

SOCIAL DISTANCE IN ILOILO CITY: A Study of Anti-Chinese Attitudes in the Philippines

JOHN T. OMOHUNDRO

In April, 1971, a demonstration by Filipinos in Iloilo City against a raise in gasoline prices turned within a few days into resentment against the Chinese for alleged hoarding of commodities, and culminated in a rock-throwing "riot" that caused one hundred thousand pesos damage to downtown Chinese stores. The Central Philippine region where Iloilo City is located has always been known as an area of relatively amicable relations between Chinese and Filipinos. But that does not mean that there are not serious difficulties in their interrelations. Arriving in Iloilo City soon after the riot of 1971, I repeatedly heard educated, urbane Ilonggos (natives of the region) express blatant, anti-Chinese sentiments.

* * *

"I've heard that when Chinese babies die, the reason they are not buried is because they are used in seasoned salt Chinese make. Is it true?"

* * *

"The solution to the Chinese problem is mass deportation."

* * *

This paper is dedicated to the premise that ameliorating such anti-Chinese attitudes is possible and necessary. But first those who would hope to change those attitudes must more fully understand them. Here, I shall examine the character of Filipino prejudice against the Chinese. I shall also present a survey of anti-Chinese attitudes which partly eliminates the weaknesses of previous studies.

* This paper is based upon fieldwork in the Chinese merchant community of Iloilo City, Philippines, during 1971-1973, under the joint sponsorship of the University of Michigan and the Institute of Philippine Culture. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the National Institute of Mental Health for this project.

I

Filipino relations with their immigrant Chinese minority have never been smooth. Since the sixteenth century when Spain colonized the Philippines and began to keep records, as well as to influence the relations of Filipinos and Chinese, there have been deportations, riots, restrictions, and occasionally even massacres (Felix 1966). Mass deportation and mass murder are fortunately a thing of the past, but the position of the Philippine Chinese with regard to Filipino culture, politics, economy, and even citizenship is still highly unsettled and a cause for anxiety among the Chinese and outside observers. Disturbingly, this unsettled position of the Chinese provokes little sympathy from the Filipinos (Bulatao 1974), who apparently feel that Chinese economic power in the country adequately compensates them for their handicaps. Instead, the Chinese serve as scapegoats for many of the ills of the country: political corruption, inflation and hoarding, the black market, and communist subversion.

The similarity of the Chinese in Southeast Asia and the Jews in Europe has frequently been alluded to and occasionally analyzed (Eitzen 1968; Wertheim 1964). But the comparison does break down at certain points of importance for this paper. Weightman and Coller have already drawn attention to these differences for the Philippine Chinese. The Philippine Chinese, for example, are immigrants from a nation that is now thriving and (perceived as) a serious threat to the security of the Philippines. This was not the case for the European Jews. There are also qualitative differences in cultures and personalities between the Jews and gentiles in Europe, on the one hand, and the Chinese and Filipinos in Asia, on the other. The cultural differences, especially, may be great enough to require more than one definition of the very nature of the prejudice.

There are many facets to the "dynamics of animosity" between the Chinese and Filipinos. There is both class-hatred and city-hatred in Filipino anti-sinicism. Most Filipinos are poor and rural, whereas most Chinese are middle class and urban. There is even an element of "group self-hatred" in Filipino attitudes. That is, the Chinese are rejected for representing the oriental elements in Filipino culture and physique which must be eliminated in order to be more fully "westernize" (Weightman 1967). For the many educated Filipinos, with their strong sense of nationalism, the Chinese are feared as fronts for and supporters of an imported communism from China. The Chinese con-

centration in the vital and profitable commercial sector of the economy has been somewhat forced on them historically, but nevertheless their success has been an obstacle to a rising Filipino commercial class. Such direct competition, even more than economic dependence, has and will precipitate expressions of animosity.

