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It would be hard to find any moment in the history of the U.S. when products, people, or ideas from Asia did not play a vital role. The American Revolution? It was 45 tons of tea from China that the Sons of Liberty, led by John Adams, dumped into the Boston Harbor. The American Renaissance? Emerson and Thoreau were reading and learning from translations of Eastern texts. American impressionism? The most famous works by painter Mary Cassatt are indebted to lessons she learned from traditions of Japanese printmaking. How about *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the book which Hemingway claimed gave birth to all 20th century American literature? Twain undertook his first experiments with using satire to attack racism when, as a young journalist in the 1860s, his direct exposes of racism towards the Chinese in San Francisco were censored. Indeed, Asia shaped what would be the U.S. even before Columbus set sail for the New World—for, as Gary Okihiro reminds us, “America’s very ‘discovery’ resulted from . . . Europe’s ancient and persistent search for a passage to Asia.” From the start, Asia—its geography, its people, its products and its culture—was woven into the very fabric of what made the U.S. what it was.

My own childhood was neither typical nor atypical. It was simply mine. All of my grandparents immigrated to New York near the start of
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the twentieth century from Jewish shtetls or small towns in Eastern Europe. But when my mother decided to buy the one antique she ever bought, it was an antique Chinese mah jong set—which is now in my living room. My mother herself didn’t play mah jong. But her mother did—along with virtually every other Jewish woman of my grandmother’s generation who had immigrated from Eastern Europe, or at least that’s how it seemed. Why was mah jong such a hugely popular game among immigrant Jewish women in America? That’s a mystery I hope to solve some day. My mother was a musicologist who, as a college professor, taught classes throughout my childhood. But the one class I recall my mother taking was a class on cultivating miniature bonsai trees that she took at the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens—a place where my playground, on sunny days, was the mall lined with Japanese cherry trees, a gift from the people of Japan. As I puzzle over my mother’s passion for things Chinese and Japanese, I always come back to the notion of how “American” it was for her to love these things. The antique mah jong set, and the knowledge of how to cultivate a miniature bonsai tree were as far from the world of the Eastern European shtetl her parents came from as, well, as far as America was. In America, could her freedom to appreciate and embrace Asian artifacts and practices have been a metonym for the larger freedoms that my grandparents’ move from the old world to the new represented? One day when I was four years old, I was cast in the chorus of a musical production at my summer day-camp. I was just beginning to learn to read, and as I rode home from camp, I diligently began to study the words to the song I was told to learn. By the time I reached my house, I was in tears. What’s wrong, my mother asked. “I’ll never learn to read” I wailed. “I can read the words but I can’t figure out what they mean!” I sobbed, as I read from the sheet: “Miya sama, miya sama / On n’m-ma no mayé ni / Pira-Pira suru no wa / Nan gia na / Toko tonyaré tonyaré na?” My mother glanced over my shoulder at the mimeographed sheet I was reading from and suppressed a smile. “Darling, you read that beautifully,” she said. “No wonder you don’t know what the words mean. They’re Japanese!” The show, of course, was Gilbert and Sullivan’s “Mikado.” Why was a four-year old little girl at a day camp based at a Jewish center in upstate New York in the 1950s being asked to learn a Japanese war song from 1868 in a musical written by two Englishmen? Some day, I hope to figure out some answers to this question.
For a very long time, Americans’ negotiation of their relationship to people and things Asian have helped them gain a sense of what it means to be American. U.S. culture has left its mark on Asian cultures, as well, shaping everything from the Japanese language, to Chinese poetry to Thai Buddhism. In the 21st century, we are increasingly recognizing that understanding these moments of interaction, intersection, contact, conflict, appropriation, appreciation, synergy, and synapse—conscious or unconscious, familiar or fresh—is a key part of our task as scholars in American Studies. Understanding the cultural crossroads of the U.S. and Asia that shape our world is increasingly central to what it means to be a scholar of American Studies today.

The field of American Studies has been dramatically transformed over the last four decades as scholars recovered the voices of women and minorities, and replaced earlier exceptionalist visions of unsullied innocence with a clear-eyed look at the lust for empire that America shared with other western powers. But the national paradigm of the U.S. as a clearly-bordered geographical and political space remained intact: the world was still divided into “us” and “them,” the “domestic” and the “foreign,” the “national” and “international.” The complexity of our field of study as we understand it today, however, encourages us to pay as much attention to the ways in which ideas, people, objects, culture and capital, have circulated and continue to circulate physically, and virtually, throughout the world, both in ways we might expect, and unpredictably. It requires that we view America, as David Palumbo-Liu put it, as a place “always in process itself.” It requires that we see the inside and outside, domestic and foreign, national and international as inter-penetrating.

I do not want to suggest that everyone needs to do transnational work, or that other work is not equally important. Japanese scholars, for example have done impressive work on Mark Twain that does not have a transnational focus, but that has added much to our understanding of this complex author—such as professor Makoto Nagawara’s memorable study of “A True Story.” Japanese scholars have also done important historical research that is not specifically transnational. (Yasuhiro Katagiri’s recent prizewinning book, The Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission: Civil Rights and States’ Rights comes to mind.) And Chinese and Taiwanese scholars have done useful work on Native American and African American literature that is not transnational in
focus (Wang Jianping’s work on Louise Erdrich, comes to mind, along with Liang-ya Liou’s work on Toni Morrison). There is still much valuable work to be done in American Studies that does not deal with the transnational. But what I do want to do is concentrate in a positive way on what I see as a major shift in the field.

My comments here build on those of others who have theorized in articles and books about the need for seeing “America,” as Paul Lauter put it, as part of “a world system, in which the exchange of commodities, the flow of capital, and the iterations of cultures know no borders.” Over the last ten years a web of contact zones has increasingly supersed “the nation” as “the basic unit of, and frame for, analysis.” Taking cues from borderlands scholars like José David Saldivar who focus on spaces that resist being reduced to a “national tradition,” scholars are increasingly paying attention to the ways in which analogous hybridities and fluidities shape other spaces less territorially and culturally “stable” than we may have thought. My focus here will be Asian crossroads—points of connection and exchange with Japan, Taiwan, China, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and other Asian nations. What topics and questions become salient if we reconceive our field with the transnational at its center, as many scholars are currently doing? What roles might comparative, collaborative, border-crossing research play in this reconfigured field?

As the transnational becomes more central to American Studies, we are likely to be more attentive to the ways in which the multidirectional flow of people, ideas, and goods between the U.S. and Asia have shaped an unexpectedly broad range of topics in the field. Take a seemingly unrelated issue like the status of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. Recent work by scholars like Henry Yu and Mai Ngai demonstrates that Asian crossroads have much more to do with this issue than we may have previously thought. In his illuminating article “Los Angeles and American Studies in a Pacific World of Migrations,” in American Quarterly last fall, Henry Yu notes that “By the mid-twentieth century, Mexican labor migrations had come to replace the supply of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Punjabi, and Filipinos cut off by exclusionary policies, and the racialization of Mexicans as eternal foreigners and cheap labor grafted onto similar representations of earlier Asian migrants. In similar ways that antiblack politics helped amalgamate various Europeans into a common white supremacy, anti-Asian and anti-Mexican politics achieved a parallel result.
Yu shows us that “Without an understanding of the consequences of regional networks of migration that brought migrants from Asia” as well as from “Europe, Latin America, and the Eastern United States to the Pacific coast, the very different patterns of regional racialization in the United States do not make sense.” Mae Ngai charts related territory in her book *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*, an ambitious investigation of race, labor, immigration and citizenship—work which builds on Lisa Lowe’s overview of the history of America’s anti-Asian exclusionary policies in *Immigrant Acts*. It turns out that the history of U.S. immigration policy and practice in relation to Asians had a lasting impact on both responses to immigrants from a range of other parts of the world, as well, and on the conditions that immigrants encountered once they were here. The racialization of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in California as well as the complex associations Americans have with the idea of “illegal aliens” are informed in key ways by the history of earlier racism towards Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Filipinos.

The ways in which race has inflected concepts of nationhood and citizenship have long been central to work in American Studies, but for decades this topic was constructed principally in the context of black-white relations in a transatlantic world. Today a number of scholars are reshaping these questions from a *transpacific* perspective. The result is a fuller and more nuanced understanding of both the past and the present. Intertwined issues of race and citizenship, of nation, gender, and the racialized body are being illuminated in fresh ways these days by critics who study the ways in which Americans of Asian descent have challenged and reshaped constructions of what an “American citizen” looks like and how individuals are “constructed” by the state. Books that mine this terrain include Viet Thanh Nguyen’s *Race & Resistance: Literature and Politics in Asian America*, David Lei Li’s *Imagining the Nation*, Jinqi Ling’s *Narrating Nationalisms*, Elena Tajima Creef’s, *Imagining Japanese America: The Visual Construction of Citizenship, Nation, and the Body*, and Patricia Chu’s *Assimilating Asians*, as well as Moon-Ho Jung’s recent *American Quarterly* article, “Outlawing ‘Coolies’: Race, Nation, and Empire in the Age of Emanicipation” (All of these works extend comments Gary Okihiro made on this topic in *Margins and Mainstreams*). (Interestingly, scholars based in both Asia and the U.S. are also increasingly exploring issues of race in the U.S. that move beyond black-white or yellow-white dyadic constructions. Kun Jong
Lee, for example, has examined responses to African-Americans in Korean American literature, while Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong has explored the role of African-Americans in Sinophone Chinese American literature and Yukiko Koshiro has examined the impact of African Americans on Japan.20

While issues involving immigration have long been important to much work in American Studies, as the transnational becomes more central to the field, we are likely to focus not only on the proverbial immigrant who leaves somewhere called “home” to make a new home in the U.S., but also on the endless process of comings and goings that create familial, cultural, linguistic and economic ties across national borders.21 These border-crossing ties are the focus of Madeline Hsu’s ambitious book, *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home: Transnationalism and Migration Between the U.S. and South China, 1882–1943,* which uses Chinese- and English-language sources to track the strong sense of connection that linked U.S. immigrants to family and friends back in China during the exclusion era.22 They are also central to Xiao-huang Yin’s study of Chinese American philanthropy to China, and of the essays collected in a recently-published anthology focused on transnational networks and trans-pacific interactions between China and Chinese America.23

