

they did from the colonial framework as if guided by the hand of the mother goddess?

The Chinese Maritime Empire (13th to 16th Centuries)

1. Peng Hu (Pescadores), the islands were a refuge of pirates in the 16th century, notably by Limahong who attacked Manila in 1574.
2. Lingayen (Luzon), this city was founded by a Chinese outpost named Lin Gayen.
3. Kumalalang, this outpost in Mindanao served as a northern route to the Moluccas (1417). It was established by Chang Chien.
4. Jolo, an embassy under Paduka Batara, arrived in China in 1417. It also used the Moluccas route.
5. Kota Kinabalu (Malaysia), once called "Tsina Balu" (Ft. China), was founded by Ong Sum-ping, a merchant whose daughter married the Sultan of Brunei (1500).
6. Patani (Malaysia), Limahong's other name which was Lin Tao-chien. He went from there to Peng Hu.
7. Morotai and Batjan (Indonesia), clearly on the Moluccan route. A Chinese residency was here as early as 1293. The Portuguese used the term *Batochina* (Batjan China).
8. Tuban and Gresik (Indonesia), these outposts on the northern coast of Java faced the Flores Sea on the passage to Ternate (1400).

References

- "*Parian — Una Aventura Historica — Etimologica Tarjetas Biograficas.*"
- Almazan, Marco A., et al, *El Galeon de Manila*, no. 143 (Mexico: D.F. Artes de Mexico, 1971).
- Collanta, Cesar V., *The Limahong Invasion* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1989).
- Latham, Ronald, trans., *The Travels of Marco Polo* (N.Y.: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1958).
- Pan, Lynn, *Sons of the Yellow Emperor* (London: Mandarin, 1991).
- Patanne, E.P., *The Philippines in the World of Southeast Asia* (Quezon City: Enterprise Publications, Inc. 1972).
- Scott, William Henry, *Filipinos in China Before 1500* (Manila: China Studies Program of De La Salle University, 1989).
- Shaffer, Lynda Narene, *Maritime Southeast Asia to 1500* (London: M.E. Sharpe, 1996).
- Wheatley, Paul, "Geographical Notes on Some Commodities involved in Sung Maritime Trade," *Journal of the MBRAS*, vol. 32, pt. 2, (Singapore: June 1959).
- Yuste-Lopez, Carmen, *El Comercio de la Nueva España con Filipinas 1590-1785*, no. 109 (Mexico: D.F. Coleccion Cientifica, Instituto Nacional de Anthropologiae Historia, 1984).

Gyo Miyahara

Osaka University of Foreign Studies, Japan

JAPANESE COLONIALISM AND THE ETHNOLOGICAL RESEARCHES ON THE 'OVERSEAS CHINESE' IN GREATER EAST ASIA CO-PROSPERITY SPHERE: AN INTRODUCTION

Introduction

When the Japanese military expanded into Asian countries, the Japanese invading army killed many overseas Chinese and plundered their properties in Southeast Asia. For instance, in Panay Island, Philippines, more than 500 ethnic Chinese were killed by the Japanese army from 1942-1945.

While it is very important to describe accurately how the Japanese invaded Asian countries, there is another significant topic we have to study in this matter. Although there are many (but not enough) historical studies on the Japanese invasion into Asian countries, few proper analyses were conducted on the ideological aspect of the Japanese invasion.

Based on the idea of "Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere (GEACPS)," the Japanese government during World War II defined the purpose of war as a sacred war to liberate the Asian nationals from western colonialism. The GEACPS was an anthropological or ethnological concept, as well as the logic behind the expansion of the Japanese government. If we try to understand the Japanese invasion totally, it inevitably requires reflecting on the ethnological scheme behind the GEACPS and how the prewar Japanese researchers defined the nationals within it.

I focused this study on the overseas Chinese in GEACPS. How the overseas Chinese was defined was one of the crucial issues in the ethnological scheme of GEACPS. While the overseas Chinese was not an indigenous population in each

host country, they were theoretically defined as a "native" in GEACPS if we saw GEACPS as a nation. In this sense, it is very important to analyze Japanese views on the overseas Chinese for an understanding of the ethnological scheme of GEACPS, and also, the logic of the Japanese expansionism.

In this perspective, first I will illustrate the definition and the general traits of the overseas Chinese in GEACPS based on the prewar Japanese studies. Secondly, I will focus on the relationship between the overseas Chinese and the indigenous people in GEACPS; for this purpose, the Philippines will be examined. Finally, I will discuss the ambiguous position of the overseas Chinese in the ethnological scheme of GEACPS and analyze the overseas Chinese policies proposed in the pre-1945 studies.

Discussion here is based on the pre-1945 Japanese descriptions on the overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia. Although my original concern is to illustrate the ethnological views on the Chinese in the Philippines, in the process of the library research, I found that it is not essential to distinguish the Philippine case from the views on the Chinese in other parts of Southeast Asia. I delimitate the object of this study within the scope of the overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia, or *Nanyo* (researchers' terminology), which was a critical element of GEACPS.

Anthropological Studies on Japanese Colonialism

Fifty-two years after World War II, the study of Japanese invasion into Asian countries has become fashionable. While many of the studies are too sentimental or even reactionary, there are also earnest academic attempts in which researchers made a great effort to reflect on the Japanese colonial policies. For instance, the eight volumes of *Iwanami Koza – Kindai Nihon to Shokuminchi (Modern Japan and Colonialism Series)* are a contribution of historians to this study (Oe, et al., eds., 1993).

There are some excellent works by non-Japanese academicians. Since Japanese scholars have very special or personal sentiments about Japanese colonialism, studies by non-Japanese are sometimes more insightful. Dr. Lydia N. Yu-Jose's contribution on Japanese views on the Philippines and the Filipino (1992) and Dr. Mark R. Peattie's contribution on the origin of Japanese colonialism (1996) are two of the most excellent works on this theme.

There are also anthropological works on Japanese colonialism, but still very few. Katsumi Nakao discusses how Japanese ethnology played a role as practical science for Japanese colonialism, and how ethnologists cooperated with the military (1993). While Nakao presupposes that ethnology or anthropology is originally colonial science, Katsuhiko Yamaji (1989, 1994) and Masao Mori (1997) suggest particularity of Japanese ethnology.

In his articles, Yamaji pointed out a basic feature of Japanese perception toward foreigners in colonial context. Analyzing Japanese colonialism in Taiwan, he wrote:

...the Japanese colonizers perceived the aboriginal Taiwanese in two ways, namely, "ignorant" or "uncivilized" on one hand and "pure" or "innocent" on the other hand. Because of the latter perception, the Japanese colonizers could promote their assimilation policy without a sense of discrimination (Yamaji, 1994:64).

