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ABSTRACT
Diaspora studies focusing on the human phenomenon of military Pan Amerasians, the biracial progeny of US servicemen and military personnel and local female nationals abandoned or stranded in numerous East/Southeast nation-states and Pacific Islands dating from World War II, the Cold War and extending to contemporary times, are non-existent. This paper examines the prior and current status of Filipino Amerasians and those in other Pan Amerasian enclaves (e.g., Japan, Okinawa, South Korea, Thailand, US Territory of Guam, Vietnam, etc.), further advancing their cause for overdue yet neglected academic consideration as a bona fide human diaspora. Many military Amerasians, no longer children but well into adulthood and advanced age, exist today as they have for years, stigmatized, forsaken and impoverished offspring of forward deployed soldiers and private military contractors, often occupying the fringes of societies as disadvantaged, at-risk human cohorts. Analysis reveals that by many traditional measurements Pan Amerasians qualify as a diasporic entity in many or more ways than other populations benefiting from such academic recognition have for decades.

INTRODUCTION
Who cares that theatrical and musical entertainment news cycles are on overdrive over plans by a United Kingdom producer to re-stage a production on London's West End of the mega musical hit "Miss Saigon" in 2014? Indeed, producer Cameron Mackintosh claimed opening day ticket sales for the planned six-month run starting in May set a record for the largest single day of sales in West End and Broadway history (Editorial Staff, 2013). The long running 1990s hit musical, featuring the iconic "Kim," the sex laboring mother of an abandoned, mixed-heritage, Anglo (White) Vietnamese Amerasian child of a US Marine sergeant, would be a fixture of cultural fascination, a sine qua non topic for a paper in any military Amerasian university Diaspora studies program. The point is that today there is no course concentration, sequence or department - not even any academic recognition per se - in any North American or East/Southeast Asian university or college for military Amerasian diasporic or ethnic studies.

Indeed, the 2014 reemergence of the public's interest in the Miss Saigon melodrama raises two other ironies of international interest deserving of analysis. One is that the reintroduction of a 21st Century version, in 2014, of Miss Saigon's saga of two "star-crossed lovers,"...
(MacClear, 1995, p. 20) raises the possibility of retelling, or at least acknowledging the story of vile abandonment, human despair and global military war policy failure that led to formation of the sizeable Filipino and Pan Amerasian diaspora in the first place. It may only amount to another attempt, however feeble and unpromising, to bring the now mostly forgotten Amerasian drama to a new generation of North Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders. As MacClear (1995) points out, Miss Saigon, after all, was merely the updated 1990s version of a previous chapter in the extended Pan Amerasian drama, a sequel to the fabled, classical opera Madame Butterfly portraying the tragic suicide of a Nippon mother of an Amerasian child abandoned by her US naval office paramour around the turn of the 19th Century in Imperial Japan. Or, Marlon Brando starring in the US film productions of Sayonara (1957) and Teahouse of the August Moon (1956). Then, of course, the players were Japanese and Okinawans respectively, with storyline plots of romantic encounters between US servicemen and native women and the fecund threat of biracial Amerasian babies being conceived along the way. In those days, as in the post-Vietnam Era of the 1990s, the US public was only vaguely aware their servicemen had philandered heavily with native Asia Pacific women and left babies behind. For the most part that is where the story ended. The overall human impact never resonated deeply or caught the social consciousness of the general American public then (Shade, 1980), and it is no more likely to now. Another irreducible irony to the story is that London and Broadway are once again seeking a Filipina national to play Kim's marquee role as a virgin Saigon bar girl who won the title Miss Saigon in a seedy night club on the eve of the US military's inglorious exit from Saigon (now Ho Chi Minh City) (Oliveros, 2012). Indeed, the November, 2012 preliminary auditions held in Manila drew hundreds of performers seeking to replicate the authenticity and star power of the Filipina soprano and actress to first play Kim-Lea Salonga. An Oliver, Tony and Drama Desk award winning artist of international acclaim (Oliveros, 2012; Trueman, 2012), Salonga, a Luzon native, was born and raised as a child in Angeles, Pampanga. Therein may yet lay another of the many supreme ironies and sub plots surrounding the Miss Saigon label. Angeles City, after all, was site of the former Clark air base and headquarters of the 13th US Air Force, and it lies deep inside the notorious AMO (Angeles, Manila, Olongapo) Amerasian Triangle, believed to contain the largest concentration of biracial military Amerasians in East/Southeast Asia (Kutschera, Pelayo & Talamera-Sandico, 2012). Within the greater Pan Amerasian diaspora, the Philippines today have the highest number of mixed-heritage, biracial Amerasians - 250,000 or more if second generation progeny are figured in (Kutschera & Caputi, 2012). In part because of more prosperous economies in other nations where Pan Amerasians reside, juxtaposed with the comparatively languid Philippine economy, Filipino Amerasians as a mass are probably the most socioeconomically deprived, isolated, stigmatized, and deeply marginalized of the Pan Amerasians today (Kutschera & Caputi, 2012). Kutschera (2010, 2011) found in one of the only known mental health studies among Filipino Amerasians that many suffered intense stigma and discrimination, experienced high psychosocial risk including joblessness, housing insecurity, dysfunctional family situations, drug and alcohol abuse and social isolation. Sixty-two percent of a 16 participant sample from Angeles sustained severe anxiety and depression scores on the DASS-21 mental health scales, indicating a propensity to develop mental pathology. Nearly two-thirds of study participants were also found to have psychosomatic illness and possibly somatization disorder (Kutschera & Talamera-Sandico, 2013). Although US troops, civilian military support and corporate contractor personnel today remain permanently stationed in other East Asian-Pacific locations, chiefly Guam, Japan, Okinawa and South Korea, the sheer number of Amerasians alive in the Philippines rivals the "estimated 200,000 Japanese Amerasian children, born from 1945 to 1951 during the US-Japanese Military Occupation" (Shade, 1980, p. 24). Overall, US military personnel fathered and largely left unsupported an estimated two million Amerasian children (Shade, 1980, p. 24). This formidable human dispersal occurred in nearly a dozen East, Southeast and Pacific Island nation-states and island territories. Its initial formation primarily dated
from the Spanish-American War, the 1898 Treaty of Paris and the Spanish cession resulting in the US acquiring the Philippine islands (Karnow, 1989).

