have thrown a little more light on this critical side of
jazz in Japan would have made this a perfect book for
me.

MICHAEL H. KATER
York University

MICHAEL SALMAN. The Embarrassment of Slavery: Contro-
versies over Bondage and Nationalism in the Ameri-
can Colonial Philippines. Berkeley and Los Angeles:

The American colonial Philippines—the period of
formal U.S. political rule over the islands from the
Philippine-American War (1899–1902) to 1946—has
long been a neglected field of historical research in
both the Philippines and United States. For Filipino
historians, U.S. rule, which relied heavily on elite
Filipino collaboration, confounded narratives of the
rise of independence-based Filipino nationalism. For
U.S. historians, colonial rule in the Philippines was
obscured by national-exceptionalist claims that the
United States was not a colonial empire and by the
inattention of military and diplomatic historians cleav-
ing to U.S. metropolitan actors and archives. Along
with other recent work, Michael Salman’s revealing
study of discourses of slavery and emancipation in the
early twentieth-century Philippines suggests that this
topic is beginning to attract the scholarly attention it
deserves.

Salman identifies slavery and emancipation as the
central means by which both U.S. and Filipino actors
came to comprehend U.S. colonialism in the Phil-
ippines. Slavery and emancipation, as he puts it, “be-
came points of social, cultural, and political conflict in
a series of intertwined American and Philippine histo-
ries” (p. 20). In locating these points, Salman’s work
simultaneously contributes to three different but rel-
ated areas of historical inquiry. First, it provocatively
extends to Southeast Asia historical debates about the
politics of emancipation that have heretofore been
firmly and almost exclusively anchored in the Atlantic
world. Second, it undertakes a cultural history of U.S.
colonial rule that highlights competing definitions of
and negotiations between ruler and ruled, whereas
most prior studies have focused primarily on more
conventional political and administrative history. Third,
implicitly but perhaps most significantly, it puts
the Muslims of the southern archipelago, and the
animists of northern Luzon, at the center of Philippine
history. These regions, Salman argues, with their “non-
Christian” peoples, were the crucibles in which notions
of what it was to be “Filipino,” and what it was to be
“colonial,” were forged.

The book is organized chronologically, from the
Battle of Manila Bay in 1898 through the 1916 Jones
Act, which “Filipinized” the colonial state and prom-
ised eventual independence. Even before the advent of
a colonial state, Salman argues, “[a]ntislavery ideology
and the history of abolition shaped Americans’ debate
on U.S. colonial rule in the Philippines” (p. 28). Drawing
on earlier works, he shows how the ranks of
anti-imperialist leadership included abolitionists and
how these figures made public sense of U.S. colonial-
ism in light of questions of slavery and freedom. When,
in 1899, the United States negotiated the Bates Treaty
with Moro datu in the southern islands, promising
nonintervention with “slavery,” it further fueled anti-
imperialist arguments that colonialism was contrary
to progress, freedom, and morality. Salman then pro-
vides a nuanced social history of slavery within the politi-
cal structures of the southern Philippines; in the interests
of indirect rule, U.S. officials represented these sys-
tems as “mild,” to be eliminated gradually through
promises of compensation and U.S. protection for
in resolving the contradiction between anti-slavery
commitments and the imperative of colonial order so
that one did not fully negate the other” (p. 115). As
the U.S. colonial state consolidated, its officials increas-
ingly redrew slavery as “harsh,” passing “anti-slavery”
laws that touched off ten years of Moro-U.S. warfare.

In his final section, Salman reveals how “slavery”
emerged as one of the central tropes in U.S.-Filipino
colonial politics through what he calls “the metapho-
rics of slavery and nation” (p. 123). He begins by
exploring the meanings of “slavery” within Tagalog
political culture, isolating anti-slavery tropes within the
larger fabric of late-nineteenth-century Tagalog millen-
arian revolutionary thought. Slavery was also an
organizing theme for the elite Filipino nationalists who
collaborated and contended with U.S. proconsuls. U.S.
colonialism might itself be cast as “slavery,” as Spanish
colonialism had been, although “official” nationalists’
own interests in the existing order suggested other
rhetorical routes. Indeed, as Salman adeptly shows,
the enslavement of “non-Christians” in northern Luzon by
Christians was used by U.S. colonial officials as an
argument against Filipinos capacities for self-govern-
ment. In response, nationalists denied the existence
of slavery in the islands in both present and past. Turning
the tide of the “slavery” controversies, Salman argues,
was essential to the maintenance of U.S. control. “The
meanings of slavery emerged as an embarrassment,”
he observes, “first for American advocates of colonial-
ism and the colonial state in the Philippines, and then
for American anti-imperialists and Filipino national-
ists” (p. 20).

