, and 1 shows no difference. Beyond the fact that positive differences were obtained only among states that had net out-migration, there is no systematic relation between size of deviation and direction of net migration.

Twelve states, those with deviations of 20,000 or more, account for well over three-fourths of the total deviation without regard to sign and for nearly 80 percent of the sum of the negative deviations. Eleven of them are among the first 12 states in size of white population. They thus account to an important degree for the association between population size and size of deviation. We shall give particular attention to these states in the search for an explanation of differences.

It should be noted that estimates of net migration for the period 19401950 show a very similar, though less disturbing, pattern of differences as between the two methods. ${ }^{35}$ For the earlier decade as for the later, the deviations of the CSR estimates from the vS estimates tend to be negative, but the migration balances for the United States as a whole (in this case, conterminous United States) leave an unexplained difference of less than 600,000 . Again, most of the difference is accounted for by a dozen states, most of them the same states that showed large differences for 1950-1960. For the earlier decade, however, some of the large differences are positive. The differences for the 12 states with differences above 20,000 are as follows, for each decade, in thousands:

[^17]$$
\underline{1950-1960}^{36} \quad \underline{1940-1950}^{37}
$$

| New York | -181 | New York | -139 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Pennsylvania | -134 | Pennsylvania | -127 |
| California | -126 | Illinois | -70 |
| Illinois | -85 | New Jersey | -59 |
| Ohio | -69 | Massachusetts | -50 |
| New Jersey | -67 | California | +49 |
| Massachusetts | -54 | Texas | +48 |
| Florida | -52 | Ohio | -46 |
| Michigan | -45 | D. C. | +35 |
| Indiana | -32 | Michigan | -32 |
| Maryland | -28 | Wisconsin | -25 |
| Missouri | -23 | Indiana | -24 |
| Sum of negative |  |  |  |
| deviations | -896 |  | -572 |
| Sum of positive <br> deviations |  |  | +132 |

Nine states appear on both 1 ists and all of them were among the 10 top-ranking states by size of white population in both 1950 and 1960 . It seems clear that the same sources of error were operative for both sets of estimates, though the present discussion is confined to an examination of the differences for 1950-1960。

## Adjustment for Comparability

Certain differences are to be expected between estimates derived by these two mentods. The first has to do with the definition of net migration implicit in each. The VS method yields an estimate, for each state and for the country, of the balance of inward and outward movement for the decade. The CSR method yields an estimate for the same areas of the migration balance among persons surviving to the end of the decade. The former takes account of the movement of persons who died after migration; the latter does not. Adjustment of CSR estimates for comparability in this respect with the VS estimates would increase, on an age-specific basis, both the estimates of
${ }^{36}$ Table 13.
${ }^{37}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census, op.cit., Table 4; Eldridge and Thomas, op. cit., Appendix Tables A1. 14 and A1.17.
net in-migration and the estimates of net out-migration. Such adjustment would tend to reduce the negative differences for gaining states, but would increase them for losing states. It would not eliminate the biased character of the differences between the two series; it might or might not reduce the difference for the country as a whole.

On the assumption that migration and deaths were evenly distributed over the decade, an overall adjustment for comparability can be made by converting the CSR estimates, which were derived by the use of forward cepsus survival ratios, to estimates by the average survival-ratio method. On the basis of a conversion formula derived by Siegel and Hamilton, a multiplier was computed for each age-sex group and applied to the CSR net migration balances at the national level. ${ }^{38}$ The result is not encouraging, for the implied net in-migration to the United States was actually smaller by the average ratio method than by the forward ratio method (1,119,000 instead of $1,213,000$ for the population 10 years old and over in 1960), and the negative difference between the VS and CSR estimates was increased by 94,000 . The immediate reason for this is that the conversion multipliers inflated the negative balances (those at the older ages) more than they did the positive balances. It is necessary to search elsewhere for an explanation of the observed difference.

## Geographic Variability

A second source of expected difference between results obtained by the two methods is the inapplicability of national census survival ratios to the experience of individual states. This source would hold little promise for

The formula is: $(1+r) / 2 r$, where $r$ is the forward census survival ratio for a single age cohort. For derivation, see Jacob S. Siegel and C. Horace Hamiltons "Some Considerations in the Use of the Residual Method of Estimating Net Migration", Journal of the American Statistical Association, September. 1952.
explaining a biased type of difference were it not that the "population system" upon which the survival ratios are based embraces an area greater than the United States proper. The ratios were based on the native population of the United States, including Puerto Rico and including United States natives living abroad and the crews of merchant vessels. This procedure gives a better approximation to the desired closed population upon which to base survival ratios. Also, it adds a fifty-second "state" and allows for a net gain or loss to the United States resulting from the movement of natives out of and into the country. For the expanded area as a whole, errors proceeding from the variation of area rates of mortality and census error about the global rate would cancel out. One would expect overstatement of net migration in either direction (i.e., net gain or net loss) for some states and understatement for others. In other words, geographic variations in mortality and census error would result in overestimates of the expected 1960 population for some states and underestimates for others, but the sum of positive errors would be equal to the sum of negative errors. This kind of variation could hardly produce an error of bias. It is only if the rates of mortality and/ or misreporting for the overseas portion differed from those for the united States proper, and differed markedly, that we should expect a seriously biased type of error in our estimates for the United States part of the expanded area.

There is no indication that mortality differentials would be a serious factor, but there is some evidence that census error is more important for the overseas area than for the United States. There are at least two lacunae in our coverage of the overseas segment. These are: (1) the outlying areas of sovereignty or jurisdiction other than Puerto Rico, and (2) citizens living abroad other than federal employees and their dependents. We shall examine
them separately.
Outlying areas. The enumerated white population of the excluded outlying areas (Virgin Islands, Canal Zone, American Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific) was 58,000 in 1950 and 57,000 in 1960. They were excluded in the belief that intercensal net migration for them would be negligible. Fortunately, it is possible to adjust for the effect of this exclusion with the use of census survival ratios, prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, that include all of them except the Trust Territory of the Pacific. These ratios differ from the University of Pennsylvania set in one other way. They contain an adjustment for nonwhites in Puerto Rico in 1960. The population of that area was enumerated by color in 1950, but not in 1960. The University of Pennsylvania ratios counted the entire population of the Island as white at both censuses. The Census Bureau ratios used estimates of nonwhites for 1960 that assumed the same proportions nonwhite as in 1950. The comparisons we are about to make will therefore give us a measure of the joint effect of both these differences between the two sets of ratios.

Application of the Census Bureau ratios to the native white pppulation resident in the United States in 1950 and calculation of the differences between the numbers enumerated in 1960 and the numbers expected yield an estimated net out-migration of 21,000 native whites, as compared with the previously estimated net in-migration of 51,000 . These figures apply to the population 10 years old and over in 1960. Alternative estimates are not obtainable for persons under 10. The difference of 72,000 betweep the two estimates is not large. The point to be noted is that, small though it is, adjustment for it would enlarge rather than diminish the gap between the VS and CSR estimates of net migration for the United States.

Citizens abroad. In 1960, for the first time, United States citizens
living abroad (other than members of the armed forces, federal employees, and their dependents) were enumerated in the census. Because enumeration of this group was on a voluntary basis, the coverage was probably less complete than for the rest of the population. The census count of such per sons was 188,000 , of whom 151,000 were native white. ${ }^{39}$ Because the number for 1950 was not known, the category was omitted in the calculation of census survival ratios, a procedure equivalent to assuming that the size of this group was not affected by migration between 1950 and 1960. Very likely, though, it increased through migration from the United States as did the other groups of United States citizens abroad. If it increased at a rate comparable with these other groups, there may have been a net movement abroad as great as 100,000 . If so, correction for the exclusion of the category "other citizens abroad" would reduce the CSR estimate of net in-migration of whites by that amount. Such correction would, again, increase rather than diminish the gap between the two types of estimate.

## Net Migration of the Foreign Born

Adjustment for the sources of difference so far examined would add an estimated 266,000 to the difference of $1,093,000$ observed at the national level, leaving us with a total discrepancy of some $1,359,000$ to be explained.

There is one respect in which the CSR estimates have violated their own basic assumptions and their principal justification. This violation lies in the application of native white census survival ratios to the foreign-born white population. At first glance, it appears reasonable enough to assume that both mortality and pecularities of enumeration are the same for the foreign born as for natives. But if in fact, mortality andor census error differ as between the two population groups, the application of native ratios
${ }^{39} \underline{\text { U.S. Census }}$ of Population: 1960 , Volume I, Part I, Table 67.
to the foreign-born population can give rise to errors of estimate. And if, as seems quite possible, the mortality of foreign-born whites is higher than that of native whites, the effect of using native survival ratios would be to understate net gains and overstate net losses due to migration at the state level, and consequently to underestimate net immigration of the foreign born at the national level. If mortality differentials do exist, they are probably larger at older ages than at younger ages, and it is precisely at the older ages that the CSR estimates of net migration are open to question on a priori grounds. The indicated net loss is disconcertingly high for the terminal age group (see Table 14). Even if mortality differentials are negligible age for age, the true rates for age groups are probably higher for the foreign born because of a greater concentration of persons at the older ages within each age group, a concentration brought about by the diminution of immigration since World War I. With these considerations in mind, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that native white ratios contain built-in underestimates of the mortality of foreign-born whites.

If, in addition to the mortality difference, there is a tendency of foreign-born persons to report themselves as natives, the effect upon estimates of net migration would reinforce that of the mortality error. Here again, one would expect the reporting error to be greater at the older ages than at the younger (the foreign born who have lived in this country for a long time are surely more likely to seem and feel like natives, and to be so reported, than are comparative newcomers) with the result that the population observed in 1960 would be too small, whereas the survival ratio for natives would have yielded an expected 1960 population that is too large. ${ }^{40}$ The

40 The error in estimates of net migration for the native population that would result from this factor is minimized by the "self-correcting" character of census survival ratios. Such error would of course vary by states, but presumably it would be close to zero for the United States part of the expanded area
ultimate effect would be an underestimate of net in-migration to the United States.

TABLE 14. - NET MIGRATION OF FOREIGN-BORN WHITES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, AS ESTTMATED BY THE CSR METHOD: NUMBERS AND RATES, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Age in <br> 1960 | Number <br> (In <br> thousands) | Rate per 1,000 <br> Average White <br> Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10-14$ | 158 | 11 |
| $15-19$ | 130 | 11 |
| $20-24$ | 217 | 23 |
| $25-29$ | 248 | 26 |
| $30-34$ | 223 | 21 |
| $35-39$ | 182 | 16 |
| $40-44$ | 112 | 11 |
| $45-49$ | 100 | 10 |
| $50-54$ | 58 | 7 |
| $55-59$ | 11 | 1 |
| $60-64$ | -14 | -2 |
| $65-69$ | -51 | -8 |
| $70-74$ | -60 | -12 |
| $75+$ | -152 | -18 |
| Total, 10+ | 1,161 | 9 |

Source: Appendix Table A (page for United States).

Of course, it is only if the mortality and census errors are of the types just described that the downward bias of the CSR estimates can be explained by them. But the opposite of either proposition - viz. that the mortality of elderly foreigners is lower than that of natives, or that elderly natives tend to report themselves as foreigners - is scarcely credible. If these errors exist, they must certainly be in the directions indicated. The real questions are whether they do exist and, if so, whether they are sufficiently important to account for all, or a considerable part, of the observed differences between VS and CSR estimates. It is only if we assume that the answer to the first question is yes that we have any hope of explaining these differences
in terms of error in the CSR estimates. There is some independent evidence that gives support to this assumption. We have already seen that deviations of the CSR from the VS estimates are associated with population size and that most of the aggregate deviation is accounted for by a handful of the largest states. These are also states with high proportions of the foreignborn population. Thus, the 12 states with deviations of 20,000 or more, which account for 78 percent of total deviation, contained in 195077 percent of the foreign-born white population, but only 54 percent of the native white population. For 1960 , the percentages were 78 and 56 respectively. These figures are a rather strong indication that the foreign born contribute disproportionately to the differences between the VS and CSR estimates. We may examine how much of the aggregate difference is likely to be explained. If we assume that net migration of foreign-born whites 70 years old and over was zero (it probably was not zero, but may have been close to i.t) then we can account for approximately 200,000 of the difference between the two estimates. If, in addition, we suppose that the downward bias exists in other age groups, though to a lesser degree, then an indeterminate further part of the difference can be accounted for. It seems unlikely that error arising from this source could account for the entire difference between the VS and CSR estimates. Perhaps a fair guess is that adjustment for it would reduce the discrepancy from approximately 1.4 million to roughly 1.0 million.

## Net Census Error

Since it is unlikely that a downward bias in the CSR estimates can be the whole explanation of the difference observed at the national level, it might be well to consider the possibility of an upward bias in the VS estimates.

The VS method is such that, whatever there is of differential enumeration
error in two successive censuses (we call this "net census error", meaning the amount by which the net undercount of the first census differs from the net undercount of the second) is ascribed to net migration. The more accurate the estimate of natural increase, the less likely that net census error will be absorbed or counter-balanced by errors in estimates of natural increase. The CSR method, on the other hand, makes no attempt to estimate natural change (mortality of each age cohort) as such, but seeks rather to determine an "expected" population that contains all change (whether due to mortality or census error) except that due to migration. In effect, the CSR method throws at least part of net census error into the estimate of natural increase; the VS method throws all of net census error into the estimate of net migration. ${ }^{41}$

The question is, then, whether the Census of 1960 was better enumerated than the Census of 1950, absolutely rather than relatively. If the net undercount (we reject the possibility of a net overcount) was smaller in 1960 than in 1950 , then the difference is attributed to net migration by the NS method of estimation, and net immigration to the United States will be overstated. The evidence is not conclusive on this point, but there are some indications that the population was more completely enumerated in the later census.

Taeuber and Hansen, on the basis of independent estimates of net immigration and natural increase, reach an estimate of "improvement in coverage" that amounts to 277,000 for the country as a whole. ${ }^{42}$ In estimating the net

[^18]movement of United States civilian citizens between the United States and other countries, they had at their disposal two sets of data that yielded conflicting results. The first, statistics of arrivals and departures by sea and air, furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, indicated $a$ net inmovement of 280,000 . The second, census counts of Americans abroad and statistics of births and deaths to persons abroad, indicated a net out-movement of 172,000. Taeuber and Hansen therefore assumed net movement for the category to be zero. . They were, in effect, "leaning over backward" in order not to overestimate improvement in coverage in 1960. But there are a number of reasons for finding the second of the two alternative estimates more acceptable than the first: (1) Statistics of arrivals and departures exclude movement across land borders. The data refer to all Americans leaving and entering the country regardless of intended length of stay. A cumulative balance for a 10-year interval of time is subject to large error. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that arrivals are more carefully recorded than departures. If so, reliance on such statistics will lead to an overestimate of net gain, or to an underestimate of net loss. (2) The increase in the number enumerated overseas is so striking (about $1,000,000$ ) that it is difficult to believe that there was not a net movement of citizens away from the United States during the intercensal period. (3) The growth of international activities of the United States, politically, militarily, and commercially, makes it seem impossible that the balance of movement of citizens between 1950 and 1960 for extended residence abroad can have been anything but outward.

If we accept the second estimate - a net out-migration of 172,000 - then the estimated improvement in coverage (or reduction in net undercount) becomes $449,000(277,000+172,000)$, and goes a considerable way toward explaining the difference between VS and CSR estimates of net in-migration to the United

States for the decade. On the other hand, if we accept the estimate based on arrivals and departures, the net gain of 280,000 just about cancels the estimated increase in coverage of 277,000 and we must conclude that the net under count in 1960 was approximately equal to the net undercount in 1950. These figures refer to the total population; comparable figures for whites only would no doubt be somewhat smaller.

Several other estimates of net undercount at the two censuses may be cited: (1) Steinberg and associates, of the Bureau of the Census, estimate a net undercount of 1.7 to 2.0 percent in 1960 , of 2.4 percent in 1950. 43 These estimates imply an increased coverage of between 60,000 and 600,000 . They, like the ones cited above, refer to the total population and represent a range of from close to zero to roughly half a million. (2) The population estimates of Coale and Zelnik imply increased coverage of between 300,000 and 600,000 for the white population, 44 (3) A later and more refined estimate by Zelnik places the net undercount of native whites at $2,252,000$ for 1960. The difference between this figure and the estimated net undercount of $3,340,000$ for 1950 indicates an improvement in coverage of $1,088,000.45$ This estimate comes perilously close to the original difference of $1,093,000$ that we have been trying to explain. Correction of the VS figure by this amount would bring the two estimates of net in-migration to the United States into very close agreement.

Although these estimates may not be of a type to be defended to the death, they nevertheless are not inconsistent with a guess that a considerable
${ }^{43}$ Cited in Taeuber and Hansen, op.cit., p.5.
44 ansley J. Coale and Melvin Zelnik, New Estimates of Fertility and Population in the United States, Appendix Tables 16, 17, and 18.
${ }^{45}$ Melvin Zelnik, ${ }^{\text {Her Erors }}$ in the 1960 Census Enumeration of Native Whites", Journal of the American Statistical Association, June: 1964.
part of the aggregate difference between VS and CSR estimates can be accounted for by a reduction in the net census undercount. Certainly, none of them suggests a larger net undercount in 1960 than in 1950.

Natural Increase
One other possible explanatory factor should be mentioned. If by any chance natural increase has been underestimated, the VS estimates will have overestimated net migration to the United States. Natural increase would be underestimated only if births were undercorrected for underregistration. (Although deaths of children under 1 year of age were corrected for underregistration, we may safely assume that total deaths were not overestimated.) There has been no systematic investigation of the completeness of birth registration since the 1950 Birth Registration Test. The VS estimates assume, on the basis of previous trends, that there has been some improvement since 1950. We are in no position to question that assumption, and must therefore remain in doubt as to how the migration estimates may have been affected by it, if at all.

## Conclusion

On balance, then, there appears to be a real possibility that the CSR estimates have a downward bias as the result of using native white census survival ratios for estimating the net migration of foreign-born whites. There is also a real possibility that a decrease in the net census undercount has introduced an upward bias into the VS estimates. Unfortunately, we have at the moment no sound basis for adjusting for either of these sources of error.

Meanwhile, one cannot say with certainty which series is nearer to the truth. It has been customary to regard estimates obtained by the VS method as more accurate than those obtained by the CSR method, and this may actually
be the correct position. Still, in the absence of more definite information, it would seem undesirable to tamper with the CSR estimates - for example, to use the VS estimates as control totals and to force the CSR age-sex detail to add up to them. Proper adjustment of each series should result in an even balance between negative and positive deviations, reflecting the variation of state census error and mortality rates around the national rate.

One point should not be lost to sight. There can be considerable variation among states in the relative quality of estimates of net migration as derived by the two methods. The question of the effect of differential completeness of enumeration upon estimates of net migration for individual states needs further study. Hamilton has begun a systematic investigation of this problem. A preliminary report of his findings is given in a paper prepared for the 1965 World Population Conference. ${ }^{46}$ Further analysis, in collaboration with the present writer, is in progress.

[^19]migration.
In the present report, considerable attention is given to comparing the results of differing methods of estimating net migration. Comparison is made of estimates for geographic divisions based on (a) United States census survival ratios for the "expanded area", (b) division-of-birth survival ratios based on birth-residence statistics, and (c) combined division-of-birth survival ratios for the conterminous United States. These comparisons lead to the conclusion that at the younger, more migratory ages, the differences between (a) and (b) are largely explained by the more comprehensive coverage and the finer age detail of (a), while differences at the advanced ages are largely explained by geographic variations in survival and in census error.

A comparison of state estimates of net intercensal migration of the white population as estimated by means of (a) United States census survival ratios for the expanded area and (b) vital statistics indicates that there is a strongly biased difference between the two series. Examination of the possible sources of difference leads to the tentative conclusion that, while use of survival ratios based on the native population for estimating the net migration of the foreign born may have introduced a downward bias into the survival-ratio estimates, improvement in enumeration and a reduction between 1950 and 1960 in the net census undercount may have introduced an upward bias into the vital statistics estimates of net migration.
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EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS

```
n data not available
... value below the level of rounding
- magnitude zero
    category not applicable
```


## ROUNDING

Many of the numerical data presented in this report are shown in thousands. Unless otherwise specified, all calculations (sums, percentages, etc.) are based on unrounded numbers.

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES. AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## United States

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 17,709 | 17,035 | 80,631 | 77,623 | -213 | -477 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-45,001$ | 25,231 | 61,747 | 67,808 | $-7,383$ | -348 |
| $20-24$ | $-161,552$ | 3,799 | 90,379 | 126,151 | $-19,516$ | $-1,249$ |
| $25-29$ | 5,560 | -973 | 103,240 | 144,799 | $-3,722$ | $-1,344$ |
| $30-34$ | 79,212 | 10,543 | 97,829 | 125,063 | $-4,461$ | -923 |
| $35-39$ | 15,492 | 3,276 | 87,999 | 93,542 | 149 | -530 |
| $40-44$ | 18,207 | 8,359 | 58,526 | 53,823 | 537 | -206 |
| $45-49$ | 16,967 | 11,436 | 55,411 | 44,324 | 497 | -88 |
| $50-54$ | 8,540 | 6,190 | 32,329 | 25,870 | 303 | -25 |
| $55-59$ | 4,099 | 3,177 | 12,301 | $-1,000$ | 169 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 2,837 | 2,632 | $-9,800$ | $-4,373$ | 117 | -4 |
| $65-69$ | $-3,254$ | $-3,384$ | $-21,893$ | $-28,942$ | 183 | 6 |
| $70-74$ | 2,812 | 4,766 | $-23,288$ | $-36,274$ | 101 | 3 |
| $75+$ | $-1,878$ | -640 | $-51,297$ | $-101,066$ | 14 | -3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tota1 | $-40,250$ | 91,447 | 574,114 | 587,348 | $-24,303$ | $-5,187$ |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | $7,285,048$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | $5,818,600$ |
| $20-24$ | $4,721,120$ |
| $25-29$ | $4,611,180$ |
| $30-34$ | $4,984,919$ |
| $35-39$ | $5,206,349$ |
| $40-44$ | $4,929,388$ |
| $45-49$ | $4,627,126$ |
| $50-54$ | $4,041,067$ |
| $55-59$ | $3,380,510$ |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | $2,857,750$ |
| $65-69$ | $2,378,381$ |
| $70-74$ | $1,808,648$ |
| $75+$ | $2,834,604$ |

Total,10+59,484,690
$6,995,911$
$5,665,398$
$4,696,685$
$4,624,090$
$5,092,140$

$5,394,527$
$5,094,662$
$4,732,956$
$4,108,323$
$3,485,882$
$3,036,158$
$2,618,269$
$2,064,563$
$3,539,623$

71,094
61,152 76,470 98,093
135,954
199,308
176,514
270,461
392,728
527,068
583,552
641,004
616,691
950,603

70,751
964,096
963,316
64,468 748,714
93,062 624,604 663,072
761,752
117,144 573,329 634,423
184,861 567,814 665,987
245,237 580,686
200,795 515,156
300,617 509,356
406,804 437,536
509,740 388,192
658,800
586,262
571,236
471,684
409,540
569,699 306,932 319,877
582,976 246,972 254,929
534,307 172,998 182,021 952,572 288,479 322,450

61,149,187
4,800,692
$4,833,0336,924,8647,465,349$

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION. OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

United States: Conterminous Area

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 13,898 | 13,278 | 80,427 | 77,473 | -218 | -607 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-57,175$ | 22,651 | 61,583 | 67,646 | $-8,032$ | -439 |
| $20-24$ | $-187,992$ | $-4,713$ | 89,799 | 125,556 | $-21,407$ | $-1,623$ |
| $25-29$ | $-2,637$ | $-10,742$ | 102,873 | 144,075 | $-4,672$ | $-1,880$ |
| $30-34$ | 82,570 | 4,127 | 97,671 | 124,428 | 4,409 | $-1,245$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 13,356 | -151 | 87,801 | 93,105 | -127 | -715 |
| $40-44$ | 17,878 | 6,971 | 58,480 | 53,681 | 316 | -355 |
| $45-49$ | 17,099 | 10,620 | 55,376 | 44,377 | 414 | -155 |
| $50-54$ | 8,405 | 5,839 | 32,328 | 25,807 | 158 | -104 |
| $55-59$ | 4,159 | 3,094 | 12,388 | -997 | 100 | -44 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 3,114 | 2,710 | $-9,780$ | $-4,362$ | 92 | -37 |
| $65-69$ | $-2,773$ | $-3,219$ | $-21,804$ | $-28,914$ | 178 | -5 |
| $70-74$ | 3,099 | 4,837 | $-23,141$ | $-36,285$ | 107 | -3 |
| $75+$ | $-1,842$ | -925 | $-51,087$ | $-100,948$ | 1 | -9 |
| Total,10+ | $-88,841$ | 54,377 | 572,914 | 584,642 | $-28,681$ | $-7,221$ |

Average Population

10-14 7,271,605 15-19 5,805,334
20-24 4,703,235
25-29 4,596,286
30-34 4,965,919
35-39 5,190,793
40-44 4,915,440
45-49 4,616,762
50-54 4,033,829
55-59 3,375,226
60-64 2,854,226
65-69 2,375,992
70-74 1,807,111
$75+2,832,994$

6,983,265
5,657,004
4,687,940
4,615,283
5,082,369
5,382,851
5,085,133
4,725,467
4,102,756
3,482,000
3,033,393
2,616,294
2,063,277
3,538,142
61,055,174

70,950
61,030
76,134
97,865
135,744
198,952
176,196
270,057
392,157
526,336
582,812
$\begin{array}{llll}640,289 & 582,592 & 246,952 & 254,921\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}615,925 \quad 533,918 & 172,990 & 182,010\end{array}$
70,626
963,892
963,094
64,344 748,256.
92,738 623,603
116,716 572,612
184,119 567,154
$\begin{array}{lll}244,547 & 580,240 & 658,611 \\ 200,384 & 514,894 & 586,131 \\ 300,249 & 509,194 & 571,174 \\ 406,335 & 437,406 & 471,630 \\ 509,238 & 388,124 & 409,514 \\ & & \\ 569,277 & 306,896 & 319,852 \\ 582,592 & 246,952 & 254,921 \\ 533,918 & 172,990 & 182,010 \\ 951,740 & 288,468 & 322,440\end{array}$

761,613
662,844 634,129 665,759

4,793,554.4,826,823 6,920,681 7,463,722

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Maine

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-4,425$ | $-4,212$ | 336 | 211 | 35 | 67 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-3,580$ | $-3,660$ | 246 | 327 | 156 | 62 |
| $20-24$ | $-5,330$ | $-7,191$ | 301 | 701 | 460 | 78 |
| $25-29$ | $-6,764$ | $-8,500$ | 146 | 676 | 274 | 117 |
| $30-34$ | $-3,624$ | $-4,213$ | 6 | 195 | 80 | 81 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-2,510$ | $-2,613$ | -16 | 229 | -6 | 31 |
| $40-44$ | $-1,850$ | $-1,955$ | 39 | -70 | 8 | -3 |
| $45-49$ | $-1,640$ | $-1,586$ | -108 | 118 | -3 | 4 |
| $50-54$ | -800 | -895 | -290 | -244 | 15 | 7 |
| $55-59$ | -699 | -737 | -212 | -372 | -14 | -11 |
| $60-64$ | -215 | -893 | -255 | -147 | -11 | 9 |
| $65-69$ | 12 | -867 | -420 | -305 | -15 | -15 |
| $70-74$ | -76 | -419 | -84 | -226 | -8 | 8 |
| $75+$ | $-1,068$ | $-1,097$ | -418 | -813 | -1 | -25 |
| Total, 10+ | $-32,569$ | $-38,838$ | -729 | 280 | 970 | 410 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 48,817 | 46,604 | 348 | 358 | 78 | 87 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 39,721 | 37,854 | 340 | 441 | 114 | 76 |
| $20-24$ | 32,328 | 30,886 | 350 | 654 | 308 | 108 |
| $25-29$ | 30,770 | 30,600 | 494 | 918 | 192 | 86 |
| $30-34$ | 29,996 | 30,728 | 744 | 1,300 | 134 | 58 |
| $35-39$ | 29,988 | 30,448 | 1,248 | 1,838 | 76 | 46 |
| $40-44$ | 27,870 | 28,206 | 1,522 | 2,009 | 54 | 44 |
| $45-49$ | 26,506 | 26,264 | 1,879 | 2,536 | 36 | 28 |
| $50-54$ | 23,943 | 24,302 | 2,672 | 3,216 | 31 | 18 |
| $55-59$ | 20,546 | 21,180 | 3,246 | 3,684 | 26 | 27 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 18,484 | 19,523 | 3,654 | 3,978 | 26 | 36 |
| $65-69$ | 15,722 | 17,179 | 3,732 | 3,834 | 28 | 16 |
| $70-74$ | 12,748 | 13,846 | 3,590 | 3,594 | 14 | 32 |
| $75+$ | 23,970 | 28,824 | 6,803 | 7,226 | 40 | 28 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ | 381,409 | 386,444 | 30,622 | 35,586 | 1,157 | 690 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## New Hampshire

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign- born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 396 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 214 |
| $20-24$ | -881 |
| $25-29$ | $-1,727$ |
| $30-34$ | -629 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 523 |
| $40-44$ | 595 |
| $45-49$ | 576 |
| $50-54$ | 185 |
| $55-59$ | 107 |
| $60-64$ | -16 |
| $65-69$ | 293 |
| $70-74$ | 20 |
| $75+$ | -361 |
| Total, 10+ | -705 |


| 232 | 174 | 143 | 23 | 12 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 371 | 187 | 145 | 17 | 17 |
| $-1,519$ | 303 | 319 | 176 | 76 |
| $-2,057$ | 208 | 452 | 150 | 89 |
| -392 | 135 | 314 | 60 | 39 |
| 566 | 220 | 224 | 13 | 5 |
| 304 | 194 | 101 | 13 | -9 |
| 405 | -14 | -49 | 13 | -1 |
| 229 | -14 | 59 | 17 | 1 |
| -141 | -92 | 61 | -17 | -6 |
| 362 |  | -18 | -383 | -4 |
| -35 | -186 | -346 | -1 | -1 |
| -133 | -126 | -204 | 10 | -13 |
| -195 | -760 | $-1,073$ | -3 | -6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $-2,003$ | 211 | -237 | 467 | 208 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 27,912 | 27,020 | 190 | 237 | 41 | 55 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 22,150 | 21,402 | 194 | 220 | 43 | 44 |
| $20-24$ | 17,942 | 17,180 | 240 | 328 | 149 | 62 |
| $25-29$ | 17,515 | 17,504 | 292 | 443 | 108 | 58 |
| $30-34$ | 18,168 | 18,434 | 383 | 721 | 67 | 44 |
| $35-39$ | 18,446 | 19,146 |  | 713 | 996 | 49 |
| $40-44$ | 17,857 | 18,065 | 851 | 1,194 | 36 | 43 |
| $45-49$ | 16,464 | 17,064 | 1,312 | 1,579 | 17 | 27 |
| $50-54$ | 14,727 | 15,366 | 1,786 | 2,170 | 18 | 19 |
| $55-59$ | 12,686 | 13,180 | 2,470 | 2,675 | 22 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| $60-64$ | 11,125 | 12,206 | 2,901 | 3,210 | 22 | 16 |
| $65-69$ | 9,415 | 10,219 | 3,180 | 3,543 | 7 | 16 |
| $70-74$ | 6,814 | 8,201 | 3,212 | 3,172 | 5 | 7 |
| $75+$ | 12,458 | 15,928 | 5,828 | 6,995 | 19 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ 223,679 | 230,915 | 23,552 | 27,483 | 603 | 429 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Vermont

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-2,473$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-1,713$ |
| $20-24$ | $-3,431$ |
| $25-29$ | $-3,576$ |
| $30-34$ | $-2,556$ |
| -5 |  |
| $35-39$ | $-1,571$ |
| $40-44$ | $-1,048$ |
| $45-49$ | -751 |
| $50-54$ | -675 |
| $55-59$ | -491 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | -155 |
| $65-69$ | -221 |
| $70-74$ | -183 |
| $75+$ | -791 |
| Total,10+ | $-19,635$ |
|  |  |
| Average Population |  |


| $10-14$ | 20,244 | 19,278 | 214 | 183 | 18 | 16 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 16,445 | 15,998 | 342 | 243 | 20 | 22 |
| $20-24$ | 12,846 | 12,617 | 206 | 234 | 31 | 16 |
| $25-29$ | 11,976 | 12,240 | 240 | 352 | 18 | 13 |
| $30-34$ | 12,003 | 12,264 | 350 | 524 | 20 | 18 |
| $35-39$ | 11,814 | 12,072 | 545 | 852 | 23 |  |
| $40-44$ | 11,274 | 11,500 | 681 | 813 | 18 | 16 |
| $45-49$ | 10,786 | 10,707 | 930 | 1,037 | 16 | 14 |
| $50-54$ | $9,998 \ldots$ | $9,823, \cdots$ | 1,158 | 1,260 | 12 | 12 |
| $55-59$ | 8,634 | 8,766 | 1,298 | 1,308 | 13 | 12 |
| $60-64$ | 7,592 | 8,088 | 1,264 | 1,268 | 10 | 8 |
| $65-69$ | 6,700 | 7,258 | 1,300 | 1,356 | 8 | 12 |
| $70-74$ | 5,220 | 6,033 | 1,293 | 1,386 | 9 | 12 |
| $75+$ | 10,058 | 12,944 | 2,382 | 2,725 | 16 | 14 |
| Total,10+ | 155,590 | 159,588 | 12,203 | 13,541 | 232 | 205 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES IO YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Massachusetts