Thus we see that military Pan Amerasians, though generally on the wane, in terms of numbers across the Western Pacific Basin, remain a part of the geo-political, socioeconomic, human, ethnic and geo-political firmament of East/Southeast Asia. Hence, if a London, Broadway, Asian or international revival of interest in Miss Saigon is now solidly in the works, so then may be the rationale for revisiting, examining, updating and projecting what the future holds for the Pan Amerasian condition in the 21st Century. Why have US and Asia Pacific academics failed so strikingly to generate coherent or consistent interest over the years and, in fact, generally paid and continue to pay minimalistic attention to the human plight of the military Amerasian Diaspora?

That being said, in comparatively recent times, there have been some encouraging spurts of university driven, empirically based research interest. For example, from the mid-1980s to well into the 1990s this occurred over socioeconomic, psychological, mental and medical health issues facing Vietnamese Amerasians; it was a condition driven by public demand to write final closure to the agonizing and volatile war era, coupled with academic institution and foundational interest on many unresolved and emotionally heart wrenching refugee issues at the conclusion of the violent Vietnam American War (1964-1975) (McKelvey, 1999). Such coalescing had also existed, in one form or another, in the years following the conclusion of the Japanese Occupation (1951), and in the long aftermath of the Korean War (1950-1953). Yet since those intermittent periods the contemporary literature review cupboard on Amerasians is thin; there is, for instance, no structured or unified research thrust emanating either from the academic or foundational research establishment today. This reality, finally, leaves researchers to draw mostly on sporadic, individually driven dissertations, theses or independent research reports, but even more likely news media and book publishing accounts of isolated and anecdotal occurrences of stigmatization, hate mongering, or socioeconomic marginalization (e.g., Kim, 2009; Lamb, 2009; McKelvey, 1999; Song, 2003; Wu, 2012; Yarborough, 2005; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). For military Filipino Amerasians the empirical research landscape, in fact, is even bleaker.

This paper amplifies on two earlier preliminary study analyses: Kutschera and Caputi (2012) and Kutschera, Pelayo and Talamera-Sandico (2012) maintaining that (a) the unofficial estimated total number of military Amerasians in the Philippines at 50,000 was far larger than originally and unofficially projected in 1992 when permanent US military bases were ejected; (b) that the total figure of military Amerasians in the Philippines today, when second and new generation Amerasians are taken into account, is between 200,000 and 250,000, possibly many more; and (c) that when traditional, classical and more contemporary definitions of diaspora are taken into account, there is a strong case that Filipino Amerasians and other Pan Amerasian enclaves amply qualify for such designation.

Additionally, the paper seeks to provide readers a rationale for revisiting, examining, updating and projecting what the future holds for the military Filipino and broader Pan Amerasian condition in the 21st Century. This is done in the context of recent military and strategic defense and security developments in the Southeast and East Asia Pacific sphere, including such events as the 2012 announcement by the US Obama-Biden Administration to "pivot," or rebalance the emphasis of US international defense posture to East Asia from the Middle East and other regions of the globe (Cloud, 2012; O’Callaghan & Mogato, 2012); the aggressive and anxiety-provoking changes in foreign and defense policy by the People's Republic of China (PRC) as it relates to assertion of territorial and mineral claims in the South China Sea (“China's Territorial Disputes,” 2012; Perlez, 2012), renewed tensions in East Asia regarding island and territorial disputes between the PRC, Japan and South Korea (China's territorial disputes, 2012), and the apparently continuing efforts by North Korea to develop future nuclear warhead missile delivery capability reaching as far as the US mainland (Ryal, 2013).
LITERATURE REVIEW

The term *Pan Amerasian* was initiated by Kutschera (2010, 2011) who posited the phenomena as a social construct and "a general, inclusive reference" to military Amerasian progeny dispersal, the direct result of long standing US military presence in East and Southeast Asia. Driven by "US military servicemen, civilian and contractor employees, these servicemen have fought or been garrisoned in dispersed locations, such as Guam, Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, South Korea, Thailand and Vietnam" (p. 189). In reality, the historically definitive list includes a much wider swath, extending to other locations across East/Southeast Asia including, at one time or another, Cambodia (Kampuchea), mainland China, Myanmar (Burma), Laos, Micronesia, and Taiwan (Formosa) (Bass, 1996; Shade, 1980).

The Philippine case for diaspora offer attributes of considerable size coupled with unique historical ties to the US as a former colony and commonwealth. While possessing enough of the general characteristics of traditional and contemporary diasporic definitions, Kutschera and Caputi (2012) maintained that diaspora status might also be extended to remaining Pan Amerasian cohorts perhaps in the form of a series of collective Amerasian enclaves:

Certainly Filipino and other Pan Amerasians could arguably maintain that their births on foreign soil by US military personnel fathers assigned there constituted either a forceful or involuntary circumstance. Moreover, ample proof exists that Filipino and Pan Amerasian populations have made and continue to make an on-going effort to stay in contact and maintain communication with their (paternal) homeland. One verification is to log onto the Internet and search for numerous organizations and websites created by Filipino and Pan Amerasian ethics devoted to disseminating news or providing locator sites for Amerasians seeking to locate their long lost fathers (Amerasian Research Network, Ltd., 2012, http://www.AmerasianResearch.org).

