



The Resurrection of New York City After 1920: Al Smith's 1920 Tax Reform Law and Its Aftermath

By Dr. Mason Gaffney

Article citation:

Gaffney, Mason. "The Resurrection of New York City After 1920: Al Smith's 1920 Tax Reform Law and Its Aftermath." No date. Draft.

Fair Use Disclaimer

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, a non profit private foundation, is publishing this article, at no cost, pursuant to the Fair Use provisions of Section 107 of the Copyright Act which states that under certain circumstances, the fair use of a copyrighted material for purposes of criticism, comment, teaching, scholarship and research is not an infringement of copyright. If you have any concerns about the publication of this article, please contact us at info@schalkenbach.org.

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation's Digital Collections and Archives is an extension of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation's Engel Georgist Library. It collects, organizes, preserves, and provides free online access to researchers and the general public of Georgist literature including books, newspapers, pamphlets, scholarly articles and archival materials.

RSF is particularly proud to offer free online access to the works of the late Georgist scholar Mason Gaffney, made possible through the generosity of the Danica Foundation and with the consent of the Mason and Letitia Gaffney Trust.

Robert Schalkenbach Foundation: <https://schalkenbach.org/>

Engel Georgist Library: <https://www.librarycat.org/lib/EngelGeorgistLibrary>

RSF Digital Collections and Archives: <https://schalkenbach.starter1ua.preservica.com/>

DRAFT, FOR COMMENT PLEASE

The Resurrection of New York City after 1920

Al Smith's 1920 tax reform law and its aftermath

Mason Gaffney

The major purpose here is to show the aftermath of NYC's 1920 law exempting new housing construction (but not the land) from the property tax, until the end of 1931. The major finding is that NYC did grow much faster, percentagewise, than comparison cities, 1920-30. It had been losing ground, 1910-20. Afterwards, 1930-40, NYC continued to grow, while most comparison cities stopped, and began to waste away. NYC not only held its #1 ranking among U.S. cities, it grew faster, even in percentage terms. This finding tends:

a, to refute the "convergence" thesis, which would have all cities becoming more alike, regardless of public policies;

b, to refute the thesis of inevitable (or highly probable) "regression towards the mean," which would have early leader(s) replaced by other leaders;

c, to support a thesis that the 1920 law, supported by Gov. Al Smith, had the intended effect of reanimating NYC at a time when it would otherwise have stagnated and rotted like other older eastern cities;

d, to support a thesis that cities and states, through their public policies, control their own destinies.

The stimulus for this study is a pamphlet by Charles Johnson Post, How New York Solved its Housing Crisis. He gives data on per capita spending on new buildings in NYC and four comparison cities, 1910-29, showing NYC suddenly recovering from stagnation in 1920 and outstripping the other cities: Philadelphia, Boston, and Minneapolis especially, and, to a lesser extent, Chicago. Post credits the housing tax holiday for this recovery. Post cries for substantiation because what he alleges is momentarily challenging, while what he writes is tantalizingly casual.

Post sources none of his data, and they stop after 1929. His hortatory tone makes the reader wary. Edward Polak (1924), Register of Deeds for Bronx County, published a brief chapter on years 1921-23, giving data consistent with Post's, showing a startling 7-fold increase in construction outlays compared with the previous three years, 1918-20. No one else has, to my knowledge, published on this episode, either to refute or support Post or Polak. I have searched the scholarly and other periodical literature, so far in vain. So I will tentatively accept Post's data, subject to later confirmation. I assume it

came from city sources. (U.S. Census data on construction and housing do not go back that far.) The population changes documented herein track Post's construction data quite well, adding to Post's credibility.

Post describes the enabling law (NY State Laws of 1920, ch. 949, section 4-B, and later amendments) rather too offhandedly. Apparently the new construction, to qualify, had to be ready for occupancy by April 1, 1927; and the exemption lasted through Dec. 31, 1931. However, Post writes loosely, and there were later changes, with possible extensions, and who knows what administrative latitude. Polak, in 1924, described the law a little differently - and perhaps it was different, then. More work is needed to specify these details.¹[Note 1]

The law had a political history. In 1920 Gov. Al Smith called a special session of the NY State Legislature to address a housing crisis in NYC (Polak, 1924). This law, which Smith signed, was the outcome, so we will call it "The Al Smith Law," even though Smith, like all political leaders, had to be pushed. Earlier, as majority leader of the Assembly, he had blocked a 1910 effort along similar lines (Marsh, 1953), but changed his mind by 1920. We may surmise that his success in reviving NYC helped boost him to the nomination for U.S. President, 1928. Both efforts (1910 and 1920) were pushed by the single-tax clubs of NYC, the enduring legacy of Henry George's runs for Mayor of NYC in 1897 and 1886: some dead men rise again (Marling, 1916).