Not all regions and social strata of Filipinos feel the same way about the Chinese, but there has been little careful inquiry into variation within the country. It is popular knowledge that the Ilocano-speaking regions of Luzon are the most anti-Chinese, whereas the Muslim Filipinos of Mindanao are considered in the main very tolerant. The Ilonggo- and Cebuano-speakers of central Philippines, popularly considered easy-going sorts, harbor less animosity and express it less than the Tagalog speakers of Manila. It remains to be shown that these popular conceptions are a social reality.

Researchers have perpetuated a number of basic errors in examining Filipino stereotypes of Chinese and social distance from them. Sampling was often haphazard and most of the population of the Philippines was never represented. Cities other than Manila have rarely been surveyed. Tests were usually in English and tediously long for the respondents, who were often students in the major universities in Manila. Chester Hunt has argued that these persons represent the decision-makers in the nation's near future. But so large a segment of the Filipino population is omitted by this reasoning that any real understanding of Filipino prejudice cannot be achieved.

Sampling problems are rather insignificant in comparison with the cultural appropriateness of the tests used. Most tests were developed in the United States with white anti-Negro prejudice in mind. George Weightman has consistently called attention to the culture-bound nature of the social instruments, for example. He argues that the particularism of Filipino social relationships makes prejudice more differentiated than in the U.S. The Western paradigms of anti-Negro prejudice do not apply, and the classic Bogardus social distance situations will not scale. Unlike U. S. prejudice patterns, Filipino ethnic animosity against the Chinese for example does not categorically restrict intermarriage between individuals. The social distance situations themselves could be misconstrued completely by respondents in Filipino culture, and the analyst, blithely assuming congruence between Filipino and American prejudice, would falsely interpret results. For example, having other ethnic groups for neighbors is far less noxious to Filipinos than to

Americans because the homogeneous community with residential standards is a rarity; expensive homes and squatters' shacks can be found next door to one another all across the nation. Clearly some care must be exercised in choosing the social distance situations to apply to the Filipino context, and even greater care must be shown in interpreting the results.

II

During my anthropological field work in the Chinese community of Iloilo City, the subject of Filipino anti-Sinicism was constantly before me. I was mindful of the limitations of the attitude tests in the Philippine context, but I felt compelled to make some survey of Ilonggo attitudes toward the Chinese. I chose the social distance test, greatly modified from Bogardus' original design, primarily because I was interested in ranking the social situations in which Filipinos would feel more or less comfortable associating with the Chinese.

The social distance test was modified in several ways to reduce some of its assumptions and methodological flaws. I made no assumptions that the items would scale, instead choosing to let the respondents' results determine the specific ordering of the social distance situations from most agreeable to most repugnant. To ease the "distortion of self-report" (Cook and Selltiz) which would result if Filipinos over-emphasized their own animosity or tolerance in paper-and-pencil tests, I included the Filipino Muslims and Japanese along with the Filipinos themselves in the test situations. Ilonggos have a great deal of indirect contact with the Muslims of the south, because many Ilonggos have gone to the south to settle. Much of the fighting between Muslims and Filipinos in Mindanao is between Ilonggo farmers-settlers and Muslims. There was also a great deal of contact with Japanese in the towns during the Japanese occupation of the Philippines in World War II. At present, Japanese economic presence in the Philippines is everywhere in evidence, but only inhabitants of Manila have any chance for personal interaction with them. I suspected that Ilonggo attitudes toward both groups would be negative, overall. Comparing these attitudes with those toward the Chinese would give a relative measure of the anti-Chinese sentiment. This could be compared also to the Filipinos' attitudes toward their own ethnic group.

Social distance situations which are particularly inappropriate for Filipino culture, such as dancing and unspecified "partying," have been eliminated. Culturally valued relationships, like ritual godparenthood

(*maninoy, maninay*) have been added. The list of social distance situations included most of the usual marriage, work, and residential situations found in tests to U. S. subjects. These twelve situations were as follows:

1. How would you feel about a member of this group as a next door neighbor?
2. . . . a husband or wife?
3. . . . an important government official?
4. . . . a business partner?
5. . . . your daughter's husband?
6. . . . a Philippine citizen?
7. . . . your employee?
8. . . . your son's wife?
9. . . . your boss?
10. . . . a close friend?
11. . . . the spouse of a kinsman?
12. . . . a godparent?