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-10,288$ | $-10,218$ | 3,223 | 2,947 | 791 | 1,025 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-8,801$ | 1,249 | 2,725 | 3,327 | 869 | 1,071 |
| $20-24$ | $-5,998$ | -716 | 3,943 | 6,092 | 1,905 | 1,908 |
| $25-29$ | $-7,494$ | $-16,454$ | 3,890 | 5,627 | 2,150 | 1,763 |
| $30-34$ | $-12,865$ | $-16,891$ | 3,164 | 4,156 | 1,164 | 1,228 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-13,196$ | $-11,299$ | 2,449 | 2,355 | 582 | 645 |
| $40-44$ | $-9,100$ | $-7,949$ | 2,116 | 2,053 | 225 | 390 |
| $45-49$ | $-6,040$ | $-5,589$ | 1,918 | 603 | 126 | 307 |
| $50-54$ | $-4,715$ | $-4,364$ | 1,138 | -262 | 140 | 302 |
| $55-59$ | $-3,422$ | $-4,014$ | -384 | $-1,358$ | 6 | -55 |
| $60-64$ | $-4,135$ | $-3,519$ | $-1,450$ | $-2,590$ | 78 | 146 |
| $65-69$ | $-4,123$ | $-3,102$ | $-3,961$ | $-4,742$ | -113 | -103 |
| $70-74$ | $-3,585$ | $-1,436$ | $-2,936$ | $-4,012$ | 10 | -19 |
| 754 | $-3,196$ | $-3,769$ | $-5,294$ | $-10,564$ | 153 | 123 |
| Tota1,10+ | $-96,958$ | $-88,071$ | 10,541 | 3,632 | 8,086 | 8,731 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 220,509 | 211,516 | 2,602 | 2,357 | 4,432 | 4,445 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 176,632 | 174,518 | 2,441 | 2,588 | 3,302 | 3,400 |
| $20-24$ | 140,021 | 139,892 | 3,132 | 4,048 | 3,472 | 3,414 |
| $25-29$ | 141,496 | 144,678 | 4,198 | 4,972 | 3,426 | 3,396 |
| $30-34$ | 157,916 | 162,750 | 5,701 | 7,942 | 3,821 | 3,918 |
| $35-39$ | 163,527 | 171,071 | 9,420 | 11,568 | 3,982 | 4,076 |
| $40-44$ | 156,366 | 166,403 | 9,326 | 11,080 | 3,295 | 3,288 |
| $45-49$ | 141,114 | 150,776 | 14,418 | 18,395 | 2,654 | 2,878 |
| $50-54$ | 119,734 | 128,085 | 22,670 | 28,676 | 2,007 | 2,280 |
| $55-59$ | 97,869 | 107,873 | 31,316 | 35,761 | 1,788 | 1,976 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 83,250 | 96,053 | 36,787 | 42,558 | 1,816 | 1,780 |
| $65-69$ | 64,664 | 78,558 | 43,051 | 46,638 | 1,460 | 1,534 |
| $70-74$ | 45,194 | 59,183 | 40,913 | 43,768 | 1,160 | 1,230 |
| $75+$ | 70,530 | 108,802 | 66,120 | 83,708 | 1,730 | 2,132 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+1,778,822 | $1,900,158$ | 292,095 | 344,059 | 38,345 | 39,747 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Rhode Island

| Age in 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White. |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-2,849$ | $-2,305$ | 373 | 366 | 12 | -16 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 2,986 | -342 | 289 | 311 | 75 | 1 |
| $20-24$ | 5,253 | -111 | 439 | 557 | 408 | 90 |
| $25-29$ | $-4,840$ | $-2,693$ | 292 | 540 | 139 | 93 |
| $30-34$ | $-7,822$ | $-2,874$ | 362 | 477 | -92 | 92 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-3,739$ | $-2,469$ | 231 | 146 | -109 | 21 |
| $40-44$ | $-3,049$ | $-1,432$ | 302 | 23 | -32 | -2 |
| $45-49$ | $-1,431$ | $-1,391$ | 141 | 163 | -33 | -5 |
| $50-54$ | -739 | -831 | -194 | -81 | -21 | 2 |
| $55-59$ | -108 | -414 | -526 | -563 | -73 | -50 |
| $60-64$ | -527 | -337 | -210 | -741 | 16 | -5 |
| $65-69$ | -612 | -522 | -502 | -972 | -52 | -62 |
| $70-74$ | -388 | -78 | -444 | -879 | -34 | -23 |
| $75+$ | -363 | -194 | -747 | $-1,770$ | -2 | -4 |
| Total,10+ | $-18,228$ | $-15,993$ | -194 | $-2,423$ | 202 | 132 |

Average Population

| 10 |
| :--- |
| 1 |
| 2 |
| 30 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
|  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Connecticut

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 7,694 | 7,723 | 2,318 | 2,228 | 1,562 | 1,532 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 1,494 | 3,462 | 1,958 | 1,719 | 1,034 | 1,581 |
| $20-24$ | 1,051 | 6,380 | 2,047 | 2,927 | 1,918 | 2,856 |
| $25-29$ | 8,243 | 8,977 | 2,700 | 3,593 | 2,654 | 2,801 |
| $30-34$ | 10,623 | 8,864 | 3,260 | 3,448 | 2,193 | 2,004 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 8,381 | 6,219 | 3,276 | 3,388 | 1,475 | 1,519 |
| $40-44$ | 5,926 | 4,516 | 2,154 | 1,922 | 901 | 803 |
| $45-49$ | 4,193 | 3,799 | 2,665 | 1,856 | 709 | 815 |
| $50-54$ | 2,936 | 1,356 | 1,734 | 1,841 | 317 | 483 |
| $55-59$ | 1,180 | 1,581 | 1,525 | 203 | 243 | 350 |
|  |  |  |  | -95 | -355 | 179 |
| $60-64$ | 1,039 | -100 | -90 | 105 | $-1,320$ | $-1,482$ |
| $65-69$ | 148 | 180 | $-1,036$ | $-1,021$ | 26 | 177 |
| $70-74$ |  |  | $-1,467$ | $-2,386$ | 115 | 17 |
| $75+$ |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |
| Total,10+ | 52,718 | 53,879 | 19,719 | 17,881 | 13,400 | 15,123 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 100,670 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 79,494 |
| $20-24$ | 58,588 |
| $25-29$ | 61,338 |
| $30-34$ | 71,509 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 78,244 |
| $40-44$ | 80,416 |
| $45-49$ | 71,126 |
| $50-54$ | 56,641 |
| $55-59$ | 43,717 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 34,600 |
| $65-69$ | 27,082 |
| $70-74$ | 18,635 |
| $75+$ | 28,376 |
|  |  |

Total,10+810,436

95,632
77,150
59,262
62,444
73,730
82,574
84,038
72,480
58,064
46,186
38,846
31,632
23,453
41,432
846,923

1,698
1,380
1,684
2,489
3,338
5,239
4,562
7,740
10,780
14,446
17,848
20,756
19,332
27,216
138,508
1,857
1,588
2,276
3,014
4,388
6,301
5,180
8,141
11,482
14,618
18,115
20,272
18,023
29,238

3,969
2,850
2,908
3,170
3,338
3,894
2,954
3,422
3,272
3,457
3,544
3,598
2,932
2,593
2,019
1,622
1,228
904
702
1,056
144,493 31,916
33,653

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## New York

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-21,492$ | $-18,418$ | 17,157 | 14,802 | 9,363 | 11,104 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-37,595$ | $-4,165$ | 12,110 | 13,735 | 9,791 | 14,758 |
| $20-24$ | $-36,200$ | 12,597 | 17,202 | 25,727 | 19,043 | 31,573 |
| $25-29$ | 12,254 | 3,179 | 21,052 | 27,791 | 25,278 | 30,860 |
| $30-34$ | 4,367 | $-19,152$ | 23,568 | 22,102 | 19,441 | 18,320 |
| $35-39$ | $-20,436$ | $-28,831$ | 18,456 | 17,586 | 11,069 | 9,472 |
| $40-44$ | $-22,981$ | $-26,704$ | 12,145 | 10,417 | 5,869 | 5,429 |
| $45-49$ | $-20,410$ | $-25,075$ | 11,654 | 8,472 | 3,161 | 3,666 |
| $50-54$ | $-13,171$ | $-17,122$ | 2,740 | 412 | 1,233 | 3,227 |
| $55-59$ | $-9,662$ | $-10,882$ | $-2,816$ | $-7,871$ | 1,371 | 2,797 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | $-11,115$ | $-15,515$ | $-10,478$ | $-8,121$ | 1,551 | 2,180 |
| $65-69$ | $-13,285$ | $-9,055$ | $-12,381$ | $-12,708$ | 189 | -361 |
| $70-74$ | $-12,644$ | $-7,398$ | $-12,051$ | $-16,790$ | 19 | -24 |
| $75+$ | $-11,206$ | $-12,502$ | $-13,622$ | $-30,272$ | 1,308 | 2,081 |
| Total,10+-213,576 | $-179,043$ | 84,736 | 65,282 | 108,686 | 135,082 |  |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 637,244 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 496,652 |
| $20-24$ | 390,374 |
| $25-29$ | 406,166 |
| $30-34$ | 457,270 |
| $35-39$ | 477,093 |
| $40-44$ | 463,826 |
| $45-49$ | 437,264 |
| $50-54$ | 380,928 |
| $55-59$ | 304,644 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 253,164 |
| $65-69$ | 192,360 |
| $70-74$ | 136,390 |
| $75+$ | 198,745 |

Total, $10+5,232,120$

| 611,032 | 13,322 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 494,596 | 10,201 |
| 401,903 | 15,148 |
| 420,457 | 21,486 |
| 487,062 | 31,922 |
| 513,927 | 46,994 |
| 505,466 | 41,420 |
| 471,100 | 69,108 |
| 398,468 | 109,440 |
| 322,314 | 147,101 |
|  |  |
| 278,530 | 158,985 |
| 222,989 | 154,856 |
| 168,368 | 135,432 |
| 285,176 | 184,880 |

5,581,388
1,140,295

| 13,576 | 52,276 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11,920 | 37,300 |
| 20,000 | 37,014 |
| 25,604 | 38,814 |
| 39,915 | 44,580 |

54,712
48,588
83,120
118,016
144,890
27,
157,072
148,096
125,648
195,750
21,237
13,882
8,912
10,534

1,186,907 458,776
544,989

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

New Jersey

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 16,867 | 17,387 | 5,988 | 5,539 | 5,228 | 5,316 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 4,450 | 5,863 | 4,344 | 4,200 | 4,198 | 5,143 |
| $20-24$ | 3,613 | 7,761 | 5,168 | 7,526 | 6,900 | 9,296 |
| $25-29$ | 12,229 | 21,638 | 6,953 | 8,950 | 8,002 | 9,727 |
| $30-34$ | 26,802 | 24,985 | 8,313 | 9,332 | 5,993 | 6,566 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 20,692 | 17,335 | 8,503 | 8,088 | 4,154 | 4,225 |
| $40-44$ | 13,584 | 11,150 | 5,193 | 5,114 | 2,692 | 2,782 |
| $45-49$ | 8,729 | 6,802 | 6,542 | 4,376 | 1,946 | 2,395 |
| $50-54$ | 4,454 | 2,623 | 4,534 | 2,646 | 975 | 1,447 |
| $55-59$ | 2,841 | 351 | 2,394 | 1,326 | 834 | 863 |
| $60-64$ | $-2,110$ | -808 | 787 | -615 | 662 | 853 |
| $65-69$ | $-3,843$ | $-1,941$ | -498 | -568 | 138 | 164 |
| $70-74$ | $-2,247$ | -655 | $-1,891$ | $-2,169$ | 180 | 221 |
| $75+$ | $-2,399$ | $-1,612$ | $-2,035$ | $-4,830$ | 491 | 786 |
| Total,10+ | 103,662 | 110,879 | 54,295 | 48,915 | 42,393 | 49,784 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 226,572 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 175,714 |
| $20-24$ | 133,160 |
| $25-29$ | 141,734 |
| $30-34$ | 165,216 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 182,350 |
| $40-44$ | 182,629 |
| $45-49$ | 166,334 |
| $50-54$ | 137,966 |
| $55-59$ | 108,878 |
| $60-64$ | 89,971 |
| $65-69$ | 68,498 |
| $70-74$ | 46,992 |
| $75+$ | 64,323 |

216,255
170,185
131,860
142,268
173,281
195,277
193,318
171,238
140,901
112,390
97,110
78,539
57,762
95,626
Total,10+1,890,337
4,265
3,311
3,984
5,378
7,750

4,082
3,484
5,203
6,572
10,539
12,649
10,226
16,970
25,970
34,996
39,505
42,345
39,662
55,278
302,289

14,802
11,338
18,176
25,646
33,954
41,296
7,748
42,058
36,807
57,492

19,746
20,080
15,108 15,788
14,534 16,336
15,352 16,904
16,559 18,381
17,013 18,318
14,186 15,574
12,970 14,220
11,238 12,005
9,928 10,382

311,449 169,165
182,049

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Pennsylvania

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White | Negro |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-27,892$ | $-27,972$ | 3,374 | 3,511 | 3,903 | 4,447 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-40,990$ | $-19,391$ | 2,392 | 2,653 | 1,881 | 3,600 |
| $20-24$ | $-77,413$ | $-41,329$ | 2,609 | 4,933 | 1,450 | 5,330 |
| $25-29$ | $-44,382$ | $-50,329$ | 2,979 | 5,055 | 5,679 | 6,873 |
| $30-34$ | $-26,475$ | $-38,196$ | 3,454 | 4,388 | 5,882 | 5,256 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-29,861$ | $-28,668$ | 3,004 | 3,782 | 3,483 | 3,011 |
| $40-44$ | $-21,234$ | $-20,328$ | 2,512 | 2,345 | 1,944 | 1,353 |
| $45-49$ | $-15,508$ | $-14,634$ | 2,109 | 1,578 | 1,477 | 1,558 |
| $50-54$ | $-12,686$ | $-13,092$ | 1,540 | 1,198 | 690 | 781 |
| $55-59$ | $-10,257$ | $-11,473$ | -23 | $-1,796$ | 622 | 708 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | $-8,603$ | $-11,328$ | $-2,859$ | $-3,380$ | 208 | 355 |
| $65-69$ | $-10,651$ | $-12,418$ | $-4,558$ | $-6,718$ | -296 | -905 |
| $70-74$ | $-8,436$ | $-9,460$ | $-5,901$ | $-6,139$ | -333 | -366 |
| $75+$ | $-10,104$ | $-14,815$ | $-7,230$ | $-11,374$ | 694 | 1,161 |
| Tota1,104$-344,492$ | $-313,433$ | 3,402 |  | 36 | 27,284 | 33,162 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 477,098 | 457,490 | 3,220 | 3,082 | 37,232 | 37,210 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 383,176 | 382,108 | 2,314 | 2,304 | 28,390 | 30,070 |
| $20-24$ | 305,396 | 316,872 | 2,412 | 3,366 | 24,169 | 27,039 |
| $25-29$ | 305,128 | 319,082 | 3,668 | 4,292 | 23,744 | 27,292 |
| $30-34$ | 346,512 | 368,650 | 5,432 | 8,823 | 25,986 | 31,357 |
| $35-39$ | 368,796 | 392,700 | 9,262 | 12,460 | 28,994 | 32,916 |
| $40-44$ | 360,076 | 382,898 | 7,832 | 8,766 | 24,864 | 29,044 |
| $45-49$ | 336,597 | 349,048 | 15,299 | 16,565 | 24,005 | 27,480 |
| $50-54$ | 291,908 | 301,644 | 22,954 | 24,832 | 21,280 | 23,077 |
| $55-59$ | 240,778 | 252,446 | 33,450 | 34,906 | 20,483 | 20,622 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 203,054 | 218,571 | 45,332 | 45,830 | 17,119 | 16,160 |
| $65-69$ | 164,052 | 185,318 | 57,798 | 52,111 | 12,154 | 11,640 |
| $70-74$ | 122,819 | 145,936 | 56,489 | 47,471 | 7,951 | 8,014 |
| $75+$ | 196,147 | 256,073 | 79,302 | 75,082 | 10,666 | 12,159 |
| Total,10+4,101,537 | $4,328,836$ | 344,764 | 339,890 | 307,037 | 334,080 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Ohio

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 10,039 | 10,552 | 3,814 | 3,456 | 6,784 | 7,131 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-6,371$ | 15,879 | 2,560 | 2,402 | 4,354 | 6,045 |
| $20-24$ | $-7,754$ | 26,259 | 2,882 | 4,765 | 6,008 | 8,700 |
| $25-29$ | 32,105 | 26,083 | 3,574 | 5,244 | 9,714 | 11,192 |
| $30-34$ | 31,362 | 12,057 | 4,552 | 5,108 | 8,304 | 8,391 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 10,449 | 3,483 | 4,645 | 4,260 | 5,314 | 4,643 |
| $40-44$ | 4,744 | 2,141 | 2,876 | 2,098 | 2,988 | 2,968 |
| $45-49$ | 4,120 | 1,533 | 3,110 | 2,273 | 2,800 | 2,920 |
| $50-54$ | 1,422 | $-1,072$ | 1,634 | 1,390 | 1,882 | 1,660 |
| $55-59$ | $-1,963$ | $-3,994$ | 816 | $-1,095$ | 1,369 | 1,019 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | $-2,646$ | $-6,524$ | $-1,362$ | -978 | 1,060 | 1,016 |
| $65-69$ | $-8,533$ | $-9,344$ | $-2,685$ | $-2,406$ | -511 | -125 |
| $70-74$ | $-6,320$ | $-6,495$ | $-2,313$ | $-1,988$ | -92 | 9 |
| $75+$ | $-6,078$ | $-8,408$ | $-2,778$ | $-4,185$ | 813 | 1,064 |
| Total,10+ | 54,576 | 62,250 | 21,325 | 20,344 | 50,787 | 56,633 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 410,534 | 394,222 | 3,055 | 3,173 | 32,001 | 32,256 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 306,477 | 308,133 | 2,260 | 2,377 | 23,006 | 24,321 |
| $20-24$ | 248,913 | 261,354 | 2,462 | 3,332 | 20,267 | 23,050 |
| $25-29$ | 243,335 | 252,549 | 3,308 | 4,068 | 20,991 | 24,044 |
| $30-34$ | 276,117 | 290,153 | 4,734 | 7,232 | 24,448 | 27,857 |
| $35-39$ | 296,030 | 310,942 | 7,306 |  |  |  |
| $40-44$ | 278,193 | 288,725 | 6,309 | 6,952 | 26,046 | 28,206 |
| $45-49$ | 253,662 | 260,846 | 10,838 | 11,144 | 22,314 | 21,134 |
| $50-54$ | 222,934 | 227,876 | 15,587 | 15,615 | 17,948 | 22,228 |
| $55-59$ | 188,090 | 194,474 | 21,322 | 20,800 | 16,817 | 18,032 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 162,808 | 171,640 | 26,826 | 25,546 | 13,755 | 12,748 |
| $65-69$ | 138,190 | 152,254 | 32,164 | 27,305 | 10,440 | 9,690 |
| $70-74$ | 107,120 | 122,522 | 31,197 | 25,132 | 6,817 | 6,600 |
| $75+$ | 180,546 | 226,493 | 43,118 | 40,348 | 9,354 | 10,075 |
| Total,10+3,312,949 | $3,462,183$ | 210,486 | 202,761 | 265,338 | 279,197 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Indiana

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 569 | 983 | 1,068 | 1,115 | 2,825 | 2,905 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-2,172$ | 3,108 | 644 | 687 | 1,522 | 2,103 |
| $20-24$ | $-6,308$ | 4,012 | 1,010 | 1,273 | 1,470 | 2,487 |
| $25-29$ | 4,117 | 3,145 | 1,002 | 1,669 | 3,081 | 3,460 |
| $30-34$ | 1,527 | $-1,240$ | 822 | 1,128 | 2,473 | 2,697 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-1,948$ | $-3,018$ | 751 | 982 | 1,523 | 1,690 |
| $40-44$ | -831 | $-1,787$ | 692 | 403 | 1,083 | 1,099 |
| $45-49$ | -297 | 489 | 717 | 99 | 900 | 955 |
| $50-54$ | -292 | $-1,201$ | 291 | 339 | 598 | 652 |
| $55-59$ | -783 | $-1,864$ | 293 | -137 | 482 | 234 |
|  |  | -939 | $-1,907$ | -128 | 62 | 305 |
| $60-64$ | $-2,896$ | $-3,897$ | -549 | -591 | -99 | -991 |
| $65-69$ | $-2,477$ | -779 | -325 | 17 | 33 |  |
| $70-74$ | $-1,687$ | $-4,151$ | -983 | $-1,211$ | 350 | 243 |
| $75+$ | $-2,838$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ | $-14,778$ | $-9,805$ | 4,851 | 5,493 | 16,530 | 18,753 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 206,838 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 164,510 |
| $20-24$ | 133,552 |
| $25-29$ | 127,915 |
| $30-34$ | 140,384 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 145,527 |
| $40-44$ | 134,294 |
| $45-49$ | 127,404 |
| $50-54$ | 113,350 |
| $55-59$ | 99,264 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 86,556 |
| $65-69$ | 74,840 |
| $70-74$ | 61,034 |
| $75+$ | 107,036 |

$$
199,139
$$

$$
1,1
$$

| 798 | 1, |
| :--- | :--- |
| 920 |  |

1,056

| 11,202 | 11,100 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 8,222 | 8,639 |
| 6,852 | 7,696 |
| 6,916 | 8,036 |
| 8,036 | 8,924 |
| 8,448 | 9,045 |
| 7,070 | 7,809 |
| 6,992 | 7,444 |
| 5,930 | 6,200 |
| 5,448 | 5,371 |
| 4,637 | 4,324 |
| 3,679 | 3,436 |
| 2,496 | 2,348 |
| 3,640 | 3,926 |
| 89,568 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Illinois

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Négro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-12,701$ | $-12,334$ | 6,967 | 6,763 | 10,158 | 10,376 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-11,052$ | $-4,905$ | 4,544 | 4,821 | 6,468 | 9,305 |
| $20-24$ | $-18,316$ | 7,770 | 6,878 | 8,981 | 11,185 | 17,681 |
| $25-29$ | 5,762 | 5,952 | 9,206 | 10,522 | 16,667 | 19,300 |
| $30-34$ | 2,372 | $-9,910$ | 10,146 | 9,420 | 11,925 | 11,652 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-12,720$ | $-17,058$ | 8,695 | 8,045 | 6,306 | 5,514 |
| $40-44$ | $-11,559$ | $-13,315$ | 6,076 | 4,197 | 3,520 | 2,956 |
| $45-49$ | $-7,031$ | $-9,995$ | 5,737 | 3,701 | 2,703 | 2,241 |
| $50-54$ | $-6,341$ | $-9,459$ | 2,590 | 879 | 2,206 | 1,750 |
| $55-59$ | $-5,739$ | $-9,405$ | -54 | $-2,119$ | 2,044 | 1,814 |
|  |  |  | $-12,151$ | $-2,787$ | $-2,991$ | 1,183 |
| $60-64$ | $-7,726$ | $-12,1,311$ |  |  |  |  |
| $65-69$ | $-13,142$ | $-14,503$ | $-7,714$ | $-6,763$ | -430 | -385 |
| $70-74$ | $-9,442$ | $-8,788$ | $-8,171$ | $-7,005$ | -170 | $1,-92$ |
| $75+$ | $-6,238$ | $-7,577$ | $-8,768$ | $-11,597$ | 948 | 1,099 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,104 $-113,873$ | $-115,678$ | 33,345 | 26,854 | 74,713 | 84,522 |  |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 389,006 | 373,210 | 5,107 | 5,350 | 40,212 | 40,690 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 311,964 | 305,590 | 3,672 | 3,957 | 28,746 | 30,432 |
| $20-24$ | 248,110 | 255,396 | 4,796 | 6,165 | 26,151 | 31,162 |
| $25-29$ | 250,634 | 249,344 | 6,934 | 7,662 | 27,364 | 31,386 |
| $30-34$ | 279,796 | 286,426 | 10,254 | 11,579 | 31,472 | 36,824 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 298,358 | 308,420 | 14,636 | 15,714 | 33,091 | 37,370 |
| $40-44$ | 291,698 | 307,004 | 11,377 | 11,470 | 28,420 | 31,934 |
| $45-49$ | 277,425 | 288,970 | 18,530 | 18,735 | 26,700 | 29,198 |
| $50-54$ | 241,470 | 248,872 | 29,332 | 28,610 | 23,202 | 24,603 |
| $55-59$ | 205,646 | 213,204 | 40,744 | 37,811 | 21,498 | 21,249 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 174,442 | 185,298 | 45,181 | 42,692 | 16,376 | 15,901 |
| $65-69$ | 143,186 | 160,784 | 51,570 | 45,989 | 11,936 | 12,082 |
| $70-74$ | 107,616 | 123,947 | 50,708 | 42,418 | 7,899 | 8,303 |
| $75+$ | 159,544 | 201,987 | 75,429 | 75,564 | 10,629 | 13,028 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+3,378,895 | $3,508,452$ | 368,270 | 353,716 | 333,696 | 364,162 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Michigan

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 582 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-14,915$ |
| $20-24$ | $-26,468$ |
| $25-29$ | 7,808 |
| $30-34$ | 12,292 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 573 |
| $40-44$ | -634 |
| $45-49$ | 140 |
| $50-54$ | $-1,162$ |
| $55-59$ | $-2,074$ |
|  | $-2,354$ |
| $60-64$ | $-6,588$ |
| $65-69$ | $-4,802$ |
| $70-74$ | $-2,886$ |
| $75+$ | $-40,588$ |
| Total, 10+ | -401 |
| Average Population |  |


| $10-14$ | 334,086 | 319,644 | 3,757 | 3,866 | 30,492 | 30,318 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 258,346 | 257,550 | 3,396 | 3,260 | 20,796 | 21,870 |
| $20-24$ | 204,535 | 210,870 | 3,350 | 3,854 | 16,408 | 19,211 |
| $25-29$ | 198,364 | 204,238 | 4,731 | 5,496 | 17,802 | 20,516 |
| $30-34$ | 221,920 | 227,114 | 7,604 | 9,801 | 22,250 | 24,799 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 228,553 | 236,404 | 12,919 | 15,318 | 25,687 | 26,708 |
| $40-44$ | 213,752 | 220,790 | 11,691 | 13,456 | 22,574 | 23,596 |
| $45-49$ | 195,220 | 193,805 | 16,876 | 18,844 | 21,102 | 20,712 |
| $50-54$ | 167,362 | 162,749 | 23,596 | 24,510 | 16,782 | 15,661 |
| $55-59$ | 141,642 | 135,512 | 33,261 | 30,171 | 14,924 | 13,026 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 116,444 | 114,540 | 36,642 | 32,493 | 11,127 | 9,653 |
| $65-69$ | 95,656 | 97,596 | 41,010 | 32,743 | 7,624 | 6,750 |
| $70-74$ | 69,316 | 75,146 | 36,746 | 28,368 | 4,682 | 4,408 |
| $75+$ | 99,948 | 120,009 | 51,630 | 49,068 | 5,194 | 6,104 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+2,545,144 | $2,575,967$ | 287,209 | 271,248 | 237,444 | 243,332 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Wisconsin

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-6,486$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-10,509$ |
| $20-24$ | $-21,683$ |
| $25-29$ | $-7,390$ |
| $30-34$ | -616 |
| $35-39$ | $-4,851$ |
| $40-44$ | $-2,768$ |
| $45-49$ | $-1,529$ |
| $50-54$ | $-1,073$ |
| $55-59$ | -969 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 455 |
| $65-69$ | $-1,286$ |
| $70-74$ | -800 |
| $75+$ | -153 |

Total,10+ -59,658
-61,189
6,573
$-6,717$
$-4,465$
$-10,869$
$-11,971$
$-6,684$
$-4,592$
$-2,555$
$-1,419$
$-1,011$
$-2,112$
$-2,208$
$-3,641$
$-2,757$
-188
1,361
843
1,079
1,413
1,410
1,198
1,018
866
1,178
466

-284
-302
-601
$-3,072$
1,301
1,192
1,584
2,108
1,964
1,519
506
742
593
-238
94
-889
-699
$-4,219$

5,558 10,946
12,567

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 185,078 | 177,026 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 142,802 | 140,884 |
| $20-24$ | 115,141 | 117,440 |
| $25-29$ | 112,040 | 112,932 |
| $30-34$ | 116,678 | 118,650 |
| $35-39$ | 120,024 | 122,298 |
| $40-44$ | 116,595 | 120,028 |
| $45-49$ | 113,176 | 114,562 |
| $50-54$ | 101,230 | 100,580 |
| $55-59$ | 89,656 | 89,220 |
|  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 81,028 | 81,639 |
| $65-69$ | 68,473 | 71,490 |
| $70-74$ | 51,862 | 55,930 |
| $75+$ | 74,940 | 87,568 |

Total,10+1,488,723
1,510,247
101,420

| 1,003 | 2,544 | 2,668 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 938 | 1,644 | 1,807 |
| 1,091 | 1,755 | 2,017 |
| 1,466 | 1,894 | 2,214 |
| 2,490 | 2,345 | 2,285 |
|  |  |  |
| 3,598 | 2,206 | 2,094 |
| 2,386 | 1,718 | 1,578 |
| 3,946 | 1,430 | 1,256 |
| 6,448 | 1,079 | 960 |
| 8,696 | 927 | 762 |
|  |  |  |
| 9,134 | 740 | 562 |
| 10,556 | 532 | 433 |
| 11,518 | 328 | 289 |
| 28,424 | 394 | 422 |
|  |  |  |
| 91,694 | 19,536 | 19,347 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Minnesota

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-7,659$ | $-7,417$ | 704 | 723 | 211 | 236 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-12,245$ | $-2,837$ | 646 | 528 | 199 | 296 |
| $20-24$ | $-18,957$ | $-5,064$ | 577 | 1,161 | 301 | 402 |
| $25-29$ | $-6,493$ | $-10,043$ | 781 | 1,294 | 410 | 393 |
| $30-34$ | $-2,079$ | $-9,145$ | 821 | 1,089 | 250 | 313 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-4,952$ | $-5,400$ | 290 | 380 | 148 | 116 |
| $40-44$ | $-3,675$ | $-2,731$ | 196 | 102 | 115 | 144 |
| $45-49$ | $-1,612$ | $-1,635$ | 271 | 32 | 127 | 88 |
| $50-54$ | -662 | $-1,028$ | 272 | -107 | 20 | -10 |
| $55-59$ | -964 | $-2,501$ | -315 | -283 | -56 | -70 |
| $60-64$ | -419 | $-1,871$ | 192 | -238 | 34 | 15 |
| $65-69$ | -550 | $-2,763$ | -596 | -925 | -16 | -35 |
| $70-74$ | -183 | $-1,504$ | -876 | -895 | -22 | -21 |
| $75+$ | 1,575 | 1,679 | $-3,567$ | $-3,947$ | -47 | 55 |
| Total,10+ | $-58,875$ | $-52,260$ | -604 | $-1,086$ | 1,674 | 1,921 |

Average Population


TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Iowa

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| 10-14 | -13,735 | -13,242 | 225 | 261 | 106 | 107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -13,242 | -8,723 | 220 | 196 | 71 | 126 |
| 20-24 | -23,489 | -15,436 | 255 | 552 | 130 | 182 |
| 25-29 | -16,302 | -16,480 | 324 | 428 | 130 | 183 |
| 30-34 | -12,211 | -14,029 | 67 | 180 | -66 | 105 |
| 35-39 | -11,829 | -10,429 | -140 | -57 | -35 | 89 |
| 40-44 | -7,298 | -6,785 | -105 | -216 | 3 | 30 |
| 45-49 | -4,919 | -4,536 | -95 | 37 | -25 | 67 |
| 50-54 | -3,418 | -3,280 | 51 | -134 | 11 | 45 |
| 55-59 | -2,539 | -3,040 | -260 | -296 | -103 | -102 |
| 60-64 | -762 | -2,295 | -229 | -326 | 28 | -2 |
| 65-69 | -1,781 | -3,257 | -242 | -598 | -51 | -19 |
| 70-74 | -875 | -2,062 | -11 | -159 | -54 | -36 |
| 75+ | -1,166 | -1,098 | -1,450 | -1,871 | 11 | , |
| Total, 10+ | -113,566 | -104,692 | -1,390 | -2,003 | 156 | 778 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 136,274 | 129,912 | 390 | 380 | 1,157 | 1,199 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 107,024 | 104,938 | 380 | 333 | 860 | 913 |
| $20-24$ | 86,494 | 88,080 | 396 | 401 | 811 | 808 |
| $25-29$ | 81,558 | 83,714 | 426 | 534 | 726 | 790 |
| $30-34$ | 86,342 | 87,568 | 592 | 964 | 832 | 816 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 88,093 | 89,446 | 845 | 1,299 | 840 | 801 |
| $40-44$ | 83,772 | 86,006 | 759 | 927 | 674 | 690 |
| $45-49$ | 80,622 | 81,381 | 1,110 | 1,230 | 652 | 684 |
| $50-54$ | 74,061 | 74,566 | 2,182 | 1,612 | 548 | 554 |
| $55-59$ | 67,326 | 69,566 | 2,802 | 2,380 | 510 | 450 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 62,722 | 65,845 | 3,342 | 2,787 | 497 | 511 |
| $65-69$ | 57,140 | 60,654 | 4,445 | 3,519 | 480 | 428 |
| $70-74$ | 45,613 | 49,958 | 5,369 | 4,103 | 360 | 337 |
| $75+$ | 77,262 | 92,624 | 13,670 | 12,712 | 616 | 580 |
| Total,10+1,134,303 | $1,164,258$ | 36,708 | 33,181 | 9,563 | 9,561 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Missouri

