In the Philippines, a “bahay kubo” is a traditional home, made of bamboo and leaves, lightweight materials that make it easy to pick up and move if necessary. Culturally, it is a family gathering space. In 2006, I was 25 years old when I first visited “Bahay Kubo” on Gleane Street. Deep in the heart of the Filipino community in Elmhurst, Queens, Bahay Kubo was the home of three of my kasamas (comrades in Tagalog). Located on the ground level of a two-story, two-family home, it was constantly filled with people, all of us ranging in age from our late teens to late 50s. In its sala (living room), Filipina/o domestic workers politicized me and each other during educational and political discussions. It’s where I learned to play the Filipino card game Pusoy Dos late into the night, which we did to wind down after painting banners and organizing trainings. In the kusina (kitchen), we cooked, ate, and cleaned up together. It’s where I learned how to fry up large batches of fish and lumpia for events attended by 50+ people. In mga kuwarto (bedrooms), queer and straight love between 1st [immigrants], 1.5 [those who immigrated when they were children], and 2nd [US-born] “gens” of working-class and petit-bourgeois upbringings commenced and culminated. Bahay Kubo is where we members of Generation X and Y sought to “decolonize” ourselves, where we launched “criticisms and self-criticisms,” and engaged in what we believed were “principled struggles” for justice. Around 2010, another rent increase and the urge for some housemates to cohabitate with partners led the kasamas to leave Gleane Street. But just like the tradi-
tional bahay kubo in the Philippines, its community spirit was mobile. Two housemates moved to another building nearby, where they resur-
rected Bahay Kubo. Fourteen years later, we are still in close commu-
nity, organizing with many folks from that house. It will always hold a special place in my heart because it’s where I first “got organized.”

How can the spaces where we live spark and nurture revolu-
tionary intimacies? My notes about Bahay Kubo gesture toward the importance of physical space in building intimacies of support and experimentation for what my comrades and I called “decolo-
ning” ourselves or the work of undoing and unlearning oppres-
sive socialization, knowledge, and epistemologies. They also suggest that intimate relationships forged and solidified in Bahay Kubo planted seeds for future political connections and commitments.

This essay pushes us to consider the radical potential of shared living spaces as sites that foster revolutionary intimacies. For those invested in creating a more just world, these spaces, built on trust and repetition in close quarters, can be transformative in their commitment to processes of (re)humanization, interrelationality, and what Ruth Wilson Gilmore calls “radical dependency.” They are sites that not only lead to the germination and exchange of political ideas generated from mundane domestic acts, but also messy daily attempts and struggles with their application. I ask: How does one “work” the home, from a place that has traditionally reinforced heteropatriarchal violence, toward a space with liberatory intention? In other words, how are new economies, systems of care based on principled ethics, shaped from the old? And how have self-proclaimed revolutionaries contended with the palimpsests that resurface within the “new?” I share several stories of those involved in US-based anti-Marcos activ-
ism during the 1970s and 1980s, whose revolutionary intimacies in their living spaces led to the creation of new imaginings and expressions of freedom and liberation: Filipino and Black radicals who as room-
mates founded an internationalist Marxist study group that met in the apartment they shared, forging Black-Filipino anti-imperialist solidar-
ies; experimental housing collectives of the KDP (Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino aka Union of Democratic Filipinos); and domes-
tic work negotiations between married and life partner comrades. I show that revolutionary intimacies are indeed sparked and culti-
vated in the simple acts that take place in the kitchen, on couches in salas, in bedrooms under covers late into the night, and in bath-
rooms while sorting out who in the house should next scrub the toilet.

In *Emergent Strategy*, adrienne maree brown discusses “close daily personal contact, occasional opportunities for mutual support, noticing and supporting one another’s work and growth from afar, and being more intentional about bringing this practice into the way we hold all of our relationships” as being elements of “co-evolution through friendship.” Indeed, the places where friends live together, where close and personal contact is frequent and where, in the best scenarios, bonds developed in mutual care and concern can be the catalysts by which individual and collective growth happen.

I suggest that for three anti-Marcos activists, Enrique de la Cruz, Ray Hewitt, and Bobby Bowens, the mutual intimacy and knowledge cultivated among them as roommates yielded the creation of a radical multiracial study group that met in their home in 1970s Los Angeles. Its name was the Sunday Morning Group (SMG). Further, it built and strengthened Black-Filipino anti-imperialist solidarities.

The idea for the Sunday Morning Group was developed among three roommates: de la Cruz, Hewitt, and Bowens. De la Cruz was a seasoned activist. Prior to his move to the United States for graduate school, de la Cruz, then a professor at the University of the Philippines-Tarlac, mentored young student activists involved in the National Democratic Movement (NDM) of the Philippines who participated in demonstrations against Ferdinand Marcos in the late 1960s. By the time Marcos declared martial law in 1972, de la Cruz was based in Los Angeles and finishing his doctoral degree in philosophy at UCLA. Still committed to the NDM, de la Cruz was motivated to build a network to educate and mobilize the diasporic Filipina/o community against Marcos’s martial law. Working with an established organizer in the Filipina/o American community, Esther Soriano, one of the founding members of the National Committee for the Restoration of Civil Liberties in the Philippines (NCRCLP), de la Cruz established the Los Angeles chapter of the NCRCLP, the first national organization in the United States to oppose Marcos’s martial law, in 1972.

Like de la Cruz, Hewitt and Bowens were also longtime activists, both former members of the Black Panther Party. Founded in 1966 in Oakland, California, the Black Panther Party was a political organization dedicated to the protection of African Americans from police brutality and the establishment of revolutionary socialism through community-based programs and mass organizing. By the time de la Cruz and Hewitt met in 1974, Hewitt and Bowens had recently left the Oakland chapter of the Black Panther Party and moved to Los Angeles. Having recently graduated, de la Cruz was in search of a roommate. Soriano connected de la Cruz to Hewitt, who she was dating (and would later marry) and knew was also looking for

---

a roommate. Soon after, de la Cruz moved into Hewitt's apartment. Bowens, a former Vietnam veteran, then joined them, and together the three activists lived for almost three years and became close friends.

