

philippine studies: historical and ethnographic viewpoints

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

Patterns of Filipino Migration to Guam: United States Military Colonialism and its Aftermath

Ann M. Pobutsky and Enrico I. Neri

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints
vol. 66 no. 1 (2018): 77–94

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted 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.soss@ateneo.edu.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

Research Note

ANN M. POBUTSKY AND ENRICO I. NERI

Patterns of Filipino Migration to Guam

United States Military Colonialism and its Aftermath

In the context of US military colonialism, this research note examines patterns of migrant Filipino employment in Guam using US census data. While Chamorros were in the majority in various occupational categories in 1920, by 1950 Filipinos dominated many categories, except in professional, technical, and managerial positions in which whites had preponderance. The surge of Filipino male migration to Guam owed to the need for skilled labor in postwar reconstruction. From 1970 onwards, Filipino migration to Guam increased, but so did other Asians, resulting in a labor situation in which no ethnic group was dominant in any one occupational category.

KEYWORDS: GUAM • FILIPINOS • OVERSEAS MIGRATION • SKILLED MIGRANTS • US MILITARY

The largest and southernmost of the Mariana Islands and the largest island in Micronesia, Guam is known in Philippine history as a part of the *Islas Ladrões* that Magellan encountered on his crossing of the Pacific in 1521. It is also the place where Pedro Calungsod, the lay missionary companion of the Jesuit Diego de San Vitores, was martyred in 1672 (Schumacher 2001a, b). Once Spain's grip on the islands was consolidated with the help of Filipino soldiers, men and women from the Philippines (and later Mexico) moved or were brought to Guam to repopulate and work in the island, with most of the men intermarrying with indigenous Chamorro women. Indeed, numerous prehistoric and historical ties link the Philippines and Guam (Abella 1973, 1978; Pobutsky and Neri 2014, 6–7). Today, Guam is a US territory and the most populated island in the Marianas. Filipinos form Guam's second largest ethnic group, a pattern solidified in the course of the twentieth century (Table 1). The 2010 US census recorded Guam as having a population of 159,358 among whom the Chamorros constituted 37.3 percent and Filipinos made up 26.3 percent.¹ This research note examines the patterns of Filipino migration to Guam using US census data on occupation, race/ethnicity, and sex to illustrate their niche in Guam.

Beginnings of US Military Colonialism

Under the Treaty of Paris, the United States acquired the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico (Carano and Sanchez 1964, 178). Thus US military colonialism was established in Guam after the Spanish–American War in 1898, with Pres. William McKinley designating the Department of the Navy responsible for governing Guam through an executive order that remained in place until 1950 (*ibid.*, 183). The order created a military government with naval officers as governors of Guam.

In geographically strategic places in the Pacific, such as Guam, the Philippines, Hawaii, and American Samoa, the primary “concern of American power in the Pacific has not been to defend the island spaces from attack, and certainly not to provide and care for the populations that live on them, but to defend, protect, and steer the vital system of international trade with Asia” (Davis 2015, 9). Walden Bello (1998, 2) has pointed out that “Guam in the Mariana Islands and the Philippine archipelago were depicted as stepping stones to the riches of China, but only to justify their annexation in the face of significant opposition. Washington's main desire was the projection of US power.” Catherine Lutz (2010, 2) specifically

Table 1. Guam's population, by respondent's identification with an ethnic group, 1990, 2000, and 2010

ETHNIC GROUP	1990		2000		2010	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
Chamorros	49,935	37.5	53,373	34.5	59,381	37.3
Filipinos	30,043	22.6	40,729	26.3	41,944	26.3
"Whites"	19,160	14.4	10,666	6.9	11,321	7.1
Chuukese	1,919	1.4	6,229	4.0	11,230	7.0
Other Micronesians/ Pacific Islanders	4,590	3.4	11,315	7.3	7,971	5.0
Koreans	3,931	3.0	3,816	2.5	3,437	2.2
Other Asians	5,307	4.0	5,943	3.8	6,000	3.8
Other single ethnic group	5,390	4.0	7,405	4.8	3,145	2.0
Multiple ethnic group	52,877	9.7	15,239	9.9	14,929	9.4
Total	133,152	100.0	154,805	100.0	159,358	100.0

Source: US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1992a, 19; 2004, 7; 2012

calls the US appropriation of the island and establishment of the Naval Government of Guam not just colonialism but "militarization." Between the two world wars, maintaining military security included (1) restriction of outside investment on the island, (2) importation of labor to keep wage rates low, and (3) imposition of a security clearance that restricted entry to the island (Guam Political Status Education Coordinating Commission 1996).

