

12-1-1943

The Present Indian Population of the Americas

Donald Brand

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nm_anthropologist

Recommended Citation

Brand, Donald. "The Present Indian Population of the Americas." *New Mexico Anthropologist* 6, 4 (1943): 161-170.
http://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nm_anthropologist/vol6/iss4/2

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Mexico Anthropologist by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

THE PRESENT INDIAN POPULATION OF THE AMERICAS¹

DONALD D. BRAND

This paper is essentially a preliminary abstract of one portion of a monographic study on the population of the New World upon which the writer has been working for several years. For presentation to this congress, within the space and time allowed, bibliographic references have been omitted and discussion of details has been reduced to a minimum.

The determination of the Indian population of the Americas, both absolute and comparative, must be based upon (a) total population by political entities, (b) distribution of national populations among constituent ethnic or racial groups. When the writer attempted an appraisal of the ethnic composition of New World population, he was confronted by a varied set of national censuses, partial censuses, and official and private estimates. Only a few countries undertake a complete national census at regularly repeated intervals, as does the United States which in 1940 took its sixteenth decennial census. Chile has done well in this century with complete national censuses in 1907, 1920, 1930, and 1940. Colombia has a recent history of censuses in 1918, 1928 (incomplete), and 1938; Mexico's most recent censuses were taken in 1900, 1910, 1921, 1930, and 1940; and Venezuela has taken a number of incomplete censuses during this century, the most recent being 1936 and 1941. The last two censuses of Argentina were 1895 and 1914; of Brazil 1920 and 1940; of Cuba 1919 and 1931; of the Dominican Republic 1920 and 1935; and of Perú 1876 and 1940. Haiti has not had a census since 1918; Uruguay not since 1908; Bolivia not since 1900; Paraguay not complete since 1899 (an incomplete census in 1936); and Ecuador never has taken a census. The Central American republics have an especially poor record of few and commonly incomplete censuses.

This forces one to use estimates in order to obtain a fairly up-to-date and synchronous picture of New World population. Official estimates cannot be used uncritically since these often have been disproved by actual count, even in the United States where there is a large corps of experienced estimators with the greatest amount of material upon which to base estimates. The writer examined the literature of censuses, estimates, and travelers' guesses, and then worked out the figures presented in Table I. These figures represent what the writer considers the most authoritative estimates, modified for time differential or from the writer's own observations. They must be considered to be only estimates, subject to varied modification, but essential as bases for the determination of approximate ethnic composition. Most of the estimates for the total population of the New World range between 260,000,000 and 290,000,000. The writer believes

1. This paper was presented at the Tenth Chilean General Scientific Congress.

that the December 31, 1942, total probably was between 282,000,000 and 284,000,000.

The determination of American population by races is almost an entirely subjective process. Many New World countries do not include race in their census schedules. Instead, one will find analyses of population by mother tongue, effective nationality, country of birth, etc. Even when enumeration is by race there is so much variation among the various census instructions that the resultant data are not comparable between countries or even within the same country from one census to another. This is an expectable situation since race, although a biological reality, is an anthropological abstraction which cannot be determined accurately either by observation or measurement. In the first place, anthropologists agree neither as to what are the basic human races nor as to the criteria for their determination. Even when certain racial concepts (such as the tri-part division of mankind into white, black, and yellow) are accepted arbitrarily, it is often difficult to assign an individual to his proper race because of physical peculiarities or departures from the racial norm, lack of knowledge concerning ancestry, and because of cultural conditioning. This is especially true in the New World where a large amount of miscegenation has taken place among all three of the commonly accepted primary races and among their offspring. In the case of mixed bloods it is impossible, through anthropologic measurements, to determine the proportions of the constituent races. Only a long and well kept family history can supply the answer, and few individuals in this New World of much immigration and many rapidly moving frontiers have such information. The average mixed-blood is illiterate, or his parents were; he probably never knew all four grandparents; and neither family tradition nor baptismal or marriage records (if such exist) throw much light on the actual proportions of races involved.