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-10,197$ | $-9,526$ | 473 | 513 | 1,876 | 2,117 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-7,883$ | $-6,109$ | 351 | 386 | 1,022 | 1,485 |
| $20-24$ | $-12,787$ | $-9,594$ | 747 | 1,194 | 638 | 1,874 |
| $25-29$ | $-12,130$ | $-16,710$ | 700 | 1,393 | 1,610 | 2,071 |
| $30-34$ | $-7,227$ | $-13,622$ | 452 | 811 | 1,693 | 1,310 |
| $35-39$ | $-9,442$ | $-9,794$ | 118 | 389 | 393 | 653 |
| $40-44$ | $-5,604$ | $-6,335$ | 136 | 275 | 172 | 191 |
| $45-49$ | $-4,096$ | $-5,276$ | 30 | 68 | 356 | 114 |
| $50-54$ | $-3,945$ | $-4,148$ | 177 | 32 | 86 | -3. |
| $55-59$ | $-2,162$ | $-2,957$ | 41 | -275 | 18 | 228 |
| $60-64$ | $-1,597$ | $-3,046$ | -197 | 65 | 361 | 196 |
| $65-69$ | $-1,151$ | $-2,561$ | -143 | -507 | -346 | -73 |
| $70-74$ | 410 | $-1,355$ | -185 | -116 | 106 | -25 |
| $75+$ | $-1,554$ | $-3,271$ | -922 | $-1,466$ | 569 | 478 |
| Total,10+ | $-79,365$ | $-94,304$ | 1,778 | 2,762 | 8,554 | 10,616 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 176,608 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 145,756 |
| $20-24$ | 121,082 |
| $25-29$ | 115,984 |
| $30-34$ | 119,576 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 126,460 |
| $40-44$ | 118,284 |
| $45-49$ | 120,164 |
| $50-54$ | 114,416 |
| $55-59$ | 102,829 |
| $60-64$ | 91,032 |
| $65-69$ | 81,391 |
| $70-74$ | 66,482 |
| $75+$ | 116,916 |

$$
\begin{array}{r}
169,239 \\
142,413 \\
119,945 \\
119,908 \\
126,491 \\
132,438 \\
126,684 \\
126,063 \\
120,548 \\
109,634 \\
\\
98,716 \\
90,324 \\
75,290 \\
141,028
\end{array}
$$

696
496
710
750
1,044
1,386
1,138
1,900
2,904
4,427
4,642
4,981
5,298
10,854

| 660 | 16,582 | 16,790 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 522 | 12,822 | 13,087 |
| 828 | 10,880 | 12,030 |
| 1,073 | 10,102 | 12,074 |
| 1,917 | 10,515 | 13,177 |
| 2,152 | 11,164 | 13,254 |
| 1,362 | 10,025 | 12,159 |
| 2,128 | 10,562 | 12,214 |
| 2,957 | 9,902 | 10,898 |
| 4,256 | 9,266 | 9,931 |
| $\vdots$ |  |  |
| 4,199 | 7,814 | 7,834 |
| 4,436 | 6,463 | 6,466 |
| 4,653 | 4,792 | 4,628 |
| 10,483 | 7,774 | 8,318 |
| 41,626 | 138,663 | 152,860 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES IO YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

North Dakota

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-5,941$ | $-5,889$ | 8 | -38 | 9 | -12 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-4,906$ | $-4,678$ | 41 | 19 | 23 | 3 |
| $20-24$ | $-7,087$ | $-7,022$ | 21 | 102 | 140 | 10 |
| $25-29$ | $-7,087$ | $-7,787$ | -12 | 174 | 78 | 45 |
| $30-34$ | $-5,360$ | $-5,283$ | -32 | -6 | 33 | 2 |
| $35-39$ | $-4,451$ | $-3,377$ | -163 | -68 | 22 | 21 |
| $40-44$ | $-3,104$ | $-2,027$ | -91 | -130 | -4 | 7 |
| $45-49$ | $-2,124$ | $-1,683$ | -204 | -137 | -3 | 13 |
| $50-54$ | $-1,681$ | $-1,347$ | -98 | -41 | -15 | - |
| $55-59$ | $-1,072$ | $-1,545$ | -85 | 68 | -6 | 12 |
| $60-64$ | -590 | -913 | -68 | -223 | 5 | -4 |
| $65-69$ | -718 | $-1,103$ | -339 | -327 | - | -12 |
| $70-74$ | -262 | -775 | -270 | -245 | -5 | -3 |
| $75+$ | 113 | 190 | -708 | $-1,004$ | -10 | -8 |
| Totai, 10+ | $-44,270$ | $-43,239$ | $-2,000$ | $-1,856$ | 267 | 74 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 34,561 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 28,086 |
| $20-24$ | 22,580 |
| $25-29$ | 21,314 |
| $30-34$ | 21,277 |
| $35-39$ | 20,398 |
| $40-44$ | 19,950 |
| $45-49$ | 19,513 |
| $50-54$ | 17,431 |
| $55-59$ | 14,160 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 11,788 |
| $65-69$ | 9,642 |
| $70-74$ | 7,323 |
| $75+$ | 9,746 |

Total,10+ 257,769
242,336
21,231
18,310
254

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## South Dakota

| Age in 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| 10-14 | -5,376 | -4,888 | 55 | 15 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -4,110 | -3,592 | 42 | 37 | -5 | -14 |
| 20-24 | -5,769 | -5,706 | 44 | 80 | 120 | 42 |
| 25-29 | -6,055 | -6,312 | 7 | 136 | 85 | - |
| 30-34. | -5,207 | -4,118 | -55 | 12 | -43 | -2 |
| 35-39 | -4,420 | -3,379 | 5 | -50 | -26 | 21 |
| 40-44 | -2,809 | -2,123 | -5 | -33 | 5 | 20 |
| 45-49 | -1,922 | -1,477 | 17 | 49 | -9 | -15 |
| 50-54 | -1,169 | -962 | -80 | -33 | 5 | 3 |
| 55-59 | -798 | -1,150 | -84 | -123 | 11 | -2 |
| 60-64 | -327 | -706 | -227 | -54 | -3 | 8 |
| 65-69 | -555 | -685 | -6 | -252 | -13 | -1 |
| 70-74 | -96 | -712 | -241 | 8 | 8 | 1 |
| 75+ | 239 | 175 | -653 | -855 | -9 | -13 |
| Total, 10+ | -38,374 | -35,635 | -1,181 | $-1,063$ | 132 | 55 |

Average Population

| 10-14 | 34,944 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | 26,840 |
| 20-24 | 21,795 |
| 25-29 | 21,108 |
| 30-34 | 22,231 |
| 35-39 | 22:296 |
| -40-44 | 20,843 |
| +45-49 | 19,308 |
| -40-54 | 17,374 |
| -55-59 | 15,838 |
| 4 60-64 | 14,950 |
| 65-69 | 12,871 |
| 40-74 | 10,469 |
| +475+ | 14,542 |
| fotal, $10+$ | 275,409 |


| 33,422 | 106 | 114 | 26 | 38 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 26,252 | 104 | 92 | 34 | 22 |
| 21,484 | 84 | 128 | 96 | 26 |
| 20,936 | 81 | 146 | 74 | 34 |
| 20,996 | 137 | 232 | 61 | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 20,560 | 183 | 384 | 50 | 34 |
| 19,760 | 152 | 200 | 22 | 15 |
| 18,489 | 259 | 306 | 26 | 21 |
| 16,684 | 587 | 543 | 12 | 26 |
| 15,162 | 919 | 802 | 6 | 8 |
| 13,988 |  |  |  |  |
| 12,485 | 1,2374 | 921 | 10 | 12 |
| 10,078 | 2,144 | 1,239 | 17 | 8 |
| 14,247 | 5,494 | 4,643 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  | 44 | 22 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Nebraska

| Age in <br> 1.960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | F'emale |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-7,563$ | $-7,831$ | 278 | 238 | 234 | 271 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15--19$ | $-5,909$ | $-4,384$ | 284 | 287 | 173 | 139 |
| $20-24$ | $-8,216$ | $-5,193$ | 262 | 470 | 533 | 469 |
| $25-29$ | $-7,420$ | $-8,596$ | 194 | 546 | 594 | 408 |
| $30-34$ | $-6,454$ | $-7,232$ | 90 | 258 | 269 | 262 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-6,496$ | $-5,313$ | 159 | 157 | 159 | 169 |
| $40-44$ | $-3,679$ | $-3,603$ | 114 | 52 | 47 | 45 |
| $45-49$ | $-3,289$ | $-2,902$ | 55 | -9 | -1 | 56 |
| $50-54$ | $-2,118$ | $-1,769$ | -33 | 46 | -59 | -43 |
| $55-59$ | $-1,284$ | $-1,689$ | -136 | -88 | -81 | -32 |
| $60-64$ | -593 | $-1,276$ | -97 | -125 | -40 | 3 |
| $65-69$ | -808 | $-1,482$ | -183 | -278 | -20 | -31 |
| $70-74$ | -422 | $-1,077$ | 46 | -192 | 6 | -6 |
| $75+$ | 271 | 359 | $-1,106$ | $-1,318$ | 25 | 50 |
| Total,10+ $-53,980$ | $-51,988$ | -73 | 44 | 1,839 | 1,760 |  |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 66,568 | 63,859 | 269 | 304 | 1,228 | 1,144 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 51,861 | 50,824 | 256 | 274 | 962 | 832 |
| $20-24$ | 43,922 | 43,456 | 250 | 354 | 965 | 880 |
| $25-29$ | 43,554 | 43,544 | 183 | 388 | 886 | 895 |
| $30-34$ | 44,992 | 44,547 | 349 | 634 | 898 | 922 |
| $35-39$ | 45,708 | 44,262 | 529 |  | 852 | 811 |
| $40-44$ | 41,605 | 42,332 | 438 | 539 | 649 | 916 |
| $45-49$ | 40,544 | 40,782 | 722 | 912 | 692 | 729 |
| $50-54$ | 37,946 | 38,404 | 1,355 | 1,234 | 610 | 644 |
| $55-59$ | 33,585 | 34,454 | 2,013 | 1,800 | 542 | 531 |
| $60-64$ | 31,524 | 32,770 | 2,188 | 2,095 | 522 | 520 |
| $65-69$ | 28,336 | 30,101 | 2,967 | 2,282 | 438 | 396 |
| $70-74$ | 22,602 | 24,022 | 3,749 | 3,001 | 330 | 312 |
| $75+$ | 35,220 | 39,958 | 9,517 | 8,782 | 512 | 529 |
| Total,10+ | 567,967 | 573,315 | 24,785 | 23,451 | 10,045 | 10,015 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AMD OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Kansas

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-3,132$ | $-3,127$ | 92 | 172 | 179 | 230 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-2,435$ | $-1,710$ | 69 | 246 | 265 | 107 |
| $20-24$ | $-1,344$ | $-2,303$ | 398 | 736 | 951 | 241 |
| $25-29$ | $-3,692$ | $-3,782$ | 292 | 849 | 696 | 189 |
| $30-34$ | $-1,312$ | $-2,392$ | 138 | 562 | 334 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-1,763$ | $-1,520$ | 89 | 75 | -123 | -140 |
| $40-44$ | $-1,581$ | $-1,338$ | -132 | -25 | -108 | -68 |
| $45-49$ | -911 | -549 | -98 | -10 | -18 | 47 |
| $50-54$ | -397 | -686 | 38 | 26 | -58 | -14 |
| $55-59$ | -11 | -546 | -171 | -82 | 48 | -127 |
| $60-64$ | 732 | -151 | $-1,166$ | -45 | -35 | 51 |
| $65-69$ | 285 | -36 | -19 | -41 | -126 | -208 |
| $70-74$ | 519 | 793 | -427 | -163 | -20 | -153 |
| $75+$ |  |  | -960 | 76 | 52 |  |
| Total,10+ | $-15,193$ | $-18,379$ | 297 | 1,350 | 2,147 | 227 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 97,065 | 92,752 | 332 | 332 | 4,016 | 3,979 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 77,246 | 74,727 | 258 | 291 | 3,226 | 3,144 |
| $20-24$ | 64,780 | 62,765 | 363 | 523 | 3,114 | 2,862 |
| $25-29$ | 63,756 | 62,596 | 300 | 598 | 2,972 | 2,826 |
| $30-34$ | 66,464 | 65,942 | 378 | 1,028 | 2,788 | 2,956 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 69,602 | 68,456 | 534 | 1,080 | 2,832 | 2,863 |
| $40-44$ | 62,749 | 63,428 | 466 | 615 | 2,408 | 2,540 |
| $45-49$ | 59,768 | 60,516 | 691 | 634 | 2,319 | 2,451 |
| $50-54$ | 55,664 | 56,702 | 865 | 798 | 2,120 | 2,212 |
| $55-59$ | 49,211 | 51,254 | 1,326 | 1,150 | 1,972 | 2,156 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 44,659 | 46,853 | 1,465 | 1,312 | 1,916 | 1,970 |
| $65-69$ | 39,880 | 42,907 | 1,698 | 1,490 | 1,796 | 1,680 |
| $70-74$ | 33,020 | 36,824 | 2,216 | 1,680 | 1,363 | 1,289 |
| $75+$ | 58,474 | 67,750 | 5,752 | 5,672 | 2,284 | 2,342 |
| Total,10+ | 842,338 | 853,472 | 16,644 | 17,203 | 35,126 | 35,270 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Delaware

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration


| $10-14$ | 15,886 | 15,196 | 149 | 118 | 2,633 | 2,690 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 11,974 | 12,038 | 106 | 119 | 2,093 | 2,106 |
| $20-24$ | 10,244 | 10,120 | 120 | 192 | 1,867 | 1,828 |
| $25-29$ | 10,634 | 10,692 | 204 | 226 | 1,735 | 1,797 |
| $30-34$ | 11,440 | 12,005 | 226 | 372 | 1,746 | 1,938 |
| $35-39$ | 12,480 | 13,014 |  | 340 | 440 | 1,928 |
| $40-44$ | 12,170 | 12,374 | 271 | 257 | 1,776 | 1,044 |
| $45-49$ | 10,434 | 10,520 | 462 | 449 | 1,751 | 1,759 |
| $50-54$ | 9,054 | 9,013 | 562 | 647 | 1,550 | 1,431 |
| $55-59$ | 7,388 | 7,678 | 682 | 655 | 1,354 | 1,229 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 6,290 | 6,731 | 844 | 820 | 1,104 | 1,028 |
| $65-69$ | 5,140 | 5,810 | 965 | 779 | 884 | 748 |
| $70-74$ | 3,919 | 4,750 | 858 | 684 | 598 | 548 |
| $75+$ | 6,459 | 8,534 | 1,168 | 1,176 | 988 | 910 |
| Total,10+ | 133,512 | 138,475 | 6,957 | 6,934 | 22,007 | 21,860 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Maryland

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 11,903 | 12,086 | 672 | 685 | 2,378 | 2,341 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 8,015 | 9,034 | 619 | 565 | 1,757 | 2,187 |
| $20-24$ | 14,167 | 12,004 | 748 | 1,523 | 2,292 | 2,308 |
| $25-29$ | 16,247 | 16,268 | 1,076 | 2,023 | 2,767 | 2,704 |
| $30-34$ | 14,340 | 14,585 | 1,214 | 2,050 | 2,002 | 1,966 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 11,638 | 11,936 | 1,230 | 1,730 | 1,133 | 1,030 |
| $40-44$ | 8,495 | 7,834 | 830 | 965 | 507 | 375 |
| $45-49$ | 6,095 | 5,460 | 783 | 975 | 250 | 401 |
| $50-54$ | 3,323 | 2,789 | 438 | 596 | -18 | 6 |
| $55-59$ | 1,427 | 1,415 | 233 | 239 | 315 | 234 |
| $60-64$ | -257 |  | 779 | 110 | 441 | -389 |
| $65-69$ | -967 | -654 | 383 | 77 | 207 | -353 |
| $70-74$ | $-1,136$ | -56 | -434 | -44 | -381 | -237 |
| $75+$ |  |  | -186 | -725 | 35 | -394 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 227 |
| Total,10+ | 92,636 | 94,981 | 7,410 | 11,230 | 12,295 | 12,590 |

## Average Population

| 10-14 |
| :---: |
| 15-19 |
| 20-24 |
| 25-29 |
| 30-34 |
| 35-39 |
| 40-44 |
| 45-49 |
| 50-54 |
| 55-59 |
| 60-64 |
| 465-69 |
| 470-74 |
| 75+ |
| Total |
|  |
| \% |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

District of Columbia

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-13,465$ | $-12,665$ | 239 | 191 | 1,923 | 2,510 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-3,387$ | $-1,897$ | 114 | 339 | 2,049 | 3,382 |
| $20-24$ | 4,230 | 3,560 | 505 | 879 | 5,037 | 7,321 |
| $25-29$ | $-1,233$ | $-4,382$ | 658 | 855 | 7,014 | 6,812 |
| $30-34$ | $-12,865$ | $-13,793$ | 372 | 394 | 4,336 | 3,476 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-14,893$ | $-16,037$ | -193 | -255 | 1,586 | 1,056 |
| $40-44$ | $-11,676$ | $-11,413$ | -83 | -138 | 519 | 499 |
| $45-49$ | $-7,934$ | $-7,849$ | -209 | -193 | 464 | 450 |
| $50-54$ | $-4,932$ | $-5,030$ | -355 | -320 | 542 | 703 |
| $55-59$ | $-4,117$ | $-4,186$ | -349 | -278 | 331 | 487 |
| $60-64$ | $-3,157$ | $-4,049$ | -410 | -292 | 58 | 188 |
| $65-69$ | $-2,986$ | $-3,542$ | -416 | -326 | -121 | -378 |
| $70-74$ | $-2,029$ | $-2,029$ | -256 | -479 | -58 | 93 |
| $75+$ | $-1,261$ | $-2,446$ | -467 | -420 | 417 | 589 |
| Total,10+ | $-79,705$ | $-85,758$ | -850 | -43 | 24,097 | 27,188 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 14,031 | 13,810 | 355 | 342 | 16,285 | 16,579 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 12,062 | 12,840 | 279 | 384 | 11,238 | 12,368 |
| $20-24$ | 12,454 | 12,397 | 498 | 628 | 10,929 | 12,592 |
| $25-29$ | 12,995 | 11,240 | 610 | 770 | 11,518 | 12,856 |
| $30-34$ | 16,426 | 15,396 | 758 | 1,208 | 13,095 | 15,567 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 16,703 | 18,048 | 1,046 | 1,588 | 14,795 | 17,250 |
| $40-44$ | 14,802 | 17,267 | 880 | 1,161 | 13,051 | 15,313 |
| $45-49$ | 14,056 | 17,608 | 1,220 | 1,503 | 12,663 | 14,176 |
| $50-54$ | 13,526 | 17,177 | 1,524 | 1,832 | 10,418 | 11,016 |
| $55-59$ | 12,020 | 15,130 | 1,986 | 1,953 | 8,174 | 8,582 |
| $60-64$ | 11,021 | 14,538 | 2,070 | 1,962 | 5,926 | 6,332 |
| $65-69$ | 8,818 | 12,070 | 1,920 | 1,715 | 4,054 | 4,550 |
| $70-74$ | 6,186 | 9,033 | 1,604 | 1,510 | 2,746 | 3,358 |
| $75+$ | 9,178 | 16,368 | 2,163 | 2,380 | 3,964 | 5,574 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ | 174,078 | 202,922 | 16,913 | 18,936 | 138,856 | 156,113 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Virginia

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 418 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 12,892 |
| $20-24$ | 29,092 |
| $25-29$ | $-1,126$ |
| $30-34$ | $-13,109$ |
| $35-39$ | -559 |
| $40-44$ | -571 |
| $45-49$ | $-1,361$ |
| $50-54$ | -691 |
| $55-59$ | 317 |
| $60-64$ | -255 |
| $65-69$ | -255 |
| $70-74$ | 135 |
| $75+$ | -218 |
| Total, 10+ | 24,709 |
|  |  |
| Average Population |  |


| $10-14$ | 149,604 | 144,094 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 126,560 | 118,718 |
| $20-24$ | 112,481 | 100,678 |
| $25-29$ | 104,669 | 98,004 |
| $30-34$ | 115,755 | 106,802 |
|  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 115,008 | $\cdots 115,748$ |
| $40-44$ | 106,004 | 103,604 |
| $45-49$ | 95,486 | 93,664 |
| $50-54$ | 79,998 | 80,339 |
| $55-59$ | 64,718 | 66,887 |
|  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 52,696 | 56,804 |
| $65-69$ | 43,070 | 47,824 |
| $70-74$ | 32,676 | 38,366 |
| $75+$ | 53,904 | 68,377 |

fotal,10+1,252,629
1,239,909
17,322
20,450
331,432
336,231

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## North Carolina

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White | Negro |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-5,984$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 4,441 |
| $20-24$ | $-3,797$ |
| $25-29$ | $-17,747$ |
| $30-34$ | $-14,281$ |
| $35-39$ | $-7,911$ |
| $40-44$ | $-4,448$ |
| $45-49$ | $-4,352$ |
| $50-54$ | $-1,944$ |
| $55-59$ | $-1,034$ |
| $60-64$ | $-1,337$ |
| $65-69$ | 643 |
| $70-74$ | 1,041 |
| $75+$ | 51 |
| Total, 10+ | $-56,659$ |
| Average Population |  |

$10-14$
$15-19$
$20-24$
$25-29$
$30-34$

$35-39$
$40-44$
$45-49$
$50-54$
$55-59$
$60-64$
$65-69$
$70-74$
$75+$
Total
4

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## South Carolina

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | -330 | -615 | 75 | 101 | $-8,894$ | $-9,247$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 10,054 | -194 | 122 | 136 | $-9,490$ | $-12,130$ |
| $20-24$ | 6,715 | $-1,408$ | 274 | 490 | $-18,981$ | $-20,741$ |
| $25-29$ | $-2,961$ | $-2,617$ | 94 | 522 | $-18,858$ | $-20,458$ |
| $30-34$ | $-2,067$ | $-1,749$ | -18 | 377 | $-11,527$ | $-12,929$ |
| $35-39$ | -588 | -182 | -60 | 120 | $-6,600$ | $-6,087$ |
| $40-44$ | 412 | -193 | 40 | 77 | $-2,904$ | $-2,439$ |
| $45-49$ | -560 | -548 | 15 | 7 | $-3,135$ | $-3,168$ |
| $50-54$ | -614 | -157 | 23 | 108 | $-2,114$ | $-2,017$ |
| $55-59$ | -637 | 178 | 35 | -10 | $-1,492$ | $-1,814$ |
| $60-64$ | -766 |  | 104 | 22 | -39 | $-1,131$ |
| $65-69$ | -496 | 166 | 52 | -51 | 166 | -936 |
| $70-74$ | -411 | -56 | -23 | 28 | -388 | -311 |
| $75+$ | $-1,044$ | -180 | 7 | -31 | $-1,621$ | $-2,081$ |
| Total,10+ | 6,707 | $-7,451$ | 658 | 1,835 | $-86,969$ | $-93,851$ |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 79,500 | 75,688 | 208 | 217 | 59,302 | 59,152 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 71,888 | 64,382 | 214 | 167 | 50,067 | 49,537 |
| $20-24$ | 59,536 | 54,704 | 244 | 324 | 37,190 | 37,310 |
| $25-29$ | 54,084 | 53,360 | 180 | 390 | 29,723 | 32,843 |
| $30-34$ | 54,012 | 53,796 | 178 | 574 | 24,526 | 30,002 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 55,612 | 57,074 | 236 | 540 | 23,690 | 27,708 |
| $40-44$ | 49,932 | 50,525 | 177 | 280 | 21,078 | 23,812 |
| $45-49$ | 45,824 | 46,722 | 224 | 248 | 20,879 | 24,020 |
| $50-54$ | 38,588 | 39,942 | 242 | 274 | 15,957 | 18,328 |
| $55-59$ | 30,330 | 32,646 | 354 | 328 | 13,424 | 16,102 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 24,219 | 26,786 | 406 | 361 | 10,519 | 13,088 |
| $65-69$ | 20,004 | 23,008 | 395 | 240 | 9,504 | 10,978 |
| $70-74$ | 14,800 | 18,034 | 336 | 272 | 7,059 | 8,145 |
| $75+$ | 22,548 | 29,995 | 320 | 342 | 12,608 | 15,230 |
| Total,10+ | 620,877 | 626,662 | 3,714 | 4,557 | 335,526 | 366,255 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Georgia

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-1,346$ | $-1,228$ | 149 | 373 | $-9,832$ | $-10,405$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 438 | $-1,641$ | 191 | 268 | $-8,401$ | $-9,580$ |
| $20-24$ | 3,592 | -720 | 551 | 1,096 | $-14,029$ | $-15,380$ |
| $25-29$ | $-4,512$ | $-1,303$ | 341 | 1,472 | $-15,970$ | $-16,634$ |
| $30-34$ | -38 | -228 | 52 | 938 | $-9,629$ | $-11,865$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | -543 | -874 | 181 | 514 | $-6,605$ | $-7,097$ |
| $40-44$ | 117 | -246 | 118 | 22 | $-3,436$ | $-3,838$ |
| $45-49$ | -862 | -572 | 20 | 7 | $-4,007$ | $-3,743$ |
| $50-54$ | -751 | -173 | 60 | 26 | $-2,222$ | $-2,369$ |
| $55-59$ | -426 | 183 | -64 | -28 | $-1,864$ | $-2,227$ |
| $60-64$ | -884 |  | 155 | -38 | 35 | $-1,663$ |
| $65-69$ | -417 | -4 | 896 | -49 | 24 | $-1,351$ |
| $70-74$ | -562 | 374 | -13 | 20 | 43 | 489 |
| $75+$ |  |  | -79 | -36 | $-2,031$ | $-2,018$ |
| Total,10+ | $-6,198$ | $-4,580$ | 1,420 | 4,731 | $-79,804$ | $-85,286$ |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 141,023 | 135,618 | 516 | 464 | 69,644 | 69,652 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 117,292 | 112,756 | 308 | 349 | 56,064 | 56,473 |
| $20-24$ | 100,748 | 97,184 | 410 | 678 | 45,092 | 46,840 |
| $25-29$ | 96,160 | 93,316 | 396 | 912 | 38,361 | 42,378 |
| $30-34$ | 95,316 | 96,083 | 388 | 1,554 | 32,420 | 40,240 |
| $35-39$ | 97,034 | 100,254 | 522 | 1,379 | 31,040 | 37,769 |
| $40-44$ | 91,990 | 92,560 | 408 | 606 | 29,100 | 35,381 |
| $45-49$ | 86,058 | 87,018 | 498 | 557 | 30,834 | 36,786 |
| $50-54$ | 74,746 | 76,592 | 620 | 534 | 25,808 | 29,519 |
| $55-59$ | 59,520 | 63,845 | 744 | 728 | 21,468 | 25,754 |
| $760-64$ | 47,832 | 53,116 | 768 | 634 | 16,756 | 20,272 |
| $65-69$ | 40,232 | 46,585 | 866 | 626 | 14,145 | 17,241 |
| $70-74$ | 30,489 | 36,746 | 664 | 498 | 10,062 | 12,394 |
| $75+$ | 48,128 | 63,273 | 1,022 | 930 | 19,947 | 24,432 |
| Total,10+1,126,568 | $1,154,946$ | 8,130 | 10,449 | 440,741 | 495,131 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Florida

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 62,029 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 44,550 |
| $20-24$ | 42,588 |
| $25-29$ | 46,406 |
| $30-34$ | 45,843 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 49,049 |
| $40-44$ | 44,624 |
| $45-49$ | 38,622 |
| $50-54$ | 32,372 |
| $55-59$ | 29,849 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 32,449 |
| $65-69$ | 44,546 |
| $70-74$ | 31,185 |
| $75+$ | 21,535 |

Total,10+
565,647
59,652
43,749
41,630
47,425
50,872
51,335
44,121
39,666
37,754
38,728
43,391
42,778
26,435
19,666
587,202

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 142,238 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 112,713 |
| $20-24$ | 93,513 |
| $25-29$ | 90,852 |
| $30-34$ | 102,849 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 107,200 |
| $40-44$ | 101,584 |
| $45-49$ | 94,838 |
| $50-54$ | 84,318 |
| $55-59$ | 72,996 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 64,891 |
| $65-69$ | 63,034 |
| $70-74$ | 47,410 |
| $75+$ | 67,960 |

Total,10+1,246,396

1,292,932
136,789
109,558
91,271
90,598
104,508
112,678
105,833
100,757
90,665
80,237
74,634
67,670
51,371
76,363

75,261
77,667
44,747
35,078
2,482
2,022
2,305
2,972
3,529
3,957
3,465
3,653
4,416
5,477
7,078
12,946
12,724
8,235
2,597
2,317
3,889
4,738
5,316
4,945
3,767
4,217
4,952
7,206
9,755
11,137
7,553
5,278
77,667
5,068
4,569
9,433
9,249
4,855
3,696
2,479
2,426
1,421
635
31
425
377
83

5,337 4,916
7,783 6,462 3,445

2,231
1,704
1,596
699
131
136
598
328
-288

40,232
31,340
29,027
27,332
29,170
27,950
25,996
25,400
20,878
17,824
10,079 11,516
12,391
12,448
12,188
10,766
9,600
9,889
6,810

94,262
300,698
316,412

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Kentucky

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-19,616$ | $-19,914$ | -48 | 128 | -780 | -716 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-16,264$ | $-21,958$ | 131 | 76 | 78 | -706 |
| $20-24$ | $-30,319$ | $-34,050$ | 394 | 500 | -531 | $-1,153$ |
| $25-29$ | $-36,971$ | $-31,432$ | 126 | 594 | $-1,842$ | $-1,514$ |
| $30-34$ | $-19,818$ | $-18,351$ | 80 | 297 | $-1,333$ | -932 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-14,489$ | $-12,613$ | -115 | -9 | -955 | -473 |
| $40-44$ | $-9,846$ | $-8,084$ | 13 | -20 | -549 | -659 |
| $45-49$ | $-7,985$ | $-6,559$ | -94 | -37 | -376 | -429 |
| $50-54$ | $-5,473$ | $-4,862$ | 2 | -56 | -464 | -480 |
| $55-59$ | $-3,107$ | $-3,867$ | -59 | 30 | -322 | -437 |
| $60-64$ | $-1,777$ | $-2,702$ | -76 | -92 | -111 | -291 |
| $65-69$ | 132 | $-1,271$ | -3 | -40 | -228 | -479 |
| $70-74$ | 1,418 | -847 | -82 | -26 | -200 | -237 |
| $75+$ | -613 | $-3,554$ | -197 | -185 | -196 | -300 |
| Total, 10+ $-164,728$ | $-170,064$ |  | 72 | 1,160 | $-7,809$ | $-8,806$ |

Average Population

| 210-14 | 156,504 | 151,488 | 348 | 281 | 10,050 | 10,004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | 132,152 | 125,388 | 238 | 180 | 8,390 | 8,132 |
| +20-24 | 109,752 | 105,408 | 350 | 306 | 7,022 | 7,050 |
| 25-29 | 98,816 | 98,094 | 236 | 517 | 6,854 | 6,938 |
| 130-34 | 94,578 | 97,194 | 264 | 950 | 6,570 | 7,128 |
| 45-39 | 95,984 | 98,022 | 406 | 910 | 6,732 | 7,267 |
| 40-44 | 87,186 | 88,734 | 299 | 364 | 6,041 | 6,807 |
| 745-49 | 84,532 | 85,443 | 292 | 386 | 6,336 | 7,098 |
| $450-54$ | 75,528 | 76,419 | 525 | 468 | 5,965 | 6,506 |
| -55-59 | 66,952 | 68,920 | 658 | 562 | 5,774 | 6,192 |
| 460-64 | 57,686 | 60,427 | 804 | 569 | 5,110 | 5,316 |
| -65-69 | 51,206 | 53,315 | 786 | 547 | 4,534 | 4,562 |
| 270-74 | 41,148 | 43,858 | 622 | 533 | 3,450 | 3,586 |
| 4 $775+$ | 72,684 | 81,238 | 1,340 | 1,408 | 6,275 | 6,662 |
| Total, 10 | ,224,708 | 1,233,948 | 7,168 | 7,981 | 89,103 | 93,248 |

TABLE A
NE'T MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Tennessee

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-11,836$ | $-12,486$ | -119 | 20 | $-2,368$ | $-2,522$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-9,180$ | $-10,416$ | -44 | 108 | $-1,431$ | $-1,399$ |
| $20-24$ | $-23,835$ | $-16,854$ | 260 | 430 | $-3,607$ | $-3,008$ |
| $25-29$ | $-21,876$ | $-18,232$ | 150 | 480 | $-5,269$ | $-5,236$ |
| $30-34$ | $-13,079$ | $-13,995$ | 16 | 89 | $-4,814$ | $-4,671$ |
| $35-39$ | $-10,304$ | $-10,099$ | -114 | 40 | $-3,595$ | $-2,793$ |
| $40-44$ | $-6,629$ | $-6,059$ | -3 | -113 | $-2,105$ | $-1,731$ |
| $45-49$ | $-5,370$ | $-4,465$ | 49 | -101 | $-1,565$ | $-1,249$ |
| $50-54$ | $-2,953$ | $-2,974$ | 69 | 68 | -401 | -901 |
| $55-59$ | $-1,206$ | $-1,647$ | -36 | 36 | -101 | -479 |
| $60-64$ | -338 | -535 | -31 | -61 | -737 | -850 |
| $65-69$ | 660 | 259 | -30 | 45 | -175 | -511 |
| $70-74$ | 1,789 | 765 | -87 | -3 | -30 | -60 |
| $75+$ | 67 | -787 | -27 | -50 | -65 | -529 |
| Total, $10+-104,090$ | $-97,525$ | 53 | 988 | $-26,263$ | $-25,939$ |  |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 155,691 | 150,228 | 285 | 346 | 31,415 | 31,258 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 133,022 | 127,843 | 197 | 246 | 24,003 | 24,607 |
| $20-24$ | 107,894 | 108,606 | 298 | 338 | 19,444 | 21,029 |
| $25-29$ | 101,058 | 104,792 | 299 | 428 | 17,462 | 20,226 |
| $30-34$ | 101,010 | 107,824 | 350 | 820 | 16,803 | 20,730 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 104,226 | 110,696 | 399 | 826 | 16,889 | 19,840 |
| $40-44$ | 95,180 | 99,968 | 326 | 476 | 15,756 | 18,424 |
| $45-49$ | 92,602 | 95,370 | 428 | 443 | 16,709 | 19,646 |
| $50-54$ | 82,664 | 85,742 | 480 | 395 | 15,132 | 16,990 |
| $55-59$ | 68,606 | 72,964 | 596 | 544 | 13,713 | 15,138 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 56,690 | 61,460 | 704 | 510 | 11,494 | 12,446 |
| $65-69$ | 48,618 | 53,202 | 696 | 496 | 9,917 | 10,030 |
| $70-74$ | 38,242 | 43,107 | 654 | 546 | 6,896 | 7,188 |
| $75+$ | 65,630 | 76,752 | 1,182 | 1,018 | 12,586 | 13,642 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+1,251,133 | $1,298,554$ | 6,894 | 7,432 | 228,219 | 251,194 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Alabama