For comparison cities I have selected mainly cities of the northeast, with fixed boundaries. I have grouped them as

¹I would not criticize Post, however: at least he made an effort. Tax economists and urbanists have neglected this striking policy experiment, and its apparently important, affirmative results in having saved the nation's largest city from decay. This neglect is itself noteworthy - negatively. It is not as though academicians were too busy with more important matters. Graduate students search desperately for thesis topics that have not already been overworked; academic and political literature teems with long disquisitions on factitious problems, and trivial, soporific, and transient topics. Everyone bemoans inner city decay. The U.S. Congress has created a new Cabinet Department, and appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars, to combat it - without success. This neglect raises questions about the professions that deal with with such matters, but that is a topic for another day.

follows, presenting aggregate data for each group (as well as the individual cities).

A. Other major cities in NY State: Albany, Syracuse, Rochester and Buffalo. Statewide policies would affect all these the same - but the Al Smith enabling law (although "local option" in form) was tailored for NYC only. Rochester and Buffalo and, to a degree, Albany, also pick up influences from the Great Lakes economy, which reaches NYC also.

From 1920-40, these cities grew by 13.8%, while NYC grew by 32.7%.

B. Other major cities along the mid-Atlantic coast: Boston, Providence, New Haven, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

From 1920-40, these cities grew by 7.3%, while NYC grew by 32.7%.

C. Near neighbors of NYC: Jersey City, Newark, and Paterson. (Jersey City and Newark might also be lumped with the cities in "B", but are such close locational substitutes for NYC that separate treatment seems warranted.)

From 1920-40, these New Jersey neighbors of NYC grew by 2.8%, while NYC grew by 32.7%.

Res ipsa loquitur? Post hoc ergo propter hoc? Not entirely: "proofs" in economics are always open to doubt and challenge. Certainly, though, this tax holiday was a cause, with a definite effect expected *a priori*. The expected happened - starting immediately. Anyone questioning cause and effect should accept some burden of proof.

I have also disaggregated NYC into its Boroughs. Manhattan actually lost a little resident population, 1920-30: the explosive growth was in the outer Boroughs of Bronx, Brooklyn, and especially Queens²[Note 2]. This raises the qualifying possibility that NYC had simply merged with its inner suburbs, unlike some comparison cities, providing it with land to expand, lacking in, say, Boston. There are two reasons to doubt the weight of this qualification, however. One is that the population density of NYC, vast although NYC is, was double that of any comparison city. The other is that the merger occurred about 1900, while the growth revival we are studying waited until 20 years later, after NYC appeared to be choking from lack of housing.

²I have omitted Richmond, as too small to matter.

Milwaukee provides an instructive contrast. Milwaukee grew faster than most other cities up until about 1960, at which time it annexed all of northwest Milwaukee County and doubled its area, under the leadership of Hoan's successor, Mayor Frank Zeidler. Zeidler was also a "socialist" of the Hoan school, but he believed annexation was the way to provide cheap housing for workers. He then made way for a retrograde Mayor, Henry Maier, under whom Milwaukee immediately started losing population.

Data in Tables I and II, gathered for the primary purpose above, also point to other arresting findings, *a posteriori*. I itemize these here as suggestions for future research.

1. Urbanization in the northeastern U.S. was very rapid during the 1890-1900 depression. In sharp contrast, urbanization stopped cold in the 1930-40 depression (except in NYC, where it just slowed down). This dead stop was hardly due to suburbanization in that era of no-growth. The difference between the two depressions calls for some explanation. In the "dirty 'thirties," apparently people returned to marginal farms, for survival. What was different in the 1890s? I hope someone will find the reason - it is not evident to me.³[Note 3]

Urbanization revived weakly, 1940-50, but de-urbanization began after 1950 or so, and after 1960 turned into a rout, led by the Interstate Highway System. NYC resisted this 20 years longer than most other cities.