Hewitt, like de la Cruz, was an ideologue. In fact, he had been the Panthers' Minister of Education from 1969 to 1971. Thus, it was no surprise that, according to de la Cruz, it was Hewitt who proposed forming the Sunday Morning Group. De la Cruz recalls:

When Ray Hewitt...first broached the idea of a study group to me, he explained that one of the greatest needs when he was with the Panthers, was that the membership hardly knew any theory. Although he tried to get the brothers to read some basic theoretical stuff on racism and Marxism, their day-to-day struggles often got in the way. Ray was an avid reader and he felt strongly that the struggle for social justice would be less divided if we all (activists) had some basic knowledge of the classics (Marx/Engels/Lenin, and Mao). The progressive movement was quite fractured at the time, likewise for the anti-Marcos movement.

Here de la Cruz discusses one of the lessons Hewitt learned from his time with the Panthers: that its members lacked theoretical grounding, which, in Hewitt's opinion, led to subsequent fracturing of the organization. He also gestures to the splintering of the anti-Marcos movement, which had begun to show tension at that time and would later evolve into more permanent fractures.

In a 1988 LA Times article commemorating Hewitt’s death, Bowens expressed similar sentiments to Hewitt, also struggling to understand the lessons of the Panthers. He reflected,

I put in three years of my life in the party. We took militancy to the ultimate. Here we came with guns and black leather jackets. We didn't realize that you can't get people to understand what you are saying by waving guns in their faces. We were angry militants who heard a call for revolution so what we did was run and pick up guns.

3. Soriano, born in Santa Paula, California to Filipina/o migrant farmworkers, was a founding member of the original NCRCLP formation in the Bay Area. By 1974, Soriano was already a political stalwart in the community. She had already established several Los Angeles-based service organizations, including the Asian American Drug Abuse Program (with the group Asian Sisters) and the Search to Involve Pilipino Americans (SIPA), which both still exist today.
4. Enrique de la Cruz, e-mail message to author, November 10, 2017.
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Bowens too wished to distill his own lessons from the Panthers, echoing the importance of study to complement organizational militancy.

Of course, lack of study was not the sole reason for the Black Panther Party’s struggles. Complicating the Panthers further were internal and external forces that split them apart. While its leaders argued along ideological grounds, the US government targeted them relentlessly, leading to the imprisonment, exile, and murders of many of its leaders. Hewitt, himself, was a target of COINTELPRO (Counter Intelligence Program), a series of covert and often illegal projects conducted by the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) that sought to undermine domestic political organizations. The traumatic impacts were severe. Looking back on Hewitt and the Panthers at his funeral in 1988, Ester Soriano-Hewitt remembered that her husband:

...used to refer to the Panthers as the walking wounded...It was like the Vietnam veterans, they are still trying to come to grips with what went wrong. It took 20 years for the Vietnam veterans to begin to talk about the war and now (the Panthers) are just getting to the point of being able to talk about what happened.6

For Hewitt, “coming to grips with what went wrong” meant evaluating the past in all its lights. In other words, it was important to recognize the Panthers’ many milestones, including its children’s free breakfast programs, health clinics, and legal assistance for the poor. Yet, Hewitt also insisted on examining the Panthers’ shortcomings. Moreover, a study group allowed Hewitt to correct what he deemed one of the biggest failures of the Panthers. It offered a site to wager hope and corrective visions for rectifying opportunities lost.

In 1975, the Sunday Morning Group (SMG) began meeting in the three roommates’ apartment. Located in the Victoria Park section of Los Angeles, members collectively read, contemplated, and discussed theories, including Karl Marx’s *Das Kapital* and readings by Vladimir Lenin, Mao Zedong, and other popular radical thinkers, which they would then return to apply within their respective political organizations. SMG stressed internationalist collaboration. In an interview in 2016, member Enrique de la Cruz recalled that the group consisted of “white working-class folks—a carpenter and a couple of teachers, African Americans, Latinos, and Filipinos,” all members of different political organizations.7 He continued, “The desire to understand the perspective of other activists vis-à-vis our common struggles pretty much set the criteria of who might be recruited to participate in SMG—one had to pretty much have had a history of involvement in grassroots organizing in your community.” De la Cruz remembered that Hewitt encouraged a multi-ethnic composition so that members could “learn from progressive struggles everywhere around the world that were supported by many local ethnic

---

7. Enrique de la Cruz, e-mail message to author, November 10, 2017.
communities in L.A. . . . and the US struggle against racism.” While the group organized educational forums to provide the L.A. community with updates about recent events in the Philippines, Nicaragua, Palestine, and other places in the world, it intentionally chose not to plan events that might be perceived as competitive by local leftist organizations.

The group rigorously met every Sunday “like church,” as de la Cruz remembers, except for some holidays, for about four years. Member Prosy Abarquez Delacruz recalls:

It was intense, it required a lot of time, focus, discipline, active engagement and reading the materials. There was no room for slack or slackening. Each Sunday was ‘grim and determined,’ stimulating and a lot of camaraderie after, sometimes not. We were [composed of approximately] half men, half women... It was actually a very good leadership...we were very democratic in what we would select as far as our readings and everything. And they rotated leadership skills...I became a teacher.8

Here Abarquez Delacruz describes not only the intensity and commitment of the group, but also the personal and political fulfillment she received from it as an activist, teacher, and woman.

