

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS

POPULATION ESTIMATES

MAR 9 AM 8 53

FOR RELEASE

February 20, 1955

Washington 25, D. C.

Series P-25, No. 110

ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION, BY STATES 1960 AND 1965*

(The projections shown here supersede the figures given in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 56. They are consistent with projections of the total population of the United States shown in Series P-25, No. 78)

This report presents projections of the population of each region, geographic division, and State, for 1960 and 1965, taking into account the most recent projections of the total population of the United States and the estimated changes in State population that have taken place since 1950. The projections are designed to represent the civilian population plus the Armed Forces stationed in each area.

These projections are being published at this time because the earlier series of State projections published by the Bureau of the Census (January 1952) have become somewhat out-dated by revisions of the projections of the total population of the United States upon which they were based and showed projections only to 1960.¹ It was also felt advisable to derive several other series of State projections to 1965, employing somewhat different methods from those used in the earlier report. Thus, this report contains seven illustrative series of projections for 1960 and 1965 and a detailed discussion of the two essentially different techniques used in deriving the figures.

It should be emphasized that these figures are subject to relatively large errors.

¹ See Current Population Reports, Series P-25, Nos. 56 and 78, respectively.

* Prepared by Meyer Zitter of the Estimates and Forecasts Unit, Demographic Statistics Section, Population and Housing Division.

It is believed, however, that they may serve as rough guides for many important purposes and that persons working in the fields of public planning and market research will find them useful. In addition, the techniques used here can readily be adapted for use in preparing population projections of geographic areas below the State level.

SOURCES, METHODS, AND ASSUMPTIONS

General methods.--Two different procedures were used in developing the population projections shown here. The first method, which may be described as a "component" method, involves the preparation of separate projections of each of the components of population change, i.e., births, deaths, and net migration. The other procedure is the one usually referred to as the "ratio" method. This method involves extrapolating the ratio of the population of a State to that of the United States and applying these ratios to projections of the population of the United States.

For the component method, several different assumptions were made regarding the future level of migration inasmuch as net migration is an important component of change in the population of States and probably the least predictable one. Specifically, each series of

projections by the component method is based on the assumption that average annual net civilian migration of some previous period would prevail throughout the projection period from 1953 to 1965.² The base periods selected were 1940-53, 1940-50, and 1930-53.³ These periods appear to offer for most States a varied selection of reasonable alternatives regarding future net migration. They are of sufficient duration to minimize the effects of short-term fluctuations in migration, but encompass, in each case, marked changes in the conditions affecting interstate migration. They are periods representing a variety of economic and military conditions. Even the 1940-50 period is long enough to represent some variety in these respects. None of the three periods reflects solely the migration patterns characteristic of a period of depression, war, demobilization, or reconversion. One may make his own choice as to which of these three periods the projection period will most nearly resemble.

Births and deaths were projected separately by a relatively simple procedure. It was assumed that the ratio between State birth and death rates and the United States birth and death rates would remain constant throughout the projection period. The constant ratio was based on the average ratio of the State rates to United States rates for the 1950-53 period.⁴ These ratios were applied to the projected average annual birth and death rates for each period 1953-60 and 1960-65, for the United States as a whole, implied in an earlier Bureau of the Census report, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 78. The products represented average annual birth and death rates for each State for each future period. These rates were assumed to apply to the population at the beginning of each projection period and to the migrants projected for each period. The initial State populations to which the 1953-60 rates were applied were the total resident population figures (civilian population plus Armed Forces stationed in the area)

² In the actual computations, net civilian internal migration and immigration from abroad were projected separately. Net immigration from abroad as assumed in the earlier national projections was distributed in accordance with the 1950-53 distribution of immigrant aliens admitted to the United States by State of intended future residence as reported by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice.

³ A special adjustment was made for the District of Columbia for the migration projections based on the 1930-53 period. A discussion of this point is given in a later section, "Factors Unique for Specific Areas."

of July 1, 1953, as published in Series P-25, No. 97. The sum of the projected number of births or deaths for each period 1953-60 and 1960-65 thus obtained was then adjusted to add to the total number projected for the United States as a whole as shown or implied in Series P-25, No. 78.

Because of the considerable uncertainty regarding future fertility, two series of birth rates were projected; one tied in with "Series A and B" of the No. 78 report and the other with "Series C." Briefly, "Series A and B" imply that fertility will continue at the 1950-53 level until, at least, 1965. "Series C" implies that fertility will decline to about the 1940 level by 1975.⁵ The projected components of population change for the 1953-60 period were then added to, or subtracted from, the July 1, 1953, estimates of the total population, by States, to obtain projections of the population for July 1, 1960. The projections for July 1, 1965, were obtained in a similar fashion.