Similarly, Mori discussed the basic structure of Japanese perception toward foreigners. In his discussion, disappearance of "other" in Japanese ethnology is a critical point for Japanese colonialism. He wrote:

...the Taisho period witnessed the decline of the perception of "other." The more the Japanese lost their samurai spirit, the more the perception of "others" as opposed to "self" disappeared. From then on, Japan expanded without "others" regulating her. Japanese anthropologists began to look upon the Japanese as a sole nation, which had existed since ancient times (Mori, 1997:84-85 quoted from his English abstract).

This particularity of Japanese ethnology suggests what the concept of *minzoku* is in GEACPS. While *minzoku* might be translated into "ethnic group" or "national" in English, the connotation is different from what "ethnic group" means in British social anthropology. It is illustrated in the *Prospectus of the Ethnologist League of Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere*. The four-fold aim of the league quoted by Mori was:

...to extol the peculiar culture of each minzoku, to study the common features among them, to clarify the oneness of the minzoku of Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere, and to establish the theory of minzoku and nationalism (Mori, 1997:80).

While western concept of "ethnic group" is based on the encounter with "outsider," "stranger," and "plurality," the Japanese concept of *minzoku* integrates individual ethnic consciousness into the communal consciousness of the whole GEACPS nation. In this peculiar concept of *minzoku* in Japanese ethnology, the overseas Chinese was crucial. As I mentioned before, while the overseas Chinese was an "outsider" in each host country, it was a part of larger ethnic Chinese. The overseas Chinese as a *minzoku* had an "outsider" feature and "externality" in itself. Therefore, how the overseas Chinese was defined was a touchstone for appreciating the ethnological scheme of GEACPS.

Definition and General Traits of the Overseas Chinese in GEACPS

In most studies, *Kakyo* and *Shina-jin* were terms used for the overseas Chinese. Every study included descriptions on the definition of the overseas Chinese, population, and the situation of migration, socio-economic status, political activities, assimilation, anti-Japanese movements, and so on.

In the definition of the overseas Chinese, we can find a kind of perplexity. A report of the Bureau of International Trade, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Gaimu-sho

Tsusho-kyoku) defined the overseas Chinese as "the Chinese and descendants who migrated from the Chinese territory to foreign territories, regardless of their nationality," and made the following qualifications (Gaimu-sho Tsusho-kyoku, 1929:2-3):

1. Leased or ceded territories do not belong to "the Chinese territory" here. Since Taiwan was ceded to Japan in 1895, immigrants from Taiwan are the subjects of Japanese Empire, and cannot be called overseas Chinese.
2. The Chinese, who were residents in Hong Kong before 1842, do not belong to the overseas Chinese category. However, one who migrated from the Chinese territory to Hong Kong after 1842 should be called overseas Chinese.
3. In the literal sense of *kakyo*, the descendants of immigrants cannot belong to the overseas Chinese category. However, it is common in Southeast Asia to call Chinese descendants as overseas Chinese.
4. Nationality of the Chinese immigrants is a sensitive issue. It is especially true among the Chinese descendants. Sometimes, there is contradiction between the law in China and the law in each host country. Avoiding over-complication, we have to eliminate the criteria of nationality from our definition.

There are two aspects in this definition of the overseas Chinese, namely, the "biological" aspect and the "territorial" aspect. The "biological" aspect or more accurately the "ethno-biological" aspect emphasizes Chinese blood. It was because of their Chinese blood that the Chinese descendants could be defined as the overseas Chinese. The other aspect is the "territorial" or "ethno-geographical" aspect. In the definition of the Bureau of International Trade, "territory" meant purely political territory based on international law. It was negotiable and could be expanded regardless of cultural territory defined by blood. These contradictory aspects of the definition of the overseas Chinese caused the Japanese concept of *minzoku* to become peculiar. Each *minzoku* is recognized by the combination of his blood and territory and then integrated into larger political entity as the "ethno-biological" basis expands.

How did the Japanese researchers view the overseas Chinese based on this definition? The "ethno-biological" aspect of the definition gave rise to a stereotype on the overseas Chinese. For instance, Kiwata Ide referred to the trait of the overseas Chinese as a "tribe."

The Chinese in the south is generally vigorous, bright, and poetic, while the Chinese in the north is dull and reticent, but also enthusiastic... the overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia is a good businessman full of pioneer spirit, but not patriot. Their trait is individualistic, and they pursue only their self-interest as the Jewish does (Ide, 1942b:16).

This view on the overseas Chinese was different from the view on the indigenous people in Southeast Asia. Anthropologists and ethnologists perceived the

latter as "innocent" and "uncivilized." In their view on the overseas Chinese, however, researchers generally respected the overseas Chinese for their pioneering spirit, even though there were some prejudices and ill treatments. In the following section, I will turn to the Philippine case and discuss the researchers' view on the relationships between the overseas Chinese and the indigenous people in GEACPS.

Relationships between the Overseas Chinese and the Indigenous People in the Philippines

While there are very few studies on the ethnic Chinese in the Philippines today, there were a lot of studies and researches before 1945. Most of them pointed out the overwhelming economic influence of the overseas Chinese over the indigenous Filipino on one hand, and Filipino and Spaniard's scorn for the overseas Chinese on the other hand. Ide reported:

Since the Chinese did up their hair Chinese style and wore kamisa de chino in those days, the Spaniards ridiculed the Chinese, even missionaries called them "pigtail." Filipino people followed this and called the Chinese baboy. In the American period, since the Chinese influence in the Philippine economy was overwhelming, the Filipino envied the Chinese and looked down upon them. After the Commonwealth government was established in the Philippines, anti-Chinese sentiments intensified. Every newspaper strongly criticized the Chinese, and political parties propagated the slogan of anti-Sinoism (Ide, 1942b:317-318).

Most of the Japanese researchers did not reproach the Chinese for monopolizing the Philippine economy; rather, they admired their economic power. The Policy Planning Authority (Kikakuin) commented that:

...millions of overseas Chinese, who almost monopolized foreign and domestic trade in Nanyo, would undoubtedly become more and more important to Japan in the near future. We should realize what the overseas Chinese were, especially their economic status (Kikaku-in Chousa-bu Daini-Chōsa-shitsu, 1939b:2).

It is not true that there was no trade friction between the overseas Chinese and the Japanese in the Philippines. Several boycotts and anti-Japanese movements arose after the Japanese military invaded mainland China. However, researchers' reaction to the boycott was generally moderate, or even sympathetic. They reported:

...the overseas Chinese were forced to join boycotts, and they, instead of the Japanese merchants, suffered a great loss (Taiwan Takushoku Kabushikigaisha, 1939:111).

