palgrave▸pivot

How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico

Rebecca Jean Emigh
Patricia Ahmed
Dylan Riley

palgrave
macmillan

How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico

Rebecca Jean Emigh • Patricia Ahmed
Dylan Riley

How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico

palgrave
macmillan

Rebecca Jean Emigh
Department of Sociology
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA, USA

Patricia Ahmed
Department of Sociology
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD, USA

Dylan Riley
Department of Sociology
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-82517-1 ISBN 978-3-030-82518-8 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank César Ayala, Rosa Elena Carrasquillo, Miguel A. Centeno, Andrew Herman, Johanna Hernández Pérez, Corey O'Malley, Michelle Marinello, Kyle Nelson, Jose L. Ortiz, Vilma Ortiz, Tala Oszkay, Jennifer Uribe, Ariana Valle, the Palgrave reviewers and editors, and the members of Emigh's working group for their helpful comments on this manuscript. A UCLA Faculty Senate Grant provided funding for this project.

Contents

1 The Potential of Censuses to Transform Categorization 1

2 Methods 17

3 Spanish Mercantilist Censuses 23

4 Spanish Imperialist Censuses 31

5 US Imperialist Censuses 49

6 Assessing Explanations of Transformations in Categories 59

Appendix 69

References 89

Index 105

List of Tables

Table 1.1	The association among state and social factors and the transformation of social categorization	10
Table A.1	Unpublished (or out of print) sources	69

CHAPTER 1

The Potential of Censuses to Transform Categorization

Abstract State-centered approaches, which assign transformative capabilities to state-driven social classification schemes, dominate census scholarship. Simply put, from this perspective, states' categories shape popular perceptions of social categories, including race. However, the Puerto Rican case challenges these positions. Fluid phenotypical and social characteristics underlie everyday racial categorization there, despite centuries of colonial and imperialist censuses that restricted racial categories to Black, White, and Brown. Thus, the Puerto Rican case exemplifies the need to recast successful official classification as a multidimensional, interactive state-society process. This chapter specifies some features of states and societies, such as a strong imperialist state, the familiarity of census categories, the engagement of social actors and institutions in information gathering, and local power relations that may help explain where and when censuses have these transformative effects. Using this approach, the transformative power of censuses can be evaluated empirically instead of unilaterally assumed.

Keywords Official classification • State-society interaction • Colonial Puerto Rico • Every categorization • Colonial censuses • The sociology of statistics

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8_1

Puerto Rican Categorization as a Strategic Research Site

How does the everyday cognitive ordering of the social world into types (categorization) connect to the official presentation of that ordering in government documents (classification)? This is one of the most important topics in sociological theory and in social life. The fascinating history of categorization and classification on the island of Puerto Rico from the colonial period through the epoch of US hegemony constitutes a strategic research site for investigating this issue. As in the rest of the Caribbean and Latin America, in Puerto Rico, racial categorization in everyday life is based on a continuum of terms marking appearance, such as skin color, hair texture, and facial features, as well as social characteristics of language, mannerisms, and income. At the same time, a tripartite summary classification of White, Brown, and Black is also widely used. Puerto Rico is unique, however, in that Spanish and then US censuses were redacted there using these summary categories of White, Brown, and Black, starting in the sixteenth century and with increasing intensity and detail in the eighteenth century, sometimes resulting in data collection every year. Censuses were collected elsewhere in the Caribbean and Latin America but never so frequently nor in such detail. Thus, if these censuses had the potential to eliminate the multiple, fluid categories used in everyday life, it was in Puerto Rico. Yet, such an outcome did not occur. Whatever effects these censuses had, they did not have the power to eliminate these everyday categorizations.

In the twentieth century, the census forms and enumerator instructions were routinely published, and census information was collected in a fairly standardized way, so it is relatively apparent what official categories existed that might have had a transformative effect (e.g., Loveman 2007, 30, 36, 37; Loveman and Muniz 2007, 934–935). It is clear that the official categories used in these twentieth-century US censuses were incongruent with Puerto Ricans' own categorizations used in everyday life. While anti-blackness was inherent in both Spanish and American racial ideology, the latter applied the category of Black in a broader way that contradicted Puerto Ricans' everyday uses. In contrast, before the twentieth century, census forms and enumerator instructions were less frequently published, and even where they were, the actual census information was collected in more variable formats. Although summaries of the pre-twentieth-century censuses have been published and give a few racial categories, it is currently unknown whether these categories were on the actual census declarations

in the same format as in the summaries or whether the summaries combined information from different census categories (e.g., Duany 2002, 248; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265). Thus, it is difficult to assess what possible effect the official census categories may have had on the everyday ones before the twentieth century, since it is largely unknown what the official categories actually were. To fill this gap, we searched extensively for and analyzed thoroughly the censuses before the twentieth century, which were generally unpublished, collected on manuscripts or typeset forms. Thus, we describe below the racial categories of every major census in Puerto Rico so that it is clear what categories were available that might have been able to transform everyday categorization throughout Puerto Rican history. We can then take the next step of better understanding the effect—or lack thereof—of these census categories on everyday life and, consequently, better understand the historical precedents to their lack of effect in the twentieth century.

Our evidence provides three crucial pieces of information about these pre-twentieth-century censuses. First, it shows that the Spanish censuses collected a variety of information about multiple dimensions of stratification, including race, but also legal status, social status, and nationality. Second, it shows that race was a highly fluid category, defined in multiple ways before the twentieth century. Third, it shows that the tripartite categories of White, Brown, and Black (notably, this tripartite scheme probably had ecclesiastical origins) were commonly used in all of the censuses, though not consistently. This tripartite schema seems to have arisen together with the multiple categories used in everyday life but at no time replaced them.

We argue, therefore, that the Spanish census categories were fluid enough that the population whitened more slowly in the centuries of Spanish rule than in the twentieth century when the US categories were introduced; nevertheless, the Spanish census categories never replaced the everyday categories that were even more fluid and permitted even more upward mobility. Thus, our analysis highlights the role of social actors in the process of categorization and the state's limitations in transforming these categories. Importantly, we consider the entire history of the Puerto Rican census, including the Spanish period, for which there has been little examination of the actual census categories. Our evidence shows that the relative stability of the tripartite White, Brown, and Black official categories had relatively little effect on categorization, while the culturally widespread racial ideologies were much more influential. While our evidence fills an important gap in Puerto Rican history, it also directly addresses a theoretical debate about the power of censuses, to which we turn next.

The State-Centered Perspective of the Transformative Power of Censuses

One of the strong claims of the sociology of statistics is that censuses, as well as other forms of official information, far from reflecting reality, in fact construct that reality (Cohn 1987, 250; Espeland and Stevens 2008, 405; Loveman 2005, 1654; 2014, 59; Nobles 2000, xi, 1; Peabody 2001, 821). Of course, censuses create and disseminate information, which in turn changes how individuals act. But the sociology of statistics makes a stronger claim: censuses transform individuals' consciousness, that is, the very ways that they categorize, conceptualize, process, and use additional information. Individuals fill out census forms using its given classificatory schemes, and once the information is compiled, it becomes widely disseminated, as individuals again use them to conceptualize reality (Anderson [1983] 1991, 165; Desrosières 1998, 324–327; Hacking 1990, 3; Kertzer and Arel 2002, 11; Loveman 2014, 14–19; Nobles 2000, 5; Patriarca 1996, 11–12; Scott 1998, 2; Starr 1987, 53).

As we will argue, this construction of reality has social and state influences, but most of the sociology of statistics privileges the states' categories and role in this process of social construction because states are powerful entities, usually with identifiable bureaucratic structures and actors that can collect data and create and spread knowledge, and thus, have transformative effects (see review in Emigh et al. 2016a, 5–12). Within this broad "state-centered" perspective, state power is conceptualized in different ways. According to Weber (1978, 213, 223; Stapleford 2009, 6), states are powerful because they have legitimate authority enshrined in rule-governed bureaucratic administrations. These bureaucracies—following Weber's logic—have the power to collect and process information according to calculations and rules that become increasingly pervasive as they are adopted by other organizations (Dandeker 1990, 12; Saiani 2012, 226; Schware 1981, 46; Shaw and Miles 1979, 34; Stapleford 2009, 7; Weber 1978, 223). Thus, the information that states collect, as well as the principles of its collection, transforms social relations.

Bourdieu (1999, 61; 2012, 13, 262–264; cf. [1997] 2000, 175) focused on the power of the state to impose information-collecting schemes, such as surveys and censuses, on the population; to systematize the information collected to its advantage; and to order its subjects according to this systematization by imposing common principles of thinking. The state imposes and inculcates these classificatory principles through symbolic and

material capital that social agents, endowed with categories of perception, recognize and value (Bourdieu 1999, 62–63; Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 15–16; Loveman 2014, 17, 19; cf. Anderson [1983] 1991, 168–169; Epstein 2007, 278). Thus, the state's categories shape mental structures (Bourdieu 1999, 61; 2012, 263).

Foucault ([1976] 1978, 140; [1975] 1979, 28; [2004] 2007, 274–275; Hannah 2000, 8; review in Higgs 2005, 3–4) also argued that information, far from providing a neutral description of the population, instead controls it through "biopower." Written records form disciplinary practices that provide institutions with knowledge about individuals and aggregate populations (Foucault [1975] 1979, 190; see Espeland and Stevens 2008, 414). These practices are transformative because they function as panoptic forms of power and knowledge that create states of conscious, permanent visibility in individuals that allows power to function automatically (Foucault [1975] 1979, 190–191, 201).

Similarly, Latour (1987, 234–237) noted that some actants, such as maps or censuses, have a particular power to act at a distance because they make reality mobile, stable, and combinable. Census bureaucrats are positioned at the center of this process of reducing huge amounts of individuals' information to a few summary tables. Their governance is facilitated because this type of information processing induces self-regulation (Miller and Rose 1990, 2, 9; Rose et al. 2006, 89). Thus, actor-network theory also suggests how the combined network of a state bureaucracy and a technology of quantification (as in Weber) links power and knowledge (as in Foucault) and leads to a transformation of social categorization (see also Carroll 2006, 22–24; Curtis 2001, 26, 29–33).

In sum, this state-centered perspective provides valuable insights: states' collection of information, through censuses, can transform social categorization by disseminating classificatory schemes (e.g., Bourdieu), by inducing widespread use of these schemes (e.g., Bourdieu and Weber), and by using these schemes as panoptic mechanisms of surveillance (e.g., Foucault) or action at a distance (e.g., Latour). Thus, taken together, the state-centered perspective suggests that census categories begin with the state administrative structures and bureaucracies. State bureaucrats develop techniques to collect information through these categories, individuals respond to these requests for information, and report it in terms of the state's categories. Furthermore, once the information is collated and distributed widely, it shapes social institutions and individuals' categorizations (Emigh et al. 2016a, 35–36).

Most of this literature, then, describes a state-centered mechanism or process by which censuses can have transformative effects. Because the thrust of these arguments is directed toward showing how censuses can alter consciousness, they tend to assume these effects. Three types of empirical work, in particular, are missing. First, these works rarely consider whether censuses have these effects, and if they do, why and when. Thus, relatively little is known about the boundary conditions under which censuses have transformative effects (Luft and Thomson 2021, 108; cf. Barnard 2019, 755). Second, relatively little is known about the types of categorization processes that censuses are likely to alter. Consequently, specifications about outcomes tend to be vague, pointing to something that happened, rather than explaining specific types of outcomes that most often occur. Third, there is little work pointing to deviant or negative outcomes, where transformations do not occur when they are expected to occur, or when they unexpectedly do occur. These negative or deviant cases are important parts of theory building as well as understanding particular empirical cases (Emigh 1997, 655–658).

An Interactive View of the Transformative Power of Censuses

To date, these processes of transformation, stemming from censuses, have been mostly conceptualized from this state-centered perspective. However, it is important to note that while the state-centered perspective offers important insights, the process of information gathering depends on the interaction between states and societies. In general, and especially in censuses, a higher level of knowledge by one party necessitates a higher level of knowledge of the other (Carruthers and Espeland 1991, 36; Emigh et al. 2015, 487; Espeland and Stevens 1998, 325; Goody and Watt 1963, 325–326). This interactive process can be state-centered as we noted: government officials collect information that induces individuals to categorize, think quantitatively, and keep increasingly detailed records (Bourdieu 1999, 61; Clanchy [1979] 1993, 19; Desrosières 1998, 324–327; Hacking 1990, 2–3; Loveman 2014, 11; Schweber 2006, 26). However, it can also be society-centered: states respond to social actors' pressures for information gathering using relevant social categories and thus collect more detailed records in reaction to the social construction of knowledge (Bruno and Didier 2013, 50–58; Cohen 1982, 164; Emigh 2002, 689; Porter 1995, 35–37).

Of course, these two processes work together; for example, the state-centered perspective does not completely ignore social influences nor proposes that states are all-powerful entities. Nevertheless, when social influences are considered, this state-centered perspective generally focuses on how social actors resist imposed forms of classifications rather than on how they might actively contribute to their development and spread (Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 15–16; Foucault [1976] 1978, 95; Hannah 2000, 39–40, 115; Kertzer and Arel 2002, 6–7; Latour 1987, 234–235; Loveman 2014, 12; Sauder and Espeland 2009, 75). From the state-centered perspective, while social actors are not powerless to subvert these classifications, their actions, however subtly, may reinforce these categories because their resistance must operate through categories established by the state. Most analyses of resistance, then, in the end intensify the role of the state by treating states as active and social groups as resistant (e.g., Barnard 2019, 780; Kertzer and Arel 2002, 6; Loveman 2007, 37; Murdoch and Ward 1997, 308; Sussman 2004, 98). This emphasis makes it difficult to analyze the autonomous social influences on information gathering (Bayly 1996, 366; Luft and Thomson 2021, 124; Ostler 2002, 313).

In contrast, we proposed a perspective that explains state and social influences, as well as the interactive influences of states and societies (Emigh et al. 2016a, 19–41; cf. Bayly 1996, 366). The first step in creating this fully interactive perspective was to develop a society-centered model analogous to the state-centered one. We thus explained and described in detail the mechanisms through which changes in social categorization could stem from society-centered processes (Emigh et al. 2016a, 39, 210–216; 2016b, 212–218). First, widespread lay categories of common sense provide the raw materials of social categorization. Second, these lay categories are embedded in local social institutions, thus embodying the categories. Third, social actors—whom we call "information intellectuals," drawing on the Gramscian idea of intellectuals—positioned in local social institutions, transform these lay categories into formalized categories of information gathering. Fourth, depending on the power relations between these information intellectuals and state actors, state actors take up these formalized categories. Fifth, state bureaucracies change in response to these new categories, changing state structures. Finally, these new state structures influence social ones, reinforcing the lay categories that gave rise to these changes.

An excellent example of this socially driven process is the bureaucratic adoption of nonbinary gender categories (Meadow 2010, 815–816). Nonbinary individuals, expressing a variety of gender orientations, have pushed for the adoption of official categories and legal definitions in state bureaucracies. These challenges have produced a number of changes in official legal classifications, bureaucratic forms, and physical spaces (e.g., bathrooms) that have reshaped state structures. Thus, the society-centered perspective can (like the state-centered perspective) be summarized: information gathering originates in society and social institutions, social actors press for the social information to be systematized or collected, state actors implement these requests, and the information collected changes the state and its institutions (Emigh et al. 2016a, 30).

Our point, however, was not to replace the state-centered perspective with the society-centered one but to create a fully interactive model so that state and social influences can be examined together and empirically evaluated. Indeed, we (and of course, others, e.g., Bruno and Didier 2013, 50–58; Cohen 1982, 164; Emigh 2002, 689; Porter 1995, 35–37) argued that both state-centered and society-centered mechanisms are specifications of a broader process of interactive information gathering. Thus, we historicized both the state-centered and society-centered theories by showing how both types of influences stem from historically specific processes of interaction between the two. Our fully interactive perspective shows how the state-centered and society-centered influences occur together, but also how they can be examined empirically to show, in particular places and times, which influence, at which level of state and society (micro, meso, or macro), may be present or particularly important. In this way, we can begin to understand empirically where and when state and social influences may be crucial, moving away from general heuristics that assert the importance of state or social influences but without specifying whether, and if so, how and why, they are important.

For the census, of particular importance is the interaction among and between social and state actors about information gathering with respect to the census categories. It is at this analytic location that much of the conflict and negotiation occurs. Social actors, drawing on lay categories, push for the adoption of categories in their interests, and depending on their location in social institutions and their relative power vis-à-vis other social actors and state actors, may pressure state actors into adopting their census categories. At the same time, state actors, with their own interests,

agendas, and census categories, push for the adoption and collection of the categories they have developed. The outcome of this interactive conflict, depending on the interests and relative powers of the social and state actors, shapes how information is gathered, as well as what information is available to then mold state and social institutions. The state-centered perspective, of course, recognizes this analytic location as important, but only as a point of resistance by social actors to the state's categories. In the fully interactive perspective, this analytic point stems not only from the state actors' attempts to collect information in official categories, but also from the social actors' demands to collect information based on their reformulation of lay categories.

Examining state and social processes has implications not only for building theories of information gathering, but also for political sociology more generally because of the current debates in this field about how best to capture the states' roles. States are not unitary, invariant entities defined by formal, legal boundaries, but can have far-reaching effects because they often work invisibly through social networks and practices, including information gathering (Balogh 2009, 7; Foucault [1976] 1978, 95; 1991, 100–101; Joyce and Mukerji 2017, 2; Mayrl and Quinn 2016, 2–3, 19–20; Mettler 2011, 4; Mitchell 2002, 84–93). Thus, Mitchell (1991, 94; 1999, 89), for example, argued against such tactics as "bringing the state back in" and, by analogy, "bringing society back in," suggesting instead that the state should be analyzed as an "effect." We agree that careful attention must be given to the analysis of the boundary between state and social activities, as their mutual constitution, symbolic appropriation, and historical contingency make the distinction between them difficult to specify (Mayrl and Quinn 2016, 1, 19). We thus try to explore the interconnections between states and societies as well as the hybrid forms that combine attributes of both (cf. Balogh 2009, 9–10, 13–15; 2015, 6, 10–14; Clemens 2006, 191; Mayrl and Quinn 2016, 3; Mettler 2011, 4).

Under What Conditions Are Censuses Transformative?

Here, we do not try to explain the plausibility of mechanisms—state-centered, society-centered, or fully interactive—through which censuses may be transformative, as these have been highlighted in the work we

reviewed in the previous sections. Instead, as we noted, few studies have explicitly considered empirically where, when, and under what conditions these mechanisms of transformation actually work, even though the mechanisms themselves are highly plausible. Thus, here, to understand how the transformative effect of censuses works through states and societies, we use the state-centered and society-centered perspectives to motivate some specific factors that we could observe empirically that could—or could not—be associated with the transformative effects of censuses. In particular, we examine the specific transformation given in Table 1.1 as the outcome, that is, whether census categories became widely used in everyday life (Table 1.1, bottom row, "Census categories are used in everyday life"). Thus, we have to reorient the literature to this particular undertaking by specifying these factors in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 The association among state and social factors and the transformation of social categorization

	Mercantilist Spanish Puerto Rico	*Imperialist Spanish Puerto Rico*	*Imperialist US Puerto Rico*
Census categories:			
Commonly collected census categories with potentially transformative power	Primarily legal categories, secondarily racial categories	Primarily racial categories, sometimes combined with legal status	Racial categories
State-centered perspective:			
Strong imperialist state	No	Yes	Yes
Society-centered perspective:			
State's categories are familiar to social actors	Yes	Yes	Yes
Social actors and local institutions are engaged in information gathering	No	Yes	Yes
Local power relations support state's census categories	Yes	No	No
Outcome:			
Census categories are used in everyday life	Yes	No	No

Incorporating State Effects

As we noted, the overall thrust of the state-centered perspective is that states produce effects through censuses because they are powerful. We would expect, then, that powerful states would more often produce censuses with transformative effects. State strength is often defined in terms of capacity, performance, or infrastructure (Centeno et al. 2017, 3; Mann 1993, 59–60; Soifer and vom Hau 2008, 220). This sort of definition can be very useful, but it provides little leverage in understanding the variability in the relationship between the collection of censuses or their effects on the one hand and state strength on the other, because the collection of a census is an infrastructural and performative capacity of a state. For example, the collection of a national census can be a proxy for state strength (Centeno 2002, 110; Soifer and vom Hau 2008, 220). Similarly, state strength can be defined as an effect of its infrastructure, such as the effect of census categories on a population (cf. Soifer 2008, 247). Alternatively, state strength is often defined in terms of the development of a centralized authority that creates geographical integrity (cf. Emigh et al. 2016a, 51). Again, this definition can be quite useful, but again provides little leverage in an empirical case such as ours where we consider a single, relatively small geographical region. Because of these issues—although these conventional definitions would have classified the states we use as empirical examples in the same way in Table 1.1—we instead turn to Foucault's distinction between sovereignty and governmentality as a more specific way to understand the historically variable effect of state power on information gathering.

Starting in the late sixteenth century and consolidating in the eighteenth century, there was a fundamental shift between states' exercise of rule through "sovereignty," characterized by states' absolute power over subjects through law and rules, and through "governmentality," characterized by states' justifications of actions because they served the governed (Curtis 2002, 509, 522; Foucault 1991, 96–102; [2004] 2007, 94–95, 102). Information was crucial to rule through sovereignty because knowing the distribution of subjects was necessary, for example, for waging war, colonization, and providing for such subjects; mercantilist theory furthermore suggested that a large population was intrinsically advantageous as it was a sign of state power (Curtis 2002, 507, 508; Dillon 2005, 40; Higgs 2005, 3–4). However, this theory provided little motivation for an understanding that the governed themselves were

changeable, so social intervention was not central to information gathering. Thus, the descriptive information gathering that prevailed at this time probably had few transformative effects.

In contrast, governmentality was linked to the idea that the population could be altered through human reflection and social intervention (Curtis 2002, 506, 509; Foucault 1991, 99–101; [2004] 2007, 105–106; Higgs 2004, 20; Murdoch and Ward 1997, 308–310; Rose et al. 2006, 86–87; Sánchez-Matamoros et al. 2005, 184; Singer and Weir 2008, 59). States required a specific knowledge of their populations to justify governance on their behalf, so they conducted statistical, demographic, and economic analyses (Foucault 1991, 96, 99, 100). These analyses are most transformative when multiple bureaucratic state institutions attach mandatory classifications directly to individuals because they become determinative for social life across a wide spectrum of activities (e.g., mobility, transportation, housing, etc.) (Loveman 2014, 16–17). Thus, these interventionist censuses that were collected during this time are more likely than the previously collected descriptive ones to have transformative effects (cf. Anderson [1983] 1991, 164–165).

Mercantilist and imperialist censuses of colonies in particular, though they are rarely differentiated from each other in terms of Foucauldian sovereignty and governmentality, are almost exclusively viewed as state institutions of control and domination (e.g., Anderson [1983] 1991, 120, 165; Appadurai 1996, 115; Asad 1994, 76–77; Carroll 2006, 93; Dillon 2005, 42; Dirks 2001, 198–199; Hirschman 1987, 566–568; Kalpagam 2000, 39; Loveman 2007, 20; Sussman 2004, 98; review in Peabody 2001, 820–822). Mercantilist rule, however, was generally more superficial than imperialist governance. It was oriented toward the extraction of resources from colonies, while imperialist rule was oriented toward the economic, political, and cultural transformation of colonies.

