VOL.11 NO.1 & 2 3RD & 4TH QUARTER 1995

People, Capital and Goods: Bridges Between the Philippines and Japan, 1970-1993

MARUJA M. B. ASIS

The flow of people between the Philippines and Japan, could be understood in relation to other types of exchanges, namely, the movement of capital and goods. Until the 1970s, there was not much exchange in terms of people and trade between the two countries. The flow of Japanese ODA to the Philippines in the 1970s started the exchange of people — Filipino trainees coming to Japan and the dispatch of Japanese experts and volunteers to the Philippines. The flow of Japanese capital through investments into the Philippines over the years also involved some population mobility similar to the mobility stimulated by development assistance. In the last two decades, the flow of people between the two countries accelerated. While majority of Japanese visitors to the country are tourists, Filipinos in Japan are predominantly workers. Labor migration, particularly the migration of the relatively unskilled has engendered problems to both sending and receiving countries. Although there had been some tentative discussions to consider the implications of development assistance, investment and trade on population mobility, alternatives arising from these have yet to be translated into policies for generating stay-at-home development. These alternatives to labor migration need to focus on generating domestic employment in sending countries. Otherwise, they may be simply contributing to a jobless economic growth which is not sustainable in the long run.

Introduction

The rise of Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan as newly industrialized countries (NICs) in the 1980s has catapulted Asia as the new growth region. In the 1990s, other rising stars such as Thailand and Malaysia are following in the heels of the NICs. Asia's growing prosperity, however, has also sharpened inequalities in the region, and this is evident

This research was made possible by a grant from The Japan Foundation. The author is grateful to the University of the Philippines, particularly, to the Department of Sociology, for giving her some time off from teaching to undertake this study. She also would like to thank Prof. Toshikazu Nagayama and the staff of the University Research Center of Nihon University for their support during her stay in Japan.

in the movement of people in the region. Amid the brisk transfers of capital and goods are transfers of people across national borders. Stahl and Appleyard (1992:417) observed that "International migration within and from the Asian region changed substantially in terms of magnitude, direction and character during the decade of the 1980s." They added that although there are various types of migration taking place in the region, the most dominant is the south-north movement. Among the key players are Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and South Korea as major receiving countries, and the Philippines, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Pakistan as primary source countries of migrants. Some countries like Malaysia and Thailand are both receiving and sending countries.

This paper focuses on the migration stream that developed between the Philippines and Japan, particularly that which became more discernible in the past two decades. As of 1995, Japan ranked fifth as a destination country for Filipino workers (Philippine Overseas Employment Administration, nd). Why Filipinos flock to Japan is not surprising given the economic and demographic differentials between the two countries. In addition, there are other factors that also influence the flow of people between the Philippines and Japan. One, at some point in their history Japanese nationals sought opportunities in the Philippines. Two, if there are Filipinos going to Japan, there are also Japanese nationals who come to the Philippines. Three, the flow or exchange of people between the two countries is just part of other flows, including flows of capital and goods. These are the themes pursued further in this paper using the migration systems approach.

Migration systems has been gaining ground in the recent literature on population mobility (e.g., Kritz, Lim and Zlotnik, 1992; Fawcett, 1989; Fawcett and Arnold, 1987). As an approach, it considers both the sending and receiving ends of migration, and it recognizes the interconnectedness between migration and other flows. The ties between sending and receiving countries may develop from various types of linkages (tangible, regulatory, relational) involving various actors (state to state, mass culture connections, family and personal networks, and migrant agency activities) (Fawcett, 1989).

Based on this framework, the flow of people between the Philippines and Japan is examined along with other types of exchanges, namely, the movement of capital and goods. These three flows are highlighted in this

paper because they have been an important leitmotif in the state-to-state ties between the Philippines and Japan since the 1970s. Furthermore, in discussions about alternatives to migration, the infusion of capital (either through aid or foreign investments) or trade is presented as likely options to stimulate stay-at-home development. In the Philippines, attracting foreign investments is viewed as an alternative to deploying Filipino workers overseas, especially since the human and social costs of overseas employment are rising (Asis, 1992). Similarly, in Japan, some sectors are calling for increased investment and trade to generate domestic employment in the sending countries instead of hiring foreign workers (Shimada, 1993:49). However, the choice between labor import or capital export is not a simple either-or situation. In the long run, it is even likely that capital export will stimulate further emigration because of the structural impacts of capital in the recipient country and the increasing familiarity between the host country and the foreign investor (Stahl and Appleyard, 1992:469). Bringing together data on the flows of people, capital and goods is a step towards understanding how one flow relates to other flows.

■ [I]n discussions about alternatives to migration, the infusion of capital or trade...is presented as likely options to stimulate stay-at-home development. In the Philippines, attracting foreign investments is viewed as an alternative to deploying Filipino workers overseas...

The Philippines and Japan Before the 1970s

Given the geographic proximity of the two countries, their ties go back a long way (see for example, Yu-Jose, 1994b and Sta. Romana and Jose, 1991). The present century has witnessed significant transformations in Philippines-Japan relations. In the early decades of this century, Filipinos did not consider Japan as an attractive destination. The few Filipinos who went to Japan were part of exchanges of government officials, professionals, students and businessmen sponsored by Japanese cultural organizations formed in the 1920s and 1930s (Yu-Jose, 1994a:127). The Philippines was, vis-a-vis Japan, a receiving country of Japanese nationals who came to the Philippines in search of employment, land and other opportunities. Although the Philippine economy was not much better than Japan's, the Japanese then (ca. 1900-1920) viewed the Philippines as rich in natural resources. They also assessed that the Philippines was sorely lacking in

capital and labor. To the Japanese, the solution was "to increase Japanese investments in the Philippines, and to send laborers" (Yu-Jose, 1992:7).

Early in the 20th century, the Philippines and Japan were both source countries of workers to the United States. In the early 1900s, Filipinos were being recruited as agricultural workers for Hawaiian plantations. The Philippine government, however, had a minimal role in this program. On the other hand, Japanese emigration started earlier and was actively promoted by the government. Emigration from Japan (with government support) started in 1885 with the departure of Japanese nationals to Hawaii (JICA, 1977:106). Demographic pressures, a shrinking resource base, and the primogeniture inheritance system (where the first son inherits the family's wealth and resources) were factors that contributed to Japanese emigration. Apart from the United States, Japanese emigrants sought opportunities in South America and Southeast Asia. Among the Japanese pioneers in the Philippines were women or *karayukisan* who came in the early 1900s. According to Yu-Jose (1994b:11), the *karayukisan* — Japanese women who were classified as entertainers, prostitutes, serving women, miscellaneous or unemployed in surveys — were initially attracted to the Philippines because of the presence of American soldiers. Compared to other Southeast Asian countries, Yu-Jose (1994b:11) indicated that the number of Japanese prostitutes in the Philippines was much smaller. Japanese men, on the other hand, came to the Philippines in the early 1900s to work on the construction of Kennon Road. Upon the completion of Kennon Road, some Japanese nationals went to Davao. There they were able to establish an abaca plantation, which later expanded into a Japanese community, complete with their own school run by teachers sent from Japan. If the Japanese in Davao were mainly cultivators, the Japanese in Manila were more diverse consisting of shopkeepers, company personnel, and government officials (Yu-Jose, 1992:94).

By the 1930s, Japanese nationals in the Philippines were no longer ordinary sojourners. They became highly successful in their various ventures — real estate, timber, mining, agriculture, shipping, gravel and rock, printing and binding industry, manufacturing — and had virtually monopolized the fishing industry (Sta. Romana and Jose, 1991:75 and 77). In terms of trade, in general, the volume of trade between the Philippines and Japan was low (Yu-Jose, 1992:65). Nonetheless, as of

1926, Japan became the Philippines' largest trading partner. Japanese companies — Mitsui Bussan Co., Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, the Yokohama Specie Bank, and the Bank of Taiwan — also established offices in the Philippines (Sta. Romana and Jose, 1991:75).

The growing Japanese population and their participation in the domestic economy heightened suspicions about Japanese interests in the Philippines. The annexation of Korea and the Manchurian incident were not reassuring to Filipinos who were looking forward to independence from the United States. Before the outbreak of World War II, there were about 20,000 Japanese nationals in the Philippines (Yu-Jose, 1994b:11). In order to curb further immigration and the entry of foreigners into lucrative industries, the Philippine government passed the Immigration Act of 1940 imposing an annual quota of 500 immigrants per country (Sta. Romana and Jose, 1991:31). Although it was addressed to foreign nationals in general, the Japanese would have been greatly affected by it because they constituted a fairly large group. The full impact of this legislation, however, was superseded by other events. As the possibility of war intensified, many Japanese started to return to Japan (Yu-Jose, 1994a:32). World War II reared its ugly head and changed many aspects of Philippine-Japan relations.

On January 2, 1942, the Japanese occupation of the Philippines began which lasted until 1945. The Philippines became an unwilling partner in Japan's Greater East-Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Under the Japanese occupation, there were, at most, 800,000 Japanese troops stationed in the Philippines (Interview with Dr. Ricardo Jose, February 1994). There were also some Japanese civilians (those who were unable to return to Japan before the outbreak of the war) and they were repatriated when the war ended (Yu-Jose, 1994a:32).