Whether it was a fact or not does not matter. It is more important that researchers did not accuse the overseas Chinese of such action.

Japanese researchers based this evaluation on the ethnological perception on

the overseas Chinese, which is in contrast with the view on the indigenous Filipino. The indigenous Filipino was described as: *Hito-jin*, the Philippine Islander (Iminjoho, 1933); *Filipin-jin*, the Filipino (Mantetsu Toa-keizai-chisa-kyoku, 1939); *Fulipin Dojin*, the native Filipino (*Ibid.*); *Dochaku-min* or *Dochaku-minzoku*, the native (Nanyo-kyokai, ed., 1940c). *Do* of the *Dojin*, *Dochaku-min*, and *Dochaku-minzoku* means "soil." Japanese people associate these terms with "uncivilized" or "savage" and assumed that the overseas Chinese were superior to the indigenous Filipino "racially" as well as ethnically.

In *Nanyo no Kakyo* (the overseas Chinese in *Nanyo*), the author commented:

Needless to say, the overseas Chinese contributed to the Philippine nation building, while the lazy native (Dochaku-min) neglected to do so. Compared with the natives, the overseas Chinese were not only patient and hardworking, but also worked at low wages, with great business ability. The overseas Chinese were indispensable to every town in the Philippines (Nanyo-kyokai, ed., 1940c: 73-74).

Similarly, Mantetsu Toa Keizai Chosa-kyoku reported the reason for intermarriage:

Since Chinese males are ethnically superior to native male, native females prefer getting married to Chinese males (1939:20).

It is noteworthy that researchers found Chinese superiority even in Filipino blood.

There are 700,000 to 1,000,000 mestizos or Filipinos with mixed parentage. They are good middle-class citizens and hardworking, Christianized in Spanish times, and have a civilized life (Ibid.:32).

This evaluation of the Filipinos of mixed parentage explained the substantial ethno-political ranks in the Philippines. Reports pointed out:

Since most of the indigenous Filipinos descended from foreign stock, they are intellectual, while the natives in the British and Dutch Colony are not so. In the British and Dutch Colony, the Caucasian ranks first, the overseas Chinese second, then the indigenous people third. However, in the Philippines, the Filipino with mixed parentage ranks first (Mantetsu Toa Keizai Chosa-kyoku, 1939:34; Ide, 1942b).

In the following section, I will analyze the overseas Chinese policy proposed by the Japanese researchers, and discuss how they perceived the overseas Chinese in the ethnological context of GEACPS.

The Overseas Chinese Policy and the Ethnological Scheme of GEACPS

The overseas Chinese policy in the early years of Japanese expansion was haphaz-

ard. The Policy Planning Authority (Kikaku-in), which was just a competitive power against the military, pointed out:

The ruler of the tropics is the king of the world. The overseas Chinese substantially got its position. In this sense, it is the true king of the world in future who could handle the overseas Chinese in Nanyo. However, the overseas Chinese policy in Japan is just opportunistic and inconsistent until now. There was no sufficient study at all (Kikakuin Chousa-bu Daini Chosa-shitsu, 1939b:7).

There are some reasons for the inconsistency of overseas Chinese policy. First, because the overseas Chinese policy was not fully discussed. Second, *Nanyo* was not within Japanese territory, and the overseas Chinese were not subjects of Japanese sovereignty. These two factors allowed the military to interfere with the overseas Chinese policy. Eventually, the military arrested some researchers of the Policy Planning Authority (Kikaku-in) on suspicion of communistic activity.

In addition to these technical reasons, another reason for the inconsistency concerned the perception of the overseas Chinese in the ethnological scheme of GEACPS. The overseas Chinese policies proposed by scholars were dichotomized into two types. The first type of policies expected overseas Chinese co-operation with Japanese colonialism. In contrast, the second type aimed to eliminate the overseas Chinese from the GEACPS scheme. Each type of policy was spun out of the fluctuation of the ethnological view on the overseas Chinese. I will describe various overseas Chinese policies and sketch this fluctuation in the following section.

Some scholars defined the overseas Chinese as cooperators or co-builders of GEACPS. For instance, Ide suggested two major points of the overseas Chinese policy.

First, the economic and cultural benefit of the overseas Chinese must be considered, and second, proper measures must be taken to make the overseas Chinese adjust to each local administration and to make them play a significant role in the establishment of GEACPS (Ide, 1942b).

Similarly, Taiwan Takushoku Kaisha pointed out:

...the overseas Chinese, whom western colonizers regard as a troublesome being, can join GEACPS, or the contesting bloc against the western world system (Taiwan Takushoku Kaisha, 1938:68).

In these proposals, researchers highly evaluated the economic influence of the overseas Chinese. We can find the prototype in the theory of ethnic division of labor. Yokota admired the economic achievement of the overseas Chinese, and discussed the necessity of ethnic division of labor:

They were weak in technology. They accumulated a big fortune in their commerce. They started working as sanitation workers, gum plantation farmers, and

tin miners, then had gone into commerce. They did not expand their business to manufacture... In competition with the overseas Chinese, some policy makers proposed to send Japanese tradesmen to engage in small- and medium-sized business. However, Japanese tradesmen cannot absolutely compete with Chinese businessmen. Rather, it was wiser for us to devote to manufacture (Yokota, 1942:13).

There was another proposal to expect overseas Chinese cooperation, but more high-handed or compelling. For instance, Takeshi Watanabe, of the Manchuria and China Research Institutes, accused the overseas Chinese for exploiting and money lending at high interest (Watanabe, 1942:25). According to him:

If they were following the GEACPS doctrine, and were cooperative enough with the establishment of GEACPS, there was no reluctance in guaranteeing their rights. However, if they returned evil for good and if they protested against us, it should be punished severely (Ibid: 25, 29-30).

In his discussion, he insisted that the overseas Chinese must be controlled, since they were essentially exploiters in Southeast Asia. It was this particular view on the overseas Chinese that gave rise to the theory of elimination.

One of the typical proposals of the elimination theory was illustrated in "The Philippines and the Overseas Chinese: A Proposal for National Independence," editorial of the *Economist* (1942). Firstly, the editorial discussed the reason why the overseas Chinese extended their economic influence.

