

# 菲華歷史學報

The  
ANNALS

of

Philippine Chinese Historical  
Association



Eighth Issue  
October, 1978

## IN THIS ISSUE...

**Teodoro A. Agoncillo, "History as Humanities"** — The author considers history as the liveliest of the humanities subjects as it recreates the past with a deep sense of realism. Suggestions on how to teach the subject more effectively are given.

**Anita Beltran Chen, "Selectivity in Philippine Migration"** — A comparison is made between two waves of Philippine migrants to North America (1906-1946 and 1946-present) and suggestions are offered for new foci of interest in looking at the problem of selectivity pattern in Philippine migration.

**Min-sun Chen, "China in the Early Seventeenth-Century: Alvarez Semedo's History of the Great and Renowned Monarchy of China"** — The author discusses the account of seventeenth-century China by Semedo to examine the degree of its accuracy and to test its reliability.

**Han Lih-wu, "Rizal and Sun Yat Sen"** — Two great sons of Asia, each worthy in his own way, are compared here to bring out remarkable coincidences and parallelisms in their lives and ideals.

**Hsiao Shi-ching, "The Chinese Sense of Humor"** — Although sense of humor is common among peoples, that of the humorously serious Chinese has an appeal of its own, as the author proves with various examples.

**Gideon C. T. Hsu, "A World University in Metro Manila"** — With its curriculum for world peace, the proposed World University seeks to promote international understanding through graduate instruction in various fields of the humanities and social sciences.

**Gideon C. T. Hsu, "Limahong"** — Little-known details in the life of the notorious sea-farer and his Philippine misadventures are presented to provide a new perspective of his role in the history of this country.

**Samuel K. Tan, "Social History for National Awareness and Survival"** — Among others, social history performs the role of an agent of change and becomes a vehicle for national awareness in Philippine society.

**Leopoldo Y. Yabes, "Tondo and Its Great Minds"** — One of the few published studies on the Tondo intellectual, this article gives an insight into the intellectual milieu of the most populous district of Manila.

**Bill T. C. Yang, "Missions in Cultural Contextualization"** — In this study of cross-cultural missions, the author discusses why and how indigenization is being replaced by contextualization.

**Antonio S. Tan, "The Chinese in the Philippines During the Japanese Occupation, 1941-1945"** — This article attempts to re-create one of the most difficult experiences that the Chinese were called upon to endure. In those fateful years the Japanese would exact a heavy price for the anti-Japanese acts of the ardently patriotic Chinese who before the outbreak of the Pacific War supported ~~the cause of China against Japan~~.

**The Editor — Gideon C. T. Hsu**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

In This Issue .....	i
History as Humanities	
<b>Dr. Teodoro A. Agoncillo</b> .....	1
Selectivity in Philippine Migration	
<b>Dr. Anita Beltran Chen</b> .....	7
China in the Early Seventeenth Century: Alvarez Semedo's History of the Great and Renowned Monarchy of China	
<b>Dr. Min-sun Chen</b> .....	20
Rizal and Sun Yat Sen	
<b>Dr. Han Lih-wu</b> .....	80
The Chinese Sense of Humor	
<b>Dr. Hsiao Shi-ching</b> .....	89
A World University in Metro Manila	
<b>Dr. Gideon C. T. Hsu</b> .....	99
Limahong	
<b>Dr. Gideon C. T. Hsu</b> .....	101
Social History for National Awareness and Survival	
<b>Dr. Samuel K. Tan</b> .....	107
Tondo and Its Great Minds	
<b>Dr. Leopoldo Y. Yabes</b> .....	111
Missions in Cultural Contextualization	
<b>Dr. Bill T. C. Yang</b> .....	118
The Philippine Chinese During the Japanese Occupation, 1941-1945	
<b>Dr. Antonio S. Tan</b> .....	121

## HISTORY AS HUMANITIES

Dr. Teodoro A. Agoncillo\*

When one looks over the catalogues of universities here and abroad, one finds that history as a discipline is categorized as a social science. At the University of Chicago, however, it is classified as humanities and social science, and the student is given the dubious privilege of choosing whether the discipline should be included in his humanities or social science requirements. Social scientists, generally speaking, are of the belief that history is a social science, a stand that is questioned by the humanists. Among students of history, there has been a disagreement: some consider it a social science, while others classify it with the humanities. In the Philippines, history is considered by the great majority of students and teachers as social science. Only a small minority believes it to belong to the humanities and, consequently, belongs to the realm of literature.

