

THE DISTRIBUTION OF ABILITY IN THE UNITED STATES.



SOME time ago there appeared in "The Nineteenth Century" an article entitled "The Distribution of Ability in England." The writer had taken a dictionary of contemporary biography and had classified all the Englishmen therein mentioned according to the occupation in which they had attained distinction, and then by the counties in which they were born. In this way he was able to show in what proportion the counties of England had produced men of distinction and in what department these men had gained eminence. This article suggested to me the idea of writing one of a similar character showing the distribution of ability in the United States by States, and also by race-extraction, which I felt sure would have an even greater interest than the classification made by the English writer, because it was possible here to cover the entire history of a rapidly growing country, and because American States are necessarily far more distinct and important social and political divisions than counties could possibly be. I therefore took Appleton's "Encyclopedia of American Biography" in six volumes, one of the largest and most recent works upon the subject, and classified the persons mentioned therein who were citizens of the United States according to occupation, birthplace, and race-extraction.

I began this work, which has proved much larger and more laborious than I anticipated, with a feeling of curiosity. But when I had obtained my results I found that they went much further than the satisfaction of a merely curious inquiry. I am satisfied, and I think any one who will examine the tables which follow will be equally satisfied, that the results obtained have a great deal of historical value. The number of names classified and tabulated reaches 14,243, not including the immigrant table, and a number so large includes virtually all the men and women who by their ability have raised themselves even slightly above the general level. The method of classification which I have adopted shows what communities have produced the men who have

governed the country and fought its battles, who have educated it and influenced its thought, who have produced its literature, art, and science, and who have made the inventions which in some instances have affected the history of the United States and of mankind.

The classification according to birthplace is as absolutely accurate as is possible in tallying such a large number of names. There are a few instances in which the birthplace was unknown, and these have of necessity been omitted. There are many cases in which the birthplace may be said to have been accidental, and where the person in question had no real connection either by parentage, ancestry, or subsequent career with the State in which he was born. I found it impossible to fix any rule in regard to these cases if I once departed from the actual place of birth as a test. I determined therefore to exercise no discretion in the matter, but to credit to each State every one who was born within its borders, no matter whether their parentage and subsequent career connected them with that State or not, and as I am satisfied that these cases in a large degree balance each other I do not think the accuracy of the general result is affected. To this general rule I have made but a single exception. Edgar Allan Poe was born in Boston, but it would have been such a manifest absurdity to credit him to Massachusetts that I have given him to Maryland, to which State he of course really belonged.

While it was possible to be absolutely accurate in regard to the place of birth, and practically so in regard to the occupation or profession, it was not possible to be more than approximately correct on the question of race-extraction. In the first place it was necessary to make the race classification according to the paternal line alone, which is of course partial and, if the French saying that "*les races se feminisent*" be true, is also a misleading arrangement. At the same time, as will be readily seen, it is the only method possible, and moreover the errors arising in this way in large measure balance one another. Taking, therefore, the paternal line as the one to fix race origin, it is less difficult than might be supposed to determine what the race

origin is. In a large number of cases, especially where the extraction is not English, the race stock is given in the dictionary. In a still larger number of instances the name and the place of birth furnish unmistakable evidence as to race. That error should be avoided in this classification is not to be expected, but I am perfectly satisfied that the race distribution is in the main correct. Such errors as exist tend, I think, here as elsewhere in these statistics to balance one another, and the net result is, I believe, so substantially accurate as to have very real value, and to throw a great deal of light on what we owe in the way of ability to each of the various races who settled the United States.

The classification which I have described thus far shows only the quantity, and has no bearing upon the quality of ability. The arrangement of the dictionary, however, furnished me with methods of estimating and distributing ability by quality as well as quantity. A small portrait inserted in the text is given of each person who attained more than ordinary distinction, and my examination satisfies me that these portraits have been in the main so judiciously distributed as to enable us to use them as a test of quality and as constituting a class. To the persons having a small portrait I have given a single star, and in the following tables there will be found a classification of these names under that head. A further but much less valuable classification of the same sort I have given of those to whom were awarded full-page steel engravings. This, I say, is less valuable from the fact that these large portraits do not appear to have been distributed simply on the ground of ability and eminence. For example, an arrangement which gives a place to William Gilmore Simms and shuts out Hawthorne, Poe, and Lowell in the field of literature is manifestly of little weight. In the same way a classification which of necessity includes Tyler, Pierce, and Fillmore, and which omits Jay, Taney, and Chase because they did not happen to be Presidents, is quite misleading as an index of the quality of ability represented. At the same time there is something to be learned from the distribution of these large portraits, especially as their race classification is perfectly accurate, and I have therefore given the persons who have had them a double star and have made a table in which they are classified by State and race.

I have also classified by race and occupation all persons of foreign birth who have gained distinction in this country. I have treated as immigrants all persons who came to the United States after the adoption of the Constitution. It was, of course, necessary to draw the line dividing the immigrant from the original settler

at some definite point, and for this purpose I took 1789 as the most convenient date. This table, to which I have appended one covering all negroes mentioned in the dictionary, is, of course, accurate, and will, I think, be found to have an especial value as showing the countries to which we are indebted for ability among our immigrants, and also in what directions that ability has been displayed.

The total number of names classified, apart from the table last described, is, as I have said, 14,243, and these are divided among the States as follows:

TABLE A.

TOTALS BY STATES.

