Handout for February 3 and February 5, 2015

Table 1. Population Size

	Total population	Percent Rural	Percent Nonwhite
1790	3.9 m	94.9 %	17.9 %
1820	9.6 m	93.2 %	18.8 %
1850	23.3 m	84.3 %	15.5 %
1860	31.5 m	80.0 %	14.5 %

Source: Historical Statistics, Series A2, A69, A92.

Table 2. Number of children (ages 0-9) per 1000 women (16-44), 1840

Missouri	2350
Arkansas	2259
Alabama	2224
Mississippi	2139
Georgia	2109
Tennessee	2026
Indiana	2016
Illinois	1944
lowa	1874
New Hampshire	1164
Rhode Island	1130
Massachusetts	1071
Connecticut	1047

Source: Paul David & William Sundstrom, "Old-Age Security Motives," *Explorations in Economic History* 25 (April 1988): Table 1.

Sources of U.S. historical data (follow links from course website)

- Librarian's page with LOTS of economic history links
- Librarian's <u>second</u> page with even more links for economic history
- U.S. Census (1975), Historical Statistics:
 Colonial Times to 1970
- Carter et al (2006), Historical Statistics of the United States: Millennial Edition Online
- U.S. Census, *Statistical Abstracts*, annual publication dating back to **1878**

Table 3. Birth Rates

	Births per 1000 population	
	White	Black/Other
1800	55	
1840	48	
1855	43	59
1880	34	52
1900	29	44
1920	27	35
1930	21	27
1960	23	32
1990	16	22
2010	13	15

Source: 1800-1990, *Historical Statistics (2006)*, Series Ab41 & Ab43. 2000-2010, *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol. 61, No. 1, August 28, 2012, Table 1.

Table 4. Determinants of Fertility, 1840

	Dependent Variable: Log of Child- Woman ratio in 1840		
	All States	North	South
Constant	4.7228** (0.6106)	4.0930** (1.3991)	4.7164** (0.3032)
Log (Male-Female ratio in rural areas, 1840)	0.5078 (0.2871)	0.3606 (0.6308)	0.6530** (0.1426)
Log (Rural land <i>lack of</i> availability index, 1840)	0.0269 (0.0484)	0.00783 (0.09151)	0.0461 (0.0321)
Log (ratio of non- agricultural to agricultural labor force, 1840)	-0.1799** (0.0243)	-0.1547* (0.0667)	-0.1547** (0.0153)
Log (ratio of wages paid non-farm labor to wages paid farm labor, 1850)	-0.8228** (0.2122)	-1.0416* (0.4907)	-0.8538** (0.1069)
n	29	16	13
Adjusted R ²	0.776	0.661	0.951

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

Source: David & Sundstrom, "Old-Age Security Motives," Table 4.

^{**} is significantly different from 0 at 1%

^{*} is significantly different from 0 at 5%

Table 5. Determinants of Fertility, 1850-1910

	Dependent Variable: Log of Child-Woman ratio				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Abortion law	0.121** (0.029)	0.149** (0.034)	0.118** (0.029)	0.124** (0.030)	0.148** (0.034)
Medical Exemption		-0.030 (0.025)			-0.028 (0.025)
Medical School			-0.033 (0.022)		
Birth Control Law				-0.012 (0.019)	-0.010 (0.019)
State & year fixed effects?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
State-specific time trends?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Adjusted R ²	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
n	291	291	291	291	291

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Source: Lahey, Joanna N., "Birthing a Nation: The Effect of Fertility Control Access on the Nineteenth-Century Demographic Transition," *Journal of Economic History* 74 (June 2014): Tables 2, 3, and 4.

Table 6. Share of Population Growth
Attributable to Immigration

Attributable to Immigration		
1800-25	2-3 %	
1830s	over 10 %	
1840s	almost 25 %	
1850s	almost 33 %	

Source: Derived from Historical Statistics.