As a student of history, I have always held the belief that history as a discipline and as a species of composition has the elements of the humanities and the social science. The historian's methodology is scientific and does not allow the literary artist's imagination to interfere with the scientific method of investigating the data used in historical writing. On the other hand, the processed data are given life, meaning, and significance by the artistic temperament of the historian and thereby becomes a branch of the humanistic studies. The historian uses his imagination to re-capture the past as closely as his data permit him, but in thus using his imagination he differs from the literary artist in that he could not, should not, allow his imagination to roam wildly but to put a rein to its flight by sticking closely to his facts. It is in this respect that the historical imagination differs from the literary imagination. At any rate, imagination, limited though it is by the materials already established as authentic and credible, is a very important element of historical writing. Without it, any historical piece becomes a dull compilation of data devoid of life. And since history deals with life as it was lived, that piece of unimaginative, uninspired writing is not history but at best a calendar.

This leads us to the question whether history as a discipline should be taken as a social science or as humanities in college. But first, let us examine the difference between history and any of the recognized social sciences, economics, for instance. History, as any teacher of history knows, deals with the particular, while social science deals with the general. History, for example,

---

\* Retired University Professor, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

says that King Richard the Lion-Hearted was crowned King of England, but social science says that all kings are crowned. Since history deals with particulars, it does not investigate facts in order to discover so-called laws. On the other hand, social science, because it deals with the general, attempts to formulate laws out of the materials examined. So the economists have the law of supply and demand, Greshams' law, and other so-called laws which today are taken to heart by students of economics. In history, there are no such or similar laws, although students of historiography are familiar with such philosophers of history as Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee who formulated laws or what they thought were laws of history and who, on the basis of such "laws", made predictions. In a social science, as in economics, for example, one can predict trends or possibilities, such as how much the people will spend for clothing, food, entertainment, and so forth. In history, prediction is anathema, for it deals with what had passed not with what the future will bring. It is for this reason that most historians consider Spengler and Toynbee as prophets but not historians.

In the social science, it is not necessary to be literary in order to be great. In other words, one can become a great social scientist without being a great writer, although there are social scientists who are also good writers. Thomas Huxley readily comes to mind. A historian, on the other hand, in order to be recognized as great must have a literary style that is at once clear, flowing, and charming. This is because a historian, to be convincing, must succeed in re-creating the past or at least approximating the past as gleaned from reliable and credible sources. Thus, all great historians were also great writers: Gibbon, Froude, and Macaulay in England; Ranke and Mommsen in Germany; Taine and Michelet in France; Motley, Parkman, and Prescott in the United States. The historian, therefore, should provide his readers not only with the bones of history, but with flesh and blood as well. Consequently, while the historian uses the scientific method in investigating his materials, he uses the methods known to the humanist in breathing life into the past. This is necessary in order to make the past become the present, which is to say, to make the past alive and contemporaneous with us. This is what the Italian philosopher-historian, Benedetto Croce, meant when he said that all history is contemporary to the humanistic studies. The great French biographer of Christ, Ernest Renan, eloquently said:

History is not one of those studies of antiquity called **umbra- tiles**, for which a calm mind and industrious habits suffice. It touches the deep problems of human life; it requires the whole man with all his passions. Soul is as necessary to it as to a poem or work of art, and the individuality of the writer should be reflected in it.

Because history is a re-creation of the past as seen by the historian, it is not objective. In the process of re-creation, the personality of the historian plays an important role. He displays his passion, his prejudices, and emotion — in brief, his humanity — and as such he cannot help being affected by the

events and personalities he is creating. It is this subjectivity that characterizes all great historians, a subjectivity that makes for divergencies in interpretation. It is ignorance of the nature of historical writing that made even learned men in the past say that history is and must remain objective — an impossibility since the historian as man or woman cannot run away from himself/herself. We as human beings have feelings, emotions, prejudices, loves, and jealousies which play a part in our writing, whether this be a mere letter, essay, or an extended historical work. It is my belief that an objective historian is unhuman and, therefore, dull and impossible to deal with. I do not know of any such unhuman historian.

Since interpretations in history vary from person to person and from time to time, some people fear that the readers might get confused in the wilderness of interpretations. There need not be any such fear, for far from sowing confusion differences among historians make for intelligent and critical appraisal on the part of the readers. What the readers should fear is uniformity of opinions or interpretations, for such a situation can only come about at a time and in a place where freedom has no meaning.