Comparative use of national censuses must be done with great care for the following reasons: (a) incompleteness and inaccuracy in simple enumeration, (b) no provision for race or color in the census schedule, (c) varied criteria, and (d) varied terminology. In many countries (e. g., Venezuela, Paraguay, Perú, Brazil, etc.) remote, and comparatively inaccessible, and scantily populated areas may not be visited at all by census-takers. In such cases the census may be allowed to remain incomplete or an arbitrary percentage may be added to cover the people presumably not counted. Unfortunately, such areas normally are the very ones that contain either the most Indians or the highest percentage of Indians. Also, quite commonly, the census is not completed on one specified day (because of transportation difficulties, too small a corps of enumerators, etc.), and many individuals are counted more than once. Sometimes this is corrected by deducting an arbitrary percentage. A number of countries do not enumerate by race or color but concentrate on such non-racial elements as location of home (urban or rural), occupation, mother-tongue, religion, nationality, birth-place, etc. Examples of such censuses will

be found in Mexico, Colombia, Chile, Brazil, and a number of the European colonies in Latin America. Even when race is considered probably no two countries employ identical or even similar criteria. In the United States (which probably draws the color line, in census-taking, more sharply than any other country) the preservation of statistically white blood is carried to ridiculous extremes. The white race and twelve non-white "races" are enumerated, but there is no provision for mixed races. Any mixture of white and non-white is returned according to non-white parentage. At the other extreme are found such countries as Cuba, Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico where commonly an individual of mixed white and Indian blood is listed as a white, and where a majority of the negro-white mixtures are considered white rather than mulatto.

Since no country employs trained anthropologists to take the census, and since anthropometry is not employed in census-taking, the census enumerator commonly makes his own personal interpretation of the census instructions and makes his racial identifications in terms conditioned by his education, experience, and social and economic bias. More often than not an individual will be listed as a white because he speaks a non-Indian language, or wears European clothes, or is wealthy, or carries one or more other hallmarks of European culture. Conversely, a white-Indian breed (or occasionally a white) who lives with Indians or who lives as an Indian will be labeled as Indian. The racially pure Indians and whites do not cause so much difficulty as do the mixed bloods. It is especially in this group that cultural rather than racial criteria are employed for the determination of census race.

Both local and official terminology add yet more confusion. Although *white* is most used for Caucasian race, at times *European* seemingly is considered synonymous. In Alaska *native* does not mean simply one born in Alaska but in addition is a collective term for Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians. West Indian, in the British possessions, apparently refers to individuals with varying amounts of Negro blood, while *East Indian* refers to anyone from the Dutch East Indies and British Malaysia and their descendants. *Asiatic* is commonly used for individuals from China, Japan, and Korea, and is practically the same in usage as *Oriental*. However, other Asiatics such as Hindus, Turks, and Syrians are often listed separately although they usually are white in race. In many countries Negroes, mulattos, and zambos are lumped together as Negro, although in some of the European possessions the individuals who are only part Negro are called *coloured*. In the Guianas bush Negroes and Indians commonly are lumped together.

Terminology for the pure races is least confused. *Blanco* (Span.), *branco* (Port.), *white* (Eng.), *Español* (Span.), and *European* (Eng.) mean Caucasian. *Gachupín* or *cachupín*, *chapetón*, *godo*, *maturrango*, and *peninsular* are common terms for Iberian-born whites. *Criollo* (Span.) should not be confused with *crioulo* (Port.) and *creole* (Fr., Eng.) which commonly mean a Negro born in the New World,

especially in Brazil, the West Indies, and the southern United States. *Negro* is a black or Negroid. *Indio* (Span., Port.) and *Indian* (Eng.) mean Amerindian branch of Mongoloid. Sometimes Aleuts and Eskimos are classed as non-Indian Mongoloids. A wild Indian may be referred to as *bugre* (Brazil), *jivaro* (Perú), *chuncho* (Bolivia), *Indio bravo*, *Indio gentil*, etc.

