

# A

---

## ABUSE

---

The improper treatment of a person, often to gain unfair or improper benefit, is considered abuse. There are a variety of types of abuse, which are typically sorted into four categories: physical, sexual, emotional, and neglect. Through the lens of Filipina/x/o American (FA) culture and history, this entry will cover prevalence rates of abuse, cultural considerations for defining abuse, and understanding the interaction of risk factors for reporting and acknowledging abuse.

### Prevalence

There is a dearth of available literature that is focused on abuse in Asian American communities, and even less is focused on FA communities. Historically, statistics from large national studies documenting occurrence rates of abuse has excluded Asian Americans. When data about Asian Americans are included, it is presented in an aggregated format. Reasons for documenting incidence rates as aggregated data have primarily been noted as a lack of respondents from specific Asian American backgrounds. Prevalence rates are typically reported on specific populations based on age, such as elder abuse or child abuse, or as classifications with legal definitions, such as physical assault or sexual assault. Much of the available data regarding prevalence of abuse are based on large-scale survey collections by academic institutions or foundations supported by funds from government agencies.

Alternatively, statistical data is collected from reporting agencies, such as Adult Protective Services or Child Protective Services.

Large national studies (e.g., epidemiological studies conducted by the Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence or the National Asian Pacific Center on Aging) on elder abuse among Asian Americans estimate prevalence rates to be from 1% to 10%. Community-based studies assessing elder abuse among FAs is unavailable. Large national data based on reporting on child abuse indicate that 1.8 of 1,000 Asian American children are victims of child abuse. Community-based studies or disaggregated data for specific Asian American groups are not available.

In February 2018, the Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence published a fact sheet focused on domestic and sexual violence in Filipino communities. Across the studies they referenced, between 21% and 31% of Filipinos reported having experienced physical violence from a partner. One study cited in the fact sheet focused on 87 Filipinas in the San Francisco Bay Area and noted incidence rates as high as 95% of Filipinas experiencing physical violence over their lifetime. Although several studies state that Asian Americans experience less interpersonal violence (IPV) than other communities of color, it is important to note that differences in data collection methods, differences in the definitions of abuse, and differences in the measures utilized across the studies significantly impact the study results.

Lastly, there is a dearth of information available regarding various genders and relationships.

For example, the aforementioned statistics regarding IPV focus on women, with little to no data available for other genders. The type of relationships in which abuse is reported typically is focused on heterosexual relationships or does not offer detailed information about the relationships. Further, data regarding abuse toward sexual and gender minorities does not typically disaggregate different types of queer or trans relationships.

### Cultural Considerations for Defining Abuse

Abuse definitions can be refined by describing the age of the victim or relationship to the victim (i.e., older adult vs. child or partner vs. stranger) as well as means (i.e., physical, emotional, sexual, or neglect of care). One challenge of studying and reporting on instances of abuse is the lack of a universally accepted legal and social definition for this concept. A definition specific to FA culture and history is necessary to obtain accurate data. A second challenge of and reporting on instances of abuse is the reliance on reporting. For abuse to be reported, the victim of the abuse needs to recognize and acknowledge the event as abuse. While the legal system has specific regulations that place restrictions on behaviors and definitions of abuse, such as sexual assault, there are instances of abuse that are outside of legal prevue, such as emotional abuse. Reporting of abuse relies on trust in the institution that the incident is being reported to appropriately addressing the mistreatment. Cultural mistrust, or a stance where a person of color lacks trust of an institution or group of persons, is a factor that dissuades some individuals from reporting abuse.

Internal, cultural perspectives can also contribute to one's decision to not disclose abuse to reporting agencies, friends, or family. The level of adherence a person may have to Filipino culture versus American culture, often referred to as *enculturation and acculturation*, respectively, can impact reporting behavior in a variety of ways. Several research studies have indicated higher levels of enculturation among Asian Americans in general. FAs, specifically, are associated with a decreased likelihood of seeking help. The available literature describes many variables that predict decreased

probability of engaging in help-seeking behaviors among Asian Americans, such as reporting abuse. These variables include having decreased proficiency of the English language, experiencing loss of face and shame, and strong adherence to Asian cultural values. Variables contributing to increased probability of engaging in help-seeking behaviors among Asian Americans include having higher income levels, being highly familiar with and high assimilation to American culture, as well as having health insurance. In considering the impact of the U.S. colonization of the Philippines, it is fairly typical for FAs to be very familiar and assimilated to American culture, to have high levels of English proficiency, and to have a strong preference for American culture to the point of negating the importance of Filipino culture, also known a *colonial mentality*. The contrast in the factors that impact the likelihood of engaging in help-seeking behaviors in Asian Americans in general, and for FAs more specifically, suggests that there are other considerations when conceptualizing abuse, reporting, and utilization of related services. The strength of these various factors is influenced by generational effects as well as cohort effects in migration patterns to the United States. There is also evidence of a multilayered relationship between some of these variables. A study by researchers McJason F. De Luna and Yoshito Kawabata has explored the role of self-stigma or how an individual perceives their behaviors as unacceptable if they participate in a particular action. In the context of help-seeking behaviors, these researchers concluded that high levels of enculturation were not as important in negative attitudes toward seeking out mental-health services in FAs when self-stigma was also considered.

Lastly, common coping styles among FAs, described by Felicitas A. Dela Cruz and V. J. Periyakoil, contribute to whether or not someone will report abuse. Some common coping styles among elderly FAs include the following: *tiyaga* (the ability to tolerate uncertain situations); *lakas ng loob* (being respectful and honest with oneself); *tatawanan ang problema* (the capacity to laugh at oneself in times of adversity); *bahala na* (the view that illness and suffering are the unavoidable and predestined will of God, and in which the patient, family members, and even medical professionals should not interfere); *pakikisama* (conceding to the

wishes of the collective to maintain group harmony); the tendency to avoid *hiya* (devastating shame); and *amor proprio* (sensitivity to criticism).

### Understanding the Interaction Between Risk Factors

The factors associated with increased risk of abuse are thought to be quite complex and the relationship between the risk factors is not clear. While there are a multitude of risk factors that impact the occurrence of reporting abuse and seeking help, it seems that the relationship between those risk factors, and not the risk factors alone, play a significant role. For example, experiences of abuse may be occurring during instances of racism, which is associated with poorer mental health. Colonial mentality and cultural mistrust also play a role in whether an event may be identified as abuse by the victim or reported. A more recent study by counseling psychology researchers Alyssa Hufana and Melissa L. Morgan Consoli suggests resilience also plays a role in the denial of harmful events and influences whether action may be taken.

### Elder Abuse

Some Asian American cultures believe that elder abuse can only occur within a family unit. In this context, a stranger could not be identified as the perpetrator of abuse making it virtually impossible to identify some instances of abuse. Such belief structures conflict with legal definitions and directly impact the reporting of abuse. There are many additional culture variables that impact the likelihood of a person reporting incidents of abuse: language barriers, culture mistrust of the system, and lack of culturally sensitive services or staff working in these agencies. Additionally, there are risk factors that increase the risk of elder abuse occurring: lower levels of acculturation; living with nonfamily members; living in an intergenerational household; being dependent on other adults for mobility; inability to use technology, like a telephone or computer; lacking English proficiency; and inability to care for one's physical appearance. Recent reports assessing adult maltreatment through adult protective services from 2019 indicates that fewer than 2% of individuals who were victims of adult maltreatment were

Asian American. While collecting data of incidence rates in the Asian American community is important, differences between Asian American cultures emphasize the necessity to disaggregate these data. Attitudes and perceptions of what constitutes elder abuse is an integral piece of information to understand, which significantly contributes to not only reporting of the events but acknowledgment of the events by the abuse victims.

### Partner Abuse

Partner abuse, also referred to as *intimate partner violence* (IPV), occurs when harm has been inflicted by an intimate partner. Studies assessing IPV among Asian Americans indicate having lower socioeconomic status, lower education levels, unemployment, and marital dissatisfaction as key risk factors. Hyunkag Cho compared IPV prevalence rates between three Asian American groups: Vietnamese Americans, FAs, and Chinese Americans. Data extracted as a subset from the National Latino and Asian American Study suggest that 12.6% of their sample of FAs experienced IPV. A study by Patrick Leung and Monit Cheung assessed the prevalence of partner abuse among six different Asian American groups in the greater Houston, TX, area: Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Indians. Their results noted that FAs experienced the second highest prevalence of domestic violence at 21.6%. FA survey respondents also indicated having significant concerns about community acceptance and social acceptance compared to other Asian American groups. FAs in this study were also more likely to seek help from religious consultation compared to the other Asian American groups studied. While it is culturally valued in the Filipino community to have a large support system, research by Krista M. Chronister and colleagues states instances of abuse may be ignored by friends and family, abusive tactics may be encouraged, or individuals who are meant to be part of one's support system may be the perpetrators of abuse.

### Emotional/Psychological Abuse

While emotional and/or psychological abuse may be directed at a person of any age, much of the literature describes the parent-child dynamic.

Jennifer Loh and colleagues describe nine categories of verbal abuse identified among Filipinos: put-downs and shaming (words that devalue self-worth), rejection (expressing withdrawal of affection and attention), blaming (accusing of or instilling guilt for behaviors out of one's control), fault exaggerating (unfairly magnifying faults or weaknesses), threat (suggesting an intention to physically harm, intimidate, and withhold material support), invoking harm (using words or phrases that invoke evil, harm, and misfortune), regrets (expression of disappointment that something bad should have happened), unfair comparison (unreasonable comparisons to others), and negative predictions (forecasting an unfavorable outcome). These authors note traditional child-rearing practices in the Philippines teach children to "be dependent, respectful, and submissive." Specifying deferential acts and respect toward the elderly and imbedded into cultural traditions, it becomes a possibility that instances of emotional and psychological abuse go unrecognized and considered normative behavior. There is less research available regarding emotional and psychological abuse among FAs. Of note, there is a significant amount of anecdotal discussion in news articles and blogs noting how common this type of abuse is as well as expressions of its harmful effects.

Michelle R. Madore

See also Acculturation; Assimilation; Colonial Mentality; Cultural Mistrust; Enculturation

### Further Readings

- Agbayani-Siewert, P., & Enrile, A. V. (2003). Filipino American children and adolescents. In J. T. Gibbs, & L. N. Huang (Eds.), *Children of color: Psychological interventions with culturally diverse youth* (pp. 229–264). Jossey-Bass.
- Cho, H. (2012). Intimate partner violence among Asian Americans: Risk factor differences across ethnic subgroups. *Journal of Family Violence*, 27(3), 215–224. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10896-012-9413-9>
- Chronister, K. M., Rao, K., Williams, L., Woodlee, K., Linville, D., Woods, C. C. R., & Felipe, L. (2021). Family and friend responses to Filipino loved ones experiencing partner abuse. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 12(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000213>.
- De Luna, M. J. F., & Kawabata, Y. (2020). The role of enculturation on the help-seeking attitudes among

Filipino Americans in Guam. *International Perspectives in Psychology*, 9(2), 84–95.

- Dela Cruz, M. T. D., & Periyakoil, V. J. (2010). Filipino American older adults. *eCampus Geriatrics*. [https://geriatrics.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/ethnomed/filipino/downloads/filipino\\_american.pdf](https://geriatrics.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/ethnomed/filipino/downloads/filipino_american.pdf)
- Domestic & Sexual Violence in Filipino Communities. (February 2018). Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence [Fact Sheet]. <https://www.api-gbv.org>
- Hufana, A., & Morgan Consoli, M. L. (2020). "I push through and stick with it": Exploring resilience among Filipino American adults. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 11(1), 3–13.
- Leung, P., & Cheung, M. (2008). A prevalence study on partner abuse in six Asian American ethnic groups in the USA. *International Social Work*, 51(5), 635–649.
- Loh, J., Calleja, F., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2011). Words that hurt: A qualitative study of parental verbal abuse in the Philippines. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(11), 2244–2263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2F0886260510383031>

---

## ACADEMIA, FILIPINA/X/O AMERICANS IN

---

This entry focuses on Filipina/x/o Americans' (FAs) experiences in academia, specifically those who are working in postsecondary environments concerned with pursuing research, education, and scholarship. Despite limited visibility, FAs contribute substantially to academic disciplines and community progress. As will be discussed in what follows, however, tensions and structural barriers have hindered broader impact. Further research contextualizing the resistance and struggles of FAs in academia is warranted.

### Representation of FAs in Academia

FA academics include tenure-track and nontenure-track professors, adjunct instructors, researchers, and higher education administrators with teaching responsibilities. The myriad of professional titles, the increasingly common practice of holding multiple positions, and the overall transformation of academia contribute to the difficulty in quantifying the number of FAs in academia. Based on the 2019 American Community Survey, approximately

10.1% of those identifying as “Filipino alone” have graduate or professional degrees. However, this rate excludes nearly a quarter of FAs who identify with more than one race/ethnicity. This figure also includes professional degrees (e.g., MD), which is not indicative of a research PhD and does not specify whether the doctorate was earned in the United States or abroad, thus impacting whether the doctoral degree holder qualifies for academic positions in the United States.

FAs are represented throughout most academic disciplines, but they may be more visible in fields where FAs have been the subject of research. A larger number encompasses faculty in Ethnic Studies, Asian American studies, and American studies disciplines compared with education, psychology, economics, social work, and communications. Research also shows that FAs are not well represented at the full-time tenure-track faculty level. The pipeline for social science FA professors also indicates a higher number of nontenured professors. Some efforts to collect data on FA professors have found sizable numbers teaching in the California State University system, the United States’ largest public university system, which also passed a mandatory Ethnic Studies requirement in 2020. Unsurprisingly, most FAs in academia are located in states with higher populations of FAs, such as California, Hawaii, Illinois, Texas, and Washington, which also boast regional intellectual networks of scholars.

### Contributions of FAs in Academia

FAs have shaped the academic arena and broader community through teaching, research, service, and leadership. In solidarity with the Third World Liberation Front, students from the Philippine American Collegiate Endeavor at San Francisco State College helped establish the first Ethnic Studies program in 1969. Asian and Asian American Studies programs offer Philippine, FA, and diasporic content through courses, concentrations, graduate certificates, and minors. Interdisciplinary curricula include Filipino languages, history, sociology, economics, and the arts.

Formal academic programs exist at the university and community college levels. Originating as one course in 1962, the University of Hawai’i at Manoa offers the first and only bachelor’s program

in Philippine Language and Culture. Established in 2002, students can obtain an interdisciplinary minor from the Philippine Studies Department at the University of San Francisco. In 2020, the University of California, Los Angeles became the first University of California campus to offer an undergraduate minor in Pilipino Studies. Filipina/x/o curriculum has also spread to community colleges. The City College of San Francisco offers Philippine Studies courses that satisfy transfer and general education requirements.

In addition to developing and administering academic programs, FA academics across the nation address disparities in educational attainment, health care, and civil rights of FAs. First established in 1975, the University of Hawai’i at Manoa established the Philippine Studies Program, which later became the Center for Philippine Studies. It serves as an intellectual and community hub for teaching, research, library acquisition, and exchange with Philippine institutions. In 2001, Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales and several students at San Francisco State University established the Pin@y Education Partnership program, which fosters critical educators both within and outside of academic spaces through strong partnerships between the university, community colleges, public schools, and the local community. Through a series of community-based efforts led by Robyn Rodriguez from 2011 to 2019, the Bulosan Center for Filipino Studies at University of California, Davis was established. The center aims to preserve and disseminate knowledge about the FA experience in the United States and its diaspora. The Kababayan Learning Community at Skyline College in San Bruno, California, provides academic and non-academic transfer support. Other organizations aimed at preserving and archiving FA experiences, such as the Filipino American National Historical Society, continue to be supported and led by FA academics.

Both Philippine- and U.S.-born scholars of Philippine descent continue to advance knowledge and theorize about the FA experience and Asian American identity. Academics have theorized concepts such as Peminism, Pinayism, and colonial mentality and have published research on the educational experiences and health outcomes of FAs. Scholars have written about the psychological and

social impacts of racism, colonization, transnationalism, and globalization on Filipina/x/o people. FA academics have also made notable contributions to literature, education, women's studies, Ethnic Studies, sociology, psychology, public health, engineering, and science.

### **Tensions and Structural Barriers to Participation in Academia**

Undoubtedly, the number of Filipina/x/o professors has yet to keep pace with the growing Filipina/x/o student population attending higher education institutions in the United States. Multiple factors contribute to this disparity, including the U.S. colonial and postcolonial relationship with the Philippines, economic considerations, racialization as Asians, lack of role models, and whiteness in education. These factors intersect to produce challenges along the pipeline from college access through employment.

#### **College Access**

Although 93.5% of adult FAs have high school diplomas, only 49.8% have bachelor's degrees or higher, according to the 2019 American Community Survey. As the Immigration Act of 1965 focused on granting visas to highly skilled professional workers, many FAs had come to the United States with some form of a postsecondary degree. In turn, this policy excludes many second-generation FAs from resources to help navigate higher education that is generally afforded to first-generation college students. And yet, as Tracy Buenavista points out, research has shown that second-generation FAs share more characteristics with first-generation students than students whose parents have U.S. college degrees.

Being racialized as Asian "model minorities," FA students are overlooked as a racially underrepresented group, adding another form of exclusion from equity-oriented pipeline programs into higher education. After being removed as an underrepresented group for Affirmative Action consideration in 1987, Filipina/x/o enrollment at UC Berkeley plummeted. The effect of this change remains three decades later: Nearly half of FAs in the United States reside in California, yet, as Jonathan

Okamura notes, they are underrepresented at UC Berkeley and California's other selective institutions. In 2010, according to Robert Teranishi's *Asians in the Ivory Tower*, 81% of FAs attended less selective colleges, which tend to be local and more affordable.

#### **Graduate School Aspirations**

The lack of culturally responsive education may turn FAs away from pursuing further education. In college, many FA students engage in collegiate Filipina/x/o organizations to find a sense of belonging and likely spend less time preparing for graduate school. As FA participation in academia appears regionally specific, a case can be made for the decreased likelihood of FA students in areas of the country with fewer potential academic role models who share their ethnic identities.

Once in graduate school, FAs who aspire to become academics may still have difficulty finding support. As in earlier stages of the pipeline, ineligibility for programs designed for first-generation or racially underrepresented groups continue to disadvantage aspiring FA academics. Further, those hoping to research Filipina/x/o communities may have to contend with continually asserting the importance of their research to advisors, grant funders, and colleagues. Data aggregated within the broader Asian racial category hinders FAs from quantifying community needs, making it more challenging to qualify for grants programs meant to bolster work on and about marginalized communities.

#### **Employment in Academia**

Encouraging more FAs to earn graduate degrees does not remove the difficulties of the academic job market. Structural barriers and dominance by Whites in higher education continue to create conditions blocking the pathway to academic positions. A large portion of tenure-track professors in the United States obtained degrees from Ivy League or other elite universities, yet only a small proportion of FAs attend such institutions. Thus, despite their earning terminal degrees, bias remains with respect to institutional pedigree and can impede greater participation of FAs in academia.

Additionally, many Filipina/x/o immigrants have faced difficulty finding employment in the United States commensurate with their college degrees earned in the Philippines. Scholars have characterized many FAs as underemployed or working in jobs that do not utilize their full skills and training. Some immigrants eventually decide to start over, finding it necessary to repeat their degrees/certifications in the United States to be eligible for specific jobs.

FAs may enter the workforce with their bachelor's degrees/certificates rather than considering a career in academia. Even in nursing and allied health fields where Filipina/x/os are overrepresented compared with the general population, there is a dearth of Filipina/x/o professors and instructors. While professionals in health care pursue graduate degrees for professional or monetary gain, instructors'/professors' compensation remains incommensurate with that of clinical positions. Thus, potential FA academics in health care are not incentivized to enter academia.

Understanding FAs' participation in postsecondary education and graduate school is essential for providing a sense of the opportunity structures for FA pathways into to the professoriate. Although there are informal efforts, no formal database systematically monitors FAs in academia. The final section of this entry offers recommendations regarding the gaps in research, data collection, and positioning to encourage greater participation of FAs in academia.

### Future Directions and Recommendations

Moving forward, there are several important areas to consider for FAs in academia. First, more research on understanding the FA professoriate pathway needs to be conducted. Further examination of recruitment and retention practices is also needed, as this has implications for FA students who look to role models for entering the professoriate. Without an official database on FAs in academia, gaining a clear understanding of the educational trends will be arduous. FA academics have made great strides in moving and advancing the academy by creating and expanding knowledge and centering the narratives of FAs and the Philippine diaspora. Future research needs to continue

discussing scholarship activism and moving toward acknowledging and centering indigenous narratives within the FA and Philippine diaspora. Moreover, there is a clear need for more data and continued discourse about FAs, including their socio/political positioning in the United States to better understand their experiences in academia.

*Dina C. Maramba, Elaine Jessica Tamargo,  
Krystle Palma Cobian, and Erin Manalo-Pedro*

*See also* College Student Organizations; Educational Achievement of Filipina/x/o American K–12 Students; Filipina/x/o American Studies; The “Other” Students: Filipino Americans, Education, and Power

### Further Readings

- Buenavista, T. L. (2010). Issues affecting U.S. Filipino student access to postsecondary education: A critical race theory perspective. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 15, 114–126.
- David, E. J. R. (2013). *Brown skin, white minds: Filipino American postcolonial psychology*. Information Age Publishing.
- De Jesus, M. L. (Ed.). (2005). *Pinay power: Peminist critical theory: Theorizing the Filipina/American experience*. Routledge.
- Maramba, D. C., & Nadal, K. L. Y. (2013). Exploring the Filipino American faculty pipeline: Implications for higher education. In D. C. Maramba & R. Bonus (Eds.), *The “other” students: Filipino Americans, education and power* (pp. 297–307). Information Age Publishing.
- Nadal, K. L. (2021). *Filipino American psychology: A handbook of theory, research, and clinical practice* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Okamura, J. Y. (2013). Filipino American access to higher education in California and Hawai'i. In D. C. Maramba & R. Bonus (Eds.), *The “other” students: Filipino Americans, education and power* (pp. 213–235). Information Age Publishing.
- Quinajon, R. A. (2019). *Voices of Filipina academic success: Pinay educational experiences in doctoral programs* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Tintiangco-Cubales, A. (2019). Mothering is liberation: Giving birth to Alagaan pedagogy (pedagogy of care). In K. L. C. Valverde & W. M. Dariotis (Eds.), *Fight the tower: Asian American women scholars' resistance and renewal in the academy* (pp. 350–364). Rutgers University Press.

## ACCULTURATION

Acculturation is the systematic process in which a person from one cultural group learns to adapt to the values and behaviors of a new cultural group. Such processes may involve learning and practicing new customs or traditions; changing or adapting one's belief system; learning new languages or ways of speaking; and integrating new foods, styles of dress, or music into one's everyday life. Unlike assimilation, which involves a total adoption of the new group's values and behaviors (and the total erasure of the values and behaviors of their family or culture of origin), acculturation involves a negotiation of both the new host culture and the old home culture.

The term *acculturation* is typically used to describe the experiences of immigrants who physically leave their home country to live and work in another country. However, it can also be applied to the children of immigrants who adopt new norms upon leaving their home and first entering dominant society (e.g., a child raised in an ethnic minority home who attends school with classmates of one predominant group or of other racial and ethnic backgrounds). Related to acculturation is *biculturalism*, which describes the process of people who navigate between two or more identities (e.g., a U.S.-born Pakistani American who balances or struggles with their identities as Pakistani, as American, and as Pakistani American).

Relatedly, *code switching* refers to the act of a bicultural person changing languages or behaviors to match whatever context they are in (e.g., a Dominican American who speaks Spanish at home and among Latinx friends but who speaks only English at work or among non-Latinx friends). Finally, *enculturation* refers to the degree to which an individual learns or maintains the values of their home, ethnic, or indigenous culture. For instance, while some children of immigrants may learn to assimilate to the dominant culture, others may be socialized to maintain their parents' cultural or ethnic values; this may occur through speaking the language of one's country of origin, learning about familial or cultural history or arts, or actively practicing cultural customs and traditions.

For Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs), the processes of acculturation and assimilation are contingent on a number of factors, including immigration status, age, social class, and gender. Further complicating acculturation for FAs is the impact of historical and present-day colonialism, which may influence the slow erasure of what is considered the home culture. The following sections focus on acculturation processes for FAs, concentrating on historical and colonial contexts, generational factors and other intersectional identities, and psychological stressors.

### Historical and Colonial Contexts

To best understand acculturation among FAs, it is important first to review the historical context of the Philippines. Located in Southeast Asia, the Philippines was colonized by Spain for nearly 400 years and then by the United States for almost 50 years. Prior to and during colonization, the country was also involved in trade with countries including China, Portugal, and Australia. With all of these influences, Filipina/x/o culture consists of a hybrid of indigenous, Spanish, and U.S. American values, with traces of other cultural groups as well. Relatedly, Spanish colonizers forcefully indoctrinated the majority of the indigenous people with Christianity, primarily Catholicism, resulting in a high majority of Filipina/x/o people who are Catholic or otherwise Christian. For this reason, many FAs share similar religious and cultural values as Latinx people, whose lands were also colonized by Spain for centuries.

Although the Philippines gained independence from the United States in 1946, the country remains a neocolonial state. English is one of its two official national languages; educational systems are suffused with U.S. curricula; and instruction across all grade levels is given in the English language. Moreover, many Philippine dialects have incorporated both Spanish and English words, and many people in the Philippines code switch between their native language (e.g., Bisayan, Ilokano, Tagalog) and English. Similarly, Philippine media infuse English-language content, and many U.S. television programs and movies are popular in the Philippines.

When FA immigrants first arrive in the United States, they are likely to have a strong command



of the English language and to have been heavily exposed to American culture, long before they set foot on U.S. soil. In this way, acculturation processes may be somewhat easier for Filipina/x/o immigrants than for other immigrants, who must begin learning English on arrival or who have limited knowledge about American customs. At the same time, even with exposure to U.S. culture, Filipina/x/o immigrants may not be prepared for their sociocultural experiences in the United States. For example, many Filipina/x/o immigrants encounter racial discrimination for the first time or might feel isolation or loneliness upon arrival.

### Generational Status

Acculturative processes are likely to manifest differently for people of different generations. Many first-generation immigrants choose to assimilate to U.S. American culture, with the intention of fitting in and thereby being most successful. Many FA immigrant parents, especially those of previous generations, explicitly decided to not teach their children to speak a native Philippine language. As a result, many second-generation FAs (those who were born and grew up in the United States) speak only English. Some FAs are 1.5 generation, which means that they migrated when they were older children or teenagers, and had already been socialized with many values and behaviors from the Philippines. While many 1.5-generation FAs may learn to acculturate (and adjust to new dominant U.S. cultural norms and standards), many might reject their Philippine heritage, as a result of being teased by their peers for being “fresh off the boat.”

Gender may also influence how acculturation processes manifest. For example, although the Philippines may be a matriarchal country in general (e.g., women and girls are generally encouraged to share their opinions or enter any competitive career field; mothers and wives tend to manage finances; women have served as presidents), Filipina American women may feel pressured to adapt to different gender role norms in the United States. As an example, Filipina women in general may be taught to be dutiful and conservative (to remain close to their parents, to avoid drinking or sexual promiscuity, etc.); however, in the United States, women may be taught to be outspoken and assertive. Accordingly, some Filipina women (especially immigrants)

may struggle with engaging in behaviors that they may view as being too boisterous or bold.

### Acculturative Stress

In having to navigate one's multiple cultural identities, some FAs may encounter psychological distress, also known as *acculturative stress*. Acculturative stress may result from other obstacles encountered by immigrants, such as language difficulties, issues with citizenship or documentation, and work-related or financial problems. Acculturative stress has been found to be commonly experienced by immigrants of all ethnic groups, including FAs. For FA immigrants, primary stressors include adjusting to their new host culture, overcoming feelings of isolation, and mastering the American English language (without an accent). For U.S.-born FAs, acculturative stress may include feeling disconnected to one's ethnic identity and wanting to learn more about Philippine culture.

Acculturative stress occurs from a clash between home and host cultural values. For example, although many FA teens learn to be conservative when it comes to sexuality or dating, American culture may induce them to be more sexually free or liberal. Conflicting messages may be internal (e.g., the FA may feel shame for connecting to sexual feelings) or external (e.g., the FA's parents may explicitly forbid them from dating). Such cultural clashes are said to be reasons why FA parents have difficulty talking with their teens about a range of issues, including safe sex, sexuality, mental health, or academic problems. Cultural stigma may also be a form of acculturative stress; because of stigmas regarding issues such as mental illness, divorce, involvement in the criminal justice system, and queer and trans identities, FAs may feel shame or embarrassment, which may lead to isolation or inability to seek help or social support.

Cultural conflicts are inherent, perhaps inevitable, in the process of acculturation. Numerous scholars have highlighted how intergenerational family conflict can negatively impact the entire family, including first-generation FA immigrant parents and second-generation FA school-aged children and college students. Some studies have indicated that FA college students' academic performance and mental health suffer as a result of unresolved familial and cultural conflicts. When

these conflicts are not addressed, FAs are negatively impacted on individual and familial levels.

### **Protective Factors**

There are many protective factors that assist in reducing acculturative stress and other psychological problems. Dr. Alicia del Prado's studies on enculturation have found that maintaining strong connections to family in the Philippines predicted positive mental health and wellness. Research by Dr. Maria Teresa Tuason and others describes how multiple sources of cultural access points (e.g., parents, family members, community events, schools, ethnic media) can be positive influences for healthy identity development. Studies by Dr. Allyson Tintiango-Cubales and others suggest that community support is particularly helpful for dealing with isolation or loneliness. For FA immigrants, this may involve formal or informal social support networks; for second-generation FAs, this may involve college student organizations, mentorship, or Ethnic Studies classes.

### **Future Directions**

To address acculturative stress and cultural conflicts, community support systems can promote opportunities for communication and dialogue. For example, FA forums can be held to address family relations and to help community members understand these dynamics. Within such convenings, facilitators can emphasize how dialogue in the family helps build love and trust. FA families can be taught the importance of maintaining ongoing healthy family relationships and be reminded that all family members must be committed to communicate, stay engaged when conflict occurs, and work through conflicts as best as possible. Sharing experiences, listening, and being open can help produce caring connections within the family.

Relatedly, parents and children can be taught to empathize with their generational counterparts. Youth and young adults can learn about the stressors immigrant parents experienced in their cultural adaptation to life in the United States (often with limited social support). Similarly, parents can be educated about the issues their U.S.-born children encounter, such as peer pressure,

cultural conflicts, academic obstacles, microaggressions, and struggles with ethnic identity.

Ethnic Studies courses in the K–12 educational systems and in higher education can help resolve the acculturative stressors that negatively impact FAs' academic performance and mental health. Such courses can increase awareness and understanding of the accomplishments, contributions, history, and resiliency of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in the United States—topics that many BIPOC students may otherwise never encounter in academic settings. Specific to FAs, both Philippine Studies and FA Studies (at college/university and high school levels) contribute to increased cultural awareness, knowledge of Philippine and FA history, self-esteem, understanding of FA parents' acculturative struggles, and pride in their FA ethnic identities. In addition to giving validation to FA experiences, Ethnic Studies can strengthen the gap between formal educational systems and community engagement. Because of these numerous positive outcomes, both the California State University system and the California Community College system have instituted Ethnic Studies graduation requirements. Higher education systems throughout the United States can consider advocating for similar requirements.

Finally, when examining one's approach to identity, an intersectional perspective is crucial in recognizing how people's multiple identities (generational status, socioeconomic status, gender, sexual orientation, spiritual beliefs, etc.) influence their worldviews, behaviors, and communication styles. For instance, an immigrant grandparent's lack of emotional expression toward their children, or an immigrant parent's desire to acculturate or assimilate to U.S. society, may be a result of traumatic experiences in the Philippines. In seeing the differences and similarities between generations, identities, and experiences, people can empathize with others' tendencies toward acculturation, assimilation, biculturalism, or enculturation. In understanding these terms and how they manifest within individuals, people can better understand their collective selves with all the complexities they encompass. We also learn that the content of who we are relies on the context of our people.

*Judy Patacsil and Marc Pescadera*

*See also* Assimilation; Cultural Stigma; Enculturation; Ethnic Identity Development; Immigration; Intergenerational Conflict; Psychology

### Further Readings

- Chung, P. J., Travis, R., Jr., Kilpatrick, S. D., Elliott, M. N., Lui, C., Khandwala, S. B., & Schuster, M. A. (2007). Acculturation and parent-adolescent communication about sex in Filipino-American families: A community-based participatory research study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 40*(6), 543–550.
- Del Prado, A. M., & Church, A. T. (2010). Development and validation of the Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(4), 469–483.
- Ea, E. E., Griffin, M. Q., L'Eplattenier, N., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2008). Job satisfaction and acculturation among Filipino registered nurses. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 40*(1), 46–51.
- Nadal, K. L. (2021). *Filipino American psychology: A handbook of theory, research, and clinical practice*. Wiley.
- Tintiango-Cubales, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Pin@y Educational Partnerships: A Filipina/o American Studies sourcebook: Vol. 2. Filipina/o American identities, activism, and service*. Phoenix Publishing House International.
- Tuason, M., Teresa, G., Taylor, A. R., Rollings, L., Harris, T., & Martin, C. (2007). On both sides of the hyphen: Exploring the Filipino-American identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(4), 362–372.
- Vargas, P., & Jurado, L. F. (2016). Dietary acculturation among Filipino Americans. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(16), 1–11.

---

## ACTIVISM AND EDUCATION

---

The story of Filipina/x/o America is filled with moments of enduring activism. Much can be attributed to the ways activism has shaped education. Education has been a force by which the nuanced and diverse experiences of Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs) are being documented and taught. In its simplest terms, activism can be thought of as a collective struggle for change. Central to such change are the organizing activities that animate an individual or group's activism. Common conceptions include

a variety of actions and demonstrations including sit-ins, protests, boycotts, strikes, petitions, and letter-writing campaigns. It is often because of activism that significant material changes have been made within education.

Important to note are the differences between education and schooling, which are oftentimes used interchangeably. Schooling is a process where students learn about society's existing order. In a U.S. context, the status quo or dominant group reflects the system of White cis-heteropatriarchy and its benefactors. Students learn their suggested place within society even if their experiences mirror those of the dominant culture. Even with the numerous contributions from FAs to building the United States, FAs are not a part of what some term the official curriculum. As a result, schooling involves narrow views or metanarratives of history and limited acceptable ways for participating in society. People internalize the worldviews, values, and ways of being reflective of the dominant group, thereby preserving the status quo. Schooling functions as an institution that reifies Whiteness and maintains White supremacy by ensuring that people do not question existing ways of life. This is achieved primarily through what is taught and how it is taught. Conversely, critical education scholars have detailed how education enables people to develop a critical consciousness. In doing so, education allows people to develop skills to interrogate what they are learning and ask *why*. Education is the process through which people can identify and question the status quo, learn how their experiences are connected to others, and are given the tools to transform society. Education is not solely found within the traditional classroom spaces where schooling typically takes place. Rather, education occurs in a variety of places including community spaces, alongside elders, studying ancestral knowledges, from youth, in organizing, at the dinner table, and in the preparation and sharing of food.

This essay surveys a breadth of topics connected to activism and education and ways Filipino Americans have been engaged in issues related to the two. The first section explores activism and the FA community. The next section presents an overview of key contributions to education by FAs. The essay concludes with a charge

forward on the power and promise of activism and education.

### Activism and the FA Community

While it might be customary to associate activism as *effective* when changes are measurable, it is important to rethink efficacy and consider activism as a process and practice. The goals of activism are not solely about change but ought to be approached as both the moments and movements that lead to material changes. Activism involves the relational, the coalitional, and the learnings imbued through a shared struggle. For some, FAs participating in activism brings up concerns around safety as activism can be met with violence. Others might liken activism to *civil disobedience*, foreclosing the fact that many privileges people are afforded are because of activism. In other words, tracing activism within Filipina/x/o America necessitates a robust understanding about how and why activism is central to the community. Less obvious are ways activism becomes a space for unlearning what was thought of as truth, sharpening people's understanding and analyses, and a mode for envisioning other ways of being. Activism supports political clarity, connects shared struggles across communities, and develops the tools necessary to collectively respond to oppression.

### Actualizing Activism in the Building of Filipina/x/o America

FAs are part of the greater history and development of the United States. Much of their contributions have been documented by the work of historians, archivists, and scholars of the Filipino American National Historical Society (FANHS). By applying an activist and critical educational lens, the building of Filipino America against this history may be ascertained. It is believed that the United States brings together people from different cultures, languages, abilities, histories, and religions from across the globe. Despite the myth of a seamless unification, it is clear that many groups do not have equal access to resources or decision making. This is true for FAs. Through Ethnic Studies and FA studies, it can be understood that FAs are implicated in settler colonialism—occupying stolen Indigenous lands—and at the same time understand how colonization shapes the

experiences of Filipinos in America. Moreover, the prevalence of anti-Blackness within the community, many of whom identify as Black and Filipino, reveals a necessary context to contend with when engaging a FA activist praxis.

