

TABLE 30.—Museum development at the end of 1930, compared by States

State	Coefficient ¹ of museum develop- ment	Ratio ² of coefficient to popula- tion
1	2	3
District of Columbia	23.0	(2)
1. New York	100.0	100.0
2. Pennsylvania	79.0	89.0
3. Connecticut	10.0	81.0
4. Michigan	27.0	77.0
5. Massachusetts	25.0	73.0
6. Rhode Island	4.0	68.0
7. Illinois	53.0	58.0
8. California	22.0	49.0
9. Ohio	25.0	47.0
10. New Hampshire	1.0	41.0
11. New Mexico	1.0	40.0
12. Colorado	3.0	33.0
13. Missouri	7.0	26.0
14. Wisconsin	6.0	26.0
15. Maryland	3.0	25.0
16. New Jersey	7.0	21.0
17. Minnesota	3.0	18.0
18. Wyoming	0.5	17.0
19. Vermont	0.5	14.0
20. Maine	1.0	12.0
21. Florida	1.0	11.0
22. Arizona	0.5	9.0
23. Nebraska	0.5	8.0
24. Oregon	0.5	8.0
25. Delaware	0.1	7.0
26. Indiana	2.0	7.0
27. Washington	0.5	7.0
28. Louisiana	1.0	6.0
29. Virginia	1.0	4.0
30. Texas	1.5	4.0
31. South Carolina	0.5	3.0
32. Kansas	0.5	3.0
33. Tennessee	0.5	2.0
34. Kentucky	0.5	2.0
35. Oklahoma	0.5	1.5
36. Alabama	0.5	1.5
37. North Carolina	0.5	1.5
38. Iowa	0.2	1.0
39. Georgia	0.2	1.0
40. Utah	0.1	1.0
41. Montana	0.1	1.0
42. Idaho	0.1	0.5
43. Mississippi	0.1	0.5
44. West Virginia	0.1	0.5
45. South Dakota	0.1	0.5
46. North Dakota	0.1	0.5
47. Arkansas	0.1	0.5
48. Nevada	0	0

¹ Expressed as percentage of the best to facilitate comparison.

² The District of Columbia is not treated here as a State; it is really comparable to a city. Its ratio as a State would be six times as great as that of New York.

Surveying the middle portion of our table, one notes some features of interest. New Hampshire is in tenth place, although its museum development is no greater than that of Virginia in twenty-ninth place. This is a reminder of the smallness of its population—only 465,000 against 687,000 for Rhode Island and 1,607,000 for Con-