At the outset of Guam's naval governance, few "foreigners" were on the island: 9,930 persons were registered as "natives" and 46 "non-natives" in the 1901 US census (Thompson 1947, 37). The "natives" were an amalgamated group of Chamorros and (mainly) Filipino men who had migrated or were sent to the island during the Spanish colonial period. Earlier in 1830, based on the last Spanish census, Guam's population of 6,490 comprised of 40 percent Chamorro, 40 percent Filipino, and 18.9 percent other ethnic groups (Underwood 1976, 203, 205). The figure on the proportion of Filipinos translated to 2,596 persons from the Philippines. The 1830 census also showed a relative parity in gender distribution: 51 percent males and 49 percent females for Chamorros and 49 percent males and 51 percent

Table 2. Guam's population by ethnicity or "race," 1901 to 1950

	1901		1920		1930		1940		1950	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
Chamorro	—	—	12,216	92.0	16,402	88.6	20,177	90.5	27,124	45.6
Filipino	—	—	396	3.0	365	2.0	569	2.6	7,258	12.2
"Whites"	—	—	280	2.1	1,205	6.5	785	3.5	22,920	38.5
Other "races"	—	—	383	2.9	537	2.9	759	3.4	2,196	3.7
Total	9,676	100.0	13,275	100.0	18,509	100.0	22,290	100.0	59,498	100.0

Source of data for 1901: US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1931

Source of data for 1920–1950: US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, US Census of Population 1953a

females for Filipinos. By the 1901 US census, “natives” accounted for the vast majority of the population (99 percent), with males at 47.1 percent and females at 52.8 percent.

Although Filipinos formed a sizeable minority of Guam’s population before the mid-nineteenth century, with a relative parity in the sex ratio, the situation changed drastically in the period leading to the Second World War. The 1920 census showed that Guam’s Filipino population numbering 396 individuals comprised 3 percent only of a total population of 13,275 (Table 2).² The sex ratio also stood at 1.5 Filipino men to women. According to Bruce Campbell (1987, 16), “the number of Filipinos migrating to Guam in the thirty years following the American victory in 1898 was negligible.” This statement, however, does not explain the dramatic decline in the Philippine population in Guam since the 1830 census. The imposition by the Spanish of a tax on “non-natives” led to any offspring of unions between Filipinos and Chamorros becoming “Chamorro,” and for this reason there was no great number of Filipinos in the 1901 US census of Guam (Pobutsky and Neri 2014, 10).

The heterogeneity of Guam’s population was nonetheless recognized in the following descriptive summary of Guam’s inhabitants found in the introduction to the 1920 census (US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 1922a, 1223):

Race. – The native inhabitants of Guam, who constituted 92 percent of the population of the island in 1920, are called Chamorros. The name Chamorro is derived from Chamorri or Chamoli, the ancient word for “noble.” The Chamorros are a hybrid race, with the Malayan strain predominating. The ancient inhabitants were a warlike people, and most of the adult males were exterminated during the Spanish conquest. Subsequently many of the Spanish, Philippine, and Mexican soldiers who were brought to Guam to subdue the natives married or made concubines of the native women, and the present inhabitants are mainly the descendants of such unions. The various races have amalgamated so thoroughly that even the descendants of Englishmen and Scotchmen now call themselves Chamorros.

The mixed racial or ethnic make-up of Guam’s population has been a notable part of its history (Carano and Sanchez 1964, 105; Stevens 1953, 37).

Perhaps in response to this amalgamation, the early naval governors of Guam issued various edicts and proclamations prohibiting interracial marriage.

In 1919 Gov. William Gilmer passed the navy's first anti-miscegenation law that prohibited whites (defined as those not having any Chamorro, Filipino, or Negro blood) from marrying with Chamorros or Filipinos (Taitano-De Lisle 2010, 4, 9). The concern was with miscegenation by whites, probably issuing from a desire to prevent the "dilution" of "white blood."

