

A STUDY OF PREJUDICE IN A PERSONALISTIC SOCIETY:
AN ANALYSIS OF AN ATTITUDE SURVEY OF COLLEGE
STUDENTS—UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES

GEORGE HENRY WEIGHTMAN

Summary:

IN 1955 A QUESTIONNAIRE designed to explore the nature of stereotypical thinking and of cultural animosities in a non-Western cultural context was distributed to college students at the University of the Philippines. An analysis of the data supports the earlier observations that there is a tendency for Filipinos to prefer Caucasians (especially Americans) to Orientals (including even certain Philippine sub-groups). Perhaps the most significant findings of the study are: (1) demonstration of the inapplicability of an American-type "vocabulary of prejudice" to another culture and (2) the implications of such a study of *antipathies* for an understanding of the nature of Philippine culture as a whole.

Questions in American studies dealing with the issues of *antipathies* and of *social distance* which have been found to be highly correlated with items in the universe of prejudice in the different context of Philippine society appear to be correlated to a universe of social relations. Only in the examinations of the "extreme cells" (which are not scale types) was it possible to detect any indication that antipathy of personality, values, contacts, and general background questions.

Prejudice: Its Universe and Correlates

Gordon Allport has defined prejudice as a "feeling, favorable or unfavorable toward a person or thing, prior to, or not based on actual experience" and as "thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant."¹ This definition, by its nature, tends to conceive narrowly of prejudice as "negative" or "against" while it actually could be "positive" or "for." Robin H. Williams's description is more encompassing: "prejudgement of individuals on the basis of some type of social categorization . . . a generalization which operates in advance of the particular situation in which it is manifested . . . a cluster of cognitive judgments, implying a set of behavioral expectations . . . and a set of evaluations of good and bad, superior and inferior."²

¹ Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, pp. 6-9.

² Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, p. 36.

Conceptually, prejudice may be viewed as a form of automatic thinking in which the ascription of certain traits is done on the basis of some simple categorization. "I dislike the color purple" is a simple statement, a statement of dislike or antipathy. However, the observation "since it is purple, nothing can be good about it" would represent a prejudicial remark.

The conceptual mappings of the dimensions of prejudice would include subuniverse of normative behavior and indices of social distance, antipathy, stereotyping, hypothetical interactions, and personal interactions. In the attempt to point out prejudice in the American context, American social scientists have long been able to use successfully in surveys question items dealing with these various indices in order to study the nature of prejudice in American society. This has been possible because questions of antipathy, social distance, and stereotyping are known to act as indices of items in the American universe of prejudice. They correlate so closely with prejudice that they may be viewed as "equivalents."

Of considerable heuristic interest is the question of whether or not, given a society with a cultural context for social relations different from that of America, the concept of prejudice can be universally indexed by items of antipathy, social distance, and stereotyping similar to those found so effective in America. Seemingly, the Philippines, for more than fifty years profoundly influenced by American culture, would not be expected to provide the ideal setting for such an inquiry, but as students of Philippine society are aware, such apparent resemblances prove quite superficial upon analysis.

The study presently being discussed chose for the purpose of economy and administrative ease to use in the analysis of a particular social context affect items from the dimensions of social antipathy and stereotyping (which has been defined as "an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify [rationalise] our conduct in relation to that category.")³

The Philippine Cultural Setting

The issues of ethnic antagonisms and of prejudice in the Philippines operate in a society which is personalistic and particularistic to a marked degree. Concern with social relationships is pervasive and profound. Dyadic, rather than collective, interaction is both paramount and crucial. Consanguine, conjugal, and ritual extensions of the kin relationships are

³ Gordon W. Allport, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

all important. In such a non-collective oriented society, the phenomenon of cultural pluralism partakes of a form in sharp contrast to the pluralism of American life. Almost eighty languages or vernaculars are spoken in the Philippines. The seven or eight largest native language groups each numbers more than one million speakers. While all of these are "related languages," they are not mutually intelligible and tend (especially in the past) to reinforce the particularistic orientations of kin, village, and regional ties.

Four hundred years of Hispano-American colonialism has made the Philippines the most Christian and superficially the most Westernized of all Asian nations. Actually, the Philippine *peoples* have preserved a rich indigenous institutional framework, albeit influenced by the Sino, Hispano and lastly American cultural patterns. Nevertheless, this identification and esteem for the West among certain elements of the society have been coupled with a disdain for the Asian cultural forms — of both the alien Asian residents and certain Filipino groups which possess values or demonstrate practices perceived as deviating from the desired Western patterns.