During the Japanese occupation of the Philippines, there was a small flow of Filipinos who went to Japan. One select group were the "pensionados" (government scholars) who were sponsored by the Japanese government for training in Japan. This was part of the program launched by the Greater East Asia Ministry in response to the request of the Army and Navy to train "local young men who could assist the Japanese occupation forces" (Goodman, 1962:1)[1] Participants were recruited from the countries occupied by the Japanese. On July 9, 1943, the first batch of 27 pensionados consisting of two groups — 10 from the

Constabulary (in the ages 21 to 29) and 17 general students (who ranged in age from 15 to 21 years) — left for about a year of training in Japan (de Asis, 1979:3; Goodman, 1962:3). In his account, de Asis mentioned encounters with a number of Filipinos who had been living in Japan (he mentioned meeting a Filipino who had been living in Japan for 21 years). He also described a meeting with the "grand old man", General Artemio Ricarte, a Filipino who opposed American rule in the Philippines and went to Japan instead as an exile (Yu-Jose, 1992:18). In addition, there were Filipino visitors (including dignitaries such as Pres. Laurel) who came and went for short visits (de Asis, 1979). A second batch of 25 "pensionados" arrived in Japan on June 10, 1944 (de Asis, 1979:156).

When the war came to an end, the Philippines and Japan were devastated. About one million Filipinos died (out of an estimated 16 million population); about 500,000 Japanese died in the Philippines, said to be the heaviest Japanese casualty outside of China (Interview with Dr. Ricardo Jose, February 1994). For the survivors, the collective memory of loss and destruction took a long time to heal. After the war, emigration once again figured as an alternative for Japanese nationals wanting to have a better life. A first step in this direction was the lifting of the ban on emigration of about 10,000 Japanese between 1956 to 1961, most of whom went to Central and South American countries (JICA, 1977:106).

In the immediate post-war years, the flows and counterflows of people between the Philippines and Japan did not provide much indication that the exchange of people will assume an important aspect of Philippines-Japan relations in later years. Post-war reconstruction involved not only infrastructure but also the mending of relationships. The Philippine government lifted the ban on Japanese nationals in September 1951 upon the recommendation of the United States (Yu-Jose, 1994b:32). Although the legal barriers had been lifted, the exchange of people did not intensify until later. Memories of the war hindered trade and investments between the two countries (please refer to Yoshihara's comment in a later section). The war also played a point of reference in providing assistance to the Philippines.

By the 1960s, the Japanese economy was growing at an average of 10 percent per annum. Within a short period of time, Japan ceased to be an aid-receiving country. But even before this economic take-off occurred, Japan had already began its aid-giving program when it joined the

Colombo Plan on October 6, 1954.[2] The following year, 1955, it began its trainee acceptance program and expert dispatch program (OECF, 1994:6).

Japan's foreign aid program started out as reparations to most countries "victimized by Japan's aggressive war in Asia" (Orr, 1990:53). Reparation agreements were concluded with Burma in 1955, the Philippines in 1956, and Indonesia in 1958.[3] Asian countries had been the major target of Japanese aid since the inception of its aid program. In the 1950s and the 1960s, almost all of Japanese aid — 98-99 percent — were directed to Asia. This regional bias, according to Yasumoto (1986:91), derives from "pragmatic and emotional criteria". The pragmatic part came from the division of labor among donor countries. British aid targetted mainly Commonwealth members, French aid was for French-speaking areas, particularly in Africa, and American aid mainly went to Egypt and Israel. Japan, therefore, directed its attention to Asia. The emotional part was explained by Yasumoto (1986:91) as follows:

> Given limited financial resources available for Official Development Assistance (ODA), Japan should concentrate on its neighbors with whom Japanese share a common heritage, history, culture, economic philosophies, and political values. Never mind that much of this must be qualified with respect to Japan-Asian relations, but the Japanese do retain a strong identification with the Asian region.

The Philippines has been a major concern of Japan's aid program for the same reasons — and more.

> There were several reasons in the 1950s for Japan to give high priority to the Philippines. These included geographical closeness and the Philippine position astride major sea lanes, historical association in the pre-war period during which time Japanese business interests began to establish themselves in the Philippines, lingering and indeed festering resentments against the Japanese in the Philippines because of the harsh occupation experience, and the presence of natural resources crucial for Japan's growing industries. (Takahashi, 1993:65)

From 1956 to 1976 Japanese aid to the Philippines was, in fact, reparations for war damages. The allocation of $550 million to the Philippines was the biggest among the countries which received reparations

(Takahashi, 1993:65). This amount, however, fell below the $8 billion initially demanded by the Philippine government (Vellut, 1963, as cited in Yoshihara, 1978:33).[4]

In 1969, Japan embarked on what Takahashi (1993:67) considered as "development assistance in a more genuine sense" by way of a $30 million loan for the construction of the Maharlika highway. Even then, the loan was secured by expected future reparations. By the time reparations were completed in 1976, the share of loans and grants to the Philippines for development financing purposes had already been established.

Japanese investments in the Philippines before the 1970s were generally negligible. As of 1967, five Japanese investments were received by the manufacturing industry in the Philippines (Yoshihara, 1978:83). The paucity of data on Japanese investments as late as 1973 (Tsuda, 1977:8) is another indication of the small volume of Japanese investments in the Philippines. This was due to the anti-Japanese feelings which have their roots in World War II — on the part of the Japanese, there was also a general negative attitude towards the Philippines because of the extent of Japanese casualties during the war (Yoshihara, 1978:83-4). Also, other external factors were not conducive to Japanese investments, including the pro-American stance of the Philippines then, strong economic nationalism, strict regulations on remittance of profits and importation of raw materials, relatively high wage levels, and the high crime rate in major Philippine cities (Yoshihara, 1978: 85-7).

The exchange of people between the two countries was also limited. In general, there were not too many factors that encouraged or facilitated the flow of people. Government-to-government ties were not particularly close, trade was limited, and investments were minimal. At the level of individuals, it is probably reasonable to suggest that there were no compelling reasons for Filipinos or Japanese to visit each others' countries. Filipinos who found their way in Japan in the 1970s were likely to be participants in the exchange programs initiated by the Japanese government.

Through technical cooperation programs, Filipinos and nationals from developing countries came to Japan as trainees while Japanese nationals were assigned overseas as experts. From 1954 to 1969, an estimated 12,520 participants from other countries came to Japan to participate in

government-sponsored training programs. About 82 percent of the total participants came from Asian countries. During this period, about a thousand (968) Filipinos received some training in Japan. Most of the Japanese experts dispatched before the 1970s were also assigned to Asian countries (about 67 percent of the 1,716). The Philippines received a total of 37 Japanese experts during this time, or about 3 percent of all Japanese experts assigned in Asia.

Cultural programs of the Japanese government were also instrumental in facilitating people exchange. The Monbusho (Ministry of Education) programs which began offering scholarship grants in 1954 perhaps served as the most important cultural arm of the Japanese government. Interestingly, despite the fact that Monbusho grants were more generous than the Fulbright programs of the United States, more Filipinos availed of the latter. From 1954 to 1987, 727 Filipinos studied in Japan under the Monbusho program. By comparison, between 1948 and 1984, 2,731 Filipinos studied in the United States under the Fulbright programs and the East-West Center degree and non-degree programs (Sta. Romana and Jose, 1991:86). The lack of interest in studying in Japan can be partly explained by the language barrier, unfamiliarity with the Japanese educational system, and perhaps the perception that there was not much to study in Japan. According to Sta. Romana and Jose (1991:87), by the mid-1980s, more Filipinos were attracted to study in Japan, which they attributed to Monbusho's greater budget (thereby increasing the number of grantees) as well as changing perceptions about Japan as a place of study among Filipinos. Events up until the end of the 1960s did not provide much indication of the scale and diversity of exchanges that would be forged between the Philippines and Japan in the next decades.

The Philippines and Japan Since the 1970s

Through the 1950s and the 1960s, shadows of the war influenced the nature and extent of Philippines-Japan relations. Beginning in the 1970s, economics came to be the defining factor not only in their relationship vis-a-vis each other but also in defining their place in the global community. As an emerging economic power, Japan came to hold the upper hand in relation to the Philippines, and as a country to reckon with in the community of nations.

The 1973 oil crisis affected developed and developing countries alike. In the Philippines, it sharpened existing problems of employment and balance of payments, preconditions that launched the overseas employment program. Although it was meant to be a temporary measure, overseas employment increasingly assumed an important role in generating employment and foreign reserves for the country (Asis 1992). Over time, instead of weaning away from overseas employment, more and more Filipinos sought employment abroad. By the late 1970s, apart from the oil-rich Gulf countries, Asian countries, including Japan, were also drawing many migrant workers from the Philippines.

Although Japan was also badly affected by the oil crisis, the adverse impacts did not linger. When the second oil crisis struck in 1979, Japan was well-prepared to deal with it. The "economic miracle" that was Japan in the 1960s was unequivocally an economic powerhouse in the 1980s (Reischauer, 1990: 293-294). As an economic power, it assumed more responsibility in providing development assistance to less developing countries. Its highly favorable trade balance vis-a-vis other western industrialized countries was an irritant in its relationship with these countries. The soaring yen and rising domestic wages had many Japanese industries turning to Asian countries as production sites. The small and medium-sized industries left behind had a difficult time recruiting Japanese workers unwilling to perform jobs described as dirty, dangerous, difficult (or the 3D's). Initially, foreign workers, including Filipinos, came in trickles. As their numbers grew, Japan had to face the fact that without wanting to, it had become a labor-receiving country.

■ Aiming at technology transfer and the development of human resources, technical cooperation has the most impact on the exchange of people through its training programs and dispatch of experts. In the former, participants from developing countries receive training in Japan. In the latter, Japanese experts are assigned to developing countries.

Given the changed framework of Philippines-Japan relations in the 1970s, it was not only the flow of people which accelerated in the succeeding years. Development assistance, investments and trade also flourished since the 1970s, which created conditions that fostered population mobility.

