

# **imagine otherwise**

on Asian Americanist critique

Kandice Chuh

Duke University Press Durham & London

2003

E184  
O6  
C197  
2003

© 2003 Duke University Press

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States

of America on acid-free paper ∞

Designed by C. H. Westmoreland

Typeset in Monotype Joanna by

Keystone Typesetting, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-

in-Publication Data appear on

the last printed page of

this book.

to my parents, with love and gratitude

celebrated with me the big and small accomplishments associated with this project. For buttressing my work efforts with unbounded support and teaching me daily the joys of living in difference, I am grateful. Various iterations of Browns, Greens, Gucks, and Gulnicks constitute the remainder of the amazing family network that I have relied upon in writing this book.

An earlier version of chapter 3 was previously published as “Transnationalism and Its Pasts” in *Public Culture* 9, no. 1 (1996): 93–112.

## introduction:

### on Asian Americanist critique

Asian American culture is the site of more than critical negation of the U.S. nation; it is a site that shifts and marks alternatives to the national terrain by occupying other spaces, imagining different narratives and critical historiographies, and enacting practices that give rise to new forms of subjectivity and new ways of questioning the government of human life by the national state.—Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (1996)

Justice remains, is yet, to come. Perhaps, one must always say for justice.—Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law” (1992)

We need to remember as intellectuals that the battles we fight are battles of words. . . . What academic intellectuals must confront is thus not their “victimization” by society at large (or their victimization-in-solidarity-with-the-oppressed), but the power, wealth, and privilege that ironically accumulate from their “oppositional” viewpoint, and the widening gap between the professed contents of their words and the upward mobility they gain from such words.  
—Rey Chow, *Writing Diaspora* (1993)

The Hawai'i of Lois Ann Yamanaka's novel, *Blu's Hanging* (1997), is anything but paradisaical. Filled with poverty and meanness, with violence and uncertain futures for the Ogata children who anchor the novel, *Blu's Hanging* directly challenges edenic images of the islands. It is indeed a challenging book on many fronts, depicting as it does vivid accounts of child abuse entwined with cruelty to animals, and culminating in the rape of the novel's eponymous character. And it does so in a lyrical prose that underscores the intolerability of the situation presented by juxtaposing poetics with violation.

In some perhaps perverse sense, it seems fitting that this thematically provocative novel should have animated the intense discussions that reached a climax at the Association for Asian American Studies' 1998 Annual Conference, held in Honolulu, Hawai'i. Practitioners of Asian American studies will no doubt be familiar with the controversy surrounding the novel. Briefly, criticized for its putatively racist representations of Filipino Americans, the novel's naming as Best Fiction by the association incited impassioned debate that led ultimately to the rescinding of the award and concomitant en masse resignation of the association's executive board.<sup>1</sup> For many, the awarding of this prize to *Blu's Hanging* signified the validation of racist representations by the Association itself, charges especially troubling for an organization in a field that emerged in large part precisely to counter racism. Perhaps for all, it provoked debate regarding freedom of artistic expression and critical evaluation—a thematization of the relationships between politics and aesthetics forwarded by this kind of association and award. In one sense, this controversy functioned as a crucible for testing the politics and practices of the association and its membership, dramatically highlighting marginalization and exclusionary knowledge politics within Asian American studies. And certainly, though these events are contemporary, these issues are not. They have circulated in the field since its inception in the 1960s and 1970s, as the grounding assumptions of to whom and to what "Asian American" refers, of the nature and constitution of the object of knowledge of Asian American studies, have faced repeated interrogation. Criticized for its homogenization of peoples, artifacts, and histories, and for its sometime deployment with masculinist and heteronormative biases and tacit East Asian orientation, "Asian American" as a term of criticism has never functioned as a label free of dispute. Through this controversy, perhaps because it seemed that the future of the

association—one of the relatively few institutional sites for Asian American studies—was in jeopardy, attending critically to marginalization has gained a sense of field-wide immediacy.

In the aftermath of these events, as the association has rebuilt itself and many have attempted to apprehend their precipitating conditions, that multiple issues of concern for Asian American studies collided around the award has become evident. In retrospect, allegations of marginalization seem to have referred not only to biases in terminology and critical practice, but obliquely to the very orientation of the field as well: Activist or academic? Practical or theoretical? Had the association, the field, become too institutionalized, cut off from not only its membership, but also and maybe more importantly, "the community"? Had it lost, through that disconnection, a clear sense of how to conduct antiracist work?

Such questions arise at a time when discourses like transnationalism and postcolonialism solicit examination of the implicit framing principles of nation-based fields like Asian American studies. Propounding, or at least auguring, the end of the dominance of the nation-state as the preeminent unit of global organization, transnationalism recognizes contemporary flows of capital and information that seemingly find national borders irrelevant and "patriotic" loyalties displaced from nation-states to differently configured collectivities. It suggests that it is no longer clear—if it ever was—that the subject ("American") is a discretely bounded, discretely knowable entity merely modified by a specific adjective ("Asian"). Postcolonial studies, too, has mounted its own interrogations of the nation-state form, especially regarding its viability as a site of post-colonial liberation. Although with an emphasis on European colonialisms and their consequences in Asia and Africa, postcolonialism in the U.S. academy has of late become increasingly important to illuminating U.S. practices of empire. The critiques of modernity emergent under the rubric of postcolonial studies both inform and compel investigation of the U.S. nation-state, the putative and self-proclaimed representative of the achievement of modernity's principles of the Rule of Law, Democracy, and Equality. The already complex matter of understanding the position of U.S. racialized minorities is further complicated by recognizing the United States as an imperial metropole, I wonder, in hindsight, if the award controversy did not perhaps find especially fertile ground in light of these broad-based incitements to rearticulate the field.

*Imagine Otherwise* undertakes a critical consideration of Asian American studies, motivated in part by questions that arose through the award controversy, questions that give added impetus to revisit its framing assumptions in light of critiques of the (U.S.) nation-state emergent through postcolonial and transnational studies. I mean to ask after the coherency and object(ive)s of Asian American studies and to understand its work as both an academic field and an explicitly political project. I take the award controversy as my point of departure because it brings into sharp relief the significant differences too easily elided by the rubric "Asian American," differences both enumerated and complicated in part through the critiques mounted by postcolonial and transnational theorizing. Asian Americanists continue to search for ways to negotiate such differences so that the field can remain a politicized tool for social justice; this book attempts to contribute to such a project. My focus, in working through Asian American literatures toward that end, results from working in both Asian American studies and U.S. American literary studies as my two primary field locations. What motivates "Asian American" in the face of infinite heterogeneity among its referents? What does it mean to be a practitioner of Asian American studies when the anchoring terms—"Asian" and "American"—seem so fatally unstable? Does field coherency depend on political consensus, and, if so, what are the terms of those politics? What are the connections between the political and the literary? Is "Asian American" literature to be read/evaluated somehow differently from "American literature," and if so, how?

These questions animate *Imagine Otherwise*. In their interrogations of referentiality and calls for reflexivity in discourse and politics, they register this book's engagement with poststructural theorizing and its influence on the contemporary U.S. academic scene. Investigation of the currency and intelligibility of "Asian American" occasions scrutiny of that influence as an exigent condition of contemporary knowledge production. Arguably inaugurated by Ferdinand de Saussure's theorization of the arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign in the opening decades of the twentieth century, poststructuralism's radical destabilization of fixity and transparency in language has been manifested in what is often understood as the postmodern phenomenon of the assertion and recognition of the constructedness of "the real." That is, under the name of postmodernism, and underwritten by the social and political movements of the 1960s and 1970s that similarly de-

manded a radical interrogation of authority, poststructuralism's insights articulate to a critique of European master narratives of progressive subjective enlightenment characterizing modernity. And in the U.S. context, that articulation has conditioned the emergence of multiculturalism, which can thus be seen as a consequence of challenges to and the unraveling of structuring meta-narratives.<sup>2</sup> A paradigm that acknowledges the limitations of meta-narratives of Identity and History, multiculturalism is often evoked as justification for fields like Asian American studies. In other words, Asian American studies may be seen as a formation of the critical landscape configured by a (poststructural) problematization of referentiality, which facilitates the (postmodern) jettisoning of the authority of the meta-narrative.

Despite these genealogical links to poststructural theory, Asian American studies has yet, I believe, to contend thoroughly with their implications. And at least two reasons for this are immediately apparent. First, the dominant narrative of Asian American studies consistently foregrounds political activism, especially in the language of community work and social transformation, an emphasis that derives from its rootedness in the socio-political movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Student strikes in that era on the campuses of San Francisco State University and the University of California at Berkeley compelled the academic institutionalization of Asian American studies, a process that continues today at various sites around the nation. The vitality of this narrative, which has in many ways been instrumental to establishing Asian American studies in institutional locations over the past three decades, has tended to overshadow other possible narratives of the field's emergence.