The potentialities of these cultural antagonisms have been complicated by the presence of non-Christian native enclaves (the "pagans" and Muslims) and by a sizeable Chinese minority⁴ which, in spite of its social rejection and its politically precarious position, has long wielded an economic power out of proportion to its numbers. Sino-Filipino interaction in the past has been characterized by massacres, communal rioting, severe legal restrictions, expulsions, and legally imposed ghettos. At present the Philippine government is engaged in an extensive, but hardly systematic, campaign to bar "aliens" (i.e., Chinese) from a considerable portion of the economic life of the country. Yet while anti-Chinese feeling has always been marked, there has always been widespread intermarriage among Chinese and Filipinas (i.e., Chinese *men* and *Philippine women*). A large proportion of the Filipino population is of relatively recent Sino-Filipino ancestry. Thus, the final argument of the American Southern White, "Yes, but would you want your sister to marry one?" is in the Filipino context inappropriate and not indicative of Filipino feelings of antipathy toward the various minority groups.

The minute Western (mainly American and Spanish) communities⁵ of considerable economic power and social prestige, an Indian resident

⁴ The number of Chinese who registered in 1958 was put at 145,750 by the Philippine Bureau of Immigration. Estimates of "ethnic Chinese" range from 300,000 to 750,000, with the lower figure probably closer to the actual number.

⁵ Registered American and Spanish citizens total only a few thousand. However, the social picture is obscured by large numbers of naturalized Filipinos of "mixed" ancestry—especially Spanish mestizos.

group⁶ famous in the Filipino folklore for its magic-sexuality and for constituting the "bogeyman" of all Christian Filipino children, and the recently (post World War II) repatriated Japanese community have also produced occasions for discord in the past and at present. However, the point should be made that while the typical Filipino village (*barrio*) or small town often possesses the features of a homogeneous and mutually cooperating extended kin group, the larger towns and cities possess (by Filipino standards) heterogeneity that Americans would associate with New York City at the height of the various waves of migration. The villager has a word for the outsider or stranger (*taong-labas*). To the villager transplanted or uprooted to the city, the Chinese, the "Bombay" (Indian), Spanish *mestizo*, the American *tourista*, and the Filipinos who are not his kin (*kamag-anak*) nor even his village mates (*Kababayan*) are all "outsiders." (*taong-labas*). Thus, antipathy to the Chinese (or any other ethnic group) embodies elements of antipathy to the non-kin. While at times (which might be quite often) such "compounding" intensifies ethnic animosities, on the level of individual interaction, personalistic contacts and elaboration of ritualistic kinship ties can conceivably dissipate such antipathies.

At the same time, overt prejudice and anti-locution against the Chinese in the Philippines operate in a socio-political context strikingly different from that of America. For in America, despite all the marked expressions of socio-economic discrimination and conflict, ethnic and racial prejudice runs counter to the basic American *credo*, posing what writers have termed the "American dilemma." Discrimination against fellow-Americans creates ambivalent feelings which even the most zealous bigots must attempt to rationalize. This is not necessarily the case in the Philippines where discrimination and anti-locution against the "alien," the stranger, and *taong-labas* find overt expressions in folklore, law, and society. Thus, anti-locution, cultural antagonisms, and ethnic stereotyping are far more overt in the Philippines than in the United States. Yet, given the personalistic orientation of the traditional Philippines society, prejudice may be expected to be more differentiated than in the American context.

The 1955 Study

Various social distance studies in which American Whites and Spaniards were preferred over the Chinese, Indians, and Japanese (particularly after the war) in that order, had long been taken in the Philippines as a demonstration of Filipino preference for Occidentals over Orientals.⁷

⁶ The registered number of Indians totaled less than 2,000 in 1958.

⁷ Joel V. Berreman, "Philippine Attitudes toward Racial and National Minorities," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, XXV:2, June

(The fact that social distance scales *correlate* with rather than are necessarily equivalences of prejudice was often obscured.) None of these studies, however, passed far beyond the most elemental aspects of the social distance method nor were they productive of data on the more complex discussions of opinion in the area of inter-group relations. In 1955, while a member of the Department of Sociology of the University of the Philippines, this writer attempted a construction of a survey of attitudes which would closely parallel similar studies that had been carried out in America. This admittedly exploratory account was designed to produce some insights into the forms of stereotyping and social antipathy taken in a particularistic rather than a universalistic culture.