The basic economic conditions implied by the use of the 1930-53 patterns and levels of migration seemed inconsistent with economic levels implied in the projected fertility rates of Series A and B. The latter assume a continuation of the recent very high levels (1950-53) of fertility that reflect the prosperous conditions of those years. The 1930-53 levels and patterns of migration include the depression experience and hence usually imply substantial arithmetic reductions from the more recent levels of migration. Thus, although the underlying economic conditions assumed in the use of the Series A and B fertility

⁴ This short period was used because the required vital rates were readily available. It is believed that the results would have been substantially the same if the average ratios were based on a somewhat longer period. As Bogue has pointed out "... aside from year to year fluctuations ... the crude birth and death rates of a sub-area tend to stand in a fairly constant relationship to the parent area, or tend to change relatively slowly" (Donald J. Bogue, "A Technique for Making Extensive Population Estimates," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Volume 45, Number 250, p. 151, June 1950).

⁵ Series P-25, No. 78 shows four series of projections to 1975, viz., Series A, B, C, and D, but only three different series to 1965, since the projections of births based on assumptions A and B are the same through 1965. "Series D" was not incorporated for use here inasmuch as current fertility levels indicate a substantial divergence from the levels implied in that series. The national birth rates implied here are as follows:

Series A and B:	Series C:
1953-60.....22.7	1953-60.....21.6
1960-65.....21.9	1960-65.....19.4

rates or the 1930-53 migration patterns cannot be specifically stated, it appeared inconsistent to combine migration projections based on the 1930-53 migration levels with projections of births based on Series A and B fertility rates. Hence, the projections by the component method were limited to five; two series using Series A and B fertility with 1940-53 and 1940-50 migration levels, respectively; and three series using Series C fertility with 1940-53, 1940-50, and 1930-53 migration, respectively.

The underlying projections of the components of population change are not shown here but may be obtained upon request from the Bureau of the Census. Although the components are subject to substantially greater errors than the population projections themselves, they may be useful to persons interested in using the present technique for local areas. Of course, the assumptions can be modified to reflect peculiarities in the local situation.

The second procedure used in preparing the projections is the one usually referred to as the "ratio" method. This method was used by the Bureau of the Census in developing the projections of State population to 1960 that were published in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 56. Briefly, the ratio method consists of (1) extrapolating the ratio of (a) the population of the area for which a projection is required to (b) the population of a larger area which includes the first area and for which acceptable population projections are already available; and (2) applying the extrapolated ratios to the population projections for the larger area to obtain projections for the smaller area. In preparing the projections for geographic divisions shown in this report, the ratio of the division total to the United States total was extrapolated, and the extrapolated ratios were applied to projections of the United States total population; in preparing projections for States, the ratio of the State total to the appropriate division total was applied to the projections of the division total. Regional projections were obtained by summing the appropriate division totals.

In preparing the projections by the "ratio" method, much reliance was placed on the earlier research conducted in connection with the preparation of the State projections to 1960 shown in the No. 56 report. The fundamental techniques and underlying assumptions used in that report to extrapolate ratios were

also used here. The specific procedures were as follows: First, the ratio of the population of each division to the total population of the United States and the ratio of the population of each State to the total population of its division were computed for each decennial census year from the earliest census to 1950. On the basis of these data, the divisions and States were next divided into the following three groups:

Group 1. Those areas for which the ratios show a consistent direction of change from 1920 to 1950.

Group 2. Those areas for which the direction of change in the ratios from 1940 to 1950 was the same as from 1930 to 1940 but not the same as the change from 1920 to 1930.

Group 3. Those areas for which the direction of change in the ratios from 1940 to 1950 was different from that for 1930 to 1940.

The following assumptions were then made for each group with respect to the initial annual rate of change in the ratio:

Group 1. The rate of change in the ratio was the same as the average annual rate of change in the ratio for 1920-50, 1930-50, or 1940-50, whichever was the least in absolute value (closest to zero).

Group 2. The rate was the same as the average annual rate for 1930-50 or 1940-50, whichever was the lesser.

Group 3. The rate was one-half of the average annual rate for 1940-50.

The ratio method, like other methods of population projection, assumes that past trends in population provide the most convenient key to estimating future growth or decline. On the average, it would appear that trends in the ratio during the period immediately prior to the benchmark date would be of greater value for the purpose of projection than trends in the more remote past. Therefore, all of the base periods from which rates of change in the ratio were developed incorporate the decade 1940-50. At the same time, a past history of consistent change would seem to justify a greater confidence in the stability and persistence of given trends than a past history of irregular and contradictory change. Thus, subject to certain limitations, the length of the base period was varied from State to State in accordance with the degree to which the trend in ratios to the total United States population has been consistent. In recognition, however, of the fact that the

record of the past is only a partial guide to the future, steps were taken to scale down the rates of change in the ratio observed in the base period. These procedures involved the selection of the minimum rates from the available base period data and the assumption that change in the ratios would cease at a point 50 years beyond the benchmark date. The ratio method then tends to be conservative in the sense that, although it permits further changes in the ratios, it assumes a slowing down of the processes of population redistribution among the States.

The periods chosen for the earlier report were also used here but were extended through 1953. For example, where the period for the earlier report was 1930-50, the period used here was 1930-53 and 1940-50 became 1940-53.⁶ Table 3 shows the periods used as a base for determining the rate of change in the ratio for each State.

