

Chapter Two.

The colonial census (1): a social construction by which state?

A revised interpretation of statistical reports put forward by Scott (1988) sees them as subjective texts constructed to consolidate particular views of the political economy and its associated relationships of power within a society (see Chapter 1). Benedict Anderson (1991) foreshadows a similarly revised interpretation of colonial censuses. Like Scott, he questions the referential use of a census as an historical document and contends that its significance lay in its being consequential. He supports this perspective with claims about colonialism and the power of colonial states in relation to the census instrument. Since he elaborates his proposition from instances in Southeast Asian colonial censuses, it is appropriate to test his hypothesis using the example of the Philippines Census of 1903.

Addressing the cultural evolution of nationality and nationalism in new states, Anderson hypothesises that colonial imaginings predestined those developments. In Chapter 10 of his monograph, he argues that colonial states created an imagined cultural context for their territories using censuses, maps and museums. The style of the instruments enabled the state to shape, regulate, reproduce and legitimise that context. Each of the three instruments of power contributed in different ways to the imagined context yet each complemented the others. The state ordered, redefined and systematically quantified the population in the census in a way that envisaged a social reality, while the drawing of boundaries on maps might have anticipated geographical space, presenting a model for the state. Archaeological surveys and ethnographic collections that appropriated the culture and history of the colonised people, created and legitimised the ancestry of the state, he reasons. Anderson concludes his argument by suggesting that the style of these cultural instruments influenced the form of emerging nationalism as well as the form of the new states, when nationalists inherited and adopted the colonial portrayals.

Colonial censuses, he hypothesises, determined the social characteristics of the population. He bases his proposition on an assertion that after approximately 1850, colonial states transformed the function of a census from its traditional, partial count for military and tax purposes. He argues that the immediate aim became one of

identifying, classifying and counting the total population according to an imagined order. The census increasingly reordered and redefined the population by generalised or imagined race, with later attempts by the state to align race and religion a further means of manipulating the populace. Anderson therefore perceives the form of the document, that is, its unconditional quantification, generalisation and redefining of identities, to constitute its style. This form communicated a sense of order and direction in the document and in the representation. The interpretation gives precedence to the stance taken by colonial census authorities in representing the colonised population over the manner and techniques of the census construction. Accordingly, Anderson questions the objectivity of the representation.

From this perspective, it follows that the style explained the purpose, meaning and significance of the colonial census. The form of the document enabled reproduction of the imagined representation by photograph and print media that in turn confirmed the state's power and the sense of control. It also allowed administrative regulation of the population. Anderson asserts that the subsequent bureaucracies of education, health, law and order and immigration reified the imagined community and established the form of colonial and post-colonial society. Thus, he implies that the census as a text became the context and the significance of the document was in its consequence, since the representation created supposed reality for local nationalists as well as for colonial rulers. He is, along with Scott, in effect implying the reconceptualisation of a census.

Examples from censuses in long-established colonial states in the Malay peninsula, Netherlands East Indies, and the Spanish Philippines illustrate his argument. The Philippine Islands in 1903, however, were under the new regime of the United States of America, then a comparatively inexperienced imperialist nation internationally. If Anderson's hypothesis is correct, then the twentieth century colonial census in the Philippines will show characteristics similar to those of other colonial state censuses. That is, the census will classify by race, generalise and systematically quantify the total population. Section 1 of this chapter tests this part of his proposition, investigating the form of the Philippines Census.

Section 2 examines Anderson's claims about the purpose and meaning of a colonial census that implied a redefinition of a census, as well as his implication that the colonial state acted independently of the metropolitan power in constructing the

record. The section considers his assertion that colonial states transformed the purpose of a census. Conclusions reached in Section 3 indicate that partial support for his proposition is possible, although his approach raises questions about the connections between metropolitan and colonial censuses and the significance of the latter. A third issue raised by Anderson's work, that the style predestined any nascent feelings of "nation", is beyond the scope of this research. It might be suggested that this chapter is largely redundant following the evaluation by Vergara (1995) of the 1903 Philippines Census, but my investigation tests Anderson's proposition and might contribute to the critique of his theory. It also places the Philippines Census in its larger context. In contrast, Vergara expands on Anderson's proposition in his detailed examination of the Census style and in his analysis of the photographic record that reinforced the colonial narrative in the Philippines.

The setting for my investigation is the 1903 Census of the Philippines, published in 4 volumes in English and Spanish at Washington, D.C. in 1905. Government clerks, local historians and scientists compiled accounts of the history, settlement and physical geography of the islands in Volume 1. Volume 3 dealt with mortality statistics and education while Volume 4 contained agricultural, social and industrial statistics. The volume of most relevance to my inquiry, Volume 2, constituted descriptive statistics of the population. Here, the Census tabulated sex, age, colour, ethnicity, marital status, citizenship, occupation, literacy and housing for inhabitants, in different combinations of the variables for both administrative (barrio, province or military district) and geographic units (islands). Two Schedules of enumeration, Schedules 1 and 7, were used in the gathering of this population data. All references to Census Tables in the following investigation are from Volume 2.

I. Style and subjective representation.

The style of a colonial census, Anderson proposes, disclosed a belief held by the authorities in arbitrary, systematic classification and quantification by race as a precise, objective means of representation. Although the census classified and counted each person, standardised identities submerged individuality so that the generalisation reinforced for the colonial state the imagined characteristics of the colonised population. Religious faith as a type of classification declined. Where religious

communities and institutions remained outside census classifications, he further argues that the colonial state tried to ethnicise and stereotype those groups, to make them fit the census framework of description and control. For example, he accuses British Census officials of the arbitrary inclusion of various ethnic or tribal groups within the category "Malay" in the 1911 Federated Malay States Census and of equating Muslim with Malay in later censuses. He contends, therefore, that the colonial state census mirrored a mental image of the colonised population. It portrayed an imagined and unconditional uniformity in line with the colonial state thinking made concrete in the census style.

Certainly, the Philippines Census classified and quantified the population. As noted, the population was counted on two Schedules. Schedule 1 covered all people referred to by the Secretary of Public Instruction, Bernard Moses, as the "Christian tribes" (Third Report of the Philippine Commission [hereafter referred to as RPC3], 1-2, 1902, p. 901). Enumerators were to complete all questions on the Schedule for this portion of the population and detailed descriptions in the Census Tables are restricted to this Schedule. Schedule 1 counted 6,987,686 people in total. Of the 3,491,034 women so counted for example, 99.67 per cent (3,479,032) were classified as "Brown", and 991,285 were girls reported to be aged 9 years or under (Tables 5, 17). To that extent, Schedule 1 was a comprehensive count of each person, which supports Anderson's point, although other scholars now dispute the demographic statistics (see for example, Gates 1984; May 1983; P. Smith 1975; UN 1960).

Contrary to Anderson's interpretation, however, Census officials did not intend to make the count complete. Secretary Moses, who had final approval of Census Schedules (Act 467, Sec. 5, see RPC3, 1-2, 1902, pp. 1100-1105), made provision in Schedule 7 for the "non-Christian and wild tribes". This part of the enumeration, decreed Moses, "covers such general statistics as are probably obtainable, but no attempt will be made to enumerate such tribes individually, except where they are tractable, accessible, and live in compact communities" (RPC3, 1-2, 1902, p. 901). Accordingly, this Schedule estimated a generalised, approximate 8 per cent of the population (647,740), listing 16 tribes or ethnic groups, of whom 14 were also named and part enumerated in the Christian Schedule. American authorities and the historians acknowledged the tribal diversity in Volume 1 of the Census and elsewhere (for example, Beyer 1916; Worcester 1914). Indeed, Worcester himself noted that Judge

Blount had earlier accused him of "discovering, getting acquainted with, classifying, tabulating, enumerating, and otherwise preparing for salvation, the various non-Christian tribes" (Worcester 1914, Vol. 2, p. 638)¹. Nevertheless, statisticians excluded the estimated population of Schedule 7 from all other tabulations in the Census. In short, the count of the population was neither unconditional nor definitive as Anderson suggests.

