

**CHAPTER 37**  
**MEXICAN DEMOGRAPHIC HISTORY OF THE**  
**NINETEENTH CENTURY:**  
**EVIDENCE AND APPROACHES**  
**by**  
**John E. Kicza**

James W. Wilkie and Stephen Haber, eds., *Statistical Abstract of Latin America*, Volume 21 (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, University of California, 1981).

76b

# MEXICAN DEMOGRAPHIC HISTORY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: EVIDENCE AND APPROACHES

The success of the quantitative approach to modern history has led scholars to investigate the existence and utility of statistical evidence in earlier historical periods. Though various statistics have been unearthed, they have often been dismissed on grounds of unreliability or uselessness. This conclusion, I submit, is unwarranted in many cases and stems from the scholar's predilection to ask preconceived questions of the material rather than to ask what questions, if any, the evidence can answer. Data examined and found valid can stand as evidence that future scholars with new perspectives may find valuable.

Such is the character of population statistics for nineteenth-century Mexico. The known body of statistical material bearing on nineteenth-century Mexico is growing as scholars, now cognizant of its potential, actively compile it. Yet as the evidence accumulates, historians are often unsure what ends it can serve. As a result, books such as *Estadísticas Económicas del Porfiriato* and *Estadísticas Sociales del Porfiriato* appear. Products of the cooperative effort that resulted in the multivolume *Historia Moderna de México*, these books of unincorporated tables and statistics lie unused; no scholar has made extensive use of these data in a synthetic work. In this paper I argue the utility of population figures from nineteenth-century Mexico. These statistics are evaluated both in terms of the limits of their reliability and in terms of the information they contain. The intellectual climate in which they were assembled, the uses to which they were put in their own time, and the methods by which they were derived are all discussed.

As statistics are gathered within the cultural confines of a society, the history of nineteenth-century Mexico is reflected to some degree in the character and reliability of its statistics. Censuses comprehensive enough to merit that label do not appear until the end of the colonial period, the first in 1793. Previous attempts were either too crude to deserve attention or too circumscribed to have significance outside of their specific regions. Many scholars have deemed the 1793 census conducted under the viceroyalty of the Count of Revillagigedo the first reliable population estimate of Mexico, but even this census suffers from the difficulties in information gathering inherent in the social and political character of the late colonial period. Much of the population lived in scattered villages and isolated homesteads rarely visited by feared governmental officials; these people, quite understandably, viewed with suspicion any attempt by external authority to compile a listing of their numbers and characteristics. At this time Mexico was ruled by two audiencias and various provincial governors, all of whom were jealous of their autonomy and generally reluctant to execute orders from higher authorities that they did not find conducive to their own ends.

The provinces of Guadalajara, Veracruz, and Coahuila did not submit counts; however, reasonable estimates of the population of these provinces (when compared with later population studies and with the population growth rate) were later assembled. The Revillagigedo census served as the base for Humboldt's well-known population estimates for 1803. But Humboldt's figures, his scientific reputation notwithstanding, suffer from a lack of data from Veracruz, San Luis Potosí, Zacatecas, Mérida, and several provinces in the north.<sup>1</sup> His calculations are also thrown off by a very inaccurate guess about the population in these uncounted provinces and by his use of a growth rate that recent scholarship has revealed to be far removed from the actual rate.<sup>2</sup>

To arrive at new growth rate figures, I use here linear calculation expressed as the average percentage growth rate (APGR). Thus absolute change is calculated by subtracting the population count of one year from that of the next year for which we have another reliable figure. This difference is divided by the total population from the first year and is then divided by the number of years separating the two dates. The resulting number, when expressed in percentage terms, yields the APGR during the interval between the two years. Since we have no way of knowing what fluctuations, if any, occurred in the intervening years, this approach seems the most sound.

Every constitution of independent Mexico has called for a national census each decade. As the prescribed political framework of Mexico for the bulk of the nineteenth century was a republican form of government, accurate state population counts were considered vital to the proper organization of a representative congress. All the constitutions of that century left the actual census-taking to the individual states. The dedication of the individual state government, therefore, determined the appearance and accuracy of its census figures. The political instability that characterized Mexico in the nineteenth century meant that the efforts of the various states were usually uncoordinated. Plausible population counts for all the states and territories rarely appeared in any one-year period. When they did, it was through the cooperation of the federal government and of dedicated individuals competent and willing to assemble the various figures.

In the nineteenth century many individuals, societies, and agencies published statistics; unfortunately, despite the accuracy of many of these works, they are restricted geographically or temporally or deal with a topic not of interest

<sup>1</sup> Fernando Navarro y Noriega, "Memoria sobre la población del reino de Nueva-España," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 13(1869): 284.

<sup>2</sup> Victoria Lerner, "Consideraciones sobre la población de la Nueva-España (1793-1810)," *Historia Mexicana* 22(January-March 1968): 333-337.

to modern historians. But while there was a diversity of data-collecting bodies, concurrently, there was an effort to standardize the units of comparison affecting both methodology and categorization. There were two reasons for this drive toward standardization. The Western world was developing new interest in the utility of statistics for economic and social planning, and the expansion of societies, both private and public, dedicated to the compilation of accurate statistics (and also often to the "betterment of human conditions") was disseminating improved statistical methodology and uniformity across the globe.

By far the most prominent Mexican society of this type was the Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística founded under government sponsorship in 1833. Its prestigious *Boletín*, published quite regularly on an annual basis despite the political turmoil that so often afflicted Mexico, remains the best single source for nineteenth-century Mexican population figures. Scholars such as Manuel Orozco y Berra, Manuel Payno, José Gómez de la Cortina, and especially Antonio García Cubas frequently published new population estimates, commentaries on the works of others, and articles on aspects of geography, meteorology, and Indian ethnology, including studies of different Indian languages with accompanying dictionaries, in its pages.

By the time of the War of the Reform, the government through the Ministerio de Fomento was cooperating with nongovernmental groups and individuals for the purpose of assembling more accurate series of statistics. Efforts were made to measure more closely the fiscal aspects of state government and the nature and movement of commerce in the different parts of the country. The most outstanding contribution of this governmental effort was a national population estimate with state population figures derived from the most accurate data from the various states and municipalities produced under Manuel Orozco y Berra and published in the 1857 *Memoria* of the Ministerio de Fomento. During the Porfiriato, in 1882 the government founded the Dirección General de Estadística under the same ministry. Its head for the remainder of the century was Antonio Peñafiel, one of the most distinguished statisticians of that time.

Throughout the nineteenth century, Mexican statisticians acknowledged that the nation's parish records were the best source for population studies. In 1870, over a decade after the Mexican government had established a civil registry, Antonio García Cubas, who had been considered the nation's most diligent statistician since his first efforts at compilation of population figures in the 1850s, stated that without doubt clerics still retained the best data for population studies.<sup>3</sup> Given that the Church still penetrated more deeply into the countryside than did the government and that people still tended to fear that utilization of the civil registry would

expose their families to greater taxation and to recruitment into the military, his statement seems to have basis in fact. The government had long recognized the quality of the nation's parish records and in the years before the Reform sought to have the Church supply it with civil statistics. Unfortunately, at best this was a piecemeal process in which only a scattering of clerics participated and the recurrent conflict between Church and State doomed even this small level of cooperation.

The data compiled by the statisticians of nineteenth-century Mexico suffered from imprecision that many modern historians feel negates its value. It should first be stated that the Mexican statisticians of that century were not a group of casual dilettantes playing with figures from questionable sources. The best of them, a clear majority of the active members of the Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística, were deeply committed scholars who investigated different fields of knowledge. Men such as Manuel Orozco y Berra, Manuel Payno, and Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, who contributed both valuable statistics and meaningful commentaries, also achieved renown that endures to this day for their accomplishments in other areas. Perhaps in our own time when so many of the works of value in history are interdisciplinary in nature, we can better appreciate the labors and insights of these people. They and their lesser-known associates did not simply gather data for the sheer pleasure of doing so, but rather compiled it to further understand their own society. The character of the statistics gathered and the use to which they were put reflect the intellectual concerns of Mexican thinkers of that time.

The hostility of the Mexican intellectual toward the Indian, for so long taken as a characteristic of the nineteenth century, is not evidenced so clearly in the statistical writings. Of course, with Independence came the end of the practice of ethnic classification of the population, a practice that would not be renewed until after the Revolution. The loss of this information should not be greatly lamented, as even the statisticians of that time denigrated the accuracy of these estimates, casting aspersions on the techniques of those attempting such studies. As for the attitude of these scholars toward the Indian himself, it is perhaps best characterized in an article by Antonio García Cubas in 1870 highlighted by a new estimate of the nation's population. Looking first at the areas of the nation experiencing the lowest rates of population increase and then at the ethnic makeup of these regions, García Cubas concluded that the Indians suffered a very high mortality rate, especially among their infants, and displayed disturbingly little regard for nutrition and hygiene. Then, as many Mexican scholars had done previously, he forecast the gradual but inevitable disappearance of the Mexican Indian. But García Cubas did not stop his analysis with this prediction and sought to understand the Indians in terms of their own cultures. He recognized the cultural bias he possessed and the restraints that it put on his research. He never argued that the Indians created their own misery, but charged that

<sup>3</sup> Antonio García Cubas, "Materiales para formar la estadística general de la República Mexicana," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 14(1870): 358.

the white man was behind the squalor of the contemporary Indian and declared that the Indians constituted a viable cultural entity if left alone.<sup>4</sup>

Other social concerns written about by Mexican scholar-statisticians of the nineteenth century include public health and crime rates. In their commentaries on the raw data on causes of death these individuals militated against burial in churches and stressed the need for better nutrition. The figures on crime rates and prostitution were closely scrutinized and recommendations were offered. When these people assiduously assembled and evaluated this quantitative evidence, they did so to better serve the needs of their own society, not to accumulate an evidentiary base for future historians.