With the assistance of students in the Social Work Department of Central Philippine University, Iloilo City, four neighborhoods in Iloilo City were selected as representative of the range of urban residents. These four neighborhoods were: an expensive suburban subdivision; a less ostentatious suburban subdivision; an urban street near the downtown business district (where most of the Chinese live and work); and a "slum" barrio near the harbor. Using a questionnaire that could be administered orally or written by the respondent, in either Ilonggo or English, the social work students succeeded in completing twenty-eight to thirty interviews in each neighborhood, after establishing some rapport with the respondents to insure their conscientious efforts to report their true attitudes. Forty per cent of the respondents were men and forty-five per cent were over forty years old. Each interview lasted about fifteen minutes to half an hour, and required the respondent to judge each of the four ethnic groups (Chinese, Japanese, Muslim Filipino, and Filipino) on each of the twelve social distance situations. The project was truthfully presented as the doctoral research of the field workers' American professor. According to the workers' notes, there was extremely little hostility to themselves or the project in any neighborhood except the expensive suburban subdivision.

So for the first time, the social distance test was administered to all ages, sexes, and social strata (with the important exception of rural Filipinos). The interviews were short and in a language comfortable to the respondents. Efforts were made to interest Filipinos in making truthful answers. The social situations were made somewhat less culturally irrelevant and were not assumed to scale.

III

The results of these tests show that Ilonggos hold the Chinese at less social distance than they hold the Japanese, while the Filipino Muslims elicit the most negative reactions. (Table 1). Suburban residents and people of the urban barrios have nearly the same social distance from other ethnic groups. In general, the most negative attitudes are held by Ilonggos living in the urban street.

All Ilonggos rank the social distance situations very much in the same way for all ethnic groups (Diagram 1). They are most willing to have close friends, neighbors, and godparents from other ethnic groups, and least willing to have them as sons-in-law, important government officials, and bosses. There are some notable differences in the ranking of the social distance items: Ilonggos rate intermarriage with Filipino Muslims quite negatively, and they rate themselves relatively undesirable as bosses and business partners. There are differences, then, in the way Filipinos order the social distance items for different ethnic groups. The items do not form a proper scale, so one cannot assume that each item is a marker for a certain level of ethnic animosity. Filipinos seem to be willing to judge each ethnic group in each social situation in terms of itself.

There is no significant difference between Ilonggo men and women in their social distance from the Chinese or from their own self-image. There is also no significant difference between the young and the old concerning Chinese and Filipinos (Table 2). The differences between the sexes and the generations are greater concerning the Muslims and the Japanese. Men and young people are relatively less socially distant from Filipino Muslims and Japanese. Young men in particular stand out: they alone view the Japanese with less social distance than they view the Chinese.

DIAGRAM 1
 FILIPINO SOCIAL DISTANCE FROM SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS
 ILOILO CITY, PHILIPPINES, 1972¹