And second, it is arguably politically suspect to claim or adopt a relation to poststructuralism, a deeply Eurocentric philosophical tradition that makes difficult immediate political intervention by means of its destabilization of subjectivity itself.<sup>3</sup> In undermining the knowability of "knowledge," poststructural thinking corrodes the authority of the "knowing" subject, whose grounds for action are consequently called into question. Here, subjectivity is conceived as an unstable construct of repressive/constructive orders of knowledge.<sup>4</sup> Neither "subject" nor "knowledge" has within this framework immanent authority/validity/stability.

Despite, on the one hand, the value of the political activist narrative of Asian American studies and, on the other, the questionability of tracing Asian American studies through poststructuralism, I believe that investigat-

ing the object(ive)s of Asian American studies in relation to poststructural theorizing illuminates ways that the field may productively imagine itself within the contexts and currents of the present historical moment. This is done in part to enable us fully to contend with the impact of liberal multiculturalism, arguably the dominating paradigm of U.S. academic culture today. Multiculturalism, contradictorily, attempts to retain a liberal conception of subjectivity while simultaneously claiming to take seriously radical critiques of precisely the liberal subject. In so doing, it occludes and effaces the historicity of racism and the deep-rootedness of racialization as a technology through which the United States, also contradictorily, has perpetuated a self-stylization as the achievement of the universalist Enlightenment values of equality and liberty. This kind of multiculturalism manages at once to sediment Asian Americanness in a narrative of otherness that achieves cohesiveness through an emphasis on (previous) exclusion and powerlessness, and to erase the continuities of the materialities underwriting such positions by insisting on the irrelevance of the past.<sup>5</sup> In light of these effects, what does recognizing Asian American studies as a formation of multiculturalism mean in efforts to conceive Asian Americanist discourse under contemporary historical conditions?

The current moment includes globalized practices of capital that have instituted demographic and immigration patterns in such ways as to prompt deliberate attention to how the "national" articulates to the "global." It is by now commonplace to recognize that globalization has made it an increasingly difficult task to determine with any certainty what peoples and cultural practices belong to or originate from where.<sup>6</sup> Globalization refers to the transformations of economic, political, and social organization set in motion by the emergence of transnational capitalist practices, especially since the 1970s. Unlike the multinational corporations of the previous iteration of capitalism, transnational corporations are unanchored in a given nation but rather are highly flexible and mobile in their pursuit of the locales that will best maximize their accumulation of capital.<sup>7</sup> Transnational corporations in fact prompt the development of new nation-specific laws that serve their interests, a phenomenon that signals the erosion of the sovereign power of nation-states. Transnational capitalism is a global mode of production that is globalizing in its attempts to integrate all sectors of the world economy into its logic of commodification. Class exploitation in contemporaneous forms, articulated in racialized and gendered differentia-

tion and layered unevenly across the north/south, first/third world divides, aggressively inscribes this globalized terrain.<sup>8</sup> Multilateral cultural and information flows, enabled by contemporary technologies and driven by jagged relations of power, circulate across this landscape.

The shifts referred to by globalization include the changing economic significance of the Asia-Pacific region, which has affected the demographics and subjectivities of Asian-raced peoples in the United States. The U.S. 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act coincided with the post-World War II burgeoning strength of Asian economies, a difference in circumstance from earlier conditions that has resulted in a resurgence of immigration from Asia to the United States. But now, at least in part, no longer are Asian nations perceived, Eurocentrically, primarily as sources of labor and raw materials for "Western" capitalism. Rather, some are recognized exporters of capital and are influential nodes in the multilateral trajectories of transnational capitalism. Accordingly, while an underclass of immigrant laborers characterizes present as it did past flows of migration to the United States, today there is also a large professional, managerial class whose migrations may be multilateral and whose members are not necessarily interested in formally attaching themselves to the United States by way of citizenship.

Because the 1965 legislation favored the latter cohort of migrants, the roughly fivefold increase between 1970 and 1990 in the population of persons of Asian descent living in the United States has meant dramatic alterations to "Asian America" along multiple identificatory axes, including nativity and citizenship. Theorization of subjectivity follows suit, as earlier models of subject formation face revision to better correlate with this globalized scene. "Oppression," "marginalization," and "resistance," keywords in dominant narratives of Asian American studies, are terms that each require redefinition within this globalized context, as "by whom" and "against what" are questions that are increasingly difficult to answer with certitude. The uneven power relations and disparate distribution of resources to which these terms refer have not dissolved; rather, they have been articulated into new forms, necessitating investigation of the "scattered hegemonies" that characterize the present (Grewal and Kaplan 1994).

This moment too is characterized by discourses like feminism that also prompt concerted efforts to conceptualize subjectivity in ways that privilege difference over identity through interrogations of the racialized,

gendered, classed, and sexualized ideologies underwriting U.S. national subjectivity. The convergence of these socio-discursive movements that critically recognize diversity and those that illuminate the operations and effects of globalization compels the generation of epistemologies that bear a renewed sense of the difficulties of defining (much less achieving) justice given shifting material terrains and the irreducible complexities of life, culture, and politics.<sup>9</sup> Poststructuralism or, more specifically, a “deconstructive attitude” contributes to this process by emphasizing the need to interrogate “identity-as-such,” as R. Radhakrishnan has put it (1996, xxiii). The maintenance of a deconstructive attitude keeps contingency, irresolution, and nonequivalence in the foreground of this discourse. Such a stance helps the interrogation of field coherency in the face of multiple kinds of differences, precisely by its emphasis on difference as anterior to and irresolvable in identity.

Recall that deconstruction is neither method nor technique; rather, it is the state of internal contradiction itself, of the constitutive difference within any seemingly stable term (*différance*). “Asian American,” because it is a term in difference from itself—at once making a claim of achieved subjectivity and referring to the impossibility of that achievement—deconstructs itself, is itself deconstruction. “Deconstruction takes place,” Jacques Derrida theorizes. “It is an event that does not await the deliberation, consciousness, or organization of a subject” (1988a, 4). In other words, deconstruction is a state of becoming and undoing in the same moment. “Asian American” is / names racism and resistance, citizenship and its denial, subjectivity and subjection—at once the becoming and undoing—and, as such, is a designation of the (im)possibility of justice, where “justice” refers to a state as yet unexperienced and unrepresentable, one that can only connotatively be implied. Arguably, the overarching purpose of Asian American studies has been and continues to be pursuit of this (im)possibility, the pursuit of an as yet unrealized state of justice by tracing, arguing, and critiquing, and by alternatively imagining the conditions that inscribe its (im)possibility. Justice is understood here not as the achievement of a determinate end, but rather as an endless project of searching out the knowledge and material apparatuses that extinguish some (Other) life ways and that hoard economic and social opportunities only for some.

As the discussion that follows will show, a deconstructive understanding of “Asian American” emphasizes a necessary reflectiveness of Asian Ameri-

canist discourse upon itself. In part, this serves as an effort to intervene in multiculturalist ways of subjectifying and conceiving Asian American and other ethnic studies fields, to work through and against, in other words, the liberal legacy of negotiating identity and difference in such a way as to flatten power relations. But also, this deconstructive attitude attempts to shift the grounds of intrafield debates about Asian American subjectivity that seem to resort to some version of identity for intelligibility. To imagine otherwise is not about imagining as the other, but rather, is about imagining the other differently. It is, to borrow from Gayatri Spivak, “to recognize agency in others, not simply to comprehend otherness” (1997, 473; emphasis original). By emphasizing the internal instability of “Asian American,” identity of and as the other—the marginal, the marginalized—is encouraged to collapse so that the power relations to which it referred may be articulated anew, as the basis and effect of an Asian Americanist discourse grounded in difference.

I recognize that in interpreting Asian American studies in these particular ways, I am prioritizing the role of literary studies despite its constitution by multiple disciplines. Clearly, my own disciplinary biases are in play. At the same time and not unrelatedly, I will suggest that approaching Asian American studies literarily traces the internal work (the deconstruction) of individual disciplines necessary for Asian American studies to work interdisciplinarily in more than name alone. And that remains a project of some significance for Asian American studies, lest its transformative energies be deflated by cooptation of its practitioners into traditional disciplinary divisions, a point to which I shall later return.

