VOLUME XXIV NUMBER 93

The American
MERCURY

September 1931

THE WORST AMERICAN STATE: Part I[1]

BY CHARLES ANGOFF & H. L. MENCKEN

Just what such words as progress and civilization mean is often disputed, but no one doubts that the things themselves exist. Holland is obviously a more progressive country than Portugal, and equally obviously France is more civilized than Albania. It is when concrete criteria are set up that dispute begins, for every man tries to measure the level of a given culture by his own yardstick, and so we have heard a musician argue that no country which lacks symphony orchestras can be called really civilized, and a banker maintain that wealth and civilization are indistinguishable, and not long ago a medical statistician was saying that "the average length of life is the one and only sure index . . . of social progress". But under all these differences there is still something resembling a general agreement, and back in 1928 it was well stated by Dr. A. J. Todd of Northwestern University at the Memphis Conference on Social Work:

> We shall have to agree that life on the whole is better than death, that health is better than sickness, that freedom is better than slavery, that control over fate is better than ignorance, that moderate provision for human need is better than chronic lack, that broad interests and moderate desires are better than narrowness and enforced asceticism—

in other words, that a civilized society is one in which there is reasonable liberty and security, and opportunity to acquire knowledge, and no general or unendurable poverty, and no other avoidable impediments to happiness and well-being. The best of societies, of course, fall far short of the ideal, but they at least cherish it, and when fortune runs with them they usually move toward it. Thus "a condition of general happiness," in J. B. Bury's phrase, is "the issue of the earth's great business". It may never be attained, but certainly one must admit that there is such a thing as striving for it, and that this striving results in changes that may be measured. When the percentage of illiteracy in a

[1] A part of the material used in this article was assembled by Dr. James M. Chalfant of Ohio State University, who also suggested some of the observations upon it. He is, of course, not responsible for any of the conclusions. Thanks are also due to Dr. S. H. Hobbs, Jr., of the University of North Carolina, for permission to use some of the tables in his book, "North Carolina: Economic and Social". In that book Dr. Hobbs employed the present method in an ingenious study of the position of North Carolina among the States. Part II of this article will appear next month, and Part III in November.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given area is reduced 50% in a generation, we all agree—save maybe a few cantankerous iconoclasts—that progress has been made, and we likewise agree when the death-rate is reduced, when crime diminishes, when despotism gives way to free government, and when the arts and sciences are actively and effectively practised. And most of us agree, too, when there is an increase in the *per capita* wealth. In itself, that increase may not be important, for a very rich country might still show a great deal of horrible poverty and suffering, but in practise we know that money tends to get itself distributed, and that when the average wealth increases the average well-being usually also increases.

Here in the United States the criteria of progress are often hotly debated, and there is visible a wide difference over them. The people who live in cities commonly regard the dwellers in smaller places as barbarians, and not infrequently the rural folk think of the city hordes as savages. There is a large literature on the subject, running both ways. One hears, too, of purely sectional disdains and derisions. Not many natives of New England would admit that Iowa is as civilized as Massachusetts, and not many Southerners would admit that either the North or the West is as civilized as the South. Of late the Pacific Coast has come into the contest, and for a long while the Middle West has been advancing its claims. Some time ago, indeed, William Allen White was depicting Kansas as a State almost beyond compare —as certainly superior, on all rational cultural counts, to the highly populous States along the Atlantic seaboard. But meanwhile, there are plenty of Americans who regard Kansas as almost barbaric, just as there are other Americans who shudder whenever they think of Arkansas, Ohio, Indiana, Oklahoma, Texas or California.

Perhaps these disputes are destined to go on forever, as they have been going on in Europe for centuries. Is Kansas more dry than New York? Then that is a proof of a relatively high civilization to the majority of Kansans, and perhaps also to most people in various other States, but to New Yorkers it is only proof that the Kansans are jays. Does California burn more gasoline *per capita* than any other State, and attract more retired farmers, and produce more movies, and jail more labor agitators, and support more inventors of new religions? Then the Californians are proud of it, but nearly everywhere else there are only scoffs. Nevertheless, there remain certain criteria that are pretty generally accepted, even in areas where their applications are somewhat embarrassing. All Americans seem to be agreed that education is a good thing, and that the more of it there is, the better. All of them agree likewise that crime is a bad thing, and that the less of it there is, the better. And all—or nearly all—agree that it is better to be rich than to be poor, and that any civilization which sees an increase in the general wealth is a civilization going up grade, not down. So maybe it will be possible, by examining certain tables of statistics, with the forty-eight American States (to which, of course, the District of Columbia should be added) ranged in order, to find out which of them tend toward the top of the heap and which toward the bottom. Statistics, to be sure, are not always reliable, but we have nothing better, and we must make as much of them as we can.

II

Let us be thoroughly American by starting with wealth. Which is the richest of the States, and which the poorest? We turn to "The Statistical Abstract of the United

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States," an official publication of the Treasury, and find an attempt to answer the question on page 294.

It shows the estimated value of all the tangible property in each State, reckoned *per capita*—not the total wealth *per capita*, but the amount of *tangible* property *per capita*, regardless of whether it is owned by residents or by persons living elsewhere. Here is the table:

TABLE NO. 1: TANGIBLE PROPERTY PER CAPITA

1	Nevada	$6,998
2	Wyoming	4,663
3	South Dakota	4,482
4	Iowa	4,274
5	Oregon	4,182
6	Nebraska	4,004
7	District of Columbia	3,879
8	North Dakota	3,692
9	Montana	3,691
10	Connecticut	3,614
11	Washington	3,600
12	New Jersey	3,524
13	Arizona	3,512
14	Kansas	3,493
15	Minnesota	3,442
16	New York	3,436
17	Idaho	3,301
18	Illinois	3,295
19	Colorado	3,285
20	Utah	3,247
21	Massachusetts	3,243
22	Pennsylvania	3,187
23	Rhode Island	3,086
24	New Hampshire	3,074
25	Ohio	3,048
26	West Virginia	3,040
27	Indiana	2,942
28	Missouri	2,903
29	Michigan	2,899
30	Wisconsin	2,887
31	Delaware	2,728
32	Maryland	2,665
33	Maine	2,586
34	Vermont	2,389
35	Florida	2,358
36	New Mexico	2,229
37	Virginia	2,050
38	Texas	2,010
39	Oklahoma	1,864
40	Louisiana	1,855
41	Tennessee	1,773
42	North Carolina	1,708
43	Kentucky	1,459
44	Arkansas	1,439
45	South Carolina	1,385
46	Georgia	1,306
47	Alabama	1,244
48	Mississippi	1,216
49	California	1,007
	United States	2,916