An intellectual preoccupation of these scholars was the effects of geography, altitude, climate, and other natural forces on demographic patterns. At its worst, this predilection led to endless charts of the barometric pressures of many areas of Mexico at different times of the year and at different altitudes. Several scholars attempted rigorous investigations of the effect of altitude and climate on the population in different parts of the country. It was thought that climate would have an effect on mortality and, consequently, on population growth rates. The ratio of men to women was perceived as crucial, with women expected to outnumber men in warm climates and the reverse in temperate climates.<sup>5</sup>

These intellectuals, sharing a uniformly high regard for the achievements of Mexico in such matters as literacy and the health and prosperity of the nation's inhabitants, did not hesitate to compare Mexico with the leading nations of Europe. Some of their articles read like promotional literature to attract immigration and, in fact, one major article written during the Intervention by a French doctor addressed itself directly to this topic. Doctor Jourdanet began by offering his readership an interpretation of the effect of climate, especially altitude, on health and population growth; he concluded by declaring Mexico a land well suited for the European immigrant. In his comparison of the well-being of the Mexican population with the French under Napoleon III he not-too-surprisingly decided in favor of the former.<sup>6</sup>

Clearly, the most formidable challenge to the statistics of the nineteenth century is their reliability and, especially, the methodology used to obtain them. In this paper I restrict myself to national population estimates that are subdivided at least to the state level. Many of the most outlandish figures for Mexico's population are removed by using this simple device. Anyone can take a stab at the gross population of a nation; it takes a much more critical, probing effort to

gather reasonable figures at the state level. Likewise, I only use state figures when they are part of a national calculation. It is clear, however, that many of the finest population counts we have from this century result from the dedicated efforts of one or several individuals computing the population of a single state. Good examples are Longinos Banda for Jalisco, José M. Régil and Alonso M. Peón for Yucatán, Pedro García Conde for Chihuahua, and Antonio Linares for the state of México. But these figures, though perhaps the best in terms of exactitude, are geographically and temporally so isolated as to forbid the comparisons necessary for determining national patterns. Fortunately, these state and regional population counts were disseminated in their own time and used by scholars undertaking accurate national population estimates.

By far the most prevalent practice used by Mexican statisticians of the last century to obtain reliable figures was to take the most accurate previous census and then to apply regional growth rates to it to derive the new calculation. This approach took many forms, some more reliable than others. Humboldt in 1803 utilized the 1793 Revillagigedo census and increased it by 10% for the population believed missing in it and added an additional 20% for the population growth in the intervening decade. Unfortunately, Humboldt applied these percentage increases across all the provinces without realizing that different natural growth rates and patterns of migration would cause some areas to grow at different rates than others. Navarro y Noriega in 1810 used much the same approach; however, he benefited from more recent figures, having availed himself of tribute and parish records from 1807 and detailed intendants' and governors' records from various provinces.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, it must be remarked that he was very poorly informed about the more remote districts and hazarded reasonable guesses for them. But these writers did not operate in an uncritical atmosphere. For example, an author calling himself M.P., perhaps Manuel Payno, outlined different forces retarding population growth in Mexico which made simple natural growth rate projections unfeasible. Listed as general forces were the Wars for Independence, the civil wars, epidemics, and Indian raids still prevalent in the north; under specific were listed the expulsion of the Spaniards, matrimonial difficulties, hiding from census takers to avoid military service, and emigration.<sup>8</sup>

The figures obtained in the study conducted by Orozco y Berra in 1857 under the auspices of the Ministerio de Fomento provided the base for many of the estimates made between that date and 1895, the date of the first national census that merits credibility. It was common during the interim to use the 1857 figures as a starting point and to calculate the rate of change up to the date of the scholar's estimate. I should interject here that not one of these individuals claimed his figures were exact; they were content merely

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 371-373.

<sup>5</sup> José Gómez de la Cortina, "Introducción," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 1(1861): 14-15.

<sup>6</sup> Doctor Jourdanet, "De la estadística de México," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 11-12(1865): 228-233.

<sup>7</sup> Gómez de la Cortina, "Introducción," p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> M.P., "Artículo sobre la población de la República," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 7(1859): 144.

to claim that which they were actually doing: obtaining the most reasonable estimate of the national population possible at that time.

When better figures appeared for various regions, analysts utilized them for the region itself and, if applicable, extrapolated from them to modify their growth rate calculations and the resultant totals for the rest of the country. In 1868 and 1869 the national government attempted another comprehensive census of the nation; regrettably, only a fraction of the states responded with up-to-date population figures.<sup>9</sup> Still, using this material, Antonio García Cubas derived a new national population estimated by calculating the APGR for each region rather than forcing the national APGR on the different regions of the country. Some scholars relied on more exact city or municipality figures and extrapolated entire state population counts from them. Others tried to project what the growth rate of the nation would have been without civil war and epidemics and then subtracted from their calculations to account for these vicissitudes.<sup>10</sup> But those estimates that appear the most consistent and credible are those that recognized regional variation of growth rates, attempted to update these rates, and took into account the latest state and regional population figures. As the figures on state populations in the following section show, these statisticians, if they felt the modification warranted, would account for variations of several hundred persons in regional populations of hundreds of thousands, rather than allow the figures to remain static.

Such scholars maintained critical attitudes toward their data and toward each other's calculations and carried on long-running debates ever seeking to improve their methods and results. This pervasive critical spirit and rigorous attention to methodology invests in their works a degree of reliability that makes them worthy of our attention and analysis. These estimates of the nineteenth-century Mexican population at different points in time provide insights into this period of history when approached with the same questioning attitude evinced by their authors, with the realization that they are estimates containing variable ranges of error, and with a knowledge of other aspects of nineteenth-century Mexican history.

Though unable to carry out censuses that would be deemed satisfactory according to the standards of our time, these scholar-statisticians were closely attuned to contemporary developments in their country and, therefore, were able to develop population estimates that, when converted into percentages, provide an understanding of the comparative regional population growth of Mexico in the nineteenth century and of the effect that wars, modernization, and other factors had on the demographic makeup of that nation.

<sup>9</sup> Antonio García Cubas, "Extensión y población de la República Mexicana," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 13(1869): 370.

<sup>10</sup> Rafael Durán, "Memoria sobre el censo de la República Mexicana," *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 9(1862): 263-265.

### National Population Figures From 1793 to 1910

I have selected twelve Mexican population counts from 1793 through 1910; each breaks down its figures to the state level. More estimates of this type are available, but most of them are grouped around the same dates and are very similar. When forced to make a choice, I selected what appeared to be the most reliable count according to the criteria described in the previous pages. These estimates are:

1793. Compiled under the auspices of the viceroy, the Count of Revillagigedo. The first Mexican census worthy of that term, it lacked figures from Guadalajara, Veracruz, and Coahuila but estimates that now appear quite plausible were provided for these regions. Source: Alejandro de Humboldt.

1810. Compiled by Francisco Navarro y Noriega, high-placed administrator in the viceregal administration. Used the 1793 Revillagigedo census, but updated it through extensive use of parish and tribute records from 1807. Far more accurate for central Mexico than for the outlying provinces. Source: *Boletín*, volume 1.

1838. Compiled by José Gómez de la Cortina. First reliable estimate of the postindependence period. Author was a well-known member of the Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística and conducted his research under its auspices. He states that his figures are an absolute minimum. Source: *Boletín*, volume 1.

1857. Compiled by Jesús Hermosa. One of three major censuses in the same year. All three interrelate in terms of source material and approach and emerge with extremely similar results. Hermosa's figure is only 20,000 under the calculation of Antonio García Cubas and 40,000 under the census conducted by Manuel Orozco y Berra for the Ministerio de Fomento. Hermosa, unlike the others, offers figures for the capital cities of each state and the Federal District. Source: Jesús Hermosa, *Manual de Geografía y Estadística de la República Mexicana* (Paris, 1857).

1862. Compiled by Antonio García Cubas. Offers a revision of the 1857 census to account for the intervening five years, the time of the War of the Reform. Source: *Boletín* volume 9.

1869. Compiled by Antonio García Cubas. Another revision, this time since 1862, which is based on newly gathered raw data from several states. Unique in that he cites the corpus of evidence he used as sources for each state. He repeats his 1862 data on the state capitals as he lacked new information on them and sought to avoid haphazard guesswork. Source: *Boletín*, volume 13.

1879. Compiled by Matías Romero. Little information available on this calculation, but it could well be a copy of a García Cubas survey. Source: Matías Romero, *Geographical and Statistical Notes on Mexico* (New York, 1898).