Building Filipina/x/o America includes explicit encounters with power and oppression, resistance, and collective action. History is instructive for documenting and contextualizing what these encounters consisted of. For instance, early Filipino laborers were met with posters containing taunting language: “Positively No Filipinos Allowed” or “Get Rid of All Filipinos or We’ll Burn This Down.” Racist nativism—used to justify the superiority of the native, perceived to be White, over the nonnative, typically people and immigrants of color—is arguably an accurate characterization of im/migration in the United States. Such warnings have always been met with collective resistance. Contemporarily, FAs have been faced with explicit racism and hate crimes. At the time of this writing, anti-Asian American sentiments are increasingly being documented. On the east coast, Vilma Kari, a 65-year-old Filipina living in New York, was brutally attacked, sparking national attention to a string of violence against Asian Americans. A 52-year-old Pinoy (who wished to maintain anonymity) was attacked at a New York City subway station after witnesses heard the assailant hauling racist nativist slurs. In California, calls for defunding the police grow amid increasing concerns with state sanctioned violence by police. The death of Angelo Quinto, a 30-year-old veteran, is fueling such calls. Family members of Quinto called for support from police to address a mental health crisis, yet police responded with violent force. Quinto died from asphyxiation while in police custody as officers knelt on his neck. The “Justice for Angelo Quinto” campaign quickly called for an investigation and police accountability.

Historical and judicial activism offers key insights for understanding the experiences of FAs. In the 1930s, *Roldan v. Los Angeles County* was instrumental in challenging anti-miscegenation laws. Salvador Roldan, an Ilocano, was engaged to a British White woman, Marjorie Rogers, and the two applied for a marriage license. Racial categories were unclear and determining whether Filipinos were considered *Mongolians* complicated Roldan and Rogers's application. At the same time, racism

against the Filipino community—comprised mostly of men—exacerbated opponents of interracial coupling of Filipino men and White women. This was fueled by racist nativism and tensions around labor. These tensions erupted in what is famously referred to as the *Watsonville Riots*, when 500 armed White men converged on the streets of Watsonville, California, to intimidate, incite violence, and attack Filipinos. The riots lasted 5 days. Fermin Tobera, a 22-year-old, was shot and killed amid the rioting. News of the riot and his death spread to the Philippines and Tobera's body was returned for burial. He was lauded for pursuing the *American dream*. Protests challenging the violence followed. Nearly 90 years later, assembly member Luis Alejo introduced a bill calling for California to formally acknowledge and apologize for the discrimination against Filipinos and FAs. Although decades have passed since the racialized violence occurred in Watsonville, the insistence on justice remains through Alejo and community activism.

### Activism Across Generations

The category “Filipino” has been an option on the U.S. census since 1920. The formal classification coincided with more people identifying as Asian American, as a pan-ethnic group during the 1970s and 1980s. The political origins of *Asian American* undergird what has been used by members of the community as an important organizing mechanism and an enduring example of self-determination. What can sometimes be lost under this are the unique contexts, histories, and experiences for ethnic groups that comprise the Asian American category. Maintaining a separate category proves to be productive for several reasons especially as it relates to allocation of resources and revealing needs unique to FAs. In this way, advocates for data disaggregation among Asian Americans to highlight Filipino, Pilipino, and other iterations remain an important facet for activism in data collection efforts. Disaggregated data and subsequent work to ensure the community is accurately counted reveal nuance, diversity, and unique needs within Filipina/x/o America. Activism in this sense can quantitatively illuminate at a granular level how and where foci of the community are needed.

Young people have been active in movements and made significant contributions for the FA

community. For example, high school youth of Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP) advocated for culturally and community responsive education. Their desire for FA curriculum inspired leaders in PEP to transform it from a lunchtime mentorship program to a thriving program with FA classes offered from elementary to college-level courses. PEP students were bold in taking their demands to the San Francisco school board and speaking on the need for Ethnic Studies for all students. In 2015, youth leaders collaborated with their teachers in Union City, CA, to advocate for the renaming of their school. Itliong-Vera Cruz Middle School would become the first public school in the nation to be named after the famed Filipino American leaders Larry Itliong and Philip Vera Cruz. In 2020, Stockton Unified School District would follow suit and name a new K–8 school after Flora Arca Mata. Mata earned her teaching credential from the University of California, Los Angeles as the first Filipina American graduate from the university and would teach for more than 30 years in Stockton. Mata is believed to be the first FA school teacher in California. These institutional developments highlight the ways young people are leading the way to advocate and demand change. A shining example of youth activism is found in the efforts of 9-year-old Makai Scott-Deleon from San Francisco, CA. At the height of the COVID-19 pandemic and anti-Asian violence, Makai knew he wanted to do something to help the Asian American community and he organized “Bake Against Hate: A Community Bake Sale.” Local Asian American and FA vendors learned of Makai's work and supported his effort. According to Makai, he wanted to “fight racism and try to help the AAPI community during this time of hatred and sadness” and ultimately his activism garnered \$3,581 in donations with full proceeds going directly to AAPI organizations. Youth are very much aware of the injustices and conditions of the world they are living in and acknowledge the power of activism to transform their worlds.

Pinay historian Dawn Bohulano Mabalon chronicled the making of a FA community in Stockton, CA—considered the epicenter of Filipina/x/o America. Mabalon and other community leaders worked tirelessly to ensure coordinated efforts to save some of the remaining buildings and sites where Filipinos created community in Stockton.

From their activism emerged the next generation of FA teachers, activists, artists, cultural workers, organizers, and leaders. Little Manila Rising is an organization dedicated to the preservation and education of FA life in the delta region.

### Mass Movements and Movement Making

Movement building is central to the formation of the FA community. Such efforts have provided a strong connection between Filipinos in the Philippines and Filipinas/xes/os diasporically. History reveals the significant ways FAs have been leaders for change at local levels and across the diaspora. Activist networks have maintained deep ties to on-the-ground issues in the Philippines urging immediate actions garnering global attention and support. In the 1970s, the Anti-Martial Law Movement ignited a generation of activists pushing back on the insidious and atrocious abuses of power by Philippine leaders. In 2014, the killing of Jennifer Laude, a 26-year-old trans woman, by Joseph Pemberton, a U.S. Marine stationed in the Philippines, put pressure upon the ongoing neocolonial relationship between the United States and the Philippines. Mounting pressures between local government officials in the southern region of the Philippines and extrajudicial killings of Indigenous leaders continues to draw national attention and highlights shared struggles between Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines and across the globe.

These examples are but a few of the many injustices prompting activists of all ages to demand better. In this way, movements and movement building are essential to the narratives and strength of FAs. From the labor movements made possible by Filipino leadership and activism in the United Farm Workers to the move for national recognition of Filipino American History Month championed by FANHS or the intergenerational movement for equity on behalf of FA World War II veterans and recent attention to FA foodways ushered in by the Filipino American Food Movement, activism remains an essential component in the building of Filipino America.

### Filipina/x/o Americans and Education

Across the history of education are examples of how activism has been used in response to the expressed needs of FAs. A critical assessment of

education for Filipinos and FAs reveals the knotted relationship between U.S. colonization, militarism, and using schooling as a technology of conquest. One of the main programs revealing this was the Pensionado Program. In the 1900s, Asian Americans (and generally all People of Color) were excluded from accessing public education. In 1903, however, a cohort of Filipinos—later referred to as *pensionados*—were granted access to elite universities in the United States. They were carefully selected because of their social statuses, power, and influence. The hope was this group of students would receive an elite U.S. education and return to the Philippines bringing with them the U.S. ideologies and models of governance to install upon return. Important to note is that the pensionados were from different class backgrounds and regions in the Philippines than the migrant laborers who came to the United States and worked in Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington. From this perspective, the United States utilized schooling as an extension of the colonial project. This supports the belief that institutions of higher education were not made with Filipinos and other People of Color in mind. Through activism and collective action, however, this would change, and FAs would play an important role in transforming the landscape of education.

### Creating FA Education

One of the most widely known examples of collective activism in education is the decades-long fight for Ethnic Studies. The efforts of the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) resulted in the establishment of the College of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State University (SFSU). For nearly 5 decades, it was the *only* college focused on connecting the community to the university and the teaching, research, and service of minoritized groups worldwide. Within the College of Ethnic Studies, FA faculty worked to make the Asian American Studies Department a hub for community responsive and culturally rooted education that centered the experiences of FAs. The creation of spaces, programs, research, resources, and curricular tools would become the blueprint for groups seeking a relevant and community connected education. Students of Ethnic Studies, Asian American and Filipino American studies in particular, ushered in

paradigmatic shifts in what can be described as a Filipino American education.

Decades since the first Filipinos attended U.S. institutions of higher education and in the years following the movement for Ethnic Studies, the contributions of FAs to education have considerably expanded. The educational research and theorizing of FAs resulted in powerful developments in radical tradition including critical race studies, Ethnic Studies, gender studies, and sexuality and queer studies. These contributions have informed new ways of understanding and addressing intersecting issues of power and empire, colonialism and imperialism, and race and racism as they relate to FAs and education. Such inroads have proven to provide a foundation upon which a FA educational tradition have been established. Moreover, the educational interventions created in service of the FA community are abundant in geopolitical places where FAs live. For instance, the Sistan C. Alhambra Filipino American Institute in Hawaii; Seattle, Washington's PinoyTeach; San Francisco, California's, Pin@y Educational Partnerships; Stockton, California's Little Manila After School Project; San Diego, California's Kuya Ate Mentoring Project and The Filipino School; the inland empire in Southern California's Lakas Mentoring Project; Carson, California's Filipino Cultural School; Los Angeles, California's Search to Involve Pilipino Americans; and most recently, Bayani Ng Kabataan—Filipino American Cultural and Social Justice School of San José in San José, California. Many of the organizations and spaces have partnerships tied to institutions of higher education while others have emerged despite connections to universities. Each demonstrates deep commitments to serving the FA community and allies to center the educational experiences, histories, and stories within and across Filipino America.

As evidenced by the student activists and organizers of the TWLF demanding a relevant education, student voice has fueled significant programmatic and policy changes in higher education. The phenomena of student-initiated, student-run programming has become a model for ways in which universities can better serve historically excluded groups. One of the oldest FA student organizations is the Pilipino American Collegiate Endeavor (PACE). Since its founding in 1967, student leaders in PACE have created a host of programming. For instance, PACE is credited with having the first Pilipino Cultural Night (PCN), a student theatrical production

involving dance, music, and singing. PACE has organized the “Uniting Pilipino Students for Success” conference to bring high school students from across the Bay Area to visit SFSU. PACE's student-run internship program provided opportunities for FA college students to learn about community issues resulting in a pathway to participate in local Filipino organizations on a variety of issues. At the University of California, Los Angeles, Samahang Pilipino is the *mother organization* that is primarily student run in service of Filipino Americans. Because of the institutional barriers met once students enroll in higher education, a variety of programs exist at UCLA to support Filipino Americans. Samahang Pilipino Education and Retention (SPEAR) was created to address the dismal retention rates of Filipinos. Samahang Pilipino Advancing Community Empowerment (SPACE) promotes access to higher education through academic achievement, personal development, and leadership and community connection. SPACE connects UCLA with neighboring community colleges and high schools across Los Angeles. Another program founded to create a space for transfer students attending UCLA is Pilipino Transfer Student Partnerships (PTSP). In 2016, UCLA launched one of the first residential halls for students focused on serving the Pilipino community. In 2020, UCLA would become the first campus in the University of California system to offer a Pilipino Studies minor after decades of advocacy by students, faculty, and community members.

Access to Filipino American and Ethnic Studies courses is a privilege. For FAs attending higher education and participating in the FA campus community, certain events are typified as a part of a rite of passage. This is not to suggest a generalization of a singular FA college experience but rather, to acknowledge the ways FAs have co-created community within institutions of higher education. From cultural production through PCN to fellowship and fun in the annual Friendship Games—fieldgamesinvolvingFAstudentorganizations—held at California State University, Fullerton, FA collegians create spaces that reflect and honor their experiences with or without institutional support. Although many events and organization are concentrated on the west coast, a vibrant FA college community exists in the Midwest and East Coast. For instance, the Filipino Americans Coming Together conference and the Filipino American Intercollegiate Networking Dialogue (FIND) have

been gathering for three years, bringing participants from the Midwest, East Coast, and Canada.

The last decade ushered in significant milestones for FAs and education. Over 20 years since its founding by Dr. Allyson Tintiango-Cubales, PEP has been instrumental in the development of FA educational research, programming, and curricula. PEP alumni have gone on to pursue graduate degrees, doctorates, and have become professors, cultural workers, teachers, social workers, artists, and community leaders. Under the direction of Dr. Robyn Rodriguez, the Bulosan Center for Filipino Studies is currently the first and only center of its kind in the United States and University of California system. The Bulosan Center has charted a strong trajectory across Asian American Studies, public health, education, and cultural studies. Within the professoriate, it is important to note the increase in FA professors whose scholarship and teaching focuses on FAs. Further, this last decade has marked several FA education scholars earn full professorship.

### Activism and Education: The Paths Ahead

In the past 2 decades, social media has been an instrumental form of activism spreading awareness of issues not shared on mainstream news, using hashtags to amplify community concerns and issues or as a tool for grassroots organizers. Within an education context, activism can appear as broad-based efforts to desegregate schools, calls for adequate and healthy learning environments, and demands for relevant curriculum. What remains clear is the notion that indeed education is political. Because of the vision and desire to create educational opportunities centering FAs, much can be anticipated for future generations. If the past is any indication about what lies ahead, FAs will continue to be active participants in creating a world and education where our stories are honored, documented, and shared.

*Edward R. Curammeng*

*See also* Academia, Filipina/x/o Americans in; Anti-Martial Law Movement; Filipino American National Historical Society; Filipina/x/o American Studies; Pensionados; Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP); Pinoy Teach

### Further Readings

- Curammeng, E. R., & Tintiango-Cubales, A. (2017). Growing our own hope: The development of a Pin@y teacher pipeline. In B. Power & R. Kohli (Eds), *Confronting Racism in Teacher Education*, (pp. 157–163). Routledge.
- Francisco-Menchavez, V. (2018). Save Mary Jane Veloso: Solidarity and global migrant activism in the Filipino labor diaspora. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 17(1–2), 202–219.
- Rodriguez, R. M. (2019). *Filipino American transnational activism: Diasporic politics among the second generation*. Brill.
- Sales, J. N. (2019). #NeverAgainToMartialLaw: Transnational Filipino American activism in the shadow of marcos and age of duterte. *Amerasia Journal*, 45(3), 299–315.

## ADAMS V. HOWERTON

In 1975, Richard Frank Adams and Anthony “Tony” Corbett Sullivan became one of the first documented same-sex couples to be legally married in the United States. While the couple had been in a loving relationship for 4 years, the primary reason why Sullivan (an Australian immigrant) and Richard Adams (a Filipino American naturalized citizen) sought marriage was so that Sullivan could become an American citizen.

On April 21, 1975, Sullivan and Adams exchanged marriage vows at the First Unitarian Church of Denver and became one of six same-sex couples to obtain marriage licenses in Colorado that year. However, for 10 years, they would unsuccessfully engage in a long legal battle to fight for their marriage to be recognized on both state and federal levels. Although their case is commonly referred to as *Adams v. Howerton*, the case was officially known as *Richard Frank Adams, et al., v. Joseph D. Howerton*. It was the first federal case challenging same-sex marriage in the United States.

### History

Richard Adams was born in Manila, Philippines, on March 9, 1947, as Richard Frank Salanga. When he migrated at age 12 to the United States, he took his stepfather’s last name, Adams. After having spent his adolescence in Minnesota, he



moved to Los Angeles in early adulthood. In 1971, Tony Sullivan, an Australian man who was traveling around the world, arrived in the United States on a tourist visa in 1971. He met Adams at a Los Angeles bar and the two fell in love. While the couple began to build a life together, they knew that after Sullivan's visa expired, he would not be authorized to live in the United States.

In March 1975, the couple flew from California to Colorado, after learning that Clela Rorex—the county clerk of Boulder County, CO—was issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples. As the official wording of Colorado state law on marriage indicated that marriage was valid between *any two persons*, Rorex interpreted the state's statutes as being gender-neutral and not limited to only opposite-sex couples. Accordingly, she issued marriage licenses to a total of six same-sex couples, including Adams and Sullivan. In spite of intense backlash, she only stopped authorizing same-sex marriages after being ordered to do so by the state's attorney general.

Upon returning to California, Adams immediately submitted his application to the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) to petition for his spouse to become a U.S. citizen. In November 1975, however, he received a letter that stated: "You have failed to establish that a bona fide marital relationship can exist between two faggots." After the couple launched a formal protest against INS and gained media attention (including an appearance on *The Phil Donahue Show*), a revised letter was sent that stated: "Marriage between two males is invalid for immigration purposes and cannot be considered a bona fide marital relationship since neither party to the marriage can perform the female functions in marriage."

Further, it is important to note that in the 1970s, immigrants who were open about their LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, or Queer) identities were not legally able to become U.S. citizens. The American Psychiatric Association classified homosexuality as a psychiatric disorder; hence, the federal government considered them to have mental defects—which resulted in an automatic denial of citizenship. Although the American Psychiatric Association removed the diagnosis of homosexuality from the second edition of its *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-II)*

in 1973, the federal clause would not be repealed until the Immigration Act of 1990.

### Legal Battle

Upon receiving INS notices that their application had been rejected, the couple filed a lawsuit against Joseph Howerton—the acting district director of the INS, which was housed under the U.S. Department of Justice. The plaintiffs claimed that the couple's marriage was valid under both Colorado state law and federal immigration law. Using the same rationale as the county clerk, they argued there was no specific language prohibiting marriages between people of the same sex. Further, the suit recognized federal laws that had allowed American citizens to petition for their noncitizen spouses and relatives to attain citizenship since 1855.

The case was first heard in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California on February 25, 1980. The district judge ruled against the plaintiffs, asserting that marriage had historically meant a union between a man and a woman. Further, the ruling cited that although Colorado law neither allowed nor prohibited marriages between people of the same sex, one of the benefits of marriage was for "propagation of the race" (i.e., procreation).

The couple appealed, and the case was heard by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. On February 25, 1982, a three-judge panel affirmed the District Court's opinion—ruling that *spouse* referred to married people of the opposite sex and that it would be inappropriate to alter the definition of the term for immigration purposes. In 1985, Sullivan appealed to the INS to reconsider his deportation order; it was denied, and he was forced to leave the country within 60 days.

### Aftermath

Although Sullivan was the only one being deported, both Sullivan and Adams left the United States in exile so they could continue living together as a couple. The couple lived in Europe for a year before returning to the United States, via the Mexican border. For decades, Sullivan lived as an undocumented immigrant, and the two lived a private life together.

In 1996, the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) federally defined marriage as union between a man and woman; it thus invalidated any state-recognized same-sex married couples from receiving federal benefits and protections. However, in 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) deemed DOMA to be unconstitutional, thereby granting any state-recognized same-sex married couples the same federal rights as opposite-sex married couples—including the ability to petition for their noncitizen spouses to become citizens.

Regrettably, Richard Adams was diagnosed with lung cancer in 2010 and died in 2012—just 1 year before the 2013 SCOTUS ruling that would have validated their marriage and 3 years before the 2015 SCOTUS ruling that legalized same-sex marriage across all 50 states. In 2014, the U.S. Customs and Immigration Services wrote a letter to Tony Sullivan, apologizing for the homophobic letter he and his husband had received in 1975. In 2016—four decades after his husband petitioned for his citizenship—Tony Sullivan received his green card.

*Kalaya'an Mendoza and Kevin Leo  
Yabut Nadal*

*See also* Anti-Miscegenation Laws; Citizenship Eligibility; Immigration; LGBTQ Rights Movement, Filipina/x/o American; Queer Filipina/x/o Americans; Queer Studies

### Further Readings

- Fox, M. (2012, December 24). Richard Adams, same-sex spouse who sued U.S., dies at 65. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/25/us/richard-adams-who-sued-us-after-1975-gay-marriage-dies-at-65.html>
- Miller, T. G. (Producer, Director), & Marcolina, K. (Producer). (2014). *Limited partnership*. Tesseract Films.
- Nadal, K. L. (2020). *Queering law and order: LGBTQ communities and the criminal justice system*. Lexington Books.

---

## ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY

---

Adolescent pregnancy, also known as *teen pregnancy*, is defined as pregnancy in a female who is 20 years of age or younger regardless of marital

status. In the United States, among female teens ages 15–19, birth rates have declined from 89 births per 1,000 in 1960 to 19 births per 1,000 in 2017. Although reasons for the declines are not clear, evidence suggests these declines are due to more teens abstaining from sexual activity and more teens who are sexually active using birth control than in previous years. Between 1991 and 2015, the teen birth rate dropped 64%, which resulted in \$4.4 billion in public savings in 2015 alone.

Despite the positive trends, the U.S. teen birth rate remains higher than in other developed countries and when examined closer, racial disparities in teen birth rates persist. In 2017, while American Indian/Alaska Natives teens had the highest birth rate of 32.9 per 1,000 compared to Hispanics (28.9) and Black teens (27.5), the Asian and Pacific Islander (API) teens had a birth rate of 7 per 1,000. While this number may appear low, concerns remain when data are disaggregated into Asian subgroups. According to the CDC National Vital Statistics in 2018, the highest percentage of teen mothers among API mothers in 2016 was found among Filipina American mothers.

Although specific data are sparse for teen pregnancy in Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs), the known data show a consistent trend of FAs having the higher rates within the API groups. A 1991 study done in San Francisco recorded FAs with the highest pregnancy rates among Asians as well as the highest rate of increase in the number of births compared with African Americans, Latinas, Whites, and other Asian groups. FA girls, mostly second generation, have the highest ranking of teen pregnancy and single teen mothers compared to other Asian American groups. A study was done that showed that 6% of births were from FA teenagers, and each year the numbers have increased.

The limited data that disaggregate Asian American ethnic groups make it difficult to identify the actual health status and specific health needs of Filipina/x American pregnant youth. The lack of sufficient numbers for reliable analyses about the socioeconomic, emotional, psychological, physical, financial, and educational impact creates a gap for specific interventions to be created to fully address teen pregnancy among FA girls.

Even with the advancement of information and research, there still needs to be further exploration

of adolescent pregnancy in Filipino American girls. This entry provides a general overview of the societal impact of teen pregnancy, cultural stigmas, reasons teens get pregnant, support systems available, and how future research opportunities can deepen the understanding of this public health condition for FAs specifically and adolescents in general.

### Problems Related to Adolescent Pregnancy

Adolescent pregnancy is a complex issue affecting the pregnant youth, families, government, health care professionals, and educators. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more than four of five or 80% of teenage pregnancies are unintended and 89% of these births take place out of wedlock. Untimely childbearing causes substantial negative effects on the teenage mother's physical, emotional, educational, and economic potential.

Teenage pregnancies are often hidden for months, resulting in a lack of prenatal care and dangerous outcomes for the babies. These are concerns particularly for girls ages 15 or younger because they are less likely to be physically developed enough to sustain a healthy pregnancy or to give birth. Pregnant teens face higher medical risks including premature labor, preterm delivery, contracting sexually transmitted diseases, anemia, and preeclampsia. Babies of adolescent mothers face higher risks of low birth weight and severe neonatal conditions.

Adolescent mothers may not possess the same level of maternal skills as do adult mothers. Many teen parents do not have the intellectual or emotional maturity needed to provide for another person; their children often experience compromised physical and intellectual attainment due to parental immaturity and the related economic and social instability. Children of teenage mothers are more likely to have lower school achievement and to drop out of high school, have more health problems, be incarcerated during adolescence, give birth as a teenager, and face unemployment. Rates of postpartum depression are greater in adolescents than in adults. Thorough mental health assessments during the prenatal period are critical for pregnant adolescents as well as during the immediate postdelivery period and well into motherhood. Many pregnant teens are forced to

drop out of school, which threatens future education and economic opportunities.

### Why Teens Get Pregnant

During the early adolescent years, sexual intercourse can be predicted by early pubertal development, poverty, lack of attentive and nurturing parents, cultural and family patterns of early sexual experience, history of sexual abuse, lack of school and career goals, substance abuse, and poor school performance. Inadequate sex education including knowledge of their bodies and the proper use of contraception as well as lack of access to birth control are risks for teenage girls to get pregnant.

Adolescence represents a key time of rapid growth and the young person's brain is still developing. Adolescents are primed to engage in risk-taking as they test the boundaries of self. While sexual socialization is part of development, sexual involvement can involve outcomes that youth are not prepared to handle. The use of social media is a common venue for adolescents to construct, express, and be influenced by sexual content that can produce positive and negative effects.

FAs are a large minority at high risk for adolescent behavioral health problems. Limited research describes the family as offering a source of positive support for some FA youths, and yet for some, it is also a source of stress and isolation leading to struggles with adolescent depression and suicidal behavior. Unattended mental health conditions increase the risk of the adolescent to engage in high-risk behaviors that can produce untoward outcomes.

FA adolescents find it difficult to discuss their situations with their parents. A study by P. J. Chung in 2007 found few adolescents (22%) reported regularly discussing sex with parents. In the same study, a focus group with FA adolescents, parents, and grandparents described major breakdowns in intergenerational communication about sex stemming in large part from family struggles with acculturation. While youth in the United States are encouraged to have open discussions, parents can perceive that as a lack of respect leading to arguments and sometimes silence. The thought of talking about topics related to sexuality can create anxiety and apprehension, which may

lead to avoidance of discussion. Parents may also delay because they might equate talking about sex as giving permission to get involved.

### Cultural Factors and Stigmas

Childbearing at an early age and bearing numerous children in the Philippines was far more common in previous decades up until the mid-1900s. It was common for mothers born in the early 1900s to become pregnant in adolescence and bear 10 or more children. As of 2021, while there are still existing traditional societies where teens becoming pregnant is acceptable and socially desirable, numerous studies point out the stigma associated with adolescent pregnancies when it does occur.

The family is the basic and most important aspect of Filipina/x/o culture. Culture places high value on education and starting families but only after educational priorities are met. Being a teen mother is not consistent with the strong Filipina/x/o cultural values that demand acquiring education, work experience, and financial stability in that order. Any deviation from that expectation is deemed less accepted and stigmatized.

The stigma of rejection, disappointment, or violence from parents, partners, and peers is high for pregnant teens. Problems posed by an unintended unplanned pregnancy brings *hiya* (shame) to the family. Social consequences for unmarried pregnant adolescents include parental letdown and deepened tension with the already challenging generational parent-child differences. This alienation can lead to negative impacts on school causing further stress for the pregnant youth. She can be disowned by the family and labeled pejoratively as a *black sheep*—or a member of a family who is regarded as a disgrace to them.

### Program and Support Services

Support systems help teens make healthy choices about relationships, sex, and birth control.

Teenage parents who can rely on family and community support, social services, and childcare support are more likely to continue their education and get higher paying jobs as they progress with their education. Some high schools in the United States offer programs for pregnant and parenting teens to continue their education, sometimes referred to as *teen parent programs*.

Some believe the best method of reducing the consequences of teenage parenthood is providing age-appropriate comprehensive sexual education and ensuring adolescents' access to sexual and reproductive health information and services that welcome them and facilitate their choices. Pregnancy prevention programs and messages directed toward teens, such as reality TV shows that follow the struggles of teen mothers, also play an educational role.

Building on the unique aspects of FA immigrant experience is also critical. For example, a 2010 study by Dr. Joyce Javier titled “Lessons Learned From a Community-Academic Partnership Addressing Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention in Filipino American Families” describes how a partnership between the Filipino Youth Coalition in San Jose, CA, and Stanford Pediatrics Advocacy Program planned a culturally tailored parent-teen conference aimed at normalizing struggles with intergenerational communication.

### Future Directions

Teen pregnancies can be prevented, and it is important to address the underlying reasons involved—including poverty, social pressures, and coercion. Parental supervision, setting expectations, and parent/child connectedness have been recognized as decreasing risky sexual behavior and other risky behaviors among adolescents. Family and community relationships can be useful as a means of promoting health by engaging FA communities on certain health topics to support health-related programs. Health care and public health providers need to tailor adolescent sexual health programs based on acculturation and other immigration-related factors. Exploring communication in FA families about sexual health topics including family planning and where to get contraception is important. An increase in role models in the community who promote futures in which children are planned and pregnancies are intended may support the need for FA youth to have educational and career goals.

Finally, owing to the limited number of studies specifically addressing the health status and health behaviors of FA youth, there are vast opportunities to further explore other relevant research topics. These include experiences of FA adolescent fathers, lived experiences of FA teen mothers in the United States, and the role of family during the

decision-making process of Filipina American adolescent girls.

*Laarni San Juan*

*See also* Acculturation; Community-Based Participatory Research; Health Care; Pediatrics; Second-Generation Filipina/x/o Americans

### Further Readings

- Chung, P. J., Travis, R., Jr., Kilpatrick, S. D., Elliott, M. N., Lui, C., Khandwala, S. B., & Schuster, M. A. (2007). Acculturation and parent-adolescent communication about sex in Filipino-American families: A community-based participatory research study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 40*(6), 543–550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.01.004>
- Driscoll, A. K. (2018). Asian-American mothers: Demographic characteristics by maternal place of birth and Asian subgroup, 2016. *National Vital Statistics Reports: From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System, 67*(2), 1–12.
- Javier, J. R., Chamberlain, L. J., Rivera, K. K., Gonzalez, S. E., Mendoza, F. S., & Huffman, L. C. (2010). Lessons learned from a community–academic partnership addressing adolescent pregnancy prevention in Filipino American families. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 4*(4), 305–313. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2010.0023>
- Odhiambo, J. N. (2018, December). Exploring the underlying causes and psychological consequences of teen pregnancy in the Philippines. *International Forum Journal, 21*(2), 170–187. <https://doi.org/10.35974/isc.v6i1.1153>
- Weitz, T., Harper, C., & Mohllajee, A. (2001). *Teen pregnancy among Asians and Pacific Islanders in California: Final report*. University of California, San Francisco Center for Reproductive Health Research and Policy.

---

## ALASKA, FILIPINA/X/OS IN

---

Filipina/x/os have been on lands now known as *the United States* since 1587, long before the United States even existed. For the next several hundreds of years, the Filipina/x/o American (FA) population has consistently grown, making it the third-largest Asian American group in the United States by the year 2020. However, people

often associate FA communities with states such as California and Hawaii and perhaps with major cities like New York, Chicago, Las Vegas, or Seattle. When thinking of FA communities, few people think of Alaska, even though Filipina/x/o Alaskans have just as long and just as rich of a history as any other FA community in the United States. To this end, this entry discusses the history of Filipina/x/os in Alaska and their more contemporary experiences, along with Filipina/x/o Alaskans' many achievements and contributions.

### Early Filipina/x/o Alaskan History

Filipina/x/os have been on lands now called *Alaska* since the 1700s, long before Alaska became part of the United States. The reason for this early Filipina/x/o presence in North America is colonialism. Indeed, because the Philippines was a Spanish colony from the 1500s to the 1800s, many Filipinos or Indios worked as crew members or as slaves on European ships that were exploring the world during this time. While on these ships, some Filipinos reached different parts of Alaska during the 1700s and 1800s; from Yakutat Bay in the southeast, Dutch Harbor or Unalaska in the southwest, Cook Inlet in southcentral, up to Point Hope in the north by the Arctic Ocean. According to research conducted by noted Filipina Alaskan historian Thelma Garcia Buchholdt, the earliest documented person from the lands now known as *the Philippines* to set foot in the lands now known as *Alaska* was an unnamed *Manila man* who was working on the British merchant ship *Iphigenia Nubiana*, which bartered for sea otter furs with Alaska Native Peoples. This took place in 1788.

Although Filipinos have been in Alaska since the late 1700s, it was not until the early 1900s when large numbers of Filipinos began moving to Alaska. What led so many Filipinos to come to Alaska? Once again, the reason is colonialism.

### The Manongs and the Alaskeros

In 1898, at the end of the Spanish–American War, the United States colonized the Philippines. During the early 1900s, there was a need for cheap workers in the fields of Hawaii, California, and Washington. Because the Philippines was a U.S.

territory, Filipinos could freely move to the United States as they were subjected to fewer immigration restrictions than were people from other countries. This allowed Filipino farmworkers to fill the need for cheap labor. The early Filipino farmworkers called themselves *manong*, which is a Tagalog word for male elder. They came to the United States filled with dreams of a better life.

The manongs quickly learned that life in the United States was not as fair as they had supposed. They faced discrimination and poor working conditions. To fight for their rights, they formed labor unions. For example, Filipino American community leader Larry Itliong—along with the more celebrated Cesar Chavez—united the Filipino and Mexican farmworkers in California to fight for their civil rights. It should be noted, however, that prior to his historic work in the grape fields of California, Itliong worked in the Alaska salmon canneries, where he also gained his early experience in union organizing.

Indeed, like Itliong, many of the Filipino farmworkers in California and Washington also went all the way north to Alaska during the early to mid-1900s. Many of them worked in the gold mines and the fish canneries. These Filipino Alaskan workers called themselves *Alaskeros*. The Alaskeros worked in fishing towns like Juneau, Kodiak, Dillingham, and Dutch Harbor. Many Alaskeros came to Alaska only to work during the fishing season, going back to California, Washington, or other states to follow other seasonal crops. Some Alaskeros, though, decided to stay permanently in Alaska.

### Immigrant-Indigenous Solidarity

Just as they did in California and Washington, the Alaskeros faced racism in Alaska. Their living and working conditions were poor, and they were paid less than White workers. The Alaskeros also had to sleep and eat separately from the White workers.

Most of the Alaskeros were men. Because of racism, they were not allowed to interact with White people—especially White women. Alaska Native Peoples also faced similar racism. As a result, Filipinos and Alaska Natives were segregated together. Furthermore, Native Americans and Alaska Native Peoples share a similar history of colonialism under the United States. Because of

this, Filipina/x/o Alaskans and Alaska Native Peoples also worked together to fight against discrimination. For example, during the 1940s in Juneau, it was common for restaurants and other businesses to post signs such as *No Natives Allowed* or *No Filipinos Allowed*. Thus, many Tlingit women who were married to Filipinos raised funds to establish a Filipino community hall for their communities and families to gather without the threat of racial discrimination.

During the early to mid-1900s, many Alaskeros developed relationships with Alaska Native Peoples. Over time, many Alaskeros and Alaska Natives had children together. They combined Alaska Native and Filipino cultures in raising their families, such as making beaver adobo, salmon lumpia (spring rolls), or moose nilaga (stew). Many Alaska Native-Filipino children grew up to become leaders in various areas such as education, government, health care, indigenous rights, sports, arts, and business. Some examples of notable Alaska Native-Filipinas are Katherine Gottlieb (Sugpiaq, Filipina), who was Southcentral Foundation's President/CEO and MacArthur Genius awardee for developing innovative health care services for Alaska Natives and American Indians; H. Sally Floresta Smith (Yup'ik, Filipina), who was instrumental in shaping the Alaska Tribal Health System, negotiating the transfer of health services from the federal government to Tribal self-governance; and Lisa Lopez Dolchok (Aleut, Yup'ik, Filipina), a well-respected Tribal doctor/traditional healer who uses Native ways to heal substance abuse, mental illness, people released from prison, family violence, and other concerns.

### More Recent History

In the 1930s, during the Great Depression when many Americans struggled with poverty, immigrant groups like Filipina/x/os were blamed for taking away jobs. As a result, Filipinas/xs/os experienced even more racism. For example, the Repatriation Act of 1935 promised Filipina/x/os in America a free one-way trip to the Philippines, but their return to the United States was forbidden because the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 limited the number of Filipina/x/o immigrants to the United States to just 50 per year. In other words, laws were passed

by the U.S. government to encourage Filipina/x/os to leave and to keep Filipinos/x/os out.

In 1965, however, U.S. immigration laws were changed to eliminate the yearly limit and to prioritize family reunification. These changes allowed more Filipina/x/os to enter the United States. This contributed to the continued growth of the Filipina/x/o Alaskan community. From the small villages of southeast Alaska all the way up to Utqiagvik—the northernmost U.S. city—Filipina/x/os are making important contributions in their Alaskan communities in the health field, service industry, hospitality, technology, education, government, armed forces, and construction, among many others. A prime example of a Filipina/x/o Alaskan who made a big impact in the state is Thelma Garcia Buchholdt. She was a founder of the Boys and Girls Club of Alaska, the first Asian American elected to the Alaska State Legislature, the first female Filipino American elected to a U.S. legislature, and the first Asian American to be elected as president of the National Order of Women Legislators.

### Contemporary Filipina/x/o Alaskan Communities

Today, Filipina/x/o Alaskans are the largest Asian group in the state of Alaska, composing approximately half of the state's Asian population. Furthermore, unlike most other states where the largest immigrant group is Mexicans, the largest immigrant group in Alaska is Filipina/x/os. Large and vibrant FA communities exist in various cities throughout Alaska. For instance, several Alaskan cities have significant FA residents, as indicated by 2010 U.S. Census data: Kodiak (34% Filipina/x/o), Dutch Harbor/Unalaska (29% Filipina/x/o), Cordova (10% Filipina/x/o), Ketchikan (9% Filipina/x/o), and even Utqiagvik (7% Filipina/x/o). In Juneau, the Filipino Community, Inc., which runs the Filipino Hall in the middle of downtown Juneau (where a Jose Rizal monument is also prominently displayed), has been around since 1956, evidence of the long and rich history of Filipina/x/os in Alaska's capital city. In Anchorage, the state's largest city, approximately 4% of the population are FAs, and there are several long-standing community organizations such as the Filipino Community of Anchorage Alaska and the Alaska Federation of Filipino Americans.