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-8,595$ | $-8,183$ | 81 | 47 | $-11,169$ | $-12,203$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-11,938$ | $-9,750$ | 101 | 54 | $-10,540$ | $-10,530$ |
| $20-24$ | $-19,847$ | $-15,351$ | 287 | 523 | $-18,067$ | $-18,650$ |
| $25-29$ | $-13,404$ | $-14,107$ | 261 | 474 | $-19,568$ | $-20,748$ |
| $30-34$ | $-4,781$ | $-8,437$ | -483 | 370 | $-12,103$ | $-13,492$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-4,435$ | $-5,157$ | 31 | 87 | $-7,577$ | $-7,391$ |
| $40-44$ | $-3,443$ | $-3,538$ | 114 | 62 | $-4,234$ | $-4,368$ |
| $45-49$ | $-2,851$ | $-3,116$ | 155 | -25 | $-3,516$ | $-4,367$ |
| $50-54$ | $-2,420$ | $-1,790$ | 163 | -43 | $-2,248$ | $-2,382$ |
| $55-59$ | $-1,597$ | -952 | -91 | -48 | $-1,568$ | $-1,820$ |
|  |  |  | -423 | -42 | -32 | $-1,471$ |
| $60-64$ | -880 | 77 | 624 | -56 | 54 | 188 |
| $65-69$ | 668 | 697 | -7 | -40 | 461 | 759 |
| $70-74$ | 342 | 116 | -80 | -118 | $-1,337$ | $-1,596$ |
| $75+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $-69,367$ | 434 | 1,365 | $-92,749$ | $-98,834$ |

Average Population

| を10-14 | 120,710 | 116,184 | 194 | 262 | 63,933 | 63,587 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 415-19 | 100,824 | 98,424 | 172 | 185 | 51,556 | 51,798 |
| \%20-24 | 83,832 | 83,985 | 216 | 355 | 39,962 | 41,886 |
| - 25-29 | 77,987 | 80,354 | 214 | 354 | 33,264 | 37,594 |
| +30-34 | 77,132 | 82,452 | 52.8 | 720 | 27,481 | 35,304 |
| - 35 -39 | 78,944 | 82,432 | 291 | 733 | 26,347 | 32,267 |
| 4.40-44 | 73,852 | 76,317 | 288 | 368 | 23,883 | 29,593 |
| 245-49 | 71,536 | 73,464 | 406 | 389 | 26,310 | 31,802 |
| 450-54 | 63,854 | 65,170 | 422 | 384 | 23,298 | 26,433 |
| +55-59 | 52,048 | 53,935 | 485 | 502 | 20,629 | 23,205 |
| 260-64 | 41,066 | 44,361 | 606 | 462 | 1.6,476 | 19,038 |
| +65-69 | 35,208 | 38,822 | 662 | 541 | 14,282 | 15,840 |
| 870-74 | 27,500 | 30,744 | 725 | 460 | 10,573 | 11,460 |
| $\$ 275+$ | 44,422 | 52,174 | 1,308 | 1,134 | 20,467 | 23,433 |
| $\text { Total, } 10+$ | 948,915 | 978,818 | 6,517 | 6,849 | 398,461 | 443,240 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Mississippi

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-5,634$ | $-6,398$ | -103 | -30 | $-18,471$ | $-19,998$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-1,547$ | $-5,621$ | -27 | 23 | $-15,131$ | $-16,051$ |
| $20-24$ | $-10,473$ | $-11,430$ | 22 | 314 | $-23,496$ | $-24,743$ |
| $25-29$ | $-13,931$ | $-11,786$ | 13 | 230 | $-25,316$ | $-25,448$ |
| $30-34$ | $-8,069$ | $-6,487$ | -76 | 85 | $-16,695$ | $-16,646$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-4,732$ | $-4,162$ | -146 | -69 | $-10,199$ | $-9,888$ |
| $40-44$ | $-3,043$ | $-2,531$ | -62 | -93 | $-6,301$ | $-5,938$ |
| $45-49$ | $-2,275$ | $-2,510$ | -118 | -157 | $-4,538$ | $-5,376$ |
| $50-54$ | $-1,910$ | $-1,697$ | -122 | -183 | $-3,454$ | $-4,545$ |
| $55-59$ | -848 | -886 | -24 | -63 | $-2,552$ | $-3,036$ |
| $60-64$ | -360 | -264 | -10 |  |  |  |
| $65-69$ | 545 | 454 | 18 | -61 | $-1,588$ | $-2,018$ |
| $70-74$ | 507 | 314 | 61 | -66 | 362 | 35 |
| $75+$ | 60 | -38 | 15 | 12 | $-1,239$ | $-1,781$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, 10+ | $-51,710$ | $-53,042$ | -559 | -47 | $-128,483$ | $-135,756$ |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 66,164 | 63,098 | 173 | 128 | 66,671 | 65,805 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 57,631 | 53,924 | 135 | 104 | 53,148 | 52,491 |
| $20-24$ | 47,832 | 45,966 | 187 | 242 | 40,116 | 41,298 |
| $25-29$ | 44,364 | 43,668 | 190 | 296 | 31,674 | 34,918 |
| $30-34$ | 42,980 | 43,752 | 156 | 428 | 25,239 | 31,372 |
| $35-39$ | 41,938 | 43,316 |  | 188 | 398 | 22,344 |
| $40-44$ | 39,123 | 40,622 | 139 | 168 | 21,059 | 26,118 |
| $45-49$ | 39,455 | 40,754 | 170 | 190 | 23,515 | 28,041 |
| $50-54$ | 37,005 | 37,174 | 242 | 232 | 21,955 | 24,853 |
| $55-59$ | 30,634 | 31,645 | 342 | 270 | 20,291 | 22,214 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60=64$ | 25,272 | 26,555 | 401 | 263 | 16,030 | 17,766 |
| $65-69$ | 21,500 | 22,928 | 346 | 286 | 15,154 | 15,354 |
| $70-74$ | 17,428 | 18,742 | 352 | 256 | 10,660 | 10,730 |
| 75 ( | 29,074 | 33,627 | 661 | 430 | 22,472 | 22,860 |
| Total,10+ 540,400 | 545,771 | 3,682 | 3,691 | 390,328 | 421,862 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Arkansas

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-15,569$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-17,852$ |
| $20-24$ | $-26,985$ |
| $25-29$ | $-23,120$ |
| $30-34$ | $-11,906$ |
| $35-39$ | $-9,364$ |
| $40-44$ | $-6,624$ |
| $45-49$ | $-5,701$ |
| $50-54$ | $-4,206$ |
| $55-59$ | $-2,260$ |
| $60-64$ | -825 |
| $65-69$ | 978 |
| $70-74$ | 1,627 |
| $75+$ | 744 |
|  |  |
| Total, 10+ -121, 063 |  |
| Average Population |  |


| $10-14$ | 79,115 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15-19$ | 68,476 |
| $20-24$ | 54,372 |
| $25-29$ | 48,406 |
| $30-34$ | 44,698 |
| $35-39$ | 46,485 |
| $40-44$ | 45,667 |
| $445-49$ | 47,028 |
| $50-54$ | 43,913 |
| $55-59$ | 38,369 |
| $460-64$ | 32,068 |
| $65-69$ | 30,290 |
| $70-74$ | 24,490 |
| $\mathbf{7} 75+$ | 40,964 |

75,754
66,084
53,384
49,824
47,937

49,253
47,916
47,692
44,676
39,532
32,840
30,400
23,888
41,949

Total,10+ 644,341
651,129

| 166 | 132 | 26,309 | 26,076 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 95 | 81 | 20,896 | 20,842 |
| 108 | 158 | 15,534 | 15,977 |
| 88 | 200 | 12,844 | 14,212 |
| 108 | 324 | 10,228 | 12,925 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 132 | 400 | 9,342 | 11,827 |
| 115 | 185 | 9,268 | 11,494 |
| 154 | 176 | 10,239 | 12,528 |
| 224 | 218 | 10,035 | 11,584 |
| 296 | 281 | 9,920 | 11,019 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 370 | 326 | 8,418 | 9,036 |
| 497 | 346 | 8,238 | 8,120 |
| 502 | 338 | 6,144 | 5,702 |
| 1,163 | 779 | 11,855 | 11,195 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 4,018 | 3,944 | 169,270 | 182,537 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Louisiana

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 1,405 | 1,406 | 206 | 163 | $-4,522$ | $-4,832$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-2,958$ | 724 | 164 | 241 | $-3,977$ | $-3,373$ |
| $20-24$ | $-4,619$ | 1,141 | 470 | 763 | $-8,388$ | $-7,407$ |
| $25-29$ | 4,692 | 2,287 | 312 | 907 | $-8,744$ | $-8,758$ |
| $30-34$ | 4,627 | 1,762 | 357 | 639 | $-5,080$ | $-5,560$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 1,612 | 1,248 | 56 | 171 | $-2,634$ | $-2,682$ |
| $40-44$ | 1,766 | 1,273 | 60 | 11 | $-1,076$ | $-1,466$ |
| $45-49$ | 1,082 | 411 | 67 | 572 | -453 | $-1,052$ |
| $50-54$ | 582 | 793 | -19 | 142 | 231 | -69 |
| $55-59$ | 471 | 729 | -25 | -57 | -234 | -275 |
|  |  | 903 | -138 | -11 | 805 | 431 |
| $60-64$ | -202 | 630 | -49 | -71 | 816 | 1,373 |
| $65-69$ | -165 | 605 | -63 | -150 | 531 | 666 |
| $70-74$ |  | 629 | -254 | -209 | -134 | -374 |
| $75+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, 10+ | 8,936 | 14,041 | 1,144 | 3,111 | $-32,859$ | $-33,378$ |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 108,256 | 104,190 | 419 | 421 | 61,272 | 60,724 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 85,094 | 85,486 | 362 | 432 | 47,930 | 48,640 |
| $20-24$ | 70,274 | 71,710 | 403 | 652 | 37,282 | 39,554 |
| $25-29$ | 67,156 | 69,470 | 477 | 796 | 30,925 | 34,784 |
| $30-34$ | 72,574 | 75,103 | 585 | 1,278 | 27,548 | 34,064 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 74,188 | 76,014 | 846 | 1,383 | 26,522 | 31,836 |
| $40-44$ | 68,269 | 69,112 | 580 | 772 | 23,788 | 28,557 |
| $45-49$ | 65,411 | 66,196 | 709 | 434 | 24,988 | 29,181 |
| $50-54$ | 58,642 | 59,332 | 968 | 822 | 22,752 | 25,817 |
| $55-59$ | 49,612 | 50,724 | 1,232 | 1,087 | 21,180 | 22,882 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 39,322 | 41,396 | 1,460 | 1,111 | 16,382 | 17,856 |
| $65-69$ | 30,846 | 34,784 | 1,496 | 1,154 | 14,815 | 15,866 |
| $70-74$ | 22,936 | 26,566 | 1,504 | 1,148 | 10,430 | 11,354 |
| $75+$ | 34,985 | 44,879 | 2,921 | 2,538 | 20,381 | 22,799 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ 847,565 | 874,962 | 13,962 | 14,028 | 386,195 | 423,914 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Oklahoma

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-11,821$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-10,870$ |
| $20-24$ | $-14,442$ |
| $25-29$ | $-19,214$ |
| $30-34$ | $-12,018$ |
| $35-39$ | $-9,489$ |
| $40-44$ | $-5,631$ |
| $45-49$ | $-4,409$ |
| $50-54$ | $-3,461$ |
| $55-59$ | $-2,062$ |
| $60-64$ | 19 |
| $65-69$ | 752 |
| $70-74$ | 1,323 |
| $75+$ | 460 |
| Total, 10+ | $-90,863$ |
| Average Population |  |



## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Texas

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 5,596 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 12,956 |
| $20-24$ | 14,057 |
| $25-29$ | 6,336 |
| $30-34$ | 7,722 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 3,445 |
| $40-44$ | 2,973 |
| $45-49$ | 2,106 |
| $50-54$ | 1,289 |
| $55-59$ | 1,301 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 1,044 |
| $65-69$ | 2,637 |
| $70-74$ | 3,217 |
| $75+$ | 5,194 |

Total,10+ 69,873
Average Population

| $10-14$ | 402,074 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 323,810 |
| $20-24$ | 264,723 |
| $25-29$ | 262,692 |
| $30-34$ | 270,902 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 273,366 |
| $40-44$ | 243,556 |
| $45-49$ | 234,892 |
| $50-54$ | 208,628 |
| $55-59$ | 176,030 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 142,909 |
| $65-69$ | 116,869 |
| $70-74$ | 89,376 |
| $75+$ | 136,800 |

Total,10+3,146,627
3,758
2,355
3,813
2,695
$-1,375$
-349
-866
-589
-950
-585

-328
374
842
3

8,798
5,386
3,764
13,911
15,402
6,396
3,773
3,417
2,807
2,688
3,587

5,121
4,724
4,558
9,905

85,439
386,919
309,704
259,706
255,890
273,508

278,730
245,736
238,960
207,900
178,287
147,322
124,944
98,954
165,498

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4,759 \\
5,348 \\
5,679 \\
6,624 \\
8,693 \\
10,492 \\
8,982 \\
11,801 \\
13,576 \\
14,222 \\
11,214
\end{array}
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$$
10,426
$$

$$
8,603
$$

$$
11,469
$$

$$
12,501
$$

$$
13,168
$$

$$
10,792
$$

$$
9,564
$$

$$
8,428
$$

$$
17,362
$$

3,172,058
138,090
137,597
$-1,275$
113
-1,443
-2,747
-1,839
$-2,304$
-1,310
-1,139
-732 -1,328
-251
-673
-206

- 527
$-462$
-406
635
845
432 282
$-7,958$
-11,614

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Montana

| Age in 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-1,137$ | $-1,086$ | 148 | 40 | -25 | -20 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-2,216$ | $-1,562$ | 9 | 122 | 24 | 25 |
| $20-24$ | $-2,975$ | $-2,520$ | 188 | 216 | 102 | -12 |
| $25-29$ | -741 | $-1,004$ | 117 | 241 | 46 | -4 |
| $30-34$ | -143 | -133 | 25 | 107 | -28 | -19 |
| $35-39$ | -747 | -447 | -77 | -29 | 8 | -27 |
| $40-44$ | -824 | -731 | 7 | -104 | 4 | 9 |
| $45-49$ | -544 | -468 | -154 | -117 | 18 | 26 |
| $50-54$ | -750 | -683 | -199 | -126 | -6 | 10 |
| $55-59$ | -715 | -564 | 22 | -55 | 10 | -3 |
| $60-64$ | -363 | -709 | -303 |  | 1 | -9 |
| $65-69$ | -626 | -737 | -328 | -276 | -19 | -13 |
| $70-74$ | -328 | -461 | -448 | -195 | -21 | -3 |
| $75+$ | -291 | 17 | -270 | -393 | -9 | -13 |
| Total,10+ | $-12,400$ | $-11,088$ | $-1,263$ | -568 | 95 | -40 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 32,532 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 25,479 |
| $20-24$ | 20,434 |
| $25-29$ | 18,904 |
| $30-34$ | 20,236 |
| $35-39$ | 21,136 |
| $40-44$ | 21,513 |
| $45-49$ | 20,016 |
| $50-54$ | 17,279 |
| $55-59$ | 14,346 |
| $60-64$ | 11,593 |
| $65-69$ | 10,694 |
| $70-74$ | 9,434 |
| $75+$ | 13,266 |

Total,10+ 256,862
31,711
24,872
20,118
18,604
19,193
19,910
20,646
18,666
15,065
12,468
189
19

| 52 | 41 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 54 | 50 |
| 136 | 47 |
| 87 | 54 |
| 70 | 22 |
|  |  |
| 48 | 54 |
| 37 | 25 |
| 26 | 40 |
| 34 | 24 |
| 24 | 19 |

10,716
1,702
2,604
3,584
6,262
1,471
1,798
2,366
4,682
21
27
10,238
8,263
11,638
242,108
19,952
16,390
697

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Idaho

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| 10-14 | -1,684 | -1,864 | 121 | 165 | -12 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -3,169 | -2,791 | 82 | 46 | 28 | 18 |
| 20-24 | -6,371 | -5,889 | 155 | 324 | 41 | 23 |
| 25-29 | -3,839 | -4,037 | 122 | 242 | 41 | 6 |
| 30-34 | -668 | -1,345 | 80 | 136 | 29 | 9 |
| 35-39 | -1,044 | -995 | -45 | 16 | -13 | -6 |
| 40-44 | -1,036 | -842 | -85 | -136 | -24 | 18 |
| 45-49 | -675 | -735 | -66 | -43 | 11 | 16 |
| 50-54 | -603 | -415 | -79 | -71 | 16 | -22 |
| 55-59 | -264 | -758 | -173 | 14 | -12 | -42 |
| 60-64 | -372 | -313 | -10 | -55 | -8 | 1 |
| 65-69 | 142 | -523 | -138 | -17 | -8 | 6 |
| 70-74 | 10 | -148 | -110 | -165 | -14 | 3 |
| 75+ | 240 | 487 | -4 | -276 | 10 | -3 |
| Total, 10+ | -19,333 | -20,168 | -150 | 180 | 85 | 37 |
| Average Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 35,748 | 34,611 | 148 | 88 | 43 | 62 |
| 15-19 | 29,026 | 28,291 | 158 | 182 | 28 | 38 |
| 20-24 | 22,663 | 22,078 | 158 | 202 | 64 | 54 |
| 25-29 | 19,944 | 20,096 | 167 | 180 | 63 | 43 |
| 30-34 | 19,697 | 19,801 | 194 | 330 | 62 | 36 |
| 35-39 | 20,658 | 21,000 | 280 | 486 | 58 | 34 |
| 40-44 | 20,857 | 20,654 | 344 | 439 | 46 | 38 |
| 45-49 | 20,294 | 18,926 | 418 | 442 | 24 | 32 |
| 50-54 | 17,924 | 16,038 | 586 | 428 | 33 | 24 |
| 55-59 | 14,298 | 12,982 | 870 | 530 | 40 | 32 |
| 60-64 | 11,972 | 11,225 | 975 | 560 | 29 | 20 |
| 65-69 | 10,558 | 10,104 | 1,120 | 773 | 28 | 22 |
| 70-74 | 8,815 | 8,268 | 1,320 | 905 | 36 | 11 |
| 75+ | 14,086 | 12,862 | 2,581 | 2,084 | 29 | 26 |
| Total $10+$ | 266,540 | 256,936 | 9,319 | 7,629 | 583 | 472 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Wyoming

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| 10-14 | -947 | -1,149 | 66 | 10 | -77 | -21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -1,472 | -1,247 | 45 | 20 | 28 | -5 |
| 20-24 | -1,645 | -996 | 70 | 132 | 78 | 16 |
| 25-29 | -1,539 | 300 | 57 | 121 | -278 | 38 |
| 30-34 | -1,322 | -10 | 12 | 132 | -255 | -9 |
| 35-39 | -745 | -596 | -27 | 2 | -72 | -48 |
| 40-44 | -784 | -766 | 1 | -75 | -75 | -11 |
| 45-49 | -714 | -418 | -20 | 28 | -12 | 1 |
| 50-54 | -371 | -409 | -87 | -58 | -14 | -4 |
| 55-59 | -377 | -271 | -204 | -173 | -19 | -21 |
| 60-64 | -150 | -500 | -116 | 6 | -5 | -11 |
| 65-69 | -315 | -344 | -319 | -93 | -4 | -23 |
| 70-74 | -302 | -162 | -38 | -88 | -1 | 1 |
| 75+ | 31 | 189 | -146 | -86 | 8 | -5 |
| Total, 10+ | -10,652 | -6,379 | -706 | -122 | -698 | -102 |
| Average Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 16,778 | 15,836 | 70 | 91 | 102 | 127 |
| 15-19 | 12,931 | 12,446 | 69 | 61 | 60 | 68 |
| 20-24 | 10,225 | 10,216 | 64 | 95 | 74 | 53 |
| $25-29$ | 11,010 | 9,874 | 57 | 125 | 230 | 73 |
| ¢ 30-34 | 12,035 | 10,408 | 112 | 208 | 215 | 72 |
| -35-39 | 11,528 | 11,026 | 188 | 294 | 104 | 98 |
| 40-44 | 10,820 | 10,097 | 150 | 230 | 93 | 74 |
| + 45-49 | 10,138 | 9,415 | 336 | 290 | 97 | 48 |
| 4.50-54 | 8,855 | 7,789 | 408 | 318. | 58 | 50 |
| -55-59 | 7,096 | 6,316 | 638 | 428 | 64 | 33 |
| 4.60-64 | 6,256 | 5,440 | 786 | 515 | 42 | 26 |
| - 65-69 | 5,287 | 4,574 | 968 | 486 | 32 | 48 |
| +70-74 | 3,919 | 3,444 | 1,034 | 537 | 35 | 20 |
| \% $75+$ | 5,408 | 4,912 | 1,573 | 1,140 | 39 | 36 |
| WTotal, $10+$ | 132,286 | 121,793 | 6,453 | 4,818 | 1,245 | 826 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Colorado

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 6,318 | 6,921 | 699 | 634 | 617 | 676 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 7,085 | 5,786 | 544 | 509 | 677 | 599 |
| $20-24$ | 5,003 | 6,961 | 690 | 841 | 1,137 | 763 |
| $25-29$ | 5,345 | 7,030 | 750 | 1,149 | 1,150 | 1,083 |
| $30-34$ | 6,032 | 6,067 | 636 | 1,271 | 551 | 762 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 4,755 | 5,632 | 502 | 824 | 420 | 517 |
| $40-44$ | 5,099 | 4,486 | 368 | 499 | 231 | 190 |
| $45-49$ | 3,932 | 3,487 | 285 | 347 | 274 | 274 |
| $50-54$ | 2,689 | 2,418 | 228 | 112 | 181 | 166 |
| $55-59$ | 1,954 | 1,724 | -30 | 213 | 37 | 120 |
| $60-64$ | 1,338 | 1,510 | 163 | 132 | 117 | 151 |
| $65-69$ | 1,128 | 1,091 | 190 | 418 | 76 | 62 |
| $70-74$ | 1,061 | 1,183 | 107 | 37 | 37 | 8 |
| $75+$ | 1,650 | 2,438 | -170 | -605 | 1 | 93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ | 53,389 | 56,734 | 4,962 | 6,381 | 5,506 | 5,464 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 77,238 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 60,996 |
| $20-24$ | 51,156 |
| $25-29$ | 50,002 |
| $30-34$ | 52,296 |
| $35-39$ | 54,484 |
| $40-44$ | 49,959 |
| $45-49$ | 45,586 |
| $50-54$ | 40,026 |
| $55-59$ | 33,130 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 28,262 |
| $65-69$ | 24,789 |
| $70-74$ | 19,460 |
| $75+$ | 31,635 |

Total,10+ 619,019
628,916
29,135
27,703 12,398
12,247

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## New Mexico

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| 10-14 | 2,540 | 2,593 | 332 | 275 | 204 | 200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -231 | -216 | 258 | 184 | 103 | 133 |
| 20-24 | 2,184 | 974 | 505 | 677 | 786 | 433 |
| 25-29 | 4,801 | 3,658 | 515 | 648 | 592 | 407 |
| 30-34 | 3,497 | 3,614 | 141 | 576 | 166 | 336 |
| 35-39 | 3,087 | 2,864 | 131 | 339 | 225 | 84 |
| 40-44 | 2,758 | 2,132 | 66 | 115 | 136 | 35 |
| 45-49 | 1,850 | 1,330 | -90 | 76 | 44 | 17 |
| 50-54 | 1,029 | 1,134 | -78 | -7 | 21 | 57 |
| 55-59 | 686 | 553 | -133 | -83 | 61 | 2 |
| 60-64 | 300 | 15 | -52 | 46 | 44 | 19 |
| 65-69 | 242 | 133 | -117 | 37 | 11 | 18 |
| 70-74 | 389 | 175 | 5 | 63 | -30 | -21 |
| \% 75+ | 540 | 668 | 20 | -122 | 4 | -10 |
| Total,10+ | 23,672 | 19,627 | 1,503 | 2,824 | 2,367 | 1,710 |
| Average Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 45,812 | 44,134 | 291 | 360 | 720 | 605 |
| +15-19 | 34,954 | 34,156 | 312 | 359 | 528 | 450 |
| - 20-24 | 30,272 | 29,184 | 448 | 518 | 584 | 490 |
| +25-29 | 27,915 | 27,458 | 529 | 521 | 600 | 499 |
| +30-34 | 28,232 | 27,591 | 620 | 713 | 573 | 466 |
| 435-39 $27.733-741488$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 24,506 | 23,803 | 589 | 496 | 402 | 340 |
| \%45-49 | 21,955 | 21,636 | 762 | 594 | 320 | 384 |
| +50-54 | 18,084 | 17,544 | 858 | 628 | 325 | 310 |
| S5-59 | 14,682 | 14,246 | 925 | 777 | 288 | 228 |
| 680-64 | 11,434 | 11,264 | 850 | 650 | 216 | 140 |
| -65-69 | 9,659 | 9,302 | 819 | 703 | 126 | 136 |
| -8754 | 7,397 | 6,834 | 794 | 568 | 76 | 64 |
| $575+$ | 10,698 | 10,389 | 1,082 | 895 | 154 | 138 |
| Motal,10+ | 313,333 | 305,259 | 9,620 | 8,570 | 5,380 | 4,732 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Arizona

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White | Negro |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 18,920 | 18,082 | 997 | 979 | 668 | 624 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 10,084 | 11,579 | 886 | 899 | 438 | 375 |
| $20-24$ | 8,572 | 8,503 | 2,879 | 1,281 | 778 | 354 |
| $25-29$ | 12,487 | 10,694 | 2,293 | 1,355 | 512 | 349 |
| $30-34$ | 12,857 | 13,587 | 1,633 | 1,347 | 176 | 230 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 14,549 | 14,426 | 1,857 | 1,074 | 142 | 274 |
| $40-44$ | 12,762 | 11,767 | 801 | 580 | 215 | 277 |
| $45-49$ | 9,938 | 9,096 | 694 | 613 | 264 | 127 |
| $50-54$ | 7,365 | 7,090 | 399 | 597 | 242 | 152 |
| $55-59$ | 5,784 | 5,973 | 467 | 401 | 185 | 154 |
| $60-64$ | 4,396 | 5,172 | 667 | 737 | 116 | 129 |
| $65-69$ | 5,437 | 4,759 | 737 | 708 | 183 | -36 |
| $70-74$ | 3,297 | 3,001 | 657 | 357 | 48 | -50 |
| $75+$ | 2,310 | 2,970 | 535 | 336 | 43 | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, 10+ | 128,758 | 126,699 | 15,502 | 11,264 | 4,010 | 3,019 |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 49,270 | 47,512 | 705 | 712 | 1,795 | 1,842 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 38,352 | 37,921 | 858 | 832 | 1,364 | 1,431 |
| $20-24$ | 32,367 | 31,347 | 1,709 | 954 | 1,328 | 1,152 |
| $25-29$ | 29,380 | 29,302 | 1,574 | 1,061 | 1,195 | 1,229 |
| $30-34$ | 30,063 | 30,645 | 1,476 | 1,444 | 1,316 | 1,238 |
| $35-39$ | 31,363 | 32,788 | 2,108 | 1,916 | 1,175 | 1,132 |
| $40-44$ | 29,502 | 30,302 | 1,844 | 1,686 | 1,142 | 1,092 |
| $45-49$ | 27,640 | 27,814 | 2,133 | 2,289 | 1,103 | 1,109 |
| $50-54$ | 23,418 | 22,788 | 2,482 | 2,552 | 1,079 | 941 |
| $55-59$ | 18,590 | 18,168 | 2,862 | 2,736 | 890 | 746 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 14,817 | 15,344 | 2,588 | 2,544 | 681 | 582 |
| $65-69$ | 13,257 | 12,807 | 2,629 | 2,365 | 666 | 416 |
| $70-74$ | 9,539 | 9,285 | 2,396 | 2,018 | 371 | 286 |
| $75+$ | 12,448 | 12,972 | 3,438 | 3,224 | 610 | 442 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tota1, 10+ | 360,006 | 358,995 | 28,802 | 26,333 | 14,715 | 13,638 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Utah

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | -916 | -523 | 453 | 469 | 22 | 64 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-1,128$ | 1,673 | 396 | 440 | 36 | 4 |
| $20-24$ | $-2,417$ | 1,003 | 496 | 715 | 101 | 78 |
| $25-29$ | 348 | $-1,849$ | 509 | 812 | 76 | 31 |
| $30-34$ | 404 | $-1,682$ | 279 | 536 | 74 | 32 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | -633 | -363 | 268 | 324 | -5 | 6 |
| $40-44$ | 232 | -56 | 169 | 313 | -17 | 67 |
| $45-49$ | 530 | 381 | 139 | 149 | -17 | 61 |
| $50-54$ | 397 | 141 | -13 | 100 | -48 | 14 |
| $55-59$ | -84 | 411 | 328 | -61 | -5 | -24 |
|  |  | 148 | -22 | 153 | 11 | -8 |
| $60-64$ | 455 | 263 | -184 | -97 | -12 | -3 |
| $65-69$ | 308 | 38 | 1 | -3 | 5 | -20 |
| $70-74$ |  |  |  | -124 | -285 | -23 |
| $75+$ |  | -222 | 2,782 | 3,650 | 207 | 15 |
| Total,10+ | $-1,793$ |  |  |  | 321 |  |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 46,839 | 44,438 | 488 | 468 | 184 | 176 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 37,057 | 36,604 | 438 | 446 | 92 | 121 |
| $20-24$ | 28,849 | 30,454 | 444 | 534 | 128 | 93 |
| $25-29$ | 27,458 | 27,512 | 460 | 605 | 78 | 86 |
| $30-34$ | 26,508 | 26,718 | 529 | 768 | 138 | 115 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 26,179 | 25,910 | 585 | 854 | 206 | 148 |
| $40-44$ | 24,163 | 23,767 | 556 | 726 | 182 | 122 |
| $45-49$ | 21,602 | 21,092 | 837 | 886 | 172 | 128 |
| $50-54$ | 18,608 | 18,086 | 1,066 | 1,190 | 104 | 81 |
| $55-59$ | 15,174 | 14,901 | 1,278 | 1,206 | 82 | 74 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 12,650 | 12,619 | 1,424 | 1,334 | 63 | 43 |
| $65-69$ | 10,090 | 10,486 | 1,616 | 1,381 | 59 | 48 |
| $70-74$ | 7,824 | 8,419 | 1,557 | 1,338 | 29 | 18 |
| $75+$ | 11,248 | 13,126 | 3,086 | 3,508 | 59 | 44 |
| Total,10+ 314,249 | 314,132 | 14,364 | 15,244 | 1,576 | 1,297 |  |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Nevada

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign- born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 3,664 | 3,614 | 38 | 125 | 268 | 338 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 2,535 | 2,315 | 32 | 131 | 252 | 213 |
| $20-24$ | 3,412 | 3,220 | 174 | 282 | 467 | 390 |
| $25-29$ | 4,327 | 4,254 | 220 | 315 | 553 | 520 |
| $30-34$ | 4,271 | 4,148 | 135 | 309 | 336 | 368 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 4,331 | 3,696 | 65 | 245 | 272 | 187 |
| $40-44$ | 3,555 | 2,983 | 220 | 208 | 199 | 164 |
| $45-49$ | 3,177 | 2,300 | 327 | 200 | 103 | 145 |
| $50-54$ | 2,194 | 1,859 | 100 | 84 | 97 | 55 |
| $55-59$ | 1,532 | 1,139 | 184 | 125 | 94 | 70 |
|  |  |  |  | -6 | 8 | 41 |
| $60-64$ | 1,101 | 430 | 320 | 127 | 74 | 42 |
| $65-69$ | 72 | 325 | -16 | -48 | 16 | 98 |
| $70-74$ | 175 | 399 | -49 | 23 | -5 | 38 |
| $75+$ |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |

Total,10+ 34,776
31,259
1,551
2,081
2,735
2,539

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 9,802 | 9,622 | 90 | 68 | 414 | 402 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 7,551 | 7,181 | 66 | 84 | 316 | 314 |
| $20-24$ | 6,716 | 6,345 | 139 | 153 | 384 | 374 |
| $25-29$ | 6,520 | 6,288 | 172 | 166 | 400 | 340 |
| $30-34$ | 7,166 | 6,948 | 241 | 263 | 407 | 356 |
| $35-39$ | 7,942 | 8,132 |  | 275 | 387 | 307 |
| $40-44$ | 8,050 | 7,878 | 312 | 307 | 334 | 284 |
| $45-49$ | 7,994 | 7,202 | 334 | 422 | 248 | 303 |
| $50-54$ | 6,769 | 5,817 | 512 | 426 | 190 | 178 |
| $55-59$ | 5,594 | 4,369 | 772 | 470 | 205 | 142 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 4,388 | 3,310 | 820 | 450 | 133 | 94 |
| $65-69$ | 3,307 | 2,546 | 858 | 453 | 89 | 73 |
| $70-74$ | 2,364 | 1,897 | 780 | 414 | 46 | 40 |
| $75+$ | 3,269 | 2,782 | 1,086 | 704 | 60 | 46 |
| Total,10+ | 87,432 | 80,317 | 6,457 | 4,767 | 3,533 | 3,238 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Washington