1885. Compiled by Antonio García Cubas. Another updating of figures on state and city population figures for a separate volume describing Mexico. Source: Antonio García Cubas, *Cuadro Geográfico, Descriptivo e Histórico de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos* (México, 1885).
1889. Compiled by Antonio García Cubas. Another revision to bring his figures up to date. Source: Luis Pombo, *México: 1876-1892* (México, 1893).
1895. Compiled by Federal Census. First "modern" census. Source: *Estadísticas Económicas del Porfiriato* (Mexico, n.d.).
1900. Federal Census. Source: *ibid.*
1910. Federal Census. Includes state capitals. Source: *ibid.*

At first glance the many changes in the internal Mexican political boundaries would seem to doom any efforts to make meaningful comparisons of the population growth patterns of different regions. Though Mexico changed state boundaries to create new states on more than several occasions in the nineteenth century, it did not do so in a haphazard manner. By 1793 colonial Mexico was already divided politically by the intendency system that astutely segmented greater Mexico into areas that matched recognized geographical, cultural, and economic boundaries. Subsequently, when independent Mexico created new states, it did so in a way that retained the integrity of much of the colonial intendency system. The modern states of Guanajuato and Querétaro, for example, compose the old intendency of Guanajuato while the states of Zacatecas and Aguascalientes form the colonial intendency of Zacatecas. The nation of Mexico, therefore, can be subdivided into regions which closely match the colonial intendencias and which allow regional comparisons of population growth patterns. I have divided Mexico into eleven regions that are as follows:

- Northwest. Intendency of Arizpe which included Sonora, Sinaloa, and the Californias, and the intendency of Durango which included Durango and Chihuahua
- Northeast. Intendency of San Luis Potosí which included San Luis Potosí, Coahuila, Nuevo León, Tamaulipas (Nuevo Santander), Texas, and New Mexico
- North Central. Intendency of Zacatecas which included Zacatecas and Aguascalientes
- Midwest. Intendency of Guadalajara which included Jalisco and Tepic (Nayarit)
- Bajío. Intendency of Guanajuato which included Guanajuato and Querétaro
- West. Intendency of Valladolid which included Michoacán and Colima
- Central. Intendency of México which included México, the Federal District, Hidalgo, Morelos, and Guerrero

East Central. Intendency of Puebla which included Puebla and Tlaxcala

Veracruz. Intendency of Veracruz

Oaxaca. Intendency of Oaxaca

Peninsula. Intendency of Yucatán which included Yucatán, Campeche, Quintana Roo, and Tabasco, and the state of Chiapas acquired from Guatemala

When arranged in tables, these population estimates can yield significant information, especially when we apply to the statistical evidence the same critical standards applied to literary evidence. Obviously, there are some egregious errors in the regional and state estimates for various years, but they comprise a very small fraction of the total figures amassed and their effects on the interpretation of the data can be neutralized. Most of the gross statistical errors listed below relate to border states and the Yucatán Peninsula, areas generally sparsely populated until the late nineteenth century and distant from Central Mexico, the residence of the men who compiled the data. In the case of the Yucatán Peninsula the ignorance of these men about these isolated and economically peripheral areas was exacerbated by the demographic catastrophe of the Caste War, a struggle little understood but most terrifying to the elites, educated or otherwise, of Mexico.

The tables are constructed here so as to permit horizontal comparisons from 1793 to 1910 by region and state in each census year (table 3700) and vertical comparisons over the entire time span for each region and state (table 3701). Comparative regional demographic trends are best exposed when figures for PTP and APGR are compared over time. A region may be growing in terms of actual population, but losing its share of the national population because other regions are growing even more rapidly. Of course, the APGR for the states can only be computed when the states have reached their final boundaries; until then the regional figures are the best available.

While there is no doubt about the efficacy of compound annual growth rates for many demographic analyses, their use is not warranted in this study. As the state and regional histories of nineteenth-century Mexico are still so little known, linear averaging between each two census dates in the series is less likely to convey unwarranted accuracy because considerable population variation could have occurred between any two dates and have remained undetected.<sup>11</sup>

Inspection of tables 3700 and 3701 quickly reveals some obvious errors in estimates made by nineteenth-century sources. These errors are shown in table 3702.

<sup>11</sup> James W. Wilkie, *Statistics and National Policy* (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1974), p. 184.



Table 3700 (Continued)  
 "HORIZONTAL VIEW" OF MEXICAN POPULATION BY CENSUS OF  
 REGION AND COMPONENT STATES, 1793-1910

Region and State	1857			1862			1869		
	Hermosa			García Cubas			García Cubas		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
<b>Bajío</b>	1,109,431	13.5	4.4	1,054,000	12.8	-1.0	1,040,643	11.9	-.2
Guanajuato	874,073	10.6	3.7	874,000	10.6	=	874,000	10.0	~
Querétaro	235,388	2.9	5.0	180,000	2.2	-4.7	166,643	1.9	-1.1
<b>West</b>	552,922	6.5	.6	670,829	8.2	4.3	666,721	7.6	=
Michoacán	491,679	6.0	~	604,509	7.4	4.6	618,072	7.1	.3
Colima	61,243	.7	~	66,320	.8	1.7	48,649	.6	-3.8
<b>Central</b>	1,512,554	18.4	.5	1,562,554	19.0	.7	1,620,426	18.5	.5
México	1,012,554	12.2	~	1,012,554	12.3	=	599,810	6.9	~
D.F.	230,000	2.8	~	280,000	3.4	4.3	225,000	2.6	-2.8
Morelos	~	~	~	~	~	~	121,409	1.4	~
Hidalgo	~	~	~	~	~	~	404,207	4.6	~
Guerrero	270,000	3.3	~	270,000	3.3	=	270,000	3.1	=
<b>East Central</b>	745,793	9.1	6.7	745,780	9.1	=	947,941	10.8	3.9
Puebla	665,622	8.1	~	655,622	8.0	-.3	830,000	9.5	3.8
Tlaxcala	80,171	1.0	~	90,158	1.1	2.5	117,941	1.3	4.4
<b>Veracruz</b>	338,859	4.1	1.7	380,976	4.6	2.5	380,976	4.4	=
<b>Oaxaca</b>	582,062	7.1	.9	533,733	6.5	-1.7	601,850	6.9	1.9
<b>Península</b>	918,240	11.1	.9	595,855	7.3	-7.0	646,781	7.4	1.2
Yucatán	680,325	~	~	263,547	3.2	~	282,634	3.2	1.0
Campeche	12,305 <sup>b</sup>	~	~	86,453	1.1	~	86,453	1.0	=
Tabasco	63,596	.8	=	79,486	1.0	5.0	83,707	1.0	.8
Quintana Roo	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Chiapas	161,914	2.0	.8	166,369	2.0	-.6	193,987	2.2	2.4
<b>Total</b>	8,238,088	100.0	.9	8,212,579	100.0	-.1	8,743,614	100.0	.9

  

Region and State	1879			1885			1889		
	Romero			García Cubas			García Cubas		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
<b>Northwest</b>	748,510	7.6	.9	798,143	7.6	1.1	872,941	7.7	2.3
Sonora	115,424	1.2	-2.2	143,924	1.4	4.1	134,790	1.2	-1.6
Sinaloa	186,491	1.9	1.6	201,918	1.9	1.4	223,686	2.0	2.7
California	30,208	.3	4.4	30,198	.3	=	31,161	.3	.8
Durango	190,846	1.9	1.0	196,852	1.9	.5	255,652	2.2	7.5
Chihuahua	225,541	2.3	2.5	225,251	2.2	=	225,652	2.0	=
<b>Northeast</b>	989,933	10.0	3.3	1,002,949	9.6	.2	1,064,303	9.3	1.5
San Luis Potosí	516,486	5.2	3.0	516,486	4.9	=	516,486	4.5	=
Tamaulipas	140,137	1.4	2.9	140,137	1.3	=	161,121	1.4	3.7
Nuevo León	203,284	2.1	1.9	201,732	2.0	-.1	236,074	2.1	4.3
Coahuila	130,026	1.3	9.2	144,594	1.4	1.9	150,622	1.3	1.0
<b>North Central</b>	562,936	5.7	1.6	562,936	5.4	=	606,042	5.3	1.9
Zacatecas	422,506	4.3	.6	422,506	4.0	=	465,862	4.1	2.6
Aguascalientes	140,430	1.4	6.2	140,430	1.3	=	140,180	1.2	=
<b>Midwest</b>	983,484	9.9	.6	983,484	9.4	=	1,381,019	12.1	10.1
Jalisco	~	~	~	~	~	~	1,250,000	11.0	~
Tepic	~	~	~	~	~	~	131,019	1.1	~
<b>Bajío</b>	1,038,095	10.5	=	1,171,363	11.2	2.1	1,210,366	10.6	.8
Guanajuato	834,845	8.4	-.4	968,113	9.3	2.7	1,007,116	8.8	1.0
Querétaro	203,250	2.1	2.2	203,250	1.9	=	203,250	1.8	=
<b>West</b>	727,361	7.3	.9	856,699	8.2	3.0	856,699	7.5	=
Michoacán	661,534	6.7	.7	784,108	7.5	3.1	784,108	6.9	=
Colima	65,827	.7	3.5	72,591	.7	1.7	72,591	.6	=
<b>Central</b>	1,944,483	19.6	2.0	2,066,237	19.8	1.0	2,275,003	20.0	2.6
México	710,579	7.2	1.8	710,579	6.8	=	798,480	7.0	3.1
D.F.	351,804	3.6	8.1	426,804	4.1	3.6	475,737	4.2	2.9
Morelos	159,160	1.6	3.1	141,565	1.4	-1.8	141,565	1.2	=
Hidalgo	427,350	4.3	.6	434,096	4.2	.3	506,028	4.4	4.1
Guerrero	295,590	3.0	.9	353,193	3.4	3.2	353,193	3.1	=
<b>East Central</b>	923,454	9.3	-.3	922,944	8.8	=	971,603	8.5	1.3
Puebla	784,466	7.9	-.5	784,466	7.5	=	833,125	7.3	1.6
Tlaxcala	138,988	1.4	1.8	138,478	1.3	=	138,478	1.2	=
<b>Veracruz</b>	542,918	5.5	4.3	582,441	5.6	1.2	621,476	5.5	1.7
<b>Oaxaca</b>	744,000	7.5	2.4	761,274	7.3	.4	768,508	6.1	.2



Table 3700 (Continued)