Massachusetts	2,686
New York	2,605
Pennsylvania	1,827
Connecticut	1,196
Virginia	1,038
Maryland	512
New Hampshire	510
New Jersey	474
Maine	414
South Carolina	398
Ohio	364
Vermont	359
Kentucky	320
North Carolina	300
Rhode Island	291
Georgia	202
Tennessee	136
Delaware	115
Indiana	113
District of Columbia	75
Louisiana	68
Illinois	59
Michigan	44
Missouri	39
Alabama	34
Mississippi	26
Florida	12
Wisconsin	12
California	5
Iowa	5
Arkansas	3
Texas	1
	14,243

TOTALS BY GROUPS.¹

New England States	5456
Massachusetts	2686
Connecticut	1196
New Hampshire	510
Maine	414
Vermont	359
Rhode Island	291
	5456
Middle States	5021
New York	2605
Pennsylvania	1827

¹ I have here, and throughout this article, included in the Middle States New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, giving Maryland to the Southern group, to which it properly belongs by settlement, history, population, and, in the main, occupations. For the same reason I have given Kentucky to the Southern, and Missouri to the Western group.

New Jersey	474	
Delaware	115	
	<hr/>	5021
Southern States		3125
Virginia	1038	
Maryland	512	
South Carolina	398	
Kentucky	320	
North Carolina	300	
Georgia	202	
Tennessee	136	
District of Columbia	75	
Louisiana	68	
Alabama	34	
Mississippi	26	
Florida	12	
Arkansas	3	
Texas	1	
	<hr/>	3125
Western States		641
Ohio	364	
Indiana	113	
Illinois	59	
Michigan	44	
Missouri	39	
Wisconsin	12	
California	5	
Iowa	5	
	<hr/>	641

The foregoing table needs no comment, but the next, which distributes the totals according to race, requires, perhaps, a few words of explanation. The term Scotch-Irish is well understood in this country, and I have therefore used it, but it is so far from accurate as an ethnic description that it is almost a misnomer. The English phrase of "Ulstermen" is unfortunately no better. The people called Scotch-Irish in the United States are descendants of the Scotch and English who settled in the north of Ireland, and who made themselves famous by their defense of Londonderry. In some instances there was an infusion of Irish blood, but for the most part these people were of pure Scotch (both lowland and highland) and English stock and were ardent Protestants. Their heaviest emigration to America began about 1729 and continued with fluctuating numbers until 1774. They have played a great part in the United States, as will be seen by the detailed tables presently to be given.

The Huguenots cover of course the Protestant French who came here during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, either direct from France, or by way of England and Holland, where they had first taken refuge. They are quite distinct from those classified simply as French, who are descended as a rule from the original settlers of Louisiana, Missouri, and Illinois, from soldiers who came with Rochambeau, or from refugees who fled here from San Domingo in 1792.

The Welsh enumeration is undoubtedly im-

perfect. I have included all described as of Welsh origin, and all others where the Welsh extraction was obvious, but there are certainly many Welshmen whom it was impossible to distinguish either by name or place of birth, and who are therefore counted among the English.

The Irish may seem surprisingly few, but as there was virtually no Irish immigration during the colonial period, and indeed none of consequence until the present century was well advanced, no other result could have been looked for.

All the other race divisions are, I feel satisfied, substantially accurate, except, perhaps, for a slight margin of error in each case in favor of the English. It is possible that the Scotch-Irish have benefited at the expense of the Scotch pure and simple, owing to identity of name, but the two classes include virtually all persons of Scotch descent given in the dictionary. The division of the total number by races is as follows:

TABLE B.
TOTALS BY RACE.

English	10,376
Scotch-Irish	1439
German	659
Huguenot	589
Scotch	436
Dutch	336
Welsh	159
Irish	109
French	85
Scandinavian	31
Spanish	7
Italian	7
Swiss	5
Greek	3
Russian	1
Polish	1
	<hr/>
	14,243

The next two tables, C and D, give the State and race divisions, with the distribution in each case according to professions or occupations, showing in what directions the ability of the States and races has been manifested. A few words only are needed to explain the classification. "Statesmen" includes not only persons who have held public office, but all who as reformers, agitators, or in any other capacity have distinguished themselves in public affairs. "Clergy" covers not only ordained ministers and missionaries, but all who have been conspicuous in any religious movement, and many of those included under this head, it may be added, have attained distinction in other fields, chiefly as writers. "Literature" covers all who have distinguished themselves as writers and includes journalists. "Musicians" includes singers, players, and composers. All the other titles are, I think, self-explanatory.

TABLE C.