In July 1955, the questionnaires were distributed in the first term course of Sociology, which was then compulsory for all students at some time in their college career. Since the classes were compulsory and controlled by the surveyor, the choice of the first term sociology students was obvious. There had been no previous discussion of ethnic relations in the class sections. The original sample numbered 672, of which 654 were Filipino citizens. But it should be borne in mind that in their sociology classes — to say nothing of their university contacts — there were foreign nationals (e.g., Chinese, Indians, Vietnamese, Americans, and Spaniards). In addition, a handful of the Filipino "citizens" are "ethnic" Chinese or "ethnic" Spaniards, while many more are of recent "mixed" ancestry. Almost half of the sample (313) were in their first year of college. Sophomores accounted for 233 of the remainder. Certain peculiarities of the general Philippine educational system led to the following age distribution:⁸

16 years and below (i.e., 14 to 15)	156
17 years	169
18 years	159
19 years and above	170

Although Sociology II was a university-wide required course, students from the College of Liberal Arts numbered 583 of the total sample of 672. The sex ratio in that particular college reflected itself in the sample — there being almost twice as many girls as boys in the sample. In the analysis, these background factors of age and sex are controlled; they

1957, pp. 186-194 summarizes the various findings of S.E. Macaraig, Benicio T. Catapuzan, Chester Hunt, and Akhtar Sharif Kanwar. Kanwar's *A Study of Social Distance between some Filipinos and Sixteen Other Ethnic Groups* is the most elaborate and Philippine oriented of these initial studies.

⁸ Since there are only ten years of pre-college schooling and many children commence school before the legal age of seven, it is quite possible for a college freshman class to include many fourteen and fifteen year olds.

are discussed here only to note that any sample drawn from the University of the Philippines would *not* possess the characteristics usually associated with an American state university.

Analysis: Climate of Opinion

A perusal of the marginals of questions relating to social distance, antipathy and stereotyping tend to support most of the previous findings about Filipino preferences for Westerners. Interactions of various types with Westerners (Table I) are persistently perceived as less distasteful than with other Orientals or even a Filipino sub-group (the Moros). Table II presents the marginals dealing with traits or characteristics frequently attributed to various groups in the Philippines. Again the Americans fare better than the Chinese and various Filipino groups. Few members of the sample agreed with unfavorable descriptions of the Americans. The Spaniards present an unusual contrast. While faring relatively well with respect to marriage and partying (Table I) they are regarded as possessing, at least by American standards, certain unattractive attributes. The response to the Chinese characterization is rather provocative:

TABLE I

Preferential Directions of Marginals N = 654

	Number	Percent
Distasteful to eat at the same table		
Q. 51 American	107	16.4%
Q. 47 Chinese	155	23.7%
Distasteful to dance with		
Q. 52 American	130	19.9%
Q. 48 Chinese	199	30.4%
Distasteful to have a relative marry		
Q. 54 American	248	37.9%
Spanish	317	48.5%
Chinese	415	63.5%
Indian	455	69.3%
Distasteful to attend party where others are		
Q. 53 American	287	43.9%
Q. 55 Spanish	375	57.0%
Q. 60 Moro	419	64.1%
Q. 57 Indian	421	64.4%
Q. 49 Chinese	434	64.4%
Q. 59 Japanese	445	68.0%

TABLE II

Stereotypical Directions of the Marginals

Agree		Number	Percent
Q. 36	Leyteños: lazy and ignorant	110	17%
Q. 40	Americans: insincere	127	19%
Q. 41	American aid for P.I. for self interest	128	19.5%
Q. 37	Better to have fewer foreigners here	279	43%
Q. 39	Moros: cruel, inclined to run amok	370	56%
Q. 42	Members of the Iglesia: fanatics	384	59%
Q. 38	Chinese: dishonest in business dealings	421	65%
Q. 44	Spaniards: proud and high hat	543	83%
Q. 45	Chinese: better businessmen than Filipinos	547	84%

they are deemed to be dishonest and far better businessmen than the Filipinos.