Imagine Otherwise argues that current conditions call for conceiving Asian American studies as a subjectless discourse. I mean subjectlessness to create conceptual space to prioritize difference by foregrounding the discursive constructedness of subjectivity. In other words, it points attention to the constraints on the liberatory potential of the achievement of subjectivity, by reminding us that a “subject” only becomes recognizable and can act as such by conforming to certain regulatory matrices. In that sense, a subject is always also an epistemological object. If Asian Americanists have mounted sophisticated interrogations of representational objectifications of Asian-raced peoples in the United States, of dehumanizing images that affiliate certain object-ive meanings to certain bodies, we have not, I think, always paid such critical attention to “Asian Americans” and to “Asian

American studies" as "subjects" that emerge through epistemological objectification. Part of the difficulty in doing so results from the powerful demands of the U.S. nation-state's celebration of citizenship, or national subjectivity, held out as "natural" and tantamount to achieved equality and so long denied to Asian-raced peoples. In spite of claims about the death of the Subject heralded by postmodernism, the idea and importance of a consummate subjectivity remains unabashedly vital in the state apparatuses of the law. As the uniquely authorized discourse of the nation, and in contrast to the postulation of the modern era that subjects (to monarchical power) have transformed into consensual citizens (of a nation-state), law requires subjection/subjectification.<sup>10</sup> The centrality of citizenship and subjectivity to the politics of modernity both motivates and explains Asian American studies' central concerns with representation and representational politics in similar terms. The importance of political/legal subject status telescopes into the importance of discursive subject status; the metaphor of marginalization manifests the distance between these—between, that is, the "American" and the "Asian American." And clearly, as long as the state demands subjectivity and wields its particular kinds of power, Asian Americanists cannot simply dismiss those terms altogether.

At the same time, and despite how enormously enabling citizenship continues to be in the garnering of access to certain material resources, subjectivity itself, alone, cannot remedy injustice. Recognition of the subject as epistemological object cautions against failing endlessly to put into question both "Asian American" as the subject/object of Asian Americanist discourse and of U.S. nationalist ideology, and Asian American studies as the subject/object of dominant paradigms of the U.S. university. Otherwise, Asian American studies can too easily fall into working within a framework, with attendant problematic assumptions of essential identities, homologous to that through which U.S. nationalism has created and excluded "others." Subjectlessness, as a conceptual tool, points to the need to manufacture "Asian American" situationally. It serves as the ethical grounds for the political practice of what I would describe as a strategic anti-essentialism—as, in other words, the common ethos underwriting the coherency of the field. If we accept a priori that Asian American studies is subjectless, then rather than looking to complete the category "Asian American," to actualize it by such methods as enumerating various components of differences (gender, class, sexuality, religion, and so on), we are

positioned to critique the effects of the various configurations of power and knowledge through which the term comes to have meaning. Thinking in terms of subjectlessness does not occlude the possibility of political action. Rather, it augurs a redefinition of the political, an investigation into what "justice" might mean and what (whose) "justice" is being pursued.

In the context of a globalized world in which corporate economies are often larger than nations' and racialized and gendered class exploitation has corollary renewed vitality, it may seem that a project such as this, that emphasizes discursive constructedness and problematizes the possibility of achieving justice through legal means, moves in the wrong direction. My vantage point as a U.S. academic and citizen undoubtedly underwrites the orientation of this argument. At the same time, I think that precisely these contemporary conditions, including the institutionalized setting of Asian American studies and its practitioners, warrant reflection on what and how Asian Americanist discourse can contribute to ways of thinking and producing knowledge about identificatory categories and subject formations that might interrupt the concepts that justify the sustenance of grossly unjust political and economic practices. Subjectlessness as a discursive ground for Asian American studies can, I think, help to identify and trace the shifting positionalities and complicated terrains of U.S. American culture and politics articulated to a globalized frame, by opening up the field to account for practices of subjectivity that might not be immediately visible within, for example, a nation-based representational grid, or one that emphasizes racialization to the occlusion of other processes of subjectification. It is an approach to conceiving of field coherency that consistently puts the field's own boundaries into question in an effort to resist turning into a properly disciplined academic discourse.<sup>11</sup>

Though I draw from and speculate that there may be implications of this argument for other minoritized discourses, I believe this move toward a subjectless ground is especially important for Asian American studies, given the uniqueness of the "Asian/American" dynamic. As David Palumbo-Liu has argued, "Asian American social subjectivity now vacillates between whiteness and color," and always, "its function is . . . to trace a racial minority's possibilities for assimilation" (1999, 5). Palumbo-Liu uses the construct "Asian/American" to suggest this function, where, "[a]s in the construction 'and/or,' . . . the solidus at once instantiates a choice between two terms, their simultaneous and equal status, and an element of inde-



cidability" (1999, 1). He explains that "as it once implies both exclusion and inclusion, 'Asian/American' marks both the distinction between 'Asian' and 'American' and a dynamic, unsettled, and inclusive movement" between them (1999, 1). "Asia" in the U.S. frame neither can be or has been completely segregated out of the national imagination nor absorbed into "America" such that distinctions do not remain. Modern America has come into being through mediations of the figure of Asia as a signifier of foreign nations and interests and as that figure is recognized already to be within America. The United States has negotiated both the conditions of its interiority (i.e., "Asians" already in residence) and global relations, a double mode of introjection and projection at work within a field of interplay between U.S. racial ideology and its economic interests. The irresolution of the United States' preoccupation with the "foreign within" manifests in such figures as the "model minority." That stereotypical image precisely bespeaks simultaneous inclusion and exclusion, thus bearing the particular function of being at once a signifier of assimilative potential and of the limitations proscribing that possibility. The distinctness of the Asian/American dynamic suggests ways that "Asian American," through such figures as the model minority, may be co-opted in the perpetuation of injustice. The model minority image stages the competitive divisiveness that deflects attention from systemic conditions that give rise to differential advantage along various identificatory axes (race, gender, class, sexuality, and so on). Precisely because of the co-optability of the Asian/American dynamic toward such ends, Asian American studies must mount redoubled efforts to undermine the essentialism and identitarian assumptions through which such divisiveness proceeds.

The modality of competitive divisiveness registers in the kind of intra-field dissent that the Yamanaka book award controversy represents. Candace Fujikane's (2000) analysis of the controversy and the novel suggests that Asian American studies has clearly paid insufficient attention to intra-Asian American racisms. The counter-charge of censorship mounted in defense of Yamanaka's novel, Fujikane argues, covered over anti-Filipino Japanese racism palpable in the Hawaiian context. The uneven intra-Asian American positions of dominance and power underscored by her critique and by the award controversy itself testify to the ways that Asian Americanist discourse must identify those ideologies and structures that undermine projects of justice by compelling disunity through competition. I return to this discus-

sion in the following chapters, and most explicitly in chapter 4. For now, my point is that a turn toward subjectlessness is driven both by recognition of how "Asian American" can be deployed in the service of conservative ends, and by the need to appreciate fully intra-Asian American difference.

Reconstituting Asian American studies in difference helps us to recognize that Asian Americanist critique must be consistently and insistently critical of both U.S. nationalism and its apparatuses of power, and of analytic frameworks that, however unintentionally, homologously reproduce U.S. nationalism's promotion of identity over difference. Part of the exigency underwriting this argument lays in the institutionalized settings of Asian American studies. The remainder of this introduction maps the term "Asian American" and examines its functions as a marker of "otherness" and as a sign of an academic discourse. That consideration underscores the importance of recognizing Asian American studies as unfolding within the spaces of the U.S. university, an institution, in David Lloyd's words, that "continues to organize crucial social functions" (1998, 15). Within this particular setting, I suggest, emphasizing the literary, discursive nature of the term "Asian American" helps make clear the necessity of revising what counts as "political" in Asian Americanist practices by revising understanding of the status of the subject(s)/object(s) of Asian American studies.

The awareness of contemporary historical and discursive conditions and the institutionalized location of Asian American studies rehearsed in this introduction grounds the encounters with the particular "Asian American" formations that focus each respective chapter. We begin in chapter one with consideration of the ways that the construct "Filipino America" challenges certain paradigmatic assumptions that have been important to cohering Asian American studies. As the Yamanaka award controversy dramatized, the unresolved tension between "Asian American" and "Filipino American" articulates perhaps most immediately the need to reinvent Asian American studies in difference. Carlos Bulosan's *America Is in the Heart* (1988 [1943]) and Bienvenido Santos's "Immigration Blues" (1992 [1977]) anchor that chapter's discussion. Building on the growing body of scholarship that speaks to the specificities of "Filipino America," I argue in that chapter that one of the implications of critically recognizing such particularity is conceiving "Asian America" as a sexualized sign formed through the interplay of multiple systems of subjectification, including the non-equivalent technologies of race, nation, empire, and sexuality. By invit-

ing us to prioritize sexuality as a way of understanding "Asian America," Bulosan and Santos help us to understand the limitations of uniform subjectivity as a construct regulating the boundaries both of the U.S. nation and of Asian American studies.