Generalisation and reduction of difference in the Census organisation of the population did occur as Anderson predicts. Classifications of Brown, Mestizo, Yellow, White and Black to describe the population first appeared in Table 5. Census officials thereafter used these variables in a majority of Tables, including for occupations. In tracing the Brown (*Moreno*) classification for example, Table 17, which tabulated the Schedule 1 population, alphabetically listed 22 ethnic and tribal groups plus 258 *Extranjeros* (foreign born) as Moreno². The quantified 6,914,880 Morenos included 3,219,030 identified as Visayans and 2,323 identified as Moros, to name two examples, and such groups subsequently lost this identity in other Tables. The 72,806 Schedule 1 non-Morenos included 15,419 Mestizos (including Chinese and Spanish mixes), as well as the Yellow, White and Black classifications³. Note, however, that the Census listed whites second last in the Tables, in contrast to Anderson's assertion of ranking according to political power.

Use of colour as the defining variable in the Tables, instead of a title of race such as "Filipino" that assumes a national identity⁴, or the Spanish *Indios*, differed from the practice in other Southeast Asian censuses highlighted by Anderson. Nevertheless, there was inconsistency in the Philippines Census document. While Volume 1 recognised the historic uncertainty and mix of racial origins within the population, the written text in Volume 2 constantly referred to "Filipinos". As to the identification of race, Stanley (1974) concluded that by the end of the nineteenth century, the Filipino, Spanish and Chinese communities themselves had become more internally assertive of their racial definition and distinctions. The Census identified the population by place of birth and citizenship in Table 11, but that did not necessarily identify race. Because the Census inadequately described race, it therefore partly conformed to Anderson's assertion of generalisation and stereotyping.

Anderson's classificatory grid of the census in the Philippines quantified and generalised, so that the appearance of the document was in accord with his proposition.

Classifications of five colours enabled the Census Office to place the population in an imagined order. On the other hand, the count was incomplete and ambiguous. Although the classification and counting superficially appeared to be systematic, closer inspection shows that it was not the case. Some images remained fuzzy or unregulated. As well, while there is little doubt that colour was used as a substitute for race, consistency and clarity of group definition did not appear to be a prime objective given the confusion between the two Schedules. To that extent, the style of the document did not fully comply with Anderson's interpretation.

The imposition of a mythical unity of national identity on the colonised population, Anderson suggests, was a direct objective of the counting and standardisation by colonial states (see also Vergara 1995). It might be argued that the Census classification of Moreno was evidence in support of Anderson's claim. In this view, the classification, which included ethnic groups considered to be "Filipino" and which separated Moreno from other races, illustrated the intention of Census officials to unify imagined Filipinos. Furthermore, it might be argued that the Census Director, Colonel J. P. Sanger endorsed a national Filipino identity. He wrote in the Prologue to the Report: "In truth, we believe that it is not too much to hope that...the tribal distinctions in existence will gradually disappear, and the Filipinos will become a numerous, English speaking, homogeneous race, exceeding in intelligence and capacity all other people of the Tropics"⁵ (1903 Census, Volume 1, Prologue, pp.42-3). The statement also appears to support the assumptions behind Anderson's point. Anderson assumes, following Said (1995), that there was an attempt to draw a distinction based on race or religion between the colonial state, represented by the census officials, and the colonised population. This assumption is dependent in part upon other assumptions of a Western, white superiority and a belief that other civilisations or ethnic groups have their own essence. The statement by Sanger perhaps implied that colonial officials believed in the inferiority of a natural Filipino race. But his comment does not prove that Census officials manipulated the classifications of colour for the purpose Anderson advocates and it cannot verify the beliefs of the officials. Anderson's argument depends upon assumptions of belief and intent by colonial Census officials that cannot be tested. On the point of an imposed national identity therefore, Anderson fails to distinguish between cause and effect.

According to Anderson, classification by race replaced identification by religion in colonial censuses. He implies that when the census ignored different faiths, the state ignored ethnic identities and institutions and the differences amongst them. He also argues that construction of imagined identities for the population was continuous in the periodical twentieth century censuses. In particular, the state attempted to align race and religion when different religious communities became identified with particular ethnic populations. It was in his view another means for the colonial state to regulate, homogenise and subordinate the local population. Evidence from the Philippines Census on these points is mixed at best. An initial inquiry would support Anderson's claims, as does Vergara, but closer inspection of the document perhaps draws attention to different circumstances and another possible interpretation.

Themselves ordering and generalising, the two Schedule divisions and titles in the 1903 Census (Christian and non-Christian) appear at first to support this part of Anderson's argument. The titles perhaps indicate that the state in 1903 aligned and standardised ethnicity and religion by over-riding minute details. It might therefore be argued that the Census representation imagined a religious universality of the Filipino population. Schedule 1, the so-called Christian enumeration, included 42,097 "Yellow" inhabitants, for example, along with the 4 per cent (26,963) representing the 14 ethnic or tribal groups who were common to both Schedules. Thus, the Census represented them as having a single, uniform, religious belief. At face value therefore, the notion of an imposed uniform identity in this Census cannot be disputed. Second, it might be argued that the disappearance of the titles from subsequent Censuses, which counted the population on a single Schedule per Census, partly confirms the assertion that race replaced religion in later censuses. Yet, I suggest that those Schedule titles in 1903 were terms with limited intent or meaning and their significance can be exaggerated.

It should be recognised first that the 1903 Philippines Census made no attempt to quantify religion per se. Most likely, this was simply because of its American origins, in contrast to the British or European descent of the Malayan, Dutch East Indies and Spanish Philippines census examples with which Anderson illustrates his argument. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, passed as part of the Bill of Rights in 1791, guaranteed free exercise of religion. Section 8 of the U.S. Census Act, 3 March 1899, for example, therefore restricted the Director to "collect

statistics relating to special classes, including...religious bodies...The statistics of special classes...specified in this section shall be restricted to institutions containing such classes" (Wright and Hunt 1900, pp. 951-2). That is, individual persons were not to be identified by their religion. The similarity between the U.S. Census and that of the Philippines is striking on this topic. It also means that the disappearance of religious categorisation from the 1918 Philippines Census, consistent with U.S. Census practice, might be misunderstood.

The population Schedules in the 1903 Philippines Census did not ask for respondents to nominate their religion. The lack of relevant space on the punch card (see Figure 4.1) supports the claim. The Census document otherwise contained scant information or data on the topic. In Volume 3, we find the tabulation of teacher and student numbers in each of the public, private and religious school groups, and a count of Roman Catholic and Protestant teachers by race. Volume 4 contained a brief discussion of the relative importance of Christian denominations, in addition to the number, value, and capacity of churches, as per Schedule 3. No information was given on any other religion, or temple, shrine or mosque, or on numbers of adherents⁶. But if the enumeration did not identify and count the population by religion, how could the Schedule titles be justified?

Earlier Spanish censuses of the Philippines divided the population into two groups, *Civilizada* and *Infiel*. The Spanish distinction might well have been as Said (1995) suggests, an attempt to correlate Christian with Western, or as Anderson puts it, an attempt to shape their Spanish colonial images. But any effort to draw religious distinctions between Western and the Philippines population runs into the difficulty that the great majority of the latter was avowedly or nominally Christian by the time of U.S. rule. We simply cannot apply to the 1903 Census the argument that Christian was used to correspond to western⁷. It might be argued that adoption of the inappropriate Spanish terms in the 1903 Census is a glaring example of the uncritical repetition of previous textual knowledge based on Spanish imagined categories. From this perspective, Census officials in 1903 were exhibiting a conscious use of their knowledge to create or maintain stereotypes. It implies intent by the Census Office or the colonial state. Conversely, it might have been that Census staff retained the titles purely for convenience, with unwitting consequences. Although use of the titles did conform with the contemporary racism associated with neo-Lamarckism (Livingstone

1992), it nevertheless does not prove any conspiracy or the personal beliefs of Census Office staff. We therefore cannot claim with certainty that officials intended to unify, homogenise or subordinate Filipinos by these religious categorisations.