Despite the book’s many strengths, Salman’s careful
tracking of languages of slavery and emancipation is
carried out in isolation from other discourses, leaving
readers the mistaken impression that such themes
were the primary or even exclusive ground of Philip-
pine-American colonial politics. While highly signifi-
cant, “anti-slavery” politics were far from the only
languages of Philippine-American colonial politics,
which involved equally charged exchanges over the
meanings of race, republicanism, education, civiliza-
tion, and family that intersected with, rather than
being subsumed within, “anti-slavery.” The presence
or absence of slavery was far from the only criteria for "self-government," progress or civilization for the Filipinos' resourceful American rulers. Salman's argument for the predominance of "anti-slavery" is achieved in part by effacing important boundaries between discourses. He blurs the lines between distinct tropes of colonial difference: for example, fusing at one point "slavery, head-hunting and other 'barbaric practices'" (p. 144). Confronted with the absence of slavery and emancipation in William McKinley's 1898 "Benevolent Assimilation" proclamation, Salman reduces its many tropes—among them "high mission," "good and stable government," "individual rights and liberties," as well as "benevolence" and "assimilation"—to those of slavery and emancipation, arguing that McKinley's terms "resonate strongly with an American repertoire of binary oppositions between individual freedom and slavery" (p. 29).

These criticisms aside, this book persuasively makes the case that, for both Filipinos and Americans, slavery and freedom were core perceptual and political tools in colonial political struggles. It furthermore points toward comparative and transnational perspectives: as Salman notes, the marking of "slavery" and efforts at "emancipation" were projects the United States had in common with other colonial states. This book both greatly enriches our knowledge of the early twentieth-century Philippines and opens the way for further research in a field that has long merited it.

PAUL A. KRAMER
Johns Hopkins University

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES


Even scholars who appreciate the charm of statistical representation and the quantitative impulse as topics of historical inquiry may feel that thirty-five years of the Canadian census makes a rather narrow topic for a book. Yet there are good reasons not to disdain this one. Excellent archival records survive from the mid-nineteenth-century Canadian censuses, and they enable Bruce Curtis to depict in unexampled detail the complex social process of surveying, compiling, and standardizing. The author draws two main conclusions from his story. First is a word to the wise to quantitative historians, who should never take official numbers for granted, without asking where they came from. It is tempting to say that a quantitative history must always be also a cultural history, involving not only patterns of numbers but also unstable categorizations of ethnicity, religion, disease, property, and occupation, and motives to conceal or to exaggerate whenever the results are associated with a public purpose. In the case at hand, the process of gathering data was hilariously unsystematic until 1871. This leads to Curtis's other main point: that a successful census is a striking institutional achievement, associated with ominous bureaucratic modes of rationalization and even domination.

The author's reflections on Michel Foucault's "governmentality," developed at the beginning and end of his book, are pertinent and of some interest. But the heart of the study is made up of material gathered from archives and from evanescent contemporary publications about the censuses of 1851 and 1861, both fascinating failures, and 1871, which was executed with relative competence. As in the United States during this period, there was no permanent census office but only a temporary staff assembled on rather short notice and chosen, through 1861, mainly for patronage reasons. The enumerators, a haphazard lot, were given forms, often in inadequate numbers, sometimes in the wrong language, with ambiguous categories and egregious misprints, and sent out into the Canadian winter to locate and interview the inhabitants of Upper and Lower Canada. Their mission was not only to count the population but also to gather myriad data about religious faith, ethnicity, education, wealth, and manner of earning a living. Despite the many obstacles, the enumerators succeeded in registering many more people than actually lived in Canada, a 110 percent effort that we can credit mainly to the piece-rate system of compensation. They also produced a superlative result for Canadian literacy in 1861, merely by ignoring in many cases the troublesome item: "Persons over 20 years of age not knowing how to read or write." Often they had little idea how to handle questions about race or occupation, and the guidance they received from the census office was often absent or even contradictory.

The bumbling inadequacies of these early censuses, organized mainly by Walter Cavendish Crofton and then William Hutton, contrast sharply with Joseph-Charles Taché's meticulous effort in 1871. Curtis links Taché's systematic approach to his ultramontane Catholicism, a marriage, he proposes, of backward-looking religious severity with the "totalizing" purposes of the modern state. At the same time, he suggests that Taché's choice to tally the inhabitants on the basis of legal residence rather than where they happened to be on census day, and to identify ethnicity with (Old World) country of origin, reflected a special form of population politics. Taché wanted to show a large and flourishing population of pure-blood French Catholics.

Not only in retrospect but in its own time, the Canadian census was deeply controversial. The great questions were the ratio of French to British population and of Catholics to Protestants. Also at issue was the rate of demographic growth, a question that was itself suffused with ethnic politics with and rivalry against its large and boastful southern neighbor. Ironically, the relatively competent 1871 census was the most contested, because it seemed to indicate a radical slowing of population growth. In retrospect, it can be read as illustrating how, even where enumeration is