Modern-day Filipina/x/o Alaskan communities continue to celebrate the diverse cultures of their heritage through banquets, parades, artistic performances, educational events, and other efforts. Furthermore, Filipina/x/o Alaskan communities today also continue to support younger and future generations by offering scholarships, language and cultural classes, athletic leagues, and other activities. Just like early Filipina/x/o Alaskans, however, Filipina/x/o Alaskans today also face many issues pertaining to education, immigration, the economy, health, and racism. For example, a study conducted by FA professors at the University of Alaska Anchorage in 2019 found that approximately half of Filipina/x/o Alaskans have experienced racism recently, and that these experiences are related to poorer mental health.

### Final Thoughts

Filipina/x/o people have a long and rich history in Alaska. Their experiences are filled with hardships, injustices, and struggles but also with resilience, joy, and accomplishments. From their experiences, one can see important similarities and connections between Filipina/x/os and other communities. Filipinas/x/o and other peoples have a long history of collaborating with each other to survive and thrive even under difficult situations. Today, Filipina/x/o Alaskans continue to build on the legacies of their ancestors as they work together with other Alaskans to ensure that the state stays strong for future generations.

*Christine Ramos Marasigan and E.J.R. David*

*See also* Alaska Salmon Canneries; Alaskeros; Arrival of Filipinos in California, 1587; Buchholdt, Thelma Garcia; Colonialism; Indipinos; Itliong, Larry; Racism; *Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio*

### Further Readings

- Buchholdt, T. (1996). *Filipinos in Alaska: 1788–1958*. Aboriginal Press.
- Cordova, F. (1983). *Filipinos: Forgotten Asian Americans*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- David, E. J. R. (2018). *We have not stopped trembling yet: Letters to my Filipino-Athabascan family*. State University of New York Press.
- David, E. J. R., & Nadal, K. L. (2013). The colonial context of Filipino American immigrants' psychological

- experiences. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 19, 298–309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032903>
- Garcia, G. M., David, E. J. R., & Mapaye, J. C. (2019). Internalized racial oppression as a moderator of the relationship between experiences of racial discrimination and mental distress among Asians and Pacific Islanders. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000124>
- Mabalon, D. B. (2013). *Little Manila is in the heart: The making of the Filipino American Community in Stockton, California*. Duke University Press.
- Mabalon, D. B., & Romasanta, G. (2018). *Journey for justice: The life of Larry Itliong*. Bridge & Delta Publishing.

---

## ALASKA SALMON CANNERIES

---

Alaska salmon canneries served as seasonal workplaces for thousands of Filipinos who migrated northward each summer. Filipino cannery workers, also known as *Alaskeros*, worked in segregated shore plants throughout coastal Alaska. They worked within maritime industrial complexes to produce millions of cans of salmon each year. In the Civil Rights era, younger Filipino American (FA) cannery workers instigated court cases leading to the desegregation of cannery workspaces and jobs.

In 1878, the first two salmon canneries in Alaska were established on Tlingit land in southeast Alaska in the towns of Klawock and Sitka. Salmon canneries quickly proliferated across coastal Alaska, including in Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet, Kodiak Island, the Alaska Peninsula, and Bristol Bay. From 1878 to 1949, 134 salmon canneries were constructed in Alaska. From the beginning of the salmon canning industry, local Alaska Natives and migrant White men worked as fishermen; Asian Americans worked within the canneries and in cannery support functions.

Filipino men were first enumerated at Alaska canneries in the 1910 U.S. census, though it is likely Filipinos had started working in Alaska canneries prior to then. By 1918, the federal Bureau of Fisheries began enumerating Filipinos as a distinct group in the agency's annual *Alaska Fisheries and Fur Industry* reports; that year 1,338 Filipinos

worked as shoremen, over half of whom worked in Southeast Alaska.

Typically, one cannery site was owned by a succession of different companies over time due to frequent mergers, sales, and bankruptcies. Some canning businesses owned and operated a single cannery, but most canneries were owned by large corporations that operated multiple canneries. Examples of corporations that owned and operated many Alaska salmon canneries include the Alaska Packers Association (a Del Monte company), New England Fish Company, Pacific American Fisheries, and Wards Cove Packing.

Alaska was sparsely populated; hence, canneries had to import their own labor force. Most canneries had business headquarters in West Coast cities, including San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle. From these population centers, labor contractors and later unions like Local 37 recruited Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, and Filipino men. It was from these West Coast cities that the workers would leave on company ships (and later commercial airplanes) at the beginning of the season and to where they would return at the end.

The pulse and number of salmon returning to their natal streams each summer dictated the timing of the fishing and canning season and the pace of work. The length of time a worker was deployed to Alaska depended on the length of each region's salmon season; in Kodiak, a worker could spend up to 6 months, while in Bristol Bay a worker might spend 2 months or less.

Salmon canneries were located near freshwater sources and close to fishing grounds. Some canneries were constructed in villages, but most were constructed in isolated locations. As a result, canneries were akin to seasonally operated company towns. Cannery complexes were constructed partially on piers, partially on land, and contained buildings that housed the industrial activity of canning salmon (such as the cannery, can shop, and warehouses) and buildings providing needed services for workers, including bunkhouses and mess halls. Large canneries employed more than 500 people and could contain dozens of buildings, including a store, a medical clinic or hospital, recreation hall, laundry, carpenter shops, and more. The grounds of some salmon canneries contain a cemetery, the final resting place for workers who died during the salmon season.



The cannery complexes were physically segregated. Asian American workers (regardless of ethnicity) lived in the so-called China House, which sometime was known as the *Oriental Bunkhouse* or *Filipino Bunkhouse*. Asian American workers ate in the Filipino mess hall, separate from the mess hall for Whites. Although the Alaska Territorial Legislature had passed the Alaska Equal Rights Act of 1945, which purportedly ended segregation, Alaska canneries remained segregated through the late 1970s.

Job tasks changed over time, prompted by mechanical innovations that improved the efficiency of the canning operation. Likewise, the number of cannery workers required to *make a pack* decreased with mechanical innovations. Yet regardless of era, it required a crew of workers to convert gleaming salmon into cases of cans, and Filipino cannery workers held the myriad jobs that moved salmon through this process.

Typical jobs for Filipino cannery workers included working in the can shop, where cans were fabricated or reformed. They worked in the cannery building as *butchers*, responsible for butchering salmon or later as operators of the iron butchering machine; as *slimmers*, who cleaned butchered salmon and removed viscera and blood; and *fillers* and *patchers*, who ensured the cans contained the requisite 1 lb or ½ lb of salmon. They pushed trays of salmon into retorts for pressure canning. Before the adoption of the sanitary can, Filipinos soldered the can lids. They moved trays of cans to cooling warehouses. They affixed labels to cans. They constructed wooden salmon cases and *cased up* the cans. Other Filipinos were employed in cannery support functions, such as cooks, bakers, and waiters.

It was not until the Alaska Cannery Workers Association brought forth discrimination lawsuits, beginning in 1974, that Asian Americans and other minority workers were likely to access higher skilled, higher paid cannery jobs. Prior to the civil rights era, Filipino workers were not promoted beyond working as *Filipino foremen* (their official job title), those responsible for overseeing the manual laborers engaged in fish processing work. White workers, on the other hand, were given more skilled jobs, including working as machinists, carpenters, accountants, and superintendents.

In the 1980s, frozen salmon became increasingly important. A variety of factors, including

competition from farmed Atlantic salmon, shuttered many Alaska salmon canneries. Others removed their canning lines and installed freezers. Although these fish factories continue to be called canneries, most are actually seafood processing plants, as few still retain canning equipment.

Anjuli Grantham

See also Alaska, Filipina/x/os in; Alaskeros; Labor Movements, Filipina/x/o American; *Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio*

### Further Readings

- Chew, R. (2012). *Remembering Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes: The legacy of Filipino American labor activism*. University of Washington Press.
- Friday, C. (1994). *Organizing Asian American labor: The pacific coast's canned salmon industry, 1870–1942*. Temple University Press.
- Grantham, A. (Ed.). (2019). *Tin can country: Southeast Alaska's historic salmon canneries*. Clausen Memorial Museum.
- Guimary, D. (2006). *Marumina Trababo dirty work: A history of labor in Alaska's salmon canning industry*. iUniverse.

---

## ALASKEROS

---

For many Filipina/x/o American (FA) scholars, educators, and students, Carlos Bulosan's semi-autobiographical novel *America Is in the Heart*, originally published in 1943, has served as an introduction to the history of Alaskeros. *Alaskero* is a self-identifying term used by Filipinx migrant workers and their American-born children who seasonally toiled in Alaska's salmon canning industry. For Allos, the protagonist of *America Is in the Heart*, cannery labor served as an exploitative introduction to the precarious, low-wage labor conditions that he and other Filipinx migrant workers encountered in the United States. As Bulosan's work as a labor organizer and journalist continued through the early years of the cold war, he produced yet another political text that introduced subsequent generations of FAs to Alaskero history. In his capacity as publicity agent for the Filipina/x/o-led cannery union, International

Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) Local 37, Bulosan edited the organization's 1952 yearbook (hereafter cited as *The Yearbook*). Amid a political context where Local 37 labor leaders faced pending deportation for their assumed affiliations with the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA), *The Yearbook* offered an unapologetically radical response to state repression and unwavering solidarity with peasant and labor movement in the Philippines. Using the writings of Bulosan and the scholarship of following generations of FA labor historians, this entry offers a brief political and social history of Alaskeros. As discussed in what follows, to be an Alaskero was a *political relationship*—one shaped by racial subjugation and labor exploitation, class hierarchies within the FA community, and transnational bonds with labor movements in the Philippines.

### Alaskeros and Racial Capitalism

By 1917, just 4 years prior to Filipina/x/o labor migrants entering Alaska's salmon canneries in significant numbers, 118 canneries operated in Alaska that packed more than half of the world's supply of salmon, nearly 6 million cases valued at \$46 million. This massive capitalist enterprise depended upon the labor of workers of color, particular Asian migrants and Indigenous Alaskans, who toiled in cold, wet *fish houses*. To understand the regime of labor control and exploitation that Alaskeros endured, the FA experience must be placed within the context of what Black studies scholar Cedric Robinson has termed *racial capitalism*. This concept emphasizes that the production of capital and the production of race were historically intertwined political process. In the context of Alaska's salmon canning industry, an analysis of racial capitalism requires a close examination of the converging histories of settler colonialism and racialized labor migration in Alaska.

When U.S. secretary of state William Seward orchestrated the purchase of Alaska in 1867, which was done with neither Native permission nor participation, he opened the door for U.S. capitalists to exploit the new territory's extractive industries, of which salmon was central. In turn, Alaska's salmon canning industry quickly developed a racially stratified employment structure,

which changed little over the course of the 20th century. European settlers and their U.S.-born children filled the industry's need for fishermen. Outside of skilled positions, such as mechanics and supervisory roles, fishermen were the highest paid workers in the canneries and tasked with catching fish at sea and transporting them to processing centers. By contrast, it was successive waves of Asian labor migrants, first Chinese, then Japanese, and finally Filipina/x/os, who toiled in the cannery sites across Alaska alongside Indigenous Alaskan workers who represented a smaller but consistent segment of the cannery labor force. When a *catch* arrived at a canning site, cannery workers often labored 20 hr straight sorting, butchering, cleaning, canning, and cooking salmon. Between the 1920s and the 1980s, Filipina/x/o workers constituted the dominant labor force responsible for transforming commercially caught salmon into a global commodity.

### Alaskeros and Filipina/x/o American Class Hierarchies

At the same time, the exploitation that Alaskeros endured cannot be reduced simply to a conflict between capital and labor. Alaska's salmon canneries were also a site where class hierarchies within Filipina/x/o migrant communities were contested. Like other Western industries that exploited the labor of Asian migrants, such as railroads and mining, canneries hired Asian labor contractors to recruit their seasonal workforce. In *America Is in the Heart*, Bulosan vividly captured the exploitative relationship that existed between contractor and worker regardless of the former's ethnicity. Upon Allos's arrival to Seattle, he did not have the funds to pay for rent and was quickly coerced by a hotel proprietor to exchange housing costs for seasonal labor in Alaska. In summarizing this experience, Bulosan offered a searing critique of Filipinx labor contractors:

In this way we were sold for five dollars each to work in the fish canneries in Alaska [ . . . ] We were forced to sign a paper which stated that each of us owed the contractor twenty dollars for bedding and another twenty for luxuries . . . The contractor turned out to be a tall, heavy-set, dark Filipino, who came to the small hold of the boat barking at

us like a dog [. . .] “You will never come back alive if you don’t do what I say.” (p. 100)

Bulosan’s fictional account of the relations between contractors and cannery workers aligns with the findings of labor historians. As Rick Baldoz notes, most of the contractors had little concern for the conditions of work in the canneries, since their interests were aligned with management. Prior to a canning season, contractors and cannery owners negotiated numerical benchmarks that guaranteed the delivery of a set number of cases of canned salmon by the season’s end. Under this system, a contractor’s profits were a result of a difference between a fixed amount that they agreed upon with cannery owners and the “aggregate wages they paid to their work crew.” This arrangement gave contractors little interest in raising the wages of their workforce. Moreover, contractors consistently gauged the wages of their workers through *special deductions*, such as hiring fees and supply costs. By far, the most notorious practice instituted by contractors was that of gambling rings, where contractors sent professional gamblers into the cannery and received a portion of their winnings. Empirical evidence of the exploitative relationship between contractor and worker can be seen in the number of complaints filed by Alaskeros in 1933. That year, 555 complaints were filed by workers who received an average of \$1–\$15 out of a promised seasonal wage of \$140. When Alaskeros took up the task of building a labor union over the course of the 1930s, the exploitative relationships between cannery owners and contractors served as equal sources of motivation.

### **Alaskeros, Labor Organizing, and Transpacific Solidarity**

Since the field of FA studies emerged in the late 1960s, the long history of Filipina/x/o-led labor organizing in the canneries has served as a site of political inspiration for students, activists, and scholars. Some of the most insightful theorizations of Alaskero activist history have come from cannery labor activists themselves. One prominent *organic intellectual* of this tradition was Silme Domingo. Domingo was well acquainted with the

militant history of labor organizing in the canneries. As Dorothy Fujita-Rony reminds us, cannery union organizing began in earnest in the winter of 1932, when a *secret caucus* began planning a union and took to the streets of Seattle’s Chinatown to enlist workers to their cause. Within 5 years, the first iteration of the cannery union, the American Federation of Labor (AFL) Local 18257,

negotiated a contract granting wages that were 35 to 40 percent higher than those of the previous year, bann[ed] labor contractors, and ma[de] the [Cannery Workers and Farm Laborers Union] CWFLU the exclusive representative of cannery workers in southeast and central Alaska. (2003, p. 173)

By the end of the 1930s, the union had established themselves, both locally and nationally, as a prominent force within radical labor circles. The clearest expression of this was the union leadership’s decision to leave the politically moderate and openly racist AFL and affiliate with the agricultural arm of the more militant Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO)’s United Packing Cannery Agricultural Workers Association (UPCAWA). However, the labor leaders that Domingo encountered were a far cry from past union radicals.

Domingo entered the canneries as a teenager during the late 1960s. By this point, cold war immigration policies had left a significant imprint on leadership within the ILWU Local 37, the newest iteration of Alaska’s cannery union. In 1949, as U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) officials began to target *alien subversives* within the labor movement, five of the Local 37’s leaders—Chris Mensalvas Sr., Ernesto Mangaoang, Ponce Torres, Joe Prudencio, and Casimiro Absolar—faced deportation orders for their supposed affiliations with the Communist Party of the United States (CPUSA). This was the beginning of a protracted legal struggle that lasted until 1955. Although immigration officials never issued formal removal orders, the physical and emotional toll of defending union leaders from politically motivated deportation charges would result in a conservative turn within Local 37’s politics. As Bruce Occena, a Bay Area activist who worked closely with Domingo to reform the Local 37 during the late 1970s, recalled, cold war repression

ushered in “an era of naked corruption.” With politically principled labor organizers increasingly finding themselves pushed out of the Local 37, new union officials not only failed to fight for better wages and working conditions but also oversaw the return of many of the exploitative practices that defined the preunionization period, such as illegal dispatch system whereby members were expected to pay bribes for seasonal employment to which Occena and others vocally declared as corrupt practices.

Upon studying the history of cannery union organizing in Alaska, Domingo developed a theory of social change. As Tyree Scott, a fellow labor activist and close friend to Domingo, noted, he likened the nature of labor activism in the canneries, as well as social movements more broadly, to the flow of a river. He acknowledged, much like a river, social movements “ebbed and flowed.” However, if one wanted to produce genuine social change, Domingo concluded, groups had to “work along the river bed” during an “ebb” in political activity, thus creating the conditions for social transformation in the next “flow” of workplace resistance. This was a commitment to grassroots organizing and leadership building, something the conservative leadership of the Local 37 throughout the 1960s and 1970s refused to take seriously. As Domingo and others of his generation committed themselves to a process of revitalizing a tradition of militant union leadership with the Local 37, their union’s history of radicalism served as an important source of inspiration. Arguably, the most important lesson Domingo heeded from his elders came from the *ILWU Local 37’s Yearbook*.

As the *Yearbook’s* editor, Bulosan began the text by expressing the Local 37’s “unconditional unity” with “all workers . . . against the evil designs of imperialist butchers and other profiteers of death and suffering.” Throughout the yearbook, significant efforts were made to identify connections between Local 37 members and Filipinx workers across the Pacific. Most notable was the political links the yearbook made between Filipinx workers across the Pacific. In articles like “Terrorism Rides the Philippines,” Bulosan detailed the intense repression that labor activists and peasant movements faced in the neocolonial republic. As argued elsewhere, by placing the mass arrests and assassinations of political dissenters in

the Philippines in conversation with the *deportability* of Filipina/x/o labor activists in the Local 37, Bulosan framed Alaska and the Philippines as interconnected geographies that were forged together by the political struggles of Filipino workers on both sides of the Pacific, as well as the violent repression of their radical imaginaries.

While Bulosan and other Local 37 radicals were never able to physically return to the Philippines, the Alaskeros of Domingo’s generation fulfilled the political mission that Bulosan outlined in the *Yearbook*. In April 1981, Gene Viernes, fellow reform movement activist in the Local 37, traveled to the Philippines with the explicit purpose of linking the Local 37, as well as the broader membership of the ILWU, to the political struggles of the Kilusang Mayo Uno, a militant labor federation in the Philippines that faced constant repression under the Ferdinand Marcos dictatorship. While this act of solidarity would ultimately cost Domingo and Viernes their lives, it powerfully demonstrated that transnational solidarity was a defining feature of Alaskero history.

*Michael Schulze-Oechtering*

*See also* Alaska, Filipina/x/os in Alaska Salmon Canneries; Bulosan, Carlos; Seattle and Greater Washington, Filipina/x/os in

### Further Readings

- Ciria Cruz, R., Domingo, C., & Occena, B. (Eds.). (2027). *A time to rise: Collective memoirs of the Union of Democratic Filipinos (KDP)*. University of Washington Press.
- Baldoz, R. (2011). *The third Asiatic invasion: Empire and migration in Filipino America, 1898–1946*. New York University Press.
- Bulosan, C. (1973/1946). *America is in the heart*. University of Washington Press.
- Chew, R. (Ed.). (2012). *Remembering Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes: The legacy of Filipino American labor activism*. University of Washington Press.
- Fujita-Rony, D. B. (2003). *American workers, colonial power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West, 1919–1941*. University of California Press.
- Schulze-Oechtering, M. (2016). The Alaska Cannery Workers Association and the Ebbs and Flows of Struggle: Manong knowledge, blues epistemology, and racial cross-fertilization. *Amerasia Journal* 42(2), 23–48.

## ALCOHOL USE

Although there is sparse (but growing) research literature focusing specifically on alcohol use among Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs), alcohol use is a relevant public health issue that can impact the well-being of FAs and their respective communities. In comparison studies with either youth or adult Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs), FAs tend to be among the higher risk AAPI groups. As described in what follows, drinking problems tend to vary among FAs based on risk and protective factors identified in previous research. To date, there have been no treatment or prevention studies focused exclusively on FAs. Potential future directions include development and testing of culturally relevant interventions, as well as examining sub-groups within the FA population.

### Alcohol Use: General Background

Unlike other recreational drugs (with the exception of marijuana in many United States), alcohol can be consumed legally; therefore, it is more accessible and is typically seen as a normal part of social and cultural experience. That said, attitudes toward drinking and actual drinking behavior can vary widely. Moderate levels of drinking, with minimal adverse effects, are often seen as acceptable (*healthy drinking*). Toward the other end of the spectrum, excess alcohol use can lead to both acute and chronic health risk outcomes ranging from intoxicated driving to dependence symptoms such as withdrawal (*harmful drinking*). It can also increase risk of chronic medical conditions such as cardiovascular diseases, which are among the leading causes of death among FAs.

### Defining Problem Drinking

There is a large body of research dedicated to understanding and addressing this significant public health problem. Before reviewing any alcohol studies, it is important to bear in mind that what is considered harmful drinking may vary depending on different groups and target outcomes. For example, studies of adolescents might focus on whether or not they have ever initiated alcohol use. Meanwhile, binge drinking episodes (currently

defined by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism as consuming four drinks within 2 hours for women and five drinks within 2 hours for men) might be more relevant for young adults. Diagnosis of alcohol use disorder (AUD; formerly known as *alcohol abuse* or *dependence*) is another relevant outcome. According to the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edition*, the symptoms of AUD may include interference in work or family functioning, unsuccessful attempts to quit or cut down, and cravings.

### Alcohol Use, AAPIs, and the Model Minority Myth

Like most health research, data on FA alcohol use are often subsumed in studies that aggregate all AAPIs into a single group. Nonetheless, AAPIs as a group have historically been ignored in alcohol research, prevention, and treatment efforts. In an extension of the model minority myth, AAPIs are often assumed to be a low-risk population due to lower prevalence rates of alcohol use and related problems when compared with other groups. This is potentially problematic for several reasons:

- Aggregated data may mask specific experiences and needs of specific AAPI groups, such as FAs.
- Data trends indicate that prevalence of AUD has gradually increased among AAPIs as a whole.
- Even with a lower prevalence rate, it is not zero, and AAPIs including FAs tend to have lower rates of treatment seeking.

### FA Alcohol Use

Although there is a dearth of research studies examining alcohol use among FAs, the available literature to date can help to inform future research and intervention efforts.

### Comparisons With Other AAPI Groups

The majority of alcohol studies that include FAs often focus on comparing drinking behavior and outcomes between AAPI groups. Across studies and age-groups, FAs have been found to be at least comparable to other higher risk AAPI groups

in a range of outcomes. A greater proportion of FA adolescents have reported starting alcohol use, recent alcohol use, drinking to intoxication, and AUD symptoms relative to other AAPI adolescents. Among college students, FAs are among higher risk AAPI groups who report increased heavy/binge drinking episodes as well as risk for alcohol-related problems. Similar findings have been found in broader samples of adults. At a minimum, this area of research highlights the need to disaggregate AAPIs from a single group. At the same time, it also highlights that not all AAPIs should be assumed to be at low risk.

### **Philippine and FA Drinking Culture**

Among immigrant populations, a common framework used to explain variations in drinking behavior is acculturation/enculturation model. In this case, that could involve adopting the norms and attitudes around alcohol use (*drinking culture*) that are more consistent with the dominant U.S. culture or maintaining those found in the Philippines or in FA communities. However, there has not been a thorough examination of drinking culture in either case.

Survey studies have inquired about motives or reasons for drinking among FA adults. The reasons most commonly cited for drinking were that one was being sociable, in a good mood, with visitors, and looking for fun. Common reasons for abstaining included dislike for the taste of alcohol, seeing no benefit, and seeing it as a waste of money.

Some qualitative findings have described drinking alcohol as a way to socially bond at family parties, and the adults in attendance would be gathered in spaces separate from the children to partake. Drinking alcohol has also been described as a means to cope with emotional distress, perhaps more preferable than seeking professional help. Finally, potential drinking problems may be ignored or unaddressed by friends and family.

### **Risk and Protective Factors**

Examining the etiology of alcohol use can help to inform future prevention and treatment efforts. To that end, examining sociodemographic variables may identify subgroups of FAs to target

and/or to design interventions for. Males, individuals born in the United States (or immigrants who have lived in the United States for a greater amount of time), and those with greater English proficiency tend to be more at risk of initiating alcohol use among adolescents and more frequent binge drinking and AUD symptoms among adults. Likelihood of problem drinking among FAs has also varied by geographic location.

Risk of problem drinking can also vary according to psychosocial factors. FA adults with greater social support and greater religious involvement have been found to be at lower risk of AUD and binge-drinking episodes. Having supportive relationships with parents is also a protective factor for initiating drinking among adolescents. Meanwhile, greater psychological distress, recent stressful life events, conflict with parents (for adolescents), and more frequent experiences of discrimination have been identified as risk factors. The latter is particularly relevant for FA adults, who have reported experiencing the most frequent discrimination when compared with other AAPI groups.

Consistent with broader research on problem drinking, cognitive factors such as expectancies, perceived social norms, and motives for drinking also account for variations in drinking behavior among FAs. FA adolescents who hold more negative expectancies about alcohol (i.e., beliefs that consuming alcohol will lead to negative outcomes such as illness or disciplinary sanctions) are less likely to initiate or frequently drink alcohol. Conversely, adolescents who perceive that peers drink alcohol or that close adult figures drink at more frequent and higher levels (i.e., examples of perceived social norms) are more likely to initiate and continue alcohol use. Finally, FA adults may endorse drinking to cope with negative emotions (i.e., coping motives) more so than other ethnic groups. Although not examined directly with FAs, coping motives are commonly to be associated with drinking-related problems.

### **Prevention and Treatment**

To date, there have been no published studies on alcohol prevention or treatment programs targeting FAs specifically. In fact, few studies on treatment programs disaggregate AAPIs as a group.

Studies examining prevention programs targeting adolescents in Hawaii have had large portions of FA youth in their participant sample. However, any possible differential effects of these and other existing prevention/treatment programs on FAs have yet to be examined.

It has been established, however, that AAPIs are least likely to seek alcohol and drug treatment. For mental health treatment services as a whole, FAs seek treatment at even lower rates than do other AAPIs. There are a number of possible reasons for this. For newer immigrants, language proficiency may be a barrier to seeking care. There may also be distrust of mainstream health care systems or a preference for seeking support through personal social networks or religious communities. Finally, there is likely stigma or shame in revealing personal problems, particularly drinking problems, to either family or treatment providers.

## Future Directions

### Research Limitations and Challenges

With so few studies on FA alcohol use, limitations in the current literature are to be expected and will need to be addressed in future work. As mentioned previously, the majority of past studies either aggregate AAPIs into a single group or compare FAs with other AAPI groups. Additionally, newer data on FA alcohol use have been hard to come by, as the majority of etiological studies used a data set collected several decades prior (Filipino American Community Epidemiological Study). Additionally, geographic representation has been limited, as that study and most other alcohol studies have sampled FAs residing in Hawaii or California. Finally, recruiting alcohol research participants can already be challenging on account of low base rates (i.e., the majority of people abstain or drink moderately) and this is doubly so when FAs are the target population.

Furthermore, the available alcohol research has barely begun to address the diversity within FAs highlighting the need for increased recruitment efforts. The majority of participants tend to be U.S. born and English speaking. Additionally, no studies have examined multiethnic Filipinos or specific

ethnolinguistic groups (e.g., Ilokano, Visayan). Other intersectionality identities and diversity factors must also be considered—including, but not limited to, sexual orientation, gender identity, social class, immigration status, or religion. Other challenges to consider are addressing stigma and ensuring privacy/confidentiality. Considering cultural values, there is a possibility of underreporting and thereby impacting the accuracy of research findings.

### Future Prevention and Treatment

As stated earlier, no current evidence-based behavioral treatments or prevention programs (i.e., those whose effectiveness has been supported by research findings) have been tested with FAs specifically. Evidence-based treatments (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, motivational enhancement) might involve education on the effects of alcohol, setting goals around drinking, learning other ways to cope with stress, and building social support. In similar situations, research-supported interventions have been adapted for a specific group's culture and context, also known as *cultural adaptations*. This can be as simple as translating educational components (e.g., providing worksheets in Tagalog) or recruiting and training more providers who speak the native language. On the other end, it could involve significant alterations to a protocol.

In any case, there is at least some support for risk/protective factors that can be addressed in interventions targeting FAs. Like existing interventions, training in alternative coping behaviors appears to be a vital component. One possible adaptation is addressing daily stressors that are relevant for FAs, such as experiencing discrimination, or intergenerational conflicts with parents or other elders. Family members could also be involved to foster supportive relationships and/or to provide education on alcohol and its effects. Additionally, some existing interventions provide personalized feedback to address beliefs about alcohol, including correcting perceptions of social norms and providing accurate information on the effects of alcohol.

Other cultural adaptations have involved faith communities and their leaders, which would likely be relevant for FAs as well, especially in addressing

stigma toward acknowledging drinking problems and seeking treatment. Finally, there is evidence to support promoting involvement in the FA community and Filipino culture (e.g., learning language and other traditions).

### Conclusion

Alcohol use is an issue that may be overlooked even within the FA community. There is evidence, however, that there are at least some FAs in need of effective and culturally competent interventions for drinking and related problems, a need that has not yet been addressed.

*Andrew P. Paves*

*See also* Community Health; Discrimination and Health; Help-Seeking Behaviors; Filipina/x/o Americans and Mental Health Treatment; Psychology; Substance Use

### Further Readings

- Iwamoto, D., Takamatsu, S., & Castellanos, J. (2012). Binge drinking and alcohol-related problems among U.S.-born Asian Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*(3), 219–227. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0028422>
- Kim, I., & Spencer, M. S. (2011). Heavy drinking, perceived discrimination, and immigration status among Filipino Americans. *Substance Use & Misuse, 46*(10), 1256–1264. <http://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2011.570844>
- Kim, W., Kim, I., & Nochajski, T. H. (2010). Risk and protective factors of alcohol use disorders among Filipino Americans: Location of residence matters. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 36*(4), 214–219. <http://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2010.493593>
- Nadal, K. L. (2000). Filipino American substance abuse: Sociocultural factors and methods of treatment. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 46*(2), 26–36.
- Paves, A. P. (2016). *Coping with discrimination: The roles of discrimination, coping, and group identity in alcohol Use among Filipin@ American young adults* [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington]. <https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/>
- Shih, R. A., Tucker, J. S., Miles, J. N. V., Ewing, B., Pederson, E. R., & D'Amico, E. J. (2015). Differences in substance use and substance use risk factors by Asian subgroups. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 6*(1), 38–46. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0036251>

## ALEGADO, DEAN

Dean Tiburcio Alegado (1952–2020) was a Filipino scholar, educator, and activist. He served as the chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of Hawai'i (UHM) Mānoa and was a respected leader in the Filipino American community of Hawai'i.

### Formative Years

Alegado was born on March 27, 1952, in San Narciso, Zambales, Philippines, the only child of Juanito Sahagon Alegado and Rosalinda Tiburcio Alegado. Six years after the Philippines had been granted independence from the United States in 1946, the presence of the U.S. Navy at Subic Bay and the newly developed Olongapo City would pervade Alegado's early childhood. His father and most of his uncles enlisted in the U.S. Navy and were deployed overseas for months at a time, leaving Alegado and his cousins to be raised together by his mother and aunts.

When the opportunity arose for families of Navy men to emigrate to the United States in 1963, Alegado's parents moved to the San Francisco Bay Area. His family returned to Zambales briefly in 1967, but returned to Alameda, CA, where Alegado later graduated from high school.

### Activism and the Anti-Marcos Dictatorship Movement

As a member of the post–World War II baby boomer generation growing up in the Bay Area, Alegado was immersed in the movements for civil rights, against the Vietnam War, and for Black Power. He engaged in community organizing for low-income and senior housing when urban redevelopment schemes led to seizure of properties with rundown buildings where elderly immigrant *Manongs* lived on their meager Social Security incomes.

While earning a bachelor's degree in political science and Ethnic Studies from the University of California at Berkeley, Alegado connected with young Filipino Americans seeking to find their ethnic identity. Together with other Filipinos who had left the Philippines under martial law, he became a



member of the *Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino* (KDP, Union of Democratic Filipinos), a nationwide organization of progressive Filipino Americans, immigrants, and allies who opposed the dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos during the 1970s and 1980s.

In the Fall of 1974, Alegado was part of the inaugural master's cohort in Philippine History at the Goddard–Cambridge Graduate Program in Social Change with Dr. Daniel Boone Schirmer in Cambridge, Massachusetts. In 1975, Alegado moved to Hawai'i, ostensibly as a lecturer in the fledgling Ethnic Studies Program at the UHM at Mānoa, but also to engage in grassroots community organizing on behalf of the KDP. Alegado's ability to speak Ilocano was an asset, as most of the *sakadas* (Filipino plantation workers) in Hawai'i were recruited from the Ilocos region. Throughout the late 1970s and 1980s, Alegado gradually became a fixture in the Filipino community in Hawai'i—as chair of the Hawai'i Chapter of the KDP and working with the Hawai'i Committee for Human Rights in the Philippines.

The KDP, under Alegado's leadership, also became known as a persistent advocate for the Filipino community around cross-cutting issues related to immigration, affirmative action, employment and education, bilingual and language rights, and affordable housing—particularly for senior citizens who were evicted for the redevelopment of Honolulu's Chinatown. In 1981, Alegado coproduced the play *Ti Mungyuna* with Ermena Vinluan of the organization Sining Bayan and earned the sponsorship of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, Local 142. The play highlighted how the multiethnic plantation workforce formed a union—despite deep racial and national prejudices that divided them—to combat oppressive plantation conditions. Although seemingly unrelated, Alegado's approach to community education and organizing found resonance between the plight of previous generations of Filipino plantation workers and those struggling for human rights in the Philippines.

### **Filipino Community in Hawai'i**

Although the end of the Marcos dictatorship in 1986 heralded a new era for the Philippines and

Filipino Americans, Marcos's exile in Hawai'i presented difficult challenges to KDP's work. Alegado continued to provide leadership within the Filipino community in Hawai'i, encouraging local and immigrant leaders to unite despite political differences. Alegado and the KDP played a major role in two Hawai'i immigrant rights civil suits: the Mangrobang case, which sought to secure access to health and social services for legal immigrants, and the Fragante case, which challenged employment discrimination against limited-English speakers. These cases provided an impetus for the drafting and creation of the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission. In the mid-1990s, as the U.S. Congress passed anti-immigrant legislation, Alegado served as a co-principal investigator for Project Students Helping in the Naturalization of Elders, which brought together students from UH Mānoa, Chaminade and local community colleges to tutor immigrants seeking naturalization.

As the centennial for Philippine independence from Spain approached in 1998, Alegado focused on projects to bring to highlight the contributions of Filipino immigrants in the United States and Hawai'i. In addition to chairing the 1997–1998 trade mission to the Philippines, he led the Filipino Americans in Hawai'i photo exhibit at the Bishop Museum.

In 2006, Alegado was appointed as the state-wide chair and coordinator for the Philippine Centennial Committee of Hawai'i—an effort to commemorate the arrival of the first 15 *sakada* contract workers in 1906. In a role he considered to be the culmination of his efforts to unify the Filipino community in Hawai'i, he coordinated the prestigious Summer Folklife Festival in Washington, DC. Two years later, he curated and was the executive producer for the Singgalot: Ties That Bind photo exhibit that toured across the United States from 2008 to 2012.

### **Scholar and Educator**

Alegado was the foremost representative of the UHM in the Filipino community. His community organizing was foundational to his educational philosophy, which emphasized the application of intellectual theories to the problems in the local, national, and global communities.

When Alegado began his teaching career at UH Mānoa in 1975 as a quarter-time salary nontenure track lecturer, few could have predicted the transformational effect that Ethnic Studies programs would have on university curricula across the nation. Alegado and others were foundational to the push to make the ethnic studies program permanent and eventually become a department at the UHM.

After completing his PhD in political science, Alegado was promoted to assistant professor in 1992. His published works covered international migration from Asia and the Pacific, the Philippine diaspora, Asian American experiences in Hawai'i, the continental United States, and more. He is noted as one of the first scholars to disaggregate the experiences of Filipinos in Hawai'i from those of Filipinos in the U.S. mainland while also articulating a transnational framework for Filipino American identity in both Hawai'i and mainland United States.

Alegado's approach to teaching was to inform theory with action—praxis. He served as mentor and advisor to the UH Filipino Students Association and Operation Manong outreach programs, aimed at increasing the success of Native Hawai'ian, Filipino, Pacific Islander, and other underrepresented minority group students. In developing summer field courses for the UHM Study Abroad program, he personally led second- and third-generation Filipino American students on trips to the Philippines, ushering them into academic and activist endeavors. Alegado strongly practiced what he believed—that education is an active dialogical process, not a paralyzing curricular structure. Many students noted that he was extremely accessible and imbued justice-oriented thinking into his teaching—insisting on situating educational activities in the students' lived experiences.

After being promoted to full professor in 2001, Alegado served as department chair through 2006 and briefly as director for the Center for Philippine Studies. His tenure as chair was critical to stabilizing the department: undergraduate major enrollment increased by 60%. He also successfully advocated for additional tenure-track positions, increased scholarships and fellowships for students, and developed summer program agreements with Michigan State University and

UCLA (University of California Los Angeles). UHM's Ethnic Studies program is now considered to be one of the best in the Asia-Pacific region.

By the end of his professional career, Alegado had earned accolades from the City and County of Honolulu, the State of Hawai'i (2001) and received U.S. Congressional and Hawai'i State Community Service awards (2008). Upon his retirement in 2008, he returned to his hometown in the Philippines to care for his parents and their family's rice lands.