Let me recall my days as a student on the old campus of the University of the Philippines on Padre Faura, Manila. In those days history as taught to us concerned mainly with political history. A British historian of the nineteenth century once said that history was past politics — and this definition, then considered witty, became the accepted dictum in the academe. With one exception, all our senior professors taught us political history. There was no attempt to expand the horizon to include economics, literature, the arts and music, and social life. History then was conceived as mainly, if not exclusively, past politics and any inclusion of matter outside politics was looked upon as an affront to the historical discipline, if not heresy. The consequence for the student was that unless he had a natural inclination and talent for the arts and literature, his readings were invariably narrow and pedestrian. Moreover, we were warned against being literary, for it was believed that literature and history did not mix. Such strictures gave us the shivers and led most of us to abandon the pursuit of historical scholarship. But times have changed. Today, history is not merely past politics but past cultural and social life. To deviate from Spengler's longitudinal character of the study of history, this discipline as it should be taught today must be a cross-section of a people's life. It is only in examining the varied contexts of a people's life that one gains a clear insight into their character.

In this connection, I think it pertinent to point out that history as a subject in the schools and colleges in our country is considered worthless, for it was made clear to me on several occasions that students are compelled to memorize dates, names of persons and places, and so earned the enmity of the students. In the University of the Philippines at Los Baños, Philippine history as a subject was abolished a few years ago because, according to some students, the authorities of the college felt the subject to be irrelevant because the teachers

taught nothing but dates, something which the students abhor. Unfortunately, the higher authorities at Diliman, Quezon City, did nothing to dissuade the Los Baños little gods from "killing" a subject so necessary for the proper understanding of our past, and, therefore, of our future. The little gods failed to realize that history is never irrelevant and that if the students today do not have any sympathy for history as a subject it is not because of any defect in the discipline but because of the shortcomings of certain teachers of history. I do not at all blame the students for abandoning or avoiding history, but I do blame those teachers who believe that dates and names of persons and places constitute history. To be sure, dates and names do not constitute history; they are meaningless unless placed in their proper context and perspective. To make the students memorize dates and names is to discourage them from what history really means. History is not only an interesting subject; it is a lively one, for it is re-creation of the past, and the past is always colorful and exciting especially because we view it from the perspective of the present — which is to say, the distance that separates us from the past gives us the necessary perspective to see it as it was: exciting, colorful, and palpitating with life and all passion, emotion, fear, joy, sorrow, happiness, doubt, hope, and exasperation. It is for this reason that it is the most lively of the humanistic studies, and it is lively because it re-creates the past with a deep sense of realism and verisimilitude. No other humanistic discipline approaches history in this respect.

Consequently, history as a subject should be taught in a lively way, always keeping in mind that to re-create the past, which is the primary function of the historian, is not to be dull or foolish, but to be interesting — as interesting as the actual events of the past were when they were being enacted. It is, indeed, a sad reflection on the teacher of history not to be able to infect the students with the charm of what happened in the past as recorded for ages; nor is a history teacher less competent for making the past live again before the eyes of the students, as in a newsreel. A good teacher of history is not he who can rattle off dates and names like a trained parrot, but he who makes the past come alive in the imagination of the students. A bad teacher, to cite an example, is one who says matter-of-factly that the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Hawaiian time, and soon the United States declared war on Japan. This statement, although accurate, is merely factual and unimaginative. A good teacher, on the other hand, will describe how the Japanese airmen wrought havoc on the American navy at Pearl Harbor, the inferno thus created, the confusion, the fear, the anger aroused in the American people in Hawaii, the reaction of the American people and their officials upon hearing the treacherous attack and their morale at the time of the attack and after, and so on. No one can be expected to re-capture all the details of an event, and history is not expected to detail everything that happened in the past. But a choice is given to the individual historian in selecting his materials, and a historian who has a good command of language, assuming of course he

has a lively imagination, is in a better position to re-create for the present what happened in the past than one who has no command of the language or who has no imagination.

All this implies that a good teacher must have a catholicity of taste and has the ability to appreciate not alone the subtleties of the arts, but also the implications of philosophy and letters. Is this a tall order? Perhaps it is, but then, as the old saying goes, there is no royal road to knowledge and wisdom. Through sustained effort, the difficult road can be made as to make the travel less hazardous and more rewarding. It takes infinite time and patience to make a good history teacher out of a fresh college graduate. No **summās, magnas, and cum laudes** can become good teachers overnight. Experience, by which I mean not only personal but intellectual experience, helps much in the making of a good teacher, and as experience grows with the years so does emotional maturity. The intellectual experience that I mention relates to the intensive and extensive studies made after graduating from college, for real education begins only outside of the university. What we learn in college is a small drop in the ocean of knowledge, and most of what we have learned in college needs to be unlearned after graduation.