*Social Distance
 Situations Ranked:
 (Most Positive to
 Most Negative)*

	<i>Chinese</i>	<i>Japanese</i>	<i>Muslim Filipino</i>	<i>Filipino (Self-Image)</i>	<i>Overall²</i>
1.	Close friend	Close friend	Close friend	Close friend	Close friend
2.	Business Partner	Business Partner	Citizen of Phils	Husband or wife	Next Door Neighbor
3.	Next Door Neighbor	Employee	Next Door Neighbor	Next Door Neighbor	Godparent
4.	Godparent	Next Door Neighbor	Godparent	Citizen of Phils	Employee
5.	Employee	Godparent	Married to Relative	Wife of Son	Business Partner
6.	Married to Relative	Married to Relative	Employee	Godparent	Citizen of Phils
7.	Husband or wife	Wife of Son	Business Partner	Employee	Husband or Wife ³
8.	Boss	Husband or wife	Impt. Gov. Official	Husband of Daughter	Married to Relative ²
9.	Wife of Son	Boss	Boss	Impt. Gov. Official	Wife of Son
10.	Citizen of Phils	Citizen of Phils	Husband or wife	Married to Relative	Boss
11.	Husband of Daughter	Husband of Daughter	Wife of Son	Business Partner	Impt. Gov. Official
12.	Impt. Gov. Official	Impt. Gov. Official	Husband of Daughter	Boss	Husband of Daughter

¹ Kendall's W. of Concordance for the similarity of ranking these 12 items equals .61, on a scale of 0.0 to 1.0

² This is a composite ranking for these four ethnic groups. A sum-of-ranks calculation from Kendall's W. of Concordance.

³ tied scores.

TABLE 1

SOCIAL DISTANCE OF FILIPINOS FROM THREE ETHNIC GROUPS
AND SELF-IMAGE, BY NEIGHBORHOOD TYPE,
ILOILO CITY, PHILIPPINES, 1972¹

<u>Social Distance From:</u>	<u>Neighborhood Type</u>				<u>Overall Average</u>
	<u>Upper Class Suburb</u>	<u>Middle Class Suburb</u>	<u>Mixed Urban Street</u>	<u>Urban Barrio</u>	
Chinese ²	2.04	2.03	1.57	1.97	1.90
Muslim Filipinos	1.65	1.90	1.22	1.54	1.58
Japanese	1.75	1.90	1.75	1.75	1.80
Filipinos	2.90	3.15	3.25	3.15	3.10

¹ Average scores on twelve social distance items. Scored from 0 — 4, 0 = most negative, 2 = neutral, 4 = most positive. N = 115.

² Kruskal-Wallis One-way Analysis of Variance shows that the differences between the neighborhoods' social distance from the Chinese is significant at $p < .001$.

TABLE 2

SOCIAL DISTANCE OF FILIPINOS FROM THREE ETHNIC GROUPS
AND SELF-IMAGE, BY SEX AND AGE, ILOILO CITY,
PHILIPPINES, 1972¹

<i>Social Distance From:</i>	<i>Sex</i>		<i>Age</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Over Forty Years</i>	<i>Under Forty Years</i>
Chinese	1.95	1.88	1.84	1.98
Muslim Filipinos	1.80	1.33	1.47	1.70
Japanese	2.04	1.57	1.57 ²	2.04 ²
Filipinos	3.12	3.10	3.08	3.14

¹ Average scores on twelve social distance items. Scored from 0—4, 0 = most negative, 2 = neutral, 4 = most positive
N = 115.

² Significant at $p < .05$, by the two-tailed Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Significance of Difference of Paired Samples.

Ilonggo social distance from the Chinese compared to their social distance from their self-image is examined in detail in Diagram 2. The Chinese are viewed as undesirable bosses, kinsmen, and even Filipino citizens, but Ilonggos are neutral or slightly positive about Chinese as friends, neighbors, godparents, and business partners.

During the social distance interviews, Ilonggos were also asked what they most liked and disliked about the Chinese. Each person expressed in his own words a most positive trait and a most negative trait. While these responses do not present complete stereotypes, they do suggest the aspects of the Chinese stereotype to which Ilonggos assign the most positive and negative values.

