

THE BOOK OF THE STATES

**2002 EDITION
VOLUME 34**

**The Council of State Governments
Lexington, Kentucky**

ISBN 0-87292-877-2



7 80872 928770 >

Headquarters: (859) 244-8000

Fax: (859) 244-8001

Internet: www.csg.org



New State Demographic Divisions Revealed by Census 2000

By William H. Frey and Bill Abresch

Census 2000 data reveal a new set of patterns, featuring a new cast of demographic actors. States and regions have begun to steal the show from cities, suburbs and countryside. In this article, states are grouped into three broad categories according to their distinct demographic trajectories: the Melting Pot states, the New Sunbelt states and the Heartland states.

The results from Census 2000 point to emerging divisions in the demographic dynamics and population profiles across a new regional grouping of states. This stands in contrast to much of the 20th century, when the most noticeable demographic divisions could be found among central cities, suburbs and rural areas. The century saw blacks migrating from the Southern countryside to Northern cities in search of work and less rigidly enforced segregation, "white flight" from the central cities to the suburbs, the beginning of massive immigration from Asia and Latin America to a handful of gateway cities and sporadic "rural renaissances."

Census 2000 data reveal a new set of patterns, featuring a new cast of demographic actors. States and regions have begun to steal the show from cities, suburbs and countryside. The trend is toward declining demographic heterogeneity across the "borders" of cities, suburbs and their environs and, consequently, toward greater demographic homogeneity within states.

This insight permits us to group states into three broad categories according to their distinct demo-

graphic trajectories: the Melting Pot states, the New Sunbelt states and the Heartland states. For the Melting Pot states (such as California, New York and Texas), this trajectory is one of substantial, immigrant-driven growth, an increasingly multiethnic population and a youthful age structure. For the New Sunbelt states (such as Arizona, Nevada and Georgia), it is rapid growth driven by domestic migration, a native-born population of whites and blacks, and a suburban, middle-class ethos. For the Heartland states (such as Alabama, Kansas and Michigan), it is the aging of its mainly white population and a consequent baby-boomer domination of culture and politics. The remainder of this paper will look at the various aspects of these distinct trajectories in greater detail.

The Engines of Demographic Change

The 2000 Census marks the first time in the 20th century that every state's population grew. From a demographic perspective, there are three "engines" contributing to a state's population change: natural increase (births and deaths), domestic migration