Furthermore, the Census provides evidence that officials were little concerned to align ethnicity and religious belief. As noted, the two population Schedules enumerated the same ethnic groups, but statisticians did not arbitrarily place any particular group under one category, Christian or non-Christian, alone. Take for example, the Igorot people of the central Cordillera on Luzon. Schedule 1 identified 13,582 as Christian while Schedule 7 categorised 197,938 as non-Christian (Table 20). But the enumeration neither asked nor confirmed such a religious distinction. Secretary Moses gave as a reason for the different Schedules the more practical matter of restricted access to sections of the population, that is, those not yet under American control (RPC3, 1-2, 1902, p. 901). In relation to the Schedules and therefore, the supposed religious categorisation, place of residence appeared more defining than ethnicity or religion. To that extent, the titles appeared to have little meaning or implication. On the other hand, Anderson would argue that this example typified the reordering and redefining of the population and the imagined categorisations and quantification that were evident in the style of colonial censuses. Vergara supports that view. But evidence for the notion that the colonial state tried to fit faith communities into any imagined classification framework in the Philippines Census relies upon a possibly unjustified presumption of authorial intent.

When asking whether a census might have any objective meaning, Anderson criticises census officials (as Scott does) for their attempts to be complete, their obliteration of differences among the population through classification into imposed, standardised identities, and their reduction of race to an essence or stereotype. The evidence from the Philippines, however, is conflicting. Certainly classification and quantification were obvious and the terminology and form of the completed census, its style, tended to be similar to that which Anderson suggests. Yet, in the effort to standardise, confusion occurred, resulting in ambiguity. An incomplete count of the total population increased that confusion. Use of the term Filipinos in the written text, perhaps with political intent, was countered by recognition of ethnic differences in the Tables. This contrasts with Anderson's assertion of attempted completeness, clarity and exactness. It suggests that he may have exaggerated the scale or intensity of

coherence in colonial attitudes or the capacity of the authorities to be so prescriptive. Furthermore, perhaps the apparent imposition of generalised racial-religious identification and alignment reflected an already partly reified order and practicalities, rather than purely American invention or attempts to ally the two unambiguously. On the other hand, it is entirely debatable whether classification as a Christian had any meaning for the non-Christians included in Schedule 1. For those people, census officials produced an identity with which the people themselves might have disagreed, and to that extent, we cannot say that the Census reflected reality. The representation in the Census appears to be subjective, contestable and culturally constructed (despite the non-quantification of religion), and for the short term at least, became fixed.

2. Purpose, meaning and significance: the redefined census.

Where a representation in a document is subjective, Said (1995) contends, the style of the document is the link between the strategy of representation and the domination of the colonised population. This proposition underlies Anderson's interpretation of style that emphasises the form of the document over the method and manner of its construction. Because of an assumption of intent, the perspective considers that the style indicates the purpose of the document. Anderson argues that the census identification and quantification of a total population, the shaping of images, had no discernible purpose for the colonial state than to make those images reproducible. If the colonial state had the capacity to produce photographs, maps, tables, graphs or the written word, he reasons, then it might use that capacity to represent and consolidate its images. In this way, the state indicated and exercised its power over the population. The style of the census thus connected the colonial state, its power and authority and its planned, predetermined portrayal of the population.

Proceeding with this line of thought, Anderson claims that we can also infer the meaning of the document from its style (see also Barnes and Duncan 1992). He asserts that the identification and quantification in the census, the sense of order imparted by census officials, meant that bureaucracies could be established to regulate the imagined identities. The state was able to use its mental picture of the population, substantialised in the census, to pervade, order and control administratively all aspects of colonial life. In doing so, it increased the extent of its power over the colony and solidified the form

of society. Anderson concludes that the significance of the census and its embedded style therefore was in the effect on subsequent history. The census created and established a supposed reality, which became fixed so much so that emerging national movements absorbed the imagined representation as an accurate reflection of their society.

Implicit in Anderson's interpretation is the rethinking of a census. His hypothesis suggests that we reassess not just the census product or the method and practice of census taking, but the idea of a census as form of knowledge. The implication is that census officials used their ideological and practical knowledge to build a representation, and that therefore, a census might be seen as a constructed means of data representation. Such a reconceptualisation gives preference and privilege to the historically specific, cultural, social and political meaning over technical production. Basic to this rethinking, it is assumed that power relationships are of greater importance than any sense of accurate description. A census is therefore thought of as a controlling mechanism, a means of surveillance and a means of communication instead of as part of an expanding information system. Thus, context is absorbed by text and text becomes context⁸.

The argument is based on the premise that knowledge is a function of power. Following Said, two conclusions are drawn from that premise. First, power is concluded to be the intellectual authority of census officials, and its function is to monitor directly the colonised population, their lives and places in society. Census officials can then use their authority to represent the population in their own image, with the style of representation being the linkage to the surveillance. Anderson claims, for example, that a colonial census would make sense only if it were presented in understood codes such as a racial hierarchy. As well, because of this power, colonial census officials would express the dominant ideas of Western imperialism and racism, indicating this in the purpose of the census. Their intention would be to stress the social, economic, political or cultural inferiority of the colonised population, and to show what was needed for the population to reach Western standards. In this way, Anderson suggests, the authority of the census officials indirectly could simultaneously enable and reinforce colonial rule. A census was a sign of the authoritative power of the dominant colonial culture.

Second, the knowledge used by census officials in constructing the census is thought of as political knowledge as distinct from pure knowledge. Said argues the latter can be defined as having no direct political importance or influence on real world life. That the body of knowledge of census construction is political in character is demonstrated by the intention of census officials to manipulate the colonised population, as well as by their use of that knowledge to show and reinforce their authority. Understanding the role of the colonial census and the use that the census is intended to fulfil is therefore part of that knowledge. In this view, the context of the event becomes part of the body of knowledge and is given agency. Furthermore, it is implied that this body of knowledge forms part of a census culture, a set of beliefs compelling and restricting the methods and process of census taking to a particular style and certain details. A census official could not be impartial owing to the fact of his involvement.

Although there appears to have been in the argument a reduction of values and beliefs to social or ideological practices, Anderson accepts this position. His argument incorporates the context of colonial society and government, not just as a scene of action but as an active contributor. The body of knowledge therefore can be viewed as being positioned in different locations – the state, a census office, and individual enumerators. At the same time, the view downgrades the technical and management skills necessary for putting the knowledge into practice. Although some conflict with this interpretation is revealed from an examination of the evidence of the Philippines context in 1903 and the U.S. Twelfth Census of 1900, there are some areas of agreement.

Anderson indicates that the style adopted by census officials would reflect their purpose and thereby demonstrate its ideological significance. It would illustrate their assumptions of colonial state power and their intellectual authority in this view. Specifically, according to Anderson, the purpose was to represent the population in ways that facilitated replication. As seen, the ordering and quantifying of the Philippines Census of 1903 was neither complete nor clear. This, however, did not prevent later duplication of images produced during the process of assembling the Census (see Vergara 1995 for detailed criticism of the Census illustrations). For example, the *National Geographic* published the full complement of photographs from the Census (Grosvenor 1905). Gilbert Grosvenor, Editor of the magazine and distant

cousin to the then Secretary of War, W. H. Taft, did this in response to a request from Taft for publicity and financial help for the Philippines government and people. Grosvenor's accompanying text evaluated and generally lauded the natural resources, including the native population, in an imperialist and racist manner characteristic of the National Geographic Society (Rothenburg 1994)⁹. The shaped images, to use Anderson's term, that Americans subsequently saw and read about exposed the need for and reinforced the authority of U.S. rule. The proposition by Anderson about the purpose of a colonial census appears to be indirectly substantiated.

Additionally, the accusation that the style would reveal the colonial state's power and authority by indicating the role and use of a census can be given some credit from the written Census text. Joseph P. Sanger, Director of the Census, wrote in his conclusion, "From the subject aim of this report, it will be very apparent to the reader that the great need of the Philippines is moral, material and industrial improvement and not so much political advancement for which they are not yet prepared"¹⁰ (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue, p. 51). In highlighting the economic and social backwardness, much less the lack of political awareness, he made the undisputed difference between the U.S. and the Philippines clear in the text. He implied that the U.S. would provide a model for the organisation of the colony's future, with the unstated message of necessary continued tutelage. Indeed, Sanger finished that second last paragraph in his report by noting that the Census performed a lasting and important task if it made evident and plain the duty of the Governor and all "American patriots" towards the Filipinos. From these comments, the ideological significance of the Census seems obvious. It was a constructed document solidifying pre-conceived ideas, designed to exhibit U.S. intellectual authority and buttress its imperialist position in the Philippines.