The arguments offered in chapter 1 are complemented directly by the discussion constituting chapter 4. There, I reestablish the limitations of a discourse and politics framed by the paradigms of space and subjectivity made available through the form of the nation-state. In that chapter, I extend the consideration of Yamanaka's *Blu's Hanging* begun here and locate inquiry specifically within the context of Hawaiian history and politics. In so doing, I demonstrate how the "postcolonial" as an analytic critiques the borders of Asian American studies in such a way as to identify how Asian Americanist discourse might resist transformation into a depoliticized instrument of hegemonic nationalist pedagogy. Employing the insights garnered through the preceding analyses and echoing in particular the arguments of chapter 1, I ask after what is lost when a text like Yamanaka's is evaluated primarily in terms of race and racism, and what broadening the terms of criticism might do to our understanding of the novel and the issues raised by it.

Bracketed by these linked discussions, chapters 2 and 3 do the work of exploring the potential of transnationalism as a discourse that offers alternatives to the frame of nation. Anchored by analysis of John Okada's *No-No Boy* (1992 [1957]), a novel "about" Japanese American internment during World War II, and by examination of Hisaye Yamamoto's story, "High-Heeled Shoes" (1998 [1948]), written in the same era, chapter 2 argues that the transnational as a critical frame in Asian Americanist discourse reaffirms the importance of maintaining a deconstructive attitude toward identity in generating and employing paradigms alternative to nation. The historic deployment of the "transnation" as a means for justifying internment points to ways that transnationalism may be used to reify specifically national boundaries through a reaffirmation of the identity of the "true" national subject. In that chapter, I argue that employing the transnational as an analytic helps us to recognize the undecidability of identity and contributes to the construction of an Asian American studies geared specifically toward undermining racial essentialism. Moreover and equally importantly, the transnational emerges from that discussion as a critical frame attuned to bringing to surface the practices of life and culture that unfold beneath the

radar of state power. Okada and, especially, Yamamoto compel us to understand that even or perhaps especially when, as in the historic instance of internment, the U.S. nation's power is seemingly near-absolute, life continues in all of its complexities. Pointing not only to the nation-state's power but to its powerlessness as well, the transnational along these lines functions as a tool for identifying the variegated spaces of the U.S. nation.

Chapter 2's introduction of space as an axis of analysis translates in chapter 3 to a concerted focus on the spatial logic of U.S. nationalism and of Asian American studies. Chapter 3 extends consideration of transnationalism and Asian American studies and demonstrates the need to trace deeply the global contexts within which both national and transnational subjectivities are formed. Driven by the insights of Ronyoung Kim's *Clay Walls* (1987) and Chang-rae Lee's *A Gesture Life* (1999), I underscore in chapter 3 the ways that practices of Japanese imperialism participate in producing "Korean America" as a formation that is both national and transnational, as subjectivities that are demonstrably effects of apparatuses of subjectification, which are themselves effects of negotiations of unstable and changing global power relations. These writers help to illuminate the limitations of a territorial imagination that cannot account for the transnational dimensions of nationalized subjectivities. In so doing, they prompt us to understand the ways that Asian American studies' historic definition of itself as distinctly "about" here can effectively support a colonial epistemology contrary to the project of social justice.

This book unfolds largely by means of examining various legal narratives—cases and legislation—in conjunction with literary texts. As I have already begun to suggest (and as I discuss more fully below), because debates about the meanings and methods of Asian American studies center around questions of representation, literary and legal discourse, with their respective foundational concerns with representation and subjectivity, prove apposite sites from which to mount this study. I draw from especially critical race theory legal scholarship and feminist jurisprudential scholarship to understand how U.S. law works upon the assumption of the consensual subject—a subject anterior to politics—an understanding that drives identity-based models of political activism.<sup>12</sup> Consistently, as the discussions in the following chapters demonstrate, the modern subject of U.S. law does not and ontologically cannot represent, can neither fully stand nor act for, the racialized "other." The literary texts considered here schematize an

understanding of subjectivity that takes issue with the assumption of modern subjectivity that the subject precedes politics. Along these lines, *Imagine Otherwise* conceives of Asian American literatures and U.S. legal discourse as functionally theoretical texts. They forward contrasting—though not necessarily directly oppositional—understandings of the nature of normative truth claims about race, gender, and sexuality as categories of nationalized/naturalized subjectivity, and about the nature and value of normativity itself. It is within these theoretical, philosophical, “disciplinary” contrasts that this book considers questions of justice; indeed, it is in part from the spaces of these differences that the imperative to work interdisciplinarily emerges, as I discuss below.

### **multiculturalism, or, why read literature as theory**

If the questions driving *Imagine Otherwise* arise through reflecting on Asian American studies, they also engage in ongoing conversations in U.S. American literary studies. Among these, especially persistent and pertinent to this present project are those that take up the position of “minority” literatures (the “multicultural problem”) and the place of “theory” (the “theory problem,” which is also the problem of the “literary”). The multicultural problem has particular visibility in relation to canonicity and curriculum, and multiculturalism often serves as putative solution. The racialized, sexualized, gendered character of debates over what gets taught, by whom, and how is easily recognized.<sup>13</sup> It will no doubt be familiar to those who work with such texts that within that frame, minoritized literatures tend to be coded as “(multi)cultural.” Meanwhile, the “literary” is reserved for canonical writers and texts. This solution to the multicultural problem retrenches a divide between “high” (literary) and “low” (minority) culture, effectively racializing the idea of culture itself. It thus exemplifies what Rey Chow has described as “an institutionalization of racialization of intellectual labor . . . resulting in an aristocracy and a subordinate class in terms of the production and dissemination of ‘knowledge’” (1998a, xvi). Dismissively referred to as a symptom of identity politics or political correctness, this kind of logic minoritizes (re-racializes and re-hierarchizes) even as it “celebrates diversity.” It reduces the rationale for offering courses like Asian American Literature to a matter of demographics (as in, “X percent-

age of students on this campus are of Asian descent, and, therefore, Asian American Literature”).

This version of multiculturalism is recognizably, as Minoou Moallem and Iain Boal have argued, a “multicultural nationalism,” an iteration of liberal ideology that “operates on the fault line between a universalism based on the notion of an abstract citizenship that at the same time systematically produces sexualized, gendered, and racialized bodies, and particularistic claims for recognition and justice by minoritized groups” (1999, 245). Inasmuch as the modern (U.S.) university is tasked with producing citizens vis-à-vis multicultural nationalism, efforts within the academy to prioritize and protect difference must negotiate structural elements designed to herald the possibilities and promises of abstracted citizenship. As David Lloyd cogently explains:

The [U.S.] university is modeled . . . on a European system that promoted not so much a mono-ethnic culture as . . . a universalist culture which, though mediated through national differentiations, is assumed to supercede local or ethnic values or knowledges. The disciplinary structure of the university further reinforces this model by dividing the sciences from the humanities and from the social sciences, a division that corresponds to a postenlightenment (that is, Western and modern) division of a universal human reason into “faculties,” and in turn into the larger differentiation of spheres of practice within Western society: the technological/economic, the political, and the cultural. The disciplinary as well as the curricular structure of the university is profoundly “Western” and conforms in all respects to the West’s notions of modernity, academic objectivity, relevance, and hierarchy of bodies of knowledge. (1998, 20)

Debates about canonicity and curriculum in relation to multicultural literary studies in this sense are symptomatic of the structural barriers to attending to difference in light of the university’s liberal mission to abstract and universalize. “Ethnic and minority positions as such always emerge in differential relation to the unifying tendencies of the state and its apparatuses, and this differential formation of positions produces the contradictions in which the pluralist model founders: the plures out of which the unum should emerge are in fact constitutively, not merely accidentally, antagonistic to it” (Lloyd 1998, 21). Lloyd argues the need to work proactively to change the structure of the university as part of a far-reaching project of

investigating modern political subjectivity. Such an insight, though perhaps implicitly, drives the interdisciplinary focus of fields like Asian American studies, a point to which I shall later return. Articulated specifically to the parameters of American literary study, it also, I think, requires resistance to the return of referentiality that characterizes the sedimentation of "multicultural literatures" as expressions of "other" cultures. For the multiculturalism enabled by the poststructural/postmodern undoing of Authority articulates to the structural economies of the U.S. university in such a way as to promote a version of otherness, as the identity of the other, against which Asian Americanists must work.