The Flow of Capital Through Official Development Assistance

In the area of foreign aid, the nature of Japanese aid to the Philippines ceased to be war payments upon the completion of reparations in July 1976. Although Japanese aid has since generally increased (Table 1), the relative share of the Philippines and other Asian countries declined beginning in the 1970s due to a shift in Japan's aid philosophy (Rix, 1993; Orr, 1990; MOFA 1990). Despite the change, the Philippines continues to be a priority of Japanese aid. From the 1970s onwards, the Philippines has been consistently among the top 10 recipients of Japanese aid. Also, from the standpoint of the Philippines, over the years, Japan has been the number one source of foreign aid.

Increasing volumes of Japanese aid to the Philippines, particularly technical cooperation, have some direct implications on the mobility of people. Japanese ODA is one of three components of Japan's Economic Cooperation (the two others are "Other Official Flows" and "Private Flows").[5] ODA, in turn, is divided into: grant aid, including reparations and technical cooperation; bilateral official loans; and contributions/donations to multilateral agencies. Grant aid and technical cooperation are often grouped together because they do not require repayment from the recipient country, while bilateral loans (also known as yen loans) require repayment at low interest rates for a longer grace period (APIC, 1993).

Aiming at technology transfer and the development of human resources, technical cooperation has the most impact on the exchange of people through its training programs and dispatch of experts. In the former, participants from developing countries receive training in Japan. In the latter, Japanese experts are assigned to developing countries. In addition, survey teams and Japan Overseas Corps of Volunteers have become part of technical cooperation. These activities were coordinated and implemented by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) since 1974. About 50 percent of technical cooperation under the auspices of the Japanese government are implemented by JICA.

As mentioned earlier, Japan's technical cooperation program immediately started after it became a member of the Colombo Plan. From 1955 up until the end of March 1994, some 90,817 participants from various countries had received training in Japan (JICA, 1994:49). By May 1994, JICA welcomed Dr. Nora Licup from the Philippines as its 100,000th participant (Kenshu-in, 1994:2). In recent years, an average of 7,200

participants come to Japan for training purposes. JICA plans to increase the number of participants to about 10,000 a year as part of its mid-term targets (Kenshu-in, 1994:2). By comparison, the counterflow of Japanese experts to other countries is smaller in numbers. In the beginning, that is in 1955, 28 experts were dispatched to five countries in Southeast Asia. As of fiscal year 1993, the number of experts dispatched totalled 17,567 (JICA, 1994:56).

To some extent, financial grants and bilateral loans also involve the flow of Japanese nationals to other countries. According to JICA reports, on the average, experts are dispatched for as short as two weeks or for as long as two years. In comparison to other donor countries, Japanese ODA-related personnel involves fewer numbers, partly as a reflection of the lower proportion of technical cooperation in relation to the whole development assistance package (Furuya, 1992:588). Also, unlike other donor countries, there is no identifiable central agency that handles Japan's ODA (for example, the United States or Canada has the United States Agency for International Development and the Canadian International Development Agency, respectively). Instead, Japan's ODA involves several ministries — the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Finance, International Trade and Industries, and the Economic Planning Agency participate in decision-making. The administration and implementation of Japanese ODA is also divided among several agencies — the Overseas Economic Cooperation administers bilateral loans, JICA is responsible for technical cooperation, and the Export-Import Bank handles loans to private corporations in the receiving countries.

In general, although the volume of people in development assistance is rather limited, it is significant for two reasons: it involves the mobility of the highly-skilled, and it is bidirectional. The development impact of this group of migrants is an aspect that should be examined further (Salt and Findlay, 1989).

The Flow of Capital Through Investments/The Flow of Goods

Japanese investments in the Philippines also recorded an increase since the 1970s. Like the flow of development assistance, the direction of the flow of investments was from Japan to the Philippines. In contrast to the restrictive climate of the 1960s, the 1970s proved to be more conducive to foreign investments. For Japanese investors, the ratification

of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation in December 1973 (which took effect in January 1974), was a positive development after a 13-year delay (Sta. Romana and Jose, 1991:80). The treaty was ratified by Pres. Marcos under martial law conditions. Soon after, Japanese investments flowed into the Philippines. Between 1970 and 1976, Japanese investments grew rapidly, from under a million dollars ($0.40 million) in 1970 to $151.57 million as of June 30, 1976 (Tsuda, 1978:5). Compared to other ASEAN countries, as of 1975, the Philippines ranked next to Indonesia as the highest recipient of Japanese private investment (Alonzo, 1987:143).

■ [A]lthough there was an upward trend in foreign investments in the late 1980s, the volume of investments that went to the Philippines was considerably smaller.... A reason why the Philippines lost out to other ASEAN countries is due to perceived political and economic instability in the country.

The promise of more Japanese investments did not materialize in later years as the Philippines slid into economic and political upheavals. Thus while Asia in general (see Table 2), and ASEAN in particular (Table 3) increasingly attracted Japanese investments, the Philippines was not among the top drawers of Japanese capital. Between 1980 and 1985, the Philippines ranked fourth or fifth among the ASEAN countries as a destination for Japan's private direct investment (Alonzo, 1987:143). This did not change in the next years, despite the fact that Philippine laws moved to dismantle earlier restrictions on foreign investments in the 1980s. Data in Table 3 bear this out — although there was an upward trend in foreign investments in the late 1980s, the volume of investments that went to the Philippines was considerably smaller. Liberalizing laws on foreign investments did not make much of a difference as there was a general swing towards liberalization in other ASEAN countries since the mid-1980s. A reason why the Philippines lost out to other ASEAN countries is due to perceived political and economic instability in the country (Kajiwara, 1994:505). For the ASEAN countries that attracted Japanese investments, the influx of foreign investments in the late 1980s was significant in terms of their scale and nature, representing what Phongpaichit (1990:2) calls a "new wave" of Japanese investment in Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand.[5] From 1985 to 1987, Japanese investments in ASEAN amounted to $3.3 billion compared to $12.5 billion accumulated over three decades (Phongpaichit, 1990:100).

Part of the new wave of Japanese investments is the move from resource extraction (especially in Indonesia), and to some extent, import-substitution manufacture towards export-oriented projects (Phongpaichit, 1990:31, 100).

Without intending to, capital transfers can also have implications for population mobility. The influx of foreign capital may also require the migration of highly skilled expatriate staff to contribute to the development of manufacturing industries in the developing countries. Likewise, personnel in the developing countries may be sent for training in the developed countries (Salt and Findlay, 1989:162). The mobility of Japanese capital in Asia was also accompanied by the deployment of some 9,511 Japanese personnel to staff overseas subsidiaries, according to a MITI study (cited in Furuya, 1992:595). Given the lower volume of Japanese investments in the Philippines, it can be expected that fewer Japanese personnel were assigned to the Philippines to oversee these investments.

In general, it is very difficult to come up with fairly accurate estimates of the mobility of the highly-skilled, including personnel who accompany capital transfers (Salt and Findlay, 1989). According to White (1991:17) between 1968-75, the number of Japanese expatriates stationed overseas jumped from 130,000 to 450,000. A more recent estimate reported in Withers (1993:8) puts the number of overseas Japanese at 1 million. At least, up until the present time, Japanese companies generally deploy a limited number of Japanese nationals overseas. Itami (1994:34) noted that the number of Japanese employees working abroad over a long term is about four per company, and most of them come from a small number of companies. For example, Matsushita Electric has about 1,000 employees overseas (or 2 percent of their domestic employees) and Toshiba has 550 employees working abroad (or 0.8 percent of their domestic personnel). In the future, though, more Japanese nationals may be sent abroad in keeping with expanding Japanese direct investments. This is a very likely prospect inasmuch as Japanese companies tend to prefer hiring Japanese nationals to fill top managerial positions in Japanese companies overseas.

As trading partners, Japan is the second most important destination of Philippine exports, next to the United States from 1976 to 1992. In turn, Japan is the number one source-country of goods imported by the

Philippines (ADB, 1994:258-261). Tables 4 and 5 present the volume of trade between the two countries since the 1970s. The figures are not exactly comparable but they basically point to the same pattern. On the whole, the trade balance is generally in Japan's favor. In addition, when the commodity composition of trade with Japan is considered, it is generally a case of exchanging resource-based exports from the Philippines with industrial products from Japan (Alonzo, 1987:137). Data on Philippine exports (by principal commodity) for the period 1976 to 1992 show that coconut oil, copper concentrates, and centrifugal and refined sugar were the mainstays of Philippine exports. Since the 1970s, there has been a slowdown in the export of copra while that for logs/lumber declined in 1990 (ADB, 1994:258-259).

The Flow of People: Japan as a Receiving Country

The idea of a homogenous Japanese society and the need to preserve it as such is widely held in Japan (White, 1992:14). Although critics consider such an idea mythical or imagined, its influence cannot be ignored, especially when referring to the place of foreigners in Japanese society.[7]

Throughout its history, Japan has not been very open to the influx of foreigners. Two hundred years of seclusion during the Tokugawa period further heightened the walls between the Japanese and foreigners. The re-opening of Japan during the Meiji period did not erode its cautious stance towards foreigners. Despite policies espoused by the Meiji leadership of catching up with the west and learning from the west, the approach was a highly selective one. According to Burks (1985:148), to speed up development, Japan had three options in the 19th century: the use of loans or foreign capital, to import foreign educational materials (which had been done under the Tokugawa period), and the employment of foreigners as teachers and advisers (later the dispatch of Japanese students to foreign countries supplemented this option). The third option became the focal point of implementing the Charter Oath of 1865, embodied by the objective that, "Knowledge was to be sought throughout the world, to strengthen the foundation of Imperial Rule" (Burks, 1985:147). Although knowledge was supposed to be sought worldwide, Japan directed its interest to the west. Most of the foreign employees recruited by the Japanese government came from four countries, namely, Great Britain (for public works), France, the United States (for the development

of Hokkaido), and Germany (for medicine) (Schwantes, 1985:210-214). There were probably between 1,500-2,000 foreign employees during the Meiji period (1868-1912). The use of foreign employees was conceived and was implemented as a temporary arrangement — to meet immediate needs, to train Japanese replacements, and to phase them out as quickly as possible (Schwantes, 1985:215).