If the intention of the colonial census was a declaration of power and authority, then the meaning of the census document could be seen as an indication of how that would be achieved. Once the census re-ordered and categorised individuals and groups as statistics in supposed culturally neutral, objective classifications, asserts Anderson, then the meaning of the census text became clear. These imagined categories of the colonised population, regarded as reality by the government, were open to greater administrative contact and control (see also Prakash 1990). In the proclamation of the Philippines Census, Governor Taft clearly states the administrative benefit expected

from the exercise. "The taking of the census is indispensable to the calling of a general election for this popular assembly. No other object besides the collection of the necessary data for determining the social and industrial conditions of the people, as the basis of intelligent legislative action, is involved in the taking of this census ...The taking of the census will therefore form a test of the capacity of the Filipinos to discharge a most important function of government" (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue, pp. 11-12). Here, "legislative action" implies associated bureaucratic departments. There is no question that one motive for the Philippines Census was this political aim. It suggests that Anderson's proposition that the style indicated the meaning, as well as his interpretation of the meaning of the document, may be supported.

On the other hand, the Philippines Census did not lead to the establishment of the bureaucracy, which was already in place under the auspices of the Philippine Commission (Corpuz 1957). Nor was the Census information crucial to the diffusion of government control. That was occurring already, as for example, Iletto (1988) shows in relation to the cholera outbreak in 1902. The proposition that constructed reality was characteristic of a census style can be supported from Philippine evidence, as can the fact that Census data was used by the state, but the direct system of rule was not wholly dependent on the Census representation in the Philippines. Although this does not contradict Anderson's claims, it denotes that he perhaps ignores other possible explanations of the meaning of a colonial census. Additionally, closer examination of his hypothesis in relation to the Philippines context reveals other difficulties with his interpretation.

Emphasis on the political purpose (the power to represent) of a census first exposes inconsistency in his position. Individual authors of a census, thought of as being dependent, are disallowed individual intent. The re-conceptualised census, however, is seen as wholly and politically functional. Both positions tend to collapse agency to structure, but the first position subverts human will and consciousness and human capability. Effectively, the encompassing theory absorbs an author's subjectivity. In the second position, the purpose or intent of the individual is subsumed by the purpose of the structure, which is given a capacity to influence activity. In the case of colonialism, this was specifically to express power and authority. This, however, attributes human consciousness, agency and intent to the dominant culture and hence to the body of knowledge of census takers, and is selective in its application.

If we allow the one, a structure, the capacity and capability to pursue and express a purpose, then so must we allow individual authors the same intent and facility. The position also privileges politics to the detriment of moral or ethical issues.

Can the intention of the Census Director be identified? Was it to exert and show the power of the U.S. through the authority of the Census, or was it to follow closely the terms of reference of the Philippine Commission and Governor Taft? Post-structuralist theory insists that truth is a myth, that we can ask only how the author expresses the system in which he was implicated, not search for authorial intent. Individuals are subjects whose agency is created through the status conferred on them by their situation in this view. Accordingly, as a professional United States Army officer, Sanger's military experience of imperialism determined, or limited, his capability. This assumes that the sense of superiority and approval of territorial expansion associated with the U.S. Army at the time (Sullivan 1991b) was inherent. It suggests that Sanger's intention can be identified only from a political, imperialist perspective.

Yet Sanger possessed other knowledge and capabilities which might have affected his action in relation to the Philippines Census. Prior to his time in Manila, Sanger systematically organised, revised and completed in 1879 an unfinished report on major powers' artillery systems, for which he was respected (Upton 1917). It was those skills and ability of organisation that were put to good use in his Census work. While it appears he was loyal to his country's ethos, he had the capacity to reach his objective and to follow legislative instructions meticulously. His concluding remarks in the Prologue, therefore, might be seen in part as addressing the terms of reference, which in turn reflect his superiors' presumed imperialist intent. By doing so however, Chouinard (1997) suggests, Sanger perpetuated rather than challenged the existing power relationship. To adjudicate this question is difficult, where the effect of his action is necessary but not sufficient proof of his intent, and Anderson and Chouinard disregard the problem except to pass their own moral judgements. At the larger scale, the question of meaning and purpose of the Census turns not just on Sanger's intent, but on that of all involved in the count, particularly the U.S. Census Office.

There also tends to be inconsistency in Anderson's position over the usefulness of a census linked to a belief in the relativism of knowledge. He accepts as legitimate the financial and military purposes of pre-colonial monitoring of populations. Owing

to his pre-occupation with colonial imaginings, race and representation, however, he disparages colonial state counting for its effect on the emergence of a state mentality, supported by a growing bureaucracy and accompanied by the spread of Orientalist type practices. Both forms of census taking involved imposition (the former, direct and real burdens) and both implied a disciplining of society. But the colonial search for accurate knowledge is looked upon as a tool of imperialism (B. Hudson 1977) and the possibility of progress derided as a myth (see also Godlewska and Smith 1994). An untenable distinction has been drawn between the two forms of censuses where officials were seeking knowledge, because of a difference in condition.

Furthermore, Anderson's scepticism of the way colonial states viewed their domains dismisses the possibility that the purpose of a census might have been more practical than to control imaginings or enable replication. In so doing, he excludes other uses of a census that are seen as an imposition and exploitative. Those uses include for the process of democratic representation, for example, when population numbers and distribution are the criteria, or for government economic and social policy making, or for longitudinal comparison. Consideration of the usefulness in this instance is not intended to suggest that the interpretation is any truer, as in pragmatic philosophy theory (McHoul 1997). Instead, it is to point out that Anderson offers no alternative way for these administrative and government functions to be undertaken.

Such an alternate purpose for the Census was present in the Philippines. Belief in Americanism, the widely held notion that U.S. Constitutional principles and its republican form of government were of universal application (Healy 1970; Sullivan 1991b), ensured that the process of establishing a legislature was begun promptly after the declaration of peace in the islands¹¹. The fact that the civil government, through the Philippine Commission, held both executive and legislative powers was thought to be “fundamentally un-American^s by some (Doherty 1904, p. 18). The declared purpose of the Philippines Census was to calculate political representation according to population distribution, in order to comply with Section 6 of the Act of Congress, 1 July 1902. This conditionally provided for the establishment of a Filipino Assembly two years after the taking of a census (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue). The Census therefore can be seen as integral to the assumption and expression of Americanism and to U.S. authority, or even as a continuing legitimisation of American colonialism from Iletto's (1988) perspective. Although this interpretation might be accepted, nevertheless there

remains the fact of the proposed Assembly, which provided a practical purpose for the counting.

Constitutionally (Article 1, Sec. 2 of the 1787 Constitution) and traditionally, the census function in the United States was as an apportionment mechanism (Wright and Hunt 1900). While that obligation was diminishing in importance in Washington (M. Anderson¹² 1988), the necessity had just emerged in the Philippines. Governor Taft ranked apportionment as the prime reason for taking the Census, before the search for knowledge, legislative policy making, or political learning (see p. 31). That the apportionment function was of importance can be supported from the first publication of the preliminary Philippines population count. The distribution of the population (Schedules 1 and 7) was by province, not by race (RPC4, 3, 1903, p. 692). Furthermore, race was not used as a variable in the published Census Tables until Table 5. It cannot be disputed, however, that Census officials used the opportunity to enumerate the Philippines population according to race while acting under the guise of apportionment. The evidence is mixed. A practical, necessary use for the census was clear, whereas it was for an institution imposed by outsiders who were sure of their system's infallibility. The Census itself neither led to nor caused the imposition of the institution or system, although it subsequently facilitated the system's operation.

Arbitrary representation, racism and subordination, in Anderson's view, typify the style used in a colonial state census. It should be stated that he distinguishes between the colonial state and the metropolitan power. Yet, use of a certain census style, by which a population is regulated and ordered particularly in relation to race, was neither confined to colonies nor wholly dependent on national political status. The U.S. Census Office employed the same style in domestic Censuses. Schedule No. 1 of the 1900 U.S. Census illustrates the point. In the Personal description columns, colour or race had priority over sex, date of birth, age, marital status, number of years married, motherhood, number of children living, nativity, citizenship, occupation, education, and ownership of home. Enumerators were instructed to record race as White, Black, Chinese, Japanese, or Indian¹³, and data were subsequently tabulated according to race for each other variable (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979). This data provided the foundation of the census style and reflected the facets of the population in which the government, Census Office or other organisations were most interested. As

Anderson argues for colonial censuses, U.S. Census categories, organised on racial lines, also classified and standardised.