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| 10-14 | 2,222 | 1,286 | 1,210 | 1,243 | 116 | 249 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | 645 | 2,395 | 1,052 | 1,118 | 621 | 590 |
| 20-24 | 8,814 | 3,003 | 1,315 | 2,158 | 1,927 | 731 |
| 25-29 | -2,006 | 3,815 | 1,320 | 2,703 | 1,168 | 876 |
| 30-34 | -4,283 | 3,008 | 1,059 | 1,968 | -203 | 375 |
| 35-39 | -70 | 1,025 | 597 | 1,333 | -160 | 112 |
| 40-44 | 367 | 1,244 | 89 | 275 | -36 | 103 |
| 45-49 | 1,036 | 1,506 | 173 | -48 | -98 | 72 |
| 50-54 | 919 | 411 | -119 | -22 | 16 | 2 |
| 55-59 | 181 | -144 | -58 | -169 | -164 | 42 |
| 60-64 | 113 | 165 | 144 | 122 | 54 | 104 |
| 65-69 | -273 | 44 | -201 | -587 | 67 | -5 |
| 70-74 | -284 | 110 | 43 | -327 | 4 | 105 |
| 75+ | 926 | 1,604 | -722 | -689 | 21 | 22 |
| Total | 8,307 | 19,472 | 5,902 | 9,078 | 3,333 | ,378 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 131,083 | 126,422 | 1,508 | 1,391 | 2,140 | 2,055 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 100,150 | 97,374 | 1,362 | 1,437 | 1,416 | 1,276 |
| $20-24$ | 80,831 | 76,704 | 1,522 | 1,882 | 1,636 | 1,190 |
| $25-29$ | 80,028 | 72,112 | 1,692 | 2,276 | 1,594 | 1,135 |
| $30-34$ | 84,688 | 79,921 | 2,218 | 3,847 | 2,120 | 1,577 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 90,174 | 89,966 | 3,527 | 5,538 | 2,224 | 1,885 |
| $40-44$ | 88,070 | 85,639 | 3,956 | 5,238 | 1,988 | 1,514 |
| $45-49$ | 82,612 | 79,777 | 5,122 | 5,914 | 1,551 | 1,148 |
| $50-54$ | 70,804 | 67,524 | 6,266 | 6,134 | 1,070 | 870 |
| $55-59$ | 58,800 | 56,540 | 8,035 | 7,201 | 822 | 554 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 49,592 | 50,034 | 8,250 | 7,662 | 616 | 410 |
| $65-69$ | 42,509 | 44,320 | 10,120 | 8,222 | 456 | 300 |
| $70-74$ | 33,190 | 35,544 | 12,868 | 9,238 | 304 | 228 |
| $75+$ | 52,190 | 57,610 | 23,628 | 19,547 | 464 | 426 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+1,044,721 | $1,019,487$ | 90,074 | 85,527 | 18,401 | 14,568 |  |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## Oregon

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 1,672 | 1,809 | 427 | 464 | 144 | 134 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-2,741$ | 1,319 | 358 | 361 | 84 | 251 |
| $20-24$ | $-7,281$ | $-2,618$ | 377 | 674 | 116 | 112 |
| $25-29$ | -971 | $-1,397$ | 386 | 613 | 260 | 107 |
| $30-34$ | 674 | 135 | 301 | 486 | 144 | 250 |
| $35-39$ | -317 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-44$ | 446 | 300 | 45 | 204 | 142 | 108 |
| $45-49$ | 914 | 730 | 119 | 47 | 83 | 10 |
| $50-54$ | 442 | -79 | -57 | 137 | 85 |  |
| $55-59$ | -732 | -362 | -109 | 173 | 93 | 142 |
|  |  | -18 | 369 | -119 | 14 | -18 |
| $60-64$ | 571 | -299 | -101 | -303 | 56 | -15 |
| $65-69$ | -344 | 370 | 273 | -343 | -2 | -28 |
| $70-74$ | 734 | 1,329 | -360 | -428 | -58 | -7 |
| $75+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, 10+ | $-6,915$ |  |  | 1,649 | 1,206 | 1,182 |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 83,204 | 80,287 | 516 | 474 | 822 | 844 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $15-19$ | 63,834 | 63,654 | 532 | 465 | 506 | 539 |
| $20-24$ | 49,154 | 49,754 | 509 | 608 | 496 | 484 |
| $25-29$ | 45,443 | 47,212 | 623 | 750 | 449 | 437 |
| $30-34$ | 50,196 | 51,749 | 804 | 1,423 | 534 | 558 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 55,062 | 56,910 | 1,448 | 2,163 | 636 | 677 |
| $40-44$ | 55,220 | 55,834 | 1,644 | 1,996 | 586 | 598 |
| $45-49$ | 55,306 | 53,987 | 2,236 | 2,335 | 621 | 560 |
| $50-54$ | 48,778 | 46,556 | 2,924 | 2,738 | 441 | 422 |
| $55-59$ | 41,314 | 39,637 | 3,845 | 3,204 | 382 | 265 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 35,400 | 35,524 | 4,058 | 3,482 | 298 | 168 |
| $65-69$ | 31,709 | 31,702 | 4,652 | 3,588 | 206 | 137 |
| $70-74$ | 25,000 | 25,836 | 5,559 | 3,847 | 146 | 101 |
| $75+$ | 37,470 | 40,819 | 10,236 | 8,554 | 161 | 190 |
| Total,10+ | 678,090 | 679,461 | 39,586 | 35,627 | 6,284 | 5,980 |

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

## California

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 118,964 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 114,995 |
| $20-24$ | 140,124 |
| $25-29$ | 140,351 |
| $30-34$ | 120,101 |
| $35-39$ | 108,949 |
| $40-44$ | 76,656 |
| $45-49$ | 57,374 |
| $50-54$ | 38,921 |
| $55-59$ | 25,503 |
| $60-64$ | 18,201 |
| $65-69$ | 16,747 |
| $70-74$ | 11,583 |
| $75+$ | 14,853 |

Total,10+1,003,322
Average Population
114,257
83,590
116,334
136,496
121,956

99,472
70,692
53,758
38,083
30,562

26,413
27,561
19,355
22,731

961,270
191,616
19

196,555
12,291
11,586
19,265
21,171
14,257
22,761
9,899
5,451
3,893
3,621
2,305
2,127
1,081
784
1,336
109,067

111,315
13,107 10,777 18,097 19,794 14,776

8,975
5,642
4,781
4,453
3,821
2,628
1,813
883
1,768

| $10-14$ | 580,031 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 453,931 |
| $20-24$ | 368,802 |
| $25-29$ | 366,662 |
| $30-34$ | 409,574 |
| $35-39$ | 448,052 |
| $40-44$ | 421,173 |
| $45-49$ | 385,336 |
| $50-54$ | 321,720 |
| $55-59$ | 263,572 |
| $60-64$ | 216,431 |
| $65-69$ | 177,278 |
| $70-74$ | 136,127 |
| $75+$ | 201,752 |

Total, 10+4, 750,441

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 559,488 \\
& 428,015 \\
& 352,775 \\
& 347,737 \\
& 402,041 \\
& 461,522 \\
& 423,155 \\
& 386,370 \\
& 322,877 \\
& 267,344 \\
& 234,931 \\
& 207,856 \\
& 167,549 \\
& 282,554
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
4,844,214
$$

10,934
11,421
15,169
18,906
23,981
10,82

| 11,530 | 23,825 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15,104 | 23,361 |
| 18,948 | 23,145 |
| 26,692 | 26,120 |

32,562 $34,629 \quad 30,341$
$\begin{array}{lll}29,634 & 32,177 & 26,905\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}38,285 & 40,884 & 24,413 \\ 47,340 & 46,956 & 18,808\end{array}$
$47,340 \quad 46,956 \quad 18,808$
60,114
58,434
57,701
55,064
51,704 48,106 86,628

534,114

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Alaska

| Age in 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 2,066 | 1,913 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 5,245 | 1,123 |
| $20-24$ | 11,324 | 3,835 |
| $25-29$ | 4,188 | 5,066 |
| $30-34$ | $-2,082$ | 3,383 |
|  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 1,216 | 2,056 |
| $40-44$ | 427 | 1,185 |
| $45-49$ | 230 | 645 |
| $50-54$ | 214 | 287 |
| $55-59$ | 36 | 124 |
|  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | -146 | -60 |
| $65-69$ | -383 | -149 |
| $70-74$ | -297 | -133 |
| $75+$ | -175 | 6 |

Total, 10+ 21,863
19,281
389
1,298
3,486
1,718
Average Population

| 10-14 | 5,908 | 5,590 | 74 | 75 | 56 | 94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | 5,444 | 3,436 | 76 | 62 | 180 | 59 |
| 20-24 | 7,502 | 3,613 | 156 | 128 | 440 | 124 |
| 25-29 | 7,332 | 3,919 | 122 | 180 | 331 | 158 |
| 30-34 | 9,862 | 4,385 | 126 | 318 | 214 | 124 |
| 35-39 | 7,444 | 5,132 | 216 | 346 | 184 | 101 |
| 40-44 | 6,630 | 4,216 | 184 | 197 | 134 | 84 |
| 45-49 | 5,094 | 3,298 | 184 | 188 | 68 | 42 |
| 50-54 | 3,608 | 2,413 | 295 | 174 | 76 | 34 |
| 55-59 | 2,614 | 1,566 | 393 | 194 | 34 | 22 |
| 60-64 | 1,647 | 904 | 444 | 138 | 12 | 11 |
| 65-69 | 1,000 | 581 | 448 | 162 | 8 | 2 |
| 70-74 | 588 | 332 | 536 | 147 | - | 2 |
| 75+ | 816 | 372 | 868 | 170 | 6 | 2 |
| Total, 10+ | 65,489 | 39,757 | 4,122 | 2,479 | 1,743 | 859 |

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Hawaii

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 1,745 | 1,844 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 6,929 | 1,457 |
| $20-24$ | 15,116 | 4,677 |
| $25-29$ | 4,009 | 4,703 |
| $30-34$ | $-1,276$ | 3,033 |
|  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 920 | 1,371 |
| $40-44$ | -98 | 203 |
| $45-49$ | -362 | 171 |
| $50-54$ | -79 | 64 |
| $55-59$ | -96 | -41 |
|  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | -131 | -18 |
| $65-69$ | -98 | -16 |
| $70-74$ | 10 | 62 |
| $75+$ | 139 | 279 |

Total, $10+26,728$
17,789
113
59
341
182
79
52
-19
46
2
-5
31
-6
-19
-45

811
1,408
892
-59
-27
127
219
74
-18
-18
-17
11
1
11
7
2
316

## Average Population


7,535
7,822
10,383
7,562
9,138
8,112
7,318
5,270
3,630
2,670
1,877
1,389
949
794
74,449
7,056
4,958
5,132
4,888
5,386

6,544
5,313
4,191
3,154
2,316
1,861
1,394
954
1,109

| 70 | 50 | 148 | 128 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 46 | 62 | 278 | 80 |
| 180 | 196 | 561 | 104 |
| 106 | 248 | 386 | 136 |
| 84 | 424 | 446 | 104 |
| 140 | 344 | 262 | 88 |
| 134 | 214 | 128 | 47 |
| 220 | 180 | 94 | 20 |
| 276 | 295 | 54 | 20 |
| 339 | 308 | 34 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 296 | 284 | 24 | 14 |
| 267 | 222 | 12 | 6 |
| 230 | 242 | 8 | 9 |
| 628 | 662 | 5 | 8 |

$$
54,256
$$

3,016
3,731
2,440
768

## TABLE A

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

United States Population Abroad

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 7,864 | 8,793 | 1,949 | 518 | 213 | 477 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 80,806 | 7,161 | 2,134 | 524 | 7,382 | 348 |
| $20-24$ | 213,925 | 34,724 | 4,472 | 3,339 | 19,516 | 1,249 |
| $25-29$ | 39,438 | 39,059 | 1,274 | 3,744 | 3,723 | 1,344 |
| $30-34$ | $-46,532$ | 24,314 | -936 | 2,194 | $-4,461$ | 923 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-1,045$ | 9,473 | -317 | 593 | -151 | 530 |
| $40-44$ | $-5,426$ | 2,024 | -366 | -21 | -536 | 206 |
| $45-49$ | $-6,449$ | 14 | -407 | -96 | -494 | 88 |
| $50-54$ | $-4,124$ | -409 | -306 | -96 | -306 | 25 |
| $55-59$ | $-2,265$ | -534 | -280 | -80 | -169 | -1 |
| $60-64$ | $-1,515$ | -161 | -244 | -27 | -114 | 4 |
| $65-69$ | $-1,241$ | -158 | -244 | -25 | -178 | -6 |
| $70-74$ | -579 | -93 | -149 | -16 | -101 | -3 |
| $75+$ | -72 | 1 | -24 | -5 | -17 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, 10+ 272,785 | 124,208 | 6,556 | 10,546 | 24,307 | 5,187 |  |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 19,448 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 48,102 |
| $20-24$ | 110,072 |
| $25-29$ | 74,116 |
| $30-34$ | 90,394 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 52,126 |
| $40-44$ | 36,937 |
| $45-49$ | 18,750 |
| $50-54$ | 10,248 |
| $55-59$ | 5,184 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 3,206 |
| $65-69$ | 1,462 |
| $70-74$ | 584 |
| $75+$ | 298 |

Total,10+470,927
17,679
10,399
19,702
21,312
19,990
20,916
11,989
6,336
3,290
1,618

773
370
233
262
134,869
17,230
14,010
41,458
4,109

TABLE A
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OE NATIVE WHITES, EOREIGN-BORN WHITES, AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, FOR THE POPULATION ABROAD, AND FOR PUERTO RICO, 1950-1960.

Puerto Rico: Native White

| Age in <br> 1960 | Net Migration |  | Average Population |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $10-14$ | $-25,572$ | $-25,823$ | 173,722 | 170,093 |
| $15-19$ | $-35,803$ | $-32,396$ | 141,892 | 140,601 |
| $20-24$ | $-52,372$ | $-38,526$ | 109,234 | 111,962 |
| $25-29$ | $-45,001$ | $-38,086$ | 85,443 | 92,768 |
| $30-34$ | $-32,679$ | $-34,856$ | 74,903 | 84,926 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-14,448$ | $-12,750$ | 68,966 | 75,362 |
| $40-44$ | $-12,784$ | $-10,381$ | 59,835 | 59,710 |
| $45-49$ | $-10,519$ | $-11,450$ | 60,468 | 58,880 |
| $50-54$ | $-4,414$ | $-5,783$ | 43,792 | 39,430 |
| $55-59$ | $-1,838$ | $-2,644$ | 37,150 | 33,658 |
| $60-64$ | $-1,321$ | $-2,473$ | 32,829 | 31,824 |
| $65-69$ | 4,496 | 3,541 | 24,662 | 22,652 |
| $70-74$ | $-2,226$ | $-4,671$ | 21,102 | 19,203 |
| $75+$ | 1,950 | 639 | 30,082 | 34,007 |
| Total, 10+ | $-232,531$ | $-215,659$ | 964,080 | 975,076 |

Source: Estimates were derived by means of census survival ratios based upon the population of the United States including Puerto Rico and the United States population abroad. For a detailed account of the pro-cedures followed, see Ann Ratner Miller, Net Intercensal Migration to Large Urban Areas, 1930-1940, 1940-1950, 1950-1960, Analytical and Technical Reports, Number 4. Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1964, pp. 47-59.

ABLE A-1
NET MIGRATION OF THE WHITE AN', NEGRO POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN 1960, BY NATIVITY OE WHA LES AND BY RACE, FOR STATES, 1950-1960.

In thousands )
$\left.\begin{array}{l|r|r|r|r}\hline & & \text { Native White } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Foreign-born } \\ \text { White }\end{array} & \text { Negro }\end{array}\right]$ Total

TABLE A-1
NET MIGRATION OF THE WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN 1960, BY NATIVITY OF WHITES AND BY RACE, FOR STATES, 1950-1960.
( In thousands )

|  | Native White | Foreign-born White | Negro | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West South Central |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | -243.8 | -0.6 | -108.6 | -353.0 |
| Louisiana | 23.0 | 4.3 | -66.2 | -39.0 |
| Oklahoma | -179.5 | 2.2 | -18.8 | -196.0 |
| Texas | 155.3 | 38.7 | -19.6 | 174.5 |
| Mountain |  |  |  |  |
| Montana | -23.5 | -1.8 | 0.1 | -25.3 |
| Idaho | -39.5 | ... | 0.1 | -39.3 |
| Wyoming | -17.0 | -0.8 | -0.8 | -18.7 |
| Colorado | 110.1 | 11.3 | 11.0 | 132.4 |
| New Mexico | 43.3 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 51.7 |
| Arizona | 255.5 | 26.8 | 7.0 | 289.3 |
| Utah | -2.0 | 6.4 | 0.5 | 4.9 |
| Nevada | 66.0 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 74.9 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |
| Washington | 27.8 | 15.0 | 6.7 | 49.5 |
| Oregon | -4.5 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 1.2 |
| California | 1964.6 | 388.2 | 220.4 | 2573.1 |
| Alaska | 41.1 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 48.0 |
| Hawaii | 44.5 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 47.9 |
| UNITED StATES | 51.2 | 1161.5 | -29.5 | 1183.2 |
| Conterminous Area | -34.5 | 1157.6 | -35.9 | 1087.2 |
| Population Abroad | 397.0 | 17.1 | 29.5 | 443.6 |
| Puerto Rico | -448.2 |  |  | -448.2 |
| EXPANDED AREA | - | 1178.6 | - | 1178.6 |
| Sum of Gains | 5008.7 | 1201.4 | 1363.7 | 6517.7 |
| Sum of Losses | -5008.7 | -22.8 | -1363.7 | -5339.1 |

Source: Computed from Appendix Table A.

TABLE A-2
NET MIGRATION OF CHILDREN UNDER 10 YEARS OF AGE IN 1960, BY COLOR, FOR STATES, 1950-1960.
( In thousands )

| State | White | Nonwhite |  | State | White |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | Nonwhite

Source: For each state, age-sex-color-specific survival ratios were applied to births for 1950-1955 and 1955-1960 and the results subtracted from the enumerated population 5-9 and 0-4 in 1960. Survival ratios and statistics of births, distributed by state of residence and corrected for underenumeration, were provided by the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE A-3
RATES OF NET MIGRATION OF NATIVE WHITES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, SELECTED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Age in 1960 | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rhode Island |  | New York |  | New Jersey |  |
| 10-14 | -77 | -65 | -34 | -30 | 74 | 80 |
| 15-19 | 97 | -12 | -76 | -8 | 25 | 34 |
| 20-24 | 202 | -5 | -93 | 31 | 27 | 59 |
| 25-29 | -194 | -115 | 30 | 8 | 86 | 152 |
| 30-34 | -259 | -101 | 10 | -39 | 162 | 144 |
| 35-39 | -123 | -80 | -43 | -56 | 113 | 89 |
| 40-44 | -112 | -50 | -50 | -53 | 74 | 58 |
| 45-49 | -58 | -53 | -47 | -53 | 52 | 40 |
| 50-54 | -37 | -38 | -35 | -43 | 32 | 19 |
| 55-59 | -7 | -23 | -32 | -34 | 26 | 3 |
| 60-64 | -40 | -22 | -44 | -56 | -23 | -8 |
| 65-69 | -57 | -42 | -69 | -41 | -56 | -25 |
| 70-74 | -55 | -8 | -93 | -44 | -48 | -11 |
| 75+ | -34 | -12 | -56 | -44 | -37 | -17 |
| Total, 10+ | -59 | -50 | -41 | -32 | 55 | 56 |
|  | Pennsylvania |  | Ohio |  | Illinois |  |
| 10-14 | -58 | -61 | 24 | 27 | -33 | -33 |
| 15-19 | -107 | -51 | -21 | 52 | -35 | -16 |
| 20-24 | -253 | -130 | -31 | 100 | -74 | 30 |
| 25-29 | -145 | -158 | 132 | 103 | 23 | 24 |
| 30-34 | -76 | -104 | 114 | 42 | 8 | -35 |
| 35-39 | -81 | -73 | 35 | 11 | -43 | -55 |
| 40-44 | -59 | -53 | 17 | 7 | -40 | -43 |
| 45-49 | -46 | -42 | 16 | 6 | -25 | -35 |
| 50-54 | -43 | -43 | 6 | -5 | -26 | -38 |
| 55-59 | -43 | -45 | -10 | -21 | -28 | -44 |
| 60-64 | -42 | -52 | -16 | -38 | -44 | -66 |
| 65-69 | -65 | -67 | -62 | -61 | -92 | -90 |
| 70-74 | -69 | -65 | -59 | -53 | -88 | - 71 |
| $75+$ | -52 | -58 | -34 | -37 | -39 | -38 |
| Total, 10+ | -84 | -72 | 16 | 18 | -34 | -33 |

TABLE A-3
RATES OF NET MIGRATION OF NATIVE WHITES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AgE And SEX, SELECTED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Age in 1960 | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wisconsin |  | Minnesota |  | Iowa |  |
| 10-14 | -35 | -38 | -46 | -47 | -101 | -102 |
| 15-19 | -74 | -32 | -96 | -22 | -124 | -83 |
| 20-24 | -188 | -93 | -189 | -48 | -272 | -175 |
| 25-29 | -66 | -106 | -67 | -102 | -200 | -197 |
| 30-34 | -5 | -56 | -21 | -88 | -141 | -160 |
| 35-39 | -40 | -38 | -47 | -52 | -. 134 | -117 |
| 40-44 | -24 | -21 | -37 | -27 | -87 | -79 |
| 45-49 | -14 | -12 | -17 | -17 | -61 | -56 |
| 50-54 | -11 | -10 | -8 | -12 | -46 | -44 |
| 55-59 | -11 | -24 | -13 | -32 | -38 | -44 |
| 60-64 | 6 | -27 | -6 | -26 | -12 | -35 |
| 65-69 | -19 | -51 | -9 | -44 | -31 | -54 |
| 70-74 | -15 | -49 | -4 | -32 | --19 | -41 |
| 75+ | -2 | -2 | 27 | 25 | $-15$ | $\cdots 12$ |
| Total, $10+$ | -40 | -41 | -46 | -40 | -100 | -90 |
|  | Virginia |  | West Virginia |  | South Carolina |  |
| 10-14 | 3 | 8 | -18.3 | -185 | -4 | -8 |
| 15-19 | 102 | 40 | -264 | -240 | 140 | -3 |
| 20-24 | 259 | 94 | -577 | -. 477 | 173 | - 26 |
| 25-29 | -11 | 50 | -495 | -455 | --55 | -49 |
| 30-34 | -113 | 26 | -301 | -300 | - 38 | -33 |
| 35-39 | -5 | 30 | -264 | -225 | $-1.1$ | -3 |
| 40-44 | -5 | 1.4 | -202 | - 166 | 8 | -4 |
| 45-49 | -14 | 10 | -163 | -131 | --12 | -12 |
| 50-54 | -9 | 9 | -131 | -114 | -1.6 | -4 |
| 55-59 | 5 | 10 | -112 | -98 | -21. | 5 |
| 60-64 | -5 | 15 | -60 | -74 | -32 | 4 |
| 65-69 | -6 | 20 | -44 | -92 | -25 | 7 |
| 70-74 | 4 | 24 | -8 | -53 | -28 | -3 |
| 75+ | -4 | 8 | -5 | -48 | -46 | -6 |
| Total, 10+ | 20 | 27 | $-232$ | --216 | 11 | $-12$ |

TABLE A-3
RATES OF NET MIGRATION OF NATIVE WHITES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, SELECTED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Age in 1960 | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Florida |  | Kentucky |  | Tenne'ssee |  |
| 10-14 | 436 | 436 | -125 | -131 | -76 | -83 |
| 15-19 | 395 | 399 | -123 | -175 | -69 | -81 |
| 20-24 | 455 | 456 | -276 | -323 | -221 | -155 |
| 25-29 | 511 | 523 | -374 | -320 | -216 | -174 |
| 30-34 | 446 | 487 | -210 | -189 | -129 | -130 |
| 35-39 | 458 | 456 | -151 | -129 | -99 | -91 |
| 40-44 | 439 | 417 | -113 | -91 | -70 | -61 |
| 45-49 | 407 | 394 | -94 | -77 | -58. | -47 |
| 50-54 | 384 | 416 | -72 | -64 | -36 | -35 |
| 55-59 | 409 | 483 | -46 | -56 | -18 | -23 |
| 60-64 | 500 | 581 | -31 | -45 | -6 | -9 |
| 65-69 | 707 | 632 | 3 | -24 | 14 | 5 |
| 70-74 | 658 | 515 | 34 | -19 | 47 | 18 |
| $75+$ | 317 | 258 | -8 | -44 | 1 | -10 |
| Total, 10+ | 454 | 454 | -135 | -138 | -83 | -75 |
|  | Arkansas |  | Arizona |  | California |  |
| 10-14 | -197 | -211 | 384 | 381 | 205 | 204 |
| 15-19 | -261 | -262 | 263 | 305 | 253 | 195 |
| 20-24 | -496 | -469 | 265 | 271 | 380 | 330 |
| 25-29 | -478 | -458 | 425 | 365 | 383 | 393 |
| 30-34 | -266 | -260 | 428 | 443 | 293 | 303 |
| 35-39 | -201 | -187 | 464 | 440 | 243 | 216 |
| 40-44 | -145 | -139 | 433 | 388 | 182 | 167 |
| 45-49 | -121 | -115 | 360 | 327 | 149 | 139 |
| 50-54 | -96 | -80 | 315 | 311 | 121 | 118 |
| 55-59 | -59 | -60 | 311 | 329 | 97 | 114 |
| 60-64 | -26 | -27 | 297 | 337 | . 84 | 112 |
| 65-69 | 32 | -22 | 410 | 372 | 94 | 133 |
| 70-74 | 66 | -4 | 346 | 323 | 85 | 116 |
| $75+$ | 18 | -5 | 186 | 229 | 74 | 80 |
| Total, 10+ | $-188$ | -189 | 358 | 353 | 211 | 198 |

Source: Appendix Table A.

TABLE A-4
RATES OF NET MIGRATION OF NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR STATES WITH NET GAINS OR LOSSES OF MORE THAN 100,000, 1950-1960.

| Age in 1960 | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New York |  | Ohio |  | Illinois |  |
| 10-14 | 179 | 211 | 212 | 221 | 253 | 255 |
| 15-19 | 262 | 362 | 189 | 249 | 225 | 306 |
| 20-24 | 514 | 700 | 296 | 377 | 428 | 567 |
| 25-29 | 651 | 657 | 463 | 465 | 609 | 615 |
| 30-34 | 436 | 315 | 340 | 301 | 379 | 316 |
| 35-39 | 219 | 153 | 204 | 165 | 191 | 148 |
| 40-44 | 137 | 100 | 134 | 124 | 124 | 93 |
| 45-49 | 80 | 74 | 132 | 131 | 101 | 77 |
| 50-54 | 37 | 83 | 105 | 92 | 95 | 71 |
| 55-59 | 49 | 88 | 81 | 63 | 95 | 85 |
| 60-64 | 73 | 94 | 77 | 80 | 72 | 82 |
| 65-69 | 14 | -23 | -49 | -13 | -36 | -32 |
| 70-74 | 2 | -2 | -13 | 1 | -22 | -11 |
| 75 + | 124 | 136 | 87 | 106 | 89 | 84 |
| Total, 10+ | 237 | 248 | 191 | 203 | 224 | 232 |
|  | Michigan |  | North Carolina |  | South Carolina |  |
| 10-14 | 263 | 266 | -98 | -111 | -150 | -156 |
| 15-19 | 199 | 273 | -113 | -147 | -190 | -245 |
| 20-24 | 220 | 408 | -323 | -410 | -51.0 | -556 |
| 25-29 | 539 | 548 | -481 | -479 | -634 | -623 |
| 30-34 | 392 | 358 | -389 | -334 | -470 | -431 |
| 35-39 | 187 | 180 | -232 | -174 | -279 | -220 |
| 40-44 | 134 | 125 | -140 | -103 | -138 | -102 |
| 45-49 | 127 | 129 | -95 | -77 | -150 | -132 |
| 50-54 | 93 | 122 | -80 | -71 | -132 | -110 |
| 55-59 | 98 | 129 | -28 | -38 | -111 | -113 |
| 60-64 | 97 | 146 | -107 | -67 | -108 | -72 |
| 65-69 | 27 | 83 | -38 | -47 | 17 | 46 |
| 70-74 | 83 | 159 | -62 | -71 | -55 | -38 |
| $75 \div$ | 168 | 176 | -56 | -51 | -129 | -137 |
| Total, 10+ | 211 | 246 | -185 | -186 | -259 | -256 |

TABLE A-4
RATES OF NET MIGRATION OF NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR STATES WITH NET GAINS OR LOSSES OF MORE THAN 100,000, 1950-1960.

| Age in 1960 | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Georgia |  | Alabama |  | Mississippi |  |
| 10-14 | -141 | -149 | -175 | -192 | -277 | -304 |
| 15-19 | -150 | -170 | -204 | -203 | -285 | -306 |
| 20-24 | -311 | -328 | -452 | -445 | -586 | -599 |
| 25-29 | -416 | -393 | -588 | -552 | -799 | -729 |
| 30-34 | -297 | -295 | -440 | -382 | -661 | -531 |
| 35-39 | -213 | -188 | -288 | -229 | -456 | -352 |
| 40-44 | -118 | -108 | -177 | -148 | -299 | -228 |
| 45-49 | -130 | -102 | -134 | -137 | -193 | -192 |
| 50-54 | -86 | -80 | -96 | -90 | -157 | -183 |
| 55-59 | -87 | -86 | -76 | -78 | -126 | -137 |
| 60-64 | -99 | -67 | -89 | -137 | -99 | -114 |
| 65-69 | -11 | 46 | 13 | 48 | 30 | 4 |
| 70-74 | 4 | 35 | 44 | 50 | 3 | -32 |
| 75+ | -102 | -83 | -65 | -68 | -55 | -78 |
| Total, 10+ | -181 | -172 | -233 | -223 | -329 | -322 |
|  | Arkansas |  | California |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -273 | -303 | 359 | 381 |  |  |
| 15-19 | -301 | -326 | 486 | 446 |  |  |
| 20-24 | -628 | -635 | 825 | 779 |  |  |
| 25-29 | -785 | -751 | 915 | 840 |  |  |
| 30-34 | -617 | -511 | 546 | 531 |  |  |
| 35-39 | -413 | -327 | 326 | 284 |  |  |
| 40-44 | -271 | -233 | 203 | 203 |  |  |
| 45-49 | -181 | -166 | 159 | 191 |  |  |
| 50-54 | -129 | -162 | 193 | 242 |  |  |
| 55-59 | -135 | -128 | 155 | 270 |  |  |
| 4 60-64 | -73 | -116 | 212 | 270 |  |  |
| $65-69$ | -34 | -80 | 155 | 237 |  |  |
| 70-74 | 7 | -61 | 170 | 169 |  |  |
| 75+ | -34 | -72 | 212 | 221 |  |  |
| Total, 10+ | -305 | -312 | 398 | 396 |  |  |

Source: Appendix Table A.