From the Philippine-American war to World War II to debates about U.S. bases in Asia today, military actions and encounters have created crossroads and contact zones. As the transnational becomes more central to American Studies, scholars are examining those spaces and moments from multiple perspectives, yielding more complex insights than we had before. The Philippine-American War, for example, was a key turning point in the career of Mark Twain, prompting a major re-evaluation of such issues as his nation’s role in the world, the relationship between religion and foreign policy, the nature of imperialism, and the seductions of white supremacy. Twain’s writings on this war, while not totally buried, have been largely neglected, and their broader significance has generally not been examined.24 One particularly important piece that the war prompted him to write was “The War Prayer,” a devastatingly clear-sighted and brutal fable of the role of religion in war that has received almost no critical attention. Takayuki Tatsumi and I are co-editing an international forum on the “War Prayer” that will appear in the Japanese journal *Mark Twain Studies.* Other American Studies scholars, as well, are increasingly recognizing the value of seeking multiple perspectives on military actions that have brought the U.S. and Asian nations into con-
tact and conflict. The recent impressive anthology *Vestiges of War: The Philippine-American War and the Aftermath of an Imperial Dream, 1899–1999* edited by Angel Velasco Shaw and Luis H. Francia, for example, brings together both U.S. and Filipino perspectives on the war that so disillusioned Mark Twain about his country’s role in the world.25 A massive anthology like this one, however, is not the only place that dissonant voices may be brought together, as Gordon Chang demonstrated in his article about the U.S.-Korean war of 1871 that he was able to write after consulting both Korean and U.S. archives: each side accused the other of barbarism and treachery, each side discharged significant firepower (although the U.S. more than the Koreans), and then each side declared victory and went home.26

Chang’s 2003 article in the *Journal of American History* entitled “Whose ‘Barbarism?’ Whose ‘Treachery’? Race and Civilization in the Unknown United States-Korea War of 1871” focuses on a “battle between American and Korean military forces in June 1871 near Korea’s Rock of Gibraltar, during an American expedition to ‘open’ Korea as Matthew C. Perry had opened Japan in 1853.” He notes that “the standard American interpretation of the war differs dramatically from the Korean, with the differences having everything to do with national perspective rather than with ‘facts’ alone. The nationality of the storyteller commonly predicts which side will be identified as the ‘aggressor’ and which the ‘defender’ in the conflict.” In this particular case, “each side has claimed glorious victory over a demoralized enemy. Each side has built its own version of a victory column at home and honored its martyrs as national heroes. . . . [Few] if any, American students (and only a small minority of American diplomatic historians) know anything about the 1871 events in Korea. It is, for Americans today, an unknown war. (Those who know of the incident may have read articles entitled ‘Our Little War with the Heathens,’ ‘America’s War with the Hermits,’ or perhaps ‘When We Trounced Korea,’ the dismissive titles themselves reflecting a common historical attitude toward the Asian enemy.) In contrast to their American counterparts, most Koreans, in the south as well as the north, are familiar with the outlines of the Shin-mi Yang-yo (the barbarian incursion of 1871, a name suggestive of attitudes toward the Western adversary) and with the valiant Korean resistance to the aggression. A respected Korean scholar, Dae-Sook Suh, eulogizes the war as ‘one of the bloodiest battles that Koreans have fought to defend their country.’”27 (Despite articles like this one, I might add, the U.S is behind
the curve when it comes to melding multiple national narratives about wars in Asia. Historians in China, Korea and Japan have just completed a new text book, which has been published in Chinese, Korean and Japanese—but not translated into English—which is the result of a collaboration among historians from all three countries to jointly write the history of World War II in Asia. When different national versions conflict with one another, the book acknowledges that fact. I’m eagerly waiting to read forthcoming English-language articles about this project that Julie Higashi is completing.

As the transnational becomes more central to American Studies, We are likely to focus less on the U.S. as a static and stable territory and population whose most characteristic traits it was our job to divine, and more on the nation as a participant in a global flow of people, ideas, texts and products. As Lisa Lowe observes, “the sweatshops of the garment industry located in San Francisco and Los Angeles . . . employ immigrant women from Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Hong Kong, South Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines, while in these countries of origin, U.S. transnational corporations are also conducting garment assembly work.”28 Despite “national, cultural and linguistic differences,” Lowe writes, “there are material continuities between the conditions of Chicanas and Latinas working in the United States and the women working in maquiladoras and low-cost manufacturing zones in Latin America, and Asian women working both within the United States and in Asian zones of assembly and manufacturing.”29 Those continuities require that our research cross borders as readily as consumer goods do. Some examples of research that does this are articles like “Si(gh)ting Asian/American women as transnational labor,” by Laura Hyun- Yi Kang and “(Dis)assembling Rights of Women Workers Along the Global Assembly Line: Human Rights and the Garment Industry” by Laura Ho, Catherine Powell, and Leti Volpp.30

As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American Studies, we may well seek to recover chapters of the past that have eluded any archive despite their importance. For example, in Mark Twain’s powerful satire on racism toward the Chinese serialized in 1870 and 1871, a fictional immigrant in California named Ah Song-Hi writes to his friend Ching-Foo back in China. Twain makes it clear that his narrative of the treatment of the Chinese in the U.S. was based on his observations of real people.31 But where are the voices of the real Ah Song-Hi and his brothers? Many of the immigrants were illiterate, but some of
them probably dictated letters through literate scribes and sent them home to China—which is where they stayed. To the best of our knowledge, no library in the U.S. has even a photocopy of a letter sent to China by anyone who worked on the railroad. Are there caches of family papers in Guangdong Province where one might find some of these letters? My university was founded with the fortune that Leland Stanford made from railroads largely built by Chinese workers—but those workers’ voices have yet to be recovered. If such letters are an example of primary sources that have eluded any archive, there are other sources readily available in China that Americanists in China are positioned to recover, translate and analyze. For example, the U.S. decision in 1904 to extend indefinitely the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 that made the Chinese ineligible for citizenship sparked not only a massive boycott of U.S. goods the following year in China, but also a vast body of Chinese protest literature. In 1960 a huge, multigenre compilation of this literature was published in China. But to this day only one small excerpt from this compilation has been translated into English. Still untranslated is Kuxuesheng, a novella written in Chinese set in Chinese America that predates the book widely considered the first Chinese American novel set in Chinese America by more than half a century. Kuxuesheng, as Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong tells us, is a well-crafted novella about a “patriotic student who travels to America in order to acquire the knowledge needed to save his crumbling country from corrupt Manchu rule as well as economic and military invasion by foreign powers.” As Wong notes, “Before the protagonist returns home, he receives help from an extraordinary old man, a wealthy Chinese immigrant who has managed to create his own utopian estate in an inhospitable, often overtly racist, society.”

Chinese Americanists I met at the first American Studies Network conference in Shanghai in June, 2004 tittered with amusement when they heard that to the extent that Americans had heard of this book, it was known as The Industrious Student. They said a more accurate translation of the title would be The Bitter Student. The novella could provide a fascinating glimpse of one writer’s vision of how one might meld Chinese and American identities at the dawn of the twentieth century. Perhaps a collaboration between scholars based in China and the U.S. would allow the book to be translated and contextualized as a potentially important work in American Studies. Xiao-huang Yin’s monograph, Chinese American Literature Since the 1850s, draws our attention to other examples of American literature in Chinese that we have yet to
fully assimilate into American Studies.37 Yin’s illuminating discussion of Chinese American writing in Chinese and in English, and the history that shaped that work, provides important insights into writers who sometimes wrote in both languages and the often quite different audiences they addressed in each. The result is an invaluable contribution to our understanding of a neglected chapter of American literary history in all its complexity.38

Another early excellent model of the recovery of Chinese-language American literature is edited by Mark Him Lai, Genny Lim and Judy Yung.39 These books are exemplars of the move to pay attention to that neglected body of American literature that was written in languages other than English—a trend that led to books like the pioneering Multilingual Anthology of American Literature edited by Mark Shell and Werner Sollors and the collection of essays Sollors edited entitled Multilingual America: Transnationalism, Ethnicity and the Languages of American Literature, which pointed to some of the intriguing places that attention to this neglected body of literature can take us if we recognize that insistence on “English Only” has as little place in our scholarship as it does elsewhere in our society.40 Despite the increased attention devoted in the U.S. to this body of material, there are still many gaps to fill, and much important work to be done. For example, the Multilingual Anthology of American Literature is ambitious and broad-ranging; but it contains no selection that originally appeared in Korean. As it turns out, there is a sizeable body of American literature written in Korean, that has never been translated. When I visited his office at Korea University, Kun Jong Lee showed me six volumes of Korean-American literature written before 1945 anthologized by Kyuick Cho and published in Seoul in 1999.41

American literature continues to be written today in languages other than English, and scholars based outside the U.S. are playing a key role in interpreting that literature. Pin-chia Feng’s fascinating 2000 essay on Yan Geling’s novel, Fu Sang, is a case in point.42 The education of Shanghai-born Yan Geling in China was disrupted by the Cultural Revolution; at age 13 she was sent to Chengdu, Sichuan Province, with the People’s Liberation Army. She later studied at Beijing University, but after the Tiananman Square events of 1989, she fled to the U.S. to study at Columbia University, where she is completing an MFA in Fiction Writing. She was an accomplished fiction-writer in Chinese before she began studying English in her thirties, and some of the more than 20 short story collections, novellas and screenplays she has written in Chinese
have garnered major literary awards in both Taiwan (where many were first published) as well as mainland China. Although her most acclaimed novel, *Fu Sang*, was published in Chinese in Taiwan in 1996, it was not translated into English and published in the U.S. until 2001, when it appeared under the title *The Lost Daughter of Happiness*, translated by Cathy Silber. An epic tale about a young Chinese woman who is kidnapped in China in the 1860s and sold into prostitution in San Francisco’s Chinatown, the book (inspired by a real historical figure) explores an interracial love story against the backdrop of racism towards the Chinese in 19th-century San Francisco; it promptly rose to prominence on the *New York Times* Bestseller list. A year before this novel appeared in English, however Pin-chia Feng, a Taiwanese Americanist, introduced the book to English-speaking scholars in an article in *American Studies International* that included her own translations of extended passages from the novel and flagged its significance for American literary studies.