Guam's economy at the turn of the century was mainly subsistence agriculture and fishing. The majority of the population lived in Agana, the main town, yet "most of the people who lived in the towns and villages went to work each day on their small ranches. There each family produced just enough food to support itself" (Carano and Sanchez 1964, 209). By 1920 the military wage economy, which created jobs related to running Guam as a naval station, including naval government jobs, was beginning to be established (*ibid.*, 239; Pobutsky 2001, 104). Beyond subsistence agriculture, the naval government encouraged cash crop production, including copra and rice, because the island could not sufficiently provide food for the navy during the early decades of naval rule. Even so, Guam experienced repeated food shortages that were met by importing food (Carano and Sanchez 1964, 240), a problem that also prevailed throughout the Spanish colonial period.

Data on occupations by "race" in the 1920 Guam census³ illustrate that more than half of Chamorros were involved in agriculture and animal husbandry (55.1 percent), with another 18.9 percent in manufacturing and mechanical industries, followed by domestic and personal services (17.2 percent). Filipinos followed the same general pattern as that of the Chamorros, even though in 1920 their numbers were very small. Across all occupational categories, Chamorros comprised a plurality or majority of all persons involved in each of them (US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 1953b).

Interestingly, Chamorros formed 88.4 percent of all workers in the manufacturing and mechanical industries category, with Filipinos accounting for a mere 4.3 percent of the total. The data reflected the change in the economy from subsistence farming to wage jobs with the US Navy under military colonialism. However, the exact types of jobs included under "manufacturing and mechanical industries" could not be determined. For both Chamorros and Filipinos at this time, to be employed by or enlisted in the navy meant usually that they would be assigned as stewards or mess attendants (US Naval History and Heritage Command 1976).

Prior to 1962 there was a security clearance for all civilian travel to Guam, which was originally put in place by Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt at the beginning of the Second World War; the clearance system remained in place throughout the 1950s, but it was lifted in 1962 when the security situation no longer made it necessary. In the postwar period the population of Guam changed dramatically.

The “Filipinization” of Guam, 1945–1975

The Japanese occupied Guam from 1941 until their military defeat in 1944. After the Second World War, Guam needed to be rebuilt because the island was devastated by bombing and military activities. Navy Seabees undertook the initial rebuilding of Guam from 1944 to 1946 (Campbell 1987, 25), but the massive reconstruction required more labor than what was available on the island. The navy considered Guam’s existing labor pool “insufficient to meet the demands of the island-wide rehabilitation” (*ibid.*, 26). After the newly independent Republic of the Philippines forged an agreement with US Navy contractors to recruit laborers from the Philippines, Filipinos became Guam’s major construction labor force from 1947 to 1950 (*ibid.*, 27). The number of Filipinos experienced a huge leap from 569 (2.6 percent of the population) in 1940 to 7,258 (12.2 percent of the total population) in 1950 (Table 2), although during this period the jump in the white population was even more staggering than that of Filipinos.

More than 6,000 Filipinos were recruited specifically to help rebuild the island (Table 3). At this time, while males comprised 68 percent of the entire population of Guam, males comprised 96.6 percent of the Filipino population on the island (US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 1953a, 54-46). For whites, there was a huge influx of military personnel and contractors after the war, but by 1950 this number had stabilized, probably as a result of the recruitment of labor from the Philippines, which enabled some US military personnel to return to the continental US (Table 2).

Noteworthy is the wage differential, with Filipino contract laborers paid lower wages than local residents working for the government of Guam, federal agencies, or the United States Navy (USN). In 1948 the USN set up a three-tier wage structure as the basis for the salaries of (1) nonlocal hires at an average wage based on twenty-four market centers and a 25 percent wage differential; (2) local US citizen hires at a prevailing wage set by the Government of Guam, which was one-half of the total on nonlocal hires;

Table 3. Percent distribution of Guam's population by occupation and ethnicity or "race" among males who worked as civilians, 1949