The terminology for the mixed races is extensive and utterly confused. *Mestizo* (Span., Eng.) and *mestiço* (Port.) in general refer to anyone of mixed race, and are equivalent to *mongrel* and *hybrid*. In Brazil *mestiço* commonly includes all types of race mixtures, but in Spanish America and Anglo America *mestizo* means an Indian-white mixture—usually a halfbreed. There are dozens of terms, once commonly in use, that indicate various proportions of more white than Indian blood (*castizo*, *español*, etc.) and of more Indian than white blood (*coyote*, *chino*, etc.). In Brazil the most common term for an Indian-white halfbreed is *caboclo*, but this term also is used for a tame or civilized Indian, and for a rustic or countryman; and in Colombia *caboclo* may mean a country laborer or tenant—much like *colono* and *jivaro* are used in the West Indies. *Caipira*, in Brazil, may signify a mixed-breed although usually meaning from the country or rustic. *Mameluco* is the term most used after *caboclo* in Brazil for an Indian-white halfbreed. *Cholo* is the term for an Indian-white mixed-breed most used in Ecuador, Perú, and Bolivia, and somewhat in Colombia, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, and Mexico; but it also may be used for “cultured” or civilized Indians who speak Spanish—much like *ladino*. The term *ladino* is commonly used in Central America for an Indian-white breed, but it is also used for pure or nearly pure Indians who speak Spanish as their mother tongue and for “civilized” Indians. *Roto* (Chile, Perú, etc.), *jibaro* or *goajiro* or *gibaro* (West Indies), and *caipira* (Brazil) usually mean rustic, peasant, countryman, backwoodsman, and the like, and *huaso* or *guaso* (Chile) and *gaucho* (Arg., Uru., Brazil) commonly mean cowboy or horseman. However, all of these terms are used on occasion to mean crude, uncivilized, and mixed-breed. *Roto*, in Chile, may mean anything from poor man, day laborer, tenant, criminal, and boor, to ignoramus; in Perú it means *cholo*, and in Ecuador it means *mestizo*. *Jibaro*, in Cuba and Puerto Rico, may mean small farmer, native white, any rural inhabitant, or a *mestizo*. *Huaso*, from a Quetchua word for a rustic person, is so used most in Chile but also elsewhere over South America. *Gaucho*, from Araucanian “friendly vagabond,” may mean cattle thief, *mestizo*, dweller in the Pampas, and a horseman. *Pardo* is sometimes used, as in Chile, for an Indian-white breed, but in Brazil and rather generally in Latin America it is used for a mulatto or for the child of a white-mulatto union. Lack of space forbids consideration of terms for Negro mixtures, such as *mulatto*, *jarocho*, *sambo* or *zambo*, *lobo*, *cafuso*, quadroon, octaroon, coloured people, etc.

Actually, the determination of the racial constituents of a people

or nation is of pure scientific and academic rather than practical value. In a true democracy a person's race should carry no social, economic, or other similar cultural connotation. However, dating back to the period of the conquest, possession of the white blood of the conqueror had practical as well as prestige values. Moreover, during the colonial period, birthplace (Old World versus New World, or *peninsular* versus *criollo*) and amount of white, Negro, and Indian blood were rewarded or penalized by both law and custom. This situation gave rise to (a) a large number of names for the various races and types of race-mixtures, (b) a more accurate recording of race than obtains in republican days, and (c) an exaggeration of the presumed value of being classed as a white if one were of mixed blood, or of being classified as of mixed blood if one were of pure non-white race. The tendency on the part of mixed bloods to claim recognition as whites has continued unabated and even accentuated into the present. Officially and generally this tendency is considered desirable because the ruling classes in most New World countries wish to claim the highest possible degree of "whiteness" for their countries. This desire is conditioned by local history and custom, and is based upon the unproved assumption that a member of the white race is innately superior to a non-white. Such countries as Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, and Uruguay have consistently minimized the proportion of non-whites and mixed bloods in their population. On the other hand, in recent years, there has been a commendable tendency toward recognizing and eulogizing the mixed racial constituency of the population in such countries as Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Paraguay. This tendency often has been associated with an *Indianismo* which has placed the Indian upon a theoretical and exalted pedestal, or has developed cults of ridiculous glorification of the pre-conquest Indians.