In proposing that history should be a cross-section of people's life and culture, I do not mean to say that the historian should include everything about social life, culture, politics, and economy of a country. This is impossible for one man to undertake. Perhaps in the Philippine context, a better solution is for a group of scholars to write a book that would evaluate the achievements of a people along the lines indicated. But while this is feasible, it nevertheless may lack the required unity and coherence and thereby defeat its own purpose. A better alternative, I think, is for a group of scholars in each discipline to submit to a scholar-writer their own findings and let him write the book on the basis of the scholars's findings and interpretations. Of course, the result of his writing should be gone over carefully by each of the scholars who prepared the original draft in order to correct whatever errors crept into the preparation of the scholar-writer's draft. In this way, unity of purpose and style is achieved. Perhaps if the writer has a lively imagination and a good style he could produce a book that every reader, whether he be a history student or a mere layman would relish with gusto and thus make history a subject devoutly to be loved. This is not an impossibility. As a matter of fact, we have a good example of this kind of book, the multi-volume **The Story of Civilization** by the philosopher Will Durant and his wife. This is, I believe, the best example so far of an eclectic history written in a readable and clear style, with touches of humor and wit. If only this multi-volume work on the history of civilization can be compressed into a single volume without losing its charm, flavor, and accuracy, then it can be used as a textbook on a course in the history of civilization, a two-semester course. Only a man with a disciplined mind can compress such massive work into a single volume. A similar work, that is, a compressed work, has been done with respect to Toynbee's multi-volumed **The Study of History**, which was abridged into two volumes.



In the Philippine colleges and universities, the work of compressing the results of centuries of achievements in the arts, letters, and sciences is enormously difficult not only because the language of the classroom is a foreign language whose nuances we have not to this day mastered, but also because we do not have an eminent writer in English who could put together in very readable and accurate fashion the technical knowledge that has come down to us through the ages. We may have the expertise, to be liberal, in the arts, the sciences, and letters, but we do not have the genius who could put them together in orderly, readable, and meaningful fashion. In his absence, I propose that for either a one- or two-semester course in the liberal arts, competent faculty members in the three divisions should be named to prepare a syllabus for each of the three divisions. Each syllabus should be a resume of the findings in the division, taking care that the whole syllabus — that is, the combined syllabi of the three divisions — should not exceed one- or two-semester work on the undergraduate level. In other words, the experts in each division are called upon to be concise and effective. Since nobody can handle the whole course alone, a relay of experts in each division should lecture to the students. For this purpose, I think the lecture hall should accommodate or hold from eighty to a hundred students. The lecturer does not have to correct the test papers; the faculty members not assigned to lecture should do the "dirty" job. These non-lecturers can audit the lecture classes to familiarize themselves with the disciplines not falling within their competence. This is one of the ways in which college students of whatever ambition or orientation can imbibe a semblance of the liberal arts in one or two semesters. Of course, it is superficial, but since the purpose is not to make the students cultured within one or two semesters but merely to acquaint them with the achievements of man in his peregrination to civilization, this one- or two-semester course, if properly handled, might lead the serious-minded students to delve deeper into the subject and in the course of his long life — if he lives that long — he might become truly cultured. The ultimate purpose of the course should be to arouse the interest of the students in man's development of his intellectual endowments and so give them a chance to think for themselves. That's all there is to it in education.

## SELECTIVITY IN PHILIPPINE MIGRATION

Dr. Anita Beltran Chen\*

### Introduction

This paper discusses two distinct waves of Philippine migration to North America. Broadly delineated, the first occurred during the period from 1906-1946; the second, from the latter date to the present. To demonstrate selectivity in migration, comparisons based on socio-demographic characteristics were made between these two waves of migrants. Significant contrasts between them are discussed within these two time dimensions. The paper further suggests some new foci of interest in studying Philippine migration in light of more recent trends.

### First Wave (1906-1946)

Prior to 1906 movement of Filipinos abroad was sporadic in nature and insignificant in number. This was largely limited to government officials and students. Added to this were a number of Filipinos enlisted in the United States Navy.<sup>1</sup>

The situation changed starting around 1906. Filipinos migrated to Hawaii in response to the demand for workers in the sugar plantations.