Alegado passed away on November 6, 2020, in Kāhala'u, Hawai'i. He was survived by one daughter, Rosanna, from his first marriage to Davianna Pōmaika'i McGregor, two adopted daughters Nui and Abegail, and his wife of 25 years, Emerita. In a *Fil-Am Courier* article highlighting his career, it was noted that "What makes Dean an extraordinary leader and educator [. . .] is his unwavering commitment to the community at large. [. . .] Dean is the faculty member who aligns himself with struggling working and oppressed people" (Liongson, 2009, p. 4)—truly a scholar-activist committed to a world grounded in justice and equity.

*Rosanna 'Anolani Alegado*

*See also* Academia, Filipina/x/o Americans in; Anti-Martial Law Movement; Ethnic Studies; Hawai'i, Filipina/x/os in; Historical Figures; Katipunan ng Demokratikong Pilipino (KDP)

### Further Readings

- Alegado, D. T. (1991). The Filipino community in Hawaii: Development and change. *Social Process in Hawaii*, 33, 12–38.
- Alegado, D. T. (1998). *Sinking roots: Filipino American legacy in Hawai'i*. University of Hawai'i Manoa Center for Philippine Studies.
- Alegado, D. T., & Finin, G. (2000). Exporting people: The Philippines and contract labor in Palau. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 359–370.
- Liongson, R. (2009, January 1–15). Dr. Dean T. Alegado: Accomplished scholar, educator and staunch activist. *Fil-Am Courier*, 21(5), 4–6.
- University of Hawai'i News. (2020, November). In memoriam: Former ethnic studies chair Dean Alegado. <https://www.hawaii.edu/news/2020/11/16/in-memoriam-dean-alegado/>

## ALEJANDRO, REYNALDO

Reynaldo “Ronnie” Gamboa Alejandro (1941–2009) was an author, dancer, choreographer, librarian, dance director, community historian, chef, and newspaper columnist. He authored 40 books focusing on Philippine culture, dance, and food, as well as the experiences of Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs) in New York. He was the founder of the Metropolitan New York Chapter of the Filipino American National Historical Society (FANHNS-NY).

### Life in the Philippines

Alejandro was born on October 11, 1941, in the City of San Juan, located in the metropolitan area of Manila, Philippines. Jacinto Alejandro and Arsenia Gamboa had two sons, Ronnie and Nolando. Ronnie was raised by his maternal grandmother.

Although little is known about Alejandro’s earlier years, it does appear that he was a dancer since childhood. A newspaper clip from 1955 depicts a young Alejandro performing ballet with a young actress named Bulaklak Tatlonghari.

After attending Ateneo High School, Alejandro obtained a bachelor of arts degree from Ateneo College in 1963 and a master’s degree in library science from the University of the Philippines at Diliman in 1966. After his graduation, he worked professionally as a librarian, while also performing as a dancer and a choreographer.

In 1964, he was a member of the renowned Philippine dance troupe *Filipinescas*, where he developed his artistry in Philippine modern and cultural dance. In 1967 and 1968, he won the honors of “best choreography” at the Philippine National Songfests. In 1967, he was also noted as being among the first Filipina/x/os to dance professionally in China. Later, he became a resident choreographer of the Philippine Educational Theater Association Kalinangan Ensemble and a member of Bayanihan Philippine Dance Company.

### Migration to New York City

With the passage of the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act, Alejandro joined the newest wave of FA immigrants into the United States.

He arrived in New York City in 1969 and found a home in the heart of Greenwich Village in lower Manhattan. He studied with Martha Graham and also secured a job as a librarian at the New York Public Library. He applied for naturalization in 1975 and became a U.S. citizen shortly after.

As a New Yorker, Alejandro initially became known for his dance and choreography. He was the artistic director and choreographer of the Philippine Dance Company of New York from 1969 to 1981. In 1974, he founded his own dance company called the Reynaldo Alejandro Dance Theater (which he led until 1981). A *New York Times* reviewer stated that Alejandro’s work was “right on target,” and that he “has a gift for choreographing for women.” With his expertise in dance in both the Philippines and the United States, he published his first two books: *Sayaw Silangan: The Dance in the Philippines* (1972) and *Philippine Dance: Mainstream and Crosscurrents* (1978).

With his new success as an author, Alejandro became passionate about educating others about the history and culture of the Philippines. He lectured about Philippine dance at the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, DC, and he curated a library collection of Philippine art and culture at the New York Public Library. His writings then moved toward another of his passions: Philippine cuisine. He published *The Philippine Cookbook* in 1982 and *Flavor of Asia* in 1984. In 2004, he published *Authentic Recipes of the Philippines* and also coauthored *The Adobo Book: Traditional and Jazzed Up Recipes*, with Nancy Reyes-Lumen. In 2005, he cowrote *The Food of the Philippines* with Doreen Fernandez.

Upon graduating from the New York Restaurant School, Alejandro started his own catering company. With his signature takes on Filipino dishes, he served Filipino food for events held at many prestigious New York venues, such as the Museum of Natural History, Lincoln Center, and Bloomingdale’s. For a significant period, he was known as the leading authority on Filipino food in the United States.

Alejandro’s additional books spanned an array of topics, ranging from *The Culinary Collection of the New York Public Library* (1988) to *Selyo: Philippine History in Postage Stamps* (2000) to *Magan-dang Filipina: Beauty for Life* (2005). He also

contributed a weekly column to the *Filipino Reporter*—a publication dedicated to highlighting news for Filipina/x/o Americans in the tristate region (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut).

### Filipino American History

In 1994, Alejandro founded the Metropolitan FANHS-NY, the sixth chapter in the United States, through which he aimed to preserve FA culture and history. In 1992, he published *The Pinoy Guide to the Big Apple* (coauthored with Gloria Syquia), which outlined important points of interest for Filipina/x/o migrants and tourists. In 1998, he wrote *Pinoyork: The Filipino Americans in New York*, which highlighted the experiences of FAs in New York City.

Alejandro served as the president of FANHS-NY from 1994 until 2008. In 1996, Alejandro coordinated the first FANHS national conference to be held in New York City. With a few hundred attendees and events held at the Philippine Consulate and a banquet hall in Chinatown, speakers included Lilia Clemente (CEO, Clemente Capital, Inc), Loida Nicolas Lewis (CEO, TLC Beatrice, Inc.), Jessica Hagedorn (author), and Ben Cayetano (former governor of Hawai'i).

### Death and Legacy

Throughout Alejandro's life, he received numerous accolades and awards. In 1987, he received the Parangal ng Lahi-Medal of Excellence; that same year, he was also cited as an outstanding alumnus of the University of the Philippines. In February 2009, Alejandro received the Dakilang Pilipino Award at the Philippine Center in New York City. Cited for "his dedicated and exemplary efforts in promoting Filipino arts and culture during his over four decades in America," Alejandro heard remarks from friends and colleagues, before graciously accepting the award. He was a powerful presence in the FA and LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Queer) communities.

Six months later, at age 67, Alejandro died of complications from liver cancer (a condition he had been diagnosed with several years prior). He died in his Greenwich Village apartment on August 7, 2009. According to his wishes, Alejandro

was cremated, and his ashes were scattered off the Christopher Street pier in the West Village and into the Hudson River.

*Joseph Tabaco and Kevin Leo Yabut Nadal*

*See also* Dance, Filipina/x/o Americans in; Filipino Food Movement; Historical Figures; New York City, Filipina/x/os in; Queer Filipina/x/o Americans

### Further Readings

- Alejandro, R. G. (1972). *Sayaw silangan: The dance in the Philippines*. Dance Perspectives Foundation.
- Alejandro, R. G. (1985). *The Philippine cookbook*. Penguin.
- Alejandro, R. G., & Florentino, E. S. J. (1998). *Pinoyork: The Filipino Americans in New York*. Filipino American National Historical Society, Metropolitan New York Chapter.
- Reyes, V. A. (2017, August 27). Ronnie Alejandro: To the very end, an extraordinary man with a plan. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*. <https://lifestyle.inquirer.net/271676/ronnie-alejandro-end-extraordinary-man-plan/>

---

## ALIEN LAND LAWS

---

Alien land laws prohibit noncitizens—often noncitizens who are ineligible to apply for U.S. citizenship—to own or lease property. Although these laws extend as far back as the founding of the United States, they are most prominently discussed in the context of early- to mid-20th-century Japanese immigration into the United States.

Perhaps the most notable real property restriction is rooted in California's 1920 Alien Land Law, which barred noncitizens ineligible for U.S. citizenship to hold real property. This constraint against noncitizens was primarily fueled by the perceived threat of Chinese and Japanese immigrants largely employed by the agricultural labor industry on the west coast. In fact, prior to the Supreme Court of the United States' 1948 watershed decision *Oyama v. California*, several western state and federal courts found real-property discrimination and restrictions proper. *Oyama v. California* would change the course of history, however, reversing a California Supreme Court decision upholding the denial of real property to a U.S. citizen of Japanese descent.

Philippine citizens who migrated to the United States were also affected by the racial hostility versus Chinese and Japanese immigrants. In 1941, via *DeCano v. State*, the Washington Supreme Court affirmed a decision that determined the State of Washington could not have forfeited land belonging to a native Filipino. Similarly, in 1945, via *Alfajara v. Fross*, the California Supreme Court upheld the trial court's decision that a native Filipino was entitled to the real property he purchased because he was not actually an alien as allegedly described in the 1920 Alien Land Law. These cases, while favorable to native Filipinos, reveal the surrounding history of animosity against Asian and Pacific Islander real property ownership in the United States.

### 18th-Century Alien Land Laws

In the nascent years of the American polity, court decrees—rather than state law—determined real property interests. Often, these courts selected citizenship—instead of, for instance, residency—as the qualifying category for property ownership. Rarely did legislatures, either through constitutional provision or by statute, establish laws on real property rights for aliens.

This reliance on citizenship was derived from the English common law, which found that aliens were persons who did not owe allegiance to the king. As a result, alienage would disqualify a person from owning real property, and people were thus encouraged to naturalize into U.S. citizens.

The consequences of alien land laws were severe. During their lifetime, noncitizens could have their property subject to forfeiture to the state (a *defeasible* estate). Or, more commonly, an alien's property would be forfeited to the state after their death—even if they had heirs who were themselves American citizens. In fact, being an alien without a drop of *inheritable blood* was often considered a hindrance.

### Historical Context

In the late 19th century, the United States experienced a surge of immigration from China. Although the Chinese were instrumental in constructing the transcontinental railroad system, animosity festered among Americans of European descent, which prompted the prohibition against Chinese

immigration. This prohibition would be ratified in the infamous 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act.

The perceived threat associated with Chinese aliens would transfer to Japanese aliens and other Asian communities. Japan's growing industrial strength and their imperial military aspirations in the Pacific undoubtedly exacerbated this hostility. Consequently, in 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt and Japan entered into an unpublished agreement, known as the Gentleman's Agreement of 1907, restricting Japanese immigration onto American shores.

Several loopholes evaded the 1907 Gentleman's Agreement. First, a U.S. Supreme Court decision provided for citizenship to those children born on American soil, even if the parents were aliens. Many wives of settled agriculturalists were also permitted to immigrate to the United States to join their spouses. These, among other loopholes, boosted the population of Japanese families in the United States.

In response to the loopholes, California enacted the 1913 Alien Land Law, which barred "aliens ineligible to citizenship" from owning fee simple absolute interest in agricultural property and from entering leases for longer than 3 years. Violating the 1913 law would prompt the land to escheat to the state after action by the California state attorney general.

Nevertheless, noncitizens continued to acquire land at escalating rates. Aliens found clever ways to avoid penalty by placing land in trusts and guardianships, putting property in the name of American-born friends or relatives, or continually renewing 3-year leases.

California put several initiatives on a 1920 legislative ballot to respond to these evasive tactics including a wholesale bar on guardianships and trusteeships for aliens who are ineligible to citizenship. The initiative "passed with decisive majority in every county in California," thereby resulting in a dramatic decline of Asian-owned acreage after 1920.

Although the 1920 law would be challenged, the U.S. Supreme Court would "send a stark message to the nation that the alien land laws clearly passed constitutional muster." In two companion cases, the Court declared that states had full authority to render aliens as ineligible to own real property: "State legislation applying alike and equally to all aliens, withholding from them the

right to own land, cannot be said to be capricious or to amount to an arbitrary deprivation of liberty or property, or to transgress the due process clause.” A quarter of a century later, the U.S. Supreme Court would alter its course in its landmark decision: *Oyama v. California*.

### ***Oyama v. California***

In 1934, 6-year-old American-born citizen Fred Oyama owned six acres of land in Southern California. His father, a Japanese alien named Kajiro Oyama, paid \$4,000 for the six acres of agricultural land and duly recorded the deed in Fred’s name. Three years later when Fred had turned 9 years old, Kajiro—already legally established as Fred’s guardian—purchased a second parcel of two acres in Fred’s name and recorded that deed.

Amid World War II, suspicions of Japanese residents became heightened and thousands of Japanese persons were displaced from the Pacific Coast and Hawai’i. Fred and his family were no exception and were removed from California in 1942. By the time Fred was 16 years old, he was still forbidden to return home. During this time, the state of California filed a petition to escheat his two parcels of land. The State argued that because Kajiro, a Japanese citizen, had purchased land in the name of his U.S. citizenson, the Oyamas had intended to violate and evade California’s Alien Land Law.

The California Superior Court agreed with the State. It concluded that the Oyamas violated the law in that “the transfers were subterfuges effected with intent to prevent, evade or avoid escheat,” and the State had the lawful vested interest in the parcels of land.

After an unsuccessful appeal to California’s highest court, the Oyamas petitioned to have their case heard in the U.S. Supreme Court. In a unanimous decision, Chief Justice Vinson wrote:

The cumulative effect, we believe, was clearly to discriminate against Fred Oyama. [ . . . ] The only basis for the discrimination against [Fred,] an American citizen, moreover, was the fact that his father was Japanese and not American, Russian, Chinese, or English. But for that fact alone, Fred Oyama would be the undisputed owner of the eight acres in question.

The Court reversed the California Supreme Court and Fred Oyama became the vested owner in the property. Interestingly, the year before its decision in *Oyama*, the California Supreme Court rendered a very different outcome in a different alien property ownership dispute.

### ***Alfajara v. Fross***

When the Philippine Islands became a U.S. territory in 1898 after the Spanish-American War, Filipinos began entering the United States as American nationals. It was a slow, but steady pace: In 1903, approximately 100 Filipinos immigrated into the United States and by 1930, that number raised to approximately 110,000.

Like many of its other Asian counterparts, many Filipinos would join the U.S. polity as farmers or as soldiers in the military. And, like many of its other Asian counterparts, Filipinos would encounter roadblocks to their meaningful participation in American life. For instance, in 1925, via *Paolo v. Weedin*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the exclusion of a Chinese-Filipino noncitizen national into the United States. The 1925 court reasoned that while a Philippine citizen owed their allegiance to the United States as U.S. nationals, a Chinese citizen does not have the same loyalty. Thus, Paulo Palo was excluded for having been a Chinese-Filipino noncitizen national.

Prior to the effect of the Philippine Independence Act, Filipinos were American nationals duly entitled to acquire real property despite their alienage. Thus, in 1944, U.S. national and Filipino native Celestino Alfajara sought to purchase real property in California. Although he had never lived anywhere but the Philippines and the United States, he was denied the title after rendering the full payment of \$65 for the real property.

The defendant argued that California’s 1920 Alien Land Law precluded Alfajara from holding and owning title. However, the trial court disagreed, reasoning that Alfajara was not actually an alien and therefore not barred from holding or receiving real property in California. The California Supreme Court upheld the trial court’s decision. It acknowledged that while the state could forbid real property ownership interests against aliens, Alfajara is a national (and therefore is not an alien as contemplated by the Alien Land Law). Accordingly, they

ruled that he would not be prohibited by law from acquiring and possessing land in California.

### Alien Land Laws Today

As of April 2021, according to the Pew Research Center, there are an estimated 22.9 million Asian Americans in the United States. Many of them are born of immigrant parents or are themselves immigrants. Yet, it was not until November 6, 2018, that the last of the U.S. alien land laws was repealed. On this day, the State of Florida repealed its 1920s alien land law that was prompted by the anti-Asian and anti-immigrant sentiment in Florida. A century's worth of alien land laws and millions of Asian and Pacific Islander immigrants later, the United States has finally reached a turning point in its real property title laws for those who seek to achieve the American Dream.

Gretchen A. Smith

See also Anti-Asian Immigration Policies; *De Cano v. State* (1941); Immigrant Rights; Racism

### Further Readings

- Aoki, K. (1998). No right to own? The early twentieth-century "Alien Land Laws" as a prelude to internment. *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, 19, 37–72.
- Cuison-Villazor, R. (2010). Rediscovery *Oyama v. California*: At the intersection of property, race, and citizenship. *Washington University Law Review*, 87, 979–1042.
- Cuison-Villazor, R. (2017). American nationals and interstitial citizenship. *Fordham Law Review*, 85, 1673–1724.
- National Asian Pacific American Bar Association. (2018, November). NAPABA, APABA-SF, and GOAABA celebrate the repeal of the Alien Land Law from Florida's Constitution. Retrieved from <https://www.apabasfla.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/PRESS-RELEASE--NAPABA-APABA-SF-GOAABA-CELEBRATE-FLORIDA-CONSTITUTION-REPEAL-OF-ALIEN-LAND-LAW-National-Asian-Pacific-American-Bar-Ass1.pdf>
- Oyama v. California*. 332 U.S. 633 (1948).
- Pew Research Center. (2021, April 29). *Key facts about Asian Americans, a diverse and growing population*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/29/key-facts-about-asian-americans/>

- Price, P. J. (1999). Alien land restrictions in the American common law: Exploring the relative autonomy paradigm. *American Journal of Legal History*, 43, 152–208.

---

## AMERICA IS IN THE HEART

---

A central text within Filipino American studies, *America Is in the Heart*, by Carlos Bulosan (1911–1956), was published by Harcourt, Brace, & Co. in 1946. Bulosan chronicles the collective experiences of Filipino migrant farmworkers on the west coast of the United States during the Great Depression until the start of Japan's occupation of the Philippines during World War II. Providing a unique, working-class Filipino perspective on racism, economic injustice, and the rise of fascism, *America Is in the Heart* documents and bridges the *manong* generation's experiences of exploitation and resistance in the Philippines and the United States—from the plantations of California to the canneries of Alaska. This entry highlights various dimensions of *America Is in the Heart*: publication history, narrative structure and function, relationship to interdisciplinary field formation, and impact on Filipino artists within the diaspora.

Nearly two decades after Bulosan's death, *America Is in the Heart* (AIH from this point on) was reclaimed as a pioneering text on the Filipino American experience through the intersection of two social justice movements of the late 1960s/1970s—the Philippine national sovereignty movement and the Asian American movement. The University of Washington Press republished AIH in 1973 with an introduction by Carey McWilliams that highlights the central role of E. San Juan Jr.'s scholarship (*Carlos Bulosan and the Imagination of the Class Struggle*, 1972) in the renewed interest in Bulosan within the United States and the Philippines. In 2014, the University of Washington Press released a second edition, with an introduction by Marilyn C. Alquizola and Lane Ryo Hirabayashi that highlights the canonical status of AIH within Asian American studies and its continued relevance through its dramatizing the formation of a racialized class consciousness. In 2019, AIH was released as a Penguin

Classic with a foreword by Elaine Castillo, an introduction by E. San Juan Jr., selected letters and inventory of resources compiled by Jeffrey Arellano Cabusao, and artwork by Sarah Gonzales. This edition, also released as an audiobook narrated by Ramon de Ocampo, further secures Bulosan's text within the American literary canon.

Subtitled by Bulosan as "a personal history," *AIH* also articulates the collective experiences of Filipino migrant farmworkers. According to Dolores S. Feria, readers should view the protagonist of the text—Allos—as a composite of working-class Filipino experiences. E. San Juan Jr. refers to *AIH* as an ethnobiography. Michael Denning draws parallels between *AIH* as migrant narrative and mid-19th-century African American slave narratives—both raising awareness about the collective experiences of racial oppression and exploitation. *AIH* experiments with and blends various approaches to writing and storytelling—naturalism, bildungsroman, memoir, and proletarian literature. Global in its scope, the four-part narrative begins with Allos's story in Binalonan, Philippines, where his family (part of the Filipino peasantry) dissolves under the conditions of absentee landlordism—an exploitative system exacerbated by American colonial occupation. Parts two to four of the migratory narrative take place on the U.S. west coast. Allos, who joins a diasporic community of 150,000 Filipino migrant workers, attempts to reconstitute family (reconnecting with brothers Macario and Amado) and community (forging solidarity with progressive characters such as the Odell sisters and José) through the intersection of writing (cultural production) and labor activism—organizing against inhumane working conditions in Alaskan canneries and the agricultural fields of the U.S. west coast and systemic anti-Filipino racist violence.

*AIH* also functions as a historical text on labor activism and literary radicalism. With regard to the former, the narrative documents the contributions of Filipino farmworkers to anticolonial subaltern struggle in the Philippines (the Tayug peasant revolt in part one) and to militant labor activism in the United States (from the UCAPAWA union to Gordon Parks's *The New Tide*), which anticipates the farmworker movement of the 1960s. With regard to literary radicalism, the sections of the narrative are devoted to detailed inventories of

authors, literary journals, and groups such as the Philippine Writers' League. Allos reflects on the significance of authors who have contributed to the notion of literature as a weapon against oppression—Richard Wright, Mark Twain, Maxim Gorky, Lu Xun, and Nicolás Guillén, among others. These authors provide models for Allos's "coming to voice" as an organic Filipino intellectual for whom writing and activism are intimately interconnected.

The location of *AIH* within various interdisciplinary fields provides insight into the historical development and heterogenous roots of Filipino American studies. *AIH* holds a significant position within the formation and expansion of interdisciplinary fields such as Asian American studies (e.g., Frank Chin et al., *Aiiieeeee!* anthology, 1974; E. San Juan's Bulosan edition of *Amerasia Journal*, 1979; Elaine Kim's *Asian American Literature*, 1982), American studies (Paul Lauter's *Heath Anthology of American Literature*, 1990; Michael Denning's *The Cultural Front*, 1997), and Philippine literary studies (Dolores S. Feria's 1957 essay in *Writer in Exile/Writer in Revolt* and San Juan's *Carlos Bulosan and the Imagination of the Class Struggle*). Within the interdisciplinary field of Filipino American studies, *AIH* is particularly useful in highlighting a deconstructive Filipino critique of American orientalist discourse (Allos's performing native otherness in part one) and militant collective Filipino resistance (from peasant revolts in the Philippines to union activism in the United States). *AIH* also highlights the specificity of the Filipino American experience—one that is informed by the condition of racial-national subordination situated within U.S.–Philippine colonial relations. When Allos expresses that his only crime in America is being Filipino (a response to a long flight from brutality and fear), he is speaking from interlocking positions of displacement during the 1930s—a migrant, a farmworker, and a colonial subject.

*AIH* has inspired generations of Filipino artists such as filmmaker Linda Mabalot, whose unfinished 1981 film *Quiet Thunder* features poignant scenes from the Philippine and U.S. settings of the narrative. The Chicago-based *Pintig* theater group staged *AIH* as its first theatrical play in 1992. *AIH*



was adapted by Philippine National Artist Bienvenido Lumbera into the Filipino opera *Nasa Puso ang Amerika* in 2003. In hip-hop music, the Black Eyed Peas video for “Bebot” (Generation One version, 2006) recreates scenes from *AIH*—from the backbreaking labor in the California fields to taxi-dance hall scenes. Elaine Castillo’s *America Is Not the Heart* (2018) acknowledges Bulosan’s pioneering meditation on the Filipino experience in America. In 2017, the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center released a short video featuring Hasan Minhaj, Ivy Quicho, and Junot Díaz on the continued relevance of *AIH* for the 21st century.

Jeffrey Arellano Cabusao

*See also* Alaska Salmon Canneries; Anti-Miscegenation Laws; Bulosan, Carlos; Labor Movements, Filipina/x/o American; The Forbidden Book: The Philippine–American War in Political Cartoons; Riots in Yakima Valley, Washington; Taxi Dance Halls; Working-Class Filipina/x/o Americans

### Further Readings

- Bulosan, C. (1995). *On becoming Filipino: Selected writings of Carlos Bulosan* (E. San Juan Jr., Ed.). Temple University Press.
- Cabusao, J. A. (Ed.). (2016). *Writer in exile/Writer in revolt: Critical perspectives on Carlos Bulosan*. University Press of America.
- Denning, M. (1997). *The cultural front: The laboring of American culture in the twentieth century*. Verso.
- San Juan, E., Jr. (2017). *Carlos Bulosan: Revolutionary Filipino writer in the United States*. Peter Lang.

---

## AMERICAN DREAM

---

The *American Dream* axiom is the promise that people regardless of their background or origins can live a happy and successful life in the United States. The term first appeared in James Truslow Adams’s *Epic of America* (1931), in which he describes how “life should be better and richer and fuller for everyone, with opportunity for each according to ability or achievement.” Although benevolent in nature, the myth is deeply ingrained in the day-to-day lives of Filipina/x/o Americans

(FAs)—consciously or subconsciously traversing contradictory moments of reality and fantasy. FAs continuously pursue economic prosperity, social mobility, and (a)polity that will provide the imagined future for themselves, their families, and to some extent the Philippine nation.

### American Colonialism

Manifest Destiny—a phrase coined in 1845—was a dream to spread U.S. American democracy, Western civilization, and the Christian faith throughout the far-flung places in an ever-expanding world. U.S. president William McKinley was hesitant and dismissive of engaging in military activities halfway across the globe, especially as the Filipinos were at the cusp of winning their independence from Spanish colonial rule of almost 400 years. In 1898, McKinley declared his vision to occupy the Philippines—which began the first chapter in American history of suppressing a burgeoning sovereign Philippine nation.

The lucid dream of McKinley’s expansion of the U.S. empire in the Pacific under the guise of *benevolent assimilation* would lead to American colonization of the Philippines, as well as innumerable atrocities against the Filipino people at the hands of U.S. imperialism. American government officials and military personnel assumed the Filipino people would concede to U.S. benevolence; however, to their dismay, they were met with an unwavering Philippine independence movement for freedom and liberation. American military leaders demeaned Filipinos as *savages*, *niggers*, and *monkeys*; they deemed the Philippine independence movement an illegitimate insurrection or armed skirmish. In fact, U.S. general Jacob Smith commanded military policies that murdered almost a million Filipinos under his order to kill everyone over the age of 10. Smith was quoted as saying:

I want no prisoners. I wish you to kill and burn, the more you kill and burn the better it will please me. I want all persons killed who are capable of bearing arms in actual hostilities against the United States. (numerous sources)

Violence toward Filipinos (and subsequent movements for resistance) continued well past

1903—after 3 years of genocide and the installation of a *mestizo* subelite that favored U.S. colonial hegemony in the Philippines. The “evil in our Nation” that Philippine Revolutionary Leader Andrés Bonifacio y de Castro (1863–1897) speaks to is the *slavery* of the Filipino people under a different colonial ruler and the *promised prosperity* under U.S. empire that still, to this day, has not materialized for the majority of the Filipino people, as many have been forced to leave their homeland for aspirant possibilities abroad.

### Migration to the United States

One way that the American Dream was perpetuated was through the promise of prosperity through education and migration. From 1903 to 1924, hundreds of *pensionados* (sponsored students) were given scholarships to study at elite American universities and return to the Philippines to service U.S. economic and political interests, promote Americanization, and facilitate the development of a Filipino middle class. Around this time, expanding U.S. agribusiness began the use of Filipino immigrants to increase corporation-controlled agricultural infrastructure in the 1920s. Filipino workers with limited rights were met with openly racist anti-Filipino sentiment, intimidation, and violence (e.g., the Watsonville Riots of 1930). While the exploitation of Filipino labor continued for decades, multiple labor strikes emerged. Most notably, the Delano Grape Strike of 1965—led by Filipino laborers like Philip Vera Cruz and Larry Itliong (with the support of Chicano leader Cesar Chavez)—yielded a labor victory for Filipino and Latino farmworkers. Their acts of resistance demonstrated that FAs, like their ancestors during the Philippine American War, rejected benevolent assimilation.

The promise of an American Dream was endorsed again with the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965, which put an end to immigration quotas. Large waves of Filipinos migrated to the United States as professionals (mainly as nurses)—mainly a result of the influx of Western-based Philippine nursing schools during American colonialism. In spite of the opportunities that were provided to post-1965 immigrants, many were met with hostile racial discrimination and had limited rights as noncitizens. Scholars like Yen Le

Espiritu, Catherine Ceniza Choy, and Leny Strobel write about some of the harsh realities that FA immigrants faced upon arrival—contrary to the images of the American Dream that they had been introduced to.

### American Dream Today

The American Dream is a myth that is still being taught to migrants today who leave their home countries in search of opportunities in the United States. It is estimated that 3,000 Filipinos leave the Philippines every day—or roughly a million every year; some years yield even more migrants leaving—with 8.08 million leaving the country in 2004 alone. Today, with a Philippine population of 89.5 million, about 3–4 million migrate to North America every year.

Relatedly, Overseas Filipino Workers substantively sustain the Philippines economy by the dependence on remittances. Filipino domestic workers and seafarers remit billions of dollars and carry the financial burden consequent to the Philippine government’s having failed to develop national industrialization, which would provide local jobs whereby workers could remain home with their families. While economic conditions push Filipinos to work overseas, Filipinos are fighting for better conditions in the homeland and across the globe.

In essence, as its critics have noted, the American Dream had less to do with providing opportunities for immigrants, or about developing the Philippines or other countries, than with legitimizing the growth of a global U.S. empire. Today’s Filipino Americans demonstrate their advocacy for a new dream—one that involves Filipino independence, a love for themselves culturally, and a healing for their community.

*Eugene Gambol and Kevyn Lorenzana*

*See also* Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation; Colonial Mentality; Colonialism; History, Filipina/x/o American: An Overview; Immigration

### Further Readings

- Choy, C. C. (2003). *Empire of care: Nursing and migration in Filipino American history*. Duke University Press.
- McCoy, A. W. (2000). Philippine commonwealth and cult of masculinity. *Philippine Studies*, 48(3), 315–346.

- Miller, S. C. (1984). *Benevolent assimilation: The American conquest of the Philippines, 1899–1903*. Yale University Press.
- Rusling, G. J. (1903). Interview with President William McKinley. *The Christian Advocate*, 22, 22–23.
- San Juan, E., Jr. (2006). *On the presence of Filipinos in the United States: And other essays*. Sarimanok Publishers.
- Strobel, E. M. (2016). *Coming full circle: The process of decolonization among post-1965. Filipino-Americans* (2nd ed.). CreateSpace.

---

## ANGEL ISLAND

---

In the 1920s and 1930s, Angel Island, located in the San Francisco Bay, was a major entry point to the United States for thousands of Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs). Nicknamed “the Ellis Island of the West” for its history as an immigration detention and processing station, the island symbolizes the hopes immigrants carried with them as they began life in a new land and the realities of xenophobia and racism they faced once they had arrived. The island’s historical and cultural significance reflects its connection to dimensions of U.S.–Philippine relations, such as imperialism and colonization, military expansion, labor recruitment and exploitation, and immigrant surveillance and assimilation. Alongside these developments emerged a series of exclusionary immigration policies that codified into law discriminatory attitudes about non-European newcomers that persist to this day.

### The Island as a Settler Colonial Project

The history of Angel Island reflects the larger objectives of European settler colonialism or the process of colonizing occupied land by replacing indigenous populations with a new society of settlers. Beginning at least 1,000 years prior to European arrival, the island was home to the Coast Miwok American Indians who used it as a hunting and fishing camp. European presence on Angel Island and in the surrounding region brought disease that significantly reduced the indigenous population. The island was under the control of the Mexican government after 1821 until the United States annexed California in 1848.

In 1850, California gained statehood, and the young nation looked to the Pacific to build an empire. Under U.S. control, as a reflection of this ambition, a military base was built on the island. Among other functions, the base served as an overseas assignment and discharge depot for troops bound to and from Hawai’i and the Philippines as the United States sought to establish control over both archipelagos. In addition, a nearby quarantine station operated in the island’s Ayala Cove from 1891 to 1946. During World War I, 700 German enemy aliens were housed at the immigration station for a brief period. Similarly, prisoners of war from Japan, Germany, and Italy were imprisoned during World War II. Approximately 600 Japanese Americans were briefly held at Angel Island before being sent to concentration camps around the nation.

Angel Island’s role as an immigration center began with the Asian Exclusion Act of 1882, which stipulated passengers not to be allowed to land in the United States until they had been inspected and approved for admission by a *Chinese inspector*. In response to the new law, immigration officials and steamboat companies were forced to piece together a makeshift detention system. With New York’s Ellis Island model in mind, federal officials suggested that a permanent island facility be built in the San Francisco Bay. In 1905, the Department of Commerce and Labor requested from the War Department 20 acres of land on the north side of the island to establish the immigration facility. Officials reasoned that an island location would be the most effective means of keeping a watchful eye over the newly arriving Chinese.

### Filipina/x/o Americans and Angel Island: From National to Alien

For generations, the United States had an open system of immigration, and newcomers were actively encouraged to come over because the newly colonized lands required cheap labor with which to build and expand. In 1819, the federal government began keeping a record of immigrants and passed its first immigration laws in 1875. From that point on, the nation began to close its open-door policy. In part, immigration policy became viewed as a tool to define what it means to be an *American*.

Contemporary immigration policies continue to serve as gatekeeping mechanisms for those deemed unassimilable in the eyes of White Americans.

Angel Island reflects the sociopolitical landscape of early Filipino immigration to the United States and represents how this displacement is a project of *manifest destiny* and the movement to build an empire in the Pacific. As its colonial subjects, Filipinos have experienced the notion of *arrival* to the United States differently than have many other groups; since 1898, the point of contact with American culture and language had occurred prior to any Filipino migrants reaching a port or crossing any U.S. physical border. After the conquest of the Philippines, many Filipinos were forced to seek opportunities abroad owing to American colonial policies that increased poverty, tenancy, and landlessness in the Philippines. These conditions, coupled with the images of the United States as “the land of opportunity” and a place where the “streets are paved with gold” captured the imaginations of young Filipinos (predominantly men) and inspired them to sail abroad in search of fortune.

During the late 1920s and 1930s, Filipinos were the largest Asian immigrant migratory workforce in California—as the Chinese, Japanese, and South Asian laborers who had come before them had all been excluded by federal law. Labeled *U.S. nationals* by virtue of the colonization of the Philippines, over 150,000 Filipinos migrated to Hawai'i and the mainland in the early 20th century. The earliest of these migrants were *pensionados* (*fountain pen boys*), college and university students who were tasked with bringing American knowledge and skill sets back to the homeland.

The largest group of these early arrivals were domestic and rural laborers who were recruited as migrants to work in agriculture, canning, fishing, and as domestic service workers. Angel Island was a direct port to the circuit of low-skilled labor for these newly arrived Filipinos. From San Francisco, these newcomers could seek work along the California coast or migrate to Washington or Alaska (where they could work in fish canneries). By 1930, the population of Filipinos in the mainland United States was 56,000, of which approximately 80% were migratory laborers. Because of its convenient location, Stockton, CA, became home to the largest populations of Filipinos anywhere outside of the Philippines.

Between 1907 and 1929, roughly 72,000 Filipinos went to Hawai'i to work on sugarcane plantations. Migration to the U.S. mainland followed, as some Filipinos from Hawai'i moved to the West Coast via steamship liners offering affordable tickets to San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle. From 1920 to 1929, more than 31,000 Filipinos arrived via California ports from both Hawai'i and the Philippines. However, by the late 1920s, most Filipinos arriving on the mainland came directly from the Philippines.

Initially, Filipinos were welcomed, but as their numbers increased, some White residents felt threatened. Like the Chinese, Japanese, and South Asians before them, Filipinos became victims of exclusion and domestic racism as they became increasingly described as undesirable Asians and another *Asiatic invasion*. Earlier anti-Asian arguments were repeated; nativists portrayed Filipinos as backwards and uncivilized, criminals, and people who would never make good American citizens. As a result, anti-Filipino violence escalated in the late 1920s and early 1930s with a series of attacks by White men in communities across the West Coast.

Nativist efforts eventually culminated in exclusionary immigration policies. The Tydings–McDuffie Act of 1934, otherwise known as the Philippine Independence Act, was a significant win for anti-Filipino exclusionists. It called for the independence of the Philippines within 10 years, changed the status of Filipinos from *nationals* to *aliens*, and established an entry quota of 50 per year. Overnight, with this change in status, Filipinos on route to the United States were now detained and sent back.

Because Angel Island was a primary site for enforcing these policies, Filipinos who arrived in San Francisco just after the signing of the Tydings–McDuffie Act were given a medical examination and brought before a Board of Special Inquiry to determine their qualification for admittance. In most cases, newly arrived Filipinos were denied entry. Filipinos who could prove that they were returning and had proof of previous residence in the United States were denied admission on the grounds that they were now considered aliens. Those without proper visas or who were suspected of being contract laborers, illiterate, or likely to become public charges were denied entry. Resistance to exclusion was common, particularly

among those allowed entry while they appealed. Many parolees defied orders to return to the Philippines and stayed illegally. Immigration station officials searched for these men in California, across the United States, and in the Philippines. Inspectors interviewed family members, neighbors, employers, Selective Service Board officers, and postmasters in their quest to find, arrest, and deport the Tydings–McDuffie Filipinos. In many cases, these searches lasted for years.

