
Filipino American Lives

Yen Le Espiritu



Temple University Press
Philadelphia

Introduction

Filipino Settlements in the United States

Although a majority of Filipinos have come to the United States only since the liberalization of immigration laws in 1965, the history of Filipinos in this country dates back to the middle of the 1700s. As early as 1765, Filipinos lived along the southeastern coast of Louisiana. Congregated in the marshlands of Louisiana's Barataria Bay (about thirty miles south of New Orleans), these Filipinos were believed to be descendants of Filipino seamen who had escaped Spanish galleons—ships that carried cargoes of luxury goods between the Philippines and Mexico from 1565 to 1815.¹ Today, with a total population of more than 1.4 million in 1990, Filipinos compose the second largest immigrant group as well as the second largest Asian American group in the United States.

Despite the long history of the immigration and settlement of Filipinos in the United States, very little sound research has been published about either their past or their contemporary life. As E. San Juan, Jr., maintains, the existing studies on the historical development of the Filipino community in the United States "have been sketchy, superficial, and flawed in their methodology and philosophical assumptions."² Lamenting the neglect of Filipino Americans in the literature on U.S. immigration, ethnicity, and communities, others have declared that Filipinos are the "forgotten Asian Americans"; that "not much is known about them"; and that on this group there is "no history. No published literature. No nothing."³ However, most scholars and writers stop short of asking *why* this is the case. In a rare analysis, Oscar Campomanes argues that the institutional invisibility of the Philippines and Filipino Americans is connected to the historical amnesia and self-erasure regarding the U.S. colonization of the Philippines in particular and U.S. imperialism in general.⁴ Employing a cultural perspective, Cecile Cruz asserts that the academic neglect of Filipinos stems from the erroneous assumption that the Philippines lacks an "authentic" indigenous culture. This perspective echoes Renato Rosaldo's contention that most anthropologists have ignored the Philippines because they perceived it as "too Westernized,"

with “no culture” of its own.⁵ These observations suggest that recent Filipino American history can best be understood within the context of the colonial and postcolonial association between the Philippines and the United States.

The Impact of the U.S. Colonization of the Philippines

In 1898, following the Spanish American War, the United States assumed colonial rule of the Philippines, thereby extending its “Manifest Destiny” to the Pacific. After intense debate, Congress finally decided to retain the Philippines as a U.S. possession—ostensibly to prepare the archipelago for eventual independence. Battling to oust their new overlords, Filipino nationalists held off U.S. rule for several years.⁶ From the very beginning, superior American fire power put Filipino troops at a dreadful disadvantage. In the opening battle in Manila, “dead Filipinos were piled so high that the Americans used the bodies for breastworks.” After this initial rout, the Philippine Army quickly resorted to mobile warfare, whereby they took advantage of their superior knowledge of the terrain and the ardent support of many Filipinos. Harassed and attacked throughout the islands by determined peasants, the Americans slowly realized that the major foe of U.S. imperialism was not the Philippine Army but rather the Filipino people.

A series of bloody “pacification” campaigns ensued. Unable to penetrate the guerrillas, the Americans began to attack the population at large, burning barrios, destroying storehouses and crops, poisoning wells, slaughtering farm animals, and killing noncombatants. In the notorious Samar campaign in late September 1901, General “Howlin’ Jake” Smith ordered his troops to ravage the province and to kill “everything over ten.” Three months later, in another brutal campaign, Major General J. Franklin Bell set out to destroy Batangas. According to statistics compiled by U.S. government officials, by the time Bell was finished, at least one hundred thousand people had been killed or had died as a direct result of the scorched-earth policies. In 1902, through superior military force and the collaboration of the conservative and moneyed Filipinos, the Americans finally put an end to the armed nationalist resistance. Although it is difficult to determine how many Filipinos died resisting American aggression, estimates of the combined death toll from fighting, disease, and starvation ranged from several hundred thousand to one million. According to Sucheng Chan, many of the brutal facets of the Philippine American War remain largely hidden from the public.⁷

Although guerrilla warfare continued for several more years, on July 4, 1901, William Howard Taft had taken the oath of office as the first civil governor of the Philippines. The U.S. occupation affected all segments of Philippine society. Politically, the Philippine government was modeled after that of the United States.⁸ To win over the existing leadership of the Philip-

pinos and to pacify many Filipino nationalists, the United States adopted the policy of Filipinization—the gradual substitution of Filipino personnel for American administrators and clerks in the colonial government. As early as 1900, Filipinos began assuming positions in the municipal, provincial, and later, in the national governments. However, Americans still controlled the strategic positions that allowed them to formulate and implement policies. Under U.S. colonial rule, the Philippine national economy changed significantly.⁹ Foremost among the changes were the further development of the agricultural export economy (begun under Spanish rule), with sugar in the lead, and the growing dependence upon imports for such basic necessities as rice and textiles. By its tariff regulations and the subsequent free trade between the two countries, the United States fostered this export-import policy and kept the Philippines an unindustrialized export economy.

As a civilian government replaced military rule, the cultural Americanization of the Philippine population became an integral part of the process of colonization. Convinced that education was one of the best ways to pacify the Filipinos, U.S. colonizers introduced universal public education and revamped Philippine educational institutions and curriculum using the American system as its model and English as the language of instruction. Filipino historian Renato Constantino contends that through this policy the colonial educational system became an instrument of assimilation or Americanization. With the use of U.S. textbooks, “young Filipinos began learning not only a new language but a new culture. Education became miseducation because it began to de-Filipinize the youth, taught them to regard American culture as superior to any other, and American society as the model *par excellence* for Philippine society.”¹⁰ Infected with colonial culture and with grand illusions about the United States, Filipinos soon started to migrate to what they had been taught to think of as the land of opportunity and fair play.

The Beginning of Filipino Emigration to the United States

The first Filipinos to come to the U.S. mainland were students on government scholarships. As part of their effort to acculturate Filipinos and to augment their devotion to the United States, the territorial government sent several hundred individuals (predominantly males) to study in U.S. colleges and universities during the first decade of this century. Highly selected, these *pensionados* often were the children of prominent Filipino families whose loyalty the colonial regime hoped to win. Screened from twenty thousand applicants, the first group of one hundred government-sponsored students sailed from Manila to the United States in October of 1903. The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported their arrival, stating that the goal of their venture was their Americanization. By the early 1920s, almost all of the original *pension-*

ados had returned home to well-paying positions in agriculture, business, education, engineering, and government.¹¹

The achievements of the *pensionados* inspired other young Filipinos to seek their fortunes through U.S. education. Between 1910 and 1938, about fourteen thousand Filipinos migrated to the United States as nonsponsored students. Although they came as laborers, these young men fully expected to earn enough money to attend U.S. schools. Regardless of their qualifications, racial discrimination relegated them to unskilled and menial occupations; some aspiring students took years to save enough money to go to school. A. B. Santos (Chapter 1) was one such student. Arriving in San Diego in 1922 at the age of fifteen, he worked as a dining-room helper at the Coronado Hotel while attending Coronado High School. Years later, as a student at San Diego State College (now University), Santos worked full-time one semester and then went to school full-time the next. Juggling work and classes, Santos took four years to finish two years of course work.

Nonetheless, before the Great Depression, the Filipinos' hopes for higher education had seemed possible. According to Chris Friday, between 1920 and 1925, an estimated two thousand (or 15 percent of the Filipinos in the continental United States) attended high school or college. By the end of the decade, the number had increased dramatically. In 1928 alone, approximately a thousand enrolled in classes. The depression years shattered the Filipinos' dream of success through education. In 1932 only eight hundred Filipinos attended school; in 1935 just five hundred; by 1939 the number had fallen to three hundred. Confronted by the economic devastation of the 1930s, many working Filipino students joined the American labor movement and fought to secure equal treatment for all races. Economic necessity and widespread discrimination forced many self-supporting students eventually to abandon their goals of completing their studies and returning to the Philippines. Stranded by the Great Depression and lost ambitions, most of these "unintentional immigrants" lived out their lives as laborers in the United States.¹²

According to Barbara M. Posadas and Roland L. Guyotte, the pre-World War II Filipinos in Chicago were among these "unintentional immigrants." Originating around 1905 with the arrival of the *pensionados* and expanded during the 1920s with the coming of self-supporting students, Chicago's Filipino community was composed principally of students. H. Brett Melendy reported that in 1907, the University of Illinois, with thirteen students, had the largest enrollment of Filipinos in the country.¹³ In 1917, the U.S. Bureau of Insular Affairs counted forty-five Filipinos attending school in Chicago or Evanston out of a nationwide total of three hundred and thirty-seven. Like their counterparts elsewhere in the United States, Chicago's working students alternated quarters at school with periods of full-time employment, thus stretching their stay in the United States into unplanned-for years. The

onset of the Great Depression further exacerbated their plight as they scrambled to find work to finance their education. At the University of Chicago, the number of full-time Filipino students dropped from forty-six in 1926–27 to ten in 1933–34. By the time of Pearl Harbor, the majority of Chicago's Filipino students had been forced to abandon their studies and became like the Filipino immigrant laborers who had immigrated to Hawaii and the West Coast.¹⁴

Filipino Workers in Hawaii

Filipino migration to Hawaii was tied to the fortunes of the islands' sugar companies. By the last decade of the nineteenth century, the sugar industry had become so massive that the prosperity of Hawaii depended largely upon its continued expansion and prosperity. Because sugar cane cultivation is so labor-intensive, plantation owners needed a constant flow of cheap and compliant labor to work their expanding properties. Filipinos were the last immigrant group to arrive on Hawaii's sugar plantations.¹⁵

In 1906, Hawaiian sugar planters sent Albert F. Judd to Manila to recruit three hundred Filipino workers. However, after six months of strenuous campaigning, Judd was able to enlist only fifteen laborers, who came not from Manila but from Luzon's northern province of Ilocos Sur in the coastal area of Candon. After the 1908 "Gentlemen's Agreement," which restricted the emigration of Japanese laborers and the 1909 strike by Japanese plantation workers, which threatened sugar production in the islands, the planters mounted an aggressive and well-organized program to import massive numbers of Filipino workers. Filipinos had become the favored source of labor because of their unusual legal status, for until the passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act in 1934, Filipinos could migrate freely to the United States, protected by their colonial status as U.S. nationals. Moreover, because the Philippines was a "ward" of the United States from 1905 to 1935, the Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association (HSPA) could rely on the assistance of American colonial officials there. Although the territorial government supported the HSPA's recruitment efforts, the Philippine sugar interests and legislature, through physical force and steep taxes, strained to halt Hawaiian recruiting, as they needed labor for their own growing sugar industry.¹⁶

In the next two decades, HSPA labor recruiters concentrated on the Philippines as "the only available source of a permanent labor supply and the only hope of the future under existing laws."¹⁷ So successful were their efforts that, for the first time, the Hawaiian planters could report an adequate supply of labor. Between 1907 and 1919, 28,500 Filipinos arrived in Hawaii; between 1920 and 1924, 29,200 did. The termination of Japanese immigration in 1924 resulted in a surge of Filipino arrivals in Hawaii—a total of 44,000 during the second half of the 1920s.¹⁸ The Filipino migration was

overwhelmingly composed of young men. In 1920, some four thousand Filipinas resided in the islands; by 1930, their number had increased to over ten thousand, but women still represented only 16.6 percent of the Filipino population.¹⁹

By the middle of the 1920s, it was no longer necessary for HSPA recruiters to offer free round trips as an incentive to Filipino migrants. As Filipinos became increasingly Americanized and as some successful individuals returned home from Hawaii triumphantly, so many Filipinos were eager to migrate to Hawaii that the HSPA ceased recruiting in 1926. Hopeful migrants not only were willing to pay their own passage, they even bribed the recruiters to assure being chosen. Some educated people tried to pass themselves off as illiterates in order to circumvent HSPA policy to recruit the physically strong and the less educated, who were thought to be more likely to remain on the plantations and perform the menial work they were hired to do.²⁰ A former Filipino plantation worker in Kauai recalled how he had by-passed the recruiters' inspection:

I was told that if you have education, if you talk English that . . . you'll not be accepted. Besides that, if your look is like student, you cannot be accepted there, the same. But, in order that I could get in, I had to go and roughen my hand by having calluses on the back of the knuckles so that when the inspector will see, "Oh, you are hard working man, so you can go". . . . That's how I got in. And I had to avoid speaking any English. Otherwise, I cannot get to Hawaii.²¹

During the 1930s, however, the demands for Filipino exclusion and a labor surplus in Hawaii reduced the flow of migrants to a trickle.