How did the overseas Chinese penetrate the Philippines? The perseverance of the overseas Chinese was of course one reason, however, the poor national character of the Filipino was the other reason. In the tropics, they can survive even though they do not work at all. Since they got used to living lazily, they do not notice the overseas Chinese working hard and extending their economic influence. They borrow a lot of money with their future harvests for security. They consume the money for gambling... It is the Filipino national character to expect a windfall profit... How can the Filipino have an economic advantage over the overseas Chinese? (Ibid:39).

Then, the editorial insisted that the overseas Chinese must be eliminated from the Philippines. For that purpose, it proposed that the Commonwealth government should take strict measures against the overseas Chinese, and also the Filipino should be conscious of one of the nationals (*minzoku*) in GEACPS.

Since the Commonwealth government was established in November 1935, President Manuel L. Quezon had taken the strict restriction measures against the overseas Chinese. The overseas Chinese problem for the Philippine government is also critical for Japan. Now, the Philippines joins the GEACPS. Prime Minister Tojo promised that Japan would approve the independence if the Philippines is cooperative for building GEACPS. For her independence, the Filipino people should

stir themselves and change their attitudes toward life. In order to beat the overseas Chinese, the measures within the reforms of administration are not enough. It requires the change of the Filipino national character (Ibid:39-40).

Similarly, Shozo Fukuda, of Toa Research Institute, also discussed the gradual weakening of overseas Chinese economic influence:

So far, there was no measure against the anti-Japanese movement of the overseas Chinese. As the result of recent military operations, it becomes possible to take some political measures against the overseas Chinese. However, these measures must not be aimed to exclude them from Southeast Asia. If the overseas Chinese should be completely excluded, it would paralyze the Nanyo economy. The measures must be aimed not to exclude the overseas Chinese but to weaken their economic influence. The doctrine of GEACPS is, firstly, to liberate natives (dochaku-min) from overseas Chinese exploitation, and secondly, to improve the welfare of natives. For this attempt, it is necessary to educate people to improve their economic ability, and to promote local finance system. It is also important to send Japanese merchants as competitors against the overseas Chinese... What the author would like to emphasize is the possibility that GEACPS is overwhelmed by the great wave of Chinese migration in the future. Even at present, the overseas Chinese built up the very firm foundation of their economy. It is a threat to order in GEACPS if left uncontrolled. Proper measures to weaken overseas Chinese economic influence are required to protect natives (Fukuda, 1942:11).

There are two types of overseas Chinese policies. One expects the cooperation of the overseas Chinese with Japanese colonials. The other aims to eliminate the overseas Chinese from the GEACPS scheme. As mentioned before, these two types of overseas Chinese policies spun out of the disparities in the ethnological view on the overseas Chinese. Although both of them commonly admitted the economic influence of the overseas Chinese, each type of policy emphasized the different aspects of ethnic relations between the overseas Chinese and the natives.

According to the slogan of GEACPS, "in the whole world under one roof, has each nation stood its proper position." The problem here is how to interpret the ethnological position of the overseas Chinese, or in short, whether the overseas Chinese is a native in GEACPS or not. If the overseas Chinese cannot be recognized as a native in GEACPS, it gives grounds to the theory of elimination. If the overseas Chinese is a native, they also have their proper roles in GEACPS. Yamamoto's discussion illustrates this disparity of overseas Chinese position in the ethnological scheme of GEACPS.

It is admirable how vigorous and how invincible the overseas Chinese are. They migrated to every corner of the world, and with their business abilities, they established themselves as the leading status in each local economy. They might economically oppress native residents, who were lazy, gutless, ignorant, and physically inferior by nature. The overseas Chinese could accumulate a big fortune at the sacrifice of native residents. In this sense, the overseas Chinese is

similar to the Jews. We cannot overlook their exploitation of native residents.

Such exploitation is against the ideal of GEACPS, as well as humanitarianism. It must be corrected immediately. However, it is too naïve to propose the thorough exclusion of the overseas Chinese. They have their own home country. It is understandable that they unite and devote themselves to supporting their home country. They are completely different from the Jewish people, who have no home country. What the Jewish pursued is just their own interest. Both the overseas Chinese and the Japanese are *Toa-jin*, and the overseas Chinese are also the Chinese who should take a great role in GEACPS. They belong to the same race, and use Chinese characters for writing. They must be the cobuilders of GEACPS ideology. They should regard their privilege and qualification properly.

The Japanese cannot surpass the overseas Chinese in vitality and perseverance. However competent the Japanese are, they cannot have the advantage of the overseas Chinese in their strongest suits. We must not ill-treat them, just because the Japanese cannot compete with the overseas Chinese. It is out of jealousy, if not narrow-minded also, to eliminate them from GEACPS. We will completely lose face, if we do so.

The situation was changed already. We must take the initiative in rebuilding GEACPS. The overseas Chinese is not a competitor, but a cooperator or cobuilder. We should quit competition with the overseas Chinese.

The overseas Chinese is a reliable ally to us, whose vitality and perseverance is superior to the Japanese. Since residents in Nanyo have suffered Western colonialism, they are generally uncivilized and gutless. It will take a long time to recover themselves and become active elements in GEACPS. In this sense, the overseas Chinese are necessary as our ally in rebuilding GEACPS (Yamamoto, 1942:24-25).

In his discussion, Yamamoto first distinguished the native residents and non-natives in *Nanyo*. The overseas Chinese was classified as an exploiter. Then, he insisted that the overseas Chinese could be identified as the Chinese nationals on one hand, and as the native of GEACPS or *Toa-jin* on the other hand. Here, we can see the hierarchical structure of the ethnological scheme in GEACPS. At the bottom of this ethnological scheme, the smallest unit is defined in the combination of blood and territory. Then, assuming some commonness, each unit is integrated into a larger unit, and finally GEACPS is defined as the whole politico-cultural territory of the largest Asian nation. It is in this context that the contradictory policies on the overseas Chinese were produced.

Final Remarks

In this essay, I discussed the scholars' view on the overseas Chinese in the ethnological scheme of GEACPS. The overseas Chinese was regarded paradoxically as an "outsider" on one hand, and as the "native" of GEACPS on the other hand.

These contradictory views on the overseas Chinese suggest that *minzoku* in GEACPS is identified in the dissimulation and assimilation processes. In the dissimulation process, local residents are classified and ranked according to their

"blood," which is ethno-biologically defined. Then, each category of people is substantiated in or reduced to each specific geographical territory. In the assimilation process, each *minzoku* was integrated into higher-ordered conception of *minzoku* in assuming the shared blood, and it justified GEACPS as the whole politico-cultural territory.