After a year of investigation, we are not aware of any other academic researchers who have succeeded in publishing academic journal articles or presenting research conference papers offering Filipino Amerasians, or any enclaves of Pan Amerasians, as prospective nominees as diaspora. This specifically includes the narrower definition of military Amerasians, the subject of this paper, whose origin are an offshoot of the original definition of Amerasian advanced by Nobel and Pulitzer Prize winning author Pearl S. Buck. The iconic Buck made first reference to the encompassing term Amerasian - a sort of counterpart to the older 19th Century Eurasian definition describing biracial colonial children of British and Indian descent - in *East Wind, West Wind* (1930), an early novel depicting Chinese family and marriage traditions. Buck’s definition originally referred to a controversial marriage between a Chinese man and a US American woman, but was interpreted to encompass multi-racial marriages of Asians and North Americans in general. The wide use of the term Amerasian to include US military progeny born in East/Southeast Asia did not come into popular lexicon until post-World War II.

The categorical nature of military Amerasians in our paper are implicitly defined as "any person who was fathered by a citizen of the United States (an American serviceman, American expatriate, or US government employee, regular or contract) and whose mother is, or was an Asian national" (Amerasian Foundation, 2007). The Amerasian Foundation prefaces its basic definition with an explanation that many Amerasian progeny, who sprung up after World War II in nation-states including Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, Thailand and Vietnam were abandoned by their fathers and in some cases their mothers, implying but not directly stating they were abandoned by military personnel fathers.

In the first known published research report suggesting military Filipino Amerasians possessed basic attributes of a qualifying diasporic population, Kutschera (2010, 2011) posited in his doctorate dissertation that, "the unique sociological configuration of Filipino Amerasians as a diaspora" might make them future candidates for such consideration (p. 8). He cited two other sources: (a) Palmer (2000), who maintained that "diasporas are
generally defined as the movement, migration, forced relocation, or scattering of a people or their descendants sometimes far from an established homeland” (p. 8), and (b) San Juan (2006), who maintained that diasporas are determined "not only by a homeland but also by a desire for eventual return, and by collective identity centered on myths and memories of the homeland" (p. 42). Regardless of their location or origin, Palmer further posited that diaspora in many instances were "not actual but imaginary and symbolic communities and political constructs. [They] share an emotional attachment to their ancestral land, are cognizant of their dispersal and, if conditions warrant, their oppression and alienation.”

Indeed, in applying traditional, fundamental definitions of diaspora, Filipino and ostensibly other Pan Amerasian enclaves as a minimum meet multiple essential qualifications. In a classical anthropological definition, Kottak (2008) described diaspora simply as “people in motion . . . [.] the offspring of an area who have spread to many lands . . . [.], a trans-local and interactive system which is strikingly new” (as cited in Kutschera & Caputi, 2012, p. 4). Greek in origin, the term also may refer quite liberally to general or specific forms of dispersal, a migration, movement, or simply a scattering of people away from an established homeland. In short, people dispersed whether voluntarily or involuntarily, or by whatever cause to multiple locations, and often settling or displaced to lands away from the ancestral locus (Ember & Skoggard, 2004).

Given such variance of basic criteria Kutschera (2010) held that Filipino Amerasians and possibly other Pan Amerasians would amply qualify as a diasporic population on several levels:

1. They were fathered by military communities of US servicemen stationed at permanent US military bases;
2. They were forced to forfeit or suspend claim on their US homeland when their fathers departed;
3. They are scattered at numerous locations in East and Southeast Asia as Pan Amerasian population cohorts (e.g., Guam, Japan, Okinawa, South Korea, Thailand, Vietnam);
4. They maintain collective identities as Amerasians and cultural and social ties to the US mainland;
5. In significant numbers among the sample, they expressed the desire or sought, however tenuous, to immigrate and claim US American family ties (Kutschera, 2010, pp. 8-9).

Kirk (1996) and Kutschera (2010) implicated that entrenched US bases in the Philippines, such as Clark air base, formerly the US Army’s Fort Stotsenburg in Angeles and Sangley Point naval base, Cavite, and Subic Bay naval base, dating to the Philippine American War (1899-1902), were virtual outposts of Americana; thus, they were de facto incubators of diaspora. They were transported to foreign lands by a globally driven war policy. Outside the bases, tenderloin districts symbolic of the scourge of military prostitution that flourished from the start of the US colonial administration helped foster the creation of the biracial, mixed-heritage military Amerasian phenomenon (DeStoop, 1994; Sturdevant, & Stoltzfas, 1992). The scenario was not much different from dozens of camps and bases and their surroundings, also described as "camp towns" which sprouted outside military installations in South Korea following the Korean War (Gillem, 2007, p. 55). Similar scenarios were documented in varying detail in Japan and Okinawa (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2004; Shade, 1980); Pattaya City, Phuket and Bangkok, Thailand (Odzer, 1994), and Vietnam (Bass, 1996; McKelvey, 1999).

Modernizing classical definitions of diaspora, Safran (1991) averred such human dispersals were essentially “a group of ethnic expatriates who shared” a close-knit variety of like characters (as cited in Otalvaro-Hormillosa, 1999, p. 2). Such characteristics - all of which Pan Amerasians could well qualify for - included distributions to two or more nearby or overseas regions, possession of a common memory or vision about their homeland, belief
they were not fully welcomed or integrated into their current domicile, visions of their ancestral land of origin as their ideal homeland, and beliefs they should remain committed to their homeland.

One of the formidable hurdles confronting Pan Amerasian diaspora advocates would be to clear the bar defining diaspora as presented by Tololyan (2007), a contemporary seminal writer on the subject, who has promulgated robust if not highly challenging diasporic definitional doctrine. Specifically, Tololyan (2007) maintains that mere human dispersals or distributions and many contemporary definitions are over simplistic, impulsive, and not reason enough to qualify as a true, contemporary diaspora. For example, Tololyan (2007) wrote of a common mistake by some social scientists and more probably news reporters who erroneously defined general dispersals of varying reasons as diaspora. "Though conceptually untidy, this is one of the ways in which diaspora is used today. For example, the dispersion of poor and often Blacks from New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina is now routinely called 'the Katrina diaspora'" (p. 12). Surely the case for a Pan Amerasian diaspora might be much stronger than the Katrina reference.