TABLE B
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULAATION OF
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHTTES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

## New England

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-11,945$ | $-11,271$ | 6,558 | 6,065 | 2,431 | 2,623 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-9,400$ | 197 | 5,549 | 5,869 | 2,166 | 2,736 |
| $20-24$ | $-9,336$ | $-6,217$ | 7,078 | 10,785 | 4,905 | 5,021 |
| $25-29$ | $-16,158$ | $-25,000$ | 7,292 | 11,119 | 5,375 | 4,873 |
| $30-34$ | $-16,873$ | $-18,001$ | 7,038 | 8,763 | 3,411 | 3,460 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-12,112$ | $-10,956$ | 6,253 | 6,295 | 1,950 | 2,215 |
| $40-44$ | $-8,526$ | $-7,547$ | 4,705 | 4,095 | 1,125 | 1,167 |
| $45-49$ | $-5,093$ | $-4,974$ | 4,572 | 2,585 | 809 | 1,117 |
| $50-54$ | $-3,808$ | $-4,984$ | 2,409 | 1,268 | 473 | 796 |
| $55-59$ | $-3,433$ | $-3,930$ | 169 | $-2,283$ | 136 | 221 |
|  |  | $-3,995$ | $-2,185$ | $-4,403$ | 256 | 312 |
| $60-64$ | $-4,009$ | $-3,997$ | $-6,536$ | $-7,945$ | -168 | -156 |
| $65-69$ | $-4,751$ | $-4,9170$ | $-4,713$ | $-6,400$ | 40 | 3 |
| $70-74$ | $-4,302$ | $-2,190$ | $-8,789$ | $-16,816$ | 258 | 218 |
| $75+$ | $-5,631$ | $-5,738$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ $-115,377$ | $-109,523$ | 29,400 | 18,997 | 23,168 | 24,606 |  |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 455,336 | 435,634 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 365,224 | 355,805 |
| $20-24$ | 287,743 | $282,, 815$ |
| $25-29$ | 287,992 | 290,810 |
| $30-34$ | 319,748 | 326,386 |
|  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 332,419 | 346,071 |
| $40-44$ | 321,065 | 336,782 |
| $45-49$ | 290,584 | 303,377 |
| $50-54$ | 245,003 | 257,600 |
| $55-59$ | 199,668 | 215,369 |
|  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 168,381 | 190,175 |
| $65-69$ | 134,229 | 157,294 |
| $70-74$ | 95,641 | 120,114 |
| $75+$ | 155,978 | 223,834 |

Total,10+3,659,011

5,414
5,397
5,410
8,000
10,265
16,002
23,185
18,337
18,332
28,540
42,842
58,114
68,662
78,865
74,994
118,673
543,186
76,029

75,74
142,603
617,641

83,034 2,637 2,704

9,398
6,997
7,640
7,505
8,164 8,179
8,368 8,393
6,593 6,813
5,436 5,940
4,212 4,675
3,727 3,943
9,295
7,182
7,650
7,446

1,989 2,174
3,001 3,592
79,077 81,348

## TABLE B

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

## Middle Atlantic

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-32,517$ | $-29,003$ | 26,519 | 23,852 | 18,494 | 20,867 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-74,135$ | $-17,693$ | 18,846 | 20,588 | 15,870 | 23,501 |
| $20-24$ | $-110,000$ | $-20,971$ | 24,979 | 38,186 | 27,393 | 46,199 |
| $25-29$ | $-19,899$ | $-25,512$ | 30,984 | 41,796 | 38,959 | 47,460 |
| $30-34$ | 4,694 | $-32,363$ | 35,335 | 35,822 | 31,316 | 30,142 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-29,605$ | $-40,164$ | 29,963 | 29,456 | 18,706 | 16,708 |
| $40-44$ | $-30,631$ | $-35,882$ | 19,850 | 17,876 | 10,505 | 9,564 |
| $45-49$ | $-27,189$ | $-32,907$ | 20,305 | 14,426 | 6,584 | 7,619 |
| $50-54$ | $-21,403$ | $-27,591$ | 8,814 | 4,256 | 2,898 | 5,455 |
| $55-59$ | $-17,078$ | $-22,004$ | -445 | $-8,341$ | 2,827 | 4,368 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | $-21,828$ | $-27,651$ | $-12,550$ | $-12,116$ | 2,421 | 3,388 |
| $65-69$ | $-27,779$ | $-23,414$ | $-17,437$ | $-19,994$ | 31 | $-1,102$ |
| $70-74$ | $-23,327$ | $-17,513$ | $-19,843$ | $-25,098$ | -134 | -169 |
| $75+$ | $-23,709$ | $-28,929$ | $-22,887$ | $-46,476$ | 2,493 | 4,028 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total,10+ $-454,406$ | $-381,597$ | 142,433 | 114,233 | 178,363 | 218,028 |  |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | $1,340,914$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $1,055,542$ |
| $20-24$ | 828,930 |
| $25-29$ | 853,028 |
| $30-34$ | 968,998 |
| $35-39$ | $1,028,239$ |
| $40-44$ | $1,006,531$ |
| $45-49$ | 940,195 |
| $50-54$ | 810,802 |
| $55-59$ | 654,300 |
| $60-64$ | 546,189 |
| $65-69$ | 424,910 |
| $70-74$ | 306,201 |
| $75+$ | 459,215 |


| $1,284,777$ | 20,807 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $1,046,889$ | 15,826 |
| 850,635 | 21,544 |
| 881,807 | 30,532 |
| $1,028,993$ | 45,104 |
|  |  |
| $1,101,904$ | 68,905 |
| $1,081,682$ | 59,478 |
| 991,386 | 101,377 |
| 841,013 | 158,364 |
| 687,150 | 215,547 |
|  |  |
| 594,211 | 243,822 |
| 486,846 | 254,999 |
| 372,066 | 231,583 |
| 636,875 | 319,460 |


| 20,740 | 109,254 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 17,708 | 80,798 |
| 28,569 | 75,717 |
| 36,468 | 77,910 |
| 59,277 | 87,125 |
|  |  |
| 81,974 | 96,528 |
| 68,692 | 81,894 |
| 117,861 | 76,533 |
| 168,494 | 65,871 |
| 213,750 | 58,362 |
| 244,198 | 46,104 |
| 242,265 | 31,641 |
| 209,926 | 20,727 |
| 328,324 | 26,514 |

109,792
86,678
88,451
91,132
107,846
113,056
98,688
90,972
73,982
62,654
47,459
33,305
23,418
33,685

Total,10+11,223,994 11,886,234 1,787,348 1,838,246 934,978 1,061,118

TABLE B
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE FOPULATION OF
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OID AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

East North Central

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-7,997$ | $-6,814$ | 17,459 | 16,989 | 29,338 | 30,389 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-45,019$ | 9,364 | 11,616 | 12,540 | 17,686 | 24,803 |
| $20-24$ | $-80,529$ | 25,350 | 14,913 | 21,481 | 23,885 | 38,813 |
| $25-29$ | 42,402 | 27,861 | 19,652 | 25,840 | 41,248 | 47,731 |
| $30-34$ | 46,937 | $-2,664$ | 22,058 | 23,822 | 33,135 | 33,405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-8,497$ | $-21,604$ | 20,085 | 19,013 | 18,926 | 17,645 |
| $40-44$ | $-11,048$ | $-17,191$ | 13,355 | 9,720 | 11,191 | 10,567 |
| $45-49$ | $-4,597$ | $-9,112$ | 13,046 | 8,797 | 9,502 | 9,196 |
| $50-54$ | $-7,446$ | $-13,843$ | 6,895 | 3,350 | 6,663 | 6,377 |
| $55-59$ | $-11,528$ | $-20,998$ | 1,066 | $-4,753$ | 5,457 | 4,908 |
| $60-64$ | $-13,210$ | $-27,611$ | $-6,989$ | $-5,757$ | 3,763 | 4,129 |
| $65-69$ | $-32,545$ | $-38,143$ | $-14,930$ | $-14,048$ | -795 | 6 |
| $70-74$ | $-23,051$ | $-24,371$ | $-15,699$ | $-13,387$ | 135 | 717 |
| $75+$ | $-18,193$ | $-21,745$ | $-19,606$ | $-26,453$ | 3,018 | 3,530 |
| Total,10+ $-174,321$ | $-141,521$ | 82,921 | 77,154 | 203,152 | 232,216 |  |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | $1,525,542$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $1,184,099$ |
| $20-24$ | 950,251 |
| $25-29$ | 932,288 |
| $30-34$ | $1,034,895$ |
| $35-39$ | $1,088,492$ |
| $40-44$ | $1,034,532$ |
| $45-49$ | 976,887 |
| $50-54$ | 846,346 |
| $55-59$ | 724,298 |
| $60-64$ | 611,278 |
| $65-69$ | 520,345 |
| $70-74$ | 396,948 |
| $75+$ | 622,014 |

Total, 10+12,448,215 12,830,593

1,016,935
14,265
11,044
12,516
17,321
25,793
39,795
33,187
52,866
79,154
109,858
124,599
564,062
446,557
762,980

| 14,448 | 116,451 | 117,032 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11,298 | 82,414 | 87,069 |
| 15,408 | 71,433 | 83,136 |
| 19,930 | 74,967 | 86,196 |
| 33,499 | 88,551 | 100,689 |
|  |  |  |
| 47,576 | 95,478 | 103,423 |
| 35,955 | 82,096 | 88,909 |
| 55,233 | 77,358 | 80,838 |
| 78,265 | 64,941 | 65,456 |
| 101,844 | 59,614 | 56,506 |
|  |  |  |
| 114,497 | 46,635 | 43,188 |
| 121,737 | 34,211 | 32,391 |
| 112,332 | 22,222 | 21,948 |
| 202,324 | 29,211 | 33,555 |

TABLE B
NET MIGRAIION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OE
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

West North Central

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| 10-14 | -53,603 | -51,920 | 1,835 | 1,884 | 2,621 | 2,956 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -50,730 | -32,033 | 1,653 | 1,699 | 1,748 | 2,142 |
| 20-24 | -77,649 | -50,318 | 2,304 | 4,295 | 2,813 | 3,220 |
| 25-29 | -59,179 | -69,710 | 2,286 | 4,820 | 3,603 | 3,289 |
| 30-34 | -39,850 | -55,821 | 1,481 | 2,906 | 2,470 | 1,992 |
| 35-39 | -43,353 | -39,212 | 358 | 826 | 538 | 929 |
| 40-44 | -27,750 | -24,942 | 113 | 25 | 230 | 369 |
| 45-49 | -18,873 | -18,058 | -24 | 30 | 427 | 370 |
| 50-54 | -13,390 | -13,220 | 327 | -211 | -10 | -22 |
| 55-59 | -8,830 | -13,428 | -1,010 | -1,079 | -169 | -93 |
| 60-64 | -3,556 | -10,124 | -671 | -936 | 436 | 285 |
| 65-69 | -5,714 | -13,017 | -1,528 | -2,928 | -572 | -380 |
| 70-74 | -1,143 | -7,521 | -1,464 | -1,762 | 19 | -243 |
| 75+ | -3 | -1,173 | -8,833 | -11,421 | 615 | 617 |
| Total,10+ | $-403,623$ | -400,497 | -3,173 | -1,852 | 14,769 | 15,431 |
| Average Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 710,897 | 680,584 | 2,674 | 2,777 | 23,907 | 24,035 |
| 15-19 | 564,601 | 553,856 | 2,285 | 2,360 | 18,558 | 18,631 |
| 20-24 | 461,007 | 462,364 | 2,537 | 3,365 | 16,520 | 17,216 |
| 25-29 | 444,484 | 450,134 | 2,635 | 4,121 | 15,386 | 17,329 |
| 30-34 | 461,393 | 469,266 | 3,852 | 7,145 | 15,830 | 18,572 |
| 35-39 | 476,857 | 478,243 | 5,625 | 8,947 | 16,468 | 18,580 |
| 40-44 | 447,778 | 458,858 | 4,876 | 6,167 | 14,441 | 16,785 |
| 45-49 | 435,701 | 441,278 | 8,018 | 8,825 | 14,822 | 16,653 |
| 50-54 | 402,964 | 409,075 | 13,336 | 12,102 | 13,654 | 14,792 |
| 55-59 | 358,942 | 371,062 | 19,798 | 17,608 | 12,667 | 13,442 |
| 60-64 | 327,117 | 340,780 | 22,925 | 20,129 | 11,129 | 11,197 |
| 65-69 | 289,185 | 307,881 | 31,041 | 24,130 | 9,555 | 9,288 |
| 70-74 | 229,350 | 249,780 | 37,773 | 29,081 | 7,141 | 6,796 |
| 75+ | 370,631 | 432,043 | 89,616 | 81,084 | 11,713 | 12,236 |
| Total,10+ | ,980,907 | 6,105,204 | 246,991 | 227,841 | 201,791 | 215,552 |

TABLE B
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

## South Atlantic

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 36,414 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 55,375 |
| $20-24$ | 58,565 |
| $25-29$ | 9,122 |
| $30-34$ | 3,564 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 22,564 |
| $40-44$ | 27,079 |
| $45-49$ | 21,436 |
| $50-54$ | 20,772 |
| $55-59$ | 20,868 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 23,706 |
| $65-69$ | 38,691 |
| $70-74$ | 29,176 |
| $75+$ | 17,172 |

Total,10+ 384,504
35,472
31,876
24,368
21,466
25,631
30,904
28,986
27,946
30,211
32,603
38,883
39,726
25,950
15,790

409,812
4,277
3,350
5,678
6,311
5,964
5,752
4,596
4,455
4,919
5,061

6,417
12,386
11,329
7,132
87,627

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
4,289 & -20,415 & -21,850 \\
4,392 & -20,960 & -24,915 \\
10,554 & -38,164 & -47,519 \\
12,989 & -43,330 & -51,277 \\
11,692 & -31,594 & -36,271 \\
7,925 & -20,228 & -19,481 \\
5,145 & -10,899 & -9,800 \\
5,005 & -8,705 & -8,354 \\
5,344 & -6,088 & -6,561 \\
7,011 & -3,931 & -5,644 \\
9,570 & -6,292 & -5,184 \\
10,931 & -1,493 & -1,502 \\
6,552 & -2,175 & -2,080 \\
3,986 & -4,770 & -5,077 \\
105,385 & -219,044 & -245,515
\end{array}
$$

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 937,867 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 780,097 |
| $20-24$ | 658,578 |
| $25-29$ | 623,664 |
| $30-34$ | 666,720 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 683,631 |
| $40-44$ | 633,065 |
| $45-49$ | 584,088 |
| $50-54$ | 503,943 |
| $55-59$ | 414,169 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 345,374 |
| $65-69$ | 292,661 |
| $70-74$ | 221,584 |
| $75+$ | 346,511 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 901,324 \\
& 744,459 \\
& 630,390 \\
& 614,093 \\
& 665,022
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5,587 \\
& 4,268 \\
& 5,000 \\
& 5,823 \\
& 7,444
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5,369 \\
& 4,555
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
335,656
$$

$$
335,481
$$

$$
705,838
$$

$$
643,783
$$

$$
595,539
$$

$$
519,862
$$

$$
439,735
$$

$$
380,040
$$

326,632

$$
255,598
$$

$$
432,506
$$

$$
7,854,821
$$

209,546
221,267 2,251,323 2,407,111

## TABLE B

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

## East South Central

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White | Negro |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| 10-14 | -45,681 | -46,981 | -189 | 165 | -32,788 | -35,439 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -38,929 | -47,745 | 161 | 261 | -27,024 | -28,686 |
| 20-24 | -84,474 | -77,685 | 963 | 1,767 | -45,701 | -47,554 |
| 25-29 | -86,182 | -75,557 | 550 | 1,778 | -51,995 | -52,946 |
| 30-34 | -45,747 | -47,270 | -463 | 841 | -34,945 | -35,741 |
| 35-39 | -33,960 | -32,031 | -344 | 49 | -22,326 | -20,545 |
| 40-44 | -22,961 | -20,212 | 62 | -164 | -13,189 | -12,696 |
| 45-49 | -18,481 | -16,650 | -8 | -320 | -9,995 | -11,421 |
| 50-54 | -12,756 | -11,323 | 112 | -214 | -6,567 | -8,308 |
| 55-59 | -6,758 | -7,352 | -210 | -45 | -4,543 | -5,772 |
| 60-64 | -3,355 | -3,924 | -159 | -174 | -3,907 | -5,768 |
| 65-69 | 1,414 | 66 | -71. | -2 | 247 | -183 |
| 70-74 | 4,382 | 929 | -115 | -135 | 266 | -70 |
| 75+ | -144 | -4,263 | -289 | -341 | -2,837 | -4,206 |
| Total, | -393,632 | -389,998 | - | 3,466 | -255,304 | $-269,335$ |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 499,069 | 480,998 | 1,000 | 1,017 | 172,069 | 170,654 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 423,629 | 405,579 | 742 | 715 | 137,097 | 137,028 |
| $20-24$ | 349,310 | 343,965 | 1,051 | 1,241 | 106,544 | 111,263 |
| $25-29$ | 322,225 | 326,908 | 939 | 1,595 | 89,254 | 99,676 |
| $30-34$ | 315,700 | 331,222 | 1,298 | 2,918 | 76,093 | 94,534 |
| $35-39$ | 321,092 | 334,466 | 1,284 | 2,867 | 72,312 | 87,492 |
| $40-44$ | 295,341 | 305,641 | 1,052 | 1,376 | 66,739 | 80,866 |
| $45-49$ | 288,125 | 295,031 | 1,296 | 1,408 | 72,870 | 86,587 |
| $50-54$ | 259,051 | 264,505 | 1,669 | 1,479 | 66,350 | 74,782 |
| $55-59$ | 218,240 | 227,464 | 2,081 | 1,878 | 60,407 | 66,749 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 180,714 | 192,803 | 2,515 | 1,804 | 49,110 | 54,566 |
| $65-69$ | 156,532 | 168,267 | 2,490 | 1,870 | 43,887 | 45,786 |
| $70-74$ | 124,318 | 136,451 | 2,353 | 1,795 | 31,579 | 32,964 |
| $75+$ | 211,810 | 243,791 | 4,491 | 3,990 | 61,800 | 66,597 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tota1,10+3,965,156 | $4,057,091$ | 24,261 | 25,953 | $1,106,1111,209,544$ |  |  |

Table B
NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

West South Central

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | $-20,389$ | $-20,145$ | 3,967 | 3,703 | $-14,115$ | $-15,516$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-18,724$ | $-24,156$ | 2,533 | 3,407 | $-11,395$ | $-13,002$ |
| $20-24$ | $-31,989$ | $-27,215$ | 4,931 | 8,430 | $-21,336$ | $-20,791$ |
| $25-29$ | $-31,306$ | $-22,250$ | 3,271 | 9,452 | $-23,823$ | $-24,216$ |
| $30-34$ | $-11,575$ | $-14,730$ | $-1,097$ | 6,518 | $-14,631$ | $-15,342$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | $-13,796$ | $-12,433$ | -335 | 2,448 | $-8,551$ | $-8,370$ |
| $40-44$ | $-7,516$ | $-7,450$ | -934 | 841 | $-4,815$ | $-6,027$ |
| $45-49$ | $-6,922$ | $-6,602$ | -665 | 1,224 | $-2,825$ | $-4,290$ |
| $50-54$ | $-5,796$ | $-3,133$ | $-1,087$ | 404 | $-1,430$ | $-2,863$ |
| $55-59$ | $-2,550$ | -60 | -659 | -440 | $-2,183$ | $-2,131$ |
| $60-64$ | $3, ~$ | 4,175 | -688 | -140 | 871 | -192 |
| $65-69$ | 4,165 | 4,659 | 489 | -601 | 1,504 | 1,481 |
| $70-74$ | 6,002 | 5,767 | 1,011 | 308 | 1,186 | 851 |
| $75+$ | 6,950 | 11,661 | -395 | $-1,267$ | -155 | $-1,067$ |
| Total, 10+ | $-133,117$ | $-111,912$ | 10,342 | 34,287 | $-101,698$ | $-111,475$ |

Average Population

| $10-14$ | 693,638 | 667,295 | 5,695 | 5,647 | 155,271 | 154,939 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 567,882 | 547,868 | 6,033 | 6,279 | 123,081 | 123,807 |
| $20-24$ | 465,945 | 457,592 | 6,574 | 8,103 | 97,570 | 102,352 |
| $25-29$ | 449,342 | 446,156 | 7,467 | 9,459 | 86,345 | 95,544 |
| $30-34$ | 457,775 | 467,346 | 9,752 | 12,606 | 77,982 | 93,643 |
| $35-39$ | 465,753 | 477,217 | 11,903 | 13,133 | 74,334 | 87,769 |
| $40-44$ | 423,294 | 430,660 | 9,983 | 10,060 | 67,172 | 79,669 |
| $45-49$ | 412,703 | 421,562 | 13,036 | 12,431 | 70,703 | 82,630 |
| $50-54$ | 373,453 | 376,255 | 15,378 | 14,101 | 65,525 | 73,276 |
| $55-59$ | 319,039 | 326,408 | 16,376 | 15,144 | 61,284 | 65,874 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 261,382 | 270,648 | 13,708 | 12,887 | $49,1,40$ | 51,613 |
| $65-69$ | 218,994 | 234,412 | 13,417 | 11,731 | 43,886 | 44,790 |
| $70-74$ | 170,006 | 185,614 | 12,217 | 10,644 | 31,620 | 32,086 |
| $75+$ | 273,367 | 318,508 | 23,187 | 22,584 | 59,130 | 62,352 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, 10+5,552,573 | $5,627,541$ | 164,726 | $164,8091,063,0431,150,344$ |  |  |  |

## TABLE B

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

Mountain

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

## Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 26,758 | 26,588 | 2,854 | 2,697 | 1,665 | 1,871 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 11,488 | 15,537 | 2,252 | 2,351 | 1,586 | 1,362 |
| $20-24$ | 5,763 | 11,256 | 5,157 | 4,468 | 3,490 | 2,045 |
| $25-29$ | 21,189 | 19,046 | 4,583 | 4,883 | 2,692 | 2,430 |
| $30-34$ | 24,928 | 24,246 | 2,941 | 4,414 | 1,049 | 1,709 |
| $35-39$ | 23,553 | 24,217 |  |  |  |  |
| $40-44$ | 21,762 | 18,973 | 1,547 | 2,795 | 977 | 987 |
| $45-49$ | 17,494 | 14,973 | 1,115 | 1,400 | 669 | 749 |
| $50-54$ | 11,950 | 11,135 | 271 | 1,253 | 685 | 667 |
| $55-59$ | 8,516 | 8,207 | 461 | 381 | 489 | 428 |
| $60-64$ | 6,705 | 6,010 | 321 | 1,028 | 351 | 256 |
| $65-69$ | 6,701 | 4,515 | 55 | 839 | 278 | 277 |
| $70-74$ | 4,407 | 3,951 | 158 | -42 | 40 | -37 |
| $75+$ | 5,203 | 7,808 | -208 | $-1,408$ | 29 | 151 |
| Total,10+ 196,417 | 196,462 | 24,181 | 25,690 | 14,307 | 12,948 |  |

## Average Population

| $10-14$ | 314,019 | 303,212 | 2,550 | 2,541 | 4,662 | 4,602 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 246,346 | 240,307 | 2,477 | 2,586 | 3,462 | 3,520 |
| $20-24$ | 202,682 | 200,294 | 3,681 | 3,301 | 3,830 | 3,276 |
| $25-29$ | 191,133 | 188,912 | 3,787 | 3,774 | 3,913 | 3,455 |
| $30-34$ | 196,233 | 194,120 | 4,293 | 5,780 | 4,205 | 3,517 |
| $35-39$ | 201,023 | 201,474 | 5,655 | 7,135 | 3,626 | 3,414 |
| $40-44$ | 189,370 | 187,451 | 5,140 | 5,472 | 3,238 | 3,054 |
| $45-49$ | 175,225 | 170,965 | 7,231 | 7,215 | 2,890 | 2,951 |
| $50-54$ | 150,963 | 142,999 | 9,255 | 8,539 | 2,523 | 2,329 |
| $55-59$ | 122,910 | 117,155 | 11,469 | 9,874 | 2,135 | 1,914 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 101,372 | 99,754 | 12,145 | 9,956 | 1,677 | 1,462 |
| $65-69$ | 87,641 | 87,020 | 14,109 | 10,473 | 1,491 | 1,188 |
| $70-74$ | 68,752 | 68,172 | 15,388 | 11,077 | 950 | 800 |
| $75+$ | 102,058 | 106,621 | 26,922 | 23,731 | 1,525 | 1,455 |
| Total,10+2,349,727 | $2,308,456$ | 124,102 | 111,454 | 40,127 | 36,937 |  |

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

Pacific

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White | Negro |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 126,669 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 125,073 |
| $20-24$ | 168,097 |
| $25-29$ | 145,571 |
| $30-34$ | 113,134 |
|  |  |
| $35-39$ | 110,698 |
| $40-44$ | 77,798 |
| $45-49$ | 59,192 |
| $50-54$ | 40,417 |
| $55-59$ | 24,892 |
| $60-64$ | 18,055 |
| $65-69$ | 16,564 |
| $70-74$ | 10,668 |
| $75+$ | 16,477 |
| Toti 1,10+1,053,305 |  |
| Average Population |  |


| $10-14$ | 807,761 | 778,843 | 13,102 | 12,814 | 37,428 | 37,487 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 631,181 | 597,437 | 13,437 | 13,556 | 26,205 | 26,120 |
| $20-24$ | 516,672 | 487,978 | 17,536 | 17,918 | 26,494 | 25,136 |
| $25-29$ | 507,027 | 475,868 | 21,449 | 22,402 | 25,905 | 25,442 |
| $30-34$ | 563,458 | 543,482 | 27,213 | 32,704 | 29,434 | 30,196 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 608,844 | 620,074 | 37,893 | 43,020 | 33,647 | 34,386 |
| $40-44$ | 578,411 | 574,157 | 35,552 | 39,822 | 29,741 | 30,075 |
| $45-49$ | 533,618 | 527,623 | 46,047 | 49,501 | 26,747 | 26,788 |
| $50-54$ | 448,540 | 442,524 | 57,101 | 56,297 | 20,449 | 19,766 |
| $55-59$ | 368,970 | 357,403 | 72,726 | 65,775 | 16,130 | 15,007 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 305,947 | 323,254 | 71,482 | 66,630 | 11,002 | 10,351 |
| $65-69$ | 253,885 | 285,853 | 73,188 | 63,898 | 7,650 | 8,107 |
| $70-74$ | 195,854 | 230,215 | 75,219 | 61,580 | 5,059 | 5,579 |
| $75+$ | 293,022 | 382,464 | 121,652 | 115,561 | 6,941 | 8,619 |
| Total,10+6,613,190 | $6,637,175$ | 683,597 | 661,478 | 302,832 | 303,059 |  |

## TABLE B

NET MIGRATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

Pacific: Conterminous Area

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Net Migration

| $10-14$ | 122,858 |
| :---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 112,899 |
| $20-24$ | 141,657 |
| $25-29$ | 137,374 |
| $30-34$ | 116,492 |
| $35-39$ | 108,562 |
| $40-44$ | 77,469 |
| $45-49$ | 59,324 |
| $50-54$ | 40,282 |
| $55-59$ | 24,952 |
|  |  |
| $60-64$ | 18,332 |
| $65-69$ | 17,045 |
| $70-74$ | 10,955 |
| $75+$ | 16,513 |

Total,10+1,004,714

117,352
87,304
116,719
138,914
125,099
101,128
72,236
56,004
38,587
30,056

26,947
27,306
19,835
25,664
983,151
199,183
207,282
113,606
115,875

| $10-14$ | 794,318 | 766,197 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 617,915 | 589,043 |
| $20-24$ | 498,787 | 479,233 |
| $25-29$ | 492,133 | 467,061 |
| $30-34$ | 544,458 | 533,711 |
|  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | 593,288 | 608,398 |
| $40-44$ | 564,463 | 564,628 |
| $45-49$ | 523,254 | 520,134 |
| $50-54$ | 441,302 | 436,957 |
| $55-59$ | 363,686 | 363,521 |
|  |  |  |
| $60-64$ | 302,423 | 320,489 |
| $65-69$ | 251,496 | 283,878 |
| $70-74$ | 194,317 | 228,929 |
| $75+$ | 291,412 | 380,983 |

Total,10+6,473,252
6,543,162
676,459
12,689
13,432
17,594
21,974
31,962

42,330
39,411
49,133
55,828
65,273
66,208
63,514
61,191
114,729
655,268

| 37,224 | 37,265 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 25,747 | 25,981 |
| 25,493 | 24,908 |
| 25,188 | 25,148 |
| 28,774 | 29,968 |
| 33,201 | 34,197 |
| 29,479 | 29,944 |
| 26,585 | 26,726 |
| 20,319 | 19,712 |
| 16,062 | 14,981 |
| 10,966 | 10,326 |
| 7,630 | 8,099 |
| 5,051 | 5,568 |
| 6,930 | 8,609 |

298,649 301,432

TABLE C
RATES OF NET MIGRATION PER 1,000 AVERAGE POPULATION FOR
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS , 1950-1960.

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

New England

| $10-14$ | -26 | -26 | 1,211 | 1,124 | 259 | 282 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -26 | 1 | 1,101 | 1,085 | 310 | 381 |
| $20-24$ | -32 | -22 | 1,173 | 1,348 | 642 | 656 |
| $25-29$ | -56 | -86 | 896 | 1,083 | 716 | 654 |
| $30-34$ | -53 | -55 | 628 | 548 | 418 | 423 |
| $35-39$ | -36 | -32 | 341 | 272 | 233 | 264 |
| $40-44$ | -27 | -22 | 257 | 186 | 171 | 171 |
| $45-49$ | -18 | -16 | 160 | 75 | 149 | 188 |
| $50-54$ | -16 | -19 | 56 | 25 | 112 | 170 |
| $55-59$ | -17 | -18 | 3 | -36 | 36 | 56 |
| $60-64$ | -24 | -21 | -32 | -58 | 75 | 93 |
| $65-69$ | -35 | -31 | -83 | -96 | -64 | -58 |
| $70-74$ | -45 | -18 | -63 | -83 | 20 | 1 |
| $75+$ | -36 | -26 | -74 | -118 | 86 | 61 |
| Total, IO+ | -32 | -29 | 54 | 31 | 293 | 302 |
| Middle Atlantic |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $10-14$ | -24 | -23 | 1,275 | 1,150 | 169 | 190 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -70 | -17 | 1,191 | 1,163 | 196 | 271 |
| $20-24$ | -133 | -25 | 1,159 | 1,337 | 362 | 522 |
| $25-29$ | -23 | -29 | 1,015 | 1,146 | 500 | 521 |
| $30-34$ | 5 | -31 | 783 | 604 | 359 | 279 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | -29 | -36 | 435 | 359 | 194 | 148 |
| $40-44$ | -30 | -33 | 334 | 260 | 128 | 97 |
| $45-49$ | -29 | -33 | 200 | 122 | 86 | 84 |
| $50-54$ | -26 | -33 | 56 | 25 | 44 | 74 |
| $55-59$ | -26 | -32 | -2 | -39 | 48 | 70 |
|  |  |  | -47 | -51 | -50 | 53 |
| $60-64$ | -40 | -65 | -48 | -68 | -83 | 1 |
| $65-69$ | -76 | -47 | -86 | -120 | -6 | -31 |
| $70-74$ | -45 | -72 | -142 | 94 | 120 |  |
| $75+$ |  | -32 | 80 |  | 62 | 191 |
| Total, 10+ | -40 |  |  |  | 205 |  |

## TABLE C

RATES OF NET MIGRATION PER l,000 AVERAGE POPULATION FOR NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

East North Central

| $10-14$ | -5 | -5 | 1,224 | 1,176 | 252 | 260 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -38 | 8 | 1,052 | 1,110 | 215 | 285 |
| $20-24$ | -85 | 26 | 1,192 | 1,394 | 334 | 467 |
| $25-29$ | 45 | 29 | 1,135 | 1,297 | 550 | 554 |
| $30-34$ | 45 | -2 | 855 | 711 | 374 | 332 |
| $35-39$ | -8 | -19 | 505 | 400 | 198 | 171 |
| $40-44$ | -11 | -5 | -16 | -902 | 270 | 136 |
| $45-49$ | -9 | -16 | 247 | 159 | 123 | 119 |
| $50-54$ | -16 | -29 | 87 | 43 | 103 | 97 |
| $55-59$ | -22 | -43 | -50 | -47 | 92 | 87 |
| $60-64$ | -63 | -68 | -103 | -50 | 81 | 96 |
| $65-69$ | -58 | -55 | -112 | -115 | -23 | 119 |
| $70-74$ | -29 | -29 | -93 | -131 | 6 | 33 |
| $75+$ |  |  |  | 82 | 80 | 215 |
| Total, 10+ | -14 | -11 |  |  |  | 232 |

West North Central

| $10-14$ | -75 | -76 | 686 | 678 | 110 | 123 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -90 | -58 | 723 | 720 | 94 | 115 |
| $20-24$ | -168 | -109 | 908 | 1,276 | 170 | 187 |
| $25-29$ | -133 | -155 | 868 | 1,170 | 234 | 190 |
| $30-34$ | -86 | -119 | 384 | 407 | 156 | 107 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | -91 | -82 | -54 | 92 | 33 | 50 |
| $40-44$ | -62 | -43 | -41 | -3 | 4 | 16 |
| $45-49$ | -33 | -32 | 25 | -17 | 29 | 22 |
| $50-54$ | -25 | -36 | -51 | -61 | -1 | -1 |
| $55-59$ | -11 | -30 | -29 | -47 | -7 |  |
| $60-64$ | -20 | -42 | -49 | -121 | 39 | 25 |
| $65-69$ | -5 | -30 | -39 | -61 | -60 | -41 |
| $70-74$ | -3 | -99 | -141 | 3 | -36 |  |
| $75+$ | -67 | -66 | -13 | -8 | 53 | 50 |
| Total, 10+ | - |  |  |  | 73 | 72 |

TABLE C
RATES OF NET MIGRATION PER l,000 AVERAGE POPULATION FOR NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

South Atlantic

| $10-14$ | 39 | 39 | 766 | 799 | -61 | -65 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 71 | 43 | 785 | 964 | -78 | -92 |
| $20-24$ | 89 | 39 | 1,136 | 1,474 | -174 | -212 |
| $25-29$ | 15 | 35 | 1,084 | 1,423 | -226 | -246 |
| $30-34$ | 5 | 39 | 801 | 783 | -175 | -174 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | -96 |
| $35-39$ | 33 | 44 | 580 | 455 | -112 | -54 |
| $40-44$ | 43 | 45 | 515 | 456 | -67 | -47 |
| $45-49$ | 47 | 47 | 370 | 362 | -54 | -47 |
| $50-54$ | 50 | 74 | 315 | 325 | -45 | -46 |
| $55-59$ | 69 | 102 | 240 | 346 | -35 | -46 |
| $60-64$ | 132 | 122 | 271 | 406 | -71 | -54 |
| $65-69$ | 132 | 102 | 440 | 459 | -21 | -19 |
| $70-74$ | 50 | 37 | 426 | 310 | -42 | -37 |
| $75+$ |  |  | 202 | 123 | -54 | -51 |
| Total, $10+$ | 50 | 52 | 418 | 476 | -97 | -102 |

## East South Central

| $10-14$ | -92 | -98 | -189 | 162 | -191 | -208 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -92 | -118 | 217 | 365 | -197 | -209 |
| $20-24$ | -242 | -226 | 916 | 1,424 | -429 | -427 |
| $25-29$ | -267 | -231 | 586 | 1,115 | -583 | -531 |
| $30-34$ | -145 | -143 | -357 | 288 | -459 | -378 |
| $35-39$ | -106 | -96 | -268 |  | 17 | -309 |
| $40-44$ | -78 | -66 | 59 | -119 | -198 | -235 |
| $45-49$ | -64 | -56 | -6 | -227 | -137 | -157 |
| $50-54$ | -49 | -43 | 67 | -145 | -99 | -132 |
| $55-59$ | -31 | -32 | -101 | -24 | -75 | -86 |
| $60-64$ | -19 | -20 | -63 | -96 | -80 | -106 |
| $65-69$ | 9 | -9 | -29 | -1 | 6 | -4 |
| $70-74$ | 35 | -1 | -17 | -49 | -75 | 8 |
| $75+$ | -99 | -96 | -64 | -85 | -46 | -2 |
|  |  |  | - | 134 | -231 | -63 |
| Total, $10+$ | -923 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE C
RATES OF NET MIGRATION PER 1,000 AVERAGE POPULATION FOR
NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS, 1950-1960.

| Age in <br> 1960 | Native White |  | Foreign-born White |  | Negro |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |

West South Central

| $10-14$ | -29 | -30 | 697 | 656 | -91 | -100 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -33 | -44 | 420 | 543 | -93 | -105 |
| $20-24$ | -69 | -59 | 750 | 1,040 | -219 | -203 |
| $25-29$ | -70 | -50 | 438 | 999 | -276 | -253 |
| $30-34$ | -25 | -32 | -112 | 517 | -188 | -164 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-39$ | -30 | -26 | -28 | 186 | -115 | -95 |
| $40-44$ | -18 | -17 | -94 | 84 | -84 | -76 |
| $45-49$ | -17 | -16 | -51 | 98 | -40 | -52 |
| $50-54$ | -16 | -8 | -71 | 29 | -22 | -39 |
| $55-59$ | -8 | $\cdots$ | -40 | -29 | -36 | -32 |
| $60-64$ | 1 |  |  | -50 | -11 | -18 |
| $65-69$ | 19 | 20 | 36 | -51 | 34 | -4 |
| $70-74$ | 35 | 31 | 83 | 29 | 38 | 33 |
| $75+$ | 25 | 37 | -17 | -56 | -3 | -17 |
| Total, 10+ | -24 | -20 | 63 | 208 | -96 | -97 |

Mountain

| $10-14$ | 85 | 88 | 1,119 | 1,061 | 357 | 407 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 47 | 65 | 909 | 909 | 458 | 387 |
| $20-24$ | 28 | 56 | 1,401 | 1,354 | 911 | 624 |
| $25-29$ | 111 | 101 | 1,210 | 1,294 | 688 | 703 |
| $30-34$ | 127 | 125 | 685 | 764 | 249 | 486 |
| $35-39$ | 117 | 120 | 473 | 392 | 269 | 289 |
| $40-44$ | 115 | 101 | 301 | 256 | 207 | 245 |
| $45-49$ | 100 | 88 | 154 | 174 | 237 | 226 |
| $50-54$ | 79 | 78 | 29 | 74 | 194 | 184 |
| $55-59$ | 69 | 70 | 40 | 39 | 164 | 134 |
| $60-64$ | 66 | 60 |  | 26 | 103 | 183 |
| $65-69$ | 76 | 52 | 4 | 80 | 186 | 189 |
| $70-74$ | 64 | 58 | 10 | -4 | 42 | 45 |
| $75+$ | 51 | 73 | -8 | -59 | 19 | 104 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, $10+$ | 84 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 357 |

TABLE C
RATES OF NET MIGRATION PER 1,000 AVERAGE POPULATION FOR NATIVE WHITES, FOREIGN-BORN WHITES AND NEGROES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SEX AND AGE, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS; 1950-1960.

| Native White  Foreign-born White  Negro  <br> 1960      | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Pacific


Pacific: Conterminous Area

| 10-14 | 155 | 153 | 1,323 | 1,405 | 337 | 362 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | 183 | 148 | 1,173 | 1,231 | 477 | 447 |
| 20-24 | 284 | 244 | 1,383 | 1,454 | 836 | 760 |
| 25-29 | 279 | 297 | 1,317 | 1,429 | 897 | 826 |
| 30-34 | 214 | 234 | 904 | 928 | 493 | 514 |
| 35-39 | 183 | 166 | 623 | 574 | 298 | 269 |
| 40-44 | 137 | 128 | 431 | 374 | 187 | 192 |
| 45-49 | 113 | 108 | 276 | 232 | 148 | 185 |
| 50-54 | 91 | 88 | 171 | 197 | 184 | 233 |
| 55-59 | 69 | 83 | 110 | 131 | 134 | 257 |
| 60-64 | 61 | 84 | 95 | 1.29 | 204 | 263 |
| 65-69 | 68 | 96 | 80 | 76 | 150 | 220 |
| 70-74 | 56 | 87 | 83 | 60 | 145 | 184 |
| 75+ | 57 | 67 | 23 | -7 | 195 | 209 |
| Total, 10+ | 155 | 150 | 294 | 316 | 380 | 384 |

Source: Table B.