It is remarkable here that only one term, *minzoku*, is applied to refer to each unit from the smallest to the largest in Japanese. *Minzoku* can be translated into various terms in English, namely, "ethnic group," "nation," "national," and so on. As the Chinese and the Filipinos are called *minzoku*, *Toa-jin* can also be called *minzoku*. It is in this ethnological scheme that the contradictory views on the overseas Chinese in GEACPS was produced, and more importantly, the Japanese expansion into Asian countries was justified, which aimed to realize new ethnic order in this area.

After the War, this ethnological scheme of GEACPS seemed to be eliminated, and the discriminative terminology was deleted in ethnological and anthropological textbooks. For instance, "race" is one of those terms. However, it is not the result of a thorough criticism of ethnological conception, but only an outcome of anti-war sentiments. Although some new words as "ethnic group" replaced old *minzoku*, *dochakumin*, and *dojin*, the definition on the basis of "blood" and "territory" is essentially preserved. Most Japanese ethnologists and anthropologists are sympathetic to any nationalistic and aboriginal rights movement without consideration of the cultural politics in an appropriate area. It ironically allows hegemonists to expand their influences, as the prewar ethnological scheme allowed the military to invade Asian countries.

"Blood" and "territory" are not essential criteria to define "ethnic group," but in themselves, the idioms of cultural politics or ethno-nationalism. What ethnologists and anthropologists should do is not to discuss ethnic relations based on the concept of "ethnic group" or *minzoku*, but to give an interpretation to "blood" and "territory" or other ethno-reproductive substances, as ethno-nationalistic symbols.

References

Studies on Japanese Colonialism

- Eizawa, Kouji, *Daitoa-kyoeiken no Shiso [Ideology of Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere]* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1995).
- Mori, Masao, "Nihon-Minzokugaku to Kindai-Nihon no Tasha Ninshiki [Ethnology in Japan and Japanese Perception of 'Others' in the Modern Period]," *Minzokugaku-Kenkyu [The Japanese Journal of Ethnology]*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1997), pp. 66-85.
- Nakao, Katsumi, "Shokuminchi-Shugi to Nihon-Minzokugaku [Colonialism and Japanese

- Ethnology],” in *Chugoku: Shakai to Bunka*, vol. 8 (1993).
- Oe, Shinobu, et al., eds., *Iwanami Koza: Kindai Nihon to Shokuminchi [Modern Japan and Colonialism Series]*, 8 volumes (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992-1994).
- Peattie, Mark R., *Shokuminchi: Teikoku 50 nen no Kobo [Colonialism: The Prosperity and Adversity of the Japanese Empire]* (Tokyo: Yomiuri Shinbunsha, 1996).
- Yamaji, Katsuhiko, “*Mushu no Yaban-jin to Jinruigaku* [Owner-less Savage and Anthropology],” *Kansei-Gakuin Daigaku Shakai Gakubu Kiyō*, vol. 64 (1991).
- _____, “*Shokuminchi Taiwan to Kodomo no Rhetoric* [Colonial Taiwan and the Rhetoric of Infant],” *Shakai Jinruigaku Nenpo*, vol. 20 (1993).
- Yu-Jose, Lydia N., *Japan Views the Philippines 1900-1944* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991).

Researches and Studies on the Overseas Chinese

- Aritaka, Iwao, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Rekishi-teki Kansatsu* [A Historical Observation on the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Chiri Kyoiku*, vol. 30, no. 5 (1939).
- “*Nanyo Kakyo no Keizai-yoku* [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese],” *Diamond*, vol. 30, no. 11 (1942a).
- _____, “*Hi-to Kakyo no Jiban to Zento* [The Background and the Future Direction of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines],” *Diamond*, vol. 30, no. 16 (1942b).
- “*Kakyo no Seiji-teki Doko: Genjitsu-teki Taisaku no Yosei* [Political Trends of the Overseas Chinese: A Request for Realistic Policy],” *Economist*, vol. 20, no. 10 (1942a).
- _____, “*Toa-ken to Kakyo no Chii: Kyoiei-ken Kensetsu eno Kyoryoku Yosei* [The Status of the Overseas Chinese in GEACPS: A Request for their Cooperation to Build GEACPS],” *Economist*, vol. 20, no. 10 (1942b).
- _____, “*Kakyo no Sekai-teki Bunpu* [The Distribution of Overseas Chinese Population],” *Economist*, vol. 20, no. 10 (1942c).
- _____, “*Filipin to Kakyo: Hi-to Dokuritsu Kansui no tame ni* [The Philippines and the Overseas Chinese: For the Independence of the Filipino Nation-State],” *Economist*, vol. 20, no. 18 (1942d).
- Fujiwara, Yasushi, “*Nanyo Kakyo Genchi Shihon Doin no Igi* [The Significance of Overseas Chinese Investments in Local Economy in Nanyo]” *Keizaigaku-zasshi*, vol. 11, no. 6 (1942).
- Fukuda, Shozo, *Kakyo Keizai-ron [A Discussion on Overseas Chinese Economy]* (Tokyo: Ganshodo, 1939).
- _____, “*Daitoa Minzoku to Nanyo no Kakyo* [Nationals and the Overseas Chinese in GEACPS],” *Menyu-Geppou* (April 1942).
- Gaimu-sho Oua-kyoku Daisan-ka* [Bureau of Europe and Asia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs], in *Nanyo to Kakyo [Nanyo and the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Gaimusho, 1939).
- Gaimu-sho Tsusho-kyoku* [Bureau of International Trade, Ministry of Foreign Affairs], in *Kakyo no Kenkyu [A Study on the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Gaimu-sho, Tsusho-kyoku, 1929).