Tololyan (2007) originated one of the defining conundrums of the modern day diaspora, positing that, "All diasporic communities are also ethnic communities, but not all ethnic communities are diasporic" (p. 649). In ascertaining diaspora, Tololyan required "a culture and a collective memory that preserves elements of the homeland's language or religious, social, and cultural practice… [;] by contrast, ethnic groups at best exhibit a diluted form of biculturalism."

Tololyan's tests for a population's desire to restore linkages or return to the homeland mandate a high threshold, something that might be particularly difficult to sustain among Pan Amerasian enclaves in Japan and South Korea, for instance, where national economies have improved so much there is little economic incentive for mixed-blood military Amerasians to reunite with North American military fathers.

**OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION**

**Filipino and Pan Amerasian Diasporic Historical Insights**

Although US military preoccupation in the Western Pacific Basin is historically linked to the Spanish American War (1898), and subsequent surrender of the Philippines to the US by Spain, the Amerasian Foundation (2007) suggests that US involvement and birth of the first mixed-race Amerasians actually date to the early 1850s. Then, expeditions to Japan and later Taiwan (Formosa) by the US Navy vessels commanded by Commodore Matthew C. Perry are credited with reconnoitering and opening up Japan and adjacent sea lanes to US and Western shipping commerce.

Although the Philippines is believed today to hold the highest number of living military origin Amerasians (Kutscher & Caputi, 2012), that distinction for many years probably belonged to Japan including the Ryukyu chain island of Okinawa. In fact, the island of Okinawa is where an estimated 75 percent of US air force, navy, army and marine personnel in Japan are today stationed (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2004). Thirty years after the US occupation of Japan (1945-1951) ended, the Pearl Buck Foundation estimated 200,000 plus Anglo, African, Hispanic and Latino, and Native American origin Japanese Amerasians were living in Japan having been sired by US servicemen. Buck wrote despairingly of the post-war Japanese Amerasian condition:

> The problem, of course, is how to get the children into this land of their fathers. Our present narrow immigration laws forbid their being brought in easily. American parents have often asked me how to do what they (sic) can to alleviate suffering in Asia, particularly for children…. It is imperative what is done should be done soon, for the younger the child, the more easily he or she will be accepted into American homes. (Shade, 1980, pp. 24-25)
Literature supporting possible diasporic formation for military Filipino Amerasians or Pan Amerasians is not known. In fact, chroniclers of the various, well-documented Asian American diaspora and their myriad ethnic or cultural experiences on the US-North American mainland whether Filipino, Japanese, Korean or Vietnamese either rarely mentioned and more often ignored unsavory or disdainful military Amerasian originations. They viewed or categorized them on the far margins of the widely acknowledged and accepted Asian American diaspora, driven whether consciously or not by the stereotypical and never scientifically investigated belief that the overwhelming number of Amerasian children were the offspring of mothers driven involuntarily or not into prostitution or sex labor. Thus, there were persistent, discomforting factors contributing to avoidance of focus on societies with the prostituted mother stereotype and a venal system of globally-sanctioned militarism and military prostitution (Butler, 2000; Enloe, 1989; Moon, 1997; Sturdevant & Stultzfus, 1992). Such skeptical or dubious academic and literary approaches have generally reflected the low, for example, for Amerasians mentioned or provided limited notice in contemporary studies of Japanese Americans (Chan, 2007), Korean Americans (Young-ee, 2007), or mixed heritage, multi-racial Asian Americans (Williams-Leon & Nakashima, 2001).

Given the lack of extant research or any centralized or formal method of enumeration or census taking of Filipino or other Pan Amerasian populations (Kutschera & Caputi, 2012), one of the most creditable sources of information remains America's Forgotten Children: The Amerasians (1980), a book written by John C. Shade. A devoted researcher of the military Amerasian experience, Shade was executive director of the Pearl S. Buck Foundation, the non-profit NGO long active in humanitarian support and adoption programs for military Amerasians for many decades following World War II. Shade's book, though dated, remains one of the most authoritative, comprehensive and thoroughly researched chronicles on military Pan Amerasians. It is one of the few making an attempt to enumerate and analyze total numbers of mixed-blood Amerasians born in East and Southeast Asian nation-states.

Shade (1980) and numerous contemporary researchers (i.e., Bass, 1996; Gage, 2007; Kutschera, 2010, 2011; Levi, 1993; McKelvey, 1999; Yarborough, 2005) have all reported wide divergence in estimated numbers of military Amerasians residing in host nation-states. There are several reasons. For instance, Kutschera and Caputi (2012) reported that during the nearly century long colonial and neo-colonial involvement of the US in the Philippines, neither government tallied comprehensive or reliable census figures; this was particularly the condition with unrecorded, or so-called illegitimate, out-of-wedlock births. Most significantly, Shade (1980) maintained such was also the condition with Amerasians in other East Asian states. In reality, there was no sound political or strategic reason for either government to do so because un cared for, orphaned or unsupported Amerasian progeny were basically powerless and voiceless, a geo-political embarrassment, and/or a living proof of war and social policy failure.