The writer has divided man in the New World into five main groups—White, Mestizo, Negroid, Indian, and Oriental (Asiatic and Oceanic Mongoloid). White, Indian, and Oriental in each case include individuals varying from more than three-fourth to pure blood. However, because Negro blood is commonly dominant over White and Indian and traces of Negro blood are more easily discernible than other ingredients in race mixtures, and because the statistics of many countries lump all *zambos*, mulattos, other Negro mixtures, and pure Negroes together, the term *Negroid* will be employed for all individuals seeming to possess Negro blood. In other words, the writer has set up the arbitrary superficial criterion that any individual (with the exception of Negroids) seeming to be more than three-quarters White is White, more than three-quarters Indian is Indian, and that all in between are Mestizos. To the Indian group have been added all others who call themselves Indians, or who live as accepted members of an Indian community, or who speak an Indian language as the mother tongue. Naturally, this study is highly subjective, and is based primarily upon the works of others modified and interpreted in the light of the writer's own observations from the United

States to Chile and Argentina. Furthermore, the Indian population estimated is neither the Indian population from the point of view of pure anthropologic race, nor is it the New World population that lives like Indians. Rather, this study pretends to estimate the approximate number of individuals who are actually considered and treated as Indians. A more practical study from the viewpoint of geography and economics would be the determination of the number and location of the people who live more like Indians than like Europeans, as has been suggested by Manuel Gamio. However, such a study would entail detailed field work by all the geographers, economists, anthropologists and sociologists in the Americas over a period of many years. To attempt the determination of the population and proportion of anthropologic races would require the time of all American anthropologists for many years, and even then it would be little more than a sampling of the various national and regional populations. No country in the New World with more than 500,000 population has yet sampled adequately as much as one-tenth of one per cent of its population.

In Table II are presented the racial components of New World population by estimated percentages. In the right hand column the Indian percentages are converted into absolute population. Probably the pure and nearly pure Indian population is between 20 and 22,000,000, or 7.6 per cent of the population of the Americas. This estimate can be compared with others such as 16,000,000 Johnston (1910), 15,500,000 Rivet (1924), 14,400,000 Willcox (1929), 15,600,000 Rosenblat (1930), 17,200,000 Loyo (1932), 20,000,000 Saenz (1940), 16,500,000 Jones (1939), 18,500,000 Green (1941), and 17,500,000 Rycroft (1942). Several organizations such as the Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, the Pan American Union, and the United States Office of Indian Affairs have for the past two or three years consistently mentioned the figure of 30,000,000 Indians, but such a figure cannot possibly be justified. Probably it is based on Spinden's 1928 estimate that the Indian population *plus a fraction of the mestizo population* gave an equivalent of 26,000,000.

Defense of the writer's estimates would entail a series of papers on each country, on the order of the writer's paper on *The Peoples and Languages of Chile* (NEW MEXICO ANTHROPOLOGIST, V:3, 1941). Therefore, at this time brief comment will be made only on the writer's estimates that differ most radically from the official or other estimates, and upon those estimates that are most poorly based. Persons who consider only "wild" Indians and those retaining native languages will be surprised at the percentages and numbers assigned to Colombia, El Salvador, Chile, Honduras, Venezuela, Argentina, and Uruguay. In these countries, with the exception of Uruguay, large numbers of "physical" Indians have become so acculturated that they commonly are considered as mestizos. Furthermore, in Venezuela, Chile, and Argentina, large blocks of Indians have been uncounted or the estimates have been minimized excessively. Although the pure Indians were nearly annihilated in Uruguay more than a century ago, there

has been a more recent immigration of Indian laborers from Argentina and Paraguay. The West Indies undoubtedly possess more than the estimated 1,200 Indians (such as the Seminoles in the Bahamas, Maya laborers and the descendants of slaves from lowland Tamaulipas and Veracruz in Cuba, Caribs in Martinique and the Windward Isles, and small acculturated remnants in mountain "refuge" areas of eastern Cuba, central Dominican Republic, central Puerto Rico) but most of these now have varying degrees of Negro blood. The high figures for Negroids in Cuba and Puerto Rico will come as a surprise to most people, but any observation of the inhabitants in these countries will verify the conclusion that a considerable part of the so-called white population is tintured with Negro blood. Paraguay's population is such a melange of Indian-white mixtures that the percentages of Indians and of mestizo blood are quite dubious. Possibly there are more mestizos than Indians according to the criteria used, but in any case the majority of the population is on the borderline. It is possible that the Indian-Eskimo blood in Newfoundland is closer to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent than 1 per cent. Also, it is possible that the percentage of white blood in Honduras has been overestimated. Conversely, the writer feels that Negro blood in Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Perú may be underestimated, and that the percentage of Indian blood in Perú, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua may be higher than given.

