

# philippine studies

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

---

## **The Pilipinos in America, by Pido**

Review Author: Susan Evangelista

*Philippine Studies* vol. 35, no. 3 (1987) 387–389

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

*Conspiracy for Empire* thus serves to remind us that our understanding of history cannot remain static. Instead, we must constantly reevaluate the findings and conclusions of past historians in the light of new research such as this.

Before we discard, however, our previously held notions on this subject, a few things about the work under review should be kept in mind. First, in his introduction to the book, Renato Constantino states that Francisco and Fast "provide us with a new analysis, using corporate records and other primary source material heretofore undiscovered or otherwise unavailable" (p. iii). However, in the bibliography at the end of the book, no primary sources save newspaper and journal articles of the period are listed. Reading through the end notes, one will realize that very few citations come from such sources as the Aldrich and the McKinley Papers. Even statements attributed to key figures in the study (Aldrich, Havemeyer, etc.) were lifted from secondary sources. It also appears that the major source used in this study was the congressional records and not corporate records as Constantino claims.

The question of sources is of course vital in determining the quality of conclusions made by the authors. The observations made regarding sources might help to explain why, as the authors themselves admit in several parts of the book, a number of conclusions were drawn on the basis of circumstantial evidence, and thus require additional documented evidence before they can be confirmed.

Despite these shortcomings, Fast and Francisco have come up with a fascinating account of how economic power can be translated into political leverage. *Conspiracy for Empire* also provides very serious implications for our own history. Realizing the immense social, economic and political influence that our sugar planters and millers wielded when we were a colony of the United States, one can appreciate the relevance of this study. And when one looks back at how this powerful sector responded to such issues as free trade and early Philippine independence, one cannot help but be saddened by the implications that their actions have borne out.

*Maria Josefina G. Dahupan*  
*Department of History*  
*Ateneo de Manila University*

THE PILIPINOS IN AMERICA. By Antonio J.A. Pido. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1986. x, 151 pages.

The subtitle of this newest book on Filipinos as immigrants, *Macro-Micro Dimensions of Immigration and Integration*, serves to give the reader a clear idea of the framework from which Dr. Pido considers his subject – that is to

say, he has added an overview of world trends and problems of international politics and economics to the traditionally-considered more immediate micro problems of the immigrants' environment. This is indeed a valuable approach, and is probably the first time such an approach has been explicitly used to study Filipino immigration. On the other hand the macro level has been implicitly considered in many studies, with different writers focusing on whatever macro trends they felt were most significant: Carey McWilliams, for instance, was quite conscious of the fact that the early Filipino immigrants were brought in to the U. S. to fulfill urgent labor needs in the development of California agriculture, *after* Chinese and Japanese laborers had been cut off due to local and international political phenomena. This reviewer has, as well, pointed out the significance of the Filipinos as the *Third Wave* of Asians to arrive in California, and as the group which was unlucky enough to arrive during the Depression years.

Nevertheless, it is helpful to have the macro trends in politics, economics, and sociology all clearly defined as backdrop for international movement. And it is within this rather broad, all-encompassing framework that Dr. Pido introduces the idea that all immigrants are in fact *refugees* — that is to say that they are all subject to broad forces which they cannot control, and that therefore immigration in general is a nonvoluntary movement.

Specifically, Dr. Pido shows how colonial land policies carried out by Spain in the Philippines, plus the introduction of the Philippines into the world economy, resulted in the creation of a class of landless laborers just at the time when the United States needed laborers for agricultural expansion and had replaced Spain as the colonial ruler of the Philippines. The stage was thus set, economically, politically, and legally (and after some years of American education, socially as well) for the immigration of Filipino laborers to the cane fields of Hawaii and the asparagus and lettuce fields of California. And thus these immigrants kept coming in ever-increasing numbers until they were slowed down by the economic problems of the Depression and then cut off by the legal changes involved in Philippine Independence.

Immigration thus came to a near standstill in 1935 and remained at a very low level, with the exception of a group of field laborers welcomed into Hawaii in 1946 and the postwar influx of men who had fought with the American armed forces, until 1965 when a new Immigration Law was passed. Pido here echoes the arguments of many other scholars that the U. S. has never really had an immigration *policy* and simply bases new laws on *expediency* — i.e., the political aims the U. S. government wishes to pursue at that moment, the economic needs of the country, etc. The 1965 law favors family reunification (presumably a political end) and the entrance of high and middle level professionals (an economic need). The second large wave of Filipino immigrants took advantage of both these types of provi-

sions but especially the second, with the result that these immigrants are much higher on the socioeconomic scale than their predecessors – in fact their average earnings are above the native Caucasian average – and they seem to have a much easier time adjusting to American society. They are subject to very little racism, but the women must learn to live with American sexism – i.e., the college-educated Filipina, along with her Caucasian sister, makes less money than the high school educated male of any color.