Meantime, a new kind of quasi-urbanization at low densities and high auto-dependency was taking over the south and southwest, as exemplified by our one data set from there, for Los Angeles. This also led to rapid growth in a few eastern cities specializing in autos and components: Detroit, Akron, and Dayton, which, however, began shrinking even while the auto boom was rising.

New cities have grown so fast that the minimum population required to be among the "top 100 cities" keeps rising, decade by decade. Thus U.S. cities, on the whole, have not "disappeared" so much as they have migrated, lowered their densities, disintegrated, and changed their settlement patterns.

³To trace this back through the several depressions of the 19th Century, see the 1940 Census of Population, Vol. I, by state. This source gives city populations from 1790-1940.

2. Urban and tax scholars routinely cite Pittsburgh, with its "graded tax plan," to exemplify a tax-induced growth effect roughly like what New York's law induced. Whatever happened in Pittsburgh, however, has not made its population rise. Its fall after 1980, especially, is steeper than most.

No one publishing on Pittsburgh's plan, pro or con, has addressed this point, to my knowledge. Various studies have shown rapid building in Pittsburgh under this stimulus - that by Oates and Schwab is the latest and most ambitious, methodologically. Of course, Pittsburgh's plan, compared with New York's, is not focused on housing. It has the effect of encouraging high-rise commercial building, and industry, which might actually take land from residential use within the city limits, while stimulating residential demand in the suburbs. Pittsburgh is also tightly constricted in area, unlike NYC, and perhaps should be compared with Manhattan, rather than all of NYC. Whatever is the answer, champions of the Pittsburgh graded tax plan need to explain it.

Population growth is not the only goal of civic policy, to be sure. Some cities discourage population growth, while seeking to import and retain taxable capital. Population, however, is surely a factor to consider, even from the particularistic local view. From a national view, it is vital to the interests of labor to have cities competing to attract population. "Labor" includes all kinds of workers: professional, managerial, white and pink-collar, actors, athletes, public employees: everyone except rentiers. As to the last, however, the rise of land prices in NYC (which Post also documents), and their fall in torpid cities and neighborhoods, says that landowners, too, gain from urban vigor.

3. Cleveland grew very fast, 1900-20. For most of this time it was under the administrations of single-taxers Tom L. Johnson, 1901-09, and Newton D. Baker, 1911-16. In 1906, Mayor Johnson inaugurated the first 3¢ trolley fare in America, probably entailing deficits to be met by taxing property. In 1909, he formally put in place reformed machinery for land assessment. W.A. Somers, who had furnished his system to Johnson in 1901, was made Chief Clerk. They raised assessments from \$180m to \$500m. For the first time there was a fair assessment in Cleveland (Russell, p.291; Bremner, Chap. 14, pp.153-64). Johnson failed of reelection in 1909, but he left this system behind. For more on Ohio, Detroit and Milwaukee, see Appendix III.

4. Detroit's soaring growth, 1900-30, obviously involved the auto industry, but why did that industry choose Detroit over other cities? It began under Mayor, then Governor Hazen S. Pingree (Lorenz, pp.17-18; Johnson, p.91). Pingree had retained Tom Johnson to advise him on how to implement low transit fares, so it seems Pingree was growth-oriented, and Johnson-oriented, but this calls for more investigation and explanation, not attempted here.

Table II, 1950-98, shows an equally sensational collapse of Detroit after 1970 or so, also calling for analysis (a bootstrap city, dependent on one industry, is inherently unstable?)

5. Columbus, Ohio, has been a "sleeper" all this time, growing steadily from 88,000 in 1890 to 633,000 in 1990, surpassing many other older, once-larger northeastern cities. One reason is extensive annexation. There may be other explanations, not attempted here.

Those 5 ancillary findings and questions should not distract us now from our immediate goal, to observe the population growth of NYC, 1920-40, to compare it with that of other cities, and of NYC itself before and after. See the Tables appended at the end.