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY	CHAMORRO		FILIPINO		WHITE		OTHER GROUPS		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER (RT)	RT AS % OF 15,584
Professional, technical and managerial (non-farm)	380	7.7	131	2.0	676	17.9	18	6.5	1,203	7.8
Farm managers	751	15.2	33	0.5	15	0.4	3	1.1	799	5.2
Clerical, sales and service (except private household workers)	969	19.6	1,588	24.1	661	17.5	38	13.8	3,255	20.9
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	1,310	26.5	2,556	38.8	1,710	45.3	111	40.4	5,690	36.5
Operatives and kindred workers	809	16.4	1,066	16.2	516	13.7	30	11.0	2,421	15.5
Private household workers	19	0.4	85	1.3	—	—	7	2.5	110	0.7
Laborers (non-farm)	514	10.4	1,091	16.6	79	2.1	29	10.5	1,718	11.0
Farm laborers and foremen	177	3.6	20	0.3	32	0.8	9	3.3	238	1.5
Occupation not specified	11	0.2	10	0.2	93	2.5	30	11.0	150	0.9
TOTAL	4,942	100	6,588	100	3,779	30	275	100	15,584	100%

Source: US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1953b

and (3) Filipino nonimmigrant hires who were paid two-thirds and three-fourths of the local US citizen rate (Campbell 1987, 31). Although these wages were higher than rates found in the Philippines, they did result in lower standards of living for Filipino laborers in Guam (*ibid.*, 33).

Among the civilian workforce, the skilled labor category of “craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers,” according to the 1949 US census, became the largest occupational category among males for all ethnic groups (Table 3). Of the total 5,690 workers in this category, Filipinos represented 44.9 percent, with whites accounting for 30 percent and Chamorros, 23 percent. The second largest occupational category in 1949 was that of the “clerical, sales, and service” category that had 3,255 workers, 48.8 percent of whom were from the Philippines, 29.8 percent were Chamorros, and 20.3 percent were whites. “Operatives and kindred workers” made up the third largest category distributed as follows: Filipinos, 44 percent; Chamorros, 33.4 percent; and whites, 21.3 percent. The fourth largest category of workers was that of “laborers (non-farm)”; in this category Filipinos accounted for 63.5 percent of all workers, with Chamorros at 29.9 percent. However, in the fifth largest category, that of “professional, technical and managerial (non-farm),” Filipinos made up 10.9 percent only of the total 1,203 workers, with whites predominating at 56.2 percent and Chamorros at 31.6 percent.

The predominance of Filipinos in the largest occupational categories was strongly felt. As Russell Leroy Stevens (1953, 40) put it:

Although the local and federal governments and certain others utilize Guamanian (i.e. Chamorro) tradesmen, their training has been neglected over the past years and they are generally not experts at the trades . . . Many employers now endeavor to obtain the services of Filipino tradesmen and skilled workers. The Filipinos, who have moved into the population by the thousands since the war, have heavily infiltrated nearly all phases of economic activity, as laborers, taxicab drivers, barbers, tailors, bookkeepers and accountants.

In Guam US military forces (and their contractors) deliberately recruited male Filipino labor throughout the 1940s and until the 1970s to obtain skilled but cheap labor and to keep wages low (Campbell 1987, 27–30). The historical colonial connections between the US and the Philippines as

Table 4. Percent distribution of Guam's population by occupation, sex, and ethnicity/"race" among males, 1960

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY	CHAMORRO		FILIPINO		"WHITE"		OTHER GROUPS		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional, technical and managerial (non-farm)	509	10.0	366	5.6	764	46.6	91	20.7	1,730	12.6
Farm managers	265	5.2	3	---	7	0.4	2	0.5	277	2.0
Clerical, sales and service (except private household workers)	1,251	24.5	1,656	25.5	253	15.4	62	14.1	3,222	23.6
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	1,277	25.0	2,805	43.1	458	27.9	200	45.6	4,740	34.6
Operatives and kindred workers	842	16.5	924	14.2	85	5.2	43	5.2	1,894	13.8
Private household workers	7	0.1	2	---	3	0.2	20	4.6	32	0.2
Laborers (non-farm)	858	16.8	723	11.1	35	2.1	17	3.9	1,633	11.9
Farm laborers and foremen	41	0.8	5	0.1	1	---	---	---	47	0.3
Occupation not specified	49	1.0	19	0.3	33	2.0	4	0.9	105	0.8
TOTAL	5,099	100	6,503	100	1,639	100	439	100	13,680	100

Source: US Bureau of the Census 1963b

well as the Filipinos' knowledge of English likely facilitated this recruitment pattern (Karnow 1989).

