

We can not tell that, but it is quite possible that there may be life on many of them.

And after pondering for some time, the politician rose and said: It does not matter after all whether Taft or Bryan gets in.

Happy were the times, when it could be said with truth that the strife of politics counted as nothing before the silent display of the heavens. Mightier issues are at stake to-day: in the struggle which convulses the world, all intellectual pursuits are vitally affected, and science gladly gives all the power she wields to the service of the state. Sorrowfully she covers her face because that power, accumulated through the peaceful efforts of the sons of all nations, was never meant for death and destruction; gladly she helps, because a war wantonly provoked threatens civilization, and only through victory shall we achieve a peace in which once more science can hold up her head, proud of her strength to preserve the intellectual freedom which is worth more than material prosperity, to defeat the spirit of evil that destroyed the sense of brotherhood among nations, and to spread the love of truth.

ARTHUR SCHUSTER

THE MIGRATIONS OF DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS

WHERE do great men go? Do they go anywhere? Are the recognized leaders of activity and thought in the class of "rank outsiders" or have they been born and brought up in the same spot which now marks the field of their labors?

These questions can not be answered finally for two reasons. In the first place, because there is no perfectly authentic record from which the names of all leaders may be gleaned, and second, because the available records are in many cases faulty. Nevertheless, the eighteen thousand names listed by "Who's Who in America" contains a large proportion of the leading men of the country, and even though the list does contain the names of

many who are not recognized leaders, it is, on the whole, an excellent weathervane for America's great and near-great in the mass.

Among other suggestive facts, "Who's Who"¹ tells for each person whose biography appears, the place of birth and the present address. By comparing the two, for a large number of cases, the facts regarding the movements of great men may be ascertained.

A study of "Who's Who" shows two distinct movements, one from the east and south to the north and west; the other from the country district and the small town to the great city. The great men born in the east and south have gone west in large numbers. At the same time, many of the leaders in city life came from outside the city.

The movement of great men from the east to the west is strikingly apparent. Among 16,449 distinguished persons whose names appear in "Who's Who," over nine-tenths (91.6 per cent.) were born in the New England, Middle Atlantic states, the East North Central, South Atlantic and East South Central states. This division includes roughly the territory east of the Mississippi River. Although only one twelfth of the distinguished persons were born west of this division line, at the present time, one sixth (16.8 per cent.) resides there. The migrations from the Eastern states have been felt most heavily in New England and in the East North Central states. Among the persons listed in "Who's Who," 3,764 (22.9 per cent.) were born in New England—2,921 (16.2 per cent.) now live there; 3,609 (22.0 per cent.) were born in the East North Central states—2,919 (16.2 per cent.)

¹ "Who's Who" is published in Chicago. The editor, Albert Nelson Marquis, was born in Ohio. "The standards of admission to 'Who's Who in America' divide the eligibles into two classes: (1) Those who are selected on account of special prominence in creditable lines of effort, making them the subjects of extensive interest, inquiry or discussion in this country; and (2) those who are arbitrarily included on account of official position—civil, military, naval, religious or educational—or their connection with the most exclusive learned or other societies." From a statement following the preface, 1912-13 edition.

now reside there. The gains have been most notable in the Mountain and Pacific states. Among the persons listed in "Who's Who," 48 (.3 per cent.) were born in the Mountain states—466 (2.5 per cent.) now reside there; 207 (1.2 per cent.) were born in the Pacific states—865 (4.8 per cent.) now reside there. Apparently the northeastern section of the United States has lost heavily in favor of the extreme western portion of the country. Although producing a negligible portion of the total distinguished persons, the western states are gaining considerably through the migration of distinguished persons from their birthplace.

An excellent corroboration of this appears from a study of specific states. Among the Eastern states, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and Illinois alone have more distinguished persons now resident than were born in them. At the same time, Minnesota and Florida have a resident population of distinguished persons larger than the number born there. With the exception of Florida and the District of Columbia, these states are western and southwestern states. The opposite condition appears if a list is made of those states in which fewer distinguished persons are resident than the number born. In this list appear Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa together with eleven of the southern and east south central states.

The total number of persons native born in the states having more distinguished persons now resident than were born in them was 7,302; the total number now resident in these same states is 12,058. The total number of persons born in the other group of states was 9,119; and the total number now resident is 6,042.

A similar result may be arrived at by making a table showing the number of states in which the resident distinguished persons are larger or smaller than the number native born distinguished persons.

If the statistics are carried out in the form of ratios, it appears that there were 12 states

in which the ratio of distinguished now resident to distinguished born persons was less than 74 per hundred. All of the states with the exception of Wisconsin were in the eastern and northeastern parts of the United States. At the same time, there were 19 states in which the ratio of distinguished persons now resident to distinguished persons native born was over 175 per hundred. Every one of these states, except Florida, was west of the Mississippi.