The ensuing immigration acts continued to deny most applicant's entry to the United States. In 1952, the Walter–McCarran Act reinforced the tough restrictions of the 1920s by maintaining the national origins quotas and put in place a new *Asia Pacific Triangle* race quota aimed at restricting Asian immigration. The U.S. government continued to shift the burden of screening prospective immigrants to American consular officials overseas and the Angel Island Immigration Station was no longer needed. The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 would later change the composition of the FA community by privileging professional-class immigrants.

### Restoring the Immigration Station and Reclaiming History

In 1940, a fire broke out on Angel Island and destroyed parts of the immigration station. The government had no intention of rebuilding on Angel Island, and the location quickly reverted to a U.S. army site, primarily used to house American troops or to hold German and Japanese prisoners during World War II. In 1946, the island was declared surplus property and turned over to the state of California. In 1963, it became part of the California State Parks system.

In the years since, community activists and descendants of Angel Island detainees recovered the history of the immigration station by founding the Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation. Strategic partnerships with public agencies and national allies helped secure federal and state funds to promote Angel Island as the site of a central chapter in American history. Scholars, journalists, and filmmakers produced public knowledge about the island's significance, and in 1997, the station was awarded the National Historic Landmark status by the National Register of Historic Places.

Efforts to preserve and restore Angel Island have been guided by a commitment to preserve forgotten chapters in America's immigration history and connect them to past and present issues of inequality. One particular interest of preservation were poems written in Chinese calligraphy on the walls. Original plans to tear down and renovate the buildings were revised when photos of the etchings were shown to faculty and students in the Department of Asian American Studies at San Francisco State College (now San Francisco State University). College students and activists (many whose parents and grandparents entered the United States through Angel Island) began making field trips to the station to see the poetry. Uncovering this history led to a call for political action to restore the immigration station to reclaim and protect a vital site of Asian American history. Today, the island strives to serve the FA community as a meeting place for schools and universities to understand the plight of newcomers and recognize the need to revitalize sites of historical significance.

Benjamin Fenkell, a third-generation Filipino American and California State Parks interpreter for the Angel Island Immigration Station, was representative of the efforts to bring greater racial and ethnic diversity to the California State Parks system. Fenkell guided countless educational tours about FA and Asian American immigration—hosting numerous artists, cultural workers, and political activists in his effort to reclaim Angel Island as a place for cultural and historical revitalization. After Fenkell passed away in 2018, the California State Parks system dedicated a bench to his memory and installed it on the island's south side. It faces the same vista that greeted the thousands of *manongs* and *manangs* who arrived on the California shores nearly 100 years ago.

*James Fabionar*

*See also* Anti-Asian Immigration Policies; California, Filipina/x/os in; Ellis Island; Immigration; Tydings–McDuffie Act of 1934.

### Further Readings

Baldoz, R. (2004). Valorizing racial boundaries: Hegemony and conflict in the racialization of Filipino migrant labour in the US. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(6), 969–986.

- Cordova, D. (1989). Voices from the past: Why they came. In Asian Women of California (Ed.), *Making waves: An anthology of writings by and about Asian American Women* (pp. 42–49). Beacon Press.
- Cordova, J. M. T., & Canillo, A. S. (Eds.). (1984). *Voices: A Filipino-American oral history*. Northwestern Graphics.
- Hing, B. O. (2004). *Defining America through immigration policy*. Temple University Press.
- Lee, E., & Yung, J. (2010). *Angel Island: Immigrant gateway to America*. Oxford University Press.
- Mabalon, D. B., & Nadal, K. L. (2017). What Filipina/o American history can teach us about the recent executive order on immigration. Filipino American National Historical Society. <http://fanhs-national.org/filam/what-filipinao-american-history-can-teach-us-about-the-recent-executive-order-on-immigration>
- Mabalon, D. B., & Reyes, R. (2008). *Filipinos in Stockton*. Arcadia.

---

## ANTHOLOGIES, FILIPINA/X/O AMERICAN

---

Filipina/x/o American (FA) anthologies did not emerge until Filipino communities in the United States were firmly established. The first arrival of Filipinos on the California coast in 1587 and again in 1595 aboard the Manila galleons traveling to Acapulco, Mexico, did not result in establishments of communities. Settlements in Louisiana in the 19th century of Filipinos who abandoned the Spanish galleons, although considered permanent, were limited and some gradually assimilated with the general population. Owing to the U.S. annexation of the Philippines in 1899, Filipinos, when permitted, were legally able to travel to and reside in the United States with the status of noncitizen U.S. Nationals, until July 4, 1946, when the United States declared the Philippines an independent nation. It was not until the period from the first half of the 20th century and onward that Filipinos established communities that continued to grow with a gradual influx of more Filipinos from the Philippines and other parts of the United States. This entry discusses anthologies of FA poetry and short stories, as well as polythematic and multigenre collections.

In Hawaii, contract workers known as *sakadas* were recruited to work on sugar plantations from

1906 to the 1940s. Some created new families, while others brought their families from the Philippines. Many immigrants came to the United States as laborers, students, or professionals and arrived and initially settled mainly, although not exclusively, on the West Coast of the United States. Through the decades, in addition to those immigrants who arrived in the United States with writing skills, new writers emerged from these Filipino communities to not only express their creativity, visions, and memories of and connections with the Philippines but also to reveal their new realities as Filipinos living in a country where they were not the majority, faced with obstacles such as racism, marginalization, and discrimination.

In the first half of the 20th century, except for a few noted Filipino authors in the United States such as Marcelo de Gracia Concepcion, Felicidad V. Ocampo, Jose Garcia Villa, N. V. M. Gonzalez, and Carlos Bulosan, whose work was published by American presses, FA writing appeared primarily in FA periodicals, and to a limited degree, university student publications. In the second half of the 20th century to the present, there was a gradual rise in the number of published FA authors, some in mainstream publications and university presses, some in Philippine presses, others through independent presses that sometimes were created by FA writers themselves.

### Poetry

*Chorus for America: Six Philippine Poets* published by Wagon and Stars Publishers in Los Angeles in 1942 was the first anthology of Filipino poets, edited by a Filipino, and published in the United States. Edited by Carlos Bulosan, the anthology presents the work of R. Zulueta da Costa, R. T. Fera, Jose Garcia Villa, Cecilio Baroga (a pen name for Bulosan), C. B. Rigor, and Carlos Bulosan, poets who at some point had lived in the United States. In his introduction, Bulosan acknowledges the poets' conscious use of language and literature as a weapon toward the formation of a new Philippine society.

The second anthology of FA writing published in the United States is *Flips: A Filipino American Anthology*, edited by Serafin Syquia and Bayani Mariano in 1971. *Flips*, a writers-funded publication, is a collection of poetry offering a window

to the FA experience by predominantly San Francisco poets with their commonality, identity crisis, racism, other struggles, and remembrances of growing up Filipino in America. If *Chorus for America* specifically refers to Philippine poets, then *Flips* is actually the first anthology of strictly FA poets/writers. In 2015, Filipino American National Historical Society's (FANHNS) San Francisco Chapter and Philippine American Writers and Artists, Inc. (PAWA) collaborated in reprinting the anthology with a new introduction by Juanita Tamayo Lott: *Flips 2015: A Filipino American Anthology, A Reprint*. Some of these poets also appear in the 1985 Kearny Street Workshop Press publication of *Without Names, A Collection of Poems* by the Bay Area Filipino American Writers with a foreword by Al Robles and featuring Shirley Ancheta, Luis Syquia, Jaime Jacinto, Oscar Peñaranda, Virginia R. Cerenio, Jeff Tagami, Al Robles, and other active San Francisco Bay Area poets from the 1980s.

*Returning a Borrowed Tongue*, edited by Nick Carbó and published by Coffee House Press in Minneapolis in 1995, traces the Filipino poetic tradition in English and in particular, poetry written in the United States. At the time of its publication, it represented contemporary poetry by accomplished Filipino poets, many who live or had lived in the United States, and it was the most significant collection of Filipino poetry published in this country.

### Short Story

In 1993, Southern California-based author Cecilia Manguerra Brainard collected and edited *Fiction by Filipinos in America*, published by New Day Publishers in the Philippines in 1993. This collection features stories by FAs from Carlos Bulosan, N. V. M. Gonzalez, and Bienvenido Santos, to Oscar Peñaranda, Virginia R. Cerenio, Marianne Villanueva, Jean Vengua Gier, and others. This collection was reissued in 1998 by Anvil Publishing, Inc. as *Contemporary Fiction by Filipinos in America*. In 2021, Philippine American Literary House (PALH) issued the U.S. edition under the same title as that of Anvil.

*Philippine American Short Stories*, edited by Leonor A. Briscoe and Anita Merina with an introduction by Bienvenido N. Santos and published by Giraffe Books in Quezon City in 1997, consists of

15 prize-winning pieces of fiction from the Philippine Arts, Letters and Media Council's Philippine American Short Story Contest. In 2001, Lara Stapleton edited *The Thirdest World, 3 Stories by Filipino Writers*. Published by Factory School in San Diego, CA, the book features Gina Apostol, Eric Gamalinda, and Lara Stapleton. In the editor's Manifesto, she speaks of the uniqueness and revolutionary stance of FA writers and writes that they are capable of speaking for themselves and that they should be read on their own terms.

PALH, based in Santa Monica, CA, published two anthologies of stories collected and edited by Cecilia Manguerra Brainard. The stories are about growing up Filipino by writers from the Philippines, the United States, and the diaspora. *Growing Up Filipino: Stories for Young Adults* (2003) deals with family, angst, friendship, love, and home. *Growing Up Filipino II: More Stories for Young Adults* (2010) has 27 stories that explore what it is to be Filipino or FA.

### Polythematic, Multigenre Collections

The next anthology of FA writers published in the United States to appear after *Flips* was *Diwang Pilipino: Pilipino Consciousness*, edited in 1974 by Jovina Navarro. The collection features poems, articles, and essays with topics close to the heart of the contributors. A few of the writers from *Flips* also appear in this anthology. In 1977, Navarro also released *Lahing Pilipino, Pilipino American Anthology* with poems and articles by mostly students from UC Davis. At the end of the introduction, Navarro dedicates the work to the *Manongs* who fought oppression and social injustice.

For reference, there are two anthologies of writing from the Philippines previously published in the United States that include writers also classified as Filipino Americans: *New Writing From the Philippines: A Critique and Anthology*, edited by Leonard Casper and published by Syracuse University Press in 1966 and *Philippine Writing: An Anthology*, edited by T. D. Agcaoili, originally published by Archipelago Publishing House in Manila in 1953 and later in the United States by Greenwood Press in 1971.

*Liwanag: Literary and Graphic Expressions by Filipinos in America*, published by Liwanag Publications in San Francisco in 1975, is a significant

volume with 47 writers and artists revealing the diverse Pilipino American experiences of the period through their authentic and uncensored sensibilities in words and images. A publication such as this did not exist prior to *Liwanag*. In 2019, SOMA Pilipinas published a limited special commemorative reissue with an introduction by Barbara Jane Reyes. In 1993, *Liwanag Volume 2*, with an introduction by Theo Gonzalves, was published and continued the mission of the first *Liwanag*. In the winter of 2021, *Liwanag 3* saw the light of day through the efforts of SOMA Pilipinas in San Francisco. The volume presents the multiplicity of the Pilipinx American experience during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Filipino writers born in the Philippines and who live or have lived in the United States and whose work has been published in the Philippines have sometimes been classified as both *Philippine* and *Philippine American* writers. In Luis H. Francia's *Brown River, White Ocean, An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Philippine Literature in English*, published by Rutgers University Press in 1993, various Filipino Americans figure in the collection. Francia, in his brilliant introduction, educates the reader and clearly establishes the historical, cultural, and literary place of the English language in the Philippines. In 1996, Francia and Eric Gamalinda edited and released *Flippin': Filipinos on America* through The Asian American Writer's Workshop in New York. In Francia's introductory note to this important collection of stories and poems, he dedicates the book to the young men coming to the United States portrayed in the writings of Bulosan and Bienvenido Santos. In the dedication, he includes both the men and their children and conveys that their work is an assertion of their existence, lives, and determination.

At the end of the 20th century, *The Literary Review: An International Literary Journal of Contemporary Writing*, published by Fairleigh Dickenson University in the spring of 2000, featured "Am Here": *Contemporary Filipino Writing in English*. The special issue was guest-edited by Bino A. Realuyo and features writers from the Philippines and the United States. Realuyo, at the end of his introduction, states that English, a colonial language of the writers, is a unifying language chosen by the writers themselves to affirm their presence. Nick Carbó's *Pinoy Poetics* presents

other non-Filipino magazines featuring Filipino writers in "Literary Magazines With Special Issues/Sections on Filipino Writing."

There are two anthologies that stand out in this period: *Babaylan: An Anthology of Filipina and Filipina American Writers*, coedited by Nick Carbó and Eileen Tabios and published by Aunt Lute Books in San Francisco in 2000, and *Going Home to a Landscape: Writings by Filipinas*, edited by Marianne Villanueva and Virginia Cerenio and published by Calyx Books in 2003. Both publications highlight prose and poetry by Filipina writers from the Philippines, the United States, and the diaspora.

Another anthology that is of interest is *Screaming Monkeys: Critiques of Asian American Images*, edited by M. Evelina Galang and published by Coffee House Press in Minneapolis in 2003. Although this collection includes various Asian American groups, there is a large number of Filipino Americans represented.

PAWA, a San Francisco-based nonprofit organization since 2002, has published several anthologies. *Reflections: Readings for the Young and Old*, edited by Penélope V. Flores and published in 2002, presents prose and poetry. *Whisper of the Bamboo: An Anthology of Philippine American Writers and Artists*, edited by Penélope V. Flores and Allen Gaborro and published in 2004, includes prose, poetry, photographs, and paintings. *Field of Mirrors, An Anthology of Philippine American Writers and Artists*, edited by Edwin A. Lozada and published in 2008, features prose and poetry of multigenerational Filipino writers from the United States. *Remembering Rizal: Voices From the Diaspora*, edited by Edwin Agustín Lozada and published in 2011, celebrates the 150th anniversary of José Rizal's birth with selected works by Rizal and articles, poems, and essays about Rizal by multigenerational writers from the United States, Chile, and the Philippines. *The Pilipinx Radical Imagination Reader*, edited by Melissa-Ann Nievera-Lozano and Anthony Abulencia Santa Ana and published in 2018, includes prose, poetry, and the visual arts.

Carayan Press in San Francisco published two anthologies. *Walang Hiya: Literature Taking Risks Toward Liberatory Practice*, edited by Lolan Buhain Sevilla and Roseli Ilano and published in 2010, features poetry and short fiction by 32 emerging Pilipino and Pilipino-American writers committed to using the narrative for personal and



political transformation. In 2015, Carayan Press released, in collaboration with PAWA, *Kuwento: Lost Things, An Anthology of New Philippine Myths*, edited by Rachele Cruz and Melissa Sipin. Writers from the United States and the Philippines created new works of prose and poetry inspired by the elements of Philippine mythology.

*Hanggang sa Muli: Homecoming Stories for the Filipino Soul*, edited by Reni R. Roxas and published in 2011, consists of memoirs, poetry, stories, essays, and narratives by Filipinos from the United States and the diaspora. The initial call for submission invited writers to write about their connection to the motherland or the disconnect between them and the motherland.

The East Bay chapter of the FANHS produced two anthologies focusing on prose and poetry inspired by the FA experience: *Seven Card Stud With Seven Manangs Wild*, edited by Helen C. Toribio and published in 2002, and *Beyond Lumpia, Pansit, and Seven Manangs Wild: Stories From the Heart of Filipino Americans*, edited by Evangeline Canonizado Buell with Edwin Lozada, Eleanor Hipol Luis, Evelyn Luluquisen, Tony Robles, and Myrna Zialcita and published in 2014.

Not relying on traditional mainstream publishers who for decades largely ignored the FA experience and undervalued the contribution of FA authors to American literature, editors of FA anthologies, many of whom are authors, understand and feel an urgency to create publishing opportunities for their community of writers. In the spirit of *bayanihan*, they have endeavored in their anthologies to share and voice the diverse experiences, common concerns, artistry, and visions of Filipina/x/o immigrants from the first, second, or third generations, as they struggle, adapt, evolve, and flourish in the United States.

Edwin Lozada

See also Arts and Humanities; *Liwanag*; Memoirs, Filipina/x/o American; Poetry, Filipina/x/o American

### Further Readings

Abad, G. H. (1993). *A native clearing: Filipino poetry and verse from English since the '50s to the present: Edith L. Tiempo to Cirilo F. Bautista*. University of the Philippines Press.

Abad, G. H. (1999). *A habit of shores: Filipino poetry and verse from English, 60's to the 90's: The sequel to a native clearing*. University of the Philippines Press.

Abad, G. H., & Katigbak-Lacuesta, M. (2018). *The achieve of, the mastery: Filipino poetry and verse from English, mid-'90s to 2016*. University of the Philippines Press.

Abad, G. H., & Zapanta-Manlapaz, E. (1989). *Man of Earth, an anthology of Filipino poetry and verse from English, 1905 to the mid-50s*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.

---

## ANTI-ASIAN IMMIGRATION POLICIES

---

With the words “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,” from Emma Lazarus’s poem “The New Colossus” etched on its pedestal, the Statue of Liberty is often thought to symbolize the United States as a nation that is welcoming of immigrants. However, the history of immigration laws in the United States belies the conventional understanding of the poem. On the contrary, an examination of immigration laws passed in the United States since the 1870s, when Congress began passing these laws, demonstrates that the country consistently excluded immigrants for various reasons, including race, gender, class, religion, disability, sexual orientation, and political views. This entry highlights how Asians, including those from the Philippines, were among those immigrants who were excluded from the United States between 1875 and 1965, on the grounds of a combination of race, gender, and class.

### Anti-Asian Immigration Laws in U.S. History

The U.S. Constitution, adopted in 1789, granted to Congress the power to enact uniform naturalization laws; however, it did not expressly provide it with the power to regulate immigration law. Thus, although Congress passed a law in 1790 that naturalization (or the ability of non-citizens to apply for citizenship) could be granted to *White persons* who were of *good moral character*, Congress did not begin passing immigration laws until 1875. Until then, states oversaw and regulated the entrance of immigrants to their borders. Immigrants from various parts of the

world sought entry to the United States, and it was up to the individual states to determine whether these immigrants would be allowed to enter and remain.

Asian immigrants who came to the United States before 1875 included Filipinos who settled in Louisiana in 1763; Chinese, primarily men, who immigrated to California to work in the gold mines after the discovery of gold in 1848; and Chinese who later sought work in the transcontinental railroad industry in the 1860s. Between 1850 and 1860, the population of Chinese immigrants in California was roughly 35,000, which constituted about less than 1% of the entire U.S. population.

In 1870, Congress amended the country's naturalization laws, so that immigrants of African descent were eligible to apply for naturalization. That same year, over 63,000 Chinese immigrants were residing in the United States, and under the 1870 Naturalization Act, they were not eligible for naturalization. By this time, there were significant calls in California to curb the immigration of Chinese.

Ultimately, these calls to restrict Chinese immigration in California led to the first restrictive federal immigration law in 1875 known as the Page Act. This act barred the immigration of not only Chinese but also Japanese immigrants along race, class, and gender lines. Specifically, the Page Act excluded the immigration of laborers from "China, Japan or any Oriental country," who were brought to the United States against their own free will or if they had been brought for "lewd and immoral purposes." Notably, the Page Act prohibited the "importation of women for the purposes of prostitution" and targeted Chinese women, who were hypersexualized and stereotyped to be prostitutes. By restricting the immigration of Chinese women, this act also prevented the formation of Chinese families in America and thus the growth of an American-born Chinese population.

Calls to restrict the immigration of Chinese to the United States continued, and in 1882, Congress enacted the Chinese Exclusion Act (also known as the Asian Exclusion Act). It was the first immigration law that explicitly discriminated on the basis of race. Specifically, the Chinese Exclusion Act barred skilled and unskilled Chinese laborers

from entering the United States for 10 years. The law, which applied to newly entering Chinese laborers, created exceptions for merchants. It also exempted Chinese who were already residents of the United States and allowed them to leave the country to visit China and return to the United States if they carried a re-entry permit. However, in 1888, Congress amended the law and provided that even long-term Chinese residents of the United States would be barred from re-entering if they left. In 1889, a Chinese immigrant who had resided in California and was prohibited from returning to California after a visit to China challenged the law and lost in the case of *Chae Chan Ping v. United States*, 130 U.S. 581 (1889). This case validated Congress's power to regulate immigration law. In 1892, Congress renewed the Chinese Exclusion Act for another 10 years and ultimately made the racial ban permanent a few years later.

Other immigrants, including those from Japan, also faced threats of being excluded. However, in 1907, the United States and Japan entered the informal Gentlemen's Agreement, in which the Japanese government restricted its own citizens from leaving Japan to limit the number of Japanese immigrants entering the United States. In exchange, the United States did not bar Japanese immigrants from entering the United States.

On the other hand, Filipinos were exempt from exclusionary laws by virtue of the Philippines becoming a U.S. territory beginning in 1898. Although Congress could have extended citizenship to Filipinos, lawmakers labeled them as *U.S. nationals* instead. As U.S. nationals, Filipinos were not considered *aliens* or noncitizens and were therefore allowed to migrate to or enter the United States. However, they were forbidden from owning property or voting.

In the Immigration Act of 1917, Congress expanded restrictions against Asian immigration when it stated that no immigrant from the Asiatic Zone, encompassing the majority of Asia and the Pacific Islands, could enter the United States. This act also implemented literacy tests, effectively barring southern Europeans, Russians, and Asians from the United States. In 1921, Congress enacted an *emergency* act to create quotas for immigrants based on their country of origin. These quotas restricted immigration numbers to 3% of the total

foreign-born population from that country as they were recorded in the 1910 U.S. census.

In the Immigration Act of 1924 (also known as the Johnson–Reed Act), Congress enacted yet another quota based on national origins. This time, Congress reduced the quota from 3% down to 2% of the foreign-born population as it was recorded in the 1890 U.S. census. Because the Chinese had been barred under the Chinese Exclusion Act, few visas were available for Chinese immigrants. The Johnson–Reed Act also made inadmissible immigrants who were not eligible to become U.S. citizens. Using eligibility for citizenship as the basis for immigration exclusion played a crucial role in excluding Asians. One of the chief eligibility requirements for naturalization was race. Between 1790 and 1870, only White immigrants were eligible to apply for citizenship. In 1870, Congress amended the naturalization law to allow persons of African descent to be eligible for naturalization. Immigrants who were neither White nor of African descent were deemed racially ineligible for citizenship. In 1922, the Supreme Court held in *Ozawa v. United States*, 260 U.S. 178 (1922), that a Japanese man was not White and thus not eligible to become a citizen. Three months later, in the Supreme Court case, *United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind*, 261 U.S. 204 (1923), India-born Bhagat Singh Thind was not allowed to naturalize, as Hindus were deemed to be *aliens*. Therefore, in 1924, when Congress passed the Johnson–Reed Act, those who were not racially eligible to become U.S. citizens could not immigrate, thus effectively barring all Asians from the border. Those prevented from entering included Japanese immigrants who had previously been allowed to enter, as noted earlier, under the 1907 Gentlemen’s Agreement.

In 1934, the Tydings–McDuffie Act, also known as the Philippine Commonwealth and Independence Act, was passed. On the one hand, it provided a 10-year transitional period leading to Philippine independence in 1946. On the other hand, however, the act reclassified Filipinos to alien status, allowing for a quota of 50 Filipino immigrants per year to be established. Thus, this act stripped Filipinos of their status as U.S. nationals, which they had held since the annexation of

the Philippines just a few decades before, placing them in a *limbo* where they were ineligible for citizenship.

### Repeal of Exclusionary Immigration Laws and Enactment of Restrictive Immigration Laws

Congress began to lift immigration bans starting in the 1940s during World War II. In 1943, Congress repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act and allowed Chinese immigrants to become eligible for citizenship. Furthermore, the Luce–Celler Act of 1946 extended naturalization rights to immigrants from the recently independent countries of the Philippines and India, thus making them eligible for citizenship.

In 1952, Congress passed the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and repealed all racial restrictions to immigration. This law should have therefore allowed Asians to be able to immigrate to the United States. However, Congress continued to impose quotas on the number of Asians who could enter every year. A quota of only 100 immigrants per year was set on most Asian powers, except for Japan, which was given a quota of 185 immigrants.

As the civil rights movement gained momentum, advocates pushed for removing the national origins quotas against Asians. In 1965, Congress amended the INA when it passed the Hart–Celler Act, which abolished the quota system and prohibited “discrimination in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence.” This consequently lifted the restrictions against the immigration of Asians. It also promoted an immigration policy focused on family unification, which allowed immigrants from Asia who became eligible to become U.S. citizens to eventually sponsor their family members to immigrate to the United States. Consequently, the 1965 Immigration Act facilitated an increased Asian immigrant population in the United States. The Pew Research Center reported in 2021 that Asians are projected to become the largest immigrant group by 2055 and will surpass 46 million in number by 2060.

However, it should be noted that other forms of immigration restrictions have been enacted since

1965 that had a negative impact on Asian Americans, with two notable examples. After the September 11, 2001, attacks, Congress passed laws and policies that targeted Muslim noncitizens and Muslim Americans. One such policy was the establishment of the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System in 2003, also known as NSEERS. This *special registration* system systematically targeted men in Arab, Muslim, South Asian, and Sikh communities, who became subject to significant scrutiny and interrogations, often-times resulting in deportation. Although this racial profiling system was suspended in 2011, it was not fully terminated.

Such animus against Muslims continued several years later. In 2017, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13769, titled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,” which banned immigrants from predominantly Islamic countries. In addition to issuing the *Muslim ban*, President Trump banned the entry of all refugees for 120 days and refugees from Syria indefinitely, and his administration adopted extreme vetting of immigrants entering the United States and immigrants applying for U.S. citizenship. Although not explicitly known as an *anti-Asian* immigration policy, most of the countries that were targeted (Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen) are in West Asia. Further, these immigration laws impacted many South Asian communities in the United States, resulting in increased racial and Islamophobic violence.

Finally, although Asian American immigration has continued to increase exponentially, scholars have described how many history books fail to acknowledge the systemic oppression that Asian Americans have faced throughout history. In fact, as anti-Asian hate violence surged amid the COVID-19 pandemic, many scholar activists cited the need for integrating Asian American studies into K–12 curricula and increasing Asian American Studies courses and programs in colleges and universities.

Reese Carolina Cuison Villazor and  
Rose Cruz Cuison-Villazor

See also Citizenship Eligibility; Immigration;  
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965; Philippine

Immigration Act of 1940; Philippine Repatriation Act of 1935; Tydings–McDuffie Act of 1934

### Further Readings

- Baldoz, R. (2011). *The third Asiatic invasion: Empire and migration in Filipino America, 1898–1946*. NYU Press.
- Chin, G., & Cuison Villazor, R. (Eds.). (2015). *The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965: Legislating a new America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cuison Villazor, R. C. (2011). The other Loving: Uncovering the federal government’s racial regulation of marriage. *New York Law Review*, 86(5), 1394–1396.
- Johnson, K., & Cuison Villazor, R.C. (2019). The Trump administration and the war on immigration diversity. *Wake Forest Law Review*, 54(2), 575–616.
- Lee, E. (2007). The “yellow peril” and Asian exclusion in the Americas. *Pacific Historical Review*, 76(4), 537–562. <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2007.76.4.537>
- Ngai, M. M. (2012). *The lucky ones*. Princeton University Press.

---

## ANTI-MARTIAL LAW MOVEMENT

---

On the evening of September 23, 1972, Philippines president Ferdinand E. Marcos announced on television that he had placed the Philippines under martial law. He and his government argued that the communist threat to the Philippines was so great that his government needed to curtail civil liberties to restore order to the nation. Soon after the declaration, countless Marcos opponents were arrested or disappeared, and Marcos loyalists took over the press as well as a number of national industries. Marcos had exaggerated the threats that activists posed to the Philippines as a ploy to both claim near absolute power over the archipelago and obtain the tacit permission to do so by his American allies. From 1972 until Marcos’s removal from power in 1986, activists from all over the United States worked with activists in the Philippines to oppose the Marcos government. They were part of an international movement against the Marcos regime, with activists from Western Europe, Canada, and throughout the Pacific world organizing in opposition to martial law. This transnational anti-Marcos movement followed the lead

of Filipino grassroots activists, many of whom had been forced underground or detained for their opposition to injustices in the Philippines. This entry traces the movement from its inception to the downfall of the Marcos regime in 1986.

By the time Marcos declared martial law, Filipino Americans were already prepared to oppose the dictatorship in the Philippines. There existed a long and proud tradition of activism among Filipino Americans, particularly within labor organizing. In recent years, Filipino Americans had also been part of the Third World Liberation Front and anti-Vietnam War protests. And even before the declaration of martial law, concerned Filipinos and Filipino Americans organized out of concern regarding the creeping authoritarianism in the Philippines.

Activists immediately responded with the formation of the National Committee for the Restoration of Civil Liberties at a meeting in San Francisco, CA. Soon after, other organizations would be formed throughout the United States. Although there were a number of different organizations, the three biggest groups were Movement for a Free Philippines (MFP), Friends of the Filipino People (FFP), and Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino (KDP) or Union of Democratic Filipinos. All three of these organizations were formed in 1973. MFP was commonly known as the more politically moderate organization. The group was led by Raul Manglapus, a former senator in the Philippines. They were primarily interested in advocating for a removal of Marcos from power while maintaining the long-standing relationship between the United States and the Philippines. FFP was an organization made up of non-Filipino religious leaders, academics, and other activists who were interested in altering the nature of the relationship between the United States and the Philippines. They too hoped for removal of Marcos from power but saw the reduction of U.S. influence in the archipelago as key to this aim. One of the most important figures in this organization was Daniel Boone Schirmer, a longtime anti-imperial activist who spent much of his life working in solidarity with the Filipino people. Finally, the KDP was made up of youth activists, students, and Filipino activists. They pursued a strategy known as the *dual line*, whereby they worked to advance national democracy in the

Philippines and socialism in the United States. Some of their leaders included activists, such as Melinda Paras, Bruce Occeña, Cynthia Maglaya, and Rene Ciria Cruz.

### **Building an Anti-Martial Law Movement in the 1970s**

A number of Marcos opponents escaped to the United States after the declaration of martial law and worked to oppose the dictatorship from abroad. In 1973, as he tried to defect from the Marcos regime, Philippine consul general Ruperto Baliao released a blacklist of between 100 and 150 Filipino Americans. These activists and opponents to the Marcos regime were deemed “detrimental to the national interest.” Baliao had been given instructions not to renew or extend the Philippine passports of those in the blacklist. Being on the blacklist was a scary thing and, for many, implied more than just the denial of visas or passport renewals. No one knew exactly how far the arms of Marcos’s power might reach, and later events would prove such fears to be valid.

News about the Marcos regime spread in the United States through lobbying efforts, alternative and ethnic news publications, and the organizing efforts of different groups. Some of the major publications included *Ang Katipunan* (KDP), *Philippine News* (San Francisco-based under Alex Esclamado), *Ningas Cogon* (New York-based under Nelson Navarro and funded by Loida Lewis), *FFP Bulletin*, *Philippine Information Bulletin*, and many others. These publications kept the Filipino American community abreast of the worrisome situations in the Philippines. Throughout the pages of these newspapers, community members read about arrests in the Philippines, Marcos government graft and corruption, and in general remained updated on what was going on in the Philippines and what could be done from the United States. Activists organized on campuses, in churches, and throughout the community to spread word about the Marcos regime. Others lobbied congressional members and other political leaders to take a stand against the Marcoses. Still others discussed ways to materially support underground activists in the Philippines and help destabilize Marcos’s hold on power.

It is important to highlight that people opposed the Marcos regime in a wide variety of ways. They worked in formal political lobbying, attempting to convince elected officials to investigate Marcos's human rights abuses and deny U.S. foreign and military aid to the regime. Others organized human rights organizations to contribute funding to grassroots movements in the Philippines. Cultural activism was a huge component of the U.S.-based opposition, as many artists used their talents to draw attention to injustices in the Philippines. As in so many activist movements, many activists also undertook the vital care work that held organizations together and created conditions whereby others could undertake more visible forms of political organizing. In the first few years of martial law, Filipino American activists pursued a wide range of tactics. Some worked and some did not, and activists continued to learn and develop approaches to oppose the Marcos regime.

During the early 1970s, FFP and KDP collaborated to offer an M.A. program in Philippine studies at the Goddard-Cambridge School of Social Change. This program brought activist scholars to the Boston area to train under Daniel Boone Schirmer in a 1-year master's degree program. Both groups hoped to train individuals to be educators in Philippine studies and share their knowledge of Philippine and U.S. imperial history with their communities. The school was relatively short-lived, closing its doors by the end of the decade. However, it was a remarkable collaboration of activist groups and trained a number of Filipino American activists who would continue to serve the Filipino American community for decades. Student activists who attended the program also collaborated with Boston-area anti-imperialists in political organizing efforts for the Philippines and beyond.

As in the case of Baliao, exiles and defectors proved to be an important part of the anti-martial law movement in the United States. Their ability to provide firsthand testimony to the Marcos government, its abuses, and their effect on Philippine society made them highly regarded among the U.S.-based opposition. In 1975, another defector from the Marcos government, Primitivo Mijares, testified in the U.S. Congress against the Marcos government and soon after published a scathing critique of the Marcos regime entitled *The*

*Conjugal Dictatorship of Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos*. The public defection and publication were embarrassing to the Marcos regime. Soon after the publication, Mijares disappeared, and in 1977, his son was kidnapped and brutally murdered. The disappearance and murder confirmed the suspicions of anti-Marcos activists that the dictator was both bothered by the international opposition to his regime and willing to take extraordinary steps to silence dissent even from outside of the Philippines.

### The Challenges of Solidarity

Achieving and sustaining solidarity can be a tricky thing. Activists in the United States had to walk a fine line of using their privilege of being in the United States to fight for Philippine rights without overstepping into pronouncements of what Filipinos should do. Some were called *steak commands* in reference to the real and perceived positions of privilege afforded to activists in the United States. Nonetheless, many formed real and lasting transnational relationships in the formation of a broad opposition to dictatorship in the Philippines. And many activists understood that they could use their presence in the United States to build pressure against the Marcos regime.

Knowing that U.S. support of martial law was a central component of Marcos's power, many sought out ways to diminish U.S. public support of the Marcos government. They tried to make Marcos deeply unpopular with everyday Americans to put further pressure on the U.S. government to denounce the regime. Every time that Marcos visited the United States, activists organized protests at various points in his itineraries and discouraged political leaders from agreeing to public appearances with the Philippine president. These activists similarly warned U.S. leaders about their visits to the Philippines serving as legitimating opportunities for the Marcos government.

Others, such as activists Walden Bello, Severina Rivera, and Robin Broad, worked to make public the ways that the United States, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank propped up the Marcos regime. These activists published reports like *Logistics of Repression* (1978), which documented U.S. military assistance to the martial

law regime. Later, Bello would also be involved in the publication of *Development Debacle* (1982), the product of covert research to uncover and expose the role of the World Bank in the continuation of Marcosian power.

Also during the late 1970s, there were a variety of tensions and challenges facing the anti-Marcos movement. The FFP faced takeover attempts and competing claims to organizational leadership. FFP, being made up of mostly non-Filipinos, firmly espoused the principle that they were fighting for the Filipino people to decide what their future should look like. However, some activists wanted FFP to take a more explicit political position and be in lockstep with other groups' political positions. As FBI records have since shown, organizations like KDP were under frequent surveillance. Similarly, the KDP faced tensions with the movement in the Philippines over disagreements regarding the primacy of causes in the Philippines versus causes in the United States. Many within the KDP also disagreed with national and international positions taken by leaders of the National Democratic movement. These disagreements and others eventually led to splits within KDP and between the KDP and the National Democratic movement. In the aftermath, several other anti-Marcos organizations such as Ugnayan and the Alliance for Philippine Concerns were formed. Even MFP experienced organizational crises during the 1970s and 1980s. Some members of the MFP felt that more insurrectionary tactics were necessary, which gave rise to the April 6 Liberation Movement, a group that was held responsible for a series of bombings in Manila.

Nonetheless, many continued to do organizing work to bring about change in the martial law situation. Even with all of these tensions, people continued to do the work. Members of KDP worked on local issues such as the evictions at the International Hotel in San Francisco, the formation of Agbayani Village, and the Narcisso-Perez case. FFP and MFP members continued to lobby Congress. In particular, FFP pushed toward a reduction in military aid to the Philippines and opposed a proposed extradition treaty, which would further endanger activists outside of the Philippines. Exiles from the Philippines spoke out fiercely against the dictatorship, including Charito Planas, Bonifacio Gillego, and Heherson Alvarez.

Two crucial ways that solidarity networks between the Philippines and the United States were fostered during the martial law period were through religious and human rights activism. Indeed, the two were often wrapped up together as human rights became a prominent moral and political issue in the United States and as different religious groups felt that they had a role to play in promoting human rights values worldwide. In the Philippines, one of the primary hubs of information about human rights violations was the Task Force Detainees Philippines (TFDP), which was led by Catholic nuns such as Sister Mariani Dimaranan. TFDP circulated its data to activists in the United States, where religious organizations took up the human rights cause. For example, Mennonite organizations such as Synapses circulated word of Marcosian abuses regularly in its newsletters. Religious leaders gathered at meetings like the International Ecumenical Conference in the Philippines in 1983, where attendees gathered to listen to opposition figures, learn about the gravity of human rights abuses under Marcos, and strategize about how best to use their positions to support those fighting for democracy in the Philippines.