The constitutive antagonism to which Lloyd refers in other words plays out in the failure of U.S. multiculturalism to allow for the complexity of "ethnic literatures," which are effectively coded as transparent, self-evident expressions.<sup>14</sup> Such a positioning obviously makes difficult an engagement with minoritized literatures as anything other than ("authentic") artifacts of an ethnography of the Other. Otherness, here, appears principally as an idea, one devoid of the contradictions and complexities that inscribe and describe people's lives.<sup>15</sup> In other words, an already determined idea, a predetermined ideal, of minoritized cultures, of otherness, predicates acceptable versions of alterity. Importantly, the idea/ideal of otherness animating U.S. multiculturalism enables what Rey Chow has termed "self-subalternization" (1993): since this multiculturalism is a model of sameness-in-difference, then anyone and everyone is an other. This includes not only the assertion of the sameness of "white" and "non-white" (or "multicultural"), but also of researcher/scholar and subject. Within this scheme, the other is no longer oppositional, but simply another, and the researcher/scholar's privileged and empowered position is quickly effaced. The conservative effect of this resolution of the multicultural problem precisely registers in the racialized distinction between the literary and the multicultural.

One way of challenging this flattening of otherness into otherness-as-the-same may be to appropriate and redirect the logic of multiculturalism by introducing a third term, "theory." That is, if the literary (through multiculturalism's logic) excludes the multicultural, and if theory putatively excludes the literary, then we might write Asian American literatures into the space of theory itself. Theory, to borrow from Jonathan Culler, names works that "exceed the disciplinary framework within which they

would normally be evaluated and which would help to identify their solid contributions to knowledge" (1982, 9). Asian American literatures' excessiveness, its uncontainment by the literary, dramatizes this definition. Moreover, conceiving of Asian American literatures as theory recognizes that, as Barbara Christian has explained, "people of color have always theorized—but in forms quite different from the Western form of abstract logic. And I am inclined to say that our theorizing . . . is often in narrative forms, in the stories we create, in riddles and proverbs, in the play with language" (1990, 38). Theorization by "people of color" in literary forms displaces the question of the relevance of theory to literary studies: Insofar as "people of color" and "Asian American" are designations of racial formations, this theorization, following Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1994), is interested and invested in the socio-historical apparatuses and processes through which racial categories are manufactured and signified. The material embeddedness of cultural expressions ("theory") emergent from positions of subjugated alterity re-injects power into the equation, creating a disequilibrium that unsettles sameness-in-difference. This move of defining Asian American literature as theory potentially effects both the disruption of the multiculturalist sedimentation of Asian American and other minoritized literatures as seemingly transparent vehicles of authentic otherness, and the unbounding of "theory." As Donald Goellnicht explains, it is "to appropriate to Asian American texts the power usually reserved . . . [for] what metropolitan Europeans and Americans at the center of academic power write" (1997, 341). Christian and Goellnicht remind us that the politics of knowledge that gives rise to such categorical divisions is a racialized politics, a locus of struggle over racialized power.<sup>16</sup>

This (re)definition of Asian American literatures prompts a reconceptualization of culture, from something one has either by nature (for "the multicultural" or "ethnic") or refinement (for "the literary"), to that which is a site in which the affiliation of meaning to individuals, ideologies, and social structures occurs in negotiation with the material conditions of existence shaped by politics and economics.<sup>17</sup> That is, in contrast to understanding "culture" as a referent of multicultural difference, and "culture" as a signifier of achievement ("high culture"), here culture is understood as the locus in which signification has a material life. Asian American literatures stand as the material traces of such practices of signification. From that vantage point, they offer a theory of the materiality and partiality

of knowledge itself. "Theory oppresses," Trinh Minh-ha reminds, "when it wills or perpetuates existing power relations, when it presents itself as a means to exert authority—the Voice of Knowledge" (1989, 42). As the following chapters will show, the particular Asian American literatures considered here argue a different stance on knowledge by calling for scrupulousness of the materialities underwriting in particular the authority of national subjectification as a process of signification—of "knowing."

To be clear, I do not mean to rebound Asian American literatures tightly as "theory." Rather, I mean to emphasize the ways that they offer "theoretical" knowledges, where "theoretical" refers in a common parlance sense to the "unreal." Weighted by the burden of authenticity, Asian American literatures seem to have some immanent, "real" meaning to them. Invoking the term "theory" in this sense is a tactic employed to problematize that kind of understanding of them. I offer Asian American literatures-as-theory as a provisional identification designed to undermine its definition as transparently "multicultural," not in order to reconcretize it.

### deconstructing "Asian American"/ reconstructing Asian American studies

I have been arguing that unraveling distinctions between literature and theory may contribute to the project of challenging the hierarchical racialization that effects the subordinate status of Asian American literary studies in the realm of U.S. American literary studies. That doing so, in other words, intervenes in the conservative effects of U.S. multiculturalism. The deconstruction of other distinctions, like those between "activist" and "academic," can help, I will suggest in this section, the broader project of transforming the work and idea of the university.

"Asian American" emerged in the 1960s as a representational sign alternative to the predominating image of the forever-foreign, unassimilable "Oriental" through which Asianness in the United States had historically been coded. With its grammatical assertion of an American identity, activists of the era put forward the term as part of a cultural nationalist strategy of "claiming America."<sup>18</sup> Gary Okihiro offers an enlightening summary: "Asians in America, historically and within our time, have been and are rendered perpetual aliens, strangers in the land of their birth and adoption. Simultaneously, Orientalism has conflated the diverse ethnicities that con-

stitute Asian America and therewith has exacted similar treatment of and tribute from those dissimilar groups. Those commonalities—the ties that bind—arose within the context of the United States. Little wonder that activists and intellectuals seized upon the United States as the site for contestation, to claim as a politicized, pan-Asian people its spaces and its ideals" (1999, 441). Rooted in this cultural nationalism that proclaims a pan-ethnic unity based on experiential similarity as a strategy of antiracist activism, "Asian American" has since faced criticism as part of the critique of such paradigms for their heteronormative and masculinist biases, as well as their erasure of diversity.<sup>19</sup> As the demographic, historical, and experiential diversity among Asians in the United States has proliferated, the difficulties of using "Asian American" descriptively have become increasingly apparent.<sup>20</sup> Those who might identify as "Asian American" may be newly arrived immigrants or have generations-old roots in the United States; they inhabit the widest range of social and economic and political positions; and they may refuse the pan-ethnic designation in favor of more or less particularized terms of identification. Organized around identity, the term homogenizes diversity such that recognizing "differences among" fractures its intelligibility. Attempts to resolve fragmentation by pluralizing its designated referents (as in Asian American literatures and histories), while successful in indicating multiplicity, appear able only to recognize (as in the multicultural models discussed above) rather than account for difference.<sup>21</sup>

Such adjustments, through pluralizing or through expansion, as in "Asian Pacific Islander American," are clearly corrections designed to enhance the term's accuracy, its reflectiveness as a representational sign. Remaining in a descriptive mode, "Asian American" and its various permutations in this sense serves as a positivist identity category: correcting the term's inaccuracies indicates an understanding of the nature of language as referential, and of identity as more than less stable. This "Asian American" in effect implies a normative subject. Definitional debates along these lines cannot but end in a dead end, where one either is or is not found to be a "real" Asian American, whether a particular representation is or is not found to be "authentic."<sup>22</sup> Here we might recall that the grounds for deploying "Asian American" are inseparably connected to a history of (racist/refused) representation both in the literal sense of "acting for" and in the figurative sense of "standing for." The parameters of what constitutes politics itself has productively shifted as a result of these kinds of defini-

tional debates such that connections between representation and politics can be more explicitly identified and more readily analyzed. But perhaps precisely because of this connection between “acting” and “standing,” “Asian American” in this regard serves as a unit of a normalizing discourse not wholly dissimilar from the ways that U.S. legal discourse works to establish and sustain norms of behavior and identity.

And this is an important connection. For this descriptive “Asian American” works in accord with the civil rights discourses dominating the U.S. social and political landscape in the 1960s, its moment of generation. Rights are fundamental units of U.S. jurisprudence and bespeak its rationalist, Enlightenment underpinnings. They function upon the assumption of autonomous individuals who possess rights as a matter of both nature and social contract, and such possession defines the importance and parameters of individual autonomy. Justice, within this economy, is derived by proclaiming a denial of rights that “ought” to be in one’s possession, by claiming standing as the implied, proper subject of the law.<sup>23</sup> Only by claiming position as, or identity with, the legal norm can one achieve this version of justice. This is a situation that has meant for Asian-raced peoples in the United States the need to claim standing as national subjects, as deserving of everything from rights to immigration and citizenship to property ownership and miscegenation—all historically refused to “orientals.”<sup>24</sup> A persistent domestic focus in Asian Americanist work registers this legal/political/representational history. As Sau-ling Wong summarizes, “Asian American studies began with an activist commitment to ‘local’ (as opposed to ‘homeland,’ i.e., ‘Asians in Asia’) politics; an emphasis on the experiences of American-born, Anglophone Asians; and a strong anti-Orientalist agenda that, in extreme cases, led to a studied avoidance of Asian connections by cultural critics” (2001, 135). At the same time that working in terms of the nation (i.e., working for rights, for example) has garnered certain forms of “justice,” doing so also plays into myths of Americanness that cover over the material contradictions of U.S. culture and politics.