Actually the story which the marginals tell may be deceptive. There is indeed an impressive progression in the preferential directions of the marginals. True, an increasing number find it "distasteful" to eat, dance, marry, and party with various ethnic minorities. There is a clear preference for Westerners over Orientals. However, analysis of the matrix of responses to all the items revealed that the responses indicating preferences or antipathy for these alien and native groups do not form a scale pattern. In other words, these sets of antipathies cannot be said to refer to a specific discussion or variable "antipathy," but on the contrary, indicate differential responses. Many who find it distasteful to dance with a foreigner would *not* find it distasteful to eat with, or even have a relative marry one. Many who would not find it distasteful to have a relative marry an American, Spaniard, or Chinese would find it distasteful to party with them. Regarding Chinese as dishonest, Spaniards as "high hat" and proud, and Moros as cruel was seen to have little relationship to whether or not one would find it distasteful to have a relative marry one or to party with them. Indeed, a large part of those who did *not* find it distasteful to mix with Chinese or Spaniards agreed with descriptions of these groups that stressed certain unpleasant traits attributed to them.

How, then, to explain this seemingly erratic behavior? Actually the responses were anything but erratic; they graphically mirror the particularistic nature of social life in the Philippines. Items in America which belong to the universe of prejudice are found in the Philippines to be involved in a universe of personalistic social relationships. Thus, the question, "Would you find it distasteful to dance with a Chinese?" is

asking not only about one's reaction to a Chinese but also to one's reaction to dancing. Anyone who finds it distasteful to dance must inevitably find it distasteful to dance with a Chinese. Although Filipinos, as a group, are quite fond of Western dancing (in contrast to other Southeast Asians), a not too small minority find it immoral *per se*. Similarly, it might be demonstrated that the question, "Would you find it distasteful to eat with a Chinese (or an American)?" involves more than a mere response to a specific prejudice.

The question, "Would you find it distasteful for a member of X group to marry your brother or sister?" probably most sharply represents the case where for American and Philippine societies the concepts are not the same. In the particularistic and personalistic Philippines, a member of X group who marries one's sister is perceived not as a member of X group but as a brother-in-law. In contrast, to go to a party as an outsider is to go into a social situation unstructured by previous personalistic ties. Many Filipinos would thus find such a party distasteful whether or not X group were Chinese, Americans, rich men, paupers, engineers, or members of another Filipino kindred. In effect, to many Filipinos the question is perceived as asking, "How would you like to feel that you didn't belong at the party?"

Whereas the question dealing with social interaction was confounded by Philippine perceptions of social relationships, those dealing with stereotyping were confounded often by a literal grasp of social realities in the Philippines. One of the individuals concerned with the project once asked, "How can these statements (Questions 36-44) give an insight into prejudice? Most of them are true." In the more literal Philippine context it appears that the non-prejudiced, just as the prejudiced, will agree that most Chinese businessmen are dishonest (most Filipino businessmen are similarly regarded), that most Spaniards (who are upper class) are "high hat" and proud, and that members of the Iglesia ni Kristo (who possess some annoying evangelical techniques) are fanatics because *they are*.

Fifty years ago in America, dialect jokes and overt stereotyping of minority groups were so widespread that they could hardly be used as effective cutting points to differentiate high and low prejudice groups. Now, however, it is assumed quite accurately that the use of stereotypical epithets and thinking closely mirrors prejudice in America. In the Philippines often extreme (by American standards) stereotypical verbalization by a Filipino tells one surprisingly little of how the speaker will respond to a specific Chinese (or other ethnic group member). The widespread anti-Chinese sentiments in the Philippines are generalized rather than

specific in their application. Ironically, the American-style patronizing form, "Some of my best friends are X" is rarely used in the Philippines, largely because it is not seen as germane to *ethnic animosity*. That one's father or brother-in-law is Chinese is not viewed as relevant to whether one feels Chinese as a group to be dishonest or un-Filipino. Similarly, regarding Spaniards as "aristocratic," "luxury loving," and "snobbish" (as Berreman found in 1955)⁹ has little to do with their preference rating in general or with social interaction on the individual level.

Analysis of the Extreme Cells

In an effort to study prejudice itself or at least its correlates of social distance and antipathy unconfounded by factors identifiable with questions of social relationships or of social realities, analysis was directed to those elements of the sample group who had consistently agreed or disagreed about the Chinese. These statements included:

1. Do you think you would find it distasteful:
 - a. To eat at the same table with a Chinese?
 - b. To dance with a Chinese?
 - c. To go to a party and find that most people are Chinese?
 - d. To have a Chinese marry your brother or sister?
2. Do you dislike the idea of going to a university with Chinese, or don't you mind it?
 - a. I dislike the idea.
 - b. I don't mind, but I rather not.
 - c. I just don't care.
 - d. I like to have some Chinese in the university.