A little over a century later, Japan is once again pondering the matter of foreign workers. In the 1990s, Japan now has to deal with foreign workers already in its midst (Shimada, 1993; Obata, 1994). Until the 1980s, the entry and status of foreigners in Japan have been defined according to the provisions of the Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act (which was revised in 1989) and the Alien Registration Law.[6] The former provides guidelines on who can enter Japan, the activities they may engage in, and their length of stay. The latter's stated purpose is to clarify matters pertaining to the residence and status of foreigners in Japan. The Alien Registration Law requires all foreigners (except diplomats/officials; members, civilian employees, and dependents of the US or UN forces; and those in transit or emergency landings) to register with the city, ward, town or village, within 90 days of their arrival in Japan. In addition, the law requires foreigners to carry their alien registration card, and to present it to authorities if asked.

In the 1980s, structural changes in Japanese industries and the appreciation of the yen imperilled small and medium-sized enterprises (Nagayama, 1992). To survive, these industries needed the cheap labor that can be readily provided by foreign workers. However, the government's stance on unskilled foreign workers clashed with the needs of these industries. Employers and workers went around the rules. By the late 1980s, Japan discovered the reality of undocumented workers.

In response to what was perceived as rapidly rising numbers of undocumented workers, the Japanese government amended the Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act (Cabinet Order No. 319 of 1951, also known as "Immigration Act") in 1989. Shimada (1993:62) added that the revisions were also influenced by the recognition that the coming of foreign workers to Japan was exacerbated by "the world trend towards internationalization, globalization of business activity, and increasing movements of people across national borders". The amended

immigration policy was proclaimed on December 15, 1989 and it took effect on June 1, 1990 (JIA, 1994:2).

Table 6 describes the legislative framework of the revised law. Under the new law, there are 28 categories of status of residence, each of which defines the activities allowed foreign nationals in Japan.[5] Seventeen statuses of residence (subsections A1, A2 and B3 of Section I) allow foreign nationals to engage in employment while in Japan; 6 statuses of residence (subsections B1 and B2 of Section I) do not allow for employment; and 5 statuses of residence (Section II) do not have restrictions on the activities of foreign nationals in Japan. Although college students and pre-college students should not engage in employment, they may be permitted to work part-time for a certain number of hours per week. The new law does not differ much from the old version in its view about unskilled workers. Japan welcomes foreign workers if they are skilled, and the doors are still closed to unskilled foreign workers. A new element in the revised law is the inclusion of penalties to employers hiring unskilled foreigners (Shimada, 1993:62).

The Revised Immigration Law has generated mixed reviews in Japan. Some perceive it as an improvement over the old laws. For example, Shimada (1993:62) lauds the clearer standards for immigration screening and the reduction of red tape involved. He writes (1993:62): "...the Revised Immigration Law responds to internationalization by making it easier for *qualified* foreign workers (underscoring mine) to enter the country, but maintains the ban on workers without specialist skills or knowledge, and takes a tougher stance on admitting unskilled foreign workers." Other sectors consider the revisions as restrictive and detrimental to the working conditions of foreigners since the revised law distinguishes between documented and undocumented workers, and cuts off the latter's access to social services (e.g., Obata, 1994; Forum on Asian Immigrant Workers, 1993).

One of the immediate impacts of the revised law was the rise in the undocumented workers apprehended by authorities. From 1989 to 1992, the figures were 16,608 (1989), 29,884 (1990), 32,908 (1991) and 62,161 (1992) (Shimada, 1993:24). Thus, it seems the revised law was effective in apprehending undocumented workers. It lost sight, however, of the fact that as migration unfolded, some foreign workers have become settlers. The experiences of Filipinos in Japan illustrate this point.

Filipino Nationals in Japan

The number of foreigners coming to Japan has been increasing since 1970 (Table 7). Towards the end of the 1970s, the number of foreigners coming to Japan hit the one-million mark, the second million was recorded in the 1980s, and the third million, in the 1990s. Most of the foreigners come only for short visits. At the end of 1993, Japan's foreign population (based on alien registration records) of 1,320,748 exceeded 1 percent of its total population for the first time (JIA, 1993:107).[10] Compared with other industrialized countries like the United States, Canada and Australia, Japan's foreign population is small. However, since it was never a country of immigration, this one percent share of foreign population means a great deal to Japan.

Asians comprise the largest proportion of all foreigners entering Japan, accounting for at least 50 percent of all foreigners from 1970 to 1993. The number of Filipinos coming to Japan hit a low point in 1973, after which, their numbers have since increased.

Data on purpose of entry provided are suggestive of why (and also how) Filipinos come to Japan (Table 8). This information, however, has some limitations. Among others, reported purpose of entry may not necessarily correspond with the activities foreigners will engage in once they have been admitted to Japan. This, in fact, is one violation of the Immigration Control Act. In order to discern trends or patterns, I grouped related categories of entry and classified them into work, education, family, residence, and temporary visits.

Over the years, the nature of Filipino migration has undergone some rather marked changes. In the early 1970s, tourists comprised the majority of Filipino arrivals in Japan. By 1973, work-related migration (especially those entering for designated activities) was more numerous. Throughout the 1970s, entertainers were a sizeable percentage of those on work-related permits, but they were not yet the most dominant group. Entertainers made a mark beginning in the 1980s, crowding out not only other workers but also other Filipino visitors (including tourists) to Japan.[11] Also on the rise since the 1980s were those who came to Japan under family-related categories. Throughout the 1970s, their numbers were very negligible, but since 1983 or 1984, more and more Filipinos entered Japan as family members of Japanese nationals. Other categories of Filipinos who come to Japan, that is, those coming to Japan for study, for

business, and those who can be classified as highly-skilled, had always comprised a small percentage of Filipino visitors.

Data on registered foreigners residing in Japan provide further information on the foreigners who stay in Japan for a considerable period of time (Table 9). This information is obtained from alien registration records. Table 9 presents data on the foreign population in Japan from 1970 to 1993. Note that Asians comprise an overwhelming majority of all foreigners living in Japan. Koreans are the largest group among Asians in Japan. The share of Filipinos residing in Japan has been small, although since 1990, they comprise some five percent of all foreign residents.

Filipinos residing in Japan are dominated by three groups: entertainers, family members of Japanese nationals, and those under designated activities. The increasing share of family members is an important marker of the changing nature of Filipino immigration to Japan. Marriages between Filipinos and Japanese increased at about the same time that Filipino migration to Japan accelerated. Most of these marriages are between Filipino women and Japanese men. It is possible that many of the Filipino women married to Japanese men initially came to Japan as entertainers.[15]

Filipinos in Japan have figured rather prominently in undocumented migration. In recent years, undocumented Filipinos and those who committed other visa violations have been on the downturn. One indicator of undocumented migration can be gauged from comparing immigration and emigration forms submitted by foreigners entering and leaving the country. Between July 1, 1990 and November 1, 1992, Filipinos slipped from the largest to the fourth largest group of overstayers in Japan. Among undocumented workers (they are commonly referred to as illegal workers in Japan), Filipinos topped the list in 1989, but they have since declined into lower ranks. As of 1993, they were the sixth largest group of undocumented workers (JIA, 1993:90).

Japanese Nationals Going to the Philippines

Given its history of emigration, it is not surprising to find Japanese communities in various parts of the world. Today, about 2.16 million

people of Japanese ancestry are living outside Japan, including third generation settlers (JICA, 1994:76).

Presently the Japanese are as mobile (or even more so) as the generations before them. In contrast to the "imin" or emigrants who left Japan permanently, today's migrants are mostly tourists. The ubiquitous Japanese tourist is in part a creation of the soaring yen which unleashed an appetite for travel in Japan. As data in Table 11 show, the number of Japanese nationals going to other countries has been increasing rapidly. As of 1993, there were 11.3 million Japanese who ventured out of Japan (most of them were tourists), representing about nine percent of the country's total population (estimated at 124 million).

Asian countries are popular destinations for Japanese nationals. From 1970 to 1993, Asian countries attracted, on the average, about 50 percent of Japanese visitors. Relative to other Asian countries, the Philippines drew some three percent of Japanese nationals going to Asia during the same period.

Comparing the outflow of Japanese nationals to other countries with the inflow of foreigners to Japan reveals interesting trends and patterns. Comparing the volume of in-migration to and out-migration from Japan, the latter had, in fact, been consistently larger than the former. In 1970, less than a million Japanese traveled to other countries; in 1980, close to 4 million Japanese did; in 1990, close to 11 million Japanese left Japan. These trends and patterns coincided with the increasing affluence of Japanese society where mobility is an option rather than a necessity. The mobility of Japanese nationals thus reflects the mobility of the relatively affluent. Given the temporary nature of their mobility and the manner in which they are leaving, it seems exposure to other cultures is not seen as problematic.[13]

■ The nature of Filipino migration to Japan...has changed in the past two decades. Initially, they went to Japan as tourists, a second phase was ushered in by the shift from tourism to labor migration. A third phase in Filipino migration is unfolding, that is, the shift from temporary to permanent settlement, with the rise in Filipino-Japanese marriages.