The initial rates of change in the ratios were assumed to apply to the period July 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954. Furthermore, as indicated above, it was assumed that annual rates of change in the ratios would decrease linearly to zero in 50 years. Accordingly, values for the annual rates of change, assumed to apply to each year 1954 to 1965, could be obtained by linear interpolation between the initial and terminal values. Preliminary values of the ratios for 1960 and 1965 were then computed by multiplying the ratios for July 1, 1953, serially by one plus the projected annual rate of change for the appropriate years.⁷ These preliminary ratios for 1960 and 1965 were then adjusted to sum to 100 percent. Table 3 shows the adjusted ratio as well as the initial rates of change in the ratio. These projections of the population including Armed Forces abroad were then adjusted to represent the "resident" population of the area (i.e., the civilian population plus the Armed Forces stationed in the area), which is

⁶ Two exceptions to the rule are Nevada and Arizona where the implied projections for 1953 were substantially lower (more than 10 percent) than the latest current estimates for that date. For these States, the periods were selected so as to yield somewhat higher rates of increase in the rates of change in the ratios than those used in the earlier report.

⁷ Actually, a "short-cut" method was used which does not require obtaining the ratios for the intermediate years. This short-cut procedure is described by Helen R. White, Jacob S. Siegel, and Beatrice M. Rosen in "Short Cuts in Computing Ratio Projections of Population," Agricultural Economics Research, Vol. V, No. 1, pp. 5-11, January, 1953.

comparable to the population enumerated during a census. The adjustment was made by using the 1953 estimates of the size and distribution of the Armed Forces. By using "Series A and B" and "Series C" of projections of the total United States population, two series of projections for States were developed for 1960 and 1965 by this ratio procedure.

Thus, all told, seven series of projections are shown for 1960 and 1965 (tables 1 and 2)--five series based on the component method (two series with the national projections "A and B" and three series with "C") and two by the ratio method.

Definition of population.--The population projections shown here were designed to be consistent with the type of population that would be enumerated in a census. This population, which may be referred to as the "resident" population of an area, comprises the civilian population and the Armed Forces stationed in the area. Such projections are comparable with the postcensal estimates of State population published annually by the Bureau of the Census. In projecting this type of population, assumptions must be made as to the future level and distribution of the Armed Forces, not only as to the total number serving overseas during the projection period, but also as to their distribution within the continental United States, by States. The present projections assume that the total military strength of the United States will remain roughly at the current level of about 3 million and that the number serving overseas will not change appreciably from the 1953 average of about 1 million. Although the risks of these assumptions are obvious, it should be noted that it would take changes of considerable magnitude in the Armed Forces to have any great effect on the final projections.

Although the use of a "resident" population may involve somewhat arbitrary assumptions as to the future size and distribution of the Armed Forces, the use of a sort of de jure population--that is, the civilian population of States plus persons serving in the Armed Forces allocated to State of pre-service residence--implies that variations in the size and distribution of the Armed Forces have no differential effect on the size of the civilian population of the various States. On balance, it would seem that the use of the "resident" population is preferable for present purposes because it is the population used in decennial censuses and the assumptions it

involves with respect to the Armed Forces are at least as realistic as those involved in the use of a de jure population.

In preparing the projections by the ratio method the procedure in the initial stages of computations does involve using ratios based on the "de jure" population rather than the resident population. It is essential to work with such ratios in order to eliminate the effect of the relatively large military base of recent years, as compared with 1940 and earlier years. If the resident population had been used as a base for the ratios, then the estimated rates of change in the ratio between 1940 and 1953, for example, would have reflected to a considerable degree the changes in the size and distribution of the Armed Forces between these two dates--a kind of change that is unlikely to be repeated in the future. Thus, the final population ratios shown in table 3 relate to the "de jure" population rather than the resident population. However, as noted earlier in the section on General Methods, the population projections based on the ratio method were converted to resident population figures by assuming that the distribution of the Armed Forces would remain constant throughout the projection period. Thus, all projections shown in tables 1 and 2 relate to the resident population.

Limitations of the projections.--A definite statement as to the reliability of the population projections presented in this report cannot be given. However, it should be recognized first of all that these projections represent the results of the use of certain procedures and assumptions; they must be interpreted in the light of these methods and assumptions. Other methods and other reasonable assumptions could have been used which would have produced somewhat different results.

Since the projections are tied in with the projections of the total population of the United States published in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 78, they are affected by the accuracy of those projections as well. Of course, the projections for States, divisions, and regions are, on the average, subject to greater error than the national projections.

Within the framework of the assumptions concerning each series, it is felt that all of the projections shown are reasonably possible, and no series is selected as most likely.

The projections are not intended to define the range of reasonable possibility. Furthermore, it may be noted that there is no "highest" or "lowest" series. A series that is high for one State will be low for some other State.