	Statesmen.	Soldiers.	Clergy.	Lawyers.	Physicians.	Literature.	Art.	Science.	Educators.	Navy.	Business.	Philanthropy.	Pioneers and Explorers.	Inventors.	Engineers.	Architects.	Musicians.	Actors.	Totals.
Massachusetts.....	255	246	493	235	167	538	89	131	136	52	118	61	33	43	22	13	33	21	2,686
New York.....	259	331	366	304	130	388	147	122	110	78	140	51	21	40	54	15	155	34	2,605
Pennsylvania.....	202	236	306	178	153	227	67	92	52	63	112	34	21	13	35	7	8	22	1,827
Connecticut.....	147	102	270	127	67	184	33	37	76	23	49	16	18	12	1	8	10	1	1,196
Virginia.....	271	234	121	129	46	83	4	12	29	43	10	10	39	2	4	1,038
Maryland.....	110	64	84	39	40	54	13	14	8	48	16	4	5	3	5	1	...	4	512
New Hampshire.....	97	47	65	55	29	93	15	15	34	17	14	4	3	11	3	3	510
New Jersey.....	79	46	98	61	34	35	10	12	22	22	19	8	5	9	9	1	474
Maine.....	55	53	49	39	19	83	16	21	28	18	14	4	2	5	414
South Carolina.....	106	69	46	51	26	40	7	14	9	16	6	1	2	2	398
Ohio.....	63	83	32	18	19	59	20	11	21	11	8	3	1	7	5	2	364
Vermont.....	52	36	60	44	22	50	14	14	25	5	11	5	3	11	2	2	3	...	359
Kentucky.....	70	71	30	49	19	33	4	11	4	30	4	3	3	3	3	320
North Carolina.....	108	59	39	41	12	18	...	2	2	8	4	4	300
Rhode Island.....	68	25	31	24	17	42	8	8	7	22	16	8	8	2	3	291
Georgia.....	52	36	17	37	18	17	1	5	7	8	1	2	202
Tennessee.....	47	32	15	18	4	8	...	3	2	3	2	136
Delaware.....	31	12	15	12	11	12	2	3	...	9	5	...	1	1	1	115
Indiana.....	23	32	4	6	7	19	2	3	6	4	5	3	113
District of Columbia.....	5	22	1	5	5	13	2	3	2	11	2	1	3	75
Louisiana.....	10	7	3	8	3	14	1	6	1	6	5	3	...	68
Illinois.....	12	13	2	3	3	7	2	8	3	1	2	1	2	1	59
Michigan.....	5	8	3	4	...	5	1	8	1	1	1	...	2	1	4	44
Missouri.....	8	6	6	4	2	5	1	2	1	2	1	...	1	39
Alabama.....	8	4	4	5	5	5	2	1	34
Mississippi.....	3	6	3	2	...	9	...	1	1	1	26
Florida.....	2	5	1	1	1	2	12
Wisconsin.....	1	3	5	...	1	1	1	12
California.....	1	1	...	1	2	5
Iowa.....	1	2	1	1	5
Arkansas.....	1	...	2	3
Texas.....	1	1
Totals	2150	1892	2164	1500	859	2051	462	564	586	482	559	221	183	169	174	43	82	102	14,243

TABLE D.

	Statesmen.	Soldiers.	Clergy.	Lawyers.	Physicians.	Literature.	Art.	Science.	Educators.	Navy.	Business.	Philanthropy.	Pioneers and Explorers.	Inventors.	Engineers.	Architects.	Musicians.	Actors.	Totals.
English.....	1542	1260	1520	1100	632	1631	335	441	442	350	402	167	120	136	123	37	63	75	10,376
Scotch-Irish.....	265	273	221	162	86	131	21	32	64	54	41	14	29	15	14	2	2	13	1439
German.....	67	84	163	45	41	80	40	37	18	16	27	8	7	4	12	2	5	3	659
Huguenot.....	84	93	65	57	37	85	24	22	31	23	35	10	4	5	7	589
Scotch.....	79	77	59	47	31	47	6	7	16	11	14	6	3	3	8	2	4	4	436
Dutch.....	56	45	75	40	13	22	8	6	9	11	26	7	10	2	6	336
Welsh.....	36	25	19	30	7	18	3	6	1	4	4	1	2	2	1	159
Irish.....	9	18	28	12	2	17	7	3	...	4	3	4	2	109
French.....	7	14	7	4	6	15	3	7	3	1	4	3	5	...	1	...	2	3	85
Scandinavian.....	3	...	5	...	3	1	3	1	...	6	3	1	3	2	31
Spanish.....	1	...	1	1	2	...	1	1	7
Italian.....	1	3	1	7
Swiss.....	1	...	2	...	1	...	1	5
Greek.....	2	1	3
Russian.....	1	1
Polish.....	1	1
Totals	2150	1892	2164	1500	859	2051	462	564	586	482	559	221	183	169	174	43	82	102	14,243

TABLE E.

SINGLE STARS — BY STATES.

New York.....	245
Massachusetts.....	213
Pennsylvania.....	113
Connecticut.....	112
Virginia.....	94
New Jersey.....	56
Maryland.....	50
New Hampshire.....	35
Maine.....	34
South Carolina.....	34
Ohio.....	32
Kentucky.....	29
Georgia.....	25

Vermont.....	24
North Carolina.....	20
Rhode Island.....	20
Delaware.....	15
Tennessee.....	11
District of Columbia.....	9
Illinois.....	6
Indiana.....	6
Louisiana.....	6
Michigan.....	6
Missouri.....	1
Florida.....	1
California.....	1
Alabama.....	1
Wisconsin.....	1
Total	1200

BY GROUPS.

Massachusetts.....	213
Maine.....	34
New Hampshire.....	35
Vermont.....	24
Rhode Island.....	20
Connecticut.....	112
Six New England States.....	438
<hr/>	
New York.....	245
New Jersey.....	56
Pennsylvania.....	113
Delaware.....	15
Four Middle States.....	429
<hr/>	
Maryland.....	50
Virginia.....	94
South Carolina.....	34
Kentucky.....	29
Georgia.....	25
North Carolina.....	20
Tennessee.....	11
District of Columbia.....	9
Louisiana.....	6
Florida.....	1
Alabama.....	1
Ten Southern States and Dis. of Columbia.....	280
<hr/>	
Ohio.....	32
Illinois.....	6
Indiana.....	6
Michigan.....	6
Missouri.....	1
California.....	1
Wisconsin.....	1
Seven Western States.....	53

TABLE F.