Much of the international solidarity work in the Philippines focused on the issue of political detention. Political prisoners included labor organizers, peasant workers, politicians, and students. Human rights activists courageously documented the arrest, disappearance, torture, and murder of individuals who had run afoul of the Marcos regime. Human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and NOVIB (Dutch Organization for International Aid) highlighted these prisoners of conscience and lent material support to activists in the Philippines. U.S.-based activists called attention to these injustices, publishing testimonials, photographs, and stories to help garner sympathy and support for political detainees.

### **A Crumbling Regime, Mounting Crisis, and Windows of Opportunity in the 1980s**

The question of Marcos was deeply divisive within the Filipino American community. Although there was an impressive anti-Marcos movement in the United States, there was also a considerable

number of Filipinos who were very much in support of Ferdinand Marcos's rule, his policies, and his crusade against activists. There were also many Filipino Americans who preferred to avoid the subject of Marcos altogether. As the 1980s began, the Marcos regime became an even more hot-button issue for Filipinos in the United States. Ferdinand Marcos had nominally lifted martial law in January 1981 in what many saw as an attempt to appease both the United States and the Catholic Church. However, most of the restrictions that existed in the previous 9 years continued beyond the nominal lifting of martial law, leaving many to point out that very little had changed. The election of Ronald Reagan to the U.S. presidency meant that Marcos would have an even more committed ally in the U.S. government. In addition to their shared cold war anti-Communist sentiments, the two were old friends. Later in 1981, Reagan's vice president, George W. Bush, lauded Marcos's supposed commitments to democratic principles, explicitly and publicly affirming the United States's support of the Marcos regime.

Despite U.S. government support for the Marcos regime, the mythology around the Marcoses was quickly falling apart. In the early 1980s, Bonifacio Gillego and others undertook research to help debunk the myth that Marcos was a war hero. In 1982, Jorge Burgos released these findings through his Philippine-based newspaper, *We Forum*, so enraging the dictator that the press's offices were raided and Burgos was arrested. In 1986, Alfred W. McCoy's research further confirmed these findings and resulted in a *New York Times* exposé to document and publicize the fabrication of Marcos's war record.

In June 1981, two labor activists in Seattle, Gene Viernes and Silme Domingo, were gunned down in downtown Seattle. Family members and fellow activists immediately suspected that the Marcos regime was involved in the killings. Viernes had recently returned from a visit to the Philippines and suspected that he was being watched by government authorities. Both had been involved in anti-Marcos organizing, labor and anti-corruption organizing, and had helped foster connections between the labor movements in the Philippines and the United States. The Committee for Justice for Domingo and Viernes soon became a formidable force in anti-Marcos organizing and worked

to bring the Marcos family to justice in 1989. The assassination enraged the U.S.-based opposition to Marcos and drew attention to the ways that the Marcos government sought to stop dissent even outside of the Philippines.

Several other news stories about the dictatorship continued to cast the Marcos family in an unpopular light. U.S. State Department and other government communications showed that patience with the Marcoses was wearing thin among many officials. Reporters devoted extensive attention to the materialist excesses of Imelda Marcos as she conducted notorious shopping sprees during her visits to the United States. Other reports pointed out how Marcosian beautification projects in the Philippines had done little more than sweep economic struggles away from the public eye. Some projects, such as the Cultural Center of the Philippines, were so rushed that workers had been buried alive during construction. The gossip around the Philippines and beyond was also that Ferdinand Marcos himself was suffering a grave illness. Much of the public did not know of Marcos's lupus diagnosis and his increasingly frequent dialysis treatments, but the dictator certainly did not look well in public appearances. Such rumors led to speculations about a crisis of succession.

Seeking to take advantage of this potential opportunity was former senator Benigno Aquino Jr., who from 1980 to 1983 was based in Massachusetts. In 1980, Aquino came to the United States for emergency heart surgery. Aquino was the most prominent opponent to the Marcos regime. He had been imprisoned for much of the martial law period, had been near death as a result of hunger strikes, and was now in desperate need of medical treatment. Bowing to public pressure, the Marcoses permitted Aquino to seek treatment in the United States. Aquino promptly found a way to delay his return to the Philippines (and likely prison), staying in Cambridge on fellowships at Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Aquino, like other exiles, drew the American audience's attention to the Marcos regime by sharing his firsthand experiences in the Philippines under Marcos. Aquino spoke far and wide, in front of Filipino American audiences and even on Pat Robertson's television program *The 700 Club*.

But in August 1983, Aquino decided that it was time to return to the Philippines. He knew this was



a dangerous choice and joked, even on the plane, that he might be assassinated. His haunting prediction would sadly come true when he was brazenly assassinated on the tarmac of then Manila International Airport. The assassination was a powerful mobilizing point for the opposition. People worldwide held the Marcos family responsible. Outraged, the business and middle sectors of the Philippines more explicitly turned against the Marcos regime. The anti-martial law movement in the United States was also reenergized. Organizations such as the Ninoy Aquino Movement and Justice for Aquino, Justice for All formed, explicitly drawing upon the assassination of Aquino to call for Marcos's removal from power.

Pressure against the Marcos government continued to mount. In late 1985 during a visit to the United States, Ferdinand Marcos sat for an interview with newscaster David Brinkley. In the interview, Marcos confidently asserted that he would call for a snap election to demonstrate that he still had the popular support of the Filipino people. The opposition eventually rallied around Senator Aquino's widow, Corazon Aquino, who though lacking in formal political experience was a prominent member of the powerful Cojuangco family. Opponents of Marcos worldwide approached the elections with mixed emotions. Many were convinced that Marcos would merely steal the election and use it as an occasion to solidify his hold on the archipelago. As they had in prior elections and plebiscites, many decided to boycott the elections, calculating that participating would lend legitimacy to an illegitimate ruler. Marcos, to the surprise of few, eventually declared himself as the victor of the election, but Filipinos were largely unconvinced of his claims. With the backing of the Catholic church, hundreds of thousands of Filipinos gathered on Epifanio de los Santos Avenue from February 22–25, 1986, to peacefully protest the Marcos regime. Marcos called upon the military to attack and disperse the protestors, but he soon found that much of the military had defected from the executive through the leadership of the Reform the Armed Forces movement. Even his long-time allies in the United States withdrew their support, choosing instead to encourage and facilitate the Marcos family's escape into exile in Hawai'i. At Philippine embassies throughout the United States, Filipino Americans celebrated the removal of the Marcos dictatorship.

## Conclusion

The anti-martial law movement in the United States was characterized by ideological and political diversity. Despite its wide range of orientations, activists shared a commitment to ending martial law in the Philippines and removing Ferdinand Marcos from power. The anti-martial law movement in the United States was made up of Filipinos and Filipino Americans. Non-Filipinos, including educators, academics, and religious groups, also joined in the battle against the regime. In addition to fighting against martial law in the Philippines, many anti-martial law activists connected political struggles in the Philippines with the marginalization they faced in the United States. Many believed it was necessary to combine these struggles to address injustice broadly. After Marcos was removed from office in 1986, anti-martial law activists continued to work on Philippine and community-based issues. These included opposition to the U.S. military bases in the Philippines, HIV/AIDS activism, human rights, international solidarity, and many other issues. The martial law period was a critical time period for Filipino Americans, both laying bare political differences in the community and fostering the politicization of a generation of activists who have spent much of their careers fighting against injustices in the Philippines and in the United States.

Mark John Sanchez

See also Civil Rights Movement; International Hotel; Third World Liberation Front Movement

## Further Readings

- Bonner, R. (1988). *Waltzing with a dictator*. Vintage.
- Cruz, R. C., Domingo, C., & Occena, B. (Eds.). (2017). *A time to rise: Collective memoirs of the Union of Democratic Filipinos (KDP)*. University of Washington Press.
- De Guzman, M. (2016). *Women against Marcos: Stories of Filipino and Filipino American women who fought a dictator*. Carayan Press.
- Fuentecilla, J. V. (2013). *Fighting from a distance: How Filipino exiles helped topple a dictator*. University of Illinois Press.
- Gaerlan, B. (1999). The movement in the United States to oppose martial law in the Philippines, 1972–1991: An overview. *Pilipinas*, 33, 75–99.

- Habal, E. (2007). *San Francisco's international hotel: Mobilizing the Filipino American community in the anti-eviction movement*. Temple University Press.
- Hanna, K. B. (2019). When mothers lead: Revolutionary adaptability in a Filipina/o American diasporic community theater organization. *Amerasia Journal*, 45(2), 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00447471.2019.1682450>
- Sales, J. N. (2019). #NeverAgainToMartialLaw: Transnational Filipino American activism in the shadow of Marcos and age of Duterte. *Amerasia Journal*, 45(3), 299–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00447471.2019.1715702>
- Sanchez, M. J. (2017). Human rights and the Task Force Detainees of the Philippines: Religious opposition to the Marcos dictatorship, 1972–1986. *Kritika Kultura*, 29, 126–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13185/KK2017.02906>
- Thompson, M. R. (1995). *The anti-Marcos struggle: Personalistic rule and democratic transition in the Philippines*. Yale University Press.

---

## ANTI-MISCEGENATION LAWS

---

Until declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967, anti-miscegenation laws prohibited marriage between persons defined as *White* and persons of another specified race. Although this entry focuses specifically on Filipinos targeted in the 20th century, anti-miscegenation statutes were first enacted more than 100 years prior to the American Revolution, thus making clear the prime importance of racial categorization since the 17th century. As the preferred term defining mixed-race relationships, *miscegenation* first appeared in 1864 when it was used in a political pamphlet in New York. *Miscegenation* soon replaced *amalgamation* in popular discourse and law.

### Anti-Miscegenation Laws Before the 20th Century

In 1664, Maryland enacted the first anti-miscegenation statute to regulate relationships between White women and Black men, who also became subject to lifetime enslavement under the law. Any White woman who married an enslaved man after passage of the act became the servant of her husband's master for the lifetime of her spouse, and any children born to the couple would be enslaved

to their father's master for their entire lives. During the colonial period, other British colonies, including Virginia, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Georgia, followed Maryland's lead, as did the French colony of Louisiana. The Virginia and North Carolina statutes also included *Indians*. Gender disparity in these laws is notable. Although the marriage options of White women came to be reserved for White men by law, often through the threat of severe punishment, White men retained unregulated sexual access to Black women. Enslaved status followed the status of the mother. Thus, a mixed-race child born to an enslaved mother and a White father became enslaved for life and the property of the mother's master.

Legislation prohibiting interracial marriage persisted and expanded after the United States declared independence from England in 1776. Prior to the end of the U.S. Civil War in 1865, states increasingly declared such marriages null and void and punished those who entered into them, as well as the officials who issued a marriage license to an interracial couple or performed their marriage ceremony. After the Civil War, many states in the northeast and the midwest repealed such laws. Only Alaska, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Hawai'i, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Vermont, and Wisconsin *never* enacted anti-miscegenation statutes.

As migration from Asia increased in the western United States in the second half of the 19th century, anti-miscegenation laws added new groups by name. In 1861, the Territory of Nevada prohibited intermarriage between a White man or woman and "any Black person, mulatto, Indian or Chinese," the first time that an Asian group was specified. Other jurisdictions followed Nevada's example, but the names of the groups varied. In addition to *Chinese*, Asians targeted by 1935 included *Mongolian*, *Malay*, *Hindu*, *Japanese*, *Korean*, and *Asiatic Indian*. In 1912, in linking perceived color to racial discrimination, the State of Nevada added (*Yellow*) after *Mongolian* and (*Brown*) after *Malay*.

### Filipinos and Anti-Miscegenation Laws

First included in 1912 in both Nevada and Arizona, Filipinos were typically called *Malay* in anti-miscegenation laws. *Malay* described Filipinos in

California in 1933, in Utah in 1939, in South Dakota and Wyoming in 1913, in Virginia in 1924, and in Maryland in 1935. Thus, eight states came to prohibit intermarriage between Whites and Filipinos or *Malays*, but Filipinos could also fall under bans targeting *Asians* and *non-White persons of color*.

Colonized by Spain in 1521, the Philippines became a possession of the United States in 1898 in the aftermath of the Spanish–American War. In the first third of the 20th century, labor migration from the Philippines grew steadily, first to the Territory of Hawai'i and then to the continental United States, especially the western states, and the Territory of Alaska. Filipinos followed the crops, toiled in Alaska's canneries, and worked in domestic service, restaurants, and clubs in the west and elsewhere in the country. Inspired by the *pensionados*, government-supported scholarship students sent to the United States to attend college and be molded into model American colonials, others came to study—some with financial support from their families and others planning to work while attending school. As U.S. *nationals* rather than aliens subject to increasingly stringent immigration law, Filipinos could come and go between the Philippines and the United States without restriction until passage of the Tydings–McDuffie Act of 1934. Tydings–McDuffie promised the Philippines independence in 10 years—delayed until 1946 because of World War II—and limited migration from the Philippines to a 50-per-year quota. After independence, Filipinos would be totally excluded.

Virtually, all Filipinos who arrived before 1934 and stayed in the United States were males, born either at the end of the Spanish colonial period or in the first 10–15 years after America took control of their homeland. They came to the United States as young men, but unlike migrants from China, Japan, and Korea, Filipinos had had considerable contact with American culture before their arrival. Because of U.S. educational policy in the Philippines, they had been schooled in English, and most could read and write the language even if they spoke it with an accent. They participated in and followed American sports, especially baseball and boxing. Recognized as natty dressers, they embraced American styles in clothing and learned American popular songs and dances. Taught to regard the United States as “the land of the free and the home

of the brave,” they did not expect, and often challenged, the racial prejudice and inequality that they confronted after traveling across the Pacific.

In Depression-era America, Filipinos were sometimes vilified as disease carriers and criminals and denounced for taking work from White Americans. But nothing generated more hostility than the Filipinos' belief that they could keep company with and marry White women. They, and the White women with whom they associated, frequently faced verbal and physical attack. No longer embraced as *little brown brothers* capable of improvement under American tutelage, Filipinos were instead portrayed as monkeys—primitives lacking in intelligence and not far removed from the violent savagery of the jungle. A gender imbalance fueled the tension over race and sexuality. Before the end of World War II, few Filipinas came to the United States, and as a result, immigrant males outnumbered females by approximately 14:1. Not surprisingly, Filipinos turned to other women for companionship, romance, sex, and marriage, thereby provoking the ire of some White men—not only those who competed with Filipinos for White women's affections but also those who feared that interracial marriage would mongrelize America.

Beginning in the mid-1920s, anti-Filipino race riots occurred in various West Coast communities—in Yakima Valley, WA; in Hood River, OR; and in Exeter, Salinas, San Francisco, San Jose, and Stockton, CA. The most notable violence occurred in January 1930 in Watsonville, CA, where Filipinos picked vegetable and fruit crops. The sight of Filipinos swaying with White women in their arms on the dance floor of a recently opened, Filipino-owned taxi dance hall generated attacks that began on January 19 and continued for several days. Initially focused on the dance hall, the violence engulfed Filipinos present in Watsonville and then spread throughout the locale to the farms and ranches where Filipinos worked and lived. Marauding Whites beat and robbed Filipinos and demanded that they leave the area. On the night of January 22, unknown assailants fired their guns through the walls of a Filipino bunkhouse. A single shot to the heart killed 22-year-old Fermin Tobera, whose public funeral in Manila drew thousands of outraged mourners.

Riot and mayhem offered only a temporary salve for White grievance. Anti-miscegenation laws

promised more. By preventing interracial marriages, these laws would stop family formation and the birth of U.S. citizens of Filipino heritage. As bachelor Filipinos aged and their numbers were not replenished with newcomers from the Philippines because of exclusion, the United States would be rid of its Filipino problem. While the theory might have seemed plausible to some at the time, the reality proved far different.

Despite facing pervasive prejudice and rampant discrimination, Filipinos could legally marry White women in states without anti-miscegenation laws. In Chicago, interracial couples and their children constituted a significant part of the Filipino community before World War II. Even in California, which had long had an anti-miscegenation law, early Filipino/White marriages occurred without challenge into the 1920s because authorities regarded Filipinos as *Malay*, not *Mongolian*. For example, in March 1921, Theophilo Manalo and Gertrude Taylor, the Filipino and English immigrant parents of 1948 Olympic diving gold medalist Victoria Manalo Draves, married in Oakland, CA, and raised three daughters, all born by 1924, in San Francisco.

By the mid-1920s, however, attempts to apply the California anti-miscegenation law to Filipino/White couples became more common. In 1925, when Filipino restaurant worker Timothy Yatko was charged with killing the lover of his White wife, prosecutors won a judgment that the Yatkos' marriage was invalid because it violated the anti-miscegenation law. Released from the shield that a wife could not testify against her husband, Lola Butler Yatko willingly provided eyewitness testimony that resulted in Timothy Yatko's first-degree murder conviction. Although various Filipino aid organizations worked to defend the racial classification of Filipinos as *Malay*, a 1926 advisory opinion by the California Attorney General held that Filipinos were the members of the *Mongolian race* and could not marry Whites. In 1930, a court ruling prevented Tony Moreno from marrying his White fiancée. However, in the absence of a court challenge like Moreno's, couples turned away by clerks who refused to issue a marriage license do not appear in the historical record and their number remains unknown.

The question of Filipino racial identity came to a climax in *Roldan v. Los Angeles County*, a lawsuit brought by Salvador Roldan after he was denied a

license to marry Marjorie Rogers, his English immigrant fiancée. In 1933, the California Supreme Court effectively upheld an appellate court decision that when the state anti-miscegenation law was written, scientific use of the term *Mongolian* applied only to Chinese and Japanese. As *Malays*, Filipinos were not included in the law. On April 10, 1933, Roldan and Rogers married, but the legality of their marriage soon came into question. In March, just 3 days after the Roldan decision, California added *Malay* to its anti-miscegenation law and declared *null and void* all such marriages that had taken place in California. Whatever their legal status, Salvador Roldan and Marjorie Rogers reported themselves as *married* in the U.S. Census of 1940, became the parents of three children, and lived together in Los Angeles until Salvador's death in 1975. Similarly, Theophilo and Gertrude Taylor Manalo remained married in fact, if not under the law, until his death in 1945. As historian Peggy Pascoe has noted, the legal status of an interracial couple rarely came into question unless an annulment or an inheritance was involved.

After Filipinos were included in the California anti-miscegenation law, some Filipino/White couples left the state to marry. Hollywood actor Rafael Lopez De Onate and Ellen Wilson McAdoo, the granddaughter of President Woodrow Wilson, went to Albuquerque, NM, in 1934. Because their marriage did not take place in California, the state recognized their short-lived marriage, which ended in divorce in 1937, almost 2 years after the birth of their son. Like New Mexico, the State of Washington never prohibited Filipino/White marriage; Filipino community and labor organizations defeated attempts to enact anti-miscegenation laws in 1935 and 1937. Although cost and distance could make it difficult, if not impossible, a couple living in an anti-miscegenation law state might travel to a state that allowed their marriage. Thus, because the federal government never enacted a nationwide restriction, state anti-miscegenation statutes could never totally eliminate interracial marriage.

### Anti-Miscegenation Laws Overturned

Between 1948 and 1967, anti-miscegenation law came to an end in the United States. In *Perez v. Sharp*, a case involving an African American man

and a Mexican American woman technically considered *White*, the California's Supreme Court struck down California's anti-miscegenation law as a violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. The fundamental right of individuals to marry could not be restricted on the basis of race. After *Perez*, 10, mostly western, states also repealed their laws. In *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court voided anti-miscegenation laws still in force in Virginia and 15 other states as violations of the equal protection and due process clauses of the 14th Amendment. *Race* as a legal qualification for marriage was thereby extinguished.

Barbara M. Posadas and  
Roland L. Guyotte

See also Filipino-Latinx Relations *Roldan v. Los Angeles County*; Multiracial Filipina/x/o Americans; Racism; Taxi Dance Halls; Watsonville Riots of 1930

### Further Readings

- Baldoz, R. (2011). *The third Asiatic invasion: Empire and migration in Filipino America, 1898–1946*. NYU Press.
- España-Maram, L. (2006). *Creating masculinity in Los Angeles's Little Manila: Working-class Filipinos and popular culture 1920s–1950s*. Columbia University Press.
- Pascoe, P. (2009). *What comes naturally: Miscegenation law and the making of race in America*. Oxford University Press.
- Sohoni, D. (2007). Unsuitable suitors: Anti-miscegenation laws, naturalization laws, and the construction of Asian identities. *Law and Society Review*, 41(3), 587–618. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2007.00315.x>
- Strandjord, C. (2009). Filipino resistance to anti-miscegenation laws in Washington State. *The Great Depression in Washington State Project*. Retrieved February 1, 2021, from [https://depts.washington.edu/depress/filipino\\_anti\\_miscegenation.shtml](https://depts.washington.edu/depress/filipino_anti_miscegenation.shtml)

---

## ANXIETY

---

Anxiety is a feeling of worry (apprehensive expectation), unease, or nervousness. Anxiety may occur in anticipation of future threats, such as change, social expectations, situational stress, or

overload. If stress is defined as an emotional pressure or strain, anxiety can be a normal response to stress. Anxiety is associated with muscle tension, fatigue, vigilance, and behaviors that try to protect oneself and avoid danger. At times, anxiety may be a symptom of other disorders (e.g., biological disorders).

Related to anxiety is fear—which is an emotional response to a threat of a real or perceived situation. It is associated with autonomic response of fight/flight, thoughts of immediate danger, and escape behaviors. For most people, anxiety is transient (i.e., usually not more than 6 months); normalized anxiety is typically stress/situation-induced and can be developmentally appropriate (e.g., separation anxiety is common when a toddler starts to attend daycare). Anxiety behaviors or experiences are typically different in adults than in children.

While it is known that Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs) generally experience higher rates of substance abuse, depression, anxiety, hypertension, obesity, and diabetes than other Asian Americans, there is limited research on FAs and anxiety. Further, because FAs may or may not openly display psychiatric distress or may also feel hesitant to seek mental health (MH) services when they experience anxiety, traditional symptoms of anxiety may be difficult to detect. This entry provides an overview of different types of anxiety that FAs may encounter; explores cultural considerations, such as norms, traits, and values among the FA population; and concludes with a discussion of possible directions for future research.

### Types of Anxiety Disorders; Classifications in DSM-5

Excessive fear or anxiety may occur when people overestimate the danger in situations they fear or avoid. When that anxiety becomes debilitating or interferes with functioning, it may be categorized as a mental disorder. Sociocultural context must be considered to determine what defines excessive worry or anxiety response. Neural system models of anxiety disorders often emphasize the amygdala and related structures that heighten arousal and fear response. There is increased risk of anxiety disorders among offspring of parents with anxiety disorders, though it may be a combination of genetic and environmental factors.

The American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th edition (DSM-5)* has categorized nine anxiety disorders. Obsessive compulsive disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder were previously classified as anxiety disorders but are not discussed here; the rest are described briefly.

*Separation anxiety disorder* is excessive fear or anxiety concerning separation from home or attachment figures; it may develop after a life stress such as immigration, romantic relationship, move from the parental home, or parenthood. The individual may limit independent activities away from the attachment figure (e.g., not traveling).

*Selective mutism* is when an individual does not converse with others in social interactions—though they may speak freely with family members or loved ones. For example, newly immigrated children may normally refuse to speak the new language due to lack of knowledge; however, if they refuse to speak though they understand the new language, they may meet criteria for selective mutism.

*Specific phobia* is excessive fear or anxiety immediately due to presence or thought of a particular situation or object. The individual may go to great lengths to avoid the situation or object and may experience a panic attack if they encounter the situation or object.

*Social anxiety disorder* (also known as *social phobia*) is consistent and intense fear or anxiety of social situations, in which the individual may be judged or be negatively evaluated by others (e.g., peers and/or authority figures). They worry that they may show signs of anxiety (e.g., faint, sweat, tremble, say the wrong thing). They may be concerned that they will be seen as weak, stupid, or unlikeable. Societies with strong collectivist orientations may report high levels of social anxiety but low prevalence of social anxiety disorder.

*Panic disorder* is fear of panic attacks. A panic attack is an abrupt surge of intense fear/discomfort that is unexpected and reaches a peak within minutes. Symptoms may include heart palpitations, trembling, perceived shortness of breath, choking, or chest pain. The individual may worry about future panic attacks, their consequences, and may utilize avoidance behaviors to avoid panic attacks.

*Agoraphobia* is excessive fear and anxiety about public situations (e.g., being in open spaces, staying in a line or crowd, or being alone outside

the home). Individuals may avoid leaving the home for fear of lack of control.

*Generalized anxiety disorder* is marked anxiety and worry about several events or activities. The frequency, duration, and intensity of the anxiety/worry are out of proportion to the actual risk of the anticipated event. The situation may involve worry about health, finances, work, or minor matters. There may be physical symptoms (e.g., restlessness, fatigue, poor concentration, irritability, muscle tension, disturbed sleep, stomachaches, and headaches). The excessive worry affects attention, efficacy on tasks, and is time-consuming.

*Substance or medication-induced anxiety disorder* is the presence of anxiety symptoms that are clearly related to intoxication or withdrawal from a substance or medication; for example, withdrawal from prolonged alcohol abuse may cause anxiety. Corticosteroids may increase anxiety as a side effect.

The final two anxiety disorders involve medical concerns. First, *anxiety disorder due to another medical condition* is clearly related or induced by another medical condition; for example, hyperthyroidism may cause anxiety symptoms (e.g., restlessness, increased heart rate, sweating). Second, *illness anxiety disorder* is excessive worry about illness, concern about pain, and bodily preoccupations.

### Cultural Considerations for Anxiety Among FAs

In general, anxiety disorders are less prevalent for Asian Americans as a whole, in comparison to White Americans. However, it is possible that these reports are an underrepresentation of actual prevalence due to underutilization of MH treatment by FAs. Because of cultural traits like *hiya* (shame) and *pakikisama* (smooth interpersonal relationships), FAs may not seek MH services due to stigma of mental illness and the potential of bringing shame to one's family. As a result of not seeking treatment, FAs may not be diagnosed with anxiety, which then affects overall prevalence rates.

### Psychosocial Stressors That May Lead to Anxiety

There are many FA cultural norms, traits, and values that may become distressing and influence the development and presentation of anxiety.

Further, there are many sociocultural factors that may cause anxiety for FAs—some that would be different or absent for people of other racial or ethnic groups. Following is a sample of stressors that may potentially result in anxiety in FAs.

*Family Dynamics.* Family may be a positive source of support for some individuals, while a source of stress and isolation for others. Level of enmeshment versus disengagement of a family system (i.e., how dependent family members may be for each other) may result in anxiety; while enmeshed families may feel support and connectedness, their dynamics may lead to codependency or children taking on excessive burden of household responsibilities. Disengaged family networks due to conflict of family and work demands (e.g., migrant parents spread in different countries for work) may support autonomy but may lead to isolation and limited support.

*Socioeconomic Status (SES).* SES may contribute to health and MH disparities. Lower SES often have higher rates of unemployment, higher stress, and higher risk of anxiety among FAs relative to White Americans. One study found that FAs with lower SES resulted in more internalizing disorders (e.g., anxiety, depression) than White Americans. Job dissatisfaction among migrant Filipina/x/o workers is also associated with high stress and anxiety.

*Racial Discrimination/Stereotypes.* Direct acts of discrimination such as slurs, indirect microaggressions, inaccurate perceptions or assumptions about FAs may lead to anxiety. For example, some Asian subgroups are subject to the model minority stereotype and are expected to do well academically, financially, and occupationally, which may apply extraneous stress on individuals. Meanwhile, many FAs may experience racial microaggressions not typically experienced by other Asian Americans, including stereotypes of intellectual inferiority, criminality, or racial misidentification.

*Colonial Mentality.* For FAs, the colonial mentality is an internalized attitude that the cultural values of White Americans are superior to FA cultural values. This can lead to stressors around issues like body image, appearance, or concerns about accents or intellects.

*Social Dynamics and Multiculturalism.* Some studies indicated that FA children report higher anticipatory social fears compared to Whites. In considering an individual's level of enculturation/acculturation, stress may result from additional mental/emotional burden of context-switching and internally resolving conflicting cultural norms in each situation. Uncertainty of social role/identity in different situations while living in a multicultural environment can also be a stressor. For example, for FA immigrants, mastery of the English language and accent can cause anxiety because mastery of English can be a source of discrimination that may lead to difficulty in finding or maintaining employment.

### **Expression of Anxiety**

Although anxiety disorders exist across all cultural groups, their expression may vary. Some older immigrant FAs may complain of having *high blood pressure* whether or not they are medically diagnosed. In stressful or in confrontational situations, they may faint or complain of *high blood* to deter attention. Similar to the culture-bound clinical syndrome of *Ataques de nervios*, a phenomenon common in Latin/Caribbean countries, these expressions of anxiety are associated with intense emotional upset, anger, grief, screaming and shouting uncontrollably, attacks of crying or trembling, verbal and physical aggression, and some dissociative experiences. While *ataques* may be associated with panic attacks, they are often seen as a display of distress. For example, it is common for FAs to experience *ataques* at funerals as a way to express personal closeness with the deceased or receive sympathy or attention from others. Scholars have hypothesized that shared experiences of Spanish colonization may influence these similar behaviors.

Another form of social anxiety is *Taijin-Kyofusho*, experienced as a fear of interpersonal relationships due to excessive fear of offending others. Although this syndrome occurs primarily in Japan, it reflects how many Asian ethnic groups including Filipina/x/os and FAs share some common norms, such as emotional suppression, somatization of stress, notion of strong mind and body connection, and interdependence.

## Age and Anxiety

Children generally tend to experience headaches/stomachaches as a reaction to stress; however, bad dreams, night terrors, or feelings of fear/anxiety are common too. Adolescents and adults cope with anxiety through alcohol or substance use (e.g., pre-gaming before going out to manage social anxiety). Older Filipina/x/os and FAs may tend to express more physical ailments as signs of stress or anxiety.

## Research Directions

Future research efforts are likely to focus on exploring the different manifestations and sources of anxiety among FAs, while also identifying resiliency factors and effective forms of treatment. Clinicians need to gain experience in contextualizing underlying factors of worry or anxiety for diagnosis and treatment, considering the client's level of acculturation/enculturation and the cultural appropriateness of the anxiety. For example, for separation anxiety, the expected age that adult children should leave the parental home may vary depending on the level of acculturation/enculturation of the family and individual.

Although many evidence-based treatments for anxiety have been adapted within cultural considerations and values of Asian Americans, few of these have been specifically adapted or tested for FAs. Modifying evidence-based interventions for FAs may optimize adherence and outcomes. Further, anxiety-focused research can examine whether other disparities exist among FAs, based on gender, sexual orientation, generational status, immigration status, or other factors.

Community-focused interventions for education and preventive care (which typically integrate cultural traditions) have been helpful in engaging multiple generations of FAs. These programs may involve art contests, dance, and other social activities, as well as educational programs to promote physical and mental wellness. For example, *kwentuhan* (storytelling) allows space for FAs to own and define their experiences, connect with others, describe the impact of their stress, and brainstorm what psychological distress and treatment might look like within the context of their culture. Studies have found that this less confrontational and

thus more engaging format has aided in addressing MH stigma, recognizing the physical and emotional experiences of stress and anxiety, identifying appropriate ways anxiety can be managed, and determining when and whom to ask for help. Family-focused interventions have been considered strategies for FA children and adolescents—including the utilization of faith settings and evidence-based parental interventions.

Developing multimedia resources to appeal to different age groups and facilitate intergenerational and family conversations can also help in providing psychoeducation about anxiety and other MH issues. Movies, podcasts, articles, social media groups, and community-based groups (e.g., Filipino Mental Health Initiative—Vallejo; Filipino American National Historical Society) can also help reduce the stigma of mental illness, identify community needs, and encourage people to use resources.

*Laimie Jay Falco Posecion*

*See also* Acculturation; Colonial Mentality; Depression; Discrimination and Health; Model Minority Myth; Psychology

## Further Readings

- Gee, G. C., Spencer, M., Chen, J., Yip, T., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2007). The association between self-reported racial discrimination and 12-month DSM-IV mental disorders among Asian Americans nationwide. *Social Science and Medicine*, 64(10), 1984–1996. <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.socscimed.2007.02.013>
- Javier, J. R., Galura, K., Aliganga, F., Supan, J., & Palinkas, L. A. (2018). Voices of the Filipino community describing the importance of family in understanding adolescent behavioral health needs. *Family and Community Health*, 41(1), 64–71. <https://doi.org/10.1097/fch.000000000000173>
- Lau, A. S., Fung, J., Wang, S. W., & Kang, S. M. (2009). Explaining elevated social anxiety among Asian Americans: Emotional attunement and a cultural double bind. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 15(1), 77–85. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0012819>
- Martinez, A. B., Co, M., Lau, J., & Brown, J. S. L. (2020). Filipino help-seeking for mental health problems and associated barriers and facilitators: A systematic review. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric*



*Epidemiology*, 55, 1397–1413. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-020-01937-2>

Nadal, K. L. (2021). *Filipino American psychology: A Handbook of theory, research, and clinical practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

---

## ARRIVAL OF FILIPINOS IN CALIFORNIA, 1587

---

In 1587, the Filipino crewmen on the Spanish galleon *Nuestra Señora de Buena Esperanza* were among the earliest natives from the Philippines to have set foot in California. The landing in the central coast of California, in what is now known as Morro Bay, is fully documented by the captain's log of Pedro de Unamuno. Unamuno's reportage includes the actions of these Filipinos as they explored inland from the coast as part of the landing party, as they resupplied the ship where it was anchored, and as they shared in a deadly encounter with the local Indian population. In contemporary times, October 18, 1587, is celebrated as the first documented arrival of people from the Philippines (and people from modern-day Asia) in what is now known as the United States.

### Seafaring Labor

Filipino natives from the Southeast Asian islands (now known as the Philippines) had an important role in the progress of shipping—dating back to at least the 1400s. Often without acknowledgment of their contributions, these Filipinos were counted on to build ships, including the galleons, to navigate shoals and seas and oceans, to crew on to the largest of ships, and to advance landing parties ready to battle or interpret strange tongues and customs.

Their skills made them desirable and often indispensable on ships of many countries, especially those of Spain during the 250 years of the Manila galleon trade, from 1565 to 1815. This world trade route brought ships laden with products from the Orient via the entrepôt of Manila across the Pacific Ocean to the trading fairs in Acapulco, with transfers to a parallel fleet in Vera Cruz to cross the Atlantic to Sevilla and Cádiz in Spain. In his definitive work on the subject, *The Manila Galleon*, the

dean of the Latin Americanists William Lytle Schurz states that four of every five men on these ships were Filipino natives.

### Logs and Accounts

Filipinos were often overlooked in captain's logs and by chroniclers of early voyages. They did not write the reports on these voyages and had no power to control the content of these communications. Nonetheless, Filipinos made up most of the able-bodied seamen on the Spanish ships even before and after the years of the Manila galleon trade.

The expedition led by Captain Pedro de Unamuno in 1587 was unique in that, unlike other captains of his time, he included in his log the mention of his crew of *Indios Luzones*, which translates to Indians from the island of Luzon in the Philippines. Unamuno mentioned the term *Indios* 42 times in his log. In a more careful reading of a facsimile of Unamuno's log and two different translations, Eloisa Gomez Borah in her 1995 *Amerasia Journal* article determined he was referring to the Filipino natives in his crew in 19 instances. In the other instances, he had referred to the Indians encountered in the land exploration in California.

Unamuno's ship was the *Nuestra Señora de Buena Esperanza*, and his mission was to explore the west coast for a safe landfall port for the trade galleons on their final leg of their voyage as they hugged the coast south to Acapulco. This ship was not a trade galleon, which in 1587 was the *Santa Ana*, heavily laden with goods when it was sacked by the English pirate Thomas Cavendish, just off Cabo San Lucas. Notably, Cavendish's log mentioned the Filipinos on the *Santa Ana*, while the *Santa Ana*'s own captain's log made no such mention. The Spanish government's subsequent investigation over the great loss of the *Santa Ana* eventually revealed Filipino natives on board and their roles on the captured galleon.

### Landing in California

The Unamuno expedition found themselves along the central California coast on October 18, 1587. Despite heavy coastal fog, which is common in the month of October along this coast, the ship found

its way to the then north entrance to Morro Bay and finally dropped its anchor in the vicinity of present-day White Point. This location was determined by several in-person assessments by Henry R. Wagner and reported in his 1929 book, *Spanish Voyages to the Northwest Coast of America in the Sixteenth Century*.

Reportage on the 3-day exploration of the landing party described the involvement of the Filipino natives. In addition to their duties on board the ship, the Filipinos with the landing party provided advance guard armed with swords and shields and as scouts prepared to encounter any unknown dangers and to report on what was found to the captain, priest, and soldiers in their party. Their observations, made independently, were those included in the captain's log, while not always attributed. Such was the first encounter with local Indians by Filipino scouts, who first spotted them. By the time the scouts reported back to the captain and soldiers, the local Indians had dispersed. So, the firsthand encounter with the coastal Indians of California, the very same observations by the Filipinos, were those reported by Unamuno in his captain's log.

### Among the Dead Left in California

Always an equal number of soldiers and Filipinos proceeded in the exploration, which included the customary hilltop ceremony of taking possession of the land for the King of Spain, in which Filipinos were witnesses and participants. The Filipinos left at the beach by the ship also had an encounter with the local Indians, where some clothing was traded. A few were enticed, then forcibly taken, but shortly escaped without incident.