In terms of volume, the Japanese nationals who come to the Philippines generally outnumber Filipinos who come to Japan (except in 1970 and 1971 when

more Filipinos came to Japan compared to Japanese nationals who came to the Philippines). The gap was particularly large from 1973 to 1984. Afterwards, the gap narrowed somewhat. Thus, in 1993, for example, for every two Japanese who came to the Philippines, one Filipino went to Japan.

In terms of purpose of visit, tour/sightseeing and short-term business stand out in importance (Table 12). For most years, 97-98 percent of all Japanese nationals came to the Philippines for either one of these purposes. Unlike the changes evident in Filipino migration to Japan, Japanese migration to the Philippines has basically followed the same course.

Concluding Remarks

The flow and counterflow of people, capital, and goods have served as important bridges between the Philippines and Japan. In the past two decades, the volume of all three flows have increased in scale and in significance. When the 1970s began, there was little interest to stimulate population mobility and trade between the two countries. The movement of ODA from Japan to the Philippines was perhaps the most substantial of these flows. Through technical cooperation activities, ODA fueled the exchange of people — Filipino trainees coming to Japan, and the dispatch of Japanese experts, survey team members, and volunteers to the Philippines. Although they involved a select group of people, the exchange presumably contributed towards a better understanding of each others' society and culture.

An important development in Philippines-Japan relations was the ratification of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation in 1973. Japanese capital by way of investments flowed into the Philippines, but this was fairly short-lived. The movement of capital also involved some population mobility similar to the mobility stimulated by development assistance. High-level Japanese personnel were dispatched to overseas subsidiaries and stations, while local staff were temporarily sent to Japan for training. The people flows involved in development assistance and investments are limited, and are likely to remain so.

A more "spontaneous" and bigger people exchange became more evident since the 1970s. Over the years, more Japanese nationals came

to the Philippines, mainly as tourists, compared with the flow of Filipinos to Japan. The profile of Japanese nationals visiting the Philippines hardly changed in the past two decades. The nature of Filipino migration to Japan, on the other hand, has changed in the same period. Initially, they went to Japan as tourists, a second phase was ushered in by the shift from tourism to labor migration. A third phase in Filipino migration is unfolding, that is, the shift from temporary to permanent settlement, with the rise in Filipino-Japanese marriages.

Although there had been some tentative discussions to consider the implications of development assistance, investments, and trade on population mobility, translating these alternatives into policies for generating stay-at-home development have yet to be worked out. Discussions in regional blocs such as the AFTA and APEC heavily emphasize the mobility of goods without as much recognition that this can trigger other flows, including the flow of people. In the envisaged borderless economy, labor is not as free to move about nor as readily welcomed as goods or capital. Labor migration, particularly the migration of the relatively unskilled, has also engendered problems to both sending and receiving countries. If development assistance, investments and trade are going to be pursued as alternatives to labor migration, they need to focus on generating domestic employment in sending countries. Otherwise, they may be simply contributing to a jobless economic growth which is not sustainable in the long run. ✪

Notes

1 None of the Filipino participants described their objective for studying in Japan with a view towards helping the occupation forces. In the Constabulary group, for example, there were those who said they did not like to participate but they had no choice. Also interesting was a remark by a participant that guerillas encouraged their participation so that they can learn as much as they can about Japan (Goodman, 1962:5-6).

2 The Colombo Plan was launched in 1950 to facilitate economic and technical cooperation among the British Commonwealth of Nations. Recipient countries were later expanded and Japan extended technical assistance to Asian countries after joining it (MOFA, 1994:1).

3 Although China was badly damaged by the war, it did not receive reparations from Japan. China then was leaning to a different ideology and it perceived Japan as an ally of the United States (Orr, 1990:53). Laos and Cambodia did not receive reparations payments; instead Japan provided them cash grants starting in 1959 (Orr, 1990:53). India was the first recipient of yen loans in 1958.

4 The development impact of the reparations was hardly felt by the Filipino people. Instead, the beneficiaries of the reparations were the Filipino elites on the one hand, and the *sogo shosha* (Japan's trading companies) which served as brokers for the procurement transactions (Takahashi, 1993:67).

5 Apart from ODA, Japan's Economic Cooperation also includes "other official flows" (made up of export credits, direct investment, and financing and others to multilateral organizations) and "non-official flows" (private export credit, direct investment, financing and others to multilateral organizations, and grants by voluntary agencies) (APIC, 1993:7).

6 She focused on these four countries because together they accounted for 95% of Japanese investments in ASEAN. The Philippines recorded a 5% share; Brunei's was much less (Phongpaichit, 1990:2).

7 The presence in Japan of Ainus, Ryukyus, and Koreans, among others, challenge the notion of homogeneity.

8 There are laws concerning Koreans in Japan in view of historical precedents. When Japan annexed Korea, Koreans became Japanese citizens. After the war and following Korea's independence, Koreans were no longer Japanese citizens. The Potsdam Declaration (Law no. 126 of 1952) and the Special Immigration Law for Enforcement of the Agreement on the Legal Status of the Nationals of the Republic of Korea Residing in Japan (Law no. 146 of 1965) apply to Koreans.

9 JIA's *A Guide to Entry, Residence, and Registration in Japan for Foreign Nationals* also indicates the period of stay allowed per status of residence.

10 Obata (1994:48) writes that the share of Japan's foreign population exceeded 1% of the total population for the first time in 1992.

11 Entertainers are welcome in Japan because they are regarded as skilled workers. To qualify as an entertainer, "the applicant must have two years experience abroad in the type of performance which he/she will engage in, except in cases where the total receipts of the applicant's performance exceeds 5 million a day (for group performers, the receipt must exceed this amount)" (JIA, 1990:75+). Other criteria pertain to the background of the promoter/contractor and the venue of the performance. In the Philippines, applicants go through dancing/singing lessons and must pass audition prior to deployment. Entertainers are made up mostly of young women, mainly from the Philippines and Thailand. In reality (or the general perception), many entertainers end up as hostesses or workers in Japan's commercial sex industry.

12 An interview with an NGO coordinator based in Japan related the changing nature of problems faced by Filipinos in Japan. Before, most of the problems that came to their attention were work-related, now, there are more problems dealing with family matters (how to deal with their husbands, in-laws, etc.). She added that perhaps in the near future, the problems will have to do with children.

13 Those who stay outside Japan for a considerable period of time may be regarded less positively. Merry White's (1992) work describes problems of reintegration of Japanese families returning to Japan from their overseas assignments.

References

Alonzo, Ruperto (1987) "Japan's Economic Impact on ASEAN Countries", in Jusuf Wanandi and Kumao Kaneko (eds), *Towards a Closer ASEAN-Japan Partnership: Proceedings of the Japan-ASEAN Conference 1987*.

Asis, Maruja M.B. (1992) "The Overseas Employment Program Policy", in Graziano Battistella and Anthony Paganoni (eds), *Philippine Labor Migration: Impact and Policy*. Quezon City: Scalabrini Migration Center.

Burks, Ardath W. (1985) "Japan's Outreach: The *Ryugakusei*". In Ardath W. Burks (ed), *The Modernizers: Overseas Students, Foreign Employees, and Meiji Japan*. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.

de Asis, Leocadio (1979) *From Bataan to Tokyo: Diary of a Filipino Student in Wartime Japan 1943-1944*. The University of Kansas.

Fawcett, James T. (1989) "Networks, Linkages, and Migration Systems", *International Migration Review*, 23(3):671-680.

Findlay, A. (1990) "A Migration Channels Approach to the Study of High Level Manpower Movements: A Theoretical Perspective", *International Migration*, 28(1): 15-23.

Forum on Asian Immigrant Workers (1993) *Citizens' Report on the Human Rights of Foreign Workers in Japan*. Tokyo.

Furuya, Ken-ichi (1992) "High-Level Manpower Movement and Japan's Foreign Aid" *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal*, 1(3-4):585-599.

Grant, Goodman K. (1962) "An Experiment in Wartime Intercultural Relations: Philippine Students in Japan, 1943-1945." Data Paper Number 46. Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University.

Itami, Hiroyuki (1994) "The Globalization of Japanese Firms", in Nigel Campbell and Fred Burton (eds), *Japanese Multinationals*. London and New York: Routledge.

Japan Immigration Association (1994) *Basic Plan for Immigration Control*. Tokyo: Japan Immigration Association

_____ (1993) *1993 Statistics on Immigration Control*. Tokyo: Japan Immigration Association.

Japan International Cooperation Agency (1977) *Annual Report 1977*. Tokyo: JICA.

Kajiwara, Hirokazu (1994) "The Effects of Trade and Foreign Investment Liberalization Policy on Productivity in the Philippines", *The Developing Economies*, 32(4): 492-507.

Kritz, Mary, Lin Lean Lim, and Hania Zlotnik (eds) (1992) *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1994) *Japan's Official Development Assistance: Summary 1994*. Tokyo: Association for the Promotion of International Cooperation.

Nagayama, Toshikazu (1992) "Clandestine Migrant Workers in Japan", *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal*, 1(3-4):623-636.

Obata, Kaoru (1994) "'New Foreigners,' an Antiquated Immigration Policy", *The East*, 30(4): 48-53.