Feng observes that “Since Yan has won many Taiwanese awards after her immigration in 1989, a fact that makes her one of the stars of the island’s literary scene, it has become increasingly difficult to label her in terms of geographical location and language.” She goes on to ask, “Is she still a mainlander writer? Is she a Taiwanese writer? Or is she now an Asian American writer?” Feng argues compellingly that the “complicated political and linguistic issues inside the text and behind the writing and publishing of *Fu Sang* make it a significant text in terms of re-mapping Asian American literature.” Some of these theoretical issues had emerged, as well in an insightful article that included a discussion of Yan Geling by Taiwanese scholar Te-hsing Shan that appeared in *Multilingual America* two years before Feng’s article appeared (an article that Feng cites). But Feng’s essay, which focuses specifically on *Fu Sang*, and includes substantial passages from the novel translated by Feng into English, manages to dramatize these issues for the English reader in ways that Shan’s equally useful but more theoretical article did not. Even now, when the novel is widely available to English readers, there are still dimensions of it that this essay by a Taiwan-based, Chinese-speaking critic like Feng can illuminate in distinctive ways. For example, Feng’s 2000 article about the Taiwan publication of the book included an extended discussion of the significance of the iconography of the illustrations on the front and back covers of the book, noting that the illustrator has skillfully managed to “translate for us what has happened inside the text with visual language,” underlining the metamorphosis
undergone by its eponymous heroine, and also highlighting the character’s “transformation in terms of spatial location,” probing her relation to the geographical spaces of both China and San Francisco’s Chinatown. These illustrations, which Feng describes in detail, are not available to readers of the English-language editions of the novel that came out subsequently: the book’s British and U.S. publishers, presumably with their eyes on local markets, each selected different cover art.\(^{47}\)

Our understanding of the multicultural and multilingual traditions that inform American literature written in English, as well, can be greatly enriched by border-crossing scholarship. For example, Sanehide Kodama’s knowledge of Japanese, Chinese and English allow him to provide fresh insights into American writers’ use (and alleged misuse) of Chinese and Japanese sources in his book *American Poetry and Japanese Culture*.\(^{48}\)

Meanwhile, Kun Jong Lee’s work on the role of Korean shamanistic traditions as a context for Nora Okja Keller’s novel *Comfort Woman*, as well as Sung-Ae Lee’s examination of common cultural threads linking four recent novels by Korean-American women writers, remind us of the importance of being conversant with Korean religious, linguistic, social and cultural traditions if one wants to understand the English-language literature of Korean America.\(^{49}\) What role does literature by Korean-Americans play in Korea? What kinds of diasporic dialogue between the two countries is going on among contemporary writers and readers? Analogous questions might be asked about authors writing other diasporas, as well. For example, Niaz Zaman’s study of Pakistani responses to work by Pakistani-American writer Bapsi Sidhwa comes to mind. In an article titled “The Americanization of Bapsi Sidhwa,” *Bangladesh Journal of American Studies*, Zaman explores what Pakistani readers take from novels set in the U.S. by a writer whom Zaman considers “the foremost Pakistani novelist writing in English,” who now lives and writes in the U.S. Zaman notes the ways in which Sidhwa’s novel *An American Brat* “introduces Jews and the rituals of Judaism to her Pakistani readers,” and also “introduces the subject of lesbianism, a subject that in the sub-continent ‘nice’ girls don’t talk about.”\(^{50}\)

American writers with Chinese roots who write in English are increasingly being translated into Chinese, facilitating cross-border conversations with readers and critics in China and Taiwan. During recent years: Amy Tan, Shawn Wong, and Shirley Geok-lin Lim are a few of the writers who have been translated into Chinese and published in Taiwan.\(^{51}\) Taiwan’s first English-language monograph on Chinese American liter-

Asian American writers by definition embrace dual traditions—forms and themes they inherit from their precursors in American literature, and forms and themes drawn from their own or their forebears’ experiences in Asia. As the transnational becomes more salient in American Studies, we will appreciate the benefits of interleaving and interweaving perspectives of Asia-based critics of their work with those of U.S.-based critics. In her recent essay entitled “When Asian American Literature Leaves Home,” Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong outlines a rather dizzying array of new publications on Asian American literature from scholars based in Asia and in Europe. She writes that two Japanese scholars, “Teruyo Ueki and Fukuko Kobayashi, have edited an anthology of Chinese American women’s writing annotated in Japanese” and notes that “In Taiwan, the Institute of European and American Studies of the Academia Sinica has been holding biennial conferences on Chinese American literature since 1991 and publishing selected papers. . . .” And if Japanese critics are publishing work on Chinese American writers, some Taiwanese critics, such as Su-ching Huang, are publishing work on Japanese American writers. Although the U.S. may have been the site of the first wave of writing on Asian American literature, much of that work is now going on outside the U.S., particularly in Asia, with each community of scholars framing its own distinctive approaches to the field.

Since the early 90s, it has been clear that new critical questions can emerge when Asian scholars encounter Asian American literature.
Chinese readers of Maxine Hong Kingston and David Hwang, as John Deeney observed, expressed distress at these writers’ lack of familiarity with Chinese language and cultural traditions; furthermore, in their candor on topics such as colonial subjugation and sexism, Sau-ling Wong notes, these authors were seen as “literary laundrymen and women from Chinatown exposing their culture’s dirty linen in public.” They saw their writing “as a national disgrace for China and almost as a personal affront.”

One text can have very different meanings depending on whether it is viewed as an embarrassing milepost in literature of the Chinese diaspora, or whether it is viewed as a bold and enterprising appropriation and extension of U.S. literary traditions. The name of the central character in Kingston’s novel *Tripmaster Monkey, His Fake Book*—Wittman Ah Sing—gestures to both sides of the Pacific. Is the book handling Chinese literary traditions reductively, or embracing American literary traditions expansively? Or both? When I interviewed Kingston shortly after *Tripmaster Monkey, His Fake Book* came out, she emphasized her view of herself as an American writer, an heir to Walt Whitman and William Carlos Williams. Yet readers in China saw her as a writer creating literature of the Chinese diaspora.

Can one text be all of the above? Of course. Think of the optical illusion in which a figure is both a wine glass, on one view, and two people’s profiles, on another view. The image is the same. Our frame of reference for “reading” it is different. A similar process is at play when an Asian-American text is read in Asian or American contexts. Sau-ling Wong observes, for example, that “certain seemingly familiar details related to Chinese culture in Frank Chin’s works are, in a sense, faux amis or false cognates. Their superficial familiarity obscures the entire social, cultural and political matrix out of which the author operates and which profoundly alters their meaning. It is one thing for a Chinese living in Hong Kong to say Goong Hay Fat Choy to his friends at Chinese New Year. It is quite another for Donald Duk, the juvenile protagonist in Frank Chin’s eponymous novel, to be made to say Goong Hay Fat Choy in front of an Orientalist fetishist of a teacher and a class of white boys ready to mock his foreignness (Chin 1991, p. 34).”

The status of a text itself can also change as it crosses borders. Chih-ming Wang reminds us, for example, that “as a subcategory of American literature, Chinese American literature, though situated in US’s socio-cultural margins, becomes the mainstream after being transported across the Pacific. While the content is supposedly ‘Chinese,’ its style, language, and messages are unmistakably ‘American.’” Intrigu-
As the transnational becomes more central to American Studies, we will pay more attention to figures and texts who have been marginalized precisely because they crossed so many borders that they are hard to categorize. One key figure is Amérigo Paredes, a writer from the Texas-Mexico borderlands who has become increasingly canonical in Chicano studies in the U.S. for brilliant and innovative works of folklore and fiction. But as Ramón Saldívar demonstrates in his book *Borderlands of Culture*, which will be out in 2006, it was Paredes’ experiences as a journalist in Asia that seminally shaped his ideas about citizenship and belonging. In his “writings from the Far East as a reporter [for *Pacific Stars and Stripes*] and member of the U.S. army of occupation in Japan,” Saldívar tells us, Paredes explored ideas that indelibly shaped the folklore and fiction he wrote later. Occupied Japan offered him “an enormously fertile testing ground for his developing ideas on the relationships between culture, language, ethnicity, race, and national affiliation.” As he watched a nation negotiate the challenges of an era that, as Saldívar tells us, the Japanese “came to call ‘the confusion era,’” as he watched American and Japanese interact in new and unpredictable ways, the meeting of cultures that he witnessed and wrote about gave him a framework of thought that he would later apply to his work on the dynamics of the hybrid culture in which he grew up along the Texas-Mexico border.63

Saldívar tells us that “In all of his writings from postwar Japan, Paredes attempts to capture the despair of the exhausted and impoverished Japanese, their anguish and regret mixed with the birth of hope in strange new forms, in their sense of relief and simple joy at what Dower has called ‘the unexpected surcease of misery and death’ that came with the end of the war (Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, 38). What would this new postwar Asian world under American occupation look like? What shape would its political forms and social traditions take? How would its language, media, and arts evolve? What would it be like to live in a homeland suddenly inundated with white men who were now quietly but unmistakably in control? Who were these new Japanese? Paredes’ dispatches from the Occupation frontline [addressed] all of these questions.” Saldívar’s book, a superb example of transnational American Studies at its best, asks the question, of how Paredes’ “experiences as an American soldier, journalist, and humanitarian aid worker” in post-war
Japan “affect his understanding of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands.” Saldívar argues persuasively that this new transnational world that he was documenting in Japan afforded Paredes “a site from which to revise, refashion, and energize his consolidating understanding of the nature of cultural difference and of life in the borderlands of the postwar intercultural contact zones” that would inform his understanding of the borderlands in which he’d grown up.