Roommates, in their best form, offer emotional support and live-in listeners with whom to talk and commiserate. Given their shared political commitments and overlapping experiences as activists, I can imagine that Hewitt, Bowens, and de la Cruz bonded closely in their home. Though de la Cruz was not a Panther, he may have provided an open, non-judgmental, but politically astute ear for Hewitt and Bowens to discuss the Panthers’ trajectory and trauma associated with their party experiences, as well as their experiences with anti-Black racism. Writing in 2020 in the wake of the savage police murder of George Floyd, de la Cruz reflected on his time as their roommate:

We shared that apartment for many years, enough time for me to learn about racism, and the anger and frustration from those who lived it. I learned of behavioral adjustments that they engage in, automatically, to live with that racism. For example, do not go shopping for food items in white neighborhoods, even if it’s just for bottled water or beer. They are not used to seeing you there, and might call security, or worse, the police. They are very conscious that white folks often weaponize their discomfort with black folks around their neighborhood by calling the police.”9

In these ways, de la Cruz, who was for the first time living with two Black men, learned what it was like to be a Black man in anti-Black racist America. It was perhaps the roommates’ shared understanding of their varying racist experiences that led to the one and only time the
Sunday Morning Group took to the streets: challenging the Bakke decision which ruled against race-based quotas in higher education in 1978.

One can only guess the types of conversations in which Hewitt, Bowens, and de la Cruz engaged after coming home from long days at work, listening to the news together, participating in local and national political demonstrations, and following the unfolding of Marcos's martial law in the Philippines. I surmise that Hewitt and Bowens's proximity to de la Cruz and their friendship offered a material basis for furthering internationalist visions, and specifically Philippine solidarities, that grounded the group. While the Black Panther Party is known for its internationalist embrace, its solidarity with the Philippines’ National Democratic Movement, which was explicitly taken up by the Sunday Morning Group, is rarely mentioned in academic scholarship and historiography. It should be noted that well after the Sunday Morning Group disbanded around 1978, Bowens and Hewitt remained active supporters of Philippine sovereignty. When Enrique married Prosy in 1979, he chose Bowens as his best man and Hewitt as one of his groomsmen. During the 1980s, Bowens and Hewitt became members of the L.A.-based Philippine Support Committee, an organization of the Alliance for Philippine Concerns that worked primarily with non-Filipina/o allies.

It was in a small apartment that the idea of the Sunday Morning Group was imagined and developed. Their living space provided a private and consistent venue, where they could freely discuss political ideas without fear of eavesdropping strangers or pressure to make purchases in a restaurant or bar. Moreover, meetings in homes lend themselves to potlucks and sharing food. Cooking and eating in community barefoot and in our “house clothes” invites intimacy and joy.

Even as these types of study groups were commonplace then and now, the circumstances of their existence are worth emphasizing. As mundane as they are, recognizing their typical nature reminds us that the seeds for revolutionary thinking can be planted anywhere at any time. Indeed, De la Cruz’s explanation of the Sunday Morning Group’s “innocuous” name reveals that it was coined to minimize its importance to others. Building on his suggestion, I suggest that it also points to the revolutionary potential of the mundane. The SMG’s origins and existence invite us to subvert preconceived apolitical notions of weekend mornings at home, making space for collective radical imaginings on the weekends over steaming cups of Cafe Bustelo, not far from the Sunday paper.

10. While this specific solidarity has been sparsely documented, there is a history of Black and Filipino alliance building in the United States. For example, see Michael Schulze-Oechtering’s “The Alaska Cannery Workers Association and the Ebbs and Flows of Struggle: Manong Knowledge, Blues Epistemology, and Racial Cross-Fertilization,” *Amerasia Journal* 42.3 (2016): 23–48, for a history of multiracial alliance between Black and Filipino workers in the Pacific Northwest grounded in exploitative labor conditions and cultures of resistance.
KDP’s Housing Collectives, Various US Chapters, 1973–1986

For activists, the intimacy, privacy, and self-actualization that living spaces can offer open up possibilities for the application of radical ideas and experimentation. While they were working to expose US–Philippine colonialism from afar and end Washington’s political, economic, and military support for the Marcos regime, activists in the militant KDP (Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino or Union of Democratic Filipinos) also challenged themselves to build the revolutionary world they imagined. One way they did so was by establishing housing collectives, where they held themselves and one another accountable to their vision, albeit imperfectly. Modeled after housing collectives in the Philippine underground, these alternative housing arrangements offered a practical solution for the burdens of domestic work while also reflecting ideological principles of Marxist–Leninist–Maoism (toward the late 1970s, the organization would eventually shift its line to Marxist–Leninism).

From 1973 to 1986, KDP built nine chapters in cities across the United States, from Seattle to New York to Chicago to Guam. Syl Savellano, a member of the San Francisco Collective, discusses her life as a KDP activist in the early 1970s: “We took part-time jobs, I ended up working in the early morning in the bakery. From the IH [International Hotel, where anti-eviction work was happening], I go down to the Mission District and helped spin granola and make bread and shit like that . . . We all had some kind of work other than working and sleeping, we had to pay rent somehow. I didn’t have a car, then, no way . . . I never had so many damn meetings in my life. Every day.”

The busy schedule of a worker-activist commuting to and from work, home, and meetings made housing collectives useful for maximizing productivity. Savellano recalls, “You barely had time to wash, and do your laundry. And those who had families, [or were] starting families, we had to do childcare for that. So it was like a total collective [effort].” Housing collective members thus shared domestic responsibilities, which eased up time for the many meetings they attended throughout the week. Of course collective living necessitated organization. According to Savellano, “Cooking, maintaining the household, we all had to figure it out. Unit by unit . . . Who’s cooking today, who’s doing what. If not, it [would] be pretty bad chaos.” Ia Rodriguez of one 1979 Bay Area housing collective remembers the rotation of responsibilities, “if you don’t have any meetings, then maybe you will be cooking two nights a week, depending on who is available.”