Prior to 1915, attempts to recruit Filipinos were concentrated in the vicinity of Manila City in central Luzon and of Cebu City in central Visayas; accordingly, more Tagalogs and Visayans, natives of these areas, were among the earliest to emigrate. These efforts generally had poor results, however, since recruits from urban areas usually lacked agricultural experience and also had more economic opportunities than their rural counterparts.²² HSPA agents thus shifted their recruiting efforts first to the Visayan Islands and then to the Ilocano region in northwestern Luzon. From 1919 to 1928, two-thirds of the Filipino laborers migrating to Hawaii were from the Ilocano-speaking provinces. Visayans, primarily from the hard-pressed eastern Visayan provinces, comprised the second largest group.²³

The recruiters' shift to Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, and their adjoining provinces was deliberate. A rural people who toiled in the least developed region in the Philippines, the Ilocanos filled the needs of the HSPA for unskilled laborers "who wouldn't be too unhappy to do manual work in the plantation, ten hours a day."²⁴ To understand the forces propelling emigration from

the Ilocano region, one first needs to consider the changes in the Philippine economy brought about by both Spanish and U.S. colonial rules, the foremost being the shift to an agricultural export economy (led by sugar) in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the growing dependence on imports for such necessities as rice and textiles. Instituted by the Spanish, these economic policies were continued by the United States through tariff regulations and subsequent free trade between the two countries. According to Miriam Sharma, these economic changes significantly dislocated the native economy. In the Ilocano area, the shift to an agricultural export trade destroyed the region's important textile industry, thus retarding its economic development. With no investment in other manufactured exports to replace textiles, "the main industry in the area then became the production, reproduction, and subsequent export of human resources."²⁵ By 1910, when HSPA agents were scouting the Philippines for laborers, the Ilocanos, having suffered severe economic displacements and dislocations, willingly emigrated.

The arrival of Filipinos in Hawaii changed the ethnic composition of the sugar plantations' work force. In 1915, Filipinos formed only 19 percent of the workers and the Japanese 54 percent; by 1932, Filipino workers predominated, constituting 70 percent, and the Japanese were 19 percent.²⁶ To defuse the organizing efforts of their ethnically diverse work force, planters stratified employment by race and paid different wages to different nationalities for the same work. Viewed primarily as instruments of production, Filipino workers were given the least desirable jobs and housing and earned the lowest wages. Laboring ten to twelve hours a day in the cane fields, they carried out the tedious and backbreaking tasks of hoeing, hauling, planting, and weeding during the cultivation, and cutting, hauling, loading, and fluming during the harvest. For this type of labor, from 1915 to 1933 Filipino men earned eighteen to twenty dollars a month, and women twelve to fourteen dollars. As late as 1932, the dwellings allotted to Filipinos were still of poorer quality than those furnished to other plantation workers. This segregation system was so entrenched that by the mid-1940s, many more Filipinos than Chinese and Japanese in Hawaii remained unskilled workers, dependent on the plantations.²⁷ In 1930, according to the U.S. Census, fewer than five thousand Filipinos lived in Honolulu. Composed mainly of ex-plantation laborers (and a small group of U.S. Navy and Army men), most of these urban dwellers worked in canneries, hotels, and private homes as domestic and day laborers.²⁸

Like other plantation workers in Hawaii, Filipino laborers had little control over their time and activities. Roused by the screams of the plantation siren at dawn, they spent their days laboring under the watchful eyes and abusive treatment of the *lunas* (foremen). A retired Filipino worker described the control that plantation managers had over their laborers: "In the planta-

tion, if you stay off work without permission, or go to the doctor, the camp police will go up into your house, and bring [sic] crowbar and open the door. If you are not in the house, he looks up the attic and everywhere.”²⁹ In her narrative, Connie Tirona (Chapter 3) describes the hard life that her parents endured as laborers in Hawaii in the late 1920s: “It was sad, because my father said that they were so mistreated by the different crew bosses. . . . They would leave for work before the break of dawn and return long after dusk. The women like my mother would do the cooking, and some of them would go to work in the fields along with the men.” As a noncitizen labor force, Filipinos had few protections from such exploitation. Whereas other nationalities theoretically could appeal to the representatives of their homelands for assistance, the Filipinos, as colonial subjects of the United States, had no representation either in the Philippines or in Hawaii.

But the Filipino plantation workers did not yield to their oppressive conditions, but rather engaged in labor militancy to improve their lives. As H. Brett Melendy reported: “The Filipinos proved that they would not be used, cheated, or forced into serfdom for long. They fought hard for equality in labor’s struggle over wages, hours, and working conditions.”³⁰ In 1920, in the first interethnic workers’ strike in Hawaii, Filipino plantation workers, led by Pablo Manlapit, joined forces with Japanese laborers to demand greater control over their working conditions and a greater share of the profits they had produced. Because together they constituted more than 70 percent of the work force in Oahu, the 1920 Japanese-Filipino strike brought plantation operations to a sudden stop. Although the strikers were eventually defeated, the plantation owners agreed to improve housing, sanitation, and recreational facilities, raise wages, and distribute monthly bonuses.³¹

In April 1924, Pablo Manlapit called another Filipino strike, which lasted eight months and involved some two thousand workers on twenty-three plantations. The most violent incident in the strike—and in Asian American labor history—occurred in the Hanapepe plantation on Kauai. During a fight between two factions of Filipinos, a sheriff’s posse invaded the strikers’ camp and fired their rifles into the crowd, killing sixteen and wounding many others. Blamed for the Hanapepe incident, in which four policemen were also killed, strikers and their leaders were arrested, tried, and imprisoned. Many were later deported to the Philippines.³²

Filipino laborers also resisted their oppressive conditions by leaving plantation work. From the mid-1920s through the 1930s, more than fifty thousand Filipinos headed for the U.S. mainland. One-third were reemigrants from Hawaii,³³ many having been blacklisted for their alleged participation in the 1924 strike.

Filipino Workers Along the Pacific Coast

Large-scale emigration of Filipino agricultural workers to the U.S. mainland coincided with their influx to Hawaii. The 1920s was a decade of dramatic increase in their numbers, with some forty-five thousand Filipinos migrating to the Pacific Coast. The 1921 and 1924 immigration acts, which barred Asian immigration and restricted European immigration, prompted West Coast farmers and canneries to turn to Filipinos to help fill the labor shortage created by the exclusion of the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and South Asians.³⁴

Filipinos were scattered across the nation: in 1930, 3,480 were in Washington, 2,011 in Illinois, 1,982 in New York, 1,066 in Oregon, 787 in Michigan, and hundreds of others in states like Colorado, Kansas, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Montana, Idaho, Texas, and Arizona. But the majority concentrated in California. From 1923 to 1929, Filipinos streamed into the state at the rate of over 4,100 a year. Between 1910 and 1930, the Filipino population in California had increased from only 5 to 30,470. The majority of these immigrants had little formal education and came primarily from the Ilocano region.³⁵ Almost all came as single young men without families. Out of every hundred Filipinos who migrated to California during the 1920s, 93 were males, 80 of whom were between sixteen and thirty years of age.³⁶

In large metropolitan areas like Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York, Filipinos worked in restaurants as dishwashers, busboys, or kitchen helpers; in hotels as bellboys, bed makers, or elevator attendants; and in private homes and apartments as servants, janitors, or maintenance men.³⁷ But most of the Filipinos—about 60 percent—flocked to agriculture. Although they were the largest group of Asian laborers along the Pacific Coast in the 1920s, few became tenant farmers or independent farm owner-operators. By the time large numbers of Filipinos immigrated to the American West, various anti-alien land regulations had been passed, legally forbidding them to lease or buy agricultural land. As a result, Filipinos, unlike Japanese immigrants, never managed to climb the agricultural ladder; the majority toiled in the fields as unskilled migrant laborers.³⁸

Unlike plantation workers in Hawaii, who remained in one place, Filipino farm laborers on the mainland moved with the crops. Given the great variety of crops grown along the Pacific Coast, something needs to be harvested virtually every month, but each harvest lasts only two to six weeks. This specialty agriculture created a migratory labor force that moved with the harvests.³⁹ From the 1920s to the 1970s, Filipinos (and Mexicans) on the Pacific Coast formed the backbone of this harvest labor supply. Under the leadership of labor contractors, Filipinos moved in crews of five to fifty from

Philippine workers also but majority in agriculture

job to job and pooled funds to help meet car payments, fuel, food, and lodging.⁴⁰ In the 1930s, a Filipino agricultural laborer in California earned an average wage of twenty to twenty-five cents per hour. Out of this meager sum, from sixty to seventy-five cents a day would be deducted for room and board.⁴¹

Viewed by racist growers as ideally suited for “stoop labor,” Filipino farm workers remained in high demand until the Great Depression, following the ripening fruit and vegetables as they developed specialized roles in western agriculture. In Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho, they picked apples, hoed hops, topped beets, and dug potatoes. In California, moving from the San Joaquin Valley to the Salinas Valley to the Imperial Valley, Filipinos dominated the agricultural labor force, pulling carrots, picking strawberries, cutting celery, and harvesting grapes. They were also the predominant workers in the cultivation of asparagus—a multimillion dollar industry. In 1925, Filipinos constituted over 80 percent of the asparagus labor force, numbering approximately seven thousand.⁴² Because of the long hours of stooping, extreme heat, and dust involved, cutting asparagus is the most difficult job a farm worker can do, with even experienced, able-bodied laborers passing out from heat prostration and exhaustion.⁴³

Filipino laborers also lived and worked within a gender-skewed context. Legally prohibited from marrying white women, most Filipino laborers were lonely bachelors, destined for a harsh life without families. Missing the company of small children, these single men adopted and pampered the few Filipino children that were around. Born in 1929, Connie Tirona’s (Chapter 3) childhood days were surrounded by bachelor friends of her parents. In her narrative, she describes the joy that her family’s visits brought to the lonely *manongs*⁴⁴ who labored in the Sacramento–San Joaquin area:

[Our family] went to see them almost every week or every other week. . . . It was so beautiful there when we visited them. . . . The *manongs* would fix up their rooms immaculately. . . . After eating they would play guitars and mandolins, and we, as little children of the families, would sing and dance. . . . They were so happy. I especially remember when we sang the Visayan songs. You could see the tears on the faces of those grown men. . . . As I was drifting off to sleep, I could hear them laughing as they started to sing nostalgic songs from the Philippines. . . . After such weekends, the *manongs* prepared for another grueling week of hard work.