A CLASSIFICATION SHOWING THE NUMBERS OF STATES
IN WHICH THE NUMBER OF RESIDENT DISTIN-
GUISHED PERSONS WAS LARGER AND IN
WHICH THE NUMBER WAS SMALLER
THAN THE NUMBER BORN IN THOSE
STATES, CLASSIFIED BY GEO-
GRAPHICAL DIVISIONS

Division	Number of States in Which Number of Resident Distinguished Persons Is	
	Larger	Smaller
United States		
New England.....	1	5
Middle Atlantic	2	1
East North Central ...	1	4
West North Central ...	6	1
South Atlantic	2	7
East South Central ...	0	4
West South Central ...	4	0
Mountain	8	0
Pacific	3	0

There seems to be no question but that the great men of the present generation have been moving steadily westward. The older parts of the country produced them, but they have persistently found their way into the newer parts. Some critics will contend that this is merely another way of saying that the opportunities of the new territory brought out the latent abilities of those who went there. While such a view may have some justification, the fact can not be lost sight of that while the west was gaining so persistently, the east was as steadily losing.

The facts regarding the movement into the cities are less conclusive, but none the less significant.

Of the four northeastern states showing a larger number of distinguished persons now resident than the number native born were

Massachusetts, New York and Illinois. In each of these states is at least one great city center of commerce and industry. Had this fact any influence upon the position of these three states? In order to answer this question, the consecutive names of 2,000 native-born persons were taken at random.² Among this 2,000, 549 were born in cities of more than 100,000 population, and 1,365 are now resident in these cities. The figures for New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston and Washington show 317 born in these cities, and 791 now resident. The figures for New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, Washington, Baltimore and Chicago show 355 born and 851 now resident. The proportion absorbed by the larger cities is not, on the whole, greater than the proportion absorbed by urban as opposed to rural life.

One thing the figures show conclusively, that there has been a marked movement of distinguished persons from the northeastern section of the United States to that section west of the Mississippi and particularly that section included in the Pacific and Mountain states. City life is in no large sense responsible for this movement. It is evidently a logical reaction to the wide range of opportunity which the west affords.

SCOTT NEARING

SCIENTIFIC NOTES AND NEWS

DR. MAX PLANCK, professor of physics at Berlin, and Professor Hugo von Seeliger, director of the Munich Observatory, have been made knights of the Prussian order pour le mérite. Dr. Ramón y Cajal, professor of histology at Madrid, and Dr. C. J. Kapteyn, professor of astronomy at Gröningen, have been appointed foreign knights of this order.

M. GEORGES VAN BIESBROECK, Dr. Ing., adjunct astronomer at the Royal Observatory of Belgium, situated at Uccle, has joined the staff of the Yerkes Observatory, University of Chicago, for the academic year 1915-16, with the title of visiting professor of practical astronomy. His work will be chiefly devoted to

² They started with I. F. Merrifield, and ended with H. W. Ranger.

double stars and to the regular program of determining stellar parallaxes from photographs made with the 40-inch refractor.

THE second Pan-American Scientific Congress, which will meet in Washington, December 27, 1915, and adjourn January 8, 1916, will be divided into nine sections, which, with their chairmen, are as follows: Anthropology, William H. Holmes; Astronomy, Meteorology and Seismology, Robert S. Woodward; Conservation of Natural Resources, George M. Rommel; Education, P. P. Claxton; Engineering, W. H. Bixby; International Law, Public Law and Jurisprudence, James Brown Scott; Mining and Metallurgy, Economic Geology and Applied Chemistry, Hennen Jennings; Public Health and Medical Sciences, William C. Gorgas; Transportation, Commerce, Finance and Taxation, L. S. Rowe.

DR. THEOBALD SMITH, head of the division of comparative pathology of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, should be addressed at Princeton, N. J., after October 1.

DR. RICHARD PEARSON STRONG is returning to this country from Servia to resume his position as professor of tropical medicine in Harvard Medical School.

DR. SEISHU KENOSHITA, professor of gynecology and obstetrics in the Imperial University, Tokyo, Japan, has been designated by the government to make an extensive tour and study of American hospitals.

NEWS has been received of the safe return of Vilhjalmur Steffanson, who has been conducting a Canadian expedition to the far north. He expects to spend two more years in exploration.

DR. STOCK, professor of chemistry at Munich, has been appointed a member of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Chemistry at Dahlem.

DR. ELISHA H. COHOON has been appointed administrative head of the psychopathic department of the Massachusetts State Hospital, at Boston. Dr. E. E. Southard, who has been director of the institution for a number of years, will be relieved of his administrative duties, but will retain the title of director and