- _____, *Kakyo no Gensei [The Influence of the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Gaimusho, Tsusho-kyoku, 1935).
- Goto, Asataro, *Nanyo no Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Tokyo: Kozanshoin, 1942).
- Haga, Hiroshi, *Toa-Kyoiei-ken to Nanyo Kakyo [East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere and the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Tokyo: Tokoshoin, 1941).
- Hara, Shigeharu, “*Filipin no Kakyo Dosei* [Situations of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines],” *Filipin Joho*, vol. 46 (1941).
- Hattori, Tetsuro, “*Kakyo to Yudaya-sei* [The Overseas Chinese and Jewish-like traits],” *Nanpo*, vol. 4, no. 3 (1942).
- Higuchi, Hiroshi, “*Nanyo niokeru Kakyo no Kaisha Kigyō* [Overseas Chinese Enterprises in Nanyo],” *Gaiko-jiho*, vol. 103, no. 3 (1942).
- Ichikawa, Koshiro, “*Gendai Kakyo Mondai no Igi* [The Significance of Overseas Chinese Problems],” *Kokusai Chishiki oyobi Hyoron*, vol. 20, no. 5 (1940).
- Ide, Kiwata, “*Fukien Minzoku to Nanyo Kakyo* [The Fukienese and the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Nanyo*, vol. 24, no. 5 (1938).
- _____, “*Fukien Kakyo no Sokin to Kinyu Kikan* [The Remittance and Lending Institutions of the Overseas Chinese],” *Nanyo*, vol. 25, nos. 2 & 4 (1939a).
- _____, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Konin Kankei ni Tsuite* [Marriage Alliances of the Overseas Chinese],” *Nanyo*, vol. 25, no. 1 (1939b).
- _____, “*Nanyo no Kakyo* [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Umi wo Koete*, vol. 3, no. 10 (1940a).
- _____, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Doko to Shorai* [Trends and Future of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Toyo*, vol. 43, no. 2 (1940b).
- _____, “*Daitoa Kyoieiken to Nanpo Kakyo* [The Overseas Chinese in Nanpo and GEACPS],” *Toyo*, vol. 44, no. 8 (1941a).
- _____, “*Daitoa Kensetsu to Nanpo Kakyo* [The Overseas Chinese in Nanpo and the Construction of GEACPS],” *Toyo*, vol. 44, no. 8 (1941b).
- _____, “*Nanyo Kakyo Taisaku-ron* [A Discussion on the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Taiheiyō*, vol. 4, no. 5 (1941c).
- _____, *Nanyo to Kakyo [Nanyo and the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1941d).
- _____, “*Daitoa-sen to Kakyo Taisaku* [The Greater East Asian War and Policies on the Overseas Chinese],” *Gaichi-Hyoron*, vol. 5, no. 41 (1942a).
- _____, *Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Rokko Shokai Shuppanbu, 1942b).
- _____, “*Kakyo Haigeki-ron' wo Haisu* [Anti-Overseas Chinese Policy],” *Gaiko Hyoron*, vol. 6, no. 54 (1943).
- Imura, Kaoru, *Rekkoku no Taishi-toshi to Kakyo Sokin [European Investments to China and the Remittance of the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Seikatsusha, 1940).
- _____, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Keizai Seiryoku* [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Shina*, vol. 10, no. 6 (1942).
- Iriyama, Taichi, “*Hon-po ni okeru Kakyo wo Ronzu* [Hikone Kosho Ronso],” *Hikone Kosho*

- Ronshu, vol. 30 (1941).
- Ishida, Hatsuyoshi, "Manila Kakyo ni Kansuru Chosa [A Research on the Overseas Chinese in Manila]," *Nanpo*, vol. 3, no. 3 (1941).
- Ito, Ken, "Nanyo Kakyo to O Seiken [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo and O Government]," *Kokusai Chishiki oyobi Hyoron*, vol. 21, no. 11 (1941).
- Iwamoto, Hisashi, "Nanyo Kakyo-shi (5): Filipin," *Nanpo*, vol. 4, no. 9 (1942).
- Jochi Daigaku Keizaikenkyusho (Saito, Shunichi), *Kakyo no Kenkyu [A Study on the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Sophia University, 1935).
- Kanan-Ginko, *Hi-to ni okeru Taiwan-sekimin ni kansuru Chosa [A Research on the Taiwanese in the Philippines]* (Taipei: Kanan-Ginko, 1941).
- Kawabe, Hisao, "Nanpo no Kyoiku Kakyo [The Educated Overseas Chinese in South]," *Economist*, vol. 20, no. 24 (1942).
- Kenko Ryoji Dairi Hokoku, "Kakyo-sho to Hi-to-jin Kourisho no Eigyoburi," *Iminjoho*, vol. 5, no. 11 (1933).
- Kikaku-in Chousa-bu Daini Chosa-shitsu, *Kakyo Kenkyu Shiryo [A Reference on the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Kikaku-in, 1939a).
- _____, *Kakyo no Kenkyu [A Study on the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Kikaku-in, 1939b).
- Kimata, Shogo, *Nanyo Kakyo no Shin Josei [New Situations on the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Tokyo: Kaizosha, 1941).
- Kimura, Eiichi, "Nanpo-ken ni okeru Kakyo ni tsuite [The Overseas Chinese in Nanpo Sphere]," *Gaiko-Hyoron*, vol. 22, no. 4 (1942).
- Kokusai Keizai Shuho, "Nanyo Kakyo Sakikin no Doko" [New Trends of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]," *Kokusai Keizai Shuho*, vol. 22, no. 36 (1941).
- _____, "Daitoa-sen Boppatsu-go no Kakyo Taisaku [The Greater East Asian War and Policies on the Overseas Chinese]," *Kokusai Keizai Shuho*, vol. 23, no. 45 (1942a).
- _____, "Nanpo-ken ni okeru Kakyo no Chii [The Status of the Overseas Chinese in Nanpo Sphere]," *Kokusai Keizai Shuho*, vol. 23, no. 16 (1942b).
- Kokusaku Kenkyukai, "Nanyo Keizai ni okeru Kakyo no Ichi [The Status of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo Economy]," *Kokusaku Kenkyukai Shuho* (1942a).
- _____, "Kakyo Taisaku Yoko Seian [A Proposal of Overseas Chinese Policy]," *Kokusaku Kenkyukai Shuho* (1942b).
- Kuwajima, Chikara, "Nanyo Kakyo no Hatten to Sono Taisaku" [The Overseas Chinese and Its Policy]," *Shina*, vol. 10, no. 6 (1942).
- Mantetsu Chosa-ka, *Nanyo ni okeru Sina-jin [The Chinese in Nanyo]* (Tokyo: Matetsu Chosa-ka, 1926).
- Mantetsu Toa Keizai Chosa-kyoku, *Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Mantetsu Toakeizai Chosa-kyoku, 1927).
- _____, *Filipin ni okeru Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese in the Philip-*
- pines]* (Tokyo: Mantetsu Toa Keizai Chosa-kyoku, 1939).
- _____, *Nanyo Kakyo to Fukien, Canton Shakai [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo and Fukien and Canton Society]* (Tokyo: Mantetsu Toa Keizai Chosa-kyoku, 1940).
- Matsubara, Banka, "Canton Koryaku-go no Nanyo Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo after the Occupation of Canton]," *Toyo*, vol. 42, no. 1 (1939).
- Matsuda, Shoichi, "Nanyo Kakyo Taisaku [Overseas Chinese Policy in Nanyo]," *Economist*, vol. 20, no. 24 (1942).
- Matsumoto, Sokichi, "Nanyo Kakyo wo Kakutoku seyo [Get Supports from the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]," *Gaiko Jiho*, vol. 97, no. 1 (1941).
- Miyoshi, Shunkichiro, *Nanyo Kakyo ni tsuite [On the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Toa Kenkyusho, 1940).
- Morita, Shigeo, "Nanyo Kakyo no Dotai [Recent Trends of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]," *Takumu Hyoron*, vol. 14, no. 1 (1942).
- Muta, Tetsuji, "Nanpo ni okeru Kakyo Mondai [Overseas Chinese Problems in Nanyo]," *Toyo Boeki Kenkyu*, vol. 21, no. 15 (1942).
- Nagano, Akira, "Nanyo Kakyo no Ugoki [Trends of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]," *Gaikoku no Shinbun to Zasshi*, vol. 455 (1940).
- Naigai Keizai Gaikan, "Nanyo Kakyo no Shogyo-teki Kino [The Commercial Function of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]," *Naigai Keizai Gaikan* (1942).
- Nakayama, Kyushiro, "Iwayuru Kakyo ni Tsuite [On the Overseas Chinese]," *Toyo*, vol. 42, no. 1 (Nanshi-hakengun Chousa-han, 1939).
- _____, *Taiwan Zaiju Kakyo no Chosa [A Research on the Overseas Chinese in Taiwan]* (Taipei: Nanshi-hakengun, 1940).
- Nanyo Kyokai, ed., *Filipin ni okeru Kakyo no Nikka Haiseki [The Overseas Chinese Boycott in the Philippines]* (Tokyo: Nanyo Kyokai, 1938).
- _____, "Kyokuto Boeki ni okeru Kakyo no Yakuwari [Overseas Chinese Roles in Far Eastern Trading]," *Nanyo*, vol. 25, no. 1 (1939).
- _____, "Nanyo Kakyo Kaikoku Irodan no Katsuyaku [The Activities of Overseas Chinese Delegation to Home Country]," *Nanyo*, vol. 26, no. 7 (1940a).
- _____, "Filipin Kakyo no Shogyo Toshi [Commercial Investments of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]," *Nanyo*, vol. 26, no. 5 (1940b).
- _____, *Nanyo no Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Tokyo: Nanyo Kyokai, 1940c).
- _____, "Filipin Kakyo no Seiryoku (1) [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]," *Nanyo*, vol. 27, no. 11 (1941a).
- _____, "Filipin Kakyo no Seiryoku (2) [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]," *Nanyo*, vol. 27, no. 12 (1941b).
- _____, "Filipin Kakyo no Seiryoku (3) [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]," *Nanyo*, vol. 28, no. 1 (1942a).
- _____, "Filipin Kakyo no Seiryoku (4) [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese in