Because they were predominantly single men, Filipino workers could be housed inexpensively. A Japanese grower told an interviewer in 1930 that he preferred to hire Filipinos because “these Mexicans and Spaniards bring their families with them and I have to fix up houses; but I can put a hundred

Filipinos in that barn” (pointing to a large firetrap).⁴⁵ Housed in dilapidated, crowded shacks or in tents, Filipino laborers endured harsh climate, unsanitary living conditions, and the lack of privacy. Philip Vera Cruz, a pioneering Filipino laborer, recalled: “The first camp I lived in had a kitchen that was so full of holes, flies were just coming in and out at their leisure, along with mosquitoes, roaches, and everything else. . . . The toilet was an outhouse with the pit so filled-up it was impossible to use.”⁴⁶

Familial and friendship networks helped Filipino workers to cope with the daily punishment of agricultural labor. In virtually every area of the American West where Filipinos labored in large numbers (California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Colorado, and Alaska), they established strong and lasting cultural, religious, and community organizations. Among the most important were fraternal associations with elaborate rites of initiation. Some of these groups, such as the Dimas Alang and the Legionarios del Trabajo, spanned great geographic distances. Equally important were regionally and provincially based organizations of immigrants who came from the same area in the Philippines. In Seattle, for example, Ilocanos, Tagalogs, Pangasinans, and Visayans formed their own associations to perpetuate the traditions and folkways of their home regions and to provide mutual aid to their members. Regardless of size, these community organizations provided the earliest immigrants with a substitute for the extended families left behind in the Philippines.⁴⁷

As in Hawaii, Filipinos on the mainland fought oppressive working conditions through labor activism. In the Salinas Valley, where they comprised 40 percent of the agricultural work force, Filipino field workers were especially militant. Harsh words from a boss or sudden wage cuts would prompt them to evacuate the fields. In 1933, after the American Federation of Labor (AFL) refused to organize a union on their behalf, the valley’s lettuce pickers formed the Filipino Labor Union (FLU). The following year, the FLU led Filipino workers in a strike, demanding union recognition, improved working conditions, and higher wages. This violent strike ended when local vigilantes burned the camp to the ground and forced the determined strikers to flee for their lives.

Filipino labor activism eventually jolted U.S. organized labor into accepting them. In 1936, the AFL granted a charter to the Field Workers’ Union Local No. 30326, composed of Mexican and Filipino laborers, and in 1940, it chartered the Federal Agricultural Laborers Association, a Filipino union.⁴⁸ Filipinos in the San Joaquin valley were also the ones to launch the historic Delano grape strike in 1965, which catapulted the United Farm Workers Union and its leader Cesar Chavez into the limelight of the nation’s farm labor struggles.⁴⁹

Filipinos also toiled in the canneries of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. Deemed a good source of income, cannery jobs were particularly attractive

to Filipino students who needed a quick way to make money during the summer. Manuel Buaken reported that in 1930, 500 of the 4,210 Filipinos contracted during the cannery season were college and university students; 800 others attended various trade schools.⁵⁰

As the Northwest's major metropolitan area, Seattle became the hub for "Alaskeros"—Filipino cannery hands who toiled in the Alaskan fisheries. There, in the city's International District, they doubled up in their hotel and boardinghouse beds, waiting out the winter months before sailing north to work from late spring to late summer. According to Bruno Lasker, in 1931 Seattle's Filipino summer population consisted of only a few hundred, while its winter population rose to some thirty-five hundred.⁵¹ Filipino students at the University of Washington provided an important source of labor for the canneries—so much so that contractors were obliged to cultivate a relationship with them by helping to fund their Filipino Club. The presence of the Alaskeros significantly increased the number of Filipino residents in Washington State, which grew between 1910 and 1930 from seventeen to approximately thirty-five hundred.⁵²

Recruited by Chinese and Japanese contractors on the West Coast, nearly a thousand Filipinos joined the Alaskan fishery work force in 1921 and by the mid-1930s had become the backbone of the cannery crews. In 1928, Filipino cannery hands in Alaska numbered 3,916, compared to 1,445 Japanese, 1,269 Mexicans, and 1,065 Chinese. Yet despite their numerical dominance, very few Filipinos became contractors because of the Chinese and Japanese oligarchy. Having entered the cannery labor market later than these two other Asian groups, Filipinos predominantly worked as unskilled laborers in mechanized plants. Those permitted to advance at all were halted at the rank of foreman. In charge of recruiting and managing their countrymen, these foremen received relatively high remuneration and special treatment.

Given the narrow access to cannery jobs, Filipino workers were forced to rely on those who might take advantage of them—the Chinese and Japanese contractors and Filipino foremen. Dependent on advances doled out by Chinese and Japanese contractors, Filipino workers often accumulated considerable debt—as much as a month's wages—before the canning season had even begun, as unscrupulous contractors forced them to buy lodging, food, clothes, and bedding at inflated prices from their stores. In some instances, contractors disappeared with the seasonal wages of a whole Filipino crew. Filipinos in positions of power also often took advantage of their countrymen, sometimes demanding half a month's pay or more just for the promise of a cannery job. If a Filipino complained too loudly, he found himself without a cannery job in subsequent years. The victimization of fellow ethnics is a common phenomenon in immigrant labor as the more seasoned migrants

take advantage of the new arrivals who usually don't speak English and cannot fend for themselves.

With the onset of the Great Depression, the upward mobility Filipinos had hoped might come to them through cannery work disappeared. Between 1929 and 1933, wages for unskilled cannery positions dropped by 40 percent. More than other Filipinos, students felt the sting of the Depression through the elimination of cannery jobs and severe wage cuts, which forced them to find other seasonal jobs that left little or no time for school. Faced with the dismal realities of the 1930s, Filipinos tried to open the canning industry in new ways, particularly through unionization. On June 19, 1933, Filipino laborers entered the AFL as the Cannery Workers and Farm Laborers Union (CWFLU), Local 18257. Because of Seattle's proximity to Alaska, the city became the union's headquarters.

Uniting the Filipino community behind a unionization drive proved no easy task. Before the Depression, the myriad of small-group affiliations—the family, friendship, and ethnic networks—had helped Filipinos to brave exploitative employers, contractors, and foremen. During the Depression, however, members of these same associations competed for jobs and disagreed on the solutions to their deteriorating conditions in the cannery industry. In spite of its best effort to unite the community, the CWFLU made little headway. Not until the 1936 murders of two top Filipino union leaders and their elevation to martyrdom did Filipinos rally behind the CWFLU. Negotiating for higher wages, better hours, and improved working conditions for its members, the CWFLU empowered Filipino cannery workers to unite against some of the worst abuses of employers and contractors. In 1938, Filipinos finally eliminated the contract system; from then on, cannery workers were hired through the union hall.

During the late 1920s and 1930s, as the Filipino population grew and as the Great Depression engulfed the nation, white resentment against Filipino laborers intensified. Anti-Filipino spokespersons also portrayed the largely single Filipino men as sexual threats who sought the company of white and Mexican women at taxi-dance halls. Between 1928 and 1930, competition for jobs as well as concern over "hybridization" culminated in a series of race riots in Washington and California meant to drive Filipinos out of various communities. The most explosive and most publicized incident took place in 1930 near Watsonville, California, where four hundred white vigilantes attacked a Filipino dance club, beating dozens of Filipinos and killing one. In 1933, the California state legislature amended antimiscegenation laws to include Filipino-white marriages. Twelve other states had similar restrictions.

In the midst of the Depression, exclusionists also sought—unsuccessfully—to repatriate Filipinos. Although the 1935 Welch Bill appropriated \$300,000 to pay for the fare of Filipinos who would voluntarily return to the Philippines, only 5 percent of those in the United States (2,190 out of

45,000) took advantage of this offer.⁵³ To enable the government to restrict the number of Filipino immigrants, their legal status as U.S. nationals had to be changed. In 1934, yielding to anti-Filipino forces, the U.S. Congress passed the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, granting the Philippines eventual independence, declaring Filipinos to be aliens, and cutting Filipino immigration to a trickle of fifty persons a year.⁵⁴ Filipinos who served in the U.S. armed forces, especially in the U.S. Navy, were among the few who were exempted from this immigration restriction.

Filipinos in the U.S. Navy

Filipino nationals are the only Asians who have served in the U.S. armed forces in sizable numbers without holding U.S. citizenship. This arrangement emerged out of the colonial process, specifically the extensive U.S. military presence in the Philippines. It was during the Philippine American War at the turn of the century that the United States established its first three military bases in the Philippines.⁵⁵ Since then, the Philippines has housed—sometimes unwillingly—some of the United States' largest overseas air force and naval bases. Even after the Philippines' formal independence in 1946 the U.S. military installations remained, and the Military Bases Agreement of the following year allowed the United States to lease five major bases and at least twenty minor military installations for ninety-nine years at no cost. Although the agreement was signed in 1947, its preliminary terms had been arranged prior to World War II, in effect making it an agreement between the United States and its colony, not between two sovereign states.

Despite the official pretext that the bases served the security interests of both the United States and the Philippines, they primarily protected U.S. economic and political investments in the region. In the post-World War II era, these bases served as springboards as well as training and supply stations for U.S. military interventions in China, Indonesia, Korea, and Vietnam. With the "fall" of China to Mao Zedong's forces in 1949 and the outbreak of war in Korea in 1950, the bases in the Philippines became critical to the U.S. security in terms of "containing" Communism. After the end of the Vietnam War, they represented U.S. commitment to remain a power in the Asian-Pacific region.

