population in the 1950's while experiencing a marked change in racial composition. The facts of recent population change in the large cities suggest that the people of metropolitan areas are becoming increasingly distributed along economic and racial lines. Table 5 portrays the racial composition of recent population growth in the Nation's 22 largest cities—those with a 1960 population of 500,000 or more.4

To investigate the prevalence and extent of differences between central cities and suburbs in economic, social, and racial characteristis, the Commission undertook a special analysis of data from the 1960 census of population and housing. Census reports were used to find out "who lives where" in terms of the social and economic characteristics of the population. Residence within either central cities or the remainder of the metropolitan area was correlated for persons and families against 10 broad population characteristics: Race, age, mobility status, family composition, education, occupation, employment status, family income, housing characteristics, and commuting patterns.

Table 5.—White and nonwhite population of major cities, 1950 and 1960

City	Total population		Nonwhite population		Nonwhite as a percent of total population		Percent change in population 1950–60	
	1960	1950	1960	1950	1960	1950	White	Nonwhite
New York Chicago Los Angeles Philadelphia Detroit Baltimore Houston Cleveland Washington St. Louis Milwaukee Boston Dallas New Orleans Pittsburgh San Antonio San Diego Seattle Buffalo Cincinnati Honolulu San Francisco	7, 781, 984 3, 550, 404 2, 479, 015 2, 002, 512 1, 670, 144 938, 024 938, 219 876, 050 763, 956 750, 026 741, 324 607, 197 679, 684 627, 525 604, 332 587, 718 573, 224 557, 087 532, 759 502, 550 500, 409 740, 316	7, 891, 957 3, 620, 962 1, 970, 358 2, 071, 605 1, 849, 568 949, 708 596, 163 914, 808 802, 178 856, 796 637, 392 801, 444 434, 462 570, 445 676, 806 408, 442 334, 387 467, 591 580, 132 503, 998 353, 020 775, 357	1, 141, 322 837, 656 417, 207 535, 033 487, 174 328, 416 217, 672 253, 108 418, 693 216, 022 66, 752 68, 493 131, 211 234, 931 101, 739 43, 221 44, 712 46, 528 73, 388 109, 682 321, 548 135, 913	775, 516 509, 437 211, 585 378, 968 303, 721 226, 053 125, 660 149, 544 284, 313 154, 448 22, 742 42, 744 57, 263 182, 631 82, 981 29, 545 18, 364 27, 167 37, 700 78, 685 298, 311 81, 469	14. 7 23. 6 16. 8 26. 7 29. 2 35. 0 23. 2 28. 9 54. 8 28. 8 9. 8 19. 3 37. 4 7. 4 7. 4 7. 4 7. 4 13. 8 21. 8 64. 3 18. 3	9. 8 14. 1 10. 7 18. 3 16. 4 23. 8 21. 1 16. 3 35. 4 18. 0 3. 6 5. 3 13. 2 32. 0 12. 3 7. 2 5. 5 6. 5 15. 6 84. 5 10. 5	-6.7 -12.8 +17.2 -13.3 -23.5 -15.6 +53.1 -18.6 -33.3 -24.0 -17.1 +45.5 +1.2 -15.4 +43.7 +67.2 +15.9 -15.3 -7.6 +22.5	+47.2 +64.4 +97.2 +41.2 +60.4 +45.3 +73.2 +73.2 +47.3 +39.9 +189.1 +22.6 +46.3 +143.5 +71.

Source: Calculated from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "General Population Characteristics," PC(1)B reports of the 1960 Census of Population.

Taken together for an individual, these characteristics largely determine how he lives: With whom, in what kind of housing and neighborhood, doing what kind of work, the level of goods and services he can command, the social and economic position he may anticipate for his future. When these characteristics are aggregated and compared for central cities and their surrounding areas, they present a composite sketch of the population which provides insights into

A For a fuller description of the statistical analysis and a tabulation of results, see Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs (Washington: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, January 1965), app. B, pp. 207-253.