## TABLE D

ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES ON OR BEFORE APRIL I, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in New England

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 465,097 | 445,100 | 8,419 | 8,205 |
| 5-9 | 378,265 | 361,845 | 5,421 | 5,501 |
| 10-19 | 606,335 | 591,111 | 8,827 | 8,897 |
| 20-29 | 687,705 | 713,847 | 9,076 | 9,180 |
| 30-39 | 656,641 | 694,077 | 5,783 | 6,889 |
| 40-49 | 500,240 | 523,714 | 4,350 | 4,645 |
| 50-59 | 361,245 | 390,954 | 2,890 | 3,093 |
| 60+ | 362,988 | 453,651 | 2,607 | 3,018 |
| Total | 4,018,516 | 4,174,299 | 47,373 | 49,428 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 467,291 | 450,248 | 8,927 | 8,896 |
| 15-19 | 368,524 | 359,141 | 5,475 | 5,977 |
| 20-29 | 567,349 | 582,993 | 8,152 | 9,182 |
| 30-39 | 691,055 | 713,429 | 8,538 | 10,004 |
| 40-49 | 653,776 | 682,354 | 5,407 | 6,565 |
| 50-59 | 473,087 | 503,744 | 3,900 | 4,987 |
| 60-69 | 297,874 | 352,718 | 2,181 | 2,731 |
| 70+ | 177,156 | 261,838 | 1,419 | 1,982 |
| Total, 10+ | 3,696,112 | 3,906,465 | 43,999 | 50,324 |

TABLE D
ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES
ON OR BEFORE APRIL I, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in Middle Atlantic

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 1,361,035 | 1,296,852 | 98,242 | 97,273 |
| 5-9 | 1,116,416 | 1,075,637 | 64,469 | 64,579 |
| 10-19 | 1,866,222 | 1,818,508 | 99,651 | 100,215 |
| 20-29 | 2,133,202 | 2,229,746 | 78,982 | 86,718 |
| 30-39 | 2,121,819 | 2,225,206 | 41,922 | 47,577 |
| 40-49 | 1,624,536 | 1,681,813 | 29,551 | 29,964 |
| 50-59 | 1,150,382 | 1,230,466 | 16,661 | 16,323 |
| $60+$ | 1,152,997 | 1,417,051 | 13,132 | 15,172 |
| Total | 12,526,609 | 12,975,279 | 442,610 | 457,821 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 1,377,499 | 1,317,613 | 108,602 | 107,210 |
| 15-19 | 1,088,482 | 1,072,140 | 67,947 | 69,017 |
| 20-29 | 1,764,197 | 1,793,472 | 98,519 | 111,623 |
| 30-39 | 2,165,949 | 2,240,454 | 88,170 | 100,782 |
| 40-49 | 2,091,434 | 2,162,051 | 47,906 | 54,230 |
| 50-59 | 1,526,770 | 1,606,187 | 31,948 | 35,337 |
| 60-69 | 935,508 | 1,107,278 | 15,998 | 18,296 |
| $70+$ | 555,382 | 808,034 | 8,300 | 10,299 |
| Total, 10+ | 11,505,221 | 12,107,229 | 467,390 | 506,794 |

TABLE D

ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES
ON OR BEFORE APRIL I, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in East North Central

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 1,522,349 | 1,458,968 | 95,249 | 95,561 |
| 5-9 | 1,217,854 | 1,172,615 | 57,848 | 56,913 |
| 10-19 | 1,948,213 | 1,900,760 | 78,680 | 78,983 |
| 20-29 | 2,043,774 | 2,119,815 | 65,659 | 70,356 |
| 30-39 | 1,939,167 | 2,022,797 | 30,655 | 32,601 |
| 40-49 | 1,566,433 | 1,623,903 | 20,782 | 21,793 |
| 50-59 | 1,280,657 | 1,335,825 | 15,722 | 14,055 |
| $60+$ | 1,552,228 | 1,785,552 | 14,673 | 14,923 |
| Total | 13,070,675 | 13,420,235 | 379,268 | 385,185 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 1,534,186 | 1,472,378 | 104,305 | 104,870 |
| 15-19 | 1,189,741 | 1,166,323 | 59,313 | 61,512 |
| 20-29 | 1,852,268 | 1,882,891 | 78,891 | 87,249 |
| 30-39 | 2,088,048 | 2,128,867 | 69,358 | 77,193 |
| 40-49 | 1,924,846 | 1,975,389 | 33,362 | 35,055 |
| 50-59 | 1,488,806 | 1,558,031 | 22,492 | 22,761 |
| 60-69 | 1,066,126 | 1,215,806 | 12,560 | 13,911 |
| $70+$ | 770,381 | 1,033,195 | 7,966 | 9,972 |
| Total | $11,914,402$ | 12,432,880 | 388,247 | 412,523 |

TABLE D
ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES ON OR BEFORE APRIL 1,1950 , AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in West North Central

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 743,217 | 708,317 | 27,756 | 27,389 |
| 5-9 | 615,227 | 586,858 | 20,072 | 20,215 |
| 10-19 | 1,111,939 | 1,080,768 | 32,380 | 32,635 |
| 20-29 | 1,194,264 | 1,230,672 | 29,316 | 31,731 |
| 30-39 | 1,229,910 | 1,278,431 | 21,913 | 23,434 |
| 40-49 | 1,087,393 | 1,117,626 | 18,878 | 19,767 |
| 50-59 | 915,609 | 952,640 | 15,213 | 14,650 |
| 60+ | 985,378 | 1,114,233 | 16,887 | 17,437 |
| Total | 7,882,937 | 8,069,545 | 182,415 | 187,258 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 743,690 | 709,262 | 28,958 | 28,910 |
| 15-19 | 596,680 | 579,430 | 19,723 | 20,548 |
| 20-29 | 1,029,881 | l,055,562 | 28,795 | 32,772 |
| 30-39 | 1,207,170 | 1,238,912 | 29,236 | 32,759 |
| 40-49 | 1,222,771 | 1,251,825 | 21,050 | 22,449 |
| 50-59 | 1,038,422 | ],085,998 | 17,205 | 18,579 |
| 60-69 | 767,234 | 871,238 | 12,572 | 13,209 |
| $70+$ | 539,580 | 713,853 | 8,913 | 10,491 |
| Total, 10+ | 7,145,528 | 7,506,080 | 166,452 | 179,717 |

## TABLE D

ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES ON OR BEFORE APRIL 1, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

## Born in South Atlantic

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 912,414 | 871,509 | 346,139 | 343,946 |
| 5-9 | 760,432 | 732,832 | 297,785 | 302,212 |
| 10-19 | 1,210,249 | 1,179,567 | 510,677 | 529,911 |
| 20-29 | 1,201,300 | 1,273,779 | 476,098 | 564,222 |
| 30-39 | 1,096,888 | 1,147,801 | 462,788 | 538,876 |
| 40-49 | 869,187 | 894,671 | 377,541 | 411,584 |
| 50-59 | 629,687 | 655,202 | 255,662 | 259,528 |
| 60+ | 693,406 | 794,868 | 248,270 | 270,628 |
| Total | 7,373,563 | 7,550,229 | 2,974,960 | 3,220,907 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 923,142 | 885,310 | 356,940 | 355,200 |
| 15-19 | 742,731 | 727,831 | 286,616 | 290,693 |
| 20-29 | 1,124,207 | 1,161,828 | 436,197 | 497,336 |
| 30-39 | 1,221,939 | 1,271,858 | 459,520 | 539,653 |
| 40-49 | 1,075,475 | 1,119,951 | 429,596 | 487,740 |
| 50-59 | 817,850 | 866,444 | 324,695 | 358,885 |
| 60-69 | 510,677 | 595,535 | 195,579 | 229,091 |
| 70+ | 350,631 | 470,665 | 121,801 | 151,446 |
| Total, 10+ | 6,766,652 | 7,099,422 | 2,610,944 | 2,910,044 |

## TABLE D

ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES
ON OR BEFORE APRIL 1, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in East South Central

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 530,776 | 513,733 | 191,465 | 190,846 |
| 5-9 | 469,858 | 451,522 | 170,593 | 171,929 |
| 10-19 | 837,610 | 824,001 | 301,038 | 312,255 |
| 20-29 | 816,074 | 861,048 | 266,072 | 309,440 |
| 30-39 | 766,251 | 793,921 | 262,979 | 302,334 |
| 40-49 | 661,524 | 672,118 | 233,983 | 251,927 |
| 50-59 | 494,251 | 504,284 | 167,715 | 165,517 |
| $60+$ | 606,706 | 648,015 | 180,967 | 186,575 |
| Total | 5,183,050 | 5,268,642 | 1,774,812 | 1,890,823 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 538,502 | 517,754 | 193,553 | 190,853 |
| 15-19 | 453,481 | 442,926 | 159,284 | 162,285 |
| 20-29 | 765,768 | 795,916 | 244,611 | 285,957 |
| 30-39 | 825,753 | 854,745 | 251,188 | 292,712 |
| 40-49 | 751,273 | 771,982 | 245,178 | 275,834 |
| 50-59 | 619,881 | 644,179 | 207,199 | 223,125 |
| 60-69 | 411,265 | 459,645 | 134,800 | 149,334 |
| 70+ | 311,654 | 385,172 | 92,897 | 105,177 |
| Total, 10+ | 4,677,577 | 4,872,319 | 1,528,710 | 1,685,277 |

TABLE D
ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES ON OR BEFORE APRIL l, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX; FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in West South Central

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 696,278 | 665,892 | 166,887 | 166,786 |
| 5-9 | 602,175 | 580,844 | 147,839 | 148,387 |
| 10-19 | 1,035,753 | 1,014,990 | 248,727 | 260,154 |
| 20-29 | 1,039,361 | 1,086,662 | 220,305 | 264,618 |
| 30-39 | 957,277 | 989,715 | 212,042 | 245,894 |
| 40-49 | 770,893 | 786,837 | 195,033 | 199,649 |
| 50-59 | 490,898 | 505,304 | 129,421 | 121,591 |
| $60+$ | 422,749 | 475,910 | 125,621 | 129,434 |
| Total | 6,015,384 | 6,106,154 | 1,445,875 | 1,536,513 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 709,735 | 680,705 | 172,712 | 172,193 |
| 15-19 | 587,237 | 574,896 | 141,584 | 143,758 |
| 20-29 | 965,535 | 998,749 | 213,839 | 245,424 |
| 30-39 | 1,059,754 | 1,093,993 | 217,642 | 257,576 |
| 40-49 | 940,249 | 972,946 | 200,189 | 226,011 |
| 50-59 | 731,675 | 763,717 | 168,995 | 179,571 |
| 60-69 | 408,601 | 467,987 | 107,918 | 116,027 |
| 70+ | 237,793 | 315,444 | 67,274 | 77,208 |
| Total, 10+ | 5,640,579 | 5,868,437 | 1,290,153 | 1,417,768 |

TABLE D
ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES ON OR BEFORE APRIL I, 1950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in Mountain States

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male |  | Female | Male |  | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-4$ | 291,411 | 281,812 | 17,183 | 16,807 |  |  |
| $5-9$ | 229,569 | 222,610 | 14,056 | 14,508 |  |  |
| $10-19$ | 372,067 | 369,416 | 20,665 | 20,330 |  |  |
| $20-29$ | 346,454 | 360,835 | 15,005 | 15,192 |  |  |
| $30-39$ | 321,363 | 333,339 | 10,141 | 10,094 |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 205,783 | 208,044 | 7,268 | 6,612 |  |  |
| $50-59$ | 125,936 | 127,972 | 5,025 | 3,629 |  |  |
| $60+$ | 87,634 | 96,167 | 5,764 | 4,874 |  |  |
| Total | $1,980,217$ | $2,000,195$ | 95,107 | 92,046 |  |  |

1960

| $10-14$ | 297,089 | 286,014 | 17,315 | 17,238 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 227,040 | 221,865 | 14,285 | 13,816 |
| $20-29$ | 347,198 | 362,809 | 18,329 | 18,738 |
| $30-39$ | 355,396 | 366,557 | 14,442 | 14,991 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 318,240 | 329,645 | 10,215 | 9,682 |
| $50-59$ | 194,210 | 202,795 | 6,664 | 6,132 |
| $60-69$ | 104,212 | 115,728 | 4,039 | 3,441 |
| $70+$ | 51,514 | 66,119 | 3,166 | 2,586 |
|  |  |  |  | 8,455 |
| tal, 10+ | $1,894,899$ | $1,951,532$ | 86,624 |  |

## TABLE D

ESTIMATED POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES ON OR BEFORE APRIL l, l950, AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF BIRTH, 1950 AND 1960.

Born in Pacific

| Age | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 708,837 | 687,207 | 42,529 | 41,212 |
| 5-9 | 496,101 | 474,575 | 17,402 | 17,550 |
| 10-19 | 571,444 | 555,981 | 22,974 | 22,142 |
| 20-29 | 500,986 | 514,675 | 26,162 | 26,649 |
| 30-39 | 384,823 | 387,926 | 16,850 | 14,986 |
| 40-49 | 246,108 | 251,094 | 6,688 | 5,307 |
| 50-59 | 157,064 | 165,697 | 3,668 | 2,364 |
| 60+ | 121,610 | 161,009 | 4,383 | 2,646 |
| Total | 3,186,973 | 3,198,164 | 140,656 | 132,856 |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 719,251 | 694,305 | 44,671 | 43,578 |
| 15-19 | 488,011 | 476,649 | 18,899 | 18,975 |
| 20-29 | 543,220 | 552,617 | 24,962 | 25,179 |
| 30-39 | 508,297 | 519,755 | 30,913 | 30,061 |
| 40-49 | 379,598 | 390,762 | 18,955 | 16,764 |
| 50-59 | 235,989 | 244,550 | 6,934 | 5,671 |
| 60-69 | 132,074 | 153,199 | 3,379 | 2,525 |
| $70+$ | 68,366 | 100,915 | 2,509 | 1,692 |
| Total, 10+ | 3,074,806 | 3,132,752 | 151,222 | 144,445 |
| Source: Census of 1950, State of Birth, Tables 19-22; Census of 1960 |  |  |  |  |
| State of Birth, Tables 26-29. Published figures were adjusted to in- |  |  |  |  |
| clude persons for whom state of birth was not reported. Persons who |  |  |  |  |
| were born in conterminous United States and were living elsewhere at |  |  |  |  |

TABLE E
DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Division <br> of Birth <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Male | Native White | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Memale | Male | Female |  |

New England

| $10-14$ | 1.00472 | 1.01157 | 1.06034 | 1.08422 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.97425 | 0.99253 | 1.00996 | 1.08653 |
| $20-29$ | 0.93570 | 0.98627 | 0.92353 | 1.03203 |
| $30-39$ | 1.00487 | 0.99941 | 0.94072 | 1.08976 |
| $40-49$ | 0.99564 | 0.98311 | 0.93498 | 0.95297 |
| $50-59$ | 0.94572 | 0.96187 | 0.89655 | 1.07363 |
| $60-69$ | 0.82458 | 0.90220 | 0.75467 | 0.88296 |
| $70+$ | 0.48805 | 0.57718 | 0.54430 | 0.65673 |

Middle Atlantic

| $10-14$ | 1.01210 | 1.01601 | 1.10545 | 1.10216 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.97498 | 0.99675 | 1.05395 | 1.06872 |
| $20-29$ | 0.94533 | 0.98623 | 0.98864 | 1.11384 |
| $30-39$ | 1.01535 | 1.00480 | 1.11633 | 1.16218 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 0.98568 | 0.97162 | 1.14274 | 1.13984 |
| $50-59$ | 0.93982 | 0.95503 | 1.08111 | 1.17932 |
| $60-69$ | 0.81322 | 0.89989 | 0.96021 | 1.12087 |
| $70+$ | 0.48169 | 0.57022 | 0.63204 | 0.67882 |

TABLE E
DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Division <br> of Birth <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Male | Native White | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female | Male | Female |

East North Central

| $10-14$ | 1.00778 | 1.00919 | 1.09508 | 1.09741 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.97692 | 0.99463 | 1.02532 | 1.08081 |
| $20-29$ | 0.95075 | 0.99060 | 1.00268 | 1.10466 |
| $30-39$ | 1.02166 | 1.00427 | 1.05634 | 1.09718 |
| $40-49$ |  | 0.99262 | 0.97656 | 1.08831 |
| $50-59$ | 0.95044 | 0.95944 | 1.08228 | 1.07527 |
| $60-69$ | 0.83248 | 0.91015 | 0.79888 | 1.04442 |
| $70+$ | 0.49631 | 0.57864 | 0.54290 | 0.68975 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

West North Central

| $10-14$ | 1.00064 | 1.00133 | 1.04331 | 1.05553 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.96985 | 0.98734 | 0.98261 | 1.01647 |
| $20-29$ | 0.92620 | 0.97668 | 0.88928 | 1.00420 |
| $30-39$ | 1.01081 | 1.00670 | 0.99727 | 1.03240 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 0.99420 | 0.97919 | 0.96062 | 0.95797 |
| $50-59$ | 0.95496 | 0.97170 | 0.91138 | 0.93990 |
| $60-69$ | 0.83795 | 0.91455 | 0.82640 | 0.90164 |
| $70+$ | 0.54769 | 0.64067 | 0.52780 | 0.60165 |

TABLE E
DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Division <br> of Birth <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Male | Native White | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female | Male | Female |

South Atlantic

| $10-14$ | 1.01176 | 1.01584 | 1.03120 | 1.03272 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.97672 | 0.99318 | 0.96249 | 0.96188 |
| $20-29$ | 0.92891 | 0.98496 | 0.85415 | 0.93853 |
| $30-39$ | 1.01718 | 0.99849 | 0.96518 | 0.95646 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 0.98048 | 0.97574 | 0.92828 | 0.90511 |
| $50-59$ | 0.94094 | 0.96845 | 0.86003 | 0.87196 |
| $60-69$ | 0.81100 | 0.90893 | 0.76499 | 0.88272 |
| $70+$ | 0.50566 | 0.59213 | 0.49060 | 0.55961 |

East South Central

| $10-14$ | 1.01456 | 1.00783 | 1.01091 | 1.00004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.96514 | 0.98096 | 0.93371 | 0.94391 |
| $20-29$ | 0.91423 | 0.96592 | 0.81256 | 0.91578 |
| $30-39$ | 1.01186 | 0.99268 | 0.94406 | 0.94594 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 0.98045 | 0.97237 | 0.93231 | 0.91235 |
| $50-59$ | 0.93705 | 0.95843 | 0.88553 | 0.88567 |
| $60-69$ | 0.83210 | 0.91148 | 0.80374 | 0.90223 |
| $70+$ | 0.51368 | 0.59439 | 0.51334 | 0.56373 |

TABLE E
DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Division <br> of Birth <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Male | Female

## West South Central

| $10-14$ | 1.01933 | 1.02225 | 1.03490 | 1.03242 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.97519 | 0.98976 | 0.95769 | 0.96880 |
| $20-29$ | 0.93221 | 0.98400 | 0.85973 | 0.94338 |
| $30-39$ | 1.01962 | 1.00675 | 0.98791 | 0.97339 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 0.98221 | 0.98306 | 0.94410 | 0.91914 |
| $50-59$ | 0.94913 | 0.97062 | 0.86649 | 0.89943 |
| $60-69$ | 0.83235 | 0.92615 | 0.83385 | 0.95424 |
| $70+$ | 0.56249 | 0.66282 | 0.53553 | 0.59650 |

Mountain

10-14
15-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70+
1.01948
1.01491
1.00768
1.01629
0.88696
0.96248
1.00730
0.95918
0.91690
0.80378
0.54927
0.92740
0.94820
0.53057

TABLE E
DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| Division <br> of Birth <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Pacific

| $10-14$ | 1.01469 | 1.01033 | 1.05037 | 1.05741 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.98369 | 1.00437 | 1.08602 | 1.08120 |
| $20-29$ | 0.95061 | 0.99395 | 1.08653 | 1.13716 |
| $30-39$ | 1.01459 | 1.00987 | 1.18160 | 1.12803 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 0.98642 | 1.00731 | 1.12493 | 1.11864 |
| $50-59$ | 0.95888 | 0.97394 | 1.03678 | 1.06859 |
| $60-69$ | 0.84089 | 0.92457 | 0.92121 | 1.06810 |
| $70+$ | 0.56217 | 0.62677 | 0.57244 | 0.63946 |

[^20]
## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHICi DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

New England

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-27,596$ | 16,590 | $-11,006$ | -356 | 2,407 | 2,051 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-30,963$ | 26,320 | $-4,643$ | -132 | 2,260 | 2,128 |
| $20-29$ | $-73,043$ | 62,278 | $-10,765$ | -964 | 10,154 | 9,190 |
| $30-39$ | $-33,954$ | 6,781 | $-27,173$ | -25 | 4,892 | 4,867 |
| $40-49$ | $-20,394$ | 7,765 | $-12,629$ |  |  |  |
| $50-59$ | $-7,477$ | 2,809 | $-4,668$ | 106 | 1,690 | 1,796 |
| $60-69$ | $-5,325$ | 667 | $-4,658$ | 151 | 1,040 | 1,191 |
| $70+$ | $-3,042$ | 1,392 | $-1,650$ | 127 | 291 | 418 |
|  |  |  | 114 | 122 | 236 |  |

Total, 10t
-201, 794
124,602
-77,192
-979
22,856
21,877
Female

| $10-14$ | $-26,219$ | 14,727 | $-11,492$ | -325 | 2,605 | 2,280 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-17,777$ | 15,383 | $-2,394$ | -80 | 2,461 | 2,381 |
| $20-29$ | $-70,641$ | 42,812 | $-27,829$ | -828 | 9,605 | 8,777 |
| $30-39$ | $-43,189$ | 16,311 | $-26,878$ | -212 | 4,729 | 4,517 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $-21,777$ | 6,306 | $-15,471$ | 180 | 1,842 | 2,022 |
| $50-59$ | $-8,641$ | 2,678 | $-5,963$ | 432 | 1,720 | 2,152 |
| $60-69$ | $-8,011$ | 421 | $-7,590$ | 34 | 261 | 295 |
| $70+$ | $-3,434$ | 221 | $-3,213$ | 165 | 113 | 278 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, $10+$ | $-199,689$ | 98,859 | $-100 \% 830$ | -634 | 23,336 | 22,702 |

TABLE F
NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

Middle Atlantic

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | $-76,922$ | 27,053 | $-49,869$ | $-2,939$ | 15,210 | 12,271 |
| $15-19$ | $-97,486$ | 17,219 | $-80,267$ | $-2,662$ | 12,572 | 9,910 |
| $20-29$ | $-214,750$ | 69,779 | $-144,971$ | $-7,509$ | 61,275 | 53,766 |
| $30-39$ | $-87,267$ | 30,570 | $-56,697$ | 2,163 | 35,861 | 38,024 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $-70,173$ | 3,869 | $-66,304$ | 1,296 | 8,562 | 9,858 |
| $50-59$ | $-31,136$ | $-3,607$ | $-34,743$ | 1,282 | 3,169 | 4,451 |
| $60-69$ | $-24,643$ | $-8,478$ | $-33,121$ | 970 | 799 | 1,769 |
| $70+$ | $-14,373$ | $-4,580$ | $-18,953$ | 755 | 2,463 | 3,218 |
| Total, 10+ | $-616,750$ | 131,825 | $-484,925$ | $-6,644$ | 139,911 | 133,267 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10-14$ | $-73,069$ | 25,202 | $-47,867$ | $-2,324$ | 16,696 | 14,372 |
| $15-19$ | $-56,504$ | 13,463 | $-43,041$ | -987 | 17,147 | 16,160 |
| $20-29$ | $-173,321$ | 81,166 | $-92,155$ | $-3,715$ | 78,974 | 75,259 |
| $30-39$ | $-115,106$ | 27,285 | $-87,821$ | 277 | 33,638 | 33,915 |
| $40-49$ | $-65,868$ | 2,178 | $-63,690$ | 1,316 | 5,370 | 6,686 |
| $50-59$ | $-37,311$ | $-6,412$ | $-43,723$ | 1,067 | 6,071 | 7,138 |
| $60-69$ | $-34,864$ | $-8,570$ | $-43,434$ | 930 | 1,269 | 2,199 |
| $70+$ | $-13,803$ | $-3,143$ | $-16,946$ | 624 | 3,046 | 3,670 |
| Total, 10+ | $-569,846$ | 131,169 | $-438,677$ | $-2,812$ | 162,211 | 159,399 |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

East North Central

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -90,092 | 82,357 | -7,735 | -2,202 | 26,977 | 24,775 |
| 15-19 | -94,284 | 59,357 | -34;927 | -3,275 | 18,135 | 14,860 |
| 20-29 | -221,061 | 207,003 | -14,058 | -8,345 | 68,672 | 60,327 |
| 30-39 | -94,100 | 115,683 | 21,583 | -592 | 49,300 | 48,708 |
| 40-49 | -63,437 | 42,368 | -21,069 | 1,074 | 19,712 | 20,786 |
| 50-59 | -31,719 | 9,118 | -22,601 | 1,152 | 8,346 | 9,498 |
| 60-69 | -27,656 | -10,879 | -38,535 | 251 | 1,942 | 2,193 |
| $70+$ | -9,068 | -10,029 | -19,097 | 177 | 3,919 | 4,096 |
| Total, 10+ | -631,417 | 494,978 | -136,439 | -11,760 | 197,003 | 185,243 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -84,506 | 78,630 | -5,876 | -2,180 | 28,601 | 26,421 |
| 15-19 | -59,301 | 62,813 | 3,512 | -948 | 21,772 | 20,824 |
| 20-29 | -180,577 | 236,373 | 55,796 | -4,425 | 83,363 | 78,938 |
| 30-39 | -119,192 | 92,407 | -26,785 | -96 | 46,184 | 46,088 |
| 40-49 | -65,028 | 33,979 | -31,049 | 761 | 17,504 | 18,265 |
| 50-59 | -42,201 | 3,807 | -38,394 | 636 | 9,961 | 10,597 |
| 60-69 | -36,583 | -13,556 | -50,139 | 307 | 3,498 | 3,805 |
| 70+ | -11,126 | -6,443 | -17,569 | 490 | 4,586 | 5,076 |
| Total, 10+ | -598,514 | 488,010 | -110,504 | -5,455 | 215,469 | 210,014 |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED. FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC. DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

West North Central

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-68,612$ | 22,522 | $-46,090$ | $-1,776$ | 4,156 | 2,380 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-54,966$ | 16,672 | $-38,294$ | $-1,309$ | 3,225 | 1,916 |
| $20-29$ | $-170,666$ | 68,701 | $-101,965$ | $-5,123$ | 10,659 | 5,536 |
| $30-39$ | $-100,114$ | 14,211 | $-85,903$ | $-1,818$ | 4,647 | 2,829 |
| $40-49$ | $-50,544$ | 1,470 | $-49,074$ | -72 | 828 | 756 |
| $50-59$ | $-21,553$ | $-1,273$ | $-22,826$ | 110 | -287 | -177 |
| $60-69$ | $-9,546$ | $-4,687$ | $-14,233$ | 364 | -604 | -240 |
| $70+$ | $-6,992$ | $-15,735$ | $-22,727$ | -50 | 392 | 342 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-482,993$ | 101,881 | $-381,112$ | $-9,674$ | 23,016 | 13,342 |

Female

| 10-14 | -64,297 | 21,665 | -42,632 | -1,683 | 4,405 | 2,722 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | -43,938 | 15,762 | -28,176 | -1,431 | 3,058 | 1,627 |
| 20-29 | -170,469 | 60,305 | -110,164 | -5,385 | 9,712 | 4,327 |
| 30-39 | -101,275 | 9,635 | -91,640 | -1,841 | 3,815 | 1,974 |
| 40-49 | -48,469 | 248 | -48,221. | -157 | 263 | 106 |
| 50-59 | -24,936 | -3,145 | -28,081 | 450 | 189 | 639 |
| 60-69 | -19,222 | -6,759 | -25,981 | -12 | -462 | -474 |
| $70+$ | -16,608 | -18,371 | -34,979 | -116 | -187 | -303 |
| tal, $10+$ | -489,214 | 79,340 | -409,874 | -10,175 | 20,793 | 10,618 |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION IO YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

South Atlantic

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-47,067$ | 82,562 | 35,495 | $-19,472$ | 3,619 | $-15,853$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-38,362$ | 101,812 | 63,450 | $-18,002$ | 4,831 | $-13,171$ |
| $20 七 29$ | $-128,168$ | 236,491 | 108,323 | $-81,091$ | 16,983 | $-64,108$ |
| $30-39$ | $-50,630$ | 64,419 | 13,789 | $-43,790$ | $-1,094$ | $-44,884$ |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $-19,272$ | 71,284 | 52,012 | $-12,697$ | $-1,497$ | $-14,194$ |
| $50-59$ | $-4,517$ | 48,967 | 44,450 | $-5,830$ | -647 | $-6,477$ |
| $60-69$ | 1,325 | 61,420 | 62,745 | $-1,709$ | -819 | $-2,528$ |
| $70+$ | 1,983 | 45,895 | 47,878 | $-2,839$ | -111 | $-2,950$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-284,708$ | 712,850 | 428,142 | $-185,430$ | 21,265 | $-164,165$ |