Saldívar’s forthcoming book also reminds us of the pleasures of pursuing transnational American studies from a hemispheric rather than U.S.-centric standpoint when he recounts Paredes’ experience of hearing a Geisha “sing, in Japanese, of all things, ‘Lamento Gitano’ (Gypsy Lament) a bolero by one of the greatest Mexican popular composers of the mid-century, María Grever.”64 The geisha, as well as all assembled, refused to believe that the song wasn’t originally written in Japanese. “Unable to persuade his hosts,” Paredes “sings the Spanish lyrics of ‘Lamento Gitano.’” “How beautiful,” says his host, “And how odd that a Japanese song has been translated into Spanish. . . .” Back in Tokyo a few days later, he writes, “strolling the Ginza and browsing the black market stalls in search of a guitar . . . he comes across the sheet music for Lamento Gitano, in Japanese, translated into English, advertised as an American tune.” Noting that “Cultural interaction is not simply a one-way street,” Saldívar tells us that “Paredes makes the point that as much as Japan was beginning a process of Americanization, an equally necessary Japanization of American forms and ideas was underway.”

Another hard-to-categorize border-crossing figure—this time someone who crossed in the opposite direction from Paredes—is Ayako Ishigaki, a Japanese feminist writer and activist whose 1940 memoir Restless Wave: My Life in Two Worlds, the first book written in English by a Japanese woman, was recently republished and recovered by Yi-Chun Tricia Lin and Greg Robinson, with an instructive afterword. Ishigaki immigrated to the U.S. in the 1920s, and in the 20s and 30s interpreted Japanese culture for Americans; then, when she returns to Japan during the Occupation, she interprets American culture for the Japanese. But if her exposure to American democratic ideals spurs her to an early critique of Japanese militarism, her awareness of the gaps between the ideals of democracy and the practice of it in the U.S.—particularly the racism that it tolerates—prompt her to share with her fellow-Japanese a sharp critique of the moral failings of postwar America. Paredes and Ishigaki, border-crossers whose insights were shaped by their move-
ments between Asia and the U.S., deserve more attention as the field of American Studies takes a transnational turn.65

And if border-crossing individuals are receiving more attention, so are the border-crossing implications of American laws. The September 2005 issue of American Quarterly, for example, whose focus is legal borderlands, includes a fascinating article by Teemu Ruskola entitled, “Canton Is Not Boston: The Invention of American Imperial Sovereignty,” which illuminates a little-known chapter of what Ruskola refers to as non-territorial American legal imperialism.66 The assumption that Americans, even when they were in China, could not possibly be held subject to Chinese law led to the creation in 1906 of “United States Court for China.” Any American accused of committing a crime against a Chinese person in China was triable “only by the consul or any other public functionary of the United States thereto authorised according to the laws of the United States.” Appeals from the court were directed to the Ninth Judicial Circuit in San Francisco, with further appeals to the United States Supreme Court in Washington, D.C.67 Ruskola brings to life this buried chapter of American legal history, when the U.S. Court of China, whose jurisdictional borders were contiguous with that of the Empire of China, was described, by one of its judges, as “territorially the largest district of our Federal Court system.” Sometimes the U.S. legal system had an unexpected indirect impact on an Asian society. Danika Medak-Saltzman, for example, is investigating how U.S. legislation regarding Indian land—specifically the Dawes Act of 1887, which created the allotment system—may have influenced the Japanese government’s treatment of its own indigenous people. Her dissertation entitled Colonial Reaches, Indigenous Erasure: Indian Policy and Uncle Sam’s Hand in Japan’s “Expansion” into Ainu Lands and Lives (1854–1912), examines “the hypothesis that Japan sought American expertise when deciding to take over the homelands of the Indigenous Ainu people and lay claim to Hokkaido, the now northernmost island of Japan.” It will endeavor to show “how the United States exported its American Indian Policy in general, and the Dawes Act in particular, to aid Japan in its colonization efforts.”68

The impact of the U.S. military, as well as the U.S. legal system on societies around the world when it’s off duty as well as on-duty, is likely to be studied increasingly, as well, as transnational concerns play an increasing role in scholars’ research agendas. The contact zones surrounding U.S. military bases are addressed in Beyond the Shadow of
Carmitown by Ji-Yeon Yuh and Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia by Saundra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stoltzfus.69

Bringing the transnational into American Studies creates space for the comparative study of a range of social justice movements in different locations: Ryoko Kurihara’s comparative work on the U.S. and Japanese suffrage movements, comes to mind, and Laura Hein’s comparative discussion of reparations movements in Japan and the U.S.70 The transnational turn in American Studies also invites us to examine issues of public memory in comparative perspective, examining the ways in which the public memory of transnational episodes in America’s past is constructed through commemoration, monument and historical narrative.71 Several recent books have focused attention, for example, on challenges facing American efforts to memorialize the internment experience. Elena Tajima Creef’s book Imaging Japanese America: The Visual Construction of Citizenship, Nation, and the Body, probes these challenges in useful detail, and this topic is also the subject of Marita Sturken’s essay, “Absent Images of Memory: Remembering and Reenacting the Japanese Internment” in the book Perilous Memories edited by Fujitani, White, and Yoneyama. As the book Perilous Memories makes clear, the U.S. is not the only nation struggling with how to address painful, conflict-ridden chapters of the past involving World War II. In the U.S., these struggles have taken shape over controversies surrounding the Enola Gay exhibit at the National Air and Space Museum in Washington, and the exhibition on “America’s Concentration Camps” at the Japanese American National Museum in Los Angeles.72 But the larger issue of who gets to write the narrative of World War II is the same one that has animated conflicts over the treatment of this history in classrooms in both countries. In Japan, the controversies over textbooks have arisen from the post-War era through the present.73 In the U.S. these controversies may be a bit more recent. But when a school district in the state of Washington state was accused of whitewashing the internment experience last year, and when a journalists asserted that the internment was actually a good thing, long-simmering tensions began to explode.74 How are painful and often embarrassing chapters of history best dealt with in history textbooks, monuments, and museums?75 Perhaps the transnational turn in American Studies will foster more comparative examinations of these issues, exploring ways in which textbooks in both countries have dealt with phenomena such as the U.S. imperialist designs on the Philippines...
and Japan’s imperialist designs on China and Korea; or the U.S.’s displacement of thousands of Japanese Americans in internment camps during World War II and Japan’s use of Korean women as “comfort women” for Japanese soldiers in that era. A comparative study of how both democratic nations have handled the challenge of redress, reparation and apology for past injustice would be likely to yield instructive perspectives on the battles over history on both sides of the Pacific.76

As the transnational grows more central to American Studies we will welcome investigations of the broad array of cultural crossroads shaping the work of border-crossing authors, artists and cultural forms that straddles multiple regional and national traditions. One example from literature is Ursula Heise’s recent look at the ways in which novels by Karen Tei Yamashita, a Japanese American writer who spent almost a decade in Brazil, “weave their storylines around transfers and migrations between the United States, Latin America and Japan and draw on North American multicultural writing and Latin American magical realism as well as, to a lesser extent on the techno-postmodernism that flourished in both the U.S. and Japan from the 1980s onward.”77 Another example is the body of criticism that has grown about Dictée by Theresa Hak Kyung Cha. Critical studies by Elaine Kim, Laura Kang, Fukuko Kobayashi, Kun Jong Lee, and others have helped us understand this multilingual, border-crossing text that includes, in addition to English, bits of Chinese, Japanese, French, Greek, Latin and Han-gul, and that was shaped by the author’s encounter, as Kobayashi puts it, with “Japanese colonialism, Korean militarism, U. S. imperialistic intervention into Korea leading to the Korean War and the country’s subsequent division into North and South, Cha’s immigration with her mother to Hawaii and to California, where she was to undergo the common process of assimilation, her graduate study in France, and her sojourn in Korea, where she was treated as a cultural Other.”78

As the transnational grows more central to American Studies, we will also pay more attention to contemporary border-crossing figures in the visual arts like those included in the exhibit “On the Edge: Contemporary Chinese Artists Encounter the West” organized by and mounted at Cantor Center for Visual Arts at Stanford University in 2005. The stunning exhibit, curated by Britta Erickson, includes work from the 1980s and 1990s by artists involved in the recent “Political Pop” art movement in China, who “[defuse] potent political imagery” by fusing it with “an American pop sensibility” indebted to Andy Warhol, Roy
Lichtenstein and others to critique the “current condition of Chinese culture.”

“A major Political Pop project, for example, was the visual deconstruction of Mao, undertaken by” artists including Yu Youhan, Li Shan, Liu Dahon, Zhang Hongtu and others. Erickson notes that “this desecration coincided with the Mao Craze, a popular movement that accorded Mao the kind of fond fervor reserved for Elvis in the West,” helping to bring “Mao down from his pedestal and [expose] the relationship that had existed between him and the Chinese people as bizarre.” How might we understand the iconic images of Mao painted on multiple cartons of Quaker Oats, itself an iconic image of America, by Zhang Hongtu in his the installation entitled “Long Live Chairman Mao”? What does this work seem to suggest about the ways in which national icons and commercial images both “marketed” in the service of politics or commerce? Or how might we understand the blending of prominent consumer brand logos for Coca-Cola, Canon and Marlboro with iconic socialist realism propaganda art by Wang Guangyi in his “Great Criticism” series? What do Wang Guangyi’s implied equation between socialist propaganda and American advertising say to audiences in China and in the U.S.?

American Studies scholars who study consumer culture have tended to limit their focus to the meanings of consumer goods by those who purchase and use them, most often in the U.S. or Europe. But the striking series of photographs in On the Edge by Chinese artist Xing Danwen entitled “disCONNEXION,” reminds us that that the afterlife of those consumer goods may be worth attending to, as well. Noting that seventy percent of the world’s electronic trash is exported to China, where whole villages build their economies around the salvage of wires, cell phones, and circuit boards mainly from the U.S., Xing photographed massive piles of electronic waste in Chinese villages in 2002 and 2003. Xing, who studied photography in the U.S. from 1998 to 2000 in New York before subsequently moving back to China, captures hauntingly strange yet familiar images that help focus our attention on the global environmental impact of a consumer culture promoted principally, if not exclusively, by the U.S.