APPENDIX I, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin

Tom Johnson as Mayor of Cleveland looked into property assessments, and found they were highly regressive. He put up large maps showing this, inviting discussion and suggestions from the public. To aid understanding he pushed "the Somers unit system." A Standard Unit was one front foot, 100' deep. To win support for upvaluing land and downvaluing buildings, he set up a Tax School in 1901. The biggest landowner sued to stop it, but by this time it had operated for 20 months, and prepared the public mind for large adjustments (Johnson, pp.127, 129; Bremner, pp. 129, 136, 157-58). Johnson's last and lasting achievement upon leaving office in 1909 was to see his candidates take control of the City Board of Equalization, which had the last word on assessed valuations (Bremner, pp.162-64). There is still a bronze statue of Tom L. Johnson in central Cleveland, holding a book with the graven title, Progress and Poverty.

Johnson's City Solicitor and ally, Newton D. Baker, won back the Mayoralty in 1911, so the anti-Johnson interlude was brief. Baker implemented Johnsonian policies until President Wilson made

him Secretary of War in 1916. Peter Witt, a fiery single-taxer, ran to succeed Baker, but failed narrowly. However, Baker left behind a large city debt, and the infrastructure it had financed, assuring that the City would still need heavy land taxes for a time. Cleveland then fell into respectable hands (Cramer, p.7), and began its long slide into torpor and mediocrity. From 1900-20, Cleveland's population more than doubled. If it had continued growing at the Johnson-Baker rate, its population today would be 15 millions or so, double that of NYC, and 30 times the half million it still has.

Toledo grew fast under single-taxers Samuel M. "Golden Rule" Jones, 1897-1904, and his disciple, Brand Whitlock, 1905-1913, a graduate of Gov. Altgeld's administration in Illinois. It grew by 63%, 1900-10. Detroit grew explosively under their friend Mayor (later Governor) Hazen S. Pingree. Pingree had called Tom Johnson to Detroit in 1899 to help beef up the street car system and lower fares, under public ownership (ironically, for the Motor City, considering its later destruction of mass transit) (Lorenz, pp.17-18; Johnson, pp.91-97; Bremner, p.42; Bemis).

John Peter Altgeld was Governor of Illinois, 1892-96, with an administration full of single taxers, including Brand Whitlock (Bremner, pp.57-58). To give the flavor of the times, it was during this regime that Altgeld's Bureau of Labor Statistics, under George Schilling, published its famous 8th Annual Report, 1894, including Lorenz-Curve data on the concentration of landownership in Chicago. Such radicalism did not seem to hinder the growth of Chicago, which was 54%, 1890-1900.

Milwaukee grew fast for 20 years, without stopping or staying, under its left-wing Mayor, Daniel Hoan, 1916-36 - Hoan's brand of "sewer socialism" consisted in applying the principles of marginal-cost pricing to Milwaukee's infrastructure, meaning keeping rates low, and meeting deficits by raising property taxes. Hoan also expanded social services, and pressed city assessors (in Milwaukee these serve at the Mayor's pleasure) to up-value land and down-value buildings (Hoan, 1936, pp.26-27). Mayor Hoan had his Assessor distribute maps of city land values, block by block, to enlist citizen aid and support for assessing land first, and buildings "residually" - the way to get land upvalued. Like all progressive mayors of the era, Hoan studied and learned from the achievements of Tom L. Johnson (Hoan, passim).

Cincinnati at the same time poked along only slowly under its various "business-friendly" administrations. All during the

years of Tom Johnson and Newton Baker, Samuel Jones and Brand Whitlock, Cincinnati was the power base of the old guard who opposed them and all they stood for, and put Ohioans McKinley, Taft and Harding in the White House (Steffens; Russell, pp.131, 136, 149, 155, 174, 203, et passim; Bremner). Cincinnati is now smaller than it was in 1910 (see Tables I and II).

Mark Hanna hated Tom Johnson, and called him the worst names he could think of. Hanna made McKinley President, and himself Senator. He enjoyed support from the richest American, John D. Rockefeller of Cleveland, and Bosses Cox and Foraker of Cincinnati, but could not control his own back yard because Johnson was there (Russell, p.120). Hanna called Johnson a "socialist-anarchist-nihilist." Socialism was the equivalent of anarchism, said Hanna, and McKinley was shot by an anarchist. Johnson, a native southerner, was a "carpetbagger followed by a train of all the howling vagrants of Ohio."

