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ABSTRACT

In investigating the demographic condition of Negroes in New Orleans, an attempt is made, first, to more logically delimit the field of demography than has hitherto been accomplished; second, to investigate the manner in which sociology extends into this field; and third, to develop a system of analysis incorporating these findings. Demography is defined as the study of population size, of change in size, and of the manner in which these phenomena are manifested in population movements and composition. This definition is a logical extension of what has been implicit in the trend of demographic investigation.

A sociological orientation to demography is seen to exert its heaviest influence on the study of population composition. The Negroes of New Orleans, as both a demographic and social object, are especially relevant to a demographic investigation emphasizing sociological aspects.

The method of investigation involves first an introductory examination of number and distribution. The composition of the population is next analyzed in order to prepare a logical basis for understanding the demographic processes. Biosocial composition, embracing age and sex, constitutes the first of these elements. The institutional phase represents part of the writer's effort to emphasize the sociological elements. Accordingly, for the first time in a demographic analysis, familial and political characteristics are discussed. Included also are educational and economic characteristics.

The demographic processes are comprised of fertility, mortality, and migration. Their consideration sets the stage for an analysis of past and future population change and for the sociological interpreta-
tion of the findings.

The bulk of the treatment of these topics is concerned with Negro-white differentials in the New Orleans Standard Metropolitan Area. Each discussion is terminated with an examination of the spatial distribution of the characteristics of Negroes within the city with reference to social areas.

The Negroes of New Orleans, a minority people, are heavily concentrated only in selected areas, and migration and growth patterns indicate a tendency toward increased segregation. In comparison with the whites, they are disproportionately found in the younger ages, and females are relatively more abundant. Family life is more unstable, measured according to the prevalence of broken families. Also, the woman is more often the household head. Negroes receive less education, although this differential is possibly decreasing. More often are they represented in occupations with less status and in lower income and rent brackets. Their fertility is higher, their mortality greater, and they are less migratory. Their relatively greater concentration in the city than in the suburbs is likely to continue in the next twenty-five years.

In attempting to explain these differentials, the hypothesis of innate biological differences is examined and discarded. The theory of the self-fulfilling prophecy, however, which has not been previously used in demographic analysis, is found to be in agreement with the data. Thus, these demographic differences prevail primarily because the Negro is socially defined as inferior. The act of defining (or prophesying) tends to set in motion forces which lead to the realization of the definition.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The central objective of this study is a demographic analysis of the Negro population of New Orleans. In order to achieve this objective, the writer seeks first to establish a conceptual framework with which to study demography; second, to make a demographic analysis by means of this conceptual framework; and third, to indicate and demonstrate some relationships between demographic fact and sociological theory.

The information contained in this work is demographic, or literally, descriptive of the people. To achieve a clearer understanding of that concept, a separate treatment is devoted to the science of demography. Then, because it is a central thesis of this work that demography can profit by receiving, within its demographic framework, a sociological emphasis, the relations between sociology and demography are sketched. These two discussions furnish the basis upon which the study proceeds. Since their content is thus indispensable for an adequate comprehension of the objective, they deserve not only the earliest comment, but an extended one as well. It is with their consideration that the following pages—and the major part of the introduction—are concerned.

THE SCIENCE OF DEMOGRAPHY

It seems obvious that if one chooses an area of study, it would be at least one of his objectives to explain the limits and nature of that chosen area. Such a task cannot be completed when the discipline is born—the very process of studying a phenomenon implies that it has an unknown quality. But as the researcher proceeds with his analysis,
he should pause from time to time and generalize about what has been done, or he defeats the very purpose of his endeavor. It is thus paradoxical that though for more than two and one-half centuries thousands of persons have written in the field of demography, few have bothered to spell out or perhaps even to understand the objectives of their discipline. They have found a certain body of data interesting. They have explored the subject extensively and intensively. Yet almost none has thought to inquire as to the theoretical objective of their work, as to the limits of their discipline.

The purpose of this section is to attempt to describe as comprehensively and yet as briefly as possible the subject matter with which the science of demography is concerned. The basis of the discussion will consist not of the enunciated preferences or predilections of this writer but of the actual concerns and accomplishments of demographers themselves. Such a task is logically divisible into two spheres. The first is devoted to the manner in which the field has been explicitly delineated and the second to the specific subjects which demographers have actually attempted to investigate. The sparseness of explicit concern with the limits of demography permits the first objective to be achieved in a rather comprehensive fashion. Although it would be foolhardy to contend that all such views are presented here, they at least are all that the author could find. The immense number of demographic studies makes the achievement of the second task more formidable. The best that can be hoped for is an approximation. To this end, two content analyses have been prepared. The first is concerned with the subject matter in ten of the major works in general demography. The second is based on the more than 10,000 publications in population literature as classified in the Population Index.
from 1948 through 1952.¹

In discussing the views of demographers on demography, a historical approach appears preferable. Note, however, that a history of demography in the conventional sense is not attempted. It is felt that such a task has already been adequately accomplished.² The present purpose is only to trace in historical perspective the thoughts of demographers concerning the nature and boundaries of their field.

Explicit formulations. Achille Guillard, who first used the term demography,³ "regarded it as the mathematical knowledge of the general movements and of the physical, social, intellectual and moral conditions of population, or still more broadly as the natural and social history of the human species."⁴ Towards the close of the nineteenth century, the

¹(School of Public Affairs, Princeton University; and Population Association of America, Inc.), XIV (1948); (Office of Population Research, Princeton University; and Population Association of America, Inc.), XV (1949), XVI (1950), XVII (1951), XVIII (1952).


³Elémens de statistique humaine; ou démographie comparée (Paris: Gullasain et cie., 1855).

French historian and economist Pierre Emile Levassour described its scope as "A study of human life in births, marriages and deaths, a study of the relations thus arising and the general state of the population occasioned thereby." The tendency toward specialization had increased even further when Whipple, in 1919, emphasized the quantitative aspect, an emphasis which reasserted that of Guillard and which would be only logical if one were to approach the study, as Levassour suggested, through vital statistics.

Broadly speaking demography is the statistical study of human life. It deals primarily with such vital facts as birth, physical growth, marriage, sickness and death and incidently with political, social, educational, religious, sanitary, hygienic and medical matters. In a somewhat narrower sense demography is used as a synonym for vital statistics.

Demography cannot be called a science in the sense that it is a classified body of knowledge from which laws have been developed and established. But all sciences in their evolution go through a descriptive stage in which data are collected and hypotheses tested. So regarded demography may be called a science, the science of human generation, growth, decay and death as studied by statistical methods.

Whipple divides demography into seven major divisions: Genealogy, Human eugenics, The census (collection of social, political, religious, and educational facts), Registration of vital facts, Vital statistics, Biometrics, and Pathometrics (statistical pathology). According to such a view, demography is the statistical study of anything human. More specifically, whenever the biologist, psychologist, sociolo-

---

5 As quoted in Bonar, op. cit., 15. See also Wolfe, "Demography," op. cit., 85 and 86.

6 Whipple, op. cit., 1. The pages are identical to those of the 1919 edition.

7 Ibid., 2.
gist, political scientist, or social scientist in general engages in statistical analysis, he becomes to that extent a demographer. However, Whipple does see some things as more central to demography than others. Note his reference to the primary concern with vital statistics. He thus continues in the tradition of Levassour in using vital statistics as a springboard to the further study of human life. Unlike Levassour, however, he would retain demography completely within the statistical province which saw its birth.

A. B. Wolfe in 1931 attempted an even further specialization. He held that Whipple's definition which equated demography with vital statistics, or even more broadly with the statistical study of human life, should be recognized as too narrow a concept on the one hand and too broad on the other. "... Demography may be defined as the numerical analysis of the state and movement of human population inclusive of census enumeration and registration of vital processes and of whatever quantitative analysis can be made of the state and movement of population on the basis of fundamental census and registration data."

Wolfe further perceived two phases of demography. The static phase describes the state of the population. This is the function of census enumeration and analysis. The dynamic phase of demography has as its function the statistical analysis of the movement of population.

This includes both the physical movement of individuals from one place to another (migration and settlement) and the biosocial processes: births, deaths . . .; marriages, divorces, morbidity . . . and natural increase . . . . But for the fact that dynamic demography includes migration it could be considered as coterminous with vital statistics . . . .

---

8 Wolfe, "Demography," op. cit., 85.
One must then distinguish descriptive demography, which includes the basic data of census registration statistics; analytic demography, which includes all the statistical analysis of these data, as well as the calculation of rates; comparative demography, which includes the comparison of the status and movement of different populations at a given time; and historical or genetic demography, which deals with time series of demographic rates.\(^9\)

In his article on the theory of population, Wolfe further distinguishes between population as the more general topic and demography as the specialization. He claims that modern population theory has three important aspects: (1) The demographic phase deals statistically with population composition and movement per se. (2) The biosocial phase correlates differential rates of movement (especially human fertility) with social and economic status and with organic inheritance in an attempt to understand the bearing of these differentials on the quality of the population. (3) The socio-economic phase considers the interrelation between population and society and economic institutions with primary reference to the standard of living.\(^10\)

Wolfe did not attempt to decrease the elements in demography. His concept in one sense is every bit as broad as that of Whipple. What Wolfe did was to sharpen the focus. Population movements became the core. The "springboard" was no longer vital statistics, or the means by which people are born and die. It became the vital statistics plus migration—the way in which people enter or leave a population. Demography had become for Wolfe the statistical study of population movements and their relation to human life.

\(^9\) Ibid., 86.

What had been implicit in the writings of the earlier authors became explicit through Vance. If one is to study population movements, he will do so at least partly in order to understand the size of populations in time and in reference to an area.

Space, time, mass, and movement are the essence as the philosopher might say of population study, and we can well begin by dealing with these ideas. For space we shall use the idea of regions, for time we shall refer to the economist’s idea of economic cycles and the demographer’s idea of population trends. For mass we shall find that the demographers talk simply enough about population numbers and density. As for population movements we shall later represent our regions by making use of the idea of a series of connected reservoirs.

... It may help somewhat, as we have suggested, to think of our regions as great reservoirs of population connected with each other by streams of migration. Into each region, population flows by the entrance of birth and immigration. Out of each region population flows by the exits of death and emigration. The level attained by these flows gives us an ever changing regional balance of population which, no doubt, bears some relation to the supporting capacity of the area viewed in terms of (1) physical resources, (2) the state of economic organization and the technical arts, (3) the training and abilities of the population, and (4) the relationship of the region to other areas.12

Notice that the focus was not changed. What Vance accomplished was a further clarification of logical objectives inherent in the particular type of study which demographers had chosen.

Another modern investigator who has given assistance in crystallizing the concept of demography is T. Lynn Smith. Although he seems characteristic of most demographers in that he has expended more effort in working in the area than delimiting it, at least once he has explicitly indicated a view concerning the main focus of population study: "The

---

11 Rupert B. Vance, All These People (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945), 10.

12 Ibid., 109.
number of persons in the population of a given geographical unit and the
manner of their distribution with respect to area and resources are the
central facts of demography. 13 He would thus appear to be more in sym-
pathy with Vance (and, as will be shown below, with Davis) than with
Whipple or Wolfe, but he does not say enough to assure one of such a
conclusion. In reference to the following statement, for example, one
is left in doubt whether Smith is speaking only of demography or of demog-
raphy as one of the biosocial sciences: "Once more the plea for the more
extensive application of the logical methods of science in the study of
biosocial phenomena should be entered." 14 One is faced with the question
of whether Smith equates demography with the statistical (or other) study
of biosocial phenomena or whether he conceives of it as the study of the
size of populations and their segments (composition). To phrase the ques-
tion in another way, in his use of the phrase "biosocial phenomena," is
Smith referring to all levels of biosocial analysis or is he referring
solely to the biosocial units (people)? The reader is not told which
of the alternatives he implies. The answer must be obtained by a perus-
al of context. It then becomes apparent that Smith is most interested
in the analysis of the relative size of population segments and of the
size of total populations as seen through population movements. The work
of Smith accordingly represents most an effort to continue the theoretical
development of demography by keeping it alive and functioning in concrete
analysis.

Co., 1948), 3.

14 Ibid., 393.
The most comprehensive delineation of the area which demography encompasses that has come to the writer's attention is the treatment by Kingsley Davis. Strangely enough, the chapter on population study in which it appears is found in Human Society, a work devoted to sociology rather than demography. Nevertheless, the treatment represents a culmination in logical specificity which has characterized the trend in definitions previously discussed. Demography is presented such that more important, the task harmony with the work which

There is no text missing in this thesis.

The pages are not numbered correctly, page 9 being skipped in the numbering.

(1) to ascertain the number what change—what (3) to explain the change, we trend. In explaining

Note that his use of the term "demographic processes" is equivalent to population movements. Davis further delimits the science of population, or demography, by discussing its relations to social science.

He claims that there are two common meeting grounds.

If the populationist stopped here, however, his work would have little to do with social science but would be merely a branch of bio-statistics. What gives his subject interest to the social scientist, and social science interest to him, is in the first place: the fact that fertility, mortality, and migration are all to a great extent socially determined and socially determining. They are the inner or formal variables in the demographic sys-

---

15(New York: Macmillan Co., 1949), Chapter XX.

16Ibid., 551-52.
The most comprehensive delineation of the area which demography encompasses that has come to the writer's attention is the treatment by Kingsley Davis. Strangely enough, the chapter on population study in which it appears is found in *Human Society*, a work devoted to sociology rather than demography. Nevertheless, the treatment represents a culmination in logical specificity which has characterized the trend in definitions previously discussed. Demography is presented such that it covers an area of study completely its own. More important, the task is so accomplished that the formulation is in harmony with the work which demographers themselves have done.

The primary tasks of demography are (1) to ascertain the number of people in a given area, (2) to determine what change—what growth or decline—this number represents; (3) to explain the change, and (4) to estimate on this basis the future trend. In explaining a change in numbers, the populationist begins with three variables: births, deaths and migrations . . . .

It is clear that any factor influencing the number of people must operate through one or more of the variables mentioned. In no other way can a population be changed. For this reason we may call the . . . variables "primary demographic processes." They represent the core of population analysis.15

Note that his use of the term "demographic processes" is equivalent to population movements. Davis further delimits the science of population, or demography, by discussing its relations to social science. He claims that there are two common meeting grounds.

If the populationist stopped here, however, his work would have little to do with social science but would be merely a branch of bio-statistics. What gives his subject interest to the social scientist, and social science interest to him, is in the first place—the fact that fertility, mortality, and migration are all to a great extent socially determined and socially determining. They are the inner or formal variables in the demographic sys-

---

15 (New York: Macmillan Co., 1949), Chapter XX.

16 Ibid., 551-52.
tem, whereas the outer or ultimate variables are sociological and biological. Whenever the demographer pushes his inquiry to the point of asking why the demographic processes behave as they do, he enters the social field.

Population concerns social science in the second place because the demographer studies the number of people not only with reference to area but also with reference to their characteristics. He clings always to some definite area, but at the same time breaks down the total population within this area into groups or statistical classes, each having some definite, measurable attribute . .

. . . Unconsciously he tends to adopt two criteria: (1) the importance of the traits in the social organization; (2) the importance of the traits for the purely demographic processes. Often, as one might suspect, both criteria lead to the selection of the same traits.17

Here, then, one sees most clearly drawn the boundaries of the field which demography occupies. It does not pretend (and it could only pretend) to encompass practically everything human, as the writers prior to and including Wolfe would have it. It is in substantial agreement with the views of Vance and Smith, yet it goes even farther. The reader is shown not simply the area of demography but the extent to which the boundaries of demography overlap those of other disciplines. The result is a clearer picture.

The common trait which all seven writers share, when viewed in temporal perspective, is a tendency toward specialization. For Guillard, the only limitations to the study of demography were mathematics and human life. Levasseur gave the discipline a specific focus in his emphasis on the vital processes, but apparently was not unwilling to go outside of the quantitative realm. Whipple continued Levasseur's interest in centering demography on vital processes, but he also re-emphasized Guillard's first criterion when he drew the line at statisti-

17*ibid.*, 552.
cal analysis. Wolfe brought attention to the concept of population movements as embracing more than vital statistics but migration as well. In the final analysis, however, his outlook was about as broad as the others. Only his logic was more sound. With the modern demographers (Yance, Smith, and Davis) population study—as demography had also come to be called—meant increasingly a concentration on population movements and composition as they contribute to an understanding of size.

Content of demographic studies. The researcher who is seeking to discover what demography is about cannot derive an understanding of content from what a minority have said. The remaining task therefore is an analysis of the manner in which demographers have studied populations, i.e., the subjects they have isolated for examination, and the varying emphases they have given those subjects. The goal was approached from two directions. The first involved a content analysis of ten major works in general demography. The use of this procedure was designed to shed some light on the variation and consensus of treatment as evidenced by leading authorities. The method of selecting the "major works" or "authorities" was to accept those recognized as such in leading textbooks.

The second approach sought to describe the nature of recent literature in the field. To comment on every book pertinent to the analysis would be in itself to undertake a major research project. Yet some beginning in this direction must be made if one is to assure himself of the adequacy in the few explicit treatments. The compromise chosen was to analyze the manner in which the Population Index has classified popu-

18 For the bibliographic references to these works, see Table 1.
### Table 1

**Relative Importance of Various Categories of Demographic Analysis as Found in Ten Major Publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size and change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories, method, and technique</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic processes</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population policy</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Includes critique of data.**

**Includes age and sex. For additional sub-categories, see Table 2.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Categories</th>
<th>Population literature,(1948-1952)</th>
<th>Ten major publications in general demography,(1952-1956)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent of works devoted to each topic</td>
<td>per cent of pages devoted to specified categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total all ten works</td>
<td>Davis 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic processes</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition***</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status and family</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and national</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and mental</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population policy</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the number of publications as classified in the Population Index, Vols. 14-18.

**See Table 1 for the references to the ten major publications.

***Treatments concerned solely with age and sex are excluded.
lative literature from 1948 to 1952. Because some degree of compar-
ability was desired between the publications classified by the Index
and the subjects considered in the ten major works, only the categor-
ies relevant to specific demographic phenomena were employed. This
criterion resulted in the selection of the demographic processes, com-
position, and population policy as the classificatory tools to be em-
ployed. The most serious problem in this regard was the classifica-
tion of age and sex. The Population Index treats studies which deal
solely with these factors under the heading of "Formal Demography." Such a category is not comparable with any in a classification intended
to describe the contents of a book on formal demography. Accordingly,
age and sex are included under composition only in Table 1, where the
ten publications are presented alone. In Table 2, where the major works
are compared with the literature in the Index, they are omitted alto-
gether. Before discussing the resultant tables, however, the writer be-
lieves that a few words of caution are advisable.

In the final analysis, any classification contains a germ of ar-
bitrariness. For example, natural increase could be considered under
population growth, although seldom does a population—other than that
of the world—grow in such a manner exclusively. Consequently, the
space devoted to natural increase was divided equally between fertility
and mortality. Another difficulty arises from the manner in which

\(^{19}\) A five-year period was selected because it was felt that it
was the shortest span of time which would show all of the major varia-
tions in emphasis and give enough publications in each class to permit
realistic computations of percentages.

\(^{20}\) Not included were the Index categories of "General" population
studies, "Formal Demography," "Regional Studies," "Administration and
Method," and "Bibliography and Compendia."
phenomena are labeled. The Population Index considers marital status and the family (the specific heading is entitled "Marriage, Divorce and the Family") as a thing apart from "characteristics." This latter term, however, they otherwise employ in the same manner in which Thompson and Smith use composition. These authors, in turn, place considerations of marital status under the larger heading. It was their procedure which was followed, simply because it was more generic.

An additional warning concerns the extent to which quantification of this nature is possible. To say, for example that 5.3 per cent of Davis' *India and Pakistan* was devoted to the study of population size and change would be to imply a degree of accuracy which does not exist. The reason for doing so in the tables was only to establish a basis. It can only be said that according to the pages counted as coming under this classification, the proportion is correct.

Yet the classifications were not constructed in order that something could be criticized. They serve a real and vital purpose, faulty though they may be. In fact, they represent at present the only method of obtaining information as to what the majority of demographers study.

As is shown in Table 1, all ten of the major works in general demography considered such broad subjects as size and change of total populations, the movements of these populations with respect to fertility, mortality, and migration (i.e., the demographic processes), and composition. Although the range of interest is marked, only one author (Penrose) gave less than 70 per cent of his attention to these subjects. For all but three authors (Kuczynski, Carr-Saunders, and Penrose), these categories were important enough to claim over 80 per cent of each book. In greater detail, approximately one-fifth of the total effort of all
ten works was devoted to population size and change, one-third to the
demographic processes, and one-third to composition. All but two of
the publications gave specific attention to theories, method, or tech-
nique of population study. Only one failed to mention population pol-
icy. However, these two general topics did not receive much attention—
only one-tenth and one-twentieth, respectively, of all the works taken
together.

Several facts are immediately apparent from Table 2. First is
the generally close agreement between the classification made by the
author for the ten major demographic works and that of the Population
Index for all publications in demography over the last five years. The
discrepancy between the two summary columns relative to social and eco-

demic composition is the largest one. The ten publications give it more
attention than any other sub-category. The population literature, on
the other hand, ranks migration and mortality, respectively, as more im-
portant.

There is apparently complete agreement concerning the broader
categories of demographic analysis. The demographic processes and com-
position, respectively, are most important. One the other hand, certain-
ly no more than a tenth (if that much) of modern population analysis has
been expended on a consideration of population policy.

As was indicated in the discussion of the previous table, the
individual authors vary considerably as to the emphasis they give to
the various categories. For example, socio-economic composition is the
greatest concern of Lotzelein and his co-authors, of Vance, and of Davis.
It is of least interest to Carr-Saunders.\(^{21}\) Similarly, almost half of
Kuczynski's volume is devoted to mortality, yet Penrose barely consid-
ers it. Nevertheless, agreement is more extensive than disagreement.
never does a consideration of population policy constitute as much as
one-third of any of the ten publications. Nor is it ever even the dom-
inant issue--always some other category receives precedence. For most
of the authors, it is of little more than a passing concern.\(^{22}\) The ma-
jor emphasis for them, as for the vast majority of demographers, re-
main the demographic processes and composition.

**Conclusions.** A content analysis, alone, will not serve to show
the working connections between the parts which it identifies. Although
the evidence of the previous section has shown that the study of popula-
tions has been approached through an examination of size, change, the
demographic processes, and composition, no consideration has been given
as to which of these elements has logical priority or as to how the rest
are linked to it. To achieve this end, the analysis must turn again to
the explicit statements of demographers. Note that of all the authors
who delimited the field, the modern demographers--Vance, Smith, and Da-
vis--have placed their emphasis on size, whether that size be absolute
or relative or of the total population or its segments. In other words,
they have deemed numbers of people most important to the demographer.

\(^{21}\) The reference, of course, is only to the work here considered.
Carr-Saunders, in collaboration with another author, has devoted a sub-
stantial volume to the analysis of population composition, wherein so-
cio-economic factors assume the lion's share of attention. See A. M.
Carr-Saunders and D. Caradog Jones, *A Survey of the Social Structure of
Press, 1937).

\(^{22}\) In fact, generally speaking, the more recent the work, the less
attention policy receives.
What conclusions are reached when this statement is taken as a logical premise?

The unit of the demographer's study is a population, which has generally been interpreted to mean a collection of people inhabiting a specified area. If the endpoint of demographic analysis is to focus on numbers of people—i.e., on the size of populations—the populationist must soon encounter the fact that these numbers change, that populations represent dynamic rather than static collections. Further, since a population changes only through the operation of the demographic processes, the student of populations must direct his attention to population movements.

To probe no further, however, would be to make the false assumption that every population is a homogeneous mass. In reality, few if any modern demographers have made such an assumption. In seeking to isolate the factors behind the demographic processes, they have had to examine the variations in such physical aspects as age and sex. They have also been brought to study the institutional framework of their populations: the family (especially marriage), education, economics, religion, and even in some cases, politics. For the same reason, they have directed their attention to the ethnic and national make-up and a varied aspect which some have termed quality. These elements have received the virtually synonymous names of population characteristics or composition. They represent the constituent parts of which a

\[\text{23See Carr-Saunders and Jones, op. cit., 86-88.}\]

\[\text{24Thompson, op. cit., 125, 341-371; Carr-Saunders, The Population Problem, op. cit., 54-79, 322-24, et passim. The term generally seems to refer to biological quality.}\]
population is made, and, as the demographer has found, they exert a funda-
mental (though not always quantifiable) influence on population move-
ments. Thus, one necessity for going beyond the demographic processes in
the study of size is to examine the influence which composition
exerts.

But there is logically—and has been actually—another reason for studying composition. If the demographer is primarily interested in population size, then it follows that he is interested in the size of the parts which go to make up the whole. The study of composition furnishes the means whereby this interest may be satisfied.

In the present context, such logical manipulations would be fruitless if they did not have a basis in reality. But what the writer has done in the preceding paragraphs has been only to describe the course of action which most demographers have taken. This is not to deny that many have pursued their work without any attempt to describe their ulti-
mate objectives or to see the frame of reference which they were implic-
itly using. The very fact, however, that a central focus can be ident-
ified (as has been done here for the concept of population size) and almost all—if not all—of demographic analysis can be shown to have a clearly logical connection with that central focus, should be ample e-
nough demonstration that the work of population students has not been without direction.

The conclusion appears justified that modern demography is pri-
marily interested in the study of population movements, composition, size, and change. If one wished to place these elements in some logi-
cal framework, the emphasis of Vance, Smith and Davis on numbers of people would seem to furnish an adequate basis. Demography may then
be defined as the study of population size, of change in size, and of the manner in which these factors are manifested in population movements and composition.

SOCIOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHY

The relation between sociology and demography. If demography is to be defined as the preceding section has shown it may be defined, then the conclusion follows that it is not synonymous with sociology. The concern of the latter is with group relationships, or, if the broader context is desired, with social life. Size and numbers thus become of peripheral concern. It is accordingly evident that though the same object may be examined, each approach will lead to a different picture. As mentioned above, the demographer will discuss population size, composition, movements, and change. The sociologist will talk of institutional structure and function and of the social processes. The final goal of one is not the final goal of the other.

It is equally true, however, that neither field can be explored without a genuine concern for the findings in the other. To consider groups without referring to their size would lead one to a naive obfuscation of the difference between such clearly distinct group-types as the hamlet and the metropolis, or the police squad and the military field army. On the other hand, to attempt a population analysis while

---

ignoring the familial values, the educational complexity required of 
the society, the economic achievements and potentialities, the politi-
cal structure, and the religious orientation of the population in ques-
tion would at best relegate demographic studies to descriptions of pop-
ulation movements. At worst, it would lead to the adoption of the 
false hypothesis previously mentioned concerning homogeneous popula-
tions.

There is, however, an even closer relationship. Both discip-
lines have as their "atoms" the individual. However, for both dis-
ciplines, the individual is never properly considered alone and by 
himself. He becomes a valid object of study only when he associates 
himself with other individuals. The sociologist is interested in any 
form of group which occurs in this association. The demographer is on-
ly concerned with that complex of groups called populations.

The discussion may profitably turn again to a statement quoted 
earlier from Kingsley Davis. The demographic processes, he claimed, 
"are the inner or formal variables in the demographic system, whereas 
the outer or ultimate variables are sociological or biological." This 
analysis may be carried one step further by noting the influence of 
size on social life. In such a context it may be said that as the so-
cial processes and functions are the inner or formal variables in the 
sociological system, the demographic phenomenon of size forms at least 
one set of outer or ultimate variables. A convenient example would be 
the growth of a hamlet into a metropolis. The demographer, in investi-
gating this evolution, would first consider his formal variables as the 
demographic processes. To explain these, he would have to turn to the 
sociological characteristics of the area, among other things. Converse-
ly, the sociologist, in centering his attention on changes in the institutional structure, on the change in functions, and on the workings of the social processes, would "ultimately" have to contend with the influence which changing size had wrought on the once tiny hamlet. The two-way relationship of the two phenomena are thus apparent.

The two types of study can neither be equated nor separated. They cannot be separated for they are both dedicated to the study of man, or more precisely to the study of his gregarious manifestations. The difference is that one is focusing on the social aspect of man; the other focuses on his quantity. Thus, they cannot be equated. 26

A sociological orientation to demographic analysis. One may consequently view three areas of demography and sociology, when the two are considered together. The first is comprised solely of demographic phenomena, particularly the size and change of total populations and their movements. The second embraces mainly qualitative sociology, i.e., social structure and function and the social processes, in their qualita-

26 For a somewhat different approach to this subject, see Florian Znaniecki, Cultural Sciences: Their Origin and Development (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), 406-411. The variation between the treatment of Znaniecki and that of the present writer appears to stem primarily from a somewhat differing concept of demography. The writer has attempted to demonstrate that demography, as the study of absolute and relative size of populations, is and has been a conceptually distinct area of investigation. Znaniecki is content to denote it as "all studies of populations or total human collectivities inhabiting certain geographic areas during certain periods of time," embraced by all persons who study populations, including human geographers and human ecologists. Thus, in effect, Znaniecki has left the point of view or method of approach of demography unspecified and is accordingly free to prescribe that demographic phenomena be first studied as sociological phenomena. The writer believes that the reverse may also be true: that demographic objects may quite profitably be studied demographically. He agrees completely with Znaniecki, however, that a complete explanation of demographic phenomena cannot be achieved without eventual recourse to cultural interpretation.
tive aspects. The third area represents the meeting ground of the two fields. In demographic terms it is labeled composition or characteristics. In sociological language it is termed the quantitative aspects of institutional structure.

A sociological orientation to demographic analysis would accordingly have its greatest influence on this meeting ground. Composition would not be viewed merely as the aggregate status of the population with regard to various factors. More precisely, it would fall into two main divisions: the biological and the sociological. The former would deal with age and sex. The latter would then be treated in terms of institutional structure. The end would still be an analysis of quantity, but the objects under scrutiny would be set in a new frame of reference.

Note that population movements would still come in for their full share of discussion. These remain untouched as the inner demographic variables. The same type of justification can be given to a consideration of size and change, for they still would occupy their undisputed place as central objectives of demographic analysis.

From a study oriented in this manner, there results two pictures. The first, of course, is a demographic study of a population. Much of it, however, will at the same time be a quantitative study of group structure and change. The "group" in reference is a population, which is in turn actually a complex of groups. The sociological interest in group inter-relationships enables the selection of this complex as a yet complete and concrete social phenomenon. In the demographic analysis of composition will be seen in some measure the group structure. In the workings of the demographic processes will be seen at least one aspect of social change. The sociological picture will emerge only in
its quantitative form, however. Thus, whereas the study may be regard-
ed as complete insofar as demography is concerned, only a partial view
will be given to the sociology involved.

The demographic orientation to the study is to be emphasized.
The writer has attempted to make the following chapters (with the ex-
ception of the last) as demographic as possible. He has not attempted
to convert demography into sociology. It is believed, however, that
particularly in the categories of population composition which are se-
lected for analysis, a sociological orientation can prove meaningful,
within, of course, the framework of demography.

The final chapter provides an opportunity to bring demographic
data, as such, into a working contact with sociological theory. Here
the emphasis becomes primarily sociological, although the over-all con-
cern of the study with demography is not lost. The goal becomes, rather,
an attempt to buttress a demographic investigation with sociological con-
cepts.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study is significant on three levels of analysis: the gener-
al approach utilized, the type of population chosen for examination,
and the specific population to be investigated. On the general level,
it is believed that a sociological approach to demography can yield con-
tributions to both fields in several ways. First, a greater knowledge
results concerning the extent to which the two fields overlap. Second,
demographic phenomena are seen as bearing also social characteristics,
and conversely, the social structure is seen in its demographic role.
Finally, it is to be noted that these advantages in no way serve to
detract from the possibility of making a sound demographic study, per se. An approach to demography via sociology will not give one less demography. On the contrary, it will give more, not only in the additional aspects which receive explicit attention but in the additional insights which are afforded by placing the people more fully where they "belong," in the social setting.

Parenthetically, the author wishes to add that the approach to be used is not entirely original or new. As Davis has pointed out, many have adopted it unconsciously.²⁷ Among the members of such a group, T. Lynn Smith has probably rendered the most successful effort. And although it is difficult to label the sociological approach in his Population Analysis "unconscious," at least it is implicit, for Smith never tells the reader of such intentions. Nevertheless, a sociological approach it is. In fact, it was actually from Smith's work that the author first realized the possibility of a sociologically oriented demography. The emphasis of the present study is then to be conceived as a logical extension of the work which many students of population, and especially Smith, have been doing.

The types of population chosen for analysis also have significance. The plural form is intentionally used, for the Negroes of New Orleans are, demographically speaking, two kinds of people. They are

²⁷See supra. However, Davis himself has never made a demographic analysis in this manner. The Population of India and Pakistan is the closest approximation he has made to a sociological approach to demography, and in reality, this work represents both a sociological and a demographic approach with neither oriented to the other. This result was accomplished by omitting demographic composition and substituting for it an analysis of the institutional structure, in the full sociological sense of that term.
first an ethnic population. As is generally true in the United States, the white and Negro races are socially defined as separate and different. So powerful are the social sanctions which reinforce this definition that almost the only manner in which the sizes of these races may be changed is through the demographic processes. Thus, although the members of the two races at times may live side-by-side, they remain isolated, discreet, and separable components, not merely analytically but in fact. One is therefore justified in considering an ethnic group, when it becomes socially defined as distinct, as a population in the full sense of the word.

The New Orleans Negroes are also an urban population. Demographically speaking, they are a population living within a geographically and politically delimited area and are from the demographer's point of view a valid object of study. Sociologically speaking, they represent a more or less integrated complex of groups whose members live in a culturally similar way of life. Consequently, in their entirety they represent a social object.

The ethnic group dwelling in an urban area thus represents a valid subject for either the demographic or the sociological interest. It therefore serves admirably to show the value of a sociological approach to demographic study. The selection, however, is also important methodologically. Population movements and composition in the United States vary to such an extent between its racial and residential segments that, as Smith and Hitt have stated, unless these differentials are first eliminated or corrected for, little reliance or significance should be attached to any other observed differences or relationships.

---

If the differences are ignored, the final study may do little more than show in a crude and needlessly expensive manner the varying distribution of the two races hopelessly entangled with their residential characteristics. By selecting an ethnic population of a city, the difficulty is obviated and the requisite of demographic—indeed, scientific—precision is fulfilled.

There are, finally, certain peculiar features of the New Orleans Negro population, itself, which make it of special demographic and sociological interest. Most important, the city contains the largest group of urban Negroes in the Southeastern region. Thus, it represents numerically the most important city in that region which, more than any other, has been fundamentally responsible in defining the Negro's status. Furthermore, unlike the cities in other regions, it is an instance of native Negro urbanization. The Negroes who comprise its population and their American-born ancestors as well are almost exclusively native Southerners, particularly Southeasterners. Accordingly, the population is generally not a product of long-distance interregional exchange or transplantation. This very characteristic presents another. The Negro population of New Orleans is an old one, in the sense that it has been long established. The city has traditionally contained a large proportion of Negroes. There is here no phenomenon of recent intrusion, as is true of such cities as New York, Chicago, Detroit, or even more recently, Los Angeles. This feature represents one less complicating

---

29 The regional delineation is that found in Howard W. Odum, *Southern Regions of the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936).

30 See the data presented by Smith, *op. cit.*, 332, 337; and Mc-Mahon, *op. cit.*, 185.
factor in the race which is to be expected in any large social group. Relatively speaking, in other words, the population is "purer."

The population is "pure" in another sense, one which has an important value from the heuristic standpoint. In Southeastern cities generally, the nonwhite population is composed almost entirely of Negroes. Although New Orleans suffers slightly in comparison with such centers as Atlanta, Birmingham, and Memphis, it still comes well within the generalization, having as it does 99.5 per cent of its nonwhites classified as Negro. Compare this situation with that of Los Angeles, New York, or Chicago, where Negroes constitute 80.9, 96.4, and 96.2 per cent of the nonwhite population, respectively. When one realizes that much of the Census information for Negroes can be obtained only through the category of "nonwhite," then the value of ethnic data for Southeastern cities becomes peerless. The conformity of New Orleans in this respect would alone make it attractive. Its traditional Negro population and the manifestation of native urbanization, so typical of Southeastern urban centers, make it even more so. These factors, however, when coupled with the city's numerical superiority in the region—and thus its demographic importance—make it the most logical target of the demographer interested in urban Negro populations.

THE SCOPE AND PLAN OF STUDY

Organization. In accordance with the objectives and concepts advanced in the preceding sections, the scope of the study is limited to an analysis of the population of the New Orleans Negroes from the viewpoint of their numbers and distribution, their composition, their demographic processes, and their population change, with a concluding
statement concerning the sociological implications of the findings.