On the third day of the exploration, the landing party was attacked by the local Indians. Four soldiers were wounded by javelins and arrows. A fifth soldier, who did not wear his coat of armor, was killed by a javelin. Also killed with a javelin in this attack was a Filipino. The expedition withdrew to the beach, where the skirmish wounded an additional man before all the crew returned to the safety of the ship. After an assessment of his losses, Unamuno made plans to leave this port before daybreak on October 21, 1587. The ship proceeded without any

further landings until their arrival in Acapulco on November 22, 1587.

Because Unamuno's report on the landing party was the only mention of Filipino crew members that appeared in his captain's log, our window into the Filipino experience on this Spanish ship of exploration provides no more than a brief glimpse. Future research findings may offer a chance for a more informed view.

### Locating the Landfall

While there are a handful of alternate landfall suggestions for the Unamuno land expedition in the California Central Coast, the location most often put forward is Morro Bay. Borah, in her *Amerasia Journal* article, also provides a compilation of the various suggested locations and their published academic sources, including the aforementioned Wagner book.

### Land and Sea

Important research continues in an effort to locate additional sources of more incidents of Filipinos' participation and their contributions to shipping activities, in the era when shipping was the world's largest industry. Some include contributions by Filipinos in their new homes in the Americas, such as in coconut cultivation.

The Filipino contributions to shipping are much broader and the list of related skills of Filipinos much longer. It begins very early in the process with the felling of trees in the Philippine forests, to the design and construction of ships of many sizes, to accompanying ships as carpenters, navigators, interpreters, or even warriors. These roles are explained and documented by William Henry Scott in his 1982 *Philippine Studies* article, "Boat Building and Classic Seamanship in Classic Philippine Society." For example, Scott relates that Filipino shipwrights were often unpaid or underpaid, even though they had the skills to handily lay out and construct large Manila galleons with little or no Spanish assistance or supervision.

*Eloisa Gomez Borah*

See also California, Filipina/x/os in; Filipina/x/o American Studies; History, Filipina/x/o American: Overview; Indigenous People of the Philippines

### Further Readings

- Borah, E. G. (1995). Filipinos in Unamuno's California expedition of 1587. *Amerasia Journal*, 21(3), 175–183.
- Schurz, W. L. (1939). *The Manila galleon trade*. Dutton.
- Scott, W. H. (1982). *Boat-building and seamanship in classic Philippine society*. *Philippine Studies*, 30(3), 335–376.
- Wagner, H. R. (1923). The voyage of Pedro de Unamuno to California in 1587. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 2(2), 140–160.

---

## ARTS AND HUMANITIES

---

The general field of arts and humanities encompasses several disciplines and courses of study. Throughout this encyclopedia, an expanded notion of arts and humanities is employed to create an inclusive framing of the diverse creative activities in which Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs) are engaged. The arts include visual arts, design, film, and media, performing arts, music, literary arts, and culinary arts. The humanities include the disciplines of art history; philosophy and theory; languages and linguistics; religion; anthropology and culture; archaeology; and law and politics. The purpose of this entry is to describe the general contributions of FAs to the arts and humanities, while highlighting the various fields that are described throughout this encyclopedia.

### The Intersections of Arts and Humanities

The domain of FA arts and humanities is structured like a double helix, with one strand following the traditional canons of education, research, and scholarship. The other strand is divergent, subversive, revolutionary, resistant, creative, and expressive. When discussing FA arts and humanities, one cannot disentangle these strands and atomize the field into its constituent disciplines and courses of study. Practitioners, creatives, makers, and doers express themselves holistically within and through this general field as humans who experience the world, while also making experiences for others. They recognize that we are both recipients and contributors to our world, and that the world is of our making.

As a discipline, the arts prioritize the arena of making, while the humanities as a field focuses on the analyses of experiences. The coupling of arts and humanities allows for the development of skills to create but also develops the faculties of investigation, analysis, and abstract thinking. Because these two separate strands are inextricably entangled, a critical examination of both fields comprehensively assists in a more thorough analysis of the lives and experiences of FAs.

### Historical Contexts

The earliest fossilized fragments and slices of human remains from the land now known as *the Philippines*, the Tabon Man, dates to 7000–22000 BCE. Anthropologists indicate that the Filipina/x/o people are of Malay, Indonesian, and Pacific peoples. The earliest metal tools that were found in the Philippines are believed to be from 500 BCE to 1 CE. Used by the indigenous peoples centuries before colonial rule, the tools and technology led to the development of crops, *barangays* (local societies), campsites, and eventually villages near water, making trade and travel possible. Migration led to scattered barangays, which allowed various religions to flourish in the region. This is the earliest rendition of arts, culture, and technology intersecting in the Philippines.

In the Pre-Spanish Era, ancient and indigenous peoples wrote on the barks of trees, on leaves and bamboo tubes, using pointed instruments such as knives, and other sharp tools and the colored saps of trees as ink to spread information. Literature was well developed, and Spanish colonial powers introduced a new way of life that signaled the beginning of the country's initial (and still existing) westernization. Such a notion juxtaposes with the early chapters in Carlos Bulosan's *America Is in the Heart*. While his family work and labor to provide for themselves and his eldest siblings yearn for an education, their labor is an oppressive experience instead of a communal experience that no longer serves just their barangay but also the landowners.

In the Philippines, in the 17th and 18th centuries, the desire to document, express, and voice anti-colonial critique included creating newspapers to focus primarily on news from Spain; eventually such publications became more focused on

literary perspectives over the news. Thus, the newspapers published satires, poems, and news laced with sarcasm and worked to avoid being censored. It was through literary works of Jose Rizal (who published *Noli Me Tángere* [Touch Me Not] and *El Filibusterismo* [The Reign of Greed]) that many Filipino people were called to revolt against the Spanish friars.

In addition to communication, colonizers instituted a public education system that charged these institutions with maintaining cultural and public memory, which led to producing theater, entertainment, sports, and a burgeoning film industry by the early 20th century. This led to Filipinos using the cultural and artistic resources available to them in resisting a foreign invasion, as shown in the examples of patriotic kundimans, subversive plays, and political novels. It is around this time that the first *balagtasan* was performed in 1924; *balagtasan* is competitive Filipino poetry in Tagalog that is presented in the form of a debate. This debate is a literary joust between two poets with a judge or emcee–adjudicator. To speak and write in English is a relic of an American colonial construct forged by the amalgam of U.S. colonization and migratory movements. Filipino (American) formations resist being singularly absorbed into nationalizing rubrics like *ethnic* or *Asian American* and globalizing terms like *postcolonial* or *Third World*.

During the anti–martial law movements in the Philippines (beginning during the presidency of Ferdinand Marcos in the 1970s and later during the presidency of Rodrigo Duterte in 2016), many Filipina/x/o people—in the Philippines and across the diaspora—used artistic mediums to express opposition or protest what they deemed to be corrupt governments. Like their predecessors who were vocal about Spanish colonialism, anti–martial law artists and activists demonstrated through journalism, literature, visual arts, film, theater, and music; they also used symbolism, parodies, and humor as ways to evade censorship by the government.

In more contemporary times, FA artists as a collective tend to exhibit Third World consciousness—an awareness of nationalist identity vis-à-vis the colonizing power that is coupled with understanding the nature of exploitation to which the nationalist group has been subjected. Such understandings

are parallel to 21st-century Asian American poets who had increasingly recognized a multicultural America as the new normal—even as they mapped the fissures, conflicts, and inequalities that characterize this diverse social landscape. Nowadays, FAs (and Filipina/x/o people across the diaspora) utilize various mediums as a way of calling attention to social problems or communicating politically about the injustices in regional and global societies.

## The Arts

As an umbrella term, *the arts* is used to capture any expression or application of creativity or imaginative idea. There are various subfields of arts, including visual arts (e.g., painting animation, photography, film), performing arts (e.g., theater, music), and writing and literary arts (e.g., novels, poetry, essays). This section describes these subfields—citing brief historical and contemporary contributions to FA studies.

Within the field of visual arts, there has been an array of FA artists, exhibitions, galleries, and curators who have contributed significantly to the art ecology. For instance, Carlos Villa was a San Francisco–based visual artist and curator whose work expanded over five decades and included diverse mediums such as paintings, cloaks, photography, and body casts. Various schools and movements provide contexts within a certain theoretical premise or historical moment in which these artists create and frame their works. As an example, FA conceptual artists use ideas as the material for art-making, further complicating the relationship between makers and thinkers. Many FA artists also experiment with the concept of *Filipino* as a foundational concept in visual arts practices.

Regarding comics, animation, and illustrations, many FA practitioners have made significant contributions to the field, expanding discussions around representation and diversity by providing us with engaging and entertaining projects. Animators such as Ricky Nierva and Bobby Rubio have been instrumental in bringing FA characters to life via major studios like Disney and Pixar. Meanwhile, FA muralists have created many notable large-scale outdoor works of art throughout the United States. From Historic Filipinotown in Los Angeles to Philadelphia, FA-themed murals

are becoming an essential expression of placemaking for many FA communities.

Lens-based projects like photography, film, and various digital media provide a context for the proliferation of the usage of these machines, while also investigating how these artists-technicians are pushing the capabilities of their machines to expand the boundaries of imagemaking. Still-images are produced using a camera (setting the foundation of photography); however, analyses inform how this discipline has expanded to encompass both performative and digital works. Many notable documentary and fictional films demonstrate the wide spectrum of cinematic, video works that FAs have used to tell their stories. For example, Marissa Aroy's *Delano Manongs* revealed the untold story of the FA farmworkers movement, while Gene Cajayon's *The Debut* illuminated a fictional family's struggles with cultural identity and generational clashes.

The basic human acts of eating and dressing are discussed to show how food and clothes have helped define the FA communities. These two basic human functions have been deployed simultaneously to gather around commonalities, while also a way to differentiate and exclude from the norms of White supremacy. Fashion occupies a fascinating fit in the FA community to project individuality and to unify subgroups and tribes. Food similarly functions where it can create cleavages between regional identities but also create a unified cuisine that expresses the diversity of ingredients and foodstuffs of the FA communities.

Through the musical and performing arts, there have been multiple sonic and performative landscapes in which the FA community has thrived for the past century. From stand-up to musical theater, dance, experimental performance practices, and martial arts, the performing arts has provided a platform for many FAs on which they can excel and push the boundaries of the form. While FAs have been documented as performing on Broadway since the 1940s—playing non-Filipino roles in musicals like *South Pacific*, *The King and I*, and *Flower Drum Song*—more contemporary FA artists have advocated for FA productions that cover topics like racism, colonialism, and feminism. On local levels, FA university students perform annual Pilipino Cultural Nights (known fondly as PCNs) as a way of expressing their cultural identities

through music, cultural and modern dance, and theater. In families and other social circles, FAs are known to participate in impromptu karaoke nights and talent show—for the purpose of sharing their artistic abilities, for mere entertainment, or for the sake of building and maintaining community.

The FA musical arts include a wide range of art forms, from contemporary pop and hip-hop to more traditional musical forms like the kulintang. Since the 1980s, there has been a thriving scene of Filipino DJs (including DJ Q-Bert in the Bay Area, DJ Icy Ice in Los Angeles, and DJ Kuttin Kandi in New York). Relevant hip-hop artists of today include Bambu and Ruby Ibarra. Meanwhile, Danongan “Danny” Kalanduya was a fellow with the National Endowment for the Arts who championed for the teaching and performing of traditional Filipino kulintang gong music throughout the United States.

The written word is a technological device that continuously shifts and changes, making language and literature a dynamic form to use to express equally dynamic and ever-shifting identities. In the poem *Piyesta*, Ina Cariño writes: “surrendering to a new tongue is having mine sliced.” This slicing represents the ways FA artists piece together and forge parts of language, culture, home, and self to create and craft their art. Writers such as Carlos Bulosan and Jessica Hagedorn and poets such as Jose Garcia Villa had been able to tell stories about FA (and Filipina/x/o people) during a period when very few FAs were represented in the mainstream media. Today, an influx of FA writers and poets has emerged, participating in an array of written forms like novels, memoirs, young adult literature, children's books, and spoken word.

## Humanities

The analysis and interpretation of human activities are foundational within the broad field of the humanities. Within the field, there are various schools of thought and theories about the lived experiences of people in general (as well as specific cultural groups like FAs). Humanists also invite, or give permission to, their consumers to explore new ways to discuss the world in which we live. FAs in the humanities have contributed in significant ways: from understanding how we learn and transmit knowledge, to how we participate in laws

and politics, to how we practice rituals and religion, or how we communicate with various languages. This section discusses various subfields of the humanities, namely philosophy, linguistics, religion, anthropology, and law and politics.

Within FA studies, many philosophical and theoretical endeavors have been grounded in the humanities. The theoretical foundations of Pinayism, Babaylan Studies, Critical Race Theory, and *kapwa* (inner connectedness) abstract lived experiences to create a frame for understanding, particularly as to where the FA community situates itself within the larger U.S. social structure. Discussions on decolonization describe human processes of encounters, erasures, hybridity, and survival. Other theories like queer theory and feminism remind scholars of the importance of intersectionality—recognizing that all oppressions are interrelated and that to honor people's lived experiences, they must consider people's intersecting identities.

Linguistics are important to understanding human experiences, as the spoken language is one of the oldest technological developments in human history. The Philippines, with as many as 187 languages, employing unique linguistic mechanisms such as the infix, has developed a polyglot people whose style of communication is varied and nuanced. FA scholars have highlighted the ongoing relationship of the FA community to the many languages that create vibrancy and richness in communications and self-expression.

Many FA scholars have described how religion has helped FA communities to ritualize our lived experiences and created communities, while also creating divisions. Theology provides us an overview of how the belief in a divine being has created a way of thinking and living. A generalized notion of healing helps us decenter organized religion and focus on ways in which daily guided individual practices can be a means to achieving a specified spiritual state. Relatedly, anthropology (or the study of the cultures, human behavior, and societies) has historically been problematic or harmful toward indigenous peoples across the world—especially when anthropologists center White perspectives and problematize indigenous communities. For FA studies specifically, it is vital for anthropologists to reconceptualize modernist assertions of civility and contemporaneity, asserting that indigenous peoples are not of another

civilization or time but are active contributors to our daily experiences.

A final aspect of the humanities involves law and politics. With the proliferation of social groups based on language, geography, rituals, and theories, an agreement to live together becomes the basis of law and politics. Laws are social contracts that define who is in or out of groups, or who has certain rights and privileges, setting forth a politics that contests exclusions and fights to extend right equally to every human. Throughout FA history, many key laws and policies have greatly affected FAs, including immigration restrictions, anti-miscegenation laws, labor inequities, and civil rights. Examination of these laws (and the contexts in which they were enacted and/or enforced) is vital to understanding FAs' experiences in both historical and contemporary times.

### The Influence of Technology and Social Media

One major overarching idea in the arts and humanities is the human relationship to technology. In the broadest sense of the word, technology is anything that humans create to help survive in the natural world: utterances becoming words, grunts becoming music, fingerprints becoming paintings, habits becoming rituals becoming a religion, observations becoming ideas developing into theories. All of these can be understood as technological developments that continue to evolve over time. In 21st-century parlance, technology has been narrowly defined in terms of machines (particularly the digital machines with which we engage daily), thus invalidating the non-machine technologies like speech, writing, dancing, and artmaking. The arts and humanities equalize both non-machine and machine technological advances.

The prevalence of social media on digital platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and TikTok has aided the distribution of FA art and literature. People post their own works and the works of others; they also share the books they are reading and the pieces they are viewing. They chronicle events, conferences, and workshops, and capture videos of events such as book readings or performances. They can also promote their events, add a visual identity to their art and literature, and create posts and stories documenting their

participation in arts and literature-in-the-making. The presence of social media and digital art has allowed FA readers, writers, and artists to engage each other across nations and diaspora, across time zones, and intergenerationally. Social media has allowed readers to reach out to writers and artists (and vice versa). It allows more curators, editors, and agents exposure to FA art and writing and to solicit their work for future publications, exhibitions, and opportunities.

### Networking and Mentoring

Among FA artists (and arts organizing), mentorship varies and persists. Spaces and events include the Asian American Pacific Islander American spoken word summit (known fondly to many as *The Summit*); the Asian American Theater Festival; and the Asian American Literary Festival. In specific regions, FAs have hosted weekly and monthly reading events, and open-mic spaces and guest speaking create a cycle and pathway of access to more Filipina/x/o poetry. Even amid the COVID-19 pandemic, FA artists found ways to perform new pieces and share original works through Zoom platforms and other media.

Community-based and institutionalized writing spaces like the annual Association of Asian American Studies (AAAS), Association of Writers and Writing Programs (AWP), or the Modern Language Association (MLA), and city, county, state, and national book festivals have always, though sparse in representation, had FA-centered programming and panels. Literary nonprofit organizations have nurtured spaces for FA and other Black, Latinx, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous writers and creatives; examples include PEN America and Split This Rock in Washington, DC; the Asian American Writers Workshop (AAWW) in New York City; the Asian Arts Initiative in Philadelphia; Kearny Street Workshop in the San Francisco Bay Area; and FilAmArts in Los Angeles. These spaces ebb and flow in terms of member turnover and capacity. Mentorship between poets can be found in annual writers' workshops, reading and open-mic spaces, workshops, classes, residencies, and mentorship programs, or by simply reading each other's work in books, anthologies, literary journal websites, or other forms of social media. Such mentoring and collegial relationships

demonstrate how the concepts of *kapwa* (inner connectedness) and *bayanihan* (community) are vital and pervasive for the growth of FA arts.

### Future Directions

While the field of FA arts and humanities is constantly changing and growing, there are many possibilities and directions for future works. First, perhaps artists and scholars can address the existing gaps in the literature, including the absence or erasure of FA artists and creatives who identify as Queer or Trans, Indigenous, Black, and so forth. Future scholars may also seek to acknowledge or address issues like regional and generational differences among FA artists, as well as collaborations between and within Asian American communities and other communities of color—especially as they work against the ongoing struggle against White supremacist norms, policies, and institutional oppression. And finally, future artists may begin to question how to create work that advocates for freedom and liberation for themselves, as well as for the future generations that come after them.

Janice L. Sapigao,

Ricardo Jose Reyes, and Von Torres

*See also* Broadway, Filipina/x/o Americans on; Comics, Animation, and Illustration, Filipina/x/o Americans; Conceptual Art, Filipina/x/o Americans in; Filipina/x/o American; Films, Filipina/x/o American; Hip Hop, Filipina/x/o Americans and; Musical Arts, Filipina/x/o Americans in; Poetry, Filipina/x/o American; Spoken Word, Filipino American; Theater, Filipina/x/o American; Visual Arts, Filipino Americans in

### Further Readings

- Carino, I. (2020). Piyesta. *Ex/Post Magazine*, 2. <https://www.expostmag.com/issue-ii/ina-cariño>
- Gonzalez, N. V. M., & Campomanes, O. (1997). Filipino American literature. In K. K. Cheung (Ed.), *An interethnic companion to Asian American literature* (pp. 62–124). Cambridge University Press.
- Gonzalves, T. (2010). *The day the dancers stayed: Performing in the Filipino/American diaspora*. Temple University Press.
- Nadera, V., & Mooney-Singh, C. (2019). Balagtas beyond Balagtas: Debate poetry, a Filipino Tradition. *Southeast Asian Review of English*, 56(1), 26–44.

- Rosario-Braid, F., & Tuazon, R. (1999). Communication media in the Philippines: 1521–1986. *Philippine Studies*, 47(3), 291–318.
- See, S. E. (2009). *The decolonized eye: Filipino American art and performance*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Villegas, M. R., Kandi, K., & Labrador, R. N. (Eds.). (2011). *Empire of funk: Hip hop and representation in Filipina/o America*. Cognella.
- Yu, T. (2011). Asian American poetry in the first decade of the 2000s. *Contemporary Literature*, 52(4), 818–851.

---

## ASIAN AMERICAN PANETHNICITY

---

Panethnicity is a political–sociological term that refers to the coming together of various individual ethnic groups for particular purposes. The term *ethnic group* refers to a collection or community that is made up of people who share or hold in common a geographical origin, a cultural background, or a national identity. An ethnic group may also be constituted in terms of common ancestry, language, affinity, interest, or belief. In contemporary usage, the examples of what can be considered ethnic groups include Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs), Japanese Americans, and Italian Americans. Therefore, a group that combines many ethnic groups into a larger umbrella group is called a *panethnic group*. Hence, Asian American panethnicity is defined as the coming together of many ethnic groups that commonly identify themselves as Asian American. As a group that is usually counted as part of or belonging to the Asian American category, many FAs oftentimes question or express reluctance about their inclusion in this panethnic group. Others recognize their historical political alliance with it and appreciate the socioeconomic and political benefits that accrue to being members of a much larger, unified, and more powerful group. This entry traces the history, composition, functions, significance, debates, challenges, questions, and social practices associated with Asian American panethnicity, especially in relation to FA communities.

The popularity of the term *Asian American panethnicity* is largely attributed to the scholar Yen Le Espiritu who, in her book *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*,

observed a distinct historical phenomenon of discrete U.S. population groups originally descended from various parts of Asia coalescing into one sociopolitical unit called *Asian American*. This occurred in the 1960s and 1970s when a number of participants in the later period of the civil rights movement advocated for the unification of several Asian-descended and Asian-affiliated groups into a political coalition in order to jointly express opposition against the Vietnam War, to engage with the struggles of Third World decolonization and liberation, and to fight for civil rights. These advocacies also ushered in the demands for justice and equity in educational institutions in the form of greater recruitment of diverse students, staff, and faculty; curricular change; and academic institutionalization. Such a movement later signaled the birth of Asian American studies in academia. In this instance, social scientists attribute to panethnicity its instrumentalist force: the potential and ability of large group formations to be much more effective in their advocacies when unifying together instead of remaining as singularly defined entities.

The term *Asian American panethnicity* may also be imagined as race-based in its overall composition, in reference to the social construction of *Asian* as a race group in the United States, alongside other race groups such as Black or African American, Chicana/Latina, Native American, Pacific Islander, and White. In this case, the many ethnic groups that comprise Asian America may be said to be groups that are also undisputedly racialized, usually as *non-White* in terms of their skin color and *foreign* as in descending from geographical locations in Asia or outside of America. Because the U.S. census wields a strong hand in coding, legitimizing, and enforcing such kinds of racial categorizations, there is a very resilient tendency among its subjects to consider their group assignments as occurring naturally or appearing to be unquestionably self-evident. Such racialized ethnic group categories are then easily regarded as unchanging and putatively geographical or simply based on skin color and the location of one's birth. Therefore, ethnicity and, by extension, panethnicity, is regarded as primordial, as if it is only based on a precise reference to one's birthplace and the location of one's upbringing. This manner of conceptualizing and constituting



one's ethnicity renders ethnic identity to be understood as precise, stable, undisputable, and quite *obvious*.

The ability of the term *panethnicity* to be assumed or rendered as natural and unquestionable comprises its power as a distinct marker of one's ancestry, status, identity, and sense of belonging in a group. Part of this power is its ability to hide the understanding that, like any identity or social grouping and naming, it is socially constructed through an ongoing and endless process of individuals, communities, and institutions determining similarities and differences so as to mark the limits and boundaries of group formations. In other words, panethnicity is always driven instrumentally as it is constituted by consensus building for it to be legitimized. And just like with any socially constructed group formation, such processes are often rife with conflict, negotiation, and transformation. In this formulation, panethnic formations are always situation-dependent, shifting, and impermanent. They are also inherently hierarchical and variable in its size, scale, and influence. These are the reasons why panethnicity, especially in reference to Asian Americans, is studied by many scholars, debated by policymakers, and argued by groups and individuals. The meanings and constitutions of Asian American panethnicity are, on many occasions, questioned, disputed, reinforced, or transformed.

The U.S. census' definition of the category *Asian* refers to persons "having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam." In most reference works, Asian Americans are demographically subdivided into three categories: East Asian Americans (e.g., Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans, Korean Americans, Mongolian Americans, Ryukyuan Americans, Taiwanese Americans, and Tibetan Americans), South Asian Americans (e.g., Bangladeshi Americans, Bhutanese Americans, Indian Americans, Indo-Caribbean Americans, Indo-Fijian Americans, Maldivian Americans, Nepalese Americans, Pakistani Americans, and Sri Lankan Americans), and Southeast Asian Americans (e.g., Burmese Americans, Cambodian Americans, Cham Americans, Chin Americans, Filipino Americans,

Hmong Americans, Indonesian Americans, Iu Mien Americans, Karen Americans, Laotian Americans, Malaysian Americans, Singaporean Americans, Thai Americans, Timorese Americans, and Vietnamese Americans). Within these ethnic groups, there are several more subethnic groups bound according to ancestry, religion, language, culture, or any combination thereof, as defined independently or by institutional or governmental recognition.

Such census designations and classifications may be useful in many ways. Many groups' existence is acknowledged, legitimized, and represented in view of such state-sanctioned recognition and institutionalization. In the amalgamation of different Asian American groups, public and social welfare policies related to matters such as health, education, professionalization, and political advocacy get to be focused on and enforced effectively. Social demographers and community activists are able to identify patterns of illness, educational attainment, voting behavior, social media use, mortality rates, socioeconomic mobility, and other phenomena as they are experienced by both large- and small-sized groups, making data more streamlined and population-specific for researchers, marketers, and policymakers. Therefore, there are so many precise and expansive ways in which Asian Americans, identified as a panethnic group, can be regarded as having their own specific characteristics, sharing similar fates, and proceeding toward common potential trajectories in their life cycles and conditions.

However, there are others who see Asian American panethnicity as detrimental to certain groups' interests and well-being. Many Southeast Asian American and South Asian groups, including FAs, claim that their inclusion within the larger category of Asian American effectively minoritizes or even renders their presence and value as invisible because of the dominance of larger and more powerful groups such as Chinese Americans and Korean Americans, who are counted as co-group members alongside themselves. Big gains in educational attainment by such large groups, otherwise referenced in *model minority* stereotyping, tend to overshadow or ignore the educational needs of smaller groups who are not able to perform better like the others.

In the era of COVID-19, such lumping of many different people into one large *Asian* group

("because they all look the same," as has been frequently heard) has resulted in hateful, violent, and deadly acts toward any or all of its assumed members, as they have been blanketly stigmatized to be the sources and spreaders of the virus. These incidents have caused many to sadly remember and recognize the many antecedents of such group-directed violence in U.S. history, leading them to question their panethnic identification. At the same time, others have called for a renewed strengthening of Asian American group power as a defense against group targeting.

Nevertheless, frequent calls for disaggregating Asian American panethnic formulations in education-related policies and public health programs, as well as in the contexts of media representation, have been made in order to better account for and calculate the needs of more specific groups within them. Many have continued this kind of advocacy by pointing out the seeming heterogeneity of population groups under Asian American by accounting for the sheer varieties of languages spoken, religious beliefs, sociopolitical configurations, gender, sex, sexuality identifications, and cultural practices within it that can cumulatively cause (or produce) differences rather than commonalities.

Moreover, some scholars and community activities in FA communities have questioned their inclusion in the category Asian American due to matters of unsuitability or incommensurability. They feel that their historical experiences of colonization, the ways in which they are racialized, or their professed faiths make them different from others who call themselves Asian American. They have also experienced and expressed powerlessness against other groups within it or have felt very little historical affiliation or identification as an Asian American in their upbringing, when compared with the rest. For example, those who experienced life during and after World War II may continue to harbor negative sentiments against Japanese forces who forcibly occupied their homeland, and so they would choose not to be identified alongside other Asians. Some of them, including those who are mostly later-generation FAs who attend high school and college, have even shown greater identification with Latinx, Black, or Pacific Islander panethnic groups because of skin color, political affiliation, or cultural affinity. Some of them have opted to be

categorized simply as Filipinx or FA, with no reference to being Asian American.

These instances of consensus and conflict highlight Asian American panethnicity's malleable feature, its ways of contracting and expanding, and its susceptibility to debate and contestation over time and space. Many questions have arisen along these lines: What and who gets to be dominant or erased in such a heterogeneous category? Whose interests and needs get to be prioritized, recognized, and unrecognized? Who should step back to give way to others? Who gets to decide or be in leadership positions? Who gets to represent the group? Who gets to be designated as majority and minority? If so, what should be done with those who are racially, culturally, religiously, or linguistically different from the majority? How should internal hierarchies and ethnocentric practices be challenged and avoided? What about those who have been socialized or brought up differently from the others, and therefore identify differently? How about biracial or mixed-race people, adoptees, and parentless? Transnationals or those who travel back and forth across two or more nations and cultures? Refugees or those whose immigration experiences are qualitatively different from the majority? Native American, Middle Easterners, and Pacific Islanders (the group that has been most associated with Asian Americans, but in ways that have been challenged, refuted, and now usually disentangled), and some other groups that have expressed some form of affinity, connection, or identification with Asian Americans?

Such questions animate significant matters of inclusion and exclusion, making Asian American panethnicity, just like other panethnic formations, always a critically contested site of difference and power. Throughout history, ethnicity has been wielded to justify the promulgation and practice of exclusionary and oppressive laws and policies targeting particular Asian and other groups. In places within and outside of the United States, there have been instances of violence in the name of ethnic pride, ethnic cleansing, and ethnic power. Many of these have been sanctioned by the state and enforced by the police, while others have been done extrajudicially or by way of extremist and militant group actions. But in many other instances, ethnicity and panethnicity have also been invoked

by people and institutions to celebrate cultural pride, to represent and recognize ethnic history and identity, and to mark and display ethnic belonging and feeling, in forms such as music, rap, poetry, prose, the visual arts, and drama.

Among a diversity of groups and within a profusion of social media and face-to-face locations, advertising, marketing, and publishing entities, there are ethnic-inspired tattooing practices, ethnic clothing, ethnic art, ethnic music, and ethnic programming especially in local communities, campuses, and other public spaces to stimulate ethnic revivals, to promote and observe cultural awareness, and to preserve and keep alive historical memory. All of these are strong testaments to the prolific and dynamic exercise of panethnicity as an ongoing or endless process of bringing together what appears to be, in overt or covert ways, diverse, multiple, intersecting, multifaceted, and heterogeneous definitions and calculations of selves, cultures, communities, and locations. They are also powerful and vibrant demonstrations of the histories, realities, and complexities of group formulations and formations that are constantly reinvented, debated, and transformed for the sake of belonging, demarcating, and naming.

Rick Bonus

See also Asian American Studies; Ethnic Studies; Filipina/x/o American Studies; Filipino–Black Relations; Filipino–Latinx Relations; Filipino–Pacific Islander Relations

### Further Readings

- Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities*. Temple University Press.
- Ocampo, A. C. (2013). “Am I really Asian?”: Educational experiences and panethnic identification among second-generation Filipino Americans. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 16(3), 295–324.
- Ocampo, A. C. (2016). *The Latinos of Asia: How Filipino Americans break the rules of race*. Stanford University Press.
- Okamoto, D. (2014). *Redefining race: Asian American panethnicity and shifting ethnic boundaries*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Strobel, L. M. (2000). “Born-again Filipino”: Filipino American identity and Asian panethnicity. In L. Buell,

R. C. Sander, J. Flores, & M. G. Henderson (Eds.), *Postcolonial theory and the United States: Race* (p. 349). University Press of Mississippi.

---

## ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

---

Asian American Studies (AAS) began at San Francisco State College as a political project, product of the student-led strike of 1968–1969 and component of the campaign to establish a School of Third World Studies. An unknown authority substituted *ethnic studies* for *Third World Studies* before the strike settlement in March 1969. Since then, wherever ethnic studies exist, institutional racism and the imperious politics of traditional academia have brought several existential challenges. **This entry discusses AAS from a structural, realpolitik Filipina/x/o American (FA) perspective.**

### Intentions, Origin, San Francisco State College

At SF State, three Asian American (AA) student organizations working on social and political projects in their respective communities—the Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA, a predominantly Japanese American organization), the Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action (ICSA), and the Philippine American Collegiate Endeavor (PACE)—coalesced around three principles: self-determination, representation, and community service. With pedagogy and praxis considered radical at the time, they constructed a curriculum for a School of Third World Studies that provided data and perspectives on their communities’ histories, cultures, and socioeconomic realities. The founders of AAS at SF State were determined to change the character of the college, believing that the purpose of the college should be to serve communities, and not to remove or *save* students from communities. Malcolm Collier and Daniel Phil Gonzales, who were among the students who established AAS, wrote further, “On a broad scale, we wanted the college to become a place in which the history, culture, communities—which is to say the realities of Asian American experience—would be accepted as legitimate” (Collier & Gonzales, 2019, p. 52).

### Third World Cognizance

Many SF State strikers were first-generation immigrants from Mexico, Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia. Others were second and third generation: U.S.-born to immigrant parents. Student activists of color developed a critical understanding of colonial and neocolonial exploitation of the Third World that spurred cooperative thought and action. To participate in the coalition, subscription to a particular ideology was not required. Critical awareness of serious social issues and conditions and a commitment to addressing them were.

French demographer Alfred Sauvy, credited with the first publication of the term *Third World* in 1952, used the term to describe countries not aligned with either the communist Soviet bloc or the capitalist North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bloc of the cold war era. Dr. Juan Martinez brought the concept to the Black Students Union (BSU), PACE, and Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC) in 1968, citing psychiatrist and political theorist Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth*. Consequently, the BSU established the Third World Liberation Front. PACE and MASC were the first organizations to join, followed by ICSA, AAPA, and the Latin American Students Organization.

### Representation, Self-determination, Curriculum Development

AAS founders developed a two-tier curriculum on a base of pan-ethnic courses rooted in shared or comparative historical, socioeconomic, and aesthetic experiences. Each of the three original AA ethnic groups developed up to five ethnic-specific courses as the second tier. Both components employed interdisciplinary approaches to history, identity, literature, art, and language. In the fall semester of 1969, AAS presented an initial offering of 18 courses.

Pilipino American Studies (PAS) developed a stable of eight courses in the first 5 years. Classes with historical, psychosocial, and community activism content were offered per semester, with courses about literature or art rotated once a year. Growth in the number of PAS classes with distinct titles and content during the first decade of Ethnic Studies at SF State stood in vivid contrast to AAS

on other campuses. Elsewhere, courses with exclusively Filipino content were scarce commodities: Filipino American content was often relegated to a single "Filipino American Experience" class or a portion of a pan-ethnic course.

### Building Enrollment

In 1969, General Studies (GS) provided students with foundational knowledge consistent with life-long learning. In the first semester of AAS, fall 1969, all courses were electives with no GS accreditation. Generating student interest in AAS was challenging, but the lack of GS value was prohibitive. The student founders applied for GS credit for AAS courses in spring 1970 and secured GS approval for several courses offered in fall 1970 and forward.

### Demographics and AAS Curriculum Development

The U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 resulted in a rapid increase in the Chinese American and Filipino American population of the San Francisco Bay Area. Demand for multiple sections of AAS courses increased as more students from these two communities arrived at SF State in the early and mid-1970s. A surge of Vietnamese refugee arrivals followed the fall of Saigon in 1975. While there was a significant increase in the SEA population in the late 1970s, children of the initial surge would arrive on campus in greater numbers in the 1980s.

A full-time equivalent student (FTES) is the unit of measure that connects student population to college and university budgets. One FTES is the equivalent of one student carrying 15 units. When the School of Ethnic Studies began offering classes, there was a direct relationship between department FTES and the department operating budget, expressed in full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF). Increasing student enrollment enabled requests for more faculty time, resulting in AAS curriculum and faculty to grow steadily from 1970 to the mid-1990s.

Whether to establish an AAS BA degree program was heavily debated in the second year of AAS. The matter was set aside because offering a degree was not required to have departmental status. The AAS

faculty established an MA program in the late 1980s when it was clear that the department could bear higher cost graduate-level faculty teaching units. AAS students developed a firm pedagogical rationale and organized a movement to establish the AAS Bachelor's program in 1998.

Department faculty practiced ethnic, gender, and sexuality representation in their requests for new faculty positions. In the 1980s, more Chinese American, Filipino American, and Japanese American faculty were hired, with women a continuous preference. Vietnamese American and Korean American faculty were brought on as lecturers and tenure-track faculty. In the 1990s, faculty of mixed race and mixed ethnicities were brought on. A South Asian was hired during the 2000s after years of highly competitive searches.

The importance of AA students being located at a university with a 28% AA student population amid one of the highest geographic concentrations of diverse Asian American people cannot be overstated. It is a clearly positive enrollment factor, but it is also the locus of political power. The power of organized student action was demonstrated, once again, in 2016 with peaceful protests and a hunger strike against severe budget cuts to the College of Ethnic Studies (CoEs). The students received high-profile support from local communities of color and national and international media coverage. Under pressure from the public, statewide politicians, and state university central administration, SFSU President Les Wong rescinded most of the forced reductions, saving dozens of lecturer positions and course sections.

### **General Education, FTES, and the "GE Wars"**

The most serious existential threat to the School of Ethnic Studies in its first decade at SF State was the General Education Program, implemented in 1976.

To build enrollment and satisfy FTES requirements, Ethnic Studies acquired GS accreditation for about 70% of courses offered by its four departments by fall 1974. The associate vice president of Undergraduate Studies assessed the completed forms and pertinent course materials under applicable GS criteria. With the AVP's approval, the course was listed as satisfying a specific GS

requirement such as U.S. History, first-year English, and Statistics. Reacting to indications of significant student underperformance on knowledge and skills assessments, the SFSC Academic Senate targeted the lower division GS program for reform. A General Education (GE) Policy and accreditation structure intended to raise instructional standards, which was proposed by the Academic Senate and approved by the college president, began in 1976.