Elizabeth J. Hauser, editing and prefacing Johnson's autobiography, contributed this insight:

"In Cleveland, as in these other (Ohio) cities, there was organized as if by instinct a sympathetic, political-financial-social group whose power and influence made itself known the moment it was touched. It included the banks and trust companies with their directors. Banks that did not sympathize with this conspiracy were coerced by fear into compliance with the will of the stronger institutions. Through the banks, manufacturers, wholesale and retail merchants were reached. Business men who openly sympathized with the low-fare movement were called to the directors' rooms in the banks and advised, sometimes in guarded language, that their loans might be called or their credit contracted. ... cowed at meetings of the Chamber of commerce ... threatened with boycott. The lawyers were almost a unit. At one time fourteen of the leading law firms of the city were employed against the movement. Many physicians and in a large measure the clergy were affiliated with this class. ... all who were seeking favor socially, professionally or commercially, lined up with Privilege.

"The newspaper persecution of Mr. Johnson was not confined to Cleveland. A publicity bureau supplied the country papers of the State with material ...

"To all of this was added the power of social ostracism. It was carried into the clubs and employed against all who distantly believed in or liked Mr. Johnson.

"'For the greater part of nine years,' writes Frederic C. Howe, 'Cleveland was an armed camp. There was but one line of division. It was between those who would crucify Mr. Johnson and all of his friends, and those who believed in him. ... If any kind of cruelty, any kind of coercion, any kind of social, political or financial power was left untried in those years to break the heart of Mr. Johnson, I do not know what or when it was'" (Johnson, p. xxii).

All that closely resembles "The Beast," as described in the book of that name by Judge Ben Lindsey of Denver.

The growth records, though, suggest an arresting hypothesis, that left-wing administrations are good for business - productive business, that is - and "pro-business" administrations are bad. San Francisco and New York, with their leftwing traditions, seem to hold up well compared with other old cities. Mark Lause has named NYC as the focus of radical politics back to 1820 or so, during the time it was emerging as our largest city. Bridgeport, CT, under its one-time socialist regime, bears investigating. Even Los Angeles came close to electing a socialist mayor, Job Harriman, in 1913, and supported Upton Sinclair of Pasadena for Governor in 1934. It raised property taxes to spend lavishly on public water supply, public power, harbor facilities, sewers, and other public works. I do not pursue those threads here, but they surely call for vigorous research, and review of stereotyped ideas about "pro-business" governments and "leftwing" governments.

Bibliography

Altgeld, John Peter, 1899. Live Questions. Chicago:

Bemis, Edward L., 1899. "Detroit's Effort to Own her Street Railways." Municipal Affairs III, 475, September

Bogart, Ernest L., 1911. "Recent Tax Reforms in Ohio." AER I:505-18, September

Bremner, Robert H., 1995. George and Ohio's Civic Revival. Edited, with an Introduction, by Will and Dorothy Burnham Lissner. NY: The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation (Compendium of articles originally published in the AJES, 1948-56)

Coker, Francis W., 1913. "The Administration of Local Taxation in Ohio." AAAPSS XLVII:182-98, May

Cramer, Clarence H., 1961. Newton D. Baker, A Biography.
Cleveland and NY: The World Publishing Company.

Crosby, Ernest, 1906. "Golden Rule" Jones, Mayor of Toledo.
Chicago:

Hoan, Daniel, 1936. City Government.

Howe, Frederic C., 19xx. Confessions of a Reformer.

Illinois Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1894. 8th Annual Report.
Springfield.

Johnson, Tom Loftin, 1913. My Story. Elizabeth J. Hauser (Ed.).
New York: B.W. Huebsch. Orig. 1911, Columbia Sterling Publishing
Co.

Jones, Samuel M., 1899. The New Right. NY:

Lause, Mark. "Labor Insurgency for Land Reform: The Antebellum
Prelude to Henry George's United Labor Party Movement." MS
prepared for Ed O'Donnell (ed.), HENRY GEORGE ONE HUNDRED YEARS
LATER, Proceedings of a Conference held in 1997, in process.

Lindsey, Ben B., and Harvey J. O'Higgins, 1910. The Beast. NY:

Lockhart, Oliver C., 1912. "Taxation in Ohio." AER II:729-30,
September

Lorenz, Carl, 1911. Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland. NY: The
A.S. Barnes Co.