**PAN AMERASIAN DIASPORA: UPDATE AND BACKGROUND**

**South Korea**

Shade (1980) reported that in 1957, at the end of the Korean War, Pearl Buck personally estimated that the number of stranded Korean Amerasian children, "probably exceeded 25,000" (p. 29). Consider the significance of this figure within the context that for 60 years the US has maintained a consistent military garrison presence in South Korea. Today, there is no truly reliable way of knowing how many first or second generation African, Anglo, Latino, Native American Indian or other ethnic US military Amerasians reside in Korea. Nor is there any clear way of knowing how many Amerasians have been abandoned or stranded or even born there since the Korean War (Choe, 1997). An estimated 2,500 emigrated to the US following the 1982 Amerasian Immigration Act which allowed certain Pan Amerasian nationals immigration easements; Filipinos, Japanese, Okinawans, and Taiwanese, however, were specifically excluded. According to a past Buck Foundation
International registry, there were nearly 5,000 Amerasians on the south peninsula at the turn of the 20th century. Yet the foundation reported that the actual number may have been as much as four times the registration figure (“Biracial People,” 2005).

Biracial Amerasians’ societal status is often marginalized due to widespread Korean social intolerance of mixed-racial populations (Choe, 1997). As Shade (1980) reported, and as Buck wrote and her foundation documented over the years, discriminatory practices against Amerasians in Korean society were among the severest in East Asia. In the 1950s Buck wrote of, “The unforgiving patriarchal traditions of Asia means a fatherless, mixed-race child was (and is) abused as a pariah, insulted and sometimes beaten, and routinely denied access to any educational or economic opportunity. Buck maintained that since Korean children could only be registered in their father’s names at birth, those Amerasians abandoned or orphaned by a US military person in effect had no legal status. “Many were killed and an unknown number of male children were castrated” Buck reported (Conn, 1996, p. 313). Park (2010) recently updated and further confirmed Buck’s firsthand accounts in his recent dissertation on stateless Korean G.I. babies.

Today, due to a variety of factors the number of military Korean Amerasians born is a fraction of the past. First, the number of US troops has declined over the years as the South Korean military rapidly modernized defense capabilities. There are approximately 28,500 US troops in Korea today, down from 35,000 in 2000, spread across about 20 military installations according to Rowland (2010) and the US Forces Korea Command (USFK). Another factor is economy related. As the Korean economy has rocketed upward in recent decades the number of Korean women engaging in prostitution or sex labor has decreased markedly, precipitously so around the numerous kijichon military prostitution camp towns (Hughes, Chon & Ellerman, 2007), widely believed to a ready source of Amerasian children from impregnated sex laborers. However, in Korea and Okinawa local national women have often been replaced by sex laborers from the Philippines, Russia and the former states of the Soviet Union (Cervantes, 2011; Lee, 2007). Though never reliably proven through empirical research, the widely held stereotype in the Philippines and other Pan Amerasian states, including South Korea (Lee, 2007) and Vietnam (Bass, 1996; McKelvey, 1999), is that sex laboring women comprised the majority of mothers of Amerasians. Such a notion is held despite long traditions of US military personal liaisons and fraternizations with overseas female national residents (Kutschera & Caputi, 2012). While prostitution is officially outlawed in Korea, a highly organized sex industry encircling military bases thrived through well into the late 20th Century (Hughes, Chon & Ellerman, 2007). In more recent times, US military personnel accessibility to sex industry enticements has grown more muted based on several primary developments affecting Korea, Okinawa and mainland Japan, particularly where US troops and bases are actively sited:

1. Between 2001 and 2004, following extensive worldwide publicity over the scourge of trafficking of women, largely for purposes of sex labor, the administration of US President George W. Bush prompted the Department of Defense to revisit its policies regarding troops’ consorting with prostitutes and engaging in inappropriate fraternization with local women overseas. The Bush-Cheney administration also vigorously enforced the State Department’s policy of monitoring and reporting tier ratings of nations worldwide and their human trafficking records. In 2001, South Korea, for instance, had a lowly tier 3 rating under the US Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA) grading system (the lowest mark), for failing to meet or attempt to meet minimum trafficking enforcement standards. In the next decade, the Republic of Korea rating worked its way up to tier 2, and the department’s 2012 TVPA granted Korea a tier 1, or high compliance rating (“Human Trafficking,” 2012). Yet, as little as six years ago Hughes, Chon and Ellerman (2007) described US military bases in Korea as “a hub for the transnational trafficking of women from the Asia-Pacific and Eurasia

Vol. 6, No. 1 (2014-15)
to South Korea and the U.S” (p. 16).

2. In 2005, a benchmark change in the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), Article 134, provided for a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of pay and allowances, and up to one year confinement for military personnel patronizing prostitutes (Jowers, 2006). It is a dramatic departure from the past, as the UCMJ provides criminal sanction for all US military services. Both Hughes, Chon and Ellerman (2007) and Squatrito (2005) posited US military enforcement of such measures historically is dismal.

3. In recent years in many kijichon camp towns in South Korea, harder edge, alcohol serving night spots, honkytonk and drinking and dance clubs have been replaced with so-called “juicy bars,” or drinking and dancing establishments which serve non-alcoholic beverages only. They are the new face and a sort of 21st Century version of an old profession. The establishments cater largely to lower ranking and lower paid US servicemen who, because of the economic turn of the time, simply don't have the wad of pocket cash their fathers, or even grandfathers, used to have to buy no holds barred, unrestricted sex and booze (Moon, 1997; Rabiroff & Hae-rym, 2009). While lower key and a tad subtle, the scenario inside juicy bars hasn’t changed much basically from the old days and prostitution services are often available in many.

Thailand

One of the nearly forgotten or overlooked Pan Amerasian havens is Thailand where an estimated 5,000 to 8,000 Amerasian orphans, most now in their late 30s, remain in country according to the Pearl S. Buck Foundation’s Bangkok office (Goniwiecha, 2004). Shade (1980) reported there were an estimated 11,000 Amerasians born to Thai national mothers during the Vietnam War. As many as 50,000 US servicemen were stationed there beginning in 1967 with the construction of six major air force installations and as many as 10 separate military installations; GIs on R&R leave from Vietnam also travelled in and out of three primary recreation areas: Bangkok, Chiangmai and Pattaya City. Some Thai Amerasians managed to immigrate to the US mainland, mostly as a result of eased visa and residency policies from the 1982 Amerasian Immigration Act.