## "HORIZONTAL VIEW" OF MEXICAN POPULATION BY CENSUS OF REGION AND COMPONENT STATES, 1793-1910

Region and State	1879			1885			1889		
	Romero			García Cubas			García Cubas		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
<b>Península</b>	<b>702,837</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>739,504</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>769,748</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Yucatán	302,315	3.1	.7	302,315	2.9	#	329,621	2.9	2.3
Campeche	90,413	.9	.5	90,413	.9	#	93,976	.8	1.0
Tabasco	104,747	1.1	2.5	104,747	1.0	#	104,747	.9	#
Quintana Roo	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Chiapas	205,362	2.1	.6	242,029	2.3	.3	241,404	2.1	-.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,908,011</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>10,447,984</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>11,395,712</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Region and State	1895			1900			1910		
	Federal Census			Federal Census			Federal Census		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
<b>Northwest</b>	<b>1,050,265</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>1,264,085</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>1,530,179</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Sonora	191,281	1.5	6.7	221,682	1.6	3.2	265,383	1.8	2.0
Sinaloa	258,865	2.0	2.6	296,701	2.2	2.9	323,642	2.1	.9
California	42,245	.3	5.9	47,624	.3	2.5	52,272	.3	1.0
Durango	295,105	2.3	2.6	370,294	2.7	5.1	483,175	3.2	3.0
Chihuahua	262,771	2.1	2.7	327,784	2.4	4.9	405,707	2.7	2.4
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>1,325,229</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>1,419,102</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1,604,682</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>
San Luis Potosí	568,449	4.5	1.7	575,432	4.2	.2	627,800	4.1	.9
Tamaulipas	206,502	1.6	4.7	218,948	1.6	1.2	249,640	1.6	1.4
Nuevo León	309,252	2.4	5.2	327,784	2.4	1.2	365,150	2.4	1.1
Coahuila	241,026	1.9	10.0	296,938	2.2	4.6	362,092	2.4	2.2
<b>North Central</b>	<b>557,193</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>-1.3</b>	<b>564,606</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>598,067</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>.6</b>
Zacatecas	452,578	3.6	-.5	462,190	3.4	.4	477,556	3.2	.3
Aguascalientes	104,615	.8	-4.2	102,416	.8	-.4	120,511	.8	1.8
<b>Midwest</b>	<b>1,256,003</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>1,303,988</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1,380,028</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>.6</b>
Jalisco	1,107,227	8.8	-2.0	1,153,891	8.5	.8	1,208,855	8.0	.5
Tepic	148,776	1.2	2.3	150,097	1.1	.2	171,173	1.1	1.4
<b>Bajío</b>	<b>1,291,105</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1,294,114</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>1,326,314</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>.2</b>
Guanajuato	1,062,554	8.4	.9	1,061,724	7.8	#	1,081,651	7.1	.2
Querétaro	228,551	1.8	2.0	232,390	1.7	.3	244,663	1.6	.5
<b>West</b>	<b>952,247</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1,000,923</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1,069,584</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>.2</b>
Michoacán	896,495	7.1	2.4	935,808	6.9	.9	991,880	6.5	.6
Colima	55,752	.4	-3.9	65,115	.5	3.4	77,704	.5	1.9
<b>Central</b>	<b>2,456,494</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2,720,350</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>3,130,686</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>
México	841,618	6.7	.9	934,463	6.9	2.2	989,510	6.5	.6
D.F.	476,413	3.8	#	541,516	4.0	2.7	720,753	4.8	3.3
Morelos	159,355	1.3	2.1	160,115	1.2	#	179,594	1.2	1.2
Hidalgo	558,769	4.4	1.7	605,051	4.4	1.7	646,551	4.3	.7
Guerrero	420,339	3.3	3.2	479,205	3.5	2.8	594,278	3.9	2.4
<b>East Central</b>	<b>1,151,216</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>1,193,428</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>1,285,771</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>.8</b>
Puebla	984,413	7.8	3.0	1,021,113	7.5	.7	1,101,600	7.3	.8
Tlaxcala	166,803	1.3	3.4	172,315	1.3	.7	184,171	1.2	.7
<b>Veracruz</b>	<b>866,355</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>981,030</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1,132,859</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>Oaxaca</b>	<b>884,909</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>948,633</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1,040,398</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Península</b>	<b>841,409</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>916,828</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1,061,804</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>1.6</b>
Yucatán	298,850	2.4	-1.6	309,653	2.3	.7	339,613	2.2	1.0
Campeche	88,121	.7	-1.0	86,542	.6	-.4	86,661	.6	#
Tabasco	134,839	.7	4.8	159,834	1.2	3.7	187,574	1.2	1.7
Quintana Roo	~	~	~	~	~	~	9,109	~	~
Chiapas	319,599	2.5	5.4	360,799	2.7	2.6	438,847	2.9	2.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,629,825</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>13,607,260</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>15,160,368</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>

1. The Percentage of Total Population (PTP) gives the percentage of the total national population in the particular geographic unit, be it region or state, for that year. After the 1793 census the Average Percentage Growth Rate (APGR) reveals the rate at which each region and state is growing on an annual basis.

2. Includes Alta California until 1848.

a. Includes Texas until 1848.

b. In this census no figure was given for Campeche, but one was given for the Island of Carmen. It is included here for convenience.

Table 3701  
 "VERTICAL VIEW" OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF MEXICO,<sup>1</sup> 1793-1910

I. BY REGION

Year	Total			Northwest			Northeast			North Central		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	4,483,469	~	~	228,928	5.1	~	286,233	6.4	~	118,027	2.6	~
1810	6,122,354	2.2	~	338,192	5.5	2.8	354,581	5.8	1.4	140,723	2.3	1.1
1838	7,044,140	.5	~	614,657	8.7	2.9	683,182	9.7	3.3	343,268	4.9	8.9
1857	8,238,088	.9	~	722,652***	8.8***	~	711,333	8.7	.2	385,384	4.7	.6
1862	8,212,579	~1	~	636,765	7.8	.1	718,839	8.8	.2	388,717	4.7	.2
1869	8,743,614	.9	~	686,203	7.8	1.1	744,940	8.5	2.6	485,553	5.6	4.4
1879	9,908,011	1.3	~	748,510	7.6	.9	989,933	10.0	3.3	562,936	5.7	1.6
1885	10,447,984	.9	~	798,143	7.6	1.1	1,002,949***	9.6***	~	562,936	5.4	=
1889	11,395,712	2.3	~	872,941	7.7	2.3	1,064,303***	9.3***	~	606,042***	5.3***	=
1895	12,632,425	1.8	~	1,050,265	8.5	3.4	1,325,229	10.5	2.1	557,193	4.4	~1
1900	13,607,260	1.5	~	1,264,085	9.3	4.1	1,419,102	10.4	1.4	564,606	4.1	.3
1910	15,160,368	1.1	~	1,530,179	10.1	2.1	1,604,682	10.6	1.3	598,067	3.9	.6

Year	Midwest			Bajío			West			Central		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	485,000	10.8	~	397,924	8.9	~	289,314	6.5	~	1,162,856	25.9	~
1810	517,674	8.5	.4	576,600	9.4	2.6	394,689	6.5	2.1	1,591,844	26.0	2.2
1838	679,111	9.9	1.1	634,166	9.0	3.6	497,906	7.1	.9	1,389,520	19.7	~5
1857	804,058	9.8	1.0	1,109,431	13.5	4.4	552,922	6.5	.6	1,512,554	18.4	.5
1862	924,580	11.3	3.0	1,054,000	12.8	~1.0	670,829	8.2	4.3	1,562,554	19.0	.7
1869	924,580	10.6	=	1,040,643	11.9	~1.7	666,721	7.6	=	1,620,426	18.5	1.0
1879	983,484	9.9	.6	1,038,095	10.5	=	727,361	7.3	.9	1,944,483	19.6	2.0
1885	983,484***	9.4***	=	1,171,363	11.2	2.1	856,699	8.2	3.0	2,066,237	19.8	1.0
1889	1,381,019***	12.1***	=	1,210,366	10.6	.8	856,699	7.5	=	2,275,003	20.0	2.6
1895	1,256,003	9.9	1.7	1,291,101	10.2	1.1	952,247	7.5	1.9	2,456,494	19.4	1.3
1900	1,303,988	9.6	.8	1,294,114	9.5	=	1,000,923	7.4	1.0	2,720,350	20.0	2.1
1910	1,380,028	9.1	.6	1,326,314	8.7	.2	1,069,584	7.1	.7	3,130,686	20.7	1.5

Year	East Central			Veracruz			Oaxaca			Peninsula		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	625,560	14.0	~	120,000	2.7	~	411,366	9.2	~	358,261	8.0	~
1810	897,130***	14.7***	~	185,937	3.0	3.2	596,325***	9.7***	~	528,700	8.6	2.8
1838	661,902	9.4	.1	254,380	3.6	1.3	500,278	7.1	.5	785,770	11.2	1.7
1857	745,793	9.1	6.7	338,859	4.1	1.7	582,062	7.1	.9	918,240***	11.1***	~
1862	745,780	9.1	=	380,976	4.6	2.5	533,733	6.5	~1.7	595,855	7.3	~1.0
1869	947,941***	10.8***	~	380,976	4.4	=	601,850	6.9	1.9	646,781	7.4	1.2
1879	923,454	9.3	1.4	542,918	5.5	4.3	744,000	7.5	2.4	702,837	7.1	.9
1885	922,944	8.8	=	582,441	5.6	1.2	761,274	7.3	.4	739,504	7.1	.9
1889	971,603	8.5	1.3	621,476	5.5	1.7	768,508	6.1	.2	769,748	6.8	1.0
1895	1,151,216	9.1	3.1	866,355	6.9	6.6	884,909	7.0	2.5	841,409	6.9	1.6
1900	1,193,428	8.8	.7	981,030	7.2	2.6	948,633	7.0	1.4	916,828	6.7	1.8
1910	1,285,771	8.5	.8	1,132,859	7.5	1.5	1,040,398	6.9	1.0	1,061,804	7.0	1.6

II. By Region With More Than One State

Northwest

Year	Sonora			Sinaloa			California			Durango		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	124,000	1.8	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1857	147,133	1.8	1.0	250,000***	3.0***	~	9,000	.1	~	162,618	2.3	~2
1862	147,133	1.8	=	160,000	1.9	.4	9,000	.1	=	156,519	1.9	=
1869	147,133	1.8	=	161,157	1.9	.2	21,000	.2	19.0	173,942	2.0	1.6
1879	115,424	1.2	~2.2	186,491	1.9	1.6	30,208	.3	4.4	190,846	1.9	1.0
1885	143,924	1.4	4.1	201,918	1.9	1.4	30,198	.3	=	196,852	1.9	.5
1889	134,790***	1.2***	~	223,686	2.0	2.6	31,161	.3	.8	255,652	2.2	7.5
1895	191,281	1.5	3.3	258,865	2.0	2.6	42,245	.3	5.9	295,103	2.3	2.7
1900	221,682	1.6	3.2	296,701	2.2	2.9	47,624	.3	2.3	370,294	2.7	5.1
1910	265,383	1.8	2.0	323,642	2.1	.9	52,272	.3	1.0	483,175	3.2	3.0