Marling, Alfred E., Chairman, 1916. Final Report of the
Committee on Taxation of the City of New York. New York: The
O'Connell Press

Marsh, Ben, 1953. Lobbyist for the People, Wash: Public Affairs
Press.

Marsh, Benjamin C., 1911. Taxation of Land Values in American
Cities. New York

Nevins, Allan (ed.), 1936. Letters and Journal of Brand
Whitlock. New York:

Polak, Edward, 1924, "The NY Tax Exemption Law." In Emil O. Jorgensen (ed.), **Report of the Nat. Tax Relief Convention.** Chicago: Mfrs. and Mchts. Fed. Tax League, pp.25-32

Post, Charles Johnson, 1984. How NY solved its housing crisis. NY: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. Excerpts from a pamphlet, 1951, "What Private Enterprise Can Do". NY: American Association for Scientific Taxation, Inc.

Russell, Francis, 1968. The Shadow of Blooming Grove: Warren G. Harding and His Times. NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Steffens, Lincoln, 1931. Autobiography. New York:

Steffens, Lincoln, 1905. "Ohio: A Tale of Two Cities."

Warner, Hoyt Landon, Progressivism in Ohio, 1897-1917.

Whitlock, Brand, xxxx. 40 Years of It.

ENDNOTES

1. I would not criticize Post, however: at least he made an effort. Tax economists and urbanists have neglected this striking policy experiment, and its apparently important, affirmative results in having saved the nation's largest city from decay. This neglect is itself noteworthy - negatively. It is not as though academicians were too busy with more important matters. Graduate students search desperately for thesis topics that have not already been overworked; academic and political literature teems with long disquisitions on factitious problems, and trivial, soporific, and transient topics. Everyone bemoans inner city decay. The U.S. Congress has created a new Cabinet Department, and appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars, to combat it - without success. This neglect raises questions about the professions that deal with with such matters, but that is a topic for another day.

2. I have omitted Richmond, as too small to matter.

3. To trace this back through the several depressions of the 19th Century, see the 1940 Census of Population, Vol. I, by state. This source gives city populations from 1790-1940.

4. The 1890 figure for NYC is for NYC as presently constituted, i.e. including the four "outer" boroughs added to Manhattan after 1890.

5. Hartford grew by annexation, 1930-40, so old Hartford probably lost population.
6. The NY State cities are Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany
7. The mid-Atlantic cities are Boston, Providence, New Haven, Philadelphia, Baltimore. Washington is not comparable, for obvious reasons, and is not included.
8. The N.J. neighbors are Newark, Jersey City, Paterson

Populations, NYC and Comparison Cities, 1890-1998
 Ranked by 1900 populations
 Source: U.S. Census of Population, Decennial Volumes
 Population in (000)
 Growth rates are decennial, in %
 In two tables: I, 1890-1950; II, 1960-1998

TABLE I: 1890-1950

City	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950
NYC	2507 ⁴ [Note 4]	3437	4767	5620	6930	7455	7892
Rate/dec.		37.1	39	17.9	23.3	7.6	5.9
Chicago	1100	1698	2185	2702	3376	3397	3621
Rate/dec.		54.4	28.7	23.7	24.9	.67	6.6
Philadelph.	1047	1294	1549	1824	1951	1931	2072
Rate/dec.		23.6	19.7	17.7	7.0	-1.0	7.3
St Louis	452	575	687	773	822	816	857
Rate/dec.		27.2	19.5	12.5	6.3	-.7	5.0
Boston	448	561	670	748	781	771	801
Rate/dec.		25.2	19.4	11.6	4.4	-1.3	3.9
Baltimore	434	509	558	733	805	859	950
Rate/dec.		17.3	9.6	31.4	9.8	6.7	10.6
Pittsburgh	239	452	533	588	670	672	677
Rate/dec.		89.1	17.9	10.3	14.0	.3	.7
Cleveland	261	382	562	797	900	878	915
Rate/dec.		46.4	47.1	41.8	12.9	-2.4	4.2
Buffalo	256	352	423	507	573	576	580
Rate/dec.		37.0	20.2	19.9	13.0	.52	.69
S Francisco	299	343	417	507	634	635	775

⁴This is for NYC as presently constituted, i.e. including the four boroughs added after 1890.

