

6-14-2020

Empire's Informal Ties: Pioneer Anthropologists in Davao, 1904–1916

Patricia Irene; Dacudao

Follow this and additional works at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/phstudies>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dacudao, Patricia Irene; (2020) "Empire's Informal Ties: Pioneer Anthropologists in Davao, 1904–1916," *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints*: Vol. 68: No. 2, Article 3.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13185/2244-1638.1043>

Available at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/phstudies/vol68/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ateneo Journals at Archium Ateneo. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* by an authorized editor of Archium Ateneo.

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Empire's Informal Ties: Pioneer Anthropologists in Davao, 1904–1916s

Patricia Irene Dacudao

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints
vol. 68 no. 2 (2020): 179–209

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted in a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only.

One year after its publication in this journal, the final pdf of this article may be uploaded to the author's institutional repository, provided that this copyright page is retained. Republication of this article or its storage in electronic databases other than as specified above is not allowed without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

For any further use of this work, please contact the publisher at philstudies.soss@ateneo.edu.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

PATRICIA IRENE DACUDAO

Empire's Informal Ties Pioneer Anthropologists in Davao, 1904–1916

The five Americans who studied the indigenous Bagobo people in Davao from 1904 to 1916 did not adhere to the evolutionary anthropology championed by colonial administrator Dean Worcester. Their fieldwork, being either mostly self-supported or through the privately funded Field Museum of Natural History, was also financially independent of the government. This article studies their personal, academic, and professional quests in the context of museum collections, party politics, and changes in the discipline of anthropology. The circumstances of their visits and subsequent publications on Davao show that these pioneers pursued anthropology with a different direction, away from state stereotypes and imperial entanglements.

KEYWORDS: ANTHROPOLOGY • IMPERIALISM • WORLD FAIRS • FIELD MUSEUM • DAVAO HISTORY

In *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, Donald E. Pease (1993, 22) argued that the “emergent sciences of geography, botany and anthropology” played a crucial role in American imperialism, starting with the westward expansion of the US in the nineteenth century. Cultural technologies facilitated colonial rule by “naming, classifying, textualizing, appropriating, exterminating, demarcating and governing” the territories of the US (ibid., 22–23). When the US frontier crossed the Pacific with the annexation of the Philippines in 1898, science continued to serve at the forefront of a formal American empire.¹

However, not all scientific endeavors were formally incorporated into the imperial state itself, especially when such undertakings—such as the anthropological studies on the frontiers of Davao in the southern Philippines—were exploratory in nature and done in the far reaches of the empire.² Although anthropology was a potent cultural tool for the US in “naming” and “classifying” the various inhabitants of the Philippines, not all anthropological projects stemmed from imperial fiat. The archipelago was just too vast and its peoples to be studied simply too numerous and diverse for the state to monitor all visiting anthropologists. Hence, privately funded world fairs and museums, intersecting with the emergent science of anthropology, played important roles in encouraging the quest for new knowledge on the imperial fringes. Personal motivations and private institutions propelled several individuals to go to Davao to study its peoples and their material culture.

These individuals undertook ethnographic visits that often lasted for extended periods of time. These visits had neither government directive nor funding but were welcomed by colonial officials nonetheless. Such informal ties to empire, despite not completely bridging the divide between colonizer and colonized, enabled pioneering anthropologists to live closely among their subjects. Although distinctions that came from both sides of the observer–observed dynamic still existed, the Americans were considered visitors and thus treated hospitably by their subjects and hosts, the local Filipinos.

Using extant letters, memoirs, and photographs to complement secondary sources, I examine the ethnographic journeys of five persons (four women and one man) who ventured to Davao in the context of US imperial rule. The circumstances of their visits are situated against the broader framework of the relationship between anthropology and imperialism, changes in the discipline, museum collections, and colonial

policies. In doing so, I argue that the concept of empire was not the main motivating factor for anthropological studies in Davao. The argument against a monolithic empire with a standardized US colonial anthropology has broader implications when placed against a racialized official Philippine identity constructed by a colonial government supported by the science of anthropology.³ In this context, personal relationships between observer and observed—forged despite the prevailing racial stereotyping—played significant roles in early–twentieth-century ethnographic research in the Philippine peripheries.

Entangled Histories: Anthropology, Empire, and the American Philippines

In many parts of the world, anthropological studies were closely intertwined with empire. Much literature has been written on the relationship of anthropology to colonialism. Indeed, the often-quoted line of Claude Lévi-Strauss, “anthropology as the handmaiden of colonialism,” has generated numerous works for and against the topic (Gough 1967; Conklin 2002; Tilley and Gordon 2007; Lewis 2013; Asch 2015). Anthropology and empire had been so entwined that, even when taking an anticolonial stance, modern-day anthropologists still argue within the paradigm of the colonial period, that is, the power of imperialism over the indigenous groups being studied (Asch 2015, 487). For most of the colonial world, colonial officials were also often the anthropologists; and if they were not, they worked closely with anthropologists.

In French West Africa, anthropologists openly sought the imprimatur of empire and the opportunities it afforded them for the institutionalization of their science (Conklin 2002, 30). Writing about the African experience in general, Helen Tilley (2007, 13) cited Archibald Mafeje’s critique in 1976 of anthropologists as conspiring and/or colluding with imperial powers, with the very “ontology of [their] thought categories” derived from and serving to reinforce the colonial systems. In the British Raj, Edward Said (1993, 152) singled out anthropology among the modern social sciences as the discipline most closely tied to imperialism in India because anthropologists and ethnologists often advised colonial rulers on the “manners and mores of the native people.”

A similar thought has occurred among those who study the history of anthropology in Southeast Asia. Michael Prager (1999, 330) has noted a

direct relationship between Dutch anthropology and colonial policy since the nineteenth century when ethnology as a subject formed part of the training courses for prospective civil servants and military officers in the Netherlands East Indies. Evolutionist anthropology, just like in Britain, was used for, but did not necessarily coincide with, Dutch colonial policy. The relationship between anthropology and colonial policy would lessen when the structuralist trend took root in Leiden during the first two decades of the twentieth century, but even then anthropology still informed the practice of colonial administration in the colonies (ibid., 330–38). In British Malaya, Daniel Goh (2007, 113) has traced state formation from the prevailing evolutionary beliefs of colonial officials who also conducted ethnological studies.

In his comparative study of British Malaya and the Philippines, Goh (ibid., 136) has acknowledged the “ubiquity of the ethnographer-official throughout the colonial world in the imperialist period.” In the initial years of American rule, the Philippine colonial government directly employed anthropologists in the persons of David P. Barrows, Merton L. Miller, and Albert E. Jenks in the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes (ibid., 123). Barrows then went on to head the Department of Public Instruction, the colonial office tasked to educate the inhabitants of the colony (ibid.). From the beginning of American rule, the influential Dean C. Worcester, former University of Michigan zoologist who was a member of the First Philippine Commission (also called the Schurman Commission), used a lot of anthropological theories in his government reports that shaped colonial policy—although he was not trained as an anthropologist. Moreover, Worcester relied on anthropological data to control the inhabitants of the Philippines (Hutterer 1978, 136).

Anthropological and ethnographic studies in the Philippines were conducted primarily by the insular government’s Ethnological Survey, the Bureau of Science, and the Bureau of Census. Significant works by colonial officials during the first decade of American rule included: William A. Reed (1903) on the Negritos, Barrows’s (1905) *Census of the Philippine Islands*, Jenks (1905) on the Bontoc, Najeeb M. Saleeby (1905) on the Moros, and Emerson B. Christie (1909) on the Subanon (Davis and Hollnsteiner 1969, 60). Those who were aided by government connection included Fletcher Gardner (1906, 1907), whose experience as an officer with the rank of major in the US Army in the Philippines between 1904 and 1905 formed the basis

of his collection of Mindoro Tagalog folktales in the *Journal of American Folklore* (ibid.). Fay-Cooper Cole (1908, 1913) published a study on the Tinggian in 1908 and “The Wild Tribes of Davao District” in 1913, while Laura Watson Benedict (1916) published an article on “Bagobo Ceremonial, Magic and Myth.”

Except for Cole and Benedict, all the authors on Philippine ethnology mentioned above worked for the colonial bureaucracy. Although Cole and Benedict received logistical help from the military administration to get around Mindanao, they were not government employees when they first went to Davao. Cole worked for a private institution, the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, and Benedict’s fieldwork in Davao was self-funded. Benedict later accepted a teaching position in the public school system to partially finance her personal ethnological work. She corresponded with Dr. George Dorsey, the Field Museum’s curator of ethnology, who provided her with anthropological advice on fieldwork.

The absence of government personnel conducting a major study on Davao is noteworthy when it concerns the nature of anthropological analysis utilized to study its indigenous peoples. Cole and Benedict used culture as their basis for studying Davao inhabitants rather than the government-preferred assessment of evolutionary anthropology with a focus on race. Evolutionary anthropology was a semiofficial theory in the Philippines because Worcester propagated it in government reports. Starting with the Schurman Commission report in 1900, Philippine inhabitants were depicted as lacking in civilization, a view that influenced subsequent colonial policies.

Worcester authored “The Native Peoples of the Philippines” and “Education” in the report of the Schurman Commission, which was presented before the US Congress in February 1900 (Sullivan 1992, 89). In the first essay Worcester used Frenchman Joseph Montano’s three-wave racial migration theory, mixed with a nineteenth-century American and Victorian social evolutionary paradigm to describe the peoples of the Philippines (Aguilar 2005, 606; Canuday and Porio 2019, 27). In Montano’s theory the Philippines was populated by three distinct races that came in different time periods, the Negritos, the earliest, followed by the Indonesians, then finally the Malays. Worcester attributed certain physical descriptions, attitudes, and characteristics to each group, favoring the Indonesians to be fierce and physically superior and the Negritos as doomed subhumans. Worcester judged the Malaysians, who comprised the hispanized lowland Filipino

majority, as lacking authenticity (Sullivan 1992, 89). The Schurman report colored government publications on race, linguistics, and ethnology with Victorian and American scientific theories on race and social evolution and legitimized the agenda of American colonialism to educate the Filipinos (Canuday and Porio 2019, 27).

However, the anthropological works on Davao tribes would not fall under the purview of government interpretation. Departing from race, Cole and Benedict instead highlighted culture as the basis of analysis in their studies of Davao peoples. It was not surprising that both would choose to study under Franz Boas after accomplishing their anthropological work in Davao. Boas, who made the study of culture scientific, was on his way to developing cultural relativism and was later acknowledged by allies and critics alike to have laid the groundwork for countering racism (Lewis 2001, 448).

Joining Cole and Benedict in their study of Davao indigenous groups were Mabel Cook Cole, who published an anthropological memoir of her Davao sojourn, and the Metcalf sisters, Elizabeth and Sarah, who pioneered Bagobo ethnomusicology. All of them were at different levels of their involvement and expertise in anthropology when they stayed in Davao for fieldwork. From enthusiastic amateurs such as the Metcalf sisters and a dedicated graduate student like Laura Watson Benedict to the professional museum staff Fay-Cooper Cole, accompanied by his perceptive wife, Mabel, all were fascinated with the practices and material culture of the peoples they studied and lived with. Although acknowledging differences between themselves and the indigenous tribes, they respected the latter's unique cultures.

It can be gleaned from these pioneering anthropologists' varied backgrounds and experiences that Worcester's evolutionary theories or, for that matter, the imperial government's did not have a monopoly of interpreting the peoples they had colonized.⁴ Even the St. Louis World's Fair of 1904, the trigger that generated interest in the study of Davao peoples, was a product of a private-civic effort that did not rest on government edict alone, no matter how hard the government or Worcester tried to shape the public's perceptions of the people on display (Vergara 1995, 111–50; Quizon and Afbale 2004, 439–41; Kramer 2006, 229–84).

World Fairs: The Bagobo to America

World fairs—popular events in the US during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—were instrumental in generating public interest on

the frontier province of Davao, particularly its so-called “wild tribes.” Such interests revolved around the habits, material culture, and natural landscape in which these “exotic” peoples lived. Moreover, because world fairs blended entertainment with social scholarship, science, and technology, they generated lasting effects that propelled Americans and their institutions to move westward across the Pacific in search of knowledge and to fulfill a civilizing mission.

When the US acquired the Philippines at the end of the nineteenth century, world fairs were already a hallmark of European imperialism. World expositions, organized by private individuals in partnership with their governments, were staged to inform their public, justify their nation's rule over foreign lands and populations, as well as to entertain. The themes on display usually revolved around national achievements in commerce, science, and technology, alongside a cultural display of other peoples and places or the “savages” often brought from the farthest reaches of an empire. The British started the trend with the “Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations” held at the Crystal Palace in 1851, which was modeled after the national industrial fairs of France established since the eighteenth century (Ozouf 1975, 373). A century later, in celebration of the centennial of its revolution, France held the 1889 “Exposition Universelle” in Paris, where the two most popular attractions were the Eiffel Tower and a troupe of Javanese dancers in an “ethnological” village (Young 2008, 339). This 1889 Paris Exposition, in turn, inspired organizers of the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago to mount several similar village displays, utilizing the new science of anthropology (Rydell 1984, 57).

At the Chicago fairgrounds, statues of a male and female student from Harvard and Radcliffe were strategically placed after the living villages of various American Indian tribes. These statues were meant to depict the “advancement of [the] evolution of man,” signifying the link between savagism and civilization (ibid.). The objects and artefacts displayed in these ethnological villages laid the foundation for the privately funded Field Museum of Natural History, which was opened to the public in 1894 and helped make anthropology well known (ibid.).

Apart from anthropology, the 1893 Chicago fair also placed the discipline of history squarely in the national psyche. In a memorable meeting of the American Historical Association held in conjunction with the fair, Frederick Jackson Turner (1921, 1) presented his now famous frontier thesis. Turner's

thesis enabled the US government and public to blend ambition with history in joining European powers in the game of High Imperialism. In conjunction with evolutionary anthropology popularized by the Chicago fair, the frontier thesis helped rationalize the annexation of the Philippine islands in 1898. As the American frontier expanded across the Pacific to encompass the Davao wilderness, both American soldiers and planters in Davao believed they were bringing the “future steps in progress toward a higher civilization” to the indigenous peoples (Bliss 1907, 32).

By the time the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair was staged, the US was already a Pacific power, and the nation was ready to present a world show. The businessmen-organizers of the St. Louis fair aimed to produce the “largest international exposition the world had ever seen” (Rydell 1984, 157). Staged to commemorate the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase, which doubled the size of the US, the 1904 World’s Fair was nearly twice the size of the Chicago exposition, and its total exhibition space exceeded that of Chicago by more than a third (*ibid.*; Fermin 2004, 16). It had the most extensive anthropology department of any world fair and the full support of the US government (Rydell 1984, 160, 168). Among the fair’s objectives was to utilize the science of anthropology in creating an environment that “made the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and continued overseas economic expansion as much a part of the manifest destiny of the nation as the Louisiana Purchase itself” (*ibid.*, 168).

The main proponent of government support for ethnological studies in the Philippines was the aforementioned Dean C. Worcester, who headed the Department of the Interior. Under his direction, the Ethnological Survey for the Philippine Islands was tasked to document “practically every non-Christian tribe in the archipelago” (Sullivan 1992, 142; Goh 2007, 123–24). The ethnological survey staff assisted in the efforts of the Philippine Exposition Board to transport more than a thousand “native” Filipinos to St. Louis (Fermin 2004, 44). The Filipino contingent, the largest group of human exhibits at the fair, was made to live on the Philippine Reservation, whose name and location across the American Indian display signified the connection between America’s recent past (*i.e.*, the pacification and final settlement of American Indians) and its present and future colonized Filipino peoples (Vergara 1995, 113, 138). The Philippine exhibit was a popular attraction at the fair, with an estimated 99 percent of fairgoers visiting the “reservation” (Rydell 1984, 170).

The Filipino contingent included Igorot, Negrito, and Taosug individuals, who were labeled as “dog-eaters,” “monkey-like,” and “savages” and thus garnered the most attention and curiosity from the American public and newspapers (Fermin 2004, 151–53). The thirty-eight Bagobo⁵ from Davao, living in their “authentic” village and often seen performing musical gongs or weaving intricate textiles, did not escape censure and were depicted in the press as “headhunters” (Rydell 1984, 153).

However, the novelty and artistry of Bagobo material culture was strong enough to attract the keen interest of three female fairgoers and influence their life choices. The sisters Elizabeth and Sarah Metcalf from Worcester, Massachusetts, and Chicago-based anthropology student Laura Watson Benedict consequently journeyed to Davao to learn more about the Bagobo folk whom they initially met in St. Louis. From an institutional standpoint, the display of Filipinos at St. Louis also brought Chicago’s Field Museum of Natural History to the Philippines when another fair visitor, businessman Robert F. Cummings, funded the Field Museum’s first ethnological expedition to the islands. Working for the Cummings Expedition, Fay-Cooper Cole and his wife Mabel completed their Philippine itinerary in Davao while studying its various tribes.

The Metcalf Sisters

Elizabeth and Sarah Metcalf were typical fairgoers, two of the nearly 20 million who visited the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in 1904. The sisters took photographs of the Bagobo folk, posed with and befriended them, and even sympathized with their quarantine troubles due to a smallpox episode during their transpacific journey (Quizon 2004, 529, 532). Elizabeth, who had musical training, was particularly impressed by Bagobo music, which was beautifully played even with damaged gongs (*ibid.*, 531). Thus, the idea of going to Davao to study Bagobo music was formed at St. Louis (Benedict 1907f). Two years later, and after a visit to another world fair in Portland for the 1905 Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition that also exhibited Filipinos, the sisters reached Davao in August 1906 (Quizon 2004, 537).

Elizabeth Metcalf (1906) described Davao as “the southernmost, most valuable and most beautiful of this land.” It was also a place that had recently witnessed its governor, Lt. Edward Bolton, assassinated by an aggrieved tribesman. The sisters were undaunted; they built their house in the village of Santa Cruz, where they intended to stay for a long period (Benedict



Fig. 1. Sarah Metcalf and Bagobo friends in her Mabini Street house, Manila, 1932. Courtesy of the Elizabeth H. and Sarah S. Metcalf Collection, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Neg. No. 88-17235]

1907f). They believed in the pronouncement of Moro Province Gov. Gen. Leonard Wood that it was safe to go out “among the natives,” noting that the assassination was an isolated case as the Davao tribes had never given the Americans or the Spanish trouble before this incident (Metcalf 1906).

The Metcalf siblings’ fearlessness in the face of tribal unrest was anchored in the trust they had in their Bagobo friends. This trust had its roots in St. Louis when the sisters first offered their friendship and sympathy to the visiting Bagobo tribespeople who were then in a foreign land. Now back in their homeland, with the roles reversed, the Bagobo returned this friendship exuberantly. The Bagobo social network enabled the sisters to secure laborers to clear their land and build their house, with their tribal friends Angel and Etting in charge of the work (Metcalf and Metcalf n.d.). The local chief even ordered a new ladder built for their house. The ties between the Metcalfs and their Bagobo friends deepened during the 1908–1909 cholera epidemic in Santa Cruz, when their Bagobo house helpers

refused to leave them during the quarantine period—saying, “If the Señoras can take care of themselves, they will take care of their children” (ibid.).

In Santa Cruz the sisters had frequent opportunities to pursue their study of Bagobo music. Even in their home, the domestic service workers often played their flutes during breaks from chores (ibid.). The sisters’ most impressive musical experience was listening to and watching a performance of the *kulintang*, an instrument comprised of multiple gongs. These musical sessions broke down preconceived racial barriers that represented indigenous music as barbaric. Elizabeth noted as “indescribable” the “magnificent tone colorings” of big gongs played together (MacCurdy 1912, 162).⁶ Sarah recalled to a correspondent for their hometown newspaper that after Elizabeth had listened to a Bagobo musician play on fifteen gongs at one time she “never cared to hear a symphony orchestra again” (Burncoat 1932). The sisters tried to record the *kulintang* music with a phonograph that they had brought with them to Davao, but they had trouble securing good recordings (Benedict 1907f).

Despite their interest in Bagobo music, the Metcalf sisters became known subsequently for their collection of material objects, such as Bagobo textiles, baskets, agricultural implements, and weapons, rather than for their ethnomusicology (Burncoat 1932; Afable 2003, 232–33). They collected a broad range of Bagobo abaca⁷ garments, including textiles utilizing unique weaving techniques as well as Bagobo-made materials that incorporated store-bought cotton cloth (Quizon 2004, 546–47). Their four-year residence in Davao and their close ties with the Bagobo enabled them to gather this unique ethnographic collection. These rare objects of material culture are now housed at the University Museum of Pennsylvania and in the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC (Afable 2003, 232; Quizon 2004, 543).

Living in Santa Cruz, the sisters maintained friendly relations with a small expatriate community comprised of two American planters, a Frenchman and his wife, and the anthropology student, Laura Watson Benedict (Metcalf 1906). Enterprising Americans who they met in Zamboanga encouraged them “to go into abaca in Davao.” But the two ladies resisted making such an investment, reasoning out that they were conservative risk-averse New England people (ibid.). Instead, they considered working in the civil service a more sensible way to earn a living, and Elizabeth worked as a teacher of industrial arts in the Santa Cruz public school in the 1909–1910 school year.

After leaving Davao in 1910, the sisters remained in the Philippines for most of their lives. They relocated to Manila and in 1918 opened on Mabini Street a boutique called The Little Home Shop, which specialized in Philippine textile and cultural artefacts (Afable 2003, 233). Artists and friends interested in Filipiniana frequented their shop and house (Burncoat 1932). Save for two long visits to the US, Elizabeth and Sarah lived in Manila and Baguio until their respective deaths in 1923 and 1939 (Quizon 2004, 538).

Before her death, Sarah was photographed with Bagobo friends at her house in 1932 (fig. 1). The way several Bagobo men beside her rested their arms atop Sarah's chair, even touching her shoulder, revealed the long-standing familiarity they had with the elderly American woman and spoke well of the nature of their decades-long friendship (Burncoat 1932; Quizon 2004, 549).

Laura Watson Benedict

Laura Watson Benedict (1906b) arrived in the village of Santa Cruz during the last quarter of 1906, joining its small foreign community that also included the Metcalf sisters. Santa Cruz, a few hours by launch from the main provincial town of Davao, was originally established as a *reducción*, a settlement for Christianized Bagobo, in the 1880s. By 1906, it was surrounded by American-owned coastal plantations worked by the Bagobo people. As Bagobo enthusiasts, Benedict (1907f) and the Metcalf siblings were acquainted with one another, with the Metcalfs at one point photographing Benedict's collection of Bagobo materials. Although the three women were almost of the same age (in their forties) and they shared similar interests and the St. Louis connection, the time Benedict spent with these "New England ladies," whom she described as "good ladies" but "voluble talkers," was limited (ibid.).

Benedict hardly socialized with other members of the expatriate community in Santa Cruz; she preferred to study and collect Bagobo artefacts by befriending locals and inviting them to her home. The highlight of her Davao stay was witnessing the ceremony that no white person had ever observed before—the multiday Bagobo feast of the *Ginum* at Talun, located in the interior (Benedict 1907d). Although the Bagobo did not prevent her from witnessing the important event, they neither explained anything to her about it nor told her anything concerning the separate little rituals they conducted during the four days of feasting (ibid.).

To augment funds for researching and collecting artefacts, Benedict took a teaching job at the local public school. She was a devoted teacher, leaving for school at 7:30 am daily with only a cup of coffee because she had no time to prepare breakfast. Based on her daily interaction with her Bagobo elementary students, she praised them as the "most brilliant and most interesting lot of children." She compared her Bagobo students favorably with the Visayan youngsters at Davao town, who had their "originality" and "initiative crushed" by Catholic education, and with American boys at Salem, Boston, and San Francisco, who she felt had shorter memories (Benedict 1907a). Her observations shattered the perception of the Bagobo as a backward people.

At her house, which was slightly larger than a hut, she fought a constant battle with ants, termites, and rats, which left her physically and emotionally exhausted, affecting her eating and sleeping habits. "Weevils in the flour, ants in the sugar, picaninnies in the eggs, mice in the bacon, small shiny black bores in the fruit" made her lose appetite (Benedict 1907c). She also continually needed to inspect her beddings and mosquito nets out of fear for the worm called *duligun*, which locals told her could kill if it crept "into the ear or any part of the body" and laid its eggs there (ibid.).

Benedict's difficult living conditions in Santa Cruz were very different from the life to which she was accustomed in Chicago. She had been a graduate student of Dr. Frederick Starr, an anthropology professor at the University of Chicago, whose course "The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Class in Ethnology" held at the St. Louis fairgrounds first introduced her to the Bagobo in 1904 (Rydell 1984, 166; Bernstein 1985, 173). By fall of 1905, she was apprenticed at the Field Museum under its curator of ethnology, Dr. George Dorsey, and preparing for her fieldwork in the Philippines. Upon Dorsey's advice, Benedict (1906a) went to England, the Netherlands, and Germany en route to the Philippines to view anthropological displays in museums and further her understanding of the significance of material culture.

In June 1906 she was bound for Davao, with a plan to study Bagobo religious and material culture (Bernstein 1985, 174). During her fourteen-month stay in Davao from 1906 to 1907, Benedict was closely supervised by Dorsey, who agreed that the Field Museum might purchase her collection of material culture up to a value of US\$2,000 if it passed inspection (Bronson 1982, 28). In the course of collecting Bagobo objects, Benedict even requested Dorsey to send her a large photograph of the Field Museum so she

could show the Bagobo where all their belongings would be kept together—in a “large, beautiful house” (Benedict 1906c).

By means of the photograph Benedict tried to gain the trust of the Bagobo so that they would willingly sell her their belongings. In dealing with the Bagobo, Benedict sought to understand their worldview and often used this knowledge to convince them to part with personal objects. For instance, when Undal, the Spanish-speaking Bagobo, explained that it was unlucky for him to trade his *sinkali*, a brass chain prized by his tribe, Benedict recited “Latin Catholic formulas” to ward off bad luck. After receiving the “*benedicite* [blessing] of the *Americana signora* [American madam],” Undal, with “relief and satisfaction,” readily turned over his *sinkali* to her in exchange for several pesos (Benedict 1907b).

As a budding anthropologist, Benedict was struck by the “rapidity with which the culture [was] vanishing” due to the plantations’ capitalist incursions into indigenous places and traditional practices. She noted in her November 1907 letter to Dorsey that wage “labor [was] spoiling the normal life of these people, not by little steps, but by great upheavals” (Benedict 1907e). She urged Dorsey in the same letter to send at least eight investigators to Davao, one for each major tribe, for at least a three-year period (*ibid.*). In terms of her own fieldwork, Benedict originally intended to stay in Davao for just one year but she found Bagobo material culture to be so rich and diverse that she planned to remain two more years. Convinced that “there [was] no such thing as rushing through . . . and sweeping up their things in a collection,” Benedict now planned to leave in June 1909 (Bernstein 1985, 182). However, her work among the Bagobo was cut short in December 1907.

Her dire financial circumstance, the neglect of her sleep and diet, and her strained relationship with other Americans led to a mental and physical breakdown. Toward the end of her stay in Davao, she confided to Dorsey that she felt that her American neighbor was competing against her in collecting Bagobo artefacts (Benedict 1907f). In her paranoia, she believed that the neighbor, a planter who owned the lone general merchandise store in Santa Cruz and thus had influence over his Bagobo workers, conspired against her (*ibid.*). Even the Metcalfs were no longer spared from the workings of her feverish mind, as they were accused of “trying to set the natives against her and were also after her notes” (Cole 1910a). She was hospitalized in Davao and sent to Manila to be cared for by her sister (*ibid.*). Eventually, she

returned to the US in September 1908 and recuperated in California before reaching Chicago a few weeks later (Dorsey 1908).

Shortly after her return, she presented her collection of Bagobo material culture to Dorsey at the Field Museum. However, the value of the entire collection exceeded the agreed amount of US\$2,000, and Dorsey purchased only one item, a Bagobo skull (Field Museum of Natural History 1982, 32). Offering an alternative means of sale, Dorsey then endorsed the rest of her collection to the American Museum of Natural History, which eventually bought the collection for US\$4,000 in 1909, but only after several months of “tortuous negotiations” (Bernstein 1985, 189). The American Museum hired her part-time to catalogue the collection, with the entries revealing her immersion in the Bagobo community (Quizon 1998, 290). Eventually, she graduated with a PhD in Anthropology from Columbia University in 1914 and published her monograph on the Ginum ceremony at Talun in 1916 (Benedict 1916).

The state of Benedict’s health revealed her isolation from other Americans and her status as an outsider in that expatriate community. Moreover, her situation as a cash-strapped student vis-à-vis the financially independent Metcalf sisters and the increased trafficking in material culture added to the mental stress. Related issues about the birth of museums, collection building, and the link between new institutions and colonialism also factored into the rather tragic end of her Davao sojourn.

The Cummings Expedition and Fay-Cooper and Mabel Cook Cole

Concurrent with the privately funded visits of Benedict and the Metcalf sisters to Davao, the Field Museum of Natural History prepared for a major ethnological expedition to the Philippines, the first of its kind for American anthropology.⁸ The impetus for the expedition was also born in St. Louis in 1904, but the Field Museum expedition took longer to realize because of its institutional nature (Bronson 1982, 4).

Illinois grain merchant Robert F. Cummings was so fascinated by the Philippine Reservation at St. Louis that he approached the Field Museum in late 1905 and offered a large donation of US\$20,000 to fund anthropological research in the Philippines for the benefit of the “people of Illinois” (Shankland 1906). The generous sum implied that the expedition was meant to be exhaustive. The research program entailed sending to

different parts of the archipelago a number of investigators who were to be guided largely by the locations of the “wild tribes” found at the St. Louis fair, namely: the mountain villages of Northern Luzon for the Igorot, the jungles of Bataan for the Negrito, the islands of Sulu for the Taosug, and the hills of Mindanao for the Bagobo (Cole 1910a).

Dorsey, the head of the Field Museum’s Anthropology Department, had difficulty locating the right people to carry out a project of such magnitude. Initially he invited anthropologists based in New York, but ultimately decided to employ those from Illinois (Dorsey 1906a, 1906b). Museum personnel Stephen C. Simms (assistant curator of ethnology) and Fay-Cooper Cole (one of Dorsey’s assistants) and Chicago-based linguist William Jones staffed the Cummings Expedition (Dorsey 1906c). Among the expedition members, only Cole went to Davao and other parts of Mindanao. Notwithstanding Dorsey’s knowledge of her financial difficulties in Davao, Benedict received no subsidy from the Cummings fund, despite Dorsey’s (1907) letter to Cummings listing her as part of the expedition team. Upon the advice of Dorsey (1906c) and similar to Benedict’s preparation, Cole spent three months at Columbia University and another three months at the University of Berlin before arriving in the Philippines with his new wife, Mabel, in January 1907. The Coles eventually reached Davao in July 1910 and stayed there until February 1911 (Cole 1913, 49).⁹

Laura Benedict’s strained financial circumstances and living conditions stood in stark contrast to that of Fay-Cooper Cole, who, as a member of the Cummings Expedition, did not experience any financial problems whatsoever. As a staff member of a famous institution, Cole readily gained the support of leading Americans based in Mindanao, from the Moro Province governor, Gen. John J. Pershing, to planters who were equally influential in the localities where their plantations operated. Consequently, Cole obtained copies of the late Governor Bolton’s private notes about the various tribal peoples of Davao.

In his letters to Field Museum Director Frederick J. V. Skiff and to Simms, Cole (1910b, 1910d) considered Davao, from the standpoint of museum collecting, as one of the “richest districts in the Islands . . . far richer than that north,” due to the extensive material culture of its numerous tribes. Davao was also turning out to be one of the most expensive places for collectors of material culture by the time Cole (1910a) arrived there in 1910, as he explained to Dorsey:

The beaded clothes and handsome weapons I have already seen, assure us of a striking collection, but the prices are high and are mounting higher continually for since the mutiny of last year, the regular troops have been put in here, and the officers’ houses are already small museums. Regular troops mean a monthly transport with its crowd of “joy riders” who buy everything they see regardless of price.

Even before the 1909 mutiny¹⁰ the Bagobo had already jacked up the prices, astute traders that they were, when demand for cultural objects rose due to the collecting activities and competition for Bagobo items among the Metcalfs, Benedict, and American planters. Naturally, prices rose in conjunction with demand, and Cole and his contemporary “joy-rider” collectors only served to raise prices higher by 1910.¹¹ In part, plantation stores also played a role in encouraging the Bagobo to sell their personal effects since it had become convenient to purchase ready-made food and objects from these retail outlets (Cole 1929, 217).

Nevertheless, Cole gathered a “first rate” collection of material objects not only from the Bagobo but also from other Davao ethnic communities. In fact, he became the “champion field collector” for the Field Museum because he acquired almost half the total of the museum’s Philippine collection, including 600 items of Bagobo material culture that he obtained during his Davao fieldwork (Cole 1910c; Field Museum of Natural History 1982, 31).

The Coles stayed in Davao Province for seven months hosted by American planters and government-connected local leaders in lowland municipalities and highland villages (Cole 1929, 213). Studying the Bagobo who lived on the foothills of Mount Apo, they stayed in the house of Datu Tongkaling, their host. Escorted by Tongkaling, they observed the intricate process of weaving abaca textiles and witnessed ritual gatherings in his great house where people told stories, played the agong, and capped the evening with rhythmic dancing (ibid., 233–34). Through personal connections with an American planter, the Coles also went to the neighboring Mandaya country on the eastern side of the district, where, escorted by Lenawan, a Mandaya headman, they studied the houses built atop trees. Many members of the tribes, the Coles learned, were descendants of slaves and castaways, incorporated into the local community. However, they could not distinguish master from servant, unless they were told (ibid., 241).

The Coles' visit to Davao culminated with a great typhoon that felled giant trees and a malaria fever that left the couple bedridden for days. They recuperated in the house of pioneer planter Capt. James Burchfield and were cared for by US Army doctors and a Protestant mission nurse newly arrived from the US. Datu Tongkaling came down from the hills to bring them an amulet for warding off illness and evil, and he graciously accompanied the Coles to the pier when, still weak with malaria, they left Davao bound for Manila. The image of Datu Tongkaling standing proudly at the pier was etched in Mabel Cole's memory as they left Davao (ibid., 248–49). Her earnest impression of indigenous Filipinos such as Datu Tongkaling would persist more than the earlier trope of a noble savage, as indicated by the title she later gave to her memoir of their Philippine visit: *Savage Gentlemen*.

It is worth noting that, while the Coles conducted their fieldwork in Davao, John M. Garvan, a former government schoolteacher-turned-merchant, undertook his own study of the Manobo who lived in the Agusan River Valley. In 1910 Worcester's (1911, 113) Bureau of Science had "temporarily engaged" him to complete his ethnographic investigations in the interior of eastern Mindanao. He was reported to have "worked, [eaten] and danced" with the Manobo and joined them in hunting and fishing the lakes and tributaries of the Agusan as well as attending their religious feasts (Rahmann 1975, 219). Cole's study area slightly overlapped with Garvan's when the former was visiting the Mandaya on Davao's east coast. Some of the Mandaya folk who Cole studied lived and travelled as far north as the Agusan Valley, while there were some Manobo who resided in eastern Davao who Garvan included in his study. However, the two men hardly crossed paths because Butuan on the northern coast of Surigao, where most of the Agusan Manobo came to trade since early times, was Garvan's (1931, 21) base rather than Davao.¹²

In Flux: American Interest in the Philippines

The first decade of the twentieth century was the heyday of American anthropological interest in the Philippines. Worcester generated popular interest in the US with his magazine articles and his book *The Philippine Islands and Their People* (1898). Published on the eve of the American occupation of the Philippines, Worcester's book brought him an appointment to the First Philippine Commission as the acknowledged scientific expert on the newly acquired archipelago (Rice 2015, 5–7). After more than a

decade in the colonial service, Worcester (1914) followed up with what was considered his magnum opus, *The Philippines Past and Present*. The period between the publication of Worcester's two books saw heightened American anthropological attention to the Philippines. In Davao, as shown by the personal and institutional interests of the Metcalfs, Laura Watson Benedict, the Field Museum, and the government's Bureau of Science, there was a burst of studies on the Bagobo, Mandaya, Manobo, and other ethnic groups of Davao.

However, by the time Cole's "Wild Tribes of Davao District, Mindanao" was published in 1913, this wave of interest and enthusiasm had abated as the novelty of Philippine tribal groups in the American public's mind waned. Earlier, from 1911 to 1912, Worcester had tried to sell his films on the "world-famed head hunters" of the Mountain Province to a US distributor, but he was unsuccessful (Sullivan 1992, 156).¹³

The pages of the *American Anthropologist* showcased the declining ethnological interest on the Philippines (table 1). In the fourteen-year period between 1899 and 1913, there were thirty-nine articles, reviews, and notes on the Philippines. In contrast, the next fourteen years produced only nine publications. Further indicative of the waning interest, the Field Museum acquired merely 159 objects from the Philippines between 1913 and 1947 (table 2), compared to 8,835 objects with the Cummings fund and 793 non-Cummings purchases (i.e., objects acquired external of the Cummings

Table 1. Number of anthropological writings on the Philippines in the *American Anthropologist*, 1899–1928

YEAR	VOLUME NO.	NO. OF ARTICLES	NO. OF REVIEWS	NO. OF NOTES	TOTAL
1899–1903	1–5	2	3	6	11
1904–1908	6–10	7	4	6	17
1909–1913	11–15	5	4	2	11
1914–1918	16–20	0	3	0	3
1919–1923	21–25	0	3	1	4
1924–1928	26–30	2	0	0	2
Total		16	17	15	48

Source: Hutterer 1978, 148

fund) for a total of 9,628 objects in the much shorter period of 1898 to 1912 (Field Museum of Natural History 1982, 32). The museum admitted that the scantiness of the Philippine acquisition during the interwar years “reflect[ed] a very general phenomenon” when “Americans in the United States almost stopped thinking or writing about the Philippines” (ibid., 31).

Several reasons accounted for this turn of events. In the broadest context, world affairs eventually turned American attention toward Europe at the onset of the Great War in 1914, and the Philippines receded further in the constellation of American overseas concerns. Attention remained focused upon war-torn Europe after the First World War, where the former governor of the Moro Province, Gen. John J. Pershing, had led a victorious expeditionary

Table 2. Number of gifts and non-Cummings purchases for the Field Museum Philippine Collections, 1893–1982

YEARS	ACQUISITIONS	OBJECTS
1893–1897	0	0
1898–1902	1	213
1903–1907	7	361
1908–1912	8	219
1913–1917	4	138
1918–1922	5	20
1923–1927	0	0
1928–1932	0	0
1933–1937	0	0
1938–1942	1	1
1943–1947	0	0
1948–1952	0	0
1953–1957	4	412
1958–1962	6	46
1963–1967	5	35
1968–1972	3	10
1973–1977	4	21
1978–1982	12	126

Source: Field Museum of Natural History 1982, 32

force. Americans from the public and private sectors then played important roles in the subsequent rebuilding of the global postwar economy.

Apart from the First World War and its aftermath, the changing American colonial policy regarding Philippine independence also contributed to diminishing American political interest in the colony. The “energetic spurt of interest in Philippine anthropology” coincided with the Republican Party’s dominance on Philippine colonial policy (Hutterer 1978, 125–26, 148). When the Republican Party, which oversaw the annexation of the Philippines, lost the 1912 US presidential elections, the ties between empire and anthropology started untangling. The Republicans had advocated a policy of retaining the Philippines indefinitely, believing that Filipinos were incapable of self-rule, mainly as a result of anthropological reports. This stance was countered by the Democrats, who ran on a platform of granting independence to the Philippines as soon as possible. The Democrats won the elections of 1912 and immediately signaled a change in Philippine colonial policy. Woodrow Wilson’s victory speech in Virginia set the tone when, in Turnerian language, he announced that “the Philippines are our present frontier, and we don’t know what rich things are happening out there, and are presently, I hope, to deprive ourselves of that frontier” (Sullivan 1992, 165).

In the Philippines the Democratic administration suspended government-sponsored ethnographic research, and anthropology was privatized as an academic discipline even if anthropologists continued to provide advice to colonial administrators after 1913 (Goh 2007, 133–34). Gov. Gen. Francis Burton Harrison championed Filipinization and replaced many American government officials with Filipinos. Consequently, this move discouraged Americans in Mindanao from staying longer in the islands. A colonial official in Agusan confided to Worcester his worst fears that “most of us are going to be pushed aside” by Filipinization; thus he considered an alternative career as an alfalfa farmer in Texas (Anon. 1914). Worcester, the champion of evolutionary anthropology, had already left government service in 1913 to concentrate on private business. The promise of eventual independence and more colonial government positions for Filipinos was written into the Jones Law, which was passed in 1916. Subsequently, the level of American interest in the Philippines no longer matched that of the early years of the previous decade, and anthropological expeditions to the Philippines—and Davao—suffered the same fate and general lack of attention.

New Direction in American Academia

The diminishing interest in the Philippines in the metropole coincided with the diminished prominence of race and evolution in intellectual circles. Evolutionary anthropology, which social Darwinism and the world fairs popularized, was now giving way to a more academic anthropology—one based on graduate-level university programs that insisted on empirical evidence and avoided the overgeneralizations in the earlier evolutionary approach (Bernstein 1985, 171). Much of this new direction in disciplinary thought was credited to the influence of Franz Boas, who from his academic base at Columbia University mentored a generation of students who took on leadership positions in the field in American universities (Krupat and Boas 1988, 105). Benedict and Cole's field notes and correspondences already leaned toward the Boasian idea of studying culture individually and as particular to a society's history, without acceding to comparisons with other "more advanced" cultures (Asch 2015, 483). It was only natural, then, that after their return from the Philippines both of them became Boas's doctoral students at Columbia. The academic direction that the discipline of anthropology took as a social science, owing largely to Boas, negated the sensationalism and entertainment aspects of displaying indigenous peoples in fairs and other public venues.

By the time Benedict published her work on the Bagobo in 1916, the colonial Ethnological Survey office had already been discontinued (Bernstein 1985, 171). Attendance at world fairs was also declining. That year, San Diego's Panama-California Exposition closed with only 3.5 million visitors compared to the almost 20 million at St. Louis. A year earlier, San Francisco's Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915 had attracted a million less than the St. Louis exposition a decade earlier (Rydell 1984, 209). By 1926, attendance at the Philadelphia Sesquicentennial International Exposition was so low that the fair organization went into receivership (Wilson 2012). When world fairs became popular again in the late 1930s, anthropology was no longer in the spotlight. The science of man had been replaced by industrial technology and the "hard" sciences, with aviation capturing the imagination of a nation (Ganz 2008, 2, 138; Rydell 1993, 215).

For some Americans then, their interest in anthropological encounters within the confines of the empire's frontiers had prescribed boundaries. Sarah and Elizabeth Metcalf, Laura Watson Benedict, and Fay-Cooper and Mabel Cole already reached those limits. Even the colorful John Garvan,

who "went native" in northeastern Mindanao, eventually returned to the US in the mid-1920s and affiliated with the Department of Anthropology at the University of California in Berkeley (Rahmann 1975, 219). His major work on the Manobo, published in 1931 by the federal government, sold for US\$1.00 (Garvan 1931, 4).

Conclusion

This article has attempted to nuance the relationship between anthropology and imperialism in the case of pioneer anthropologists in Davao. Ancillary to how Helen Tilley (2007, 2) has framed the debate of African colonial anthropology as a messier and less comprehensive endeavor, this article has shown a similar occurrence in US-occupied Philippines. As Tilley (*ibid.*, 9) has stated, "while ethnographic research certainly had the potential to aid colonial ambitions and ease colonial control, it also had the ability to subvert colonial relations, even if this process was neither straightforward nor without ambiguities." The case of Davao anthropologists shows that not all who studied their colonial subjects followed the government's racialized evolutionary viewpoint. Rather than colonial edict or political party platforms in the imperial metropolis, the issues that influenced and motivated anthropological studies in Davao were personal circumstances, changes in the discipline of anthropology, and the politics of museum collections.

Private motives of individuals and institutions played a significant role in launching anthropological studies in Davao, instead of a conscious effort to serve an imperial objective. The imperative of empire was subsumed in the personal goals of advancing graduate studies or career, while satisfying individual curiosities or one's sense of adventure. Nor was imperial directive evident in the institutional goals of strengthening museum collections and scholarship. Although research excursions were state-coordinated since the early anthropologists had to navigate various colonial government agencies to get around the Philippines, they were neither state-directed nor state-funded affairs. Precisely because these pioneer anthropologists pursued nonstate affairs, the blurring of roles between participants and observers became highly pronounced. Informed by the rising trend of cultural analysis in US anthropological studies, the encounters and relationships formed in the field could not simply be discounted (Quizon and Afable 2004, 434–44). Deemphasizing race and highlighting culture in understanding indigenous groups were important in constructing the Filipino identity of the past, as it is today.



Epilogue

The personal and academic exchanges between anthropologists and subject peoples continued to test the barriers of representation years after the pioneers' fieldwork had ended. In August 1934, Vice Gov. Gen. Joseph Ralston Hayden participated in an air exercise across Mindanao led by Gen. Frank Parker of the US Army Air Corps. Parker was on a mission to create a system of air routes, while introducing the archipelago to the age of aviation. That 1934 expedition was Vice Governor Hayden's (1934) first air trip. Interestingly, some Bagobo from Davao already had their first airplane ride

two years earlier in colonial Manila's version of a world fair. In 1932, when the public still looked upon flying as a novelty and regarded it with trepidation, three Bagobo from Davao were invited to participate in the Manila Carnival, upon the suggestion of their friend, Sarah Metcalf.

(Opposite page) Fig. 2.

A Bagobo exchanges the customary headdress for an aviator's cap and goggles for the Manila Carnival airshow, 1932. Courtesy of the Elizabeth H. and Sarah S. Metcalf Collection, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Photo Lot 107, Box 2, "Bagobo P.1."]

During the fair, to great fanfare, the Bagobo in their indigenous garb took a ride over the skies of Manila in a US Army Air Corps plane (fig. 2). After signing a government

waiver in case of an accident and with parachutes strapped to their bodies, the Bagobo flew as pioneer air passengers at the onset of the new era of civil aviation (Metcalf and Metcalf n.d.). A Davao tribe was no longer displayed in a backward "reservation," but in fact had publicly conquered the skies, appropriating the newest symbol of progress, the airplane, twenty-eight years after they were depicted as headhunters at the St. Louis World's Fair.

Notes

The author wishes to thank Patricia Afable, Filomeno Aguilar Jr., Bernardita Churchill, Armand Esai, Cherubim Quizon, Carol and James Francis Warren, as well as the editors and anonymous reviewers who gave insightful comments, support, and assistance in the crafting of this article.

- 1 See, e.g., Warwick Anderson (2006) on the role of medicine in supporting racial stereotyping; Christopher Schmidt-Nowara (2010) relates how ethnohistory sought to win Puerto Ricans to American rule; the exposition of Filipinos in world fairs became a colonial policy in winning the American public's approval of an overseas empire in Paul Kramer (2006); and Ann Laura Stoler and David Bond's (2006) article reads as a history lesson and a caveat to anthropology and area studies being utilized in the service of the politico-military combine of a new US imperialism in the twenty-first century.

- 2 Davao was a relatively new entity in the Philippine consciousness then, since the region was only officially brought under Spanish jurisdiction in 1848, at the twilight of the Iberian presence. Davao's location in southeastern Mindanao isolated it from the center of colonial attention and administration, yet its proximity to the highest mountain in the Philippines, Mount Apo, drew a number of Europeans to the area. The published accounts of Joaquin Rajal, Joseph Montano, Alexander Schadenberg, and Jesuits Mateo Gisbert, Martin Juan, and John Doyle made Davao known among a small circle of Western scientists in the late nineteenth century (Bernad 1959, 17–26; Quizon 1998, 292).
- 3 Vicente Rafael (2000) discusses at length the “scientific” process of census-taking to racialize Filipinos as serving the objectives in the colonial order.
- 4 Davao was not in Worcester's ambit. The rare mention of Davao in Worcester's correspondence was about his poor treatment by government men in 1912 during one of his visits to Davao Province while he was the secretary of the interior. In a letter to the acting director of the Philippine Constabulary, Worcester (1912) complained about the soldiers' failure to salute him when he arrived at the pier and the lack of coordination regarding his means of transportation and guides during a visit to a Mandaya village. When it came to Mindanao, Worcester was more interested in the central highlands of Bukidnon rather than in Davao.
- 5 The term “Bagobo” refers to three distinct subgroups: Tagabawa, Gianga, and Obo. The pioneer anthropologists discussed in this article dealt with the Tagabawa Bagobo, who resided on the coasts south of Mount Apo (Quizon 1998, 292).
- 6 An “abstract” of Elizabeth Metcalf's “The People of Sandao-a” is included in MacCurdy 1912, 161–63.
- 7 Abaca is a Philippine-grown fiber used as textile by indigenous Filipinos, but exported abroad mostly for cordage purposes during the first half of the twentieth century.
- 8 Earlier American expeditions were zoological ones, such as the Steere Expedition conducted by the University of Michigan in 1887–1888 and the Menage Expedition of the Minnesota Academy of Natural Sciences in 1890–1892. Although the 1836–1842 US Exploring Expedition included ethnographic descriptions of peoples in the Pacific, it paid more attention to zoology, botany, oceanography, and meteorology (Joyce 2001; Charbonneau 2020, 26).
- 9 The Coles' Davao trip was made during their second visit to the Philippines.
- 10 From 6 to 8 June 1909, several Filipino constabulary soldiers mutinied against their Filipino and American commanding officers, attacked Davao town, and then escaped to the hills (Templeton 1909, 1). This incident increased the number of American troops stationed in Davao by 1910.
- 11 In general, US Army soldiers were primary suppliers of museum collections in the US in the early 1900s, when North American museums competed for the acquisition of Philippine artefacts (Afable 2003, 235).
- 12 Garvan's fieldwork experience is not given an in-depth treatment in this article because he was based in Surigao, not in Davao.
- 13 Worcester's book on the Philippines, published in 1914, was favorably reviewed. The book's circulation, however, had to rely on people connected with the insular government, such as William Cameron Forbes spending “several thousand dollars” to purchase copies of the book, and on acquisitions by American libraries (Sullivan 1992, 177).

References

- Afable, Patricia O. 2003. Commerce, indigenous knowledge, and museum science in the early history of American industrial education in the Philippines: The example of basket-making. In *Back to the future: Perspectives on the Thomasite legacy to Philippine education: Papers presented at the International Conference and Annual Assembly of the American Studies Association of the Philippines, Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola Heights, Quezon City, August 24–25, 2001*, ed. Corazon D. Villareal, Thelma E. Arambulo, and Guillermo M. Pesigan, 232–56. Manila: American Studies Association of the Philippines in cooperation with the Cultural Affairs Office, US Embassy.
- Aguilar, Filomeno. 2005. Tracing origins: “Ilustrado” nationalism and the racial science of migration waves. *Journal of Asian Studies* 64(3): 605–37.
- Anderson, Warwick. 2006. *Colonial pathologies: American tropical medicine, race, and hygiene in the Philippines*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Anon. 1914. Letter to Dean Worcester, 7 July. Dean Worcester Papers, Box 1, Folder 5. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Asch, Michael. 2015. Anthropology, colonialism and the reflexive turn: Finding a place to stand. *Anthropologica* 57(2): 481–89.
- Barrows, David. 1905. Population. In *Census of the Philippine Islands: Taken under the direction of the Philippine Commission in the year 1903*, vol. 1, ed. J. P. Sanger, Henry Gannet, and Victor H. Olmsted, 411–585. Washington, DC: US Bureau of the Census.
- Benedict, Laura Watson. 1906a. Letter to George Dorsey, 27 June. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1906b. Letter to George Dorsey, 20 Dec. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1906c. Letter to George Dorsey, 30 Dec. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907a. Letter to George Dorsey, 11 Feb. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907b. Letter to George Dorsey, 10 Mar. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907c. Letter to George Dorsey, 7 Apr. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907d. Letter to George Dorsey, 5 Sept. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907e. Letter to George Dorsey, 9 Nov. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907f. Letter to George Dorsey, 23 Nov. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1916. A study of Bagobo ceremonial, magic and myth. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 25:1–308.
- Bernad, Miguel A. 1959. The ascent of Mt. Apo: 1859–1958. *Philippine Studies* 7(1): 7–67.

- Bernstein, Jay. 1985. The perils of Laura Watson Benedict: A forgotten pioneer in anthropology. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 13:171–97.
- Bliss, Tasker H. 1907. The district of Davao. In *Annual report of the governor of the Moro Province, 1907*, 30–36. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Bronson, Bennet. 1982. Field Museum and the Philippines. *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 53(7): 4–32.
- Burncoat, Nancy. 1932. Nancy talks with 'Miss Sally' Metcalf and hears something new to her about the Philippine Islands. *Sunday Telegram*, 18 Sept.: Sec. 3.
- Canuday, Jose Jowel and Emma Porio. 2019. Concepts of Filipinos: Anthropology as social science, politics and nationhood. In *Southeast Asian anthropologies: National traditions and transnational practices*, ed. Eric C. Thompson and Vineeta Sinha, 21–55. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Charbonneau, Oliver. 2020. *Civilizational imperatives: Americans, Moros, and the colonial world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Christie, Emerson B. 1909. *The Subanons of Sindangan Bay*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Cole, Fay-Cooper. 1908. The Tinggian. *Philippine Journal of Science* 3(4): 197–213.
- . 1910a. Letter to George Dorsey, 25 July. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 1. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1910b. Letter to Frederick J. V. Skiff, 26 July. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 1. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1910c. Letter to George Dorsey, 23 Sept. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 1. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1910d. Letter to Stephen C. Simms, 23 Sept. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 3. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1913. The wild tribes of Davao District, Mindanao. *Publications of the Field Museum of Natural History*, anthropological series 12(2): 49–203.
- Cole, Mabel Cook. 1929. *Savage gentlemen*. London: George G. Harrap.
- Conklin, Alice L. 2002. The new “Ethnology” and “La Situation Coloniale” in interwar France. Theme issue, “Regards croisés: Transatlantic perspectives on the colonial situation.” *French Politics, Culture and Society* 20(2): 29–46.
- Davis, William G. and Mary R. Hollnsteiner. 1969. Some recent trends in Philippine social anthropology. *Anthropologica*, n.s., 11(1): 59–64.
- Dorsey, George A. 1906a. Letter to Robert F. Cummings, 22 Jan. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 1. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1906b. Letter to Robert F. Cummings, 2 June. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1906c. Letter to Robert F. Cummings, 25 Sept. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- . 1907. Letter to Robert F. Cummings, 15 July. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4. Field Museum Archives, Chicago IL.
- . 1908. Letter to William Jones, 12 Oct. R. F. Cummings Expedition, Box 4, Field Museum Archives, Chicago, IL.
- Fermin, Jose D. 2004. *1904 world's fair: The Filipino experience*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Field Museum of Natural History. 1982. Field Museum's Philippine anthropological collection. *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 53(7): 31–33.
- Ganz, Cheryl R. 2008. *The 1933 Chicago world's fair: A century of progress*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Gardner, Fletcher. 1906. Filipino (Tagalog) versions of Cinderella. *Journal of American Folklore* 19(75): 265–72.
- . 1907. Tagalog folktales. I. *Journal of American Folklore* 20(77): 104–16.
- Garvan, John M. 1931. The Manóbos of Mindanáó. In *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, first memoir, vol. 23. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Goh, Daniel P. S. 2007. States of ethnography: Colonialism, resistance, and cultural transcription in Malaya and the Philippines, 1890s–1930s. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49(1): 109–42.
- Gough, Kathleen. 1967. New proposals for anthropologists. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 9 Sept.: 1653–55.
- Hayden, Joseph Ralston. 1934. Mindanao and Sulu notes from first air trip, 17 Aug. Handwritten notes aboard an airplane. Hayden Papers, Box 4, Folder on Correspondence, Aug. 1934. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Hutterer, Karl L. 1978. Dean C. Worcester and Philippine anthropology. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 6:125–56.
- Jenks, Alfred E. 1905. *The Bontoc Igorot*. Department of the Interior Ethnological Survey Publications, vol. 1. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Joyce, Barry Alan. 2001. *The shaping of American ethnography: The Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838–1842*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kramer, Paul A. 2006. *The blood of government: Race, empire, the United States, and the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Krupat, Arnold and Franz Boas. 1988. Anthropology in the ironic mode: The work of Franz Boas. *Social Text* 19–20:105–18.
- Lewis, Herbert S. 2001. The passion of Franz Boas. *American Anthropologist* 103(2): 447–67.
- . 2013. *In defense of anthropology: An investigation on the critique of anthropology*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- MacCurdy, George Grant. 1912. Anthropology at the Washington meeting, with proceedings of the American Anthropological Association for 1911. *American Anthropologist*, n.s., 14(1): 142–77.
- Metcalf, Elizabeth. 1906. Letter to Nellie, 13 June. Elizabeth H. and Sarah S. Metcalf Collection, Photo Lot 107, Box 1, National Anthropological Archives, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Metcalf, Elizabeth H. and Sarah S. Metcalf. [n.d.] Elizabeth H. and Sarah S. Metcalf Collection, Photo Lot 107, Box 2, National Anthropological Archives, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

- Ozouf, Mona. 1975. Space and time in the festivals of the French Revolution. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 17(3): 372–84.
- Pease, Donald E. 1993. New perspectives on U.S. culture and imperialism. In *Cultures of United States imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, 22–37. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Prager, Michael. 1999. Crossing borders, healing wounds: Leiden anthropology and the colonial encounter 1917–1949. In *Anthropology and colonialism in Asia and Oceania*, ed. Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi Shimizu, 326–61. Surrey: Curzon.
- Quizon, Cherubim A. 1998. Between the field and the museum: The Benedict collection of Bagobo abaca ikat textiles. In *Textile Society of America symposium proceedings*, 290–99. Baltimore, MD: Textile Society of America.
- . 2004. Two Yankee women at the St. Louis Fair: The Metcalf sisters and their Bagobo sojourn in Mindanao. *Philippine Studies* 52(4): 527–55.
- Quizon, Cherubim A. and Patricia O. Afable. 2004. Guest editor's introduction: Rethinking displays of Filipinos at St. Louis: Embracing heartbreak and irony. *Philippine Studies* 52(4): 439–44.
- Rafael, Vicente L. 2000. *White love and other events in Filipino history*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Rahmann, Rudolf. 1975. The Philippine Negritos in the context of research on food-gatherers during this century. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 3(4): 204–36.
- Reed, William A. 1903. *Negritos of Zambales*. Department of the Interior Philippine Ethnological Survey Publications, vol. 2, part 1. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Rice, Mark. 2015. *Dean Worcester's fantasy islands: Photography, film and the colonial Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Rydel, Robert W. 1984. *All the world's a fair: Visions of empire at American international exhibitions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1993. *World of fairs: The century-of-progress exhibitions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Saleeby, Najeeb M. 1905. *Studies in Moro history, law and religion*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. 2010. From Columbus to Ponce de Leon: Puerto Rican commemorations between empires, 1893–1908. In *Colonial crucible: Empire in the making of the modern American state*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, 230–37. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Shankland, B. F. 1906. Mr. Cummings' liberal donation. *The Republican*, 9 May: n.p.
- Stoler, Ann Laura and David Bond. 2006. Refractions off empire: Untimely comparisons in harsh times. *Radical History Review* 95:93–107.
- Sullivan, Rodney J. 1992. *Exemplar of Americanism: The Philippine career of Dean C. Worcester*. Quezon City: New Day.
- Templeton, A. M. 1909. Davao natives help the mutineers attack convent. *Cablenews-American*, 26 June: 1, 3, 5.
- Tilley, Helen. 2007. Introduction: Africa, imperialism and anthropology. In *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European imperialism, and the politics of knowledge*, ed. Helen Tilley, with Robert J. Gordon, 1–48. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Tilley, Helen, with Robert Gordon, eds. 2007. *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European imperialism, and the politics of knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. 1921. *The frontier in American history*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Vergara, Benito Jr. 1995. *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and colonialism in early 20th century Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Wilson, Martin W. 2012. Sesquicentennial international exposition (1926). *The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia* (blog). <http://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/sesquicentennial-international-exposition/>.
- Worcester, Dean C. 1898. *The Philippine Islands and their people: A record of personal observation and experience, with a short summary of the more important facts in the history of the archipelago*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1911. Report of the Secretary of the Interior. In *Report of the Philippine Commission to the Secretary of War, 1910*, 63–119. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- . 1912. Letter to the acting director of the Constabulary, 4 Sept. E1 170319. Worcester Papers, Box 1, Folder 13. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- . 1914. *The Philippines past and present*. New York: Macmillan.
- Young, Patrick. 2008. From the Eiffel Tower to the Javanese dancer: Envisioning cultural globalization at the 1889 Paris Exhibition. *The History Teacher* 41(3): 339–62.

Patricia Irene Dacudao is assistant professor, Department of History, School of Social Sciences, Ricardo and Dr. Rosita Leong Hall, Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola Heights, Quezon City, 1108 Philippines. Her current research interests include frontier and commodity histories. She is coauthor of a 2015 article in this journal with the late Lydia Yu-Jose on Filipinos and Japanese in Davao. A book on abaca and Davao is forthcoming from the Ateneo de Manila University Press. <pdacudao@ateneo.edu>