The foregoing table, as we have said, comes from "The Statistical Abstract of the United States." Following is a table showing the assessed value *per capita* of taxable property, whether tangible or intangible, compiled from figures supplied by Halsey, Stuart & Company:

TABLE NO. 2: TAXABLE PROPERTY PER CAPITA

1	Montana	$26,344.61
2	Arizona	16,441.39
3	South Dakota	2,439.00
4	Nevada	2,382.40
5	Nebraska	2,251.18
6	New York	2,241.52
7	Ohio	2,030.74
8	Rhode Island	2,025.99
9	Wisconsin	2,006.26
10	Kansas	1,958.36
11	Wyoming	1,936.59
12	Maryland	1,772.01
13	Connecticut	1,744.43
14	California	1,742.21
15	Michigan	1,693.69
16	New Jersey	1,689.80
17	Massachusetts	1,676.44
18	Indiana	1,595.45
19	Iowa	1,569.24
20	Colorado	1,531.29
21	North Dakota	1,469.70
22	Utah	1,434.21
23	Pennsylvania	1,414.43
24	Missouri	1,369.99
25	New Hampshire	1,338.88
26	Oregon	1,179.49
27	West Virginia	1,176.25
28	Delaware	1,158.47
29	Illinois	1,096.28
30	Idaho	1,093.41
31	Kentucky	1,061.73
32	Virginia	1,044.25
33	North Carolina	937.21
34	Maine	932.61
35	Louisiana	835.92
36	Washington	809.55
37	New Mexico	808.60
38	Oklahoma	807.08
39	Vermont	777.93
40	Minnesota	759.65
41	Texas	722.80
42	Tennessee	678.24
43	Arkansas	673.31
44	Alabama	470.15
45	Georgia	451.80
46	Florida	418.00
47	Mississippi	385.54
48	South Carolina	245.20
	United States[2]	2,137.98

There follows a table from "Statistics of Income," published by the Treasury (1930,

[2] The District of Columbia is omitted.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

p. 73), showing the percentage of the population filing income tax returns in 1928, the last year for which complete returns are available:

TABLE NO. 3: PERCENTAGE PAYING INCOME TAX

1	District of Columbia	8.00
2	California	6.95
3	New York	6.76
4	Nevada	5.74
5	New Jersey	5.15
6	Illinois	5.05
7	Massachusetts	5.02
8	Connecticut	4.86
9	Maryland	4.04
10	Washington	4.03
11	Delaware	3.93
12	Michigan	3.92
13	Pennsylvania	3.67
14	Rhode Island	3.60
15	Wyoming	3.49
16	Wisconsin	3.34
17	Oregon	3.25
18	Ohio	3.20
19	Montana	3.12
20	New Hampshire	3.10
21	Colorado	2.85
22	Missouri	2.82
23	Vermont	2.67
24	Utah	2.50
25	Arizona	2.43
26	Indiana	2.37
27	Maine	2.34
28	Florida	2.28
29	Minnesota	2.23
29	Nebraska	2.23
31	Texas	2.05
32	Louisiana	1.90
33	Idaho	1.80
34	Kansas	1.79
35	West Virginia	1.78
36	New Mexico	1.69
37	Iowa	1.68
38	Oklahoma	1.54
39	North Dakota	1.51
39	South Dakota	1.51
41	Virginia	1.46
42	Tennessee	1.40
43	Kentucky	1.39
44	North Carolina	1.06
45	Alabama	1.05
46	Georgia	1.03
47	Mississippi	.90
48	Arkansas	.86
49	South Carolina	.74
	United States	2.89

And here is a table from the same source showing the average income tax paid:

TABLE NO. 4: AVERAGE INCOME TAX PAID

1	Delaware	$ 1,104.35
2	New York	578.67
3	Rhode Island	313.67
4	Illinois	296.18
5	Connecticut	285.02
6	Michigan	281.29
7	Massachusetts	277.14
8	Pennsylvania	267.90
9	New Jersey	263.82
10	Ohio	253.54
11	Maryland	247.12
12	Florida	239.91
13	Maine	229.03
14	California	201.14
15	Minnesota	196.29
16	North Carolina	195.23
17	Missouri	190.45
18	Oklahoma	173.00
19	District of Columbia	169.17
20	Tennessee	160.51
21	Kentucky	159.45
22	Iowa	152.40
23	Alabama	150.08
24	Colorado	143.42
25	New Hampshire	140.95
26	Arizona	138.83
27	Indiana	134.01
28	Texas	128.28
29	Wisconsin	126.51
30	Louisiana	118.44
31	Virginia	117.20
32	Georgia	115.63
33	Vermont	112.38
34	Nevada	106.69
35	West Virginia	95.32
36	Kansas	88.92
37	Utah	82.63
38	Oregon	81.39
39	Montana	75.85
40	New Mexico	69.46
41	Washington	67.48
42	Nebraska	67.12
43	Arkansas	52.69
44	South Carolina	52.21
45	Mississippi	47.32
46	Wyoming	43.16
47	South Dakota	30.19
48	Idaho	28.87
49	North Dakota	21.57
	United States	176.97

Already, despite certain wild aberrations —for example, California is at the bottom of Table No. 1 but stands second in Table No. 3—certain trends are visible. Nevada is among the first five States in three of the four tables, and New York is among the first five in two. Also, Mississippi is among the last five in all four, and South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama are among the last five in three. Yet again, certain States seem to gravitate toward the middle of the list—for example, New Hampshire, which appears between the twenty-first

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the twenty-seventh places in three of the four tables.