Those who agreed with *all* parts of (1) and endorsed either "a and b" of (2) were classified as "anti-Chinese" (n = 49). Those who disagreed with *all* parts of (1) and endorsed *either* "c or d" of (2) were classified as "non-anti-Chinese" (n = 85).

The addition of the statement:

3. Although some Chinese are honest, in general Chinese are dishonest in their business dealings. ——— Agree ——— Disagree was found to reduce the respective groups from 49 to 40 and from 85 to 48. An analysis of these smaller sub-groups revealed a *persistence* of the same trends observed with the larger extreme cells subgroups. However, since the smallness of the latter subgroup weakened the statistical significance,

⁹ Joel V. Berreman, *op. cit.*, p. 191. Although Dr. Berreman assigns "luxury-living" as an undesirable trait, this may not be the Filipino estimation.

attention here will be devoted to a consideration of the large subgroup extremes.

Table III provides some insight into these extreme "types." The "hostile" group has a higher representation of girls, is younger, and less advanced in their college careers. City folks tend to be less "antipatico" than the *poblacion* inhabitants, while there does not appear to be much difference with respect to the minute sample from the *barrios* (villages). Education of the parents provides an interesting pattern, in contrast. In general, there is little difference between the extremes with respect to those having college graduate parents, but those who are less "antipatico" are more likely to have merely elementary educated parents while the "antipatico" are more likely to have high school educated parents. In so far as educational attainment (in the Philippines especially for women) reflects one's SES it would appear that antipathy is least among those poorest, not decisive among the richest, but most marked among the "middle class" section of the society. Father's occupation provides probably the most crucial insight into the pattern of the mechanism of Philippine Sinophobia. It is *not* those who are in competition with the Chinese (i.e., those in commerce) nor those who are dependent economically on the Chinese (i.e., those in skilled or unskilled trades or farming) who are most critical of the Chinese. Rather, antipathy is most marked among families of educators who train the future generation, professionals and government officials and employees. It is precisely these elements who constitute the most Westernized portion of Philippine society. With respect to the figures in "home dialect," the most important finding is that there appears to be no significant finding. However, this runs counter to a previously widely held belief that Tagalogs were far more prejudiced than other language groups in the country.

TABLE III

General Background Factors of Extreme Cells

(49)		(83)
5-		5+
%		%
	<u>Sex</u>	
26	Male	40
74	Female	60

	<u>Residence</u>	
45	City Inhabitants	55
51	Town (poblacion)	42
4	Village (barrio)	5
	<u>Mother's Education</u>	
14	Elementary or less	29
27	High School	19
59	Some College or More	52
	<u>Father's Education</u>	
4	Elementary or less	18
18	High School	11
78	Some College or More	71
	<u>Age</u>	
32	16 and below	15
47	17-18	60
11	19 and above	25
	<u>College Year</u>	
48	First	47
40	Second	29
8	Third	19
4	Fourth	5
	<u>Home District</u>	
59	Tagalog	64
18	Ilocano	12
12	Visayan	12
	<u>Father's Occupation</u>	
21	Government	16
50	Professionals and Educators	262 ?
17	Commerce	31
4	Skilled-unskilled	9
0	Farmer-Landlords	7

Table IV depicts the relation of such antipathy to such factors as contact, values, and personality. In this area, at least in the Philippines, the pattern of Sinophobia bears marked parallels to the American pattern of ethnic prejudice. The "simpaticos" have had more contacts and more socially meaningful contacts than do the "antipaticos." With re-

spect to questions on values and personality, the "prejudiced" Filipino mirrors the same traits associated with his American counterpart.

Table V relates Sinophobia (or its absence) to antipathy to other ethnic groups. Here again, the contrast is marked. The Sinophobes' antipathies directly mirror the marginals, (see Tables I and II), whereas for the non-Sinophobes the negative response is relatively low and their antipathy to fellow Asians is not much greater than that towards the Westerners. Among the Sinophobes, there is a pronounced tendency to view Americans in a more favorable light than even various Filipino groups (Leyteños, Moros, and Iglesia ni Kristo). Nevertheless, as observed before, in the Philippines a social reality is perceived as a social reality. Hence, even the non-Sinophobes are inclined to see the Chinese businessman as dishonest, the Iglesia ni Kristo as fanatical, and the Spaniards are "high hat." (However, they do so with more restraint than do the Sinophobes). Both extremes equally regard the Chinese as better merchants than Filipinos.