- the Philippines],” *Nanyo*, vol. 28, no. 2 (1942b).
- Nanyosuisan, “*Nanyo Gyogyo niokeru Kakyo no Chii* [The Status of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo Fishery],” *Nanyo Suisan*, vol. 7, no. 12 (1941).
- Narita, Setsuo, *Kakyo-shi [Overseas Chinese History]* (Tokyo: Keisetsu Shoin, 1941).
- Negishi, Tadashi, *Kakyo Shuroku [Notes on the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1942).
- Ninomiya, Chozo, “*Nanyo Kakyo eno Ninshiki* [An Understanding on the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Toa Keizai Kenkyu*, vol. 22, no. 4 (1938).
- Nose, Raiken, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Kyoiku* [Education of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Tiawn Jiho*, vol. 23, no. 11 (1941).
- Ozeki, Hisajiro, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Keizai-teki Seiryoku ni Tsuite* [Economic Influence of the Overseas Chinese],” *Kaigai Jijo Kenkyu* 7 (1941).
- Sano, Unto, “*Nanshi to Kakyo* [Southern China and the Overseas Chinese],” *Nanpo*, vol. 3, no. 10 (1941).
- Sayama, Sadao, *Kakyo Mondai to Sekai [Overseas Chinese Problems and the World]* (Tokyo: Daidoshoin, 1943).
- Shina Mondai Kenkyu-sho, *Kakyo: Shina Minzoku no Kaigai Hatten [The Overseas Chinese: Migration of the Chinese]* (Tokyo: Shina Mondai Kenkyu-sho, 1928).
- Shirota, Heisho, “*Kakyo Shogyodo no Kaibo* [An Analysis of Overseas Chinese Commerce],” *Nanshin*, vol. 7, no. 9 (1942).
- _____, “*Kakyo no Seikaku Kaibo* [An Analysis of Traits of the Overseas Chinese],” *Nanshin*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1943).
- Suemitsu, Takayoshi, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Himitsu-Kessha* [Secret Societies of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Manshu Hyoron*, vol. 24, no. 3 (1943).
- Suyama, Suguru, “*Nanyo Kakyo Hatten-shi Kenkyu* [A Historical Study on Migration of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Shin-Asia*, vol. 11, no. 4 (1937).
- Suzuki, Soichiro, “*Nanyo Kakyo-kan* [A View on the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo],” *Keizai Ronsou*, vol. 55, no. 6 (1942).
- Taiwan Ginko Chosaka, *Nanyo Kakyo to Kinyu-kan [The Overseas Chinese and Finance]* (Taipei: Taiwan Ginko Chosaka, 1914).
- _____, *Nanyo ni okeru Kakyo [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Taiwan Ginko Chosaka, 1917).
- Taiwan Ginko Taipei Todoriseki Chosaka, *Nanyo Kakyo Keizai-ryoku Kento [An Examination on Overseas Chinese Economic Influence]* (Taipei: Taiwan Ginko, 1939).
- Taiwan Ginko Tokyo Todoriseki Chosaka, *Nanyo Kakyo to Sono Hongoku Sokin Toshi Mondai [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo and Remittance Problems]* (Tokyo: Taiwan Ginko Tokyo Todorishi-shitsu, 1941).
- Taiwan Nichi-Nichi Shinposha, *Nanyo no Kakyo Taisaku [Overseas Chinese Policies in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Tiawan Nichi Nichi Shinposha, 1938).
- Taiwan Sotokuhu Gaijika, *Nanyo Kakyo Jijo [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Taiwan Sotokuhu, 1938).
- Taiwan Sotokuhu Kanbo Chosaka, *Nanyo ni okeru Fukein, Canton Ryosho Imin no Kakkyo [Fukienese and Cantonese Immigrants in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Taiwan Sotokuhu, 1918).
- Taiwan Sotokuhu Kanbo Gaimu-bu, *Nanyo Kakyo Jijo [The Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Taiwan-Sotokuhu, 1938).
- Taiwan Sotokuhu Rinji Joho-bu, *Nanyo Kakyo-kan [Views on the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Taiwan Sotokuhu, 1939).
- Taiwan Takushoku Kabushikigaisha, *Shina Jihen to Kakyo [The China Incident and the Overseas Chinese]* (Taipei: Taiwan Takushoku Kaisha, 1939).
- _____, *Hontojin no Nanyo Imin Jijo [Taiwanese Immigrants in Nanyo]* (Taipei: Taiwan Takushoku Kaisha, 1940).
- _____, *Honto ni okeru Kakyo no Chii [The Status of the Overseas Chinese in Taiwan]* (Taipei: Taiwan Takushoku Kaisha, 1941).
- Takamizu, Taro, “*Kakyo ni kansuru Mondai* [The Overseas Chinese Problems],” *Kaigai Jijo Kenkyu*, vol. 7 (1941).
- Takei, Juro, “*Nanpo no Kakyo* [The Overseas Chinese in South],” *Boekijoho*, vol. 54 (1942).
- Toa, “*Filipin ni okeru Kakyo no Keizai* [Overseas Chinese Economy in the Philippines],” *Toa*, vol. 12, no. 3 (1939).
- _____, “*Fukien Kakyo no Seikaku* [The National Traits of the Fukien Chinese],” *Toa*, vol. 13, no. 12 (1940).
- _____, “*Daitoa Kensetsu to Nanpo Kakyo* [The Overseas Chinese in Nanpo and the Establishment of GEACPS],” *Toa*, vol. 15, no. 4 (1942).
- Tomita, Yoshiro, “*Nanyo Kakyo no Keizai-teki Kiko* [Economic Organizations of the Overseas Chinese],” *Chiri Kyoiku*, vol. 30, no. 5 (1939).
- Tomitsu, Takezo, *Nanyo to Kakyo [Nanyo and the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Takayamashoin, 1940).
- Toyo Keizai Shinpo, “*Filipin ni okeru Kakyo no Chii* [The Status of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines],” *Toyo Keizai Shinpo*, vol. 2015 (1942).
- Toyo Kyokai Chosa-bu, *Genka no Kakyo Gaikan [A Review on the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Toyo Kyoka, 1942).
- Watanabe, Kaoru, *Filipin Kakyo Shinyo-roku [Directory of the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]* (Tokyo: Nanyo Kyokai, 1932a).
- _____, “*Filipin ni okeru Kakyo: Nikka Hiseki no Eikyo to Hosho no Genkyo ni Tsuite* [The Overseas Chinese in the Philippines: The Influence of the Boycott against Japanese Products and Japanese Merchants],” *Nanyo Kyokai Zasshi*, vol. 18, no. 10, (1932b).
- Watanabe, Takeo, *Nanpo-kyoeiken to Kakyo [South Co-prosperity Sphere and the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Shikensha, 1942).
- Watanabe, Takeshi, *Nanpo-kyoeiken to Kakyo [South Co-prosperity Sphere and the Overseas Chinese]* (Tokyo: Nishodo, 1941).
- _____, “*Kakyo Taisaku to Bei, Ei, Ran No Nanpo Kakyo Assei-shi* (1-2) [Overseas