Let us now turn to bank clearings, and confine our inquiry to the top and bottom of the table. The figures are compiled from a table in the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, a leading authority, and show the clearings *per capita* last year:

TABLE NO. 5: BANK CLEARINGS

1	New York	$27,890
2	Massachusetts	5,569
3	Illinois	3,867
4	Pennsylvania	3,858
5	Missouri	3,688
.	. . . . .	
45	West Virginia	145
46	South Carolina	114
47	Mississippi	111
48	New Hampshire	86
49	North Carolina	36
	United States	1,610

Unfortunately, this record is incomplete, for Nevada does not report its bank clearings, and neither do certain cities elsewhere, *e.g.*, Chattanooga, Tenn., McAlester, Okla., and Los Angeles, Calif. But when it comes to bank resources all States report in full, and this is what one learns about the total resources *per capita* from "The Statistical Abstract of the United States" (1930, p. 263):

TABLE NO. 6: BANK RESOURCES

1	New York	$1,652
2	Massachusetts	1,127
3	Connecticut	930
4	Rhode Island	850
5	Vermont	796
.	. . . . .	
45	Arkansas	145
46	Alabama	142
47	Mississippi	137
48	South Carolina	129
49	New Mexico	121
	United States	446

From the same source (p. 274) we compile the record of savings and other time deposits *per capita* in all banks and trust companies:

TABLE NO. 7: SAVINGS DEPOSITS

1	Rhode Island	$951.13
2	Massachusetts	715.88
3	Vermont	625.59
4	Connecticut	503.80
5	New Hampshire	458.06
.	. . . . .	
45	Arkansas	51.64
46	Texas	48.85
47	Oklahoma	47.83
48	Alabama	41.80
49	New Mexico	30.35
	United States	203.15

And from the report of the Bureau of Internal Revenue ("Statistics of Income", 1930, pp. 60-61) we compile the following return of the aggregate gross estates of resident decedents *per capita*:

TABLE NO. 8: ESTATES OF DECEDENTS

1	Delaware	$229.22
2	Rhode Island	114.65
3	New York	87.72
4	Nevada	86.81
5	Connecticut	68.36
.	. . . . .	
45	Arkansas	4.42
46	North Dakota	4.14
47	Arizona	3.85
48	Mississippi	3.48
49	Idaho	1.96
	United States	28.61

Finally, here is a table showing the spendable money income *per capita* for 1929:

TABLE NO. 9: SPENDABLE MONEY INCOME

1	New York	$1,328
2	California	1,186
3	Massachusetts	1,131
4	Illinois	1,039
5	New Jersey	1,036
.	. . . . .	
45	Alabama	329
46	Georgia	326
47	North Carolina	315
48	Arkansas	282
49	Mississippi	239

We now have nine tables, all of them dealing with the general wealth of the country. They are of varying value and significance, and it would be hazardous to attempt any very elaborate inferences from them without careful statistical weighting; nevertheless, it is safe to assume that those States which tend to appear far down the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tables are relatively poor. Of the States that so appear more than twice, Georgia appears four times, Arkansas and South Carolina five times, Alabama six times, and Mississippi eight times. Contrariwise, of the States that appear among the first five more than twice, Illinois appears three times, Nevada, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts four times, and New York six times.

III

These tendencies are furthermore supported by an examination of the available statistics dealing with separate industries. The States that are poor in general are also poor in detail. Thus Mississippi and Arkansas are among the last five in the value of their manufactures *per capita* (The *World* Almanac, 1931, pp. 324-27); Mississippi, Arkansas, Georgia and Alabama are among the last five in the average value of lands and buildings per farm ("Statistical Abstract," 1930, p. 626); Mississippi and South Carolina are among the last five in the value of their mineral products *per capita* (The *World* Almanac, 1931, p. 290), and Mississippi and Louisiana are among the last five in the average total value of their farms, including machinery and stock, in the average value of their hogs a head, and in the average value of their horned cattle. A poor State naturally has poor farm animals, and many of its farmers do not own their land, but are more or less migratory tenants. Here is a table issued by the Census Bureau showing the percentage of farm tenants in the various States for 1928, the last year for which complete figures are available:

TABLE NO. 10: RATIO OF FARM TENANCY

1	Maine	3.4
2	New Hampshire	4.8
3	Massachusetts	4.8
4	Connecticut	6.4
5	Nevada	7.9
6	Vermont	9.3
7	Utah	11.1
8	Rhode Island	12.1
9	New York	14.1
10	California	14.7
11	Michigan	15.1
12	Wisconsin	15.5
13	New Jersey	15.9
14	West Virginia	16.3
14[3]	Washington	16.3
16	Oregon	16.8
17	New Mexico	17.1
18	Pennsylvania	17.4
19	Wyoming	17.9
20	Florida	21.3
21	Arizona	21.5
22	Montana	21.9
23	Idaho	24.4
24	Virginia	25.2
25	Ohio	25.5
26	Maryland	26.4
27	Minnesota	27.1
28	District of Columbia	28.1
29	Indiana	29.2
30	Colorado	30.9
31	Kentucky	32.0
32	Missouri	32.6
33	North Dakota	34.4
34	Delaware	35.8
35	Tennessee	41.0
36	South Dakota	41.5
37	Illinois	42.0
38	Kansas	42.2
39	Iowa	44.7
40	North Carolina	45.2
41	Nebraska	46.4
42	Arkansas	56.7
43	Oklahoma	58.6
44	Louisiana	60.1
45	Texas	60.4
46	Alabama	60.7
47	Georgia	63.8
48	South Carolina	65.1
49	Mississippi	68.3
	United States	29.5

Tenant farmers, of course, usually have relatively poor equipment, but that this is not invariably the case is shown by comparing the position of Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska and the two Dakotas in the foregoing table with their position in the following, which shows the percentage of farms employing tractors ("Statistical Abstract," 1931, p. 648):

TABLE NO. 11: FARMS EMPLOYING TRACTORS

1	North Dakota	20.9
2	South Dakota	20.6

[3] When two or more States show the same serial number it is given to each of them. The slack is taken up by advancing the number of the next State to that of its actual rank.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3	California	19.0
4	Illinois	18.4
5	Kansas	17.2
6	Iowa	16.7
7	Wisconsin	15.0
8	Nebraska	13.9
8	New Jersey	13.9
10	Minnesota	13.6
11	New York	12.9
12	Montana	12.5
13	Ohio	12.2
14	Indiana	11.7
15	Colorado	10.3
16	Arizona	9.8
17	Michigan	9.6
17	Oregon	9.6
19	Pennsylvania	9.5
20	Wyoming	7.9
21	Maryland	7.8
22	Rhode Island	7.2
23	Massachusetts	6.1
24	Delaware	6.0
25	Washington	5.9
26	Connecticut	5.7
27	Vermont	5.4
28	Nevada	5.1
29	Oklahoma	5.0
30	Missouri	4.6
31	Idaho	4.4
32	Florida	4.0
33	Maine	3.4
34	Virginia	3.3
35	Texas	3.2
36	Utah	3.1
36	New Mexico	3.1
38	District of Columbia	2.9
39	North Carolina	2.7
40	New Hampshire	2.3
41	West Virginia	2.0
42	Kentucky	1.9
42	Louisiana	1.9
44	Tennessee	1.8
45	South Carolina	1.5
45	Georgia	1.5
47	Arkansas	1.2
48	Alabama	1.0
49	Mississippi	.7
	United States	7.4