KDP’s housing collectives consisted of approximately 4–7 people, sometimes more, and were a mix of

11. Syl Savellano in discussion with author, December 2015, Alameda, CA.
12. Savellano.
13. Savellano.
14. Ia Rodriguez in discussion with author, November 14, 2015, Seattle WA.
single people, their lovers, spouses, and children. Savel-lano remembers her days in the collectives in the early 1970s:

I mean, we [would] just crawl in each bedroom . . . E and C got together and they had their own bedroom. A, T, C, and I were in the other room. So that was 5 of us . . . I never lived alone. [At another point,] I lived with S, with their kids—they were upstairs, I was downstairs in the basement. [Another housemate was] G. He had one room and I had the other room. [And then he and A] kind of got together. R and C were getting married and they were [in another room] . . . We were like one big huge household . . . and the guy that liked me came over and visited and all that.\footnote{Syl Savellano in discussion with author, December 2015, Alameda, CA.}

According to Ia Rodriguez, there were so many people coming into and out of the house for meetings that the owner assumed there were 20 people living there at once. He forced the collective to move out, so its members set up two more collectives in a duplex nearby. In her collective of seven people, Rodriguez remembers dividing everything so that all expenses, from groceries to rent, were equal.

KDP’s housing collectives were experimental works in progress, especially in the beginning and for those new to the process. Cindy Domingo describes the struggles of balancing equity and sacrifice during her first housing collective experience in Boston in 1976. Domingo was one of four KDP members selected to attend a Philippine history program at the Goddard–Cambridge School in Social Change.\footnote{For more about the Goddard–Cambridge School, see Mark John Sanchez’s “The Philippines Information Bulletin and the Transnational Anti-Marcos Press,” in Robyn Magalit Rodriguez ed., Filipino American Transnational Activism: Diasporic Politics Among the Second Generation (Boston: Brill, 2020).} There was an understanding that the KDP member students would collectivize their money and expenses during the program. A “good” comrade, Domingo followed instructions, gathering money from family and her full-time job for tuition and other expenses. While her comrades were unsuccessful at obtaining steady employment, they added to the community allotment with income generated by temporary jobs. Still, she recalls building resentment as time went on:

As one of the people who felt that I was pulling too much of the load by working full-time and bringing in the biggest lump sum, I began to resent other people’s spending priorities—buying organic food at higher prices, or contact lenses when that money could have been used for the collective. “What’s the matter with glasses?” I thought because I wore glasses. Out of resentment, I started keeping the five and ten dollars that my dad would send me and spent the money on luxuries like ice cream, or eating out, or buying old books about the Phil-
ippines that I found while scouring the bookstores in Harvard Square. At one point, I was asked to pool the travel money that my parents had sent for me to fly home during spring vacation and to take the cross-country bus with everyone else. By then I’d had enough of this Pol Pot experiment, so I refused and flew home and back round-trip. “Have your parents take a loan out like my parents did,” I thought, because I wasn’t about to spend half my vacation riding a stinking bus. I’m pretty sure my petit-bourgeois attitude was reported to the National Executive Board and added to my long list of criticisms for the year.”

Here Domingo refers to Maoist “criticism-self criticism” during which comrades took one another to task for exhibiting behaviors that reflected their class upbringing. Hesitation like that described by Domingo was considered a petit-bourgeois remnant to be self-criticized and changed. For KDP, housing collectives offered another space where activists contended with the challenges of undoing their oppressive class origins. While the experience was challenging, it did not dissuade Domingo from living in other KDP housing collectives on the West Coast.

Through housing collectives, KDP comrades sought to not only undo internalized petit-bourgeois individualism, but also to restructure gendered and classed divisions of labor and care in the home by setting up cleaning and cooking schedules that rotated responsibilities. When I asked several women how successful this process was, I received numerous laughter-filled stories. Ermena Vinluan, of one of the Bay Area Chapter housing collectives, was almost in tears laughing about her male comrade’s “watery adobo,” which nobody wanted to eat. Meanwhile, Ia Rodriguez, another Bay Area Chapter housing collective member chuckled as she recalled, “On the first collective we have some men that don’t know how to cook. Every time it’s his turn, it’s pork chop. Pork chop. (Laughs) Every time, that’s what he cooks! In the second collective, we were all surprised because one of these guys made some turkey butts. So I said, ‘What is that! Would you please learn how to cook at least because we cannot basically eat turkey butts all the time!’” When I asked Rodriguez if her comrade ever learned how to cook, she recalled that the collective limited his cooking responsibilities because “we cannot eat pork chop all the time . . . He does the [newspaper] layout and everything so he’s important so he would take care of the other stuff.” Throughout the entire story, Rodriguez and I laugh, and she remarks, “It was kind of fun.” It is clear to me that Rodriguez remembers these housing collective experiments with fondness.

19. Ia Rodriguez in discussion with author, November 14, 2015, Seattle WA.
Not all recollections were as forgiving and lighthearted. One working-class kasama born and raised in California recalled in frustration a male immigrant comrade who had been raised in a wealthy family in the Philippines, “He didn't know how to hold a broom, girl, or sweep upstairs. Because they had maids back home, he was privileged. I’ll never forget that [he asked us], ‘How do you use a broom?’ We were like, ‘Whoa!’ There was a riot! Dude did not know how to clean and sweep.”21

Living in housing collectives also exposed members to alternative sexualities that challenged heteronormative ways of being. Two women in KDP’s original National Executive Board members shared a room as lovers in one of KDP’s first housing collectives in the Bay Area. These leaders set a precedent, leading to a general acceptance of homosexuality within the organization.22 There were also at least two lesbian couples in the New York City housing collective. The revolutionary intimacies they sowed in relation with one another inspired other gay and lesbian comrades who were exploring their sexualities to emerge. San Francisco housing collective member Gil Mangaoang recalls:

It was only a few months earlier that Melinda and Trinity had become known as an openly lesbian couple. When they came out, no one in the KDP made any disparaging comments. Their action was all I needed to begin my transition. I saw it as a clear signal that expressed, ‘Go for it!’ Up to this point, I had continued my straight act but lived in constant fear that I would be discovered.”23

At the same time though, because of the KDP’s respected stature in an otherwise heteronormative and homophobic Third World Left, what happened at home stayed at home for most of the 1970s until the AIDS epidemic.24 Still, because meetings took place in housing collectives, the KDP blurred the lines between organizational and private space. In his classic article about being a gay activist in the KDP, Mangaoang recalls a time around 1975:

I had been out no more than a couple of months and was just developing my network of gay friends. I had seen Ben at numerous community events, but it was not until we were both involved in a recording album project geared towards popularizing revolutionary music from the Philippines, that I had

23. Cruz et. al, 112-113.
the opportunity to get to know him. He had been out many years before me and was very flamboyant and open about his gayness. We were at the house of some KDP members for a meeting. Since some of the members weren’t there yet, Ben and I decided to make the best use of our time in one of the vacant bedrooms for an intimate get-acquainted session. Needless to say, the other members were somewhat outraged by our behavior but didn’t know how to “politely intervene.”

It was a site where Mangaoang was able to express his sexuality during a time when “there was not explicit support for [his gay] lifestyle, [yet] there was not opposition to it.” Housing collective members, as different as they were, remained linked together by their political commitment to democracy, anti-imperialism, and anti-fascism. At the end of long days, they spent nights together, bonding in relaxation. Rodriguez, a lesbian, recalls, “We [would] watch TV together—Saturday Night Live. Johnny Carson, if we had time. So it’s a family. I enjoyed the collective.” I suggest that the intimacies emergent in the home may have inspired heterosexual members and LGBT members who were not “out” to challenge internalized homophobia, opening up other radical imaginings of being.

Just like in Bahay Kubo on Gleane Street, a group of 20-year-olds in KDP sought to challenge their ways of being, trying their best to create the very world they imagined. It was in intimate spaces in the kusina, sala, and mga kuwarto of the KDP housing collectives that revolutionary intimacies were catalyzed in the small moments of the everyday. A framework that centers them recognizes the importance of dialogue in conflict and decision-making; in trial and error; and in laughter, frustration, and discomfort inherent in unlearning patriarchy, homophobia, and heteronormativity.

Racial capitalism, in its modern form, relies on processes of anti-relationality and dehumanization. In her landmark text on prisons in California, Golden Gulag, Ruth Wilson Gilmore argues, “Dehumanization names the deliberate, as well as the mob-frenzied, ideological displacements central to any group’s ability to annihilate another in the name of territory, wealth, ethnicity, religion. Dehumanization is also a necessary factor in the acceptance that millions of people . . . should spend part or all of their lives in cages.” In other words, dehumanization logics that structure our ways of being legitimize both our separation from and destruction of one another and ourselves. Over 40 years ago, housing collective members of the KDP set about challenging such processes both in and on the home in efforts to rehumanize

26. Mangaoang, 40.
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themselves and their comrades. While I do not think any of the KDP housing collectives would say they were completely successful, their stories offer one example of everyday people doing the work to try.


In a recent blog post, “OMG I Married an Activist,” Manila-based activist Mong Palatino reflected on his relationship with his wife, a member of the Philippine women’s organization GABRIELA:

> Proletarian victory aside, the ultimate prize of the revolution is embracing the struggle with the love of your life . . . It isn’t enough for lovers to transcend their differences. After the acceptance and compromise or during the non-stop struggle over this issue, the two lovers must learn and promise to share something essential. Perhaps a fundamental aim to guide their lives. A higher cause to strengthen their union. A vision of an ideal life that will inspire the couple to become better individuals.\(^{29}\)

Here Palatino refers to the beauty and potential rewards of “struggle,” in Marxist terms, for couples committed to revolutionary change. Ruth Wilson Gilmore defines struggle as “a politically neutral word [that] occurs at all levels of a society as people try to figure out, through trial and error, what to make of idled capacities.”\(^{30}\) That is, struggle involves challenging differences and contradictions while being guided by a higher principle of justice. Indeed it is this affective bond embedded in struggle between spouses and life partners, nurtured and challenged in the home, that can fuel revolutionary intimacies.

Of the over 100 activists I interviewed, about half were married between 1968 and 1992 and about two-thirds of those married remained married to the same person by the time of our interview (married individuals may be overly represented in my sample, as I specifically sought to interview coupled activists).\(^{31}\) To me, that most activists from that period were either single, divorced, or had remarried reflects the heavy

---


31. Sometimes my interviews were done with both activists present because it seemed preferable to the couple, and sometimes, it was due to time limitations. As time wore on, I surmised that some women might answer questions, particularly those about gender roles, differently without their husbands present. In fact, when asked for an interview, some activist wives would defer me to their husbands, stating that their husbands “knew more” than them. I reminded them that they too held important knowledge and had made substantive movement contributions. Over time, I became more explicit in requesting separate interviews when time allowed.
demands of the era’s organizing culture heavily influenced by the Maoist ethic of “serving the people.” The activists I interviewed, whose sexual identities ranged from gay to bisexual/queer to straight, describe having little time to devote to a relationship, especially if their partner was not also an organizer and/or did not share the same level of dedication to the movement. Almost everyone involved in a marriage or long-term monogamous relationship noted how challenging it was to balance the responsibilities of being a full-time activist with building a committed partnership. Pepe Manalo (pseudonym), of the New York City KDP chapter, added another factor of age, noting that many activists got married early, and did not have “emotional intelligence” around sexual relationships. He explained that there was “a lot of ignorance about . . . feelings, responsibilities” in long-term partnerships, which he thought eventually improved over time, presumably with age and experience. Moreover, for some couples, hetero-patriarchal tendencies emerged in their relationships. The constant demands of organizing outside of the home were an easy distraction and excuse to not deal with growing relationship tensions, which would eventually lead to separation or divorce.