The total male workforce of Guam declined by 12 percent from 15,584 in 1949 to 13,680 in 1960. The category "craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers" remained the largest at 4,740 workers (Table 4); Filipinos had consolidated their dominance of this group at 59.2 percent, with the share of Chamorros at 26.9 percent and the proportion of whites down to 9.7 percent. As in 1949, the second largest occupational category in 1960 was that of the "clerical, sales, and service" category with 3,222 workers, of whom Filipinos made up 51.4 percent and Chamorros 38.8 percent. "Operatives and kindred workers" remained the third largest category with 1,894 workers with Filipinos accounting for 48.8 percent and Chamorros 44.4 percent of all these workers. For the category "laborers (non-farm)" the Filipino share of labor declined from 63.5 percent in 1949 to 44.3 percent in 1960, while the share of Chamorros grew from 29.9 percent in 1949 to 52.5 percent in 1960. Interestingly, as is evident in table 4, among Filipino laborers the skilled outnumbered the unskilled (US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 1963b), a pattern that was entirely different from that in Hawaii, where the majority of laborers recruited for work on pineapple and sugar plantations were unskilled (Campbell 1987, 15).

In 1960 "professional, technical and managerial (non-farm)" numbered 1,730 workers, with whites making up 44.2 percent, Chamorros 29.4 percent, and Filipinos 21.2 percent of the total. Proportionally speaking, the Filipino share of the professional category doubled from 1949 to 1960.

Recent Filipino Occupations in Guam, 1980–2010

Beginning in 1970 and up to 2000, Filipinos increased their numbers each decade by about 10,000 while other Asian groups showed only small but steady, incremental increases (Table 5). The number of contract teachers recruited and brought from the continental US over the years due to ongoing shortages of qualified teachers in Guam mainly accounted for the number of whites on the island (San Nicholas and Avilla 1993, 3). However, the presence of whites⁴ declined since 1970, just as the numbers of other ethnic groups on Guam rose, mainly other Asian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups (Table 5).

Table 5. Guam's population by respondent's identification with an ethnic group, 1960 to 2010

ETHNIC GROUP	1960		1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Chamorro	34,762	51.8	47,472	55.6	48,675	45.9	49,935	37.5	53,373	34.5	59,381	37.3
Filipino	8,580	12.8	10,172	12.0	22,447	21.2	30,043	22.6	40,729	26.3	41,944	26.3
"White"	20,724	30.9	23,934	28.2	9,536	9.0	19,160	14.4	10,666	6.9	11,321	7.1
Other Asians	-----	-----	1,218	1.4	9,163	8.6	9,238	6.9	9,759	6.3	9,437	5.9
Other Pacific islanders	-----	-----	-----	-----	4,763	4.5	6,509	4.9	17,544	11.3	19,201	12.0
Other single group	2,978	4.4	2,200	2.6	10,395	9.8	5,390	4.0	7,405	4.9	3,145	2.0
Multiple ethnic group	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	12,877	9.7	15,239	9.8	14,929	9.4
TOTAL	67,044	100 %	84,996	100 %	105,979	100 %	133,152	100 %	154,805	100 %	159,358	100 %

Sources: US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1953a, 1963a, 1973, 1983, 1992a, 2004, 2012

By 1990, detailed ethnic categories illustrated the growth in the population of Asians—mainly Filipinos—in Guam, a pattern that has continued to the present time. In the 2000 US census, when ethnicity was based on self-identification, out of a population of 154,805 42.1 percent identified themselves as Chamorros while 26.3 percent said they were Filipinos (Table 5). By 2010 Guam’s population had risen by 2.9 percent. The proportion of Chamorros declined to 37.3 percent while Filipinos remained steady at 26.3 percent. By 2010, however, 9.4 percent of Guam’s population claimed to possess two or more ethnicities or races.

The growth in the population of other Asians reduced the relative proportion accounted for by Filipinos in various occupational groups. By 1990 the labor force data enumerated 8,715 Filipino male workers and 6,401 female workers.