SINGLE STARS — BY RACES.

English.....	856
Scotch-Irish.....	129
Huguenot.....	57
Scotch.....	45
Dutch.....	39
German.....	37
Welsh.....	15
Irish.....	13
French.....	6
Scandinavian.....	1
Spanish.....	1
Swiss.....	1
Total.....	1200

TABLE G.

DOUBLE STARS — BY STATES.

Virginia.....	12
Massachusetts.....	11
New York.....	7
Pennsylvania.....	5
Ohio.....	5

New Hampshire.....	4
North Carolina.....	4
South Carolina.....	2
Connecticut.....	2
Vermont.....	1
New Jersey.....	1
Maine.....	1
Rhode Island.....	1
Tennessee.....	1
Kentucky.....	1
Total.....	58

BY GROUPS.

New England.....	20
Middle States.....	13
Southern States.....	18
Western States.....	7
Total.....	58

BY PROFESSION AND RACE EXTRACTION.

Virginia.. Welsh ..	1	Statesman, 1	Soldier, ..	
English ..	6	Statesmen, 2	Soldiers, ..	
Scotch ..	1	Lawyer,		
Scotch ..	1	Soldier ..		12
Mass..... English ..	5	Statesmen, 4	Writers, ..	
Scotch ..	1	Inventor, 1	Philanthro-	
Scotch ..	1	apist ..		11
New York English ..	2	Statesmen, 1	Writer, ..	
Dutch ..	1	Statesman,		
Scotch ..	1	Statesman, 1	Writer, ..	
Irish ..	1	Soldier.....		7
Penn..... English ..	1	Soldier, 1	Naval Officer,	
Sc. Irish ..	1	Inventor, 1	Statesman,	
Scotch ..	1	Soldier.....		5
Ohio..... English ..	3	Statesmen, 2	Soldiers..	5
N. H. English ..	3	Statesmen,		
Sc. Irish ..	1	Statesman.....		4
N. C. English ..	1	Statesman,		
Sc. Irish ..	3	Statesmen.....		4
S. C. English ..	1	Writer,		
Sc. Irish ..	1	Statesman.....		2
Conn..... English ..	1	Lawyer, 1	Writer ..	2
Vermont.. Sc. Irish ..	1	Statesman.....		1
N. J. English ..	1	Statesman.....		1
Maine..... English ..	1	Writer ..		1
R. I. English ..	1	Soldier ..		1
Tenn..... Spanish ..	1	Naval Officer ..		1
Kentucky.. English ..	1	Statesman.....		1
Total.....				58

TOTALS BY RACE EXTRACTION.

English.....	41
Scotch-Irish.....	8
Scotch.....	4
Welsh.....	2
Dutch.....	1
Spanish.....	1
Irish.....	1

TABLE H.
Immigrants.

	English.	German.	Irish.	Scotch.	Scotch-Irish.	French.	British Provinces.	Scandinavian.	Welsh.	Belgians.	Swiss.	Dutch.	Poles.	Hungarians.	Italians.	Greek.	Russian.	Spanish.	Portuguese.	Totals.	Negroes.
Statesmen	8	11	13	7	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	47	14
Soldiers	7	15	16	4	11	7	5	3	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	80	1
Clergy	51	72	85	23	30	23	13	7	4	13	4	7	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	337	25
Lawyers	7	3	6	6	7	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	37	3
Physicians	15	21	2	10	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	60	1
Literature	64	30	22	34	12	5	10	3	7	1	1	6	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	201	7
Art.	43	22	12	19	1	3	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	112	1
Science	22	16	6	10	1	4	4	1	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	75	1
Educators	12	10	7	12	5	7	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	62	5
Navy	2	1	4	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14	1
Business	16	7	8	13	10	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	61	1
Philanthropy	9	1	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	19	2
Pioneers and Explorers	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	1
Inventors	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
Engineers	2	9	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	1
Architects	7	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	1
Musicians	19	20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	46	2
Actors	56	3	7	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	72	1
	345	245	200	151	88	63	60	18	16	15	15	14	13	11	10	3	2	1	1	1271	62

TABLE I.
IMMIGRANTS—SINGLE STARS.

French	Clergy	2
	Actor	1
	Statesman	1
		-4
Irish	Clergy	6
	Literature	1
	Business	1
	Lawyer	1
	Soldier	1
	Navy	1
		-11
German	Clergy	2
	Science	1
	Literature	1
	Lawyer	1
	Statesman	1
	Artist	1
	Engineer	1
	Musicians	2
	Soldiers	4
		-14
English	Clergy	3
	Actors	3
	Literature	2
	Soldiers	2
	Artist	1
	Musician	1
	Philanthropist	1
	Business	1
	Lawyer	1
		-15
Scotch	Literature	2
	Business	2
	Educator	1
	Clergy	1
	Science	1
		-7
Swiss	Science	4
	Clergy	2
		-6
Scotch-Irish	Literature	2
	Clergy	1
	Business	1
	Actor	1
	Soldier	1
	Artist	1
	Navy	1
		-8

W. I. and Prov.	Clergy	1
	Science	1
	Engineer	1
		-3
Scandinavian	Engineer	1
Belgian	Clergy	1
Poles	Soldier	1
		-7
Total		-71