The rowdy red light districts of Pattaya have long been the talk of US Navy rest and relaxation (R&R) recreation lore. “It catered to every whim of sex-hungry American sailors, regularly disgorged from visiting US warships. The town is synonymous with its continuous … zone of bars, brothels and massage parlors” (Fawthrop & Jarvis, 2004, p. 94). Odzer (1994) described the arrival and excitement generated by R&R visits of crews from US Seventh Fleet Navy vessels in the post Vietnam War 1990s in Pattaya. She observed, “Each ship had its own Thai fishing boat to ferry the boys back and forth. A cloth strung between trees announced WELCOME US NAVY. A bank trailer waited so that they could change their (US dollars) right there. Very organized” (p. 156). One of the ships docking at Pattaya was the US nuclear-powered aircraft carrier Carl Vinson and its seven support ships.

Ironically, the Carl Vinson is the same ship which docked in Manila Bay May 15-19, 2011 on its way back to the US after it completed a mission of burying the remains of al-Qaeda founder Osama bin Laden at sea. Manila newspapers and a US Embassy press release reported that the Carl Vinson ship crew and carrier group pulled a few days of R&R crew rest in the Philippine capital (Embassy of the United States, Manila, Philippines, 2011).

Japan and Okinawa

Though the main islands of Japan held the preponderance of US military bases in the aftermath of World War II for three decades or more - and most of the reputed 200,000 Nipponese Amerasian children abandoned and orphaned during the Japanese Occupation
years (1945-1951) (Shade, 1980) - most of the focus in contemporary times involving US troops and a significantly less incidence of Amerasian births has shifted to the southern Ryukyu chain island of Okinawa. There, anywhere from two-thirds to three-quarters of US troops and bases are currently located (“Okinawans, Americans,” 2010; Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2004). The island includes Kadena air base and the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force, both close in, major strategic assets in the US defense of East/Southeast Asia.

There are approximately 35,000-40,000 military personnel deployed to Japan today, predominantly in the marines and air force, two services highly represented on Okinawa. The US Seventh Fleet is based in Yokosuka (Reji, 2008). Controversy has shrouded much of the US military presence in Okinawa in the past two decades. A myriad of issues are the cause including protests involving crowding of too many troops and bases on the island, fears that the military hurts Okinawa’s expanding tourism industry, concerns over security of the local population from transient troops populations, and over a series of criminal cases involving marines and air force personnel, including violent assaults, rapes, violence against women and vehicular homicides (“Okinawans, Americans,” 2010). Numerous surveys and opinion polls taken on Okinawa and the Japanese mainland have urged that the number of personnel and bases be sharply reduced (“Japanese Protest,” 2009). In partial response the US Department of Defense has announced plans to reassign approximately 8,000 marines and about 9,000 family members from Okinawa to the US Territory of Guam, Australia and other possible locations within several years (Koop, 2009; Paik, 2010).

By most scattered reports levels of stigma and discrimination facing Amerasians on Okinawa are not much better than in South Korea, mainland Japan or the Philippines. Confirming the practice of US military personnel continuing to impregnate local women and not providing support, “Social services agencies and children’s rights advocates estimate there are about 4,000 Okinawan children abandoned by US servicemen” (Sims, 2000). Local government officials have claimed that about 200 Amerasian children are born annually on the island called “The Rock” by uniformed personnel (“Okinawans, Americans,” 2010). Typically, Amerasian numbers, if they are accurately reported by host government agencies, only categorically report children or teenage numbers, not adults, the elderly or second generation Amerasians which would be included in a diasporic study or comprehensive enumeration. A number of Internet blogs report that the Japanese Amerasians residing on Okinawa alone probably number more like 15,000 to 20,000 (“Okinawans, Americans,” 2010).

Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos

Again no one precisely knows how many Vietnamese Amerasians were actually conceived during the protracted Vietnam American War (1964-1975) nor left behind even after the US government offered immigration easements to many in the 1980s (Lee, 2009). In a dispatch from the war zone the late New York Times columnist and editor James Reston estimated that as many as 100,000 Amerasian children were sired (as cited in Bass, 1996), including unaccounted for thousands who may have perished as street children. Benge (2005) estimated that 50,000 children were left behind. US government estimates placed the official figure at 30,000 (O’Connor-Sutter, 1990), an always disputed figure (Kutschera, 2010, 2011). Vietnamese Amerasians, unlike any other Pan Amerasian population cohort, benefited immensely from a virtually unprecedented act of the US Congress - the Amerasian Homecoming Act of 1987 - which eventually resulted in approximately 26,000 men and women Amerasians visa entry to the US mainland under the Orderly Departure Program (Lamb, 2009). Advocacy groups such as the Amerasian Independent Voice of America and the Amerasian Fellowship Association claim that only a few Amerasians may still actually remain in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Lamb, 2009).

Very little is published and truly known about precise figures for comparatively isolated Cambodian and Laotian military Amerasians. Both Khmers and Laotians, including Hmong
peoples, many of whom were pro-American during the war, were permitted to immigrate freely under the 1982 Amerasian Immigration Act, although figures over precisely how many Amerasians in this grouping took advantage of the benefit have not been widely reported. Common wisdom would suggest that the bulk of the unknown number of Cambodian Amerasians - left behind after the Vietnam War, the 1970 US land incursion into eastern Cambodia, and subsequent massive bombing occurring intermittently to the latter part of the war - probably perished possibly during continuous US bombing assaults, or almost certainly during the Khmer Rouge regime's genocidal hold on the country. During this period, April 17, 1975 to January 6, 1979, under the grip of the infamous regime headed by Pol Pot (Saloth Sar) an estimated two million Cambodians perished due to torture, execution, starvation or illness - one-fourth of the entire population (Fawtrop & Jarvis, 2004; Kiernen, 1996). Routinely, enemies of the state, of which it can be safely presumed Cambodian Amerasians or their families were categorized as part of, were arrested, tortured and executed with many buried in the regime's grisly "killing fields" (Chandler, 1999, p. 161).