"So the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association (HSPA) sent numerous labor recruiting agents to the Philippines . . . a great flow of assisted contract laborers migrated from the Philippines to Hawaii under three-year contracts . . ."<sup>2</sup>

The first recruits of Filipino laborers in 1907 consisted of 188 men, 20 women and two children.<sup>3</sup> From 1907 on Filipinos migrated in increasing numbers until the depression years of the 1930s. The United States census of 1930 showed 63,052 Filipinos in Hawaii.<sup>4</sup>

---

\* Anita Beltran Chen is Associate Professor of Sociology, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada where she also served as former Chairman of the Department of Sociology. She received her A.B. and M.A. degrees in Sociology from the University of the Philippines and her Ph.D. degree in Sociology from the University of Chicago.

<sup>1</sup> Honorato Mariano, *The Filipino Immigrants in the United States* (Thesis, 1933, published, San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1972), p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> C. Gorospe, "Making Filipino History in Hawaii," *Mid-Pacific Magazine*, March, 1933, as cited in: Mariano, *Filipino Immigrants*, p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> *United States Census, 1930 "Outlying Territory and Possessions,"* as cited in Mariano, *Filipino Immigrants*, p. 4.

A great majority of the migrants were young men between the ages of 20-29. The next largest group was represented by those in the 30-39 age group, as shown in Table 1. There were very few immigrants in the older age brackets.

Table 1. Age-Sex Distribution of Hawaiian Filipinos, 1930.

Age	Total	Males	Females
0 - 9	9,331	4,679	4,652
10 - 19	5,760	4,264	1,496
20 - 29	27,933	25,753	2,180
30 - 39	14,685	13,126	1,559
40 - 49	4,214	3,780	434
50 - 59	827	687	120
60 - 69	271	242	29
70 - 79	34	23	11
80 - 89	5	3	2
All ages	63,052	52,566	10,486

Source: Adapted and condensed from Ramon R. Cariaga, **The Filipinos in Hawaii, Survey of Their Economic and Social Conditions** (Thesis, 1936, published, San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1974), p. 5.

Attempts have been made by demographers to establish "universal" migration differentials that are applicable to various countries at various times. So far, the only differential which seems to have stood the test of various spatial and temporal contexts is that "persons in young adult ages 20-34 are more prone to migrate than other age groups."<sup>5</sup> The universal finding of age selectivity, however, has some exceptions. One of these is the migration of older and retired persons to areas of milder climate. Another exception to the age finding is the migration of families from central cities to suburbs which tends to be selective of migrants in the 30-40 year age groups.<sup>6</sup>

One of the hypotheses proposed by Bogue which is characteristic of U.S. data and which may be consistent with migration at other places is, "in initial stages men outnumber women, but with the settlement phase sex selectivity tends to disappear or even favor women."<sup>7</sup>

As indicated in Table 1, males greatly outnumbered females among the Hawaiian Filipinos. There was approximately one female to every five males in 1930. The preponderance of males over females was far more striking during the initial stages of Filipino migration to Hawaii. In 1910, there was approximately one female to every ten males.<sup>8</sup> Thus, sex selectivity in favor

<sup>5</sup> Clifford J. Jansen *Readings in the Sociology of Migration* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1970), p. 14

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Donald J. Bogue, "Techniques and Hypotheses for the Study of Differential Migration," *International Population Conference, 1961, Paper 114*, as cited in Jansen, *Readings*, p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> Ramon R. Cariaga, **The Filipinos in Hawaii, Survey of Their Economic and Social Conditions** (Thesis, 1936, published San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1974), p. 3.

of men which occurred during the early stages of Filipino migration to Hawaii seems to confirm Bogue's hypothesis.

For those 15 years of age and over, 34.9% of the men were married compared to 90.6% of the women. Whereas almost two out of every three men were single, almost nine of every ten women were married. This peculiar marital situation is a reflection of the imbalanced sex ratio discussed earlier.