Number and distribution involves a chapter in itself. Unlike most
demographic treatises, however, the number and distribution of the
New Orleans Negroes embraces also a treatment of their residential
and ethnic characteristics. Since the people are an ethnic and resi-
dential group in themselves, the reason for the departure is apparent.
Race and residence are the very demographic essence of the people, and
a consideration of their number is a consideration of these character-
istics.

Composition is divided into two phases. Biosocial composition
deals with age and sex. It is the most purely biological aspect of
composition, but as will be indicated, neither is it without social
significance. The institutional phase of composition (or characteris-
tics) represents the writer's effort to emphasize the sociological as-
pects of demography. The orientation becomes immediately evident in
the discussion of the family. Population studies usually examine no
more of the familial structure than is embraced in marital status.
Not only does the present work attempt to give explicit consideration
to the family, per se, but it intends to place the discussion of marital
status within this broader context. The investigation of education,
economies, and politics completes the picture of the institutional struc-
ture to the extent permitted by the data. Education is treated from
the point of view of educational status, or the educational level at-
tained by the population. Economics is regarded in both its consump-
tion and production aspects. Data on political structure are of a dif-
ferent nature, particularly in that they are not the result of an enumer-
ated census. The discussion of the demographic aspects of political
structure must, in other words, concern itself primarily with registered voters.

An analysis of religious composition is omitted, primarily because of the lack of adequate data. The last census of religious bodies was already 14 years old when the 1950 census was taken, and it did not present data by race for populations smaller than states. The closest approximation to racial composition would thus be to separate first those denominations which were racially homogeneous and estimate the racial composition of the remaining organizations. The most disturbing factor, however, is that the largest single religious organization in New Orleans, the Roman Catholic Church, includes members of both races. Only estimates are available for these racial proportions, and the estimates are of entirely unknown validity. An additional problem results from the lack of comparability with data on religious composition and the other types of data presented in the study. Religious data are only available for the various organizations. One accordingly is able to ascertain no more than the number and characteristics of those persons which the particular religious organization regards as its members. Furthermore, not only are persons omitted who are not formally connected with a church, but no assurance can be obtained that only the active members of the organization in question are counted. Persons who have once been church members and who no longer attend a certain church may well be counted on its rolls. One may thus evaluate the existing official data on the racial composition of religious organizations as resting somewhat between worthlessness and doubtful validity. He would even more safely be able to level the charge of non-comparability. The data would probably be more defensible if racial categories
were not necessary.

The discussion of the primary demographic processes--fertility, mortality, and migration--brings the study to the "inner or formal" demographic variables. They set the stage for an analysis of population growth, both in its actual and theoretical phases, i.e., in the actual change which has occurred and in the projection of future population growth. The background will then have been prepared for the sociological interpretation.

Each chapter is generally initiated with a discussion of the nature and limitations of the data. (The justification for this procedure is treated in the following section.) The specific topics of the chapters have been treated on two levels. The first concerns what is referred to in this study as the New Orleans Area. For the first time in the history of the U.S. Census, a fairly complete set of data is presented for the environs of large cities as well as for the portion contained within their corporate limits. The most inclusive category is the Standard Metropolitan Area, which for New Orleans encompasses the three contiguous parishes of Jefferson, Orleans and St. Bernard (see Figure 1). Orleans Parish is coterminous with the corporate limits of the city itself. Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes may thus be regarded as the suburban part of the Standard Metropolitan Area. Within the Standard Metropolitan Area, however, is an additional category--the Urbanized Area--which includes not only the city of New Orleans but also the thickly settled and completely urban portion which exists outside of its corporate limits. This last category has been designated by the writer as the urban fringe. It
is found wholly within the suburbs and is obtained by subtracting the
Urbanized Area from the city of New Orleans. Although the urban fringe
is treated as a unit, an examination of Figure 2 indicates that it is
composed of two parts—the larger in Jefferson and the smaller in St.
Bernard Parish. The census, unfortunately, does not provide the in-
formation necessary to isolate those populations which reside in the
urban fringe portions of either parish alone.

The New Orleans Area is therefore a shorthand term to refer col-
lectively to all of those categories which are contained within the
Standard Metropolitan Area of New Orleans.

It is possible to place the various portions of the New Orleans
Area on a rough continuum with respect to nearness to the central city
and, accordingly, with respect to an increasing degree of urbanity.
Thus, the urban fringe is adjacent to the city and in many respects is
a part of it. Jefferson Parish includes almost all of the fringe area
and is accordingly "closer" than St. Bernard Parish but is still fur-
ther removed from the city—and thus from urbanity—than is the fringe.
Although still markedly within the urban influence of the city, St.
Bernard Parish represents the farthest point on the continuum. Analyti-
cally, therefore, one would approach the city first through St. Bernard
Parish, then through Jefferson Parish, and finally through the urban
fringe and into the city. Most of the tables have been so arranged
as to facilitate such a comparison.

In discussing the New Orleans Area, furthermore, the study makes
another set of comparisons. The demographic situation of the Negroes is
related to that of their white fellow-citizens. The writer believes that
the importance of such a comparison is not to be minimized. The Negroes
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of New Orleans do not exist in a vacuum. Quite the contrary, probably the most powerful influence on their way of life (and thus on their demographic condition) is to be found in the presence of the white population. The racial comparison thus looms of major importance in the discussion.

The analysis of the New Orleans Area serves three purposes. Analytically, it discusses the city as a unit. It describes what the Negro inhabitants are—demographically speaking—from the standpoint of averages or totals. Comparatively, it places them in their local setting with respect to the surrounding area and with respect to the whites. It also serves to furnish a background upon which the second and more specific level of analysis may proceed. This level involves an examination of the variation in demographic conditions within the corporate limits of the city itself. The task is accomplished by the use of data for census tracts. For the city as a whole, these numbered 142 in 1950 (see Figure 3). The study, however, will concentrate more often on the 89 tracts for which data on the nonwhite population are presented.

The data. Many pages of this study are devoted to the data, per se, including a consideration of both their nature and the treatment which they receive. Such a discussion concerns not demography as much as it does the means of attaining a demographic analysis. This approach is justified by the truism that no scientific analysis is any better than the information upon which it is based. A description of the quality of the information which is presented prior to the analysis will therefore provide the reader with, so to speak, a limitation of expec-
The quality of the data alone depends both on the manner in which the data are gathered and upon the errors accrued thereby (the two are not mutually exclusive categories). The information in this study is generally of three types: enumerated, or that which is gathered by actually contacting the members of the population; registered, or that which is provided by the population, itself, during such events in the life cycle as birth, death, and even voting; and estimated, or the approximation of populations for those data for which neither of the aforementioned types of data are extant.

Enumerated data themselves are of two types: complete counts and samples. Errors arise from complete counts either through faulty reporting of the respondent, through misinterpretation of the interviewer, or through omission or "double-counting" of the members of the population. Usually, little knowledge exists as to the extent of such errors, beyond the fact that they do exist. Errors arising from sample counts, on the other hand, are quite accurately measurable through application of laws of probability—they are also usually of much greater magnitude.

Generally speaking, errors in registered data are in the nature of incomplete counts. Those concerning births are capable of isolation

31 The purpose in the consideration of the data is only to provide a discussion of those factors which have a direct bearing on the present study. For a very comprehensive treatment of demographic data, see Smith, op. cit. More specialized considerations may be found in U. S. Bureau of the Census, Handbook of Statistical Methods for Demographers (preliminary edition—second printing), by A. J. Jaffe (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951).

32 For example, a person may be visiting and erroneously included in both his place of residence and in the place in which he is temporarily staying.
and measurement. The lack of a complete registration of deaths is more difficult to verify. The registration of voters is in a separate category in that the more serious errors will arise through over-registration.

An additional purpose in discussing the data is to point out the types of necessary information which are lacking and the means taken to approximate them (if any approximation is possible). Population estimates represent one such type of approximation, although their ad hoc nature renders their discussion in other chapters more appropriate. Other types of approximations are necessary when certain characteristics must be mentioned but which have not yet lent themselves to quantification. The tools used in such instances usually appear in the forms of indexes, or indirect measures of that which is not directly measurable. However, the main tools of the demographer are percentages and ratios. The latter are also quite varied, since most aspects of demography utilize highly specialized ratios. The presence of a section devoted to the data, therefore, affords an excellent opportunity to inform the reader of the specific measures to be employed, of their definitions, and of their limitations.

The separate treatment of the data has a final advantage. By initially specifying the peculiarities, limitations, and technical treatment of the information, the main body of the analysis is permitted a greater degree of continuity.

The composition of the population is to be studied at the latest period or point in time for which evidence is available. This criterion generally limits the first part of the study to an analysis of the 1950 U. S. Census of Population. For the demographic processes, the
most important source is *Vital Statistics of the United States*. The availability of relevant data, however, generally precludes investigation earlier than 1940.

**The social areas of the city.** In order to simplify the description of the demographic characteristics and processes of the Negro population as they are distributed among the city's 142 census tracts, the writer has divided New Orleans into 19 social areas. The complete explanation of the techniques used is furnished in Appendix A, but, briefly, the areas were derived from a combination of (1) data collected and organized by Calvin F. Schmid, \(^{33}\) (2) the writer's own personal knowledge of the city gathered as observations of a native, (3) information secured from 10 additional residents of New Orleans, and (4) an examination of various other relevant publications. \(^{34}\) The Areas are delineated in Figure 5, and their socio-economic status in 1940 is summarily described in Figure 4.

The data are severely restricted in their application, for two reasons: (1) They are based on information for varying time periods (1953 for the informants' observations, 1940\(^{35}\) for Schmid's data, and

---


35 Generally speaking, the change in socio-economic status among the tracts during the decade has probably not been marked, with perhaps two exceptions. An examination of educational and occupational statuses in the city revealed both Gentilly and the Lake Front (especially the latter) to have made marked improvements during the 10 years. Their socio-economic status would thus be higher in 1950 than indicated by Schmid's data for 1940.
FIGURE 4. THE ECOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF NEW ORLEANS; 1940.

(Source: From Calvin F. Schmidt, "Generalizations Concerning the Ecology of the American City," American Sociological Review (1950).)
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FIGURE 5. THE SOCIAL AREAS OF NEW ORLEANS: 1950.
varying dates in the remaining publications), and (2) the informants used were few in number. Hence, the areas are only meant to be approximate—to serve no other purpose than as general points of reference. The completeness of the delineation as presented in Figure 5 and Appendix A was attempted only in order to minimize ambiguity.
For demography, as defined in this study, members of people—both relative and absolute—are of paramount importance. It is fitting, therefore, that the analysis be initiated with a survey of the relative and absolute size of the Negro population in New Orleans. Included in this chapter are also discussions of urban-rural residence and race. Since the primary focus of the study is on a racial category in an urban area, the treatment of these aspects in a chapter on numbers of people seems justified.

NEW ORLEANS' PLACE IN THE NATION

New Orleans has one of the largest Negro populations in the United States. Certain cities of more than 100,000 persons have more Negroes, other cities have a higher proportion of Negroes relative to the total population, and yet other cities have a "purer" nonwhite population, but no city has more Negroes constituting a larger proportion of both the total and the nonwhite populations. Although the District of Columbia has more Negroes, both in absolute numbers and relative to the total population, it also has more persons of other races, thus reducing the percentage of the nonwhite population which is Negro below that of New Orleans. And whereas New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Baltimore all have more Negroes, none approach New Orleans in the proportion which its Negroes claim of the total population.

The importance which Negroes have for the population of New Orleans is demonstrated by Table 3. The more than one and one-half mil-
TABLE 3. RANK OF THE NEW ORLEANS POPULATION AMONG THE CITIES OF THE UNITED STATES, BY RACE, FOR THE CITY AND THE STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREA: 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ORLEANS AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>685,405</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>484,882</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>200,523</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>199,527</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ORLEANS CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>570,445</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>387,614</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>182,631</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>181,775</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Part 1, Table 86; Parts 2-49, Chapter B, Table 34.
lion inhabitants of the city rank sixteenth among the nation's urban places. The city's white population ranks twenty-first. Its nonwhite population, however, ranks eighth, and if the comparisons are limited to Negroes only, the rank rises to seventh place. The picture is relatively the same for the nation's standard metropolitan areas. In both cases, the Negro population of New Orleans is large enough to raise the standing of the city relative to those of the nation by five or more places over the ranking which would be accorded if only the white population was considered.

These comparisons attain greater significance when broad national averages are examined. The Negro is truly America's tenth man, for exactly 10.0 per cent of the nation's citizens are of that race. The urban population has a slightly smaller ratio (9.7 per cent). Negroes in New Orleans, however, comprise almost one-third of the city's people—31.9 per cent of the population within the central city and 29.5 per cent of the urbanized area. The proportion is thus high, and the fact that six cities of more than 100,000 persons have a higher proportion of Negroes does not detract from the statement. One has only to remember that the very fact that New Orleans does rank seventh in such an array means that 100 cities containing at least one-tenth of a million persons had smaller proportions of Negroes.

THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

Number. The 199,527 Negroes in the New Orleans Area were concentrated in 1950 primarily in Orleans Parish (see Table 4). Jefferson Parish contained the second largest contingent (16,138) and St. Bernard had the smallest (1,617). In the suburbs, however, the main portion of
TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1950.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent of total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td>685,105</td>
<td>484,882</td>
<td>199,527</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td></td>
<td>570,445</td>
<td>387,814</td>
<td>181,775</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,960</td>
<td>97,068</td>
<td>17,752</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,873</td>
<td>87,604</td>
<td>16,138</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,087</td>
<td>9,464</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>659,768</td>
<td>461,587</td>
<td>194,181</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td></td>
<td>570,445</td>
<td>387,814</td>
<td>181,775</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,323</td>
<td>76,773</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This table is designed to show the manner in which the component parts of the New Orleans Area are joined together. The table, however, has the disadvantage of separating the units of the area from one another, a practice which becomes especially confusing when the Area is examined with respect to its degree of urbanity.**

In all future tables which subdivide the New Orleans Area into its geographic and residential parts (e.g., see Table 5), the order is intended to present first the composite areas (Metropolitan New Orleans, the Urbanized Area, and the Suburbs) and second the individual units (the City, the urban fringe, and Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes), such that the latter arrangement may show these units as they progress on a more-urban to more-rural continuum. The most rural part of the New Orleans Area is St. Bernard Parish, with Jefferson Parish, the urban fringe, and the city becoming progressively more urban.

the Negro population was gathered into the urban fringe. This area contained 77.1 per cent of the suburban Negroes and 79.1 per cent of the suburban whites.

Negroes are a minority in the city and are even more so in the suburbs (see Table 4). Never do they constitute as much as one-third of the population in the city, its fringe, or the suburban parishes. In fact, it is only in the city that they actually approach the proportion of one out of three persons (31.9 per cent). Their relative strength in the suburbs is less than half as great: Jefferson Parish with the highest proportion is only 15.6 per cent Negro.

As is evident in Table 5, Negroes tend to be concentrated to a larger extent within the city limits and less in the suburbs than are the whites. Whereas more than nine out of every ten Negroes in the New Orleans Area are to be found in Orleans Parish, the corresponding ratio is only eight out of ten for whites. Conversely, whites are relatively more than twice as numerous as Negroes in the suburbs. The ratio is even higher in Jefferson Parish and higher still in the fringe area.

Population density. The conventional manner in which relative population distribution is expressed is through the concept of population density, i.e., the number of persons per square mile. Accordingly, the parish of Orleans with the smallest land area of the standard metropolitan area emerges with by far the largest population density (see Table 6). The corporate limits of the city include less than one-half the surface area of that which is found in Jefferson Parish and less than two-fifths that of St. Bernard, yet its 2,866.6 persons per square mile is more than ten times greater than that of Jefferson and 100 times
### TABLE 5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION WITHIN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, FOR EACH RACE: 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area in square miles</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>Other races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>613.1</td>
<td>433.7</td>
<td>178.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2,866.6</td>
<td>1,948.8</td>
<td>913.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>254.0</td>
<td>214.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area in acres</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>Other races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>715,520</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>127,360</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>261,760</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>326,400</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

greater than St. Bernard.

Although the concept of persons per square mile is an easily understood measure of the population density in sparsely settled territory or for large amounts of land (which generally include much thinly occupied territory), it at times becomes rather cumbersome and unwieldy. This situation is particularly apparent in urban areas, and New Orleans with its density of 2,866.6 persons per square mile is no exception. Indeed, many of the census tracts evidence densities of well over 10,000 persons per square mile. In an attempt to overcome this awkwardness, the Urban Life Research Institute in its presentation of data for census tracts in New Orleans used the concept of persons per acre.¹ As can be seen in Table 6, the measure is quite convenient in describing the condition in New Orleans.

The very nature of the usefulness of this measure in urban (or thickly settled) areas, however, renders it useless in the study of outlying districts. An acre is too small a unit to reveal anything but heavy population densities. The chief purpose in presenting the concept of persons per acre at this time is to establish a basis of comparison for the census tract analyses, and to do so in the proper place. When urban areas are compared with rural areas, the concept of persons per square mile is admittedly the only practical one. When intra-urban analyses are attempted, however, the value of using persons per acre is quite apparent: the statement that approximately four and one-half persons reside on each acre of the city's territory is more

readily understood than one which expresses the data in terms that
mount to thousands and even tens of thousands of units.

As is understandable in view of their greater numbers, whites
had a much higher population density than did Negroes. This statement
applies to every parish in the New Orleans Area. The difference be-
tween the races is greater in the suburbs than in the city.

Races other than white and Negro. Since a large proportion of
"other races" (the miscellaneous or residual racial category employed
by the Census to designate persons other than white or Negro) is com-
pounded of persons who have some connection with the Mongoloid race, the
writer felt that a more descriptive term was probably available than the
residual one. The technical anthropological terminology could not be
employed, since

The concept of race as it has been used by the Bureau of
the Census is derived from that which is commonly accepted by the
general public. It does not, therefore, reflect clear-cut definitions of biological stock, and several categories obviously refer
to nationalities.2

II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 18, Louisiana, Chapter B,

The term "Asiatic" was believed more fitting. Included are (American)
Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, Koreans, Asiatic Indians—in fact,
all elements of the Census category of "other races." The discrepancy
in the case of the American Indians is more apparent than real: after
all, their origin was Asia, and it is with most of the members of that
continent with which they have racial affinity.

Only 996 persons in the standard metropolitan area are of some
race other than white or Negro. Even with the majority of these persons
concentrated in the city, they are never numerous enough to claim a ratio of 2 persons per 1,000. As is evident in Table 4, neither are they of enough statistical importance to influence the nonwhite population. For all practical purposes, the nonwhite and Negro populations in the New Orleans Area are synonymous terms.

Residence. Although the city of New Orleans and its urban fringes are both by definition urban, the suburbs as a whole would more precisely be classed as nonfarm (see Table 7). This statement is not meant to deny that even in the suburbs the majority of the people are urbanites. It is meant instead to emphasize the fact that in the suburbs, in contrast to the urbanized area, a significant proportion of the population is technically rural-nonfarm. For the Negroes, this proportion is 18.5 per cent; for the whites, it is 15.7 per cent. In Jefferson Parish, the proportion is slightly more than one-tenth rural nonfarm. In St. Bernard Parish, however, the majority of the residents are rural-nonfarm--almost all Negroes (92.4 per cent) and approximately two-thirds of the whites (67.1 per cent).

The number of persons in the farm population is negligible. Urban farmers of both races (no data are available for each race separately) total no more than 532 persons for the entire New Orleans Area. They are accordingly even of less importance than are Asians. Rural farmers, though numerically more prominent, are still relatively inconsequential. Only among the white residents of St. Bernard Parish do they reach a proportion as high as five per cent--the percentage is usually less than two.

Generally speaking, therefore, one may characterize both races

(Note: The city, the urban fringe, and the Urbanized Area, by definition, are completely urban.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>St. Bernard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-nonfarm</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-farm</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Part 18, Tables h2, h8, h8a, h9, h9a.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent Nonwhite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 7.
in the New Orleans Area as primarily urban with a secondary concentration of rural nonfarm persons. Only in St. Bernard Parish do rural-nonfarmers assume majority status. Farmers throughout the Area are scarce and unimportant.

The minority status of the Negro extends to every residential category (see Table 8). Generally speaking, they are least important among the least important rural-farmers, and they reach their highest proportions in the most urban portion of the metropolitan area, i.e., the city, itself. The correlation with urbanity, however, is not complete. In the suburbs, not only is the urban fringe relatively low in proportion of Negroes as compared to the rest of the Area, but the urban portion of St. Bernard Parish contains the lowest proportions of all.

The degree of urbanity in the New Orleans Area may be more extensively analyzed by the use of residence ratios, of which two types have been devised by the writer. Urbanity ratios measure the urban population in relation to the rural population of a given area. It is computed according to the following formula:

\[
\text{Urbanity ratio} = \frac{\text{urban population}}{\text{rural population}} \times 100,
\]

where the rural population includes both the farm and nonfarm elements. The measure yields the number of urbanites per 100 ruralites and thus describes the relative importance of the strictly urban part of the population. The converse measure—the rurality ratio—accentuates or focuses on the most rural part of the population, the rural-farm element. It is computed in a manner similar to the urbanity ratio:
Rurality ratio = \frac{rural-farm population}{nonfarm population} \times 100,

where the nonfarm population includes the urban and rural-nonfarm categories. These measures are not meant to take the place of percentage comparisons. They are intended, rather, to supplement them, especially in that they show the relative strength of dichotomous components of a population, not, however, in relation to the total in which both have an influence, but in relation to each other.

The degree of urbanity in the metropolitan area is clearly revealed by the residence ratios. (See Table 9). For the entire Area, Negro urbanites outnumber their more rural fellows at a rate of almost sixty to one. Of course, the large population of Orleans Parish and its urbanized area are largely responsible for the extreme one sidedness, but even in the suburbs, including the urban fringe, the urban Negroes are four times more numerous than the rural ones. Only in St. Bernard Parish does the balance tip, and then heavily in the other direction, with almost 25 rural Negroes for every urbanite, or an urbanity ratio of 3.9.

The insignificance of farmers among New Orleans Negroes is attested to by the extremely low rurality ratios. For the metropolitan area, only one rural-farmer exists for every 1,000 nonfarmers. The reason even for this "high" a ratio can be found in St. Bernard Parish, where there are four farmers for every 100 persons in the remainder of the population.

The residence ratios, finally, point out with decided emphasis the relatively more urban nature of the Negroes in the New Orleans Area in comparison to that of the whites. For the New Orleans Area, Negroes

[Note: The city, the urban fringe, and the Urbanized Area, by definition, are completely urban.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urbanity Ratios (urbanites per 100 ruralites)</th>
<th>Rurality Ratios (farmers per 100 nonfarmers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>5,759.8</td>
<td>2,807.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>422.8</td>
<td>481.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>774.7</td>
<td>794.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 7.
are more than twice as urban as their white neighbors, whereas white farmers are three times more important than Negro farmers. Only in the suburbs, where smaller populations prevail, do whites have higher urbanity ratios, and generally their ratios are not impressively larger. The rurality ratios in the suburbs, however, are 0.6 and 8.6 farmers per 100 nonfarmers for the Negro and white populations, respectively, indicating a farm population among the whites which is relatively more than 14 times greater than that of Negroes.

**DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY**

**Number.** All but two census tracts in the city contain nonwhite persons. The two tracts composed entirely of white persons are located in the northernmost parts of Metairie (tract 76A) and Carrollton (tract 74). Figure 6, however, reveals several areas in the city which are especially lacking in nonwhite population. The City Park area has no tract with as many as 138 Negroes, whereas Audubon Park, University and the Lake Front each have enough nonwhites to warrant at least one tract being placed in the third sixth of the distribution. (see Figure 6.) None of the above mentioned areas has more nonwhites in any tract than does the median tract for the city (1401 nonwhites). The Broadmoor area has a greater concentration of Negroes than any of the previously specified areas, yet it is also sufficiently sparsely populated by nonwhites to merit its inclusion within this group.

The largest concentration of Negroes in the city is to be found in Magnolia. Eleven of the tracts in this area are ranked in the highest sixth of the distribution for the city. As an aggregate, these persons total 51,593, or 29.9 per cent of the city's total nonwhite
population. Next in size is the concentration in the Industrial Canal area, which comprises 9.9 per cent of the total nonwhite population, followed by Esplanade (8.6), Galves (5.9), Gentilly (2.8), Metairie (1.7), and Algiers (1.6). These areas represent all of the largest Negro census tracts in the city, i.e., those tracts in the upper sixth of the sextile distribution. The 24 tracts contain 110,345 nonwhite persons, or 60.4 per cent of all nonwhites in the city. These values are to be contrasted with those for the lower third of the array of census tracts. This category represents a total of 2,248 nonwhites or 1.2 per cent of the city's total. The intermediate tracts, on the other hand (those with populations between the second and the fifth sextile), have a total of 70,038 nonwhites, or 38.3 per cent of the total.

The single tract with the largest Negro population in the city is tract 9. Its location in the Industrial Canal area should not be surprising, since that portion of the city does rank second among the areas in respect to the size of the Negro element. Gentilly, on the other hand, is anomalous. Although the portion adjacent to Dillard University is heavily settled with Negroes, four of Gentilly's tracts are among those with the smallest Negro population in the city.

Generally, the tracts with the largest number of Negroes also contain the highest proportion of nonwhite persons (see Figure 7). The chief exceptions are found in tracts 75 (Metairie), 17C and 14 (Industrial Canal), and 6 (Algiers)—all of which have proportions of nonwhites below 50.0 per cent. From the point of view of statistics, the responsible factor is chiefly the large land area in these tracts; accordingly, a misleadingly large number of Negroes are included. However, all of the largest census tracts (in terms of numbers of nonwhites) are ranked
in the upper third (above 31.0 per cent) of the array of tracts according to percentage nonwhite.

Conversely, those areas in the city with small numbers of nonwhites are also those with low proportions in the same category--note the University, Broadmoor, Audubon Park, City Park, and Lake Front areas. The most outstanding exception is found in the rivermost portion of the Waterfront: the numbers of Negroes are small, but these persons do claim relatively large proportions of the population. All of the three tracts under discussion are above the median value of the city (16.1 per cent nonwhite).

The areas of the city with the highest proportions of nonwhites are Magnolia, Esplanade, and Galvez (see Figure 8). The highest proportions of all are in Magnolia--nine tracts are comprised of 90.0 per cent or more nonwhites. Magnolia accordingly represents the most important concentration of Negroes in the city, whether one views the data in terms of absolute numbers or in terms of relative proportions.

Population density. A comparison of Figure 9, which shows the nonwhite population densities by census tracts, with the map of the proportion of population which is nonwhite (Figure 7) suggests that those tracts with high proportions of Negroes are also the tracts where the nonwhites are most densely settled. More important, however, is the fact that the data seem to support the statement that the population density for the total population is greatest where the proportion of Negroes is highest. Thus, in the tracts having the heaviest population density (the upper sixth of the arrayed densities for the total population, i.e., from 45.41 to 82.79 persons per acre), only one census tract was found which had its proportion nonwhite below 1.4 per cent (the first sextile),
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FIGURE 8. CENSUS TRACTS COMPRISED OF 50.0 PER CENT OR MORE NONWHITE POPULATION, NEW ORLEANS: 1950.

Figure 10. Percent distribution of Asiaties and size of the nonwhite population, by census tracts, New Orleans: 1950.
Conversely, in the tracts having the lightest concentration of persons (the lowest sixth, i.e., from 0.09 to 12.65 persons per acre) only one tract had its proportion nonwhite above 58.9 per cent (the sixth sextile). In other words, where the population densities were heavy, the proportion of Negroes tended to be heavy, and vice versa. Negroes, therefore, tend to live in more crowded conditions than do the whites.

The six tracts with the greatest population densities are all in the Magnolia section. They range from 50.59 persons per acre in tract 94 to 76.27 persons per acre in tract 80. The Esplanade area ranks second in the thickness of settlement of its nonwhites, whereas the Galvez area is third. These three areas account for all tracts in the upper sixth of the array presented in Figure 9.

An analysis of population densities shows further the important bearing which a large land area can have on population size. Thus, none of the tracts in the Industrial Canal area have densities greater than 24.35 persons per acre (the fifth sextile of the array). In addition, it is this area which contains tract 17C, a tract which has more than twice as much acreage as the rest of the city combined. As would be expected, tract 17C has one of the largest Negro populations in the city. Yet its nonwhite population density is one of the lowest in New Orleans (0.07 persons per acre). Observations similar to those in the Industrial Canal area can be made for Algiers--tract 6 is especially comparable with tract 17C.3

---

3 These tracts spell out with great clarity a deficiency in the method used to calculate population densities, i.e., that the use of standardized areas (census tracts, wards, counties, etc.) ignores the possibility of there existing varying concentrations of population within the standard area. In other words, of necessity, the distribution of the population within the standard area is assumed to be homogeneous.
Distribution of Asians: The 856 Asians are scattered throughout the city, occupying 114 of the 142 tracts (see Figure 10). In only 6 tracts, however, do they claim more than 5.0 per cent of the nonwhite population. Three of these tracts are located in the French Quarter and in the adjacent tract in the Galvez area, tract 26. This latter tract represents the heaviest concentration of Asians in the city, 108 persons, or 19 per cent of the tract's nonwhite population. The remaining tracts are each in separate areas: the Garden District, Broadmoor, and Carrollton. These tracts contain 255 Asians, or 29.8 per cent of the city's total Asians. They only constitute 0.1% per cent, however, to the city's nonwhite population.

On the other hand, there are 26 tracts where only Negroes and whites reside, only two of which contain solely white persons (see the discussion above). The former are scattered randomly over the city; only Esplanade and the Industrial Canal areas are without tracts in which Asians are completely lacking. However, the general insignificance of the Asian population is attested to decisively by the fact that none of the large nonwhite tracts have as much as 1.0 per cent of its nonwhite population in this racial category.
CHAPTER XIII

AGE COMPOSITION

Age and sex represent the biological limits of demographic and sociological possibilities. To cite only the more obvious limitations, one need only note that a society of infants could not exist, a society of oldsters could not long exist; and a society of only men or only women would not last much longer than half a century. The influence of age and sex is more, however, than theoretical: the relative incidence or change of the birth, death, and migration patterns in a population not only must operate through the age and sex structure but can only operate within the limits imposed by the age and sex composition of the population: birth rates can be no higher than allowed by the number of women in the reproductive years, death rates can be no lower than permitted by the rapidly dying old persons (and often infants as well), and migration is usually not much more frequent than there are young adults to migrate. The conditioning mentioned at this point is largely biological—these two factors set biological limits upon what the society can accomplish.

But the nature of age and sex is not only biological—it is sociological as well. Of all the elements of population, age and sex are the bases for probably the most rigid types of ascribed status. A person is placed within an age and sex category by society at his or her birth, a category which may not be vacated by personal endeavor. Achievement in these areas occurs within such rigidly defined limits as to represent no achievement at all—only modification. The basis for the classification is biological, but the precise role of the participants in these classes
is determined by the culture—and even the deviation from the role. This factor of status, and, in addition, the importance of the biological aspects of these elements, sets them apart from the other characteristics of the population. They represent, then, the biological facets of composition. The discussion of age is the primary focus of the present chapter. The next chapter is devoted to the demography of sex.

THE DATA

There are perhaps no types of data more simply defined and at the same time more open to error than those relevant to the ages of the members of a population. Precision in obtaining this type of information can at the most be only approached. According to Robert Myers:

In the reporting of age there arise five major forms of errors and bias; first, under-reporting of the number of children at ages 0 and 1; second, a tendency to give exact age 21, probably because of its legal significance; third, distinct over-statement among those at very advanced ages; fourth, a general tendency (termed "heaping") for ages to be given as ending in certain digits [1, e.g., in even numbers and \frac{21}{7}]; and fifth, the reporting of some individuals as being of unknown age.²

Several attempts have been made to measure the degree of misstatement connected with each type of bias. Myers may be credited with the most accurate efforts. His measuring devices, however, are more elaborate than demanded by the needs of the present discussion. T. Lynn Smith has discovered a relatively simple and practical technique for assessing

---

¹The age classification of the 1950 U. S. Census is based on the age of the person at his last birthday, i.e., the age in completed years.

²Robert J. Myers, "Errors and Bias in the Reporting of Ages in Census Data," Transactions of the Actuarial Society of America, XLI (1940), 395. For an additional type of bias not mentioned by Myers, that concerning the misstatement of women's ages, see Chapter IV.
the accuracy of age reporting.

The United States Census and the censuses of many other countries present age distributions for single years beginning with under 1 and ending with 99, or a total of 100 1-year age periods. Omitting the persons whose age is unknown and those 100 years of age and over, approximately 10 per cent of the remainder normally should be of an age exactly divisible by 10, another 10 per cent in other ages exactly divisible by 5, 40 per cent in the other even-number ages, and the remaining 40 per cent in the odd-number ages other than those ending in 5. The effects of each of the known concentrations, i.e., on even years, years ending in 5, and years ending in 0, are to reduce the proportion of the population in the odd-number ages other than those ending in 5.3

Consequently, if one first were to obtain the percentage which those persons who reported their ages as ending in 1, 3, 7, and 9 constituted of the total population under 100 years and second would relate the resulting percentage to 40, converting this ratio in turn to a percentage, he would obtain a fairly reliable gauge of the accuracy of the reported ages. On such a scale, perfect reporting would give a score of 100, and any tendency for the reported ages to concentrate in the even years and in the ages ending with 5 would reduce the rating.

The index is not perfect. The understatement in age 0 (i.e., under 1) is not accounted for and the overstatement of age 21 would tend to upgrade the score for a given population. But the index is sensitive to what it purports to measure and has the added advantage of being easy to compute and simple to understand. Smith discovered by using this measure that the United States in 1940 had a score of 96.4 For Louisiana, the

---


4. Smith extends the computation to an additional decimal place. However, in view of the approximate nature of the index, the writer believes that dropping the decimal place is a more realistic procedure.
score was 94. The deficit in the state in comparison with the United States was apparently due to the greater misstatement of nonwhites (an index of 90) rather than the whites (an index of 96).

Unfortunately, comparable data for 1950 are not available. Most important, figures for political subdivisions (including states) for single years are presented only up to age 85 and only for a 20 per cent sample. The index then had to be modified such that only the population under 85 years was employed in the computation. This modification did not serve to alter the original value of the index, even when calculations were extended to one decimal place. Accordingly, the index of age misstatement for Louisiana in 1950 had risen to 97. Even when this figure is qualified by standard errors (since it is based on sample data), one may conclude that age data are reported with more accuracy than in 1940; the chances are 95 out of 100 (i.e., two standard errors) that the percentage will not vary more than 0.5 per cent.

On the basis of the sample data, the index of age misstatement for the white population of the state was 98 and for the nonwhite, 94. Since the same standard errors prevail as for the state as a whole (±0.25 in each case), one may similarly conclude that the age data for both races were more accurately reported in 1950 than 10 years earlier.

For the first time, the 1950 Census published data for cities of 250,000 or more which permit the computation of indexes of age misstatement. Thus, one may evaluate the condition of the New Orleans data, but not that of its standard metropolitan area or its urban fringe. The index for the nonwhite population of the city was 97, whereas that of the white population was 98 (standard errors of ±0.8 and ±0.5, respectively). Relative to Louisiana in 1950, therefore, one may conclude that the age
data for both the white and nonwhite segments of the city are satisfactorily accurate.

The only practical method yet devised for correcting the tendency for rounding of ages is to group the reported ages into categories. Myers has demonstrated that the best method is to group the ages accordingly: 0 to 1, 2 to 6, 7 to 11, etc. However, the present classification employed by the U. S. Census (0 to 4, 5 to 9, etc.) is satisfactory. This method, on the average, places 50.4 per cent of each ten year age group in the 5 to 9 category (i.e., numbers ending in these digits) and 49.6 per cent in the 0 to 4 age group.5

Four types of measures are used in addition to simple percentage comparisons in the analysis of age data: the age-sex pyramid, index numbers of age, median age, and the dependency ratio. One of the most convenient methods of summarizing the effects of the demographic variables on a population is to employ the age-sex pyramid. This device presents graphically the relative concentrations of males and females in each quinquennial age group. As in shown in Figure 11, the population ages as one "climbs up" the pyramid, the males customarily placed on the left and the females on the right side. By juxtaposing two pyramids, quite minute comparisons become feasible.