It is not my intention to analyze the foregoing tables in detail. Indeed, it is not necessary to do so even if space permitted, for the figures tell their own story plainly enough. There are, however, a few general results to which it may be well to call attention. I will take the last table, that relating to immigrants, first. It will be noted that the Irish, who in the general tables contribute a very small number of names, stand third in this table of immigrants. It will be observed too that the Irish have contributed more largely to the soldiers than any others, the Germans and Scotch-Irish coming next, and the English and Scotch being remarkably small in this field. It is also very interesting to note in this connection, especially with regard to some statements that used to be made about the persons of foreign birth in the armies of the United States, that of the men who gained distinction as soldiers, in fighting the battles of the country, 1892 were native-born, and only 80 were immigrants, while in the navy the disproportion was quite as glaring, 482 being native-born, and only 14 being contributed by immigrants. The largest amount of ability in the immigration table is shown by the English, and if we add to them the Irish, Scotch, Scotch-Irish, and Welsh, as well as those from the British provinces, we find that the immigration from Great Britain has contributed three-fourths of the ability furnished from outside sources. Germany comes next to England in the total amount of immigrants who have attained distinction, but the largest num-

ber in proportion to its immigration is undoubtedly given by France, which furnishes 63 names to the table. Immigration has contributed most largely to the clergy, to literature, and to art, the proportion in the latter case being astonishingly high, 112 immigrants to 147 native-born. On the other hand, the immigrants have contributed as little to the statesmanship of the country as they have done to its army and navy.

By the table showing the distribution according to States (Table C) it will be seen, as might be expected, that the oldest communities with the largest white population have been most prolific in ability of all kinds. At the same time this rule is by no means absolute in its application. In Virginia, Massachusetts, and Connecticut the percentage of ability in proportion to the total white population is higher than in the two other leading States, New York and Pennsylvania. In proportion to its population, Connecticut leads every other State in the total amount of ability. In the matter of groups, not only the absolute amount of ability but the percentage in proportion to population is higher in the New England and Middle States than in those of the South and West, outside Maryland and Virginia.

Even more interesting than the percentages shown by the totals is the distribution by occupation. There are eighteen departments enumerated in which distinction has been achieved. New York leads in eight: soldiers, lawyers, artists, navy, business, engineers, architects, and actors. Massachusetts leads in eight also: clergy, physicians, literature, science, educators, philanthropy, inventors, and musicians; while Virginia leads in the remaining two: statesmen and pioneers.

This table also shows that the production of ability has been remarkably concentrated, and has been confined, on the whole, to comparatively few States. A few comparisons will prove this. Two States, Massachusetts and New York, have furnished more than a third of the ability of the entire country. Three, Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania, have supplied almost exactly one-half, and five, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Virginia, have produced two-thirds of the total amount. In the arrangement by groups, we find that the New England group and that formed of the four Middle States must each be credited with more than a third of all the ability produced. The six New England and the four Middle States furnish together almost exactly three-quarters of the ability of the country. If Virginia be omitted, it also appears that Massachusetts alone has furnished a little more and New York alone a trifle less ability than all the Southern and Western

States together—that is, than twenty States and the District of Columbia. In the Western States the wide difference which exists is owing, of course, in large measure to their very recent settlement, for which proper allowance must be made in drawing any deductions from the figures given in the tables.

Among the new States settled and admitted to the Union since the adoption of the Constitution, some interesting results may also be obtained. I do not include Maine in this division, because Maine, although a new State, is one of the oldest settlements. Excluding Maine, then, we find that Ohio has a long lead over all the other new States, including Kentucky, which was settled about the same time, and Louisiana, which was settled many years before. This striking fact in regard to Ohio can be due only to the character of the original settlement.

If we turn now from the distribution by totals and examine that by professions, we find that while the Southern and Southwestern States, including Virginia and Maryland, are comparatively strong in statesmen, soldiers, and pioneers, and in a less degree in lawyers, they are weak in all other classes. The ability of the South, less in amount than that of the New England and Middle States, was confined to three or four departments. In other words, there was in the South but little variety of intellectual activity. In the Middle States and New England ability sought every channel for expression, and was displayed in various ways. All the States in not very widely varying proportions produced statesmen, soldiers, lawyers, pioneers, and clergymen, and the seaboard States naval officers. But almost all the literature, art, science, business, philanthropy, and music; almost all the physicians, educators, inventors, engineers, architects, and actors were produced by the Middle and New England States. This is a most significant fact. It shows a wide difference between the two civilizations, that of the New England and Middle States on the one side and that of the Southern States on the other; for the surest tests of civilization in any community are the amount of ability produced and the variety of directions in which that ability has been displayed. The thirteen original States were with one or two variations settled, and they were all controlled, by men of the same race-stocks and of like traditions. The cause of the wide difference in amount and variety of ability shown by these tables is a fresh proof, if proof were needed, of the pernicious results of slavery upon even the finest races. There never was a more complete or a worse delusion than the one once so sedulously cultivated, that in this age of the world aristocracy in the best and truest sense

and a high civilization could be compatible with slavery. No finer people ever existed than those who settled and built up our Southern States, but when slavery became, in the course of the world's progress, and in a free country, nothing less than a hideous anomaly, it warped the community in which it flourished, limited the range of intellectual activity, dwarfed ability, and retarded terribly the advance of civilization. It is wonderful that the people who labored beneath the burden of a slave system achieved as much as they did, and the mass of ability which they produced under such adverse conditions is a striking proof of the strength of the race. The effects of slavery are painfully apparent in these tables, and only time will enable the people who suffered by the evil system to recover from them.