Among Filipino males, the largest number (3,111) was found in the category “precision, production, craft, and repair occupations,” representing 36.7 percent of all male workers in this category. The 1,503 Filipinos in “technical, sales and administrative support occupations” represented 24.7 percent of all workers in this group, while the 1,383 Filipinos in “managerial and professional specialty occupations” accounted for 21.5 percent of all workers in this category. Among “operators, fabricators, and laborers” the 1,348 Filipinos who worked in these jobs accounted for 25.7 percent of all workers with similar jobs. In the 1990 census 1,254 Filipino males were recorded in “service occupations,” which meant they made up 31.5 percent of all the male service workers. Among “operators, fabricators, and laborers” there were 1,348 Filipino males, which translated to 25.7 percent of all workers in this group (US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 1992b, 136).

In 1990, among the Filipina workers, the largest concentration was found in “technical, sales, and administrative support occupations” with the 2,985 females from the Philippines comprising 27.5 percent of all female workers in this category. The 1,587 Filipinas in “service occupations” accounted for 37.1 percent of all women workers in this group. Filipinas were also found in large numbers (1,410) in “managerial and professional specialty occupations,” and they represented 24.8 percent of all female workers in this category (*ibid.*).

By 2010 Filipino male workers numbered 11,650, an increase of 33.7 percent from the 8,715 enumerated two decades earlier in 1990. The number

of Filipinas in the labor force jumped 47.8 percent from 6,401 in 1990 to 9,458 in 2010.

The biggest number of Filipinos (4,181) was found in “natural resources, construction and maintenance occupations,” representing 47.6 percent of all workers in this group—a plurality not seen in 1990 but appearing in 2010 with the reconfiguration of occupational categories. “Management, business, science, and arts occupations” employed 2,285 Filipinos in 2010, which meant they accounted for 26.8 percent of all workers in these occupations. In “service occupations” the 2,151 Filipinos represented 29.5 percent of all male service workers. Similarly, the 1,603 Filipinos in “sales and office occupations” made up 28.7 percent of all male workers in these jobs; and the 1,430 Filipinos in “production, transport and material moving occupations” accounted for 28.2 percent of all workers in this category (US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2013, n.d.).

In 2010 Filipina workers numbered 3,622 in “sales and office occupations,” and they accounted for only 31.6 percent of all female workers in this category. There were also 2,945 Filipinas in “management, business, science, and arts occupations,” representing 32.5 percent of all women workers in these occupations. In “service occupations” the number of Filipinas reached 2,469, which translated to 37.5 percent of all female service workers (*ibid.*).

Conclusion

Historically the biggest influx of immigrants to Guam and the other Mariana Islands was (and still is) comprised of Filipinos, who were recruited to provide needed skilled labor on the islands. Initially migration from the Philippines was almost exclusively male, but after 1970 the migration numbers grew and began to include more women. Filipinos formed a sizeable plurality or even the majority in some occupational categories. This influx of Filipinos was likely to have been a deliberate policy of the USN due to the concomitant Americanization of the Philippines, even though Filipino migration to Guam had occurred during the Spanish period (Karnow 1989; Brands 1992). The pattern of Filipino migration to Guam directly contrasted with those of other countries with US military involvement such as Korea or Japan, countries that were not formally part of US military colonialism with its deliberate Americanization process (Karnow 1989).

The Filipinos' dominance in skilled jobs in the military industry resulted from the aftermath of the Second World War. So great was the demand for Filipino labor in the postwar period that contractors were allowed to recruit both skilled and unskilled labor from the Philippines (Stevens 1953; Campbell 1987), although the occupational data confirmed that skilled workers comprised the majority of migrant laborers. This labor situation in Guam differed from that in Hawaii, which required cheap, unskilled labor for the sugar plantations (Colmenares 2003; Campbell 1987).

The connection of Filipinos' jobs to the military industry persisted until the 1960s, but after that time we do not know which occupations were connected with military-specific industries and which were not; the census reports no longer contain this level of specificity. The occupational data from 1990 to 2010 do show that people in Guam have experienced occupational convergence whereby no specific group is dominant in any one occupational category.