There is a certain contradictoriness, a certain inadequacy, in working within this hegemonic national paradigm with its attendant celebration of a rights-endowed subject status (citizenship) as a means to promised freedom and justice. In *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (1996), Lisa Lowe demonstrates how the racialization of immigrants from Asia has

been a state technology employed to suture together the conflicting demands of capital and of the U.S. nation-state. In so doing, she argues the limitations of the liberatory potential of the liberal nation-state form and its corollary citizen-subject. Lowe limns the ways that capital requires differentiation while the nation-state must unify its members largely through advancing Enlightenment liberalism’s universal citizen-subject. In this sense, racialization and universalization are concomitant processes in the U.S. context, and thus citizenship itself is found to be complicit in the inequitable distribution of power and resources that results from capitalist practices. The racialization of Asian immigrant labor has consistently served, though in varying forms, to cover over this contradiction. Lowe reminds us that “the U.S. nation was founded exactly by establishing citizenship as a legal and political category for white male persons that historically excluded nonwhites and women and that guaranteed the rights of those male white citizens over nonwhites and women” (1996, 27). The advancement of the concept of citizenship as abstract and universal and thus accessible to any and all, which is central to American mythology, precisely disavows this exclusionary history. When recognized, it becomes impossible to rely on national subjectivity as a means of liberation. At the same time, it becomes possible to see “Asian American culture as an alternative formation [at a distance from national culture] that produces cultural expressions materially and aesthetically at odds with the resolution of the citizen in the nation” (1996, 6). “Asian American,” in short, cannot stand as the national subject, nor can it be understood outside the context of the material conditions of its formation.

And yet, despite such insights, the normalizing valence of a subject-based definition of “Asian American” continues to circulate, registered in continuing debates over the academic (“theory”) versus activist (“practice”) orientations of the field and its practitioners. The imperative to articulate whatever scholarship, whatever critical practices, in the language of social transformation and political efficacy, plays out explicitly in these terms where the standard of value is contribution to community or, more specifically, to the community. In its inaugural moments, activists and intellectuals were seen as one and the same. Struggles to establish Asian American studies in universities were part of the efforts of ethnic studies movements generally to democratize the university, and being connected—“giving back”—to the community served as controlling ideology. The in-

clusion of Asian American studies was to remedy previous exclusion, to serve as an avenue of access for Asian Americans *née* orientals. "Activist" is the privileged term within this context. And while this debate has usefully focused attention on making and recognizing connections between what happens within universities and without, it is worth revisiting the underlying assumptions about the stability of such terms as *community*, *activism/practice*, and *academic/theory*. It is perhaps most readily apparent that the idea of "the community" presents some difficulty in light of the multiple communities in which one might participate or claim belonging and, indeed, in light of the fact that an "Asian American community" may not be a readily available formation at all. And as the problems of defining the community become clear, so too do the difficulties of adjudicating academic work as activist, of applying the standard of community contribution in a consistently intelligible way.

In another register, privileging "practice" over "theory" seems especially troublesome for the ways in which it deploys the selfsame logic that maintains the minoritized status of the field. As I discussed above, that distinction plays into a racialization of intellectual labor. While at first glance a rejection of "theory" may appear to be a way of undermining such hierarchization, within the institutionalized setting of Asian American studies, it effectively enables a return of referentiality, a reification of the idea of Asian American culture as transcending historical circumstance. Moreover, these terms of debate occlude recognition of the university as a national-statal institution. Far from being isolated bastions of abstract knowledge production, universities are sites of investment for corporate capital and military interest; they are shaped and sustained by government investments; and in these and myriad other ways, are precisely Ideological State Apparatuses. And indeed, this understanding undergirds the motivations of the movements of the 1960s and 1970s that sought to intervene in this particular site. In brief and crude terms, democratizing the university is in itself a "real world" project, and refusing the opposition of academic and activist is necessary to keep this in mind.

This is not unrelated to the ways in which interdisciplinarity might also help transform the university toward these ends. In recent years, disciplinary differences have been more explicitly considered as critics have responded to the imperative to be reflective about analytic methods and modes, and about the assumption of authority and the meaning of the

political that accrue to those methods. Michael Omi and Dana Takagi have summarized that the influence of "postmodern" theorizing in Asian American studies "has created a curious intellectual divide within the field. On the one hand are historians and social scientists who vigorously defend concepts of 'social structure,' and on the other are literary and cultural studies intellectuals who, heavily influenced by postmodern thought, privilege 'discursive practices'" (1995, xi). And while they are quick to point out that "this is a gross characterization of the intellectual differences in Asian American Studies," they explain as well that "while we acknowledge the artificial, constructed, and continually shifting nature of this divide, we also feel that the split is real. Moreover, we would argue that it is one that profoundly affects the work produced and the claims made about it" (1995, xi). I agree with their conclusion that "While claiming to be interdisciplinary, the reality is that most of the scholarly work in Asian American Studies today follows strict disciplinary lines with respect to theory and method" (1995, xiii). This is, as they suggest, arguably a consequence of the professionalization of the field, including the institutional demands by tenure and promotion on faculty members, as well as the growth in numbers of Asian Americanist practitioners, among whom I count myself, trained disciplinarily and without the kind of participatory relationship to the social movements of the inaugural moments of Asian American studies. Indeed, I would add that many of us are now institutionally located "east of California," a commonly used phrase in Asian American studies meant to indicate the particularities of working outside of California, the historically dominant site of both practice and research for Asian Americanists. And, moreover, many are working in settings in which Asian American studies programs are nonexistent and the very idea of the field is still quite novel if not dismissed altogether. Many of us, too, are ourselves "new immigrants," a designation of the cohort of migrants to the United States whose entry was precipitated by the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act that did away with the national-origins quota systems that had been in place since the 1920s and installed new regulatory mechanisms in their place. As Gayatri Spivak has suggested, this is a pattern of migration motivated by a desire for "justice under capitalism," by a desire, that is, to escape the wages of imperialism, recoded as global capitalism, by, perhaps ironically, removal to the global capitalist "metropole," the United States. This shared desire, Spivak argues, "is what unites the 'illegal alien' and the aspiring

academic" and what should motivate us to "reinvent this basis as a springboard for a teaching that counterpoints these times" (1997, 470). There are no pure positions within "these times" (or ever, one may presume), and only by "teaching ourselves and our students to acknowledge our part and hope in capitalism" can we "bring that hope to a persistent and principled crisis" (1997, 474).

From Spivak's suggestion that "since we are imprisoned in and habituated to capitalism, we might try to look at the *allegory* of capitalism not in terms of capitalism as the source of authoritative reference but in terms of the constant small failures and interruptions to its logic, which help to recode it and produce our unity" (1997, 483; *emphases original*), I take a model for understanding the contradictory position of Asian Americanist work within the institutionalized site of the U.S. university.<sup>25</sup> Within this site, the concept of interdisciplinarity may serve the project of transforming the university both by working at the level of struggling for structural changes, and by working to insist upon the partiality of the knowledges produced by and logics of any given discipline—by insisting upon the *allegorical* nature of the idea of disciplined knowledge. That is, the concept of interdisciplinarity may be a way of tracing the deconstruction of individual disciplinary formations themselves. This task seems especially important given the contemporary conditions of dissimilarities in relationships to the history of Asian American studies and the disparate constraints and oftentimes isolated locations in which Asian Americanists work. Part of this work must be to undermine persistently the multicultural, positivist narratives of otherness that suggest a concrete knowability. That, for me, demands a deconstructive account of "Asian American," a move toward embracing the a priori subjectlessness of discourse.