Orr, Robert M., Jr. (1990) *The Emergence of Japan's Foreign Aid Power*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Phongpaichit, Pasuk (1990) *The New Wave of Japanese Investment in ASEAN*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Reischauer, Edwin (1990) *Japan: The Story of a Nation*. Fourth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Rix, Alan (1993) "Managing Japan's Aid: ASEAN". In Bruce M. Koppel and Robert M. Orr, Jr. (eds), *Japan's Foreign Aid: Power and Policy in a New Era*. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.

Salt, John and Allan Findlay (1989) "International Migration of Highly-Skilled Manpower: Theoretical and Development Issues". In Reginald Appleyard (ed), *The Impact of International Migration on Developing Countries*. Paris: OECD.

Sta. Romana, Elpidio and Ricardo T. Jose (1991) 1991"'Never Imagine Yourself to be Otherwise..' Filipino Image of Japan Over the Centuries". *Asian Studies*, 29:65-94.

Schwantes, Robert S. (1985) "Foreign Employees in the Development of Japan". In Ardath W. Burks (ed), *The Modernizers: Overseas Students, Foreign Employees, and Meiji Japan*. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.

Shimada, Haruo (1993) *Japan's "Guest Workers": Issues and Public Policies*. (Translated by Roger Northridge) Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Stahl, Charles and Reginald Appleyard (1992) "International Manpower Flows in Asia: An Overview", *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal*, 1(3-4):417-476.

Takahashi, Akira (1993) "From Reparations to *Katagawari*: Japan's ODA to the Philippines," in Bruce M. Koppel and Robert M. Orr, Jr. (eds), *Japan's Foreign Aid: Power and Policy in a New Era*. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.

Tsuda, Mamoru (1978) *A Preliminary Study of Japanese-Filipino Joint Ventures* Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies.

White, Merry (1992) *The Japanese Overseas: Can They Go Home Again?* Princeton: University Press.

Withers, Glenn (1993) "Human Capital Flows," in C. Fred Bergsten and Marcus Noland (eds), *Pacific Dynamism and the International Economic System*. Washington, DC:Institute for International Economics.

Yasumoto, Dennis T. (1986) *The Manner of Giving: Strategic Aid and Japanese Foreign Policy*. Lexington and Toronto: Lexington Books.

Yu-Jose, Lydia N. (1992) *Japan Views the Philippines 1900-1944*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

_____(1994a) "Organizations and Philippine-Japan Relations 1890s to 1941: Friends But Not Brothers", *Solidarity*, (141-2):125-134.

_____(1994b) "International and Domestic Factors that Affected Japanese Emigration to the Philippines". Tokyo: Sophia University.

Table 1
Japan's ODA to the Philippines
(Net disbursements in US$ millions)

Year	Grants	Loans	Total
1970	15.7	3.4	19.2
1971	24.3	5.3	29.6
1972	38.2	65.2	103.4
1973	70.4	71.2	141.5
1974	33.0	40.3	73.3
1975	36.2	34.0	70.3
1976	3.0	78.6	81.6
1977	7.5	102.4	109.9
1978	16.5	187.7	204.2
1979*	-	-	-
1980	35.7	58.7	94.4
1981	45.0	165.1	210.1
1982	45.1	91.3	136.4
1983	62.0	85.1	147.0
1984	57.7	102.4	160.1
1985	69.7	170.3	240.0
1986	80.4	357.6	438.0
1987	111.8	267.6	379.4
1988	131.1	403.6	534.7
1989	176.1	227.7	403.8
1990	153.0	494.0	647.0
1991	173.6	285.3	458.9
1992	185.6	845.0	1030.6

Sources: Data for 1970 to 1990 (none for 1979) are from Table 4.2 in Takahashi (1993:69). He cited the following as sources: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Wagakuni no Seifu kaihatsu enjo 1989* (ODA of Japan), 1989; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Japan's Official Development Assistance 1990* (Tokyo, 1991). Data for 1991 to 1992 are from Ministry of Foreign Affairs,Japan's Official Development Assistance 1993 (Tokyo, 1993).

*Data not available

Table 2
Japan's Overseas Direct Investment by Region, 1984-93*

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
MDCs:										
N.America										
%Case	32.0	36.8	40.0	41.1	41.9	43.2	41.4	37.6	33.6	27.3
%Amount	34.9	45.0	46.8	46.0	47.5	50.2	47.8	45.3	42.7	42.4
Europe										
%Case	10.8	12.0	12.6	11.7	11.4	13.9	16.3	17.6	16.5	14.2
%Amount	19.1	15.8	15.5	19.7	19.4	21.9	25.1	22.5	20.7	22.0
Oceania										
%Case	3.6	4.3	4.5	6.6	8.5	9.2	9.8	8.6	6.7	4.8
%Amount	1.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	5.7	6.8	7.3	7.9	7.0	5.6
LDCs:										
Asia										
%Case	27.0	26.2	25.6	29.3	28.6	25.9	25.6	28.0	33.9	42.4
%Amount	16.0	11.7	10.4	14.6	11.8	12.2	12.4	14.3	18.8	18.4
L.America										
%Case	23.6	18.2	15.3	9.8	8.3	6.4	5.8	6.4	8.2	9.4
%Amount	22.6	21.4	21.2	14.4	13.7	7.8	6.4	8.0	8.0	9.4
Africa										
%Case	2.6	2.1	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.7	0.6	1.5
%Amount	3.2	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.8	0.7	1.5
M. East										
%Case	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.5
%Amount	2.7	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.2	2.1	0.6
TOTAL										
CASE	2499	2613	3196	4584	6076	6589	5863	4564	3741	3488
AMOUNT	10.2	12.2	22.3	33.4	47.0	67.5	56.9	41.6	34.1	36.0

* Amount is in millions of US$.

Source: Ministry of Finance (1986, 1987, 1989, 1992, 1994) *Financial Statistics of Japan.*

Table 3
Japan's Overseas Direct Investment in the ASEAN, 1984-1993*

Year		Philippines	Indonesia	Malaysia	Thailand
1984:	Case	12	82	63	76
	Amount	46	374	142	119
	%Share	(6.8)	(54.9)	(20.9)	(17.5)
1985:	Case	9	62	60	51
	Amount	61	498	79	48
	%Share	(8.9)	(72.6)	(11.5)	(7.0)
1986:	Case	9	46	70	58
	Amount	21	250	158	124
	%Share	(3.8)	(45.2)	(28.6)	(22.4)
1987:	Case	18	67	64	192
	Amount	72	545	163	250
	%Share	(7.0)	(52.9)	(15.8)	(24.3)
1988:	Case	54	84	108	382
	Amount	134	586	387	859
	%Share	(6.8)	(29.8)	(19.7)	(43.7)
1989:	Case	87	140	159	403
	Amount	202	631	673	1276
	%Share	(7.3)	(22.7)	(24.2)	(45.9)
1990:	Case	58	155	169	377
	Amount	258	1105	725	1154
	%Share	(8.0)	(34.1)	(22.4)	(35.6)
1991:	Case	42	148	136	258
	Amount	203	1193	880	807
	%Share	(6.7)	(38.7)	(28.5)	(26.2)
1992:	Case	45	122	111	130
	Amount	160	1676	704	65
	%Share	(5.0)	(52.4)	(22.0)	(20.6)
1993:	Case	56	115	92	127
	Amount	207	813	800	578
	%Share	(8.6)	(33.9)	(33.4)	(24.1)

Source: Ministry of Finance (1986, 1987, 1989, 1992, 1994) *Financial Statistics of Japan.*
% share is based on the total amount investments in the four countries. Singapore was excluded because of its NIC status.
* Amount is in millions of US$.

Table 4
Philippines-Japan Exports and Imports, 1970-1993
(In 1000 US$)

Year	Japan's Exports to the Philippines	Japan's Imports from the Philippines
1970	453,717	533,465
1971	464,787	513,812
1972	457,408	470,396
1973	620,255	820,248
1974	911,212	1,104,819
1975	1,026,211	1,121,029
1976	1,113,967	793,099
1977	1,099,946	897,376
1978	1,545,731	1,057,770
1979	1,622,029	1,582,757
1980	1,683,337	1,951,426
1981	1,928,332	1,731,222
1982	1,802,969	1,576,210
1983	1,743,556	1,306,497
1984	1,079,900	1,418,625
1985	936,558	1,243,089
1986	1,088,142	1,220,663
1987	1,414,702	1,352,857
1988	1,739,810	2,044,142
1989	2,380,533	2,059,466
1990	2,503,891	2,157,036
1991	2,659,301	2,351,476
1992	3,516,704	2,333,377
1993	4,814,317	2,379,659

Source: Ministry of International Trade and Industry, *Statistics on Japanese Industries 1994, 1985, 1979, and 1975* (Tokyo).

Table 5
Philippines-Japan Exports and Imports, 1976-1992
(In million US$)

Year	Philippines' Exports to Japan	Philippines' Imports from Japan
1976	625.4	1072.3
1977	731.7	1074.2
1978	828.2	1412.9
1979	1214.2	1510.6
1980	1540.0	1651.3
1981	1253.9	1608.9
1982	1149.1	1661.9
1983	983.7	1342.1
1984	1034.4	851.1
1985	874.5	749.5
1986	851.6	886.6
1987	980.4	1148.5
1988	1415.5	1503.0
1989	1581.4	2174.0
1990	1622.0	2396.6
1991	1771.3	2517.0
1992	2019.8	3020.6

Source: Asian Development Bank, *Key Indicators of Developing Asian and Pacific Countries 1994*, pp. 258-261.