After having completed the work contract in Hawaii, an increasing number of Filipinos proceeded to the west coast of the United States. From 1906 to 1932, it was estimated that 19,524 Filipinos proceeded from Hawaii to the United States mainland. Although this group of migrants set the first stage for migration to the United States mainland it was subsequently followed by a considerable migration stream directly from the Philippines.<sup>9</sup> The migration into the west coast increased more sharply beginning in the late 1920s, "when the number was twice greater than for those going to Hawaii."<sup>10</sup>

According to the United States census of 1930, "most of the Filipinos concentrated in the three states of the Pacific coast (California, Washington, Oregon) and states like Illinois and New York."<sup>11</sup> The reason for the concentration of Filipinos in the Pacific coast is obvious. This is where the American ports of entry are located: Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oregon. A striking similarity could be noted about the early immigrants from Europe who tend to concentrate along the Atlantic seaboard. The reason for the concentration of Filipinos in Illinois (particularly in Chicago) and New York was the lure of big cities as well as the availability of better job opportunities. Over two-thirds of all the Filipinos in the United States resided in California.<sup>12</sup>

According to an official source, "out of every 100 Filipinos who came to California during the ten years from 1920-1929, 93 were males and 7 females ... while the ratio of Filipino males to females coming to California [was] 14 to 1, the ratio of males to females in the total California population [was] 1.1 to 1."<sup>13</sup> In Washington state, the ratio was even more startling: roughly about 31 to 1; in Oregon about 33 to 1. The figure in Illinois was 22 to 1 and in New York was 8 to 1.<sup>14</sup> On the whole, there manifests a great excess of males over females. This imbalanced sex ratio contributed a great deal to a number of social problems which precipitated hostility between the Filipino immigrants and the white population.

Of those admitted to California in 1925-1929, a large majority were young persons. "Of the total arrivals 4.9% [were] under 16 years of age, and 79.4%

<sup>9</sup> Institute of Public Relations, *Pacific Problems*, as cited in: Mariano, *Filipino Immigrants*, p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Generoso P. Provido, *Oriental Migration From an American Dependency the Philippines* (Thesis, 1931, published, San Francisco: R & E. Research Associates, 1974), p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> Mariano, *Filipino Immigrants*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>13</sup> *Facts About Filipino Immigration Into California*, Special Bulletin No. 3 (San Francisco: California Department of Industrial Relations, 1930), pp. 11-12.

<sup>14</sup> Mariano, *Filipino Immigrants*, p. 20.



[were] between 16 to 30 years of age. The total number under 30 years of age [constituted] 84.3% of the arrivals."<sup>15</sup> This age composition shows a concentration of those between 16 and 30 years of age.

By comparing the age distribution between male and female arrivals into California, the female proportion under 16 years of age was 35.3%; among the males this proportion was 4.9%. While among the female arrivals 57.2% were under 22 years of age; among the male arrivals the corresponding percentage was 36.3.<sup>16</sup> From the above figures, it is clear that the problem of an imbalanced sex ratio was compounded by the fact that most of the women were relatively young and had not reached marriageable age.

Turning to the marital status of these immigrants we note that a majority of them were single which accounted for 77.3%; 22.5% were married; and 0.2% were widowed.<sup>17</sup> The same source reports that the proportion of female arrivals who were married was twice as great as among males. About 43% of the females coming to California were married as compared to about 21% among men. Of the married Filipinos who arrived in California only about 12% brought their wives with them.

The occupational role to which the Filipino immigrant found himself to be engaged in is generally classified as domestic or personal. Young and unskilled, they were mostly employed in manual work. Among the hotel, restaurant, and domestic occupations in which they found work in California were bell-boys, bus-boys, cooks, dishwashers, door boys, hall boys, house cleaners, kitchen helpers, janitors, pantry men, and other similar occupations.<sup>18</sup> They sought this type of work because they came without any special skill or training. In the opinion of Lasker,

"... the Filipino who is small in stature and delicate in physique, is best adapted to the ways of the city and the requirements of polite and refined services in hotels, clubs, and restaurants."<sup>19</sup>

Moreover, Filipinos were used extensively in agricultural occupations. This included asparagus cutting, fruit picking, rice harvesting, hoeing and topping beets, lettuce harvesting, grape picking, celery planting, and general ranch labor.<sup>20</sup>

## **Second Wave (1946-present)**

The Filipino who migrated to the United States after 1946 is subject to quota restrictions. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (McCarran-Walter Act) essentially retained the nationality origin principle,

<sup>15</sup> *Facts About Filipino*, p. 12.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13

<sup>19</sup> Bruno Lasker, *Filipino Immigration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931) as cited in: Mariano, *Filipino Immigrants*, p. 28.

<sup>20</sup> *Facts About Filipino*, p. 13.