Such apparent similarity to the metropolitan census leads to further doubt about Anderson's contention that the purpose of shaping images into replicable wholes was to comply with the local colonial state's way of thinking. Here, he attempts to deny the metropolitan state the power to represent the colonised population. It is this distinction that cannot be supported from the evidence of the 1903 Philippines Census, notwithstanding one detail that superficially could corroborate his argument. J. P. Sanger noted in his Report that the activity was essentially a Filipino undertaking. He cited 7,502 Filipinos out of a total Census workforce of 7,627 as evidence for his statement. Sanger recorded their contributions to the enumeration and gathering of statistical data and to the written descriptions and historical narratives (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue). Employment of Filipinos as Inspectors, Special Agents and Supervisors might have indicated a pragmatic understanding of Philippine society hierarchies or an acceptance of earlier Spanish colonial images in Anderson's terms. The declaration by Sanger, however, was more likely a political statement, intended for those interested in the Filipino capacity for self-rule. Despite this attempt to convince readers otherwise, the 1903 Census of the Philippines was an American exercise, not one of the local colonial rulers or one conducted by the local population. American input into the Census (planning, personnel, and data sought on the Schedules) and management of it was intentional, indisputable and definitive.

After the certifying of peace on 11 September 1902, Presidential orders were issued on 25 September for the Philippine Commission to undertake the Census. Act 467 of the Commission, providing the regulations for administration, conduct and scope of the Census, was enacted on 6 October and amended (Act 486) on 24 October 1902. Although the Census Director was instructed to gather, tabulate and publish the statistics, the newly made permanent U.S. Bureau of Census was directed to compile and prepare the results in tabular form, then to print and distribute the information (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue; RPC3, 1-2, 1902). Just over six months were available before Census date, to be not later than 1 April 1903 but declared as 2 March 1903 by Governor Taft.

In all probability, the Bureau of Insular Affairs (BIA), as part of the U.S. War Department, nominated Joseph Prentiss Sanger as Director to the Philippine

Commission¹⁴. Officially appointed by Colonel Clarence Edwards, head of the BIA, and approved by Governor Taft on 7 October, Col. Sanger, aged 62 and due to retire, was already serving in the Philippines as Chief of Staff to the military governor, Lieutenant General Adna Chaffee. As Director of the Puerto Rican and Cuban Censuses of 1899, Sanger was familiar with the personnel, policies and methods, the body of knowledge, of the Census Office in Washington. It was under his leadership that all preparations in Manila took place, including printing of blank Schedules, selection and training of staff and division of the country into enumeration districts (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue; RPC3, 1-2, 1902; RPC4, 3, 1903).

Henry Gannett and Victor Olmsted were seconded on 16 October 1902 to act as Assistant Directors to Sanger. Olmsted was an experienced U.S. Census statistician whom Sanger lauded for his field work in co-ordinating and supervising the collection of the 1899 Cuban Census data as Assistant Director while Sanger was still in Washington (U.S. War Dept. 1900). He also worked with Sanger and Gannett in Puerto Rico. Gannett (1846-1914) is of particular interest as he was responsible for the statistics on Schedule 1 in the Philippines, including those of occupations. Chief Geographer of the U.S. Geological Survey, associated with the Hayden Survey and the development of U.S. topographic mapping¹⁵, he had simplified and organised enumeration districts for the 1880, 1890 and 1900 U.S. Censuses¹⁶ and produced the statistical atlas for the last of these (see U.S. Bureau of Census 1903). In Sanger's words, he was "thoroughly familiar with census work" (U.S. War Dept. 1900, p. 14). An incessant compiler of accurate geographic data¹⁷, Gannett published his information widely. His memoirist in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, one of the geographic organisations Gannett helped found, said of him, "...the presentation of facts for popular utilization was the principal purpose of Gannett's work. In his maps...and in his census reports, he endeavored painstakingly to present facts in such a way that the public could assimilate them to advantage" (Darton 1917, p. 68). Gannett's influence on the Philippines Census was clear. Facts as he saw them were presented concisely in table and graph form for the population, schools and mortality.

Despite his zeal for and organisation of accurate Census data, his work however might be interpreted differently. That he was tainted by his participation in colonialism by "setting forth not only the purely statistical results, but giving also

many valuable facts concerning the resources and possibilities for development of the islands" (Darton 1917, p. 70) appears obvious. From this, it could be inferred that he believed in imperial authority, including the intellectual authority of census officials to provide a foundation of representation as a basis of further scientific investigation and for government. Total faith in science, observation and the utility of statistics epitomised his work, and the Philippines Census text is well supplied with comparisons of data between U.S.A., Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines¹⁸. This may be judged as indicating a view that U.S. culture and ability to measure value were thought inherently more valid than those of the colonies. Gannett does not moralise about superiority, however, and judgement cannot be passed on belief, which cannot be tested. As with the judgement of Sanger, assessment of this sort discriminates little between intent and effect.

Statistics, Scott and Anderson declare, are social products. Statistics and the devices used to present them such as tables, graphs and maps, in Scott's view are rhetorical means of asserting and reinforcing the scientific authority of constructed representations of real world circumstances. Anderson sees them as reflecting a cultural construction of an imagined community. Both imply that a body of knowledge has been used to construct a representation that reinforces the intellectual authority of census officials and the power of a dominant culture. On the one hand, the argument tends to reduce all census statistics, knowledge and dissemination of information to a single function, the exercise of power. It disregards the technical instruments and conceptual framework that can structure data (Irvine, Miles and Evans 1979). Gannett, for example, was concerned about the out-dated conceptual basis of occupation statistics in use in the U.S. Census, arguing change was necessary to reflect social life better (Gannett 1894). In contrast to Scott's argument, the opening paragraph¹⁹ of Gannett's paper places little reliability or faith in the scientific authority, to use Scott's term, of contemporary practice concerning occupations. On the other hand, because of Gannett's work in the metropolitan as well as the colonial census, on other social topics Anderson's interpretation in particular opens the possibility for new understanding of those late nineteenth century U.S. Censuses.

By 1 December 1902, the two Assistant Directors and five secretarial staff including one woman²⁰ (possibly a stenographer) appointed by the BIA, arrived in Manila. Appendix 2 of Vol. 1 of the 1903 Census listed those in the Office of Director

of the Census. Of the 32 Special Agents and above, at least 27 were American, whereas 72 Filipinos including just 7 women²¹ were "Native Employees, messengers and labourers". That the Census was an intentional American view of their new territory can be supported from one further item of evidence. In Manila, Dr. Manuel Xerez Burgos had been appointed clerk (manager) in the bureau of statistics, Department of Public Instruction, from December 1901²². Dr. Burgos, a medical graduate of Santo Tomas University, revolutionary fighter and member of the Philippines Republic government, published a daily paper, Filipino *Libre*, until this appointment²³. Yet when the Census was to be taken, "it was deemed advisable to do this by a temporary organization rather than to intrust (sic) it to the bureau of statistics sufficiently enlarged for the purpose" (RPC3, 1-2, 1902, p. 901; see also RPC4, 3, 1903, p. 691). Perhaps Dr. Burgos was thought unqualified to undertake a census to American scientific requirements, although he was asked to contribute to some statistical reports in the Census document. Anderson's suggestion that the metropolitan country's way of thinking was of lesser importance than that of the local colonial state, I therefore conclude, misrepresents the situation with regard to the 1903 Census of the Philippines.