In spite of the combination of simplicity and detail with which an age-sex pyramid describes a population, it does not depict in sufficient detail many important variations in age composition. Once the broad outline has been given, a microscope of some sort is necessary if one is to focus on the differences, themselves. Such an instrument has been

5Myers, op. cit., 406-407.
developed also by T. Lynn Smith. It may be described as simply a series of index numbers (one for each age class), each of whose values represents the importance of an age group in the population under analysis as compared with the same age group of another population arbitrarily designated as the norm. For any selected population, the index number of a given age class is computed by dividing the percentage of the population in that class by the percentage of persons in the corresponding age class of the norm population, multiplying the quotient by 100. Thus, 10.7 per cent of the 1950 U. S. population was under 5 years of age. The corresponding percentage for New Orleans was 12.3. The index number would consequently be 115, indicating simply that if the U. S. and New Orleans were both of the same size but with their original relative age distributions, for every 100 persons under 5 years in the U. S. there would be 115 persons under 5 in New Orleans.

The third measure employed in the analysis is the median age. This measure simply represents that age which divides the population into two equal parts, one being older and the other younger. Its chief advantage in regard to age analysis is an insensitivity to extreme values and open-ended classes. Thus, not only are persons of extreme age not allowed to skew the summary measure, but even when the age of the oldest persons are unknown (which has been indicated as quite possible even when reported to the enumerator), the median can be realistically computed.

The socio-economic significance of the peculiarities of the age distribution may be presented quite lucidly by means of dependency ratios,\textsuperscript{6} or the proportion of dependent persons for every 100 producers.

\textsuperscript{6} The dependency ratio was first used by Alfred H. Stone in his
The productive portion of the population is subsumed within the category of 15 to 64 years of age. Old or aged persons are counted as those who are 65 years old or older. Children are persons who are in the category younger than 15 years of age. A ratio of 100 signifies that the population has as many producers as it has dependents. Such an abundance of dependents, however, is seldom found.

The ratio of dependents to producers provides the researcher with two sets of data. He is first able to obtain some idea or approximation on a comparative basis of the potential productive strength of a population. Simply put, a population which must devote its energies to the support of a relatively large number of dependents will not have as large a potential ability to produce above its basic requirements for living as would a population with a relatively small number of dependents, all other things being equal. Equally important from the demographer's point of view is the ability which the dependency ratio has of measuring the relationship between socially meaningful age categories. Old and young, children and adults are classifications which probably every society has employed or approximated. The economic importance has been indicated. The social importance becomes evident when one recalls the crucial role which productive adults must assume in child-rearing and which the more mature must assume in the educational and political spheres.

[Footnote continued] "Some Problems of Southern Economic History," American Historical Review, XIII (1908), 779-797. It was later given more extensive application by T. Lynn Smith. Cf. his The Sociology of Rural Life (New York: Harper & Bros., 1940), 77 (and also the later editions).
THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

The age-sex pyramid. Several generalizations regarding the distribution of the population by age and sex are possible for all geographic segments of the New Orleans Area (see Figure 11). The "pinching" effect of the lowered birth rate of the depression years is apparent for both races, as is the subsequent increase in births for the last decade—revealed by the expanded base. Persons below 20 years, however, are relatively more numerous in the Negro population than in the white, indicating that the whites experienced greater decimations during the depression and reacted less expansively in the following 10 years. In the older ages, however, white persons become relatively more numerous, with the exception of the 65 to 69 year age group. In this category, almost without exception, Negroes are of greater relative importance, and almost without exception they are in greater abundance in the immediately younger age group than are the whites. The exception is Orleans Parish. There, white males are relatively larger in number than the nonwhite males, and these, in turn, are slightly smaller in number than the 60 to 64 year age group. The New Orleans population is of great enough numerical preponderance to cause this exception to become manifest in the pyramid for the Standard Metropolitan Area.

Although the age-sex pyramids do not show any definite comparable manifestations for the white population, the surplus of nonwhites aged 65 to 69 years is apparently part of a more widespread pattern common to the country as a whole. According to the Bureau of the Census, the 1950 Census reveals a deficit of persons in the 55 to 64 age group and a surplus of persons 65 years and over. The excess and deficit are deviations from
FIGURE II. AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA.

[Diagram showing age and sex distribution with specific data points for different age groups and sex distributions for various areas.]
what would be expected on the basis of vital statistics, migration, and previous census data. It is to be noted that although a deficiency in the 55 to 64 year category is suggested in the pyramids, these measures are not refined enough to permit a definite conclusion.

As one might expect, the configuration of the metropolitan pyramid differs little from that of New Orleans City. The agreement is even more close between the metropolitan and the urbanized area--so close, in fact, that the urbanized area was not depicted.7

Although the various portions of the New Orleans Area all share the more important demographic features, there are important differences also. The age-sex pyramids for the two parishes and the urban fringe in the suburbs all have more sloping sides than their central city. Particularly are their bases broader and their peaks narrower. Here, the Negroes of St. Bernard Parish differ. In each age category, nonwhites 65 years of age and over are not only relatively more important than the whites in St. Bernard, but they are proportionately more in abundance than comparable groups of either race in the city.

A peculiar aspect of the Orleans Parish population is the deficit of both white and nonwhite women, nonwhite men, and a near deficit of white men in the age group 30 to 34 years. A similar deficiency is apparent in the fringe population, only, however, for nonwhite men. St.

---

7For the white population of the two areas, no age and sex category differed by more than 0.1 per cent. For the nonwhites, the percentage were identical, save for the males aged 55 to 59 years, where a difference of 0.1 per cent asserted itself. The responsible factor for the similarity, of course, is the large proportion of the metropolitan area which is precluded by the city of New Orleans, especially with the inclusion of its urbanized area.
Bernard Parish shows the deficit for white males. In Jefferson Parish, nonwhite males in this age group are of the same proportion as those in the next older category. They accordingly could be assumed to represent a smaller-than-expected proportion, since under normal conditions the younger age group is also the larger one.

Orleans Parish, however, shows the clearest manifestation of the tendency toward a deficit among persons aged 30 to 34 years. The phenomenon is apparently a survival of a condition first observed by Charles Ross for the city's 1940 population. This investigator noted a deficit for both sexes and both races in the 20 to 24 age group which was not found in such areas as Mobile, Galveston, Dallas, Fort Worth, and the Louisiana and Texas urban populations. He further traced the shortage to the 10 to 15 year age group in 1930 and to the 0 to 5 group in 1920. World War I, he concluded, had been the initiating factor in reducing the number of births that would normally appear. Migration never compensated the loss, as it had for other areas. The deficiencies in the 1950 population, however, are not as great as they were in 1940. In fact, the data presented in Table 10 suggest that the difference may be disappearing. Migration appears to be the factor responsible for the leveling influence, since the assumption of a mortality rate especially favorable to this particular cohort appears implausible.  

The New Orleans Area and the United States. The value in supplementing an analysis of age-sex pyramids with index numbers of age becomes

---


9See Table 30, Chapter I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort aged 30-34 years in 1950</th>
<th>Cohort aged 35-39 years in 1950</th>
<th>Difference (column 5 minus column 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>under 5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHITE FEMALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort aged 30-34 years in 1950</th>
<th>Cohort aged 35-39 years in 1950</th>
<th>Difference (column 5 minus column 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>under 5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NONWHITE MALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort aged 30-34 years in 1950</th>
<th>Cohort aged 35-39 years in 1950</th>
<th>Difference (column 5 minus column 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>under 5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NONWHITE FEMALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort aged 30-34 years in 1950</th>
<th>Cohort aged 35-39 years in 1950</th>
<th>Difference (column 5 minus column 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>under 5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

apparent when Figures 12 and 13 are examined. For New Orleans, proper, nonwhite children were in greater abundance than were children in the nation. White children are relatively scarce, but white persons in the productive years are more abundant than either the New Orleans nonwhite productives or those of the United States. The city is lacking in old people, but the paucity is greater for whites than Negroes.

The suburban population (Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes) show a more marked abundance of children and a greater deficit of oldsters relative to the U. S. than is true for the city. Nonwhites have almost as many persons aged 25 to 49 as the nation. The suburban white population, however, shows generally a substantial surplus in this category.

The Negro population in the urban fringe is found to be quite similar in age composition to its counterpart in the suburbs as a whole. Young persons (below 25 years) are slightly more in evidence; persons 25 years of age and over, however, are equally as scarce, relative to the U. S., in the fringe as in the suburbs, and both populations rank below New Orleans in this aspect. Thus, the urban fringe and the suburbs generally, are the home of young persons, particularly children, but do not contain relatively as many persons in the productive years of 25 years and older as does the city or the nation, nor are there as many old people.

The use of index numbers brings forth in clearer outline two tendencies previously noted. First, the paucity in the 30 to 34 year age group is shown to be quite evident in the city (for both races), but is invisible in the suburbs, with the exception of the nonwhites in Jefferson Parish. Second, the tendency for Negroes to display an excessive heaping of persons 65 to 69 years of age is shown to be present to some
Figure 12. Index numbers showing the importance of each age group in the nonwhite population of the New Orleans area relative to those in the United States: 1960. (Source: See Figure 11.)
FIGURE 1A. THESE CHARTS SHOW THE INCIDENCE OF EACH AGE GROUP IN THE IHME CANCER DATA RELATIVE TO THOSE IN THE UNITED STATES, BY RACE AND SEX. [SOURCE: SEE FIGURE 11.]
extent among the whites of the city. Negroes, however, clearly take precedence in this regard, and the index numbers show clearly that the tendency is much more pronounced than is true in the nation as a whole.

With the exception of St. Bernard Parish, the nation does have relatively more oldsters than the New Orleans Area. The tendency to group particularly in the category of 65 to 69 years, however, remains peculiar to the Area's Negroes. Figure 13 shows the concentration to be decidedly more in evidence among Negro women than men. It also brings to light the excessive number of old white women in the city. Finally, the abundance of Negro children is found to be consistently greater than whites for either sex in both the city and the suburbs.

Median age, dependents, and producers. The discussion of the New Orleans Area can be conveniently summed up by means of Tables 11 and 12. Table 11 shows the median age for each sex, race, and geographic segment of the Area. For both races and sexes, the suburbs are seen to contain a relatively greater number of younger persons than the city. Generally speaking, as one proceeds out from the city, the population becomes younger. Negroes, however, are younger than whites. This statement applies to both sexes in every portion of the Area.

The factors immediately responsible for these differentials can be greatly elucidated by dividing the populations into three broad age groups: children (under 15 years), productives (15 to 64 years), and aged (65 years and over). For both races, the suburbs are seen to specialize in producing children, whereas the city contains the lion's share of the productives and the oldsters. The Negroes in St. Bernard Parish stand as the chief exception in that their old persons are more abundant than in any other Negro segment (and almost any white segment) of the New
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total both sexes</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12. RELATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF DEPENDENTS AND PRODUCERS, BY RACE, FOR THE NEW ORLEANS AREA: 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 15</th>
<th>15-64</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependents per 100 producers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 11.
Orleans Area.

Negros are seen to have the most children, relative to the whites, and productives and aged persons are more numerous among the whites (again excepting St. Bernard Parish).

Children have apparently the greatest influence on the median age in the New Orleans Area: where the proportion of children is high, the median age is low, and vice versa. In fact, the rank order coefficient of correlation between the two factors (i.e., that computed from the first two columns of Tables 11 and 12) is \(-1.00\).

The lowest ratio of dependents to producers for the New Orleans Area in 1950 was found in the white population: In the city, there were 43.6 white dependents for every 100 white producers (see Table 12). In each part of the Area, furthermore, dependency ratios for nonwhites were at least 17 per cent higher than those of the whites. The most extreme difference is represented in St. Bernard Parish, where the 80.7 Negro dependents for every 100 Negro producers represents a value 38.2 per cent greater than the corresponding white ratio of 58.4.

**DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY**

The analysis of the distribution of the Negro population within the city according to age is undertaken from three viewpoints. The discussion is introduced with an examination of the median ages of the nonwhite census tract populations. The varying concentrations in particular age categories (producers, aged, and children) are then brought under scrutiny. The order in which the age categories are introduced is intended merely to facilitate relevant comparisons. The discussion ends on a consideration of the distribution of dependents relative to producers.
Tracts containing fewer than 100 nonwhites were not included in the following analyses. The reason for this procedure is based on a property of percentages which makes computations to one decimal place meaningless wherever the base is less than 100 units. Since percentages which did not show a decimal value could not be arrayed with those having such a value, the former had to be omitted from the frequency distributions.

Median age. The distribution of median ages of the nonwhite population suggests a definite tendency for clusterings of persons with similar ages to become manifest (see Figure 14). Most striking is the predominance of the younger ages in the Gentilly and Industrial Canal areas. These are obviously the youngest areas in the city, in terms of averages. None of the largest tracts in either area is above the first centile for the array of tracts, and only two of the smallest tracts have a greater median years of age than the median tract for the array (the latter with a value of 28.6 years). Although the Waterfront contains a vastly smaller number of persons than does Gentilly or the Industrial Canal area, it too must be ranked close to these areas in terms of youthfulness. Algiers is similarly young.

The single oldest section of nonwhites (speaking still in terms

---

10 If one computes a percentage from a base which is less than 100, the decimal value will measure a degree of accuracy which does not exist. Thus, 98 is 99.0 per cent of 99, whereas 97 is 98.0 per cent. Or, 55 is 76.6 per cent of 70 whereas 56 is 80.0 per cent. A change of one unit in the numerator gives a change of more than one unit in the quotient. In such cases, the additional fraction (i.e., the decimal value) is not only insignificant but misleading.
of averages) occupies a belt cutting across several areas of the city. If one were to note particularly those tracts above the median for the nonwhite distribution of ages among the census tracts, he would discover a continuous strip of high median ages (from 38.3 to 42.5 years) running through the center of the city roughly parallel with the Mississippi River: starting with the eastern tip of University, occupying all of the Garden District, passing through the southern parts of Magnolia, Back of Town, and Esplanade, and including the Business District and the French Quarter. Generally, therefore, the center of the city tends to claim more Negroes in the older years (not necessarily aged persons), whereas the outer edges of the city—and particularly the eastern portion—are more substantially represented by the younger nonwhites.

**Producers.** By far the demographically most important age group among the Negroes of New Orleans is that which is generally thought of as the contributing or productive element, i.e., the population aged 15 to 64 years. No tract with 100 or more nonwhites has less than half of this population outside of the 15 to 64 year age category (see Figure 15). Thus, for every tract considered, the productive age group is in the majority.

A comparison of the tract maps showing the median age distribution and the proportion of productives (Figures 14 and 15) reveals a marked similarity in the distribution of the two factors (as would be expected from the preceding analysis of ethnic differentials in the Area). The heaviest concentration of productives is in the same "belt" where the median ages are highest. The Waterfront and the eastern portion of the city, including most of Gentilly, the Industrial Canal Area, and Algiers, show the lightest representation, as they revealed the lowest median ages.
Generally, the various tracts stand in the same relationship to each other for both factors. Only 8 of the 102 tracts are in markedly different positions, and no more than one is to be found in any single area of the city. Two of the most conspicuous deviants are found in the Lake Front and Gentilly. Tract 33D in Gentilly shifted from the first sixth in median age distribution to the fourth sixth in proportion of producers. The reason is not entirely clear, but the presence of adjacent Dillard University (for Negroes) has probably not been without effect. The situation in tract 133 on the Lake Front is so unique, however, that it calls for special mention.

Tract 133 has only 257 nonwhites, but only two persons are outside of the productive age bracket (one child and one aged person). As one might expect, the median age is low (26.6 years), and the proportion of producers is the highest in the city (99.2 per cent). The answer to this peculiar situation is probably that these persons are members of the armed forces located in the various military establishments on the Lake Front.\[11\]

In general, however, the distribution of median ages tends to describe the relative distribution of productives. This condition should not be surprising, in view of the numerical predominance of the age group.

The aged. Older persons are decidedly in the minority among

\[11\] Of the 256 nonwhite adults, 247 are males and 9 are females. Of the males, 174 are in the labor force, but only 11 are in the civilian labor force. Military pursuits are strongly suggested for 163 persons. There are, in addition, 73 adult males who are not in the labor force. They could quite possibly be in the Veteran's Administration Hospital, which in 1950 was located in tract 133. Finally, there are but two nonwhite dwelling units in the tract, but neither has occupants. (See also Appendix A.)
Negroes in New Orleans. No tract has as many as 16.0 per cent of its nonwhite population 65 years of age and over, and only 8 of the 102 tracts have the proportion in this category greater than 10.0 per cent (see Figure 16). Furthermore, the older Negroes apparently tend to live away from the larger and heavier concentrations of their people. Only in the Magnolia area are any of the largest tracts found which are placed above the median tract in the sextile distribution. Even in this area, none of the large tracts, or even those of intermediate size, appear in the upper one-third of the sextile distribution (i.e., above 7.2 per cent). On the other hand, 21 of the 34 tracts which are in the lower third of the array according to size of population are above the median of the array according to the percentage of aged in the population. Thus, most of the tracts with small nonwhite populations contain relatively heavy proportions of nonwhite aged.

Children. As is true for the New Orleans Area in general, children under 15 years of age constitute an important segment of the city's Negro population (see Figure 17). In two-thirds of the 102 census tracts, children occupy approximately one-fourth or more of the population. Only tract 133 in the Lake Front—already mentioned for its peculiar qualities—has less than 10.0 per cent of its population who are children. No tract, however, has as much as one-half of its population under 15 years of age.

The highest proportion of children are found in the eastern part of the city. All but one of the tracts in the upper sixth of the distribution according to the proportion of children are located to the east of Canal Street. In fact, the Industrial Canal area alone, with but 12.2 per cent of the nonwhite population, has 15.2 per cent of the nonwhite
### AGED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF NONWHITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4 - 4.6</td>
<td>Shaded circle 100 - 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8 - 5.3</td>
<td>Tract shaded and center cut out 467 - 3,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5 - 6.6</td>
<td>Tract fully shaded 3,665 - 7,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7 - 7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.3 - 8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3 - 15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Map:**
- **Source:** U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. III, Ch. 36.
- **Caption:** Distribution of the nonwhite population 65 years of age and over and size of the nonwhite population for census tracts of 100 or more nonwhites, New Orleans: 1950.
Figures 17 and 18. Distribution of the nonwhite population under 16 years of age and ratio of dependency of the nonwhite population for census tracts of 100 or more nonwhites, New Orleans, 1950.

**FIGURE 17. DISTRIBUTION OF THE NONWHITE POPULATION UNDER 16 YEARS OF AGE AND RATIO OF DEPENDENCY RATIOS FOR CENSUS TRACTS OF 100 OR MORE NONWHITES, NEW ORLEANS, 1950.**

**CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4 - 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.8 - 41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.5 - 52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.7 - 68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>68.7 - 84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>84.8 - 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF NONWHITES**

- Shaded circle: 100 - 466
- Tract shaded and center cut out: 467 - 3,519
- Tract fully shaded: 3,665 - 7,175

**DEPENDECY RATIOS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>DEPENDENTS PER 100 PRODUCERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8 - 40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.2 - 52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.4 - 68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.7 - 84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>84.8 - 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.1 - 125.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF NONWHITE PRODUCERS**

- Shaded circle: 100 - 395
- Tract shaded and center cut out: 415 - 2,474
- Tract fully shaded: 2,600 - 4,377

children. More than one-fifth (20.2 per cent) of such children are located in Algiers and the Industrial Canal areas, combined. Children are relatively numerous also in Galvez, Gentilly and the Waterfront.

At the opposite end of the scale, as would be expected, the section of the city with by far the fewest Negro children is located in the Business District and the surrounding areas (i.e., the adjacent portions of the Irish Channel, Bank of Town, Esplanade, and the French Quarter—including even the nearest parts of Magnolia).

Dependency ratios. The nonwhite population in the various tracts of the city exhibit ratios of dependents per 100 producers which range from 0.8 to 99.6. In other words, some tracts have almost no dependents, whereas others have almost as many dependents as producers. However, for two-thirds of the tracts employed in the analysis, dependency ratios ranged from 41.2 to 65.9, indicating a rather stable pattern for most of the tracts.

Since 83.7 per cent of the city's nonwhite dependents are represented by the population under 15 years of age, it is not surprising to find a marked agreement between dependency ratios and the distribution of children (compare Figures 17 and 18). The same areas which are heavy with children are heavy with dependents, and vice versa.
CHAPTER IV

SEX COMPOSITION

In one sense, sex is probably the simpler aspect of biosocial composition. The classification, from the point of view of the individual, is not only a simple dichotomy, but, unlike age, it does not change in time. The effects of sex composition on the demographic processes, however, need assume no minor role. Not only is the characteristic of sex ubiquitous, but the social valuations placed on this category, to mention only a single factor, are of crucial importance, since they affect--through the varying sex composition--virtually all demographic characteristics and processes. An early consideration of the balances between the sexes is thus fundamental to an adequate demographic analysis.

THE DATA

Data pertaining to the sex composition of a population would seem, a priori, to lend themselves to the greatest accuracy in reporting of any characteristic which an enumerator might seek to know. From the standpoint of the individual who is divulging such information--concerning himself--the a priori premise is certainly correct. But because the objective and unambiguous fact of sex is inextricably linked with more ambiguous (and even subjective) factors, certain errors creep into the data which make at least some of it well-nigh worthless. One of the most important sources of error probably lies in the factor of under-reporting or underregistration. In other words, some persons are not counted, and the different sex of these "missed" persons obviously biases
the final tabulations. Approximately 4.8 per cent of the children under five years of age are not reported. Since this age group is characterized by an excess of males over females, the tendency would accordingly be for such an oversight to lower the proportion of males in a population. Males are subtracted even more, however, by an underenumeration between the ages of 18 and 24. Probably this is part of the so-called "floating population" cited in the 1930 Census. Finally, there appears in 1950 to be a "deficit of persons in the age range 55 to 64 years, which, however, is more than offset by an excess over the number expected in the age group 65 years old and over." Mention has been made of this fact earlier, but here it is pertinent to note the phrase "more than offset" in reference to the next older age group. At these late ages, females predominate, and thus possibly tend (if we are to take the census wording at face value) to augment to an additional degree the deficiency of males.

These deficiencies in underenumeration apply also to Negroes. Indeed, there is evidence to lead one to the conclusion that Negroes are especially likely to be underenumerated. Thus, in the nation as a whole, as well as in its urban, rural-nonfarm, and rural-farm segments,


2Ibid.


white males under 10 years were relatively more numerous (and substantially so) in relation to their opposite sex than were Negroes. The same is true of the state of Louisiana (although not of New Orleans). More important, however, is the fact that in each of the aforementioned residential categories in the Negro population the proportion of males rises in the 10 to 14 year age group, a fact which is at striking variance with known facts of the effects of mortality on the sex ratio.5 This unexpected increase in population was found to exist in the suburbs of the New Orleans Area, but not in the city. Briefly, then, the data for both the nation and the state, as well as parts of the New Orleans Area indicate a relatively marked deficiency of Negro boys which logically may be attributed to underenumeration.

Another source of error to be found in data pertaining to sex occurs in the reporting of ages. Smith and Hitt6 have demonstrated a marked tendency for women to prefer to state their ages as fewer than the actual number of years which have elapsed since their birth. The most attractive ages are apparently the 15 to 30 year group, whereas the dearth of women reporting their ages as in the next 30 years suggests the unpopularity of that span. The tendency, however, forces the demographer to be seriously reluctant to make many generalizations concerning the relationship between sex and age. When dealing with this subject, accuracy of any great extent is not possible. Broad approximations

5See Chapter X.

are the most that can be wished for.

Since the tendency of women to misstate their ages applies to both races and all categories of the New Orleans Area, approximations are equally in order. To this end, the writer has made analyses of the sex characteristics for the population of each category and for the total populations 14 years of age and over. It is generally after the age of 14 years has been passed that "irrational" deficiencies and excesses of females appear. It is also among children that underenumeration is particularly evident. The choice of the age of 14 years as the lower delineation of the population for the purpose of demographic sex analysis thus does much to give one a picture of the true balance between the sexes.

There was additional incentive, however, for choosing the specific age of 14 years. At least two important categories of census data include only the population 14 years old or over: data on marital status and the labor force. An examination of the sex composition for this age bracket will accordingly furnish comparable data for future discussions.

Probably the most universal demographic tool is the sex ratio. Whenever demographers study the sex composition of a population, it is this measure they almost invariably (and exclusively) employ, and the practice will be continued here. The measure is computed simply by dividing the number of males in a given population by the number of females and multiplying the quotient by 100. The value is accordingly expressed in terms of males per 100 females.
THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

An examination of the sex composition of the various portions of the New Orleans Area reveals at once its striking femininity, i.e., the excess of females relative to males (see Table 13). This pattern of femininity is slightly more in evidence than is true of the nation as a whole, where white city dwellers have a sex ratio of 94.9 and the nonwhites reach 90.0. With the exception of the white population of St. Bernard Parish, every part of the Area shows an overabundance of females. St. Bernard's exceptional status, however, is part of a pattern. As the analysis focuses on areas more central to the city, the sex ratio for both races reveal a larger proportion of females. The sex ratio for the suburbs is higher than that for the standard metropolitan area, the urbanized area, or the city. The same statement can be made for the urban fringe, although it has a relatively smaller number of females than the suburbs taken as a whole.

Throughout the Area, the sex ratios for Negroes are lower than those for whites. The disparity, however, is smaller for the city than for the urbanized area, and smaller still than that present in the total Area. In other words, as one approaches the city from its outer areas, the sex ratios of both races become lower, those for the Negroes are always lower than the white's, but the sex ratios of whites decline faster than those for Negroes. These facts suggest that the influence of urbanization on the sex balance in the New Orleans Area is greater among whites than Negroes.

The remarks made above are also generally applicable to the population 14 years old and over. There are, however, several important variations. In all instances (except in the St. Bernard Parish white
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Population 64 years old and over</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White Difference</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>103.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

population) the older group is more feminine than the total population. This situation is understandable in view of the differential mortality experiences which favor the lives of females. Nor are the socio-economic conditions in New Orleans to be viewed as unfavorable to the immigration of females.

The population 14 years and over also evidence greater differences between the sex ratios for the two races than is true of the total population. Thus, that the Negroes have relatively many more females than have the whites is even more true among adults than for the population as a whole.

The closest balance between the sexes is to be found in the suburbs—the greatest imbalance is in the city. A factor previously mentioned which helps account for the difference is the greater attractiveness which the city apparently furnishes for women than men. Another factor is probably the presence in the suburbs of a higher proportion of married couples and a lower proportion of individuals having no relatives. This last factor will receive explicit attention in the next chapter.

Sex ratios by age were computed for each component of the New Orleans Area (other than census tracts), but only those for the city and its suburbs are presented here (see Figure 19). The chart for the city was found to summarize fairly well the experience for the standard metropolitan Area, whereas that for the suburbs generally described also the conditions in the urban fringe and Jefferson Parish. The age groups in St. Bernard—especially among Negroes—were too small to reveal anything except very erratic fluctuations.

The comment on Figure 19 is brief, primarily because of the inade-
queries of the data. Too much reliance, as indicated, should not be placed on the relative deficiencies of older females and the excesses of younger females. Nor should the lack of boys under 10 years be taken as a certainty. Similarly, Negro women aged 65 to 69 are shown to be more abundant than white women. The question can be fairly put as to whether this excess is actual or, for example, merely a factor of more Negro women striving to achieve welfare payments. Accordingly, the greatest danger in interpreting Figure 19 rests in attempting to assign to the quantitative symbols the exactitude which they suggest. In order to obtain any worthwhile information at all from the chart, these qualifications must be kept clearly in mind.

Negroes appear to have greater excesses of females in the younger adult ages (between 20 and 50 years of age). The abundance probably passes to whites among older persons, if the age group of 65 to 69 years is disregarded. Note, however, that among persons 85 years and older, both the city and its suburbs reveal lower sex ratios among Negroes. This situation prevails in every segment of the metropolitan area except St. Bernard Parish, and since only 18 whites and 4 nonwhites were involved in the latter area, this exception could well be only a chance one. Thus, the apparent lower sex ratios among Negroes for the total population and for the one 14 years and older would be due chiefly to the relatively heavier concentration of young women among Negroes. More older white women than Negro women migrating to the New Orleans Area could account for the greater femininity of whites in advanced ages. This interpretation would be even more acceptable if one could trust the data for persons older than 84 years, for beyond this age, the sex ratios of Negroes are lower than those of whites, indicating
a relatively greater numerical importance of Negro than of white women. Either old Negro women actually outlast their white sisters or they exaggerate their ages more consistently.

The charts also reveal a peculiar feature of the New Orleans population. At ages under 5, Negroes consistently have higher sex ratios than whites. Such was also found to be the case for the total metropolitan area, the urban fringe, and St. Bernard Parish (Jefferson Parish remaining the only exception). In the age group under one year of age, the white and Negro populations had approximately the same sex ratio in the city and the urban fringe. Compare this situation with that in the United States. For the total, urban, rural-nonfarm, and rural-farm populations, the whites under 5 years showed sex ratios substantially higher than the nonwhites (the differences amounting to almost 4 additional males per 100 females). In the age group which had not reached its first birthday, the national differences were even more pronounced (the whites having from 4.4 to 7.9 more males per 100 females than the nonwhites). Thus, not only is the sex ratio for infants higher in the New Orleans Area than in the nation as a whole, but the deficiency which the Negro population in the nation shows relative to whites is either reversed (among those under 5 years) or erased (for those who are not yet one year of age) in the New Orleans Area.

Linking this information further with the established fact that Negroes have lower sex ratios at birth than whites,7 one may only conclude that the deviations represented in the Area could be either an actuality or a function of underenumeration.

7See Chapter I.
The foregoing discussion has made evident the fact that the New Orleans Area is characterized by a deficiency of males in both races and that this deficiency is greater for nonwhites than for whites. Figure 19 reveals that the city displays this deficiency—even if in varying degrees—in every age group except the youngest. One cannot make the same claim for the suburbs. But since the excess of males in the latter area is noted in those very ages which generally include many women who relate their ages as younger than actuality, one cannot safely make the statement that the suburbs have an excess of older males and a deficiency of young adult men. One may only claim with some degree of certainty that the suburbs do not have as great an excess of females as does the city, even when considering most age groups of both races.

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY

Although sex ratios theoretically could have been computed for almost all census tracts having nonwhite persons, only those tracts containing 250 nonwhites or more proved to yield practical information. Any tract having fewer than 250 nonwhite persons also generally contained fewer than 100 females of that race, and accordingly yielded sex ratios which were quite erratic.  

The variations within the city between the sex ratios for the total population of the census tracts and those for the population 14

---

6 The range of sex ratios for all census tracts having nonwhite females was 23.5 to 2,900.0 males per 100 females. Even when census tract 133 with its 245 males and 9 females is omitted from the calculations, these values are not altered. The sex ratios for the tracts with 250 or more nonwhites (again omitting tract 133), on the other hand, ranged from 67.2 to 172.3.
years old and over are generally in the direction of lower ratios for the older population. The ten exceptions are found to be scattered widely throughout the city. Relatively, therefore, the tracts stand in about the same position to each other with the use of either measure. Accordingly, the attention will be directed specifically to the cartogram for the population 14 years old and over (see Figure 20).

All but three of the tracts with excesses of males are found near the center of the city: on the Canal Street side of Magnolia, in the Business District, and in the French Quarter. The exceptions occur in Galvez, Algiers, and the Waterfront, respectively. The census tracts in the vicinity of the Lake Front as well as two in Back of Town and one each in Magnolia and the Irish Channel also have high sex ratios relative to those for most of the city's tracts, but even these "high" values reveal fewer males than females. It is apparent, therefore, that the femininity displayed in the sex ratio for the total non-white population is carried to all but a few portions of the city.

Though almost all tracts have a numerical dominance of females, the highest sex ratios are generally found in the center of the city accompanying the exceptionally high ratios previously mentioned. Other important concentrations exist in the Galvez and Industrial Canal areas, not to mention the single large tract with a high sex ratio in Algiers. These areas are all in the eastern half of the city. The lowest sex ratios are shown in Carrollton, University, the Garden District, and in the southern section of Magnolia. Thus, the southwestern part of the city has an extremely low proportion of males per 100 females, higher ratios (although still decidedly feminine) are found in the eastern part of the city, whereas the closest balance between the sexes is
### SEX RATIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Males per 100 Females</th>
<th>Number of Nonwhites (14 years and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.1 - 75.2</td>
<td>Shaded circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.8 - 78.2</td>
<td>225 - 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78.6 - 81.0</td>
<td>Tract shaded and center cut out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81.1 - 85.4</td>
<td>520 - 2,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.5 - 90.9</td>
<td>Tract fully shaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>91.1 - 93.0</td>
<td>2,874 - 4,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104.3 - 118.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Nonwhites (14 years and over):

- Shaded circle: 225 - 510
- Tract shaded and center cut out: 520 - 2,726
- Tract fully shaded: 2,874 - 4,827

**Source:** U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. III, Ch. 36.

**Figure 3d:** Sex ratios and size of the nonwhite population aged 14 years and over, for census tracts of 250 or more nonwhites, New Orleans: 1950.
found in the city’s center. This “closest balance,” it is to be noted, represents quite high sex ratios relative to those of the rest of the tracts.
CHAPTER V

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FAMILY

The treatment of the institutional aspects of demographic composition (of which the present chapter is the first installment) is logically separable from the biocultural aspects. Although age and sex exact probably the most immediate influence on the primary demographic variables, these biocultural factors are, in turn, conditioned by the social structure. Possibly one of the most convenient manners in which to conceptualise the social structure is in terms of its major institutions—the family, education, economics, religion, and politics. The demographer usually concerns himself with all of these structural aspects in more or less complete form (with the exception of the last). The purpose of the next four chapters is to render more logically complete the treatment of the compositional aspects of demography by giving them this institutional frame of reference. As mentioned earlier, religion cannot be considered due to the lack of reliable data.

The reader will note the more extensive use of the term "characteristics" in the present and following chapters, as differentiated from "composition": Composition has been used here to refer to the biocultural elements, whereas characteristics have been reserved for the institutions. As mentioned in the introduction, these terms are practically synonymous. Their differential use has been only to emphasize the distinction between these two major aspects of demographic composition.

From the point of view of time, the family is the first of the major institutions to exert influence on the individual and thus on the
population. The demographer customarily limits his treatment of the family to a consideration of marital status. Actually, one would be more precise in claiming that the demographer has come closer to a consideration of family structure (or characteristics) than a treatment of the varying proportions found among the single, married, divorced, and widowed. Yet data on the U. S. family (as contrasted with marital status) have been published in some form since 1850.1

The reason for the limitation may well have been the lack of a sociological orientation among early demographers and a traditional observance by later students of their methodology. Nevertheless, when one considers that most persons are born in a family unit and receive their value orientation concerning birth, death, and migration from that unit, the danger in adhering to the tradition becomes obvious. Accordingly the characteristics of the family, and more particularly of the household, are given the major emphasis in this chapter. Marital status is treated as a subsidiary topic.

THE DATA

The 1950 Census of population presents four types of data which are relevant to a consideration of the family's demographic characteristics: information concerning the family, per se; data for married couples; data on households; and data on marital status. However, information

---

classified by race is published only for the last three categories. 2 What would be considered the most important category for this analysis can at best be viewed only indirectly. A few theoretical considerations, however, will furnish approaches to the problem which will enable the student to travel a great distance in unravelling the family composition in the New Orleans Area.

One may conceptually distinguish three types of families. The first is logically the broadest and most inclusive—and heuristically the most difficult to work with, i.e., the kinship group. Understandably, the census makes no effort to present data for this category. The second type may be referred to as the household family: all of the persons related by "blood," adoption, or marriage, who share the same household or living arrangements. This type of group is what the Census refers to simply as "a family." 3 This is also the type of group for which published data by race are absent. Yet, there still remains an additional category. A marital pair becomes the focal point in this final type, or more inclusively, a marital pair and their children, if any. The researcher has here the traditional family of procreation. Census data appear in the form of information on married couples.

Although all three family types overlap, the members of any one capable of being at the same time a member of the other two, they are analytically and practically separable. Demographically speaking, the


most important type is the married couple, or the family of procreation. It is this basic unit which is primarily responsible for the entrance into a population of the members by birth. 4

Although the married couple produces the children, they are initially socialized in the household. The household family would be the crucial unit of consideration here. Absence of such data leaves only an analysis of the household as an alternative. Notice that a household may contain more than one household family, as is the case with a lodger or resident employee and his or her spouse. Furthermore, the census presents data only for the aggregate of households. One thus is unable to obtain a picture of the variety of persons who live in households. Information is presented, however, as to whether a married couple has its own household. It is accordingly possible to classify households into two types—those in which the household head is living with his or her spouse and those in which the household head is either separated from the spouse or is unmarried. In this study, the former are referred to as complete households and the latter as incomplete. The terminology of "complete" and "incomplete" is directed primarily at the family status of the head of the house, the deciding factor being the presence of the spouse.

Data on marital status in the 1950 Census fall into the following major classifications: single persons and those who have ever married, the latter subdivided into those presently married, separated, divorced, and widowed. The separated category is especially important for those groups who do not have the financial means to secure a divorce.