Female

| $10-14$ | $-45,143$ | 79,054 | 33,911 | $-21,336$ | 3,302 | $-18,034$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-30,925$ | 63,501 | 32,576 | $-21,279$ | 2,556 | $-18,723$ |
| $20-29$ | $-129,882$ | 187,820 | 57,938 | $-93,975$ | 9,665 | $-84,310$ |
| $30-39$ | $-51,335$ | 115,274 | 63,939 | $-43,162$ | -698 | $-43,860$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $-17,911$ | 74,995 | 57,084 | $-10,269$ | $-1,000$ | $-11,269$ |
| $50-59$ | $-2,682$ | 64,803 | 62,121 | $-9,260$ | $-1,294$ | $-10,554$ |
| $60-69$ | 1,608 | 73,102 | 74,710 | $-1,641$ | -373 | $-2,014$ |
| $70+$ | 1,612 | 42,162 | 43,774 | $-4,097$ | -464 | $-4,561$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-274,658$ | 700,711 | 426,053 | $-205,019$ | 11,694 | $-193,325$ |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN $\operatorname{VD}$ OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF - BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF COTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

East South Central

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-58,271$ | 12,899 | $-45,372$ | $-26,858$ | 290 | $-26,568$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-49,867$ | 22,664 | $-27,203$ | $-21,840$ | 1,547 | $-20,293$ |
| $20-29$ | $-178,331$ | 43,044 | $-135,287$ | $-79,909$ | 2,906 | $-77,003$ |
| $30-39$ | $-84,012$ | 2,064 | $-81,948$ | $-47,824$ | $-3,241$ | $-51,065$ |
| $40-49$ | $-37,376$ | -519 | $-37,895$ | $-19,726$ | $-2,023$ | $-21,749$ |
| $50-59$ | $-16,036$ | $-1,649$ | $-17,685$ | $-10,242$ | $-1,078$ | $-11,320$ |
| $60-69$ | $-3,939$ | -939 | $-4,878$ | $-2,797$ | -843 | $-3,640$ |
| $70+$ | 2,615 | -317 | 2,298 | $-3,284$ | -834 | $-4,118$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-425,217$ | 77,247 | $-347,970$ | $-212,480$ | $-3,276$ | $-215,756$ |

## Female

| $10-14$ | $-55,699$ | 11,366 | $-44,333$ | $-28,595$ | 75 | $-28,520$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-48,039$ | 8,686 | $-39,353$ | $-23,531$ | 630 | $-22,901$ |
| $20-29$ | $-173,629$ | 38,696 | $-134,933$ | $-87,189$ | 1,085 | $-86,104$ |
| $30-39$ | $-81,038$ | 7,088 | $-73,950$ | $-46,215$ | $-2,338$ | $-48,553$ |
| $40-49$ | $-37,584$ | 1,364 | $-36,220$ | $-18,558$ | $-1,529$ | $-20,087$ |
| $50-59$ | $-16,053$ | $-1,895$ | $-17,948$ | $-12,359$ | $-1,472$ | $-13,831$ |
| $60-69$ | $-5,135$ | -573 | $-5,708$ | $-5,523$ | -786 | $-6,309$ |
| $70+$ | $-2,610$ | -457 | $-3,067$ | $-3,846$ | -658 | $-4,504$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-419,787$ | 64,275 | $-355,512$ | $-225,816$ | $-4,993$ | $-230,809$ |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

West South Central

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-51,981$ | 29,715 | $-22,266$ | $-14,877$ | 1,713 | $-13,164$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-44,756$ | 35,869 | $-8,887$ | $-11,690$ | 3,493 | $-8,197$ |
| $20-29$ | $-131,401$ | 99,040 | $-32,361$ | $-44,201$ | 8,177 | $-36,024$ |
| $30-39$ | $-54,534$ | 20,219 | $-34,315$ | $-22,781$ | -889 | $-23,670$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $-26,277$ | 8,626 | $-17,651$ | $-7,870$ | 192 | $-7,678$ |
| $50-59$ | $-9,456$ | -915 | $-10,371$ | $-5,308$ | -340 | $-5,648$ |
| $60-69$ | -812 | -803 | $-1,615$ | -693 | -197 | -890 |
| $70+$ | -247 | $-8,385$ | $-8,632$ | $-1,853$ | $-1,100$ | $-2,953$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-319,464$ | 183,366 | $-136,098$ | $-109,273$ | 11,049 | $-98,224$. |

## Female

| $10-14$ | $-50,500$ | 27,921 | $-22,579$ | $-15,526$ | 1,516 | $-14,010$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-38,259$ | 15,859 | $-22,400$ | $-11,881$ | 1,256 | $-10,625$ |
| $20-29$ | $-121,920$ | 81,485 | $-40,435$ | $-44,360$ | 5,106 | $-39,254$ |
| $30-39$ | $-55,156$ | 29,890 | $-25,266$ | $-22,404$ | 912 | $-21,492$ |
| $40-49$ | $-24,723$ | 9,868 | $-14,855$ | $-7,541$ | -317 | $-7,858$ |
| $50-59$ | $-9,788$ | 1,051 | $-8,737$ | $-5,569$ | -765 | $-6,334$ |
| $60-69$ | $-1,752$ | 585 | $-1,167$ | $-1,827$ | -247 | $-2,074$ |
| $70+$ | $-2,398$ | $-4,363$ | $-6,761$ | $-1,756$ | $-1,001$ | $-2,757$ |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Otal, 10+ | $-304,496$ | 162,296 | $-142,200$ | $-110,864$ | 6,460 | $-104,404$ |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC' DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

## Mountain

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-28,985$ | 53,010 | 24,025 | $-1,014$ | 2,159 | 1,145 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-18,882$ | 33,285 | 14,403 | -827 | 1,683 | 856 |
| $20-29$ | $-53,602$ | 92,287 | 38,685 | $-2,556$ | 6,567 | 4,011, |
| $30-39$ | $-18,900$ | 60,322 | 41,422 | $-1,088$ | 2,052 | 964 |
| $40-49$ | $-6,370$ | 39,413 | 33,043 | -451 | 1,143 |  |
| $50-59$ | $-1,128$ | 20,048 | 18,920 | 20 | 937 | 692 |
| $60-69$ | 984 | 8,890 | 9,874 | 118 | 154 | 272 |
| $70+$ | 3 | 3,620 | 3,623 | -6 | 62 | 56 |

Total, 10+
$-126,880 \quad 310,875$
183,995
$-5,804$
14,757
8,953
Female

| $10-14$ | $-28,150$ | 52,268 | 24,118 | -973 | 2,211 | 1,238 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-15,275$ | 30,845 | 15,570 | -815 | 1,239 | 424 |
| $20-29$ | $-55,384$ | 88,967 | 33,583 | $-1,735$ | 4,799 | 3,064 |
| $30-39$ | $-18,662$ | 66,194 | 47,532 | -725 | 2,606 | 1,881 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $-5,411$ | 36,572 | 31,161 | 29 | 1,264 | 1,293 |
| $50-59$ | -612 | 18,273 | 17,661 | 76 | 733 | 809 |
| $60-69$ | $-1,222$ | 9,396 | 8,174 | -11 | 347 | 336 |
| $70+$ | $-1,047$ | 6,909 | 5,862 | 37 | 145 | 182 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tal, 10+ | $-125,763$ | 309,424 | 183,661 | $-4,117$ | 13,344 | 9,227 |

## TABLE F

NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF INTERDIVISIONAL MIGRATION AS ESTIMATED FROM DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIOS FOR THE NATIVE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

## Pacific

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | $-23,281$ | 146,099 | 122,818 | -690 | 13,653 | 12,963 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-8,420$ | 124,791 | 116,371 | -15 | 12,006 | 11,991 |
| $20-29$ | $-26,369$ | 318,761 | 292,392 | -994 | 45,299 | 44,305 |
| $30-39$ | -994 | 210,239 | 209,245 | 1,393 | 22,838 | 24,231 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | -225 | 119,795 | 119,570 | 924 | 8,806 | 9,730 |
| $50-59$ | 555 | 48,961 | 49,516 | 536 | 6,988 | 7,524 |
| $60-69$ | 908 | 23,511 | 24,419 | 230 | 2,419 | 2,649 |
| $70+$ | 465 | 16,795 | 17,260 | 133 | 1,942 | 2,075 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| l0+ $10+$ | $-57,361$ | $1,008,952$ | 951,591 | 1,517 | 113,951 | 115,468 |

Female

| $10-14$ | $-23,150$ | 139,901 | 116,751 | -438 | 13,966 | 13,528 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $-5,379$ | 89,082 | 83,703 | 183 | 10,651 | 10,834 |
| $20-29$ | $-26,419$ | 284,617 | 258,198 | -372 | 39,677 | 39,305 |
| $30-39$ | $-3,353$ | 224,225 | 220,872 | 1,009 | 24,522 | 25,531 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | 723 | 120,536 | 121,259 | 907 | 9,933 | 10,840 |
| $50-59$ | 1,298 | 61,768 | 63,066 | 206 | 9,177 | 9,383 |
| $60-69$ | 926 | 50,210 | 51,136 | 277 | 3,959 | 4,236 |
| $70+$ | 165 | 32,729 | 32,894 | 103 | 2,814 | 2,917 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,69, |
| tal, 10+ | $-55,189$ | $1,003,068$ | 947,879 | 1,875 | 114,699 | 116,574 |

Source: See source note of Table D. Estimating procedures are explained in text.

TABLE G
COHORT AVERAGES OF 1950 AND 1960 POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF RESIDENCE.

| Division of <br> Residence <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |

New England

10-14
15-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
$70+$
Total, 10+
3,625,015
3,837,679
436,312
356,259
572,983
671,269

639,196
476,296
346,0.17
339,347

Middle Atlantic

10-14
15-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70+

1,332,753
1,273,814
1,044,313 1,032,486
1,644,854 1,692,984
1,944,484 2,088,880
1,906,180 2,042,212
1,522,280
944,180 1,069,062
747,466
996,758
11,718,476

76,538
80,934
12,576
8,852
5,144
5,108
9,812
7,292
15,089
16,400
9,812
7,558
15,246
16,638
11,410
7,904
4,593
4,038

111,274
86,391
176,602 216,171

182,658
129,752
72,753
51,978
899,303
1,027,579

TABLE G
COHORT AVERAGES OF 1950 AND 1960 POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS. DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF RESIDENCE.

| Division of <br> Residence <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Male | Fenảle | Native White |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

East North Central

| $10-14$ | $1,531,502$ | $1,468,878$ | 119,214 | 120,190 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | $1,188,268$ | $1,173,006$ | 84,423 | 89,109 |
| $20-29$ | $1,883,705$ | $1,935,282$ | 148,942 | 170,748 |
| $30-39$ | $2,103,655$ | $2,192,274$ | 186,402 | 207,101 |
| $40-49$ | $1,978,829$ | $2,065,547$ |  | 160,830 |
| $50-59$ | $1,555,733$ | $1,603,160$ | 125,930 | 170,236 |
| $60-69$ | $1,119,182$ | $1,197,062$ | 80,522 | 76,422 |
| $70+$ | 988,740 | $1,197,602$ | 51,478 | 54,939 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, $10+$ | $12,349,614$ | $12,832,811$ | 957,741 | $1,013,924$ |

West North Central

10-14
15-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
$70+$
Total, 10+

5,944,282
712,590
568,533
907,404
934,455
876,924
757,669
603,153
583,554

679,556
552,842
914,108
947,077
901,479
789,384
646,542
676,598
6,107,586

28,928
22,157
28,791
37,112
22,552
36,424
39,665
41,443
31,902
35,695
29,136
22,327
20,057
228,043
241,959

## TABLE G

COHORT AVERAGES OF 1950 AND 1960 POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF RESIDENCE.

| Division of <br> Residence <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Male | Native White | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female | Male | Female |  |

South Atlantic

| $10-14$ | 938,772 | 900,280 | 341,540 | 338,095 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 782,562 | 746,054 | 273,802 | 273,996 |
| $20-29$ | $1,283,056$ | $1,239,508$ | 412,064 | 434,948 |
| $30-39$ | $1,338,839$ | $1,368,894$ | 358,532 | 414,612 |
| $40-49$ | $1,205,310$ | $1,239,652$ |  |  |
| $50-59$ | 911,691 | 964,908 | 248,361 | 361,057 |
| $60-69$ | 626,911 | 702,990 | 159,222 | 271,101 |
| $70+$ | 533,884 | 682,231 | 138,918 | 174,562 |
|  |  |  |  | 157,686 |
| otal, 10+ | $7,641,025$ | $7,844,517$ | $2,256,021$ | $2,426,057$ |

East South Central

| $10-14$ | 500,079 | 480,928 | 172,644 | 170,789 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 426,596 | 405,983 | 137,659 | 137,701 |
| $20-29$ | 672,492 | 671,329 | 195,493 | 211,472 |
| $30-39$ | 634,058 | 668,851 | 147,928 | 182,076 |
| $40-49$ |  |  |  |  |
| $50-59$ | 580,328 | 600,891 | 138,912 | 168,264 |
| $60-69$ | 474,510 | 495,852 | 127,571 | 143,666 |
| $70+$ | 320,296 | 358,513 | 92,917 | 100,638 |
|  |  | 376,934 | 93,744 | 100,056 |
| Total, 10+ | $3,946,769$ | $4,059,281$ | $1,106,868$ | $1,214,662$ |

TABLE G
COHORT AVERAGES OF 1950 AND 1960 POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF RESIDENCE.

| Division of <br> Residence <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Male | Female | Native White |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |  |

West South Central

10-14
15-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70+
Total, $10+$
Mountain
10-14
15-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70+
Total, 10+

664,636
548,094
904,414
944,084
851,006
706,209
502,452
499,665
5,620,560
5,525,379

1,091,057
1,180,443
160,430
127,168
202,226
185,686
166,346
143,894
98,035
96,658
161,200
127,634
188,112
154,150
140,123
132,578
94,974
92,286
rex
,091,057

| 17,654 | 17,494 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 13,893 | 13,718 |
| 23,774 | 23,126 |
| 19,374 | 18,876 |
|  |  |
| 14,280 | 13,890 |
| 10,486 | 9,684 |
| 6,901 | 5,569 |
| 6,406 | 5,460 |

112,768
107,817

TABLE G
COHORT AVERAGES OF 1950 AND 1960 POPULATION BORN IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AND LIVING IN CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES AT THE CENSUS DATES, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF RESIDENCE.

| Division of <br> Residence <br> and Age <br> in 1960 | Native White |  | Native Nonwhite |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |

Pacific

| $10-14$ | 790,158 | 763,858 | 52,546 | 51,611 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 617,950 | 584,892 | 36,065 | 35,994 |
| $20-29$ | 986,804 | 941,190 | 66,402 | 65,457 |
| $30-39$ | $1,126,201$ | $1,133,642$ | 81,581 | 84,314 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | $1,073,078$ | $1,068,284$ | 68,006 | 67,786 |
| $50-59$ | 796,735 | 798,857 | 41,714 | 39,135 |
| $60-69$ | 545,407 | 596,950 | 20,714 | 20,007 |
| $70+$ | 476,304 | 608,594 | 13,955 | 15,494 |
| Total, 10+ | $6,412,637$ | $6,496,267$ | 380,983 | 379,798 |

Source: See source note of Table D.

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER I, 000 AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

New England

| Age in 1960 <br> and Sex | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |

Male

| $10-14$ | -61 | 36 | -24 | -36 | 245 | 209 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -84 | 72 | -13 | -18 | 310 | 292 |
| $20-29$ | -127 | 108 | -19 | -64 | 673 | 609 |
| $30-39$ | -52 | 10 | -42 | -2 | 298 | 297 |
| $40-49$ | -34 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $50-59$ | -17 | -18 | -21 | 9 | 148 | 157 |
| $60-69$ | -12 | 2 | -11 | 19 | 132 | 151 |
| $70+$ |  | 6 | -16 | 28 | 63 | 91 |
|  | -7 | -7 | 28 | 30 | 58 |  |

Total, 10+
$-56$
34
$-21$
$-13$
299
286
Female

| $10-14$ | -60 | 34 | -26 | -33 | 265 | 232 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | -50 | 43 | -7 | -11 | 326 | 315 |
| $20-29$ | -123 | 75 | -49 | -54 | 630 | 576 |
| $30-39$ | -64 | 24 | -40 | -13 | 284 | 271 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $40-49$ | -34 | 10 | -24 | 14 | 146 | 161 |
| $50-59$ | -18 | 6 | -13 | 49 | 194 | 243 |
| $60-69$ | -23 | 1 | -22 | 7 | 51 | 57 |
| $70+$ | -10 | 1 | -9 | 32 | 22 | 54 |

Total, 10+
$-52$
26
$-26$
$-8 \quad 288$
281

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER I, 000 AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

## Middle Atlantic

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -58 | 20 | -37 | -26 | 137 | 110 |
| 15-19 | -93 | 16 | -77 | -33 | 154 | 122 |
| 20-29 | -131 | 42 | -88 | -50 | 406 | 356 |
| 30-39 | -45 | 16 | -29 | 12 | 203 | 215 |
| 40-49 | -37 | 2 | -35 | 9 | 57 | 66 |
| 50-59 | -22 | -3 | -24 | 11 | 27 | 38 |
| 60-69 | -26 | -9 | -35 | 14 | 12 | 26 |
| 70+ | -19 | -6 | -25 | 18 | 58 | 76 |
| Total, 10+ | -56 | 12 | -44 | -7 | 156 | 148 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -57 | 20 | -38 | -21 | 150 | 129 |
| 15-19 | -55 | 13 | -42 | -11 | 198 | 187 |
| 20-29 | -102 | 48 | -54 | -21. | 447 | 426 |
| 30-39 | -55 | 13 | -42 | 1. | 156 | 157 |
| 40-49 | -32 | 1 | -31 | 7 | 29 | 37 |
| 50-59 | -25 | -4 | -29 | 8 | 47 | 55 |
| 60-69 | -33 | -8 | -41 | 13 | 17 | 30 |
| 70+ | -14 | -3 | -17 | 12 | 59 | 71 |
| Total, 10+ | -49 | 11 | -37 | -3 | 158 | 155 |

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER I,000 AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

East North Central

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -59 | 54 | -5 | -18 | 226 | 208 |
| 15-19 | -79 | 50 | -29 | -39 | 215 | 176 |
| 20-29 | -117 | 110 | -7 | -56 | 461 | 405 |
| 30-39 | -45 | 55 | 10 | -3 | 264 | 261 |
| 40-49 | -32 | 21 | -11 | 7 | 123 | 129 |
| 50-59 | -20 | 6 | -15 | 9 | 66 | 75 |
| 60-69 | -25 | -10 | -34 | 3 | 24 | 27 |
| 70+ | -9 | -10 | -19 | 3 | 76 | 80 |
| Total, 10+ | -51 | 40 | -11 | -12 | 206 | 193 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -58 | 54 | -4 | -18 | 238 | 220 |
| 15-19 | -51 | 54 | 3 | -11 | 244 | 234 |
| 20-29 | -93 | 122 | 29 | -26 | 488 | 462 |
| 30-39 | -54 | 42 | -12 | . . . | 223 | 223 |
| 40-49 | -31 | 16 | -15 | 4 | 103 | 107 |
| 50-59 | -26 | 2 | -24 | 5 | 79 | 84 |
| 60-69 | -31 | -11 | -42 | 4 | 46 | 50 |
| 70+ | -9 | -5 | -15 | 9 | 83 | 92 |
| Total, 10+ | -47 | 38 | -9 | -5 | 213 | 207 |

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER I, OOO AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

West North Central

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age in } 1960 \\ \text { and Sex } \end{gathered}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -96 | 32 | -65 | -61 | 144 | 82 |
| 15-19 | -97 | 29 | -67 | -59 | 146 | 86 |
| 20-29 | -188 | 76 | -112 | -138 | 287 | 149 |
| 30-39 | -107 | 15 | -92 | -50 | 128 | 78 |
| 40-49 | -58 | 2 | -56 | -2 | 26 | 24 |
| 50-59 | -28 | -2 | -30 | 4 | -10 | -6 |
| 60-69 | -16 | -8 | -24 | 16 | -27 | -11 |
| $70+$ | -12 | -27 | -39 | -2 | 20 | 17 |
| Total, 10+ | -81 | 17 | -64 | -42 | 101 | 59 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -95 | 32 | -63 | -58 | 153 | 95 |
| 15-19 | -79 | 29 | -51 | -63 | 136 | 72 |
| 20-29 | -186 | 66 | -121 | -136 | 245 | 109 |
| 30-39 | -107 | 10 | -97 | -44 | 92 | 48 |
| 40-49 | -54 | . . | -53 | -4 | 7 | 3 |
| 50-59 | -32 | -4 | -36 | 14 | 6 | 20 |
| 60-69 | -30 | -10 | -40 | -1 | -21 | -22 |
| 70+ | -25 | -27 | -52 | -6 | -9 | -15 |
| Total, 10+ | -80 | 13 | -67 | -42 | 86 | 44 |

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER I, 000 AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

South Atlantic

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -50 | 88 | 38 | -57 | 11 | -46 |
| 15-19 | -49 | 130 | 81 | -66 | 18 | -48 |
| 20-29 | -100 | 184 | 84 | -197 | 41 | -156 |
| 30-39 | -38 | 48 | 10 | -122 | -3 | -125 |
| 40-49 | -16 | 59 | 43 | -39 | -5 | -44 |
| 50-59 | -5 | 54 | 49 | -23 | -3 | -26 |
| 60-69 | 2 | 98 | 100 | -11 | -5 | -16 |
| 70+ | 4 | 83 | 86 | -20 | -1 | -21 |
| Total, 10t | -37 | 93 | 56 | -82 | 9 | -73 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -50 | 88 | 38 | -63 | 10 | -53 |
| 15-19 | -41 | 85 | 44 | -78 | 9 | -68 |
| 20-29 | -105 | 152 | 47 | -216 | 22 | -194 |
| 30-39 | -38 | 84 | 47 | -104 | -2 | -106 |
| 40-49 | -14 | 60 | 46 | -28 | -3 | -31 |
| 50-59 | -3 | 67 | 64 | -34 | -5 | -39 |
| 60-69 | 2 | 104 | 106 | -9 | -2 | -12 |
| 70+ | 2 | 62 | 64 | -26 | -3 | -29 |
| Total, 10t | -35 | 89 | 54 | -85 | 5 | -80 |

## TABLE H

RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER 1,000 AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

East South Central

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -117 | 26 | -91 | -156 | 2 | -154 |
| 15-19 | -117 | 53 | -64 | -159 | 11 | -147 |
| 20-29 | -265 | 64 | -201 | -409 | 15 | -394 |
| 30-39 | -132 | 3 | -129 | -323 | -22 | -345 |
| 40-49 | -64 | -l | -65 | -142 | -15 | -157 |
| 50-59 | -34 | -3 | -37 | -80 | -8 | -89 |
| 60-69 | -12 | -3 | -15 | -30 | -9 | -39 |
| $70+$ | 8 | -1 | 7 | -35 | -9 | -44 |
| Total, 10+ | -108 | 20 | -88 | -192 | -3 | -195 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -116 | 24 | -92 | -167 | . . | -167 |
| 15-19 | -118 | 21 | -97 | -171 | 5 | -166 |
| 20-29 | -259 | 58 | -201 | -412 | 5 | -407 |
| 30-39 | -121 | 11 | -111 | -254 | $-13$ | -267 |
| 40-49 | -63 | 2 | -60 | -110 | -9 | -119 |
| 50-59 | -32 | -4 | -36 | -86 | -10 | -96 |
| 60-69 | -14 | -2 | -16 | -55 | -8 | -63 |
| $70+$ | -7 | -1 | -8 | -38 | -7 | -45 |
| Total, 10+ | -103 | 16 | -88 | -186 | -4 | -190 |

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER 1,000 AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

Mountain

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -92 | 169 | 77 | -57 | 122 | 65 |
| 15-19 | -76 | 135 | 58 | -60 | 121 | 62 |
| 20-29 | -137 | 235 | 99 | -108 | 276 | 169 |
| 30-39 | -48 | 153 | 105 | -56 | 106 | 50 |
| 40-49 | -18 | 109 | 91 | -32 | 80 | 48 |
| 50-59 | -4 | 74 | 70 | 2 | 89 | 91 |
| 60-69 | 5 | 48 | 54 | 17 | 22 | 39 |
| 70+ |  | 22 | 22 | -1 | 10 | 9 |
| Total, 10+ | -. 54 | 133 | 79 | -51 | 131 | 79 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -93 | 172 | 80 | -56 | 126 | 71 |
| 15-19 | -63 | 128 | 65 | -59 | 90 | 31 |
| 20-29 | -142 | 229 | 86 | -75 | 208 | 132 |
| 30-39 | -47 | 168 | 120 | -38 | 138 | 100 |
| 40-49 | -15 | 103 | 87 | 2 | 91 | 93 |
| 50-59 | -2 | 70 | 68 | 8 | 76 | 84 |
| 60-69 | -7 | 51 | 44 | -2 | 62 | 60 |
| 70+ | -6 | 40 | 34 | 7 | 27 | 33 |
| Total, 10+ | -55 | 134 | 80 | -38 | 124 | 86 |

TABLE H
RATES: NET MIGRATION OF IN-BORN AND OUT-BORN AND NET BALANCE OF MIGRATION PER I,OOO AVERAGE POPULATION, BY AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES; 1950-1960.

Pacific

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age in } 1960 \\ & \text { and Sex } \end{aligned}$ | Native White |  |  | Native Nonwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In-born | Out-born | Balance | In-born | Out-born | Balance |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -29 | 185 | 155 | -13 | 260 | 247 |
| 15-19 | -14 | 202 | 188 | . . | 333 | 332 |
| 20-29 | -27 | 323 | 296 | -15 | 682 | 667 |
| 30-39 | -1 | 187 | 186 | 17 | 280 | 297 |
| 40-49 | . . | 112 | 111 | 14 | 129 | 143 |
| 50-59 | 1 | 61 | 62 | 13 | 168 | 180 |
| 60-69 | 2 | 43 | 45 | 11 | 117 | 128 |
| 70+ | 1 | 35 | 36 | 10 | 139 | 149 |
| Total, 10+ | -9 | 157 | 148 | 4 | 299 | 303 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | -30 | 183 | 153 | -8 | 271 | 262 |
| 15-19 | -9 | 152 | 143 | 5 | 296 | 301 |
| 20-29 | -28 | 302 | 274 | -6 | 606 | 600 |
| 30-39 | -3 | 198 | 195 | 12 | 291 | 303 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 113 | 114 | 13 | 147 | 160 |
| 50-59 | 2 | 77 | 79 | 5 | 234 | 240 |
| 60-69 | 2 | 84 | 86 | 14 | 198 | 212 |
| 70+ | . . . | 54 | 54 | 7 | 182 | 188 |
| Total, 10+ | -8 | 154 | 146 | 5 | 302 | 307 |

[^21]TABLE J
COMBINED DIVISION-OF-BIRTH (DOB-N) SURVIVAL RATIOS AND ESTIMATES OF NET MIGRATION OF NATIVE WHITE MALES 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE, GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES, 1950-1960.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & \text { in } \\ & 1960 \end{aligned}$ | Survival Ratio | New <br> England | $\begin{gathered} \text { Middle } \\ \text { Atlantic } \end{gathered}$ | East <br> North Central | West <br> North Central |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-14 | 1.01092 | -13,732 | -48,364 | -12,308 | -53,085 |
| 15-19 | 0.97554 | -5,093 | -80,831 | -33,584 | -41,191 |
| 20-29 | 0.93722 | -11,369 | -131,159 | 8,553 | -111,936 |
| 30-39 | 1.01608 | -33,601 | -58,238 | 30,475 | -89,983 |
| 40-49 | 0.98771 | -8,431 | -69,595 | -13,697 | -44,011 |
| 50-59 | 0.94618 | -5,041 | -43,285 | -17,849 | -16,740 |
| 60-69 | 0.82658 | -5,551 | -45,864 | -32,813 | -7,506 |
| 70+ | 0.51165 | -9,222 | -47,080 | -35,810 | -3,551 |
| Total,10+ |  | -92,040 | -524,416-107,033 |  | -368,003 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & \text { in } \\ & 1960 \end{aligned}$ | South Atlantic | East South Central | West South Central | Mountain | Pacific |
| 10-14 | 36,257 | -43,584 | -16,806 | 26,265 | 125,358 |
| 15-19 | 64,138 | -31,477 | -9,028 | 16,964 | 120,102 |
| 20-29 | 98,884 | -151,754 | -37,099 | 37,401 | 298,479 |
| 30-39 | 14,597 | -84,264 | -31,700 | 43,482 | 209,233 |
| 40-49 | 45,092 | -41,865 | -21,469 | 33,720 | 120,255 |
| 50-59 | 40,097 | -21, 713 | -8,695 | 19,372 | 53,854 |
| 60-69 | 54,570 | -3,288 | 1,215 | 10,778 | 28,460 |
| 70+ | 43,024 | 3,071 | 10,653 | 10,358 | 28,556 |
| Total,10 | + 396,659 | -374,874 | -112,929 | 198,340 | 984. 297 |

Source: Yun Kim, "Some Considerations in Estimating Internal Migration by the Place-of-Birth Census Survival Ratio Method" (unpublished manuscript).

## PROCEDURES FOR ESTIMATING NET MIGBATION BY THE DIVISION-OF-BIRTH SURVIVAL RATIO METHOD

1. Adjustment for nonreporting of state of birth

Prorate the "unknowns" among the knowns for each division of residence to produce tables in the form of Table $I$ and Table II, with the age data of 1960 grouped in such a way as to reflect the ages in 1960 of the cohorts of 1950. Repeat for the other divisions, producing one pair of tables for each sex-color group of each division.
I. Resident Population of Division 1 Classified by Division of Birth, 1950

| Division of Birth | Age in 1950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A11 |
|  | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+ | ages |

```
    1
    2
    •
    .
    9
```

    Total
    II. Resident Population of Division 1 Classified by Bivision of Birth, 1960

| Division of Birth | Age in 1960 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total, |
|  | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70+ | $10+$ |

[^22]Total

## 2. Calculation of survival ratios

Rearrange the data of Tables I and II into the form of Tables III and IV, so that each division's natives are accumulated into a single table for each census date. Compute division-of-birth survival ratios from the "Total" lines of Tables III and IV. The formula for the youngest cohort is:

$$
\frac{\text { Population aged } 10-14 \text { in } \frac{1960}{\text { Population aged }} 0-4 \text { in } 1950}{0-4} \mathrm{SR}_{0-4}^{10-14}
$$

Repeat for each division.
III. Division 1: In-born, by Division of Residence in 1950

| Division of | Age in 1950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Residence } \\ 1950 \end{gathered}$ | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | $60+$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { ages } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Source: Line 1 of Table I for each division |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

IV. Division 1: In-born, by Division of Residence in 1960

| Divisiqu | Age in 1960 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Residence } \\ 1960 \end{gathered}$ | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70+ | $\text { Tota } 1,$ |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | Source: Line 1 of Table II for each division |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

3. Calculation of "expected" population, 1960

Multiply the appropriate survival ratio by each entry in the body of Table III (e.g., $\mathrm{SR}^{10-14} \mathrm{x}$ each entry in column 1) and record the result in Table V. This develops Table $V$ for each division in the same form as Table IV. The column sums of Table $V$ for a given division equal the column sums of Table IV for the same division.

> V. Division 1: Expected Distribution of In-born by Division of Residence in 1960

| $\begin{gathered} \overline{\text { Division }} \\ \text { of } \end{gathered}$ | Age in 1960 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected Residence in 1960 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70+ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tota1 } \\ 10+ \end{gathered}$ |

1
2

- Source: Survival ratios derived from Tables III and IV
- and applied to Table III.
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## Total

## 4. Calculation of net migration

Subtract the "expected" 1960 numbers of Table V from the enumerated 1960 numbers of Table IV, producing Table VI for each division. These are estimates of net change due to the migration of the natives of the given division with respect to that division and with respect to each of the other divisions. The sum of the frequencies in each column will be zero, since net migration of Division 1 natives to or from Division 1 equals net migration of Division 1 natives from or to the other eight divisions combined, with the sign reversed.
VI. Division 1: Net Migration of In-born, by Divisions, 1950-1960

| Division of Net | Age in 1960 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gain or |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| through Migration | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70+ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total }, \\ 10+ \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | Source | Tabl | IV min | as Tabl | V. |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. Rearrangement of data for each division of residence

From Tables VI, collect lines 1 for Division 1 and put into form of Table VII. From Tables VI, collect lines 2 for Division 2 and put into form of Table VII. Repeat for each division.
VII. Division 1: Net Migration of In-born and Net Migration of Out-born, Classified by Division of Birth, 1950-1960

| Division <br> of <br> Birth | $10-14$ | $15-19$ | $20-29$ | $30-39$ | $40-49$ | $50-59$ | $60-69$ | $70+$ | Age in 1960 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $10+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1
2
Source: Line 1 of Table VI for each division.

- Source: Line 1 of Table VI for each division.
- 

9
Total

This tables gives, for each division, net change due to migration of its own natives (the "in-born") and net change due to the migration of natives of each of the other divisions (together, the "out-born"). In each divisional table, the figures for the out-born appear on the line that corresponds to that particular division - on line 1 in the table for Division 1 , on line 2
in the table for Division 2, on line 3 in the table for Division 3, etc. In each case, the figures for the out-born appear on the remaining lines, according to their various divisions of birth. The "Total" line of each table gives the net balance of migration to and from the division for each age-sex-color group. In general, net migration of the in-born is outward and net migration of the out-born is inward, but there are exceptions for some age groups in some divisions.
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    ${ }^{42}$ Conrad Taeuber and Morris H. Hansen, A Pretiminary Evaluation of the 1960 Censuses of Population and Housing, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C. 1963 .
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