Recently the Bureau of the Census conducted a series of tests on the accuracy of various methods of projecting the population of States. In general, the tests consisted of projecting the population of each State from 1930 to 1940 and 1950 by various methods and comparing the results with the 1940 and 1950 Censuses results. Comparisons were made among projections prepared by such methods as the following: The cohort-survival method (which represents a more detailed variety of the component method);⁸ geometric extrapolation; arithmetic extrapolation; apportionment; and several variations of the ratio method, including the variation employed in this report. A complete description of the design of the tests and of the results is given by Helen R. White in "Empirical Study of the Accuracy of Selected Methods of Projecting State Populations," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 49, pp. 480-498, September 1954. The tests showed, in general, that the cohort-survival method (with migration), the ratio method (as used here), and the apportionment method make the best showings on the basis of average percent of error and proportion of errors of less than 10 percent. The errors of projections tended to be larger for 1950 than for 1940. The present projections for 1960 shown here are, on the average, likely to be considerably more accurate than the projections for 1965. The results of tests for a particular period of time cannot be generalized to future periods of time of the same length. Only very qualified conclusions may be drawn as to the absolute and comparative levels of accuracy of the identical methods when applied to subsequent dates.

The simplified component method used here was not included in these series of tests. The much more time-consuming cohort-survival method, although one of the better methods by these tests, did not clearly surpass some of the simpler methods.

⁸ The cohort-survival method involves projecting the population at the last census, or as estimated for a current date, by age and sex, by use of projected age-specific birth rates, death rates, and migration. This method is described in detail in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 43.

Factors unique to specific areas.---The projections presented here are based on the assumptions that past trends in the chosen time periods will, State by State, continue unchanged throughout the projection period. In some instances, however, there is local knowledge of impending developments that will have a major impact on population trends. In these instances, it would have been desirable to adjust the basic assumptions to take account of these changing circumstances. In the preparation of the present population projections it was not feasible to make adjustments for special circumstances in individual States. It was known, of course, that some of the important factors operating during past periods no longer exist and ideally should not be included in a base period used for projection purposes. An example would be the migration caused by the severe drought in the 1930's. The Plain States had their characteristic out-migration reinforced by distress migration because of the drought. Most of the other agricultural States had relatively light net out-migration because of considerable return migration from industrial States during this period.

An exception to the uniform application of the methods used here is represented by the projections for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is a small area and exclusively urban. It is possible that the present population is not very far below the practical maximum. The National Capitol Park and Planning Commission, for example, suggests that the maximum population that the District of Columbia can house under present standards

is roughly between 1 million and 1.2 million.⁹ In order to keep the present projections for the District of Columbia consistent with this upper limit, the projected amount of in-migration based on the 1930-53 period was reduced by one-half. The remainder was distributed between Maryland and Virginia, in line with recent patterns of population growth in the Washington Standard Metropolitan Area. The adjustment was restricted to the migration projection based on the 1930-53 period inasmuch as this series is the only one which projected a substantial amount of in-migration for the District of Columbia (reflecting the heavy in-migration of the 1930-40 decade).

This adjustment for the District of Columbia illustrates a procedure which might be greatly extended in estimates prepared locally. The local statistician, with an intimate knowledge of the factors which may affect population growth in a State or smaller area, is in a peculiarly strategic position to bring this knowledge to bear on his projections. He may thus want to examine such things as urban development programs; actual and potential land use; prospective developments in irrigation, power facilities, port facilities; transportation arteries, plant siting and expansion, military establishments; and changes in the importance and geographic concentration of specific industries; and, on the basis of this examination, to modify his projections.

⁹ See, for example, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, People and Land, Monograph No. 2, Washington, D. C., June 1950.

Table 1.—PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, DIVISIONS, AND STATES, FOR 1960 WITH CURRENT FIGURES FOR 1953
(Figures relate to July 1 and represent the civilian population plus members of the Armed Forces stationed in the area. The estimates for 1953 are published in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 97)