Robyn Rodriguez (2010, 9) suggests that the 1950s saw the beginnings of the "globalization" of Filipino labor throughout the world, and clearly Guam was a big part of this "culture of migration" for skilled Filipinos, rooted in both colonialism as well as enabled by the Philippine government beginning in 1947. Although the Philippine government formally enacted an overseas labor migration policy only in 1974, the reconstruction of Guam explained the deliberate recruitment of skilled Filipino migrant labor soon after the war. It is possible that the situation in Guam for Filipino labor migration is a unique case because of the overlap between Spanish colonialism and US colonialism in both Guam and the Philippines.

Notes

- 1 For this research note we use US census data on the Territory of Guam by "race"/ethnicity and occupation, which have limitations arising from the inconsistent use of "race" in different US censuses. The 1990, 2000, and 2010 censuses used the categories of "race alone" (single ethnic group) or "race alone or in combination" (multiple ethnic group) for Native Hawaiians, Chamorros, and Pacific Islanders. However, the category of "race alone or in combination" does not allow for comparable measures from earlier censuses. Despite its limitations we employ the category of "race alone," found in the 2000 and 2010 censuses, in order to be consistent with the occupational data.
- 2 For the 1920 through 1960 Guam censuses, the population by "race" used four categories: white, Chamorro, Filipino, and other for those native and foreign born. The 1970 Guam census used place of birth categories, while the rest have used self-identified ethnic categories since then.

- 3 Data on occupation in the 1920 Guam census were provided separately for sex and for race/ethnicity.
- 4 Utilized in the 1970 census were birthplace categories, which included those born in the US or Puerto Rico, i.e., including African Americans. For this table in the 1990 and 2000 censuses, we have included whites and blacks together in a category known as "statesiders," the common reference used in Guam for those originating from the continental US.

References

- Abella, Domingo. 1973. Guamanians and Filipinos: Are they the same people? An introduction to the study of Philippines–Marianas relations. *Guam Recorder* 3(2): 9–12. Online, <http://www.guampedia.com/guam-recorder-1973-april-june/>, accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- . 1978. The Marianas: Part of the Philippines? In *From India to Filipino and some historical works*, 239–45. Manila: Milagros Romualdez-Abella.
- Bello, Walden. 1998. US imperialism in the Asia-Pacific. Focus on the Global South. *Peace Review* 10(3): 367–73.
- Brands, H. W. 1992. *Bound to empire: The United States and the Philippines*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, Bruce L. 1987. The Filipino community of Guam (1945–1975). MA thesis, Pacific Islands Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Carano, Paul and Pedro C. Sanchez. 1964. *A complete history of Guam*. Tokyo: Charles Tuttle.
- Colmenares, Serafin. 2003. The Visayans in Hawaii. Center for Philippine Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Online, <http://www.hawaii.edu/cps/visayans.html>, accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- Davis, Sasha. 2015. *The empire's edge: Militarization, resistance, and transcending hegemony in the Pacific*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Guam Political Status Education Coordinating Commission. 1996. Issues in Guam's political development: The Chamorro perspective. Online, <http://www.guampedia.com/early-american-economic-history/2/>, accessed 12 Mar. 2017.
- Karnow, Stanley. 1989. *In our image: America's empire in the Philippines*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Lutz, Catherine. 2010. US military bases on Guam in global perspective. *Japan: The Asia-Pacific Journal* 8(3): 3. Online, <http://apjjf.org/-Catherine-Lutz/3389/article.html>, accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- Pobutsky, Ann. 2001. Economics and fertility: Changing family structure among Chamorros on the island of Guam. *History of the Family* 6:95–123.
- Pobutsky, Ann M. and Enrico I. Neri. 2014. Cultural integration and separation: The pre-historical and historical links between Guam and the Philippines, or where did all the Filipinos go? *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 42:1–15.
- Rodriguez, Robyn Magalit. 2010. *Migrants for export: How the Philippine state brokers labor to the world*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- San Nicholas, Gregg C. and Salvador Avilla. 1993. Partnerships for the future: Collaboration between governments and higher education institutions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, Pittsburgh, PA, 5–8 Dec. Online, files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED367266.pdf, accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- Schumacher, John. 2001a. Blessed Pedro Calungsod, martyr: An historian's comments on his Philippine background. *Philippine Studies* 49(3): 287–336.
- . 2001b. Blessed Pedro Calungsod, martyr: An historian's comments on the mission in the Marianas. *Philippine Studies* 49(4): 455–87.
- Stevens, Russell L. 1953. *Guam, U.S.A.: Birth of a territory*. Honolulu: Tongg Publishing.
- Taitano-De Lisle, Christine. 2010. Civilizing the Guam museum. University of Michigan Working Papers in Museum Studies, 4. Online, https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/77460/4_delisle_2010.pdf?sequence=1, accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- Thompson, Laura. 1947. *Guam and its people*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Underwood, J. H. 1976. The native origins of the neo-Chamorros. *Micronesica* 12(2): 203–9.
- US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. 1922a. Guam: Population, composition and characteristics; occupations. In *Fourteenth census of the United States taken in the year 1920*, vol. 3: *Population 1920*, 1221–29. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- . 1922b. Table 5: Population, by sex and race: 1920. In *Fourteenth census of the United States taken in the year 1920*, vol. 3: *Population 1920*, 1224. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- . 1931. Table 1: Population of Guam: 1901–1930. In *Fifteenth census of the United States: 1930 population*, vol. 1, 1235. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1953a. Table 36: Race by nativity and sex, for Guam: 1920 to 1950. In *United States census of population: 1950*, vol. 2, *Characteristics of the population, Part 54, American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, and Virgin Islands of the U.S.*, 54–46. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1953b. Table 46: Occupation in 1949 of persons who worked as civilians in 1949, by race and sex, for Guam. In *United States census of population: 1950*, vol. 2: *Characteristics of the population, Part 54, American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, and Virgin Islands of the U.S.*, 54–53–54–54. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1963a. Table 4: Population by race, nativity and sex for Guam 1920 to 1960. In *Census of population: 1960*, vol. 1: *Characteristics of the population, parts 54–57, outlying areas*, 54–8. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1963b. Table 21: Occupational group of employed persons, by race and sex, for Guam: 1960. In *United States census of population: 1960. Guam: General population characteristics*, 54–17. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1973. Table 5: General characteristics: 1970. In *1970 census of population*, vol. 1: *Characteristics of the population, parts 54–58, outlying areas*, 54–11–54–18. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1983. Table 16: Single years of age by sex: 1980. In *1980 Census of population*, vol. 1: *Characteristics of the population, part 54: Guam*, 54–9–54–12. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