4 Illegitimacy rates, however, testify to the absence of a monopoly in this field.
This statement has particular relevance to the Negro population.

Marital status is pertinent to a discussion of family composition primarily because one of the major clusters of values centering around the family concerns marriage. The data now supplied by the census can, however, contribute more directly to an understanding of family composition, per se. Those persons who have been married but at the time of the census were separated from their spouse form a logically distinct category which may be subsumed under the term "broken family." These persons include those who are separated, divorced, and widowed. The family which has been "broken" is, of course, the family of procreation, or the married couple. It is accordingly possible to devise an index of family stability simply by relating the number of broken families to the number of persons who live as married couples. When the resulting quotient is multiplied by 100, the researcher has a meaningful index with which to measure the degree to which the family of procreation is maintained as a functioning unit, or an index of family instability. The index may be conveniently expressed in the following manner:

\[
\text{Index of family instability} = \frac{\text{number of broken families}}{2 \times \text{number of married couples}} \times 100.
\]

"Broken family," as specified, includes the separated, widowed, and divorced.\(^5\) The lower limit of the index is zero, or the condition in which

---

\(^5\)For most small areas, the number of persons living with their spouse and those separated must be obtained by subtracting the number of persons who live as married couples (i.e., 2 times the number of married couples) from the total married population. In such cases, the formula for the index of family instability may be written in reduced form. Let \(N\) equal the number of persons married, \(M_c\) the number of married couples, \(D\) the number of divorced, and \(W\) the number of widowed. The index of
the entire population of persons ever married are living as married
couples. An index of 50 signifies that there are as many broken fam-
ilies as there are married couples, whereas an index of 100 indicates
that the number of persons who have had their marriage broken are of
the same magnitude as those who are living as married couples.

THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

The Family. The discussion of the family must necessarily be
brief, as noted earlier, due to the lack of data. The only type of fam-
ily which may be considered here is that which is defined by the pre-
existence of a marital pair. Thus, the number of marital pairs furnishes
one with the number of families, although nothing is learned concerning
the complete structure of the family which is headed by that marital
pair.

Nonwhite married couples are even more of a minority in the New
Orleans Area than is the nonwhite population. Whereas 29.3 per cent of
the population in the standard metropolitan area is composed of non-
whites, only 24.2 per cent of the 151,645 married couples could be so

Footnote continued] family instability thus equals

\[ \frac{M - 2M_C}{2M_C} \times 100, \]

which may be reduced to

\[ \frac{M}{2M_C} - \frac{1}{2M_C} = \frac{M - D/2W}{2M_C} \times 100, \]

or, \( \frac{\text{number of persons ever married} - 1}{2 \times \text{number of married couples}} \times 100. \)
classified. Similarly, married couples in the urbanized area were 24.5 per cent nonwhite. In the city, the percentage reached 26.7. Both of these proportions are substantially below the percentage which the total nonwhite population claims (29.6 and 32.0 for the urbanized area and the city, respectively).

The sparsity of married couples among nonwhites is demonstrated further in Table 14. The per cent of adult nonwhites who are living as married couples ranges from 50.5 per cent in the city to 61.1 per cent in St. Bernard Parish. The range for whites (which refers again to the same areas) is 59.9 to 70.8 per cent. The lower proportion of nonwhites living as married couples relative to whites prevails also in every other portion of the New Orleans Area, the greatest difference appearing in Jefferson Parish.

Both races reveal roughly the same pattern of distribution of married couples relevant to the New Orleans Area as a whole. The city always evidences clearly the lowest proportion, St. Bernard Parish the highest, with Jefferson Parish and the urban fringe occupying a slightly lower position than St. Bernard. In other words, the more intense the degree of urbanity, the lower the proportion of married couples, although Negroes always have the lowest proportion.

As is evident in Table 14, Negroes differ strikingly from whites in the degree to which they maintain the stability of the marital unit. Broken families are considerably of less importance in the white population. Only in the city do the white adults reveal an index higher than

---

6 Adult here is considered to refer to the population 14 years of age and over. This category is the basic one used by the census in its presentation of data on marital status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Urbanized Area</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>New Orleans City</th>
<th>Urban fringe</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>St. Bernard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index of family instability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent of persons living as married couples</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the population 14 years of age and over. Based in part on a 20 per cent sample.

25.0. In other words, only in the city do the white persons who represent broken families become as much as one-fourth as important as the persons living as married couples. Among nonwhites, on the other hand, broken families in the city outnumber married couples—the index of family instability is above 50.0. Although the rates are lower in the suburbs—as low as 23.6 for St. Bernard Parish, they are in every case considerably higher than those for comparable segments of the white population.

The effect of urbanization on family instability has long been a subject of study for sociologists. In general, the consensus is that urban life, particularly in contrast with the rural world, has the effect of stripping the family of many functions and of rendering family life in general more insecure. If such conclusions are valid, then they attest also to the validity of the index of family instability. Thus, for both types of families, the ratio of broken families to married couples is lowest in St. Bernard, the most rural portion of the standard metropolitan area. The urban fringe shows a markedly higher ratio, whereas that in the city is the highest of all. The only exception to the pattern of increasing family instability with increasing urbanization is found in Jefferson Parish, wherein the nonwhite population has a higher index of family instability than does the nonwhite population of the fringe. Even here, however, the index (34.9) is con-

---

siderably lower than that for the city (55.0).

The household. In lieu of more complete data on family composition, an analysis of the data on households can be employed. Technically, a household consists of all persons who occupy a dwelling unit, whether a house, a group of rooms, or a room. Not all of the members of a household are related, therefore. In fact, in some cases, none of the members are related, as when a group of unrelated persons share the same living accommodations. Nevertheless, as the data will show, such cases are in the minority.

By relating the number of persons in households to the total number of households, one obtains a useful measure of the relative sizes of households. In terms of such a ratio, the white population has both the largest and the smallest households: The white households in the suburbs average 3.75 persons, whereas in the city they reach only 3.25 persons. Nonwhites have exactly the opposite pattern: The city households are the largest (3.62 persons) as contrasted with those in the suburbs (3.42 persons). In fact, the nonwhite households in the city are substantially larger than those of the whites.

As mentioned earlier, households are defined as complete for purposes of this study when one of a marital pair is in the position of household head. The most complete households for both races are accordingly found in the suburbs, where 87.6 per cent of the white

---

8 U. S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Part 1, op. cit., xiii. However, since the data for population and housing were published separately, the number of households and dwelling units for the same census category or area do not always agree. This statement applies even to occupied dwelling units.
households and 69.1 per cent of the nonwhite households may be so clas-
sified. The percentage of complete households for whites and nonwhites
in the city are 73.5 and 68.4, respectively. Thus, not only do the
whites have the more complete households in both the city and the sub-
urbs, but the lowest percentage of white households which were complete
is higher than the highest percentage for nonwhites. In summary, al-
though the nonwhite households in the city tend to be larger than the
white households, they are less likely to have one of a married couple
in the position of household head. In the suburbs, not only is the per-
centage of completeness smaller for nonwhites, but the households also
tend to be smaller than those of whites.

The related members of a household may be conveniently classi-
fied into central and peripheral members. The central members would
include the household head, the wife of the household head, and their
children. The peripheral members would then refer to parents, grand-
children, and other relatives, the essential criterion in all cases be-
ing the relationship of the household members to the household head.
An additional category would include the unrelated household members,
i.e., lodgers and resident employees. As is evident in Table 15, the
largest proportion of household membership is occupied by the central
members. In other words, most of the dwellers are either household
heads, wives of the heads, or their children. In this connection, it
is important to note the greater proportion of Negro women who are house-
hold heads than white women. Actually, the census procedure in clas-
sifying only the male members of the married couple as the household
head underestimates the tendency for Negro women to assume the position
### Table 15. Composition of the Households in the New Orleans Area, by Race and Sex: 1950.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Orleans City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodger</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident employee</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodger</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident employee</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on a 20 per cent sample.

of household authority.\(^9\)

Peripheral household members, specifically grandchildren and other relatives, are more in evidence among nonwhites. For whites, parents of the household head are relatively more numerous than is the case for nonwhites. One explanation which may be suggested for this differential is the fact that whites have a greater longevity than nonwhites, and the head of the household is thus more likely to have a parent to live with him if he is a white than if he is a nonwhite person. The greater proportion of female parents than male—for either race—helps substantiate such a conclusion, in view of the greater longevity of females. More will be said on this point below.

The relative insignificance of lodgers and resident employees is evident in Table 15. Resident employees are confined almost exclusively to Negroes, yet even here the highest percentage of any of the categories, found among females, is only 0.3 per cent (in both the city and the suburbs). Although lodgers are relatively more important, only among nonwhite city residents do they exceed 3.0 per cent (5.4 per cent for males and 4.2 per cent for females). Since all other household members are related, it becomes obvious that unrelated household members are in a decided minority. Notice that household members who are unrelated to the head are most important in the city, among nonwhites, and among males.

\(^9\)In a sample taken in the Magnolia area in 1950, more than half of the persons interviewed named a woman as the head of the household, even though these interviews were often men. Cf. George A. Hillery, Jr., "The Presence of Community Among New Orleans Negroes: A Case Study of a Selected Area," The Proceedings of the Louisiana Academy of Sciences, XIV (1952), 74.
For some aspects of household composition, the more important differences are between the sexes. Males are more often the heads of households than are females (obviously, only females are wives of the head), and parents who are living with the household head are more likely to be females. Other aspects reveal the most significant difference to exist between the races. Children take up relatively more space in white than in nonwhite households—a contributing factor being, of course, the larger proportion of peripheral members in nonwhite households. Actually, Negro children are relatively more important in the total Negro population than is true of white children relative to the white population, as was indicated in the earlier discussion on age composition. The marked racial differential in the extent to which grandchildren and other relatives are present has been previously mentioned.

Since 96.4 per cent of the nonwhites and 96.3 per cent of the whites in the New Orleans Area live in households, one must conclude that households contain virtually members of all ages. The importance of age composition in the household is documented by Figure 21. In the younger years, children and grandchildren make up the bulk of household membership. In later life, on the other hand—particularly after 65 years—the household head, parents, and other relatives monopolize the composition. Large proportions of both males and females are represented among the household heads, though males are relatively more important. Parents and other relatives, however, are more often women. The "disappearance" of the wife among older household members is really probably a change of status from wife to widow and from there to the head of the household. This statement may be further buttressed by taking
into account the fact that women become the heads of households to a greater extent with age, particularly so with nonwhites. This relationship and the above interpretation are in full accord with the facts concerning differential sex longevity.

The older the parent, the more likely she or he is to be a member of the household as a parent of the head (see Figure 21). Young persons are not found in this category. Women display the pattern most conspicuously. It is also present for both races, but especially for the whites.

Among other relatives, a curious bulge or excess can be noted, appearing approximately between the ages of 15 and 30 years. This bulge is much more evident among nonwhites than whites and takes place earlier among females than among males. Migration could possibly be a contributing factor to this phenomenon. It is known that these age groups are more migratory,\(^\text{10}\) that women tend to migrate to cities at an earlier age than do men,\(^\text{11}\) and that the Negro is migrating to urban areas faster than are white persons.\(^\text{12}\) Certainly these facts correlate strongly with the tendencies noted in Figure 21. In addition, the tendency toward a disappearance of the bulge in the population of other relatives older than 25 years could indicate a tendency for these persons to marry and (or) find homes of their own. The above interpretation,
however, is only hypothetical. More precise verification is necessary before it may be removed from such a category.

Aside from the almost nonexistent resident employees, lodgers constitute the least important element of any of the categories. Two relationships, however, are worthy of notice. First, the same "bulge" is evident as was seen among other relatives. The same interpretation—migration—would appear justifiable. Second, as was noted earlier, nonwhites were the strongest representatives among the lodging population of households. Particularly noteworthy, however, is the greater importance of lodgers with increasing age, an importance evident among both sexes of both races. Lodgers accordingly may be placed in two general age categories: the young adults and the aged.

**Marital status.** The most popular category of marital status among adults, whether Negro or white, male or female, urbanite or suburbanite, is the married (see Figure 22). Males, however, tend to be most often in the married condition, particularly white males, and particularly those in the suburbs. Thus, Negroes, whether male or female, or whether residing in the city or the suburbs, are less often married than their white counterparts.

Conversely, the widowed, divorced, and separated are most often found among Negro city women, whereas white suburban men are least often

---

13 Figure 22 is an attempt to procure the most extensive and accurate description attainable. Thus, the number of persons widowed and divorced, single, and married were taken from complete counts. The married category and that for widowed and divorced (data presented together in the complete census counts) were further subdivided by assigning to them the same proportions which were found to exist in a 20 per cent sample taken by the census.
FIGURE 22. MARITAL STATUS OF THE POPULATION 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY SEX AND RACE: 1950. (BASED IN PART ON A 20 PER CENT SAMPLE.
SOURCE: U. S. CENSUS OF POPULATION: 1950, VOL. II, PART 18, TABLES 34, 36, 57.)
representatives of dissolved marriages. The chief difference among these categories, however, is between the sexes—women have the more difficult task in keeping a mate, a condition not surprising in view of the low sex ratios in the New Orleans Area. Within the sex categories, Negroes are more often to be found with terminated marriages. The smallest differences appear to exist between suburbanites and urbanites (for either sex or racial category), although the marriages in the suburbs may be documented as being more secure.

The most important differential in the category of single persons is again the sexual one—men are more often single than are women. In the suburbs, Negroes are more often single—in the city, the relative dominance shifts to the whites.

Little variation prevails among those who are married but only temporarily separated from their spouse, although the difference which does exist tends to favor relatively more nonwhites and city persons.

A decided relationship between age and marital status is revealed in Figure 23.\textsuperscript{14} The proportion of persons in the various categories, however, whether examined by sex or by race, remains as outlined above. In other words, if a particular race or sex class attains predominance in a particular marital class, such persons tend to maintain that predominance regardless of which age class is studied.

Single persons tend to drop in importance quite rapidly after their dominance among the young. After age 30 years, they level off at approximately 5 to 15 per cent of the adult women. For men, the leveling off is reached after 35 years of age. The proportion married,

\textsuperscript{14} Data are available only for the standard metropolitan area as a whole.
on the other hand, rises quickly in the early years of adulthood. The highest proportion for women is attained between the ages of 25 and 35—approximately 5 years later for men. The males tend to maintain their status of married, i.e., their proportion tends to settle out into a long, down-sloping plateau. For women, a peak is reached that drops rather sharply with advancing years.

The frequency of persons separated and divorced tends to assume the shape of a normal curve, slightly skewed toward the younger years, nonwhites persons tending to attain higher proportions in the separated category at an earlier age than do whites. Widowed persons, on the other hand, are insignificant at the onset of adulthood. For males, the proportion rises slowly but quite steadily with age. For females, the rise is rapid, until most old women are widows.

**DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY**

**Family instability.** The degree of family instability is found to vary considerably among the Negro populations of the census tracts (see Figure 24). Even with atypical tract 133 removed from the analysis, the instability index ranges from 12.5 to 162.7 broken families for each 50 married couples. However, the middle tract in the 89 tracts considered in the analysis revealed an index of instability of 53.3. Since the median divides a distribution into two equal parts, one may cite slightly more than half of the census tracts as containing indexes above 50. In other words, these tracts have more broken families than they have married couples.

The area exhibiting the most stable marital unions occupies the easternmost portion of the city, i.e., the Industrial Canal and Algiers
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areas, instability in the former fringing slightly into the Gentilly and Galvez areas (see Figure 24). Only two isolated tracts in this portion of the city attain indexes of family instability of more than 50 (tract 8 in the Industrial Canal Area reaches 130.0, whereas the index in tract 2 in Algiers—66.0—is almost half as large).

The most unstable tracts (those with indexes above 83.0) are generally scattered. The most notable exception to that statement concerns the high degree of instability in the Waterfront tracts and those in the Irish Channel which front the river. The areas surrounding and including the Business District also have very high rates. Magnolia, however, is the largest single area with fairly high instability rates, and these are generally no higher than 61.1 (for the fourth sextile). The heavy Negro concentrations in Esplanade and Galvez generally differ from Magnolia in being more mixed in degree of family instability. All three areas, however, share in common a fringe of tracts evidencing high instability which almost encircles each area.

Single persons. Since stability of families was defined with reference to the married couple, the preceding discussion on family stability has also outlined the stability of marriage ties. In other words, to a large extent, an analysis of marital status has also been presented.

One deficiency remains, however, in this connection. Family instability indexes consider only those persons who have ever been married. Single persons have thus far been omitted. Figure 25 describes the distribution of single nonwhite adults. A more precise approach would have involved showing the sexes separately. The chief reason for not doing so was to avoid having denominators too small to give stable percentages.
Little or no correlation exists between the proportion of persons in the single category and the degree of family instability. The heaviest concentrations of single adult Negroes are found in Gentilly, the French Quarter, Galvez, the Waterfront, and Esplanade. Note that with the exception of the Waterfront, these areas are contiguous. All of the tracts in these areas have proportions of single persons above the median tract of the distribution in Figure 25 (21.8 per cent), with the exception of one tract each in Galvez and Esplanade. An island of fairly heavy concentrations of single persons is also found in the northeast part of Magnolia and in an adjacent tract in Back of Town. All the remaining areas, however, have relatively few single persons, especially the Industrial Canal area and the greater part of Magnolia.
CHAPTER VI

EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The discussion of education forms a logical sequel to the consideration of the family, particularly since educational institutions are those which continue the process of socialization initiated by the family. Through socialization, of course, emerge values, and values may, in turn, be viewed as at least the immediate impetus to group responses relative to the primary demographic variables. The extent to which the population is differentially educated will, therefore, furnish an aid in discovering bases for differential population change.

THE DATA

The present chapter is unique in that all of the information presented is based on a 20 per cent sample. Nevertheless, the Bureau of the Census believes that these data are better than those furnished in 1940 which were based on complete counts. The Bureau's own analysis of data from the 1940 Census and supplementary surveys indicated that respondents frequently reported the year of grade in which they were enrolled instead of the one completed. The 1950 questions were designed to reduce this kind of error. Evidence attesting to the fact that the goal of greater precision was achieved is as follows: Data from a preliminary sample of the 1950 Census for persons of elementary and high school ages showed for each age group larger proportions in the modal grade in 1950 than in 1940 and also larger proportions in the next lower grade for the later decade. In addition, the 1950 sample showed rela-
tively fewer persons in the next two higher grades (i.e., higher than the modal grade) than did the 1940 data. In other words, for each age group, the answers as to the number of years of schooling completed showed a more peaked (leptokurtic) frequency distribution and one which placed less emphasis on grades higher than the modal grade for 1950 than for 1940. The answers were apparently more homogeneous for the more recent census. The Bureau of the Census concludes:

It seems reasonable to assume that, as a result of the change in questionnaire design, there was also relatively less exaggeration in educational attainment in 1950 than in 1940 for persons 25 years old and over, the group for which statistics are presented . . . .

Educational characteristics in this chapter are discussed in terms of the number of years of schooling completed by adults aged 25 years and over. Other types of data could have been employed, as (1) the years of schooling completed for the entire population, (2) the proportions of the population enrolled in school, or (3) the year of school which the respondent was actually attending at the time of the census. The last two types of data are significantly primarily for the younger population, i.e., those under 25 years of age, as it is primarily this population which is attending school. The usefulness of data on school enrollment and attendance in a study of educational status is placed in proper perspective by a consideration of the value of

---


2For example, persons aged 25 to 29 years who are enrolled in school constitute only 0.5 per cent of the total population of the U. S., whereas the entire age group comprises 8.1 per cent of the nation's persons. Put in another way, only 6.5 per cent of the persons aged 25 to 29 years attended school in 1950, whereas 60.7 per cent of the population aged 5 to 25 years were in a similar category.
basing such a study upon the educational completeness of the total population. Such data would provide no basis for measuring the functioning educational level of the population, since the data include many who are gaining education rather than fully employing what they have gained. Thus, by selecting the population aged 25 years and over as the statistical universe of educational status, one not only approaches most closely a stable picture of the education level which the population has attained but in addition delineates more realistically the education which the population is actually utilizing.

Of the numerous measures of educational status which could have been employed, three were chosen: median years of schooling completed, percentage of functional illiterates, and percentage of high school graduates. The median is the type of average or measure of central tendency most frequently resorted to in the study of education. Indeed, one might go so far as to say that it is generally the only respectable one that can be computed from census-type data. Note that beyond the completion of the baccalaureate, it becomes exceedingly difficult to measure the amount of schooling in terms of years. Consequently, any data on educational status measured in terms of years and including more than 16 grades is inherently open-ended. Since the mean is inapplicable to such a distribution, the median by default takes precedence as an average.

The measure of the dispersion of educational status—as contrasted with the measure of its central tendency—is attained by the use of the proportion of the population which are functional illiterates and high school graduates. Functional illiterates are operationally defined as those persons who have completed no more than four years of schooling.
Accordingly, if one designates five years of schooling as the basic minimum of education which a person must have in order to function effectively in modern urban society, the percentage of functional illiterates becomes a measure of the extent to which the society is failing to satisfactorily equip its members with the means with which they may achieve its goals. The proportion of high school graduates, on the other hand, may be taken to represent those persons (or at least most of those persons) in whom those goals have been most efficiently instilled, and who are to that extent best equipped to achieve the ends. The first measure describes those who are most poorly equipped; the second describes the best equipped, since it includes also those who have advanced beyond a high school education.

Special reference should be made to the eighth grade of school. It was only in 1945 that the eighth grade was established throughout the Louisiana elementary schools. Thus, many persons having completed high school have actually completed only eleven years of school instead of twelve, as would be the case under an eight-grade elementary system. For the sake of comparability, all graduates of elementary school are treated as if they completed the eighth grade.

The education completed refers only to that received in "regular" schools, i.e., public, private, or parochial schools, colleges, universities, or professional schools (day or night), either full or part time enrollment, and regular instruction at home if comparable to the foregoing.
THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

The most obvious fact which one encounters upon examination of the educational level of the inhabitants of the New Orleans Area is the pronounced educational differential between the nonwhites and the whites. In terms of median years of schooling completed, whites have generally from three to four more years than nonwhites (see Table 16). A comparison of the racial differential in terms of functional illiteracy and proportion of high school graduates reveals that Negroes are most strongly represented among those with below-minimum levels of education and are least represented among the more advanced educational categories. For any of the segments of the New Orleans Area, whether the metropolitan area, the urbanized area, the city, the suburbs, the urban fringe, Jefferson Parish, or St. Bernard Parish, and whether one views functional illiteracy or the extent of high school graduation, the percentage difference between the two races is never lower than 8.2 percentage points, and almost always it is above 20.0 percentage points, the white population invariably evidencing more education than the Negroes.

In spite of these differentials, the patterns for both races among the various components of the New Orleans Area are the same. For either race, the most educated persons are to be found in the city, the least educated are in St. Bernard Parish. The most educated persons in the suburbs are generally residing in the urban fringe, although the educational level of such persons is always lower than persons of a comparable race who reside within the corporate limits of New Orleans.

In view of the consistency of these patterns, it would appear reasonable to assume that either of the three measures of educational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per cent of total population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Functional illiterates</td>
<td>High school graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on a 20 per cent sample.

status is adequate for the population of New Orleans. Consequently, the measure chosen for further analysis was the percentage of functional illiterates.

Even when age and sex groupings are studied separately, the aforementioned differentials between white and Negro, between city dweller and suburbanite, are still prominent (see Figure 26). Almost as striking are the differentials with respect to age and sex. Younger persons are consistently less in evidence among the functional illiterates, i.e., they consistently have the better education. Only in three age categories do exceptions become visible, and in all cases the discrepancy could well be accounted for by sampling variability. Among males and females, the women consistently have more education than the men, with the exception of only four age groups (among the older suburban nonwhites).

All of the differentials mentioned in the preceding paragraphs--those for race, residence (i.e., nearness to urbanity), sex, and age--are wholly in accordance with previous demographic findings. However, a closer examination of Figure 26 leaves one room to suspect that at least one of these differentials may be in the process of disappearing. Among the males and females of the city and among the suburban females, one may clearly note a decreasing racial difference in functional illit-

\[3\] The three cases are all for suburban nonwhites (as is shown in Figure 26). The difference between the deviating age group and that of the next youngest age group in none of the cases is smaller than 1.9 percentage points. In all cases, one standard error of the estimated percentages is plus or minus 1.9 per cent or greater. In other words, the chances are about two out of three that a complete census count would have returned data which would have given percentages which would vary from those presented in Figure 26 within a range at least as great as 1.9 per cent. One may conclude that the discrepancy could have arisen from sampling variability.
eracy with each younger age group. In other words, for all three of these categories, the younger the age, the less of a superiority is apparent among the whites over the Negroes in regard to absence of functional illiteracy. The impossibility of drawing such a conclusion for the suburban males (or even of drawing the opposite conclusion) makes one tend to such a hypothesis only with caution.

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY

The discussion of the variation of educational status among the nonwhites of the city was designed to show the concentration of persons having achieved a specific educational level. Maintenance of comparability with the previous discussion thus dictates a use of proportions of functional illiterates and high school graduates. The distributions studied accordingly concern those who might be termed as having the best as well as the worst educational attainments.

Before proceeding with the analysis of the census tract data, however, it is well to call attention to the generally low educational level among Negroes in all of the tracts. As is evident in Figure 27, the tract with the highest proportion of nonwhite high school graduates (25.0 per cent) is 11.8 percentage points lower than the proportion attained by the white population of the city as a whole (36.8 per cent). Similarly, the tract with the lowest proportion of functional illiterates (see Figure 28) is higher than the proportion of the city's total white population which is functionally illiterate (13.8 per cent as

---

*For a similar treatment, see T. Lynn Smith and Homer L. Hitt, The People of Louisiana (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952, Chapter VIII.*
contrasted with 18.2 per cent). Thus, when certain areas are mentioned as having a high educational status, the basis of comparison is the nonwhite population. Even the tract with the highest "average" education stands fairly low relative to the white population.

An examination of the distribution of educational status depicted in Figures 27 and 28 reveals two general areas of high educational attainment in the nonwhite population. The first area embraces most of the adjacent areas of Gentilly and Galvez. The second concentration covers the western portions of Magnolia and the Garden District as well as the adjacent tracts in the Audubon Park, University, and Broadmoor. Both concentrations have relatively high proportions of their nonwhites with a high school education and low proportions among functional illiterates. At the other end of the educational scale are two areas, both adjoining the Mississippi River. This description naturally refers to Algiers but is intended to include as well the area on the opposite side of the river comprised of the Waterfront, the Irish Channel, and the southern portion of Back of Town. The largest single concentration of Negroes—Magnolia—shows the entire range of educational status, as is almost the case for Esplanade. The educational level in the Industrial Canal area is generally that of advanced elementary schooling, i.e., low proportions of high school graduates but also fairly low proportions of functional illiterates.

An interesting educational differential is apparent in the tracts containing the city's two Negro universities. Dillard University (tract 33C in Gentilly) is surrounded by an area of generally high educational status. The area surrounding Xavier University (located in tract 70 of Magnolia), on the other hand, although characterized by generally large proportions of high school graduates, also has large propor-
tions of functional illiterates. Warnings against inferring a causal relationship, however, are to be found in one of the areas previously described as having high educational status, i.e., that concentration found in southwestern Magnolia and the Garden District. It adjoins the area which contains Loyola and Tulane Universities. Few Negroes, indeed, attend the former institution, and none the latter.
CHAPTER VII

ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Economic endeavor, when viewed as the way or ways in which man makes his living, may be conceptually divided into the production of things and the use made of them (or the consumption of the goods). The end product of these activities gives to groups of men a general condition of life, or what may be termed their level of living. In this study, the productive aspect of economic status will be subsumed under the categories of employment, occupational, and industrial status. The emphasis is, accordingly, not on what men produce but upon the sociologically more significant aspect of the manner in which they produce. Consumption is more difficult to measure, primarily because detailed racial breakdowns are not furnished by the Bureau of the Census. An approximation may be made, however, with an analysis of the potential to consume as measured by annual income, and by measuring the actual degree of consumption for one of the more important consumer's items, house rent. The study of one additional type of information tends to serve as a connecting link between the two categories. In the class-of-worker statistics is to be found a classification which is essentially one of the sources from which wages are obtained. Although such data are properly regarded as aspects of production, they afford an opportunity to examine the relationship between the worker and the source of his consumption potential, or income.

THE DATA

All data on the productive aspect of economic characteristics
pertains to the "adult" population 14 years of age and over. 1 The employment, occupation, and industry of the respondent were based on his condition during the "census week," i.e., the calendar week preceding the enumerator's visit. Employment status, per se, refers to the respondent's position with respect to the labor force: as a member of the armed forces, as an employed or unemployed member of the civilian labor force, or as a person outside of the labor force (keeping house, unable to work, an inmate of an institution, etc.). Generally, these categories are expressed as percentages of their total, the adult population. 2 In regard to the unemployed, however, a more useful measure was found to be the number of unemployed per 100 employed workers. This type of ratio has the effect, first, of decreasing the size of the denominator and thus rendering small fluctuations more conspicuous, and second of standardizing populations with varying concentrations of persons in the labor force. It is particularly applicable, then, to an analysis of the population of New Orleans, where the number of unemployed men and women of both races is small and where the various categories of the population differ in the amounts which are represented in the labor force.

The occupational classification utilized represents years of effort by the Bureau of the Census to secure meaning from a bewildering

1 As in the chapter on the family, the age category 14 years and over will be the delineation of the adult population.

2 Occupational and industrial categories are expressed as percentages of the total employed labor force.
variety of data. The 11 major categories presented in the 1950 census of population represent 469 items. The categories can thus hardly be interpreted as being homogeneous—a system which summarizes so many items could not be expected to be so. However, if one recognizes the difficulties arising from this heterogeneity, the system thus qualified does represent a rough approximation of the degree of skill, training, authority, and responsibility to be found among the members of the labor force.

The use of Ronald Freedman’s functional and status groupings of the occupational classes provides further means of analysis. From a functional point of view, the professionals, officials, clerks, salespersons, domestics, and service workers may be regarded as service-

---


6 To facilitate the discussion, the detailed characterizations of the Census have been reduced to descriptive titles. In the following list, the Census designations are given in parentheses after the abbreviated title: professionals (professional, technical, and kindred workers); officials (managers, officials, and proprietors, including farm); clerks (clerical and kindred workers); salespersons (sales workers); craftsmen (craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers); operatives (operative and kindred workers); domestics (private household workers); service workers (service workers, except private household); laborers (farm laborers, farm foremen, and other laborers except mine). Note that the two farm categories have been incorporated into the adjacent category, as was done in the Bureau’s reports on census tracts. Only in St. Bernard
production workers, i.e., those involved in professional or personal services, in managing and administering the productive process, or in trading. The remaining classes—craftsmen, operatives, and laborers—are included among the physical-production workers, or those who are concerned directly with the production or processing of physical goods. A rough indication of social status is achieved by Freedman by shifting the domestics and service workers from the service-production to the physical-production workers. The new groupings are termed white-collar and blue-collar workers, respectively.

The 13 major industrial groups represent a synthesis of 148 categories developed by the Census. Although heterogeneity is still present, the items in the sub-categories do not display nearly the disparity as is observable in the occupational classification. The more inclusive nature of industries as compared with the specificity of occupations is probably a contributing factor.

The industrial classification may also be summarized described. Thus, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining, construction, and manufacturing may be summed up under "productive industries." The "distribution industries" include those concerned with transportation, communication, and other public utilities, wholesale and retail trade, and finance, insurance and real estate. The remainder of the industries may be classified as "service industries" (business and repair services, personal services, entertainment and recreation services, professional and related services, and public administration).

Footnote continued: Parish did neither of the farm categories (farmers and farm managers and farm laborers and foremen) exceed 1.5 per cent.

7See footnote 6, supra.
8Loc. cit.
Aside from the confusion arising from the heterogeneity of both the occupational and industrial classifications, two additional factors have operated to determine the quality of these data and those concerning employment in general. First, an appreciable number of youths, women, and part-time workers were inadvertently omitted from the labor force. The result has been an understatement in many of the occupation, industry, and class of worker figures. Second, enumerators sometimes returned occupation and industry designations which were not sufficiently specific for precise allocation. The assignment generally had to be made on an ad hoc basis.\(^{10}\)

Information on income, as all of the preceding types of data, was obtained from all persons 14 years of age and over. Data in this study are presented only for families and unrelated individuals. Unfortunately, these two elements cannot be separated in the racial categories. It should be noted, however, that in each family, the income of all adults was used as the basis of computation. Thus, the average (median) figures for any given population segment tends to be inflated by the family incomes and deflated by those for unrelated individuals. Income is defined as gross income received in 1949 from wages, salary, income from self employment, and from such sources as dividends, pensions, and rents.\(^{11}\)

Income is the only type of economic data presented in this study which is based on a 20 per cent sample. Accordingly, general patterns

---

\(^{10}\) Ibid., xix.

\(^{11}\) Receipts from the following sources were not included as income: sale of property (unless such was the person's usual business); income "in kind"; withdrawals of bank deposits; money borrowed; tax refunds; gifts; and lump-sum inheritances or insurance payments.
become more important than precise interpretations, unless the latter
are accompanied by their appropriate standard errors. In addition,
the quality of the figures are affected, according to the Bureau of the
Census, by the quality of their being based not on records but on mem-
ory. This factor would probably lead to under-reporting, in view of
the tendency to forget minor or irregular sources. The extent of de-
liberate underreporting is unknown, nor is it even commented on in the
Census reports.

Contract monthly rent is the rent contracted for at the time of
the enumeration, regardless of what it included in addition to the
house itself. Data are presented only for occupied, rented, nonfarm
dwelling units. A dwelling unit is occupied simply if one or more
persons are living in it at the time of enumeration. Temporary va-
cancy—as absence of persons because of visiting or because the resi-
dents happen to be away on a vacation—does not remove a dwelling unit
from the occupied category.

THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

Employment status. Negro men are less often to be found as mem-
bers of the labor force than are white men, though practically three-
fourths of the Negro adult males can be so characterized (see Table 17).
Among the women of both races, the situation is just the reverse—always
a minority (less than two-fifths) are in the labor force, and in each
segment of the New Orleans Area relatively more Negro females are to
be found in the labor force than are white females (see Table 18). Thus,
not only are Negro men less numerous among the representatives of the

12 Ibid., xx.
TABLE 17. PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE MALE POPULATION 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Urbanized area</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 14 years of age and over</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net in labor force</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unemployed per 100 employed 10.5 5.8 10.6 5.9 11.9 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Urban fringe</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>St. Bernard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 14 years of age and over</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net in labor force</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed per 100 employed</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Urbanized area</td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 14 years of age and over</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed per 100 employed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 14 years of age and over</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed per 100 employed</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 17.
labor force, but those who are members are forced to share this representation to a greater extent with women of their own race than is true for white persons.

Among the men of both races, the city has the lowest proportions in the labor force, whereas the urban fringe has the highest. For the women, the highest proportions are in the city and become progressively lower in the fringe and in Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes.

The percentage computations in Tables 17 and 18 show always more white men employed than Negro men, and vice versa, more Negro women than white women. But for both sexes and all residential groupings, more nonwhites appear in the ranks of the unemployed. With the use of the unemployment ratio, the greatest area of unemployment in the area is more readily visible: Negroes of both sexes are more apt to find employment in the city than in its fringe. For Negro men, the city offers the best chance of employment of any portion of the New Orleans Area— for white men it is the poorest area.

Women of both races are less often unemployed in St. Bernard Parish, but note that here they are also less often in the labor force. These two facts suggest that particularly in St. Bernard Parish, when a woman becomes unemployed, she in fact reverts to a non-labor force category instead of one of unemployment.

Major occupation. The major occupation of Negro males in all parts of the New Orleans Area is that of laborer. The lowest proportion in this category is found in the city (34.9 per cent), whereas the highest is in the urban fringe (56.9 per cent—see Table 19). The category of operatives ranks next as the major occupation of Negro men,
**TABLE 19. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF THE EMPLOYED MALES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY MAJOR OCCUPATION AND RACE: 1950.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational status</th>
<th>Metropolitan Non-white</th>
<th>Metropolitan Non-white</th>
<th>Urbanized area Non-white</th>
<th>Suburbs Non-white</th>
<th>New Orleans City Non-white</th>
<th>Urban fringe Non-white</th>
<th>Jefferson Non-white</th>
<th>St. Bernard Non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespersons</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestics</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: See Table 17.
but the position of this occupation relative to the city and the fringe is exactly the opposite of that of laborers. These two categories together comprise considerably more than half of the employed Negro male population in every segment of the New Orleans Area. Service workers generally occupy a poor third position, with the exception of St. Bernard Parish, where this rank is occupied by craftsmen.