"... but introduced a system of selective immigration by giving a preferential quota of 50 per cent to skilled aliens whose services were urgently needed in the United States and the remainder of the quota to relatives of citizens and permanent residents."<sup>21</sup>

Just like China, Japan, and India, the Philippines was allotted quotas of 100 persons per year. A large number of the immigrants, however, was admitted on a non-quota basis. The 1951-1960 non-quota admissions were mostly composed of wives and children of United States citizens.<sup>22</sup>

The age and sex distribution of Filipino population in California and Hawaii followed clearly the effect of the previous migration pattern which was highly selective of males. The sex ratio was 184 and 179 in California and Hawaii, respectively. The median age for males "is at least twenty years in excess of the median age of 17.2 years for females" residing in both states.<sup>23</sup>

A marked change is seen in the occupational structure of the Filipino immigrants. Whereas in the pre-war years the majority of them were in the manual and unskilled categories, the post-war wave of immigrants were largely composed of professional and skilled workers. This is explained in terms of the post-war immigration measures which allocate preferential selection to skilled workers whose services are in demand in the United States. The response to such a requirement is evident in Table 2.

Table 2. Occupation Reported By Filipino Immigrants in the United States, 1951-1960.

Type of Occupation	
Number	2,721
Professional Workers	51.4%
Other White Collar Workers <sup>(a)</sup>	14.6%
Service Workers <sup>(b)</sup>	13.8%
Other Blue Collar Workers <sup>(c)</sup>	17.5%
Farm Workers <sup>(d)</sup>	2.7%

(a) Includes managerial, clerical and sales workers

(b) Includes private household and other service workers

(c) Includes craftsmen, operators and laborers other than farming and mining

(d) Includes farmers, farm managers, and farm laborers.

Source: Adapted and summarized from Monica Boyd, "Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States," *International Migration Review*, V (Spring 1971), p. 57.

In 1965 new immigration policies were in effect for immigration to the United States. Between 1965 and 1968, the quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 was gradually phased out and abolished thereafter.

<sup>21</sup> Monica Boyd, "Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States," *International Migration Review*, V (Spring 1971), p. 52.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Essentially, the 1965 Immigration Act established regulations on numerical limitations, labor certification, and a preference system for visas. The annual numerical limitation is 170,000 for the Eastern Hemisphere (20,000 per country) and 120,000 for the Western Hemisphere without country limitation. For immigrants from the Eastern Hemisphere preference categories were introduced.<sup>24</sup> This permits entry on the basis of either kinship ties with persons already residing in the United States (first, second, fourth and fifth preference) or on the basis of occupational characteristics (third and sixth preference).<sup>25</sup> To obtain visas on the basis of occupational preference, a labor certificate is issued by the United States Department of Labor.

As a consequence of changes in the United States immigration policy, immigrants from the Philippines increased dramatically as shown in Table 3. It has more than tripled from 1961-65 to 1966-68 and more than doubled from 1966-68 to 1969-72 in terms of average annual immigration.

Table 3. Philippine Emigration To The United States, 1961-1972

Average Annual Immigration	
1961-65	3,186
1966-68	11,230
1969-72	27,449

Source: Adapted and summarized from Monica Boyd, "The Changing Nature of Central and Southeast Asian Immigration to the United States," *International Migration Review*, VIII (Winter 1974), p. 509.

The 1965 immigration laws have provisions which lead to a built-in migration sequence. A large number entered the United States under the relative preference system although occupational preference categories have also contributed to this increase. There was substantial admission of those under the non-numerically limited family categories. Furthermore, it is estimated that 57,000 Philippine brothers and sisters eligible for the fifth preference are on the waiting list for visas.<sup>26</sup> This has generated family chain migration traceable to a pattern of kinship network.

According to Choldin, Litwak offers a relevant explanation of the role of the extended family in helping its members in migration both in preparing them from the place of origin and receiving them in the place of destination. Choldin elaborates further that,

"... members may pool their resources and save to provide . . . for the trip and settlement . . . Then the member who has migrated can save from his new income and send money home which will enable

<sup>24</sup> Monica Boyd, "The Changing Nature of Central and Southeast Asian Immigration to the United States," *International Migration Review*, VIII (Winter 1974), pp. 507-508.