For comparative purposes Table III is included. The range in the commonly encountered estimates of Indian population (indicated in brackets) is a striking commentary on the uncertain status of this subject. A need is indicated for more statistical and field work to carry on the good work commenced by such as R. Kuczynski, A. Rosenblat, R. Pearl, W. Willcox, H. Spinden, A. Kroeber, C. Sauer, A. Moll, E. Sady, G. Layo, M. Gamio, M. Saenz, P. Rivet, A. Bunge, et al. Also, for a clearer picture, proper perspective should be introduced through more historical studies—inspection of documents and estimates of pre-conquest and colonial populations (such as by Mooney, Kroeber, Sauer, Means, Sapper, Rivet, Spinden, Amunátegui, Larraburre y Unanue, Rosenblat, Willcox, et al.), and studies of early white contacts, miscegenation, migration, acculturation, etc. (e. g., Seminole, Carib, Inca-Quetchua, Colla, Chiriguano, Mapuche, and Tupí migrations; early French Tupí mixtures in Brazil; acculturation in highlands of Mexico and Colombia).

TABLE I
THE POPULATION OF THE AMERICAS

Country	Last Census	1942 Estimate	Grand Totals
Anglo America (geographic sense) -----			147,346,000
Greenland (1930)	17,000	18,000	
Newf'dl'd & Labrador (1935)	290,000	296,000	
St. Pierre & Miguelon (1936)	4,000	4,000	
Canada (1941)	11,506,000	11,620,000	
Alaska (1939)	73,000	75,000	
United States (1940)	131,669,000	135,300,000	
Bermuda (1939)	31,000	33,000	
Latin America (geographic sense) -----			136,671,000
Mexico (1940)	19,763,000	20,624,000	20,624,000
Central America -----			9,214,000
Belize (1931)	51,000	60,000	
Guatemala (1940)	3,284,000	3,390,000	
Honduras (1940)	1,110,000	1,154,000	
El Salvador (1930)	1,438,000	1,830,000	
Nicaragua (1940)	1,380,000	1,400,000	
Costa Rica (1927)	472,000	670,000	
Panama (1940)	634,000	650,000	
Panama C. Z. (1940)	52,000	60,000	
West Indies -----			14,215,000
Bahamas (1931)	60,000	70,000	
Barbados (1921)	156,000	200,000	
Jamaica, etc. (1921)	869,000	1,235,000	
Leeward (1921)	122,000	94,000	without Dominica
Windward (1921)	153,000	270,000	with Dominica
Trinidad & Tobago (1931)	413,000	505,000	
Curaçao, etc. -----		110,000	
Guadeloupe, etc. (1936)	304,000	330,000	
Martinique (1936)	247,000	260,000	
Puerto Rico (1940)	1,869,000	1,930,000	
Amer. Virgin Is. (1940)	25,000	26,000	
Cuba (1931)	3,962,000	4,430,000	
Dominican Rep. (1935)	1,480,000	1,815,000	
Haiti (1918)	1,631,000	2,940,000	
South America -----			92,618,000
British Guiana (1931)	311,000	350,000	
Surinam (1921)	108,000	186,000	
Fr. Guiana & Inini (1936)	45,000	40,000	
Falkland, etc. (1931)	3,000	3,000	
Argentina (1914)	7,885,000	13,650,000	
Bolivia (1900)	1,816,000	3,550,000	
Brazil (1940)	41,357,000	42,500,000	
Chile (1940)	5,024,000	5,130,000	
Colombia (1938)	8,725,000	9,525,000	
Ecuador -----		2,980,000	
Paraguay (1936)	936,000	1,050,000	
Perú (1940)	7,023,000	7,304,000	
Uruguay (1908)	1,043,000	2,400,000	
Venezuela (1941)	3,840,000	3,950,000	
New World -----			284,017,000