Table A. Demographic Components of Change, 1990-2000

	Population			Components of change	
	Population, 1990	Population, 2000	Percent Change, 1990-2000	Net Immigration, 1990-1999	Net Domestic Migration, *1990-1999
United States	248,709,873	281,421,906	13.2%	7,306,765	0
MELTING POT STATES					
Alaska	550,043	626,932	14.0	8,650	-24,423
California	29,760,021	33,871,648	13.8	2,222,239	-2,152,382
Florida	12,937,926	15,982,378	23.5	629,692	1,053,298
Hawaii	1,108,229	1,211,537	9.3	52,844	-100,255
Illinois	11,430,602	12,419,293	8.6	376,277	-544,901
New Jersey	7,730,188	8,414,350	8.9	368,874	-365,226
New Mexico	1,515,069	1,819,046	20.1	37,515	42,239
New York	17,990,455	18,976,457	5.5	1,078,011	-1,836,029
Texas	16,986,510	20,851,820	22.8	699,780	570,383
NEW SUNBELT STATES					
Arizona	3,665,228	5,130,632	40.0	103,667	575,303
Colorado	3,294,394	4,301,261	30.6	64,306	402,582
Delaware	666,168	783,600	17.6	9,118	33,765
Georgia	6,478,216	8,186,453	26.4	103,884	653,213
Idaho	1,006,749	1,293,953	28.5	17,724	133,976
Nevada	1,201,833	1,998,257	66.3	54,755	420,216
North Carolina	6,628,637	8,049,313	21.4	57,149	541,196
Oregon	2,842,321	3,421,399	20.4	64,914	261,418
South Carolina	3,486,703	4,012,012	15.1	18,210	136,917
Tennessee	4,877,185	5,689,283	16.7	29,928	350,823
Utah	1,722,850	2,233,169	29.6	29,769	73,986
Virginia	6,187,358	7,078,515	14.4	142,510	87,912
Washington	4,866,692	5,894,121	21.1	144,514	361,709
HEARTLAND STATES					
Alabama	4,040,587	4,447,100	10.1	13,898	109,522
Arkansas	2,350,725	2,673,400	13.7	10,017	109,710
Connecticut	3,287,116	3,405,565	3.6	71,367	-220,328
District of Columbia	606,900	572,059	-5.7	29,137	-141,469
Indiana	5,544,159	6,080,485	9.7	28,649	81,271
Iowa	2,776,755	2,926,324	5.4	20,750	-14,321
Kansas	2,477,574	2,688,418	8.5	27,656	-14,427
Kentucky	3,685,296	4,041,769	9.7	15,631	96,278
Louisiana	4,219,973	4,468,976	5.9	25,101	-128,574
Maine	1,227,928	1,274,923	3.8	3,826	-8,819
Maryland	4,781,468	5,296,486	10.8	128,958	-58,541
Massachusetts	6,016,425	6,349,097	5.5	143,499	-232,157
Michigan	9,295,297	9,938,444	6.9	98,354	-193,640
Minnesota	4,375,099	4,919,479	12.4	54,165	86,206
Mississippi	2,573,216	2,844,658	10.5	6,719	46,649
Missouri	5,117,073	5,595,211	9.3	37,661	99,893
Montana	799,065	902,195	12.9	2,725	48,471
Nebraska	1,578,385	1,711,263	8.4	14,892	-3,067
New Hampshire	1,109,252	1,235,786	11.4	6,900	29,730
North Dakota	638,800	642,200	0.5	5,245	-34,922
Ohio	10,847,115	11,353,140	4.7	51,955	-162,268
Oklahoma	3,145,585	3,450,654	9.7	28,051	45,881
Pennsylvania	11,881,643	12,281,054	3.4	111,849	-247,881
Rhode Island	1,003,464	1,048,319	4.5	15,895	-62,501
South Dakota	696,004	754,844	8.5	4,843	-2,193
Vermont	562,758	608,827	8.2	4,849	5,116
West Virginia	1,793,477	1,808,344	0.8	3,351	-4,029
Wisconsin	4,891,769	5,363,675	9.6	24,526	89,068
Wyoming	453,588	493,782	8.9	1,966	-2,436

Source: U.S. Census 2000, U.S. Census Bureau estimates; <http://www.CensusScope.org>.

(movement across state borders) and international immigration (movement across national borders). The states of the Melting Pot, the New Sunbelt and the Heartland are sharply divided by these demographic components of change.

Melting Pot states are growing primarily from international immigration, and most of them have large domestic outflows. Throughout the 1990s, for instance, California lost 2,152,382 of its residents to other states. Nevertheless, it grew by 13.8 percent, largely due to its 2,222,239 foreign immigrants.

In the New Sunbelt states, domestic migration drives growth. Nevada, for instance, gained 420,216 domestic migrants, compared to just 54,755 foreign immigrants. This influx made Nevada the nation's growth leader, with a 66.3 percent increase over the 1990s. The New Sunbelt as a whole had five times as many domestic migrants as foreign immigrants and experienced a 23.8 percent rate of growth, compared to 14.2 percent for the Melting Pot states and 7.3 percent for the Heartland states. The New Sunbelt states' gains are the flip side of the Melting Pot states' domestic losses: native Californians, for example, moving to Colorado and Nevada.

The Heartland states are showing only modest growth. These states are not attracting many immigrants (the Heartland as a whole attracted fewer than New York alone). Many of these states are losing migrants to other states; none is experiencing a large influx of new residents. In Pennsylvania, for example, there was not much population gain at all during the 1990s.

The Melting Pot States

People who say that we are a nation of immigrants are really talking about the Melting Pot states. People who say that we are now entering a new era of diversity really mean that the Melting Pot states are experiencing a new era of diversity. So-called "national trends" often apply mostly to these states.