Intriguing questions are raised, as well by the 2002 performance piece “My New York” by the border-crossing Chinese performance artist Zhang Huan, commissioned by the Whitney Museum of Art in New York, and recorded in still photographs and video. Acknowledging, in the wake of 9/11, the strength of the people of New York, Zhang attached strips of raw beef to his body in a manner that gave him the bulging mus-
cles of a “Mr. Olympic Body Builder” and strode through Manhattan streets releasing doves along the way, blending this display of strength with the Buddhist idea of “accruing grace through the freeing of living animals.” Zhang explained his performance piece as reflecting his belief that “the United States should take on the role of peacemaker, using its might to promote compassion.” But isn’t the jarring rawness of his meat-covered body striding forcefully through the streets of New York as much a reminder of how exposed and vulnerable this particular colossus of might and power actually is? Exhibits like the Cantor’s *On the Edge*, as well as the exhibit titled *The American Effect* at the Whitney in 2003 suggest some of the ways in which transnational perspectives on the part of visual artists can enrich our understanding of the complex, multivalent responses to American culture and American power around the world.

While transnational visual culture by innovative artists like those represented in *On the Edge* can spark intriguingly fresh critical perspectives, as I’ve discussed, Shirley Geok-Lin Lim reminds us in a disturbing and important article in *American Studies International* in 2002 that other aspects of the transnational visual culture are taking a frightening toll on Asian women. Anorexia nervosa and bulimia, serious eating disorders that can be life-threatening, are widely viewed as stemming in large part from women’s aspirations to unrealistic body images promoted by the fashion, music and entertainment media and by advertising. These disorders were not unknown in Asia, but until recently were much more prevalent in the U.S. Today, Lim tells us, these eating disorders strike “1 in 100 Japanese women, which is also the incidence reported in the United States. . . . Cases of self-starvation have spread to diverse ethnic and classed women in Singapore, Hong Kong, and Seoul in the past five years, and are now cropping up in Shanghai, Taipei, Beijing and countries such as India, Pakistan and the Philippines.” Lim also observes that Asian women, like women in the U.S., also increasingly seek dangerous, unnecessary plastic surgery to conform to these mass-produced, Caucasian body images. Lim notes that “this phenomenon is not simply a matter of gross Westernization or modernization,” but rather points, as well, to “the globalization of a patriarchal visual culture in which women’s bodies and appearances are homogenized and fetishized as child-like or waif-like, subordinate, vulnerable, and thus easily regulated.” Lim argues that although a range of culture-specific factors reinforce body images that are damaging women’s health, the
global spread of visual images drawn from American media and advertising play an increasingly deleterious role. Lim writes that “in Asian-descent communities and in Asian countries, women are increasingly dying in the roles of starved little girls, like their Western counterparts. Women of Asian descent also have differently inflected pressures on them: to achieve not simply idealized forms of beauty but impossibly racialized norms that undermine national and communal, as well as personal, identities.” As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American Studies, I hope that the understanding the impact of the “globalized commodification of images” of women’s bodies will be, too.

As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American Studies, we will also welcome research focusing on the cultural work that American literature does in a range of social and political contexts around the world. For example, we learn from Leo Oufan Lee that Lin Shu, who translated Uncle Tom’s Cabin into Chinese in 1901, presented the book to Chinese readers as a cautionary tale about America’s treatment of people of color, telling his readers that “Recently the treatment of blacks in America has been carried over to yellow people.” And as the transnational becomes increasingly central to American Studies we will welcome studies that probe the cultural work of American literature outside the U.S. for insight into the non-U.S. cultures—as well as into the American texts themselves. In the just-published book, Mark Twain and Japan, for example, Tsuyoshi Ishihara’s exploration of what Japanese writer Kuni Sasaki changed and omitted when he translated Twain’s Huckleberry Finn into Japanese in 1921 tells us much about Japanese anti-black prejudice. Ishihara demonstrates that “many significant scenes in the original book that show Jim’s dignity and humanity were deleted in Sasaki’s translation.” Sasaki also misread or mistranslated passages that emphasize the pain Jim feels at being separated from his children. Furthermore, Sasaki “tended to disregard Twain’s satirical attacks on racism and slavery,” altering or deleting “Twain’s most vivid depictions of racism in the slaveholding South” such as “Pap Finn’s famous ‘free nigger’ speech.” The omissions and distortions that Ishihara tracks lend vivid support (as he notes) to Japanese historians Masao Miyoshi’s claims about the development of anti-black prejudice in Japan—something the Japanese learned from encounters with Americans. Ishihara’s examination of how Sasaki, an author known for having “a more liberal and democratic mindset than most of his contemporaries”
nonetheless shared his peers’ entrenched racism and transmitted it to the next generation is illuminating. Ishihara also explores what a 1939 adaptation of Mark Twain’s *Prince and the Pauper*—a novel by Jiro Osaragi entitled *Hanamaru Kotorimaru*—reveals about the rigidity of class hierarchy and patriarchy in Imperial Japan; in another chapter he examines what the changes and cuts made by Japanese translators of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huck Finn* during the American occupation after World War II show about postwar moral anxieties and confusion.89

If Mark Twain provided the Japanese not only with a way to explore issues of hierarchy, freedom, tradition, and morality in their own society, Walt Whitman turns out to have acted as an intermediary who helped reattach a noted Chinese writer to his own Taoist roots, and also played a role in shaping Chinese literary modernism.90 Biographies of famous figures in American history can do “cultural work” in a transnational context as well, as we learn from Scott Wong’s intriguing discussion of the biography of George Washington in China. Scott Wong’s deft understanding of both Chinese and U.S. sources allows him to generate surprising insights into how Washington’s life story was pressed into the service of a range of political agendas in China from the 1850s through the end of the 19th century.91

Hitomi Nabae asks equally fascinating questions in her survey of the reception and translation of Henry James in Japan. Among other insights, she observes that the roots of some aspects of the Japanese language today may lie in nineteenth-century efforts to translate writers like James. James’ first translator, Nabae notes, professor and literary critic Tenjin (Shin) Katagami published his translation of James’ 1896 story, “The Way it Came” in 1909 in *Waseda Bungaku*. Nabae writes that “Translating pronouns into Japanese was problematic, because they did not originally exist in Japanese. In fact, the pronouns we use now in Japanese were the products of translation in the nineteenth century. For example, in ‘The Way It Came,’ Katagami translated ‘she’ as ‘that woman,’ ‘that person’ or ‘that one’ according to the context and depending on the gender of the speaker. He was apparently searching for a way to create a concept of a woman as a speaking and acting subject.” Translating James helped introduce the idea of “a woman as a speaking and acting subject” into Japanese. Nabae uses the history of Japanese translations of James as a lens through which to examine changing perspectives on interpretation, pedagogy, and language in Japan, as well as
Japanese literary scholars’ ideas about the West. In other words, she shows us how much we can learn about 20th century Japan by understanding how Japanese writers, teachers, and critics assimilated James.92

We need to understand the cultural work that forms originating in the U.S. do in cultures outside the U.S., studying their reception and reconfiguration in contexts informed by a deep understanding of the countries where that cultural work is taking place. One interesting model for this kind of work is Aviad Raz’s study of the ways in which the Japanese “Japanized” Disneyland in his book Riding the Black Ship.93 (Another would be a book that I long to read, but can’t, until it is translated into English—and that is Masako Notoji’s best-selling study of Tokyo’s Disneyland.)94 Priya Joshi’s recent prize-winning book on the impact that 19th century British books exported to India had on 20th century Indian writing suggests the value of pursuing analogous work regarding the impact of American literature on a range of cultures in which it was available.95 Although there has been no systematic study of the influence of American literature on Indian writers comparable to Joshi’s work on the influence of British writers, there is at least one article on the topic by Kaiser Haq, which looks at the influence of American writing on “Bengali and Indo-Anglian Poetry.”96 The cultural work done by U.S. popular culture abroad—how American television, film, the internet, rock, and popular music help societies outside the U.S. negotiate aspects of their own cultures—is a topic that will increasingly interest us, as well. Cultural imperialism turns out to be too simple a model to understand how culture works, as much of the scholarship I cite here conveys.97

As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American Studies, we will value contemporary scholarship that probes the vectors of tourism and the commodification of culture and heritage from multiple vantage points, examining the matrix of factors that produce any given interaction and that shape its impact. In her new book Longfellow’s Tatoos: Tourism, Collecting and Japan, for example, Christine Guth probes visual and material culture to explore how American travelers to Japan in the 1860s and 70s appropriated Japanese products to fashion themselves as Americans, and offers new perspectives on American and Japanese constructions of masculinity.98 A good example of transnational American Studies focused on late 20th century travel and tourism is Night Market: Sexual Cultures and the Thai Economic Miracle by Ryan Bishop and Lillian Robinson,99 which examines the “cultural, historical, material, and textual roles the U.S. played in the establishment
of the international sex tourism industry in Thailand, an industry central to that country’s ‘economic miracle.’” Yet another good example—this time focusing on Asian travelers to the U.S. rather than U.S. travelers to Asia, is a recent article by Yujin Yaguchi and Mari Yoshihara on Japanese tourist discourse on Hawai‘i.