Table 3701 (Continued)  
"VERTICAL VIEW" OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF MEXICO,<sup>1</sup> 1793-1910

Year	Northwest (Cont)			Northeast								
	Chihuahua			San Luis Potosí			Tamaulipas			Nuevo León		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	173,651	2.8	~	56,715	.9	~	43,739	.7	~
1838	147,600	2.1	~	321,840	4.6	3.0	100,068	1.4	2.7	101,108	1.4	4.7
1857	160,000	1.9	.4	390,360	4.7	1.1	108,514	1.3	.5	144,869	1.8	2.3
1862	164,073	2.0	.5	397,735	4.8	.4	108,514	1.3	#	144,869	1.8	#
1869	179,971	2.1	1.4	397,735	4.5	#	108,514	1.2	#	171,000	2.0	2.6
1879	225,546	2.3	2.5	516,486	5.2	3.0	140,137	1.4	2.9	203,284	2.1	1.9
1885	225,251	2.2	#	516,486	4.9	#	140,137	1.3	~	201,732	2.0	-.1
1889	225,652	2.0	#	516,486	4.5	#	161,121	1.4	3.7	236,074	2.1	4.3
1895	262,771	2.1	2.7	568,449	4.5	1.7	206,502	1.6	4.7	309,252	2.4	5.2
1900	327,784	2.4	4.9	575,432	4.2	.2	218,948	1.6	1.2	327,784	2.4	1.2
1910	405,707	2.7	2.4	627,800	4.1	.9	249,640	1.6	1.4	365,150	2.4	1.1

  

Year	Northeast (Cont)			North Central			Midwest					
	Coahuila			Zacatecas			Aguascalientes			Jalisco		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	13,000	.3	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	42,937	.7	13.5	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	75,340	1.1	2.7	273,575	3.9	~	69,693	1.0	~	~	~	~
1857	67,590	.8	-.5	302,141	3.7	.5	83,243	1.0	1.0	~	~	~
1862	67,691	.8	#	302,141	3.8	#	86,576	1.1	.8	~	~	~
1869	67,691	.8	#	398,977	4.6	4.6	86,576	1.0	#	~	~	~
1879	130,026	1.3	9.2	422,506	4.3	.6	140,430	1.4	6.2	~	~	~
1885	144,594	1.4	1.9	422,506	4.0	#	140,430	1.3	#	~	~	~
1889	150,622***	1.3***	~	465,862***	4.1***	~	140,180	1.2	#	1,250,000	11.0	~
1895	241,026	1.9	6.7	452,578	3.6	.7	104,615	.8	-4.2	1,107,227	8.8	-2.0
1900	296,938	2.2	4.6	462,190	3.4	.4	102,416	.8	-.4	1,153,891	8.5	.8
1910	362,092	2.4	2.2	477,556	3.2	.3	120,511	.8	1.8	1,208,855	8.0	.5

  

Year	Midwest (Cont)			Bajío			West					
	Tepic (Nayarit)			Guanajuato			Querétaro			Michoacán		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	~	~	~	513,606	7.3	~	120,560	1.7	~	~	~	~
1857	~	~	~	874,073	10.6	3.7	235,388	2.9	5.0	491,679	6.0	~
1862	~	~	~	874,000	10.6	#	180,000	2.2	-4.7	604,509	7.4	4.6
1869	~	~	~	874,000	10.0	#	166,643	1.9	-1.1	618,072	7.1	.3
1879	~	~	~	834,845	8.4	-.4	203,250	1.9	2.2	661,534	6.7	.7
1885	~	~	~	968,113	9.3	2.7	203,250	1.8	#	784,108	7.5	3.1
1889	131,019	1.1	~	1,007,116	8.8	1.0	203,250	1.8	#	784,108	6.9	#
1895	148,776	1.2	2.3	1,062,554	8.4	.9	228,551	1.8	2.1	896,495	7.1	2.4
1900	150,097	1.1	.2	1,061,724	7.8	#	232,390	1.7	.3	935,808	6.9	.9
1910	171,173	1.1	1.4	1,081,651	7.1	.2	244,663	1.6	.5	991,880	6.5	.6

  

Year	West (Cont)			Central								
	Colima			México			D.F.			Morelos		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1857	61,243	.7	~	~	~	~	230,000	2.8	~	~	~	~
1862	66,320	.8	1.7	~	~	~	280,000	3.4	4.3	~	~	~
1869	48,649	.6	-3.8	599,810	6.9	~	225,000	2.6	-2.8	121,409	1.4	~
1879	65,827	.7	3.5	710,579	7.2	1.8	351,804	3.6	8.1	159,160***	1.6***	~
1885	72,591	.7	1.7	710,579	6.8	#	426,804	4.1	3.6	141,565	1.4	1.1
1889	72,591	.6	#	798,480	7.0	3.1	475,737	4.2	2.9	141,565	1.2	#
1895	55,752	.4	-3.9	841,618	6.7	.9	476,413	3.8	#	159,355	1.3	2.1
1900	65,115	.5	3.4	934,463	6.9	2.2	541,516	4.0	2.7	160,115	1.2	#
1910	77,704	.5	1.9	989,510	6.5	.6	720,753	4.8	3.3	179,594	1.2	1.2

776

Table 3701 (Continued)  
 "VERTICAL VIEW" OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF MEXICO,<sup>1</sup> 1793-1910

II. By Region With More Than One State (Cont)

Year	Central (Cont)						East Central		
	Hidalgo			Guerrero			Puebla		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1857	~	~	~	270,000	3.3	~	665,622	8.1	~
1862	~	~	~	270,000	3.3	#	655,622	8.0	-.3
1869	404,207	4.6	~	270,000	3.1	#	830,000***	9.5***	~
1879	427,350	4.3	.6	295,590	3.0	.9	784,466	7.9	1.2
1885	434,096	4.2	.3	353,193	3.4	3.2	784,466	7.5	#
1889	506,028	4.4	4.1	353,193	3.1	#	833,125	7.3	1.6
1895	558,769	4.4	1.7	420,339	3.3	3.2	984,413	7.8	3.0
1900	605,051	4.4	1.7	479,205	3.5	2.8	1,021,113	7.5	.7
1910	646,551	4.3	.7	594,278	3.9	2.4	1,101,600	7.3	.8

  

Year	East Central (Cont)						Peninsula		
	Tlaxcala			Yucatán			Campeche		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1857	80,171	1.0	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
1862	90,158	1.1	2.3	263,547	3.2	~	86,453	1.1	~
1869	117,941	1.3	4.4	282,634	3.2	1.2	86,453	1.0	#
1879	138,988	1.4	1.8	302,315	3.1	.7	90,413	.9	.5
1885	138,478	1.3	#	302,315	2.9	#	90,413	.9	#
1889	138,478	1.2	#	329,621***	2.9***	~	93,976	.8	1.0
1895	166,803	1.3	3.4	298,850	2.4	-.1	88,121	.7	-1.0
1900	172,315	1.3	.7	309,653	2.3	.7	86,542	.6	-.4
1910	184,171	1.2	.7	339,613	2.2	1.0	86,661	.6	#

  

Year	Peninsula (Cont)					
	Tabasco		Chiapas		Quintana Roo	
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
1793	~	~	~	~	~	~
1810	~	~	~	~	~	~
1838	63,580	.9	~	141,206	2.0	~
1857	63,596	.8	~	161,914	2.0	.8
1862	79,486	1.0	5.0	166,369	2.0	.6
1869	83,709	1.0	.8	193,987	2.2	2.4
1879	104,747	1.1	2.5	205,362	2.1	.6
1885	104,747	1.0	#	242,029	2.3	.3
1889	104,747	.9	#	241,404	2.1	-.1
1895	134,839	1.1	4.8	319,599	2.5	5.4
1900	159,834	1.2	3.7	360,799	2.7	2.6
1910	187,574	1.2	1.7	438,847	2.9	2.7

1. Based on data from table 3700.

Table 3702  
 GROSS STATISTICAL ERRORS  
 IN POPULATION ESTIMATES

Region	Year	State	Year
East Central	1810, 1869	Oaxaca	1810
Northwest	1857	Sinaloa	1857
Peninsula	1857	Puebla	1869
Northeast	1885, 1889	Morelos	1879
North Central	1885, 1889	Sonora	1889
Midwest	1885, 1889	Coahuila	1889
		Yucatan	1889
		Zacatecas	1889

Rather than construct a statistical device to mitigate the effect of errors in population estimates, we can counteract their distortions by a simpler, but more effective technique: simply ignore them. They are obvious mistakes and any attempt to reconcile them with the other figures would only lead to misconstruction. In all cases there are better figures for dates on both sides of the errors; therefore, the miscalculation can always be ignored and meaningful percentages of total population and of yearly increase can be computed.

In table 3701 there are several instances where it is clear that the authors have simply repeated the state population count from the closest previous estimate. I have

included these figures because normally even small shifts in size of population were reported. By repeating the earlier estimates, the authors were not saying that they had no idea of the size of the current state population, but rather that they saw the state population as essentially static over the intervening time span. In table 3701, arranged to facilitate vertical comparisons of regions and states over time, any obviously erroneous number is indicated by a triple asterisk (\*\*\*) and the APGR is not given. In these cases the APGR for the following estimate is always calculated from the preceding reliable calculation.