City	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950
Rate/dec.		14.7	21.6	21.6	25.0	.16	22.0
Cincinnati	297	326	363	401	451	456	504
Rate/dec.		9.8	11.3	10.5	12.5	1.1	10.5
Detroit	205	286	466	994	1569	1623	1850
Rate/dec.		39.5	63	113	58	3.4	14.0
Milwaukee	204	285	373	457	578	587	637
Rate/dec.		39.7	30.9	22.5	26.5	1.6	8.5
Newark	182	246	347	414	442	430	439
Rate/dec.		35.2	41.1	19.3	6.8	-2.7	2.1
Jersey City	164	206	268	298	316	301	299
Rate/dec.		25.6	30.1	11.2	6.0	-4.7	-.7
Minneapolis	165	203	301	381	464	492	522
Rate/dec.		23.0	48.3	26.6	21.8	6.0	6.1
Providence	132	176	224	238	253	254	249
Rate/dec.		33.3	27.3	6.3	6.3	.4	-2.0
Kansas City	133	164	248	324	400	399	457
Rate/dec.		23.3	51.2	30.6	23.5	-.25	14.5
Rochester	133	163	218	296	328	325	332
Rate/dec.		22.6	33.7	35.8	10.8	-.9	2.1
Columbus	88	126	181	237	291	306	376
Rate/dec.		43.2	43.7	30.9	22.8	5.2	22.9
Toledo	81	132	168	243	291	282	304
Rate/dec.		63.0	27.3	44.6	19.8	-3.1	7.8
Syracuse	88	108	137	172	209	206	221
Rate/dec.		22.7	26.9	25.6	21.5	-1.5	7.3
New Haven	86	108	134	163	163	161	164
Rate/dec.		25.6	24.1	21.6	0.0	-1.2	1.9

City	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950
Paterson	78	105	126	135	139	140	139
Rate/dec.		34.6	20.0	7.1	3.0	.7	-.7
Los Angeles	50	102	319	577	1238	1504	1970
Rate/dec.		104	213	80.9	114.6	21.5	31.0
Albany	95	94	100	113	127	131	135
Rate/dec.		-1.1	6.4	13	12.4	3.2	3.1
Dayton	61	85	117	152	200	211	262?
Rate/dec.		39.5	37.6	29.9	31.6	5.5	24.2?
Hartford	53	80	99	138	164	166 ⁵ [N.5]	177
Rate/dec.		50.9	23.8	39.4	18.8	1.2	6.6
Yonkers	32	48	80	100	135	143	153
Rate/dec.		50	67	25	35	5.9	7.0
Akron	28	43	69	208	255	245	275
Rate/dec.		53.6	60.5	201.4	22.6	-3.9	12.2
MAJOR BOROUGHES OF NYC							
Manhattan	1513	1856	2331	2284	1867	1890	1960
Rate/dec.		22.7	25.6	-2.0	-18.3	1.2	3.7
Brooklyn	806	1167	1634	2018	2580	2698	2738
Rate/dec.		44.8	40.0	23.5	27.8	4.6	1.5
Bronx		201	431	732	1265	1394	1451
Rate/dec.			114.4	69.8	72.8	10.2	4.1
Queens		152	284	469	1079	1297	1550
Rate/dec.			86.8	65.1	130.1	20.2	19.5

⁵Grew by annexation

City	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950
GROUPS OF CITIES							
NY State- 4 ⁶ [Note 6]	572	717	878	1088	1237	1238	1242
Rate/dec.		25.4	22.5	23.9	13.7	.1	.3
Major Mid- Atlantic ⁷ [Note 7]	2147	2648	3135	3706	3953	3976	4236
Rate/dec.		23.3	18.4	18.2	6.7	.6	6.5
N. Jersey neighbors of NYC ⁸ [Note 8]	424	557	741	847	897	871	877
Rate/dec.		31.4	33.0	14.3	5.9	-2.9	.7

⁶Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany

⁷Boston, Providence, New Haven, Philadelphia, Baltimore

⁸Newark, Jersey City, Paterson

Populations, NYC and Comparison Cities, 1890-1998
 Ranked by 1900 populations
 Source: U.S. Census of Population, Decennial Volumes
 Population in (000)
 Growth rates are decennial, in %