What then were the major influences on the American Census of the Philippines? Implicit in Anderson's work is the premise that imperialist objectives shaped thinking in the U.S. about the Philippines (see also Vergara 1995). Subject to continuing imperialist control of domestic politics, that could suggest imperialists influenced and judged the colonial census taken by the U.S. Census Office. It assumes the state, including its bureaucracy and agencies, is monolithic and cohesive. On the contrary, the notion that the country was an imperial power because Congress had passed the Treaty of Paris (by a narrow margin) did not necessarily mean that all functions of government became a vehicle for external imperialist ends only. Certainly, the Congress decision to order the census through the offices of the BIA, a body by its very nature devoted to American empire, indicates indirect imperialist control²⁴. Sanger, after all, was closely linked to that body. Direct influence or control over the U.S. Census Office by declared imperialist supporters is, however, difficult to establish from reading the literature.

Nevertheless, connections between the U.S. Census Office and the Census authorities in the Philippines were close, and possible imperialist control of the Office

raised the potential for influence over the colonial census. But I suggest that the U.S. Census Office influenced the format, style, extent and conduct of the Philippines Census far more than did the BIA. The Office most likely judged the results according to its own Census Office standards. It might be argued that this illustrates an undeniable Census Office assumption of the superiority of its knowledge and authority and a lack of sensitivity to the Philippines population. There was a direct imperialist effect, in other words. This tends to confuse concept and structure. It verges on allotting a capacity to influence events to the concept, colonialism, and implies a moral judgement (the result was wrong because the belief was wrong) that perhaps is unsupportable. An outline of the relevant history of the U.S. Census Office may help to clarify its standpoint.

The purpose of the decennial U.S. Census had undergone gradual change in the years after the Civil War. From one of a mechanism to apportion political representation and taxation, the purpose evolved to one of recording the spread of industrialisation, urbanisation, the closing of the western frontier, immigration, and associated social issues (M. Anderson 1988). By 1880, those in the Census Office, still a temporary agency²⁵, had devised new and more elaborate statistics. Henceforth, Margo Anderson notes, the data lobbied for by business associations, social reformers and university researchers as well as politicians, would be subjected to new cross-tabulations and new interpretations. Census reports also began to carry authoritative statements about social policy. Most of that change was instituted by the Superintendent of the Census Office, Francis A. Walker (1870-1881), his successor, Robert Porter (1881-1893), and Carroll D. Wright, first Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor (1885-1905)²⁶ (Fitzpatrick 1957). Throughout that period, however, those statisticians and administrators were in dispute with Congress over the purpose and cost of the census, the use of Census Office jobs as positions of patronage and the need for a permanent Census Bureau (M. Anderson 1988; Wright and Hunt 1900). William Merriam, President McKinley's appointee to direct the 1900 Twelfth Census, was the last major political appointment to the census bureaucracy. The Census Office was made permanent in March 1902, then transferred to the new Department of Commerce and Labor and faced different pressures as the Bureau of the Census (see M. Anderson 1988; Eckler 1972; W. Holt 1929; Willcox 1914).

M. Anderson (1988) comments that the changing scope and methods of the Census Office and descriptions of their work preceded the policy debates of Congress and its awareness of emerging issues. Nevertheless, the Census Office was subject to considerable legislative control. Acts passed for the taking of each Census limited the extent of inquiries, size of office staff, remuneration, costs and penalties and listed the volumes and reports to be prepared with publication deadlines. On the other hand, Census directors had discretion as to the form, division and number of questions and the arrangement of schedules (see, for example, Act of 1899, Wright and Hunt 1900). Wright and Hunt²⁷ considered the problem of political patronage to be intrusive and extensive, a view M. Anderson shares. Both the President and Congressmen expected appointees to comply with political party beliefs. Superintendents Walker and Porter resigned partly because of their inability to agree with presidential wishes, and the impermanence of the Office could be traced partly to the Congressional fear of a loss of opportunity for patronage (M. Anderson 1988). While executive and legislative interference in the process of taking the various U.S. Censuses occurred to that extent, mainly for domestic reasons, no clear evidence emerges of direct interference in the Census Office for international imperialist ends. Moreover, it should be remembered that the U.S. did not acquire this part of its "empire" until 1898. To what extent continental expansion of the United States was internal imperialism, however, or whether it was inevitable that U.S. policy, including that of domestic government agencies, was influenced by imperialism, is debated by historians and historical geographers (for example, Kay 1991; Meinig 1986; Welch 1979).

At the same time, there is no reason to suspect that a colonial census conducted by the metropolitan Census Office was not welcomed by imperialist supporters. It could be seen as ordered and ordering, classificatory or sequential, a supposedly neutral representation of reality yet reflecting the power and authority of the metropolitan country. It might be highly acceptable evidence to those wanting a means to justify their presence in a colony²⁸. In the Philippines, Sanger, in addressing his terms of reference so methodically and precisely, provided exactly that evidence. The question most appropriate to ask is who passed judgement on the Census? The answer may well be imperialists – either those in the metropolitan country or those in the colony. For the Philippines, both were American citizens with interests and concerns vastly different from those of the Philippines population.

The 1903 Philippines Census also reflected other developments in American census taking. As M. Anderson (1988) details, longitudinal comparison was becoming the focus of U.S. census activity, a function of the changing society. In Manila, the Philippine Commission (composed of five Americans and three Filipinos) included in the Census requirements that investigations be as wide ranging as those of the 1900 Twelfth U.S. Census (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue)²⁹. The 1902 Philippines Commission Act outlined an extent of inquiry beyond the basic data that perhaps indicated a perceived bureaucratic need for written, trusted, ordered information to which long-term reference might be made. On the other hand, there was no direct evidence that that command was for comparison over time. There was no legislative or constitutional requirement for a periodical census as in the U.S., repeated for example in the Census Act of 1899³⁰.

Second, as the scope of the census was changing, so too were the technical aspects of measurement and statistics, machine tabulation and sorting (Truesdell 1965)³¹, presentation, interpretation, and methods and control of field administration (M. Anderson 1988; Wright and Hunt 1900). The mechanics of improved census taking were being developed for internal U.S. reasons, not because of the acquisition of the Philippines. The more complex body of knowledge incorporating technological innovation reflected the changing nature of U.S. demands, including close observation, on its own citizens. Its use in the Philippines perhaps should not be attributed wholly to colonial wishes.

It is therefore difficult to attribute the intent and style of the Philippines Census to U.S. colonialism or American imperialists only. Although the Census Office conducted the Philippines count within a colonial environment, other influences also affected the thinking and conduct of the colony's census. Certainly, Americans managed all aspects of the Philippines Census and they produced a document in terms and a style that they understood. It indicates an assumption of the superiority of the U.S. scientific knowledge and census taking authority. That authority both enabled and enhanced the subordination of the colony's population in this view. It does not mean, however, that we can disparage the Philippines Census just because of its colonial origin. We cannot hold colonialism solely accountable for the style of the census, nor can we assert that the U.S. Census Office was wholly imperialist in outlook.

3. Conclusion.

By investigating the purpose of the census, as indicated by its style, Benedict Anderson argues that the ideological significance of colonial thinking and the meaning of the document could be uncovered. In his view, the only perceptible purpose was to make images replicable by representing and controlling the population in a supposedly neutral, scientific, statistical, yet hierarchical fashion, particularly for race. This would enable technological reproduction of the images and permeation of government control. Furthermore, census officials reinforced the underlying objective to exercise and express domination, by indicating the role and use of the census. On balance, the evidence from the 1903 Philippines Census supports that suggested political purpose.

As well, Anderson's view that for these reasons a colonial census was a constructed image of an imagined community, a creative geography, can also be supported, particularly as the 1903 Census was an American exercise. To that extent, we can agree with the notion that U.S. thinking about a colonial census was similar to that of other colonial states. It provided evidence of U.S. colonising capacity (Vergara 1995). By examining the meaning of the census in these political terms, it is possible to uncover in part the dominant faith in Americanism and American census institutions and methods that might have influenced the Philippines census takers, as Anderson implies. For my inquiry, its relevance lies in disclosure of the American basis of and assumptions behind the occupation statistics. Additionally, by locating the decision makers in their context, we can recognise the local complexity of how power and knowledge came together in institutions which helped to shape geography's connections with imperialism as Driver (1994), Livingstone (1992) and N. Smith (1994), for example, recommend that we should. It also places that local arena within the wider context, so helping to understand in part how the twentieth century Philippines comes to have the characteristics that it does (Meinig 1989).