If we narrow the examination of the tables to special professions we can get in that direction also many interesting results. It is possible to point out only a few of them here. In literature Massachusetts has a long lead over any other State, and together with New York and Pennsylvania has furnished more than half of all the writers produced in the United States. New York, as might be expected from her large population, is ahead in soldiers and, what was less to be anticipated, in naval officers also. Of the total of 1892 soldiers New York, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Pennsylvania furnished the country with 1047. Ohio, however, in proportion to the total amount of ability, shows among the larger States one of the highest percentages in soldiers, and is far ahead of all those nearest it in total numbers. Virginia leads slightly in statesmen, and with Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut supplies more than half of all produced. New York is far ahead in art, which has come almost wholly from that State and from New England and Pennsylvania. Massachusetts has a similar lead in music, of which New England rather unexpectedly furnishes nearly two-thirds. Invention has come chiefly from Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut, and educators are most numerous in the same group. New York leads in business, Massachusetts in philanthropy, while Virginia is ahead in pioneers and explorers, with Massachusetts a close second.

If we turn now from the table of States to that of races we find that in statesmen and soldiers the Scotch-Irish, Scotch, Huguenots, and Dutch all have a slightly higher percentage in proportion to their totals than the English, while in other directions these four race divisions fall behind the leading race. Other per-

centages of this kind can readily be made from the tables, but the most interesting question in this direction arises in regard to the proportion of ability to the total numbers of each race. Unluckily only a rough estimate can be made, for there is absolutely no means of knowing exactly the total amount of immigration in any case. I believe that in proportion to their numbers the Huguenots have produced more and the Germans fewer men of ability than any other races in the United States. I think there can be no doubt as to the Germans, for their immigration was larger than any other in the colonial period except that of the English and possibly of the Scotch-Irish. Their comparatively small numbers in total amounts are emphasized by their further decline in the table of single stars. The explanation is, I think, obvious. The Germans settled chiefly in two or three States, and by retaining their language for at least a century kept themselves more or less separated from the rest of the community. In other words, they did not quickly become Americans. The result was less ability produced and less influence exerted upon the country in proportion to their numbers than that of a much less numerous people like the Huguenots who at once merged themselves in the body of the people and became thoroughgoing Americans. Indeed, if we add the French and the French Huguenots together we find that the people of French blood exceed absolutely, in the ability produced, all the other races represented except the English and Scotch-Irish, and show a percentage in proportion to their total original immigration much higher than that of any other race. The Dutch suffered slightly, I have no doubt, in the same way and from the same causes as the Germans, while the other immigrants, from Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, did not suffer at all and had no barriers of language to overcome.

The race table shows the enormous predominance of the English in the upbuilding of the United States, and if we add to the English the people who came from other parts of Great Britain and Ireland that predominance becomes overwhelming. The same table shows also what I think is the most important result of the whole inquiry, that the people who have succeeded in the United States and have produced the ability of the country are those who became most quickly and most thoroughly Americans. This is a moral of wide application, and carries a lesson which should never be forgotten, and which, whenever we meet it, should be laid to heart.

Henry Cabot Lodge.

not remember. Or, finally, Mr. Custis may have been convinced in 1855, when Colonel Lewis Washington called his attention to the matter, that the portrait at Arlington, which Sparks had engraved, was that of Betty Lewis.

Moncure D. Conway.

A Word More on the Distribution of Ability.

IN the abundant comment upon the article about "The Distribution of Ability in the United States" which appeared in the September *CENTURY*, much criticism was mingled. To reply to this criticism in detail would be needless, and would occupy too much space. But all of it, I think, can be met by a few general statements, and the more easily as most of it proceeds from a misapprehension of the original inquiry and of the system upon which it was conducted.

In the first place, I did not create the statistics; I merely collected them, and they are as free from error as it is possible to be in tallying and classifying over fifteen thousand names. I should have been glad to give figures which would have gratified every one's local and race sensibilities; and if I had been making up the lists as a work of the imagination solely to please myself, I should not have reached the conclusion that Connecticut among the States and the Huguenot French among the race stocks showed the highest percentage of ability. I gave the results exactly as I found them, and had no idea what they would be until all the names had been tallied, classified, and finally counted.

Another criticism has come from a failure to recognize the plainly stated system upon which the work was done. I adopted, for instance, a certain race classification. It is perfectly fair to criticize that classification as such, but it is absurd to say that I have misrepresented facts because the results of a different classification are not the same as mine. For example, I classified the Irish and the Scotch-Irish as two distinct race stocks, and I believe the distinction to be a sound one historically and scientifically. It is possible, of course, to take another view of this arrangement of races, and perhaps to defend it. But to add a large part of the Scotch-Irish to the Irish, as one of my critics has done, and then to accuse me of misrepresentation because his result based on one classification differs from mine based on another and entirely different one, is unfair and meaningless, and does not touch my conclusions. The Scotch-Irish from the north of Ireland, Protestant in religion and chiefly Scotch and English in blood and name, came to this country in large numbers in the eighteenth century, while the people of pure Irish stock came scarcely at all during the colonial period, and did not immigrate here largely until the present century was well advanced. There seems no good reason why a people who were not here except in very small numbers should perform the impossible feat of producing more ability than races which were here and which outnumbered them many times. In the table of persons born in the United States the number of pure Irish stock is small because there was very little of it. On the other hand, in the emigrant table, which represents ability after the Irish movement began, the Irish stand high. The Scotch-Irish and Huguenots show the reverse. They stand very high in the tables of persons born here, and almost disappear in the emigrant table. In

other words, the figures correspond, as they ought, with the facts of history and with the race movements.