Table 6
Categories of Status of Residence and Activities Permitted

Section I. Residence statuses permitting foreign nationals to engage in specific activities in Japan

A. Residence Statuses Permitting Employment

(1) Statuses under which immigration is not subject to a Ministry of Justice ordinance*:

Diplomat	(1) Diplomatic and consular officials and their dependents (2) Persons accorded by treaties or international custom the same privileges or exemption as diplomatic envoys (e.g., foreign heads of state, heads of cabinets or national assemblies, UN secretary-general and heads of UN organizations)and their dependents
Official	Public servants employed by foreign governments or international bodies, employees of foreign diplomatic and consular offices in Japan, and their dependents
Professor	Foreigners employed as professors, assistant professors, or assistants at universities, institutions corresponding to universities, or colleges of higher education
^Artist	Composers, songwriters, painters, sculptors, photographers, and other artists who derive income from artistic pursuits
Religious activities	Persons sent to Japan by a foreign religious organization to engage in missionary or religious activities
^Journalist	Journalists engaged in news-gathering or other journalistic activities in Japan, based on a contract with a foreign newspaper company, news agency, broadcasting company, newsreel company, or other news medium

Table 6 (continued)
Categories of Status of Residence and Activities Permitted

(2) Statuses under which immigration is subject to a Ministry of Justice ordinance:

Investor/ Bus. Manager	Foreigners conducting investment or business, or engaged in the management of such a business, where the business complies with certain criteria as to size, salary, and past record
+Legal/Accounting Services	Foreigners holding legitimate Japanese qualifications in the field of law or accountancy, as a lawyer, copyist, real estate surveyor, solicitor in foreign law, CPA or foreign-certified accountant, tax accountant, social insurance advisor, patent attorney, or administrative scrivener
+Medical Services	Foreigners holding legitimate Japanese qualifications in a medical-related profession, as a doctor, dentist, pharmacist, district nurse, midwife, nurse, practical nurse, dental hygienist, radiotherapist, physical therapist, occupational therapist, optician, clinical technician, or artificial limb fitter
+Instructor	Foreigners engaged in educational activities at primary, junior high, or high schools, specialist or other types of school. Also includes persons engaged in foreign language education at foreign language schools, subject to certain conditions
^Engineer	Foreigners engaged in work requiring knowledge or techniques in the fields of science, engineering, or the natural sciences subject to certain conditions with regard to salary and career
+Specialist in Humanities/ International Activities	(1) Foreigners engaged in work requiring knowledge in the humanities - such as law or economics - subject to certain conditions with regard to career and salary

Table 6 (continued)
Categories of Status of Residence and Activities Permitted

	(2) Foreigners engaged in work utilizing cultural knowledge or sensibilities unique to foreigners, such as interpreters, translators, copywriters, fashion designers, interior designers, also persons engaged in sales, overseas business, information services, international finance, design, or public relations and advertising, subject to certain conditions with regard to career and remuneration
+Intra-company transfer	Foreigners transferring from a Japanese subsidiary or branch office abroad to its head office in Japan, or from a head office overseas to a branch office in Japan, and engaged in activities covered by "technician", or "international activities" status, subject to certain conditions with regard to career and salary
^Entertainer	(1) Foreigners engaged in theatrical, entertainment, singing, dance, or musical performance activities, subject to certain conditions with regard to career, remuneration, and type of entertainment (2) Foreigners engaged in artistic activities such as television program or film production or photographic modelling, subject to certain conditions with regard to remuneration
^Skilled labor	Foreigners engaged in work which requires specialist skills in particular fields in Japanese industry (foreign cooking, production of foreign foodstuffs, specialist foreign building skills, civil engineering skills, gemstone, precious metal or leather processing), subject to certain conditions with regard to career and remuneration

Table 6 (continued)
Categories of Status of Residence and Activities Permitted

B. Residence Statuses Not Permitting Employment
(1) Statuses under which immigration is not subject to a Ministry of Justice ordinance:

+Cultural Activities	Foreigners engaged in non-remunerative study or artistic activities in Japan, and persons receiving individual instruction from specialists, or conducting specialist research into Japanese culture or arts (e.g., ikebana, tea ceremony, judo)
Temporary Visitor	Foreigners visiting Japan for a short period for the purposes of tourism, recuperation, sports, visiting relatives, friends or acquaintances, visiting the sick, attending ceremonies, amateur participation in events and contests, commercial visits for market research, business meetings, negotiations, contract signing,or after-service of imported machinery, study/observation visits to factories or trade fairs, participation in short courses or presentations, academic research, research and development, religious visits or pilgrimages, or goodwill visits to sister cities, schools, etc.

(2) Statuses under which immigration is subject to a Ministry of Justice ordinance:

College Student	Foreigners receiving education at a university or other institute of higher education, subject to certain conditions regarding ability to meet living expenses; includes persons receiving a fixed number of hours of tuition as auditors or research students, or receiving education in a special subject at a specialist college, subject to certain conditions regarding Japanese language ability, etc.

Table 6 (continued)
Categories of Status of Residence and Activities Permitted

+Pre-college Student	Foreigners studying at a high school, Japanese language or other type of school, subject to certain conditions regarding ability to meet living expenses
^Trainee	Foreigners engaged in acquiring skills, techniques or knowledge (not only industrial skills and techniques but also training in administrative skills at local government institutions, and training in office skills) at institutions accepting trainees which satisfy certain conditions as to their ability to provide training, and provided the skill does not consist merely in the same repetition of the same action
Dependent	Dependents of persons with residence status from "professor" to "cultural activities"above, and of persons with "visiting student" status

(3) Residence statuses under which employment may be permitted on an individual basis. (Immigration not subject to a Ministry of Justice ordinance)

Designated Activities	Foreigners entering Japan as domestic helpers privately employed by embassy or consular officials, etc., persons entering Japan under the working holiday system (which is based on bilateral agreements with other countries, allowing young people to work as a means of supplementing their travelling expenses, to increase their opportunities to learn about other cultures and lifestyles), and foreigners employed as amateur sports players by Japanese firms

Table 6 (continued)
Categories of Status of Residence and Activities Permitted

Section II. Residence statuses placing no restrictions on activities

Permanent Resident	Persons granted permission to reside permanently in Japan (excludes first-time immigrants)
Dependent of Japanese National	Dependents of Japanese citizens, children born as Japanese citizens or specially adopted as Japanese citizens (as defined by Civil Law no. 817, clause 2)
+Dependent of Permanent Resident	Dependents of permanent residents, permanent residents by agreement, or persons from the Korean peninsula or Taiwan who have resided in Japan since before World War II
Children of Persons Who Have Renounced Japanese Nationality	Children of persons who have renounced their Japanese nationality under the terms of a peace agreement with Japan, who were born in Japan and have lived continuously in Japan (excludes first-time immigrants)
+Long-term Resident	Refugees as defined by refugee treaties, permanently domiciled Indonesian refugees, persons of Japanese parentage, and permanently domiciled persons having Japanese grandparents

Source: Table 3.1 in Shimada (1993), *Japan's "Guest Workers": Issues and Public Policies*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

* For certain residence statuses, the Ministry of Justice defines criteria for eligibility. Details on these criteria are described in Japan Immigration Association (1990), *A Guide to Entry, Residence and Registration in Japan for Foreign Nationals*.

^ Residence statuses which were modified under the Revised Immigration Law.

+ Newly established residence statuses under the Revised Immigration Law.

Unmarked residence statuses were not changed under the Revised Immigration Law.

Table 7
Foreigners Entering Japan: All Foreigners, Asians, Filipinos, 1970-1993*

Year	Total	Asians	Filipinos
1970	775,061	211,684	20,477
1971	598,061	175,393	12,672
1972	662,474	197,847	10,860
1973	740,738	240,074	7,874
1974	724,017	267,881	10,411
1975	780,298	306,773	12,574
1976	881,203	335,974	13,073
1977	983,069	374,615	16,138
1978	1,017,149	419,201	20,375
1979	1,089,341	512,108	23,223
1980	1,295,866	640,637	27,902
1981	1,552,296	798,658	7,483
1982	1,708,306	879,175	37,878
1983	1,900,597	982,688	47,887
1984	2,036,488	1,057,926	49,511
1985	2,259,894	1,168,254	65,529
1986	2,021,450	1,014,787	80,508
1987	2,161,275	1,136,710	85,267
1988	2,414,447	1,387,050	86,567
1989	2,985,764	1,868,764	88,296
1990	3,504,470	2,271,598	108,292
1991	3,855,952	2,589,066	125,329
1992	3,926,347	2,651,559	120,660
1993	3,747,157	2,502,827	109,353

Source: Ministry of Justice (1970-1993), *Statistics on Immigration Control*.
*Includes foreigners entering Japan for the first time and re-entrants. First-timers are an overwhelming majority.