Yet for some activists, the home was the site in which activist couples “worked” on each other and themselves. This concept is not new. When women of color feminists Gloria Anzaldúa and Cherríe Moraga wrote, “The revolution begins in the home” in their classic This Bridge Called My Back (1981), they recognized the potential of the home as a site for “radicalizing” their own families “into action,” hoping that this groundbreaking book would find its way there. Implicated in this hope was the recognition that oppression is so often deeply embedded in the domestic sphere. Socialist feminists have spent the last four decades exposing the dialectical relationship between what happens in the home and in the public sphere. In her ruminations of the “everyday” in international politics, Cynthia Enloe argues, “In asserting that ‘the personal is political,’ feminist analysts were claiming that the kinds of power that were created and wielded—and legitimized—in these seemingly ‘private’ sites were causally connected to the forms of power created, wielded and legitimized in the national and inter-state public spheres.” Put differently, socialist feminists have urged us all to examine the “everyday dynamics in [our] lives to discover the causes of patriarchal social systems’ remarkable sustainability.”

Heeding their call, this section specifically focuses on the home as a site of revolutionary intimacy where activist couples have struggled to confront private–public (personal–political) dialectics in the everyday.

35. Ibid.
Inspired by an emergent women’s movement (which itself was internally at odds), attempts to challenge patriarchy, mostly led by women, were not always met with enthusiasm or a willingness to change. For some, they led to traumatic experiences, including domestic violence. I do not intend to romanticize this conflict, but rather, I wish to lift up the pursuit of struggle and consciousness in active attempts to restructure gendered patriarchal hierarchies in relationships with spouses and partners.

For the late Esther Simpson, an immigrant from the Philippines and KDP Chicago and Seattle chapter leader, the robust women’s leadership of KDP inspired her to challenge traditional racialized heteropatriarchal gender roles in her marriage to white American Vietnam War veteran, Bill. During our interview, they noted “CSC,” a process of “criticism” and “self-criticism” required in many circles influenced by Maoism, including the KDP. According to Esther:

[Being in KDP and the CSC process empowered me] to speak my own mind to him because as a Filipina and a wife married to a white person, I was always trained to think that we are there to serve the husband. . . [Bill never made me feel this way, but] I always struggle when I see my mom serving my dad or when I see somebody else do it for their husbands. Most of the criticism that were raised was like helping each other in the work. Like housework, dishes, that kind of thing. When you’re very tired, “he’s not helping me” kind of thing.³⁶

Comrades were required to “follow up” about their progress in addressing their criticisms in future meetings. While Esther thought the CSC process could be “intrusive” at times, she also appreciated the organizational accountability it offered in her relationship. When I asked Bill what he thought about CSC, he admitted:

First I was caught off guard. [But] I’m used to that. I grew up being criticized (laughs). I had an older brother. He never stopped criticizing and throwing things at me. And my father was always a disciplinarian. It wasn’t a problem. I just looked at it as simply—you don’t always see your personal shortcomings and it’s good to have it pointed out to you so that you can roll it in and fit it where it belongs.³⁷

Esther and Bill’s recollections of “struggle” make marriage seem simple. Eager to learn what they felt helped their marriage succeed, I asked them this very question. Bill reflected, “We had to be willing to sacrifice for each other because we’ve made a commitment. It’s not perfect. We have our arguments, we have our differences. Then you have

³⁶. Bill Simpson and Ester Simpson in discussion with author, November 16, 2015, Bothell, WA.
³⁷. Simpson and Simpson.
respect for those differences because it's not really the total sum of who we are, it's just one aspect.”

Esther made sure to add, “I think choosing someone who's also political is important. They have to be politically on the same page or somebody that will support your political work.”

Like Palatino, Esther and Bill Simpson suggest similar ingredients for revolutionary intimacy among activist spouses: the willingness to challenge and struggle out differences under overarching principles of justice.

Building revolutionary intimacy as a couple enhanced their involvement in various campaigns in support of Filipina/o nurses. In Chicago, Esther was a stalwart leader, leading KDP’s campaign for justice for Filipina Narciso and Leonora Perez, two Filipina immigrant nurses accused of murder in Michigan in the 1970s. According to filmmaker and writer, Jason Magabo Perez, Narciso and Perez were “framed by the FBI for murder and conspiracy” and falsely convicted for the deaths of patients in one of the longest trials in US history, US v. Narciso and Perez.

Meanwhile, Bill frequently attended meetings to support the National Alliance for Fair Licensure of Foreign Nursing Graduates, which worked to stop the unjust deportation of H1 visa nurses.

Esther and Bill were persistent in these campaigns while also tending to anti-Marcos work and raising a child together. Much like the radical roommates previously described, I can imagine the conversations and conflicts, about political work and childrearing, washing dishes and cooking, that pollinated their home in the early mornings and late at night.

Bill and Esther’s struggle looked different for Sunday Morning Group members Prosy and Enrique Delacruz, who met as activists in Los Angeles and married in 1979. It was just after the EDSA People Power mobilization that ousted dictator Ferdinand Marcos when a new formation, the Alliance for Philippine Concerns launched in 1986. Together, the alliance harnessed the momentum of EDSA, reminding the public that the United States continued its military and economic presences in the Philippines even without Marcos. APC’s primary purpose thus was “to educate and organize around the basic political and social issues that affect the Philippines and the United States” and “cultivate a basic interest in Philippine affairs in so far as those issues directly or indirectly stem from US foreign policy towards the Philippines.”