The same principle holds true in regard to States. Communities cannot begin to produce native-born ability until they have been in existence as communities for at least the lifetime of one generation. For this reason the total amount of ability becomes less as we pass from the old thirteen States to those founded just after the Revolution, and thence through the different stages until the newest States are reached, where practically nothing is shown in the tables, simply because there has not been time for men and women to be born and to grow to maturity, and the active and able part of the population has of necessity come from outside. The criticism that birthplace should not be the test for the classification by communities seems hardly to require an answer, for a moment's reflection ought to convince any one that no other is practicable. Place of birth is no test of race, although it may be an indication, but it is a test for determining the community which produced a given man or woman. If we attempt to credit a person to the community in which he grew up or was educated, or in which he achieved his reputation, our only guide is discretion, and the classification could be disputed in every instance. The place of birth may sometimes be misleading as to the community which really produced a man or woman, but these errors are comparatively few; they balance, or tend to balance, one another, and the test itself is not open to dispute and is not a matter of personal discretion.

In addition to these general points, there is one specific objection which I wish to meet. Some of my critics said that it was not surprising that New England and New York showed such high figures, because "Appleton's Cyclopædia of National Biography" was a Northern and Eastern publication, and its editors were a New-Yorker and a New-Englander. It was intimated that if the "Cyclopædia" had been edited and published elsewhere, and by other persons, the result would have been different, and that the place of publication and the unconscious bias of the editors had given the States which showed the best results an undue advantage. This criticism was susceptible of a test which I have accordingly made. In regard to American ability the "Encyclopædia Britannica," whatever its merits or defects otherwise, is at least a disinterested witness, unswayed by either the State or race partialities of the United States. In the index of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" I find 317 names of Americans, who are not merely mentioned in lists, but of whom some account is given either under their own names or in connection with some general subject. Of these at least 250 would be placed without dispute among the 300 most distinguished Americans. Of the remaining 67 the right of some to be in the list would be disputed, while that of others would be rejected, by American judges. These last names, however, whether removed or left in, are so divided among races and States as to make no difference in the general result. These 317 names, therefore, selected by an entirely outside authority, I have classified and arranged just as I did those in the original article, and the results are given below. These tables explain themselves. It will be seen that they not only confirm the general trend and results of the Appleton tables, but accentuate the differences among the States shown by the latter, and fully sustain the conclusions of the original article.

TABLE A.

States.	Statesmen.	Soldiers.	Literature.	Physicians.	Clergymen.	Lawyers.	Science.	Inventors.	Navy.	Pioneers and Explorers.	Philanthropy and Business.	Art.	Educators.	Engineers.	
Massachusetts	25	3	31	10	2	7	4	4	3	2	2	..	93		
New York	13	4	8	1	4	1	5	..	4	1	1	..	42		
Pennsylvania	5	3	10	2	1	..	5	1	1	3	2	1	..	34	
Connecticut	6	2	11	..	6	1	3	2	1	1	..	1	1	..	35
Virginia	15	8	1	1	2	2	29
Maryland	3	1	..	2	6
New Jersey	2	..	1	..	1	..	1	1	3	9
New Hampshire	6	..	1	..	1	..	1	..	1	1	11
Rhode Island	..	2	1	..	2	1	..	1	..	1	..	1	8
Vermont	3	..	1	..	2	1	7
Maine	2	..	1	3
Tennessee	1	1	1	3
Delaware	1	1	2
North Carolina	3	2	5
South Carolina	6	2	1	1	10
Kentucky	3	2	1	6
Ohio	5	1	6
Indiana	1	1	1	1	3
Georgia	1	1	2
Louisiana	2	2
Illinois	1	1
	97	30	69	3	28	7	26	9	8	21	7	8	3	1	317

TABLE B.
By Groups.

NEW ENGLAND.	
Maine	3
New Hampshire	11
Vermont	7
Massachusetts	93
Connecticut	35
Rhode Island	8
	157
MIDDLE STATES.	
New York	42
New Jersey	9
Pennsylvania	34
Delaware	2
	87
SOUTHERN STATES.	
Maryland	6
Virginia	29
North Carolina	5
South Carolina	10
Georgia	2
Louisiana	2
	54
WESTERN STATES.	
Tennessee	3
Kentucky	6
Ohio	6
Indiana	3
Illinois	1
	19
	317

TABLE C.

Races.	Statesmen.	Soldiers.	Literature.	Physicians.	Clergymen.	Lawyers.	Science.	Inventors.	Navy.	Pioneers and Explorers.	Philanthropy and Business.	Art.	Educators.	Engineers.	
English	75	17	58	3	25	7	20	7	5	16	4	7	3	1	248
Scotch	5	6	3	..	1	1	16
Scotch-Irish	10	2	1	1	1	1	16
Irish	..	2	2
Welsh	1	1	2
Huguenot	2	2	4	..	2	..	2	..	1	1	1	15
French	2	..	1	3
German	1	..	3	1	1	6
Dutch	2	1	1	..	2	1	7
Swiss	1	1	1
Spanish	1	1
	97	30	69	3	28	7	26	9	8	21	7	8	3	1	317

H. C. Lodge.

Note on "The Distribution of Ability."