Given that substantial migration either into or out of Mexico did not occur in the nineteenth century (the demographic impact of the loss of territory to the United States is discussed below), the figures for the APGR in the national population closely approximate the natural growth rate. No accounts of widespread deadly epidemics appear in the historical literature for the nineteenth century, and epidemics, therefore, are discounted as significant demographic factors during this time period. Organized violence, often political in nature, seems the most important factor affecting the population growth rate in that century. The censuses for the period 1810-1885, a period of intermittent violent political clashes, show an annual national growth rate of .9%, while the period 1885-1910, quieted somewhat by the effective repression of the Díaz regime and a time of economic growth, exhibited an annual national growth rate of 1.8%, a figure twice that of the earlier epoch. The actual decline in the national population during the five-year period spanning the War of the Reform demonstrates the demographic impact that this virulent and recurrent warfare had on regions that served as theaters of operations during this period, the French Intervention, the Caste War, and other such conflicts.

Local endemic disease, famine, and high infant mortality rates might also have depressed regional growth rates. But scrutiny of demographic trends in the states most prone to suffer such setbacks tends to negate this possibility. Veracruz, sparsely populated and justly reputed as a hellhole of disease throughout the colonial period, grew steadily throughout the nineteenth century, usually at a rate exceeding the national. Oaxaca, Chiapas, and Tabasco, three states heavily populated by traditional Indian groups and largely outside of the political violence that distressed central Mexico and the Yucatán Peninsula so frequently in the nineteenth century, all experienced relatively steady population increases and an increasing share of the national population up to 1910. While the data available do not permit the unequivocal dismissal of such factors as endemic disease, famine, and infant mortality on the demographic trends of the nineteenth century, the fact that those regions most likely to be affected adversely by them retained (or even increased) their percentage of the national population argues that such forces might well have had a negligible impact on population trends in the course of the century. Most likely then, the overall birth rate remained fairly constant, while the death rate fluctuated greatly.

As argued earlier, organized violence was a major cause of the lowering of population growth rates for both the nation and specific provinces in the seventy-five years after the commencement of the Independence struggle. Migration stemming from such violence is much more difficult to trace. The only clear example of population magnified by migration away from theaters of warfare is the 4.3% APGR noted for the Federal District in the five years spanning the War of the Reform, when the warfare took place primarily in the provinces. The violence and resulting outmigration from central Mexico at the time of the defeat of the French Intervention brought about a sharp decline in the population of the Federal District in the period 1862-1869, but this was followed by a quick recovery and significant growth. The other geographical units are too large and the time spans between population estimates too long to permit measurement of such sudden and usually ephemeral refugee movements. But another migration, only somewhat less concentrated, is indicated by the data: the massive movement of population into the Northwest and Northeast regions in the last fifteen years of the Díaz regime.

Spurred on by the hope of employment in the commercial agricultural enterprises sprouting up there and transported by the new railroad networks that underlay much of this economic florescence, people flocked to Northern Mexico. Most unfortunately, at present there is no way to determine the areas from which these people migrated, let alone the impact that their migration had on the areas they left. Though both the Northwest and Northeast regions of Mexico grew dramatically in the late nineteenth century, the North Central region, geographically sandwiched in between them, was watching its share of the national population decline. For the North Central, for centuries a major mining center, was suffering from exhaustion of mineral deposits and did not possess the soil or water sources necessary for transformation into a major center of commercial farming.

Before offering a commentary on the demographic history of specific regions and states, some general comments on aspects of nineteenth-century Mexican population trends seem to be in order. It is lamentable that the first post-Independence population estimate extant is not until 1838, preventing an examination of the demographic impact of the Wars of Independence. Although the Mexican-American war, along with the earlier Texas War for Independence, cost Mexico a good part of its national territory, the population decrease caused by the cession of such a large area—all of Texas and New Mexico and major parts of Arizona and California—did not exceed 110,000 people (including the Texas Anglos), or only 1.3% of the total national population. The War of the Reform caused the only decline in national population recorded in the nineteenth century. The areas most adversely affected were the Bajío, Puebla, and Oaxaca. Though the national population began to rise during the French Intervention, certain states—Guanajuato, Querétaro, and Guerrero—underwent actual population decline, while other states remained in a stagnant condition. By the 1840s

the Yucatán Peninsula was embroiled in the Caste War which seems to have had its most dire effects on the region's population growth during the next twenty years. By the end of the century, the Peninsula was growing at a rate at least equal to that of the nation as a whole.

While the population figures provided in this paper do not allow statements about the quality of life during the Porfiriato, they do reveal the high national growth rate in the fifteen years before the Revolution. Over this period the growth rate of the Northwest and the Northeast was phenomenal while that of the other regions with the exception of the Bajío, Midwest, North Central, and East Central (note the population decline in traditional mining areas) rose more gradually.

**Demographic Characteristics of Specific Mexican Regions and States from 1793 to 1910:**

*Northwest*—An area of scattered mining towns in the late colonial period, it grew moderately and unevenly until the late nineteenth century when the rapid growth of its commercial agricultural estates was reflected in its population trend. The 1857 figure is an obvious error.

*Northeast*—It experienced a rapid growth after Independence that was only slightly retarded by the loss of territory to the United States. The rapid growth again picked up after 1869. The growth between 1879 and 1895 is probably understated in the estimates. Its growth in the last fifteen years before the Revolution was exceptional, but not as phenomenal as that of the Northwest.

*North Central*—This mining region increased its share of the national population until 1869 when it began a steady decline in its share that persisted until 1910. The population figures for 1879, 1885, and 1889 appear to be overestimated:

*Midwest*—As the initial 1793 figure is well known as a blind estimate, it can be dismissed as too high. The region's population did rise steadily until its share of the national population dipped during the French Intervention. This decline of the regional share of the national population continued for another decade until leveling off. A final rather precipitous decline commenced just before the turn of the century. The figures for 1885 and 1889 have already been noted as gross errors.

*Bajío*—The healthy increase in this region's population was reversed at the time of the War of the Reform and the subsequent French Intervention. A short-lived percentage gain was then experienced until a profound decline began in the late 1880s and continued at least to 1910.

*West*—This region witnessed a healthy population rise from 1810 to 1862; the 1857 figure appears too conservative. It then lost part of its share of national population in the twenty years beginning with the French Intervention, stabilized for the remainder of the century, and finally resumed its decline in the first decade of the twentieth century.

*Central*—With no notable population growth the Central region had roughly the same population in 1862 as in 1810. Population increase was the rule for the next fifty

years with irregular increase of its share of national population.

*East Central*—The century after 1810 was a period of gradual, though irregular, decline in this region's share of national population.

*Veracruz*—This state was the nation's demographic success story of the nineteenth century; it grew consistently and usually faster than the nation as a whole. The 1879-1895 figures indicate that the statisticians appreciated the growth pattern, but still underestimated the rate.

*Oaxaca*—The gross error for 1810 has been noted above. The calculations for 1862 and 1889 also appear exaggerated although the trends indicated by the APGR are likely. Overall, except for the five-year span encompassing the War of the Reform, Oaxaca grew at a rate approximating that of the nation.

*Peninsula*—The many inaccuracies in the population figures for this region have been previously cited. A healthy population increase in the first half of the century was tragically reversed by the Caste War that precipitated an actual population decline for a roughly twelve-year period. The thirty years before 1910 saw positive population growth, but at a rate usually lower than that of the nation at large.

When Central Mexico, defined as the area of social and economic preeminence throughout the colonial period and composed of the regions labeled Midwest, Bajío, Central, East Central, and North Central, is compared to the Periphery in terms of percentage of the national population, a pattern of gradual decline in the share retained by Central Mexico is revealed. The decline in the period 1810-1838 is probably overstated, but there can be little doubt about the nearly 10% drop in Central Mexico's share of the national population in the century after 1810 and especially about the sharp percentage decrease in the last twenty years before the Revolution. This change is shown in table 3703.

Table 3703

**CENTRAL MEXICO'S SHARE OF TOTAL NATIONAL POPULATION, 1793-1910**

Year	PTP	Year	PTP
1793	62.2	1879	55.0
1810	60.8	1885	54.6
1838	52.6	1889	56.5
1857	55.3	1895	53.1
1862	56.9	1900	52.0
1869	55.2	1910	50.9

The view of Revolutionary and modern Mexico provided in table 3704 illuminates the demographic impact of that prolonged struggle and the survival of many patterns already visible in the late nineteenth century. The Revolution caused an actual decline in the national population and in the population of all states except for a few in the far North, in the Yucatán Peninsula, and in the Federal District, that traditional refuge of the Mexican populace in times of politi-