Region, division, and State	Estimate, 1953	Projection, 1960							
		Component method					Ratio method		
		Series A and B		Series C			Series A and B	Series C	
		1940-53 ¹	1940-50 ²	1940-53 ¹	1940-50 ¹	1930-53 ¹			
United States.....	158,306,000	176,103,000	176,103,000	174,803,000	174,803,000	174,803,000	176,103,000	174,803,000	
REGIONS:									
Northeast.....	40,726,000	44,268,000	44,371,000	43,980,000	44,084,000	44,162,000	44,124,000	43,797,000	
North Central.....	46,262,000	50,969,000	50,974,000	50,590,000	50,595,000	50,484,000	50,586,000	50,210,000	
South.....	49,483,000	54,079,000	53,985,000	53,640,000	53,543,000	54,100,000	54,776,000	54,374,000	
West.....	21,834,000	26,787,000	26,773,000	26,593,000	26,581,000	26,057,000	26,617,000	26,422,000	
NORTHEAST:									
New England.....	9,697,000	10,544,000	10,523,000	10,475,000	10,454,000	10,463,000	10,505,000	10,427,000	
Middle Atlantic.....	31,030,000	33,724,000	33,848,000	33,505,000	33,630,000	33,699,000	33,619,000	33,370,000	
NORTH CENTRAL:									
East North Central.....	31,879,000	35,784,000	35,810,000	35,520,000	35,546,000	35,340,000	35,385,000	35,123,000	
West North Central.....	14,384,000	15,185,000	15,164,000	15,070,000	15,049,000	15,144,000	15,201,000	15,087,000	
SOUTH:									
South Atlantic.....	22,550,000	25,277,000	25,242,000	25,079,000	25,043,000	25,148,000	25,418,000	25,233,000	
East South Central.....	11,592,000	12,030,000	12,080,000	11,926,000	11,975,000	12,214,000	12,493,000	12,400,000	
West South Central.....	15,342,000	16,772,000	16,663,000	16,635,000	16,525,000	16,738,000	16,865,000	16,741,000	
WEST:									
Mountain.....	5,564,000	6,514,000	6,470,000	6,457,000	6,413,000	6,441,000	6,426,000	6,378,000	
Pacific.....	16,270,000	20,273,000	20,303,000	20,136,000	20,168,000	19,616,000	20,191,000	20,044,000	
NEW ENGLAND:									
Maine.....	914,000	962,000	977,000	955,000	970,000	970,000	964,000	957,000	
New Hampshire.....	527,000	560,000	568,000	556,000	564,000	564,000	554,000	550,000	
Vermont.....	377,000	393,000	399,000	391,000	397,000	391,000	393,000	390,000	
Massachusetts.....	4,900,000	5,312,000	5,283,000	5,278,000	5,249,000	5,249,000	5,285,000	5,245,000	
Rhode Island.....	817,000	878,000	886,000	872,000	880,000	872,000	876,000	870,000	
Connecticut.....	2,162,000	2,439,000	2,410,000	2,423,000	2,394,000	2,417,000	2,433,000	2,415,000	
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:									
New York.....	15,233,000	16,629,000	16,730,000	16,524,000	16,626,000	16,761,000	16,556,000	16,432,000	
New Jersey.....	5,341,000	5,797,000	5,784,000	5,760,000	5,747,000	5,689,000	5,694,000	5,653,000	
Pennsylvania.....	10,656,000	11,298,000	11,334,000	11,221,000	11,257,000	11,249,000	11,369,000	11,285,000	
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:									
Ohio.....	8,369,000	9,444,000	9,444,000	9,374,000	9,374,000	9,277,000	9,291,000	9,222,000	
Indiana.....	4,136,000	4,645,000	4,651,000	4,611,000	4,617,000	4,588,000	4,592,000	4,558,000	
Illinois.....	9,003,000	9,872,000	9,886,000	9,803,000	9,817,000	9,826,000	9,826,000	9,754,000	
Michigan.....	6,852,000	7,995,000	7,980,000	7,933,000	7,918,000	7,852,000	7,841,000	7,783,000	
Wisconsin.....	3,518,000	3,828,000	3,849,000	3,799,000	3,820,000	3,836,000	3,835,000	3,806,000	
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:									