Table 8
Filipinos Entering Japan, By Purpose of Visit, 1970-93

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Work-related					
Diplomat	369	251	212	221	222
Official	518	377	341	387	520
Professor	1	2	3	-	-
Engineer	-	-	-	-	-
Entertainer	651	371	570	1328	2162
Religious	8	3	9	6	12
Art/science	-	1	-	5	2
Journalist	1	1	1	1	3
Skilled	-	-	-	-	-
Des. acts.	2342	2557	2328	3100	3627
Business-related					
Business	14	12	17	14	21
Education-related					
College student	32	41	47	78	93
Family-related					
S/C of J nat'l.	32	22	32	47	91
Dependents	21	18	11	16	44
Tourists	15034	7730	6356	1947	2568
Others	1454	1286	933	724	1046
TOTAL	20477	12672	10860	7874	10411

Table 8 (continued)
Filipinos Entering Japan, By Purpose of Visit, 1970-93

	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
Work-related					
Diplomat	240	193	258	182	215
Official	656	587	671	426	315
Professor	2	-	-	-	1
Engineer	-	-	-	-	-
Entertainer	2510	2875	3046	3902	6320
Religious	16	19	17	22	32
Art/science	3	3	1	4	5
Journalist	-	3	2	3	3
Skilled	-	-	2	1	1
Des. acts.	4286	4244	5172	6465	7499
Business-related					
Business	33	36	31	27	32
Education-related					
College student	121	119	107	135	137
Family-related					
S/C of J natl	109	111	151	86	89
Dependents	29	49	62	75	71
Tourists	3478	3574	5115	7455	6384
Others	1091	1260	1503	1592	2019
TOTAL	12574	13073	16138	20375	23223

Table 8 (continued)
Filipinos Entering Japan, By Purpose of Visit, 1970-93

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Work-related					
Diplomat	196	215	224	223	202
Official	413	403	317	220	210
Professor	1	1	2	4	3
Engineer	-	-	-	-	-
Entertainer	8509	12048	9125	8395	11972
Religious	32	29	22	33	46
Art/science	3	4	13	14	6
Journalist	1	-	1	3	4
Skilled	2	4	1	1	1
Des. acts.	7481	7490	1704	1164	1278
Business-related					
Business	34	35	74	76	72
Education-related					
College student	140	146	174	174	229
Training	-	-	803	706	958
Family-related					
S/C of J natl	86	97	560	1256	2085
Dependents	78	86	110	144	108
Tourists	8985	14831	24716	35428	32256
Others	1941	2097	32	46	81
TOTAL	27902	37483	37878	47887	49511

Table 8 (continued)
Filipinos Entering Japan, By Purpose of Visit, 1970-93

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Work-related					
Diplomat	244	225	151	208	249
Official	293	206	212	173	225
Professor	6	3	9	15	18
Engineer	-	-	-	-	-
Entertainer	17861	26029	36080	41423	32719
Religious	44	32	43	39	52
Art/science	15	14	12	27	21
Journalist	1	1	-	-	7
Skilled	1	-	1	1	10
Des. acts.	1687	2511	3242	5102	5645
Business-related					
Business	100	99	108	87	108
Education-related					
College student	256	363	417	546	695
Trainee	1157	995	1280	2537	4092
Family-related					
S/C of J natl	2679	3667	5938	10260	14995
Dependents	134	183	184	230	243
Tourists	40942	45989	37311	25463	28610
Others	109	191	279	456	607
TOTAL	65529	80508	85267	86567	88296

Table 8 (continued)
Filipinos Entering Japan, By Purpose of Visit, 1970-93

	1990	1991	1992	1993
Work-related				
Diplomat	223	256	199	259
Official	393	645	826	989
Professor	25	16	29	31
Engineer	141	577	925	902
Med. servs	5	-	-	-
Researcher	16	35	55	37
Acct/legal[3]	3	2	1	-
Intracomp.[4]	28	104	172	224
Entertainer	42867	57038	51252	42805
Religious	57	79	85	104
Artist	11	7	-	-
Journalist	4	5	4	4
Skilled	82	64	112	121
Specialist(hum)	483	454	508	528
Instructor	94	79	46	46
Des. acts.[1]	1061	1553	1489	1287
Business-related				
Investor	183	81	69	92
Education-related				
College student	858	880	828	735
Pre-college student	1487	707	471	267
Trainee	3596	5183	4509	3386
Family-related				
S/C of J natl[2]	18806	23046	26064	24344
S/C of PR[5]	150	152	129	158
Dependents	736	586	720	718
Residence				
P. resident[6]	815	1029	1341	1542
L-term res.[7]	453	868	1395	1690
Tourists	35701	31858	29404	29006
Cultural acts.	14	25	27	78
TOTAL	108292	125329	120660	109353

Source: Ministry of Justice (1970-1993), *Statistics on Immigration Control*.

[1] Designated activities
[2] Spouse/child of Japanese national
[3] Accounting/legal services
[4] Intracompany transfer
[5] Spouse/child of permanent resident
[6] Permanent resident
[7] Long-term resident

Table 9
Number of Foreigners Registered in Japan: All Foreigners, Asians, Filipinos, 1970-93

Year	All foreigners	Asians	Filipinos
1970	708,458	672,280	932
1971	718,795	681,848	863
1972	735,371	686,829	2,250
1973	738,410	692,715	2,424
1974	745,565	701,237	2,758
1975	751,842	706,784	3,035
1976	753,924	709,390	3,083
1977	762,050	716,224	3,600
1978	766,894	720,958	4,281
1979	774,505	727,593	4,757
1980	782,910	734,476	5,547
1981	792,946	742,445	6,729
1982	802,477	749,547	6,563
1983	817,129	761,263	7,516
1984	841,831	780,543	11,183
1985	850,612	789,729	12,661
1986	867,237	802,909	18,897
1987	884,025	818,330	25,017
1988	941,005	868,091	32,185
1989	984,455	891,299	38,295
1990	1,075,317	924,560	49,092
1991	1,218,891	974,551	61,837
1992	1,281,644	1,000,673	62,218
1993	1,320,748	1,027,304	73,057

Source: Ministry of Justice (1992), Statistics of the Ministry of Justice during the Showa era.

Table 10
Filipino Nationals Registered in Japan, By Status of Residence, Various Years

Status of Residence	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992
Work-related					
Professor	2	4	8	10	16
Engineer	-	-	-	161	639
Med.serv.	x	x	x	-	-
Research	x	x	x	15	21
Instructor	x	x	x	30	22
Specialist	x	x	x	202	265
Acct/legal[1]	x	x	x	2	1
Intracomp.[2]	x	x	x	10	83
Entertainer	3,835	9,075	13,243	18,783	20,090
Religious	37	40	40	54	86
Artist	3	6	14	6	-
Journalist	1	2	1	3	2
Skilled	2	1	1	25	85
Des. acts.[3]	1,505	2,510	4,381	949	1,045
Business-related					
Investor	23	28	22	24	19
Education/Training					
College	175	264	414	548	583
Pre-college	x	x	x	1,389	1,063
Trainee	273	286	1,005	1,296	1,907
Family-related					
S/C of Japanese[4]	2,967	5,299	11,298	20,516	28,351
S/C of Perm.res.[5]	x	x	x	170	164
Dependent	94	127	148	475	512
Residence criteria					
Perm. res.	192	292	541	1,083	1,461
Long-term res.	x	x	x	1,190	2,617
Temp. visitor	488	920	951	1,938	2,418
Cult. acts.				7	12
Others/unknown	21	43	118	206	755
TOTAL	9,618	18,897	32,185	49,092	62,218

Source: Ministry of Justice, *Statistics on Foreigners Residing in Japan* (1985, 1989, 1991, 1993).
x means there was no such category then.
[1] Accounting/legal services
[2] Intracompany transfer
[3] Designated activities
[4] Spouse/child of Japanese national
[5] Spouse/child of permanent resident

Table 11
The Number of Japanese Leaving Japan, By Destination 1970-93

Year	All destinations	Asian destinations	Philippines
1970	663,467	301,789	7,204
1971	961,135	481,186	9,928
1972	1,392,045	738,890	12,890
1973	2,288,966	1,314,124	30,072
1974	2,335,530	1,235,830	85,659
1975	2,466,326	1,300,355	119,876
1976	2,852,564	1,522,443	109,318
1977	3,151,431	1,715,376	145,689
1978	3,525,110	1,914,584	172,239
1979	4,038,298	2,115,241	190,637
1980	3,909,333	1,998,021	187,445
1981	4,006,388	2,024,725	161,453
1982	4,086,138	2,041,237	142,353
1983	4,232,246	2,096,940	143,934
1984	4,658,833	2,278,214	139,335
1985	4,948,366	2,406,786	136,513
1986	5,516,193	2,702,568	127,601
1987	6,829,338	3,321,348	134,204
1988	8,426,867	4,098,172	153,774
1989	9,662,752	4,623,228	170,661
1990	10,997,431	5,245,528	187,171
1991	10,633,777	5,083,031	193,730
1992	11,790,699	5,353,268	205,830
1993	11,933,620	5,423,021	222,169

Source: Ministry of Justice (1970-1993), *Statistics on Immigration Control.*

Table 12
Japanese Nationals Going to the Philippines, By Purpose of Visit, 1970-93

Year	Tour/ Sightseeing	Short-term Business	Others	Total
1970	426	1,582	425	2,433
1971	4,225	4,672	1,030	9,928
1972	6,803	4,933	1,154	12,890
1973	21,728	6,365	1,979	30,072
1974	76,726	7,385	1,548	85,659
1975	110,302	7,995	1,579	119,876
1976	97,913	9,304	2,101	109,318
1977	134,014	9,394	2,281	145,689
1978	158,302	11,465	2,472	172,239
1979	175,691	11,880	3,066	190,637
1980	172,478	11,751	3,216	187,445
1981	146,383	11,434	3,636	161,453
1982	127,055	11,408	3,890	142,353
1983	128,616	11,388	3,930	143,934
1984	123,872	11,441	4,022	139,335
1985	121,407	11,129	3,977	136,513
1986	112,280	11,133	4,188	127,601
1987	117,804	11,878	4,522	134,204
1988	135,727	12,962	5,085	153,774
1989	150,696	14,383	5,582	170,661
1990	157,997	23,465	5,709	187,171
1991	160,828	26,766	6,136	193,730
1992	171,894	28,832	5,104	205,830
1993	186,093	31,409	4,667	222,169

Source: Ministry of Justice (1970-1993), *Statistics on Immigration Control.*