As the transnational becomes more central to American Studies, scholars are increasingly exploring the consumption of culture-specific cuisines in global contexts, as well, looking at the culinary sphere as a terrain on which a range of values are negotiated. For example, Sangmee Bak explores the construction of Korean identity by studying responses to McDonald’s in Seoul, while Rüdiger Kunow examines the Indian Diaspora in the U.S. by studying the ways in which food functions in a range of contemporary texts as a “janus-faced signifier, pointing to the ‘here’ of diasporic life worlds as at the same time as it gestures to the ‘there’ of a home” to which one really cannot return. Meanwhile, Su-ching Huang explores “gastronomic mobility and model minority discourse in David Wong Louie’s Novel The Barbarians Are Coming.” And Wilfried Raussert, Rachel Lee and others have looked at the ways in which characters in Mei Ng’s novel Eating Chinese Food Naked work through issues of personal identity through their consumption of food. As Raussert put it, the main character’s “experiments with cooking as well as her multicultural eating experiences encompassing Chinese, Chinese-American, Jewish, Italian and fast food go hand in hand with her various heterosexual and homosexual adventures...” reflecting the challenges of embracing “a desire for bodily pleasures on the one hand and a hunger for identification on the other” in her efforts to determine who she really is.

While most Americanists in the U.S. today reject celebratory narratives of American exceptionalism and nationalism, viewing earlier proponents of them as blinkered and benighted, many have a curious complacency about something that may strike future generations as equally benighted: an intellectual provincialism that is just as problematical. If the old exceptionalist, nationalist scholarship privileged the U.S. as a unique repository of progress and wisdom, many today privilege the work of U.S.-based scholars in an analogous way. As John Carlos Rowe has noted, “Even when we are dealing with international phenomena, such as imperialism, economic trade, and immigration and diaspora, we continue to rely on examples and authors from within the continental United States.” The rich array of border-crossing, transnational scholarship...
that I’ve cited here should convey the pitfall of the assumption that U.S.-based scholars are responsible for the only American Studies scholarship that matters, and that and that whatever American academics do not know can’t possibly be worth knowing. One of my favorite Yiddish proverbs is: “Der vor(e)m in khreyn denkt az s’iz zis.”108 “The worm in horseradish thinks [his life] is sweet.” How does he know? How can U.S.-based scholars have any perspective on their subject of study if they talk only to themselves? I do not want to privilege or essentialize location as a key determinant of the kind or quality of scholarship a person is likely to produce. What I do want to do, however is interrogate the privileged position that U.S.-based scholars and publications enjoy in the field of American Studies.

For example, there are many useful American Studies anthologies published outside the U.S. For example, The United States in Times of War and Peace, edited by Zhou Baodi and published in Beijing 2005 includes such interesting articles as “A Comparison of G.W. Bush’s Inaugural Speeches, 2001 and 2005” by Zhou Zhen, “From Korean War to Iraq War: Change of American Attitude Toward Dover Test” by Cai Chuihong, and “Multilingualism or Unilingualism?—A Historical Review of the National Language Policies in the United States” by Wang Shijing.109 Rediscovering America edited by Kousar J. Azam and published in 2001 in New Delhi includes a stimulating discussion of the internationalization of American Studies from an Indian perspective by Azam, as well as such interesting contributions as Prafulla Kar’s overview of American Studies in India, R.S. Sharma’s discussion of the global impact of the World’s Parliament of Religions at the World Columbian Exposition, Sukhbir Singh’s look at the influence of Hinduism on several post-modern American novelists, Isaac Siqueira’s reading of the rituals of the Super Bowl, and Rui Kohiyama’s study of American Christian women’s campaign to establish women’s colleges in China, India and Japan in the 1910s and 1920s.110 Another interesting book, Crossed Memories: Perspectives on 9/11 and American Power, edited by Laura Hein and Daizaburo Yui published in Tokyo 2003, includes Yusheng Yang’s examination of Mao Tse-tung’s views of the United States and Yujin Yaguchi’s article on Japanese responses to the Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor.111

There are also a number of American Studies journals published outside the U.S. of which U.S.-based Americanists need to be more aware. One of the most important publications on Mark Twain this year is the
inaugural issue of a new Japanese journal called *Mark Twain Studies* edited by Takayuki Tatsumi, that came out in October. In a fascinating article in the journal entitled “‘Was Huck *Burak(k)u*?’ Reading and Teaching Twain in Asian Pacific World Literature,” Mary Knighton probes how Japanese novelist Kenzaburo Oe recasts Twain’s novel *Huck Finn* in his novella “Prize Stock” in ways that engage Japan’s treatment of the “burakumin,” a formerly discriminated-against and segregated outcast class. The journal also includes Tatsumi’s discussion of the role that Twain’s novel *Connecticut Yankee* plays in an important Japanese nonfiction novel about the Vietnam War. One of the most lucid and helpful discussions of the evolution of Asian American fiction was an article that appeared in 2002 in the journal of the Japanese Association for American Studies, the *Japanese Journal of American Studies* in 2002: Fukuko Kobayashi article on “Producing Asian American Spaces.” (An extensive but incomplete listing of international American Studies journals—including journals from Bangladesh, China, India, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan—with web links to many, appears on the website of *American Quarterly*, the journal of the American Studies Association as well as the “International Initiative” web page of the ASA. The ASA is planning to develop these links in the future, making it easier for Americanists around the world to access the broad range of journals published in the field, including the increasing number of relevant journals in Asia.)

Conversation and collaboration across borders are key dimensions of making American Studies more transnational. We can do much to improve and build on the array of existing institutional structures—from Fulbright grants to other forms of student-faculty exchanges to links through distance learning technology to ASA International Partnership Grants and the ASA’s International Initiative. A government-supported entity like the Fulbright Program continues to be a potentially excellent resource for U.S. and international scholars. An increased awareness of the impressive array of important work being done in American Studies outside the U.S. should make U.S.-based scholars traveling abroad on Fulbrights welcome the chance to listen and learn rather than pontificate as “expert witnesses” on the U.S. just because we happen to live there; foreign hosts and students may know more on specific topics than we do. International scholars who have come to the U.S. on Fulbrights are producing some of the most interesting books coming out of U.S. University presses—like Etsuko Taketani’s 2003 book *U.S. Women Writers*.
and the Discourses of Colonialism, 1825–1861 or Tsuyoshi Ishihara’s 2005 book Mark Twain in Japan. Other forms of student-faculty exchanges can also do much to foster transnational collaboration. For example, Jay Mechling of the University of California at Davis teaches a freshman seminar on “Violence and Culture in the U.S. and Japan” simultaneously at UC-Davis and Hosei University in Tokyo, using instructional technology for distance learning; the readings and the students come from both Japan and the U.S., and students in both countries share their thoughts through electronic discussion postings. We can also try simpler ventures linking our classrooms across the Pacific. Tsuyoshi Ishihara and I have our students read the same story or novel the same week, and email each other questions and responses. The ASA International Partnership grants are also designed to foster collaboration and communication between American Studies programs in the U.S. and outside the U.S. (Partnership grants have been approved linking U.S. programs with programs in Austria, China, Israel, the Republic of Georgia, Russia, Spain and the West Bank—but not with any programs in Asia yet, outside of China. A new round of ASA international partnership grants will be awarded this year, and I hope some will link U.S. programs with institutions in other parts of Asia.)

All of these efforts will be unnecessarily limited, however, unless we also manage to change the culture of the profession. U.S.-based scholars have to engage with scholarship published outside the U.S. and we need to require our students to do the same. We also need to seek opportunities to interact with scholars outside the U.S. in person. Exchanges at conferences can be incubators for collaborative research projects, publications and courses. We cannot predict which conversations, correspondence, or encounters will plant seeds that will bear fruit some day. What we can do is remain open to what Annette Kolodny calls “the serendipity of scholarship” as we struggle to understand the transnational crossroads of cultures that confront us in American Studies. U.S.-based Americanists should eschew imperial ambitions in our scholarship as readily as we condemn them in U.S. politics; reluctant to impose our own perspectives on others who may not share them, we should learn to listen more and talk less. U.S.-based American Studies scholars need to make an effort to connect with scholars outside the U.S. through all of these channels—in print and in person.

I have a personal reason for wanting to see that happen. It has to do with the debt I owe to scholars and writers outside the U.S. who have
been central to my own work. A conversation with University of Tokyo professor Masako Notoji in 1994 at an international committee reception of the ASA totally derailed my research agenda in enormously fruitful ways. Notoji, who was researching American theme parks and historic sites, had been regaling me with stories of the half-dozen historic sites in the United States she’d just visited, one of which was Hannibal, Missouri. I confessed I had never been there. She was incredulous. “You haven’t been to Hannibal? And you work on Mark Twain?” “But you must go,” she scolded. “It’s that simple: you must go.” I decided she was right. I went. I knew that Hannibal’s economy was built on Mark Twain tourism. But not until I followed Notoji’s advice and went there for myself did I realize how shamefully the town was whitewashing both America’s past and ignoring what mattered most about Mark Twain. My book *Lighting Out for the Territory* was the result. Key parts of that book came directly out of conversations I had with Japanese Nobel Laureate Kenzaburo Oe (whose discussion of my book in a column in *Asahi Shimbun* gratified me enormously). The book was also shaped by correspondence with scholars in China and India, as well as other scholars in Japan. Asian scholars continue to have a major impact on my research agenda. It was when I gave the keynote talk at a conference organized by Zhou Baodi of Yunnan University in Kunming, China in June 2005 that I was first struck by the importance of increasing international awareness of Mark Twain’s “The War Prayer.” And it was when I went to Kyoto to deliver the keynote talk at the Japanese Association of American Studies conference later that week that I was able to do something to make that happen: a conversation with Takayuki Tatsumi of Keio University at a JAAS reception led to a fruitful collaborative project that we hope will involve many scholars from Asia, the U.S., and other parts of the world. Visits I made to conferences and universities in Kyoto and Tokyo in 1999, in Seoul and Shanghai in 2004 and in Kunming, Kyoto, Tokyo, Seoul and Taipei in 2005, and visits from Asian scholars to ASA meetings in the U.S. set in motion correspondence and conversations that have enriched my understandings of Asian Crossroads in American Studies in enormously fruitful ways. This essay—indeed, much of my insight into the importance of transnational American Studies today—comes from those interactions.