But in this table, as in No. 10, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina continue among the last five States, and Mississippi and South Carolina do so again in the table showing the percentage of farms supplied with electric light and power (calculated as of December 31, 1930, by the National Electric Light Association):

TABLE NO. 12: ELECTRIFIED FARMS

1	California	59.5
2	Washington	58.4
3	Massachusetts	50.5
4	Nevada	47.0
5	New Hampshire	46.7
44	Mississippi	1.1
45	South Carolina	1.1
46	Tennessee	1.1
47	Arkansas	1.0
48	North Dakota	.7

Telephones, it appears, tend to run with electric lights and power, as is shown by the following table from "Telephone and Telegraph Statistics of the World," May, 1931. The figures come from the American Telephone & Telegraph Company, and set forth the number of telephones in service to each hundred of population:

TABLE NO. 13: TELEPHONES

1	District of Columbia	33.0
2	California	24.1
3	Illinois	23.6
4	New York	23.3
5	Iowa	23.0
45	New Mexico	5.6
46	North Carolina	5.3
47	Alabama	4.9
48	Mississippi	4.3
49	South Carolina	3.9
	United States	16.4

And the consumption of gasoline in gallons *per capita per annum* (*Congressional Record*, March 16, 1931, p. 7565 *f.*) naturally follows fairly closely the density of farm tractors:

TABLE NO. 14: CONSUMPTION OF GASOLINE

1	California	246
2	Nevada	208
3	Kansas	205
4	South Dakota	199
5	Oregon	178
45	Arkansas	70
46	Mississippi	68
47	South Carolina[4]	68
48	Alabama	65
49	Kentucky	64
	United States	129

The total motor vehicle registration per thousand of population follows the registration of tractors and the consumption of

[4] In this table decimals are omitted, but they are taken into account in ranking States that here show the same figures.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gasoline (Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, 1929):

TABLE NO. 15: MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

1	Nevada	350.49
2	California	347.76
3	Iowa	317.47
4	District of Columbia	311.06
5	Kansas	308.99
	. . . . .	
45	Kentucky	127.30
46	Arkansas	125.71
47	Mississippi	124.39
48	Georgia	123.39
49	Alabama	107.90
	United States	228.82

Other tables which give more or less reliable indications of the relative wealth of the different States are those which show postal receipts *per capita*, life insurance in force *per capita*, and the gross income of local corporations *per capita*. The first is compiled from the annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930:

TABLE NO. 16: POSTAL RECEIPTS

1	District of Columbia	$12.41
2	Illinois	10.34
3	New York	9.91
4	Missouri	8.28
5	Massachusetts	6.96
	. . . . .	
45	North Carolina	2.15
46	Arkansas	2.06
47	Alabama	1.93
48	Mississippi	1.61
49	South Carolina	1.25
	United States	5.56

The second table comes from the Business Research Bureau of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. It shows the life insurance in force *per capita* in 1930:

TABLE NO. 17: LIFE INSURANCE

1	New York	$1,483
2	Delaware	1,408
3	District of Columbia	1,322
4	Connecticut	1,157
5	Illinois	1,117
	. . . . .	
45	South Carolina	396
46	Arizona	380
47	Arkansas	334
48	Mississippi	277
49	New Mexico	248
	United States	705

The third table, showing the gross income of local corporations, is compiled from "Statistics of Income," 1930, p. 314:

TABLE NO. 18: INCOME OF CORPORATIONS

1	Delaware	$5,454.21
2	New York	3,024.90
3	Illinois	2,120.73
4	Nevada	1,945.43
5	Massachusetts	1,695.63
	. . . . .	
45	Alabama	194.47
46	New Mexico	177.51
47	South Carolina	176.27
48	Arkansas	158.47
49	Mississippi	143.87
	United States	818.41

So far we have eighteen tables, some of them given in full and the rest confined to the topmost and lowermost brackets. We shall now attempt, by an arithmetical method employed by Dr. Hobbs in his "North Carolina," to calculate the average position of each State in all eighteen of them, using the full tables where only parts of them have been given in the foregoing. We shall also include the six tables mentioned, but not given, in the first paragraph of this section (p. 6), and in addition we shall include tables from the Census Bureau showing the percentages of farms reporting mortgages, and the ratio of farm mortgages to the total values of farms. This will make twenty-six tables in all. Here is the result:

TABLE NO. 19: SUMMARY OF WEALTH

1	Connecticut	9.34
2	California	10.18
3	New York	12.53
4	District of Columbia	12.66
5	Massachusetts	13.19
6	Illinois	13.57
7	Nevada	14.02
8	New Jersey	15.07
9	Rhode Island	15.46
10	Pennsylvania	16.07
11	Ohio	16.92
12	Michigan	17.46
13	Washington	18.26
14	Minnesota	18.80
15	Delaware	19.32
16	Colorado	19.92
17	Oregon	20.26

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

18	Iowa	20.46
19	Maryland	20.65
20	Wisconsin	20.92
21	Maine	21.53
22	Nebraska	21.84
23	Indiana	21.88
24	New Hampshire	21.89
25	Kansas	22.23
26	Vermont	23.16
27	Missouri	23.19
28	Montana	23.88
29	Wyoming	23.89
30	Arizona	24.33
31	Utah	24.84
32	South Dakota	27.19
33	Florida	28.66
34	North Dakota	29.42
35	New Mexico	29.84
36	Idaho	30.42
37	West Virginia	30.38
38	Virginia	31.11
39	Texas	31.65
40	Kentucky	33.07
41	Oklahoma	34.07
42	Tennessee	35.00
43	North Carolina	36.19
44	Louisiana	36.23
45	Georgia	39.45
46	Alabama	40.76
47	South Carolina	42.30
48	Arkansas	42.34
49	Mississippi	45.26

In this table, plainly enough, criteria of disparate weight are grouped together and given the same value. It is thus open to serious challenge statistically. Nevertheless, it unquestionably shows certain definite trends, and is thus probably reliable enough for all practical purposes. Connecticut, which stands at the top of it, has first place in only one of the constituent tables—that showing the value of manufactures *per capita*—but it is in tenth place or better in fourteen of the twenty-six, and in twentieth or better in twenty-one, and falls below fortieth place in but one. Contrariwise, Mississippi is below fortieth place in twenty-four of the twenty-six tables, in last place in four, and in next to the last place in five more. In only two of the tables is it above fortieth place. Of its closest rivals Arkansas is above fortieth place in four, South Carolina in five, Alabama in seven, and Georgia and Louisiana in eleven.