<sup>25</sup> For other details of the preference categories, see Charles B. Keeley, "Philippine Migration: Internal Movements and Emigration to the United States," *International Migration Review*, VII (Summer 1973), p. 185.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 181-182.

one or more additional members to join him . . . The network can function as an information network . . . Thus the migrant became a communication outpost for those who remained behind . . .<sup>27</sup>

It is estimated that in 1966-1968, 54% of the immigrants from the Philippines entered the United States under the relative preference categories compared to 45% admitted under the occupational preference categories. (Of these, 23% were professionals and 6% were composed of "other" workers). In 1969-1972, the distribution was 45% and 55% admitted under the relative preference and occupational preference categories, respectively.<sup>28</sup> From this it is evident that two patterns of selectivity have been operating as a result of the immigration policies of 1965: kinship selectivity and occupational selectivity. These two components of migrants further created a large potential base for future immigrants.

The demographic features of the immigrants have also changed from that which occurred prior to 1965. Table 4 shows the age-sex distribution of Filipino immigrants from 1961-1972. The figures were presented in aggregate intervals of three to show the trends before, during, and after the 1965 immigration laws were in effect. In terms of total migration, the size has substantially increased after the implementation of the 1965 immigration laws.

Table 4. Age-Sex Characteristics of Filipino Immigrants to the United States, 1961-1972.

Total Immigration		
	Male	Female
Total N	64,835	94,576
1961-1965	5,510	10,419
1966-1968	14,263	19,426
1969-1972	45,062	64,732
Average Annual Immigration	Male	Female
1961-1965	1,102	2,084
1966-1968	4,754	6,475
1969-1972	11,266	16,183
Per Cent Age $\geq$ 20 Years	Male	Female
1961-1965	56	77
1966-1968	68	76
1969-1972	60	73
Sex Ratio		
1961-1965	53	
1966-1968	73	
1969-1972	70	

Source: Adapted and summarized from Boyd, "The Changing Nature," p. 514.

<sup>27</sup> Eugene Litwak, "Geographical Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," *American Sociological Review*, XXV (June 1960) as cited in: Harvey M. Choldin, "Kinship Network in the Migration Process," *International Migration Review*, VII (Summer 1973), p. 164.

<sup>28</sup> Boyd, "The Changing Nature," p. 511.



One striking feature found in Table 4 is the sex ratio of the immigrants. It was consistently characterized by the excess of females relative to males. This low sex ratio could be attributed to the non-quota immigration of wives of U.S. citizens and also the chain migration pattern of family re-unification; and partly to the migration of a large number of Filipino nurses. This indicates a sex distribution profile which is in contrast to that of the first wave of migrants discussed earlier in the paper.

Table 5 shows the distribution by occupations of Filipino immigrants. There is a high concentration of professional workers compared to those in other occupational categories. "The percentage of professional workers among all immigrants in 1970 . . . was 11.27% while for the Philippines it was 29.7%."<sup>29</sup> This again reflects the provisions of the 1965 immigration laws which allow a selectivity pattern based on occupational skills in demand in the United States.

Table 5. Philippine Immigrants Admitted to United States by Major Occupation Group, 1966-1970.

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	Total
Number Admitted	6,093	10,865	16,731	20,744	31,203	85,636
Professional <sup>(a)</sup>	1,041	2,800	5,224	7,396	9,262	25,723
Farmers <sup>(b)</sup>	60	129	214	152	540	1,095
Managers <sup>(c)</sup>	49	105	180	134	322	790
Clerical <sup>(d)</sup>	204	281	380	515	838	2,218
Sales Workers	38	52	82	113	151	436
Craftsmen <sup>(e)</sup>	116	222	334	265	473	1,410
Operative <sup>(f)</sup>	94	160	199	189	428	1,070
Household <sup>(g)</sup>	119	232	389	317	597	1,654
Service <sup>(h)</sup>	205	310	360	245	397	1,517
Farm laborers <sup>(i)</sup>	180	358	588	555	778	2,459
Laborers <sup>(j)</sup>	109	180	230	348	466	1,333
Housewives <sup>(k)</sup>	3,878	6,036	8,551	10,515	16,951	45,931

(a) Includes technical, and kindred workers

(b) Includes farm managers

(c) Includes officials, and proprietors

(d) Includes kindred workers

(e) Includes foremen, and kindred workers

(f) Includes kindred workers

(g) Includes private workers

(h) Except private household

(i) Includes foremen

(j) Except farm and mine laborers

(k) Includes children and others with no occupation or occupation not reported.

Source: Adapted from Charles B. Keeley, "Philippine Migration: Internal Movements and Emigration to the United States," *International Migration Review*, VII (Summer 1973), p. 182.

<sup>29</sup> Keeley, "Philippine Migration," p. 184.