### **General Education as Academic Apartheid**

A *lead school* construct was at the core of the new GE policy and sanctioning structure. The schools of Science, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Humanities, and Creative Arts—acting in concert as the General Education Council (GEC)—were charged as *lead schools* with exclusive authority to approve or disapprove courses for GE accreditation. This disadvantaged nonlead schools: Ethnic Studies, Education, Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Studies (HPERLS), and Business. Lead schools could increase their own stock of GE-approved courses and reduce participation of other schools and departments.

If Ethnic Studies could not acquire GE accreditation for at least 50% of its formerly GS-accredited courses, it would suffer immediate and continuous decline in FTES, resulting in drastic reductions in FTEF and course sections. After 2 years of failing negotiations with the GEC, the Third World Council of the School of Ethnic Studies adopted a plan devised by AAS faculty. Ethnic Studies allied with the Schools of Education and HPERLS and argue before the Academic Senate and subcommittees against the patent inequity and unfairness of the GE Policy and the structure and function of the GEC.

By 1980, the AAS strategy had resulted in modification of GE accreditation criteria and secured Ethnic Studies representation on the GEC and its subcommittees for itself and its allies. The Ethnic Studies faculty engaged in a complete reconstruction of each department's curriculum to conform to the adjusted GE Policy. Results of the conversion process were mixed: The AAS curriculum suffered substantial damage. Satisfaction of complex certification criteria required recombination of courses with detailed, sequenced content into fewer courses, often two or three courses combined into one. Loss of scope and detail resulted.

By 1990, Ethnic Studies acquired accreditation for 90% of its courses. AAS achieved certification for 100% of curricular proposals to the GEC, including all Filipino American classes. AAS and sister departments of the CoEs received approval from internal and external reviewers of the AAS GE curriculum in 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2019–2020.

## AAS Overview

### **Politics and Reductive Economics**

The six-decade-long shift of U.S. politics to the right and a series of economic recessions caused a far-reaching implementation of reduced government funding of public education. The cumulative effect of shrinking budgets prompted increases in tuition, competition for private corporation funding, and the movement from FTES-based funding to *dollar-based budgeting* that vested power of resource distribution in campus presidents. Even the largest AAS programs faced constant jeopardy of budget cuts that constricted their ability to fulfill academic responsibilities to their students and endangered faculty careers.

### **Racialized Politics of Academe**

Conservative members of college and university boards of trustees and state legislatures have established patterns of resistance and outright antagonism to ethnic studies, anti-racism pedagogies, and corrective history projects. These patterns extend to budgetary decisions made in times of economic stress. Academic units and individual faculty engaged in ethnic studies are perennial targets for defunding and denials of tenure or promotion.

### **Professionalism and Academic “Legitimacy”**

In the early years of AAS at UC Berkeley, community-centric student founders resisted the movement among faculty to perform *academic work* to legitimize the program. Sucheng Chan refers to the conflict as between *revolutionaries and reformers*. Granting tenure to faculty was necessary to stabilize the program, but the UC system required the PhD plus substantial publication—the well-known *publish or perish* standard. The *reformer* PhDs overcame internal resistance and external political

challenges from anti-ethnic studies elements among colleagues and administrators. The State College system required substantive expertise in an academic field and proven teaching ability, PhD not required. The CSU system would gradually move to the PhD-or-equivalent-preferred-plus-publication standard in the 1980s and PhD-required in the 1990s. The change is clearly reflected in the post-1981 AAS hiring pattern.

### **Location and Size**

While there are at least 26 AAS degree-granting programs in the United States, the three with the highest numbers of graduates are all in California. Location near a substantial AA population is vital to enrollment, program health, resilience, and political defensibility. Degree programs have specific enrollment criteria. Smaller AAS degree programs located in areas with low or distant AA populations are subject to chronic anxiety about fulfilling minimum enrollment criteria.

### **General Education**

Whether an AAS course at a given institution is an elective or satisfies one or more GE requirements is an essential structural matter. Although several East Coast and West Coast colleges and universities have instituted an ethnic studies graduation requirement, it can be fulfilled by enrollment in one course from a list of choices. Institutions would do well to offer a range of courses creditable toward completing an AAS minor or major that also satisfy GE requirements. Although the observations and analyses of Sucheng Chan over five decades of her history in the field are more accurate than not, she provides no comparative perspective on this important structural factor.

### **Asian American Invisibility**

Christine Zhang, a data journalist, offers a salient hypothesis: AA invisibility has to do with the relationships among low demographic data representation, low voter participation, aggregation of data under the rubric *Asian American* or *Other*, and lack of funding for large-scale studies. Her perspective indirectly points to the social and political potentials of data from the 2020 census of individual Asian ethnic groups.

In a 2013 article in the Yale Divinity School journal *Reflections*, Keun-Joo Christine Pae links Asian American invisibility to U.S. history of wars in Asia. She discusses the etymology of the racist epithet *gook* in the Korean War context, offering a credible Korean language-linked source for the word and its denigrating use against Asians in general. However, Pae ignores another etymological hypothesis explaining *gook* as derivative of *goo-goo* as used in the U.S.–Philippines War around 1898–1902. Citing the effects of the familiar stereotypes *model minority* and *perpetual foreigner*, Pae’s discussion is an apt explanation of anti-Asian loathing and hatred, but it bears indications of exclusionary interethnic bias.

### **Filipino Invisibility and Asian Americanness**

In 2016, E. J. R. David wrote about the high incidence of Filipino experiences with racist microaggressions that differed from those experienced by other Asian Americans: For instance, contrary to the *model minority* myth, Filipinos are often assumed to have inferior status or intellect. Philippines-trained professionals are treated as not being as good as others. They are often seen as deviant in some way (e.g., being a gang member or a criminal), which are microaggressions that are also commonly experienced by non-Asian American groups such as African Americans, Latinas/os, and Native Americans.

David asks for an explanation of the exclusion of Filipinos by other Asian Americans from the broader discourse on AA invisibility. The causes seem as much to do with how Filipinos see themselves as to how others see them.

At the time of the introduction of the term *Asian American* by Emma Gee and Yuji Ichioka at UC Berkeley, some FAs wondered whether they belonged in the category. East Asians wondered as well. The Philippines was for 333 years a Spanish colony and for 48 years a U.S. territory. Both conditions had substantial dis-Asianizing cultural and political effects. Further, Filipina/x/os are generally darker skinned than East Asians. Many Filipina/x/os valued the Philippines’ *special relationship* with the United States, ironically ignoring the U.S.–Philippine War began that relationship. Standing apart, Filipinos are unseen, dismissible; thus, the alliance afforded within the penumbra *Asian American* is on constant trial.

### **Current and Future Directions**

Questions raised by E. J. R. David about interethnic and interracial issues are familiar and aged but still pertinent because they have been only partially answered. At this writing, another surge of anti-Asian hatred and violence draws attention to White supremacy, on the one hand, and conflicted African American/Asian American relations on the other. Yuichiro Onishi describes the history of the latter, the role of Third Worldism in curative solidarity activism, and the need for re-visioning Afro-Asian relations.

### **Ideological Matters**

Although AA Studies as an institution does not adhere to any specific political ideology, many of its founders did. At SF State, Third Worldism was a unifying element. Professionalization has brought a generation of faculty focused on individual achievement within the structure of AAS, but in accord with standards of traditional academic disciplines. Department faculty seem more concerned with growth and maintenance rather than continuing an originalist sociopolitical agenda. The current generation of college and university students, however, has rediscovered Third Worldism as an anti-colonial, anti-capitalist global political philosophy. Many AAS faculty hired post-1990 have sufficient familiarity with the ideological arguments of the 1960s and 1970s to guide present student interest. An opportunity exists for a multigenerational approach that connects the original Third World activists to present-day students and community activists. As Nayoung Aimee Kwon said:

Since the major historical push for ethnic studies 50 years ago with the Civil Rights Movement, every program pretty much [ . . . ] didn’t emerge out of the university and the leaders and the faculty proposing it. . . . It’s usually students and activists fighting very, very hard for years and years before we can push through the inertia. (as quoted by Constante, 2019)

*Daniel Phil Gonzales*

See also Brown Asian American Movement; College Student Activism; Colonialism; Data Disaggregation; Ethnic Studies

## Further Readings

- Barlow, W., & Shapiro, P. (1971). *An end to silence: The San Francisco state student movement in the 60's*. Pegasus.
- Chan, S. (2005). *In defense of Asian Americans studies: The Politics of Teaching and Program Building*. University of Illinois Press.
- Collier, M., & Gonzales, D. P. (2019). Origins: People, time, place, dreams, at 40: Asian American studies @ San Francisco state. In R. Jeung, K. Umemoto, H. Dong, E. Mar, L. H. Tsuchitani, & A. Pan (Eds.), *Mountain movers: Student activism & the emergence of Asian American studies* (pp. 27–55). UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- Constante, A. (2019). After 50 years, Asian American Studies programs can still be hard to find. *NBC News*. Retrieved March 22, 2022, from <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/after-50-years-asian-american-studies-programs-can-still-be-n1022331>
- David, E. J. R. (2016, April 6). Why are Filipino Americans still forgotten and invisible? The perplexing case of the marginalization of Filipino Americans. *Psychology Today*.
- Hirabayashi, J. A. (2009). Ethnic education: Its purposes and prospects. In J. P. Chan, M. Collier, L. Dong, D. P. Gonzales, M. K. Hom, R. Jeung, A. Tintiangco-Cubales, & W. Ueunten (Eds.) *At 40: Asian American Studies @ San Francisco State* (pp. 29–35). Asian American Studies Department, San Francisco State University.
- Onishi, Y. (2017). Afro Asian solidarity through time and space: Roads taken and not taken. In C. I. Cheng (Ed.) *The Routledge handbook of Asian American studies*. Routledge.

---

## ASSASSINATIONS OF SILME DOMINGO AND GENE VIERNES

---

On June 1, 1981, Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes, officers of the Alaska Cannery Workers Union, Local 37, International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), were murdered in broad daylight as they worked in their union office in Seattle, Washington. Decades later, their murders remain one of the most important untold stories of Filipino American, U.S. labor, and international solidarity movement history.

## Background

Both Domingo and Viernes, second-generation Filipino Americans, were only 29 years old when they were killed. Both were active in the efforts to reform the predominantly Filipino union. Viernes was only 14 years old and Domingo 16 when their fathers bribed union officials for jobs in the Alaska salmon canneries for their sons. Domingo and Viernes were not prepared for what they experienced. Workers were segregated—with Filipinos assigned the hardest and dirtiest manual jobs, while White workers given the high-paid skilled jobs. Mess halls and living quarters were segregated, with vast differences between the quality of the food and bunk houses for whites and Filipinos.

Domingo and Viernes, however, represented a new generation of students and workers politicized through the anti-war, Asian American, and Filipino American identity movements. In the early 1970s, Domingo and Viernes—along with other Asian Americans, and women—filed class action lawsuits on behalf of the cannery workers against three Alaska canning companies, charging discrimination in employment, quality of food, and living quarters. With the 1964 Civil Rights Act in their favor, their efforts were supported by Black construction workers and Latino farmworkers. Two of the lawsuits were successful and made history—winning some of the largest monetary judgments for migratory workers of color. The last lawsuit, *Atonio v. Wards Cove Packing Co, Inc. v. Atonio*, wound its way through the legal system for more than 30 years, until after the 1964 Civil Rights Act was eroded and the then right-leaning U.S. Supreme Court decided against the workers in 1989.

Although the successful lawsuits resulted in major changes in the canneries, the reform movement Domingo and Viernes led turned to reforming the union—ridding the union of corruption, bribery, and gambling in the canneries and returning the union to its original mission of fighting for workers' rights. In 1980, the reform movement celebrated the election of Domingo as vice-president and Viernes as dispatcher, along with winning the majority of the Executive Board seats. They consciously allowed the corrupt president, Tony Baruso, to remain for



another term until the reform movement could become strong enough to challenge him.

Domingo and Viernes patterned their union reform movement after the one led by the radical leaders Chris Mensalves, Sr., and Carlos Bulosan—with a particular interest in building ties with the labor movement in the Philippines. By the time the reform movement had taken control of Local 37, the Philippines was entering its eighth year of martial law. Under martial law the president, Ferdinand Marcos, closed the Philippine Congress; shut down the free press; canceled all elections; suspended *habeus corpus*; outlawed trade unions; and arrested, tortured, and killed thousands of people. For Domingo and Viernes and others in the leadership of the union, this was a major concern as they belonged to the only radical Filipino organization in the United States of that time—the Union of Democratic Filipinos, known by its acronym, KDP.

KDP was a leading organization in the U.S.-based anti-Marcos movement, which organized in the Filipino and broader communities to end the U.S.-supported Marcos dictatorship. Domingo and Viernes embarked on a plan to use Local 37 to bring the progressive labor movement into the U.S. anti-Marcos movement. The only major union that had taken a position on the Marcos dictatorship was the United Farm Workers (UFW). Unfortunately, UFW president Cesar Chavez had been convinced to support the Marcos family, which ultimately led to key Filipino officers (including Philip Vera Cruz) leaving the UFW. It was this dangerous crossroads that also led Domingo and Viernes to continue their work—ultimately resulting in their assassinations.

One month before their deaths, Viernes went to the Philippines. Although it was mainly a personal visit, Viernes and KDP also designed the trip as a means to achieve the KDP's goals of building solidarity between the ILWU and the underground Philippine workers' movement, led by Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU or May First Movement). Viernes brought with him a letter of solidarity from Local 37 and a plan to send an ILWU investigating team to the Philippines to document the repression and abuses of workers' rights by the Marcos regime. Viernes was also highly visible when he spoke at the May Day celebration in Manila, which was

attended by thousands of workers expressing the solidarity of Local 37 with Philippine workers in their efforts to overthrow the Marcos dictatorship and restore democracy. Viernes and Domingo were prepared to bring the muscle of the ILWU to this movement, as had been done when they stopped the unloading of cargo from South Africa in the efforts to end apartheid there.

On Viernes's way back to Seattle, he met Domingo and Local 37 members in Hawaii at the ILWU International Convention. There, Local 37 submitted the resolution for the Philippine investigating team, with Viernes giving an impassioned speech for its passage. After a difficult debate on the floor with pro-Marcos Hawaii union members, joined by Local 37's president, Tony Baruso, the resolution passed overwhelmingly when the powerful ILWU Hawaii Local 142 supported the resolution. Shortly after that vote, the plans for their murders were set in motion.

## The Murders

Domingo and Viernes were shot in broad daylight in downtown Seattle on June 1, 1981. While Viernes was killed upon impact, it was the courage of Domingo that began the unraveling of the murder conspiracy. Shot five times in the abdomen, Domingo managed to make his way outside to hail down a paramedic and give him the names of his assassins. Within hours, the two hired hitmen and the head of their gang were captured. Over the course of the following year, they were all found guilty and imprisoned with sentences of life without parole for their roles in the murders. It would take another 10 years before Baruso was brought to trial and found guilty of arranging the murders, making the payment, and providing the gun.

Key to the construction of the murder conspiracy that was laid out at the two murder trials was the formation of the Committee for Justice for Domingo and Viernes (CJDV), a broadly community-based organization that led the struggle for justice in the murders and exposed the hands involved in the conspiracy. Because of Domingo and Viernes's leadership and activism at the time of their deaths, KDP knew that these were not just gang slayings related to efforts to clean up the

union of corruption, bribery, and gambling. Both the Marcos dictatorship and the U.S. government had benefited from the effort to decapitate the movement that these two were leading.

### The Civil Suit, the Trial, and Its Aftermath

Led by the CJDV in September 1982, the Domingo and Viernes families filed a civil suit in federal court alleging that the murders of Domingo and Viernes were a result of a murder conspiracy that included the Marcoses, Tony Baruso, and the gang members who had carried out the murders. Furthermore, the lawsuit alleged the murders were part of a “Philippine Infiltration Plan” that was carried out with the knowledge of U.S. government intelligence agencies. Years later, a confidential Defense Intelligence Agency document was discovered that acknowledged the arrival of high-level Philippine Intelligence officers who would “try to expand ties between the Philippine Embassy and the U.S. Department of Defense and monitor anti-Marcos Philippine activists residing in the U.S.” Furthermore, the document stated, “the attaches will undoubtedly report on and possibly operate against the anti-Marcos activists in the US.” Bonifacio Gillego, a CIA-trained and retired Philippine Military Intelligence officer who had a change of heart and joined the U.S. anti-Marcos movement, testified in the case that this was code language for the use of harassment, intimidation, and physical acts of violence. The Rev. William B. Cate, executive director of The Church Council of Greater Seattle, convened a press conference and announced he had obtained a copy of the DIA document, which then was submitted into the court record with the judge in the civil case, Judge Donald Vorhees. It was never revealed how Dr. Cate came upon the document. The plaintiffs, the Domingo and Viernes families, then asked the DIA for a copy of the report, which they eventually produced in discovery and verified its authenticity.

The case against the Marcoses was further bolstered in August 1983 when former Philippine senator Benigno Aquino returned home on an airplane from the United States to support the democracy movement in the Philippines. Before Aquino could disembark from the plane, he was shot in the back of the head by Philippine military soldiers in front of the whole world—a brazen act

even for the notorious Marcos regime. It seemed plausible that Marcos would have had Domingo and Viernes murdered in the United States if he had ordered Aquino assassinated in such a way.

It would be the Aquino assassination that would cause the downfall of the Marcos regime and lead the Marcoses to Hawaii. With the Marcoses’ arrival, a new window of opportunity for the Domingo and Viernes civil suit opened up, as Ferdinand Marcos had lost his head-of-state immunity and thus became accountable to U.S. courts. In addition, among the jewels, money, and thousands of documents the Marcoses brought with them was an incriminating piece of evidence that Gillego identified as the *smoking gun*. The document was a balance sheet for an organization called the *Mabuhay Corporation*, which was used as a slush fund, or conduit, for Philippine intelligence operations in the United States, including payment for Domingo and Viernes’s murders. The document was signed and dated by General Fabian Ver, head of Marcos’s military and intelligence forces.

In November 1989, the federal lawsuit filed by the Domingo and Viernes families went to trial in Seattle. Along with the testimony of Gillego, expert testimony also was given by Ralph McGeehee, a former case officer of the CIA, who had served 26 years in the CIA with assignments in Asia and Southeast Asia. After three weeks of trial, the jury came back within 24 hours with a verdict upholding the charge of murder conspiracy as brought by the Committee for Justice for Domingo and Viernes and awarded the families \$23.5 million. This landmark decision was the first and only time that a foreign dictator has been held liable for the murders of U.S. citizens in the United States. It is a precedent that has evidently deterred other dictators from making the United States their home and has enabled others to go after other dictators around the world for human rights abuses.

The 1989 court judgment never closed the case on the role or liability of the U.S. government in the murders of Domingo and Viernes. Because of national security and immunity laws in the United States, U.S. government officials and agencies were dismissed from the lawsuit early on. However, it was an important sideline in the first murder trial that remained seared in the minds of those at the center of the CJDV and KDP.

After Domingo named his assassins, the prosecution of the two gunmen seemed destined to be successful—at least until near the end of the defense case when a *mystery witness*, Levane Forsythe, showed up at the trial to claim that he had been an eyewitness to the murders and that Domingo did not know who had shot him. Although the jury did not believe him and convicted the hitmen, the question was raised of who Forsythe was and how he had emerged at the crime scene and later at the criminal trial.

Years later, the CJDV took Forsythe's deposition in the case against the Marcos regime for the murders only to find out he was an informant for the FBI and claimed to have been a bagman who delivered payments for billionaire recluse Howard Hughes. In that case, the IRS disclosed that Forsythe was used as a paid informant despite his committing perjury during the trial of the hitmen. However, a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit against the FBI to uncover documents related to Forsythe and the FBI revealed that the Seattle and Las Vegas offices of the FBI had extensive background information on Forsythe in 1981. This lawsuit, filed over 35 years ago, has resulted in a struggle with the U.S. government for thousands of documents relating to Forsythe and the Domingo and Viernes murders.

The families of Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes still question the role of the U.S. government in the murders, as well as the role of the U.S. government in the efforts to cover up who was responsible for the murders. Questions still linger about how U.S. intelligence may have cooperated with Philippine intelligence in the harassment of the U.S. anti-Marcos movement. Many observers and critics believe that until these questions are answered, justice will not be fully served.

*Cynthia Domingo*

*See also* Anti-Martial Law Movement; KDP; Seattle and Greater Washington, Filipina/x/os in

### Further Readings

Chew, R. (2012). *Remembering Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes—The legacy of Filipino American labor activism*. Alaskero Foundation/University of Washington Press.

- Churchill, T. (1998). *Triumph over Marcos*. Open Hand Publishing.
- Cruz, R. C., Domingo, C., & Occena, B. (2017). *A time to rise—Collective memoirs of the democratic Filipinos (KDP)*. University of Washington Press.
- DeGuzman, M. (2017). *Women against Marcos—Stories of Filipino and Filipino American women who fought a dictator*. Carayan Press.
- McCann, M., & Lovell, G. I. (2020). *Union by law—Filipino American labor activists, rights radicalism and racial capitalism*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Withey, M. (2017). *Summary execution—The Seattle assassination of Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes*. Wild Blue Press.

---

## ASSIMILATION

---

The concept of *assimilation* refers to the process wherein individuals of one cultural group reject their heritage culture's values, beliefs, and practices and adhere to those of the dominant culture. Assimilation is one of the four ways through which people may acculturate to another culture, with the other three being marginalization (not adhering to one's cultural group nor the dominant culture), separation (adhering to one's cultural group but not the dominant culture), and integration (adhering highly to both one's cultural group and the dominant culture). Assimilation can also be forced onto people and is the process by which a population is absorbed into a dominant culture. Forced assimilation is the primary means by which colonizers conquer and oppress Indigenous peoples. Being from a former U.S. colony, Filipinos may be assimilated into American culture even before emigration. This entry discusses Filipinos' historical context of assimilation, the influence of assimilation on Filipino identity development, and the impact of assimilation on Filipino Americans' economic, social, and psychological contexts.

### Colonial Context of Assimilation

Spain colonized the lands now known as the *Philippines* for over 300 years (1565–1898). Colonialism is marked by the colonizer's ongoing disintegration of Indigenous people's culture. Colonizers force Indigenous people to assimilate to a

new culture that they define as nonsavage, more civilized, and superior. In an effort to colonize and Hispanicize the Filipinos, Spanish Catholic missionaries evangelized Filipinos. They taught them the values, practices, language, and trades of the Spanish people. Through the Catholic church, the Spanish forced Filipinos to believe that their indigenous beliefs and practices were savage and that the Spanish way of life was superior and more civilized. One instance of forced assimilation in the Philippines is the Spanish decree that Filipinos must adopt Spanish surnames so that families could easily be traced and taxed by the Spanish government. Assimilation during the Spanish occupation was also characterized by the Filipinos' emulation of the Spanish language, dress, serenades, and beauty standards.

Following the end of the Spanish–American War in 1898, the United States established its own colonial rule of the Philippines, taking possession from Spain through the Treaty of Paris. U.S. president William McKinley (1843–1901) used his notion of *benevolent assimilation* to justify American imperialism in the Philippines. Whereas Spain used the Catholic church as an instrument of assimilation, the United States used the Philippines' educational system to assimilate Filipinos into U.S. American culture forcibly. They taught Filipinos to regard American culture as superior and view American society as the model of excellence for the Philippines. English became the primary language used in government, education, business, and science. Americans propagated their values and ways of life throughout all domains of Philippine society. A group of Filipino students referred to as *pensionados* were sent to the United States to study in American universities. The Americans hoped that the *pensionados* would learn American values and practices, become the leaders of the Philippines, and model their governance and leadership according to what they had learned through their American education, thus reinforcing the need to assimilate to American culture and ways of life.

Consequently, many Filipinos began to believe that America was the land of opportunity and that the best way to become as American as possible was to live in the United States. Because the Philippines was a U.S. territory in 1898, Filipinos were regarded as U.S. nationals and were allowed to

immigrate to the United States and its other colonies. What followed was the influx of Filipino immigrants into the United States in the early 1900s. At that point, many Filipinos were already assimilated into American culture even before their emigration.

Today, it appears that Filipinos continue to assimilate to American culture even before arriving in the U.S. mainland. Although America's colonial rule ended in 1946, its colonial legacies have had a lasting impact in the Philippines. Specifically, English continues to be the primary language used in education and all formal communications. Accordingly, many Filipinos regard English as a superior language and the language of the educated before emigrating to the United States. Furthermore, as evidenced by the extreme amounts of skin-whitening clinics and products, Filipinos' preference for having light skin speaks to their acceptance of American standards of beauty. Moreover, Filipinos are consumers of American media and products even before emigration. As such, it is evident that U.S. American culture remains heavily promoted in the Philippines. Many Filipinos in the Philippines may feel the need to be Americanized in their homeland.

Conversely, Filipinos who emigrate to the United States today may have a tendency to leave their cultural heritage behind. First-generation Filipino American parents may believe that teaching their children their native language will hinder their children's success in education and among their peers. They may also think that teaching their children to speak English only helps protect them from racial discrimination.

### **Assimilation and Filipina/x/o Identity Development**

Immigration and assimilation to the dominant culture have had a significant impact on the development of Filipina/x/o identity. In his 2004 essay, "Pilipino American Identity Development Model," Kevin Nadal discussed the 6 stages of identity development of U.S.-born Filipino Americans, which includes (1) *ethnic awareness*, (2) *assimilation to the dominant culture*, (3) *social political awakening*, (4) *panethnic Asian American consciousness*, (5) *ethnocentric realization*, and (6) *introspection*. *Ethnic awareness* is the stage

during which young children (2–5 years old) realize that they are Filipino, based on their exposure to Filipino culture and language. Especially relevant to assimilation is the second stage, *assimilation to the dominant culture*, which begins around the age of 5 and may persist for a person's entire lifetime. At this stage, Filipino Americans are exposed to other social settings and cues, such as school and media, where they realize that they are from a different cultural group. This stage is characterized by Filipino Americans' preference for dominant cultural values, beliefs, and practices over their own. Thus, a Filipino American will have negative attitudes and beliefs toward the self. They are embarrassed by Filipino cultural values, practices, and foods. Filipino Americans in this stage attempt to assimilate to the dominant White culture by emulating American behaviors (e.g., consuming American media over Filipino media, preferring American food over Filipino food, speaking English only and without a Filipino accent). At this stage, Filipino Americans have negative attitudes and beliefs toward other Filipino Americans, Asian Americans, and ethnic minority groups. They internalize the American stereotypes and beliefs about Filipinos, other Asian Americans, and other minority groups, which leads them to be passive when they witness the dominant culture mock or insult the various nondominant cultural groups. As such, Filipino Americans have positive attitudes and beliefs toward the dominant White culture. This is manifested in Filipino Americans' belief that Whites are superior. In turn, they are enticed to assimilate to the dominant White culture. At this stage, Filipino Americans want to look like White Americans (i.e., having lighter skin, eyes, and hair; and a high, narrow nose) because they believe these physical characteristics are more attractive. In turn, they may want to be in relationships with White people and be surrounded and accepted by White peers.

As mentioned, *assimilation to the dominant culture* may continue for a person's whole life. However, Filipino Americans may experience other stages of identity development in a nonlinear way. In the *social political awakening* state, they become aware of Filipinos' cultural differences from dominant American culture. In the *panethnic Asian American consciousness* stage, Filipino Americans begin to adopt the Asian

American identity. Filipino Americans begin to reject their Asian American identity in the *ethnocentric realization* stage and accept an ethnocentric Filipino identity. In the *introspection* stage, Filipino Americans learn to maintain a strong Filipino ethnic identity while also accepting their identities as Asian Americans.

### Socioeconomic and Psychological Impacts of Assimilation

Assimilation plays a large role in the economic, social, and psychological experiences of Filipino Americans. For many Filipinos, assimilating to American culture means having more access to opportunities for upward socioeconomic mobility. In practical terms, Filipinos who are more fluent in English and more familiar with American cultural norms and practices will more easily navigate barriers to socioeconomic mobility and may aim for—and may be deemed more qualified for—more prestigious occupations and professions. They may also more easily build valuable social connections with dominant-culture people, which may lead to other socioeconomic opportunities.

Conversely, Filipino Americans who reject their traditional values, beliefs, and practices and adhere to American ones may experience more significant interpersonal distress between family members who are not assimilated to American culture. For Filipino American families, differences in generational status and level of acculturation result in various challenges. More-assimilated Filipinos often prefer English to their parents' native language to the extent that they become monolingual. Thus, a language gap is created, and the intergenerational transmission of Filipino cultural knowledge is halted. Moreover, because assimilation to American culture results in the rejection of Filipino values, Filipino Americans who are assimilated may stop observing traditional practices at home. To illustrate, assimilated Filipinos may adhere to the American value of being vocal, engaging, and confrontational. While this may be something that is praised in White dominant settings, at home, family members may perceive the behavior as disrespectful. Furthermore, Filipino Americans who are assimilated may value individualism over family cohesion, a traditional Filipino value. Accordingly, Filipino Americans who are assimilated to American culture may perceive

more dysfunction and intergenerational difficulties within their families.

Assimilation is also associated with more acculturative stress, which is the psychological impact of adapting to a new culture. Specifically, Filipinos who assimilate compromise their group membership with other Filipinos. They are more likely to attempt to leave their Filipino group membership by trying to pass as White. Consequently, they may experience a false sense of self and low self-esteem. Assimilation has also been linked to depression, anxiety, substance use, and social maladjustment.

### Managing the Impacts of Assimilation

Assimilation presents two conflicting cultural value sets for Filipino Americans. It often leads to distress and identity confusion. Nonetheless, Filipino Americans can manage the adverse effects of assimilation by learning to balance Filipino and American cultural values, beliefs, and practices. In other words, adopting the integration strategy of acculturation, being *bicultural*, and believing that one can function in two cultures can mitigate the negative consequences of assimilation. People who are bicultural and believe that they can perform well in two cultures experience better well-being and mental health. Specifically, if Filipino Americans are able to find ways to maintain a strong connection to their native culture while practicing dominant American culture, they may experience more life satisfaction, have a more positive sense of belonging and evaluation of the Filipino group, and experience fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression.

Hannah Lintag Rebadulla

See also Acculturation; Colonialism; Enculturation; Colonial Mentality; Immigration; Internalized Oppression

### Further Readings

- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(1), 5–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>
- David, E. J. R. (2013). *Brown skin, white minds: Filipino-American postcolonial psychology*. Information Age Publishing.
- David, E. J. R., & Nadal, K. L. (2013). The colonial context of Filipino American immigrants' psychological experiences. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 19(3), 298–309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032903>
- David, E. J. R., Okazaki, S., & Saw, A. (2009). Bicultural self-efficacy among college students: Initial scale development and mental health correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(2), 221–226. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0015419>
- Espiritu, Y. L., & Wolf, D. L. (1999). The paradox of assimilation: Children of Filipino immigrants in San Diego. In R. Rumbaut & A. Portes (Eds.), *Ethnicities*. University of California Press.
- Fanon, F. (1965). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove.
- Nadal, K. L. (2021). *Filipino American psychology: A handbook of theory, research, and clinical practice* (2nd ed.). Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Phinney, J., Chavira, V., & Williamson, L. (1992). Acculturation attitudes and self-esteem among high school and college students. *Youth & Society*, 23(3), 299–312. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X92023003002>

---

## ASTHMA

---

Asthma is a chronic pulmonary disease that impacts the airways involved in circulating air to and from the lungs. For people with asthma, *flare-ups*, or asthma exacerbations, can occur. During these exacerbations, air movement becomes difficult due to inflammation (e.g., swelling of the airways and mucus build-up). Although there is no cure for asthma, proper daily management of the disease can limit symptoms and the impact of these asthma exacerbations on one's quality of life.

The airway inflammation that is associated with asthma exacerbations is often a reaction to triggers, such as colds, allergens, or irritants. Triggers are defined as anything that worsens, or causes an onset of, asthma symptoms. An asthma exacerbation can last from several hours to several days. Triggers include colds or other infectious illnesses; irritants such as air pollutants and smoke; specific foods; exercise; and emotional factors such as stress or anxiety. Each person has a particular set of triggers for exacerbation. Thus, identifying an individual's triggers is helpful in management, as

many individuals seek to reduce or remove them from their surroundings or lives.

Aside from minimizing triggers, there are also medications to prevent and control symptoms of asthma. In general, medications fall into one of two general classes—quick-relief and long-term controller medications. Bronchodilators, such as short-acting beta-agonists, open up airways to allow more air flow during a flare-up. Oral corticosteroids are also used for asthma exacerbations to decrease inflammation. For children with chronic symptoms, long-term controller medications are taken daily to control airway inflammation.

In the United States, 25 million individuals, or approximately 1 in 13 people, have asthma. Asthma is slightly more prevalent among children than with adults, with prevalence estimates of 8.4% and 7.7%, respectively. Additionally, asthma has been found to have varying prevalence among different ages, sexes, and racial and ethnic groups. Filipina/x/o Americans (FAs), for example, have disproportionately higher rates of asthma. One study in California found that FA children reported the second highest prevalence of lifetime asthma compared with all of the other racial and ethnic groups identified in the survey. Notably, asthma prevalence for Filipina/x/o children born in the United States is higher than the prevalence found among Filipina/x/o children born outside the United States, with prevalence estimates of 13.2% and 10.7%, respectively.

Several factors can impact asthma disparities between FAs and other ethnicities. For example, there is a significant association between lifetime prevalence of asthma and obesity among FAs, along with other Asian American subgroups. Additionally, smoking is heavily associated with an increased risk of asthma, and research suggests that FAs have a higher proportion of smokers than do Chinese American, non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans, with an increased prevalence among U.S.-born individuals. Further, genetic research suggests that there may also be gene-level risk factors for asthma in Filipina/x/o people; one study found that the presence of the *-590 C/T IL-4* gene polymorphism—a factor associated with asthma—was statistically more likely among FAs with asthma. Medical adherence is

also considered a contributor to disparities in asthma course and outcome. Previous research has shown that, for a variety of complex reasons, ranging from individual patient factors and preferences to patient-physician communication and relationships and healthcare system access and complications, there are lower rates of asthma medication use and initiation among racial and ethnic minorities.

Notably, socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with various exposures and risk factors, such as air quality and smoking, that have been associated with differential rates of asthma. In a nation where classism and racism are inextricably tied, ethnicity is strongly correlated with SES, with racial and ethnic minorities being disproportionately poor and, it follows, at a disproportionately higher risk of various asthma risk factors. For example, research suggests that indoor allergen levels associated with increased rates of asthma, such as cockroaches or dust mites, are higher in urban households in low-income areas, and in those hosting multiple families, than in the suburbs or rural areas. Similarly, smoking, which has been found to be a predictor of asthma, is more prevalent with lower SES. The trend continues with other factors such as air pollution, exposure to stress, and obesity—all risk factors for asthma and more prevalent among those with lower SES. Lower SES is also associated with less access to healthcare and insurance, and a lack of adequate access has been linked to negative impacts on asthma management. Although SES does not account for the totality of increased risk of asthma among FAs, it is heavily correlated with several factors and mechanisms that may explain the variability in prevalence.

Few interventions that have specifically focused on the FA population have been evaluated. Additionally, educational materials meant to increase asthma awareness have failed to address the cultural concerns of many racial minority groups. In a study examining the cultural competency of printed asthma materials in Wisconsin, few materials targeting racial minorities were found. Additionally, most existing materials were identical to White-targeted brochures, except for language translations, and photo changes. Other key modifications, such as reflection of normative cultural values and awareness building around provider practice leading to

racial/ethnic disparities in healthcare, were absent. The creation and distribution of culturally and linguistic relevant materials that are unique to particular racial/ethnic groups have the potential to reduce the increased risk for asthma and its associated morbidity.

Further, understanding the potential barriers to care and adherence is helpful in creating potential intervention strategies. For example, culturally tailored education, simplified regimens, and the incorporation of family supports may help alleviate individual patient factors' disruption of medical adherence. Provider communication training, cultural competence initiatives, discussion of complementary and alternative medicine use, as well as open conversations about patient concerns, may combat medication non-adherence arising from patient-provider interactions. Finally, providers' awareness of systems barriers and reviews of eligible benefits and costs may assist patients in navigating cultural and other potential barriers associated with the healthcare system. Additionally, interventions that target risk factors, such as programs for smoking cessation and prevention, along with

other social programs, may be successful and help decrease asthma among FAs.

*Michael D. Cabana and  
Leesh Menard-Livingston*

*See also* Cardiovascular disease; Health; Lung Cancer; Tobacco Use

### Further Readings

- Brim, S. N., Rudd, R. A., Funk, R. H., & Callahan, D. B. (2008). Asthma prevalence among US children in underrepresented minority populations: American Indian/Alaska native, Chinese, Filipino, and Asian Indian. *Pediatrics*, *122*(1), e217–e222. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2007-3825>
- Davis, A. M., Kreutzer, R., Lipsett, M., King, G., & Shaikh, N. (2006). Asthma prevalence in Hispanic and Asian American ethnic subgroups: Results from the California Healthy Kids Survey. *Pediatrics*, *118*(2), e363–e370. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2005-2687>
- Tran, H. N., Siu, S., Iribarren, C., Udaltsova, N., & Klatsky, A. L. (2011). Ethnicity and risk of hospitalization for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Annals of Epidemiology*, *21*(8), 615–622. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2010.10.015>