Yet difficulties arise from Benedict Anderson's interpretation. First, that census officials might have been seeking knowledge for power is true but trivial. The census did not cause the instigation of U.S. imperialism in the Philippines or the establishment or diffusion of imperial power through bureaucratic institutions. The interpretation tends to confuse intent with effect. Second, the reification of meaning leads to

exclusion of interpretations other than for political domination and the expression of racial superiority. It is not the only way to examine the purpose of a census. Perhaps legitimate purposes within the established colonial circumstances included apportionment in accordance with constitutional and legislative requirements or the need for relatively accurate information. There was an obligation to address public policy in the Philippines as well as domestic U.S. concerns.

Next, the style adopted by census officials, rather than being an indication of purpose alone, might have been more a reflection of the contemporary, fashionable state of statistics at the time (T. Porter 1986), a description of mass phenomena by the category of race. Said (1995) suggests that this is a naïve interpretation because statistics were used to create the stereotypes. Description of race, however, was part of the social construction of the time for metropolitan countries as well as in colonies and should be accepted. We cannot decide on complex historical, political or moral issues from a literary structure alone. Furthermore, it is argued that if scholarship or writing of the time were not of contemporary style, then the work would have been disregarded. It was socially situated work (Barnett 1995; Johnston 1993). Associated with this, it appears improbable that the BIA in conjunction with the Census Office would deliberately appoint Census staff in the Philippines who would challenge current assumptions and writing style.

Finally, Anderson's effort to de-link local, colonial censuses from the metropolitan theory of census taking falls down in relation to the Philippines. The Philippines Census was an American census based very much on U.S. Census Office practice, including the scope of inquiries and technical methods, and managed by visiting American specialists. The style was a modification of the domestic U.S. Census style, with slightly less focus on race than in the U.S. The relatively recent U.S. acquisition of the archipelago inevitably meant reliance on the metropolitan Census Office to such a degree. Under these circumstances, it was perhaps not unexpected that Census officials in the Philippines would construct an image of the islands similar in style to that with which they were familiar. The Philippines example has shown that in attempting to institute a medium for the local colonial state, careful examination of the context is necessary. We cannot always assume that either the colonial state or its population had sufficient authority to represent themselves in such an exercise³².

Were we to accept Anderson's hypothesis uncritically, such similarity between the colonial and metropolitan censuses in the U.S.-Philippines case would raise a number of questions. Is his hypothesis relevant or applicable to the domestic U.S. Census, an event that had taken place every ten years since 1790? If so, how much of the domestic census, temporally and spatially, was a created geography of an imagined community and how can that be explained? How did the changing study and nature of statistics within the U.S. influence U.S. Census officials and how did the latter influence that change? Were U.S. Census officials defining their "self" by defining the "other" of the Philippines, relying on stereotypes, or had this been done in relation to other communities within the United States and how was that achieved? Margo Anderson has begun to address some of these issues in her examination of the U.S. institution.

In drawing on Said's work, B. Anderson and Scott, using the principle that answers looked for depend on the questions asked, wish to show that if census officials were ideologically manipulative then it must be asked how they achieved that. Anderson therefore questions how the body of knowledge of census makers best served the ideological interests of colonial states. Scott, in her examination of the history of the categorisation of the working class in Paris, queries the discourse of that city's conservative establishment under siege from a socialist movement. Both scholars therefore see the census purely as a constructed means of data representation and a means of control by the state and its authorities. In this interpretation, both scholars stress the power of census officials as outside viewers to manage and reproduce a view of a population. Thus, the knowledge and intellectual authority of census officials and how those officials conveyed their ideological meaning are of prime importance. The style of the document communicated their purpose and meaning. The emphasis, which dismisses the technical aspects and accuracy of the census work as being insignificant, tells us more about the authors than about the surveyed population.

The next chapter continues the literature review by narrowing the focus to the representation of women's work in colonial censuses and to the specific picture of women's occupations in the Philippines. The question underlying the review is whether a census represents the employment of women in occupation statistics any better than it represents the identity of particular populations.

- ¹ For commentary on this aspect of Worcester's work, see Chapter 6 in Sullivan (1991a).
- ² Table 20, Total Population of the Philippines, Christians and non-Christians, by colour and tribe, lists 25 ethnic classifications including *Extranjero* under *Moreno*. The total includes 586 Batak and 900 Tagabili people, identified and enumerated on Schedule 7 only and therefore excluded from all tabulations that described the supposed Christian population from Schedule 1.
- ³ Similar forms of generalisation also applied in these classifications as shown by the listing of citizenship in Table 11.
- ⁴ Previously restricted to Spaniards born in the Philippines, "Filipino" was not yet an accepted racial or national description. This does not deny that there was an increasing sense of national identity, encouraged by the leaders of the Philippine revolution and the 1899-1901 Republic of the Philippines, especially Aguinaldo, who wished the tribes to think of themselves as one people (Welch 1979). See also Stanley (1972) on the influence of nineteenth century social change on the term. It is not certain, on the other hand, if more remote groups identified themselves as "Filipinos" in 1903. Use of the term as a national description by Americans in the Philippines and in the U.S. was common by then (see, for example the rather muddled call by Doherty (1904) to recognise Filipinos as a people, not distinct tribes).
In recognition of the above, when referring to women in the Philippines, I use the term 'Filipino women' for convenience, not as a restrictive definition.
- ⁵ The Spanish version read: *"En verdad, creemos que no es esperar demasiado que ...las distinciones de tribus que en la actualidad existen desaparecerán gradualmente, y los Filipinos llegarán á ser una raza numerosa y homogénea que hable el inglés, y cuya inteligencia y capacidad será mayor que le de cualquier otro pueblo de los trópicos."*
- ⁶ On this point, Anderson discusses colonial efforts to subordinate or hierarchise local institutions. It might be argued for example, that Americans tried to subordinate Roman Catholic schools to the public education system in the Philippines, particularly after the separation of Church and State, but this was not manifest in the Census. For discussion on the disputed nature of cultural imperialism by religious bodies, see A. Porter (1997).
- ⁷ I am not suggesting that the American Protestant churches accepted the Roman church and its influence in the Philippines any more than they did at home. Healy (1970) for example, noted the cry for "religious reconstruction" of the Filipinos in some contemporary Protestant church papers and articles.
- ⁸ I am indebted to Harley (1988, 1989, 1992) for this rethinking and the general argument in this paragraph.
- ⁹ Rothenburg asserts that the style used by the Society justified its objectification of people and nature, but see Meinig (1989) for an alternative view on the Society. See also J. Duncan (1993) on the use of photographs as a rhetorical device in the objective representation of the nature of place in colonial discourse.
- ¹⁰ *"Por el asunto objeto de este informe resultará muy evidente al lector que la gran necesidad de los Filipinos consiste en una mejora moral, material é industrial y no tanto en una adelanto político para el cual no están aún preparados."*
- ¹¹ Taft's declaration of peace was disputed by Chaffee, as was Taft's view that most Filipinos welcomed U.S. rule (Stanley 1974; Young 1994). The question of the imposition of an alien form of legislature on the Philippines, its denial of Filipino capacity and ability for self-rule, and the degree of representation and responsibility conferred on it, has been surveyed by Constantino (1975) and Salarnanca (1984).
- ¹² For fluidity of expression and to avoid confusion between these two Andersons, I have referred to Benedict Anderson as Anderson, whereas Margo Anderson is always given her initial or first name.
- ¹³ Indians not paying tax were singled out because they were not to be counted for apportionment purposes, as set out in the Fourteenth Amendment of 1868.
- ¹⁴ This is not clear. Cruz (1974, p. 72) noted: "The BIA arranged the special detail of Colonel Joseph P.Sanger as director." According to Cruz, in most cases, the Philippine Commission's wishes with regard to recruitment of U.S. personnel for colonial service were respected, but in others, the BIA sent personnel on the basis of perceived need. It might have been the case that the Division of Insular Affairs, precursor to the BIA, as part of the War Department under Secretary Elihu Root, arranged for Col. Sanger to be posted to Manila prior to the passage of the Organic Act of July 1902, in the knowledge that his census taking ability would be needed in the future. Colonel William Cary Sanger, younger brother to J. P. Sanger, was Assistant Secretary of War at the time, although no suggestion of nepotism or patronage has been raised. Cruz noted that W. C. Sanger was a

“Progressive”, politically independent, whose appointment was contrived by Root in his attempts to end the system of patronage operating under the previous Secretary of War. The BIA was responsible to Root, not to the Assistant Secretary, W. C. Sanger.