IV

Let us now turn to some educational statistics. The returns of illiteracy from the 1930 census show the following percentages of illiterates ten years old or over, disregarding color, sex, place of residence (that is, whether urban or rural) and the language written:

TABLE NO. 20: ILLITERACY

1	Iowa	0.8
2	Washington	1.0
2	Oregon	1.0
4	Idaho	1.1
5	South Dakota	1.2
5	Nebraska	1.2
5	Kansas	1.2
5	Arizona	1.2
9	Minnesota	1.3
10	North Dakota	1.5
11	District of Columbia	1.6
11	Wyoming	1.6
13	Indiana	1.7
13	Montana	1.7
15	Wisconsin	1.9
16	Michigan	2.0
17	Vermont	2.2
18	Ohio	2.3
18	Missouri	2.3
20	Illinois	2.4
21	California	2.6
22	Maine	2.7
22	New Hampshire	2.7
24	Oklahoma	2.8
24	Colorado	2.8
26	Pennsylvania	3.1
27	Massachusetts	3.5
28	New York	3.7
29	New Jersey	3.8
29	Maryland	3.8
31	Delaware	4.0
32	Nevada	4.4
33	Connecticut	4.5
34	West Virginia	4.8
35	Rhode Island	4.9
36	Kentucky	6.6
37	Arkansas	6.8
37	Texas	6.8
39	Florida	7.1
40	Tennessee	7.2
41	Virginia	8.7
42	Georgia	9.4
43	North Carolina	10.0
44	Arizona	10.1
45	Alabama	12.6
46	Mississippi	13.1
47	New Mexico	13.3
48	Louisiana	13.5
49	South Carolina	14.9
	United States	4.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is a considerable difference between illiteracy in town and country, but the relative position of the States is not greatly altered when urban illiteracy is isolated, as the following return for places above 2500 in population (taken from Dr. Sanford Winston's "Illiteracy in the United States," 1930, p. 53) shows:

TABLE NO. 21: URBAN ILLITERACY[5]

1	South Dakota	1.1
2	Utah	1.3
3	Iowa	1.4
3	Idaho	1.4
5	North Dakota	1.5
5	Washington	1.5
5	Oregon	1.5
8	Montana	1.6
9	Nevada	1.8
10	Oklahoma	1.9
	. . . . .	
39	Connecticut	6.6
40	Tennessee	7.0
41	Virginia	7.1
41	New Mexico	7.1
43	Louisiana	9.1
44	North Carolina	9.3
45	Georgia	9.5
46	South Carolina	10.3
47	Alabama	10.4
48	Mississippi	11.3

In both of these tables the Cotton States, with their large Negro populations, give poor accounts of themselves, but that they are striving hard to improve matters is made plain by this table showing the percentages of decrease in illiteracy between 1890 and 1930:

TABLE NO. 22: DECREASE IN ILLITERACY, 1890-1930

1	Louisiana	32.3
2	New Mexico	31.2
3	Georgia	30.4
4	South Carolina	30.1
5	Alabama	28.4
6	Mississippi	26.9
7	North Carolina	25.7
8	Virginia	21.5
9	Florida	20.7
10	Arkansas	19.8
11	Tennessee	19.4
12	Kentucky	15.0
	. . . . .	
46	Nebraska	1.9
47	New York	1.8
48	Connecticut	.8

[5] The District of Columbia is missing in this and the following table.

This effort to abate illiteracy is further revealed by a table showing the percentage of the total population enrolled in the public schools, issued by the Bureau of Education ("Statistics of State Schools Systems, 1927-28," 1930, p. 17):

TABLE NO. 23: PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

1	Mississippi	33.8
2	North Carolina	28.9
3	Oklahoma	28.1
4	Tennessee	27.0
5	North Dakota	26.9
6	Utah	25.7
7	Florida	25.6
7	South Carolina	25.6
9	Alabama	24.7
10	Arkansas	24.6
	. . . . .	
43	New York	17.8
44	Massachusetts	17.3
45	Maryland	16.8
46	Delaware	16.7
47	New Hampshire	16.0
48	Rhode Island	15.8
49	District of Columbia	14.0
	United States	21.0

It appears, however, that it is one thing to enroll a pupil, and quite another thing to get him into the classroom. In the following table, compiled from the same Bureau of Education bulletin, showing the average number of days each enrolled pupil attended classes in 1928, the Cotton States drop from the top to the bottom of the list:

TABLE NO. 24: DAYS OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

1	Michigan	171.0
2	Massachusetts	161.6
3	Indiana	160.7
4	Illinois	159.3
5	Delaware	158.4
	. . . . .	
40	Louisiana	119.7
41	Florida	117.5
42	Tennessee	115.6
43	Georgia	112.4
44	North Carolina	111.6
45	Alabama	108.3
46	South Carolina	106.8
47	Arkansas	106.0
48	Oklahoma	100.0
49	Mississippi	98.1
	United States	140.4

And they are low likewise in this table (from the same source) showing the aver-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age number of days that schools were in session:

TABLE NO. 25: DAYS OF SCHOOL SESSIONS

1	New Jersey	188.0
2	Maryland	187.1
3	Illinois	186.8
4	Michigan	186.7
5	Delaware	185.0
. . . . .		
40	Florida	154.1
41	Louisiana	153.3
42	Texas	152.9
43	North Carolina	149.4
44	Oklahoma	149.0
45	Georgia	148.0
46	Alabama	147.9
47	South Carolina	146.0
48	Arkansas	145.5
49	Mississippi	138.9
	United States	171.5

Four other tables from the same bulletin throw further light upon the matter. The first shows the number of pupils attending daily for each 100 enrolled:

TABLE NO. 26: DAILY ATTENDANCE

1	Indiana	92.3
2	Michigan	91.6
3	Wisconsin	89.7
4	Maine	88.8
5	Massachusetts	88.2
. . . . .		
40	North Carolina	75.5
41	Kentucky	73.5
42	Alabama	73.3
43	Wyoming	73.2
44	South Carolina	73.1
45	Arkansas	72.8
46	Mississippi	70.6
47	Tennessee	70.5
48	New Mexico	69.5
49	Oklahoma	67.1
	United States	81.8

The second shows the percentage of the total enrollment that is in high schools:

TABLE NO. 27: ENROLLMENT IN HIGH SCHOOLS

1	Nevada	23.9
2	Washington	23.1
3	Oregon	22.6
4	Utah	20.5
5	Kansas	20.4
. . . . .		
45	Tennessee	9.7
46	Kentucky	9.5
47	Alabama	8.6
48	Mississippi	8.3
49	Arkansas	8.1
	United States	15.5