THE writer of "The Distribution of Ability in the United States" has omitted to mention one circumstance which strikes me as a very material one. Be one's ability what it may, it is the pen alone that can confer upon him even the immortality of the biographical dictionary. Nearly all the writers and chroniclers of the country have been Northerners, and largely New-Englanders. As a consequence, local prominence, of whatever sort or degree, stood a much better chance there of falling in the way of the encyclopedia-maker, than if achieved among a people with whom literature was by far the most backward of all pursuits.

It has been said that a happy people have no history. It is self-consciousness and discontent, rather than naturalness and cheerfulness, that fill the libraries. Thus the Southerner, I opine, has come to be a maker of books.

But this is somewhat from the point. It is of course impossible even to estimate the effect of a State's backwardness in literature on the fame of her sons. That it must have some weight the author of the article mentioned will, I am sure, admit. Sallust said of the Athenians :

The exploits of the Athenians doubtless were great; and yet I believe they were somewhat less than fame would have us conceive of them. But because Athens abounded in noble writers, the acts of that republic are celebrated throughout the whole world as most glorious; and the gallantry of those heroes who performed them has had the good fortune to be thought as transcendent as the eloquence of those who have described them.

David Dodge.

By his own judgment, therefore, of what great poets are, he must be placed among them, and the office of genius, as he defined it, must be declared to be his. The millennium has not come, any more than it came in the first century. The cause Shelley served is still in its struggle; but those to whom social justice is a watchword, and the development of the individual everywhere in liberty, intelligence, and virtue is a cherished hope, must be thankful that Shelley lived, that the substance of his work is so vital, and his influence, inspiring as it is beyond that of any of our poets in these ways, was, and is, so completely on the side of the century's advance. His words are sung by marching thousands in the streets of London. No poet of our time has touched the cause of progress in the living breath and heart-throb of men so close as that. Yet, remote as the poet's dream always seems, it is rather that life-long singing of the golden age, in poem after poem, which most restores and inflames those who, whether they be rude or refined, are the choicer spirits of mankind, and

bring, with revolutionary violence or ideal imagination, the times to come. They hate the things he hated; like him they love, above all things, justice; they share the passion of his faith in mankind. Thus, were his own life as dark as Shakspeare's, and had he left unwritten those personal lyrics which some who conceive the poet's art less nobly would exalt above his grander poems, he would stand preëminent and almost solitary for his service to the struggling world, for what he did as a quickener of men's hearts by his passion for supreme and simple truths. If these have more hold in society now than when he died, and if his influence has contributed its share, however blended with the large forces of civilization, he has in this sense given law to the world and equaled the height of the loftiest conception of the poet's significance in the spiritual life of man. Such, taken in large lines and in its true relations, seems to me the work for which men should praise Shelley on this anniversary, leaving mere poetic enjoyment, however delightful, and personal charm, however winning, to other occasions.

George E. Woodberry.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Popular Crazes.

NO portion of Professor James Bryce's "American Commonwealth" reveals more strikingly the author's remarkable insight into American methods and character than the twelve chapters on Public Opinion which constitute Part 4 of Vol. II. Every American who is interested in the efforts which his own country is making to work out successfully and completely the problem of popular government can read those chapters with profit, for he will find in them, clearly and forcibly set forth, many things that he has dimly conceived but has never been able to think out thoroughly for himself.

Professor Bryce holds that "in no country is public opinion so powerful as in the United States," and in the course of his searching and able discussion of why it is so he makes certain observations which we wish to cite at this time as having an especial bearing upon the subject that we wish to consider in the present article.

Remembering that one of the chief problems of free nations is "to devise means whereby the national will shall be most fully expressed, most quickly known, most unresistingly and cheerfully obeyed," he says:

Towards this goal the Americans have marched with steady steps, unconsciously as well as consciously. No other people now stands so near it. . . . Towering over Presidents and State Governors, over Congress and State Legislatures, over conventions and the vast machinery of party, public opinion stands out in the United States as the great source of power, the master of servants who tremble before it.

There is no one class or set of men whose special func-

tion it is to form and lead public opinion. The politicians certainly do not. Public opinion leads them.

A sovereign is not less a sovereign because his commands are sometimes misheard or misreported. In America every one listens for them. Those who manage the affairs of this country obey to the best of their hearing. The people must not be hurried. A statesman is not expected to move ahead of them; he must rather seem to follow, though if he has the courage to tell the people that they are wrong, and refuse to be the instrument, he will be all the more respected.

Professor Bryce goes on to argue that one reason why public opinion is so powerful is the universal belief of the people in their star, a "confidence that the people are sure to decide right in the long run," that "truth and justice are sure to make their way into the minds and consciences of the majority." Every one who has studied the history of this country knows how true all this is. Whenever a new peril threatens us from any quarter, either in the form of some abuse in legislation or in administration, or in the form of some fresh financial or economic heresy, the final stronghold of hope to which every anxious observer clings is the conviction that the people will decide right in the end. Our national history is the record of a succession of perils of one kind or another, suddenly averted at the very moment when escape from them seemed most impossible.

The recent collapse of the Free Silver Coinage "craze" makes a review of similar popular delusions timely. We have had many of these since the war, and all of them have passed away as suddenly as they arose, after a uniformly brief and absorbing period of existence. No one can contemplate them after they have