Many Ilonggos admire the Chinese as good businessmen (Diagram 3). This attitude is very much in keeping with their desire for Chinese as business partners and godparents: the Chinese are quite capable of making money. Being friendly and generous to Filipinos is also rated highly. This good image of the Chinese relates to their agreeable manner in dealing with customers and their financial benevolence to the Filipino community through charity and extensive public relations efforts. Chinese loyalty to each other and their ability to cooperate get him high marks from Ilonggos, too. This trait most impresses the urban street and urban barrio dwellers — those who live closest to the Chinese business community and depend most on daily neighborhood cooperation themselves. Two other positive characteristics of the Chinese also relate to their diligence in business: thrift and industry. All Ilonggos admire Chinese thriftiness, but it is primarily the suburban groups who admire Chinese industry, being most influenced themselves by the Philippine cultural variant of the "middle class ethic". For most of these traits there is little significant difference between the sexes or the age groups.

There is a wide range of traits the Ilonggos dislike about the Chinese, though they all generally fall under the category of business practices and clannishness. Surprisingly, the most commonly mentioned fault of the Chinese is that "their wives don't control the family purse-strings." Elsewhere (Omohundro 1974) I have discussed at some length the cultural differences in the way Chinese and Filipino families control money and the attending problems for Filipino-Chinese intermarriage. Wives in Filipino culture can own and control economic resources, whereas in Chinese culture as it is maintained in the Philippines, women are propertyless and relegated to receiving an allowance. The poorer

DIAGRAM 2

FILIPINO SOCIAL DISTANCE FROM THE CHINESE
AND FROM THEIR SELF-IMAGE, ILOILO
CITY, PHILIPPINES, 1972¹

*Social Situations
Ranked*

	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Filipinos</u>
<u>Positive</u>		1. Close Friend
(Average		2. Ego's Spouse
Score		3. Next Door Neighbor
3-4)		4. Phil Citizen
		5. Son's Wife
		6. Godparent
		7. Employee
		8. Daughter's husband
		9. Important Govt. Official
<u>Neutral</u>	1. Close Friend	10. Kinsman's Spouse
(2-3)	2. Business Partner	11. Business Partner
	2. Next Door Neighbor	12. Boss
	4. Godparent	
<u>Negative</u>	5. Employee	
(0-2)	6. Kinsman's Spouse	
	7. Ego's Spouse	
	8. Boss	
	9. Son's Wife	
	10. Phil Citizen	
	11. Daughter's husband	
	12. Govt. Official	

¹ N = 115, 4 neighborhoods, all ages and both sexes.

DIAGRAM 3

FILIPINO STEREOTYPES OF CHINESE,
ILOILO CITY, PHILIPPINES, 1972,
N = 132

<i>Most Positive Trait of Chinese</i>	<i>Proportion of Responses</i>	<i>Most Negative Trait of Chinese</i>	<i>Proportion of Responses</i>
Good at Business	32%	Wife of Chinese Not Allowed to Handle Money	19%
Friendly	17	Stingy, Greedy	14
Generous, Helpful	12	Treat Their Workers Poorly	8
Co-operate with Each Other	11	Clannish	8
Thrifty	9	Dishonest	8
Industrious	5	Have Anti-Filipino Attitude	7
Other Traits	4	Jealous	6
No Positive Traits	5	Engage in Practices Bad for Economy	5
No Answer	5	Other Traits	14
	100%		
		No Negative Traits	4
		No Answer	7
			100%

Ilonggos are most disturbed by this trait, partly because they are most positive toward intermarriage with Chinese. Intermarriage of one's Filipino daughter to a Chinese man can mean economic security for a number of kinsmen, if only the Chinese husband would recognize the wife's right to aid her kinsmen. Perhaps for this reason, men are more disturbed by this Chinese practice than are women. There is little difference between the attitudes of the young and the old.

Ilonggos also find the Chinese stingy and greedy. This opinion predominates in the lower classes, with little sex or age difference. The barrio residents and urban street dwellers are the Filipinos most economically dependent upon the Chinese, and they resent it. Other negative traits of the Chinese which show class differences are Chinese dishonesty, which bothers the upper strata, and the Chinese mistreatment

of workers, which bothers the lower strata, being those most likely to be the employees of the Chinese.