Minnesota.....	3,053,000	3,280,000	3,288,000	3,255,000	3,263,000	3,322,000	3,279,000	3,254,000	
Iowa.....	2,605,000	2,704,000	2,733,000	2,684,000	2,713,000	2,728,000	2,712,000	2,692,000	
Missouri.....	4,096,000	4,334,000	4,305,000	4,304,000	4,275,000	4,325,000	4,361,000	4,328,000	
North Dakota.....	621,000	619,000	619,000	613,000	613,000	613,000	633,000	628,000	
South Dakota.....	657,000	686,000	686,000	680,000	680,000	673,000	680,000	675,000	
Nebraska.....	1,347,000	1,404,000	1,396,000	1,393,000	1,385,000	1,378,000	1,401,000	1,391,000	
Kansas.....	2,006,000	2,158,000	2,137,000	2,141,000	2,120,000	2,105,000	2,135,000	2,119,000	
SOUTH ATLANTIC:									
Delaware.....	358,000	418,000	410,000	415,000	407,000	415,000	417,000	414,000	
Maryland.....	2,541,000	2,981,000	2,988,000	2,961,000	2,967,000	2,949,000	2,911,000	2,890,000	
District of Columbia.....	841,000	947,000	947,000	940,000	940,000	951,000	935,000	929,000	
Virginia.....	3,547,000	3,998,000	4,029,000	3,968,000	3,999,000	3,961,000	3,978,000	3,950,000	
West Virginia.....	1,937,000	1,969,000	2,013,000	1,952,000	1,996,000	2,004,000	2,051,000	2,035,000	
North Carolina.....	4,193,000	4,529,000	4,551,000	4,492,000	4,514,000	4,559,000	4,606,000	4,573,000	
South Carolina.....	2,195,000	2,341,000	2,349,000	2,320,000	2,328,000	2,358,000	2,376,000	2,358,000	
Georgia.....	3,585,000	3,855,000	3,848,000	3,821,000	3,814,000	3,866,000	3,864,000	3,835,000	
Florida.....	3,353,000	4,239,000	4,107,000	4,210,000	4,078,000	4,085,000	4,280,000	4,249,000	
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:									
Kentucky.....	2,965,000	3,020,000	3,034,000	2,994,000	3,008,000	3,082,000	3,153,000	3,120,000	
Tennessee.....	3,329,000	3,574,000	3,611,000	3,546,000	3,582,000	3,590,000	3,658,000	3,632,000	
Alabama.....	3,114,000	3,263,000	3,270,000	3,234,000	3,241,000	3,279,000	3,379,000	3,353,000	
Mississippi.....	2,183,000	2,173,000	2,165,000	2,152,000	2,144,000	2,263,000	2,303,000	2,285,000	
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:									
Arkansas.....	1,909,000	1,865,000	1,851,000	1,850,000	1,836,000	1,910,000	1,975,000	1,960,000	
Louisiana.....	2,884,000	3,230,000	3,200,000	3,201,000	3,171,000	3,238,000	3,214,000	3,190,000	
Oklahoma.....	2,251,000	2,196,000	2,160,000	2,179,000	2,143,000	2,193,000	2,320,000	2,303,000	
Texas.....	8,298,000	9,481,000	9,452,000	9,405,000	9,375,000	9,397,000	9,356,000	9,288,000	
MOUNTAIN:									
Montana.....	614,000	661,000	661,000	655,000	655,000	662,000	649,000	644,000	
Idaho.....	603,000	656,000	664,000	650,000	658,000	672,000	664,000	659,000	
Wyoming.....	306,000	341,000	341,000	338,000	338,000	345,000	337,000	335,000	
Colorado.....	1,413,000	1,614,000	1,614,000	1,601,000	1,601,000	1,601,000	1,575,000	1,562,000	
New Mexico.....	758,000	903,000	903,000	894,000	894,000	901,000	878,000	872,000	
Arizona.....	930,000	1,212,000	1,167,000	1,202,000	1,157,000	1,150,000	1,210,000	1,201,000	
Utah.....	734,000	863,000	871,000	855,000	863,000	855,000	840,000	834,000	
Nevada.....	206,000	264,000	249,000	262,000	247,000	255,000	273,000	271,000	
PACIFIC:									
Washington.....	2,478,000	2,922,000	2,981,000	2,901,000	2,960,000	2,872,000	2,883,000	2,862,000	
Oregon.....	1,602,000	1,938,000	1,983,000	1,924,000	1,969,000	1,888,000	1,917,000	1,903,000	
California.....	12,190,000	15,413,000	15,339,000	15,311,000	15,239,000	14,856,000	15,391,000	15,279,000	