For Filipino nationalists, the bases symbolized the colonial legacy and U.S. dominance over the Philippines. For many others, however, they represented economic opportunities. In 1987, the U.S. bases were the second largest employer after the Philippine government, providing jobs and an annual salary totaling more than \$96 million to over sixty-eight thousand Filipinos. They also fueled local economies, sustaining businesses that catered primarily to the base personnel. For these reasons, local, provincial, and some national officials and business leaders lobbied to keep the bases in the Philip-

pines. However, after a 1991 vote for national sovereignty by the Philippine Senate, the last U.S.-controlled base (Subic Bay Naval Station) was turned over to the Philippine government in 1992, some ninety-four years after the first U.S. troops landed in the Philippines.⁵⁶

During the ninety-four years of U.S. military presence in the Philippines, U.S. bases served as recruiting stations for the U.S. armed forces, particularly the Navy. Soon after the United States acquired the Philippines from Spain in 1898, its Navy began actively recruiting Filipinos as stewards and mess boys. From a total of nine persons in 1903, the number of Filipinos in the U.S. Navy grew to six thousand by World War I and hovered around four thousand (or 5 percent of the total Navy manpower) during the 1920s and 1930s. After the Philippines achieved full independence in 1946, the United States no longer could unilaterally authorize recruitment of Filipino nationals, since they had become citizens of their own country. To sidestep this obstacle, U.S. officials inserted a provision in the 1947 Military Bases Agreement (Article 27) granting its Navy the right to continue to recruit Filipino citizens. With the onset of the Korean War in the early 1950s, the U.S. Navy allowed for the enrollment of up to two thousand Filipinos per calendar year for terms of four or six years.⁵⁷

For many young Filipino men, a career in the U.S. Navy had been a life-long dream. In some towns (and in many families), particularly those surrounding U.S. bases, joining the Navy had become a tradition. Beside serving as recruiting stations, these bases—centers of wealth amidst local poverty—exposed the native populace to U.S. money, culture, and standards of living, generating a strong incentive for enlistment. The economic incentive to join the U.S. Navy was high: the salary of a Filipino enlistee often placed him among the top quarter of his country's wage earners. Filipino recruits also used their service in the Navy to gain U.S. citizenship—the springboard for escaping from poverty.⁵⁸ During the 1960s, some one hundred thousand Filipinos applied to the U.S. Navy each year, but few were admitted due to a high reenlistment rate of 94 to 99 percent among Filipinos.⁵⁹ By 1970, in large part due to the grave economic, political, and social problems besetting the Philippines, there were more Filipinos in the U.S. Navy (fourteen thousand) than in the entire Philippine Navy.⁶⁰ In 1973, when the U.S. Navy reduced the number of Filipino recruits from two thousand to four hundred per year, approximately two hundred thousand applied for the few coveted slots. According to the U.S. Navy Chief of Legislative Affairs, in the 1970s about forty thousand potential Filipino enlistees were available at any given time.⁶¹

Prior to and during World War I, the U.S. Navy allowed Filipino enlistees to serve in a range of occupational ratings such as petty officers, band masters, musicians, coxswains' mates, seamen, machinists, firemen, water tenders, commissary stewards, officers' stewards, and mess attendants. How-

ever, after the war the Navy issued a new ruling restricting Filipinos, even those with a college education, to the ratings of officers' stewards and mess attendants.⁶² Leo Sicat (Chapter 6), a graduate of the University of the Philippines, described the indignity he felt in steward school: "At the school, we were taught how to cook and bake, how to set the table, and how to position the silverware, and the glass and the cup. They basically taught us the job of a waitress. Personally, I was so insulted. I was almost a chemical engineer, and I came to the United States just to become a steward."

Barred from admission to other ratings, Filipino enlistees performed the work of domestics, preparing and serving the officers' meals, and caring for the officers' galley, wardroom, and living spaces. Ashore, their duties ranged from ordinary housework to food services at the U.S. Naval Academy mess hall. Unofficially, Filipino stewards also have been ordered to perform menial chores such as walking the officers' dogs and acting as personal servants for the officers' wives. Even when they passed the relevant qualifying examinations, few Filipinos were allowed to transfer to other ratings—unless they were the personal favorites of high-ranking officials who agreed to intervene on their behalf. In 1970, of the 16,669 Filipinos in the U.S. Navy, 80 percent were in the steward rating.⁶³

In the early 1970s, responding to the demands of the civil rights movement and to a senatorial investigation on the use of stewards in the military, the U.S. Navy amended its policies to grant Filipino enlistees the right to enter any occupational rating. In 1973, the first year of the new Navy policy, Filipino nationals served in fifty-six of the eighty-seven ratings available for enlistees. But they were not distributed evenly among these ratings. According to Navy statistics for that year, over 40 percent of Filipinos remained stewards. Of the balance, the majority congregated in clerical jobs such as personnel man, disbursing clerk, storekeeper, and commissary man.⁶⁴ This rating concentration—the result of both job availability and ethnic clustering—suggests that Filipinos in the U.S. Navy continue to share common experiences.

These Navy-related immigrants form a distinct segment of the Filipino American community. Because of their similar background in the U.S. Navy, these Filipino men and their families cultivate informal but lasting social networks. In fact, many Filipino Navy retirees prefer living near their "old Navy comrades with whom they spent a great deal of time while in the service."⁶⁵ Consequently, U.S. cities with large naval facilities, such as San Diego, have sizable Filipino communities made up largely of Navy families. Following in their fathers' footsteps, some Filipino Americans have also joined the U.S. Navy—but now as officers. For example, Daniel Gruta (Chapter 10), whose father and three uncles were Navy enlistees, became a naval officer after graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1986.

Filipinos During World War II and the Postwar Years

World War II marked an important turning point in the history of Filipinos as well as other Asians in the United States. The military exploits of Filipino soldiers—both in the Philippines and in the United States—did a great deal to reduce white prejudice against Filipino Americans. Their wartime services also earned many U.S. citizenship and helped to rescind exclusion laws, thus making renewed immigration from the Philippines possible. According to H. Brett Melendy, from 1946 to 1965, thirty-three thousand Filipinos immigrated to the United States and contributed to a 44 percent increase in the Filipino American population during the 1950–60 census period.⁶⁶ Leaving a war-torn country, the postwar Filipino immigrants, who included war veterans, war brides, students, and skilled and unskilled workers, scattered throughout the United States. During the 1950s, Filipinos in California congregated primarily in the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles. Other mainland cities in which sizable Filipino populations developed were, in order of rank, Seattle, Chicago, New York, and Washington, D.C.⁶⁷

When the United States declared war against Japan in December 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt incorporated the Philippine armed forces into the United States Armed Forces in the Far East (USAFFE). University student reserve officers and nurses in the Philippines were also inducted for military service.⁶⁸ Fighting alongside American soldiers in defending Baatan and Corregidor during the spring of 1942, the heroism and courage of Filipino troops were widely publicized in newsreels and newspaper headlines across the United States. The wartime performance of Filipinos forced whites to view and treat Filipinos in the United States more favorably.⁶⁹ Although Roosevelt had pledged citizenship to Filipino nationals who took up arms against the Japanese, a federal act rescinded that pledge in 1946. Only four thousand Filipino World War II veterans were able to gain U.S. citizenship before the rescission.⁷⁰

Meanwhile, large numbers of Filipinos in the United States were inducted into the armed forces.⁷¹ Their status as U.S. nationals forgotten, many became citizens through mass naturalization ceremonies held before induction. According to A.B. Santos (Chapter 1) who was drafted into the U.S. Army in 1943, "[When] I reported to Los Angeles, . . . they swore me in as a U.S. citizen. I did not even have to file an application." Because most Filipinos were males of draft age, some sixteen thousand were called up under the first draft in 1942. Over seven thousand recruits served in the segregated First Filipino Infantry Regiment and the Second Filipino Infantry Regiment of the U.S. Army. Although the U.S. Navy tried to enlist Filipinos as mess attendants, nearly one-third of the draft-age Filipino males in the continental United States volunteered for the Army. In 1944 over one thousand Filipino Americans infiltrated the Philippines via submarine to gather

intelligence for General Douglas MacArthur's headquarters in Australia. Engaged in sabotage to destroy Japanese communications, Filipino soldiers accelerated the recapture of the Philippines by U.S. forces in 1945.⁷²

World War II also changed the economic fortunes of Filipinos by opening employment in labor-starved war industries. In agriculture, California's attorney general reinterpreted the land laws to allow Filipinos to lease and buy land. The war also forced the United States to reopen its gates to Filipino and other Asian immigrants. In 1946, seeking to demonstrate U.S. commitment to democracy, Congress passed the Luce-Celler Bill, permitting the entry of one hundred Filipino immigrants annually and granting Filipinos the right of naturalization. As citizens, qualified Filipinos were able to secure professional licenses and upgrade their occupational status. As the country's industrial base expanded, many found jobs in factories, in trades, and in wholesale and retail sales. Nevertheless, in California in 1960, agriculture remained the largest employer of Filipinos, with 3 percent classified as farmers and farm managers and another 28 percent as farm laborers and foremen.⁷³ Filipino veterans also made use of the G.I. Bill to attend college and to purchase property. Sociologist R. T. Feria has noted that shortly after the war, many Filipinos in Los Angeles bought homes and small farms that had been vacated by the Japanese who had been incarcerated in "relocation camps."⁷⁴

It was during the postwar years that Filipino women first came to the United States in significant numbers. The majority immigrated as U.S. dependents: some, such as Juanita Santos (Chapter 1), had met and married U.S. servicemen in the Philippines—including a sizable number of Filipino Americans serving in the U.S. Navy; others came to join their Filipino husbands already in the United States; still others, such as Ruth Abad (Chapter 2), entered as "repatriates"—dependents of U.S. citizens who had lived in the Philippines before World War II. According to David Reimers, nearly half of the Filipino immigrants (16,000) between 1946 and 1965 came as wives of U.S. servicemen.⁷⁵ Single Filipinas came to the United States primarily as students. As in the case of Luz Latus (Chapter 4), an unknown number married U.S. citizens and stayed in the United States after their schooling was completed.⁷⁶

The postwar immigrants also included the last batch of Filipino plantation workers. Facing a postwar shortage of cheap laborers, the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association requested the U.S. Department of Interior, by provision of the Tydings-McDuffie Act (section 8), to permit unlimited Filipino immigration to the islands. Exempted from the immigration quota of 50 persons a year, that is applied to Filipino immigration to the mainland, in 1946 some 7,361 Filipinos migrated to Hawaii to work on its sugar plantations. Many arrived to beat the quota of 100 persons a year that would go into effect following Philippine independence.⁷⁷ In sharp contrast to the restrictions

imposed on the immigrant plantation laborers of the 1920s, women and children were allowed in the 1946 group. Most of these families, which included 710 women and 1,425 children, settled on the island of Kauai.⁷⁸

Post-1965 Filipino Immigrants

Contemporary Filipino immigration has been shaped by changes in U.S. immigration legislation and by political, economic, and social conditions in the Philippines. The 1965 Immigration Act, which abolished the national-origins quotas and permitted entry based primarily on family reunification or occupational characteristics, dramatically increased the number of Asian immigrants. In the twenty years following passage of the 1965 act, about 40 percent of the legal immigration to the United States has come from Asia.⁷⁹ The Philippines has been the largest source, with Filipinos comprising nearly one-quarter of the total Asian immigration. In 1961–65, fewer than 16,000 Filipinos immigrated to the United States, compared to more than 221,000 in 1981–85. Since 1979, over 40,000 Filipinos have been admitted annually, making the Philippines the second largest source of all immigration, surpassed only by Mexico.⁸⁰ The 1990 U.S. Census counted close to 1.5 million Filipinos in the United States, 50 percent of whom reside in California. Hawaii and Illinois ranked next, with close to 170,000 and 65,000 respectively.