Empirically, the most important cases of the transformative effects of governmentality are the imperialist censuses of British India. The examination of British information gathering in India suggested that over the centuries it did not merely describe reality, but generated it, because it shaped the very categories of thought and thus transformed categorization (Cohn 1987, 250; reviews in Appadurai 1996, 116; Peabody 2001, 820–822). In particular, although castes certainly had existed before British rule, British imperialist censuses, more than Mughal and mercantilist British information gathering, consolidated and reified the classifications associated with them (Appadurai 1996, 119; Cohn 1987, 233–247; Dirks 2001,

60, 219–221; Kalpagam 2000, 51; Peabody 2001, 821, 841). This evidence supports Foucault's argument that imperialist censuses linked to governmentality had greater transformative effects than the mercantilist ones linked to sovereignty (Table 1.1, Row 2, "Strong imperialist state").

Incorporating Social Effects

To consider possible social factors, we draw on our previous conceptualization (Emigh et al. 2016a, 39, 210–216; 2016b, 212–218). However, here we do not attempt to trace both the state-centered and society-centered influences on the transformative possibilities of censuses as a full implementation of our model would suggest. Instead, we examine three society-centered influences on information gathering as generated from our society-centered perspective. First, lay categories form the basis of census classifications; second, social actors and institutions are crucial for information collection; and third, the power of social actors affects what information is collected (Emigh et al. 2016a, 41–46).

Lay Categories

First, censuses always bear strong marks of the lay categories of their societies (Emigh et al. 2016a, 207; 2016b, 210; see empirical application in Emigh et al. 2015, 508, 511). Official categories are most likely to be transformative when they draw on lay categories and when the official ones are consistent with the classified's own practices and lay categories; they have little effect when they fail to incorporate lay knowledge or are inconsistent with them (Loveman 2014, 18; Mitchell 2002, 86, 90, 92, 106, 115) (Table 1.1, Row 3, "State's categories are familiar to social actors").

As we noted above, the cases of Indian colonial censuses are, perhaps, the most thoroughly examined ones with respect to the transformative power of censuses, providing a set of detailed studies that can be used to generate empirical expectations about the effects of social categories as well as state ones. The Indian cases, for example, show that familiarity with lay and official categories, as well as the timing of use of these categories (e.g., did Indians' use of caste precede or follow the British censuses), helps explain the transformative effect of censuses. In India, the categories of caste were familiar. The Mughals, who collected tax information, acknowledged, but did not extensively enumerate, these group identities (Appadurai 1996, 115, 129). The British censuses created a new logic of

social difference, drawing on already familiar Indian categories of caste, but also applying to the colonial setting the focus of the British domestic census on controlling deviance and poverty (Appadurai 1996, 115, 118, 129). Although caste was familiar, the British censuses reified and concretized it, creating a much more fixed and rigid system out of the preexisting Indian categories. This new application gave the British power over the colonial populace by altering consciousness and identities and by changing categories of thought that in turn were used in political battles and gave rise to new Indian political forms (Appadurai 1996, 116; Cohn 1987, 250; Peabody 2001, 821). Thus, the Indian case as well suggests that the familiarity of official categories to social actors is crucial to their transformative power.

Social Actors

Second, social actors and institutions are essential to information gathering (Emigh et al. 2016a, 44). Sometimes they actively press for information to be collected, sometimes they provide the background knowledge for information collection, sometimes they actively transform lay categories into official ones, and sometimes they actually collect the information (Emigh et al. 2016a, 207–208; 2016b, 210–211). These social actors, of course, do not exist in a vacuum but are located in social institutions that may conduct their own information gathering or that may support information gathering by others. Despite the huge diversity in social groups and the forms of their involvement in information gathering, merchants and capitalists, along with religious officials, were frequently crucial to historical information gathering (Emigh et al. 2016a, 211, 213–214, 215; 2016b, 214, 217; cf. Dandeker 1990, 12–13; Stapleford 2009, 6–7). With the rise of interest group politics in the twentieth century, lobbyists, media executives, and activists also became important influences on information gathering (Emigh et al. 2016b, 213, 215–216; Mora 2014a, 183, 203; 2014b, 118; Rodríguez-Muñiz 2017, 387). We thus expect censuses to be transformative when social actors and social institutions are prominent in information gathering (Table 1.1, Row 4, "Social actors and local institutions are engaged in information gathering").

A similar dynamic may have influenced the Indian case. The Mughals and the Hindu kingdoms had well-developed institutions for information gathering and a staff of administrators who could collect such information (Peabody 2001, 824). Social actors, however, such as merchants and village accountants, were key to gathering information for revenue

assessment (Bayly 1996, 22). The British, during their rule, built upon these systems of information gathering and formalized them. The press to collect detailed information about caste arose not from the British colonial bureaucracy but from lower-level Indian administrators (Peabody 2001, 830–831). Local merchants and scribes sought to gain status through categories of caste and promoted their use even when British officials found them difficult to use (Peabody 2001, 841). Indian merchants, but not the landed elite, also supported British information gathering that focused on trade, goods, and manufacturing that was consistent with British commercial interests (Peabody 2001, 837–840). Thus, the Indian case also suggests that social actors and institutions were key.

The Balance of Power Among Social and State Actors

Finally, the balance of power, among social actors and between social and state actors, affects information gathering (Emigh et al. 2016a, 44–45). Powerful social actors can block, support, or demand information gathering (Emigh et al. 2016a, 45). The relative power of social actors influences which actors' interests are transformed into information categories, which social actors successfully implement these categories, and where and when these social actors persuade state actors to use them. Thus, the society-centered perspective suggests, in sharp contrast to the state-centered perspective, that censuses should be transformative where information gathering aligns with the interests of powerful social actors (Table 1.1, Row 5, "Local power relations support state's census categories").

Of course, the British were powerful rulers, but they were particularly dependent upon Indians for rule in general and for information gathering in particular (Bayly 1996, 7, 371; cf. Comaroff and Comaroff 1991, 32; Peabody 2001, 819–820; Stoler 1989, 154–155). They were forced to master and manipulate the Mughal and Hindu systems of information gathering (Bayly 1996, 8, 365). Although these Indian information systems were well developed, they were piecemeal (Bayly 1996, 8). It was not a single system that the British could assume, so they had to deal with multiple individuals and locations. Furthermore, once the British systematized these information networks, they were easily assumed by Indians to serve their own purposes (Bayly 1996, 351). Thus, again, the Indian case shows that social actors, though perhaps not as powerful as the British colonizers overall, were strategically placed in powerful information-gathering agencies and were thus able to further their own interests. Thus,

even in the Indian case, which perhaps constitutes the strongest evidence for the state-centered view, there were clear social influences on the census.

In sum, we have used the state-centered and society-centered perspectives to generate empirical expectations about where and when we expect census categories to have a transformative effect: where there is a strong imperialist state, where the state's categories are familiar to social actors, where social actors and local institutions are engaged in information gathering, and where local power relations support the state's census categories. We now turn to our case of Puerto Rico, starting with a discussion of our methods. As we will show, the Puerto Rican case poses a serious challenge to the statist view, which our theoretical perspective can resolve.

CHAPTER 2

Methods

Abstract This chapter presents the methods and data used in the analysis. First, it establishes Puerto Rico as a "negative case" with respect to state-centered approaches (see Chap. 1), that is, one in which the predicted outcome (widely transformative census classification) is missing. It then employs historical narrative to trace processes contributing (or not) to the transformative power of census categories. It deploys narrative comparatively in three periods: Spanish mercantilism, Spanish imperialism, and US imperialism. These methods of narrative and comparison are used with three types of data: published secondary literature, published census documents, and unpublished (or out of print) documents and manuscripts microfilmed by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. These documents provide comprehensive data, and in particular, the format of racial categories, for censuses collected from the beginning of Spanish colonization through the beginning of the twenty-first century. These methods help evaluate what features of states and societies facilitate the transformative effects of censuses.

Keywords Negative case methodology • Narrative analysis • Process tracing • Comparative analysis • Historical analysis

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8_2

Case Selection

Although Puerto Rico was mostly neglected by its colonial administrators, it became the site of some of the most frequently collected censuses, starting in the 1500s, in the Spanish Empire. These censuses typically summarized race into a few well-known and widely used categories. Everyday racial categorizations, on the other hand, were composed of multiple, relatively fluid categories (cf. Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 152). Despite being used for hundreds of years, these official census categories promulgated by strong imperialist powers never transformed the everyday categories of Puerto Ricans. Although the fluidity and multiplicity of everyday racial categorization is widespread throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, Puerto Rico is unique because of the frequency of Spanish and US censuses collected there. This outcome presents, then, a paradox for the state-centered perspective, which suggests that strong states, through the collection of censuses, can transform social categorization. If the state-centered perspective is correct, a set of census categories should have been easily implemented and highly transformative. In this respect, Puerto Rico is a negative case: it does not conform to the expectations of the state-centered perspective (Emigh 1997, 656). We thus use the Puerto Rican case to understand more clearly the historical conditions under which censuses transform social categorization, and therefore explain some of their variable transformative power.

Our empirical analyses also contribute to the substantive knowledge of Puerto Rico classification and categorization. In the twentieth century, official census categories and their definitions clashed with Puerto Ricans' interests, so they subverted, ignored, or eventually eliminated these categories while leaving in place the system of everyday categorization (Bennett 2000, 173; Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 152; Duany 2002, 252–253; Loveman 2007, 30, 36, 37; Loveman and Muniz 2007, 934–935; Rivera-Batiz and Santiago 1996, 70). However, in earlier centuries, it is unclear from published censuses and research to date what categories were actually used in censuses (Table 1.1, Row 1), so it is impossible to evaluate how these official categories might have compared to the everyday system of categorization (Table 1.1, Row 6). Our comprehensive examination of the actual census declarations in earlier centuries fills this empirical gap: while the census categories before the twentieth century were much more fluid and flexible than afterward, Puerto Ricans had few reasons to adopt the official ones over the everyday ones. We consider three colonial time periods: mercantilist Spanish rule, imperialist Spanish rule, and imperialist US rule (Table 1.1, Columns 1, 2, and 3).

Using Comparison

To provide evidence for the state- and society-centered perspectives that suggest where and when censuses can transform everyday categorization, we use the tools of historical sociology, comparison and narrative. Comparisons make it possible to understand how different factors possibly influence outcomes by considering sets of strategically chosen cases, while historical narratives or sequence analyses trace out the processes that allow these factors to produce these outcomes (Anderson 2018, 183; Mahoney 2003, 363; Riley and Fernández 2014, 444; Sewell 2005, 7; Tsutsui 2017, 1057). Like all methods, these are not without drawbacks, criticisms, or debate, but they are useful tools to conduct empirical analyses and draw conclusions when it is difficult or impossible to accumulate a large number of cases (see Emigh 1997, 649; Goldthorpe 2000, 58–59; Gorski 2004, 22–27; Kiser 1996, 250–256; Riley and Fernández 2014, 492). The most serious criticism of Millian comparative analysis is that it cannot demonstrate causality as is sometimes claimed. We agree; like statistical models, comparative methods can help to show a patterning among the factors and outcomes that corresponds (or does not correspond) to theoretical expectations, and thus provide evidence for or against theories, but this patterning itself cannot demonstrate causality. We also agree that the methodological use of induction cannot demonstrate causality. Thus, for us, Millian comparisons do not imply a commitment to the existence of pre-theoretical cases to be compared (Riley et al. 2021: 331–334; cf. Burawoy 1989, 763). Nor does this patterning alone provide a mechanism that illustrates a possible causal process that could link these factors and outcomes; a temporal narrative is more helpful in this respect. Nevertheless, most comparative work relies on an analysis of patterning similar to Mill's, even if it does not explicitly invoke Mill.

We therefore deploy comparative methods within a deductive, not inductive, framework in which the factors relevant to a comparative discussion are theorized prior to the analysis (Emigh 1997, 655). In particular, above we suggested that four factors—a strong mercantilist state, familiarity of the state's categories to social actors, engagement of social actors and local institutions in information gathering, and support of local power relations for the state's census categories—are important to where and when census categories have transformative effects. We deploy these factors on the basis of extensive theorizing about the interactive influences on information gathering, as well as summaries of the most

developed empirical case, colonial India. We then evaluate the pattern of the factors and outcome empirically, with reference to these theories. Indeed, we see no other basis on which comparative analysis can be conducted. We evaluate three time periods that follow the two standard patterns of comparative research: most similar systems/Millian method of difference and most different systems/Millian method of agreement (Mill [1843] 1950, 211–216; Przeworski & Teune 1970, 32–39; Skocpol 1979, 36–37). Of course, time periods in a single location are not independent, so again, our comparison, even if we were invoking the application of Mill's methods to demonstrate causality, cannot provide this conclusion. Nevertheless, comparing time periods within regions or countries is a common strategy to understand how outcomes change over time (e.g., Campbell and Schoenfeld 2013, 1386; Fairbrother 2014, 1336). In particular, we analyze the patterns of social and state factors based on a theoretical understanding of censuses and their effects that previous work has neglected precisely because the conditions under which censuses can be transformative have been understudied. Thus, we argue that our analysis contributes to comparative understandings of the structures of racial classification (Bonilla-Silva 1999, 904) by showing patterns of association among factors and outcomes. These patterns can be linked to mechanisms that explain why such patterns occur (or not).

Using Narrative

We present our evidence through historical narratives in three time periods and then use the narratives to fill in the factors and the outcomes in Table 1.1 at the end of each section. We emphasize that we are not presenting an administrative history of the Puerto Rican censuses (that is, what were the official laws or intentions of the administrators); instead, we search through the documents to see how the official categories were actually constructed and deployed (Table 1.1, Row 1), to determine what sets of census categories were used that might have affected everyday categorization (Table 1.1, Row 6). To construct our narrative, we use three types of evidence: published secondary literature, published census documents, and unpublished documents and manuscripts. First, throughout our narrative, we use secondary material in a standard way (i.e., author/date citations), but there is only a small secondary literature on Puerto Rican censuses. Second, we examine published primary census documents. We searched exhaustively through the published literature for census documents and

cite these publications wherever possible in standard author/date format. In many cases, these primary documents are compiled into books, so they are cited by the author's name of that book. Most of these published documents are summaries of censuses, though a few are household declarations. Finally, we look at unpublished typeset and manuscript copies of censuses for the nineteenth century, in formats ranging from the original household declarations to the final, published summaries, microfilmed by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. These vast holdings represent that church's attempt to provide comprehensive documentation. Of course, there may be additional census records in the archives, but censuses generally repeat similar information across different households, so any documents we missed are likely to have been similar to those that we viewed, and we are unlikely to have missed anything relevant to our investigation. Because it is highly repetitive and awkward to cite these documents in author/date format since they are rarely paginated, we provide Table A.1 (Appendix) that lists the documents that we used. Table A.1 lists only nineteenth-century documents because we found no extant unpublished census documents before the nineteenth century, and the forms for the twentieth-century US censuses are all published. Our narrative references the year of the documents that corresponds to the sources listed in Table A.1. This table gives the citation directly from the microfilm (not the original archival source, as we consulted only the microfilm). Geographic names, as well as any other terms drawn directly from the manuscripts, are used and spelled as given in the sources (and not modernized; in particular, the original sources did not usually use diacritical marks).

For simplicity, we use English words, with Spanish terms in parentheses as needed, as much as possible in our text. We use Spanish terms alone to prevent confusion when a repeated English rendering would be awkward, but we provide an approximate translation at first Spanish use. The term, race, is highly context specific, so we specify our use of it here. We use the English word, race, to denote a twenty-first-century American sociological meaning of this concept, as actors' social and cultural distinctions based on presumed biological difference (Ahmed et al. 2007, 247; Omi and Winant 1994, 55). However, we provide the Spanish terms used in the documents (*clase, color, raza,* etc.) to make specific, substantive, and temporal points about their historical meanings. We also use the term, enslaved persons, as a general label. However, we use the term, slaves, to refer to the classificatory categories of the official documents, as this is a close translation for the Spanish term, *esclavos,* used in these documents at

that time. Finally, we distinguish conceptually between classification, the process by which outsiders label insiders, and categorization, the process by which insiders label insiders (though a sharp distinction between them may be difficult to make in practice) (cf. Ahmed et al. 2007, 231–232). Because the term "classes," which would designate the outcomes of processes of classification, has multiple meanings, we use the term "categories" for the outcomes of both processes of classification and categorization. To prevent ambiguity as needed, we note whether categories are lay or official, and thus stem from processes of categorization or classification, respectively.

CHAPTER 3

Spanish Mercantilist Censuses

Abstract This chapter explores censuses conducted in Puerto Rico by the weak mercantilist Spanish state. Initial ambitions of conquest and resource extraction eventually shifted to long-term settlement and military control. Culturally, colonization prompted a mixing of European, Indigenous, and African populations. Initial enumerations were descriptive. These censuses classified the population using three legal statuses: the *vecinos* (colonists with full legal rights), the enslaved, and laborers. These statuses reflected racialized differences. Most property owners were European; Africans were enslaved and occasionally property owners; Indigenous were enslaved or laborers. Officially and popularly, these categories corresponded to White, Black, and Indian, respectively. Spanish colonists benefited from these categories, as they facilitated their rights to land and labor. Subsequently, the term *vecino,* originally introduced by a relatively weak Spanish state, became widely used, along with the other categories. These categorizations did not previously exist in Puerto Rico. Thus, Spanish mercantilist censuses were transformative, despite a weak state.

Keywords Mercantilist censuses • Census classification • Colonial Puerto Rico • Everyday categorization • Spanish mercantilism

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8_3

State Information Gathering (1530–1764)

Like most early colonial censuses, Spanish ones were descriptive, mercantilist efforts linked to extracting resources from their possessions. The first goals were conquest and the discovery of easily extractable wealth, but these turned into more long-term goals of settlement and military control. The first census, as we will show, established the number of inhabitants under Spanish rule, primarily in legal terms.

As with most early colonial encounters in the Americas, colonization produced a mixing of European, Indigenous, and African cultures that had been much more discrete. The Taíno (a label used to designate a group of Arawak Indigenous peoples) inhabited Puerto Rico before Spanish colonization in 1508 (Dietz 1986, 3; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 39, 56–59). There is considerable debate as to whether any of the Taíno's descendants and cultural practices survived the brutalities of Spanish colonization; however, there is widespread agreement that they did not survive as distinct groups in Puerto Rico, as did Indigenous cultures elsewhere in the Spanish colonies (Allen 2015, 610; Barreiro 2006, 22; Dietz 1986, 6; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 73–74, 92; Guitar et al. 2006, 54; Haslip-Viera 2006, 267; Kinsbruner 1996, 3; López 1974a, 18–19; Martínez-Cruzado et al. 2005, 148–149). Enslaved Africans were forcibly brought to Puerto Rico beginning in 1508 (Figueroa Mercado 1972, 83; Martínez-Cruzado et al. 2005, 132). The mixing of these three groups produced a new, emergent, Eurocentric culture with notable borrowings from Taíno and African cultures (Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 153; Estevez 2008, 220–224; Godreau 2015, 231; Lloréns 2018a, 159; Rogler 1940, 5; Sued Badillo 1995, 38). Although other Indigenous populations collected censuses or census-like information (Cassedy 1969, 3–4; Halacy 1980, 30), there is no evidence that the Taíno did so.

The governor of Puerto Rico, Francisco Manuel de Lando, conducted the first census in 1530 (Figueroa Mercado 1972, 83). It lists the Spanish heads of households (mostly male), gives their names, and sometimes provides their marital statuses, their number of children, and their professions (see Damiani Cósimi 1994, 37–154 for a transcription of the original document). The declarations sometimes give the household head's toponym and often the wife's race, ethnicity, or nationality and toponym (e.g., *india*, *negra*, *castilla*, or *españa*). A few household heads are described as *negro*. It is not always clear whether household heads had unenumerated wives and children. The document lists the numbers of

Blacks (*negros*) and Indians (*indios*), both enslaved persons and laborers, but provides no other information about them. These counts excluded the Indigenous or Black population living outside the Spaniards' purview.

The central function of the document was to record legal status, including that of the head of the household, along with that of the Black and Indigenous enslaved persons in the household (*esclavos*) and the Indigenous individuals (*naborias libres*) held under the trustee labor system known as *encomienda*. Most Spaniards had the legal status of *vecinos*, permanent residents with legal rights given by the Spanish crown to control the labor of Indigenous persons through *encomienda* (Morse 1984, 78). Other Spaniards were classified as *moradores*, permanent residents without *encomienda* rights; *estantes*, temporary or transient residents (often merchants or soldiers); and *ausentes*, absent individuals (Morse 1984, 78; cf. Fundación Puertorriqueña de las Humanidades 2009).

The Indigenous laborers held under *encomienda* were legally free, but they did not have the same rights as *vecinos*, and they had extensive duties (Figueroa Mercado 1972, 463). Enslaved persons had virtually no legal rights. Over time, laborers with a variety of racial classifications became described in the censuses usually as *agregados*; they were also legally free but did not have the same social status as *vecinos* (Dietz 1986, 40–42). *Agregados*, for example, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, had usufruct rights to land but not titles (Bergad 1983, 62, 64–66, 120–125; Dietz 1986, 40–42; Scarano 1989, 34). Separate lists of *vecinos* were redacted through the end of the nineteenth century, and especially in the later years, these documents did not usually record race. This tripartite legal classification of *vecinos*, laborers, and slaves, which partially tied legal status to physical presence, may have influenced the early appearance of nationality (e.g., the 1833 census in San Juan) and the enumeration of the *de jure* and *de facto* population in the censuses (e.g., the 1877 census in Isabela). This tripartite distinction remained essentially intact in all the censuses through the end of slavery in 1873, and the classification was also found in the late nineteenth century (e.g., declarations for *vecinos* in Ponce; the final Spanish census in 1897).

Like other early colonial mercantilist information-gathering efforts, the 1530 census described the colonial power's human resources by counting the number of *vecinos* who could make tribute payments and the number of laborers and enslaved persons (cf. Browning 1974a, 6). The three continental populations—Europeans, Africans, and Indigenous—were grouped primarily as individuals with different legal statuses that largely

(though not completely) mapped onto these continental distinctions: Europeans were property holders, Africans were enslaved and occasionally property holders, and Indigenous were enslaved or workers under the *encomienda* system. In the census, some of these individuals were also explicitly marked with racial, ethnic, or national categories. These classifications of legal status and race corresponded to the interests of the Spaniards, who originally had no rights to land or labor in Puerto Rico and who relied on military force to dispossess the Indigenous population from their land and to coerce Africans into slavery. This first census, then, recorded the rights that the Spaniards had procured through military force. The legal rights to land and labor were of course crucial for Spanish settlers to establish agriculture, and their racial ideology of European superiority seemed to provide cultural justification for it.

Once the Spaniards learned that Puerto Rico did not have large amounts of gold, their remaining interest in the island was largely military, as control of it allowed Spain to dominate the sea lanes to the Americas (Berbusse 1966, 4; Dietz 1986, 7; Ortiz 1983, 44; Morris 1995, 21). Beyond this, however, until the late eighteenth century, the Spanish crown, in decline throughout most of the 1600s, mostly neglected this poor, military outpost (Dietz 1986, 7–12; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 95; Grose 1910, 144; Ortiz 1983, 13; Scarano 1989, 30). Small-scale, self-sufficient peasant agricultural production predominated (Dietz 1986, 10; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 93, 103; Ortiz 1983, 14). Landowners, *vecinos*, though not necessarily wealthy, were distinguished from those without formal title to land and from slaves (e.g., Figueroa Mercado 1972, 104–105). The limited hacienda production that did exist was much smaller in scope than in other Caribbean or Latin American locations (Dietz 1986, 10). Although sugar production in the non-Spanish Caribbean was established in the 1600s, the number of sugar mills in Puerto Rico declined during this time (Figueroa Mercado 1972, 103). Commerce was quite limited because Puerto Rico was allowed to trade only with a few Spanish cities (Dietz 1986, 9; Ortiz 1983, 14). The population was small, and most people were dispersed throughout the rural regions (Scarano 1989, 30). Only San Juan and San Germán were organized towns with city governments, and San Juan was a fortified military outpost (Scarano 1989, 30).