¹ Refers to period used as base for migration projections. See text for detailed explanation.

Table 2.—PROJECTIONS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, DIVISIONS, AND STATES: 1965
(Figures relate to July 1 and represent the civilian population plus members of the Armed Forces stationed in the area)

Region, division, and State	Component method					Ratio method	
	Series A and B		Series C			Series A and B	Series C
	1940-53 ¹	1940-50 ¹	1940-53 ¹	1940-50 ¹	1930-53 ¹		
United States.....	188,593,000	188,593,000	184,823,000	184,823,000	184,823,000	188,593,000	184,823,000
REGIONS:							
Northeast.....	46,574,000	46,755,000	45,751,000	45,930,000	46,065,000	46,436,000	45,503,000
North Central.....	54,230,000	54,243,000	53,144,000	53,155,000	52,960,000	53,554,000	52,476,000
South.....	57,351,000	57,187,000	56,086,000	55,914,000	56,895,000	58,436,000	57,273,000
West.....	30,438,000	30,408,000	29,842,000	29,824,000	28,903,000	30,167,000	29,571,000
NORTHEAST:							
New England.....	11,109,000	11,071,000	10,909,000	10,873,000	10,887,000	11,055,000	10,834,000
Middle Atlantic.....	35,465,000	35,684,000	34,842,000	35,057,000	35,178,000	35,381,000	34,669,000
NORTH CENTRAL:							
East North Central.....	38,528,000	38,577,000	37,762,000	37,812,000	37,452,000	37,804,000	37,043,000
West North Central.....	15,702,000	15,666,000	15,382,000	15,343,000	15,508,000	15,750,000	15,433,000
SOUTH:							
South Atlantic.....	27,250,000	27,188,000	26,671,000	26,607,000	26,791,000	27,420,000	26,877,000
East South Central.....	12,302,000	12,392,000	12,014,000	12,102,000	12,522,000	13,105,000	12,842,000
West South Central.....	17,799,000	17,607,000	17,401,000	17,205,000	17,582,000	17,911,000	17,554,000
WEST:							
Mountain.....	7,226,000	7,146,000	7,058,000	6,982,000	7,027,000	7,035,000	6,895,000
Pacific.....	23,212,000	23,262,000	22,784,000	22,842,000	21,876,000	23,132,000	22,676,000
NEW ENGLAND:							
Maine.....	992,000	1,018,000	972,000	998,000	998,000	996,000	976,000
New Hampshire.....	582,000	596,000	570,000	584,000	584,000	573,000	562,000
Vermont.....	403,000	414,000	395,000	405,000	395,000	404,000	395,000
Massachusetts.....	5,583,000	5,532,000	5,486,000	5,436,000	5,436,000	5,545,000	5,435,000
Rhode Island.....	918,000	931,000	902,000	915,000	902,000	916,000	898,000
Connecticut.....	2,631,000	2,580,000	2,584,000	2,535,000	2,572,000	2,621,000	2,568,000
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:							
New York.....	17,511,000	17,689,000	17,212,000	17,387,000	17,622,000	17,456,000	17,104,000
New Jersey.....	6,247,000	6,223,000	6,139,000	6,116,000	6,016,000	6,075,000	5,954,000
Pennsylvania.....	11,707,000	11,772,000	11,491,000	11,554,000	11,540,000	11,850,000	11,611,000
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:							
Ohio.....	10,204,000	10,205,000	10,001,000	10,001,000	9,833,000	9,925,000	9,725,000
Indiana.....	5,006,000	5,019,000	4,907,000	4,918,000	4,868,000	4,905,000	4,807,000
Illinois.....	10,452,000	10,477,000	10,256,000	10,282,000	10,230,000	10,388,000	10,178,000
Michigan.....	8,825,000	8,798,000	8,641,000	8,616,000	8,499,000	8,536,000	8,364,000
Wisconsin.....	4,041,000	4,078,000	3,957,000	3,995,000	4,022,000	4,050,000	3,969,000
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:							
Minnesota.....	3,435,000	3,449,000	3,363,000	3,376,000	3,479,000	3,431,000	3,362,000
Iowa.....	2,762,000	2,814,000	2,706,000	2,757,000	2,783,000	2,788,000	2,727,000
Missouri.....	4,487,000	4,436,000	4,403,000	4,352,000	4,439,000	4,538,000	4,447,000
North Dakota.....	614,000	599,000	599,000	599,000	599,000	642,000	629,000
South Dakota.....	705,000	705,000	688,000	688,000	688,000	696,000	682,000
Nebraska.....	1,437,000	1,424,000	1,407,000	1,393,000	1,381,000	1,437,000	1,408,000
Kansas.....	2,262,000	2,224,000	2,216,000	2,178,000	2,152,000	2,222,000	2,178,000
SOUTH ATLANTIC:							
Delaware.....	462,000	447,000	452,000	439,000	452,000	457,000	448,000
Maryland.....	3,303,000	3,315,000	3,242,000	3,253,000	3,218,000	3,167,000	3,104,000
District of Columbia.....	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,001,000	1,001,000	1,021,000	999,000	979,000
Virginia.....	4,327,000	4,382,000	4,238,000	4,291,000	4,226,000	4,271,000	4,189,000
West Virginia.....	1,983,000	2,061,000	1,938,000	2,014,000	2,029,000	2,123,000	2,080,000
North Carolina.....	4,771,000	4,809,000	4,662,000	4,702,000	4,781,000	4,881,000	4,784,000
South Carolina.....	2,443,000	2,459,000	2,383,000	2,397,000	2,450,000	2,494,000	2,445,000
Georgia.....	4,046,000	4,034,000	3,950,000	3,937,000	4,028,000	4,045,000	3,964,000
Florida.....	4,895,000	4,661,000	4,805,000	4,573,000	4,586,000	4,983,000	4,884,000
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:							
Kentucky.....	3,045,000	3,070,000	2,974,000	2,999,000	3,129,000	3,279,000	3,214,000
Tennessee.....	3,745,000	3,811,000	3,666,000	3,729,000	3,742,000	3,885,000	3,806,000
Alabama.....	3,362,000	3,375,000	3,281,000	3,295,000	3,361,000	3,558,000	3,487,000
Mississippi.....	2,150,000	2,136,000	2,093,000	2,079,000	2,290,000	2,383,000	2,335,000
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:							
Arkansas.....	1,820,000	1,795,000	1,778,000	1,753,000	1,883,000	2,018,000	1,978,000
Louisiana.....	3,484,000	3,431,000	3,401,000	3,347,000	3,466,000	3,439,000	3,371,000
Oklahoma.....	2,140,000	2,077,000	2,096,000	2,032,000	2,121,000	2,366,000	2,318,000
Texas.....	10,355,000	10,304,000	10,126,000	10,073,000	10,112,000	10,088,000	9,887,000
MOUNTAIN:							
Montana.....	693,000	693,000	677,000	677,000	690,000	671,000	658,000
Idaho.....	693,000	707,000	677,000	691,000	716,000	703,000	689,000
Wyoming.....	367,000	367,000	358,000	358,000	369,000	357,000	350,000
Colorado.....	1,760,000	1,760,000	1,722,000	1,722,000	1,722,000	1,681,000	1,646,000
New Mexico.....	1,016,000	1,016,000	989,000	989,000	1,001,000	962,000	943,000
Arizona.....	1,429,000	1,347,000	1,397,000	1,318,000	1,304,000	1,424,000	1,396,000
Utah.....	961,000	975,000	937,000	951,000	937,000	912,000	894,000
Nevada.....	307,000	281,000	301,000	276,000	288,000	325,000	319,000
PACIFIC:							
Washington.....	3,244,000	3,348,000	3,180,000	3,283,000	3,130,000	3,171,000	3,108,000
Oregon.....	2,187,000	2,264,000	2,143,000	2,222,000	2,080,000	2,145,000	2,101,000
California.....	17,781,000	17,650,000	17,461,000	17,337,000	16,666,000	17,816,000	17,467,000

¹ Refers to period used as base for migration projections. See text for detailed explanation.