¹⁵ Darton (1917, p. 68) noted: “As a map producer, Gannett well deserved the title ‘father of American map making,’ which was often applied to him.” Livingstone (1992) derides this American habit of establishing patriarchal lineage in U.S. geography as a form of presentist history. For a critique of American mapping in the nineteenth century in relation to its domination over space and disregard of the indigenous population, see Harley (1988). As a member of a government body, Gannett’s pioneering work in the American West had another political consequence. N. Smith (1992) asks how physical geography provided the technology and ideology for building the nation: Gannett’s compilations of data and his map work were recognised by his peers as basic to much of then emerging geomorphology, forestry, and meteorology (Darton 1917; see also Dictionary of American Biography 1964).

¹⁶ James and Jones (1954) make particular note of Gannett’s contribution to population geography in U.S.A., where the theory was not well developed. Gannett’s subdivisions were still partly in use in 1916.

¹⁷ His interests covered contours, magnetic declination, rainfall and climate, boundaries, place names, river profiles, hanging valleys, even to a *Dictionary of Altitudes in the United States*, which by 1899 was in its third edition.

¹⁸ See, for example, his text on pp. 100 to 103, Vol. 2, which compares labour force activity by sex and age for the four countries.

¹⁹ “There is probably no subject connected with the census concerning which there seems to be less clearness of purpose or plan than the classification of occupations. What the purpose of the statistics of occupations is, or the character of the information which such statistics are designed to present, is not made clear by any existing classifications” (Gannett 1894, p. 12)

²⁰ Louise Dennington: she was also official paymaster for Inspection District Number 18 (Manila) and the military districts.

²¹ Constancia Poblete, Valentina del Rosario, Mariana Warren, Manuela Lopez Palma, Trinidad Carrios, Esperanza Maniquiz, and Paz Bulalio.

²² Given that there was no U.S. tradition of a permanent Census Office, and as conditions were unsettled in the Philippines, the Manila bureau of statistics within the Department of Public Instruction had been closed from March to December 1901 (RPC3, 1-2, 1902)

²³ Dr. Burgos continued to work for the bureau of statistics in the Department of Agriculture and Commerce after 1903, although his main interests were medicine and drama. He was the last direct descendant of the patriot, Fr. Jose Burgos. For an obituary, see *Manila Daily Bulletin*, 11 November 1937.

²⁴ The requirement that each employee of the Philippines Census had to “solemnly swear that I recognize and accept the supreme authority of the United States of America and will maintain true faith and allegiance thereto...” (Act 467, Philippine Commission, RPC3, 1-2, 1902) is a clear indication of the imperial rulers directly seeking the allegiance of the Filipinos so employed. Meinig (1982) defines this psychological focus as one of five aspects of life whereby imperialism imposes unequal relationships. On the other hand, employees of the U.S. Census Office for the 1900 Census had to undergo a civil service examination and take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation, as prescribed by the Census Director, before they could be employed (U.S. Congress Act of 1899, Sections 5 and 18, Wright and Hunt 1900).

²⁵ The impermanence of the Census Office contrasts with the notion of a body of census taking knowledge. For each U.S. Census, superintendents, staff and especially enumerators were inexperienced and lacked training. It was not until the establishment of the Bureau of the Census that managerial and administrative staff became permanent (M. Anderson 1988).

²⁶ See M. Anderson (1992) for an outline of the changes begun on the statistical studies of women’s education, labour patterns and housing, for example. Anderson considers that Wright supported these improvements.

²⁷ Carroll D. Wright (1840-1909), a statistician who made his name collecting labour statistics in Massachusetts, where he provoked severe criticism for his determination not to be seen as friend of either labour or capital, followed the same fearless policy throughout his long term as Commissioner of Labor in the Bureau of Labor, Department of the Interior. He is credited with teaching the precept to many poorly trained, political

appointees to state labor bureaux (Fitzpatrick 1957: Dictionary of American Biography 1964). That his co-authored book, still well regarded as an authoritative source for the pre-1900 growth of the Census Office (M. Anderson 1988), was so opposed to patronage, was to be expected. William C. Hunt was Chief Statistician of U.S.A.

²⁸ In order that the Census might be available to a wider audience in the Philippines, and perhaps therefore to emphasise the ideological message to the Spanish speaking *illustrats* and bureaucracy, two men, M. E. Beall and F. L. Joannini, of the Compilation and Translation Branch, BIA, in Washington, translated the complete document from English into Spanish (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Appendix 2). The Report of the Secretary of Public Instruction (RPC4, 3, 1903, p. 691) confirms that the compilation, tabulating and Director's Report were written and completed in Washington after Sanger and five of his staff returned from Manila. The Schedules were shipped out from Manila on 20 August 1903.

²⁹ Sec. 6 of the Organic Act of 1902 directed the Philippine Commission: "such census in its enquiries relating to the population shall take and make, so far as practicable, full report of all the inhabitants...and such other information ...as the President and such commission may deem necessary." In his report to the Commission, Bernard Moses, Secretary of Public Instruction, outlined the details to be enumerated in each of the seven Schedules (RPC3, 1-2, 1902, p. 901). Act 467, Sec. 5 of the Philippine Commission required that "...inquiries shall be restricted to the population, schools, agriculture, and industrial and social statistics...*Provided*, That whenever an official registration of mortality or other statistics is and has been maintained, the Director of the Census may employ experts or special agents to investigate and ascertain such statistics, whether of manufacturing, railroad, fishing, mining, telegraph, express, transportation, insurance, banking, or of such other industries, as the Secretary of Public Instruction may direct." (RPC3, 1-2, 1902, p. 1101).

³⁰ The Organic Act of 1902 left open to dispute to what extent Congress, in passing that Act, was bound by the provisions of the (U.S.) Constitution and Bill of Rights, for example with regard to trade, civil or criminal rights (Morison and Commager 1962). The nature and extent of Congressional control and the exact status of the Philippines and Puerto Rico were tested in the Supreme Court, whose decisions were indecisive, with the result that interpretations of the rulings varied (see, for example, Pomeroy 1985; Williams 1924). Article 1, Sec. 2 of the U.S. Constitution requires a decennial census be taken for apportionment: should that have been applied to the Organic Act?

Note, however, that both the U.S. Census Act of 1899 and the Philippine Commission Act 467 of 1902 contained a clause declaring, "That nothing herein contained shall be construed to establish a permanent Census Bureau" (Act 467). The U.S. clause ends, "...a census bureau permanent beyond the Twelfth Census." (RPC3, 1-2, 1902, p. 1101; Wright and Hunt 1900, p. 950).

³¹ Truesdell (1965, p. 117) recorded that the Philippines Census was tabulated in 1903 in Washington "in the main by 'regular' census employees – to the saving of funds for return to the Treasury, but at the expense of some other inquiries on which work has been discontinued for the time being, in order to complete this new assignment promptly." Eight automatic Hollerith tabulating machines and two sorters were used for the Philippines work. The automatic tabulators were said to be able to consolidate and aggregate data in "about one-twentieth of the time and about one-third the cost" (p. 118) of hand consolidation. He also explained why he thought the sorters used were of a type not generally used until after 1940.

Stoddart (1986, p. 31), in discussing the expansion of geographical knowledge of the earth, noted that "Instrumental developments made possible conceptual developments". It is a moot point in relation to the concept of surveillance as advanced by those who see a census in re-conceptualised terms, particularly for a country the physical size of U.S.A. By 1880, before the mechanical census aids were developed, the country boasted a population of 50.1 million that had grown to 62.9 million by 1890. Margo Anderson (1988) suggests that the mechanical aids were needed primarily to counter the problems of political interference in the Census Office and census process, in association with recording population data quickly for constitutional purposes. The question remains, did the wish for surveillance drive the development of census counting machines, or was it the other way around?

³² But see Spivak (1985) and McClintock (1995) who suggest that colonial documents contain evidence of the agency of the "subaltern" population, through active, cultural negotiation.