The immigrants driving the Melting Pot states' growth are mainly from Asia and Latin America, but each Melting Pot state's ethnic mix is unique. The next 10 to 20 years will see the continued development of different melting pots in different parts of the country, rather than the formation of a single, national melting pot.

When trying to characterize a particular Melting Pot state, one needs to look beyond its racial composition and talk about particular ethnic groups, immigrant waves and national origins. In New York, 36.4 percent of Hispanics are Puerto Rican and 9.3 percent are of Mexican origin. In California, 77.2 percent of the Hispanic population is Mexican, with only 1.2 percent

Puerto Rican. Florida's Hispanic population, on the other hand, is 31 percent Cuban. New York and California both have large Asian populations, but while 40.6 percent of New York's Asian population is Chinese, only 26.5 percent of California's is. And while California's Asian population is 24.8 percent Filipino, Filipinos account for only 7.8 percent of New York's Asian population. It behooves politicians and policy-makers to remember that nobody comes to the United States as an Asian or a Hispanic – but as a Thai, Japanese, Mexican, or Nicaraguan – and later generations may never identify with such a broad group. The politics, culture and economy of each Melting Pot state is and will continue to be unique and irreducible to a common pattern of ethnic interaction.

The marked differences between the various Melting Pot states are in part due to our immigration policy, which since 1965 has made family reunification a priority. Thus, immigration has occurred in chains linking prospective immigrants to related co-nationals in the United States. Moreover, new immigrants want to live in areas where they can find the social networks and informal relationships that will connect them to jobs and friends.

The New Sunbelt

The New Sunbelt states might be termed "America's suburbs." They are not suburbs in the old-fashioned sense of a ring around the city, but areas where much of the population has a suburban demographic character, in the classic sense. They are made up of mostly white – or in the South, white and black – middle-class residents who want to live in a low-density environment with good schools for their children, and also, perhaps, not as much federal-government involvement in their lives. By and large, these native-born whites and blacks are not leaving the Melting Pots for the New Sunbelt states to get away from immigrants. They are moving for better job opportunities, cheaper living and more placid, less urban lifestyles.

The 2000 Census shows that for the first time in quite a while there are more whites living in non-metropolitan areas than there are in central cities. Whites are largely a suburban population in the United States, but they are moving to the outskirts of the suburbs and now to rural or nonmetropolitan areas, which is very distinct from the nonwhite population. The growth of the white population in the New Sunbelt, and also in other parts of the country, is going to be increasingly of this ex-urban type of growth, and this is part of the allure of the New Sunbelt.

Another part of this story of domestic migration to the New Sunbelt states is the return of blacks to the

South. The black population growth in the South is twice as big as it was for the 1980s or the 1970s. Blacks started to move to the South again in the 1970s, but it was really the 1990s when the influx became a surge. Middle-class blacks, baby-boomer and post-baby-boomer blacks are seeing the South as a place to come to because in cities like Atlanta and Charlotte, there is a significant black middle-class population to serve as a social, professional and political network. In these areas, we also see blacks moving to the suburbs and into more integrated neighborhoods. In many Southern areas, there was a significant decline in black-white segregation throughout the 1990s, in part because there are a lot of middle-class blacks moving to these areas. This Southward migration is going to continue, especially as baby-boomer blacks begin to retire in the next decade. Black retirees will be much more likely to go to the South than to other regions of the country.

The Heartland

There has been much misplaced attention given to the extraordinarily high population-growth rates for Hispanics and Asians in Heartland states. Many have noted that Arkansas' Hispanic population grew an astonishing 337 percent during the 1990s or that Michigan's Asian population grew by 71 percent. But Hispanics still account for only 3.2 percent of Arkansas' total population, and Asians account for only 1.8 percent of Michigan's total population.

For decision makers, the real story revolves around native-born whites and blacks – mainly whites – who are staying put. Taken as a group, the Heartland states are 81 percent white and 12 percent black. Little of these states' modest growth is due to domestic or international in-migration. It is indicative that 78 percent of Pennsylvania's population was born in-state, compared with only 24 percent of Nevada's. Since the white population has a relatively low birth rate, and younger whites are more likely to leave for the New Sunbelt or Melting Pot states, the aging-in-place of long-time residents is key to understanding the Heartland's demographic development.