- . 1992a. Table 11: Ethnic origin or race and residence in 1985: 1990. In *1990 Census of population and housing: Social, economic, and housing characteristics: Guam*, 19. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 1992b. Table 61: Occupation and class of worker by ethnic origin or race: 1990. In *1990 census of population and housing: Social, economic, and housing characteristics. Guam*, 136. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . 2004. *Population and housing profile: 2000, Geography: Guam*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Online, <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/island/GUAMprofile.pdf>, accessed 29 June 2017.
- . 2012. Guam demographic profile summary file Table GU8. In *2010 census of population and housing*. Online, http://cnas-re.uog.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/KGI_2010-Guam-Demographic-Profile-Study.pdf, accessed 29 June 2017.
- . 2013. *2010 Census of population and housing: Social, economic and housing characteristics: Guam*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- . [n.d.] *Guam_2010_Census_detailed_crosstabulations_part1_v3.xlsx. American fact finder*. Online, https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DGUAM_FTP&prodType=document, accessed 29 June 2017.
- US Naval History and Heritage Command. 1976. Filipinos in the United States Navy, Oct. Online, <https://www.history.navy.mil/research/library/online-reading-room/title-list-alphabetically/f/filipinos-in-the-united-states-navy.html>, accessed 27 Feb. 2017.

Ann M. Pobutsky is a sociologist/demographer who is an affiliate member of the graduate faculty, Department of Sociology, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 2424 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822, USA. Her research interests include social and occupational stratification and the uses of plants for medicine. <pobutsky@hawaii.edu>

Enrico I. Neri is a rural sociologist and plant pathologist, retired from Xavier University in Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines, and from the Research Corporation of the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. His research interests include plant tissue culture and mushroom propagation. <pareneri@hotmail.com >