The cohesiveness of the Chinese business community which was often mentioned as a plus also has its negative dimension. Ilonggo men complain of Chinese clannishness. I interpret the women's complaint of Chinese "jealousy" in much the same way. The younger Filipinos are most sensitive to nationalistic issues, perceiving the Chinese as unloyal, anti-Filipino, and engaging in practices bad for the national economy.

IV

The anti-Chinese attitudes of Ilonggos is apparently not as strong as their dislike of Filipino Muslims and Japanese, with whom their contact has been briefer and more intense. In fact, compared to other groups including Americans, Spanish, American Blacks, and South Asians, esteem for the Chinese have been rising among Filipinos since World War II. In the early years after the war, Filipinos ranked the Chinese below Spanish, South Asians, Blacks, and white Americans (Catapusan 1954; Hunt 1956). Later in the decade, however, more carefully done studies indicated that Filipinos placed the Chinese second only to American whites (Kanwar 1956; Berreman 1958). Apparently, as methods improve and a greater variety of tests are used, relative positions of the ethnic groups will continue to vary. Such results might not reflect a change in attitudes among Filipinos. For example, how is one to evaluate a recent test (Willis 1966) using semantic differentials, wherein the Japanese ranked higher than Chinese, Americans, or even the Filipinos themselves?

In Iloilo City, the highest and lowest social strata rated the Chinese more positively than did the middle social stratum. Filipinos of the middle social stratum have been fairly well established as the most anti-Chinese (Weightman 1964). This group includes a large proportion of people from educator or professional backgrounds, persons who are strongly western- and middle class-oriented. This western orientation is at least as responsible for middle class anti-Sinicism as are economic factors of competition and dependence. Upper class Filipinos, like the colonists before them, have always had a role for the Chinese, and are more tolerant, or at least more pragmatic. Almost one-half of the upper class Filipinos in Mindanao claim to have Chinese friends, and nearly seventy per cent of the upper class in Manila claimed to have Chinese friends.

Ilonggos rank the social distance situations for the Chinese very much like Filipinos in other regions. Throughout the nation, more Filipinos favor Chinese as business partners than oppose the idea (Boy Scouts of the Philippines 1974). All Filipinos are neutral or even positive about Chinese as neighbors and godparents (Kanwar 1956). Overall, Filipinos are negative about Chinese as employees or employers, but about sixteen to eighteen per cent of both ethnic groups have had the experience of working for the other (Boy Scouts 1974). Filipinos also oppose intermarriage with Chinese for themselves, their sons, or their daughters. This attitude clearly clashes with reality, because in Iloilo in recent decades over thirty per cent of the men in the Chinese community have been marrying Filipino women (Omohundro 1974). What is striking is that, of situations where Filipinos view Chinese positively (as business partners), there are no actual cases in Iloilo City of such partnerships. But of situations where Chinese are viewed quite negatively (as daughter's husband) there are numerous examples. For their part, many Chinese try to avoid both of these situations, so it is not Chinese attitudes which have fostered this anomaly. Instead, it is likely that Filipinos are evaluating the social distance situations sometimes not in terms of what they feel about the Chinese *per se*, but in terms of what the social situations would indicate about themselves. That is, Filipinos see business partnerships with Chinese as a symbol of (as well as avenue to) secure financial and social status, whereas intermarriage with Chinese is recognized as a practice of the poorer Filipinos. One responds more favorably to the business partner situation in part because it reflects favorably on one's self-image. The social situations are already culturally loaded with value because of the existing social practices in the Philippines. Thus behavior shapes attitudes, sometimes.