The third shows the average value of public school property for each pupil enrolled:

TABLE NO. 28: VALUE OF SCHOOL PROPERTY

1	California	$386
2	District of Columbia	375
3	New York	353
4	Michigan	351
5	New Jersey	336
. . . . .		
45	Alabama	73
46	Georgia	69
47	Arkansas	66
47	Mississippi	66
49	Tennessee	46
	United States	218

And the fourth shows the average annual salary of teachers, supervisors and principals in the elementary and high schools:

TABLE NO. 29: SALARIES OF TEACHERS

1	New York	$2,337
2	District of Columbia	2,196
3	California	2,175
4	New Jersey	2,002
5	Massachusetts	1,823
. . . . .		
45	South Carolina	769
46	Alabama	747
47	Arkansas	680
48	Georgia	647
49	Mississippi	545
	United States	1,364

To which may be added a table calculated from "Statistics of State School Systems" and "The Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1930, p. 4, showing current expenditures on the public schools *per capita* of the whole population (1927-28):

TABLE NO. 30: EXPENDITURES ON SCHOOLS

1	Washington	$57.91
2	Wyoming	27.25
3	New Jersey	25.82
4	California	25.43
5	Nevada	25.24
. . . . .		
45	Tennessee	8.72
46	Kentucky	8.58
47	Arkansas	7.63
48	Alabama	7.60
49	Georgia	6.11
	United States	17.77

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And a table (from the *World* Almanac, 1931, p. 407) showing the number of students to each 100,000 of population in universities, colleges and professional schools:

TABLE NO. 31: STUDENTS IN COLLEGES

1	District of Columbia	2598.18
2	Nevada	1294.45
3	Utah	1294.16
4	California	1241.54
5	Oregon	1184.58
.	. . . . .	
40	Mississippi	444.14
41	New Mexico	419.44
42	West Virginia	408.54
43	Maine	407.92
44	Florida	389.01
45	Alabama	383.09
46	Arkansas	327.88
47	Delaware	289.75
48	New Jersey	270.42
49	Connecticut	221.17
	United States	730.25

In public libraries, as in schools, the richer States naturally lead the poorer. Here is a table from the *World* Almanac, 1931, p. 135, showing the number of volumes in public, society and school libraries to each 100 of population:

TABLE NO. 32: LIBRARIES

1	District of Columbia	1,747
2	New Hampshire	429
3	Connecticut	327
4	Massachusetts	318
5	Vermont	313
.	. . . . .	
45	Georgia	37
46	Alabama	34
47	South Carolina	30
48	Mississippi	27
49	Arkansas	24
	United States	126

The foregoing table is confined to libraries reporting 3000 or more volumes in 1929, and thus excludes many small but very useful libraries in country towns. Moreover, the presence of the Library of Congress and other great national libraries at Washington gives the District of Columbia an unfair lead: no other State has a large national collection, and Washington is not otherwise well supplied with libraries. The following table from the Bureau of Education, showing the average population served by each public library as of 1929, may throw some additional light upon the matter:

TABLE NO. 33: POPULATION PER LIBRARY

1	New Hampshire	3,447
2	Vermont	4,333
3	District of Columbia	5,796
4	Maine	6,483
5	Connecticut	8,927
.	. . . . .	
45	Tennessee	45,904
46	Arkansas	50,121
47	Mississippi	50,246
48	Alabama	58,805
49	Louisiana	60,046
	United States	19,097

Like the number and richness of public libraries, the circulation of newspapers and magazines offers a useful index of effective literacy. Here again the richer States tend to stand far above the poorer ones. The following table, compiled from figures supplied by N. W. Ayers & Son of Philadelphia, shows the circulation of English language daily newspapers to each 1000 of population for the six months ending March 31, 1930:

TABLE NO. 34: NEWSPAPER CIRCULATION

1	District of Columbia	904.72
2	New York	615.01
3	Massachusetts	561.98
4	Missouri	467.41
5	Oregon	435.13
6	Illinois	429.86
7	Washington	425.37
8	California	413.28
9	Ohio	402.55
10	Maryland	370.44
11	Pennsylvania	369.16
12	Indiana	348.58
13	Michigan	322.90
14	Rhode Island	317.37
15	Iowa	307.76
16	Minnesota	305.82
17	Connecticut	291.90
18	Colorado	283.96
19	Nebraska	283.59
20	Florida	269.22
21	Utah	267.34
22	Wisconsin	254.91
23	Oklahoma	249.07
24	Tennessee	246.18
25	Maine	239.99
26	Arizona	235.15
27	Delaware	234.86
28	Kansas	232.07
29	Nevada	223.40

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

30	Texas	220.17
31	New Jersey	214.40
32	Louisiana	186.22
33	Montana	186.14
34	Idaho	182.24
35	Kentucky	171.33
36	Vermont	168.18
37	Virginia	165.22
38	West Virginia	157.84
39	Georgia	152.54
40	New Hampshire	140.72
41	South Dakota	139.63
42	Alabama	138.45
43	North Carolina	119.19
44	New Mexico	115.56
45	North Dakota	113.43
46	Wyoming	103.28
47	Arkansas	94.01
48	South Carolina	92.13
49	Mississippi	52.06
	United States	269.62

The circulation of magazines tends to follow the circulation of newspapers. Here is a table showing that of the *Atlantic Monthly* for each 1000 of population, compiled from a report of the Audit Bureau of Circulations as of December 31, 1930:

TABLE NO. 35: CIRCULATION OF ATLANTIC MONTHLY

1	District of Columbia	3.95
2	Massachusetts	2.68
3	Connecticut	2.35
4	New Hampshire	1.79
5	Rhode Island	1.75
6	Vermont	1.39
7	Maine	1.38
8	Delaware	1.28
9	California	1.74
10	New York	1.67
	. . . . .	
45	North Dakota	.20
46	South Carolina	.19
47	Arkansas	.15
48	Mississippi	.15
49	Florida	.06
	United States	.94

And here, turning from conservatism to radicalism, is the circulation of the *Nation*, as of December, 1930, to each 100,000 of population:

TABLE NO. 36: CIRCULATION OF THE NATION

1	California	50.6
2	Massachusetts	37.4
3	Connecticut	36.9
4	Wisconsin	34.0
5	Nevada	33.3
	. . . . .	
45	Georgia	6.9
46	Tennessee	6.4
47	Alabama	4.4
48	Mississippi	3.4
49	Arkansas	3.1
	United States	30.3

Finally, here is the circulation of the *Saturday Evening Post*, also from the Audit Bureau of Circulations, calculated to each 1000 of population for the year ending June 30, 1930:

TABLE NO. 37: CIRCULATION OF THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

1	Washington	119.98
2	California	50.73
3	District of Columbia	50.59
4	Nevada	47.25
5	Oregon	42.28
	. . . . .	
45	Arkansas	9.20
46	North Carolina	7.85
47	Alabama	7.12
48	South Carolina	6.46
49	Mississippi	5.82
	United States	25.29

These tables agree pretty well with a calculation made by Dr. S. H. Hobbs, Jr., several years ago. It is published in full on p. 375 of his before-mentioned work, "North Carolina: Economic and Social." He examined the circulation figures of no less than forty-seven national magazines, and figured out the number of inhabitants to each reader of any of them in the forty-eight States. Here are his top and bottom brackets:

TABLE NO. 38: CIRCULATION OF 47 MAGAZINES

1	California	1.84
2	Oregon	2.17
3	Washington	2.40
4	Wyoming	2.42
5	Nevada	2.79
	. . . . .	
44	Arkansas	9.07
45	Georgia	10.28
46	Alabama	10.76
47	South Carolina	10.81
48	Mississippi	12.49
	United States	3.97

These tables make it plain that the highest density of magazine readers is in New England and on the Pacific Coast, and that the lowest is in the Cotton States, with their large Negro populations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another useful gauge of the relative cultural rank of the different States is provided by their representation in "Who's Who in America." Here is a table showing the number of natives to each 100,000 of population who are listed in the edition for 1930-31:

TABLE NO. 39: NATIVES IN "WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA"

1	Vermont	85.3
2	New Hampshire	68.9
3	Maine	64.4
4	Massachusetts	51.2
5	Delaware	42.3
6	Connecticut	40.0
7	Iowa	37.7
8	Rhode Island	36.0
9	Maryland	32.6
10	Ohio	32.1
11	Indiana	31.4
12	Virginia	31.1
13	New York	29.1
14	Wisconsin	27.6
15	Nevada	24.0
16	Illinois	24.0
17	Pennsylvania	23.8
18	Missouri	22.9
19	Utah	22.8
20	Kentucky	21.6
21	South Carolina	20.3
22	Tennessee	19.4
23	Kansas	18.7
24	Michigan	16.9
25	Georgia	16.6
26	New Jersey	16.1
27	North Carolina	15.1
28	Nebraska	15.0
29	Minnesota	14.8
30	West Virginia	13.9
31	Alabama	13.5
32	Mississippi	12.2
33	Colorado	10.0
34	Louisiana	8.9
35	South Dakota	8.8
36	Arkansas	8.4
37	Oregon	8.1
38	California	8.0
39	Texas	5.7
40	Montana	5.2
41	Wyoming	4.8
42	Florida	4.2
43	Idaho	4.2
44	North Dakota	3.3
45	Arizona	2.7
46	Washington	2.4
47	New Mexico	2.1
48	Oklahoma	.6
	United States	21.7

A similar table may be extracted from "American Men of Science," the last edition of which is dated 1927:

TABLE NO. 40: NATIVES IN "MEN OF SCIENCE"

1	Vermont	1.70
2	New Hampshire	1.53
3	Iowa	1.11
3	Massachusetts	1.11
5	Connecticut	.95
6	Delaware	.81
6	Wisconsin	.81
8	Maryland	.80
8	Wyoming	.80
10	Maine	.75
	. . . . .	
40	Alabama	.07
41	Louisiana	.05
42	Oklahoma	.04
43	Texas	.01
44	Arizona	0
44	Florida	0
44	Idaho	0
44	Nevada	0
44	New Mexico	0
44	Washington	0
	United States	.41

Both of the foregoing tables show natives. When one turns to residents there is a difference, for certain States that breed eminent men and women seem unable to hold them, and others that are relatively backward in producing them give them a large opportunity to do their work. The following shows the number of *resident* scientists listed in "American Men of Science" to each 100,000 of population:

TABLE NO. 41: RESIDENTS IN "MEN OF SCIENCE"

1	District of Columbia	13.94
2	Maryland	1.42
3	Massachusetts	1.42
4	Connecticut	1.19
5	New York	1.05
6	California	1.03
7	Arizona	.84
8	Wyoming	.80
9	Illinois	.70
10	Minnesota	.66
	. . . . .	
34	Oklahoma	.04
35	Kentucky	.03
36	Alabama	0
36	Arkansas	0
36	Georgia	0
36	Florida	0
36	Idaho	0
36	Mississippi	0
36	Montana	0
36	Nevada	0
36	New Mexico	0
36	North Dakota	0
36	South Dakota	0
36	Oregon	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

36	Utah	0
36	Vermont	0
	United States	.58

The differences between Table No. 40 and Table No. 41 are striking. Vermont heads the first and is at the bottom of the second. Arizona is in forty-fourth place when it comes to natives, but in seventh place when it comes to residents. There are similar differences between the corresponding tables from "Who's Who in America" (that showing residents is omitted here). In the table of natives, for example, California is in thirty-eighth place, but in the table of residents it is in tenth place. But in general such differences are much less numerous than the correspondences. Connecticut, Massachusetts and Maryland are among the first ten States in all four lists, and Oklahoma, Texas, Alabama, Florida, Arizona, Idaho and New Mexico are among the last ten in three.

Two more tables may throw some additional light upon the relative cultural advancement of the States. The following, showing the number of persons in each 1000 of the total populations applying for passports for foreign travel in 1929, was calculated by the Campbell-Ewald Company of New York:

TABLE NO. 42: PASSPORT APPLICATIONS

1	New York City	29.88
2	Pennsylvania	9.39
3	New Jersey	7.63
4	Illinois	7.12
5	New York (exclusive of New York City)	6.97
6	Massachusetts	6.34
7	Ohio	4.66
8	California	4.00
9	Michigan	3.87
10	Connecticut	2.68
	. . . . .	
41	Delaware	.19
42	Mississippi	.15
43	South Dakota	.14
43	Arizona	.14
45	Arkansas	.12
45	Idaho	.12
45	North Dakota	.12
45	Wyoming	.12
49	Nevada	.06
50	New Mexico	.04
	United States	1.99

And this one shows the number of families to each radio outfit in use, calculated by the J. Walter Thompson Company, New York, and published in "Where They Live: Some Population Figures From the Census of 1930," p. 12:

TABLE NO. 43: FAMILIES PER RADIO

1	California	0.7
1	Nevada	0.7
3	Oregon	0.9
4	Washington	1.0
5	District of Columbia	1.2
	. . . . .	
45	Georgia	6.7
46	Alabama	6.8
47	North Carolina	7.5
48	Mississippi	8.6
49	South Carolina	9.9
	United States	2.3

It is even harder to strike a fair mean between these tables than it was to strike a mean between the tables listed in Sections II and III, for some of them plainly give an undue advantage to this or that section of the country. The Southern States, for example, are ill used by Table No. 25, for the shortness of their school session is probably due less to any indifference to education than to the excessive heat of the Southern Spring and Autumn. Contrariwise, such States as New York and Massachusetts are done some injustice by Table No. 23, for it deals with public schools only, and large numbers of their children are enrolled in parochial and private schools, which are rare in the South. Similarly, Table No. 22 bears harshly upon the same States, for their poor showing in it is not due to their indifference to the problem of illiteracy, but to their vigor in dealing with it in the past. To the advantage enjoyed by the District of Columbia in Tables Nos. 32 and 33 we have already alluded.