Race, Aging and Families

Not only does each group of states have its own ethnic mix, but their different sources of growth – immigration, domestic migration and aging-in-place – are giving each group of states its own age structure.

California's population is disproportionately young due to the youth of most immigrants and high birth rates among the immigrant population. This large number of people who are or will soon be of childbearing age provides a very broad base for California's "population

pyramid" (see Figure B), ensuring the state continues growth even if economic slow-downs or restrictive policy changes were to stem the flow of new immigrants.

The very different character of Nevada's growth is evident in its pyramid's much higher center of gravity. High rates of domestic migration have given it very large middle-aged and elderly populations, but most of these people are beyond their prime childbearing years. Should domestic migration fall off, Nevada would begin to age-in-place, rather than continue its presently explosive growth.

Pennsylvania has a typical Heartland age structure. While its pyramid has a slight baby-boomer bulge, the size of its elderly population is remarkably similar to that of its child and childbearing populations. This means that births will often be offset by deaths. Coupled with low rates of immigration and domestic migration, this means that Pennsylvania's growth will be slow.

These different trajectories can be understood by looking at the behavior of particular generations. The baby boomers are now relatively sedentary and are nesting, whereas the younger part of the population, be they immigrants or domestic migrants, are moving to other parts of the country. This means that states with the largest share of baby boomers tend to be in the Heartland. Within metropolitan areas, baby boomers tend to be on the outer parts of the metropolitan area. Of the 75 counties in the United States with the highest percentage of baby boomers, half of them are non-metropolitan counties, and a good part of the others are suburban counties. Marin County, California; Falls Church, Virginia; Putnam County, New York – well-off suburban counties – are among those with high percentages of baby boomers. So baby-boom nesting areas are places that are either not growing very fast or are too expensive for a lot of the Gen-Xers to move into.

In contrast, we can look at places with the fastest Gen-X growth over the 1990's. Gen-Xers are people born between 1966 and 1980 – aged roughly 20 to 35 years at the time of the 2000 Census. They are moving to the New Sunbelt, but also to Melting Pot states, because a lot of the Gen-Xers are immigrants and because there is a lot of job growth in these areas. By and large, these are not the places where the baby boomers are nesting. The places that have the fastest Gen-X growth are places like Las Vegas, Austin and Raleigh-Durham – places that have high-tech development going on and are very attractive culturally to Gen-Xers.

These differences in age structure interact with the differences in ethnic mixes to create new political and policy challenges and opportunities. In the Melting Pot states, the racial composition is changing much more

Table B. Racial Composition of the States, 2000


	Non-Hispanic							Two or More Races
	Hispanic	White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Other	
United States	12.5%	69.1%	12.1%	0.7%	3.6%	0.1%	0.2%	1.6%
MILITARY PORT STATES								
Alaska	4.1	67.6	3.4	15.4	3.9	0.5	0.2	4.9
California	32.4	46.7	6.4	0.5	10.8	0.3	0.2	2.7
Florida	16.8	65.4	14.2	0.3	1.6	0.0	0.2	1.5
Hawaii	7.2	22.9	1.7	0.2	40.8	9.0	0.2	18.1
Illinois	12.3	67.8	14.9	0.1	3.4	0.0	0.1	1.2
New Jersey	13.3	66.0	13.0	0.1	5.7	0.0	0.2	1.6
New Mexico	42.1	44.7	1.7	8.9	1.0	0.1	0.2	1.4
New York	15.1	62.0	14.8	0.3	5.5	0.0	0.4	1.9
Texas	32.0	52.4	11.3	0.3	2.7	0.1	0.1	1.1
NEW SUNBELT STATES								
Arizona	25.3	63.8	2.9	4.5	1.7	0.1	0.1	1.5
Colorado	17.1	74.5	3.7	0.7	2.2	0.1	0.1	1.7
Delaware	4.8	72.5	18.9	0.3	2.1	0.0	0.1	1.3
Georgia	5.3	62.6	28.5	0.2	2.1	0.0	0.1	1.1
Idaho	7.9	88.0	0.4	1.2	0.9	0.1	0.1	1.4
Nevada	19.7	65.2	6.6	1.1	4.4	0.4	0.1	2.5
North Carolina	4.7	70.2	21.4	1.2	1.4	0.0	0.1	1.0
Oregon	8.0	83.5	1.6	1.2	2.9	0.2	0.1	2.4
South Carolina	2.4	66.1	29.4	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.8
Tennessee	2.2	79.2	16.3	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.1	1.0
Utah	9.6	85.3	0.7	1.2	1.6	0.7	0.1	1.4
Virginia	4.7	70.2	19.4	0.3	3.7	0.0	0.2	1.6
Washington	7.5	78.9	3.1	1.4	5.4	0.4	0.2	3.0
HEARTLAND STATES								
Alabama	1.7	70.3	25.9	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.9
Arkansas	3.2	78.6	15.6	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.0	1.1
Connecticut	9.4	77.5	8.7	0.2	2.4	0.0	0.2	1.6
District of Columbia	7.9	27.8	59.4	0.2	2.6	0.0	0.3	1.7
Indiana	3.5	85.8	8.3	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.1	1.0
Iowa	2.8	92.6	2.1	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.9
Kansas	7.0	83.1	5.6	0.8	1.7	0.0	0.1	1.6
Kentucky	1.5	89.3	7.3	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.9
Louisiana	2.4	62.5	32.3	0.5	1.7	0.0	0.1	0.9
Maine	0.7	96.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.9
Maryland	4.3	62.1	27.7	0.3	4.0	0.0	0.2	1.6
Massachusetts	6.5	81.9	5.0	0.2	3.7	0.0	0.1	1.7
Michigan	3.3	78.6	14.1	0.5	1.8	0.0	0.1	1.6
Minnesota	2.9	88.2	3.4	1.1	2.9	0.0	0.1	1.4
Mississippi	1.4	60.7	36.2	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6
Missouri	2.1	83.8	11.2	0.4	1.1	0.1	0.1	1.3
Montana	2.0	89.5	0.3	6.0	0.5	0.0	0.1	1.5
Nebraska	5.5	87.3	3.9	0.8	1.3	0.0	0.1	1.0
New Hampshire	1.7	95.1	0.7	0.2	1.3	0.0	0.1	0.9
North Dakota	1.2	91.7	0.6	4.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.0
Ohio	1.9	84.0	11.4	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.1	1.2
Oklahoma	5.7	74.1	7.5	7.7	1.3	0.1	0.1	4.1
Pennsylvania	3.2	84.1	9.8	0.1	1.8	0.0	0.1	0.9
Rhode Island	8.7	81.9	4.0	0.4	2.2	0.0	0.8	2.0
South Dakota	1.4	88.0	0.6	8.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.2
Vermont	0.9	96.2	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.1	1.1
West Virginia	0.7	94.6	3.1	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.8
Wisconsin	3.6	87.3	5.6	0.8	1.6	0.0	0.1	1.0
Wyoming	0.4	88.9	0.7	2.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	1.2

Source: U.S. Census 2000. <http://www.census.gov/c2k00>

Figure B. Age Structures of Representative States


California (Melting Pot)

Age Distribution, 2000




Nevada (New Sunbelt)

Age Distribution, 2000



Pennsylvania (The Heartland)

Age Distribution, 2000



Source: <http://www.CensusScope.org> analysis of Census 2000 data.

Table C. Racial Composition of Child and Adult Populations for Selected Races, 2000