The 1965 Immigration Act alone, however, does not explain why so many Filipinos have come to the United States in the last quarter-century. The ties forged between the Philippines and the United States during the ninety-plus years of colonial and postcolonial rule have also contributed to this influx. Beside creating strong military and business connections between the two countries, this colonial heritage has produced a pervasive cultural Americanization of the population, exhorting Filipinos to regard the American culture, political system, and way of life as superior to their own.⁸¹ Infused with images of U.S. abundance peddled by the educational system, the media, and relatives and friends already in the United States, Filipinos quickly took advantage of the 1965 changes in the immigration law to emigrate.

The grave economic conditions in the Philippines have also pushed frustrated Filipinos to leave for the United States. During the 1960s, the Philippine economy registered high growth when President Ferdinand Marcos implemented an economic plan that depended solely upon U.S. war efforts in Vietnam. When U.S. forces withdrew from Vietnam, the Philippines was left with an economic infrastructure ill-suited to local needs.⁸² By the end of the Marcos era in 1986, the Philippines was bankrupt and inflation was rampant. Weighed down by the cost of servicing a gigantic foreign debt and heavily dependent on agricultural exports, the Philippine economy suffers

from massive unemployment and inequality in the distribution of income and wealth.

Driven off the land, many peasants migrate to Manila in search of livelihood, but the city does not have enough industries to support its burgeoning population.⁸³ Also, since the 1960s, the Philippines has had an oversupply of educated people. With U.S. aid, the Philippines underwent an “educational boom” after World War II. In 1970, one-quarter of the college-age population in the Philippines was enrolled in colleges and universities, a ratio second only to that of the United States. But this growing army of college-educated Filipinos faced extremely limited employment prospects. Heather Low Ruth estimated that in the late 1960s, jobs were available for only half the college graduates in the Philippines.⁸⁴ Under such grave economic conditions, many Filipinos seized the opportunity to work abroad as permanent immigrants in the United States or as short-term contract workers all over the world.

But the push to leave the Philippines was also political. Declaring martial law in 1972, President Marcos prorogued the legislatures, controlled the media, suspended the writ of habeas corpus, and arrested many of his alleged political opponents. According to a U.S. congressional report, there were between five hundred and one thousand political prisoners in the Philippines at the end of 1978.⁸⁵ During the Marcos era (1965–1986), an estimated three hundred thousand Filipinos emigrated to the United States.⁸⁶ In 1983, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) reported that 208 Filipinos had filed for political asylum that year. However, only eighteen were granted asylum.⁸⁷

As soon as martial law was declared in the Philippines, the Filipino American community organized against Marcos’s dictatorship. The first U.S.-based opposition group was the National Committee for the Restoration of Civil Liberties in the Philippines (NCRCLP). Shortly thereafter, exiled former Philippine senator Raul Manglapus organized the Movement for a Free Philippines (MFP). Edgar Gamboa (Chapter 8), an anti-Marcos student activist, was among those who left for the United States to escape “the tentacles of Marcos’s repressive government.” Once in the United States, he joined the MFP to protest the Marcos dictatorship. Critical of Marcos’s corruption and alarmed by his political repression and violation of human rights, these opposition groups alerted the American public to the plight of political prisoners and to the regime’s use of torture and execution of alleged opponents. Convinced that U.S. economic assistance enabled the Marcos regime to maintain its totalitarian rule, the main goal of these groups was to stop such aid.⁸⁸

Since the 1960s, the Philippines has been the source of the largest number of white-collar professionals to immigrate to the United States.⁸⁹ Because of the shortage of medical personnel in this country, particularly in the inner

cities and in rural areas, doctors, nurses, and other health-related practitioners are overrepresented among the recent Filipino immigrants. Just as the early Filipino immigrants were recruited for farm labor, by the 1970s recent medical graduates in the Philippines were recruited to work in U.S. hospitals, nursing homes, and health organizations.⁹⁰ However, as indicated in the narratives of Luz Latus and Edgar Gamboa (Chapters 4 and 8, respectively), strict licensing procedures and the racial discrimination in the United States have forced many Filipino medical professionals to work in jobs for which they are overqualified or that are totally unrelated to their knowledge and expertise.⁹¹

Since 1960, women have dominated the Filipino immigrant population,⁹² a phenomenon that can be accounted for in part by the need for health professionals in the United States. In the Philippines, according to Antonio Pido, women are the majority in all health-related professions (including nursing, pharmacy, medical technology, and institutional food services) except for medicine, where the numbers of male and female physicians are nearly equal. Because their occupations are high on the list of preferred professions for U.S. immigrants, Filipino women, married or unmarried, can apply as the principal immigrants under the 1965 Immigration Act.⁹³ For example, when Joey Laguda’s mother (Chapter 12), a medical technologist, entered the country, she carried the primary immigrant status, with her husband and children entering as her dependents.

Since the 1970s, the Philippines has been the major source of foreign-trained nurses in the United States, with at least twenty-five thousand Filipino nurses arriving between 1966 and 1985. In fact, many women in the Philippines still study nursing in the hope of securing employment abroad, and many of the nursing programs in the Philippines are accordingly oriented toward supplying the U.S. market.⁹⁴

Not all of the contemporary immigrants from the Philippines are professionals, however. Instead, the dual goals of the 1965 Immigration Act—to facilitate family reunification and to admit workers needed by the U.S. economy—have resulted in two distinct chains of emigration: one of the relatives of Filipinos who had left for the United States prior to 1965 and another chain of highly trained immigrants who entered during the late 1960s and early 1970s. During the period 1966–75, the two groups entered in about the same proportion. However, in 1976–88, the proportion of occupational preference immigrants dropped to 19–20 percent of the Filipino total, while the proportion of family preference immigrants rose to about 80 percent. This shift was the result of tightened entry requirements for professionals in the mid-1970s and their subsequent reliance on family reunification categories.⁹⁵

Because new immigrants tend to have socioeconomic backgrounds similar to those of their sponsors, family reunification immigrants such as Neme-

sia Cortez (Chapter 7) represent a continuation of the unskilled and semiskilled Filipino labor that had emigrated before 1965. In contrast, professionals who immigrate, such as Paz Jensen and Edgar Gamboa (Chapters 5 and 8, respectively), originate from the middle to upper social, economic, and educational sectors of Philippine society, and they in turn sponsor relatives with the same backgrounds.⁹⁶ As a result of these two distinct groups of immigrants, the contemporary Filipino American community exhibits more class diversity than it did in the past.

By allowing resident Filipino Americans to bring their relatives into the United States, the family unification provisions of the 1965 law rejuvenated the established Filipino communities in Hawaii, California, and Washington, and supported a proliferation of regional, hometown, and even village associations.⁹⁷ But such organizations do not bridge class differences, because immigrants with professional backgrounds tend to settle in suburban neighborhoods, beyond the reach of their compatriots, and form their own communities and organizations. Having minimal ties to the pre-1965 Filipinos, these professionals join voluntary associations that cater primarily to their particular class interests and needs. Because employer sponsorship, rather than family sponsorship, influences the destination of occupational immigrants, large numbers of post-1965 immigrants have by-passed the Pacific Coast and settled in the Northeast and Midwest.⁹⁸ This is particularly true for health-care workers who have been recruited to fill the shortage of medical personnel in older metropolitan areas in the Northeast. For example, in 1984 nearly half (46 percent) of the Filipino nurses who had received their licenses within the preceding four years resided in the New York–New Jersey region. The Filipino community of Washington, D.C., provides a similar example. Characterized by high levels of education and middle to upper-middle levels of income, many if not most of these D.C. Filipino Americans are post-1965 immigrants. The new communities in which they predominate add to the complexity of the contemporary Filipino experience.

While class differences both divide established Filipino communities geographically and organizationally and create essentially new communities (each dominated by class), the common confrontation with U.S. racism may eventually lead to greater unity, at least for political purposes.

The Filipino American Community in San Diego

All of the narrators in this book reside in San Diego County, the third largest U.S. destination of contemporary Filipino immigrants.⁹⁹ Numbering close to ninety-six thousand in 1990, Filipinos were the county's largest Asian American group, representing approximately 50 percent of this population. Despite the long history of the San Diego community (dating back to 1903), it receives little mention in the literature. For this reason, I have selected

narratives that illumine not only the Filipino American experience in general but also the Filipino American experience in San Diego in particular.

As in other parts of the U.S. mainland, the first Filipinos in San Diego were students. According to Adelaida Castillo, school records indicate that in 1903 a group of Filipinos between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five enrolled at the State Normal School (now San Diego State University). Lawrence Lawcock reported that nineteen Filipinos organized a Filipino Students' Club in San Diego that same year. Presumably arriving on government scholarships, these *pensionados* stayed only for one year, during which they studied algebra, drawing, botany, English, and music.¹⁰⁰ As illustrated in A. B. Santos's narrative (Chapter 1), the nonsponsored students who followed the *pensionados* scrambled to maintain themselves by combining work and study.

The prewar San Diego Filipinos also included laborers. While the farm workers concentrated in the agricultural communities of El Centro and Escondido, California, the urban laborers lived and worked in downtown hotels and restaurants. For example, according to A. B. Santos, in the early 1920s about eighteen to twenty Filipinos worked at the Coronado Hotel as busboys, janitors, and dining room helpers. Although numerically small (see Table 1), the prewar Filipino community was vibrant. Barred from renting or purchasing homes outside of the business district, most Filipinos lived in the downtown section of the city. There, around Market Street, Filipinos ran small restaurants and pool and gambling tables, and sponsored dances and other cultural events. Rizal Day—a yearly observance in honor of Philippine national hero Dr. José Rizal—was the most celebrated festivity, drawing several hundred Filipinos from all over the county.¹⁰¹

The virulent racism against Filipinos in San Diego—and in other parts of the country—declined after World War II. According to Ruth Abad (Chapter 2), before the war, Filipinos who were not U.S. citizens* could not own property “unless they married an American. And even then, the white people used to stone their homes. Also, some hotels . . . did not allow Filipinos to hold their dances in their ballrooms. . . . But after the war, the white people learned that Filipinos are good, so the prejudice faded.” In the 1950s, non-Filipino women's clubs and churches began to invite Filipino folk dancers and speakers to teach them about Filipino culture.¹⁰² Recalling her immigration to the United States in 1952 as a war bride, Juanita Santos (Chapter 1) mentions receiving “so many invitations” to the women's clubs of Coronado, Pacific Beach, Chula Vista, and La Jolla to speak about Filipino women.