Dr. Pido's main argument in his consideration of both groups of immigrants is that it is the forces of capitalism (i.e., demand for labor at whatever level) and the unequal nature of the political relationship between the United States and the Philippines that are decisive in both the initial immigration and the nature of immigrant experiences.

While it is easy, then, to accept the main thesis of the book, the macro approach used here opens up the field for debate over corollary issues. Why, for instance, were the early Japanese immigrants so very successful in their adjustment? Is the difference between them and the early Filipinos entirely due to the more equal footing between the Japanese and U.S. governments? The early Filipino immigrants themselves pointed out this difference when they responded in print to a set of strongly anti-Filipino resolutions presented by Judge D.W. Rohrbach to the Northern Monterey Chamber of Commerce, saying

Is it because the Filipinos are unwelcome little brown men but ten years removed from a bolo and a breech cloth [as charged], or is it because the Filipinos have no Japanese Emperor, Chinese President, Mexican President, or a Mussolini behind them? (A.E. Magsuci, *The Evening Pajonarian*, 21 January 1930.)

Nevertheless, this must not be the *whole* explanation, as the Japanese did experience extremely harsh forms of racism and even legalized discrimination, and still ended up on top. (Japanese income figures in the state of California are generally higher than any other ethnic group's including native Caucasians.) Pido objects to the idea of Japanese participation in the Protestant Work Ethic, pointing out that Protestants have never had a monopoly on hard work and that in fact all immigrants work hard. True enough. But one could still argue that the Japanese worked longer and harder, lived more frugally, saved more, etc., and that these behavioral traits also contributed to their success.

A second issue for speculation comes readily to mind. Dr. Pido argues that the second group of Filipino immigrants, i.e., post-1965, were more successful in the immigration experience because of the more independent stance of the Philippines in relation to the U. S. at that point. It is true, of course, that the Philippines is now an independent country and that anti-American rhetoric is loud and clear in Manila. However, it would seem to

this reviewer that the class difference between the two groups is the more decisive factor. Dr. Pido also mentions the difference in social climate, inroads of civil rights groups, Third World consciousness, and these too have doubtless eased the later assimilation. But one could well argue that U.S.-Philippine relations remain about as unequal as they ever were.

Nevertheless, the interesting thing about Pido's approach, and thus the greatest virtue of the book, is precisely in the fact that it will bring up questions and stimulate debate by broadening the field for consideration of the problem. Presumably the viewpoint would also vary from discipline to discipline, with different scholars emphasizing political, economic, or social explanations, although the macro approach is by its very nature interdisciplinary. The book is thus a valuable contribution to the literature on immigration.

*Susan Evangelista*  
*Department of English*  
*Ateneo de Manila University*

CREDO: TEACHING AND SHARING. By Pacita Guevara-Fernandez. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1985. ix, 89 pages.

It is perhaps redundant to describe the present Philippine historical moment as a time of crisis. Philippine society has staggered from crisis to crisis in its relatively short history of independence and has always emerged to move on to the next challenge with apparently inexhaustible resilience and imperturbable confidence in itself and the ways of a provident God. The main theme of Professor Fernandez's *Credo*, low-keyed but pervasive throughout her book, is that Philippine education, reflective of the Philippine political and economic situation, confronts a crisis of its own.

The situation in most Asian countries is that of suffering from a series of protracted child-birth pangs and pains of nation building. Our Philippines is one of these. The situation is one that focuses sharply on economic growth through industrialization . . . . But wherever and whenever the machine has largely taken over human and humane contacts and relationships . . . the beauty that there is, is cold, hard, unyielding and non-personal because non-human. (pp. 1-2)

The crisis in Fernandez's eyes is precisely a crisis in human values.

In the opening essay of her collection Fernandez describes the value crisis, this "spiritual bankruptcy" (p. 6), in many different ways: "exacting ethical discourse is no longer demanded even of the better educated" (p. 3): "the