	Under Age 18				Age 18 and Over			
	Non-Hispanic				Non-Hispanic			
	Hispanic	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Black	Asian
United States	17.1%	60.9%	14.7%	3.3%	11.0%	72.0%	11.2%	3.7%
MELTING POT STATES								
Alaska	5.4	58.8	3.6	3.4	3.6	71.4	3.2	4.2
California	43.8	34.8	7.1	9.3	28.1	51.1	6.2	11.3
Florida	19.3	55.4	20.6	1.7	16.1	68.4	12.3	1.6
Hawaii	11.9	15.0	1.8	29.0	5.7	25.4	1.7	44.6
Illinois	17.0	59.2	18.5	3.0	10.7	70.9	13.7	3.5
New Jersey	16.2	59.4	15.6	5.9	12.3	68.2	12.2	5.6
New Mexico	50.9	32.5	1.7	0.8	38.7	49.5	1.7	1.1
New York	19.0	54.6	17.8	5.0	13.8	64.4	13.8	5.6
Texas	40.5	42.6	12.4	2.4	28.6	56.3	10.9	2.8
NEW SUNBELT STATES								
Arizona	36.1	49.6	3.4	1.5	21.3	69.0	2.7	1.8
Colorado	23.5	66.2	4.3	2.1	14.9	77.3	3.5	2.2
Delaware	7.0	64.2	23.7	2.0	4.0	75.2	17.4	2.1
Georgia	6.3	55.5	34.1	2.0	5.0	65.2	26.4	2.1
Idaho	11.6	83.4	0.4	0.7	6.4	89.9	0.4	1.0
Nevada	28.6	54.0	8.0	3.6	16.7	69.1	6.1	4.7
North Carolina	6.1	62.5	26.2	1.6	4.3	72.6	19.9	1.3
Oregon	12.7	76.3	1.9	2.9	6.5	85.9	1.4	3.0
South Carolina	2.8	58.0	36.4	0.8	2.2	68.8	27.0	0.9
Tennessee	2.8	73.0	21.1	1.0	2.0	81.2	14.8	1.0
Utah	10.9	82.4	0.8	1.2	8.1	86.6	0.7	1.8
Virginia	5.9	64.0	23.1	3.5	4.2	72.2	18.3	3.7
Washington	11.7	71.5	3.7	5.0	6.0	81.5	2.9	5.6
HEARTLAND STATES								
Alabama	2.2	63.3	31.8	0.7	1.5	72.7	23.8	0.7
Arkansas	4.7	71.3	20.6	0.7	2.8	81.0	13.9	0.8
Connecticut	13.7	69.6	11.1	2.5	8.0	80.1	7.9	2.4
District of Columbia	9.9	11.9	74.3	1.5	7.3	31.8	55.7	2.9
Indiana	4.8	81.6	10.3	0.9	3.1	87.3	7.6	1.0
Iowa	4.5	88.8	2.9	1.4	2.3	93.9	1.8	1.2
Kansas	10.4	77.0	6.9	1.7	5.8	85.3	5.2	1.7
Kentucky	1.9	86.3	8.9	0.7	1.3	90.2	6.7	0.7
Louisiana	2.5	54.6	39.7	1.2	2.4	65.5	29.5	1.2
Maine	1.2	94.6	0.8	0.9	0.6	97.1	0.4	0.7
Maryland	5.3	55.9	31.9	3.7	4.0	64.2	26.2	4.1
Massachusetts	10.5	75.2	6.5	3.9	5.6	83.9	4.6	3.7
Michigan	4.8	72.4	17.3	1.8	2.7	80.7	13.0	1.7
Minnesota	4.3	82.0	4.9	4.2	2.4	90.3	2.9	2.4
Mississippi	1.6	51.6	44.7	0.6	1.3	64.2	33.0	0.6
Missouri	3.0	78.9	14.3	1.0	3.8	85.4	10.1	1.1
Montana	3.2	83.9	0.4	0.5	1.6	91.5	0.3	0.5
Nebraska	8.3	81.8	5.3	1.3	4.5	89.3	3.5	1.3
New Hampshire	2.5	93.4	0.8	1.3	1.4	95.7	0.6	1.3
North Dakota	2.0	86.6	0.8	0.6	1.0	93.5	0.5	0.6
Ohio	2.8	79.2	14.2	1.1	1.6	85.7	10.4	1.2
Oklahoma	7.9	64.6	9.3	1.2	4.3	77.4	6.8	1.4
Pennsylvania	5.1	78.2	12.7	1.9	2.6	85.9	8.9	1.7
Rhode Island	14.1	72.7	5.5	2.7	7.0	84.7	3.5	2.1
South Dakota	2.2	80.6	0.8	0.6	1.2	90.8	0.5	0.6
Vermont	1.2	94.7	0.7	1.0	0.8	96.6	0.4	0.8
West Virginia	1.0	93.0	3.6	0.5	0.6	95.0	3.0	0.5
Wisconsin	5.5	80.4	8.3	2.6	2.9	89.6	4.7	1.3
Wyoming	9.0	84.7	0.8	0.4	5.5	90.3	0.7	0.6