US Territory of Guam

There is scant anecdotal and no empirical research information regarding birth of Filipino Amerasian and indigenous Chamorros and Pacific Islander children from US military personnel and local national women; recent census information indicates the population includes 39 percent Chamorros, Micronesian heritage Guam home landers, 26 percent Filipinos and 11 percent Pacific Islanders residing on this southernmost island in the Pacific Mariana chain. A veritable US military island fortress and modern day forward US Pacific Forces deployment platform (Kopp, 2009; Paik, 2010), Guam is home of Anderson airbase, a strategic, B-52 staging installation for heavy US bombing capability; strategic and expanding Apra Harbor naval base and several marine and army installations. There are no comprehensive figures readily available on numbers of military Filipino Amerasian or other mixed-blood Charmorro or Pacific Islander progeny fathered with US military personnel fathers. Nevertheless, the recipe for a sizeable Pan Amerasian enclave is obvious given the long standing use of Guam as a US military base hub. Military presence on Guam dates to its acquisition along with the Philippines and the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1898 (Karnow, 1989). Today, the same tenderloin district type bars, discos, honky tonks, strip bars, karaoke and juicy bars found in South Korea and Okinawa proliferate, though on a smaller scale, in this key Western Pacific Basin outpost.

PERSPECTIVES, ASPECTS AND GLOBAL IMPLICATIONS OF PAN AMERASIANS AS DIASPORA

Filipino Amerasians represent the best candidates for future formal categorization as diaspora given a variety of factors including their deep historical ties to the US mainland, a high English speaking penetration among the population, and its sheer population size (Kutschera & Caputi, 2012). But the researchers never ruled out other Pan Amerasian enclaves as possibilities, implying that a number of the characteristics which presented Filipino Amerasians as standouts were also inherent in Pan Amerasian groupings. Among the attributes and similarities that would support proper credentialing for Pan Amerasians as a diaspora include:

1. Similar to Filipino Amerasians, their military personnel fathers in many cases resided, at least for the length of extended military tours and even shorter deployments, on US military bases and installations, many of which were virtual pockets of American society and culture (Gillem, 2004). Thus, the links to their patriarchal bloodline were just as powerful as that of many other already readily recognized diasporas given that original, incipient bloodlines were as close or undiluted as the progeny of many traditionally and contemporarily recognized diasporas (Ember, Ember & Skoggard, 2004).
2. As in the case of the Filipinos, Pan Amerasians were forced to forfeit or suspend claim on their US homeland when their fathers departed. In short, first generation Pan Amerasians faced the same socioeconomic travails, impoverishment and stigma brought on by the loss and abandonment by the father as Filipino Amerasians. In addition to losing any claim to US citizenship Amerasians, labeled *honhyola* in Korea, were classified as stateless because children with Korean mothers but non-citizen fathers were regarded as such by archaic and racist South Korean National Assembly laws (Park, 2010).

3. Pan Amerasians, though many in much fewer numbers than Filipinos, Japanese (Okinawan) and Korean Amerasians (e.g., Cambodia, Guam, Laos and Thailand and Vietnam), are amply dispersed across multiple locations of East/Southeast Asia - a strong requirement for diaspora bona fides.

4. Pan Amerasian social, cultural and linguistic linkages may not be as intense as Filipino Amerasians, who are largely North American dialect English language speakers; however, many Pan Amerasians also are English speakers where the tongue is widely taught as a foreign language, such as in South Korea and Japan. As the Philippines is a former US colony, English along with Filipino (Tagalog), is one of two official state languages mandatorily taught in public schools (“The Philippines,” 2013). Significantly, many Pan Amerasians maintain binary, hybrid identities and promote cultural and social ties to the US mainland through English, or their native tongues of their birthplace abroad. One of the proofs of this phenomenon is evidenced by the high number of active Pan Amerasian community unity organizations with websites on the Internet (many in English) and the emergence of the Internet in the last two decades as a precursor for bonding diasporic populations in general (Hiller & Frantz, 2004; Pro-Amerasian groups, 2013).

5. Although household incomes are doubtlessly higher for many Pan Amerasians than for Filipino Amerasians, there is ample empirical evidence that such economic advantage does not necessarily translate into social or psychological advantage. Many Pan Amerasians (e.g., Japan, Okinawa, South Korea, Vietnam) face exclusion, isolation, discrimination and stigmatization (Benge, 2005; Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2004; Park, 2010; Lee, 2007; MacClear, 1995, 2008; Wu, 2012). These Problems have plagued numerous diasporic groups for centuries and, indeed, it is one of the hallmark characteristics, and most qualifying traits of numerous diasporas (Ember, Ember & Skoggard, 2004).