There was a systematic gap in government information for all the Spanish colonies between 1646, the date of the last overall estimate of the Indies, and 1741, when the Spanish crown sent an order to collect information to its colonial viceroys (Sánchez-Albornoz 1974, 11). There

were no major government-sponsored Puerto Rican censuses between 1530 and 1765. During this period, however, the Catholic Church began to collect information. Parish registers had been mandated by the Council of Trent (1545–1563), though their collection in Puerto Rico began only in 1645 (Emigh et al. 2016a, 174; Rodríguez León 1990, 35, 40–54).[1] At least some registers, including ones from the 1600s, recorded race (e.g., *blanco*, *pardo*, *moreno*, *negro*) and legal status (free, slave) apparently by keeping separate books for the different categories of individuals (Rodríguez León 1990, 75, 79, 88, 90, 341). Ecclesiastical censuses were conducted in 1651 and 1673 (Sepúlveda-Rivera 1986, 99). Summaries of the 1673 census list Whites (*blancos)*, slaves (*esclavos*), and free mixed-race individuals (*pardos libres*) (Álvarez Nazario 1974, 75; Brau [1904] 1978, 131; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 103; cf. Sepúlveda-Rivera 1986, 99). It is not, however, clear how individuals represented race to the individuals gathering information or how these individuals in turn summarized racial information.

Racial Classification in the Census

The first census described individuals primarily in terms of legal status. Its goal was to determine the number of Spanish settlers and, in particular, to establish rights to land and enslaved labor and to determine tribute payments. This goal was accomplished. The Taíno, at least as an organized cultural and political group, were eliminated, and the property rights of Spanish settlers were established, transforming the island into a military outpost with agricultural production based on smallholding. Enslaved Africans, deprived of virtually all rights, became laborers.

This first census also secondarily used racial and national markers and collected other information about the heads of household. It used racial markers, especially for individuals of African (*negro*) and Indigenous (*indio*) descent. However, the mixed-race categories (*pardo*, *moreno*), as well as the explicit categories of White, Brown, and Black, were first found in the ecclesiastical censuses. This is not particularly surprising since the populations were largely separate before colonization. Racial categories and legal classifications in the 1530 census were distinct—there were Black *vecinos* even if rare. A century later, however, the three continental populations had, at least to some extent, mixed.

[1] The first extant documents record events in 1653, but most start in the 1800s (Rodríguez León 1990, 196, 219–371).

Everyday Uses and Meanings of Race

During the first several centuries of Spanish rule, the state and church were very weak institutions with a limited presence, especially in rural regions (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 22). Individuals of African, Indigenous, and mixed-race descent frequently lived and worked together, while the small Spanish and Puerto Rican elite were invested in guarding the privileges of whiteness (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 22). Spanish colonial legislation shaped racial and legal classification by creating *castas*—groups of individuals with different ancestries—and giving them differential legal rights, although it is difficult to know to what extent Spanish laws were actually deployed or enforced in Puerto Rico (Kinsbruner 1996, 19–21). Because the Indigenous population did not survive as a distinct group in Puerto Rico, by the end of the eighteenth century, the primary *castas* were Whites, a free mixed-race population, and slaves (Kinsbruner 1996, 21). Whites had the most legal rights; the free mixed population, some rights; and slaves, the fewest (Dietz 1986, 38–40; Kinsbruner 1996, 22–26; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 22–23; Scarano 1989, 27). The free mixed-race population was further subdivided into legal groups: *pardo, moreno,* and *negro* (Kinsbruner 1996, 30). By the nineteenth century, these subdivisions had social, but not legal, consequences (Kinsbruner 1996, 31).

This attachment of differential legal rights to racial groups produced an asymmetrical information-gathering pattern (that is, the racial and legal categories were not fully cross-classified) (cf. Emigh et al. 2015, 488). This asymmetrical combination of legal and racial categories was first apparent in the mid-1600s in church records. Thus, this pattern could not have stemmed from census classification, since the 1530 census did not use it, and there were virtually no government censuses thereafter (though it is quite possible that the *castas* categories were perpetuated through church records and ecclesiastical censuses).

The category *vecino*, established in the 1530 census, however, had long-lasting import. The term may have been familiar to Europeans in Puerto Rico, as information about *vecinos*, as well as other individuals, was collected in Spain between 1528 and 1536 to assess taxes (Reher and Valero Lobo 1995, 18; Molinié-Bertrand 1985, 11–12; Ryskamp 2002, 15). However, in Puerto Rico, Europeans had no historical claim to land as in Spain, so the status of *vecino* had to be created and enforced. Over time, this term no longer had a strict, legal meaning and became widely used in everyday life. During the sixteenth century, *vecino* was widely used

with the relatively narrow, legal definition. Over the centuries, it remained widely used but developed an increasingly broad connotation that sometimes retained its original meaning designating a tributary status, but also came to mean neighbor, citizen, resident, householder, head of household, or simply someone of relatively high status (Browning 1974a, 6; Denevan [1976] 1992, 298; Dietz 1986, 7; Ortiz 1983, 62, 193, 197; Restall 2003, 44; Rosenblat [1976] 1992, 48; Safa 1964, 10). For example, in a document written by a priest in the seventeenth century, it seemed to mean landowner or resident (see Figueroa Mercado 1972, 105). Perhaps by the end of the nineteenth century, but certainly by the mid-twentieth, it was used in everyday life colloquially, for example, to mean neighbor (and is now commonly translated as such) (Carrasquillo 2006, 44, 154; Safa 1964, 10). The idea of a racially mixed population rooted in agricultural production created the widespread cultural trope of the *jíbaro* (peasant) (Bergad 1983, 60–62; López 2008, 168–169; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 7; Scarano 1996, 1400, 1402; Sued Badillo 1995, 28, 43–44).

Assessing the Historical Conditions and Outcomes of Spanish Colonial Censuses

We add this information to Table 1.1. The first census in 1530 established the legal categories of *vecino*, laborer, and slave as markers of primary social distinctions (Table 1.1, Column 1, Row 1). During this early period, Spain was a mercantilist colonial power, its intentions were limited, and its presence in Puerto Rico was weak (Table 1.1, Column 1, Row 2). The first legal categories of these censuses, however, of Spanish landlords and African and Indigenous slaves and laborers were rooted in the initial and stark differences between the populations of the three continents who found themselves in Puerto Rico, and thus were familiar to the census takers and colonists (Table 1.1, Column 1, Row 3). There were no preexisting Indigenous institutions in Puerto Rico, among the Taíno, to support the collect census-like information (Table 1.1, Column 1, Row 4). Similar types of tax documents had been collected in Spain around the time of the 1530 census, so Europeans in Spain may have been familiar with them, but local institutions had to be developed from the ground up. The Spanish colonialists were clearly more powerful than the African or Indigenous populations, and it was clearly in their interest to maintain and perpetuate this power to establish their rights to land and labor through

census categories (Table 1.1, Column 1, Row 5). Thus, the interests of these colonists aligned with the interests of the census takers in establishing their rights. Finally, we note that these mercantilist censuses corresponded to the transformation of social categorization (Table 1.1, Column 1, Row 6). During this early period, Puerto Rico changed from an object of Spanish conquest over the Indigenous population to an island of smallholders, and the term *vecino* became widely used. These early censuses helped to establish rights among the Spanish colonialists, reinforce the subordinate status of laborers and enslaved persons of African and Indigenous descent, and push the remaining Indigenous population to the marginal territories. Smallholding predominated, where *vecinos* with formal rights and residency status were advantaged in the social hierarchy (cf. Quijano 2000, 534).

CHAPTER 4

Spanish Imperialist Censuses

Abstract Over time, Spain developed into a strong imperialist state. This chapter explores its use of interventionist censuses to govern Puerto Ricans through regularized enumeration. Everyday understandings of race likely influenced early imperialist censuses; census records used multiple and varied terms related to race. Racial markers also varied (except *blanco* [White] and *negro* [Black], which were universally used). The information gathered varied regionally: some areas reported categories only for some groups but not others. Starting in 1860, the state employed more systematic, uniform, and rigid binary and tripartite racial categories. Such a system was not in the interests of most Puerto Ricans. Thus, while binary/tripartite distinctions were widely used, the more fluid system of multiple and varied racial markers still figured prominently in daily life. Thus, the census did not transform everyday categorizations.

Keywords Spanish imperialism • Official classification • Everyday categorization • Whitening in Puerto Rico • Imperialist censuses

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8_4

The Transition from Mercantilist to Imperialist Censuses (1765–1859)

During the Spanish Enlightenment, royal administrators attempted a new method of governing: they tried to diagnose a social problem, analyze its causes, and implement a solution (Sánchez-Matamoros et al. 2005, 182–183). They reformed colonial administration and began to redact regular censuses. The reforms were designed to increase the colonies' agricultural, commercial, and mineral production; their self-sufficiency; and their military invulnerability (Curtis and Scarano 2011, 202; Ortiz 1983, 66). Thus, unlike earlier mercantilist censuses that were designed mostly to describe the state of the population, these censuses were explicitly and intentionally interventionist, designed to transform the population.

Although Puerto Rico remained a poor colony, these Enlightenment reforms helped change its fortunes toward the end of the eighteenth century (Sánchez-Matamoros et al. 2005, 182–183, 186–188). Between 1765 and 1800, the population grew from 45,000 to 155,000 (Curtis and Scarano 2011, 203; Scarano 1989, 31). Concerned with the British seizure of Havana in 1762 and the loss of the Spanish North American colonies east of the Mississippi in 1763 (Ortiz 1983, 14, 21–24), in 1765, King Charles III sent Field Marshall Alexander O'Reilly to investigate Puerto Rico, complete a census, and develop recommendations for its governing authorities (Figueroa Mercado 1972, 114–118; Ortiz 1983, 14, 21–24, 26). The census enumerated the population by district, age category, sex, and legal status (slave or free) (O'Reylly [1765] 1945, 526, 539 [numero 3]).

Miguel de Muesas (governor from 1769 to 1776) implemented O'Reilly's reforms by taking a census in 1769 and again in 1775 to illustrate the population increase during his administration (Ortiz 1983, 14, 117). A summary of the 1775 census has separate categories for Whites (*blancos*), free Colored or mixed-race individuals (*pardos libres*), free Blacks (*negros libres*), free laborers (*agregados*, who were often used or pressed into service alongside slaves; Dietz 1986, 35; Guerra 1998, 25, 223; Mintz 1953, 227; Scarano 1977, 556; Wessman 1980, 271), and slaves (Ortiz 1983, 191). The laborers and slaves were not classified by race. Male and female children were counted separately from adult men and women for all racial categories of the *vecinos*, though not for laborers or slaves. Summaries of the 1776 census follow this pattern (Abbad y Lasierra [1788] 1866, 286–287). These asymmetrical combinations of legal status

and race followed the format of the summaries of the seventeenth-century ecclesiastical censuses.

In 1776, Charles III instructed the viceroys and governors to conduct a census, undertaken throughout most of the Spanish colonies, followed by regular censuses thereafter (Curtis and Scarano 2011, 207; Sánchez-Albornoz 1974, 10). Local authorities were to "make exact censuses, with the proper distinction of class, marital status and race, of all persons of both sexes including the children" (Browning 1974b, 6). Puerto Rican authorities sent annual summaries of these censuses to Spain (Scarano 1989, 37). The 1776 order, however, never specified how to collect the information; local officials and parish priests were often responsible (Browning 1974a, 7; Curtis and Scarano 2011, 205). Priests may have relied on their parish registers instead of house-to-house counts when compiling information for the censuses (Browning 1974a, 7).[1] There may have been a considerable amount of overlap between censuses and lists of *vecinos*. For example, the titles for the declarations for 1856 in Isabela suggest that they are household declarations for *vecinos*, but they include *agregados*, servants, and slaves, so they may form a complete census if the other household members were completely enumerated (see also, e.g., 1850 in Isabela, where the documents are sometimes, but not always, labeled as documents for *vecinos*). The terms for census and lists of *vecinos* may have been used somewhat interchangeably in the documents, the archival annotations, and the archival titles (e.g., Isabela 1850; Juncos 1857 [in Table A.1, 1857]).

The year 1812 marked the last comprehensive attempt to take censuses throughout the Spanish territories, but it was disrupted by liberation movements throughout the Americas (Browning 1974a, 4). Although few administrators collected annual censuses elsewhere in New Spain, in Puerto Rico extant unpublished documents, published summaries, and secondary reports suggest that censuses continued to be taken virtually every year from the end of the 1700s through the mid-1850s.[2] They form

[1] Government censuses are often called "*Censo de Almas*" (census of the souls) in the archival sources, suggesting indirectly the link between parish and state records, as well as a possible close collaboration between the church and the colonial government (cf. López 1974a, 26). For example, 1873 declarations for Isabela are titled in this way although the information is collected on official, typeset forms.

[2] Censuses were reportedly taken in 1777, annually from 1779 to 1803, and in 1808 and 1812 (Acosta y Calbo 1866, 299, 300; Álvarez Nazario 1974, 76, 77, 78; Brau [1907] 1966, 479; [1904] 1978, 173; Browning 1974a, 6, 14, 18, note 15; 1974b, 10; Browning

one of the most complete sets of colonial censuses (Curtis and Scarano 2011, 204).

Unlike censuses that were primarily fiscal documents that counted the number of *vecinos* who could make tribute payments, these censuses provided demographic information (Browning 1974a, 6). However, when only summaries remain, it is not clear whether new household declarations were collected or how detailed they were. Some censuses may have been much more comprehensive than others, both geographically and topically. Where both nominal declarations and summaries remain, it appears that the nominal declarations were collected regionally, in small units, and then summarized into increasingly larger ones (e.g., 1839, Marina). In 1867, even after the comprehensive and relatively standardized census of 1860, there may have been a headcount in which the enumerator tallied the number of individuals in columns (e.g., Fajardo). Some censuses contained information about agriculture and property, as well as population information (e.g., 1820, 1821, and 1846).

We were unable to find household declarations before 1832 (with the exception of the 1530 census), but summaries of these censuses suggest that legal status, race, sex, and some age information was collected (Álvarez Nazario 1974, 76, 77; Brau [1907] 1966, 479; [1904] 1978, 173; Browning and Robinson 1976, 226; Córdova 1832, 3, 405, 462; Flinter

and Robinson 1976, 226; Córdova 1832, 3, 12–13, 47, 52, 53, 57, 60–66, 122, 124, 126, 129, 131, 132, 135, 182; Curtis and Scarano 2011, 206; Enamorado Cuesta [1929] 1975, 22; Flinter 1834, 206; González-Mendoza 1989, 140; Goyer and Domschke 1983, 297; Grose 1910, 238; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; Scarano 1989, 37; US War Department et al. 1900, 57; Vázquez Calzada 1988, 8). These sources largely, but not completely, agree on the dates. However, at least one of these sources indicates that a census was taken between 1779 and 1803. Acosta y Calbo was working from Córdova's text, so except for a few exceptions, they give the same dates. Acosta y Calbo (1866, 301) also noted some contradictions in Córdova's text. We found documentation for censuses taken in 1812, 1814, 1815, 1816, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1824, 1827, 1828, 1830, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1844, 1846, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1854, 1856, 1857, 1858, and 1859 (See Table A.1 and Acosta y Calbo 1866, 300, 301, 302; Álvarez Nazario 1974, 77–78; Córdova 1832, 3, 208, 228, 405, 407, 462; 1832, 4, 296–297; Enamorado Cuesta [1929] 1975, 22; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 195; Flinter 1834, 206; González-Mendoza 1989, 140; Goyer and Domschke 1983, 297; Grose 1910, 238; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; INE 1858; Puerto Rico Comision de estadistica especial. and Garcia y Rayo 1861, 12, 16; US War Department et al. 1900, 57; Vázquez Calzada 1988, 8). Before 1860, major censuses may have been redacted in 1765, 1775, 1800, 1815, 1832, and 1846, because the 1950 summary for Puerto Rican census reports Spanish censuses in those years (and in 1860, 1877, and 1887) (US Bureau of the Census 1953, 53–56).

1834, 206; Grose 1910, 238; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; Schmidt-Nowara 2006, 123; US War Department et al. 1900, 57; Vázquez Calzada 1988, 8). The 1824 census may have included marital status, nationality, and some occupational categories as well (Córdova 1832, 4, 296–297). Household declarations, which we found starting in 1832, are usually quite detailed and often contain information about the names of the individuals in the household, their relationships to the head of the household, their ages, their sexes, their marital statuses, their legal statuses, their occupations, their nationalities or places of birth, and some sort of racial marker. In most censuses, the enumerators entered the information in columns, either by writing in the response or by checking the box, but sometimes they wrote out the information in paragraph-like format (e.g., 1838 had both formats).

In these censuses, racial classification was a flexible system with different meanings and implementations. First, different terms referred to race. The most consistent term used to denote race was "*clase*" (1800, 1812, 1820, 1821, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1850, 1856, 1857, 1859), but "*calidad*"[3] (1800, 1833) and "*color*" (1838, 1846) were also used. In one set of declarations in Isabela in 1850, "*clase*" was used to mean legal status and "*condicion*" was used to mean race, even though in most of these censuses "*condicion*" designated legal status (free or slave).

Second, different terms referred to the racial markers. Virtually all censuses used "*blanco*" and "*negro*," and other common terms included "*pardo*," "*mulato*," "*moreno*," and "*de color*." For all of these censuses, it is not clear whether the enumerators assigned these racial markers or whether the respondents reported them. Within any given census, the terms were usually used consistently. In 1838, however, in some regions a racial marker was given for legally free individuals but not for enslaved persons. The free individuals were described as White (*blanco*), Brown (*pardo*), or Black (*negro*).[4] In other regions, a racial marker was given only for enslaved individuals, and these markers were clearly intended to be a physical marker of skin color because they were given along with other descriptions of physical characteristics like hair and eye color. Multiple

[3] *Calidades* may have referred to race as well as appearance (López 2008, 167).

[4] These terms were flexibly used and sometimes referred to a range of skin color from light to dark (*blanco, pardo, moreno, negro*) (Kinsbruner 1996, 1). In other contexts, *moreno* and *pardo* may have designated free individuals, while *mulato* and *negro* may have designated enslaved individuals (Álvarez Nazario 1974, 347; Godreau 2008, 9).

terms were used, such as "*chocolato*," "*colorado*," "*chocolato claro*," "*mulato claro*," "*mulato blanco*," "*blanco*," "*grifo*," "*claro*," and "*negro*." These multiple terms were similar to the ones used in everyday life as racial markers. Race was clearly an expandable and contractible scale with different uses and meanings.

Third, data collection techniques varied among censuses. In most of them, the column heading was a general term for which the enumerators noted the assignment of the specific categories in columns either by writing out the term in full or by abbreviating it using the first letter (e.g., for the column heading, "*clase*," the enumerator wrote in "*blanco*," "*mulato*," or "*negro*," or "*b*," "*m*," "*n*"). In principle, this format allowed enumerators to fill in a wide range of responses and gave them considerable variability in assigning them, as in the example of 1838 above. In 1857 and 1858, however, some of the column headings were categories of responses for the enumerator to check (e.g., "*blanco*," "*mulato*," or "*negro*" was given as a column heading, sometimes partially cross-classified with legal status). Where the columns themselves asymmetrically combined race and legal status (e.g., "*blancos*," "*pardos libres*," "*negros libres*," "*negros esclavos*"), there was little flexibility. In 1859, however, "*clase*" was the column heading for race, and "*condicion*" was a separate column heading for legal status, creating the possibility that free and enslaved individuals could be recorded for any race (though, of course, legal status was linked, at least in some ways, to race through Spanish colonial law as well as social practices). In 1841, in some of the declarations, race, legal status, and relationship to the household head were recorded together. These different formatting and recording techniques produced different possibilities for combinations of race and legal status.

Fourth, this information was summarized in different ways. Summaries commonly listed multiple racial categories for free individuals, they less frequently gave racial descriptors of laborers and slaves, and they sometimes classified slaves as mixed race or Black, but never White (Acosta y Calbo 1866, 301, 302; Álvarez Nazario 1974, 76, 77, 78; Brau [1907] 1966, 479; [1904] 1978, 173; Browning and Robinson 1976, 226; Córdova 1832, 3, 405; 3, 462; 4, 296–297; Enamorado Cuesta [1929] 1975, 22; Figueroa Mercado 1972, 195; Flinter 1834, 206; González-Mendoza 1989, 140; Grose 1910, 238; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; INE 1858; Puerto Rico Comision de estadistica especial. and Garcia y Rayo 1861, 16; Vázquez Calzada 1988, 8). For example, a manuscript summary of the 1782 census gives the racial categories of Whites (*blancos*), Indians

(*indios*), free mixed race (*pardos libres*), free Blacks (*morenos libres*), mixed-race slaves (*mulatos esclavos*), and Black slaves (*negros esclavos*) (Browning and Robinson 1976, 226). Summaries of the 1820 census list Whites (*blancos*), mixed-race individuals (*mulatos*), and Blacks (*negros*); White, mixed race, and Black free laborers (*agregados blancos*, *agregados mulatos*, and *agregados negros*); and slaves (*esclavos*) (Córdova 1832, 3, 462; cf. Álvarez Nazario 1974, 77; Flinter 1834, 206; Grose 1910, 238; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; Vázquez Calzada 1988, 8). Summaries of the 1854 census also show similar categories of mixed race and legal status (*blancos, mulatos, negros libres, esclavos*) (González-Mendoza 1989, 140; INE 1858).

It is not clear whether the declarations and summaries reflected the social patterning of responses, explicit decisions made about reporting, or the *castas* of Spanish colonial law.[5] For example, in 1833, 1839, and 1857, race was recorded (at least in principle) separately from legal status in the household declarations, but the summaries use mixed legal and racial categories, such as "*habitantes blancos*," "*mulatos libres*," "*negros libres*," and "*esclavos*." The household declarations similarly in 1846 were formatted so that they also in principle could record the race of all household inhabitants irrespective of legal status; the summaries, however, used the categories "*blancos*," "*mulatos libres*," "*negros libres*," "*mulatos esclavos*," and "*negros esclavos*." These summary categories reflect, to some extent though not perfectly, Spanish colonial *castas*. The summaries may have been based on the social pattern of responses in which very few individuals were in some categories. In sum, different patterns of summarizing the censuses, like the variety of terms for the racial categories, show that race was conceptualized as an expandable and contractible scale that sometimes, but not always, was merged with legal status.