Source: U.S. Census 2000

dramatically for the younger segment of the population than for the older segment, because the immigrant population tends to be younger and have higher fertility. In California, 65 percent of the children are non-Anglo, compared to 49 percent of the adults. If you look at projections for California in the year 2025, only the elderly population is going to be mostly white. The working-age and child populations will be mostly multiethnic. Along with that age structure will be a different kind of social-economic dynamic in California and other Melting Pot states than the dynamics in a lot of New Sunbelt or Heartland states.

This racial generation gap also means that the cities with the highest percentage of married couples with children are places like Santa Ana, California; El Paso, Texas; and Riverside, California – not the kinds of places that *Leave it to Beaver* and *Ozzie and Harriet* took place in back in the 1950s. These are the cities, because the Hispanic population tends to have higher levels of family households than the white or black populations. This distinction may introduce new racial overtones to existing conflicts over resources between parents, who care about schools and aid to children, and the elderly, who care about health care and Social Security. On the other hand, the long-standing necessity of intergenerational compromise and collaboration in the political arena may bridge racial divides that would otherwise simply be ignored.

Apportionment, Redistricting and Voting

Their different sources of growth also confront these different groups of states with new issues relating to political representation. The apportionment and redistricting of congressional seats are determined by population growth, whatever its source. However, the right to vote in national – and usually local – elections is extended only to adult citizens.

Large numbers of immigrants are benefiting many of the Melting Pot states in terms of apportionment. California and New York, for instance, lead the country with 15.69 percent and 10.95 percent of their populations non-citizens, respectively. These immigrants, however, do not necessarily get represented politically. Issues of fairness are likely to be raised on two fronts. On the one hand, is it fair that people who cannot vote are disproportionately affecting the congressional seats allocated to some states? On the other hand, is it fair that some states – and, even more, some congressional districts – have so many people who have no clout at

the polling booth? While many of the Hispanics and Asians living in Melting Pot states are citizens, these questions of fairness will be hard to avoid if intergenerational conflicts come to be inflected by a racial generation gap.

(See also Ronald Weber's essay on redistricting in Chapter 6.)

Conclusion

These diverse trends that are driving states toward the distinct demographic profiles of Melting Pot, New Sunbelt and Heartland states will affect state governments on several levels. Policy-makers will need to respond to their states' particular sources of growth, whether it be integrating new immigrants, keeping pace with domestic influxes and sprawl or looking after their aging populations. Political actors will need to anticipate racial overtones to conflicting interests within and between the states and remain mindful of new questions of fairness in representing their constituencies. While each state's demographic trajectory is unique and invites unique responses, across the nation, many demographic trends that were once important mainly to city planners and politicians are becoming genuinely statewide issues.

References

- Frey, William H., Bill Abresch and Jonathan Yeasting. *America by the Numbers: A Field Guide to the U.S. Population*. New York: New Press, 2001.
- Frey, William H. "Metro Magnets for Minorities and Whites: Melting Pots, The New Sunbelt, and the Heartland." Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center, Research Report No. 02-496, February 2002.
- Frey, William H. "Melting Pot Suburbs. A Census 2000 Study of Suburban Diversity." Brookings Census 2000 Series, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy, June 2001.
- Frey, William H. "Census 2000 Shows Large Black Return to the South, Reinforcing the Region's 'White-Black' Demographic Profile." Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center, Research Report No. 01-473, May 2001.
- Social Science Data Analysis Network, University of Michigan. *CensusScope Web Page*. <<http://www.CensusScope.org>>.
- U.S. Census Bureau Web Page. <<http://www.census.gov>>.

About the Authors

William H. Frey is a demographer on the faculty of the University of Michigan Population Studies Center and is a senior fellow at the Milken Institute in Santa Monica, CA (see <http://www.frey-demographer.org>). **Bill Abresch** is an associate of the Social Science Data Analysis Network at the University of Michigan.