- Chinese Policy and the Overseas Chinese Abuse of American, British, and Dutch Colonialism]," *Nanpo*, vol. 4, nos. 7 & 8 (1942).
- Yamamoto, Koyata, "*Daitoa-kyoeiken no Kakyo Shori Mondai* [Overseas Chinese Policy in GEACPS]," *Menyu-Geppou* (April 1942).
- Yokota, Minoru, "*Keizaisen No Shohai Wo Kessuru Kakyo Mondai* [Overseas Chinese Problem as a Critical Issue for Economic War]," *Diamond*, vol. 30, no. 11 (1942).
- Yoshida, Eitaro, "*Nanyo Kakyo no Bunka Katsudo* [The Cultural Activities and the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]," *Kokusai Bunka*, vol. 18 (1942).
- Yoshida, Tanichiro, "*Filipin no Kakyo* [The Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]," *Shin-Asia*, vol. 3, no. 5 (1941a).
- _____, "*Filipin no Kakyo to Keizai* [The Overseas Chinese and Their Economy in the Philippines]," *Nanyo*, vol. 27, no. 1 (1941b).
- Yoshida, Yoshizo, "*Nanyo Shakai to Kakyo Shonin: Korigashishihon* [Nanyo Society and Overseas Chinese Merchants: Usury Capitalism]," *Takao Shoko Jiho*, vols. 9-11 (1939a).
- _____, "*Nanyo Kakyo No Keizai-teki Kino* [Economic Function of the Overseas Chinese in Nanyo]." *Diamond*, vol. 27, no. 23 (1939b).
- _____, "*Filipin ni-okeru Kome to Kakyo* [Rice Business and the Overseas Chinese in the Philippines]," *Nanshi-Nanyo*, vol. 179 (1940).

Deanie Lyn Ocampo-Go
Kaisa Para Sa Kaunlaran, Inc.

UNDERSTANDING *TSINOY* FAMILIES: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE AND MORE

Tsinoy, an abbreviation for *Tsinong Pinoy* or *Tsinong Filipino*, was a newly coined term representing a group of Filipinos of Chinese descent. Born in the Philippines after the Pacific War, the *Tsinoy*s (or Chinese Filipinos) belong to a relatively younger generation who are Filipinos by birth and by heart. The *Tsinoy*s identify with the concerns of the country, while simultaneously taking pride in the richness of their Chinese heritage. *Tsinoy*s occupy a large part of the heterogeneous Chinese community in contemporary Philippine society.

Approximately 10 percent of present day ethnic Chinese community are the first-generation Chinese immigrants who hailed from Southern China, immigrated and settled in the Philippines in search of greener pastures due to poverty then. Most of them were born before the war, use Chinese names, speak Chinese as their first language, are active in family associations, socialize mostly with Chinese, practice traditional Chinese customs and traditions, and still maintain linkages with and invest in their hometowns. For them, China is their Mother country. The remaining 90 percent are Philippine-born (even fourth- or fifth-generation *Tsinoy*s). They are less than 60 years of age, have Christian names, speak Filipino or English as their first language, socialize with both Chinese and Filipinos, are active in religious and civic organizations, attended Filipino schools, quite Westernized in thoughts and deeds, and have no memories of or affiliation towards China. The only country that they have known is the Philippines. These are the *Tsinoy*s. Thus, between the first-generation Chinese and the *Tsinoy*s lie vast differences in terms of socio-cultural and politico-civic orientations. In addition to these two groups are approximately 40,000 new immigrants.

Why, then, a paper on the *Tsinoy* families?