Reading Thoreau helped inspire Gandhi to develop his own brand of civil disobedience, which crossed the Pacific to inspire the Civil Rights Movement; the idea of dissent through civil disobedience as particularly
American resurfaced in Asia when Tiananmen square protesters used the Statue of Liberty as a symbol. The story of this apparently “American” phenomena—civil disobedience—is a story of transnational flow, as is the story of America itself. The U.S. is and has always been a transnational crossroads of cultures. And that crossroads of cultures that we refer to as “American culture” has itself generated a host of other crossroads of cultures as it has crossed borders between the U.S. and Asia. I wrote this essay sitting in my living room, in a Japanese-style house on the Stanford campus, designed in the 1950s by an architect who drew his inspiration from, among others, Frank Lloyd Wright, who drew his inspiration, in part, from a Japanese exhibit at the World Columbian Exposition, as well as subsequent trips to Japan.\(^\text{124}\) I hope that the transnational turn in American Studies will help us continue to explore some of the U.S.-Asian crossroads I’ve discussed here in all their richness and complexity.

**NOTES**

This paper was given at the Annual Meeting of the Japanese Association for American Studies, Kyoto University, 4 June 2005.


\(^2\) “Emerson, Thoreau, and Alcott were especially attracted to Oriental philosophy and religion, reading in translations available to them and copying favorite passages (from Confucius, Laws of Menu, Hinduism, Buddhism, and more) into their personal notebooks and from there into the *Dial*, their prose and poetry [see Emerson’s *Hamatreya*, *Saadi*, and *Brahma*, for example.] Tracking these influences can be difficult, as David Ch’en’s essay on Thoreau and Taoism shows. See also “East Meets West: Oriental Seeds in Occidental Soil,” by Swami B. G. Narasingha and Satyaraja dasa (Steven Rosen), http://www.vcu.edu/engweb/transcendentalism/roots/rootsintro.html, accessed 17 November 2005. See also http://www.gosai.com/chaitanya/saranagati/html/nmj_articles/east_west/, accessed 17 November 2005.

\(^3\) For an image of “one of the set of ten color prints [by Cassatt] inspired by the 1890 Paris exhibition of Japanese woodblock prints,” see “From the Artist’s Studio: Unknown Prints and Drawings by Mary Cassatt,” November 10-December 29, 2000, Mark Rosen Fine Art, Ltd., http://www.marcrosenfineart.com/pages/cassattpages/cassattexhcat.html, accessed 6 May 2005. Although Japanese woodblock prints may have been the form of Japanese art that had the greatest influence on Cassatt, she is known to have collected other Japanese art, as well. On exhibit at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, for example, is “Autumn Flowers,” by Kitagawa Sosetsu, which came from Cassatt’s personal collection. This mid-seventeenth-century ink-and-colors on paper painting mounted on a
six-fold screen depicted (according to the descriptive card in the display case), “ivy, bush clover, mallow, cockscomb, and grasses,” and the artist to whom it was attributed was “a disciple of Tawaraya Sosetsu, who was either a younger brother, son, or disciple of the famed early seventeenth-century Rimpaschool painter Tawaraya Sosatsu.” I viewed this object at the museum on October 29, 2005.


6 “‘Miya sama, miya sama / On n’ma no mayé ni / Pira-Pira suru no wa / Nan gia na / Toko tonyaré tonyaré na?’—This is a legitimate Japanese song and was of fairly recent composition when Gilbert appropriated it for The Mikado. A war song of the Japanese Imperial Army, it was sung by the loyalist troops who put down a rebellion in 1877. Translations vary.” http://members.aol.com/gsvloc/mik_glo1.htm, accessed 6 May 2005.

7 Hitomi Nabae’s research, discussed below, addresses the ways in which translations of American authors into Japanese reshaped Japanese language in the nineteenth century. The influence of Walt Whitman on Chinese poets is also discussed below. John Listopad, curator of Asian Art at Stanford University, has noted that although Protestant missionaries made few converts in 19th century Thailand, they did manage to spark a number of transformations in Thai Buddhism (personal communication, spring 2004).


See José David Saldívar, Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

Transnational questions inform crossroads involving other parts of the world, as well, and I have addressed some of these other crossroads in my Presidential Address to the American Studies Association. See Shelley Fisher Fishkin, “Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004,” American Quarterly, 57:1 (March 2005): 17–57.


24 The most important book addressing this body of work is Jim Zwick, Mark Twain’s Weapons of Satire: Anti-Imperialist Writings on the Philippine American War (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1992).


31 Mark Twain’s “Goldsmith’s Friend Abroad Again,” was serialized in Galaxy in October 1870, November 1870, and January 1871. Twain begins each of the three serializations with the following: “NOTE.—No experience is set down in the following letters which had to be invented. Fancy is not needed to give variety to the history of a Chinaman’s sojourn in America. Plain fact is amply sufficient.” The series of letters are reprinted in Mark Twain: Collected Tales, Sketches, Speeches, & Essays, 1852–1890, ed. Louis J. Budd (New York: Library of America, 1992), and are available online at http://www.twainquotes.com/Galaxy/gindex.html. Goldsmith himself took the device from Persian Letters (1721) by Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, which inspired other works in this vein as well.


33 Louis Chu’s 1961 Eat a Bowl of Tea is widely cited as the first Chinese-American novel set in Chinese America.


36 Referring to yet another body of literature that has not made its way into American Studies, Chih-ming Wang suggests that “Re-examining the popular genre known as liuxuesheng wenxue (literature of the overseas students) in the 1960s and 1970s would help us map out a different set of Asian/American relations,” and would be a fruitful subject for critical inquiry. Wang explores some of the issues this body of literature raises in “Feeling Asian America in Taiwan.” (Wang, “Feeling Asian America in Taiwan,” 4). Discussions of this literature in Chinese that Wang cites include David Der-wei Wang, Xiaoshuo Zhongguo: wanqing dao dangdai de zhongwen xiaoshuo (Taipei: Maitian, 1993), and Dai Jinghua, Jingsheng Dingxiu: Dangdai wenhua xuzie yu yanjiu (Taipei: Lianhe wenxue, 1999). Some of these texts are also discussed in the monograph cited below by Xiao-huang Yin.

37 Xiao-huang Yin, Chinese American Literature since the 1850s (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2000).


47 Feng writes “Fu Sang’s power of transformation is perhaps most clearly represented by the two illustrations on the book jacket. The front cover portrays the back of a naked woman stranded on a bare rock, with a sampan sailing away from her. This picture visualizes Fu Sang’s sense of extreme isolation and vulnerability after her involuntary voyage across the Pacific. On the back, however, we see a smiling woman dressed in a formal Chinese outfit of the late nineteenth century. Instead of the bare rock, this woman is standing on an open shell, posing as Botticelli’s Venus. Between these two cover drawings, the illustrator has skillfully translated for us what has happened inside the text with visual language; we see how Fu Sang has metamorphosed from a slave woman into a goddess of love. It is also interesting that the illustrator chooses to highlight Fu Sang’s transformation in terms of spatial location. This brings us to the issue of space in the novel. Throughout the text, Fu Sang is exoticized not only in visual codes but also in spatial terms and her otherness is always demarcated by spatial and geographic references. Even in the Chinese community she is an ‘other’ because she comes from an
inland province instead of the oceanic Canton, where most of the early immigrants came from. Physically, Fu Sang has always been locked inside Chintaown, a miniature replication of the ‘mysterious Orient’ that is full of evil and corruption in the land of freedom. Her alien features, including her bound feet, personify the ‘inscrutability’ of the Orient, at least to Chris: ‘Every move of this oriental woman surprised him. She is the demonic Orient in his mind’ (101). During the raid, her violated body comes to symbolize the devastated Chinatown. As seen from the sand and phoenix metaphors, her exploited body is transformed into a space in which she could achieve inner freedom and rise above restrictions imposed by any spatial institution. Out of her objectified and exploited body, the author creates a utopian ‘her-land’ for Fu Sang. In this textually constructed space, Fu Sang finally finds a space to which she belongs. No longer is she the enslaved waif stranded in an alien country but she has become the heroine of a new Chinese American myth.” (Feng, “Re-mapping,” 67–68). The covers of the British edition of the novel and the American edition of the novel are completely different, and Feng’s reading of the visual iconography would not be possible without the original Chinese-language edition. The front cover of the Chinese-language first edition of the book may be seen at http://www.bookswindow.com/Asianbook/BookImages/957081585x.jpg, accessed 30 September 2005. The front cover of the English-language British edition may be seen at http://i3.yesasia.com/assets/84/776/p1003977684.jpg, accessed 30 September 2005. The front cover of the English-language American edition may be seen at http://images.amazon.com/images/P/0786866543.01._SCTZZZZZZZ_.jpg, accessed 30 September 2005.


51 Taiwanese scholars Wen-Ching Ho and Joan Chung-Huei Chang translated (respectively) Shawn Wong’s *Homebase* and Shirley Geok-lin Lim’s *Among the White Moon Faces* into Chinese in the 1990s, and many of Amy Tan’s works were also translated and published in Taiwan in the 1990s, as well. Chih-ming Wang notes that “At the same time, more Chinese American writers got introduced: Eric Liu’s *The Accidental Asian* and Adeline Ma’s *Falling Leaves* are two of the successful cases. Besides the translated works, immigrant writers are also highly regarded during this period: Yan Geling, Hong Ying, Ha Jin, and Gao Xingjian are popular overseas ‘Chinese’ writers.” (Chih-ming Wang, “Feeling Asian American in Taiwan,” 8).
52 Pin-chia Feng, “The Multicultural and Multiethnic Turn of American Literary Studies in Taiwan,” unpublished essay in English. (I am grateful to Pin-chia Feng for sharing this material with me.) Chih-min Wang, of the University of California at Santa Cruz, in an unpublished essay entitled “Thinking and Feeling Asian America in Taiwan,” tracks Asian American studies in Taiwan to the late 1980s, when Lin Maozu’s essay, “The Identity Crisis of Chinatown Cowboys” was first published. (I am grateful to Chih-min Wang for sharing this essay with me. The Chinese version of it has been published as “Yamei yanjiu zai Taiwan (Asian/American Studies in Taiwan),” Chung-wai Literary Monthly 33:1 (2004): 11–40). Wang notes that “Amy Tan’s The Joy Luck Club and David Henry Hwang’s M. Butterfly were well-received, not only for their own literary merits, but also because of the filmic adaptation of both texts. In addition to Tan, Hwang, and Maxine Hong Kingston, the younger generation of Asian American writers, such as Fae Myenne Ng, Jessica Hagedorn, Gish Jen, and Eric Liu, also became “prominent” in the academies. The sudden rise of immigrant novels—by Hong Ying and Yan Geling, for instance—along with the success of Chinese films—from Ang Lee’s Wedding Banquet, Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon, to Jacky Chan’s Rush Hour I & II—in the international box office have also enhanced the visibility of Asian America in Taiwan.”