The distribution of the major occupations of the white males is more even. With the exception of St. Bernard Parish, craftsmen occupy the dominant position, with officials and operatives variously claiming second or third rank. In St. Bernard, officials drop to fourth place, and the first position is accorded to laborers. But whereas the first three occupations of Negro men at times could claim more than three-fourths of the employed of their sex (in the fringe and in Jefferson Parish), in no portion of the New Orleans Area did the first three occupations of white men attain as much as 60.0 per cent.

The characteristic occupation of Negro women is that of a domestic -- in every portion of the Area more than 40.0 per cent are found in this category (see Table 20). Operatives and service workers rank next, except in St. Bernard Parish, where laborers (all of which are farm laborers) edge out service workers. Almost as characteristic as domestics for Negro women is the occupation of clerk for white women -- the percentage in this category generally approximates 40.0 per cent. Professionals and operatives occupy either second or third rank, with salespersons claiming the fourth position everywhere except in St. Bernard, where they rise to second place.

Among women, there is little overlapping of occupations between the races. Thus, white women are seldom found in the ranks of domestics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational status</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Urbanized area</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>New Orleans City</th>
<th>Urban fringe</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>St. Bernard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>Non-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespersons</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-production</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical-production</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 17.
(less than 1.5 per cent), and Negro women are seldom found holding the job of clerk (less than 3.0 per cent). The same statement cannot be applied to men. In every part of the New Orleans Area, more than 6.0 per cent of the employed Negro males hold the position of craftsmen, which is the dominant occupation of the whites, and more than 5.0 per cent of the white employed men are to be found in any one of the three dominant Negro occupations. It is to be noted, however, that Negroes are seldom found occupying the category of officials (less than 3.1 per cent). One may conclude that there is less competition among women for the dominant occupation of either race than is true for men.

In regard to the summary occupational classifications, one finds both sexes of Negroes concentrated in the blue-collar jobs—never does the proportion drop below seven-eighths. White males, on the other hand, are fairly evenly divided between the white- and blue-collar positions (with the exception of St. Bernard Parish where the proportions are approximately one-third and two-thirds, respectively), whereas white women are always concentrated in the white-collar occupations—never do they drop below St. Bernard's "low" of 69.7 per cent.

Negro males are to be found predominantly in the physical-production categories. With the exception of the city of New Orleans, the same may be said of white men, although always there are relatively more Negro men in the physical-production jobs than there are white men. The situation of women is exactly reversed—service-production jobs are dominant, although the white women are always more strongly represented than are the Negro women. Furthermore, one should bear in mind that Negro women are heavily concentrated in the categories of domestics and service workers—the very jobs which are so crucial to the difference
between the functional and the status occupational groupings. In other words, not only do the white women have a heavier proportion of their members in the service-production ranks than is the case with Negro women, but the difference between this same category for the two races is qualitatively distinct.

**Industrial status.** The most important industries in the city for Negroes are those concerned with personal services (see Table 21). Trade and utilities (i.e., transportation, communication, and other public utilities), respectively, follow in importance. For the white city-dwellers, trade is the most important industry. Manufacturing ranks a poor second place and utilities are third. The situation in the suburbs, including the urban fringe, is markedly different. Relatively speaking, manufacturing is of much greater importance outside of the city for the members of both races, and particularly for Negroes. The summary classifications emphasize this difference. For both races, the production industries (made up largely of manufacturing and construction) in the city rank below both the distribution and service industries. In every part of the suburbs, the production group heads the list for Negroes and is at least above the service industries for the whites.

Especially for the nonwhite population, the city is the service center. This group of industries is most important for the city Negroes and is second only to the distributive industries for the whites. In the suburbs, service industries always constitute the smallest category for both races.

Finally, it should be noted that Negroes are always more concentrated in the productive industries. St. Bernard is the one exception, and the difference between the races, as is evident in Table 21, is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and communication</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and repair services</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 17.
small. Never, however, are Negroes more predominant in the distributive industries than are whites. These industries include not only utilities but trade and finance as well. In fact, it is precisely in these two categories that a marked racial differential exists, a differential which favors the white race. Evidently, the nonwhite population controls a smaller proportion of the means of production than does the white group. 13

Class of worker. Although the Bureau of the Census does not do so, class-of-worker data can be interpreted as a classification of wages, based on the source of wages. This interpretation serves to provide a connecting link between the discussion of production and that of consumption, to the extent that one focuses his attention on the source of the consumption potential among the employed. Thus, most workers (over two-thirds) receive their income primarily as wages and salary from private firms (see Table 22). This statement applies to each race and sex grouping in each part of the New Orleans Area. Negroes of both sexes, however, are relatively more heavily concentrated in this category than are whites. On the other hand, they are underrepresented in comparison with white workers in the government and self-employed classes. In other words, these two categories, in contrast to that of private wage and salary workers, are more the prerogative of whites. Those Negroes who do enter these classes seem to favor the government over self-employment as a source of income.

13 For similar findings concerning the 1940 populations of Houston, Atlanta, and New Orleans, see William Edward Hopkins, "A Demographic Analysis of Houston, Texas," (unpublished doctor's dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1951), 99-102.
TABLE 22. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF WORKERS IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY CLASS, SEX, AND RACE: 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and class of worker</th>
<th>Metropolitan Non-white</th>
<th>Metropolitan White</th>
<th>Urbanised area Non-white</th>
<th>Urbanised area White</th>
<th>Suburbs Non-white</th>
<th>Suburbs White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid (family)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid (family)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid (family)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid (family)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 17.
Everywhere in the New Orleans Area, unpaid family workers are in a decided minority. Except for the St. Bernard white women who attain a proportion of 2.2 per cent in this category, no portion of the Area has as much as 1.5 per cent of its employed workers who are content to labor for the family without pay. The percentages become even smaller within the urbanized area (and even more so within the city) than in the remainder of the suburbs.

Among Negroes, and especially among the women of this race, increasing nearness to the city signifies decreasing proportions among wage and salary workers and increasing proportions among government workers and those who are self employed. Such patterns are not in evidence for the whites.

Income and rent. The discussion of the income received in 1949 and the contract monthly rent in 1950 is regrettable brief. As indicated earlier, the writer does not assume that these two factors are adequate measures of the level of living of a population—they leave too much unsaid. On the racial level, however, these data are all that are available, and to that extent they do fill a gap in organized knowledge. Their joint treatment is intended primarily to guard against singling out either factor as the more important one.

In every portion of the New Orleans Area, whites earned more than twice as much money in 1949 as the nonwhites (see Table 23). However, nearness to the city meant an increasingly higher income for Negroes. It also signified a decrease in the difference between the incomes of the two races. For the whites, on the other hand, the wealthiest area
TABLE 23. INCOME IN 1949 AND RENT IN 1950 IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Median Income in 1949 of families and unrelated individuals*</th>
<th>Median contract monthly rent (1950) of occupied nonfarm dwelling units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>$1,375</td>
<td>$2,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanised area</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>2,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>3,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>3,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>3,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>2,283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on a 20 per cent sample.

was the fringe, followed by Jefferson Parish and the city, respectively. For both races, St. Bernard Parish displayed the lowest median income.

The same statements can be made for the rents paid by the occupants of nonfarm dwellings, with two important exceptions. White renters pay more than twice as much rent as do nonwhites in every portion of the Area except in the city (there, the differential is slightly under one-half). Furthermore, unlike the situation described in connection with median incomes, there is no exception to the statement that proximity to the city signifies a higher median rent for both races. Therefore, the whites in the city, in comparison to the rest of the white population, are doubly burdened with relatively low incomes and high rents. This relationship does not mean that the Negroes have a better situation—the analysis here was intended to be intra-racial. As disadvantaged as the city whites are with respect to other whites, their level of living as measured by income received and rent paid is obviously higher than that of any category of Negroes in the Area.

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY

The main task of the student who wishes to analyze economic

---

Although the data are based on sample estimates, the samples are so large and the differences so pronounced that it is very unlikely that sampling variability could be responsible for a change of pattern. The standard error of the median income for white New Orleanians was between 2,884 and 2,915 dollars, with the median income at 2,900 dollars. The chances are 2 out of 3 that a median obtained from the total population would lie between the values of the standard error. As can be seen in Table 23, the median income for Jefferson Parish whites is well above even the highest estimate for the city (3,510 as compared with 2,915 dollars).
characteristics rests primarily in reducing the vast amount of data to manageable quantities through the use of summarizing measures. The necessity for this task is nowhere more heavily emphasized than in the study of economic differentials among census tracts. If the researcher does not wish to spend all of his time in expounding on this particular subject, he must remain content with an examination of but a few indices of the qualities in which he is interested. Accordingly, the delineation of the production aspect of economic characteristics is achieved by the use of unemployment ratios and proportions found in the white-collar occupations. The study of the economics of consumption proved a less difficult problem in that comparability with the previous sections could be attained simply by a portrayal of median incomes and rents.

**Unemployment.** The distribution of the unemployed Negroes does not develop into well defined patterns for most of the city, as is shown in Figure 29. Algiers has probably the best claim to sharp delineation—generally most of the area is characterized by high unemployment rates. The broad area in the center of the city occupied by Galvez, Esplanade, the French Quarter, the Business District, and the southern part of Back of Town has no sharper distinction than occupying a position above the median for the distribution of tracts, i.e., the rates are high, but not uniformly so. The Industrial Canal area contains several large tracts in the upper sixth (in the southern portion) and an equal number in the lowest (in the north). Gentilly similarly has widely divergent unemployment rates occurring in adjacent tracts.

Outside of the Industrial Canal area, the lowest rates are generally found in the southwestern portion of the city (in the crescent
formed by the river). Thus, the areas adjacent to University, including parts of Carrollton, Broadmoor, Magnolia, and the Garden District, are usually devoid of unemployment.

White-collar workers. Nonwhite workers classed as in the white-collar status group appear to be more definitely clustered (see Figure 30). As would be expected, therefore, little relation appears to exist between their distribution and that of the unemployed workers. Algiers, so uniformly unemployed, has each of its five tracts holding different sentile positions in the array of white-collar jobs. The Industrial Canal area is now uniformly low in proportions of these workers, in contrast to the marked split it revealed in degree of employment. The Galvez area has high percentages of white-collar workers and high ratios of unemployment, and the same is true in Gentilly, though to a lesser extent. On the other hand, the low unemployment rates in the interstitial area surrounding University are accompanied by high percentages of white-collar workers; the situation in the eastern part of Magnolia and the southern part of Back of Town is just the reverse. Briefly, the highest proportions of white-collar workers are found in Galvez and in the parts of the areas surrounding University. The lowest proportions exist in eastern Magnolia, southern Back of Town, the Waterfront, the Irish Channel, and the Industrial Canal area. An important generalization emerging from this analysis is that Negro white-collar workers tend to live on the outskirts of the large clusters of nonwhite population.

Income. Galvez and the interstitial areas surrounding University are also the locations of high median incomes in 1949. (See Figure 31).
**INCOME**

**MEDIAN INCOME (IN DOLLARS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Income Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>607 - 1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1100 - 1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1295 - 1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1375 - 1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1500 - 1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1700 - 2208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF NONWHITES**

- Shaded circle: 250 - 720
- Tract shaded and center cut out: 737 - 3,739
- Tract fully shaded: 3,926 - 7,175

**RENT**

**MEDIAN CONTRACT MONTHLY RENT (IN DOLLARS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Rent Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.13 - 12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.75 - 14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.83 - 16.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.49 - 17.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.25 - 18.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.49 - 25.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF OCCUPIED, RENTED, NONWHITE DWELLING UNITS**

- Shaded circle: 108 - 233
- Tract shaded and center cut out: 279 - 978
- Tract fully shaded: 1,015 - 1,775

However, the Industrial Canal area is somewhat surprisingly also a part of this group. Metairie, which held a rank close to the median for the two measures of production, reveals an income level which is decidedly high. Magnolia has fairly high rates, but the tracts are also somewhat varied in their chosen position in the sextile distribution. The lowest rates are found in the French Quarter, the Business District, and in the fringe area surrounding Magnolia's heavy population concentration (extending southward as far as the Irish Channel). Thus, one may safely state that the very low-income tracts are also relegated to areas outside of the more densely settled portions of the city.

Rent. The discussion of median rents is impaired somewhat by the fact that calculations were based on occupied dwelling units. Thus, the number of units involved was necessarily small. When the practice of the Census is followed in not computing rates for areas of less than one hundred cases, a great many census tracts are omitted. Figure 32 accordingly describes the rent conditions in only 67 tracts.

The high-rent areas for the Negro populations are clearly located in Metairie, Gentilly, Esplanade, and especially the Industrial Canal area. The rents in Magnolia are fairly high, but, as was the condition with income, the tracts show great variation. The low income areas are plainly visible as occupying all of Algiers, the Irish Channel, and Carrollton (i.e., all tracts for which data are computed). These low-rent areas appear to exhibit the most homogeneous grouping of any of the economic data considered.
CHAPTER VIII

POLITICAL CHARACTERISTICS

To the writer's knowledge, never has a chapter on political characteristics appeared in a treatise on demography.\(^1\) The reason for the omission is difficult to conceive. Voting populations are generally registered populations, and, as such, records are kept. The data, further, appear more often than do census data, i.e., the intervals between elections in this country never exceed four years. Nor has the information been ignored in other fields: witness the extensive use of voting records by the political sociologists and the students of government.\(^2\) It is this writer's conclusion that the lack of such analyses on the part of demographers has resulted from their failure to view populations as social phenomena or to investigate the fruitfulness of studying composition from a sociological as well as a demographic point of view. A demonstration of the value in discussing political characteristics as a part of population composition is the task of the present chapter.

\(^1\)Part of a chapter is devoted to this topic by A. M. Carr-Saunders and D. Caradog Jones, A Survey of the Social Structure of England and Wales: As Illustrated by Statistics (second edition, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937), 85-85. The treatment is excellent, in spite of the lack of adequate data.

\(^2\)Detailed references may be found in Rudolf Heberle, George Hillery, Jr., and Frank Levich, "Continuity and Change in Voting Behavior in the 1952 Primaries in Louisiana," The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XXXIII (1953), 323-342.
THE DATA

The data on political characteristics are drawn from enumerated, estimated and registered information. The enumerated data concern citizenship, a topic usually relegated to a position in discussions on race and nativity. Since citizenship is a political function, the writer feels the re-categorization in the present context to be more meaningful. These data, however, exist only for the city of New Orleans and are based on a 20 per cent sample. In addition, the status of the population is so homogeneous with respect to its citizenship that the treatment is limited to the data on race and age, the sex categories being omitted.

All remaining data in this chapter are concerned with the citizens, or more precisely with the voting citizens. Estimates of population were computed for the various categories aged 21 years and over as of October 1, 1952. The estimates were derived by simple linear (arithmetic) interpolation based on the 1940 to 1950 population change.

In Louisiana, any voter is a registered voter. Consequently, the data on the characteristics of voters must be secured from the information supplied by the voter at the time of his or her registration. All information on voters presented in this chapter is based on records supplied by the Registrars of Voters of the parishes in the New Orleans Area. The data for the Area as a whole were obtained from the Report of Secretary of State of Louisiana. The precinct data in Figure 33 were secured by the writer from photostatic sheets furnished by the Registrar of Voters of Orleans Parish. In order that the data for all

parishes would coincide, the time of the analysis was selected as just prior to the last general election: October 4, 1952. Accordingly, the discussion includes the metropolitan area, the suburbs, and the separate parishes. No information is available concerning the urban fringe.

It is conceivable that in certain instances, over-registration has occurred. Such a condition would appear to be more important on the local (or precinct) level than any other and would arise from the attempts of one or more over-ambitious politicians to secure a more predictable support. By definition, the extent of such occurrences would be quite difficult to verify. Nevertheless, the cautious researcher must admit the possibility, if not the potentiality. The evidence which this writer has been able to secure suggests that whatever over-registration has taken place has not seriously impaired the demographic qualities of the data. More information will be presented on this point in connection with the distribution of voters. Under-registration, of course, is almost impossible, for the registered voter is such by definition.

A word is in order regarding the eligibility of voters. The total number of such a population is generally interpreted to include all persons who are 21 years of age and over. Technically, there is an additional prerequisite of residence, which requires that the voter reside in a locality for a specified period of time. The population of eligible voters is thus smaller than the population which is 21 years and over, and the size of the former would be heavily affected by the incidence of migration. Practically speaking, there is yet no tested manner of estimating this population by race. The total population 21
years and over, therefore, is taken as an index of the population of eligible voters. With this qualification in mind, the reader will perhaps find it interesting to note that the percentage of voters to the eligible population at times closely approximates but never equals that "total."

Evidence is also lacking concerning two important characteristics of voters (i.e., by race): their participation and their party affiliation. Participation must go undisussed. Party affiliation is so homogeneous, on the other hand, that although the party-proportions are not directly measurable, the predominance of Democrats can be readily demonstrated.

THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

Citizenship. Possibly the most striking feature concerning the citizenship of New Orleanians is the high degree of homogeneity in the population of either race. Almost everyone in the city is a citizen of this nation: The total population of aliens is less than 3,860, and even that of the foreign-born numbers no more than 14,420 persons (allowing for sampling variability). As is evident in Table 24, the foreign-born reach their greatest relative strength in the white population, in which practically 19 out of 20 are native citizens. Indeed, only 1 out of 100 white persons is an unnaturalized foreigner.

Such extreme homogeneity, however, does not obscure the emergence of a definite racial differential. One may safely state that the Negro is more often a native American than is the white man. This statement

---

There is, accordingly, no need to distinguish between registered voters and those registered voters who cast their ballot.
### TABLE 24. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF CITIZENSHIP AND NATIVITY IN THE CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship and nativity</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>Under 21 years</th>
<th>21 years &amp; over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alien</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on a 20 per cent sample.

holds true no matter whether attention is directed to persons below or over 21 years of age. The Negro is more often a native and more often a citizen. On the other hand, he is least likely to be found as one of the foreign-born—either alien or naturalized. In fact, even the very status of his citizenship is more likely to be reported than is that of the white man.5

Characteristics of registered voters. The 128,906 registered non-white voters in the New Orleans Area represent the highest degree of political activity among Negroes in the recent history of the Area. During the period extending from 1932 to 1952, only in the last four years has the proportion of non-white voters been greater than one per cent. The exercise of their political franchise is thus a relatively new event for the New Orleans Negroes.

In 1952, the highest proportion of non-white voters relative to the total registered population was found in the city of New Orleans (12.1 per cent), although this attainment was closely approached by the suburban parish of Jefferson (10.7 per cent). In St. Bernard, on the other hand, only 2.7 per cent of the registered population were non-white. Increasing urbanity in the New Orleans Area, therefore, meets an increasing amount of Negro voters, both numerically and proportionately.

5The extreme nature of the percentages (i.e., so close to either 100 or 0) renders improbable the possibility that sampling variability could change the relationships—the base of all percentages for non-whites approximates 100,000 persons; the standard errors of estimated percentages of a value of 2 or 98 for such a sample is approximately 0.1 per cent. The standard errors for the white population, with even less extreme variation (e.g., 5 or 95 per cent) are even smaller, due, of course, to the larger base population.
Although the percentage of nonwhite voters in Orleans Parish is four and one-half times greater than that of St. Bernard, the proportion is nevertheless a low one. Part of the reason behind the low rate is, of course, the low proportion of Negroes in the city. The proportion of registered Negro voters to the total "eligible" population is much higher than the per cent of Negro population in every parish and for either sex, although these voters are still markedly below the proportion of white voters (see Table 25).

The largest percentage of eligible nonwhite voters (of either sex) who exercise their privilege to register reside not in Orleans but in Jefferson Parish. The corresponding percentages for Negro men and women in New Orleans city are substantially lower and are only slightly higher than those for St. Bernard. Among whites, the city has the lowest percentage of registration in the area, whereas the highest per cent (again for either sex) occurs in St. Bernard.

In every category shown in Table 25, the Negroes have a lower percentage of eligible registered than do the whites. Furthermore, the lowest proportion displayed for the whites (women in the city have a percentage of 64.8 who are registered) is still higher than the highest proportion reached by nonwhites (Jefferson Parish nonwhite men have 63.0 per cent of their population registered). The racial difference is therefore so marked that at no time does it overlap. The greatest difference displayed between the races for both sexes appears in St. Bernard Parish, and in Jefferson the two races are most "equal." Even in this latter parish, the closest agreement (that between women) leaves a differential which favors the whites by 22.9 per cent.

Therefore, relative to their own eligible populations,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Men Nonwhite</th>
<th>Men White</th>
<th>Women Nonwhite</th>
<th>Women White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State of Louisiana, Report of Secretary of State... (1951 to 1952).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sex ratio of voters Nonwhite</th>
<th>Sex ratio of voters White</th>
<th>Per cent of illiterate voters Nonwhite</th>
<th>Per cent of illiterate voters White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>219.2</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 25.
Negroes are registered to the greatest extent in Jefferson Parish and least in the city, although even in Jefferson, no more than approximately two-thirds of the males and one-half of the females do register. The whites always have higher percentages. St. Bernard Parish evidences both the highest proportions of voters to eligible voters in the New Orleans Area and the greatest differences between the races. The proportions for the white voters in this parish actually reach over nine out of ten. For males, the astonishing high of 97.5 per cent is attained. If only persons 21 years and over who had established residence were utilized as a base, the percentage would have probably been higher.

The foregoing analysis has indicated in addition to a racial differential, one between the sexes as well. Among both races, women are less often registered as voters. This statement may be even more clearly demonstrated by the use of sex ratios, specifically the males per 100 females in the population of registered voters (see Table 26). The highest sex ratios among voters generally appear among Negroes. The one exception is in Jefferson Parish, where the sex ratio of the whites is higher than that of Negroes by one-half of one per cent. In other words, in spite of the fact that Jefferson Negro women are relatively less often registered than are white women, when compared with the registration of their own opposite sex, the difference shifts in favor of the Negroes. This statement means that Negro women tend to approximate the registration of their men more than white women do of their men. For the majority of the population in the Area, however, one may safely conclude that the discrepancy between the sexes in voting registration is greater among Negroes than among whites.

Table 26 shows also the relative importance of illiterates in
the Area. Only 3,105 of the 292,140 voters were illiterates, or signed their name to the voting rolls by making "their mark." Such a low proportion is reflected in the percentages: Only among Jefferson Parish Negro voters (7.8 per cent of whom were illiterates) does the percentage of illiterates exceed 3.0 per cent. And although the percentages for both races are low, the whites have lower rates in both the larger parishes. The high degree of illiteracy in Jefferson Parish extends to both races, i.e., both races have the highest percentages (for their race) in the Area. The lowest values are accorded to the city.

In reference to political affiliation, members of the Democratic Party constitute the lion's share of the registered voters of both races. Only 6,508 persons registered other than Democrat in 1952, 3,215 of whom were Republicans, 3,205 Independents or no party, 4 Socialists, 1 Communist, and 3 unspecified. Therefore, in spite of the lack of a racial classification of party members, the predominance of Democrat in both races may be inferred. For example, if all Republicans were Negroes, they would constitute no more than 9.7 per cent of the Negro population in the city, only 8.4 per cent in Jefferson Parish, and only 7.2 per cent in St. Bernard.

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY

The low proportion of registered Negro voters can be demonstrated

---

6 Only three illiterate nonwhite persons were registered to vote in St. Bernard Parish as of the date of study. If two more illiterate Negroes had registered, the percentage of illiteracy would have been higher than that of the whites. As one would expect, t tests of significance confirm a null hypothesis of no significant difference between the races in the parish.
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Figure 25. Per cent which nonwhite voters were of the total registered voters, by precinct, New Orleans, 1902. (Source: New Orleans Registrar of Voters.)
to be widespread throughout the city. The reader will recall the analysis of Figures 7 and 8 in Chapter II which showed only two census tracts which contained no Negro population and 33 which displayed proportions of over 50.0 per cent. Note further that the city is divided into but 142 tracts— it contains 307 precincts, or more than twice as many precincts as it does tracts. Precincts are obviously the smaller division. The precinct distribution of the nonwhite voters relative to the total registered population is shown for each of the city's precincts in 1952 in Figure 33. There were at that time 84 precincts with no registered Negroes, or 42 times the number of tracts with no Negro population. On the other hand, no more than 22 precincts can be observed to have more than 50.0 per cent of their registered population as nonwhites. There are accordingly three tracts with a majority of Negroes for every two such precincts—and the precincts are the smaller areas. The wide distribution of precincts with no Negro voters, in itself, would help to indicate the great extent to which low registration among Negroes permeates the city.

Figure 33 can, in addition, serve a useful purpose in more precisely delineating the concentration of Negroes in the various portions of New Orleans. In order to achieve this end, however, certain qualifications must be kept in mind. First, areas which show no nonwhite voters may exist thusly because few or no nonwhites live in the area or because the nonwhite population does not care to register (whether because of fear, ignorance, or apathy). And vice versa, heavy concentrations of Negro registrants may indicate either few white persons or sympathetic ones (every precinct has some white voters). Since whites are more often registered, a heavy relative concentration of white voters is
more apt to mean a heavy concentration of white population than would be the case for Negroes. Accordingly, the distribution indicated in Figure 33 may be interpreted as reflecting a minimum concentration of Negro population.

The agreement between the relative distributions of Negro populations by census tracts and their voting population by precincts is very close. A comparison of Figure 33 with Figures 7 and 8 indicates further the extent to which the precinct distribution can be used to isolate concentrations which are obscured by the census tract information. (1) The heaviest concentration of population in Algiers probably exists in the lower (southern) part of tract 4, which is the largest tract immediately adjacent to gigantic tract 6. (2) In the long census tract (133) which borders Lake Ponchartrain in the Lake Front area, the only concentration of Negro voters would appear to exist in the eastern end. The precinct data thus render highly improbable an assumption that the Negro population is scattered evenly throughout this tract. (3) The concentration of Negroes near Dillard University in Gentilly is shown to be more separated from the University than was revealed by the census tract data. (4) The distribution of Negroes by census tracts indicates a possible break in population distribution in Back of Town which would separate the concentrations in Magnolia and Esplanade. The precinct data show this break to be a decided one. A "corridor" follows the eastern edge of Back of Town which never contains more than one-fourth of its voting population as Negro. (5) The heavy relative incidence of Negroes in the northwestern portion of Magnolia is shown to taper off gradually into Metairie, instead of breaking sharply. (6) In general, the shadings separating the various concentrations and
paucities show a more gradual transition for the precinct data than for the census tract data.

In brief, then, the heaviest concentrations of Negro voters (as well as of Negro population), are visible within Magnolia, Esplanade, Galvez, southern Gentilly, the Industrial Canal area (mainly the southeastern portion), and Algiers. The lightest distributions appear in the Lake Front, Metairie, University, Audubon Park, City Park, most of the Garden District, and northern Gentilly.
CHAPTER IX

FERTILITY

The composition of a population as seen through its various characteristics, is generally considered from its static aspect, and it has been done so in this study. The demographic processes, on the other hand, are as their name implies—essentially dynamic. These processes are completely subsumed under the three primary demographic variables: birth, death, and migration. They are the key elements in population movement—any change in total size or in the size of the components must operate through them. A discussion of the change in these processes is the purpose of the next three chapters.

In studying each of these variables, the demographer essentially seeks to answer two questions: how many persons were involved and who were involved. The answer to the first question is paradoxically the most fundamental and the most superficial. The primary interest in size prompts a search for information pertinent to the different degrees of speed or incidence in the change in births, deaths, and migration. Yet from the dynamic point of view, a knowledge merely of incidence is no knowledge at all, since each of the processes acts on different elements of the population in quite different ways. As far as change is concerned, one thousand births may mean quite different things in different populations. An answer to the first question then logically invites a second question: who are the persons involved? Who are born? Who die? Who migrate? The emphasis becomes shifted to the parts of the population which are involved and how they compare.

The division between these types of information exists only analy-
tically. The answers to both questions are interlaced and interdependent.

The study of human fertility, the task of the present chapter, attempts to disclose the basic patterns in the manner in which new members enter a population through birth. The question of inherent fecundity—or the upper limit of a population's potential number of births—is here ignored, not only because there is yet no means of answering this question, but because the interest is centered on the actual level of fertility the population has reached and the extent to which this level influences population change.

THE DATA

As was true of the previous chapter, and as will be the case in the chapters to follow, three types of data are to be employed: registered, enumerated, and estimated. The basic type of information—that concerning the births, per se, is gathered by means of registration, i.e., from the certificates of birth which are recorded for almost all persons born alive in this nation. It is now demonstrated knowledge that all births are not registered. During the four month period from December 1, 1939 to March 31, 1940, the registration of births in the metropolitan area of New Orleans was estimated to be 96.2 per cent complete for nonwhites and 97.2 per cent complete for whites. However,

---

1For a comprehensive discussion of the nature of the data relevant to the study of fertility, see Margaret Jarman Hagood, "Dynamics of the Rural Population; Part I, Levels and Trends in Rural Fertility," Rural Sociology, XIX (1954), 73-74.

2These rates were computed from data obtained from a field study conducted by the National Office of the Division of Vital Statistics. See U. S. Bureau of the Census, "Studies in the Completeness of Birth
not only are no later figures available, but the measures themselves are not entirely adequate; the births employed in the investigation were not those which occurred only to the residents of the New Orleans Area but were also all of those which took place in the Area. As is indicated below, the difference is an important one.

Data on registered births were obtained from the Vital Statistics of the United States\(^3\) and the Louisiana State Department of Health's Statistical Report of the Division of Public Health Statistics.\(^4\) Two types of vital statistics are published by these agencies; those which are tabulated as of the place where they occurred and those tabulated according to the residence of the person involved. That the difference can be significant is seen in the comparison of the New Orleans birth records in 1950: 14,769 births were registered to mothers who lived in the city and 22,624 births occurred in the city both to resident mothers and those who lived elsewhere. Births by place of occurrence are thus 49.1 per cent more frequent than births by place of residence.\(^5\) Thus, the percentages


\[^1\] For each of the years: 1950-1952 (New Orleans: no data of publication).

\[^2\] Data for the metropolitan area are not much better: 22,216 births were recorded by place of occurrence and 18,268 by place of residence, a difference of 3,948 births or 21.6 per cent.
quoting above concerning completeness of birth registration (since they are applicable only to births by place of occurrence) can at best be used merely as indices.

Obviously, demographic significance can be attached only to the tabulations by place of residence, and such is the only type of information presented in this study. Because these data were not published at the parish level before 1940, that date becomes the earliest used in the analysis. The latest data are for 1952.

The second type of data concerns enumerated populations. Measures of fertility used in this analysis are related in some manner to their base populations. All enumerated data are based on complete counts—no sample data are employed.

Enumerated data, however, are not always available for the uses demanded by fertility analysis, and estimates must be obtained. Such approximations are necessary for two reasons: (1) Since complete population counts are taken only once in each decade, the demographer must have estimates of the population for intercensal years if he is to study trends during such periods. (2) The recent national censuses have been taken as of April 1 in the census year. Vital statistics are gathered for calendar years. Hence, summary measures of vital statistics should be related to the mid-year populations, and the need for estimates arises. The full explanation of the technique used in computing estimates for intercensal years will be found in the chapter on population change. Suffice it here to say that the estimates are based on the

---

6 The reader will note that such was not always the case in the study of political composition (e.g., the proportion of nonwhite voters per total voting population), nor is it the case in the study of mortality (note the infant mortality rate).
assumption that the school enrollment maintains a relatively constant ratio to the total population. Since school enrollments are known for intercensal years, it becomes a relatively simple matter to inflate these figures by multiplying them by the known proportions which they bear to the total populations.

Several specialized measures are employed in the present chapter to depict levels of fertility, among which are: crude birth rates, fertility ratios, permanent replacement quotas, indexes of net reproduction, age-specific birth rates, and gross reproduction rates. The crude birth rate is the measure used to answer the initial question regarding fertility: What is the rate at which persons are born? It is expressed simply by relating the number of live births during a year to the population as it existed at the middle of the year. The quotient states the proportion of a population which enters it by means of birth and, when multiplied by 1,000, is converted into a more meaningful expression.

However, two populations with identical crude birth rates may be reproducing at entirely different levels if they differ substantially in regard to the proportion of their populations concentrated in the reproductive years. As a counteractive to such a potentially fallacious analysis, the demographer seeks to know the types of births that are produced and the persons who are producing them. The remaining measures attempt this task.

The fertility ratio is at present the best measure of reproduction available from census (enumerated) data. It is defined as the number of children per 1,000 reproductive women. "Children" usually refers to persons under five years of age, whereas "reproductive women"
are variously limited to those from 15 or 20 to 44 or 49 years. As will be indicated later, the practical span of reproduction in New Orleans women as of 1950 was between 15 and 44 years of age. The fertility ratio is defined accordingly.

The interpretation of the fertility ratio is accomplished by means of the permanent replacement quota, which is defined as the fertility ratio of a stationary population. By a stationary population is meant one which results when fertility and mortality rates are held constant and the influence of migration is eliminated. A life table is accordingly necessary in computing such a population. As will be explained in the next chapter, life tables cannot be calculated for the 1950 population of New Orleans. The nearest approximations available are life tables for the urban population of Louisiana, 1940-1941.

---

7 The degree of consensus is even smaller than this. Feailer, who first used the fertility ratio in 1830, defined it as the proportion of children under 10 to females from 16 to 45. Wilson is responsible for the sounder definition of children as under five years, and it has generally become the norm. The limit of the reproductive years, however, has fluctuated at both the upper and lower limits. One investigator has even placed the upper limit at 55 years. For a more extended discussion, see Robert E. Kuczynski, The Measurement of Population Growth: Methods and Results (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936) 96-99, 110 Fn. 2.

8 For a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages attached to the use of the fertility ratio, see ibid., and T. Lynn Smith, Population Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948), 198.

9 The values are derived from the Lx column of the life table. For details of computation, see Margaret Jarman Hagood, Statistics for Sociologists (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, Inc., 1941), 384-385, 392.

When the fertility ratio is expressed as a ratio of the permanent replacement quota, the quotient is termed the index of net reproduction. It measures the degree to which the population is reproducing above or below the level necessary to maintain a stationary population. The substitute permanent replacement quota to be used in this study prohibits any extensive use of the index of net reproduction, but the margin of error introduced is probably not large. It is extremely improbable that the permanent replacement quota for Negroses could be as low as 338, and it could not be lower. A corresponding quota for the white population would be 343. On the other hand, the permanent replacement quota seldom reaches 500. The measure is thus relatively inelastic.

The establishment of these limits, however, does more than describe the stability of the permanent replacement quota. It affords the researcher an opportunity to establish certain points of reference in interpreting fertility ratios. Thus, any fertility ratio below 338 is certainly below replacement levels whereas those of 500 or better are definitely above. With the establishment of the permanent replacement quota for the area to be studied, an additional criterion is furnished. For example, the permanent replacement quota for Louisiana's urban Negroes from 1940 to 1941 was 361, whereas that for the whites was 375.13

---

11See this lower limit was attained by applying the sex ratio at birth of the U. S. Negro population in 1950 (102.5) to a hypothetical life table population in which no mortality occurred through the reproductive period. The reproductive period is defined as between 15 and 44 years of age.

12See Nagood, op. cit., 89^4. The figure quoted above is roughly comparable to that which Nagood gives for a permanent replacement quota based on the female population from 20 to 44 years of age (600).

13As far as the author could ascertain, the difference is due to the differential sex ratio at birth.
Fertility ratios of New Orleans Negroes, the following interpretations can probably be made: below 338, substantially below replacement; 338 to 360, slightly below replacement; 361 to 500, moderately above replacement; over 500, substantially above replacement. The benchmark for the white population would be 343, 375, and 500, respectively.

These points of reference (and particularly the upper and lower limits) become especially valuable when only approximate permanent replacement quotas are available, (as is the present case) and become even more valuable in the analysis of small populations (as census tracts) where the permanent replacement quotas cannot be known.

The influence of age upon the woman's reproductive role is examined by means of age-specific birth rates. These are calculated by relating (1) the number of children born in any given year to women in a specified age group to (2) the number of women in that age group. The rate is expressed in terms of births per 100 women. The measure gives an approximate proportion of the women who bore children during the specified year.  

Gross reproduction rates are computed by summing the age-specific birth rates (for girl babies) and multiplying the sum by the number of years contained in the age intervals. This rate represents the number of daughters that would be born to 100 girl babies as of the date of measurement if two conditions prevailed: (1) the girl babies maintained the same fertility as did their mothers, and (2) all lived through the child-bearing period. The measure is consequently one of total fertility.