Table 3704  
MEXICO'S FEDERAL POPULATION CENSUSES OF  
1921 AND 1960

Region and State	1921			1960		
	Population	PTP	APGR	Population	PTP	APGR
<b>Northwest</b>	<b>1,417,611</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>4,211,170</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>5.1</b>
Sonora	275,127	1.9	.3	783,378	2.2	4.7
Sinaloa	341,265	2.4	.5	838,404	2.4	3.7
California	62,831	.4	1.8	601,759	1.7	22.0
Durango	336,766	2.3	-2.7	760,836	2.2	3.2
Chihuahua	401,622	2.8	-1	1,226,793	3.5	5.3
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>1,462,477</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>3,531,219</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>
San Luis Potosí	445,681	3.1	-2.6	1,048,297	3.0	3.5
Tamaulipas	286,904	2.0	1.4	496,340	1.4	1.9
Nuevo León	336,412	2.3	-7	1,078,848	3.1	5.7
Coahuila	393,480	2.7	.8	907,734	2.6	3.4
<b>North Central</b>	<b>483,910</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>-1.7</b>	<b>1,061,194</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.1</b>
Zacatecas	379,329	2.6	-1.9	817,831	2.3	3.0
Agascalientes	107,581	.8	-1.0	243,363	.7	3.2
<b>Midwest</b>	<b>1,355,140</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>2,833,190</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>
Jalisco	1,191,957	8.3	-1	2,433,261	7.0	2.7
Tepic	163,183	1.1	-4	389,929	1.1	3.6
<b>Bajío</b>	<b>1,080,595</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>-1.7</b>	<b>3,709,327</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>6.2</b>
Guanajuato	860,364	6.0	-1.9	1,735,490	5.0	2.6
Querétaro	220,231	1.5	-9	1,973,837	5.7	20.4
<b>West</b>	<b>976,366</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>2,016,326</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>
Michoacán	884,617	6.2	-1.0	1,851,876	5.3	2.8
Colima	91,749	.6	1.6	164,450	.5	2.0
<b>Central</b>	<b>3,083,197</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>9,336,305</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>5.2</b>
México	884,617	6.2	-1.0	1,897,851	5.4	2.9
D.F.	906,063	6.3	2.3	4,870,876	13.9	11.2
Morelos	103,440	.7	-3.9	386,264	1.1	7.0
Hidalgo	622,241	4.3	-3	994,598	2.8	1.5
Guerrero	566,836	4.0	-4	1,186,716	3.4	2.8
<b>East Central</b>	<b>1,203,525</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>2,320,536</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Puebla	1,024,955	7.2	-6	1,973,837	5.7	2.4
Tlaxcala	178,570	1.2	-3	346,699	1.0	2.4
<b>Veracruz</b>	<b>1,159,935</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>2,727,899</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Oaxaca</b>	<b>976,005</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>1,727,266</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>Peninsula</b>	<b>1,077,787</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>2,539,647</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Yucatán	358,221	2.5	.5	614,049	1.8	1.8
Campeche	76,419	.5	-1.1	168,219	.5	3.1
Tabasco	210,437	1.5	1.1	496,340	1.4	3.5
Quintana Roo	10,966	.1	1.9	50,169	.1	9.2
Chiapas	421,744	2.9	-4	1,210,870	3.5	4.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,344,780</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>34,923,129</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>

SOURCE: Adapted from James W. Wilkie, *The Mexican Revolution*, revised edition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 299.

cal violence. With the notable exception of the Federal District the demographic damage of the Revolution tends to lessen as one moves out of the central regions and into the more remote provinces. The loss of life was so extensive that some states experiencing population losses actually saw their share of the national population increase as other states suffered even worse declines. Jalisco is one case, Guerrero another.

The national growth rate was a phenomenal 3.7% annually in the 1921-1960 period. The Northwest continued the increase in the share of the national population begun in the late nineteenth century and only briefly interrupted by the Revolution. The Northeast and Veracruz stagnated after their previous steady growth in the nineteenth century while the North Central, West, Oaxaca, and East Central regions continued declines that predate the Revolution. After 1921

both the Midwest and the Bajío began to increase their percentage of the total national population, thereby reversing trends established earlier. The Central region, sparked by the Federal District, grew remarkably and the Peninsula finally displayed a healthy growth rate.

In their two volumes titled *Essays in Population History: Mexico and the Caribbean*, Sherburne F. Cook and Woodrow Borah include studies of the Yucatán and an area they term West-Central Mexico which encompass the dates of this study. They compiled all the local, state, and regional censuses and estimates they could find for these regions in the nineteenth century. After determining the most plausible figures of those compiled, they arranged them in tables and converted them into graphs that reveal the population trends for both areas. While this approach is more sensitive to local variations than the one used in the work before you, it does not offer any basis for interregional comparisons. When their methodology is applied to all the states of Mexico, comparisons of greater accuracy than those in this study will be possible.

The recent publication on the Mexican population in the nineteenth century by Viviane Brachet de Márquez also is based on a number of state censuses and estimates arranged over time. The author tries to reconcile many contradictory population figures through the use of linear regression. Her devotion to this statistical model causes her to lose all sight of Mexican history and its effect on demographic patterns. She concludes that Guanajuato grew steadily in the period of warfare that ended the French Intervention and that Puebla and Querétaro both grew during the War of the Reform.<sup>12</sup> But she has the state of Yucatán losing population at the annual rate of 7.8% at the start of the Caste War. Regrettably, she does not offer any horizontal comparisons of state populations at the same point in time, but is solely concerned with the rate of change in individual states over time. By comparing the growth rates of the pre-Porfiriato with the Porfiriato she asserts the primacy of political regimes in causing demographic fluctuation and does not realize that there were many factors influencing population trends in nineteenth-century Mexico, as there are in any time period, and that nonviolent changes in political regimes are certainly far from the most influential. For example, she would be hard-pressed to argue persuasively that the coming of the Díaz regime, its longevity, or its character had influence on the population rate of the Yucatán. Scholars need to realize that there are forces affecting history that are out of the control or sway of any political regime, no matter how powerful or enduring it might have been. Obviously, the above observation excludes cases where the regime is caught up in a violent civil war or attempts the elimination of a segment of the national population.

<sup>12</sup>Viviane Brachet de Márquez, *La Población de los Estados Mexicanos en el Siglo XIX (1824-1895)* (Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1976).

### Urban Population Growth in a Regional Context

Knowledge of the absolute population figures and of the percentage population trends of the Mexican states over a series of dates facilitates further investigations. One aspect of nineteenth-century Latin American history that has received considerable attention is the growth of the cities. Earlier, in table 3701, it was shown that Mexico City, though by far the largest metropolis in Mexico during the century under study, never contained more than 4.8% of the national population, and was, therefore, a far different creature than the dominating primate city that it became after the Revolution. But what of the other cities in the country? What can we say about them in this time period? Possessing good figures for the population of sixteen state capitals in the years 1857, 1895, and 1910 (three years for which we also have state population figures for the entire nation), a comparison of the rate of growth of these provincial centers to that of their respective states can be attempted.

Richard Boyer and Keith Davies have examined and commented on population figures for selected cities in four Latin American countries, including Mexico, in the nineteenth century.<sup>13</sup> In their commentary they made no systematic effort to present urban population trends in a regional context, but rather in terms of economic fluctuation and national population growth. This approach tends to distort the character of urban growth. The significance of urban population trends varies greatly depending on whether the city is growing more rapidly than, parallel with, or slower than the larger region of which it is part. When Boyer and Davies examined the city of Puebla from 1882 to 1895, they stressed the city's population growth.<sup>14</sup> Yet, when the city is examined for its share of state population in the period 1857-1895, its percentage of total state population falls from 10.5% to 9.4%. Certainly the city was growing, but at a rate lower than that of the state as a whole. In terms of population, the city was becoming regionally less dominant despite its positive growth rate.

Table 3705 presents both the raw figures and computations based on them for the sixteen cities in the years 1857, 1895, and 1910. Between 1857 and 1895 the absolute population of fourteen capitals increased, while that of only two, Guanajuato and Aguascalientes, decreased. But despite their positive absolute population growth, the cities of Chihuahua, Saltillo, Culiacán, Guadalajara, Morelia, Puebla, Tlaxcala, and Oaxaca joined the aforementioned two cities in growing at rates below that of the states of which they are capitals. While more people were living in these cities than ever before, even more people were living in the respective states than ever before, making the urbanization of the late nine-

teenth century much more of a moot point. These patterns did not change greatly in the 1895-1910 period of rapid national population growth. During this time Ciudad Victoria, San Luis Potosí, Zacatecas, Durango, Culiacán, and Guanajuato experienced actual population decline and were joined by Puebla, Tlaxcala, and Oaxaca as capitals growing at slower rates than their states.

Clearly, none of these findings contradict the rapid urban growth realized by Mexico City, Monterrey, and Guadalajara during the Porfiriato. But they do point out that the development of the primate city and of the congested regional center are primarily phenomena of post-Revolutionary Mexico and hint that the economic growth of the late nineteenth century attracted people to rural and small town areas rather than to traditional provincial centers.

### School Attendance and State Population

Statistics on the number of students in all types of primary and secondary schools, both public and private, for all the states of Mexico are available for the years 1875, 1889, and 1900. These figures can be converted into percentage terms of the total student population resident in any one state (table 3706). The figures for 1889 and 1900 can be compared with the state population figures available for those years and can reveal the degree of congruence of school attendance with total population on a state by state basis, affording a glimpse at the most advantaged and disadvantaged states in terms of education.

The comparison of the percentage of total school population of each region with its percentage of total national population in the years 1889 and 1910 reveals that in 1889 the Central, East Central, Veracruz, and Oaxaca held a higher percentage of the student population than warranted by their percentage of the total national population. The Northeast was evenly represented, while the Peninsula, West, Midwest, Bajío, and Northwest were underrepresented. By 1900 only the Central and Oaxaca regions were overrepresented; the Northeast was again about even and the Peninsula, West, Bajío, Midwest, and Northwest were joined by the East Central in the ranks of the underrepresented. Comparing states in the same time period, while six states, Sinaloa, San Luis Potosí, Tamaulipas, Jalisco, Tepic, and Hidalgo, improved their positions, nine states, Zacatecas, Sonora, Coahuila, Querétaro, México, Guerrero, Puebla, Veracruz, and Tabasco, found their positions deteriorating.

This study has presented the argument that seemingly unreliable statistics can be useful for purposes of historical interpretation. The utility of statistics is largely determined by the use to which they are put and the degree of accuracy necessary to yield meaningful knowledge. Though at best very approximate, the demographic figures compiled in this work, when approached with a critical eye, reveal regional demographic trends and provide a basis of comparison for other statistical data.

<sup>13</sup> Richard E. Boyer and Keith A. Davies, *Urbanization in 19th Century Latin America: Statistics and Sources* (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center, 1973).

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.