Finally, race was not the only system of social stratification: nationality and legal status were also markers of social status. Servants and *agregados* formed a middle tier between *vecinos* and slaves. Legal status was recorded

[5] It has been suggested that for the 1808 census, the governor merged the categories of "*indios*" and "*pardos libres*" in acknowledgment of the mixing of the races or perhaps in recognition of the disappearance of a culturally separate Indigenous population (Brau [1907] 1966, 479; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 4; Schmidt-Nowara 2006, 123). This mixed-race category combined finer-grained designations (e.g., *mestizos y zambos*) (Brau [1907] 1966, 479). However, it is also possible that there was no explicit decision to drop particular categories and that the summary represents the social pattern of reporting, because the summaries did not necessarily reflect the original categories.

in all the censuses, but *agregados*[6] were also recorded in 1812, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1832, 1833, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1846, 1850, and 1856. This information was sometimes recorded as a relationship to the head of the household and sometimes as "*condicion*." It was also possible to move between these statuses, as the documents often denote individuals as "*libertos*" (freed) (e.g., 1856, Isabela; cf. Kinsbruner 1996, 26–28).

The Shift to Standardization in Imperialist Censuses (1860–1897)

Starting with the 1860 census, the Spanish government attempted to create standard census-taking practices throughout its empire (IGE 1883, XXXIV). The format of these censuses made it increasingly possible to separate racial and legal categories. In 1860, Puerto Rican censuses used enumeration forms that, at least in principle, census takers filled out using standard instructions (e.g., IGE 1883, XII; Puerto Rico Comision de estadistica especial. and Garcia y Rayo 1861, 11–13; Reher and Valero Lobo 1995, 29–35). The 1860 census forms are typeset with columns for name, age, marital status (*estado*), race (*raza*), occupation, and literacy. Enumerators put a letter in the race column—"*B*," "*L*," or "*E*"—to note whether the respondent was White (*blanco*), free (*libre*), or a slave (*esclavos*). The race category (*raza*), therefore, combined race and legal status, and captured, more perfectly than any other census, the Puerto Rican implementation of the *castas* of Spanish colonial law (probably as its legal influence declined). Although in principle enumerators could have written anything in the column, a table in which they summarized the household information was supposed to follow each household declaration. This table gave the categories for race as White (*blanco*), free individuals of color ("*de color*," "*libres*"), and slaves of color ("*de color*," "*esclavos*"), so there was little variability in practice. The population was also classified by nationality (native [*nacionales*] or foreign [*estrangeros*]) and residence (present [*establecidos*] or absent [*transeuntes*]) in these tables (see also Acosta y Calbo 1866, 302–306; Goyer and Domschke 1983, 297; Puerto Rico Comision de estadistica especial. and Garcia y Rayo 1861, "Clasificacion de los habitantes"; Reher and Valero Lobo 1995, 32; US

[6] In urban settings, *agregado* probably meant a boarder, guest, or domestic servant (Kinsbruner 1996, 68, note 31).

War Department et al. 1900, 32–34).[7] However, handwritten documents from Ponce in 1860 use the continuous, detailed terms such as "*pardo claro*," "*prieto*," and "*colorado*" to describe "*color*." As these were clearly not the official census categories, it seems likely that they were drawn from the everyday uses of racial markers that were then recorded by officials.

We did not find household declarations for the years 1861 to 1867, but summaries suggest that information continued to be collected. From 1868 to 1874 (and possibly through 1876), the authorities used a similar format for the censuses that asked about name, race, legal status, sex, marital status, nationality, age, profession, and literacy. In 1868, the censuses seem to have been formatted in two different ways. In Ponce, for example, handwritten declarations mimicked the 1860 declarations with a column for *raza* that combined race and legal status and repeated many of the categories from 1860. In Caguas, however, the 1868 declarations used a new typeset format that separated race from legal status in a set of subcolumns classified under "*condicion social*." There were separate columns for legal status (slave or free) for each racial category, "*blanco*," "*de color*," and "*negro*" (as well as columns for men and women). Thus, race and legal status were recorded separately, and slaves could be of any race in principle. Though rare, the category of White slave was not socially impossible: individuals were sometimes recorded as White slaves in the census (e.g., in Caguas, 1868 [in Table A.1, 1869 (1868)]; Isabela, 1869 [in Table A.1, 1869 (1868)]; Camuy, 1870; Juncos 1870 [in Table A.1, 1871 (1870)]), and *blanco* was used to describe the *color* of slaves in slave registers in 1869 in Utuado and Lares. This format was also used in 1869 (e.g., in Fajardo and Isabela), in 1870 (e.g., in Camuy and Juncos [in Table A.1, 1871 (1870)]), and in Ponce in 1871 and 1872. Starting with some of the 1870 declarations (e.g., Juncos [in Table A.1, 1871 (1870)] and Lares [in Table A.1, 1871 (1870)]) and more systematically with the 1871 (e.g., Lares [in Table A.1, 1872 (1871)], Manati, and Isabela [in Table A.1, 1872 (1871)]) and 1872 declarations (e.g., Lares and Caguas), these columns under "*condicion social*" were merged into four major subcolumns that combined race and legal status: White (*blanco*), Colored (*de color*), Black (*negro*), or slave (*esclavos*) (each subcolumn had additional subcolumns for men, women, and the three categories of marital status, single, married, and widowed). After slavery was abolished in 1873, the

[7] In some regions (e.g., Ponce), only the first page of the standard 1860 forms seems to have been collected, and the second page with the table seems to have been omitted or lost.

column for slave was relabeled as freed (*libertos*) (e.g., Isabela [in Table A.1, 1873], Comerio [in Table A.1, 1874 (1873), film 1511845], Lares [in Table A.1, 1874 (1873)], Caguas; cf. Grose 1910, 145). In 1874, marital status was separated into separate columns under the heading "*estado*."[8] The 1868 census was the first to classify the population by making use of the *cédula de vecindad*, an identification card that indicated a person's productive capacity and noted the person's physical characteristics; these designations appear in virtually all censuses thereafter (Carrasquillo 2006, 74–75). Although we cannot find household declarations for 1875 or 1876, summaries suggest that information collection continued.

The 1877 census was clearly a major effort, with formal typeset forms that included instructions and sections for summaries. Unlike the previous censuses, there was also little variation in practice between the regions. The 1877 census enumerated the *de jure* and the *de facto* population and asked questions about names, sex, race ("*color*," with possible responses *blanco* [White], *pardo* [mixed race], and *moreno* [Black]), age, marital status, relationship to the head of the household, literacy, religion, physical defects, residence (permanent or temporary, length of residence, and whether or not they were *vecinos*), occupation, and nationality (Goyer and Domschke 1983, 297; IGE 1883, XII, XXXIV–XXXV, 695–703; Reher and Valero Lobo 1995, 37; US War Department et al. 1900, 34). The introduction to the official summaries of the 1877 census noted (although without further explanation) the well-established census organization in Puerto Rico in comparison to the ones in the other colonies (IGE 1883, XXXIV–XXXV).

Although we cannot find household declarations or unambiguous manuscript summaries, the secondary literature suggests that the 1887 census (taken on December 31) enumerated the *de jure* and the *de facto* population and asked questions about race (White, Mulatto, Black), sex, age (in approximate five- and ten-year categories), marital status, residence, nationality, and literacy (Goyer and Domschke 1983, 297–298; IGE 1891, V; Reher and Valero Lobo 1995, 39; US War Department et al. 1900, 35–36). The introduction to the 1887 census noted that the Puerto Rican census was collected more frequently and had more

[8] The dates can be ambiguous. For most censuses, in some regions either some of the forms were misdated, or the enumerators used forms from previous redactions. For example, for the 1873 census in Isabela, the typeset entry "*esclavos*" was crossed out and "*libertos*" was written in by hand.

categories than the other colonial censuses (IGE 1891, IX). The censuses collected in years between these major Spanish efforts in 1877 and 1887 must have been smaller efforts: only summaries, but no published details, remain (we found no household declarations) (Coll y Toste [1899] 2003, 27; IGE 1883, XXXV). During these years, household declarations for *vecinos,* which generally collected name, age, marital status, occupation, literacy, and residential information (location, length of residence) were frequently collected. Interestingly, though, they never collected racial information.

A final Spanish census was taken in 1897, though it was never fully published for Puerto Rico (Goyer and Domschke 1983, 298; Reher and Valero Lobo 1995, 40; US War Department et al. 1900, 32). It enumerated the *de facto* and *de jure* population and asked for information about name, sex, race ("*color*," with columns for "*blanco*" [White], "*pardo*" [Brown], and "*moreno*" [Black]), age, marital status, relationship to the head of the household, literacy, residence (permanent or temporary, length of residence, and whether or not they were *vecinos*), occupation, and nationality. Published summaries tabulate information about race (*blancos* [Whites], *cruzados* [mixed race], and *negros* [Blacks]), nationality, literacy, and the numbers of army and navy personnel and of prisoners, though they must have relabeled some categories and apparently tabulated some occupational information to get these results (Coll y Toste [1899] 2003, 367–370; US War Department 1900, 1, 5). The instructions for this census for Humacao specify the racial categories of "*blanco*," "*pardo*," and "*moreno*" without further details.

In these Spanish imperialist censuses, racial information was generally collected in a fixed format, and enumerators checked off boxes for racial status that were usually tripartite. These racial categories were sometimes combined with legal status before slavery was eliminated. Other documents show that racial information was also being collected in the more detailed, continuous format used in everyday life. For example, matricula from 1872 (Camuy) record detailed physical characteristics of individuals, including descriptions of their height, nose, eyes, skin, and hair, as well as their "*color*," which was described in multiple and detailed terms, such as "*blanco descolorido*." The *cédulas de vecindad* also typically recorded "*color*" as a physical descriptor in relatively fine-grained categories (Carrasquillo 2006, 75).

Racial Classification in the Census

During the Enlightenment, starting in the 1760s, Spain increased its efforts to collect information about its population. The number of censuses increased, and the content shifted away from fiscal information gathering toward demographic information gathering. These censuses reflected a shift away from mercantilist efforts to describe the resources of the colonies toward interventionist efforts to govern the population. These frequent censuses collected information on legal status, race, marital status, residence, age, occupation, nationality, and literacy. Over time, there was a shift away from legal categories to racial categories, which may have reflected the Enlightenment emphasis on information gathering as producing general knowledge instead of fiscal information for taxation. Despite these changes, the censuses showed remarkable continuity through the use of the category *vecino* (used through the last Spanish census), originally designating citizenship through landholding rights and tribute payments and coming to have the meaning of householder or landowner. Once slavery was outlawed, legal status per se was no longer collected, but the racial categories were maintained and probably increased in importance as a primary demographic descriptor of the population.

In the censuses of the late mercantilist and early imperialist period, up to 1860, racial categories formed a continuum that could be expanded and contracted, that had different meanings and formats even in official documents, and that created a gradated system of social stratification. Racial classifications could also be changed (López 2008, 169). As we showed, the more continuous system was used more frequently in the detailed documents about individuals and to describe physical characteristics, whereas the more discrete system was used to summarize findings. The discrete system, as well as the continuous one, obviously was influenced by the *castas* system, even though the categories rarely corresponded exactly to it. Racial categories became increasingly standardized starting in 1860, giving fewer options and using a less flexible system of classification with fixed columns to record responses, instead of written descriptors, and more often using a binary or tripartite classificatory scheme.

Everyday Uses and Meanings of Race

The everyday adoption of a racial continuum with multiple terms (e.g., as above, *chocolato*, *colorado*, *grifo*, *claro*, *prieto*) is explicitly recorded for Puerto Rico as early as 1834 (see Guerra 1998, 215–216; some terms may have been in use much earlier, even in the sixteenth century [Álvarez Nazario 1974, 346–358], cf. Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 5). In addition, summary categories that blurred the distinctions between these fine-grained distinctions, such as *pardo* and *moreno*, were also common (Sánchez-Albornoz 1974, 129–130). Throughout the Spanish Americas during these centuries, there developed an extremely complicated nomenclature to describe *castas de mezcla* (degrees of color admixture) that became the basis of racial identification in everyday life (Figueroa Mercado 1972, 138; Rodríguez 2000, 108–109; Sánchez-Albornoz 1974, 129–130). This fine-grained system was influenced by multiple social sources beyond Spanish colonial law, sometimes reinforcing their meanings, but also making them unstable and subject to contestation (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 5). This multiple system of categorization both enforced the racial hierarchy and provided opportunities to resist it (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 5). It is difficult to know whether the occasional use of the fine-grained categories in censuses and other official documents reinforced their use in everyday life, as relatively few documents exist that would provide the necessary evidence before twentieth-century ethnographic studies. Because the official, legal import, though not necessarily the social effect, of the fine-grained *castas* declined over the nineteenth century, it seems more likely that the everyday social use of the continuous system influenced the official uses, not the reverse. Similarly, the use of the summary categories, such as *pardo* and *moreno*, in the censuses may have increased their use in everyday situations, but these categories were clearly in use before the censuses became common, so the census was not the origin or only influence on them.

Spanish racial ideologies, codified in the *castas* system that gave differential legal rights to racial groups, considered Whites to be superior to other races, and Spaniards would have considered few Puerto Ricans to be White. Colorism reproduced the racial hierarchy and system of stratification among Puerto Ricans as it privileged those classified as whiter and increasingly disadvantaged those classified as browner and blacker (Kinsbruner 1996, 9; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 33). The latter faced political, social, and economic discrimination and explicit racism (Chinea 1996,

510–515; Kinsbruner 1996, 5, 16; López 2008, 168). Once slavery was abolished, race may have become even more salient for social stratification. At the same time, colorism operated inconsistently (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 33). A complex interaction between ethnic origin, physical traits, economic status, and other social characteristics combined to influence individuals' social position: blackness did not guarantee social exclusion; whiteness did not secure inclusion (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 33). Individuals of African descent asserted their humanity and dignity without rejecting their blackness, and everyday life was full of struggles over racial classification (Findlay 1999, 39; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 217; cf. Lloréns 2018a, 158–159). Nevertheless, elites and nonelites participated in the ideology of White superiority and in attempts to be socially mobile through whitening by engaging in social practices considered to be characteristic of whiteness (Findlay 1999, 23–24, 37–39). Whitening, including passing and becoming legally White, was an established means of upward social mobility (Dungy 2005, 100–102; Kinsbruner 1996, 22, 26; López 2008, 169, 170).

A strict system of classification, increasingly used in the censuses starting in the 1860s, would not have been in the interest of the Puerto Rican population. A strictly applied Spanish definition of White would have excluded most Puerto Ricans and stifled upward mobility. Any rigid system would have erased the ambiguities and opportunities for resistance that the flexible, continuous system provided. Interestingly, starting in the 1860s and accelerating in the 1870s after emancipation, liberal Puerto Rican elites promoted a single racial category, such as "*raza de color*," "*hombres de color*," or "*clase de color*," that would incorporate all the mixed-race population (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 35, 119, 125–128). A single term, suggested the liberals, would transcend the divisions created by the multiple continuous terms used in everyday life (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 127). By explicitly eliminating, and therefore silencing, the categories of Black, these liberals sought to show that the Puerto Rican population was increasingly whitening and that social problems were rooted in labor conditions and not race (Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 36, 55, 126–128, 222). The crystallization of the tripartite system of classification (White, Brown, Black) in these late nineteenth-century censuses, then, would not have been in these liberals' interests, even though they might have supported a dichotomous system (if the "White" category had been inclusive).

An acceleration of the whitening of the Puerto Rican population in official statistics seems to have been one response to imposition of an increasingly rigid racial classificatory system, in which White was the ideologically

and structurally privileged category that did not align with the interests of local elites (Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 151; Loveman and Muniz 2007, 915). Over time, the population became increasingly classified as White in official statistics, perhaps increasing from 10% in 1530 to almost 64% in 1897 (Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; US War Department 1900, 2, 8; cf. US War Department et al. 1900, 57). The percentage of White increased from 48.8% in 1846 to 51.5% in 1860 with the introduction of the binary racial categories in the 1860 census (Haslip-Viera 2006, 265). It is possible that the use of the binary categories per se increased the number of individuals classified as White, although the upward trend in the overall official counts of White individuals is apparent before that and continues after it, even though the censuses between 1860 and 1930 used the trichotomous race categories, not the binary one. In sum, is likely that some of this overall whitening trend occurred because individuals shifted their categorizations to White, probably because of racial ideology that produced social pressure to whiten and anti-Black sentiment. It is also possible the dichotomous racial classification in the 1860 census helped accelerate the whitening trend, but it could not have produced the entire effect.

In the nineteenth century, demographic factors also may have contributed to whitening, although the available sources cannot be used to assess definitively this possibility. Migration might have contributed to whitening because of the influx of White Europeans encouraged by a royal decree in 1815 granting immigrant tax exemptions (Allen 2015, 610; Chinea 1996, 503, 516; Duany 2002, 249; Rivera-Batiz and Santiago 1996, 69–70). The effect of European migration may, however, have been offset somewhat by a smaller influx of mixed-race individuals from elsewhere in the Caribbean, especially in the first half of the century (Chinea 1996, 503–504). The end of the slave trade and the cholera epidemic might also have contributed to the increased number of Whites (Vargas-Ramos 2005, 268). Moreover, the overall whitening trend occurred despite some year-to-year declines in the percentages of Whites (e.g., from 48% in 1802 to 44.4% in 1820, and from 52.9% in 1836 to 51.5% in 1860) that apparently stemmed from the arrival of Black enslaved persons between 1802 and 1865 (Sánchez-Albornoz 1974, 140–141; US War Department et al. 1900, 32).

Race was not the only system of stratification. Patterns of recording social stratification based on landholdings created by Spanish law and practice—though obviously oppressive to the Indigenous population, individuals of African descent, and enslaved persons—nevertheless were in

the interest of property owners, whose social status was reinforced through the designation of *vecino*. Starting in the early nineteenth century, there was a concerted effort to pressure the laborers, the *agregados,* to work in commercial agriculture, and they were forced to register and carry documentation (Duany 1985, 105; López 1974b, 62–63; Morales Carrión 1983, 105–106; Quintero Rivera 1974, 95). These laws (revoked along with slavery in 1873) increased the number of *agregados*, who often worked beside enslaved persons (López 1974b, 63). Other smallholders managed to hold on to their plots to avoid being forced into this category (López 1974b, 64). Though smallholding continued to predominate, the number of large landowners increased (Quintero Rivera 1974, 96). In 1860, as many as one-third of Puerto Rico's landholders were Black; there was also a large group of impoverished Whites, so race was correlated to, but not completely determinative of, social standing, and social differences among these legal categories were highly salient (Duany 1985, 106, 120).

The designation of *vecino* continued to mark social status even after it ceased to denote strict legal status. For example, *agregados* appeared in declarations of *vecinos* in 1891 in Ponce, and the major Spanish censuses distinguished among *vecinos*, *domiciliados* (boarders), and *transeuntes* (transients). Property ownership became increasingly individualistic and absolute in the 1880s and 1890s (Carrasquillo 2006, 41). The government also issued laws, deployed police, and used the legal system to control labor (Carrasquillo 2006, 67–69). Stratification based on property ownership was not completely dependent upon race. These labor laws were in the local elites' interest, as they maintained the elites' control. Furthermore, although this system disadvantaged a large section of the population, it was not rigid, and individuals could be upwardly mobile. The use of the *cédula de vecindad,* marking productive capacity, was another system of stratification that was undoubtedly correlated with race but not entirely coterminous with it. These *cédulas* became increasingly associated with labor control in the 1880s (Carrasquillo 2006, 75).

Nationality, which was frequently collected in the censuses, was also important (e.g., López 2008, 167). There was considerable immigration to Puerto Rico in the nineteenth century from Europe and other colonies, and alongside this shifting population composition arose a Puerto Rican, generally mixed-race, elite with a developing sense of protonational pride and irritation with Spanish domination (Carrasquillo 2006, 15; Findlay 1999, 13; López 1974b, 44–46, 65–68; Maldonado-Denis 1972, 22). Puerto Ricans lacked the rights of individuals born in Spain (Carrasquillo

2006, 15; López 2008, 169). This local elite consisted of landowners (who benefitted from the labor laws and legal statuses), merchants, and professionals (López 1974b, 64–68; Torres 1998, 291). Thus, during this period, a Puerto Rican, local elite, distinct from the Spanish elite, emerged. These multiple, flexible systems of racial, legal, and national classification and stratification were in the interest of this local elite, providing them some, even if not unilateral, access to categories of high social status.

Assessing the Historical Conditions and Outcomes of Spanish Imperialist Censuses

We add this information to Table 1.1. As we have shown, information gathering shifted during this period, from descriptive information gathering for mercantilist purposes of extracting resources toward interventionist information gathering for imperialist purposes of controlling the colonies. The primary census categories with transformative potential in the census likewise shifted to racial categories (sometimes mixed with legal status) (Table 1.1, Column 2, Row 1). The imperialist Spanish state was stronger than its mercantilist counterpart (Table 1.1, Column 2, Row 2). Furthermore, we note that Puerto Ricans were familiar with the general tripartite system of classification in terms of White, Brown, and Black and the dichotomous one in terms of White and Black that the state used in censuses, especially in the summaries, during this time (Table 1.1, Column 2, Row 3). Throughout this same period, there were well-established institutions in Puerto Rico for collecting censuses, as noted in the Spanish censuses. Ecclesiastical censuses, taken during a hiatus in the collection of state censuses starting in the 1600s, as we showed above, produced the first summaries that used the White, Brown, and Black categories combined asymmetrically with these categories of legal status. Thus, these particular racialized legal markers did not arise from the censuses. Parish priests probably helped collect censuses (Table 1.1, Column 2, Row 4).

During this period, although Spain increased its interest over and control of Puerto Rico, it was to a large extent left to local officials to conduct the affairs of the island, including the censuses. A Puerto Rican elite emerged during this period, and although they did not have the status of Spaniards, they were powerful local actors. The increasingly rigid and generally tripartite scheme adopted in the late nineteenth century was not in their interest, as it would have reclassified many of them as non-White

(Table 1.1, Column 2, Row 5). While both the tripartite and the everyday schemes were based on an anti-Black racist ideology, and thus not in the interests of anyone classified as Black or mixed race, the everyday scheme, as well as the other multiple systems of classification (nationality, legal status, etc.), at least provided more opportunities for mobility and ambiguity than the tripartite one. As we have shown, the everyday, continuous categories continued in this period, alongside the official census ones (Table 1.1, Column 2, Row 6). Thus, although Puerto Ricans were familiar with the dichotomous and trichotomous census categories, everyday interaction was instead guided by a fluid scheme of multiple categories.

CHAPTER 5

US Imperialist Censuses

Abstract Starting in 1899, the United States fielded interventionist censuses in Puerto Rico, following its annexation in 1898. US officials intended to revamp the island's institutions and Americanize Puerto Ricans. Censuses factored into these efforts. The 1899 US census included White, Black, and mixed-race categories. The 1930 census merged the Black and Mulatto categories into "Colored," a scheme used through the 1950 census. In addition to reducing the number of categories, the US census officials tried to introduce a narrower definition of whiteness that would have excluded most Puerto Ricans. Although the US definitions should have produced a "blackening" of the census, Puerto Ricans subverted the official classifications. This "whitening" trend, most pronounced from 1899–1920, continued through the 1950 census. Notably, everyday understandings of race coexisted with the more restrictive official ones, and the official ones never replaced the fluid, multiple ones used in everyday life. Ultimately, the United States census dropped the race categories from the 1960 through 1990. Therefore, the strong US state could not successfully deploy transformative census categories.

Keywords Puerto Rico • US imperialism • Imperialist censuses • Official classification • US censuses

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8_5

The Collection of us Censuses in Puerto Rico

The US annexation of Puerto Rico in 1898 was clearly interventionist: US officials explicitly intended to overhaul the island's political, economic, and educational system and to "Americanize" Puerto Ricans (Berbusse 1966, 141, 145–146; Guerra 1998, 36–37; Loveman 2007, 18; Morris 1995, 24; Urciuoli 1996, 41–47; US Army and Davis 1900, 10). US officials viewed themselves as superior to Puerto Ricans and the Spanish and exhibited considerable racial and religious prejudice (e.g., Morales Carrión 1983, 149). Although Spanish racial ideology privileged whiteness, US racial ideology was less flexible, increasingly applying a trichotomous or dichotomous racial classification scheme and using a narrower definition of White that excluded anyone of mixed-race ancestry (US War Department 1900, 2, 8; US War Department et al. 1900, 55–60).

Part of this "Americanization" plan was the adoption of the US census. The US War Department directed the first US census (*de jure*) in Puerto Rico in 1899, with Puerto Ricans conducting the fieldwork (Goyer and Domschke 1983, 298; US War Department et al. 1900, 361–381). Using a standardized schedule, enumerators recorded the location of the household, the name and relationship of all household members, race (color), sex, age, marital status, nativity, citizenship, occupation, school attendance, literacy, and sanitary conditions (US War Department et al. 1900, 37). The racial categories included White (*blanco*), Black (*negro*), and mixed race (and categories for a few enumerated Asians), following the categories of White, Negro, and Mulatto in the 1880 US census and the previous Spanish censuses (US Bureau of the Census 1880; US War Department 1900, 1, 5; US War Department et al. 1900, 32–38).

Starting in 1910, Puerto Rico was included in the US decennial census, and Puerto Rican censuses were conducted with similar procedures to the ones used in the US mainland. In 1910 and 1920, the enumerator instructions for Puerto Rico specified that an individual's color or race (*color ó raza*) should be classified as White (*blanco*), Black (*negro*), or Mulatto (small numbers of Asians were also enumerated) (Loveman 2007, 22). Thus, up to this point, the categories had changed little from the Spanish censuses, but the stricter US definition of White was explicitly applied: no one with any amount of "Negro blood" could be classified as White (Loveman 2007, 22).

The 1930 census altered racial classification by merging the Mulatto and Black categories. This census, as well as the special census in 1935 and the following censuses in 1940 and 1950, thus enumerated the categories

of White, Colored ("comprising Negroes and persons of mixed white and Negro blood"; US Bureau of the Census 1932, 133), and other races (including "Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, etc.") (Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration 1937, 1; US Bureau of the Census 1940, n.p.; 1943, 2; 1952a, n.p.; 1952b, VII).[1] Most tabular summaries of the information presented two categories, White and non-White (e.g., US Bureau of the Census 1943, 8; 1953, 53-27). The non-White category applied to all "Negroes," persons of mixed "blood," and persons of other races (US Bureau of the Census 1952b, VII; 1953, 53-V). Occasionally, racial data were summarized in three categories (e.g., "White," "Negro," and "Other races") (US Bureau of the Census 1953, 53-26).

The 1960, 1970, 1980, and 1990 censuses did not include a race question, perhaps because individuals refused to identify themselves racially, because the government wanted to prevent or deny racial discrimination, or because it considered such a question to be unreliable or useless (Bennett 2000, 173; Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 152; Duany 2002, 252–253; Rivera-Batiz and Santiago 1996, 70). Puerto Rico's Popular Democratic Party lobbied to remove race and color from official documents, in line with nationalist ideology promoting racial harmony (Godreau 2008, 21). The 2000 and 2010 censuses (as in the mainland United States) included a multiracial question, in which individuals could mark multiple races as given on the form or write in some other race (US Bureau of the Census 2002, B-14, D1; US Bureau of the Census 2010, n.p.; US Bureau of the Census 2012, D-1). About 80.5% and 75.8% picked White as their single racial category in 2000 and in 2010, respectively (US Bureau of the Census 2002, 52; 2012, 90). Because there had been no race question since the 1950 census, it is not clear exactly how the addition of the multiracial category affected responses, but it apparently did not dramatically increase mixed-race categorization (Vargas-Ramos 2005, 267; cf. Allen 2015, 612–613). The phrasing of the race question may have been inappropriate, offensive, or nonsensical in the Puerto Rican context (Berkowitz and Brudvig 2001a, iii; 2001b, 17–18).

[1] The introduction to the summary tables for Puerto Rico in 1935 comments that the percentage of the colored population "declined from 38.2% in 1899 to 23.8% in 1935. A part of this nominal decline, however, was without doubt the result of a gradual change in the concept of race classification as applied by the census enumerators" (Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration 1937, 1).

Racial Classification in the Census

US officials built on Spanish census collecting, and the racial categories in the first US censuses showed considerable continuity with the Spanish ones. However, the US censuses increasingly reflected American racial ideology by imposing a stricter definition of White than the Spanish one, and over time, a dichotomous understanding of race, until the race question was eliminated from the Puerto Rican census. The US censuses further privileged this strict definition of White by eliminating or downplaying previously important social distinctions based on the category of *vecino*. Instead of adopting this view of race that would have reduced the official percentage of the White population, Puerto Ricans subverted or ignored it: whitening, building on the ideology of white superiority but often on the rejection of binary or trichotomous categories as well, seems to have been the cultural response to this attempted imposed classification (cf. Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 151; Godreau 2015, 231). Thus, the percentage of the white population increased from perhaps 61.8% in 1899 to 80.5% in 2000 in official statistics (Duany 2002, 247).

This long-term pattern of whitening might have accelerated between 1899 and 1920 (Duany 2002, 248; Haslip-Viera 2006, 265; Loveman 2007, 20; Loveman and Muniz 2007, 922). Starting with US rule, an increasingly strict definition of White was applied to the census categories and even more stigma was attached to being non-White, as US officials viewed most Puerto Ricans as non-White and inferior. Census enumerators, who were local Puerto Rican elites, probably shared the Americans' (and Spaniards') belief in White superiority but reacted to the increasingly strict US definition of White and increased importance of being White by classifying more individuals as White (Loveman 2007, 30, 36, 37; Loveman and Muniz 2007, 934–935). The decade between 1910 and 1920 was one of economic and social dislocation as Puerto Rico's incorporated subordination into the US empire intensified, and this trend may have produced increasing anxieties for Puerto Rico's elite (Loveman 2007, 36).[2] Puerto Rican elites

[2] Genetic studies, though controversial, also suggest a cultural whitening effect. Most showed that at least a considerable minority—and perhaps a sizable majority—of the current Puerto Rican population had Indigenous ancestors (Estevez 2008, 222–223; Fernandez Cobo et al. 2001, 385; González Burchard et al. 2005, 2162; Haslip-Viera 2006, 262; 2008, 228–229; Martínez-Cruzado et al. 2005, 131). No census categories, however, directly reflect this ancestry.

were particularly adept at adopting, but then reframing, American discourse for their own purposes (Go 2008, 212).

Furthermore, between 1910 and 1920, other factors that might have produced whitening in the census can be evaluated. Fertility, mortality, and migration accounted for little of this whitening trend between 1910 and 1920 (Loveman and Muniz 2007, 934). In addition, the census categories were fairly constant during this time (and in fact had changed little from the Spanish period), so the stricter definition of White rather than changes in the census categories probably accelerated whitening during this period. Finally, records from those censuses show that enumerators classified individuals in ways that contradicted the official instructions, thus also illustrating that the census itself did not produce whitening. For example, in the 1910 census, and even more so in the 1920 census, enumerators sometimes classified biracial children as White, even though, according to the census instructions, they should have classified them as Mulatto (Loveman 2007, 25). A strict application of the US definition of the census categories would have led to a "blackening" of the census, not a whitening, because more individuals should have been classified as Mulatto by US definitions. In fact, post-enumeration editing, stemming from US census procedures, did produce this blackening effect by reclassifying individuals in the category of White as Mulatto, but it was very small in comparison to the whitening effect stemming from more individuals being classified as White (Loveman and Muniz 2007, 923). Thus, the whitening in the 1920 census stemmed from shifts in tacit cultural criteria used to classify individuals, probably stemming from the general effects of US rule, not from any changes or procedures in the census itself (Loveman and Muniz 2007, 934–935).

Although whitening was most rapid between 1899 and 1920, the shift in the census categories, from trichotomous to dichotomous in 1930 (and previously in 1860), also may have induced some shift from the mixed-race category to the white category because in the absence of being able to classify individuals as mixed race, census enumerators in Puerto Rico identified individuals as White rather than as Colored or Black (Duany 2002, 250). The US officials in fact hinted at this possibility. The introduction to the summary tables for the 1950 census of Puerto Rico justified the dichotomous race categories of "White" and "non-White" and stated that "[t]he concept of race as it has been used by the Bureau of the Census is derived from that which is commonly accepted by the general

public" (US Bureau of the Census 1953, 53-V). Although the census officials intended that the "non-White" category would encompass all individuals of mixed ancestry, the report noted: "There is considerable evidence which indicates that color is misreported ..." because enumerators tended "... to report persons with varying amounts of Negro blood as 'white'" (US Bureau of the Census 1952b, VIII). The US officials were clearly drawing on their own definitions of race, which did not necessarily correspond to Puerto Ricans' definitions. As in the period from 1899 to 1920, this whitening would have stemmed from enumerators' cultural criteria for White, not the census procedures, because the shift to a dichotomous US category would have produced blackening, not whitening, if enumerators had applied US census rules in accordance with the specific racial theory that those rules reflected.

Thus, this long-term trend toward whitening seems to have stemmed from changes in the population's own categorization in the face of US racial ideology that attached increasing stigma to the non-White category. The whitening of the official statistics, which was contrary to the intentions of the US census officials, stemmed from the racial ideology of White superiority that had predominated for centuries, promoting whitening as an avenue of upward mobility; it did not represent a fundamental transformation of racial categorization or the widespread ideology of whitening. Instead, it drew on the Puerto Rican understanding of the category of White as an inclusive, flexible category, in contrast to the US understanding of White as a restricted category (though both of these understandings privileged White over Black) (Godreau 2008, 14). Thus, while American rule accelerated this whitening, the census itself did not; the effects of the census, had it been applied according to its official intent, would have been to increase the non-White population through blackening. Exactly the opposite outcome occurred.

Everyday Uses and Meanings of Race

In everyday life, the continuous categorization system was used. During Spanish colonialism, a complex set of names evolved to categorize every possible mixture of Europeans, Africans, and Indigenous and to describe individuals of various skin and hair colors and physical features using a continuum of physical types (e.g., *trigueño*, *grifo, jabao*, *colorado, cuarterón, aindiado, prieto, rubia, café con leche, negro colorao, indio*; Allen 2015, 616–617; Duany 2002, 237–239, 241; Godreau 2015, 2; Gordon

1949, 298; Gravlee 2005, 962; Lloréns 2018b, 34–36; López 2008, 175; Rivero 2005, 16; Rodríguez 2000, 108–109; Rodriguez and Cordero-Guzman 1992, 525; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 5; Seda Bonilla 1961, 142, note 12). Starting in the 1930s, ethnographic and interview studies provide evidence of this usage (Hernández Hiraldo 2006, 37–40; Rogler 1940, 36; Roth 2012, 51–54; review in Duany 2002, 240–243). This system of racial categorization was based not on degrees of ancestry as in the United States, but on appearance, as well as socio-economic conditions such as social class, birthplace, and cultural modes of behavior (Duany 1985, 115; 2002, 242; Landale and Oropesa 2002, 233; Rodriguez and Cordero-Guzman 1992, 526). The categorization of individuals varied situationally and by the classifier and categorizer (Rogler 1940, 35–39). Racial markers were also used to express affiliation, mark attractiveness, or comment on social standing (Guerra 1998, 234–235; Hernández Hiraldo 2006, 39; Rivero 2005, 16; Roth 2012, 53). The use of these everyday racial markers represents and reproduces social identity—they do not necessarily refer to fixed racial qualities (Godreau 2008, 8; Lloréns 2018b, 31, 36; cf. Gravlee 2005, 962–963).

In addition to this continuous categorization scheme, in everyday life, Puerto Ricans were also familiar with the dichotomous and tripartite systems, as well as classification based on nationality (e.g., "Puerto Rican") (Duany 2002, 242; Kinsbruner 1996, 1; Roth 2012, 18, 51–54; Seda Bonilla 1961, 142). Puerto Ricans were particularly adept at switching among these various schemas depending on the context (Godreau 2008, 17; Lloréns 2018b, 31; Roth 2012, 18, 60). They generally switched to the continuous one to describe social relationships and interactions in everyday life (Roth 2012, 52). Thus, while Puerto Ricans used a dichotomous categorization scheme, they deployed it strategically as only one of multiple schemas.

This mismatch between the census categories and the everyday categories may be reflected in Puerto Ricans' hesitancy to identify with the official categories. It may also reflect their continued preference for rejecting, circumventing, or redefining the state's classificatory schemas, especially ones originating in the United States, such as the census (Godreau 2008, 25; review in Vargas-Ramos 2005, 269). For example, in the mid-1990s, just over half of Puerto Rican women identified their race as "Puerto Rican" on a health survey (Landale and Oropesa 2002, 240; cf. Duany 2002, 238; Vargas-Ramos 2005, 272). Similarly, interview respondents often referred to themselves as "Puerto Rican" or "Latino" when asked about their race (Roth 2012, 3, 33–39; cf. Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 153).

As under Spanish imperialism, the fluidity of racial classification coexisted with colorism, the idea of racial mixture with whitening, and the positive influence of African and Indigenous culture with anti-blackness and the erasure of the Indigenous population (Findlay 1999, 37; Hernández Hiraldo 2006, 16; Kinsbruner 1996, 2, 16; Lloréns 2018a, 158; Torres 1998, 286–287; cf. Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 153). When asked to choose between White and Black, Puerto Ricans often chose White or refused to answer the question (Hernández Hiraldo 2006, 243). Anti-Black colorism and discrimination was and is widespread, so some individuals may avoid identifying with the Black category (Cruz-Janzen 2001, 169–171; Sereno 1947, 262–265; Vargas-Ramos 2005, 275, 279). Whitening is a taken-for-granted ideology and continues to be a strategy for upward social mobility, common among elites and nonelites (Lloréns 2018a, 161; 2018b, 43; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 185; Vargas-Ramos 2005, 274). Whitening, as well as passing, reflected the racial ideology of White superiority and the denigration of blackness and African heritage (Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2008, 151; Godreau 2008, 12; Lloréns 2018b, 29, 31–33, 36–38, 40–42; López 2008, 172, 175). The large percentages of individuals reported as "White" in the US census of Puerto Rico are sometimes considered as evidence of passing, not as demographic information (Allen 2015, 608–609; Lloréns 2018b, 29; Vargas-Ramos 2005, 270). Affirmations of blackness, Black pride movements, and explicit denunciations of racism and anti-blackness may increase the numerical incidence of individuals in the Black category, which may help account for the increase in the number of individuals marking the "Black" category in the 2010 US Census (Lloréns 2018a, 157–158; 173–174; Rodríguez-Silva 2012, 2). Official classifications, such as the census, may obtain different results when they deploy some of the terms from the racial continuum scheme, rather than the categories of White and Black (Allen 2015, 626; Vargas-Ramos 2005, 270–271). It is not surprising, then, that census classifications are highly problematic: the official categories of the US census do not reflect Puerto Rican understandings of race, respondents ignore or redefine classifications that would put them into a non-White category as a strategy for whitening, and such classifications have not (until perhaps the 2010 census) offered any redress for colorism, racism, or discrimination nor any structural opportunities for upward mobility.

Thus, the Spanish and US censuses had little effect on Puerto Ricans' everyday racial categorization. Despite hundreds of years of censuses, and

US censuses that used only a few racial categories, Puerto Ricans, past and present, used multiple racial terms in everyday life to denote different physical appearances stemming from a mixture of races, not just a few categories (Duany 2002, 251–252; Rivera-Batiz and Santiago 1996, 70). This everyday framing accents a continuous model of race with multiple intermediate categories between White and Black (Cobas et al. 2009, 10).

Assessing the Historical Conditions and Outcomes of US Imperialist Censuses

We add this information to Table 1.1 in Column 3. During this period, the primary categories with transformative power were the racial ones, collected in a categorical bipartite or tripartite format (Table 1.1, Column 3, Row 1). The United States was undoubtedly a strong imperialist power (Table 1.1, Column 3, Row 2). Puerto Ricans were familiar with the general tripartite system of classification in terms of White, Brown, and Black, and the dichotomous system of White and Black used in censuses during this time (Table 1.1, Column 3, Row 3). There were well-developed Puerto Rican institutions, notably the church, that had a long history of collecting censuses (Table 1.1, Column 3, Row 4). Finally, the United States was undoubtedly a more powerful colonial presence than the Spanish one, and it viewed the local Puerto Rican elite much more patronizingly than had the Spanish colonists. The United States clearly was powerful enough to introduce its own census, although it relied on Puerto Rican enumerators. Local elite Puerto Ricans would have had few reasons to adopt the US racial classificatory scheme, as they would have been almost invariably been classified as non-White, which was an increasingly stigmatized category during this period (Table 1.1, Column 3, Row 5). Furthermore, the US census excluded or reframed other categories of stratification that had maintained local elites' power. *Vecino* had little meaning within the US framework; US officials abolished the *cédulas de vecindad*, so the US census did not have this measure of economic capacity that had appeared in some Spanish-era censuses; and nationality had a new meaning given US views of its own superiority. These other dimensions of social stratification thus were eliminated as ways for local elites to maintain power. These shifts left race as an increasingly important mechanism of social stratification at the same time that the US categories narrowed the definition of White. Being White in the US system had a different meaning

than in the Spanish one. Nonelites, though less powerful than elites, still would have had few reasons to adopt the US classificatory scheme as it also would have eliminated avenues for upward mobility and reclassified most of them as non-White. Puerto Ricans generally simply ignored the official census definitions and categorized themselves as White, using their own definitions of the term, rather than comply with these US definitions, or in later years eliminated the question from the census. Finally, we argued that these official census categories in fact had little association with the racial categories used in everyday life (Table 1.1, Column 3, Row 6). Although Puerto Ricans were familiar with the dichotomous and trichotomous census categories, everyday interaction was instead guided by a fluid scheme of multiple categories.

CHAPTER 6

Assessing Explanations of Transformations in Categories

Abstract While the state-centered literature usually assumes that censuses have transformative effects, an interactive approach that examines both state and social effects considers the conditions under which such a transformation might occur. This chapter, then, assesses four factors, drawn from the state-centered and society-centered approaches, that might have influenced whether census categories transformed everyday ones: a strong imperialist state, the familiarity of census categories, the engagement of social actors and institutions in information gathering, and local power relations. The results suggest that local power relations are particularly important: when official classifications support local elites' interests, they can have transformative effects. The results show that the weak mercantilist state classified Spanish colonists as *vecinos*, Africans as Black slaves, and Taínos as Indians. These categories benefited Spanish colonists, and they informed everyday categorization for centuries. The strong imperialist Spanish and US states constructed more exclusive binary and tripartite categories. These definitions conflicted with local interests, and these official categories never replaced everyday ones.

Keywords Puerto Rican censuses • Colonial censuses • Official classification • Everyday categorization • State-society interaction

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8_6

Assessing State and Social Influences

As we noted, the state-centered literature provides a strong heuristic motivation that suggests how censuses can transform social categorization and outlines plausible mechanisms through which it can take place. It primarily assumes, however, that this transformation will occur, instead of considering the historical conditions under which it will occur (e.g., Bourdieu 1999, 61; 2012, 13, 262–264; Foucault [1976] 1978, 140; [1975] 1979, 28; 1991, 96–102; [2004] 2007, 94–95, 102, 105–106; 274–275; Latour 1987, 234–237; Weber 1978, 213, 223). Similarly, an interactive view of information gathering also suggests that censuses can be transformative (Emigh et al. 2016a, 39, 210–216; 2016b, 212–218). Thus, as we have argued, much of this literature outlines the mechanisms whereby this transformation might occur. In contrast, here we explicitly examined historical conditions that are associated with this transformation by assessing four factors that might be linked to the transformative power of censuses according to the state-centered and society-centered perspectives on information gathering. In particular, to assess the state-centered perspective, we considered state power, and to assess the society-centered perspective, we considered the familiarity of the census categories, the role of social actors and institutions in information gathering, and whether local power relations supported the state's census categories. We summarized the patterns among these factors and outcomes in Table 1.1 by using a comparative method to show what factors are associated with which outcomes. We now compare this pattern from Table 1.1 with what would be expected from the state-centered and society-centered perspectives. Importantly, we do not claim that comparative methods can be used inductively or to prove causality of these factors; rather, we use it to assess the theoretical expectations of the relationship between the factors and the outcomes.

In the mercantilist period, categorizations were transformed as Spanish colonists became *vecinos*; as individuals from Africa—from a variety of different political, cultural, and linguistic units—became classified as Black slaves; and as the Indigenous population became classified as Indians. These categories were found in the first census in 1530. These censuses had classificatory effects: they established legal categories of property and rights for Spanish colonists. Thus, the census categories were transformed into everyday categories in mercantilist Puerto Rico. We attempted to assess, therefore, the conditions under which this transformation occurred. First, the mercantilist state was very weak. It exerted little control over

Puerto Rico, and local state institutions were underdeveloped. Second, the lay categories used in the census were familiar to the social actors. *Vecino* was a term used in Spain, so it was familiar. During the Spanish conquest, however, it had to be forcibly applied to the Puerto Rican context, as Spanish settlers had no historical right to land as they might have had in Spain. The establishment of the rights of *vecinos* in this new context was in the interests of the Spanish settlers. Of course, these legal categories of property rights were highly disadvantageous to the Black and Indigenous populations, as they were violently dispossessed and enslaved, at least in part, through them. But these populations had much less power than the Spanish colonists.

In the second period, the imperialist Spanish regime was a much stronger power than its mercantilist counterpart, and census collection was undertaken in earnest with the intent of improving administration. The census categories were familiar to Puerto Ricans from previous rounds of information gathering, either from church or state efforts. However, during this period, the predominant way of classifying the population, as Black, Brown, or White (which seemed to have originated in church documents), did not replace the continuous categories used in everyday life. A dichotomous or trichotomous system of classification was not in the interests of most Puerto Ricans, including elite Puerto Ricans who would have held most concrete positions of power on the island, as it was much less flexible than the continuous one.

Finally, in the third period, the US imperialist state was strong and its intentions unambiguous: a transformation of the Puerto Rican population. As in the Spanish imperialist period, the institutions that collected information were well developed, and Puerto Ricans were familiar with the categories used in the census. The US racial categories, however, were much more restrictive than the Puerto Rican ones, and their strict application was resisted by Puerto Ricans, elite and nonelite. As in the Spanish imperialist period, everyday categorizations used the continuous schema.

Thus, our findings in Table 1.1 suggest that the censuses transformed social categorization in the mercantilist period, but not in the two imperialist periods. In particular, our findings suggest that local power relations (factor 4) may have been particularly important in this transformation. We come to this conclusion by noting that Table 1.1 provides the strongest evidence for this particular factor from the society-centered perspective. The patterning of this factor across the time periods

fits the pattern suggested by this perspective: census categories are transformative where local power relations support their use (factor 4). Specifically, Table 1.1 provides evidence that supports the society-centered perspective, as local power relations supported the state's census categories only in the first period, and the census category with transformative power (*vecino*) became widely used in everyday life. The adoption of this category was in the interest of the newly arrived Spanish colonists, who were more powerful than the other inhabitants. In the second and third periods, local power relations did not support the census categories (racial categories mixed with legal status in the second period and racial categories in the third period), and the census categories did not transform the everyday categories. The tripartite and bipartite census categories were not in the interest of the local Puerto Rican elites (or nonelites either, for that matter) who held the most power locally. While the US state was a relatively strong colonial power in comparison to the Spanish one, it also relied on Puerto Ricans for local administration and, in particular, to conduct the census. This patterning thus supports the society-centered perspective, which suggests that the transformative power of censuses is shaped by the power relations among the population and, in particular, that census categories are more likely to be transformative when the interests of these social and state actors coincide.

Taken together, the comparison across the three temporal periods does not support the state-centered perspective, which suggests that strong imperialist states (factor 1) are associated with transformations of social categorization. There were strong imperialist states in the two imperialist cases where the outcome is absent. In mercantilist Puerto Rico, where the state was weaker than in the imperialist cases, the outcome is present. These outcomes in Table 1.1 are unexpected from the strong-state perspective, as that perspective suggests that strong states, which were present in the second and third periods but not in the first, are more likely to use classifications that transform categorizations. However, as we noted, these outcomes did not occur. Thus, Table 1.1 provides evidence that undermines the state-centered perspective. The results from these two imperialist censuses suggest that a strong state cannot impose a classificatory scheme of its own making on a population. Moreover, the case of mercantilist Puerto Rico suggests that a census can be transformative even in the absence of a strong state.

We also assessed the patterns of the other two social influences as suggested by the society-centered perspective: the familiarity of the state's

categories (factor 2) and social actors and preexisting social institutions (factor 3). Our findings here, however, do not allow us to comment definitively on the expectations of the society-centered perspective with respect to these factors. The second factor, the familiarity of the state's categories, was present in all three cases, regardless of outcome, including the two imperialist ones that did not have transformative effects. Thus, the evidence in Table 1.1 provides mixed support for the society-centered perspective with respect to lay categories. This perspective suggests that censuses always bear the markings of the lay categories of the populace and, in particular, that state censuses are more highly transformative when they use categories that are familiar to the population. Table 1.1 thus confirms the society-centered suggestion during the first period but disconfirms it in the other two periods.

Table 1.1 also provides evidence that disconfirms the society-centered perspective with respect to factor 3, the influence of preexisting local institutions. In particular, the findings from mercantilist Puerto Rico suggest that a census can be transformative in the absence of preexisting local institutions of information gathering. However, we note that these first censuses were quite small and the population concentrated, so it may have been relatively easy to collect a census even in the absence of the support that preexisting information-gathering institutions usually provide. In addition, the imperialist cases of Puerto Rico also show that preexisting local institutions are not always associated with a transformative effect as the society-centered perspective suggests, since these local institutions were present there, but the censuses had no such effect. Thus, with respect to these two factors (2 and 3), derived from the society-centered perspective, Table 1.1 does not provide unambiguous evidence. It is possible that in the imperialist cases, the way that lay categories and local institutions' involvement in information gathering intersected with local power relations affected whether the categories were transformative or not, but more evidence would be needed to illustrate this point.

In contrast, as we noted, these results suggest that local power relations are associated with the transformational power of censuses. Relationships of social power would have supported the state's categories in the mercantilist censuses but not in the imperialist censuses. Local Puerto Rican elites, as well as a wide swath of other Puerto Ricans, would have supported census categories in the mercantilist period that dispossessed those of African and Indigenous descent of their ability to control their labor and land. However, few Puerto Ricans, including elites who were

locally powerful, would have supported the relatively inflexible bipartite or tripartite categories increasingly used in the Spanish and US imperialist censuses, as their strict application would have decreased their social status. Thus, read in its entirety, these results suggest that social power relations are associated with the transformative power of censuses but that state strength is not.

Together, the evidence in Table 1.1 for all three Puerto Rican cases strongly casts doubt on the general thrust of the state-centered perspective of censuses that strong states can impose census categories on their populations. The state-centered perspective suggests that the collection of Spanish and US censuses, through trichotomous or dichotomous racial categories, should have transformed everyday categorization. Yet it did not. We do not deny that a census can have transformative effects; here we simply take issue with the overapplication of the state-centered perspective that often assumes this is true. As with other aspects of colonialism (cf. Comaroff and Comaroff 1991, 32; Peabody 2001, 819–820; Stoler 1989, 154–155), the collection of censuses depended on local power relations. Mercantilist censuses, deployed by a relatively weak state, successfully established the Spanish view of property relations through legal classification, while the censuses deployed by the two strong imperialist states of Spain and the United States had little effect on everyday racial categorization.

Because of this focus on the state-centered perspective, other important historical conditions that can transform social categories have been neglected. Examining cases where such a transformation occurred (e.g., British censuses in India) is not the best way to examine critically the state-centered perspective because the outcome and most of the factors hypothesized to affect this transformation are present there, making it difficult to determine which conditions were associated with this outcome. In contrast, Puerto Rican censuses during Spanish and US imperial rule are important test cases because census categories, while commonly used, did not replace the ones used in everyday racial categorization, and these cases can be used to suggest what factors seem not to be associated with the transformation. These imperialist cases suggest that local power relations must support the state's categories for the census to have a transformative effect, because in both cases where this condition was missing, the racial categories in the censuses had little transformative effect on everyday categorization. These findings suggest that the effect of local social forces was much more important than the state's imperial power.

Again, we note that these mercantilist censuses were small undertakings, both in scope and in geographical coverage, so it is possible that more ambitious censuses were crucially dependent upon preexisting local institutions, which were not present in the mercantilist case of Puerto Rico. Obviously, other cases would be necessary to further support this particular conclusion.

We noted already that we are not assessing the process or mechanisms through which censuses do their transformative work. However, these mechanisms have been considered in detail in previous work, so we can here try to fit our comparative results to these causal mechanisms for a fuller understanding of how classification and categorization work (Emigh et al. 2016a, 35–39). The state-centered perspective points to a mechanism: state actors develop the census instruments, collect the information, and their deployment shapes individuals' categorizations. In particular, our finding that local power relations are crucially important suggests that the state proceeds with the design and redaction of the census only with the cooperation of social actors. This interpretation meshes well with the finding that familiarity with the state's census categories may also be necessary for censuses to have a transformative effect. In developing census instruments, state actors probably succeed in collecting information only where they create categories that are drawn directly from categories in everyday life. Furthermore, social actors take up and redeploy the state's census categories in everyday life only when they have incentives to do so. Thus, local power relations shape where and when categories have transformative effects.

This interpretation of the mechanism suggests that the focus of the state-centered perspective on state power and its predictions for the transformative effects of censuses may be misplaced. If state actors simply draw on preexisting categories with the support of social actors, the role of these state actors may be more limited than this state-centered perspective implies. And, in fact, we can suggest that the society-centered perspective may provide a better understanding of the mechanism that produced the empirical associations in Table 1.1. This perspective suggests that social actors press for information collection, state actors take up these requests, state structures change in response to this information, and these new state structures shape social categorization (Emigh et al. 2016a, 39, 210–216; 2016b, 212–218). For the early mercantilist period, in which there was a transformation of social categorization, this mechanism seems to fit well with the pattern of the colonists' push for land rights,

their requests to the Spanish crown, the crown's increasing attention to governance in the first Puerto Rican census, and the colonists' adoption of the set of legal rights. Of course, we did not examine these mechanisms directly here, as it is not the focus of our research, so further evidence would be necessary to establish this point. However, instead of assuming the transformative consequences of censuses, our results suggest that more attention should be focused on the social conditions and patterns of power relations that surround their establishment, the role of social actors and institutions in creating censuses, and the patterns of lay categories that predate censuses categories. Then, the role of state actors and possible transformative effects of censuses can be specified with much more clarity.

With this work, we tried to redress the balance of emphasis on state and social factors when considering the possible transformative effects of censuses. Here, we showed how social factors shaped changes in categorization, as well as how these social influences interacted with state ones. Of course, a state's information-gathering attempts can transform social categorization. Narrative explanations, however, of the state's effects on these transformations may miss social factors that were important because the social and state factors were not assessed comparatively. Here, therefore, we tried to consider social influences on the transformative power of censuses systematically by specifying three important social factors, by carefully considering how their pattern of association fit with changes in categorization, and by tracing possible mechanisms of how they interacted with the state's efforts to collect censuses. Similarly, pointing to global transformations, without specifying specific categories that are available and specific paths of influence, may overstate the role of censuses per se (e.g., the influence of the census per se in whitening and blackening in Puerto Rico). Thus, here we specified a particular outcome—namely, a change in everyday categorization—and considered how available census categories may or may not have shaped this particular outcome. Finally, we considered how the state changed over time, and thus the variability in state power, instead of assuming that the state is a powerful actor. We used the temporal variation in state power as part of our comparative assessment. Because we used a comparative method as a way to analyze a pattern of association expected from a particular theoretical perspective, not as a definitive test of causality, we could use a temporal comparison to understand how the state's classifications do not always transform categorizations.

Implications for the Sociology of Statistics

In this work, we suggested that the transformative effect of states on everyday patterns of thought is often assumed in the literature of the "sociology of statistics." It shows that seemingly neutral techniques of data collection can shape how ordinary individuals perceive reality by imposing classificatory schemes. Undoubtedly, this can happen. But this work provides little assessment of when and where these transformations occur. Thus, here we considered a case in which a change in everyday categorization did not occur, even in the presence of a strong, imperialist state with the intention of producing widespread transformations.

Our work has several important implications. First, more research should seek to specify where and when classification has a transformative effect by clearly specifying a specific outcome that censuses might transform and by considering whether or not censuses categories have the possibility of transforming it. Thus, we call for empirical work that shows whether or not classification is transformative instead of assuming that it is. Second, we argue that local power relations are important in shaping whether state classification has such a transformative effect. Local actors may ignore or subvert classificatory schemes that are not in their interest. Finally, we suggest that the strength of the state may be relatively unimportant in shaping whether classification schemes are transformative. In Puerto Rico, imperialist states never transformed everyday categorization.

To make our argument, we considered the entire history of the Puerto Rican censuses, from the first census in 1530 through the twenty-first century. The twentieth-century censuses are, not surprisingly, relatively easy to use as empirical evidence. Few Puerto Ricans, including elites and nonelites, would have viewed the US racial classification scheme as in their interests and therefore were unlikely to have used it instead of the more fluid system used in everyday life. The censuses collected before the twentieth century are more difficult to use and have been examined in less detail. Thus, our work makes a unique empirical contribution by thoroughly examining these pre-twentieth-century censuses. We show that these pre-twentieth-century Spanish censuses, in comparison to the US ones, had multiple dimensions of stratification, were more fluid, and, like some but not all of the US ones, often deployed the tripartite categories of White, Black, and Brown. This evidence provides an important historical referent: it shows why Puerto Ricans' interests, especially those of elites, lay in the continued use of the everyday, continuous system of racial

categorization instead of the one represented by the official Spanish census categories. The everyday system was more fluid, flexible, and allowed for upward mobility. At the same time, the system embodied by the Spanish censuses was much more fluid than the US one adopted in the twentieth century, thus illustrating why whitening may have accelerated with the adoption of the US census that attempted to apply an increasingly rigid and narrow definition of whiteness. This evidence, taken together, shows the limits of states' classifications when such schemes are not in the interests of the population. Our work, by providing new evidence based on primary sources about the pre-twentieth-century censuses and by examining the entire trajectory of Spanish and US censuses in Puerto Rico, leads to a deeper understanding of Puerto Rican history, as well as a new theoretical understanding of where and when censuses have transformative effects.

Appendix

Table A.1 Unpublished (or out of print) sources

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1800	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 11; film 1389438, item 4	Summaries
1811	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 11; film 1389438, item 4	Summary
1812	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Govemadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Adjuntas, Añasco, Arecibo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 5	Summary
1812	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 12; film 1389438, item 25	Summaries
1819	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 11; film 1389438, item 4	Summaries

(*continued*)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 11; film 1389438, item 4	Summaries
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Governadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Adjuntas, Añasco, Arecibo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 5	Summaries
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Camuy, Cangrejos, Caguas, Cayey, Ciales, Cidra, Coamo, Culebra, caja 12; film 1389438, item 7	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Juana Díaz, Juncos, caja 12; film 1389438, item 8	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Fajardo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 9	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Gurabo, Guayama, Guaynabo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 10	Summaries
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Humacao, caja 12; film 1389438, item 11	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Las Piedras, Loiza, Luquillo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 13	Summaries
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Maricao, Manati, Maunabo, Mayagüez, caja 12; film 1389438, item 14	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Sabana Grande, San Germán, caja 12; film 1389438, item 19	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Utuado, caja 12; film 1389438, item 21	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Vega Alta, Vega Baja, caja 12; film 1389438, item 22	Summary

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 12; film 1389438, item 24	Summary
1820	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 12; film 1389438, item 25	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Governadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Adjuntas, Añasco, Arecibo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 5	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Camuy, Cangrejos, Caguas, Cayey, Ciales, Cidra, Coamo, Culebra, caja 12; film 1389438, item 7	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Gurabo, Guayama, Guaynabo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 10	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Maricao, Manati, Maunabo, Mayagüez, caja 12; film 1389438, item 14	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Patillas, Peñuelas, Ponce, caja 12; film 1389438, item 16	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Sabana Grande, San Germán, caja 12; film 1389438, item 19	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Toa Alta, Trujillo, caja 12; film 1389438, item 20	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, Yabucoa, Yauco, caja 12; film 1389438, item 23	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 12; film 1389438, item 24	Summary
1821	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 13; film 1389438, item 25	Summaries

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1832	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Declarations
1833	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales de San Juan, Fondo B, Censo de Familias, Barrio Santo Domingo; film 1389436, items 18, 19	Declarations, summary
1836	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 14; film 1389439, item 1	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1836	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, Ponce, legajo 56, exp. 3; film 1667030, item 4	Declarations
1837	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 14; film 1389439, item 1	Summaries
1837	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 100; film 1511623, item 1	Summary
1838	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 14; film 1389439, item 1	Declarations
1838	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo General; film 1667026, item 4	Declarations
1838	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Declarations
1839	Archivo General De Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales de San Juan, Fondo B, Censo de Familias, Barrio La Marina; film 1389436, item 17	Declarations, summaries
1839	Archivo General De Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 100; film 1511623, item 1	Declarations
1840	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo General, Ponce; film 1667026, item 4	Declarations
1840	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales de San Juan, Fondo B, Censo de Familias, Barrio La Marina; film 1389436, item 17	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1841	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, 1841, Ponce; film 1667026, item 6	Declarations
1841	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales de San Juan, Fondo B, Censo de Familias, Barrio La Marina; film 1389436, item 17	Declarations
1842	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 11; film 1389438, item 4	Summaries
1842	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 15; film 1389439, item 2	Summaries
1844	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, 1844, Ponce; film 1667026, item 5	Declarations
1846	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Declarations, instructions, summaries
1846	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 42; film 1511663, item 5	Declarations
1847 (1846)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Summaries
1850	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Padron de Almas, 1850, Ponce; film 1667026, item 7	Declarations
1850	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Declarations
1850	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 101; film 1511623, item 2	Declarations
1850	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Declarations
1850	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511834, item 3	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1852 (1851)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Summaries
1853 (1852)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Summaries
1853	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 101; film 1511623, item 2	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1855 (1854)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Summaries
1856	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 101; film 1511623, item 2	Declarations
1857 (1856)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Summaries
1857	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Declarations, summary
1859 (1858)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Censo y Riqueza, caja 16; film 1389439, item 3	Declarations, summary
1859 (1858)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Summaries
1859	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 119; film 1506814, item 1	Declarations
1860	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, 1860, Ponce; film 1667026, item 8	Declarations, summaries
1860	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, 1860, Ponce; film 1667026, item 9	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511631, item 5	Declarations, summaries

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Censo, Comerio, caja A; film 1563564, item 7	Declarations, summaries
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Declarations, summaries
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 13; film 1506815, item 5	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 14; film 1506815, item 6	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Cedulas de Inscripcion, Fajardo, caja 51; film 1506818, item 4	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Summaries
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Rio Grande, caja A; film 1511699, item 1	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Rio Grande, caja B; film 1511699, item 2	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 119; film 1506814, item 1	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 120; film 1506814, item 2	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 121; film 1506814, item 3	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 122; film 1506814, item 4	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Cedulas de Inscripcion, Fajardo, caja 46; film 1506817, item 1	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Cedulas de Inscripcion, Fajardo, caja 46; film 1506817, item 2	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 83; film 1511645, item 1	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 84; film 1511645, item 2	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Padrones y Censos, Utuado, caja 38; film 1511718, item 6	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511834, item 3	Declarations
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511845, item 1	Declarations, summaries
1860	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Rio Piedras, caja 552; film 1511845, item 3	Declarations
1860	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, Ponce, legajo 55, exp. 7; film 1667030, item 1	Declarations
1860	Archivo de Caguas, Padron, Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 2; film 1667254, item 2	Declarations
1861	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 123; film 1506815, item 1	Summaries
1862 (1861)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries
1863 (1862)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1863	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 101; film 1511623, item 2	Summaries
1863	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Padron de Almas, 1860; film 1667026, item 8	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1864 (1863)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries
1865 (1864)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries
1865	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Summaries
1866 (1865)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries
1866 (1865)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Summaries
1867 (1866)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 102; film 1511623, item 3	Summaries
1867 (1866)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries
1867 (1866)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Summary
1867	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Tallies
1868 (1867)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 102; film 1511623, item 3	Summaries
1868 (1867)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 39; film 1511709, item 10	Summary

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1868	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 39; film 1511709, item 10	Summary
1868	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 86; film 1511645, item 4	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 5; film 1667030, item 6	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 7; film 1667030, item 8	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 10; film 1667030, item 10	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 11; film 1667030, item 11	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 13; film 1667030, item 13	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 14; film 1667030, item 14	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 15; film 1667030, item 15	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 56, exp. 16 al 25; film 1667030, item 16	Declarations
1868	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, legajo 55, legajo 57; film 1667030, item 17	Declarations
1869 (1868)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 102; film 1511623, item 3	Summaries
1869 (1868)	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes, caja 77; film 1667324, item 1	Sample declaration
1869	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 102; film 1511623, item 3	Declarations
1869	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Sample declaration
1869	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Utuado, caja 24; film 1511699, item 3	Slave registry

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1869	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 39; film 1511709, item 10	Slave registry
1869	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Padrones y Censos, Utuado, caja 40; film 1511718, item 7	Slave registry
1870 (1869)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 5	Summaries
1870 (1869)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 102; film 1511623, item 3	Declarations, summaries
1870 (1869)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 85; film 1511645, item 3	Summaries
1870	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 123; film 1506815, item 1	Declarations, summaries
1870	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Summaries
1871 (1870)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 120; film 1506814, item 2	Summaries
1871 (1870)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 86; film 1511645, item 4	Declarations
1871 (1870)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511845, item 1	Summaries
1871 (1870)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 39; film 1511709, item 10	Declarations
1871	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Utuado, caja 24; film 1511699, item 3	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1871	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Declarations
1871	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 57a, legajo 59; film 1667030, item 20	Declarations
1871	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 57b, legajo 59; film 1667041, item 1	Declarations
1872 (1871)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 102; film 1511623, item 3	Declarations
1872 (1871)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 103; film 1511631, item 1	Declarations, summaries
1872 (1871)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 39; film 1511709, item 10	Declarations
1872 (1871)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Declarations
1872	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Registro de Esclavos 6 Departamento; film 1389438, item 1	Slave registry
1872	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Gobernadores Españoles, Registro de Esclavos 6 Departamento; film 1389438, item 2	Slave registry
1872	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 123; film 1506815, item 1	Matricula
1872	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 108; film 1667374, item 4	Declarations
1872	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 139; film 1667537, item 3	Declarations, summaries
1872	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 139; film 1667537, item 3	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1872	Archivo de Caguas, Decula de Empadronamiento, caja 142; film 1667538, item 2	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1872	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 56a, legajo 58; film 1667030, item 18	Declarations
1873 (1872)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 103; film 1511631, item 1	Summaries
1873 (1872)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Summaries
1873 (1872)	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 55, legajo 57; film 1667030, item 17	Declarations
1873 (1872)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 41; film 1511663, item 4	Declarations
1873 (1872)	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 56b, legajo 58; film 1667030, item 19	Declarations
1873	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 105; film 1511631, item 3	Declarations, summaries
1874 (1873)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 13; film 1506815, item 5	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 41; film 1511663, item 4	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 139; film 1667537, item 3	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511845, item 1	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1874 (1873)	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 56b, legajo 58; film 1667030, item 19	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 108; film 1667374, item 4	Declarations
1874 (1873)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 109; film 1667374, item 5	Declarations
1874	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 123; film 1506815, item 1	Summaries
1875 (1874)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 105; film 1511631, item 3	Summaries
1875 (1874)	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 56b, legajo 58; film 1667030, item 19	Declarations
1875	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 123; film 1506815, item 1	Summaries
1875	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 86; film 1511645, item 4	Summaries
1876 (1875)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 105; film 1511631, item 3	Summaries
1876	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 123; film 1506815, item 1	Summaries
1876	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Utuado, caja 42; film 1511699, item 4	Summaries
1876	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 105; film 1511631, item 3	Summaries
1877 (1876)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Utuado, caja 42; film 1511699, item 4	Summaries
1877 (1876)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Summaries

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1877 (1876)	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo de Almas, caja 56b, legajo 58; film 1667030, item 19	Declarations
1877	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Utuado, caja 42; film 1511699, item 4	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 87; film 1511645, item 5	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Utuado, caja 42; film 1511699, item 4	Published declaration
1877/1878	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 98; film 1667350, item 5	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 140; film 1667537, item 4	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 36; film 1511709, item 8	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 88; film 1511645, item 6	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 90; film 1511657, item 1	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 90; film 1511657, item 2	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1877/1878	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 90; film 1511657, item 3	Declarations, summaries
1877/1878	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 79; film 1667324, item 3	Declarations
1877/1878	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 107; film 1667374, item 3	Declarations
1878 (1877)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 106; film 1511631, item 4	Summaries

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1879 (1878)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 106; film 1511631, item 4	Summaries
1880 (1879)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Manati, caja anexo; film 1511845, item 6	Summaries
1880	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 106; film 1511631, item 4	Summaries
1881 (1800)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 91; film 1511657, item 3	Summaries
1881	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Isabela, caja 106; film 1511631, item 4	Summaries
1881	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 6	Summaries
1881	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 141; film 1667537, item 6	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1881	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales Censo, Fajardo, caja 260; film 1506888, item 8	Summaries
1882 (1881)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 48; film 1506817, item 8	Summaries
1882 (1881)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 91; film 1511657, item 3	Summaries
1882	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 4; film 1667254, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1882	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 80; film 1667324, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1882	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 10; film 1667254, item 10	Declarations (*vecinos*)

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1882/1883	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juana Diaz, caja 35; film 1511834, item 1	Declarations
1883	Archivo de Caguas, Decula de Empadronamiento, caja 142; film 1667538, item 2	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1883	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 144; film 1667538, item 5	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1883	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 7; film 1667254, item 7	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1883	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 11; film 1667254, item 11	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1884 (1883)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 91; film 1511657, item 3	Summaries
1884	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 15; film 1667254, item 15	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1885 (1884)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 58; film 1667297, item 24	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1885 (1884)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 58; film 1667297, item 25	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1885 (1884)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 91; film 1511657, item 3	Summaries
1887 (1886)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 91; film 1511657, item 3	Summaries
1887	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 60; film 1667297, item 26	Summaries
1888 (1887)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 90; film 1511657, item 3	Tallies
1888	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Juncos, Documentos Municipales, Censo, caja 91; film 1511657, item 3	Summaries
1888	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 108; film 1667374, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1889 (1890)	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 3; film 1667254, item 3	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1890 (1889)	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 13; film 1667254, item 13	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1890 (1889)	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 16; film 1667254, item 16	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1890 (1889)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 108; film 1667374, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1890 (1891)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 99; film 1667350, item 6	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1891 (1890)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 81; film 1667324, item 5	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1891 (1890)	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 17; film 1667254, item 17	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1891 (1890)	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 18; film 1667254, item 18	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1891	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo General, caja 411a, legajo 441; film 1667117, item 1	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1891	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo General, caja 411a, legajo 441; film 1667117, item 2	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1891	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Censo General, caja 411a, legajo 441; film 1667117, item 3	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1892 (1891)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 143; film 1667538, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1892	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 143; film 1667538, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1892	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 144; film 1667538, item 5	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1893 (1892)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 143; film 1667538, item 4	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1894 (1893)	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 144; film 1667538, item 5	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1894	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 145; film 1667538, item 6	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1894	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 12; film 1667254, item 12	Declarations (*vecinos*)

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1895	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 145; film 1667538, item 6	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1896	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Summaries
1896	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 6	Summaries
1896	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511845, item 1	Summaries
1896	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Almas, caja 105; film 1667374, item 1	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1897	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Camuy, caja 124; film 1506815, item 2	Declarations, summaries
1897	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Summaries
1897/1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 261; film 1506818, item 6	Instructions for collecting information
1897/1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Fajardo, caja 260; film 1506888, item 8	Instructions for collecting information
1897 (1898)	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Comerio, caja 12; film 1511845, item 1	Summaries
1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Lares, caja 37; film 1511709, item 9	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 93; film 1511657, item 5	Declarations, tallies
1897/1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 94; film 1511657, item 6	Declarations

(*continued*)

Table A.1 (continued)

Date of document (date of redaction, if different)	*Source*	*Description*
1897/1898	Archivo Historico de Ponce, Padron de Vecinos, libro 4; film 1667026, item 1	Declarations (*vecinos*)
1897/1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 95; film 1511663, item 1	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo, Juncos, caja 96; film 1511663, item 2	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 19; film 1667254, item 19	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo de Caguas, Padron Habitantes y Censo de Almas, caja 20; film 1667254, item 20	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 101; film 1667350, item 8	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 102; film 1667350, item 9	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 106; film 1667374, item 2	Declarations
1897/1898	Archivo de Caguas, Censo de Poblacion, caja 150; film 1667559, item 2	Declarations
1898	Archivo General de Puerto Rico, Documentos Municipales, Censo de Habitantes, Comerio, caja 12; film 1506815, item 4	Summaries

References

Abbad y Lasierra, Fray Iñigo. [1788] 1866. *Historia geográfica, civil y natural de la Isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto-Rico,* ed. José Julián de Acosta y Calbo. Puerto Rico: Imprenta y Librería de Acosta.

Acosta y Calbo, José Julián de, ed. 1866. *Historia geográfica, civil y natural de la Isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto-Rico,* by Fray Iñigo Abbad y Lasierra. *Nueva edicion, anotada en la parte histórica y continuada en la estadística y económica*. Puerto Rico: Imprenta y Librería de Acosta.

Ahmed, Patricia, Cynthia Feliciano, and Rebecca Jean Emigh. 2007. Internal and external ethnic assessments in Eastern Europe. *Social Forces* 86 (1): 231–255.

Allen, Reuben. 2015. Alternative methods to enumerate data on race in Puerto Rico. *Social Science Quarterly* 96 (2): 608–628.

Álvarez Nazario, Manuel. 1974. *El elemento afronegroide en el español de Puerto Rico: Contribución al estudio del negro en América*. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.

Anderson, Benedict. [1983] 1991. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso.

Anderson, Elisabeth. 2018. Policy entrepreneurs and the origins of the regulatory welfare state: Child labor reform in nineteenth-century Europe. *American Sociological Review* 83 (1): 173–211.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Asad, Talal. 1994. Ethnographic representation, statistics and modern power. *Social Research* 61 (1): 55–88.

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8

Balogh, Brian. 2009. *A government out of sight: The mystery of national authority in nineteenth-century America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2015. *The associational state: American governance in the twentieth century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Barnard, Alex V. 2019. Bureaucratically split personalities: (Re)ordering the mentally disordered in the French State. *Theory and Society* 48 (5): 753–784.

Barreiro, José. 2006. Taíno survivals: Cacique Panchito, Caridad de los Indios, Cuba. In *Indigenous resurgence in the contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian survival and revival*, ed. Maximilian C. Forte, 21–39. New York: Peter Lang.

Bayly, C.A. 1996. *Empire and information: Intelligence gathering and social communication in India, 1780–1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, Claudette. 2000. Racial categories used in the decennial censuses, 1790 to the present. *Government Information Quarterly* 17 (2): 161–180.

Berbusse, Edward J., S.J. 1966. *The United States in Puerto Rico, 1898–1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bergad, Laird W. 1983. *Coffee and the growth of agrarian capitalism in nineteenth-century Puerto Rico*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Berkowitz, Susan, and Lynda Brudvig. 2001a. Puerto Rico focus groups on the Census 2000 race and ethnicity questions. *Census 2000 Evaluation B.13, July 17, 2001*. Census 2000 Topic Reports and Corresponding Evaluation Reports. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau. https://www.census.gov/pred/www/eval_top_rpts.htm. Accessed 2 Aug 2019.

———. 2001b. Puerto Rico focus groups on why households did not mail back the Census 2000 questionnaire. *Census 2000 Evaluation A.8, July 17, 2001*. Census 2000 Topic Reports and Corresponding Evaluation Reports. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau. https://www.census.gov/pred/www/eval_top_rpts.htm. Accessed 2 Aug 2019.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1999. The essential social fact of race. *American Sociological Review* 64 (6): 899–906.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and David R. Dietrich. 2008. The Latin Americanization of racial stratification in the U.S. In *Racism in the 21st century: An empirical analysis of skin color*, ed. Ronald E. Hall, 151–170. New York: Springer.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. Rethinking the state: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field. Trans. Loïc J. D. Wacquant and Samar Farage. In *State/culture: State-formation after the cultural turn*, ed. George Steinmetz, 53–75. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. [1997] 2000. *Pascalian meditations*. Trans. Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. 2012. *Sur l'état: Cours au collège de France, 1989–1992*. Paris: Raisons d'agir/ Seuil.

Brau, Salvador. [1907] 1966. *La colonización de Puerto Rico: Desde el descubrimiento de la isla hasta la reversión a la corona española de los privilegios*

de Colón, ed. Isabel Gutiérrez del Arroyo. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.
———. [1904] 1978. *Historia de Puerto Rico*. San Juan: Editorial Edil, Inc.
Browning, David G. 1974a. Distribution and structure of the population of the Spanish empire, 1760–1800: Identification and retrieval of data. Paper Presented at the XLI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Mexico City, September 2–7, 1974.
———. 1974b. Preliminary comments on the 1776 population census of the Spanish empire. *Bulletin of the Society for Latin American Studies* 19 (January): 5–13.
Browning, D.G., and D.J. Robinson. 1976. Census legacy from the Spanish empire. *The Geographical Magazine* 48 (4): 225–230.
Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. 2000. Beyond 'Identity.' *Theory and Society* 29 (1): 1–47.
Bruno, Isabelle, and Emmanuel Didier. 2013. *Benchmarking: l'État sous pression statistique*. Paris: Zones.
Burawoy, Michael. 1989. Two methods in search of a science: Skocpol versus Trotsky. *Theory and Society* 18 (6): 759–805.
Campbell, Michael C., and Heather Schoenfeld. 2013. The transformation of America's penal order: A historicized political sociology of punishment. *American Journal of Sociology* 118 (5): 1375–1423.
Carrasquillo, Rosa E. 2006. *Our landless patria: Marginal citizenship and race in Caguas, Puerto Rico, 1880–1910*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Carroll, Patrick. 2006. *Science, culture, and modern state formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Carruthers, Bruce G., and Wendy Nelson Espeland. 1991. Accounting for rationality: Double-entry bookkeeping and the rhetoric of economic rationality. *American Journal of Sociology* 97 (1): 31–69.
Cassedy, James H. 1969. *Demography in early America: Beginnings of the statistical mind, 1600–1800*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Centeno, Miguel Angel. 2002. *Blood and debt: War and the nation-state in Latin America*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Centeno, Miguel Angel, Atul Kohli, and Deborah J. Yashar. 2017. Unpacking states in the developing world: Capacity, performance, and politics. In *States in the developing world*, ed. Miguel Centeno, Atul Kohli, and Deborah J. Yashar, with Dinsha Mistree, 1–31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Chinea, Jorge L. 1996. Race, colonial exploitation and West Indian immigration in nineteenth-century Puerto Rico, 1800–1850. *The Americas* 52 (4): 495–519.
Clanchy, M.T. [1979] 1993. *From memory to written record: England 1066–1307*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Clemens, Elisabeth S. 2006. Lineages of the Rube Goldberg state: Building and blurring public programs, 1900–1940. In *Rethinking political institutions: The*

art of the state, ed. Ian Shapiro, Stephen Skowronek, and Daniel Galvin, 187–215. New York: New York University Press.

Cobas, José A., Jorge Duany, and Joe R. Feagin. 2009. Racializing Latinos: Historical background and current forms. In *How the United States racializes Latinos: White hegemony and its consequences*, ed. José A. Cobas, Jorge Duany, and Joe R. Feagin, 1–14. Boulder: Paradigm.

Cohen, Patricia Cline. 1982. *A calculating people: The spread of numeracy in early America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohn, Bernard S. 1987. The census, social structure and objectification in South Asia. In *An anthropologist among the historians and other essays*, ed. Bernard S. Cohn, 224–254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coll y Toste, Cayetano. [1899] 2003. *Reseña del estado social, económico e industrial de la isla de Puerto-Rico al tomar posesión de ella los Estados-Unidos.* [Puerto Rico]: Academia Puertorriqueña de la Historia.

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 1991. *Of revelation and revolution: Christianity, colonialism, and consciousness in South Africa*. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Córdova, Pedro Tomás de. 1832. *Memorias geográficas, históricas, económicas y estadísticas de la isla de Puerto-Rico.* Vols. 3 and 4. [Puerto Rico]: D. Valeriano de Sanmillan.

Cruz-Janzen, Marta I. 2001. Latinegras: Desired women—Undesirable mothers, daughters, sisters, and wives. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 22 (3): 168–183.

Curtis, Bruce. 2001. *The politics of population: State formation, statistics, and the census of Canada, 1840–1875.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2002. Foucault on governmentality and population: The impossible discovery. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 27 (4): 505–533.

Curtis, Katherine J., and Francisco Scarano. 2011. Puerto Rico's population *padrones*, 1779–1802. *Latin American Research Review* 46 (2): 200–213.

Damiani Cósimi, Julio. 1994. *Estratificación social, esclavos y naborías en el Puerto Rico minero del siglo XVI: La información de Francisco Manuel de Lando; ensayo de cuantificación y transcripción paleográfica*. Cuadernos de investigación histórica, número 1. San Juan: Departamento de Historia, Centro de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Dandeker, Christopher. 1990. *Surveillance, power and modernity: Bureaucracy and discipline from 1700 to the present day.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Denevan, William M. [1976] 1992. Glossary. In *The native population of the Americas in 1492,* ed. William M. Denevan, 295–298. 2nd ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Desrosières, Alain. 1998. *The politics of large numbers: A history of statistical reasoning*. Trans. Camille Naish. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dietz, James L. 1986. *Economic history of Puerto Rico: Institutional change and capitalist development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Dillon, Lisa. 2005. Making a nation. The 1666, 1667, and 1681 censuses of Québec. In *Manntalið 1703: þrjú hundruð ára; Greinar í tilefni afmælis*, ed. Ólöf Garðarsdóttir and Eiríkur G. Guðmundsson, 39–49. Reykjavik: Hagstofa Íslands.
Dirks, Nicholas B. 2001. *Castes of minds: Colonialism and the making of modern India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Duany, Jorge. 1985. Ethnicity in the Spanish Caribbean: Notes on the consolidation of Creole identity in Cuba and Puerto Rico, 1762–1868. *Ethnic Groups* 6 (2–3): 99–123.
———. 2002. *The Puerto Rican nation on the move: Identities on the island and in the United States*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Dungy, Kathryn R. 2005. Live and let live: Native and immigrant free people of color in early nineteenth century Puerto Rico. *Caribbean Studies* 33 (1): 79–111.
Emigh, Rebecca Jean. 1997. The power of negative thinking: The use of negative case methodology in the development of sociological theory. *Theory and Society* 26 (5): 649–684.
———. 2002. Numeracy or enumeration? The uses of numbers by states and societies. *Social Science History* 26 (4): 653–698.
Emigh, Rebecca Jean, Dylan Riley, and Patricia Ahmed. 2015. The racialization of legal categories in the first U.S. Census. *Social Science History* 39 (4): 485–519.
———. 2016a. *How societies and states count*. Vol. 1, *Antecedents of censuses from medieval to nation states*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
———. 2016b. *How societies and states count*. Vol. 2, *Changes in censuses from imperialist to welfare States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Enamorado Cuesta, José. [1929] 1975. *Porto Rico, past and present: The island after thirty years of American rule*. New York: Arno Press.
Epstein, Steven. 2007. *Inclusion: The politics of difference in medical research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Espeland, Wendy Nelson, and Mitchell L. Stevens. 1998. Commensuration as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 313–343.
———. 2008. A sociology of quantification. *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 49 (3): 401–436.
Estevez, Jorge. 2008. Amerindian mtDNA in Puerto Rico: When does DNA matter? *Centro Journal* 20 (2): 219–228.
Fairbrother, Malcolm. 2014. Economists, capitalists, and the making of globalization: North American free trade in comparative-historical perspective. *American Journal of Sociology* 119 (5): 1324–1379.
Fernandez Cobo, Mariana, David V. Jobes, Richard Yanagihara, Vivek R. Nerurkar, Yasuhiro Yamamura, Caroline F. Ryschkewitsch, and Gerald L. Stoner. 2001. Reconstructing population history using JC virus: Amerinds, Spanish, and

Africans in the ancestry of modern Puerto Ricans. *Human Biology* 73 (3): 385–402.

Figueroa Mercado, Loida. 1972. *History of Puerto Rico: From the beginning to the 1892.* New York: Anaya Book Co, Inc.

Findlay, Eileen J. Suárez. 1999. *Imposing decency: The politics of sexuality and race in Puerto Rico, 1870–1920.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Flinter, George D. 1834. *An account of the present state of the island of Puerto Rico. Comprising numerous original facts and documents illustrative of the state of commerce and agriculture, and of the condition, moral and physical, of the various classes of the population in that island, as compared with the colonies of other European powers; Demonstrating the superiority of the Spanish slave code,—The great advantages of free over slave labour, &c.* London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman.

Foucault, Michel. [1976] 1978. *The history of sexuality.* Vol. 1, *An introduction.* Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.

———. [1975] 1979. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.

———. 1991. Governmentality, ed. Pasquale Pasquino. In *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 87–104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. [2004] 2007. *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*, ed. Michel Senellart. Trans. Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fundación Puertorriqueña de las Humanidades. 2009. Vecino. *Enciclopedia de Puerto Rico.* Fundación Puertorriqueña de las Humanidades. http://www.enciclopediapr.org/ing/glosario_article.cfm?ref=07121901. Accessed 30 July 2009.

Go, Julian. 2008. *American empire and the politics of meaning: Elite political cultures in the Philippines and Puerto Rico during U.S. colonialism.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Godreau, Isar P. 2008. Slippery semantics: Race talk and everyday uses of racial terminology in Puerto Rico. *Centro Journal* 20 (2): 5–33.

———. 2015. *Scripts of blackness: Race, cultural nationalism, and U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Goldthorpe, John H. 2000. *On sociology: Numbers, narratives, and the integration of research and theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

González Burchard, Esteban, Luisa N. Borrell, Shweta Choudhry, Mariam Naqvi, Hui-Ju Tsai, Jose R. Rodriguez-Santana, Rocio Chapela, Scott D. Rogers, Rui Mei, William Rodriguez-Cintron, Jose F. Arena, Rick Kittles, Eliseo J. Perez-Stable, Elad Ziv, and Neil Risch. 2005. Latino populations: A unique opportunity for the study of race, genetics, and social environment in

epidemiological research. *American Journal of Public Health* 95 (12): 2161–2168.

González-Mendoza, Juan R. 1989. The Parish of San Germán de Auxerre in Puerto Rico, 1765–1850: Patterns of settlement and development. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Goody, Jack, and Ian Watt. 1963. The consequences of literacy. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5 (3): 304–345.

Gordon, Maxine W. 1949. Race patterns and prejudice in Puerto Rico. *American Sociological Review* 14 (2): 294–301.

Gorski, Philip S. 2004. The poverty of deductivism: A constructive realist model of sociological explanation. *Sociological Methodology* 34 (1): 1–33.

Goyer, Doreen S., and Eliane Domschke. 1983. *The handbook of national population censuses: Latin America and the Caribbean, North America, and Oceania*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Gravlee, Clarence C. 2005. Ethnic classification in Southeastern Puerto Rico: The cultural model of 'color.' *Social Forces* 83 (3): 949–970.

Grose, Howard B. 1910. *Advance in the Antilles: The new era in Cuba and Porto Rico*. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society.

Guerra, Lillian. 1998. *Popular expression and national identity in Puerto Rico: The struggle for self, community, and nation*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Guitar, Lynne, Pedro Ferbel-Azcarate, and Jorge Estevez. 2006. Ocama-Daca Taíno (Hear me, I am Taíno): Taíno survival on Hispaniola, focusing on the Dominican Republic. In *Indigenous resurgence in the contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian survival and revival*, ed. Maximilian C. Forte, 41–67. New York: Peter Lang.

Hacking, Ian. 1990. *The taming of chance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halacy, Dan. 1980. *Census: 190 years of counting America*. New York: Elsevier/ Nelson Books.

Hannah, Matthew G. 2000. *Governmentality and the mastery of territory in nineteenth-century America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haslip-Viera, Gabriel. 2006. The politics of Taíno revivalism: The insignificance of Amerindian mtDNA in the population history of Puerto Ricans. A comment on recent research. *Centro Journal* 18 (1): 261–275.

———. 2008. Amerindian mtDNA does not matter: A reply to Jorge Estevez and the privileging of Taíno identity in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean. *Centro Journal* 20 (2): 228–237.

Hernández Hiraldo, Samiri. 2006. *Black Puerto Rican identity and religious experience*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Higgs, Edward. 2004. *The information state in England: The central collection of information on citizens since 1500*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2005. *Making sense of the census revisited: Census records for England and Wales 1801–1901: A handbook for historical researchers*. London: Institute of Historical Research in conjunction with National Archives of the UK.

Hirschman, Charles. 1987. The meaning and measurement of ethnicity in Malaysia: An analysis of census classifications. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46 (3): 555–582.

Instituto Geográfico y Estadístico (IGE) (Spain). 1883. *Censo de la población de España, según el empadronamiento hecho en 31 de diciembre de 1877 por la dirección general del Instituto geográfico y estadístico*. Vol. 1. Madrid: La Dirección General del Instituto Geográfico y Estadístico.

———. 1891. *Censo de la población de España según el empadronamiento hecho en 31 de diciembre de 1887 por la dirección general del Instituto geográfico y estadístico*. Vol. 1. Madrid: La Dirección General del Instituto Geográfico y Estadístico.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). 1858. Censo de poblacíon clasificado, de la Isla de Puerto Rico, perteniciente al año de 1854. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística. http://www.ine.es/inebaseweb/pdfDispacher.do?td=191730&ext=.pdf. Accessed 1 Jan 2021.

Joyce, Patrick, and Chandra Mukerji. 2017. The state of things: State history and theory reconfigured. *Theory and Society* 46 (1): 1–19.

Kalpagam, U. 2000. The colonial state and statistical knowledge. *History of the Human Sciences* 13 (2): 37–55.

Kertzer, David I., and Dominique Arel. 2002. Censuses, identity formation, and the struggle for political power. In *Census and identity: The politics of race, ethnicity, and language in national censuses*, ed. David I. Kertzer and Dominique Arel, 1–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kinsbruner, Jay. 1996. *Not of pure blood: The free people of color and racial prejudice in nineteenth-century Puerto Rico*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kiser, Edgar. 1996. The revival of narrative in historical sociology: What rational choice theory can contribute. *Politics and Society* 24 (3): 249–271.

Landale, Nancy S., and R.S. Oropesa. 2002. White, Black, or Puerto Rican? Racial self-identification among mainland and island Puerto Ricans. *Social Forces* 81 (1): 231–254.

Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Lloréns, Hilda. 2018a. Beyond blanqueamiento: Black affirmation in contemporary Puerto Rico. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 13 (2): 157–178.

———. 2018b. Identity practices: Racial passing, gender, and racial purity in Puerto Rico. *Afro-Hispanic Review* 37 (1): 29–47.

López, Adalberto. 1974a. The beginnings of colonization: Puerto Rico, 1493–1800. In *Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in history and society*, ed.

Adalberto López and James Petras, 12–41. New York: Schenkman Publishing Company.

———. 1974b. Socio-political developments in a colonial context: Puerto Rico in the nineteenth century. In *Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in history and society*, ed. Adalberto López and James Petras, 42–86. New York: Schenkman Publishing Company.

López, Irene. 2008. Puerto Rican phenotype: Understanding its historical underpinnings and psychological associations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 30 (2): 161–180.

Loveman, Mara. 2005. The modern state and the primitive accumulation of symbolic power. *American Journal of Sociology* 110 (6): 1651–1683.

———. 2007. The U.S. census and the contested rules of racial classification in early twentieth-century Puerto Rico. *Caribbean Studies* 35 (2): 13–47.

———. 2014. *National colors: Racial classification and the state in Latin America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loveman, Mara, and Jeronimo O. Muniz. 2007. How Puerto Rico became White: Boundary dynamics and intercensus racial reclassification. *American Sociological Review* 72 (6): 915–939.

Luft, Aliza, and Susan Thomson. 2021. Race, nation, and resistance to state symbolic power in Rwanda since the 1994 genocide. *Political Power and Social Theory* 38: 103–132.

Mahoney, James. 2003. Strategies of causal assessment in comparative historical analysis. In *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*, ed. James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, 337–372. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maldonado-Denis, Manuel. 1972. *Puerto Rico: A socio-historic interpretation*. Trans. Elena Vialo. New York: Random House.

Mann, Michael. 1993. *The sources of social power*. Vol. 2, *The rise of classes and nation states, 1760–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martínez-Cruzado, Juan C., Gladys Toro-Labrador, Jorge Viera-Vera, Michelle Y. Rivera-Vega, Jennifer Startek, Magda Latorre-Esteves, Alicia Román-Colón, Rebecca Rivera-Torres, Iris Y. Navarro-Millán, Enid Gómez-Sánchez, Héctor Y. Caro-González, and Patricia Valencia-Rivera. 2005. Reconstructing the population history of Puerto Rico by means of mtDNA phylogeographic analysis. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 128 (1): 131–155.

Mayrl, Damon, and Sarah Quinn. 2016. Defining the state from within: Boundaries, schemas, and associational policymaking. *Sociological Theory* 34 (1): 1–26.

Meadow, Tey. 2010. 'A rose is a rose': On producing legal gender classifications. *Gender and Society* 24 (6): 814–837.

Mettler, Suzanne. 2011. *The submerged state: How invisible government policies undermine American democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mill, John Stuart. [1843] 1950. *John Stuart Mill's philosophy of scientific method*, ed. Ernest Nagel. New York: Hafner Publishing Company.
Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose. 1990. Governing economic life. *Economy and Society* 19 (1): 1–31.
Mintz, Sidney W. 1953. The culture history of a Puerto Rican sugar cane plantation: 1876–1949. *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 33 (2): 224–251.
Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. The limits of the state: Beyond statist approaches and their critics. *The American Political Science Review* 85 (1): 77–96.
———. 1999. Society, economy, and the state effect. In *State/culture: State formation after the cultural turn*, ed. George Steinmetz, 76–97. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
———. 2002. *Rule of experts: Egypt, techno-politics, modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Molinié-Bertrand, Annie. 1985. *Au siècle d'Or l'Espange et ses hommes: La population du Royaume de Castille au XVIe siècle*. Paris: Economica.
Mora, G. Cristina. 2014a. Cross-field effects and ethnic classification: The institutionalization of Hispanic panethnicity, 1965 to 1990. *American Sociological Review* 79 (2): 183–210.
———. 2014b. *Making Hispanics: How activists, bureaucrats, and media constructed a new American*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Morales Carrión, Arturo. 1983. *Puerto Rico: A political and cultural history*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
Morris, Nancy. 1995. *Puerto Rico: Culture, politics, and identity*. Westport: Praeger.
Morse, Richard M. 1984. The urban development of colonial Spanish America. In *The Cambridge history of Latin America*. Vol. 2, *Colonial Latin America*, ed. Leslie Bethell, 67–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Murdoch, Jonathan, and Neil Ward. 1997. Governmentality and territoriality: The statistical manufacture of Britain's 'national farm.' *Political Geography* 16 (4): 307–324.
Nobles, Melissa. 2000. *Shades of citizenship: Race and the census in modern politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
O'Reylly, Alexandro (Alexander O'Reilly). [1765] 1945. Memoria de D. Alexandro O'Reylly sobre la isla de Puerto-Rico. In *Biblioteca histórica de Puerto-Rico, que contiene varios documentos de los siglos XV, XVI, XVII y XVIII coordinados y anotados*, ed. Alejandro Tapia y Rivera, 526–555. 2nd ed. San Juan: Instituto de Literatura Puertorriqueña.
Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
Ortiz, Altagracia. 1983. *Eighteenth-century reforms in the Caribbean: Miguel de Muesas, governor of Puerto Rico, 1769–76*. East Brunswick: Associated University Presses, Inc.

Ostler, Jeffrey. 2002. Review of Matthew G. Hannah, *Governmentality and the mastery of territory in nineteenth-century America*. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 33 (2): 312–313.

Patriarca, Silvana. 1996. *Numbers and nationhood: Writing statistics in nineteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peabody, Norbert. 2001. Cents, sense, census: Human inventories in late precolonial and early colonial India. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43 (4): 819–850.

Porter, Theodore M. 1995. *Trust in numbers: The pursuit of objectivity in science in public life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Przeworski, Adam, and Henry Teune. 1970. *The logic of comparative social inquiry*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Puerto Rico Comision de estadistica especial., and Paulino García y Rayo. 1861. *Memoria referente a la estadistica de la isla de Puerto-Rico, espresiva de las operaciones practicadas para llevar a cabo el censo de poblacion que ha tenido lugar en la noche del 25 al 26 de diciembre de 1860: Adiccionada con la descripcion geográfica, histórica, física, y política de la enunciada isla; y su dependiente la de Vieques*. Puerto Rico: D.I. Guasp.

Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration. 1937. *Census of Puerto Rico: 1935. Population*. Bulletin no. 2, *Characteristics of the population including occupations*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Quijano, Anibal. 2000. Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South* 1 (3): 533–580.

Quintero Rivera, Angel G. 1974. Background to the emergence of imperialist capitalism in Puerto Rico. In *Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in history and society*, ed. Adalberto López and James Petras, 87–117. New York: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Reher, David-Sven, and Ángeles Valero Lobo (with José V. García Sestafe). 1995. *Fuentes de información demográfica en España*. *Cuadernos metodológicos* 13. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Restall, Matthew. 2003. *Seven myths of the Spanish conquest*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riley, Dylan, and Juan J. Fernández. 2014. Beyond strong and weak: Rethinking postdictatorship civil societies. *American Journal of Sociology* 120 (2): 432–503.

Riley, Dylan, Patricia Ahmed, and Rebecca Jean Emigh. 2021. Getting real: Heuristics in sociological knowledge. *Theory and Society* 50 (2): 315–356.

Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L., and Carlos E. Santiago. 1996. *Island paradox: Puerto Rico in the 1990s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rivero, Yeidy M. 2005. *Tuning out blackness: Race and nation in the history of Puerto Rican television*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Rodríguez, Clara E. 2000. *Changing race: Latinos, the census, and the history of ethnicity in the United States*. New York: New York University Press.

Rodriguez, Clara E., and Hector Cordero-Guzman. 1992. Placing race in context. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15 (4): 523–542.

Rodríguez León, Mario A. 1990. *Los registros parroquiales y la microhistoria demográfica en Puerto Rico*. San Juan: Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico y el Caribe.

Rodríguez-Muñiz, Michael. 2017. Cultivating consent: Nonstate leaders and the orchestration of state legibility. *American Journal of Sociology* 123 (2): 385–425.

Rodríguez-Silva, Ileana M. 2012. *Silencing race: Disentangling blackness, colonialism, and national identities in Puerto Rico*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rogler, Charles C. 1940. *Comerío: A study of a Puerto Rican town*. Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Rose, Nikolas, Pat O'Malley, and Marianna Valverde. 2006. Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2: 83–104.

Rosenblat, Ángel. [1976] 1992. The population of Hispaniola at the time of Columbus. In *The native population of the Americas in 1492*, ed. William M. Denevan, 43–66. 2nd ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Roth, Wendy D. 2012. *Race migrations: Latinos and the cultural transformation of race*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ryskamp, George G. 2002. Spanish censuses of the sixteenth century. *BYU Family Historian* 1 (1): 14–22.

Safa, Helen Icken. 1964. From shanty town to public housing: A comparison of family structure in two urban neighborhoods in Puerto Rico. *Caribbean Studies* 4 (1): 3–12.

Saiani, Paolo Parra. 2012. Democracy and public knowledge: An issue for social indicators. In *Quality of life in Italy: Research and reflections*, ed. Filomena Maggino and Giampaolo Nuvolati, 225–242. Dordrecht: Springer.

Sánchez-Albornoz, Nicolás. 1974. *The population of Latin America: A history*. Trans. W.A.R. Richardson. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sánchez-Matamoros, Juan Baños, Fernando Gutiérrez Hidalgo, Concha Álvarez-Dardet Espejo, and Francisco Carrasco Fenech. 2005. Govern (mentality) and accounting: The influence of different enlightenment discourses in two Spanish cases (1761–1777). *Abacus—A Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business Studies* 41 (2): 181–210.

Sauder, Michael, and Wendy Nelson Espeland. 2009. The discipline of rankings: Tight coupling and organizational change. *American Sociological Review* 74 (1): 63–82.

Scarano, Francisco. 1977. Slavery and free labor in the Puerto Rican sugar economy: 1815–1873. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 292 (1): 553–563.

Scarano, Francisco A. 1989. Congregate and control: The peasantry and labor coercion in Puerto Rico before the age of sugar, 1750–1820. *New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 63 (1/2): 23–40.

———. 1996. The *jíbaro* masquerade and the subaltern politics of Creole identity formation in Puerto Rico, 1745–1823. *The American Historical Review* 101 (5): 1398–1431.

Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. 2006. *The conquest of history: Spanish colonialism and national histories in the nineteenth century*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Schware, Robert. 1981. *Quantification in the history of political thought: Toward a qualitative approach*. Westport: Greenwood.

Schweber, Libby. 2006. *Disciplining statistics: Demography and vital statistics in France and England, 1830–1885*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Seda Bonilla, E. 1961. Social structure and race relations. *Social Forces* 40 (2): 141–148.

Sepúlveda-Rivera, Aníbal. 1986. San Juan de Puerto Rico: Growth of a Caribbean capital city. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.

Sereno, Renzo. 1947. Cryptomelanism: A study of color relations and personal insecurity in Puerto Rico. *Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and the Pathology of Interpersonal Relations* 10 (3): 261–269.

Sewell, William H., Jr. 2005. *Logics of history: Social theory and social transformation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, Martin, and Ian Miles. 1979. The social roots of statistical knowledge. In *Demystifying social statistics*, ed. John Irvine, Ian Miles, and Jeff Evans, 27–38. London: Pluto.

Singer, Brian C.J., and Lorna Weir. 2008. Sovereignty, governance and the political: The problematic of Foucault. *Thesis Eleven* 94 (1): 49–71.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soifer, Hillel. 2008. State infrastructural power: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 43 (3–4): 231–251.

Soifer, Hillel, and Matthias vom Hau. 2008. Unpacking the *strength* of the state: The utility of state infrastructural power. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 43 (3): 219–230.

Stapleford, Thomas A. 2009. *The cost of living in America: A political history of economic statistics, 1880–2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Starr, Paul. 1987. The sociology of official statistics. In *The politics of numbers*, ed. William Alonso and Paul Starr, 7–57. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 1989. Rethinking colonial categories: European communities and the boundaries of rule. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31 (1): 134–161.

Sued Badillo, Jalil. 1995. The theme of the indigenous in the national projects of the Hispanic Caribbean. In *Making alternative histories: The practice of archaeology and history in non-western settings*, ed. Peter R. Schmidt and Thomas C. Patterson, 25–46. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Sussman, Charlotte. 2004. The colonial afterlife of political arithmetic: Swift, demography, and mobile populations. *Cultural Critique* 56 (Winter): 96–126.

Torres, Arlene. 1998. La gran familia Puertorriqueña 'ej prieta de beldá.' (The great Puerto Rican family is really Black). In *Blackness in Latin America and the Caribbean: Social dynamics and cultural transformations*. Vol. 2, *Eastern South America and the Caribbean*, ed. Arlene Torres and Norman E. Whitten Jr., 285–306. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Tsutsui, Kiyoteru. 2017. Human rights and minority activism in Japan: Transformation of movement actorhood and local-global feedback loop. *American Journal of Sociology* 122 (4): 1050–1103.

Urciuoli, Bonnie. 1996. *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Boulder: Westview Press.

US Army, Department of Porto Rico, and George Whitefield Davis. 1900. *Report of Brig. Gen. Geo. W. Davis, U.S.V., on civil affairs of Puerto Rico: 1899*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

US Bureau of the Census. 1880. 1880 Census enumeration forms. From IPUMS USA Documentation, maintained by Steven Ruggles, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center. http://usa.ipums.org/usa/voliii/tEnumForm.shtml. Accessed 8 Jan 2021.

———. 1932. *Fifteenth census of the United States: 1930. Outlying territories and possessions. Number and distribution of inhabitants. Composition and characteristics of the population. Occupations, unemployment and agriculture*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 1940. Forma PR-100: Población—Puerto Rico. *Censo décimosexto de los Estados Unidos: 1940*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 1943. *Sixteenth census of the United States: 1940. Puerto Rico: Population*. Bulletin no. 2, *Characteristics of the population*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 1952a. Forma P93. *Censo de poblacion y viviendas: 1950. Puerto Rico. Principal data collection forms used in the 1950 censuses*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 1952b. *United States census of population: 1950. General characteristics: Puerto Rico. 1950 population census report P-B53. Preprint of Volume II, Part 3, Chapter B*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 1953. *Census of population, 1950*. Vol. 2. *Characteristics of the population, number of inhabitants, general and detailed characteristics of the*

population. Parts 51–54, territories and possessions. Part 53, *Puerto Rico.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 2002. *2000 census of population and housing. Summary population and housing characteristics, PHC-1-53, Puerto Rico: 2000.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 2010. United States census 2010. [Household Declaration]. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

———. 2012. *2000 census of population and housing. Summary population and housing characteristics, CPH-1-53, Puerto Rico: 2010.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

US War Department. 1900. *Census of Porto Rico: Taken under the direction of the War Department, U.S.A.* Bulletins no. 1–3 [June 11–August 29, 1900]. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

US War Department, Office Director Census of Porto Rico, Lt. Col. J. P. Sanger, Henry Gannett, and Walter F. Willcox. 1900. *Report on the census of Porto Rico, 1899.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Vargas-Ramos, Carlos. 2005. Black, trigueño, white…? Shifting racial identification among Puerto Ricans. *Du Bois Review* 2 (2): 267–285.

Vázquez Calzada, José L. 1988. *La población de Puerto Rico y su trayectoria histórica*. Río Piedras: Escuela Graduada de Salud Pública, Recinto de Ciencias Médicas, Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*, ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Trans. Ephraim Fischoff, et al. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wessman, James W. 1980. The demographic structure of slavery in Puerto Rico: Some aspects of agrarian capitalism in the late nineteenth century. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 12 (2): 271–289.

Index

A
Activists, 14
Actor-network theory, 5
African and Indigenous descent, 63
African heritage, 56
Age (classification), 32, 34, 38, 40–42, 50
Agriculture, 26, 34, 46
  production, 26, 27, 29, 32
Americanization, 50
American rule, 52
Ancestry, 54, 55
Anti-blackness, 2, 45, 48, 56
Army and navy personnel, 41
Attractiveness, 55

B
Biological difference, 21
Biopower, 5
Birthplace, 55
Blackening, 53, 54, 66
Black pride movements, 56
Black slaves, 60
Boundaries, 6
  legal, 9
  state and society, 9
Bourdieu, Pierre, 4–6, 60
British census, 15
British colonizers, 15
British India, 12–15, 20, 64
  caste system, 12, 13, 15
  Hindus, 14, 15
  Mughals, 12–15
Bureaucracies, 4, 5, 7, 8, 15

C
Caguas, 39
Camuy, 39, 41
Capital, symbolic and material, 4
Capitalists, 14
Caribbean, 2, 18, 26, 45
Castas, 28, 37, 38, 42, 43
Categories of thought, 12, 14
Causality, 19, 60, 66

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

R. J. Emigh et al., *How Everyday Forms of Racial Categorization Survived Imperialist Censuses in Puerto Rico*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82518-8

Cédula de vecindad, 40, 41, 46, 57
Census
British census, 12, 13, 64
collection and gathering of information, 2, 4, 5, 11, 13, 18, 19, 27, 40, 47, 64, 65
descriptive, 12, 24, 47
documents, household declarations, 39
ecclesiastical census, 27, 28, 33, 47
household declaration, 21, 33, 34, 37, 39–41
imperialist census, 12, 13, 38–41, 50–58, 63
Indian colonial censuses, 13
information gathering, 8
instructions, 2, 38, 40, 41, 50, 53
interventionist, 12, 32, 42, 47
mercantilist census, 12, 24, 30, 32, 63, 65
Spanish census, 3, 18, 24, 25, 41, 42, 46, 47, 50, 52, 67
summaries, 2, 5, 21, 27, 32–34, 36, 37, 47, 51, 53
takers, 29, 38
US census, 2, 18, 21, 50, 52–54, 56, 57, 64, 68
Children, 24, 32, 53
Church, 57, 61
Catholic, 27
documents, 61
records, 28
Citizenship (classification), 42, 50
Classificatory schemes (schemas), 4, 5, 42, 55, 57, 62, 67
Colonial administration, 32, 33
Colonial administrators, 18
Colonialism, 54, 64
Colonies, 12, 40
Spanish, 24, 26, 32, 33, 42, 46, 47
Colonists, 29, 57, 60–62, 66
Colonization, 11, 24, 27
Colorism, 43, 56
Comerio, 40
Commerce, 26
Commercial production, 32
Conflict, 9
Consciousness, 14
Culture
African and Indigenous, 56
Eurocentric, 24
indigenous, 24
Taíno and African, 24

D

de Lando, Francisco Manuel, 24
De Muesas, Miguel, 32
Deductive (methods), 19
Discrimination, 56
racial, 51
Distinctions
cultural, 21
social, 29, 52

E

Elites, 15, 28, 44, 56
Puerto Rican, 44–47, 52, 57, 61–63, 67
Spanish, 47
Encomienda, system, 25, 26
Ethnicity (classification), 24, 26, 44
Enslaved Africans, 24
Eurocentric culture, 24
European superiority, 26
European, Indigenous, African, 24, 25, 54
Everyday categories, 3, 18, 55, 60, 62
everyday categorizations, 2, 18, 45, 61
lay categories, 7, 9, 13, 14, 22, 61, 63, 66
Eye color, 35

F

Facial features, 2
Fajardo, 34, 39

Fertility, 53
Fiscal information, 42
Foucault, Michel, 5, 7, 9, 11–13, 60

G
Gender categories, 8
Gold, 26
Governance, 5, 12, 66
Governmentality, 11–13

H
Hair, 35, 41
  color, 54
  texture, 2
Havana, 32
Historical conditions, 18, 60, 64
Historical sociology, 19
Household heads (heads of household), 24, 27, 29, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41
Humacao, 41

I
Identity(ies), 13, 14, 55
Ideology, white superiority, 44, 52, 56
Imperialism, 12
  imperialist census, 42
  imperialist power, 57
  imperialist Spanish rule, 18, 47, 61
  imperialist US rule, 18
Inductive (methods), 19, 60
Information intellectuals, 7
Institutions, 5, 9, 14, 28, 47, 57, 61
  social, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 19, 29, 60, 63, 65
  state, 5, 8, 12, 61
Interactive perspective, 6–9, 19, 60
Interests, 14, 15, 44, 46, 48, 68
  elite, 45, 47
  Puerto Rican, 18, 61, 67
  social actors, 8, 15, 67
  social and state actors, 62
  Spaniards, 26, 29, 44, 47, 61, 62
  state actors, 8
Isabela, 25, 33, 35, 38, 39

J
Jíbaro (peasant), 29
Juncos, 39

K
King Charles III, 32, 33
Knowledge, 4–6, 12–14, 18, 42

L
Landowners, 26, 29, 42, 46, 47
Language, 2
Lares, 39
Latin America, 2, 18, 26
Latino (racial category), 55
Latour, Bruno, 5, 7, 60
Laws and rules, 11
Legal categories, 28, 29, 38, 42, 46, 60
Legal status, 3, 25, 27, 32, 34, 37, 39, 47, 48, 62
  and race, 26, 32, 36–39
  recording, 25
Legitimate authority, 4
Literacy (classification), 38–42, 50
Lobbyists, 14

M
Manati, 39
Marital status (classification), 24, 33, 35, 38–42, 50
Media executives, 14
Mental structures, 5
Mercantilism, 12
  mercantilist census, 42
  mercantilist Spanish rule, 18, 29
  merchants, 14, 25, 47

Migration, 45, 46, 53
Military
control, 24
force, 26
invulnerability, 32
outpost, 26, 27
Millian comparative analysis, 19, 60, 66
Mineral production, 32
Mortality, 53

N
Narrative methods, 19–22, 66
Nationalist ideology, 51
Nationality (classification), 3, 24, 26, 27, 35, 37, 38, 40–42, 46, 48, 55, 57
Negative cases, 6, 18

O
Occupation (classification), 35, 38, 40–42, 50
Official categories, 2, 3, 8, 9, 18, 20, 22, 55, 56, 58, 68
official classifications, 2, 56
O'Reilly, Alexander, 32

P
Panoptic, 5
Passing, 56
Physical, characteristics, traits, and appearance, 35, 40–42, 44, 55, 57
Physical, characteristics, types and appearances, 54
Ponce, 25, 39, 46
Popular Democratic Party, 51
Power relations, 7, 15, 16, 60–67
Prejudice, racial and religious, 50
Priests, 29, 33, 47
Prisoners, 41
Profession (classification), 24, 39
Property, 34, 60, 64
holders, 26
owners and ownership, 46
rights, 27, 61
Protonational pride, 46

R
Race, 54
American sociological meaning, 21
binary, 42
continuum, 2, 41–44, 48, 54, 55, 57, 61, 67
dichotomous, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 61, 64
discrete system, 42
fluid, 2, 3, 18, 48, 56, 67
racial markers, 27, 35, 39, 55
rigid system, 14, 44
tripartite; trichotomous, 2, 3, 25, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 67
Racial
categories, 2, 27, 28, 32, 36–38, 41, 42, 45, 50, 52, 57, 58, 61, 64
classification, 20, 25, 35, 42, 44, 50, 56, 67
discrimination, 51
harmony, 51
hierarchy, 43
rigid system, 44
Racial ideology, 44, 45, 48, 52, 54, 56
Spanish, 3, 26, 43, 50
Spanish and American, 2
US, 50, 52, 54
White superiority, 52
Racism, 43, 56
Religion, 40
Religious officials, 14
Residency status, 30
Resistance, 7, 9, 44
Royal administrators, 32
Rural regions (Puerto Rico), 26, 28

S
Secondary literature, 20, 40
Sex (classification), 32, 34, 39–41, 50
Skin, color, 2, 35, 41, 54
Slavery, 25, 39, 41, 44, 46
Smallholders, 30, 46
Smallholding, 27, 46
Social actors, 6, 8, 15, 19, 61, 62, 65
  roles, 3, 14, 60, 66
Social class, 55
Social hierarchy, 30
Social networks, 9
Social standing, 46, 55
Social status, 3, 25, 37, 46, 47, 64
Society-centered perspective, 6–8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 60–63, 65
Socio-economic conditions, 55
Sovereignty, 11, 13
Spanish colonial law, 36–38, 43
Spanish conquest, 24, 30, 61
Spanish crown, 25, 26, 66
Spanish Empire, 18, 38
Spanish Enlightenment, 32, 42
Spanish settlers, 26, 27, 61
State
  effects, 2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 54, 63–66
  governmentality, 11, 12
  imperialist, 13, 16, 61, 62, 64, 67
  limits, 3, 68
  mercantilist, 19, 60
  power, 4, 11, 60, 66
  sovereignty, 11, 12
  strength (strong and weak), 11, 18, 28, 29, 60, 62, 64, 67
State actors, 7, 8, 15, 62, 65, 66
  enumerators, 34–36, 38, 50, 53, 57
  government officials, 6, 33, 47, 50, 52, 53
State-centered perspective, 4–10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 60, 62, 64, 65
States and societies, 10
  interactions, 6, 9
Statistics, sociology of, 4, 67
Stigma, 52
Stratification (social), 3, 37, 42, 43, 45–47, 57, 67
Sugar production, 26
Summary categories, 2, 37, 43

T
Taíno, 24, 27, 29
Taíno and African cultures, 24
Tax
  documents, 29
  exemptions, 45
  information, 13, 28
Taxation, 42
Theory, building, 9
Toponym, 24
Tributary status, 29
Tribute payments, 25, 27, 34, 42

U
Upward social mobility, 3, 44, 46, 48, 54, 56, 58, 68
US annexation, 50
US Empire, 52
Utuado, 39

V
Vecino, 25–30, 33, 34, 37, 40–42, 46, 52, 57, 60–62

W
War, 11
Weber, Max, 4, 5, 60
Whiteness (US definition), 50, 52, 53, 58, 68
Whitening, 44, 45, 52–54, 56, 66, 68
White superiority (ideology), 54
Wives, 24