There appears to be a north-south continuum in the Philippines of social distance from the Chinese, with the most negative attitudes held in the north. Ilonggos are less negative toward the Chinese than the Tagalogs are, in just about all social distance situations. In occupational situations, Filipinos in Manila are negative toward the Chinese, whereas Filipinos in Mindanao express more acceptance than rejection. (Boy Scouts 1974). Ilonggos are rather neutral about Chinese in occupational situations. Relative frequencies of social contact with the Chinese also follows this continuum: Filipinos in Mindanao report more social contacts per week than do Ilonggos, and Manilans claim

the least contact of all. This is in contrast to the fact that a majority of all Philippine Chinese live in the north, in Greater Manila and surrounding provinces. Why are relations with the Chinese worse in areas where they are more numerous? I suspect that the answers to this question will be more interesting and complex than a simple reference to the Chinese threat of numbers.

Ilonggo positive and negative stereotypes of the Chinese are very similar to those held by other Filipinos. The Chinese are given high marks for their industry, thrift, and general abilities in business (Tan and de Vera 1969; Willis 1966; Berreman 1958). Their trustworthiness is most suspect, however. Most Filipinos also consider Chinese as rather dirty and weak, but Ilonggos prefer to emphasize their channishness and mistreatment of wives.

Relations with the Chinese appears to be improving on the personal level. That is, younger generations claim more Chinese friends than the older generations claim (Boy Scouts 1974). But this conclusion obscures too much of the complexity of the situation and may be based on erroneous measurements. In terms of their attitudes toward the Chinese, for example, there is no statistically significant difference between the young and the old in Iloilo. Attitudes have not greatly changed, although behavior has. Young Chinese and Filipinos — especially those in Iloilo's colleges — now have many opportunities for socializing and thus for making friends, in theory. The facility of the young Chinese in Filipino language and culture has made for them many acquaintances, but few friends in the strict sense of the word (what the Filipinos call *compare*). This does not mean that relations between the young people in Iloilo are atypically hostile: I strongly suspect that many Filipinos in the national surveys exaggerate their Chinese friendships. Without playing in the street as children together, or being classmates in public school, or fighting, drinking, and working together, it is extremely unlikely that Filipinos and Chinese would form close friendships. Few of these activities are shared yet by young Filipinos and Chinese in Iloilo.

A more realistic assessment of the trend in Filipino-Chinese relations is that social contacts are easier and more numerous now, but inter-ethnic attitudes are lagging behind and do not always correlate with actual behavior. In any case, true friendship is one of the most elusive of all events in interethnic relations and should not be used as a basic criterion for their improvement.

Is there a likelihood that Filipinos will become more tolerant toward the Chinese when social contacts between them increase? There is a likelihood, but the evidence is mixed. Filipinos with Chinese neighbors are about twice as positive towards the Chinese as other Filipinos are (Boy Scouts 1974). But in Iloilo City, residents of the urban street nearest the Chinese business and residential concentrations were actually the most negative. Neighborhood in the Philippines does not mean what it does in the U.S.. Other factors besides neighborhood may be responsible for these attitudes toward the Chinese. For instance, Filipinos who have social contacts with the Chinese may be a self-selective group. In Manila, students with past or continuous social contact with the Chinese were indeed the most positive towards them (Weightman 1964). But it was also discovered that these Filipinos by other measures were most universalistic, least like the personalistic norm for Filipino culture. It is possible that social contacts with Chinese have produced universalistic social attitudes, but it is more likely that only certain types of Filipinos are prepared to associate socially with Chinese. Until we know this phenomenon better, we cannot predict accurately whether more social contacts will lead to more harmonious relations.

V

In brief, the Chinese are not as negatively viewed as some Filipino ethnic groups or the Japanese. The western orientation of a social stratum seems to be as big or bigger a determinant of its anti-Sinicism than is economic dependence on or direct competition with the Chinese. In some social and occupational situations Filipinos are quite willing to tolerate Chinese, and may actually seek them out. Filipinos from the south have more social contacts and tolerance of Chinese than do Filipinos from the north. Lastly, social contacts with the Chinese are increasing with time, and anti-Sinicism is decreasing. But these changes are not necessarily large or rapid, and vary in different regions of the country. Interestingly, attitudes toward the Chinese are sometimes in direct contrast with Filipinos' actual interaction with Chinese. It is time to devote more research of anti-Sinicism to explaining how such attitudes relate to actual behavior and how both are changing in recent decades.