Table 3.—COMPUTATION OF THE RATE OF CHANGE IN THE PROPORTION OF THE POPULATION IN DIVISIONS AND STATES ASSUMED FOR THE INITIAL YEAR OF THE PROJECTION PERIOD AND THE PROJECTED RATIOS: 1960 AND 1965

(The sum of percentages in the distributions shown may not equal 100.00 because of rounding. Percentages relate to the civilian population plus members of the Armed Forces residing in the area at the time of entry into the Armed Forces. See text for detailed explanation)

Division and State	Percentage distribution of population, 1953 (1)	Rate of change in ratio in initial projection year (percent) (2)	Period on which rate of change is based (3)	Projected percentage distribution of population	
				1960 (4)	1965 (5)
United States.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
DIVISIONS:					
New England.....	6.15	-0.34	1930-53	5.99	5.88
Middle Atlantic.....	19.75	-0.34	1930-53	19.23	18.89
East North Central.....	29.31	+0.02	1940-53	20.25	20.19
West North Central.....	9.17	-0.72	1930-53	8.71	8.42
South Atlantic.....	14.06	+0.29	1940-53	14.26	14.38
East South Central.....	7.33	-0.42	1940-53	7.11	6.96
West South Central.....	9.64	-0.11	1940-53	9.53	9.46
Mountain.....	3.50	+0.63	1930-53	3.63	3.71
Pacific.....	10.10	+1.78	1930-53	11.30	12.10
NEW ENGLAND.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Maine.....	9.47	-0.44	1940-53	9.21	9.05
New Hampshire.....	5.49	-0.44	1940-53	5.34	5.25
Vermont.....	3.92	-0.58	1920-53	3.78	3.69
Massachusetts.....	50.58	-0.09	1920-53	50.35	50.19
Rhode Island.....	8.15	-0.14	1940-53	8.09	8.05
Connecticut.....	22.38	+0.55	1930-53	23.23	23.77
MIDDLE ATLANTIC.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
New York.....	49.07	+0.02	1940-53	49.22	49.32
New Jersey.....	16.42	+0.32	1940-53	16.80	17.04
Pennsylvania.....	34.51	-0.26	1930-53	33.98	33.65
EAST NORTH CENTRAL.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Ohio.....	26.26	+0.05	1940-53	26.26	26.26
Indiana.....	12.96	+0.05	1930-53	12.96	12.96
Illinois.....	28.20	-0.21	1920-53	27.74	27.45
Michigan.....	21.50	+0.50	1930-53	22.16	22.57
Wisconsin.....	11.08	-0.23	1940-53	10.88	10.76
WEST NORTH CENTRAL.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Minnesota.....	21.31	+0.24	1940-53	21.65	21.86
Iowa.....	18.21	-0.23	1940-53	17.94	17.78
Missouri.....	28.40	+0.11	1940-53	28.61	28.74
North Dakota.....	4.35	-0.51	1920-53	4.20	4.12
South Dakota.....	4.57	-0.31	1940-53	4.47	4.42
Nebraska.....	9.42	-0.25	1940-53	9.27	9.17
Kansas.....	13.74	+0.12	1940-53	13.85	13.92
SOUTH ATLANTIC.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Delaware.....	1.61	+0.55	1940-53	1.66	1.69
Maryland.....	11.22	+0.35	1940-53	11.41	11.51
District of Columbia.....	3.65	-0.08	1940-53	3.61	3.57
Virginia.....	15.29	+0.07	1940-53	15.26	15.22
West Virginia.....	8.91	-0.89	1930-53	8.35	8.00
North Carolina.....	18.70	-0.30	1930-53	18.22	17.89
South Carolina.....	9.74	-0.53	1930-53	9.35	9.10
Georgia.....	16.02	-0.60	1930-53	15.30	14.84
Florida.....	14.86	+2.02	1930-53	16.84	18.18
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Kentucky.....	25.28	-0.19	1930-53	24.96	24.76
Tennessee.....	28.91	+0.29	1920-53	29.46	29.80
Alabama.....	26.96	+0.10	1940-53	27.13	27.23
Mississippi.....	18.85	-0.33	1930-53	18.45	18.20
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Arkansas.....	12.59	-0.82	1930-53	11.85	11.40
Louisiana.....	18.84	+0.31	1940-53	19.09	19.24
Oklahoma.....	14.82	-0.87	1920-53	13.89	13.34
Texas.....	53.75	+0.50	1920-53	55.17	56.03
MOUNTAIN.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Montana.....	11.19	-1.12	1930-53	10.25	9.67
Idaho.....	11.00	-0.53	1940-53	10.47	10.13
Wyoming.....	5.41	-0.51	1930-53	5.15	4.99
Colorado.....	25.30	-0.32	1920-53	24.42	23.83
New Mexico.....	13.36	+0.31	1940-53	13.45	13.46
Arizona.....	16.67	+2.06	1940-50	18.80	20.21
Utah.....	13.43	+0.05	1940-53	13.28	13.16
Nevada.....	3.64	+2.37	1940-53	4.18	4.55
PACIFIC.....	100.00	100.00	100.00
Washington.....	15.28	-0.95	1930-53	14.31	13.74
Oregon.....	10.14	-0.59	1930-53	9.73	9.47
California.....	74.58	+0.32	1930-53	75.96	76.79