TABLE II: 1960-98

City	1960	1970	1980	1990	1998		
NYC	7782	7895	7072	7323	7420		
Rate/dec	-1.4	1.5	-10.4	3.6	1.3		
Chicago	3550	3367	3005	2784	2802		
Rate/dec	-2.0	-5.2	-10.8	-7.4	.6		
Philadelph	2002	1949	1688	1586	1436		
Rate/dec	-3.4	-2.7	-13.4	-6.0	-9.5		
St Louis	750	622	453	394	339		
Rate/dec	-12.5	-17.1	-27.2	-12.4	-14.0		
Boston	697	641	563	574	555		
Rate/dec	-13.0	-8.0	-12.2	2.0	-3.3		
Baltimore	939	906	787	736	646		
Rate/dec	-1.2	-3.5	-13.1	-6.5	-12.2		
Pittsburgh	604	520	423	370	341		
Rate/dec	-10.8	-13.9	-18.7	-12.5	-7.8		
Cleveland	876	751	574	506	496		
Rate/dec	-4.3	-14.3	-23.6	-11.9	-2.0		
Buffalo	533	463	357	328	301		
Rate/dec	-8.1	-13.1	-22.9	-8.1	-8.2		
S Francisco	740	716	679	724	746		
Rate/dec	-4.5	-3.2	-5.2	6.6	-3.0		

City	1960	1970	1980	1990	1998		
Cincinnati	503	453	385	364	336		
Rate/dec	-.2	-9.9	-15.0	-5.5	-7.7		
Detroit	1670	1511	1203	1028	970		
Rate/dec	-9.7	-9.5	-20.4	-14.6	-5.6		
Milwaukee	741 ⁹	717	636	628	578		
Rate/dec	16.3	-3.2	-11.3	-1.3	-8.0		
Newark	405	382	329	278	268		
Rate/dec	-5.8	-5.7	-13.9	-15.5	-3.6		
Jersey City	276	261	224	228	232		
Rate/dec	-7.7	-5.4	-14.2	1.8	1.8		
Minneapolis	482	434	371	368	352		
Rate/dec	-7.7	-10.0	-14.5	-.8	4.3		
Providence	207	179	157		151		
Rate/dec	-16.9	-13.5	-12.3				
Kansas City	475	507	448	435	442		
Rate/dec	3.9	6.7	-11.6	-2.9	1.6		
Rochester	318	296	242	231	217		
Rate/dec	-4.2	-6.9	-18.2	-4.5	-6.1		
Columbus	471	540	564	633	670		
Rate/dec	25.3	14.6	4.4	12.2	5.8		
Toledo	318	384	355	333	312		
Rate/dec	4.6	20.8	-7.6	-6.2	-6.3		
Syracuse	216	197	170		152		
Rate/dec	-2.3	-8.8	-13.7				
New Haven	152				123		
Rate/dec	-7.3						

⁹Milwaukee annexed much land in this decade, under Mayor Frank Zeidler.

City	1960	1970	1980	1990	1998		
Paterson	144	145			148		
Rate/dec	3.6	.7					
Los Angeles	2479	2816	2966	3485	3598		
Rate/dec	25.8	13.6	5.3	17.5	3.2		
Albany	130				94.3		
Rate/dec	-3.7						
Dayton	262	244	203	182	167		
Rate/dec	0.0	-6.9	-16.8	-10.3	-8.2		
Hartford	162	158			131		
Rate/dec	-8.5	-2.5					
Yonkers	191	204	195	188	190		
Rate/dec	24.8	6.8	-4.4	-3.6	1.1		
Akron	290	275	237	223	216		
Rate/dec	5.5	-5.2	-13.8	-5.9	-3.1		
MAJOR BOROUGHES OF NYC							
Manhattan							
Rate/dec							
Brooklyn							
Rate/dec							
Bronx							
Rate/dec							
Queens							
Rate/dec							

City	1960	1970	1980	1990	1998		
GROUPS OF CITIES							
NY State - ¹⁰					764		
Rate/dec							
Major Mid-Atlantic ¹¹					2911		
Rate/dec							
Near neighbors of NYC ¹²					648		
Rate/dec							

¹⁰Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany

¹¹Boston, Providence, New Haven, Philadelphia, Baltimore

¹²Newark, Jersey City, Paterson