TABLE IV

Sinophobia Related to Contact, Values and Personality

%		%
	<u>Contact with Chinese</u>	
20	Considerable pre-college school contact	55
25	Short period " " "	25
65	No " " "	40
	<u>Contacts in Recent Week</u>	
35	None	23
20	One	11
31	2-4	34
6	5-9	11
6	10 or more	21
	<u>Occasions for Recent Contact</u>	
40*	Classes-University contact	38
25	Organization, Crowds, Games	42
17	Neighborhood	9
15	None	8

* % for occasions of contact relates to number of contacts given: 52 for prejudiced; 116 for non-prejudiced.

	<u>Values</u>	
62	Cannot trust people	47
	<u>Most Important</u>	
34	Doing what is expected	27
4	Having fun	1
31	Being friendly	46
31	Being successful	25
	<u>Personality</u>	
61	Feel uneasy meeting strangers	31
33	Feel guilty often	25
47	Sometimes	63
20	Hardly ever	12
	<u>Feel People Treat Unfairly</u>	
33	Often	16
55	Sometimes	66
12	Hardly ever	18

TABLE V

Antipathy to Other Ethnic Communities

<u>Anti-Chinese</u>		<u>Non-Anti-Chinese</u>
5-		5+
%		%
	<u>Distasteful</u>	
14	To dance - American	18
22	To eat with - American	11
43	To party - American	17
45	Relative marry - American	15
67	Party with Spaniards	26
59	Relative marry Spaniard	20
96	Party with Indian	23
94	Relative marry Indian	34
88	Party with Japanese	36
90	Party with Moros	32

Agree

14	Americans – insincere	14
20	Americans aid in self interest	18
31	Leyteños – lazy	12
65	Moros – cruel	48
72	Country better off if fewer foreigners	42
82	Chinese-dishonest in business	48
84	Chinese – better businessmen than Filipinos	83
84	Iglesia ni Kristo – fanatics	50
90	Spaniards – high hat	71

Favor

63	Nationalization of labor (barring aliens)	28
----	--	----

This is an objective truth but one would imagine that the Sinophobes would draw a different conclusion from this than would the non-Sinophobes. Not too surprisingly, the Sinophobes endorse the Nationalization of labor (i.e., Filipinization) far more than do the non-Sinophobes. Yet, recalling the background characteristics one notes that this means that the competitors of the Chinese and the labor force are precisely the groups most opposed to such legislation, although the advocates of such political restrictions argue that this legislation is designed to benefit those groups. Although the Philippine House of Representatives has repeatedly passed such a legislation by a wide margin and despite the widespread press-radio campaign in its favor, nearly two-thirds of the total sample opposed such legislation.

Even the extreme cells are confounded; certainly xenophobia was an aspect of the Sinophobia. And among the “non-anti-Chinese” are not only the non-prejudiced but also the adherents of “Asia for the Asians” and the “Joe (the American) Go Home” schools of thought. A study of the extreme cells on responses to questions about Americans might prove rewarding and offer insight into the realm of Philippine prejudice in general and of Filipino xenophobia in particular.

There appears a strong indication that economic and social factors are related to Philippine ethnic antagonisms in a manner different from that observed in America and elsewhere (i.e., economic competition as a crucial factor). Probably the explanation lies in the fact that the emerging semi-professional middle class senses the Chinese as a *rival* for power far more than does either the old elite or the mercantile elements of the society (who may very well be of recent Chinese ancestry). Perhaps a

felt socio-political rivalry may be more potent for cultural antagonism than actual economic competition.

Somewhat ominous is the tendency for the technically most "advanced," modern, Westernized elements to display the greatest cultural antagonism and undifferentiated prejudice. As the particularism of the kin and of the village give way to the particularism of class or zealous nationalism, one may perhaps expect an intensification of intergroup tensions. Robin Williams has noted of American intergroup tensions that "value of the Creed have continually struggled against pervasive and powerful countercurrents of valuation." In the Philippines there is no such universalistic creed to neutralize these tensions. However, in the past the nature of the old Philippine familistic particularism at least was productive of a differentiated form of prejudice. As the ethnic pluralism of the past gives way to the nationalistic antagonisms of the present, one may fear that an undifferentiated form of prejudice similar to the type studied in America but unchecked by any universalistic *credo* may become more pronounced. Given the politico-economic developments during the post-World War II period, the social implications are explosive.