TABLE II
POPULATION BY RACES*

	Population	White	Mestizo	Indian	Negroid	Oriental	Indian Pop.
Argentina	13,650,000	89	9	2	T	--	278,000
Bolivia	3,550,000	12	31	57	--	--	2,024,000
Brazil	42,500,000	39	20	3	37	1	1,275,000
Chile	5,130,000	25	66	9	--	--	462,000
Colombia	9,525,000	20	59	12	9	--	1,143,000
Ecuador	2,980,000	7	32	58	3	--	1,728,000
Paraguay	1,050,000	5	30	65	--	--	683,000
Perú	7,304,000	13	37	49	1	T	3,579,000
Uruguay	2,400,000	90	8	T	2	--	20,000
Venezuela	3,950,000	12	68	10	10	--	395,000
Guianas	576,000	3	5	12	39	41	69,000
Falkland Is.	3,000	100	--	--	--	--	-----
Brit. West Indies	2,374,000	2	T	--	90	8	200
French West Indies	590,000	2	--	--	94	4	-----
Amer. West Indies	1,956,000	20	20	--	60	--	-----
Dutch West Indies	110,000	6	5	--	85	4	-----
Cuba	4,430,000	30	20	--	49	1	1,000
Dominican Republic	1,815,000	5	14	--	81	--	-----
Haiti	2,940,000	--	--	--	100	--	-----
Panama	650,000	8	50	10	31	1	65,000
Panama C. Z.	60,000	9	20	1	70	T	600
Costa Rica	670,000	48	47	2	3	--	13,400
Nicaragua	1,400,000	10	77	4	9	--	56,000
El Salvador	1,830,000	8	52	40	T	--	732,000
Honduras	1,154,000	10	45	40	5	--	462,000
Guatemala	3,390,000	3	30	67	T	--	2,267,000
Belize	60,000	4	16	32	48	--	19,000
Mexico	20,624,000	9	61	29	1	T	5,981,000
Bermuda	33,000	36	--	--	64	--	-----
United States	135,300,000	88	2	--	10	--	370,000
Canada	11,620,000	86	13	1	--	T	120,000
St. Pierre et Miquelon	4,000	100	--	--	--	--	-----
Alaska	75,000	54	15	30	--	1	23,000
Newfoundland	296,000	95	4	1	--	--	3,000
Greenland	18,000	2	60	38	--	--	7,000

21,771,200

*Notes for Table II.

White—76-100 per cent Caucasian.

Mestizo—Indian-White breeds with not more than 75 per cent of either White or Indian blood.

Indian—76-100 per cent Amerindian (including Aleut and Eskimo), and including persons recognized or accepted as Indians.

Negroid—All individuals with perceptible Negro blood.

Oriental—Eastern Asiatics such as Chinese, Japanese, Indo-Chinese, East Indians, etc.

Fractional percentages have been converted to nearest whole percent, consequently totals may not be exactly 100 per cent; "T" represents .3-.9 of 1 per cent; "--" may mean absolute absence or an amount less than .3 of 1 per cent.

TABLE III
INDIAN POPULATION

Indian Percentage Range of Estimates			Indian Population	
Guatemala	67	(50-80)	Mexico	5,981,000
Paraguay	65	(5-97)	Perú	3,579,000
Ecuador	58	(34-75)	Guat.	2,267,000
Bolivia	57	(40-65)	Bol.	2,024,000
Perú	49	(32-70)	Ec.	1,728,000
El Salvador	40	(10-40)	Brazil	1,275,000
Honduras	40	(3-50)	Col.	1,143,000
Greenland	38	(38-98)	El S.	732,000
Belize	32	(0-32)	Par.	683,000
Alaska	30	(30-60)	Chile	462,000
Mexico	29	(25-55)	Honu.	462,000
Colombia	12	(1-20)	Ven.	395,000
Guianas	12	(1-12)	U. S.	370,000
Venezuela	10	(2-10)	Arg.	273,000
Panama	10	(2-20)	Can.	120,000
Chile	9	(2-10)	Guianas	69,000
Nicaragua	4	(3-33)	Panama	65,000
Brazil	3	(1-10)	Nic.	56,000
Argentina	2	(.1- 2)	Alaska	23,000
Costa Rica	2	(.5-10)	Uru.	20,000
Canada	1	(1- 2)	Belize	19,000
Newfoundland	1	(0- T)	C. R.	13,400
Panama C. Z.	1	(0- T)	Green.	7,000
Uruguay	.8	(0- T)	New.	3,000
United States	.26	(.2- .3)	Cuba	1,000
West Indies	--	(0- T)	C. Z.	600
			B. W. I.	200
				21,771,200