But despite all these difficulties, it may be interesting to determine the average place of each State in the tables from No.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

20 to No. 43 inclusive, and let the resultant list tell its own story:

TABLE NO. 44: CULTURAL MEANS

1	Massachusetts	10.95
2	District of Columbia	11.94
3	California	13.00
4	Connecticut	13.02
5	Michigan	13.79
6	Colorado	14.83
7	Utah	15.54
8	Illinois	16.12
9	New York	16.29
10	Oregon	16.75
11	Washington	17.08
12	Iowa	17.50
13	Nevada	17.91
14	Ohio	18.12
15	Indiana	18.16
16	Wisconsin	18.37
17	Minnesota	19.33
18	New Jersey	20.54
18	Rhode Island	20.54
20	Missouri	20.70
21	Montana	20.83
22	Maine	21.00
22	Nebraska	21.00
24	Kansas	21.08
25	Maryland	21.41
26	Pennsylvania	21.58
27	New Hampshire	21.66
28	Vermont	21.75
29	Wyoming	21.79
30	Delaware	22.41
31	South Dakota	25.04
32	Oklahoma	25.12
33	Idaho	26.08
34	Arizona	28.54
35	North Dakota	29.37
36	Florida	31.50
37	Texas	32.37
38	West Virginia	32.87
39	Virginia	33.04
40	Kentucky	34.50
41	Tennessee	35.37
42	New Mexico	35.75
43	North Carolina	35.87
44	Louisiana	37.00
45	South Carolina	37.87
46	Georgia	38.70
47	Arkansas	39.50
48	Alabama	40.70
49	Mississippi	41.70

It will be observed that this table and No. 19 show a great many correspondences. No less than five States—Connecticut, California, New York, Massachusetts and Illinois—along with the District of Columbia, are among the first ten in each table. And no less than nine—Kentucky, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas and Mississippi—are among the last ten in both. They are arranged in different orders, but Mississippi is in forty-ninth place in both tables. Nebraska and Kansas appear in both among the middle five States, and thirty States hold places in each table that are less than five removes from their places in the other. Of these, Nebraska, Wyoming, Kentucky, North Carolina, Louisiana and Mississippi have the same numbers in both.

Thus there would seem to be a very suggestive correlation between the relative wealth of a State and its relative cultural standing. And it would seem to be probable that Mississippi is the most backward of all the forty-eight States, with Arkansas, Alabama, South Carolina, Louisiana, North Carolina, Kentucky, Virginia and New Mexico (which are tied), Tennessee and Texas (also tied), West Virginia, Florida and Oklahoma following in the order named. Dr. S. H. Hobbs, Jr., in his "North Carolina," gave the last place to Alabama, with Georgia, Arkansas, Mississippi, South and North Carolinas, Tennessee, Louisiana and Kentucky following, but the statistics he used were mainly older than those employed in this article, and it seems likely that Mississippi, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana and South Carolina have been going downhill of late, while Alabama, Tennessee and North Carolina have been going up.

But before pronouncing a final judgment it will be necessary to examine many other tables—some dealing with the public health, some with public order, others with the state of public opinion on political, social and religious subjects, and yet others showing the relative standing of the States in other matters. We shall present these tables next month, and follow them with a critical study of the whole evidence.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OHIO TOWN

BY HUGH HANLEY

SPRING comes late in Ohio some years. Winter drags along until June. It did that year. There had been cold rains and even snow all through May in Scatterfield. Now in the middle of June there were three or four really hot days. The people crawled out from the warmth of their battered kitchens like a swarm of lazy flies. The streets were still thick with yellow oozy mud, but patches of green showed up here and there on the bleak hills. It was a portent of nice weather. School had been out for two weeks, and most of that time our gang found nothing better to do than loaf around in old John Delaney's lumber-yard. Old John didn't allow us in there, but the place was like a jungle, and he couldn't find us. We could squat under a heap of lumber within fifty feet of his grocery-store and he couldn't see us. We even knew where he hid his whiskey bottle. We watched every step he took.

Soap Dodger Pendleton played a good many mean tricks on Old John, but he deserved most of them. Old John was suave, and at first you thought he was fine, but when you got to really know him it was a different story. Soapy, as I say, played a good many practical jokes on him. Soapy never laughed about them though. He just watched the effects of the joke and looked satisfied. Once he got the old man's whiskey bottle and poured half of it out. Then he filled it up with something else. That *was* a mean trick. But Soapy crawled back under a pile of old lumber and waited for John to come for a drink. All of us sat on our haunches and peered out through the rain, waiting for John to come out.

It wasn't long. He came wading out through the thick mud. His old bowlegs were in a hurry. He reached up to the place where he kept the bottle, peering around all the time to see if anyone could see him from the back door of his dirty old grocery-store. I looked at Soapy. He was watching with the keenest of interest. Soapy even forgot to chew on the great cud of tobacco in his cheek. Delaney took a long pull at the bottle, and then he nearly strangled. He coughed and wheezed, and his face got so red that for a while the little red and blue veins in his cheeks disappeared.

I don't know whether or not he knew what was in the bottle, but he threw it as far as he could see it. Then he turned around and splashed off through the mud. He kept coughing and spitting like he had had something dirty in his mouth. Soapy watched him, and when he was gone, he shifted his chew into the other cheek. He squirted a great stream of tobacco juice and ran his dirty paw around under his chin. He took a deep breath and said, "Come on, fellers, let's git out of here." He acted just like a person who had set out to do a fine piece of work and accomplished it. Soapy was mean in some ways, but he never smiled about his meanness. Old John was meaner than Soapy, and he tried to hide it with gentility.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED