# UNITED NATIONS

## SECRETARIAT



Distr.
LIMITED

ST/STAT/P/L.3
11 May 1955

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Statistical Office of the United Nations New York, N.Y.

### POPULATION CENSUS PROGRAMME

1945-54 EXPERIENCE - TOTAL POPULATION

### I. National census practices: 1945-1954

Attempts to classify the basic system of counting the total population in a census have in the main relied upon the distinction between the <u>de facto</u> and the <u>de jure</u> counts. On a <u>de facto</u> basis, all persons in the country should be counted in the area where they are physically present at some precise time of the census day. In a <u>de jure</u> count, the population of each area would be defined as persons who usually or legally reside in the area, regardless of their actual location within the country or their absence from the country at the date of enumeration. In practice, strict adherence to either of these concepts is rarely found. What is usually used is some sort of modification or a combination of the two concepts.

It is obvious that the total population figure for a specified area within a country would usually vary according to the general concept of counting employed. It has therefore been the convention to define population figures as <u>defacto</u> or <u>dejure</u> according to the basic allocation of population within the country. This distinction, however, has less significance with reference to the total population of the country as a whole. The classification as <u>defacto</u> or <u>dejure</u> is, in fact, often misleading in regard to the total population of a country.

International uses of population figures are more concerned with total populations than with the populations of areas within countries. For this reason,

ST/STAT/P/L.3 English Page 2

knowledge of the basic method employed in the internal allocation of population is less important than information as to whether or not all segments of the population were included in the enumeration. Under either basic method, the inclusion or exclusion of certain population groups, such as nomadic tribes, aborigines, armed forces and diplomatic personnel outside the country and foreign military and diplomatic personnel within the country, may affect the comparability of statistics of one country with those of another. Often, one or more of these segments of the population, some of which may be quite large, are not treated in the way which would be expected from the theoretical concept presumably used by the country.

This fact is clearly brought out by a comparison between the presumed general basis of counting and the specific treatment of the special groups. Table 1 shows both types of information for the 52 censuses included in this study. The information given is based on an examination of available published results of these censuses, census schedules, instructions to enumerators and other materials used for the enumeration, and on information given in reply to census questionnaires used in compilation of the United Nations Demographic Yearbook. The use of the terms de facto and de jure in the table has been necessitated by the fact that thus far there has been no other internationally accepted terminology and, wherever available, each country's own statement as to its method of counting or allocating its total population has been used, even where this statement was apparently inconsistent with other facts. In some cases, the decision as to which term to use had to be based on vague general statements.

It is clear from even a cursory glance at the table that it is not at present possible to ascertain the degree of comparability which may exist among many of the censuses investigated, merely because no specific information could be found in regard to the treatment of the special groups under examination. Even where information was available and has been entered in the table, it can be taken only as a general indication of comparability, because each of the special groups itself presents problems of definition. For example, the meaning of the group "other civilian nationals temporarily outside the country" varies from country to country according to the length of time specified or inferred by the word "temporarily" and to whether the group included all civilian nationals temporarily outside the country or, as is often the case, only certain categories which are

easily enumerated or are of some particular national significance. Only in a very few of the censuses investigated was there indication of the inclusion or exclusion of the families of armed forces or diplomatic personnel cutside their country or of the families of foreign armed forces or diplomatic personnel within a country. The definition of "displaced persons" undoubtedly varies from country to country, some limiting this group to aliens who are present in the country but have not been accorded the usual privileges of residents and others including in this group persons who came to the country as refugees or displaced persons but have at the time of the census been assimilated as residents of the country and are therefore no longer "displaced persons" strictly defined. Differing interpretations are possible of the limits of each of the groups shown in the table.

From the foregoing comments it is evident that this table serves mainly to indicate that wide variations do exist in the scope of figures of total population given by various countries in their census publications and that the detailed composition of the total population figures must be known before it is possible to make valid comparisons among different countries. Unfortunately, knowledge of the detailed composition of the census totals with regard to all of the special groups selected for exemination, was obtainable for only 11 of the 52 countries whose recent censuses were investigated, and for 22 of the total number of countries specific information was obtainable for less than half of the special groups. Without more extensive information as to the detailed composition of the totals it is not possible to specify the exact nature and significance of the variations in coverage.

#### TABLE 1. CENSUS TREATMENT OF THE TOTAL POPULATION IN 52 COUNTRIES, 1945-1954

Explanation of symbols: DJ: De jure DF: De facto

IN: Included in the enumeration
EX: Excluded from the enumeration

- Not applicable

... Information not available

		Treatment of special groups													
Country	Census year	General basis of popu- lation count	Nomadic tribes	Abo- rigines	Armed forces outside country	Alien armed forces within country	Merchant seamen in port or ashore	Merchant seamen at sea	Alien displaced persons within country	Enemy prisoners of war within country	Diplomatic personnel		Foreign diplo- matic personnel within country	Other civilian aliens residing perma- nently within country	aliens
APRICA: Egypt Libya Union of So.Africa	1947 1954 1951	DJ DJ DF	- m 7\		EI.	H	]3 ]3 ]			 	EX	EI	IN IN IN	Dr IN Dr	Di Di
AMERICA: Argentina Bolivia Brasil Canada Chile	1947 1950 1950 1951 1952	DJ-DF DF DJ-DF DJ DF	 ¤ 2/ ¤ 2/	== 2/ == 2/ == 2/ == 18	IN	EX	IN IN	IN	•••	•••	IN	IN	EX IN	 IN	 EI 
Colombia Costa Rica Cuba Dominican Republic Ecuador	1951 1950 1953 1950 1950	DF DJ DJ-DF DJ	- - -	 -	IN	EX	IN		•••	•••	ex In ex In	IN IN	EX EX EX	DN DN DN	E E E
El Salvador	1950 1950	DF DF DJ DF DJ	-	IN IN	  	<u>ni 1/</u>	IN EI	EI EI	•••	•••	DI .	EX EX	E E IN	IN IN IN	
Bicaragua Panama Paraguay United States Venesuala	1950 1950 1950 1950 1950	DJ-DF DF DF DJ DF	11 1/ 12 2/ 12 2/	n 1/ n 2/ n 2/	 	IN IN	IN IN IN	IN 1/	•••	•••	H H	<sup>χ</sup> , π΄ Β λ	IN IN IN	DN DN DN	Di Di
ASIA: CeylonIndiaIndiaIraq	1953 1951 1947 1950 1951	DF 3/ DJ 4/ DF DJ-DF	III KI	:	::: :::	EX	IR IN	EX	134 134 134	···	ii ii 🖈	EI EI III	E E	ביי אם אם ביי אם	DI DI DI
Philippines Thailand Turkey	1948 1947 1950	DJ DJ DF	IN IN IN	ni	•••	<u>т</u> и т/	IN IN IN	IN	IN IN	É	•••	EX	in	Di . Di	IN IN
EUROPE: Austria Belgium Demmark Finland France	1951 1947 1950 1950 1954	의 의 의 의-마? 의		-	IN 	EI	IN IN	- IN	IM IN	-	IN 5/ IN EX	IN 5/ IN 5/	EX EX EX	DN DN DN	D 6
German Federal Rep., Greece	1950 1951 1950 1951 1951	DJ DJ-DF DJ-DF DF DJ	-	. 1	Di -	ш ш :	IN IN IN IN	DE 5/ DE 5/	IN 5/	-	IN IN EX IN	Di Z	EX EX IN	DN 6/ DN 100 DN 100	변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변 변
Luxembourg Betherlands Norway Portugal Spain	1947 1950 1950	13 13 13-07 13-07		:	H 5/ H 5/ H 5/ H 5/	- - -	IN IN	DH 5/ DH 2/ DN	IN IN	EX -	IN EX IN 5/ IN IN 5/	Di EN 2/ EN 8/	 H 6/	DN 6/ DN 6/ DN 6/	型 は は は も も も も も も も も も も も も も
Sweden		22 22	204 - -	:	- E	IN	200 200 200	IN 2/ IN 2/	IN IN	<u></u>	IN EX IN	ex In 5/ ex In	IN EX	IN IN IN	다 대한 대한
Australia: Now Zealand	1954 1951	DP DP	•••	.:. 10/	ī/	ä	73 73		Di	•••	•••	·::	in		, iii

<sup>1/</sup> Separately tabulated.

<sup>2/</sup> Indians living in a civilised or emi-civilised state were enumerated but Indian jungle population was not included in the enumeration.

<sup>3/</sup> Mon-resident shipping and service population were not included in the

<sup>4/</sup> Part of the tribal areas of Assam was not included in the enumeration.

<sup>5/</sup> Included in tabulated de jure total but excluded from de facto total.

<sup>6/</sup> Included in tabulated de facto total but excluded from de jure total.

 $<sup>{\</sup>mathcal U}$  Persons missing for a long period of time, such as prisoners of war, were enumerated as absentees.

B/ Mavy crews and civilian passengers on ships at sea or in foreign ports were enumerated.

Persons on vessels mgaged on a coastwise or fishing voyage which returned to port within three weeks after the census date without proceeding from a port outside the British Isles were included in the enumeration.

<sup>10/</sup> Civilised and semi-civilised aborigines were enumerated but information concerning the enumeration of aborigines living in a wild state is not available.

### II. Summary of international recommendations for 1950 censuses $\frac{1}{2}$

The United Nations Population Commission recommended that, in addition to any data on a <u>de jure</u> or other basis which might be desired for national purposes, data be obtained on the total population as a whole at the time of the census, with the addition of military and diplomatic personnel of the given country stationed abroad but excluding foreign military and diplomatic personnel in the country.

The Committee on the 1950 Census of the Americas (COTA) of the Inter-American Statistical Institute recommended that the American nations follow this definition of total population, but advised that in addition an estimate be included of the size of any important groups of inhabitants which could not be enumerated individually (such as groups living outside of the socio-economic structure of the country). It recommended that where it was considered impossible to make such an estimate the census report should indicate that such groups were cmitted from the population total.

CCTA also suggested that, in order to obtain greater international comparability, either data or estimates of foreign military and diplomatic personnel within the given country and of military and diplomatic personnel of the given country stationed abroad should be presented separately, whether or not these groups were included in the total population figure.

Finally, it pointed out that the recommended definition of total population was neither the <u>de factorier</u> the <u>de jure</u> population and suggested that the two terms not be used in relation to the topic of total population. It recommended that each country present in its census publications the definition which it employed and a clear indication of whether it included or excluded the special groups mentioned above.

Existing international recommendations on total population are quoted in full in United Nations. Statistical Office. Handbook of population census methods, document ST/STAT/SER.F/5, June 1954, pp. 37-38. (Sales No. 1954 XVII.4).