Anti-sinicism in the Philippines is more than a psychological sickness, made up of irrational leftovers from childhood, maintained in ignorance, and amenable to change through social contact and adult

rationality. But frequently this is the position articulated or assumed in studies of Filipino-Chinese relations. Filipinos rightly sense some genuine Chinese anti-Filipino attitudes which few surveys have revealed but is clearly present (Tan and de Vera 1969). We must recognize too that the Filipinos' entire cultural pattern of personalism means that they do not feel compelled to view the Chinese-as-a-group with anything remotely resembling the close feelings they may have for Chinese-as-individuals. Economic competition aside, Filipinos cannot help but suspect that some of the chaos and venality in their struggling nation is due to the Chinese, who hold a disproportionate and sensitive economic position and whose dedication to the nation is frustratingly uncertain. Prejudice toward the Chinese as a group, in other words, may be an only slightly corrupted perception of actual economic and cultural disparities. It is to be eliminated as soon as possible precisely because it is a short fuse on real and explosive problems.

REFERENCES

Berreman, Joel V.

- 1958 "Filipino stereotypes of racial and national minorities". *Pacific Sociological Review* I: 7-12.

Bogardus, Emory

- 1925 "Measuring social distance". *Journal of Applied Sociology* IX: 299-308.

Boy Scouts of the Philippines

- 1974 "Two minority groups in Philippine society", prepared by the Committee of National Solidarity. Manila: manuscript.

Bulatao, Rodolfo A.

- 1967 "A test of the belief congruence principle in prejudice against Chinese in the Philippines". Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.

- 1974 "Ethnic attitudes and prejudices in five Philippine cities". Manila: University of the Philippines Social Research Laboratory.

Catapusan, Benecio

- 1954 "Patterns of social relationships in the Philippines". *Philippines Social Science and Humanities Review* XIX: 3-8.

Coller, Richard

- 1960 "A social-psychological perspective on the Chinese as a minority group in the Philippines". *Philippine Sociological Review* VIII: 47-56.

- Cook, Stuart W. and Claire Selltiz
 1972 "A multiple indicator approach to attitude measurement". in Brigham, John C. and Theo. Weissbac., eds., *Racial Attitudes in America: Analyses and Findings of Social Psychology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Eitzen, D. Stanley
 1968 "Two minorities: the Jews of Poland and the Chinese in the Philippines". *Jewish Journal of Sociology* X: 221-240.
- Hunt, Chester
 1956 "Social distance in the Philippines". *Sociology and Social Research* XL: 253-260.
- Felix, Alphonso, ed.
 1966 *Chinese in the Philippines*. Vol. I, 1570-1770. Manila: Solidaridad.
- Jensen, Khin Khin Myint
 1959 "The Chinese in the Philippines during the American regime: 1898-1946". unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin.
- Kanwar, Abdul S.
 1956 "A study of social distance between some Filipinos and sixteen other ethnic groups". unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Omohundro, John T.
 1974 "The Chinese merchant community of Iloilo city, Philippines". unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Tan, Allen and Grace E. de Vera
 1969 "Inter-ethnic images between Filipinos and Chinese in the Philippines". *Asian Studies* VII: 125-133.
- Weightman, George
 1960 "The Philippine Chinese: a cultural history of a marginal trading community". unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.
 1964 "A study of prejudice in a personalistic society: an analysis of the attitude survey of college students — University of the Philippines". *Asian Studies* II: 87-101.
 1967 "Anti-sinicism in the Philippines". *Asian Studies* V: 220-231.
- Wertheim, Willem F.
 1964 *East-West Parallels*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Wickberg, Edgar
 1956 *The Chinese in Philippine Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Willis, Richard H.
 1966 "Ethnic and national images among Filipino university students". Paper read at the 1966 Philippine Sociological Society Convention, Manila.