---

1 Since plural births (twins, etc.) are not distinguished from other births in the reports for the county level, they are contained in the total number, and the proportion will generally be slightly too large.
Developed by Robert Kuczynski in 1907, it gives an easy solution of the problem of how to fuse age-specific fertility rates into one numerical expression.\textsuperscript{15} It also represents the absolute minimum compatible with a self-sustaining population, since it leaves no room for improvement in mortality.\textsuperscript{16}

The technique of computation, however, imports to the gross reproduction rate a peculiar mathematical quality: the rate for the sum of the parts can be smaller than either of the parts themselves, since the sum is one of proportions and not of whole numbers. That such a situation could exist in practice is, of course, impossible, and it is this feature which forms, in the writer's opinion, the measure's most serious weakness.

The most feasible method for the presentation of data concerning the demographic variables appeared to rest in a combination of both charts and tables for many of the same types of data. The general plan in the next three chapters has been to present charts or graphs for the two general or summary categories of the New Orleans Area, i.e., the metropolitan area and the suburbs, and to provide tables for the component parts (or parishes). In this manner, one is permitted to view the relationships not only graphically but specifically, as the need might arise, and the task is accomplished with the greatest economy of space and ma-


\textsuperscript{16}Rupert B. Vance, All These People: The Nation's Human Resources in the South (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945), 90.
THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

The general trend in the New Orleans Area has been towards an increasing number of births for both races. During the 12 year period since 1940, nonwhite births in the city have increased from 3,600 to almost 7,000, while the white births have exceeded these by about 2,000. Suburban Negroes have increased their number of births more rapidly—from 200 in 1940 to almost 900 in 1952, and the offspring of whites have been increasing even faster (from 900 to 3,000 births). Since 1950, nonwhites in the New Orleans Area have given birth to between 6,000 and 7,000 babies each year, with the white population again increasing those figures by approximately 2,000 births.

Crude birth rates. When births in the New Orleans Area are expressed in the form of crude birth rates, i.e., as proportions of the total population, two periods of recent reproduction are visible (see Figure 34 and Table 27). From 1940 to 1947, birth rates for both races were generally increasing, in spite of the temporary declines displayed in 1944 and 1945. Since 1947, the patterns for the two races have become more differentiated. Through 1952 (the latest date for which information is available), the Negro birth rates have maintained a rather constant level of approximately 34 births per 1,000 persons for the entire metropolitan area and 47 births per 1,000 persons in the suburbs. The white rates in this later 5 year period, on the other hand, have been

---

17 This technique was not employed in the study of composition since the categories for the demographic variables are discreet, whereas those for the composition are at times overlapping, i.e., for the urban fringe.
FIGURE 34. CRUDE BIRTH RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1940-1952.
TABLE 27. CRUDE BIRTH RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE AND PARISH: 1940-1952.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

declining. The metropolitan area witnessed its highest white crude birth rates in 1947 (29.4)—the decline to 19.9 births per 1,000 persons in 1952 has been a steady one. This trend has been approximated in the suburbs, though at a higher level: from a crude rate of 34.4 (1947) to 27.1 (1952).

Throughout the thirteen year period, the highest birth rates for any of the parishes have been registered for the Negro population. Cross-comparisons between parishes, however, do not always favor that race. In 1943, 1944, 1946, and 1947, the crude birth rates of the Jefferson whites were higher than those of the Orleans Negroes, and in 1950, the Orleans Negroes were out-reproduced by the St. Bernard whites (see Table 27). Although these were the only years in which the highest white rate was higher than the lowest Negro rate, they demonstrate that overlapping of rates for the two races is not uncommon between parishes.

The difference in the birth rates of the two races is not changing consistently throughout the Area. In the city, the difference has been generally increasing since 1945, with the Negroes maintaining a high crude birth rate and that of the whites declining. In St. Bernard Parish, on the other hand, the differences have decreased since 1948. Finally, neither convergence nor divergence is evident in the rates for the races in Jefferson.

No consistent ranking of crude birth rates can be made for any of the parishes prior to 1950. For the last three years of the analysis, however, the rates for both races have aligned themselves in the following order: the highest rates in St. Bernard Parish, followed by Jefferson and Orleans. Apparently, the most urban portions of the Area have relatively the fewest births. The recency of the pattern, however, as
well as the level of the present analysis, precludes attaching certainty to this statement. It will receive additional treatment in the following section.

**Fertility ratios and levels of replacement.** A more refined analysis of the parish differences in reproduction tends to place more credence on the patterns of crude birth rates. When the number of children under 5 years of age are related to the women who produce them (in the New Orleans Area, those from 15 to 44 years), St. Bernard still has the highest ratios, Jefferson the next highest, and Orleans Parish the lowest—for both races (See Table 26).

The use of fertility ratios permits also an analysis of the fertility in the urban fringe—a segment of the New Orleans Area for which no data exist in the Vital Statistics. The inclusion of this area in the investigation only strengthens the former generalization. The fringe is more urban than is Jefferson Parish and still more urban than St. Bernard—it has the lowest white fertility ratio of the three (555) and one only slightly higher than Jefferson for nonwhites (623). On the other hand, these ratios are substantially higher than those of its more urban "parent," the city of New Orleans.

The data in Table 26 show further that all parts of the Area are above replacement levels, in terms of the 1940-1941 mortality of urban Louisians. It will be recalled that the permanent replacement quotas for the nonwhites and whites in that population were 361 and 375, respectively. Since there is reason to believe that the present mortality level in the New Orleans Area represents, if anything, an improvement over that upon which the above data were based, it would be logical to

---

18 It will be shown in the next chapter that the rates for the New
TABLE 28. FERTILITY RATIOS AND INDEXES OF NET REPRODUCTION IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fertility ratio</th>
<th></th>
<th>Provisional index of net reproduction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized area</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The permanent replacement quotas used for the base of the index are those for each race, respectively, in Louisiana's urban population, 1940-1941.

conclude that the present permanent replacement quotas of the Area are somewhat lower. For Negroes, no fertility ratio is lower than that of the city (480 children per 1,000 reproductive women), which is still well within the classification of moderate replacement. Even the ratio of 396 for the whites of the city—again the lowest for that race—is in the moderate replacement class. In both the suburban parishes and in the fringe area as well, the fertility ratios for both races are above the substantial level (500).

Whether considered in terms of the fertility ratio or the index of net reproduction, Negroes are reproducing faster than whites in every part of the Area. This pattern appears in spite of the tendency for Negro women to leave their children with the grandparents in cityward migration. Nevertheless, again considerable overlapping in reproduction occurs when whites in one residential category are compared with non-whites in another. Both fertility ratios and indexes of net reproduction are higher for the white population in every part of the suburbs than for the Negro population in the city of New Orleans (see Table 28). One would conclude that residence is more important than race in establishing repre-

\[\text{footnote continued}\]

 Orleans Area have been steadily declining, and the urban population of the Area represented a substantial segment (52.1 per cent) of Louisiana's 1940 urban population. In addition, the age-specific death rates in the New Orleans Area for 1949-1951 are lower than those for Louisiana's 1940-1941 urban population, especially among infants. Cf. Figures 38 and 39 in the next chapter with Figure 1 in Louise Kemp and T. Lynn Smith, Health and Mortality in Louisiana, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 390, Baton Rouge (May, 1945).

\[19\] See Louise Kemp, "A Note on the Use of the Fertility Ratio in the Study of Rural-urban Differences in Fertility," Rural Sociology, X (1945), 312-313. The tendency was discovered specifically in rural-urban migration to New Orleans in 1941.
ductive patterns—that the racial differences leave their influence only after residential factors have affected the general pattern.

Sex ratios at birth. That more males are born than females is a well-confirmed demographic generalization, and the New Orleans Area is in no sense an exception. In Table 29 is also apparent another generalization: Negroes have relatively fewer boys born than do whites. These figures for New Orleans merely reflect a condition which has been evident throughout the nation. The precise reason for the racial differential is not known. T. Lynn Smith has suggested that one factor may be the high degree of stillbirths among Negroes, since stillbirths are more frequent among male than female births. Such a condition would tend, all other things being equal, to lower the sex ratio among the newly born. Table 29 demonstrates that such a force is at work to some degree in the New Orleans Area. Considering only the two larger parishes (Orleans and Jefferson), one may note stillbirths to be much more masculine than are live births, and the stillbirth rate (stillbirths per 1,000 live births) of Negroes to be higher than that of the whites. St. Bernard's small population as usual renders the exception in that the sex ratio of Negro live births is higher than both the sex ratio of stillbirths for this race and the sex ratio for white live births. This deviation, however, had hardly any noticeable influence on the metropolitan population as a whole. The association between high stillbirth rates and low sex ratios at birth among Negroes thus does appear at least approximate. 21

21 Unfortunately, the lack of data which classify stillbirths simultaneously by sex and by race hinders any more extensive investigation.
TABLE 29. **SEX RATIOS OF LIVE BIRTHS AND STILLBIRTH RATES, BY RACE, AND SEX RATIOS OF STILLBIRTHS, FOR THE NEW ORLEANS AREA: 1950-1952.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex ratios</th>
<th>Live births</th>
<th>Still births</th>
<th>Still birth rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>127.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>133.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans city</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>126.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>138.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stillbirths per 1,000 live births.

Age-specific birth rates and total fertility. As the preceding sections have indicated, one of the most important factors influencing the rate of reproduction is the age of the mother. Only those women who fall within the reproductive years will bear children, and the extent to which these women are lacking in a population will to that extent limit the birth potential. The question of "who are being born" must thus of necessity become focused on the women who are producing the young. This task is accomplished in a general way by the use of fertility ratios. A more specific approach is furnished by the use of age-specific birth rates and, through these, gross reproduction rates. (To simplify the analysis, the age-specific birth rates are computed only for female births.)

Both Table 30 and Figure 35 demonstrate the sharpness of the limitation of the reproductive period among New Orleans women. In 1950, no births were registered (for either sex) to women younger than 10 or older than 49 years. The delineation can be even smaller, however: 0.2 per cent of the female births occurred to women between 10 and 15 years of age, and 0.1 per cent of the girl babies were born to mothers older than 44 years. The age span of 15 to 44 years thus includes 99.7 per cent of all mothers who bore girl babies.

The birth curves depicted in Figure 35 are heavily skewed toward the younger ages. In other words, the young mothers are the heaviest producers (see also Table 30). For most of the Area, the heaviest period of reproduction is in the group aged 20 to 24 years, although in St. Bernard Parish, the next older age range achieves reproductive dominance. Thus, the women who are younger than the half-way mark of the reproductive span (30 years of age) are responsible for 79.1 per cent of Negro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of mother in years</th>
<th>Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>80.23</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>111.32</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>85.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>125.25</td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>145.03</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>75.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>85.04</td>
<td>70.99</td>
<td>89.90</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>192.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>50.72</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>49.13</td>
<td>48.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>59.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>374.60</td>
<td>255.06</td>
<td>435.60</td>
<td>317.32</td>
<td>461.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross reproduction rate 187 128 218 159 231 182

*No births registered to women 50 or more years of age during 1950.

births and 73.7 per cent of the white. The difference in those percentages indicates that Negro women are the younger mothers, and this condition is to be found in all parishes of the Area. The differential is clearly established in the accompanying chart and table. With the exception of the youngest age group (under 15 years), the younger the age of the mother, the greater will be the difference in the relative number of births, Negroes having the higher rates. The phenomenon is most strongly represented in both the larger parishes.

Generally speaking, therefore, Negroes tend to have the higher age-specific birth rates, and particularly so in the younger ages. When whites do have higher rates, they occur among the older mothers. The difference favoring the whites in such cases is only slight.

The extent to which the differential reproduction favors Negroes is further demonstrated by an analysis of gross reproduction rates (see Table 30). If the daughters of both races who were born in 1950 were to maintain their reproduction at the same level as did their mothers, and if all lived through the reproductive period, then the Negro daughters would produce from 49 to 59 more births (per 100 mothers) than would the white daughters. In other words, at present fertility levels, this differential would be the most that could be expected in the total number of births which the daughters would produce (since mortality is held at zero). As the next chapter will indicate, relatively more Negro than white girl babies can be expected to die as they pass through the reproductive period.

Not only is the difference between the races within the parishes consistent, but neither do the rates overlap when the races are compared for different parishes. Thus, the lowest gross reproduction rate for
Negroes is found in Orleans Parish (187 total births per 100 daughters), whereas the highest rate for whites is in St. Bernard (182 births). The importance of mortality in reducing these expected births is accordingly emphasised when the previous discussion concerning levels of replacement is recalled, since fertility ratios, permanent replacement quotas, and their resulting gestation, indexes of net reproduction, all consider to some extent the influence of death on reproduction. In those analyses, some overlapping of races in between-parish comparisons was found to exist.

**DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY**

The distribution of nonwhite fertility ratios among the census tracts of the city shows that in general, only a minority of the tracts (less than one-sixth) have nonwhite populations which are not reproducing enough to maintain their numbers (see Figure 36). All but one of these tracts are located in a fringes area around Magnolia and in and around the Business District.

On the other hand, at least one-third of the tracts are by virtually any standards reproducing well above replacement needs, i.e., they display fertility ratios above 500. These tracts are to be found mainly in the eastern part of the city, specifically in Algiers, the Industrial Canal area, Galvez, Gentilly, and Esplanade. In the west, only the Negroes in the Waterfront can be classed as having high fertility—none of the remaining tracts in the upper two sextiles of the distribution (see Figure 36) fall within this section of the city.

Heavy reproduction, then, is found mainly east of Canal Street. In the western portion of the city, fertility is only moderately meeting re-
FERTILITY RATIOS

Sixths:

1. 221 - 364
2. 370 - 400
3. 403 - 437
4. 438 - 506
5. 509 - 613
6. 617 - 745

NUMBER OF NONWHITE FEMALES
(15 to 44 years)

| Shaded circle | 100 - 285 |
| Tract shaded and center cut out | 307 - 1,241 |
| Tract fully shaded | 1,246 - 1,816 |

placement needs, with a few tracts having fertility ratios too low to maintain a stationary population and even fewer tracts evidencing substantially high reproduction.
CHAPTER X

MORTALITY

Mortality is the permanent subtractor of population. Of all the demographic variables, its influence is, of course, the most final. Yet, in spite of its irrevocable effects, in relation to the numbers of people, its quality is a dynamic one. The information presented in this chapter is accordingly intended fundamentally to answer three questions: (1) The determination of the extent or the rapidity with which the population is dying; (2) the isolation of the elements of the population which are dying; and (3) the isolation of the primary factors which promote death in the population.

THE DATA

The most effective method yet devised in determining the extent to which the total population is affected by mortality is the crude death rate. This measure involves merely relating the number of deaths in any given year to the population at the mid-point of that year (i.e., July 1) and multiplying the quotient by 1,000. The measure is not only readily comprehensible and simple to compute, but, in spite of its name, it furnishes a complete answer to the first question of the demographer: How fast is the population dying? The adjective "crude", however, is justified.

\[1\] A thorough analysis of the condition of mortality data is to be found in Homer L. Hitt, J. Allan Beagle, and John N. Burrus, "Dynamics of the Rural Population: Part II, Levels and Trends in Rural Mortality," Rural Sociology, XX (1954), 75-78.
The most serious limitation of this measure is that it treats the units of all living and dead populations as equal. In other words, it does not take into account the fact that different segments of the population die at tremendously different rates. Accordingly, a population with an excess of persons who are inherently vulnerable to mortality will tend to have higher death rates primarily because of its peculiar composition and not because of peculiar health situations. Thus, although the crude death rate describes satisfactorily the total incidence of mortality, it does no more.

The intercensal and postcensal estimates of population used for the crude death rates were computed by inflating the elementary school enrollments, as described in the discussion concerning crude birth rates. Data for the years 1940 to 1950 were obtained from the Vital Statistics reports for the respective years, whereas those for 1951 and 1952 were secured from the pertinent Statistical Report of the Division of Public Health Statistics for the state of Louisiana. These reports publish two general types of mortality data: those deaths as of the place where they occurred and the deaths for the place of residence of the deceased. The demographer is obviously more interested in the latter information. The presence of large hospitals, alone, would render data on deaths by occurrence exceedingly misleading in gauging the mortality of a population containing such an institution. This chapter, consequently, is limited to a discussion of resident deaths, only. It has only been since 1937 that the National Office of Vital Statistics has been classifying deaths by place of residence, however, and only since 1940 has such information

---

\(^2\) For reference, see Chapter IX.
been presented for the separate races within minor civil divisions.

The nature of the data accordingly prescribes the period from 1940 to 1952 as the limits within which mortality can be considered as process-

ual.

The superficial nature of the crude death rate forces the demog-
grapher to ask "who is dying?" The mortality experience of the different

elements or segments of a population is best described by means of a

life table. In brief, this device presents for each one- or five-year

age group the average number of years which the persons in that particu-

lar age group could expect to live if the mortality conditions which

were in force as of the date of measurement were to continue unchanged.

Admittedly, this device provides the most standardized and meaningful

descriptions of the mortality experience of a population. Unfortunately,

the latest data available for constructing a life table for the New Or-

leans population are for 1940.3 Since the focus of this study rests on

the demographic situation ten years later, a life table for the earlier

period has only incidental value. An approximation to a life table, how-

ever, can be achieved by the analysis of age-specific death rates for each

sex of both races. This measurement is computed in the same manner as is

---

3An abridged life table of the Reed-Merrell type requires deaths

for five-year age groups from birth to age 100 years and over. The Vital

Statistics report for 1940 was the last to present such information by race

and sex on a county level. For descriptions and evaluations of the Reed-

Merrell method, see T. H. E. Greville, "Short Methods of Constructing A-

bridged Life Tables," The Record of the American Institute of Actuaries,

XXXII, Part One (1943), 29-42. Thomas H. E. Greville, "United States A-

bridged Life Tables, 1945," Vital Statistics--Special Reports, XXXIII, No.

11 (April 15, 1947), 241-249. Margaret Jarman Haged, Statistics for So-

ciologists (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, Inc., 1941), 855-896. Lowell

J. Reed and Margaret Merrell, "A Short Method for Constructing an Abridged

Life Table," American Journal of Hygiene, XXX (1949), 33-62.
a crude death rate, with the exception that the base population and the
decade are restricted to a "specific" age category. The resultant data
are not as easy to interpret as are life expectancies, but as far as
relationships are concerned, the results are the same.

All data on age-specific death rates are drawn from those pre-

cented in the Statistical Report of the Division of Public Health Statis-
tics. The average death rate for the three-year period 1949 to 1951 are
employed in preference to those based on a single year primarily because
this procedure reduces the chance of random fluctuations appearing in the
data. The incidence of fortuitous increases or decreases in deaths be-
comes particularly conspicuous in the suburbs where the smaller populations
evidence fewer deaths in any given year than is so for the city. Were a
three-year average not employed, many age-race-sex cells would be left
blank. The same justification prevails in the use of 10 rather than 5
year age groups, though for many categories, 10 year age groups (as well
as deaths for the population 65 years of age and over) are all that are
presented in the Statistical Reports. In spite of these precautions,
the reader will note several blank entries for the information presented
for the Negroes of St. Bernard Parish.

Particularly in small populations (as cities and minor civil divi-
sions), both age-specific death rates and life tables must be considered
in a static sense. This limitation is brought about by the impossibility
of estimating with accuracy the age, sex, and racial composition for such
groups during intercensal years (in contrast to estimates made for total
populations or merely their racial components). For the same reason,
it is not feasible to compute standardized death rates for single years. 4

4 Standardized death rates are those which would prevail if the pop-
It is possible, however, to study in this manner the mortality prevalent in one age group: that of infants. The measure used in this connection is the infant mortality rate, i.e., the number of deaths to infants less than one year of age related to the number of live births in a given year, expressed as infant deaths per 1,000 live births. Since the number of live births are known for each year, the necessity of estimating the population of infants is obviated. Note, however, that the infant mortality rate is not equivalent to the age-specific death rate of infants less than one year old: Infant mortality rates are computed solely from registered populations whereas age-specific death rates are based on enumerated populations.

The availability of data on infant mortality as contrasted with the absence of such data for any other age group is perhaps fortunate. In few other age categories are the racial differences more pronounced and accordingly more observable. Further, one would not be in too great an error to assume that much of the declining death rate in recent years has been due to reductions in causes of death that affect primarily infants.

---

Footnote continued

ulation under analysis were to have the same age (and/or sex and racial) composition of some other population selected as the norm.

5 See T. Lynn Smith and Homer L. Hitt, The People of Louisiana (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952), 167-170. Cf. also Table 32.

Cause of death is treated only briefly. The single source for this information is to be found in the "Rosenbaum Work Book," a collection and analysis of mortality and morbidity data pertinent to the city of New Orleans. Most of the information in this study concerns the deaths which occurred in the city rather than those which occurred to only its residents. Two series of data, however, are presented for resident deaths. The first series consists of a number of charts describing the percentage distribution of the ten major causes of death among the whites and Negroes in each of ten age groups. Such data, unfortunately, tell nothing of the importance of the causes of death relative to the population of each age group. The basis for the computations is simply the total number of deaths for the respective age categories. Nevertheless, since these were the only data which the writer could secure, they are presented for whatever information they may yield.

The second series of data in the "Rosenbaum Work Book" pertains to the distribution of deaths by census tracts for 1946--again representing the only source for these data. The rates computed by Rosenbaum, however, were based on population estimates constructed prior to the 1950 census. As such, they are of dubious validity. The writer was fortunate

[Footnote continued] 276. The reader is cautioned to note the varying sizes of the scales by means of which the annual death rates for the different ages are compared (with the exception of Smith's treatment).


8The only information available in the Vital Statistics or the Statistical Report on this subject pertains only to the total population of their civil divisions and large cities.
enough to be able to secure Mr. Rosenbaum's raw data (i.e., the number of deaths by race for each census tract). He then calculated the population of each census tract in 1946 by arithmetic interpolations adjusted to the city's total population of that year as independently estimated.9

THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

During the thirteen-year period from 1940 to 1952, between 2,000 and 2,600 nonwhite residents of the New Orleans Area died each year. The deaths to white residents ranged from 4,200 to 4,800 persons. Thus, with a population three times larger than that of Negros, the whites had only twice as many deaths.

Crude death rates. The analysis of crude death rates brings the above mentioned differential into even sharper focus (see Figure 37 and Table 31). The downward trend in the number of deaths per 1,000 persons is clearly visible for every parish in the New Orleans Area except St. Bernard.10 In spite of the decrease, however, the nonwhites always had the higher rates for all years in every parish of the Area. Nor has this downward trend been without its fluctuations. Although the difference between the races decreased from 1940 to 1946, it has generally increased in both the larger parishes since that data. The fluctuations are made even more apparent by a reference to the peaks and depressions

---

9See Chapter XII.

10The population in this parish is generally too small to permit a reliable interpretation of rates designed to measure the variation in a characteristic per thousand persons. For this reason, the parish will generally have to be ignored in much of the analysis.
FIGURE 37. CRUDE DEATH RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1940-1952.
(SOURCE: SEE FIGURE 34.)
### TABLE 31. CRUDE DEATH RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE AND PARISH: 1940-1952.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 27.
in the time-series shown in Figure 37. The worst year for both races was 1943. The nonwhites experienced 15.7 deaths per thousand residents of the city and 17.1 deaths per thousand residents of Jefferson Parish. Crude death rates for the whites in the same year were 12.9 and 8.5 for the city and Jefferson Parish, respectively. The years in which the lowest crude rates occurred, on the other hand, vary greatly. In the city, the latest year (1952) saw the lowest rates for both races. In Jefferson Parish, extremely low rates prevailed for both races in 1946: 6.3 for Negroes and 4.1 for whites. This year was certainly atypical, and more will be said of it later in connection with infant mortality rates.

The year which ranked next to 1946 for the nonwhites was 1951, when a crude death rate of 7.9 was evidenced. For the whites, the latest year (1952) revealed the second-lowest crude rate of 5.1 deaths per thousand persons.

The position of the three parishes with respect to the rapidity with which their populations die displays a fairly clear pattern. For the whites, the rates in Orleans Parish for all of the years studied were always the highest, and considerably so. The mortality experience of Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes approximated each other closely. The pattern for the Negroes deviates only slightly: During the four years from 1942 to 1945, the rates of Jefferson Parish exceed those of the city, but the pattern was reversed in all the remaining and previous years. Occasionally, the rates in Orleans were lower even than those of St. Bernard, but only sporadically. It is important to note, however, that the crude death rates of the Negroes of Jefferson Parish, while higher than those of the Jefferson whites, for later years have been lower than those of the white persons in the city. The same phe-
necrosis can be observed to a lesser extent in St. Bernard Parish. Generally speaking, therefore, since 1946, the rates of the New Orleans Negroes have been the highest of either of the races in any one of the larger parishes, whereas those of the Jefferson Parish whites have been lowest. In regard to the intermediate positions, the crude rates of the white New Orleanians have been lower than those of the Negroes of Jefferson Parish.

The influence of age, race, and sex. The general pattern of mortality in the New Orleans Area, whether reference is to either of the sexes or the races, seems determined primarily by age composition. In this city, as elsewhere, a person’s chances of living are more dependent on his age than any other single factor. So well established is this relationship that the analysis of P. Lynn Smith regarding the death rates of the 1940 white population of the nation as a whole is still applicable to every parish, race, and sex of the New Orleans Area in 1950:

The hazards of life are great during infancy, especially during the first hours and days of life, but they decline precipitously for 2 or 3 years and continue falling gradually to the age of 10 or 12 years. By the time a person has attained early adolescence, the chances that he will be carried away by death in a given year reach their minimum. About halfway through the "teens," the age-specific mortality rates begin to rise slowly. Henceforth, the trend is ever upward, although not until age 55 or thereabouts has been attained is the rapidity of the ascent greatly accelerated. Eventually, after the "three-score years and ten" have been passed, the rates soar to points far above those of early infancy.11

For confirmation, one has only to look at Figure 36 and Table 32. There, only one exception to the above generalizations can be noted: the death rates for St. Bernard Negro women aged 65 years and over is lower than

11Smith, op. cit., 254.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and Age</th>
<th>Orleans Nonwhite</th>
<th>Orleans White</th>
<th>Jefferson Nonwhite</th>
<th>Jefferson White</th>
<th>St. Bernard Nonwhite</th>
<th>St. Bernard White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FEMALES     |                  |               |                    |                 |                      |                   |
|-------------|                  |               |                    |                 |                      |                   |
| under 1     | 40.7             | 23.9          | 37.7               | 18.5            | 16.0                 | 33.2              |
| 1-4         | 1.5              | 0.9           | 2.1                | 0.7             | ...                  | 1.3               |
| 5-14        | 0.6              | 0.4           | 0.6                | 0.4             | ...                  | 0.7               |
| 15-24       | 1.7              | 0.4           | 1.8                | 0.6             | ...                  | 1.3               |
| 25-34       | 3.0              | 1.0           | 3.5                | 0.6             | 3.1                  | 1.5               |
| 35-44       | 7.0              | 2.6           | 5.9                | 2.1             | 9.8                  | 2.0               |
| 45-54       | 17.5             | 5.9           | 15.9               | 5.0             | 10.0                 | 4.5               |
| 55-64       | 37.9             | 14.5          | 39.0               | 11.8            | 50.7                 | 10.2              |
| 65 and over | 50.0             | 60.7          | 44.5               | 54.3            | 28.9                 | 67.2              |
| Total       | 10.7             | 8.8           | 8.9                | 4.7             | 8.1                  | 5.7               |

the next younger category. The cause is obviously to be attributed, as
noted earlier, to the parish's small population—too small to permit ex-
cessive categorization.

Another demographic factor which exerts a decided influence on
the level of mortality in a given area is that of sex. The influence
is not as decided as that of age, but it is there, and consistently so.
Briefly, men live shorter lives than do women—within a given age cate-
gory, they are more apt to die. Notice in Table 52, out of a total of
96 possible comparisons (between the two sexes of both races, all three
parishes, and nine age classes), in only eight cases did the death rate
of women exceed that of men. All but one of these eight deviations were
for Negroes, and all but one occurred outside of the city. Such a lo-
cation of these deviations (i.e., among the smaller populations) merely
increases the probability that they could have occurred merely through
random variation.

Race, however, exerts a more marked pressure on one's life chances
in the New Orleans Area than does sex, although it too is of less impor-
tance than is age. In other words, within any age or sex category ex-
cept one, Negroes die faster than whites. The exception occurs among
persons aged 65 years and over, wherein Negroes have the lower rates, and
judging from the consistency of its appearance, the exception is probably
an important one. It may possibly be attributed to two factors: (1) One
may well infer that only the hardier Negroes live to advanced age. The
sons more susceptible to disease have not been saved by modern medical
care and sanitation to the same extent as have white persons, as is sug-
gested by the differential mortality in the younger ages. Consequently,
those Negroes who survive the threats to life in the younger years can
be expected to maintain their advantage in old age. (2) The second possible explanation refers not so much to conditions of life as it does to conditions in the data. It was pointed out in the chapter on age composition that an unusual and unexpected concentration of Negroes appeared among the aged. It was suggested that this over-abundance might be due to misstatement of age. Smith and Hitt have noticed the same pattern and have pointed to a similar likelihood of an inflated age class among the Louisiana Negroes in 1940.\textsuperscript{12} Clearly, then, a death rate can be reduced either by decreasing the deaths or by increasing the base population. Which of these two factors are of greater significance is not possible to discover at the present level of analysis. It is this writer's opinion that neither is without importance.

The importance of race as an influence on mortality, furthermore, appears not to be limited to comparisons within the sexes, as it is to comparisons within age categories. This fact may be demonstrated by comparing the Negro sex with the lowest death rate to the white sex with the highest rate. If the influence of sex was heavier on mortality than was that of race, one would expect to find the white males with higher rates than Negro females. On the contrary, a comparison of the age-specific death rates of Negro females and white males for each parish reveals that, with the exception of the more advanced ages, the white men always have the lower rates (see Table 32). One may conclude, therefore, that race is a more important determinant of death than is sex.

Obviously, the most important cause of death is the disease which

\textsuperscript{12}Smith and Hitt, \textit{op. cit.}, 167-170.
takes the life. What the writer has attempted to indicate in this section is that certain demographic factors render a noticeable influence on the susceptibility to mortal diseases, and that among them are sex, race, and age, in increasing importance, respectively. The analysis of causes of death will be given presently. For the moment, attention is directed to the deaths of infants.

**Infant mortality.** The general trend of the infant mortality rate in the New Orleans Area for both races has been downward, although again the erratic nature of the data for St. Bernard Parish render conclusions for that area difficult (see Figure 39 and Table 33). Negroes in all parishes have the higher rates, although the difference between the races in the two larger parishes appears to be diminishing. The divergence which became manifest between 1951 and 1952, although present for all parishes, is too recent an event to assess adequately. Little fluctuation is apparent in the time-series curve for the city: The earliest year (1940) displayed the highest rate, with 34.6 infant deaths per 1,000 live births among the nonwhites and 41.6 such deaths for the population of white infants. The most healthful years are the more recent ones. In 1949, nonwhites experienced the lowest rate at 32.2 deaths per thousand, whereas the lowest white rate (21.1) took place in 1952.

In the suburbs, fluctuation is more radical. The erratic nature of the St. Bernard data has already received comment. The curve for Jefferson Parish is essentially the same as that depicted for the suburbs in Figure 39, showing a heavy undulation with two prominent peaks for both races. The highest infant mortality rate appeared in 1943 for the nonwhites (a rate of 68.5) and the following year for the whites (56.5 infant deaths per 1,000 live births). The second (although minor) peak for the
FIGURE 39. INFANT MORTALITY RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1942-1952. (SOURCE: SEE FIGURE 34.)
TABLE 33. INFANT MORTALITY RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE AND PARISH: 1940-1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data not available.

Source: See Table 27.
two races became evident in 1946, with infant mortality rates of 47.4 for the nonwhites and 25.6 for the whites. The lowest infant mortality rates (excluding momentarily the atypical year of 1946) occurred in 1951, wherein nonwhites reached a low of 18.6 infant deaths for each 1,000 live births and the rate for the whites sank to 16.9.

The "freak" or atypical year of 1946 in Jefferson Parish deserves special attention, particularly since this is the only date for which census tract data exist. The curve for this period in both crude death rates and infant mortality rates for both of the racial categories is manifested as a deep depression. Fewer deaths took place at this time than at any other in the period of analysis. One should note first that the depression was not entirely limited to Jefferson Parish. It shows up as a fairly prominent depression for both types of rates among the St. Bernard Negroes. Among the whites of this parish, the infant mortality rate did drop sharply, but there were lower years. The crude death rate, on the other hand, dropped only slightly. Finally, even in New Orleans, a moderate though noticeable influence is present: A slight depression appears in the curves for the infant and crude death rates for both races during this year, although not always does it interrupt the previous trend. One would normally pay scant attention to these changes in the other parishes. The important feature is that the heavy dip in the curves for Jefferson Parish is noticeable to some degree among both races for both crude and infant mortality rates in all parishes in the Area. Finally, the sustaining remark is necessary that the drop in the rates (particularly in Jefferson Parish) was not due to an increase in population or births but actually to a drop in the number of deaths.¹³

¹³For example, in Jefferson Parish, excluding 1946, deaths among
It does not appear improbable that a further investigation of mortality in this year in the New Orleans Area could be quite fruitful.

The interparish variation in the infant mortality rates has been more stable in recent than in the earlier years of the study period. Thus, since 1947, Orleans Parish has had higher rates for both races than Jefferson Parish. In 1950, the rank-order of the rates for both races in the three parishes stood as follows: Orleans Parish with the highest rates, followed by Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes, respectively.

A comparison of the figures, tables, and analyses for both the crude and infant mortality rates shows to a large degree the same patterns and trends. This similarity is especially important in view of the standardized nature of the infant mortality rate—theoretically, a change in population composition cannot affect it. Consequently, one may conclude that the downward trend in mortality among New Orleansians (in both the city and the suburbs) is probably due more to a difference or change in health conditions than to a change in the composition of the various populations. It can be demonstrated, of course, that the composition has changed.\footnote{This change has probably not been without influence on mortality trends. The contention here, however, is only that a change in health conditions was probably more important in lowering the} 

Footnote continued: Nonwhite infants ranged from 16 to 25 during the study period—1946 saw only 3 infant deaths; the white infant deaths ranged from 41 to 56—there were only 12 white infants who died in 1946.

\footnote{One must only compare the previous chapters on population compositions in this study with the work of Charles Ross, "The Composition of the Population of New Orleans, 1940," (unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1951).}
mortality in the New Orleans Area than was a change in population composition. The writer believes that the similarity of standardized and unstandardized curves would lead one in the direction of this conclusion.

**Cause of death.** The importance of an analysis of cause of death in understanding the mortality patterns has been alluded to several times. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the shortcomings of the data are so severe. First, the writer was only able to secure information for Orleans Parish. Second, the discussion of the major causes of death is limited to an analysis of the two leading causes of death in each age group for the two races (see Table 34).

In spite of the fact that the data are poorly quantified, they can be made to yield some knowledge. The most obvious fact is that almost every age group in New Orleans has its own peculiar fatality. Thus, regardless of race, premature birth and broncho-pneumonia are the main killers of infants. Accidents pose the greatest threat to the lives of children, whereas tuberculosis is heavily responsible for the deaths of young adults. Finally, the mortality of the mature and the aged is due chiefly to heart disease.

Not many racial differentials can be isolated with certainty from a study of the leading and secondary causes of death. One would probably conclude from a study of Table 32, however, that tuberculosis is the more important cause of death among Negroes than whites. Twice it is reported as a leading cause (in the age groups 15 to 34 years) as contrasted to once for the whites (among persons 25 to 34 years), and unlike the situation among the whites, in neither case is it seriously rivaled by the next leading cause. In addition, it appears as the second major cause of death among children aged 5 to 9 years—tuberculosis does not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nonwhite Leading cause</th>
<th>Nonwhite Second cause</th>
<th>White Leading cause</th>
<th>White Second cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 1</td>
<td>premature birth</td>
<td>broncho-pneumonia</td>
<td>premature birth</td>
<td>broncho-pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>broncho-pneumonia</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>broncho-pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
<td>homicides</td>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
<td>accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>intra-cranial lesions</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>intra-cranial lesions</td>
<td>heart disease</td>
<td>nephritis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Causes which are of only slightly different magnitude are underscored.

appear among the two leading causes for whites prior to 15 years of age. The conclusion that tuberculosis is more important among Negroes than whites is strengthened by the fact that death rates for each age group are higher for Negroes.

The remaining differences in causes of death are more difficult to interpret. The prevalence of intra-cranial lesions among Negroes affords some interest. Never does it appear among the two leading causes of death for whites, yet it appears as the second cause twice for Negroes, and, in addition, seriously rivaled the second place of cancer among Negroes aged 55 to 64 years. Similarly, the appearance of homicide among Negro youths as the second leading cause of death is noteworthy. One would be tempted to suggest that these causes of death are more prevalent among Negroes. Such a conclusion, however, must await the analysis of more adequate data.