The Delacruz home was the central meeting place of

38. Simpson and Simpson.
42. Alliance for Philippine Concerns Southern California. March 1, 1989. “Request for Funding from Liberty Hill Foundation,” Box 35, Folder 1, Alliance for Philippine Concerns, Liberty Hill Grant Files 1977-2003, Southern California Library. In Southern California, three member organizations comprised APC-Southern California (or APC-SC): the Ecumenical Fellowship for Peace and Justice in the Philippines, Philippine Support Committee, and Philippine Network. APC-SC member organizations participated in nationally coordinated educational campaigns and hosted speaking
APC-Southern California, which was one of about twenty chapters in twenty-five major cities in the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

APC mirrored dynamics in the traditional home, namely because its meetings actually took place in people's homes (rather than in housing collectives). As such, organizational productivity was reliant on women activists' reproductive labor to set up and manage organizational meeting spaces. Because patriarchal tendencies made this labor seem natural, women's labor was further rendered invisible. Compounding this invisibility, as in other movements, male leaders in the Filipina/o community were viewed as leaders despite the fact that its rank-and-file members doing everyday groundwork were mostly women.43

Inspired by the women's movement and side discussions among women in APC in other regions of the country, activist wives took their husbands to task, challenging this contradiction. Prosy Abarquez Delacruz recalls:

The women did the cooking, the women did the cleaning, the women did the minutes of the meeting, and they would be part of the discussion, and they would also be the childcare. So, could you imagine the burden that we had to carry? . . . So we did that, until the women started to complain and say wait a minute you guys. You're going to have to help if you want us involved. Imagine three meetings in one weekend . . . Three organizations meeting! And guess who will clean the bathroom? There is no cleaning lady then. We couldn't afford cleaning ladies. Who's the cleaning lady? . . . The wives. So my activist woman friends would help me clean up. And the guys essentially got trained to help us.44

Not only had the women in APC-SC, including Abarquez Delacruz, undertaken invisible work by cooking and cleaning for the organization, but they were also engaging in the women's fourth shift. Women undergo wage labor in the workplace, unpaid reproductive labor at home, and unpaid work as activists protecting their communities. Women (and gender non-conforming) organizers additionally sometimes take on a fourth shift of gendered care work for cis male kasamas in some organizations. A private sphere therefore emerges within organizations that unequally genders care and domestic work away from cis male bodies, much like in the traditional (colonized) private household. This unreciprocated division of labor enables cis men the time and energy to engage in political intellectual discussion and other more public and traditional activist work, while women undergo cis male leaders' necessary care labor "behind the scenes."45

tours and forums, such as "People Power: Two Years After" in 1988.
44. Prosy Delacruz in discussion with author, March 2, 2016, Los Angeles, CA.
45. See Karen Buenavista Hanna, “Centerwomen' and the 'Fourth Shift:' Hidden Figures
During the 1980s, Abarquez Delacruz’s “first shift” involved wage labor for the California Food and Drug Branch, regulating food, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and other items. After work, she arrived home to a “second shift” as wife to de la Cruz and mother to a toddler and newborn, born in 1983 and 1987 respectively. On nights and weekends, she spent her “third shift” as a community worker organizing with APC against US intervention and US bases in the Philippines. Finally, during her “fourth shift,” Abarquez Delacruz discusses the labor of housework to support the many weekend meetings they would hold at their home. While she references not having a “cleaning lady,” which may suggest bourgeois tendencies, I think she is saying it tongue in cheek. Further, she describes being responsible for evolving the character of her male comrades. What Abarquez Delacruz describes is not unlike the emotional work that women of color, particularly Black women, have articulated being expected to do for cis men, including men of color. It is the work of helping cis men process their emotions to undo their internalized patriarchy. Like Esther and Bill Simpson, Abarquez Delacruz describes that this work took place in the home during formal CSC sessions and in between meetings.

Internal changes within men in APC-SC took time. Abarquez Delacruz describes witnessing her husband’s evolution, which she says has been most observable in his role as a grandfather, forty years later. His behavior today is starkly different from the days in APC when Abarquez Delacruz recalls feeling both physically tired and “emotionally triggered to sadness and more.” With an affective heaviness, she reflects:

I have had to always climb out of those feelings because the men could not see their roles in those situations. It took awhile, but they are now much evolved, to become good grandpas . . . Enrique is in fact more hands-on as a grandparent than a parent, and even delivers freshly made pressed juices to our son, Carlo, and he makes them for the entire family, twenty small milk bottles a week, including buying the produce to make them by bicycle riding with Bailey, the dog of my daughter.46

She is still recovering from the frustration and isolation of those years, yet is reassured by a shift she eventually observed in Enrique.

In retelling her experiences, Abarquez Delacruz demonstrates what Antonio Gramsci calls “organic intellectualism,” as she is both conscious and vocal about rendering visible all of her labor. She reveals the necessary labor that women undergo to keep organizational spaces clean and welcoming for house meetings, the work of struggling with male comrades to interrupt and restructure this work so that it does

46. Prosy Abarquez Delacruz via email to author, November 12, 2017.
not always fall on the shoulders of women, and the labor of helping male kasamas challenge their own internalized patriarchy. Moreover she shows the revolutionary intimacy emergent among women activists in friendship. Indeed, it was in the home that the women of APC Southern California held their informal women’s “caucuses,” with bleach and broomsticks. The mundane and close quarters of the home is where revolutionary intimacies emerged; ones of trust, as well as anger in the injustice of reproductive labor, shouldered by wives, in the everyday. For Prosy and Enrique Delacruz, revolutionary intimacies are the close bonds required that enable husbands and wives to ask difficult questions and offer solutions (hopefully) without judgment. In Prosy’s eyes, it was their love and commitment to one another, to their marriage, and to the movement that pushed them to criticize and listen to one another with care and maintain the will to improve.\footnote{47. There are so many more stories to tell. I yearn to know the stories of the several lesbian activist couples who stayed in long-term partnership with one another but declined being interviewed.}