Table 3705  
SOME MEXICAN STATE CAPITALS COMPARED TO STATE POPULATIONS, 1857-1910

State Capital	1857			1857-95			1895			1895-1910			1910		
	Total Population of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population	Absolute Change of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population Change	Total Population of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population	Absolute Change of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population Change	Total Population of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population	Absolute Change of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population Change	Total Population of Capital	Capital's Percentage of State Population	
Chihuahua	12,000	7.5	6,521	54.3	18,591	6.9	21,185	114.4	39,706	9.8					
Saltito	8,105	12.0	11,549	142.5	19,654	8.3	15,760	80.2	35,414	9.8					
Monterrey	13,534	9.3	43,321	320.1	56,855	18.4	21,673	38.1	78,528	21.5					
Ciudad Victoria	6,164	5.7	8,411	136.5	14,575	7.1	-2,472	-17.0	12,103	4.9					
San Luis Potosí	10,678	2.7	58,998	552.5	69,676	12.2	-1,654	-2.4	68,022	10.8					
Zacatecas	15,427	5.1	24,599	159.5	40,026	8.8	-14,126	-35.3	25,900	5.4					
Aguascalientes	39,699	47.7	-8,088	-20.4	31,619	30.5	14,299	45.2	46,918	37.5					
Durango	14,000	8.9	28,165	201.2	42,165	14.3	-10,402	-24.7	31,763	6.6					
Culiacán	9,647	6.0	4,658	48.3	14,205	5.5	-678	-4.8	13,527	4.2					
Guadalajara	68,000	8.5	15,870	23.3	83,870	7.6	36,598	42.4	119,468	9.9					
Guanajuato	63,368	7.3	-24,061	-38.0	39,337	3.8	-3,655	-9.3	35,682	3.3					
Morelia	22,000	4.5	10,287	46.8	32,287	3.6	7,755	24.0	40,042	4.0					
Querétaro	27,496	11.7	5,294	19.3	32,790	14.4	272	.8	33,062	13.5					
Puebla	70,000	10.5	21,917	31.3	91,917	9.4	4,204	4.5	96,121	8.7					
Tlaxcala	3,463	4.3	-589	-17.0	2,874	1.7	62	2.2	2,812	1.5					
Oaxaca	25,000	4.3	7,641	30.6	32,641	3.7	5,370	16.5	38,011	3.7					

SOURCE: Figures for 1857 from Jesús Hermosa, *Manual de Geografía y Estadística de la República Mexicana* (Paris, 1857); for 1895, Matías Romero, *Geographical and Statistical Notes on Mexico* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1898); for 1910, *Estadísticas Económicas del Porfiriato* (México: Seminario de Historia Moderna de México, Colegio de México, n.d.).

Table 3706

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL ENROLLMENTS,  
BY REGION AND STATE, 1875, 1889, and 1900

Region and State	1875		1889		1900	
	Enrollment	% in Nation	Enrollment	% in Nation	Enrollment	% in Nation
<b>Northwest</b>	20,050	5.7	33,967	6.2	65,664	7.6
Sonora	3,840	1.1	5,592	1.0	9,592	1.1
Sinaloa	9,272	2.7	9,110	1.7	21,701	2.5
California	300	.1	1,300	.2	4,362	.5
Durango	4,410	1.3	9,213	1.7	14,145	1.6
Chihuahua	2,228	.6	8,752	1.6	15,864	1.8
<b>Northeast</b>	33,009	9.5	44,997	8.3	70,684	8.2
San Luis Potosí	13,019	3.7	14,493	2.7	37,407	4.3
Tamulipas	3,600	1.0	~	1.0	14,436	1.7
Nuevo León	12,031	3.4	15,390	2.8	23,910	2.8
Coahuila	4,359	1.2	9,414	1.7	14,931	1.7
<b>North Central</b>	23,244	6.7	36,318	6.7	33,737	3.9
Zacatecas	17,581	5.0	30,219	5.6	27,365	3.2
Agascalientes	5,663	1.6	6,099	1.1	6,372	.7
<b>Midwest</b>	39,538	11.3	47,925	8.8	84,024	9.8
Jalisco	39,538	11.3	43,489	8.0	74,165	8.6
Tepic	~	~	4,436	.8	9,859	1.1
<b>Bajío</b>	24,254	6.9	28,591	5.3	50,680	5.9
Guanajuato	20,641	6.0	19,398	3.6	40,520	4.7
Querétaro	3,613	1.0	9,193	1.7	10,160	1.2
<b>West</b>	13,800	4.0	37,353	6.9	46,294	5.4
Michoacán	10,200	2.9	34,003	6.3	40,527	4.7
Colima	3,600	1.0	3,350	.6	5,767	.7
<b>Central</b>	100,954	28.9	138,317	25.4	199,520	23.2
México	43,735	12.5	51,566	9.5	56,355	6.6
D.F.	22,200	6.4	33,770	6.2	75,904	8.8
Morelos	7,271	2.1	15,101	2.8	14,049	1.6
Hidalgo	18,078	5.2	19,781	3.6	36,034	4.2
Guerrero	9,670	2.8	18,099	3.3	17,178	2.0
<b>East Central</b>	42,623	12.2	72,220	13.3	64,399	7.5
Puebla	33,755	9.7	65,320	12.0	53,071	6.2
Tlaxcala	8,868	2.5	6,900	1.3	11,328	1.3
<b>Veracruz</b>	17,062	4.9	37,331	6.9	45,530	5.3
<b>Oaxaca</b>	18,000	5.2	43,363	8.0	144,858	16.8
<b>Peninsula</b>	16,467	4.7	23,595	4.3	34,324	4.0
Yucatán	9,263	2.7	13,904	2.6	16,430	2.0
Campeche	2,585	.7	2,904	.5	5,356	.6
Tabasco	2,184	.6	3,600	.7	7,510	.9
Quintana Roo	~	~	~	~	~	~
Chiapas	2,435	.7	3,147	.6	5,028	.6
<b>Total</b>	349,001	100.0	543,977	100.0	860,103	100.0

SOURCE: For 1875 and 1889, Luis Pombo, *México: 1876-1892* (México: El Siglo, Diez y Nueve, 1893); for 1900, *Estadísticas Económicas del Porfiriato* (México: Seminario de Historia Moderna de México, Colegio de México, n.d.).

## Annotated Bibliography

Barrera Lavalle, Francisco. *Apuntes para la Historia de la Estadística en México, 1821 á 1910*. México: Tip. de la Vda. de F. Díaz de León, 1911. Pamphlet listing statistical sources.

*Bibliografía Mexicana de Estadística*, 2 vols. México: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1942. Massive listing of sources and publications of statistical materials on a great variety of topics dealing with Mexico.

Bojórquez, Juan de D. *Orientaciones de la Estadística en México*. México: Imprenta Mundial, 1929. Pamphlet-sized commentary on some sources of statistics.

*Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística*.

Vols. 1-2 (1861). Contains Cortina's figures for 1838 and commentaries on earlier censuses and Navarro y Noriega's calculations for 1810 with a commentary.

Vol. 7 (1859). Contains García Cubas's commentaries on demographic methods and M.P.'s critical appraisal of the same.

Vol. 9 (1862). Contains Durán's assessment of earlier censuses, especially those of the 1850s, and the calculations of García Cubas on the population in 1862.

Vol. 11 (1865). Contains Jourdanet's statement on the population and climate of Mexico and his recommendation of immigration.

783

- Vol. 13 (1869). Contains Navarro y Noriega's 1810 article about population and Antonio García Cubas's 1869 census.
- Vol. 14 (1870). Contains an extensive article on previous population estimates by Antonio García Cubas.
- Vol. 27 (1902). Contains the 1895 census for states and their capitals.
- Brachet de Márquez, Viviane. *La Población de los Estados Mexicanos en el Siglo XIX (1824-1895)*. Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1976. A major study of state population figures and their utility.
- Cook, Sherburne F., and Woodrow Borah. *Essays in Population History*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Vol. 1. 1971, and vol. 2, 1974. Includes incisive articles on sources and methodology by the two outstanding experts on demography in Mexico.
- Estadísticas Económicas del Porfiriato*. México: Seminario de Historia Moderna de México, Colegio de México, n.d. Great variety of economic statistics, including extensive work on the population, for the Porfiriato.
- Estadísticas Sociales del Porfiriato, 1877-1910*. México: Seminario de Historia Moderna de México, Colegio de México, 1956. Comparable volume to the above.
- García Cubas, Antonio. *Cuadro Geográfico, Estadístico, Descriptivo e Histórico de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos*. México: Oficina Tip. de la Secretaría de Fomento, 1885. Portrait of Mexico with a cross section of statistics by an outstanding Mexican statistician.
- Hermosa, Jesús. *Manual de Geografía y Estadística de la República Mexicana*. Paris, 1857. Description of Mexico with several pages of statistics.
- Alejandro de Humboldt, *Ensayo Político Sobre el Reino de la Nueva España*. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1973. This famed work contains the 1793 census figures.
- Janvier, Thomas A. *The Mexican Guide*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1887. A guidebook for American investors with some statistics from García Cubas.
- Lerner, Victoria. "Consideraciones sobre la población de la Nueva España (1793-1810)." *Historia Mexicana* 22 (January-March 1968): 327-348. A critical appraisal of the earliest Mexican censuses.
- López Cámara, Francisco. *La Estructura Económica y Social de México en la Época de la Reforma*. México: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1967. Liberal economic and social interpretation with several pages of statistics.
- O'Gorman, Edmundo. *Historia de las Divisiones Territoriales de México*. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1966. Textbook on the changes in territory and boundaries of Mexico.
- Pérez Hernández, José María. *Estadística de la República Mexicana*. Guadalajara: Tip. del Gobierno, 1862. Extensive description of Mexico with a wide variety of statistics.
- Pombo, Luis. *México: 1876-1892*. México: El Siglo Diez y Nueve, 1893. Statistics of all sorts on Mexico designed to praise the reign of don Porfirio.
- Romero, Matías. *Geographical and Statistical Notes on Mexico*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898. Interesting description of Mexico dotted with valuable statistics.
- Wilkie, James W. *The Mexican Revolution*, revised edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970. The source for my post-1910 census figures.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Statistics and National Policy*. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center, 1974. A study of recent Latin American statistics with some pertinent comments.

784