Kutschera and Caputi (2012) maintained that although the Filipino case was the strongest, military Pan Amerasian groups with higher populations had the greatest potential. For example, the sharp reduction of Vietnamese as a result of the 1987 US homecoming act and probable original smaller numbers and current research barriers on current Amerasian population numbers in Cambodia and Laos may make their situations unrealistic to consider. Due to the aging of World War II era Amerasian populations and barriers to research, Myanmar (Burma) and mainland China, for all intents and purposes, may have already been relegated to research history’s dustbin. Perhaps a case could be maintained for researching the Taiwan (Formosa) situation, given that the US maintained semblance of a garrison troop presence on Taiwan as late as the 1960s. There was a substantial enough population of Amerasian progeny on Taiwan, for instance, for them to be included in the initial draft of the Amerasian Immigration Act of 1982 which provided immigration easements for many Pan Amerasians, although Taiwanese, Filipino and Japanese Amerasians were specifically cut from the bill before the full Congress voted on it.
ADVANTAGES OF DIASPORIC LABELING AND IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL AFFAIRS

At a minimum, random disinterest, and at a maximum, institutional failure on the part of US and East/Southeast Asian academic and foundational researchers to pay significant attention to mixed-race military Amerasian as suitable candidates for diasporic subjects has impacted their common welfare negatively (Kutschera & Caputi, 2012). The general US public's interest in the plight of the Vietnamese refugee boat people and subsequently the somewhat more dramatic Vietnamese Amerasian refugee saga, engaged the attention of human services and mental health researchers who for over a decade (1982-1996) actively investigated the Vietnamese Amerasian condition - a commendable humanitarian gesture (McKelvey, 1999; Yarborough, 2005). However, virtual banishment of military Amerasians as a standalone diasporic entity stands out even at this late date, as their numbers slowly diminish and the population ages (Kutschera, Pelayo & Talamera-Sandico, 2012).

The exclusion of military Amerasians for diasporic consideration extends to a closely allied area of diasporic research activity - Asian American studies. Kutschera and Caputi (2012) commented, "if noticed or discussed, the uniquely biracial ... Amerasian experience is usually lumped together with or analyzed concomitantly as merely another segment of the generalized Asian American diasporic experience." Various examples include Amerasians mentioned or provided notice of in contemporary studies of Japanese Americans (Chan, 2007), Korean Americans (Young-ee, 2007), or mixed heritage, multi-racial Asian Americans (Williams-Leon & Nakashima, 2001). Moreover, in instances such as the Vietnamese Amerasian phenomena numerous authors (e.g., Bass, 1996; McKelvey, 1999; Yarborough, 2005) intensely examined, discussed and analyzed military Amerasian refugee and immigrant experiences, but avoided suggestion they merited inclusion as a distinct or special diasporic entity.

New diasporic and ethnic studies of Pan Amerasians - clearly a retro era by-product of both the world wide military garrison and national security state and the Cold War Era (1948-1990) - may initiate or encourage academic research interest in related areas including: (a) aspects of human trafficking and the use of women and children in prostitution and related aspects of sex labor in military deployment settings; (b) initiation of research in military science and studies disciplines, particularly with respect to new policy formation and reviews of current command control procedures as they relate to monitoring troop off-duty leisure time pursuits; and (c) research initiatives in the areas of business administration and management as they relate to policies and procedures governing defense contractor staff assigned to work on military deployments and other projects abroad, including the need for contractor rules of deportment, civil and ethical behavior in such situations.

What global event or series of events will it take to alter the status quo which constitutes a virtual blackout or minimalist academic interest in research and examining military Amerasians? Could increasingly aggressive military strategic initiatives by the PRC focusing on territorial, sovereignty and mineral rights claims in the South and East China Seas spur renewed military and related strategic tensions within the Western Pacific Basin (“China's Territorial Disputes,” 2012; Perlez, 2012) tripwire academia into taking a new look at military Amerasian social history? A US counter measure, perhaps part of the Obama-Biden administration's Asian military rebalance, could serve to remind ASEAN and Allied nation-states with bulky Amerasian populations (i.e. Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea) of the potential reemergence or enlargement of the Amerasian issue should US troop deployments surge again. Or, more likely, would a slowed and deliberate US response barely raise a muted yawn from the public over the presence but continuing invisibility of Pan Amerasian populations? This scenario seems to be particularly evident in the Philippines. There, news media coverage of increasingly visible visits to Subic Bay and other ports of call by US Seventh Fleet war vessels raises more interest in how many additional pesos ship and crew visits will pump into the local economy, rather than concerns
Military Pan Amerasians and 21st Century Implications for Diasporic and Global Studies

over sailors and seafarer contractors once again crowding Olongapo bars and nightspots searching for illicit female companionship (O'Callaghan & Mogato, 2012).

CONCLUSION

In many respects the military Pan Amerasian presence in East and Southeast Asia - as we move into the second decade of the 21st Century - raise more questions than they answer. In a sense, mixed-heritage, biracial Pan Amerasians, scattered in numerous pockets and enclaves across the Western Pacific Basin, constitute supreme victims of the passage of time. In one sense, they are considered yesterday's story. Marginalized as the detritus of old wars and faded hostilities, they are forgotten or uncared about by their own generations in the US and ASEAN nations. Correspondingly, they also evoke a "who cares?" response from younger generations or youth who have no interest or institutional memory, or who simply cannot relate to the turbulent global events which brought many misbegotten Amerasian souls into the world in the first place.

For too long the status quo has remained unchanged for Pan Amerasians. Shade (1980), the chief chronicler of Amerasian travail, probably stumbled across the proverbial "smoking gun" when he wrote that there was absolutely little self-interest, either on the part of the US or host nation-states, to do much of anything humanely to alleviate Amerasian suffering. The result is that today this marginalized and underreported population constitute, in many respects, the status of non-people. Upgrading the cohort to the recognizable status of diaspora, a transparent responsibility of the academic, university, and college research community, foundations and NGO/NPO not-for-profit groups, would go a long way towards moving them out of the globe's human shadows. Such action is woefully overdue.

One of the most poignant observations about military Amerasians was made recently by Emma Rossi Landi, the Italian co-producer of Left by the Ship (2010), a 79-minute film documentary on four Afro-Filipinos, today ranging in ages from a second-generation teenager to young adults, abandoned by their sailor fathers within the shadow of Subic Bay naval base. Landi Rossi stated, "War sometimes has unexpected consequences: children who were left behind, whose lives are shaped by the situations they were born into, and which they could not avoid. Why do women and children pay the highest price for global politics?" (deLeon, 2012).
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