For some couples, a commitment to one another, marriage, and the movement was not enough to ensure their longevity. Gil Mangaoang reflects on the intimate struggles of his marriage, during which he struggled with coming to terms with his identity as a gay man. Details of this struggle were initially made visible through the KDP’s CSC process:

> It was only in 1975 that Anne and I went through a wrenching emotional breakup in the midst of an ideological campaign against male chauvinism within the KDP. I was indirectly characterized as a villain. My self-esteem was shattered . . . there were no openly gay men in the KDP [at that time]. So here I was, perceived as a straight man who was in a live-in relationship of three years with Anne. Yet I was always suppressing my inner identity as a gay man. I was conflicted, tense, not knowing whether I would be accepted or rejected within the organization . . . I genuinely loved Anne and still do. It was a difficult decision for us to make the break. But it had to be done. I understood that I deserved to have a relationship with someone who was sexually attractive to me as a gay man, just as Anne deserved to have a relationship with someone who was attracted to her sexually.”\footnote{48. Cruz et al., 112-113.}

The revolutionary intimacies engendered through the CSC process were indeed “traumatic” for Mangaoang. Still, they were necessary for him to be able to fully forge his path as a gay man. While Mangaoang was perhaps “guilty” of the “male chauvinism” he was indirectly accused of, his story complicates traditional narratives of male chauvinism and sexism, providing a sense of humanity to the men accused.

As Mangaoang’s recollections show, some relationships were unable to “struggle out” their differences or contradictions and did
not stay together. And still, there were other reasons for this, including domestic violence. Multiple women I interviewed in heterosexual marriages experienced domestic violence perpetrated by their husbands, some of whom were also activists and violated not just their wives but their children. One woman became angry and broke down into tears during our interview when I asked about her ex-husband. I later learned that she was a trafficking survivor. Other women shared that they were aware of gender violence in the homes of their kasamas who eventually divorced, but that “it was not their story to tell.” For the women survivors I spoke with, these experiences helped catalyze a consciousness around male domination that inspired them to integrate an anti-violence lens into their political work.

While I can count the number of activists who shared or implied domestic violence on one hand, it is possible that some of the activists I interviewed chose not to share these experiences with me. Domestic violence, like in all racial and ethnic groups, carries stigma. Activists in the Left, whose work is heavily scrutinized and criticized by people across the political spectrum, often hesitate to share stories of the “contradictions” with which they struggle out of concern that these stories might be misconstrued, misrepresented, or outright used to malign a movement by “outsiders.” Additionally, leaders, who are used to being public faces of their organizations, often stick with certain narratives and details of their work during interviews. These narratives can reinforce traditional masculinist framings of history, society, and activism that separate the public and private spheres.

Conclusion

In his landmark ethnographic study *Global Divas*, Martin Manalansan identifies domestic space as one of many places where Filipino gay men negotiate their diverse social relationships. Manalansan illustrates the ways that Filipino gay men in New York City use the intimate everyday space of the home to both “contest” and “resist,” as well as “acquiesce” and “capitulate to the experiences of cultural displacement and marginality.” Similarly, as stories from activists illustrate, while the home was a place that forged revolutionary intimacies of resistance, they were also sites in which activists reinforced internalized oppressive tendencies, notably heterosexism, male domination, and sexism. Furthermore, as much as the kasamas of Bahay Kubo resisted the state and capitalism, it was rising rent costs and their own hopes of living with their partners in “private” that led to their moving out. These examples show the ways in which the state and political and economic structures shape our very modes of existence, as much as we wish to resist them. In other words, merely acknowledging the contradictions in our own collectives

does not automatically resolve them. Still, stories from these activists remind us that everyday people throughout time are imagining and creating new care economies from the ground up, albeit imperfectly.

Today, capitalism and its proponents wish to eradicate intimacy by keeping us in flux. The neoliberal capitalist state isolates us into small units by way of rising housing costs, gentrification, and housing laws. Housing policies and the legal methods of the state have led to houselessness and further isolation, displacement, and separation of people otherwise connected through time and generation. Many are either survivors of, and complicit in, gentrification, moving from apartment to apartment to new neighborhoods because we ourselves were displaced due to rising rent. With time and energy sucked into jobs, we have less and less time to build relationships with neighbors, and little incentive to do so, as they may not stay next door to us for very long for the same reasons that we too keep moving.

And yet, it is through everyday relationships that we already have or are on our way to building—by way of relationships in living spaces between roommates and lovers, comrades and confidants, researchers and narrators, connected through commitments to justice and “struggling it out”—that revolutionary intimacies can grow, fuel collective power, and create new forms of dissent. These stories show the ways in which people are working to rehumanize themselves and each other, building solidarities and radical dependencies that reject racial capitalism. I end with the words of Ruth Wilson Gilmore who offers the reminder that this “form of solidarity . . . [is] made and remade. It never just is. And I think of that in terms of radical dependency—that we come absolutely dependent on [one] another. And so solidarity and this radical dependency . . . is about life and living together. And living together in rather beautiful ways . . . And it’s possible . . . And not in a romanticized way. In a material, deliberate, consciousness-exploding way. It’s possible.”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The author thanks the activists whom she interviewed and/or featured and appreciates editors and anonymous reviewers for their encouragement and feedback. She also is grateful to Lina Chhun, Justin Phan, Kong Pheng Pha, Jewel Pereyra, Calvin Cheung-Miaw, Will Gow, Rachel Lim, Vivian Yan, Robyn Rodriguez, Robin D.G. Kelley, Grace Chang, Diane C. Fujino, and Eileen Boris for their generative insights on previous iterations of this essay.

50. Card.