*Like other Asian immigrants, Filipino immigrants were denied the right of naturalization. They became eligible for naturalized citizenship in 1946 with the passage of the Luce-Celler bill.

Because San Diego is the site of the largest U.S. naval base and the Navy's primary West Coast training facility, Navy men and their families have comprised a large proportion of the county's Filipinos since the early 1900s. According to Juanita Santos and Ruth Abad (Chapters 1 and 2 respectively), the majority of the Filipino families in San Diego during the 1940s and 1950s were Navy-connected. This association is reflected in the founding of pioneer Filipino organizations in San Diego—the Fleet Reserve Association and the Filipino American Veterans Hall (the first community center). Recalling her school days in the early 1960s, Anamaria Labao Cabato (Chapter 9) states that “there were a lot of Filipinos where I went to school [in National City]. We were all Navy children. I don't think any of my classmates were the children of professionals. Maybe their mothers were nurses, but it was the Navy that got them here.” Even into the 1970s, the Navy presence was still prominent. According to Daniel Gruta (Chapter 10), Mira Mesa's proximity to the nearby Miramar Naval Air Station in northern San Diego made it predominantly a Navy town. The biggest store in town was not Alpha Beta [a Southern California supermarket chain] but the Navy Commissary store and the Navy Exchange at the Naval Air Station.” Rubén Rumbaut reported that during 1978–85, more than 51 percent of the 12,500 Filipino babies born in the San Diego metropolitan area were delivered at the U.S. Naval Hospital.¹⁰³

As in other Filipino communities along the Pacific Coast, the San Diego community grew dramatically in the twenty-five years following passage of the 1965 Immigration Act. New immigration contributed greatly to the tripling of the county's Filipino American population in 1970–80 and its doubling in 1980–90 (see Table 1). The arrival of the new immigrants has made it more difficult to maintain the closeness once shared by the smaller group. Reminiscing about the pre-1965 community, Juanita Santos (Chapter 1) states that “we used to be very, very close. We were one big family. When we had a picnic, Oh, my Lord, everybody would come. Now we don't know everybody like we used to.”

The increasing geographical dispersion of the community is an obstacle to its cohesion. Once concentrated in South Bay communities such as National City, Chula Vista, and Imperial Beach, San Diego Filipinos now also live in the relatively newer and more affluent North County communities of Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos, and Oceanside, which means that most Filipinos who live at opposite ends of the county know very little about each other. This north-south separation also reflects differences in class and immigration history, with most newly arrived professionals residing in the North County and most retired Navy people living in the South Bay. Consider the two boards of directors of the PASACAT dance troupe.¹⁰⁴ According to Anamaria Labao Cabato (Chapter 9), executive director of PASACAT, in the North County “we've got a financial adviser on the board, a senior

Table 1
Filipino Population in the United States, California, and San Diego, 1910–90

Year ¹	United States	California	San Diego ²
1910	2,767	5	—
1920	26,634	2,674	48
1930	108,260	30,470	394
1940	98,535	31,408	799
1950	122,707	40,424	NA
1960	181,614	67,134	5,123
1970	336,731	135,248	15,069
1980	774,652	358,378	48,658
1990	1,406,770	733,941	95,945

¹Up to 1950, the data are from H. Brett Melendy, *Asians in America: Filipinos, Koreans, and East Indians* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977), whose sources include the annual reports of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The figures for 1960 to 1990 were collated from the U.S. Census of Population and Housing for each area.

²Melendy's records for San Diego through 1950 were for the city itself; the numbers from 1960 to 1990 are those for San Diego County.
NA, not available.

financial analyst, an accountant who has his own business, a mechanical engineer, an auditor working for the Department of Defense. . . . Here in the South Bay, the board members are Navy retirees, civil servants, a couple of nurses, maybe one or two teachers. They do not have the business skills that the North County people have.”

As the number of Filipinos in San Diego grew, so did the number of community organizations. According to my own estimate and that of the narrators in this book, there are currently 150 to 175 Filipino American associations in San Diego County—an exponential increase from the handful that existed prior to 1970.¹⁰⁵ The majority are town- or region-based associations, some of which have been started anew, while others have been revived by previously inactive groups. Bringing together individuals who originally came from the same town, province, or region in the Philippines, these social groups mainly sponsor annual banquets, picnics, dances, and town fiestas. In contrast, the primary goal of the professional and alumni organizations is to promote their particular class interests and needs. As Luz Latus (Chapter 4) stated, the principal aim of the San Diego Chapter of the Philippine Nurses Association of America is “to protect our profession and our nurses.” The relative class homogeneity of these associations suggests that these professionals limit their contact largely to Filipinos of the same socioeconomic background.

Most of the narrators regard the proliferation of such organizations as divisive and detrimental to Filipino American political effectiveness. The

following comment by Leo Sicat (Chapter 6) is typical: “If we are not unified, nobody is going to talk to us. We Filipinos don’t get the respect that we deserve. We are not being heard.” However, given its increasing diversity along class, regional, linguistic, and generational lines, the Filipino American community in San Diego—and elsewhere—needs a flexible organizational structure that will allow them to coalesce as well as to fragment, and to shift identity and reference groups to meet situational needs. A single organizational structure would leave them only two choices: to join or to withdraw. But if a more accommodating structure is allowed to develop, the proliferation of organizations, instead of being a detriment, may provide the strongest social and political support for Filipino Americans, linking them simultaneously to multiple levels of solidarity.

The Construction of Filipino American Identities

In the last quarter-century, the vast majority of immigrants to the United States have been people of color. However, despite their Third World origins, today’s immigrants—unlike their European counterparts of the nineteenth century—have long been exposed to Western life styles, cultural practices, and consumption patterns, because the contemporary world, although still organized as separate nation-states, is in fact bound by a global capitalist system.¹⁰⁶ Owing to the accessibility of international travel, the increasing economic and political connections between developing and developed nations, and the worldwide diffusion of postindustrial, bourgeois mass culture, today’s immigrants arrive with a working, if not intimate, knowledge of U.S. capitalist culture.¹⁰⁷

The development of a global economy means that most recent immigrants are, in a sense, the offspring of American globalism.¹⁰⁸ This global context opens new perspectives on international migration, perspectives that place the study of migrants’ identities within the *worldwide* historical context of differential power and inequality. Extending the issue of power beyond the context of the countries of settlement, this global view posits that the identity and experience of contemporary immigrants of color have been shaped not only by the social location of their racial group within the United States but also by the position of their country within the global racial order.

In the case of Filipino immigrants, the cultural, economic, and political relationships between the Philippines and the United States—imposed and maintained during the ninety-plus years of colonial and postcolonial rule—have provided and continue to provide the context within which they construct their identities. The position of the Philippines within the global racial order and the social location of Filipinos in the United States means that Filipino immigrants—regardless of their class status and familiarity with U.S.

culture—are defined as “nonwhite” and face the consequences of being so labeled.

As discussed, prior to World War II Filipinos were barred from becoming U.S. citizens, owning real property, and marrying whites. While such blatant legal discrimination against Filipino Americans (and other Asian Americans) is largely a matter of the past, Filipinos continue to encounter many barriers that prevent them from full participation in the economic, social, and political institutions of the United States. Most importantly, the economic mobility and cultural assimilation that enables white ethnics to become “unhyphenated whites”¹⁰⁹ does not lead to complete acceptance of Filipinos and other people of color as “Americans.” As Connie Tirona (Chapter 3) declared, “Sometimes, I am not sure what it means to be an American. I am not equal to anyone. My color is different and that seems to be mattering all my lifetime.”

Like Filipinos elsewhere, the narrators in this book actively resist the cultural racism and nativism of U.S. society. Juanita Santos (Chapter 1) counters arrogance with the “truth” about the Philippines: “I just wanted to ‘educate’ the other races that the Filipinos are as knowledgeable and cultured as they are. I wanted respect for my people. I wanted to project a positive image of the Filipinos and my native country.” When a tall, blue-eyed doctor at Mercy Hospital asked Santos if there were schools in the Philippines, she shook her finger at him and said, “You know what, Doctor, you are ignorant. Our University of Santo Tomas is twenty-five years older than your Harvard University.” Similarly, Ruth Abad (Chapter 2) founded the Filipino American Women’s Club in part to “show off our culture, like our cooking, our costumes, and our folk dances.” Other narrators responded to racism by resolving to outshine the offenders. For example, faced with racial tauntings by his classmates, Daniel Gruta (Chapter 10) “got even by outdoing them in school.” Still others, like Luz Latus, Paz Jensen, Edgar Gamboa, and Dario Villa (Chapters 4, 5, 8, and 11 respectively), challenged institutional racism through their positions at work and/or their involvement in professional organizations.

To resist racial categorization, Filipino immigrants in the United States also have refused to sever their ties to the Philippines. They have assumed instead the role of *transmigrants*, generating and sustaining multistranded relations between the Philippines and the United States.¹¹⁰ While some narrators in this book identify more with one society than the other, most have kept ties with family, friends, and colleagues in the Philippines through occasional visits, telephone calls, remittances, and medical and other humanitarian missions. In so doing, they have created and maintained fluid and multiple identities that link them simultaneously to both countries. As an example, while Luz Latus identifies herself as “an American citizen” who is “very much interested in and informed on what goes on in this country,” her dream is

to return to the Philippines to help “*my country and my people*” (emphasis added). According to Nina Glick Schiller and her colleagues, “through these seemingly contradictory experiences, transmigrants actively manipulate their identities and thus both accommodate to and resist their subordination within a global capitalist system.”¹¹¹

As transmigrants, Filipinos also engage in the process of transculturation, creating something new from the cultural resources of their countries of origin and of settlement.¹¹² This is particularly true among the “one-and-a-half generation”—those who came to the United States in their late childhood or teen years. In the following statement, Dario Villa (Chapter 11), who came to the United States in 1976 at the age of seventeen, describes his Filipino American world as a union of cultures:

In my case, what I have is an amalgamation of values. I have been able to find a comfort zone between both cultures, taking the values that I learned as a kid and adopting the American values that I think will make me a much wholler, more knowledgeable individual. For example, I use both the Filipino value of family interdependence *and* the American value of independence to the best interests of myself and my family.

This active cultural construction challenges both the assimilationist and pluralist perspectives, which conceptualize identity as bipolar and linear, and thus overlook the emergence of distinct, new cultures that are qualitatively different from those of the immigrant homelands as well as from traditional American society.