Such an account works to unify Asian American studies by holding the category "Asian American" under erasure so that its provisional nature and its constructedness cannot be forgotten. Work like Oscar Campomanes's emphasis on the "categorical act" (1992, 1995) and Dana Takagi's (1996) articulation of the differing apparatuses through which racialized and sexualized identities become legible, I understand to function along these lines. For, both of these are examples of efforts to renovate "Asian American" in ways that resist the normativizing impulses of the term as a descriptor. Participating in the broad-ranging de-essentializing projects that have constituted so much of the academic work undertaken over the past several

decades, arguments like Campomanes's and Takagi's emerge from an understanding of the (non)referentiality of language that might arguably be described as deconstructive. This kind of work invokes the inaugurating impetus of the term as a representational sign. As such, it is arbitrary but inscribed; it comes to have meaning through and within and as an effect of specific structures of social/power relations that are themselves ideologically valenced constructs. "Asian American" in this regard connotes the violence, exclusion, dislocation, and disenfranchisement that has attended the codification of certain bodies as, variously, Oriental, yellow, sometimes brown, inscrutable, devious, always alien. It speaks to the active denial of personhood to the individuals inhabiting those bodies. At the same time, it insists on acknowledging the enormous capacity for life that has triumphed repeatedly over racism's attempts to dehumanize, over the United States' juridical attempts to regulate life and culture. "Asian American" provides entry into these histories of resistance and racism. It transfers the properties of the racialized and gendered nation onto bodies—of people, of literatures, of fields of study. Far from being a transparent, objective description of a knowable identity, the term may be conceived as a mediating presence that links bodies to the knowledge regimes of the U.S. nation. "Asian American" is in this sense a *metaphor* for resistance and racism.

There is, in other words, a *literariness* to the term. "Asian American," as a deliberate and self-reflective term of representation, calls attention to the workings of language, to its structures and functions. It is connotative and evocative and, in that way, perhaps even poetry in itself.<sup>26</sup> There is, indeed, an aesthetic dimension to it—an inquiry into such matters as beauty and truth. In this regard, "Asian American" is *literary*. For this reason, approaching Asian American studies via literary studies may be particularly illuminating. My interest here is not in attempting to fix a definition of the "literary." Rather, it is to direct attention to critical methods and attitudes that attend to the literariness of "Asian American." As Jonathan Culler has suggested, attempts to "theorize the distinctiveness of literary language or the distinctiveness of literature" have "always functioned primarily to direct attention to certain aspects of literature. By saying what literature is, theorists promote the critical methods deemed most pertinent and dismiss those that neglect what are claimed to be the most basic and distinctive aspects of literature. . . . To ask 'what is literature?' is in effect a way of arguing about how literature should be studied" (2000, 276). Likewise, to



underscore the literariness of "Asian American" is to argue for studying the ways that it aestheticizes and theorizes the social relations and material conditions underwriting the resistance and racism to which it refers.

As a ground for Asian American studies, what this literary, deconstructive understanding of "Asian American" does is work against the authoritative-ness of any seemingly definitive knowledge. Always, it stands as a "partial fixation," to borrow from Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985, 112)—a momentary configuration of meaning that is impermanent and overdetermined. Laclau and Mouffe have argued "the final impossibility of any stable difference and thus, of any objectivity" (1985, 122) in their theorization of the possibilities for pursuing a radical democratic practice. The "'experience' of the limit of all objectivity" (1985, 122) they name "antagonism," which "constitutes the limits of every objectivity, which is revealed as partial and precarious *objectification*" (1985, 125; emphasis original). The process of objectification, the rules and methods of adjudication through which objects become "knowable," emerges as a principle focus of inquiry, and antagonism might be regarded as a point of entry for that investigation. This model is helpful to conceiving of Asian American studies as a field of *collaborative antagonisms*, collaborative in the doubled sense of working together and working subversively against, and antagonistic in the ways in which diverse approaches to knowledge critique and identify each other's limits. In this manner, difference and dissensus are more than simply acknowledged; they are valued as defining characteristics. The point is not to work toward resolving differences, to promote some version of assimilation, but is instead to insist on the productiveness of dissensus in demonstrating the impossibility of any objectivity, the irreducible inadequacy of any totalizing approach to or disciplining of knowledge. This conceptualization might displace the centrist metaphor of marginalization as organizing Asian Americanist knowledge politics, a metaphor organized by the idea of subject status problematized above. As a field of collaborative antagonisms, Asian American studies is interested in the irruptions of disciplinary formations. It is invested in facilitating those irruptions by emphasizing the ways that multiple processes of thematization characterizing both individual disciplinary practices and the idea of the university as a whole result in dissimilar subject-effects, the unevenness of which challenges the universal claims of the modern era/university. I do not mean this as a utopian celebration of dissensus. As, once again, Spivak has noted,

"difference and conflict are hard imperatives. Difference becomes competition, for we live and participate—even as dissidents—within institutions anchored in a transnational capitalist economy" (1997, 471). For precisely this reason, they are imperatives, the imagined ethical grounds upon which we must find ways of uniting.

The chapters that follow elaborate the ideas and argument introduced here. By this book's end, I hope it will be clear that Asian American literatures may be seen to advance understandings of what it means to "know" America that cannot be captured by a subject-driven discourse where subjectivity bears the legacy of Enlightenment liberalism's celebration of the nation-state. These are understandings of the material embeddedness of such knowledges that limn the possibilities of an Asian American studies that accounts for difference through a model of what Avery Gordon (1997) has described as "*complex personhood*" rather than multicultural otherness—that, in short, help us to imagine otherwise in multiple senses.

## notes

### introduction: on Asian Americanist critique

- 1 Protests over Blu's *Hanging's* depiction of Filipino Americans culminated in the form of a resolution to rescind the award. Protestors, organized by the Filipino American Studies Caucus (FASC) of the Association and a group called the Anti-Racism Coalition (ARC), but numbering many others as well, argued that a book that figured Filipino Americans as animal torturers and child molesters, and that an author who had in other works offered arguably similarly problematic representations of Filipino Americans, should not be recognized as exemplary of the "best." Fifty-eight Filipino community organizations had expressed support for the FASC's and ARC's resolution to revoke the award. Despite these protests, AAAS's executive board affirmed the award committee's freedom to make its determination, and numerous efforts to find compromise positions failed. The resolution to revoke the award was introduced to the membership at the general business meeting held at the conference and passed by a vote of 90 or 91 (accounts differ) for to 55 against, with 19 abstentions. The vote was limited to those who were in attendance at the business meeting. The Association's executive board consequently resigned in the face of possible legal liability (for potential breach of contract, perhaps), and many members—both in support of the resolution and not—have declined continued participation in AAAS. I have drawn this summary from the chronology of events compiled principally by Daniel Kim for circulation among members of the East of California Caucus of the association. I am indebted to his hard work; errors in reporting are my own.
- 2 I am using "poststructuralism" and "postmodernism" rather loosely here. My interest is in pointing to these terms as identifying a particular discursive moment in which referentiality gives way to multiplicity. The terms are intimately related in that moment. Poststructuralism otherwise generally takes up language itself as its analytic focus, while postmodernism concerns itself more with representation—obviously, there are overlaps between these focuses. My immediate sources for poststructural theorizing are Judith Butler, Paul de Man, Jacques Derrida, Drucilla Cornell, Gilles Deleuze, and Diane Elam; and for postmodern theorizing my sources are David Harvey, Fredric Jameson, and Jean-Francois Lyotard.

- 3 As R. Radhakrishnan has succinctly formulated, "The radical poststructuralist subject of epistemology, with its commitment to a nameless and open-ended process, finds itself at odds with the exigencies of political subjectivity, for the latter is not easily served by a deconstructive epistemology of perennial disaccomodation" (1996, 2).
- 4 See Derrida (1987) with respect to his theorization of subjectivity as a logocentric concept.
- 5 It is of course important to recognize that there are other kinds of multiculturalisms, "critical multiculturalisms," currently being theorized by such scholars as David Lloyd, Minoo Moallem, and Iain Boal, as well as under the auspices of such groups as the Chicago Cultural Studies Group. See Lloyd (1998), Moallem and Boal (1999), and Chicago Cultural Studies Group (1992).
- 6 This discussion draws on the vast and increasing body of scholarship on globalization. See, for example, Appadurai (1998), Cheng and Bonacich (1984), Dirlik (1996), Eisenstein (1998), Hall (1990), Harvey (1989), Lowe (1996, 2001), Lowe and Lloyd (1997), Miyoshi (1993), Ong (1999), Ong et al. (1994), Shohat (1998), Shohat and Stam (1994), and Tölöyan (1991). See also the review in chapter 2, note 1, of transnational studies scholarship.
- 7 Arjun Appadurai's concise synopsis of globalization is particularly helpful: "[Globalization] marks a set of transitions in the global political economy since the 1970s, in which multinational forms of capitalist organization began to be replaced by transnational, flexible, and irregular forms of organization, as labor, finance, technology, and technological capital began to be assembled in ways that treated national boundaries as mere constraints or fictions" (1998, 228; emphasis original). Appadurai cites Rouse (1995), Harvey (1989), and Lash and Urry (1987, 1994) in this summary. See also Coombe (1995), Dirlik (1993), Elkins (1995), Jameson (1994), Lim et al. (1999), Sassen (1996), Wallerstein (1990, 1991, 1995), and Wilson and Dissanayake (1996).
- 8 Zillah Eisenstein offers a stark summary of these conditions:

Some 800 million people are starving across the globe. Women and girls represent approximately 60 percent of the billion or so people earning one dollar a day or less. However, in countries labeled democratic, a new kind of excessive wealth exists in which billionaires are allowed to amass as much as they can with few limits. . . . Meanwhile, corporations displace countries. Of the world's largest one hundred economies, fifty-one are corporations, not countries. The two hundred largest corporations hire less than three-fourths of one percent of the world's work force but account for 28 percent of the global market. The five hundred biggest corporations account for 70 percent of world trade. No surprise that Amnesty International now reports on corporations as well as nation-states. (1998, 1)

- 9 Lisa Lowe offers an especially eloquent understanding of the need for such a shift in relation specifically to Asian Americanist discourse: "In the face of the radical nonidentity of Asian racial formations globally, Asian American studies must develop . . . a shared language about exploitation within transnational capitalism, a language about economic and social justice rather than cultural or nationalist identity" (2001, 274).
- 10 As Diane Elam cogently explains, "No longer subject to a monarch, the modern citizen is now subject of a State. Yet this subjection is held to be freedom, since the State is nothing other than the collective will of its citizens" (1994, 70). See also Berlant (1991).
- 11 In this book, I follow Rey Chow's suggestion that "it is necessary to think primarily in terms of borders—of borders, that is, as *para*-sites that never take over a field in its entirety but erode it slowly and tactically" (2001, 201; emphases original). Chow, extending Michel de Certeau's work, explains that a "tactic" is "calculated action determined by the absence of a proper locus" (Chow 2001, 202; citing de Certeau 1984, 37). A tactical, parasitical approach does not seek a space of propriety; rather, tactical intervention intends to disrupt propriety itself, to avoid becoming itself a dominating discourse by disallowing its own borders to solidify. Here I employ this approach as part of this book's project of reflecting on Asian American studies and especially on its constitutive borders—the boundaries of inquiry considered "proper" to the field, and the spatial boundedness of its territorial imagination.
- 12 On law and literature generally, see Ferguson (1984), Gutierrez-Jones (1995), Leonard (1995), and Thomas (1987). On critical race theory, see Crenshaw et al. (1995), Chang (1993), and Johnson (1997). On feminist jurisprudence, see Cornell (1991, 1995), Crenshaw et al. (1995), Eisenstein (1988, 1994), Fine-man and Thomadsen (1991), Frug (1992), Harris (1995), Matsuda (1995), Minow (1990), Schneider (1991), Volpp (1994, 1996, 2000b), West (1988), and Williams (1990). See also Tushnet (1984) and White (1988).
- 13 See Lauter (1991), Lloyd (1998), Lowe (1996), and Palumbo-Liu (1995a) on this issue.
- 14 David Palumbo-Liu offers an incisive discussion of the ways that this transparency is ascribed to U.S. ethnic literatures. See Palumbo-Liu (1995a).
- 15 Rey Chow points out that the idealization of otherness is related to a second kind of idealism—what she calls "mentalism, the tendency that treats the world as a result of ideas, which in turn are construed as the products of the human mind" (1998a, xx). She explains that "In the problematic of cultural otherness, the two senses of idealism come together: idealism in the sense of idealization, of valorization; but also in the sense of turning-into-an-idea" (1998a, xxi).
- 16 For further discussion of theory, authority, and power in relation to representing and researching raced, gendered, and classed identities, see Trinh (1989,

- 1991). Responses to earlier versions of this introduction prompt me to clarify that I do not believe or mean this ascription to Asian American literatures of this "theoretical" valence to detract from the complexities of other literatures, conventionally considered canonical or not. In particular, those texts that are considered canonical are read, I think, as the complex works that they may be. My point here is simply to try to underscore the importance of reading literatures collected under the rubric of "Asian American literature" with the same eye toward complexity to combat their conception as transparent.
- 17 This understanding of "culture" draws from and is aligned with that offered by Lowe (1996) and Omi and Winant (1994).
  - 18 Sau-ling Wong attributes the phrase "claiming America" to Maxine Hong Kingston. Michael Omi and Howard Winant have shown that cultural nationalism may be "traced back at least to the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s" (1994, 39). They explain that "Cultural nationalism found expression in every minority community. This was an explicit critique of the dominant Eurocentric (i.e., white) culture, understood to pervade both everyday life and 'high culture.' Cultural nationalists sought to redefine and recapture the specificity of their minority cultures, an objective which they identified as 'nationalist.' Painting, theater, dance, music, language, even cars and clothes, all became media through which a new style could be developed, and through which 'genuine' oppositional culture could be distinguished from assimilationist practices" (1994, 109).
  - 19 On the masculinism of Asian American cultural nationalism, see Cheung (1990, 1993), E. Kim (1990), Lim (1993b), Lowe (1996), and Wong (1993). On its heteronormativity, see generally the essays collected in Eng and Hom (1998); see also Eng (1998), Leong (1996), and especially Takagi (1996).
  - 20 For discussions of diversity among peoples of Asian descent in the United States, see Espiritu (1992, 1996a, b), Hing (1993), Palumbo-Liu (1999), Takagi (1992), and E. Yamamoto (1999). For discussions of a tacit East Asian American orientation in Asian American studies, see Campomanes (1992, 1995), Grewal (1994), Shankar and Srikanth (1998), and Visweswaran (1997). See also Davé et al. (2000), Katrak (1996), and Koshy (1996, 1998).
  - 21 Susan Koshy is especially vigorous in her critique of "Asian American literature" along these lines. See Koshy (1996, 1998). See also Davé et al. (2000), Espiritu (1992, 1996a), Hirabayashi and Alquizola (1994), Hune (1995), Katrak (1996), Lim (1997), Osajima (1995), Palumbo-Liu (1999), Prashad (1998), and Wong (1995).
  - 22 These terms closely approximate those in which Frank Chin articulates an influential definition of "Asian American." See Chin (1991).
  - 23 As Rey Chow has put it, "For those groups on the side of non-white cultures—negotiating a point of entry into the multicultural scene means nothing less

than posing the question of rights—the right to representation and the right to culture. What this implies is much more than mere flight (by a particular non-white culture) for its 'freedom of speech,' because the very process of attaining 'speech' here is inextricably bound up with right, that is with the processes through which particular kinds of 'speeches' are legitimized in the first place" (1998a, 12). Chow summarizes: "To put it in very simple terms, a non-white culture, in order to 'be' or to 'speak,' must (1) seek legitimacy/recognition from white culture, which has denied the reality of the 'other' cultures all along; (2) use the language of white culture (since it is the dominant one) to produce itself (so that it could be recognized and thus legitimized); and yet (3) resist complete normativization by white culture" (1998a, 12). See also Bell (1995), Crenshaw (1995), Delgado (1995), Freeman (1995), Tushnet (1984), and especially Johnson (1997), Lloyd (1991), and Volpp (2000c).

24 The following chapters review this history more specifically.

25 Lowe provides a synopsis of the paradoxes inhering in the institutionalization of ethnic studies:

Institutionalization provides a material base within the university for a transformative critique of traditional disciplines and their traditional separations; yet, on the other hand, the institutionalization of any field or curricula which establishes orthodox objects and methods submits in part to the demands of the university and its educative function of socializing subjects into the state. While institutionalizing interdisciplinarity study risks integrating it into a system which threatens to appropriate what is most critical and oppositional about that study, the logic through which the university incorporates areas of interdisciplinarity simultaneously provides for the possibility that these sites will remain oppositional forums, productively antagonistic to notions of autonomous culture and disciplinary regulation, and to the interpellation of students as univocal subjects. (1996, 41)

26 I am reminded of Lawson Inada's poem, "From Live Do," which articulates the impossibility of defining "Asian American poetry" and proffers instead an understanding based upon the ways in which such terms cannot be understood outside of the materialities of life as conditioned by history.

### chapter 1. against uniform subjectivity: remembering "Filipino America"

- 1 See especially Campomanes (1995) for a compelling discussion of the ways that "Filipino America" requires Asian American studies to shift its historic frames and terms of analysis. Taking as a point of departure "our seeming 'inability' to congeal the Filipino case in categorical terms," Campomanes demonstrates how that "inability" is directly related to the absence of empire as a central analytic in Asian American and American studies.