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY

The study of mortality variations among the census tracts is confined to a discussion of the distribution of crude death rates in 1946. The impracticality of constructing standardized death rates for such small populations in intercensal years, as mentioned previously, prevents the treatment from being more than a description of how fast the Negro populations in the various parts of the city are dying. Whether the mortality is due to an especially vulnerable age structure or to a low sex ratio or to poor health conditions cannot be ascertained at this level of analysis. In addition, the atypicality of mortality levels during 1946 in other portions of the New Orleans Area is to be recalled. The extent to which this deviancy reached various portions of the city is unknown,
CRUDE DEATH RATES
1946

DEATHS PER 1,000 PERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Deaths per 1,000 Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 - 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.2 - 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.3 - 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.3 - 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.4 - 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.3 - 33.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIGURE 40. CRUDE DEATH RATES AND SIZE OF THE NONWHITE POPULATION, BY CENSUS TRACTS, NEW ORLEANS: 1946. (BASED ON MORTALITY DATA PREPARED BY THE COUNCIL OF SOCIAL AGENCIES, RESEARCH DEPARTMENT, NEW ORLEANS, LA.)

G.A. Hillers, Jr.
although it will be remembered that for the nonwhite population of the city as a whole the atypical depression was least in evidence.

Figure 40 displays a clearly defined area of high mortality among the Negroes of the city as centered in and around the Business District, including the French Quarter and the adjacent parts of Esplanade, Back of Town, Magnolia, and the Irish Channel. The southern portion of Magnolia in general was characterized by high incidences of death, as was the Waterfront and all but one tract of Algiers. But the heaviest mortality of all was in the area in and surrounding the Business District. Seven of the 17 tracts in the upper sixth of the distribution of census tracts are concentrated here in one continuous area.

Mortality exerted its lightest influence in the eastern portion of the city, including the Industrial Canal area and Galves (especially the tracts with the largest Negro populations). The mortality experience of Algiers is actually divisible into two parts: The western area, as previously indicated, is characterized by high crude death rates, whereas the eastern part, composed of a single and the largest tract (tract 6), suffered relatively few deaths.

The two types of areas outlined above are the only ones displaying consistent rankings in the sextile distribution. All the remaining areas (mainly in the western and southwestern portions of the city) have extremely variegated patterns. In several instances, adjacent tracts occupied extreme and opposite positions in the sextile distribution of the city's tracts.
CHAPTER XI

THE INCIDENCE OF MIGRATION

A complete understanding of population change hinges on a knowledge of the mechanisms of all three of the primary demographic variables. The omission of any one would give to a study of population the instability comparable to that of a tripod deprived of one of its supports. It is unfortunate, then, that migration, as one of the crucial elements in the demographic processes, is also the one for which the most inadequate data exist and, accordingly, about which least is known. At every step of the analysis, qualifications adhere which all by vitiate the data themselves. Often, almost the only reason for discussing the information available is that nothing better exists. The situation since 1940, which has been the period of focus for the demographic processes, has been further encumbered not only by inadequate data but by the lack of it. In regard to the two basic questions relevant to the primary demographic variables, practically all that can be done is to discuss the incidence of migration, or how many persons have migrated. Beyond the identification of the racial segments, one cannot answer the question of who has migrated during the last decade.

THE DATA

Migration is defined for the purposes of this study as a change of residence which involves crossing a political boundary, whether of a na-

---

1T. Lynn Smith has presented a recent analysis of data on migration in "Dynamics of the Rural Population: Part III, Levels and Trends in Rural Migration," Rural Sociology, XIX (1954), 78-82.
tion, state, or county. Theoretically, one may distinguish between international migration (emigration and immigration) and internal migration (the crossing of minor political boundaries within a major political division). In the present discussion, migration is considered only in reference to persons entering and leaving the New Orleans Area or any one of its three parishes. The emphasis thus logically falls on internal migration.

Another method of classifying migration is according to its direction. The point of reference for the direction is the particular population under consideration. Accordingly, people either migrate into an area (in-migration) or out of it (out-migration). The balance of these processes leaves the population with either a residue or a deficit, which is referred to as net migration gain or loss, or simply as net migration change.

Two types of data form the basis of the discussion. In-migration during the year preceding the 1950 census is studied by means of preliminary census returns (except for census tracts). Net migration data for the intercensal years from 1941 to 1951 are obtained from estimates utilizing vital statistics.

The 1950 census employed residence in 1949 in conjunction with residence in 1950 to determine the extent of mobility of the population. In the final tabulation based on a 20 per cent sample, however, data on the parish level (and for urbanized areas) were not subdivided by race. The racial classification was furnished only on a preliminary basis and only for the standard metropolitan area and its central city. In addition, only information concerning in-migrants has been published. As incomplete as they are, however, the preliminary data become of necessity
the most reliable type of information on migration differentials between races for the area as a whole.

The situation in regard to trusted data is better. In 1950, for the first time, the student of population was able to study the extent of mobility within a city: Tabulations of the place of residence of the population in 1949 are presented also for census tracts. Fortunately, these sample data are subdivided by race, at least for those tracts containing 250 or more nonwhite persons.

The second type of data are estimates derived from vital statistics reports and population estimates (computed from school enrollment data). Of all the migration data, they provide information most comparable to that given for the vital processes. The procedure for estimating net migration change consists of two steps. First, the population at the beginning of a given year is increased by the births and decreased by the deaths which occurred during that year. The resulting figure is an estimate of the population which would have been realized at the beginning of the following year if no migration had taken place—termed simply the expected population. This figure is then compared with the observed population for the same date—or that population which was a result not only of births and deaths but of migration as well. The difference between the two figures is attributed to the net change induced by migration, or net migration change.  

---

2See Chapter XIII.

This type of net migration estimate is subject to several sources of error. There are first the errors which exist in the birth and death records, errors which have been previously discussed. The extent to which these errors compensate for each other is difficult to predict, although doubtlessly (and logically) some compensation does occur, since both types of data are subject to under- rather than over-registration. Another source of error inheres in the estimated base populations. The degree of error, however, is unknown. In fact, that any discrepancy between actuality and estimate exists at all is merely a necessary assumption. The presence of inaccuracies in the enumerated populations, themselves, must also be recognized.

An additional source of error is induced by the migrants, themselves, since the vital statistics records take no account of migrant deaths and of births which occur to migrants. Because migrant populations tend to be young, a few can be expected to die and many can be expected to bear children. The natural increase (excess of births over deaths) of migrants therefore tends to be relatively high, and for that reason estimates of net migration change which employ natural increase will tend to underestimate the number of migrants.

In spite of their weaknesses, however, the data are the best that can be obtained for the intercensal years. Their greatest value is probably to be found in the patterns and relationships they indicate rather than in absolute numbers. These estimates are computed for the calendar years, 1941 to 1951, inclusive.\textsuperscript{5}


\textsuperscript{5}The calendar year 1940 was not included, since the data on school
All migration data which have heretofore been gathered by means of enumeration contain an important qualification: The number of migrants is less than the number of moves which would be classified as migration. In other words, regardless of the number of moves in which a person participated during a period of measurement, only one change is recorded: the difference between residences at the beginning and the end of the measuring period.

In-migration from 1949 to 1950 is related to the population one year old and over, or the total population which potentially could have been involved in migration during the period. The preliminary nature of the data for the area as a whole, however, precludes the use of any more sensitive measure than percentages, and these cannot even safely be presented to one decimal place. The data for the census tracts are in better condition and permit the use of migration rates, or the number of migrants per 1,000 persons one year old and over. Estimates of annual net migration change based on natural increase are treated as are crude rates for vital statistics, i.e., they are expressed as migrants per 1,000 persons, the base population being the total estimated population as of the middle of each year (July 1).

THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

In-migration: 1949 to 1950. According to preliminary data, fewer Negroes than whites moved into the New Orleans Area during the year preceding the 1950 census (see Table 35). The predominance of white in-migrants

[Footnote continued] enrollments which provide the basis for estimates of intercensal populations did not permit the calculation of a population estimate for January 1, 1940.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence in 1949</th>
<th>20 per cent Sample Total</th>
<th>Preliminary Data* Total</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 1 year old and over</td>
<td>645,905</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>672,100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house as in 1950</td>
<td>522,540</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>564,100</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house, same parish</td>
<td>76,965</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>72,200</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county or abroad</td>
<td>33,325</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence not reported</td>
<td>12,855</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 1 year old and over</td>
<td>558,970</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>560,400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house as in 1950</td>
<td>454,970</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>475,800</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house, same parish</td>
<td>68,870</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county or abroad</td>
<td>23,615</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence not reported</td>
<td>11,515</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 1 year old and over</td>
<td>86,935</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>111,700</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house as in 1950</td>
<td>67,570</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>88,300</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house, same parish</td>
<td>8,115</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county or abroad</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence not reported</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures separately rounded to nearest hundred and thus do not necessarily agree with totals.

was both absolute and relative and was found to exist in both the city and its suburbs. In fact, one may observe further that the nonwhite population was generally less mobile than the white, i.e., not only were there fewer nonwhite migrants (in the true sense of the word), but there were even fewer nonwhites who simply changed residence (in the Area as a whole) and relatively more remained in the same home for the year of measurement.

In-migrants were more numerous for both races in the suburbs than in the city. Suburban nonwhites appeared five times more frequently among those who moved into one of these two parishes than was the case for the nonwhites of the city. Comparable preliminary data for the whites show three times as many suburban as city in-migrants. Consequently, the highest percentage of in-migrants is to be found among the suburban whites, whereas nonwhites in the city have the lowest percentage.

Annual net-migration change: 1941 to 1951. During the 11 year period for which estimates could be computed, a net total of 24,000 Negroes and 103,000 whites were added to the population of the New Orleans Area through the balance of inward and outward flows of migration (see Table 36). The degree and nature of the balance, however, varied considerably for the individual years. As can be seen by extending the analysis to Figure 41, the annual net migration change for the Negroes of the Area is divisible into two rather well-marked periods: There can be noted for all parts of the Area an early loss followed by a period of relatively heavy and extended net gains. More variation is noted for the white population, but here again, a fairly consistent generalization is in order. For a year or so after 1940, more white migrants left the parishes than entered it (with the exception of Jefferson Parish). This short period
TABLE 36. ESTIMATED NET MIGRATION IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE AND PARISH: 1941-1951.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th></th>
<th>St. Bernard</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>118.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>-32.9</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>-18.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-93.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>-48.9</td>
<td>-31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>-29.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>-68.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>20,828</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>19,972</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>16,979</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>-821</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>6,351</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>-4,508</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>-2,431</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>-305</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>-3,061</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>-1,374</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>-647</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>-396</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>-258</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-1,464</td>
<td>-22,004</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,140</td>
<td>52,216</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>46,222</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>4,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Tables 27 and 38.

*Net Migrants per 1,000 mid-year population.

**Figures are presented to the last digit as computed, instead of being rounded, not because they are assumed to be accurate but for convenience in summation.
FIGURE 41. NET MIGRATION RATES IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1941-1951.
(SOURCE: TABLE 36.)
was followed by one almost equally as short of net migration gain, which, by approximately 1945, had changed again into a slight loss. Since 1947 (earlier in some parts of the Area), considerable net migration gains continuing through 1951 were realized, as was noted also for Negroes. The gains during this period, however, have been more marked for the white than the nonwhite population, with the exception of Jefferson Parish.

The heavy influence which the estimates reveal that migration exerted in Jefferson Parish is worthy of special comment. First, for only one year did either the whites or the nonwhites in Jefferson reveal a deficit of out- over in-migrants. Such a record is not matched in either of the remaining parishes. Second, the highest migration rates ever recorded during the measuring period were in Jefferson Parish (130.8 for Negroes in 1950 and 149.4 for whites in 1949). Finally, although this parish has a nonwhite population almost one-fourth the size, it almost matched the city in regard to the number of net migrants received of both races during the 11 years. One may readily conclude that Jefferson Parish was relatively the major recipient of migrants to the New Orleans Area during the measuring period.

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE CITY

A minority of the census tracts received most of the city's non-white in-migrants between April 1, 1949 and April 1, 1950, as is shown in Figure 42. The in-migration rate for the entire nonwhite population (according to preliminary data) was almost 21, yet only one-half of the census tracts had in-migration rates above 17.2, only one-third of the tracts had rates above 24.9, and only one-sixth had rates above 36.3. The heaviest rate was in the usually atypical Lake Front, tract 133 (344.8
IN-MIGRATION: 1949-1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Migration Rates</th>
<th>Number of Nonwhites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 - 10.2</td>
<td>Shaded circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.8 - 13.9</td>
<td>250 - 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.1 - 17.2</td>
<td>Tract shaded and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>center cut out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.5 - 24.9</td>
<td>737 - 3,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.4 - 36.3</td>
<td>Tract fully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.5 - 344.8</td>
<td>shaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,926 - 7,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. III, Ch. 36.
migrants per 1,000 persons one year old and over). This tract was in
a class by itself, the nearest competitor showing a rate of only 62.5.

The heaviest in-migration was found in the central and eastern
parts of the city. Thus, the French Quarter, the Business District, and
Back of Town, all centrally located areas, had no tracts with rates be-
low the median for the distribution of the census tracts, and each had
one or more tracts in the upper sixth. Note, however, that such heavy
in-migration does not necessarily represent an increasing concentration
of population in the center of the city—it may only reflect a heavy
turnover of population.

Although not nearly as heavy as those in the above mentioned areas,
the city's largest (territorially) and easternmost census tracts also
revealed heavy currents of in-migration, i.e., tract 176 in the Industrial
Gard area and tract 6 of Algiers.

Magnolia, with the largest concentration of Negroses, has both very
heavy and very light in-migration rates. Esplanade, with another impor-
tant concentration, had even more disparate rates—it included every one
of the six classes in the centile distribution.

Only Galves and Metairie displayed a consistent pattern of low
in-migration. Most of the tracts in such a category were scattered
throughout the city. Thus, although heavy in-migration could be isolated
as occurring in a few areas, light in-migration was more widely distrib-
buted.

The patterns of heavy in-migration suggest the possibility of im-
portant developments. Note that the eastern and the central tracts (with
heavy proportions of in-migrants) are also either the most isolated from
other parishes or at least are adjacent to parishes with very small popu-
lations. Metairie and Carrollton, on the other hand, are adjacent to
becoming Jefferson Parish, yet have generally low in-migration rates.
Further, Galves, which also received only a light influx, is adjacent
to the central portion of the city, which is heavily concentrated with
migrants. The pattern of heavy in-migration is thus sharply delineated
and appears to bear little relation to proximities of heavy population.

These seemingly confusing patterns are possibly a reflector of
two factors: (1) the relative ease of transportation and freedom of
mobility within the city and (2) a sharper or more rigid social delin-
eation of the areas in which Negroes are permitted to live. Notice
particularly the low in-migration of Negroes into Metairie. This
area is considered one of the "better" residential sections of the
city, and in New Orleans this classification is generally considered
to mean a relative dearth of Negroes.\footnote{6} Gentilly is in approximately
the same classification as Metairie, and the tract in this area which
contains the most Negroes also contains one of the lowest in-migration
rates in the city. Interestingly, this tract is adjacent to another
which has also a substantial number of Negroes and also one of the city's
highest in-migration rates. The conclusion could be advanced that a
segregated area is being defined within Gentilly.

Several of the most exclusive residential sections of the city
have high in-migration rates for the Negro population, but with an im-
portant qualification. The Lake Front, Broadmoor, and Audubon Park are
all in this category. The qualification is that in each of these areas,

\footnote{6} The bases for these evaluations were taken from the writer's per-
sonal knowledge of the city and from the data and sources referred to in
Appendix A.
the tract with the highest in-migration rate for nonwhites has also one of the smallest Negro populations—never more than 720 persons.

An analysis of changing segregation patterns based only on patterns of in-migration, however, cannot be conclusive. Nothing can be said about net migration, which in the present context would be a more significant measure. More conclusive statements can be achieved in the next chapter, when population change for the decade is studied.
CHAPTER XIII

POPULATION CHANGE

Population size has been the central focus of this study. Here-
texture, however, the concern has either been with population in its
static sense (as when examining composition), or the dynamic nature of
population has been discussed statisically—i.e., through each one of
the demographic processes separately. This chapter may to some extent
be regarded as a summary, as a description of the sum total of the work-
ings of the demographic processes as they have been affected by (among
other things) the composition of the population.

THE DATA

Data are presented in this chapter which describe 140 years of
population change (from 1810 to 1950), which estimate the annual popu-
lation change between 1940 and 1952 (inclusive), and which forecast the
population growth from 1951 to 1975.

The enumerated data require little comment. The errors of under
and over enumeration were mentioned in the introductory chapter. Two
additional qualifications, however, should be emphasized. First, no
data presented in the 1930 census of population are employed in this
study, since in that census, persons of Mexican extraction were classi-
ﬁed as nonwhite. The ﬁgures for that year were taken from the appro-
priate reclassiﬁed data in the 1940 census. The second qualiﬁcation
pertains to the growth of the New Orleans Standard Metropolitan Area.
As one proceeds back in time, the suburban area becomes more and more
centered around the French Quarter. This area marked the limits of the
city in 1718. In 1797, the territorial limits were slightly more than
doubled by the inclusion of the "American" section—generally what is
now the Business District. In 1803, the city limits were extended to
their present position, with the exclusion of Algiers. Between that
date and 1874, varying amounts of the western portion (i.e., Metairie,
Corullion, Audubon Park, University, Broadmoor, the Garden District,
the Waterfront, and parts of Magnolia and the Irish Channel) were an-
nexed, relinquished, annexed, and relinquished again. In 1870, Algiers
was annexed, and in 1874, the city finally became coterminous with the
Parish of Orleans.1

Because of this shifting of city limits, the more stable parish
boundaries are used to describe population change. It would be extremely
difficult, however, to determine the degree and the rate at which Jeffer-
son and St. Bernard became truly suburbs of the city. The best the writer
can do is to indicate that the process did occur, and that the suburbs did
not emerge full blown.

Recent population change is examined from two points of view, each
using a different type of data. The change over the decade from 1940 to
1950 is studied by a comparison of the populations at each census, not
only for the parishes in the New Orleans Area but for the census tracts

1See R. Carter, A Report on Survey of Metropolitan New Orleans:
Land Use, Real Property, and Income Housing Area ( Baton Rouge: Louisiana
State Department of Public Welfare and Housing Authority of New Orleans,
1941), Map 2, p. 5. For an excellent socio-ecological discussion of the
growth of New Orleans, together with a very aptly chosen selection of maps,
New Orleans Population Handbook: 1950 (New Orleans: The Urban Life Re-
search Institute, 1953), 2-20.
as well. The annual change, on the other hand, is studied by means of population estimates. The extensive use which has been made of these figures in earlier chapters warrants here their special emphasis.

The estimates are based primarily on the relationship which the school population bears to the total number of inhabitants. The state of Louisiana publishes on an annual basis the number of children who were registered in all types of schools in the state. These data are available by race, beginning with the 1939-1940 academic session, until the present. Since for the census years (i.e., 1940 and 1950) both a total count and a count of the school populations are available, it is but a simple matter to compute a ratio of the total population to the school population. The change in the ratios for the intercensal years were next estimated by straight line interpolations. The final step consisted in multiplying the estimated ratios by the registered data for each year. In other words, the school population was simply inflated to produce an estimate of the total population. The changes which these figures revealed are thus a combination of the actual change which occurred in the total population during the ten years and the change which was registered in the school population throughout the measuring period.


3The specific enrollment figures which were used pertained only to those up to and in the seventh grade, since the eighth grade has been compulsory (and thus in existence) for all parishes only beginning with the 1945-46 academic session.

The extent of error which exists in these estimates is, of course, unknown. Studies which the writer has made of Louisiana's population, however, have indicated that large shifts in the population of unattached adults (e.g., the members of the armed forces) are particularly unlikely to be reflected when such a technique is employed. In addition, data exist for the registered school population only. No account is taken of students who withdraw from school. To the extent that the population suffered a decline which began during an academic session, to that extent will the decline not be registered until the following session. In any case, however, trends which last for longer than one year are largely recorded. The beginning of a decline can be in error for no more than one year.

The estimates pertain, in original form, to April 1 of each year. Since these data were used for many purposes which required an estimate of the population as of the middle of the year, additional estimates were computed from the original estimates (i.e., as of April 1) for July 1 by means of arithmetic interpolation. It should be recognized, however, that a property of interpolation values for a time sequence is a tendency to smooth the curve which would represent the original data. The reason for this smoothing tendency is to be found in the fact that no interpolation can be an extreme value, since the interpolation is always made between values of the original data. The net result is that the estimates presented for July 1 are always the more conservative.

Semi-logarithmic charts have been employed throughout the analysis.

---

5 Under such a condition, no one date will actually serve as a point of measurement. In order to minimize clerical effort of unknown value, it was arbitrarily assumed that the registered data referred to April 1, or the date of the census enumeration.
of population change. By means of this device, relative as well as absolute change is depicted, and populations of quite varying size can be made comparable. Proper interpretation of the charts requires only the knowledge that the rate of change is represented by the slope of the line—a steeper slope describing a more rapid relative change.

The data relevant to population forecasts, i.e., the technique of forecast construction, require a rather lengthy discussion. In addition, the forecasts are best understood in relation to the manner of their computation. For these reasons, the data used in population forecasts are treated in conjunction with the analysis of the forecasts themselves.

POPULATION CHANGE IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

Past population change: 1810 to 1920. The pattern of population change for almost a century and a half for both races in the New Orleans Area has generally been one of growth. There have been, however, both deviations from this pattern and variations within it (see Figure 43 and Table 37). The Negro population of the city grew very rapidly up to 1830, then suffered a decline which lasted until 1860. The decade of the Civil War saw a 98.2 per cent growth, after which the population has been increasing at a moderately rapid and relatively unchanging pace.

Prior to 1860, the growth of the white population in the city was generally very rapid. Following a slight decline after the Civil War, the whites have maintained a moderate but consistent rate of growth, although since 1920, the pace has been slightly slower than that of the non-whites.

With the exception of the census of 1870, which recorded 11,058
FIGURE 43. DIFFERENTIAL RATES OF POPULATION CHANGE IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1810-1950. (SOURCE: TABLE 37.)
TABLE 37. POPULATION CHANGE IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE AND PARISH: 1810 to 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Orleans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>59,519</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>28,515</td>
<td>21,281</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>22,107</td>
<td>19,244</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>28,029</td>
<td>51,331</td>
<td>7,047</td>
<td>18,046</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>42,671</td>
<td>59,519</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>57,723</td>
<td>158,367</td>
<td>7,302</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>50,495</td>
<td>110,923</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>6,709</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>28,029</td>
<td>91,431</td>
<td>7,047</td>
<td>18,046</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>78,158</td>
<td>208,946</td>
<td>6,342</td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>59,672</td>
<td>219,403</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>11,375</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>101,303</td>
<td>285,916</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>15,578</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>130,316</td>
<td>328,716</td>
<td>8,159</td>
<td>31,873</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>149,762</td>
<td>341,775</td>
<td>8,593</td>
<td>41,831</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>5,851</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>182,631</td>
<td>387,914</td>
<td>16,269</td>
<td>87,604</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>5,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

neshites, this population in Jefferson Parish for 110 years has hovered between five and eight thousand persons. The white population of Jefferson, on the other hand, has had three sharply distinguishable periods of growth. From 1830 (the earliest year for which data in this parish are available) to 1850, the whites were added at an amazingly rapid pace. During the next three decades, they declined almost as fast. Since 1880, the growth of the white population in Jefferson Parish has been the fastest of either race in any of the parishes in the New Orleans area.

The Negroes in St. Bernard Parish experienced a gradual though uneven decline for 100 years. Whether the growth during the last twenty years represents a permanent departure from the longer trend, it is yet too early to determine. Certainly, the population was much smaller even in 1930 than the 8,576 neshites recorded in the census of 1830. In addition, the growth of the last twenty years has been rather slower than several short-run gains made during the extended period of decline. On the other hand, the white population of St. Bernard has registered a decrease only during the decade of the Civil War. With the exception of but two decades of extremely slow growth (1910 to 1920 and 1930 to 1940), this population has made steady and fairly rapid gains.

In spite of the apparent individuality of the parish and racial population trends, certain patterns do emerge in association with specific periods. The decade of the Civil War (1860 to 1870) saw a decline in the white populations for all three parishes. Jefferson Parish, as mentioned, had been declining 10 years previously, and the decrease was to continue for yet a decade longer. The decreases experienced in Orleans and St. Bernard parishes, however, represented the only ones ever registered for
the white population in these areas. On the other hand, the nonwhite populations of Jefferson and Orleans grew faster during this decade than at any time during the entire 180 years.

In the early census history of the New Orleans Area, the nonwhite population was generally numerically dominant in all three parishes. This condition lasted until approximately 1835 in the city. Since that time, the white population has always maintained its larger size. The situation in St. Bernard Parish was somewhat similar. In spite of the slight numerical superiority recorded by the white population in the census of 1810, they soon were vastly outnumbered by the nonwhites. Although the nonwhite population maintained this differential in their favor for approximately 70 years, a consistent decrease in the disparity could be noted for each decade. A few years after 1870, the white population again claimed the larger measure, and the difference between the two races has increased with almost each ensuing year.

The numerical differential between the races in Jefferson Parish fluctuated throughout most of the nineteenth century, the dominance passing from one race to the other. Since 1890, however, the white population has sustained not only the larger size but a faster rate of growth.

The general pattern of racial growth in the Area has therefore been one of a larger Negro population in the earlier years, followed by a shift and increasing numerical superiority favoring the whites.

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the relative position of the races and the parishes has not been altered. Orleans has had the largest population, followed by Jefferson and St. Bernard, respectively. In each parish, the nonwhite population has been in the minority, but it has always been larger than the white population in the
next smaller parish.

Finally, with but one exception (the Negroes of St. Bernard Parish), 1950 saw both races attain their largest recorded population in all of the three parishes. Thus, the rates of growth in recent years have either been maintained for a sufficiently long period, or the rate has been rapid enough to overcome all former periods of decrease, some of which were of decided statistical importance.

Recent population change: 1940 to 1950. A glance at Figure 44 is sufficient to substantiate the claim that the populations in the New Orleans Area have tended to change in the form of an upward-bending curve throughout the recent period. This pattern is best exemplified in the city, but it is present to a more varying degree in the other parishes as well.

For the decade as a whole (1940 to 1950), the Negro population of the New Orleans Area grew faster than did the whites only in Orleans Parish (21.9 per cent as compared with 12.5 per cent). Figure 44, however, shows that there are probably more fundamental observations to make. The primary reason for the higher rate of growth can be seen as the presence of a remarkably sustained rate of growth throughout the recent period. Only the New Orleans Negroes and the Jefferson Parish whites lost no population during the 12 years, and the curve depicting the growth of the New Orleans Negroes is definitely smoother—in fact, it is by far the smoothest curve in the graph.

For both races, the highest rates of growth for the decade between the two censuses appeared in Jefferson Parish, where almost twice as many (69.3 per cent) nonwhites were present in 1950 than in 1940 and where the white population more than doubled in size (109.4 per cent). The only
FIGURE 44. DIFFERENTIAL RATES OF ESTIMATED POPULATION CHANGE IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE: 1940-1952.
TABLE 38.  ESTIMATED ANNUAL MID-YEAR POPULATIONS IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA, BY RACE AND PARISH: 1941 to 1952.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>200,200</td>
<td>1,453,100</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>112,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>1,196,300</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>97,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>181,700</td>
<td>391,100</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>89,200</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>176,900</td>
<td>370,100</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>173,400</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>168,900</td>
<td>347,600</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>163,700</td>
<td>334,900</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>161,200</td>
<td>323,400</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>55,600</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>155,800</td>
<td>312,700</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>52,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>153,600</td>
<td>306,100</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>50,500</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>151,800</td>
<td>301,400</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>45,900</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>151,300</td>
<td>323,700</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>310,800</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distinction which St. Bernard Parish could claim relative to population change was a 13.8 per cent growth for its Negro population, the lowest rate of growth for the nonwhite populations of the Area. (The lowest rate of growth for the entire Area appeared among the New Orleans whites.) On the other hand, the 61.7 per cent growth achieved by the white residents of St. Bernard was high, but not highest.

The most varied patterns of population growth occurred among the Negro populations of the Area. The most even rate of growth was registered for the New Orleans Negroes (see Figure 44), the most rapid rate of growth appeared for the Negroes of Jefferson Parish (since 1945), and the most prolonged period of loss as well as the greatest relative decrease was registered for the Negroes of St. Bernard Parish (from 1942 to 1946).

THE FUTURE POPULATION OF THE STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREA

AND THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS: 1951 TO 1975

This section presents population forecasts for both races of the New Orleans Area and its central city. All forecasts are based on mathematical extrapolations and cover a twenty-five year time interval, from 1951 to 1975.

Types of forecasts and their underlying assumptions. The forecasts

---

6 This section is adapted from George A. Hillery, Jr. and Homer L. Hitt, "Louisiana Population Forecasts, 1951 to 1975: Mathematical Extrapolations" (unpublished manuscript, Institute of Population Research, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University, 1954).

7 The terms "forecast," "estimate," and "projection" are used synonymously.
are all based on the assumption that the populations of New Orleans will continue to change in the future as they have in the past. Such an assumption is admittedly only partially valid. It is based on the fact that any large population tends to change slowly. Nevertheless, it is also a known fact that populations do not change exactly as they did in prior years. In other words, the most that can be expected from assuming such a type of change is an approximation, which is a quality of any type of forecast.

Population projections derived by means of mathematical extrapolations are based directly on but one factor—a past change in population size during a specified period. This past change, of course, represents the composite influences of births, deaths, and migrations which prevailed during that period. More elaborate techniques exist, such as the cohort-survival method, which attempt to take account individually of these factors which cause populations to change (i.e., births, deaths, and migration). Such techniques differ from the type used in this study in that (1) more variables are taken into account and (2) more assumptions are made. Unlike the present method, if the demographer discovers that later population counts prove him in error, he can discover how he was wrong, e.g., he assumed a birth rate too great or a death rate too low, etc. Projections based on mathematical extrapolation permit no such hindsight, or at least not to the same degree. However, in relation to the power to predict (as contrasted with the ability to forecast), neither mathematical extrapolation nor cohort-surviving—nor any other forecasting technique which has yet been devised—can claim superiority. Students of population cannot predict future populations. They have developed no
wisecracks which will enable them "to see the future." They must assume that certain given conditions will prevail, and by virtue of these assumptions, estimate the only type of population which will result. To the extent that the assumed conditions fail to materialize, to that extent will the projection be in error. Only if the student of population could predict future conditions could he predict future populations. Since he is no prophet, his best alternative lies in a wise choice of assumptions.

Three types of extrapolations were used in constructing the present forecasts. The first two are based on the assumption that the same number of persons will be added to the population of the area and its city each year as in the past. Consequently, the populations are assumed to change in the form of a straight line throughout the projection period. The projections differ in that two different "pasts" were used: the average change experienced each year from 1940 to 1950 and from 1920 to 1950. The third type of forecast assumes that the number of persons added to the populations of New Orleans each year will increase in geometric progression according to the rate of change experienced in the population from 1940 to 1950.

All of the forecasts can be described by means of mathematical formulas, i.e., they all represent lines which bear a specific relation to the X and Y axes in the Cartesian system of rectangular coordinates, in which the values of X are determined by the years and the values of Y are determined by the population sizes. If \( a \) is defined as the initial population and \( b \) as the rate of change, then the general formula for all of the arithmetic progressions may be described as follows:

\[ Y = a + bX, \]
which is, of course, the formula for a straight line. Where all of the
letters have the same definitions as in the previous formula, the expon-
ential formula employed for the geometric progression appears thusly:

\[ y = a(1 + b)^x \]

Substitution of the appropriate values into this formula yields the fam-
iliar "compound interest" curve.

For illustrative purposes, the total population of the New Orleans
Area in 1975 may be computed by substituting the data for each of the
three types of forecasts into the pertinent formula. Thus, the average
annual change between 1940 and 1950 was 13,316.1 persons; 25 years sepa-
rate the initial year (1950) from the year to be estimated, and the
population of the New Orleans Area in the initial year of the forecast
period totaled 685,405 persons. Therefore:

\[ y = 685,405 \div 13,316.1(25) = 1,018,398 \text{ persons} \]

or the Area's estimated population in 1975. Similarly, the 1920 to 1950
data are expressed:

\[ y = 685,405 \div 9,055.17(25) = 911,784 \text{ persons}. \]

The geometric progression utilizing the rate of change experienced from
1940 to 1950 is described by:

\[ y = 685,405(1 + 0.02184)^{25} = 1,175,892 \text{ persons}. \]

Notice that the rate of change (b) in arithmetic progressions is expressed
in terms of persons per year, whereas the rate for geometric progressions
is expressed as a fraction of the initial population.\(^8\)

As one might infer, almost any period of past growth and a great variety of curves and lines might be used in making forecasts of the type presented here.\(^9\) An attempt was made, however, to employ only those curves and periods most relevant to the Area's actual previous growth. Figure 44 suggests that the population change of every parish and for both races in the Area did tend to approximate a geometric progression from 1940 to 1952. Thus, a geometric progression is offered as one type of possible growth. In all probability, this forecast will represent the most rapid growth which the New Orleans Area can expect to achieve during the next 25 years, since the population is computed such that it increases at an increasing rate. Accordingly, deviations from this pattern would be expected, on the average, to lower the rate of growth, and to that extent, to straighten the curve. A forecast based on the mean arithmetic change from 1940 to 1950 seems a logical alternative.

---


\(^9\) For example, one could assume a gradually decreasing rate of increase, as described by a logarithmic curve \((y = a + b \log x)\), or the reverse as described by the various types of exponential curves \((y = ae^{kx} \text{ or } y = a + b^x)\). One could conceivably fit a logistic curve to the data:

\[
y = \frac{k}{1 + e^{-ax}}
\]

where \(x\) and \(y\) are as previously defined, \(k\) defines the upper asymptote on the \(y\) axis, \(a\) the lower asymptote where \(x\) equals zero, \(b\) the rapidity of growth, and \(e\) the base of natural logarithms (2.71828).
Both of the projections described above, however, take into account only the recent population growth in the Area. To furnish projections based upon data since 1940 would also be to assume that this recent period was a fairly typical one as far as population change was concerned. In other words, one would be assuming that the forces which changed the Area's population since 1940 were not very different from those which were involved in the population change of earlier decades. This assumption is quite obviously not completely true. Although events which occurred in the last decade must be held accountable for some of the change which will be expected to take place, the intrusion of such factors as a great war and recovery from a major depression should certainly be considered as atypical, as factors which will tend to have less rather than the same or more influence in the years ahead. An estimate based upon a longer time period would be suggested, if not in preference to the estimates based on recent periods, then at least as a check upon them. For this purpose, a forecast based upon the population change from 1920 to 1950 was selected; that is, an arithmetic progression based upon the average (mean) annual change which took place during this time span.

The selection of 1920 as the base year on which to compute this last set of estimates was prompted by several considerations. First, as mentioned earlier, one is more likely to get a picture of the trend in population growth by studying a long-time period than a short one. Minor fluctuations from decade to decade are in a sense smoothed out. Second, the 1920 census was the last to be taken before the onset of the great depression. From this viewpoint, it represents the last "normal" census available. The third consideration was based on the amount of time which the estimates would cover. If one is to assume that the population is to
change in the next 25 years as it has in the past, it would not appear unreasonable to use a past of an equal duration as the future to be projected. Since censuses are only decennial, a thirty-year period is accordingly prescribed.

Specific considerations. The technique used in obtaining the geometric projections for the components of the Standard Metropolitan Area and the city of New Orleans consisted of first computing separately the geometric rates of change for each component and then adjusting the resulting projections of the nonwhite and white populations such that their sum would equal that of the total population. The advantage in this procedure is that one has need of only one assumption in making the forecast—that the population and its segments will change at a geometric rate. The proportion of the white and nonwhite populations to the total population does not have to be assumed.

For the arithmetic projections, it is possible to obtain from the tables a projection of the suburban populations merely by subtracting the population of the city from that of the area. Such a procedure is not applicable, however, to the geometric progressions, since the computations for the area and the city were made separately, i.e., the city and the suburbs were not adjusted to the area's total population. To do so would have been to exaggerate the future growth of the suburbs. Attempts to use geometric progressions in estimating small populations are likely to give quite impossible forecasts, and the New Orleans suburbs present a classical example. If both parishes were to increase in geometric progression according to their 1940-1950 combined rate, by 1975 they would contain 655,000 persons, or almost as many persons as there were in the Standard Metropolitan Area in 1950. By the year 2000, the parishes of
Jefferson and St. Bernard would together have more people than did the state of Louisiana at mid-century. Since an inherent property of a geometric progression is that it increases at an increasing rate, and since a smaller population is more likely to have greater rates of change than a larger population, it was felt that the safest approach would be to omit categorically forecasts based on geometric progressions for both of the smaller parishes.