In contrast, because U.S.-born Filipinos are not as able as their parents and the “one-and-a-half generations” to draw on the knowledge of an alternative way of life or on the social ties “back home,” their identities are shaped largely by the dialogue of racial domination in the United States.¹¹³ Connie Tirona, Anamaria Labao Cabato, Joey Laguda, and Lisa Graham (Chapters 3, 9, 12, and 13, respectively) detailed the social costs of being Filipinos in the United States. Beside witnessing the economic discrimination faced by their immigrant parents, all recalled being teased and harassed by their peers for their perceived racial differences. Connie Tirona described the world of prejudice of the 1930s: “I can remember walking to elementary school and being taunted at times. . . . I used to bring rice and fish to school for lunch because I love to eat both. It was a great meal for me. [But] the little girls would not sit by me.” Joey Laguda similarly felt ostracized when his parents moved to North San Diego in the late 1970s: “Back then . . . the majority white population was not tolerant of any minorities. This I got to experience from watching racial fights my brothers were involved in and seeing the words ‘Flips go home’ spraypainted on the house of one of my

best friends.” These accounts reveal that Filipinos in both the Philippines and the United States live within, and in tension with, a racist system that defines white middle-class culture as the norm.

The racism of the larger society strongly influences the ethnic identification of second-generation Filipino Americans. Some respond by “assimilating”: speaking only English, dating and associating primarily with Anglos, and slighting Filipino culture. Dario Villa (Chapter 11) recalled being shunned by the U.S.-born Filipinos because he was an “FOB” (“Fresh Off the Boat”): “I was ridiculed because my accent reminded them of their parents. It was their shame coming out at my expense. A number of times in my classes, there were Filipinas who giggled and displayed bodily discomfort when I spoke.” Others, like Joey Laguda (Chapter 12), reacted to racism by developing “a real hatred for white people. . . . Filipinos were being slurred and slandered, and therefore it was right for us to retaliate. I was involved in many fights because of this. When I got angry about anyone thinking that I was less than human, I made sure they knew that I was someone to be reckoned with.”

U.S. racism also reconfigures gender roles for some of the women narrators in this book. In contrast to the patriarchal, patrilineal, and patrilocal nature of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean societies, the gender structure in the Philippines is more egalitarian, and kinship is bilateral. In employment as well as in participation in economic, political, and social activities, women in the Philippines had and continue to have more or less equal status with men.¹¹⁴ According to Paz Jensen (Chapter 5), “When I was growing up in the Philippines, women were already represented in almost all high positions. . . . There were so many role models of women involved in politics, in philanthropy, and in society.” As of the mid-1970s, the Philippines was one of the few countries in the world where the number of women in postsecondary education equaled or exceeded that of men.¹¹⁵ Luz Latus (Chapter 4) recalled the high aspirations that her father had for her: “He would have liked to see me become a teacher, a doctor, or a lawyer.”

Given the relatively favorable status of women in the Philippines, many immigrant Filipinas like Luz Latus, Paz Jensen, and Lucie Gamboa (Edgar Gamboa’s wife [Chapter 8]) have excelled in their professions, particularly when their skills match the needs of the U.S. labor market. But other Filipinas, like Ruth Abad (Chapter 2), encountered more restrictive female roles in the United States. Coming from a prominent family in the Philippines, there Abad did not have to do any household chores: “When I came home, the food was cooked, and the clothes were washed [by the helpers].” But in the United States, “I had to do everything, cleaning, cooking, and taking care of the children. It was endless. I used to cry. My maids in the Philippines had more days off than me.” Although Abad was not the “housekeeping type,” her class position in the United States, which is in part a consequence

of the racism that restricts the economic opportunities of many Filipinos, forced her into a more restrictive female role. Abad's narrative reminds us that class, race, and gender are interlocking categories that affect all aspects of human life.

Most importantly, in almost all of the life stories that I collected in San Diego County, Filipinos (particularly the second generation) contend that their ethnicity has changed in both importance and content over time. For example, Anamaria Labao Cabato (Chapter 9) "felt inferior" in high school because she was a Filipina; however, in college, through her involvement with the PASACAT dance troupe, she became proud of her heritage because she "knew more about our culture than other Filipinos." Lisa Graham (Chapter 13), the daughter of a white American and a Filipina American, recalls being pressured to choose between the two groups: "In school, when we had to fill out those cards for nationality, I was always confused because I never knew what to put. . . . I wish they would have something like 'half-and-half,' because if you are not one full race, you don't know what to put down." Although the larger society insists that races are mutually exclusive, Graham eventually resists being shoved into one of the existing monoracial categories. In the following statement, she described the progression of the change in her ethnic identity:

When I was younger, I used to say, "I am American, I am American. I am white." It was just because everybody seemed to be either white or black, a full race. . . . Starting in junior high, it became important for me to say that I was Filipino because of my mom. . . . But now my whole attitude is changing. Now I say that I am half-Filipino and half-white.

Stressing flux rather than continuity and multilinearity rather than unilinearity, the narratives in this book show that a Filipino American culture is not formed in isolation but in dialogue with and in opposition to the racist ideologies and practices of the United States. Each of the narratives reveals ways in which Filipino American identity has been and continues to be shaped by a colonial history and a white-dominated culture. It is through recognizing how profoundly race has affected their lives that Filipino Americans force their ethnic identities—identities that challenge stereotypes and undermine practices of cultural domination. It is in this sense that the ethnic experiences of Filipino Americans resemble those of other communities of color and diverge from those of European ethnics.

Endnotes

1. Larry Arden Lawcock, "Filipino Students in the United States and the Philippine Independence Movement: 1900–1935" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1975), 33–34; Maria E. Espina, *Filipinos in Louisiana* (New Orleans: A. F. Laborde & Sons, 1988), 1–7.

2. E. San Juan, Jr., "Mapping the Boundaries: The Filipino Writer in the U.S.A.," *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 19 (1991): 117–31.
3. Fred Cordova, *Filipinos: Forgotten Asian Americans* (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1983); Amado Cabezas, Larry H. Shinagawa, and Gary Kawaguchi, "New Inquiries into the Socioeconomic Status of Pilipino Americans in California," *Amerasia Journal* 13:1 (1986–87): 1–21; Oscar Penaranda, Serafin Syquia, and Sam Tagatac, "An Introduction to Filipino American Literature," in *Aiiieeeee! An Anthology of Asian American Writers*, ed. Frank Chin et al. (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1974).
4. Oscar Campomanes, "The Institutional Invisibility of American Imperialism, the Philippines, and Filipino Americans," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, Los Angeles, March 25, 1993.
5. Cecile Cruz, "Relocating Myths: An Analysis of Two Filipina Transmigrants," unpublished paper, University of California, San Diego, 1993; Renato Rosaldo, "Ideology, Place, and People Without Culture," *Cultural Anthropology* 3 (1988): 77–87.
6. Luzviminda Francisco, "The First Vietnam—The Philippine–American War 1899–1902," in *Letters in Exile*, ed. Jesse Quinsaat et al. (Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1976), 1–22.
7. Sucheng Chan, *Asian Americans: An Interpretive History* (Boston: Twayne, 1991), 16–17; see also Antonio J. A. Pido, *The Filipinos in America: Macro/Micro Dimensions of Immigration and Integration* (Staten Island, N.Y.: Center for Migration Studies, 1986), 48.
8. Teodoro A. Agoncillo and Milagros C. Guerrero, *History of the Filipino People* (Quezon City: R. P. Garcia Publishing Co., 1970), 303–42.
9. Miriam Sharma, "The Philippines: A Case of Migration to Hawaii, 1906 to 1946," in *Labor Immigration Under Capitalism: Asian Workers in the United States Before World War II*, ed. Lucie Cheng and Edna Bonacich (Berkeley: University of California Press), 337–58.
10. To underscore the importance U.S. colonizers gave to education, the head of the Department of Education in the Philippines until 1935 was an American. Renato Constantino, "Identity and Consciousness: The Philippine Experience." Paper presented in symposium 3 of the VIII World Sociology Congress, Toronto, Canada, 1994, 39.
11. Lawcock, "Filipino Students," 92; Constantino, *The Philippines, A Past Revisited* (Quezon City: Tala Publishing Services, 1975), 310; William J. Pomeroy, "The Philippines: A Case History of Neocolonialism," in *Remaking Asia: Essays on the American Uses of Power*, ed. Mark Selden (New York: Pantheon Books, 1974), 171; Barbara M. Posadas and Ronald L. Guyotte, "Unintentional Immigrants: Chicago's Filipino Foreign Students Become Settlers, 1900–1941," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 9 (Spring 1990): 26–48.
12. Chris Friday, *Organizing Asian American Labor: The Pacific Coast Canned-Salmon Industry, 1870–1942* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 135; Generoso Pacificar Provideo, *Oriental Immigration from an American Dependency* (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1974); Lawcock, "Filipino Students." The discussion of "unintentional immigrants" is based on Posadas and Guyotte, "Unintentional Immigrants."

13. H. Brett Melendy, *Asians in America: Filipinos, Koreans, and East Indians* (Boston: Twayne, 1977), 32.
14. According to Barbara Posadas, "At a Crossroad: Filipino American History and the Old Timers' Generation," *Amerasia Journal* 13:1 (1986–87), 85–97, not all Chicago Filipinos were laborers. Several hundred fortunate Filipinos secured jobs with the Chicago Post Office and the Pullman Company. These workers became the "elite" of the old-timers in Chicago.
15. Lawcock, "Filipino Students," 665; Mary Dorita, *Filipino Immigration to Hawaii* (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1975). See also Ronald Takaki, *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii: 1835–1920* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983).
16. Dorita, *Filipino Immigration*, 3–11, 16–17. See also Miriam Sharma, "Pinoy in Paradise: Environment and Adaptation of Pilipinos in Hawaii, 1906–1946," *Amerasia Journal* 7:2 (1980): 91–117.
17. This statement was made by Hawaii's Territorial Board of Immigration in 1909, as cited in Dorita, *Filipino Immigration*, 11.
18. Figures computed by Sucheng Chan from Bruno Lasker, *Filipino Immigration to Continental United States and to Hawaii* (1931; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969), 347–53.
19. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 109.
20. Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 61; Dorita, *Filipino Immigration*, 40.
21. Ethnic Studies Oral History Project, *The 1924 Filipino Strike in Kauai* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, Ethnic Studies Program, 1979), 4.
22. Robert N. Anderson, *Filipinos in Rural Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984), 3–4.
23. Figures are computed from Lasker, *Filipino Immigration*, 167. Most Visayans came to Hawaii in the first wave of immigration; few arrived after the mid-1920s.
24. Cordova, *Filipinos*, 28.
25. Sharma, "The Philippines," 337–58.
26. Sharma, "Pinoy in Paradise," 97.
27. Miriam Sharma, "Labor Migration and Class Formation Among the Filipinos in Hawaii, 1906–1946," in *Labor Immigration Under Capitalism*, ed. Cheng and Bonacich, 579–615. See also Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1989), 140–42.
28. Roman R. Cariaga, *The Filipinos in Hawaii: A Survey of Their Economic and Social Conditions* (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1974), 39–41.
29. Ethnic Studies Oral History Project, *The 1924 Filipino Strike*, 9.
30. Melendy, *Asians in America*, 94.
31. Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 142–55; Chan, *Asian Americans*, 84–88.
32. The most detailed account of the 1924 Kauai strike is Ethnic Studies Oral History Project, *The 1924 Filipino Strike*.
33. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 18.
34. Melendy, *Asians in America*, 41–42.
35. California State Department of Industrial Relations, *Facts About Filipino Immigration* (San Francisco: 1930), 47; Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 315.