Table 7. Patterns of Immigration by Home country

	Great Britain	Ireland	Germany	China	Total #
1820s	20. %	40. %	4. %	0. %	128,500
1830s	14	32	23	0	538,400
1840s	15	46	27	0	1,427,300
1850s	16	37	35	1	2,814,600
1860s	26	20	35	3	2,081,300

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*, Series C89, C91, C92, C95, C104.

Table 8. Patterns of Immigration by Occupation

	Skilled	Farmers	Laborers	Women & Kids
1820s	13. %	9. %	6. %	58. %
1830s	13	12	8	59
1840s	11	15	16	54
1850s	8	14	18	55
1860s	11	8	19	53

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*, Series C120, C130, C133, C134, C136.

^{** =} Significant at the 1 percent level

Table 10. Index of Antebellum Real Manufacturing Wages

	1820	1832	1850	1860
Total	101	128-150	155-197	159-191
Middle Atlantic:				
Rural	90	118-139	131-166	166-199
Urban	111	150-176	165-209	154-185
Urban/Rural	1.2	1.1-1.5	1.0-1.6	0.8-1.1
New England:				
Rural	95	133-156	143-181	156-187
Urban	110	130-153	150-190	165-198
Urban / Rural	1.2	0.8-1.2	0.8-1.3	0.9-1.3

Source: Walton & Rockoff, Table 11-4. Urban/Rural ratio calculated.

Table 9 . Distribution of Labor Force

Percent Distribution				
	Agri- culture	Manu- facturing	Trade & Service	
1810	83.6	3.2	3.5	
1840	63.1	8.8	11.2	
1860	52.9	13.8	14.4	

Source: Walton & Rockoff, Table 11-1.

Table 11. Relative Wages, US vs. England
For each group, w. . =100

For each group, W _{England} =100		
Worker	US wage, 1820-21 relative to English	
	wage	
Skilled		
carpenter	150	
mason	147	
ordinary machinist	114 - 129	
best machinists	77 - 90	
Unskilled		
common labor	135	
farm labor	123 - 154	
women in mills	102 - 153	
boys 10-12 yrs old	115	

Source: Walton & Rockoff, Table 11-5.

Table 12. Skill Premium

daily wage of machinist × 100 daily wage of common labor in urban Massachusetts		
1825	150	
1831-40	156	
1841-50	190	
1851-60	220	

Source: Walton & Rockoff, Table 11-6.

Table 13. Relieved Pauperism Rate, NY

Table 13. Relieved Fauperisiii Rate, NT					
	% of Population				
1823	1.1				
1835	1.8				
1849	3.5				
1859	6.8				

Source: Calculated from Hannon, "Poverty in the Antebellum Northeast," *Journal of Economic History* 44 (December 1984): 1009.

Table 14. Characteristics of Relief Recipients, 1843-59

	1845-49	1855-59
Male	55.6	44.8
Native born	45.7	41.5
Disabled or Elderly	12.4	5.1
Able-bodied adults	40.6	72.2
Intemperate (alcoholics)	20.4	9.9
Debauched (immoral, probably related to prostitution)	1.6	0.6
Idle & Vagrant	2.9	4.6
Indigent & Destitute (poor)	15.7	57.0

Source: Hannon, "Poverty," Table 1.

Table 15. Factors correlated with N.Y. state pauperism rate
(Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. Checks to see if independent variable maps to >1 value of dependent variable.)

	1823		1840	1840/44		1855/59	
independent variable	w/NYC	w/o NYC	w/NYC	w/o NYC	w/NYC	w/o NYC	
population growth rate	-0.79*	-0.79*	0.23	0.68	0.60	0.43	
% population that's urban	0.52	0.29	0.48	0.21	0.60	0.39	
% Non-Agricultural L.F.	0.60	0.39	0.81**	0.71*	n.a.	n.a.	
% Manufacturing L.F.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.48	0.21	
Household production per capita	-0.69*	-0.54	-0.90**	-0.86*	-0.74*	-0.61	
% population foreign born	0.27	0.00	0.79*	0.68	0.67*	0.50	
Extent of tenancy (versus freeholders)	-0.07	-0.54	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	

Note: * Significant at 5 percent level.

** Significant at 1 percent level.

Source: Hannon, "Poverty," Table 5.