Interpretation of the data. This report thus presents three types of projections for the Standard Metropolitan Area of New Orleans and for the city proper. The basic assumption employed for all projections—that the population will change in the future as it has in the past—affords no opportunity for one to say which type of estimate will be the "best." It is possible to say which projection is most consistent with the basic assumption, i.e., which projection describes best also the past population growth. Such information, however, would not enable one to explain the extent to which the basic assumption is valid, and one would be consequently no nearer his answer.

Although it is not possible to state the exact size of the future population by the use of mathematical projections, it is feasible with these techniques to provide estimates which will give a range of potential population sizes. The basic assumption as to the future population growth remains unchanged. It becomes merely qualified. One says, in effect, that since the population has grown in several different ways in the past, it is logical to assume that it could grow in any one of these ways in the future. In other words, the projection which gives the largest population can be taken as the upper limit of the Area or city's probable growth, whereas that which gives the smallest future
population can be taken as the lower limit.

In all cases, the geometric progressions give the largest population estimates (Table 39), the medium ones are found in the arithmetic progression based on 1940 to 1950 data (Table 40), and the lowest figures are given by the arithmetic progression derived from 1920 to 1930 data (Table 41).

If the Area continues to grow in the future as it has in the past, by 1975 it should number approximately one million persons. By the same token, the city will add between 150,000 and 250,000 persons. In other words, a substantial growth is expected in all parts of the Area during the next 25 years. The nonwhites will still be in the minority, but their proportion is certain to increase, if the trends realized during the last 30 years continue. It will be recalled from Chapter II that 29.3 per cent of the Area's population was composed of nonwhites, whereas the corresponding percentage in the city was 32.0. The lowest proportion of Negroes expected in the Area in 1975 is 29.7 per cent (according to the data in Table 40)—the highest percentage is 30.4 (Table 41). The high and low percentages for the city will be 34.6 and 36.7 (Tables 41 and 39), respectively. Therefore, not only will the proportions of nonwhites increase, but those for the city can be expected to increase faster than those of the suburbs. Since the data give reason to suspect that the suburban population will continue to outgrow the city and since the suburban whites have had a faster rate of increase than the nonwhites, the future change in the suburbs can be attributed mainly to an increase in the whites.

It is important to re-emphasize the fact that the estimates derived from mathematical extrapolations, as are those in this study, have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Standard Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Orleans Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Geometric Rate: 0.02184, 0.02238*, 0.02137*, 0.01143, 0.02040*, 0.01184*

*Totals in this table were obtained by rounding computed totals and hence are not always equal to the sum of the rounded figures shown by race.

*Rates for whites and nonwhites were independently computed and their products adjusted to each of the total populations.
**TABLE 40. PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREA OF NEW ORLEANS, BY RACE, ACCORDING TO ASSUMPTION OF 1940 TO 1950 MEAN ANNUAL ARITHMETIC CHANGE: 1951 TO 1975.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Change**

| Change | 13,316.1 | 4,074.2 | 9,241.9 | 7,590.8 | 3,286.9 | 4,303.9 |

1 Totals in this table were obtained by rounding computed totals and hence are not always equal to the sum of the rounded figures shown by race.
### TABLE 41.
PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREA OF NEW ORLEANS, BY RACE, ACCORDING TO ASSUMPTION OF 1920 TO 1950 MEAN ANNUAL ARITHMETIC CHANGE; 1951 TO 1975.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nonwhite</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Change**
- 1950: 9,055.17
- 1951: 3,053.57
- 1952: 6,000.60

1 Totals in this table were obtained by rounding computed totals and hence are not always equal to the sum of the rounded figures shown by race.
less reliability when a single figure is used to represent the population of a given year. The more the estimate is removed in time from an actual census enumeration, the greater becomes the possible error. Even a computation of the average population expected at any given date, as the mean of two or more estimates, will involve the erroneous implication that the future population of that date will tend to approximate that average. The safest approach seems to employ the concept of a range of population sizes, i.e., that the population may approach either the highest or the lowest estimate presented for any one year.

POPULATION CHANGE WITHIN THE CITY

The data on migration in the preceding chapter suggested the hypothesis that the Negroes of New Orleans are becoming more segregated. The information in Figure 45 tends to confirm this hypothesis. Thus, all but three of the tracts with heavy concentrations of Negroes gained in population during the decade. The exceptions included one tract in Magnolia and two in Back of Town. In all three cases, however, these losing tracts were on the fringe areas of heavy Negro concentrations.

On the other hand, most of those tracts with the smallest numbers of nonwhites lost nonwhite population between 1940 and 1950. Of those tracts which were in the lowest one-third of the distribution of nonwhite population in 1940, 61.4 per cent, or almost two-thirds lost nonwhite population. The areas with small contingents of nonwhites in 1940 which gained nonwhites were located mainly in Back of Town, City Park, and the Lake Front. The remainder of the small nonwhite tracts which gained were scattered throughout the city, no two of which appeared in the same area.
POPOPULATION CHANGE
1940-1950

PER CENT

Gain:

25.0 & OVER

UNDER 25.0

Loss:

UNDER 10.0

10.0 & OVER

NUMBER OF NONWHITES
(1940)

Shaded circle 1 - 194

Tract shaded and center cut out 195 - 2,654

Tract fully shaded 2,656 - 6,269

In addition, it is to be noted that there were no tracts without
nonwhite populations in 1940—two such tracts appeared in 1950.

Few of the tracts having large Negro populations in 1940 made
large gains (i.e., over 25 per cent). The largest gains are found in
the Industrial Canal Area, Algiers, Gentilly, and a few isolated tracts
in Magnolia.

Thus, there appears a tendency to redistribute the Negro population
of the city in two directions. First is the movement out of the areas
where nonwhites were few in number and into the areas of established
Negro concentrations. As noted earlier in the study, however, these
are precisely the areas with heavy population densities (see Figure 9).
Obviously, by present standards, these areas cannot include many more
persons. Consequently, a new area of Negro population appears to be
emerging in the easternmost portions of the city, i.e., in the Industrial
Canal area and in Algiers.
CHAPTER XIII

THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The social sciences are essentially trying to understand why
men behave as they do. Before that goal can be achieved, however, the
scientist must know how men behave, and prior to that question, one must
ask how men have acted. This present study has been devoted primarily
to the last (and logically the first) of these questions. It has clas-
sified and organized information concerning the actions of specific
groups of people in a specific locality as of a specific time. This last
chapter will be devoted to the second level of analysis. The threads of
specificity will be woven into the cloth of generalization. It is hoped
that the third level will be touched upon, that some small additional
e-clue as to the why of human behavior can be offered. But, to become more
trite, the writer wishes to add that "first things do, after all, come
first" (or should), and that the understanding of the how of men's ac-
tions is yet the primary goal.

The main emphasis of this study has been a demographic analysis
of the Negro population of New Orleans. To more fully achieve that end,
these people have been compared with the members of the numerically domi-
nant white race. To a large degree, the condition of the Negro has been
described in relation to that of the white. The employment of this
methodology has revealed definite and important demographic differences
between the two races.

Although it is not the purpose of this chapter to present a sum-
mary of the study, a brief—and perhaps over-simplified—review of the
major differentials is pertinent. The Negro was first discovered to be, numerically speaking, a minority people. In relation to the more numerous whites, they were found to be disproportionately concentrated in the younger ages. Females were also relatively more abundant. Measured according to the prevalence of broken families, family life was more unstable. They received less education and had occupations with less status and smaller incomes. Disproportionately fewer of them achieved the right to vote. Their fertility was higher, their mortality greater, and, finally, they were less often found in the migratory classification.

These differentials are not confined to the New Orleans Area. They have generally become part of the demographic literature. An adequate comprehension of the demographic position of the Negro people of the Area is consequently dependent upon an understanding of the factors prompting dissimilarities.

Two possible explanations can be offered for the differentials. The first explanation is a biological one. This theory would claim that the differences stem from an inherent biological distinction between the two races. More explicitly, since people are capable of being classified into different races according to their physical or biological characteristics, their demographic differences stem from different levels of biological capability. The second explanation recognizes the presence of a biological basis for classification, but claims that physical differences between men are, on the average, unimportant in the social situation.

The biological position can be theoretically and empirically demonstrated to be untenable. First, the biological concept of race is itself
an exceedingly vague one. ¹ Thus, any explanation based upon it is itself likely to be vague. The reason for the vagueness is to be found in the genetic basis of all hereditary biological differences and, in turn, in the biological basis of racial differences. In other words, hereditary physical differences among men are governed by their genotypes, or the types of genes which they carry. The science of genetics, however, has not progressed to the point where it is possible to determine the genetic composition (genotype) of an individual. Thus, any biological classification of men must depend practically not upon the genotype, but the phenotype, or the traits of the individual which can be observed. Unfortunately, as has been well established, persons with similar phenotypes may have markedly different genotypes. Their offspring, then, would not necessarily conform to the biological classification in which they fall.

The implications for the biological classification of race are crucial. In spite of the fact that various processes (isolation, inbreeding, etc.) have operated to give persons with the same phenotype approximately similar genetic construction, this construction is nonetheless only approximate and to that extent offers an unsound basis upon which to erect biological categories. Until the genetic composition of the individual can be known, the biological basis of race will be insecure. At present, the only basis which race has is the biological one, and thus the very concept of race itself exists in a shadowland of uncertainty.

It is not meant to deny here that classifiable biological differ-

¹This discussion is based upon the analysis of W. N. Krogman, "The Concept of Race," The Science of Man in the World Crisis (Ralph Linton, editor; New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), 35-52.
ences among human beings exist. The contention is only that the basis upon which these differences exist is very poorly known. In fact, one could claim that the discovery of genetics did no more than state a fundamental problem of racial classification—it by no means solved it.

One aspect of race, however, has been fairly well established. Racial categories are plastic phenomena—they are not fixed or immutable. The amount of change through intermixture which has occurred and the amount which can possibly occur are adequately demonstrated by an example quoted from Ammon: suppose two races, A and B, are represented in a population in the ratio of 2/3 : 1/3 and that free random mating occurs. The number of “pure” A and B types after N generations will be \((2/3)^2N\) and \((1/3)^2N\), respectively. In the fourth generation, 96 per cent of the population will be mixed, and in the fifth generation mixture will be 100 per cent. If free intermixture occurred for only 300 years there would not be a single “pure” A or B individual.\(^2\) Thus, any racial classification is at best an imperfect thing, when considered on its own basis and from the standpoint of its own mechanism.

The great naturalist Linnaeus became no more detailed in his classification of men than the isolation of the species. No one has been able to safely proceed further. In more concrete terms, the most permanent thing about any group of men is that they are men, i.e., *Homo sapiens*. From the standpoint of evolution, one can apply an additional classification, a racial one, but this classification could be considered as only a temporary construct. In other words, the scientist who erected a classification of races could not be certain that in a thousand years other scientists could still use his categories. Concerning the species, on the

\(^2\)Cited in ibid., 46
other hand, if men were only allowed to reproduce, a span of 10 centuries would still find him recognizable. In regard to the degree of permanency, then, the difference between men and other animals is an important one. Conversely, biological differences between men are of small consequence.

The basis for a biological distinction between men is thus vague and at least potentially impermanent. Any explanation based upon such a distinction must of necessity share these qualities. It is important, however, to carry the analysis one step further and examine precisely the manner in which biological differences fail to explain those which are demographic.

Probably the most vivid example which could be cited is that concerning education, especially since a biological interpretation would point most strongly to educational differences as indicative of a relative biological incapacity to learn, and through this avenue would come a biological explanation of cultural differences. In the New Orleans Area, the educational status of the Negro was demonstrated as undoubtedly lower than that of the whites. In spite of this fact, extensive overlapping did occur. Thus, one-third of the census tracts in the city containing 250 or more nonwhites had proportions of nonwhite high school graduates which were higher than the proportion of white high school graduates in St. Bernard Parish. Similarly, almost one-sixth had lower functional illiteracy rates. These facts, of course, do not mention the increasing educational attainments of younger Negroes in comparison to that of their elders, or the decreasing differential between the races with each successive younger age group. Even more important, however, is the situation extent in the most biological aspects of demography—fertility and mortality. Racial overlapping between years and for the various por-
tions of the New Orleans Area was even more evident for these factors than for the more social factor of education.

If one is to assume that biological differences between races are at the basis of these patterns, then he must also assume that biological differences are as variable—if not more so—as those between races. Clearly, either assumption contradicts the other. The biological explanation of the demographic differences is accordingly untenable. The differences do exist, but the explanation for them lies elsewhere.

As a working hypothesis, it is suggested that the differentials exist because of what may be described in an introductory manner as the social definition of the situation.\(^3\) The theory to be used is a more developed expression of one originally set forth by W. I. Thomas: "If men define the situations as real, they are real in their consequences." Although numerous earlier investigators had anticipated this statement, it remained for Thomas to set it in what could be termed codified form. Yet perhaps the very succinctness and simplicity of the principle were disquieting, for few, if any, bothered to inquire more fully into what Thomas had said. Recently, however, the theory has been brought to a logical fruition by Robert Nerton. His interpretation has provided the clue whereby the abstraction may be employed to lend form to empirical data. According to the expanded version:

---

\(^3\) It is recognized that the validity of the theory to be discussed cannot be conclusively demonstrated at the present stage of analysis. The validity must first be assumed. The task to be achieved is then one of testing the theory against the data collected.
behavior are determined by the ascribed meaning. 4

Thus, the very act of making the prophecy, the very fact that it comes into existence, creates a condition whereby the prophecy will be realized. The degree of objective truth in the assertion has no effect on its eventual fulfillment. The essential quality is initial belief. In fact:

The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false conception come true. The specious validity of the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuates a reign of error. For the prophet will cite the actual course of events as proof that he was right from the beginning. 5

The self-fulfilling prophecy actually sets in motion what MacIver has termed a "circle of causality," or a pattern in which conditions reinforce each other. 6 Thus, the assumed inferiority of an out-group leads to a lesser share in the privileges and opportunities in society which in turn leads to the creation of other deficiencies, and, in terms of the self-fulfilling prophecy, these deficiencies are used as "proof" of the originally assumed inferiority. Notice particularly that no one factor can be held responsible for the "vicious circle." On every level it involves a definition of the situation which includes a multiplicity of factors.

More concretely and specifically, these theories can be applied directly to the situation as uncovered in the New Orleans Area. Thus, the Negroes are given poorer educational facilities, in regard to both expense

---


5 Ibid., 181.

and space. They emerge with a lower educational level (as has been established), and this condition, in turn (and that of discrimination in general), leads to a decided handicap in the search for jobs, a handicap reflected in the disproportional concentration in those jobs requiring more physical effort and vested with less authority. The standards of living would be expected to decrease, and the evidence given has attested to the actuality of that expectation.

The lower educational level also signifies a lesser degree to which the waves of the larger society are insulated. In addition, a lower economic level signifies a closer proximity to marginal subsistence (if, indeed, this condition is not reached in fact). These two factors could be expected to influence the Negro family to deviate in form from that of the larger society. That such deviation has been accomplished is also a matter of record, especially in the more unstable family pattern as revealed by the greater number of broken families. The relationship which relative ignorance, poverty, and familial instability bear to mortality would lend one to expect that the previous analysis has demonstrated—that mortality rates for Negroes are higher than those in the white population.

In a sense, the circle of causality approaches completion when it is recognized that mortality, itself, is an index of the incidence of

---

7 During the 1949-50 academic session in the city of New Orleans, $81.97 per pupil was spent on instruction for Negro students. White students, on the other hand, were accorded an average of $129.66 per pupil. (State Department of Education of Louisiana, Annual Report (Division of Administration and Finance, 1951), Bulletin 716.) For documentation concerning overcrowding of schools, see the 1951 issue of The Louisiana Weekly (New Orleans Edition) and George A. Hillery, Jr., "The Presence of Community Among Urban Negroes: A Case Study of a Selected Area in New Orleans (unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1951), esp. Chapters III and VIII.
A higher disease level would tend to lower the educational and the economic levels, and high mortality rates themselves operate directly to cause broken families. And even the lower sex ratio of Negroes does not go untouched by the circle of causality: Note only the aforementioned relation between high stillbirth rates and low sex ratios.

The self-fulfilling prophecy has varied ramifications, and consequently the circle of causality is not a smooth one. The latter principle may perhaps be more fully described as a web of causality. This description will become more evident as the analysis proceeds.

The relation between education and fertility creates another circle, or strand in the web. The lower educational level would include, on the average, a lower level of knowledge regarding birth control. Accompanying this observation is the realized higher fertility of the New Orleans Negroes. This higher fertility is reflected also in the higher dependency ratios, which also affect the level of living. The lower level of living has possibly an additional impact: Since migration is expensive, one would suspect that low economic levels should accompany low migration rates, and the latter is the condition among the people studied.

The meager educational attainments have, in themselves, the potentiality to perpetuate a climate of discrimination. If nothing else, they

---


9 Clarence Albert Storia, "The Knowledge and Attitudes of Louisianians Relative to Heart Disease," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1954), Chapter XI. This study examined the relation between selected socio-economic characteristics and practices and attitudes toward heart disease in Louisianians, finding the most significant relationship to exist with economic and educational characteristics.
would deprive the people of the knowledge of the proper course of action
to follow which would afford relief from their social predicament, allow-
ing them to "better themselves," so to speak. Pertinent in this connec-
tion is another and as yet unmentioned aspect of theself-fulfilling
prophecy, i.e., political activity. No matter how weak may be the Ne-
groes' newly found political voice, it represents a force which was
practically nonexistent until quite recent years. Merely from an ex-
amination of the historical evidence on voting participation, the influ-
ence of discrimination is apparent. A sample taken of the Magnolia
Area in 1950 revealed that 93 per cent of the registered Negro voters
had cast their ballot in the 1948 general election.\textsuperscript{10} Compare this fig-
ure with a participation percentage of 59.4 for the city's total popu-
lation of voters in the same year, or even with 71.1 per cent in 1952.\textsuperscript{11}
Thus, the cause of former non-participation cannot be imputed to apathy.
Obviously, the Negroes who had the courage enough (in the words of Nor-
ten) to scale the walls of discrimination represent an even more inter-
ested voting population than the normal white registered voter.

Discrimination in the political realm obviously goes hand-in-hand
with that in the area of education, since education is to a large extent
in the hands of the local government. A smaller political voice means
simply a smaller degree of political control. The ramifications in the
self-fulfilling prophecy extending from the latter area have, of course,

\textsuperscript{10}Hilary, op. cit., 126.

\textsuperscript{11}Even the standard error of percentage of \pm 5 per cent for the
sample does not alter the relationship. Indeed, the greater number of
Negro voters in 1952 is probably partly responsible for the increased
percentage of total voter participation.
already received attention.

A final comment may be offered which falls admittedly within the area of speculation. The general pattern of racial growth noted in the preceding chapter for all the New Orleans Area was one of an early predominance of Negroes, followed by a shift to a larger white population. The foregoing analysis would suggest the hypothesis that the sustained practice of defining the Negro population as inferior has had the over-all effect of limiting population growth. When the Negro was a valued piece of property, every effort could be made—and without fear—to increase the Negro population. Such a condition represented wealth. When, however, this property definition was removed, the Negro became to some extent a liability. Whether directly or indirectly, his presence in the Area was no longer encouraged. He became an object to be competed with instead of to be competed for. He retained, further, his definition of inferiority. The net result of this complex of events would be to discourage his presence in the Area. And the data show that the Negro has claimed a decreasing proportion of the population. 12

The analysis is obviously incomplete. It has been severely handicapped at every turn by a lack of data on values and attitudes. These have not as yet become the proper—or perhaps even the available—tools of demographic investigation, but, as the discussion has possibly indicated, they are nevertheless fundamental in interpreting demographic phenomena.

In spite of such a limitation, however, the fundamental goal of

12 In this connection, the recent faster rate of growth of the Negro population in the city offers an interesting side comment on the subject of changing patterns of discrimination.
relating sociological theory to demographic analysis has been brought
at least some distance along the road to realization. In brief, the
racial differentials which were isolated on the demographic level—
from the point of view of relative and absolute numbers of people—
have been seen to fall into a consistent sociological pattern. The mem-
bers of the in-group have defined the Negro as inferior. This definition,
or prophecy, has set in motion forces which tended to fulfill it, and the
forces have involved all the differentials isolated. The present status
of the Negro is thus not as much a reflection of his racial abilities as
it is a function (in the Hartsonian sense) of the Caucasoidal prophecy.
The demographic differentials thus prevail because of a social fact.

There is nothing startling to the above remarks. To the socio-
gist, it is obvious that biology has at best only a superficial effect on
the indicated differentials, and that they are more fundamentally the re-
sult of the social situation. Prior to the analysis of W. I. Thomas,
however, the observation concerning the reality of men's definitions had
not been codified, and it remained for Robert Hartson to bring this theory
further along toward a theoretical completeness in the form of the self-
fulfilling prophecy. No matter how "obvious" were the theories of these
men, the present thesis could not have been sustained without them. It
matters little, therefore, whether a pattern or relationship is obvious.
The more important question concerns the degree to which the object of
study is fundamental. Further, and clearly on a much more elementary plane,
ever before have these theories been used to explain demographic differ-
entials. The demonstration of the existence of these differentials has
been the task of this study. The final goal (and it is hoped, the justi-
fying one) has been the attempt to depict the social implications in
numbers of people, to delineate the relationship between demographic facts and sociological theories.
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APPENDIX A

PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES FOR DELIMITING SOCIAL AREAS

IN THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

The city of New Orleans is divided into 142 census tracts. Such a large number of units enables the researcher to study spatial variations within the city with a considerable attention to detail and at the same time provides him with enough summary data that his study is capable of being executed within mechanically manageable proportions. Yet, when the student attempts to summarize or generalize his work, he finds himself in a plethora of difficulties—difficulties which stem from the same abundance of census tracts. It is true that the city's tracts are numbered according to a scheme: as one proceeds north and (or) west, the tracts are generally accorded higher numbers. But even with this information at hand, the initiated reader will have trouble remembering exactly where, for example, census tract 96 is located. And when the writer is describing a trait which is found in a number of tracts, the situation is only worsened when he glibly strings out a series of numbers, e.g., 5, 13, 42, 89, 96, 123, and 132. The reader more often than not simply skips such a conglomeration and proceeds to the next statement.

An alternative method has been to describe a situation as it exists with reference to major streets. Such a practice is not only potentially ambiguous but will help not one whit if the reading audience is to any extent a general one.

In an attempt to dispel such obscurity, the writer has divided the city into 19 social areas. The focus of the study did not permit an ex-

---

1See also Chapter I.
tensive examination of the degree to which social areas were present.
What is presented in this study are areas which have been demarcated
primarily for reference purposes, but, insofar as was practical, also
with a view toward delineating the areas such that they would correspond
(1) as closely as possible to the divisions in the city which the people
have made and (2) with reliable statistical data.

The first step involved interviewing 10 residents of the city in
order to obtain from them their opinion as to the locations of the various
"sections" or "neighborhoods" of the city. Because of a lengthy residence
in the city, the writer is aware that there are several of these areas in
New Orleans, and that they have, through the years, been given names.
Some of the names are historically connected with various areas which
New Orleans has incorporated in its growth (e.g., the French Quarter,
the towns of Carrollton and Algiers, and the settlements of Metairie and
Gentilly). Others have been given names in association with the types
of persons who resided in the area (e.g., the Irish Channel, the Garden
District), and still others are possibly more likely the brain-children
of real-estate men (e.g. Lake View, Lake Vista, Broadmoor). The inter-
views were requested to name any of the areas which they could recall
(without prompting from the writer) and to outline the locations of these
areas on a map. The 10 maps thus collected were combined into a single
map which showed the extent to which the informants' opinions coinci-
ded.

2 At times, in order to describe to the informant the type of in-
formation desired, the writer would suggest one area to designate. The
area selected in such cases was Carrollton, which is probably one of the
more widely recognized areas in the city.
Ten areas were clearly distinguishable at this stage, but in only one case did the interviewees agree as to boundaries: the choice was Algiers, or that portion of the city which is separated from it by the Mississippi River. In all the remaining nine areas, the boundaries overlapped and crossed to such an extent that one could only see the general vicinity of the areas. The next step consequently involved generalizing from this data. The procedure consisted simply of drawing a line around each area which would at all times leave two lines outside of its enclosure. In this manner, all atypical designations were excluded. The result is shown in Figure 46. The areas therein depicted are sections of the city which are generally known by a specific name. It should be noted, however, that not all respondents would agree that the boundaries as drawn would coincide with their own conception of where the areas are. But they would agree that somewhere within those boundaries would be found a large part—if not all—of what they would consider the area to be. For example, some persons would limit Carrollton to only the area covered by two or three blocks on either side of South Carrollton Avenue. Other persons would extend the area as drawn until it reached the City Park area. But persons with both types of opinions would agree that Carrollton as drawn in Figure 46 would include the lion’s share of “their” Carrollton.

In such a manner, the city was marked off into 10 areas which had been given names and one gargantuan district which was unnamed. The “named” areas were at this stage dependent for their existence only upon the fact that they represented in the minds of the people separate and distinct sections of the city. The unnamed area, on the other hand, had no such characteristic. Although parts of it were recognized as separate, no one part was recognized by many people as a distinct section.
FIGURE 44. COMPOSITE MAP OF SOCIO-CULTURAL AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY 30 RESIDENTS, NEW ORLEANS, 1925. (THE NUMBER IN PARENTHESES GIVES THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTS WHO DECLARED THE AREA.)
The final step in dividing the city was to combine the map of "sections" as shown in Figure 46 with a map showing the variation of socio-economic characteristics. Fortunately, Calvin Schmid has performed a crucial service in this regard. This investigator has developed a technique for describing the socio-economic structure of a city by obtaining composite rankings of selected indices. The procedure consists of the following steps:

First, each trait selected is ranked according to its distribution among the census tracts. The respective rankings for each tract are then totaled and divided by the number of indices, thus giving a series of mean scores equal to the number of tracts in the city. The scores for New Orleans are presented in Figure 4.

The areas depicted, however, merely show the variation in socio-economic characteristics from tract to tract. They do not mark off social areas. Persons living in census tracts with slightly different socio-economic traits may all regard themselves as residing in the same area. Such is the situation in Carrollton. On the other hand, persons living under similar socio-economic conditions may consider themselves in separate areas, even though the areas may be adjacent, as is true of the City Park and Lake Front areas, or even of Carrollton and University. In other words, from a map such as Schmid has compiled in Figure 4, only the objective situation can be known. The equally important subjective appraisal by the population is absent.

In a study of social areas, therefore, one must weigh the quanti-

---


4 The indices can be subsumed under the following general categories: income, occupational status, employment status, educational status, race and nativity, fertility, sex and age.
tative data with the qualitative opinions of the people involved. In the present instance, this step may be achieved by combining Figures 46 and 4. The result may be seen in Figure 5. This figure represents, first, all those areas demarcated in Figure 46 as "named" sections of the city. Each area, however, was maintained socio-economically homogeneous by including in any one area only three contiguous class intervals as shown in Figure 4. This criterion enabled the effective isolation of Algiers, Gentilly, City Park, the French Quarter, the Irish Channel, the Garden District, University, Broadmoor, and Carrollton. For the following areas, special considerations (as indicated) were necessary.

Lake Front. Actually, this area is composed of two sections: Lake View, which occupies most of the southern strip of census tracts in the Lake Front and which is identified as Lake View in Figure 46, and census tract 133. This tract was included not only because it fell within the appropriate class intervals but because it includes a high-rent district, Lake Vista, which is quite similar to Lake View. Actually, tract 133 is closer to Gentilly in socio-economic rank. This tract, however, includes such heterogeneous elements as the Veteran's Administration Hospital, the Naval Air Station, the New Orleans Port of Embarkation (Camp Leroy Johnson), an amusement park, and part of West End. 6

Metairie. 7 The southernmost census tract in this area is definitely

5 The exceptions were Carrollton, Algiers, and Magnolia. The deviation in Magnolia will be explained below. The inclusion of an extra interval for Carrollton was made necessary by the island formed by tract 131. The purpose of the entire classification was, of course, to avoid any one-tract areas. The same reasoning prompted the exception in the case of Algiers.


7 Cf. loc. cit.
apart from the socio-economic structure of Carrollton. The remaining
tracts are in turn excluded from most persons' conception of the Lake
Front. West End is included in this area primarily because the bound-
daries of the census tracts permit it no separate identification. The
name for the entire area is derived from the adjacent residential devel-
opment in Jefferson Parish, from Metairie Road which traverses the sou-
thern part of the area, and from the cemetery (of the same name) which
it includes. For many persons, however, Metairie is thought of as
existing in Jefferson Parish, only.

Business District.\(^8\) This area is comprised of the two census
tracts which include most of the city's major department stores and busi-
ness buildings.

Waterfront. Only one person identified this area as designated.
The socio-economic distinctiveness remains its primary justification.

Audubon Park. Although the New Orleans Population Handbook\(^9\) con-
sistently uses this term to designate an area of the city (generally in
the location as isolated by the present writer in Figure 5), none of the
10 persons questioned by the writer mentioned the name. This area is
times merely that one which remained after all the surrounding areas had
been delineated (i.e., Carrollton, University, Waterfront, and Garden
District). The park furnishes the name.

Magnolias. As indicated earlier in the study, this area contains
the largest number of Negroes in the city. Three tracts in Back of Town
are not included, although they are of an approximately similar socio-

\(^8\) For the historical identification of this area, see ibid., 11.

\(^9\) ibid., 41, 43, 53, 57, 61.
economic position, because of the numerous major railroad tracts which effectively isolate them from Magnolia. The Magnolia area, also, is one of the three areas which include census tracts representing four (instead of three) contiguous class intervals in the Schmidt socio-economic variable scale. The tracts included which forced this special rule were those remaining after University, Garden District, and Irish Channel had been delineated.

The area was unnamed by the respondents. Its designation is taken from one of the large Negro housing projects in the area.

Explanate. Explanade was marked separately because of its historical significance as the area which was settled relatively early in the city's growth, mainly by Creoles. Its name is taken from one of the more important streets traversing the area and from the ridge of high ground, bearing the same name, which it occupies.

Back of Town. Of the six persons who specified the existence of this area, two identified it where it is located in Figure 5, two other persons placed it in the Magnolia area, and still two others used the term to refer to anything west of Canal Street. Consequently, the name fell to that area which remained after the demarcation of City Park, Metairie, Carrollton, Magnolia, the Business District, and Explanade. Its main raison d'être is thus a cultural shatter belt or interstitial area. But without importance, however, is the fact that Carter's data...
show this portion of the city as a separate major industrial area. Of
special value in separating the area from Esplanade is the local signi-
ificance of Canal Street. Areas "below" (i.e., northeast of) Canal Street
are generally separated by the people from areas "above" (southwest of)
this thoroughfare. The street, therefore, forms an effective dividing
line. The importance of the railroad tracts on the Magnolia side has
already been indicated.

Galves and Industrial Canal. The creation of these two areas
from the remaining undifferentiated portion was prompted by the princi-
pal criterion: Areas were to be limited such that they included only
three contiguous class intervals in the Schmid socio-economic variable
scale. The selection of Almonaster Avenue as the specific dividing line
between the two areas was based primarily on the fact that a paucity of
Negroes inhabit the surrounding area, representing a social division be-
tween two major concentrations of Negroes. An additional criterion was
the relatively heavy industrialization around the Industrial Canal area
and the equal lack of industrialization in Galves.\textsuperscript{12} The term for the
latter (and wholly unnamed) area was taken from a bus line which traverses
the district. Historically, this is the older of the two areas, having
first been settled by immigrant truck farmers.\textsuperscript{13} The name for the Indus-
trial Canal area was, of course, suggested by the name which New Orlean-
ians have given to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. In common parlance, the two navigation routes are gen-
erally combined. Part of this area, further, was actually identified as
such by four respondents.

\textsuperscript{12}Lec. cit.

\textsuperscript{13}Gilmore, op. cit., 11.
APPENDIX B

A NOTE ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC MAPS

During the preparation of this study, the writer has employed certain techniques in the construction of the statistical maps, some of which are refinements of principles developed by other investigators and at least one of which represents a cartographic experiment.

The two basic principles of simplicity and comprehensiveness governed the construction of all maps—and indeed of charts as well. A graph—whether cartogram (statistical map), line chart, bar chart, etc.—is designed to show relationships between variables which are too complicated to be readily grasped in tabular or textual presentation. Thus, a line chart showing marital status by age presents in comprehensible form numerous cross-classified statistical categories. A cartogram, similarly, presents statistical information for geographical areas which could be shown in no other way. However, in order to achieve the basic end of graphic presentation, the chart or cartogram must be limited to a few variables, or the very purpose of the device—to present complicated variables in simplified form—is defeated. Thus, simplicity becomes the cardinal virtue.

Nevertheless, as Professor Homer Hitt has shown, a statistical map may be over-simplified.1 For example, in a cartogram showing only the proportions of unemployment, each area would be weighted on the same basis in regard to population. In the words of Professor Hitt: "In the main, the characteristics peculiar to the larger areas, even though they are gen-

---

1Homer L. Hitt, "The Use of Selected Cartographic Techniques in Health Research," Social Forces, XXVI (1947), 189-196.
ally sparsely populated, are inevitably exaggerated in the mind of the observer, while those characterizing the smaller areas, which as a rule are densely populated, are minimized.\(^2\) For demographers, this principle is crucial. If the demographer is interested in the size of populations, it is of definite importance to him not only to know the different magnitudes of the populations which manifest a given trait but as well to avoid being misled as to the statistical importance of a given trait in a given area (or even to so mislead his readers) because of inadequacies in his analytical techniques. One-factor maps, though they may admirably achieve the criterion of simplicity, at times fail in the second virtue of comprehensiveness.

The generally most successful manner in showing two factors on one statistical map has been, as Hitt has indicated, to employ varying sizes of circles which are proportionate to the absolute populations (or values) and to use within these circles shadings for the relative measures.\(^3\) Where the geographic units are few in number or where only a few units vary in an extreme manner from the modal value in regard to size, such a technique is indeed ideal. However, when the range of absolute values is extensive and where a multiplicity of units is utilized, the use of circles may do no more than destroy any patterning of the relative measures. This statement is especially applicable in the case of the New Orleans Negroes, as only a glance at Figure 6 will confirm. If circles had been used instead of volumetric spheres, the smallest circles would have been too small to reveal any discernible shading (or relative value),

---

\(^2\) Ibid., 190.

\(^3\) Ibid., 192.
and the largest circles (clustered around the tracts with the smallest areas) would have overlapped to such an extent that none of the tract boundaries would have been visible. The goal of showing both relative and absolute values for territorial units would have been defeated.

The technique devised in the present study for showing more than one factor, the writer believes, satisfies both principles of simplicity and comprehensiveness. In addition, it minimizes tendencies toward obscuring territorial patterns. The procedure was to divide all populations to be used as the second factor on a statistical map (whether total populations or those of some segment) into three groups: small, medium, and large. The essential objective was to emphasize the presence first of the largest and second of the smallest areas. Accordingly, those tracts which fall in the largest sixth population size were isolated. Those which fall into the smallest one-third were similarly placed in a separate category. The medium tracts occupied the remaining one-half of the distribution. The principle thus applied to achieve emphasis was: the smaller the number of units appearing in a category, the greater the distinctiveness. That quality which all or most objects have, being peculiar to none, is accordingly of no value for attracting attention.

Since cross-hatching (or shading) already had been chosen as a device for portraying the first factor (rates, percentages, etc.), some additional technique had to be employed for showing the second factor which in the present study was that of size. The technique chosen was

---

4 The basic unit of division for each distribution was thus one of sixths. This practice was designed to insure comparability with the frequency classes for the rates, ratios, and proportions which were generally based on percentiles.
that of using shape to represent magnitude, and, as far as possible, the shape was so designed as to give some connotation of size. Small circles (but of a standardized size) were immediately suggested for the tracts with the smallest populations. Each circle, therefore, would reveal two characteristics: (1) the value of the trait revealed by the type of shading within the circle and (2) the size of the population which manifested the trait—in the present case, a small population. After much experimentation, the simplest shape for the tracts in the medium population classification was found to be "hollowed out" tracts, i.e., those with the central portion of the shading removed. The tracts with the largest population, on the other hand, were completely shaded. This technique was designed to give the impression that the tract was completely (or practically) filled with persons. Generally, therefore, irrespective of the type of shading, the larger the proportion of a given tract which is shaded, the larger the population.

The technique is to be viewed as an experiment. Its sole purpose is to provide two factors on a single statistical map with a maximum of simplicity and a minimum of ambiguity.
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