36. Sonia Emily Wallovits, *The Filipinos in California* (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1972), 21.
37. In 1930, 25 percent of the Filipinos (11,400 out of 45,200) on the mainland worked in hotels, restaurants, and homes as janitors, valets, kitchen helpers, dishwashers, bed makers, busboys, and domestic servants; see Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 316–17.
38. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 37–39.
39. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 37.
40. Melendy, *Asians in America*, 75–76.
41. Provideo, *Oriental Immigration*, 27.
42. Lawcock, "Filipino Students," 484–85, 665; Provideo, *Oriental Immigration*, 28; Melendy, *Asians in America*, 74.
43. Roberto V. Vallangca, *Pinoy: The First Wave: 1898–1941* (San Francisco: Strawberry Hill Press, 1977), 23.
44. *Manong* literally means "uncles," a term of respect used for the old-timers.
45. Interview cited in Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 321.
46. Craig Scharlin and Lilia V. Villanueva, *Philip Vera Cruz: A Personal History of Filipino Immigrants and the Farmworkers Movement* (Los Angeles: UCLA Labor Center, Institute of Industrial Relations, and UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1992), 5.
47. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 75–78. According to Chan, compared with the information available on Chinese, Japanese, and Korean community institutions, much less is known about the social organizations of the Filipino immigrant community. For information on the Filipino American community organizations in Washington, see Jon D. Cruz, "Filipino-American Community Organizations in Washington, 1900s–1930s," in *People of Color in the American West*, ed. Sucheng Chan, Douglas Henry Daniels, Mario T. Garcia, and Terry P. Wilson (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1994), 235–45.
48. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 88–89; Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 321–23.
49. Scharlin and Villanueva, *Philip Vera Cruz*.
50. Manuel Buaken, *I Have Lived with the American People* (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1948), 201.
51. Lasker, *Filipino Immigration*, 21.
52. Provideo, *Oriental Immigration*, 30. The next 4 paragraphs are culled from Friday, *Organizing Asian American Labor*, 125–48; and Cruz, "Filipino-American Community Organizations."
53. Emory S. Bogardus, "Anti-Filipino Race Riots" (1930), in *Letters in Exile*, ed. Quinsaat et al., 51–62; Howard A. De Witt, *Anti-Filipino Movements in California: A History, Bibliography, and Study Guide* (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1976), 46–66; Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 327–330.
54. Melendy, *Asians in America*, 27–28, 40–44.
55. This and the next 2 paragraphs are based on William E. Berry, Jr., *U.S. Bases in the Philippines: The Evolution of a Special Relationship* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989); and Roland Simbulan, *A Guide to Nuclear Philippines: A Primer on U.S. Military Bases, Nuclear Weapons, and What the Filipino People Are Doing About These* (Philippines: IBON Data Bank, 1989).

56. Bob Drogin, "Americans Bid Farewell to Last Philippine Base," *Los Angeles Times*, November 25, 1992.
57. Lasker, *Filipino Immigration*, 62; Jesse Quinsaat, "An Exercise on How to Join the Navy and Still Not See the World," in *Letters in Exile*, ed. Quinsaat et al., 96–111; U.S. Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives, Special Study Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to Review Certain Immigration, Refugee, and Nationality Problems, *Report of Special Study Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to Review Immigration, Refugee, and Nationality Problems*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., December 1973 (hereafter cited as Special Study Subcommittee).
58. The Nationality Act of 1940 and its amendments give aliens who have served 3 or more years in the U.S. armed forces the opportunity to become U.S. citizens without having to meet the usual requirements such as residence.
59. Special Study Subcommittee, 3.
60. Melendy, *Asians in America*, 96.
61. Special Study Subcommittee, 15.
62. Lawcock, "Filipino Students," 473.
63. Quinsaat, "How to Join the Navy"; Timothy Ingram, "The Floating Plantation," *Washington Monthly* (October 1970): 17–20.
64. Special Study Subcommittee, 16.
65. Quinsaat, "How to Join the Navy," 101.
66. Melendy, *Asians in America*, 249.
67. H. Brett Melendy, "Filipinos in the United States," *Pacific Historical Review* 43 (1974): 524–25.
68. Vallangca, Caridad Concepcion, *The Second Wave: Pinoy & Pinay, 1945–1965* (San Francisco: Strawberry Hill Press, 1987), 11.
69. Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 358–59.
70. Citing their wartime contributions and their loyalty to the United States, many Filipino veterans have come to the United States to petition for naturalization. In 1990, nearly 50 years after the end of World War II, the United States finally restored citizenship rights to veterans who were stymied when Roosevelt's pledge was rescinded in 1946. See Paul Feldman, "A Battle for Rights," *Los Angeles Times*, February 19, 1994: B3.
71. Because of their status as aliens, Filipinos in the United States were exempt from military service. On January 2, 1942, President Roosevelt signed a law revising the Selective Service Act to permit these Filipinos to join the U.S. armed forces.
72. Cordova, *Filipinos*, 217–14; Melendy, *Asians in America*, 50; Lawcock, "Filipino Students," 576.
73. Melendy, "Filipinos in the United States," 531.
74. R. T. Feria, "War and the Status of Filipino Immigrants," *Sociology and Social Research* 31 (1946–47): 50–53; see also Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 358–63.
75. David Reimers, *Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 24–25.
76. Vallangca, *The Second Wave*, 53–54.

77. Melendy, "Filipinos in the United States," 522.
78. Vallangca, *The Second Wave*, 26.
79. Leon Bouvier and Robert Gardner, "Immigration to the U.S.: The Unfinished Story," *Population Bulletin* 41 (1986): 1–50.
80. Benjamin V. Cariño, James T. Fawcett, Robert W. Gardner, and Fred Arnold, *The New Filipino Immigrants to the United States: Increasing Diversity and Change*, (Honolulu: East-West Center, 1990), 2.
81. Pomeroy, "The Philippines," 171; Benjamin V. Cariño, "The Philippines and Southeast Asia: Historical Roots and Contemporary Linkages," in *Pacific Bridges: The New Immigration from Asia and the Pacific Islands*, ed. James T. Fawcett and Benjamin V. Cariño (Staten Island, N.Y.: Center for Migration Studies, 1987).
82. John M. Liu and Lucie Cheng, "Pacific Rim Development and the Duality of Post-1965 Immigration to the United States," in *The New Asian Immigration in Los Angeles and Global Restructuring*, ed. Paul Ong, Edna Bonacich, and Lucie Cheng (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994).
83. Chan, *Asian Americans*, 149–50; David Joel Steinberg, *The Philippines: A Singular and a Plural Place* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1990), 129–30.
84. Heathow Low Ruth, "Philippines," in *The International Migration of High-Level Manpower: Its Impact on the Development Process*, ed. The Committee on the International Migration of Talent (New York: Praeger 1970); Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 62; Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 433.
85. Berry, *U.S. Bases*, 168.
86. Steinberg, *The Philippines*, 129–30.
87. Madge Bello and Vince Reyes, "Filipino Americans and the Marcos Overthrow: The Transformation of Political Consciousness," *Amerasia Journal* 13 (1986–87): 73–83.
88. Bello and Reyes, "Filipino Americans and the Marcos Overthrow," 76–78.
89. Rubén Rumbaut, "Passages to America: Perspectives on the New Immigration," in *America at Century's End*, ed. Alan Wolfe (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), 208–44.
90. Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 85.
91. Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore*, 434–36.
92. Cariño et al., *The New Filipino Immigrants*, 13–14; Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 77–82.
93. Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 78–82. The third preference of the 1965 Immigration Act allows for the immigration of professionals and other highly talented persons whose skills were scarce within the U.S. labor market.
94. Paul Ong and Tania Azores, "The Migration and Incorporation of Filipino Nurses," in *The New Asian Immigration*, ed. Ong et al., 164–95.
95. Cariño et al., *The New Filipino Immigrants*, 11–12.
96. John M. Liu, Paul M. Ong, and Carolyn Rosenstein, "Dual Chain Migration: Post-1965 Filipino Immigration to the United States," *International Migration Review* 25:3 (Fall 1991): 487–513.
97. Liu, Ong, and Rosenstein, "Dual Chain Migration."
98. Joseph McCallus, "The Rhetoric of Journalism: The Filipino-American Press

and Its Washington, D.C., Audience" (Ph.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 1987), 19–20; Alvar Carlson, "The Settling of Recent Filipino Immigrants in Midwestern Metropolitan Areas," *Crossroads* 1 (1983): 13–19; Peter C. Smith, "The Social Demography of Filipino Migrations Abroad," *International Migration Review* 10 (1976), 307–53; and Liu et al., "Dual Chain Migration."

99. Rumbaut, "Passages to America," 220.
100. Adelaida Castillo, "Filipino Migrants in San Diego, 1900–1946," *The Journal of San Diego History* 12 (1976): 27–35; see also Lawcock, "Filipino Students," 97.
101. Castillo, "Filipino Migrants in San Diego"; Adelaida Castillo-Tsuchida, *Filipino Migrants in San Diego, 1900–1946* (San Diego: San Diego Society, Title Insurance and Trust Collection, 1979).
102. Wallovitts, *The Filipinos in California*, 79.
103. Rumbaut, "Passages to America," 220.
104. PASACAT, the name of a Philippine folk dance, is the acronym for the Philippine-American Society and Cultural Arts Troupe in San Diego, whose objectives are to preserve the cultural heritages of the Philippines through music, song, dance, and drama.
105. My estimate of the number of Filipino American organizations is derived from the official membership list of the Council of Pilipino American Organizations (COPAO) and from the announcements of community organizations in the local Filipino American newspapers.
106. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); Saskia Sassen, *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
107. James T. Fawcett and Fred Arnold, "Explaining Diversity: Asian and Pacific Immigration Systems," in *Pacific Bridges: The New Immigration from Asia and the Pacific Islands*, ed. James T. Fawcett and Benjamin V. Cariño (New York: Center for Migration Studies in association with the East-West Population Institute, East-West Center), 453–74.
- ✓ 108. For a transnational perspective on migration, see *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 645 (1992): entire volume.
- ✓ 109. Stanley Lieberson, "Unhyphenated Whites in the United States," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 8 (1985): 159–80.
- ✓ 110. Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton, "Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 645 (1992): 1–24.
- ✓ 111. Glick Schiller et al., "Transnationalism," 12.
112. The concept of transculturation was introduced by Cuban sociologist Fernando Ortiz, as discussed in Lambros Comitas, "Preface," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 645 (1992): vii–viii.
113. For a discussion of the construction of identities of second-generation Filipinos, see Yen Le Espiritu, "The Intersection of Race, Ethnicity, and Class: The Multiple Identities of Second-Generation Filipinos," *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 1:2 (1994): 1–25.
114. Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 23.
115. Pido, *The Pilipinos in America*, 82.