54 Pin-chia Feng notes in “The Multicultural and Multiethnic Turn of American Literary Studies in Taiwan,” that “The publication of Chinese monographs on Chinese American literature starts with the 1994 collection of essays edited by Te-hsing Shan and Wen-ching Ho, Cultural Identity and Chinese American Literature,” which came out of a 1993 conference on this subject. The volume includes discussions of texts by Maxine Hong Kingston, Louis Chu, Frank Chin, and Henry David Hwang. Feng writes that “Without exaggeration Cultural Identity and Chinese American Literature can be regarded as the landmark publication in terms of the development of Taiwan’s Chinese American Studies. A second collection of essays entitled Politics of Representation and Chinese American Literature, also edited by Ho and Shan, was published in 1996. . . . The scope of this collection covers poetry from Angel Island, Chinese American autobiographical writings, Wong’s Homebase, Chin’s Gunga Din Highway, Gish Jen’s Typical American, Ng’s Bone and an exploration of the butterfly image in a multicultural context.” Chung-Wai Literary Monthly published a special issue in 2001 on Chinese American literature. Feng adds that beyond these collections of essays (and others currently in press) “the single most important monograph on Chinese American literature in Chinese is Te-hsing Shan’s ‘Inscriptions and Representations: Chinese American Literary and Cultural Studies’ that came out in 2000. The eleven essays included in the monograph represent nine years of Shan’s research efforts in the field of Chinese American literature. The topics range from English texts of Kingston, Frank Chin, Louis Chu, Jade Snow Wong, Fay Myenne Ng, and Angel Island poetry and Chinese texts by C.Y. Lee and Yan Geling to cultural texts of Arnold Genthe’s photographic representations of old San Francisco Chinatown. We see how Shan is constantly rethinking and remapping Chinese American literature and culture from a Taiwanese perspective,” focusing in particular on “the problematic of subjectivity for Taiwanese scholars working on Chinese American literary and cultural studies.” (Feng, “Multicultural,” 5–6). Te-hsing Shan’s fascinating article, “American Literary Studies in Taiwan” offers the most inclusive overview of the history of work on American literature by Taiwanese


Metamorphosis: A Voice from the Margins, a special issue of Chung Wai Literary Monthly guest edited by Rose Hsiu-li Juan, Chung Wai Literary Monthly 33:8 (January 2005), which includes articles on Native American authors including Joy Harjo, Louise Erdrich, Leslie Marmon Silko, James Welch, Gerald Vizenor, and others (in Chinese); Liang-ya Liou’s Race, Gender, and Representation: Toni Morrison’s The Bluest Eye, Sula, Song of Solomon, and Beloved (Taipei: Bookman, 2000) (in English); Toni Morrison, conference proceedings in English of papers on Toni Morrison presented at a conference on Morrison in held in Taiwan in 2004 sponsored by the Institute of European and American Studies, and Rose Hsiu-li Juan’s Fantasizing the Other Stories: Salman Rushdie’s and Louise Erdrich’s Narratives from the Margins (Taipei: Bookman, 2000); Academia Sinica Masters Theses (in English) have been completed in Taiwan since 2000 on writers including F. Scott Fitzgerald, Rita Mae Brown, and Nella Larsen. (Personal communication, Liang-ya Liou). Distinguished Japanese Twain scholar Makoto Nagawara is writing a book on late Twain (expanding on ideas in his article “Ronen to Mark Twain (old age and Mark Twain),” Ritsumeikan Eibeibungaku 3 (January 1994): 1–18), and a number of other leading Japanese Twain scholars such as Masago Igawa, continue to publish books and articles on Twain in Japanese. See, for example, Igawa bibliography available at http://www5.bureau.tohoku.ac.jp/Tunv_Title_All.php?&user_num=000000000940&sel1=1&sel2=1&sel3=1&sel4=2&palette=1&lang=E, accessed 1 October 2005; Yorimasa Nasu, “Oishi Mark Twain no Tataki—’Kurayami ni Zaseru Hitobito’ eno Kenshin (the old Mark Twain’s fight: his contribution to ‘the person sitting in darkness’ Tabard 9 (February 1994): 73–96. The vitality of Mark Twain studies in Japan was apparent to me from a meetings I had with Japanese Twain scholars during trips to Kyoto, Tokyo, and Elmira, New York, during the summer of 2005. A seminar with members of the Kansai Mark Twain circle organized by Ryo Waguri and presided over by Makoto Nagawara, with Yorimasa Nasu and other leading Twain scholars in attendance showed that Twain studies continue to thrive. (Each of the scholars presented his or her work in progress. The group included, in addition to those scholars mentioned, Ryo Waguri, Takeshi Omiya, Yuko Yamamoto, Hitomi Kimura, Kotaro Nakagaki, David Zmijewski, and T. Kamogawa). For an overview of Japanese scholarship written in 1999 see Shelley Fisher Fishkin, “President’s Column: Mark Twain in Japan,” Mark Twain Circular, August-September Vol. 13, No. 3. 1999 (Rpt. South Atlantic Review 65:1 (Fall 2000) at http://faculty.citadel.edu/leond/mtinjapan.htm, accessed 1 October 2005.

Chapter IV, of Su-ching Huang’s monograph, Mobile Homes: Spatial and Cultural Negotiation in Asian American Literature (forthcoming from Routledge), entitled “Transnationality, Heterogeneity, and Spatial Negotiation in Asian American Fiction” discusses the ways in which “class, gender, ethnicity and nationality complicate the instances of boundary transgression in Ng’s Bone, Okada’s No-No Boy, and Mori’s Yokohama, California.” She argues that “Put in the context of global displacement, Asian transnationalism may serve to question hegemonic U.S. national culture but may also promote the American dream myth by participating in model minority discourse.”

Scholars in Taiwan, for example, have produced more than forty masters theses in American literature in recent years according to Te-hsing Shan (Chih-ming Wang, “Feeling Asian America in Taiwan,” 2.) Many of these deal with some aspect of Asian American literature. Chih-ming Wang notes that Shan, a research fellow at Taiwan’s Academia Sinica, “believes that Taiwan occupies a unique position, being situated simultaneously at the center and the periphery of both Chinese and American cultural hegemony.” He argues that, “like the bicultural and bilingual contexts of Chinese American literature, this position [that Taiwan shares with Chinese America] is under
the influences of China and the US, while somewhat distant to both” (Wang, “Feeling Asian America in Taiwan,” 2). Wang notes that Shan believes that this “third space” that “constantly swings and shuttles between the two centers and their peripheries,” a space shaped by but not totally dominated by the two cultural hegemonies of China and America, can be a site of fruitful critical engagement. (Wang, 2); Shan, Te-hsing, Mingke yu zaixian: huayi meiguo wenxue yu wenhua lunji (Inscription and Representation: Essays on Chinese American Literature and Culture) (Taipei: Maitian, 2000), 26.


64 María Mendez Grever (1885–1951). “Besides performing dozens of Latin favorites during a long career, María Mendez Grever wrote many of her own hits, including “Cuando Vuelva a Tu Lado,” “Júrame,” “Te Quiero Dijiste,” and “Ya No Me Quieres.” Later in the 1950s, Lamento Gitano was recorded in jazzed up mambo versions by both Pérez Prado and Stan Getz.” Saldívar, chapter 10.


Quarterly co-sponsored with the Hart Center for American History at Pomona College, USC Law School, and the USC Center for Law, History and Culture in September 2004.


68 Personal communication, Danika Medak-Saltzman, 10/5/05, 10/7/05, and 10/10/05 about her UC-Berkeley Ph.D. dissertation in the department of Ethnic Studies.


75 As we pay more attention to public memory and monuments in comparative perspective, one lucid model here is James Young’s book *The Texture of Memory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), which examines Holocaust monuments and museums in Austria, Germany, Israel and the U.S., comparing how each nation memorializes the Holocaust according to its own traditions, ideals and experiences, as well as Young’s *At Memory’s Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000) which compares the construction of Holocaust monuments around the world by artists born after 1945. Another model is Sanford Levinson’s book *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), which includes comparative discussions of how Eastern European societies deal with Soviet-Era monuments and how various cities in the American South deal with monuments to the Confederacy.


79 Britta Erikson, *On the Edge: Contemporary Chinese Artists Encounter the West*, exhibition Catalog published in conjunction with exhibition organized by the Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center fo the Visual Arts at Stanford University (January 26-May 1, 2005), (Stanford, Ca.: Cantor Center for Visual Arts, 2005), 22

80 On the Edge, 22. These works are included in the exhibition catalog. “Long Live Chairman Mao” is Figure 92, p. 88.

81 Zhang Huan, “My New York #1” in *On the Edge*, cover, and Figure 70, p.67 and “My New York #4,” p. 68. See also *On the Edge*, 66–69 for discussion of this performance piece.
82 Erickson, *On The Edge*, 69.
88 Ishihara, *Mark Twain in Japan*, 27.


102 Heike Paul has noted that “the culinary sphere provides a realm of cultural contact beyond the immediate consumption of food as a terrain on which racial attitudes and specificities become visible and American democratic values are negotiated.” “Tasting America: Food, Race, and Anti-American Sentiments in Nineteenth-Century German-American Writing” in Tobias Döring, Markus Heide, Susanne Mühleisen, eds., *Eating Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Food* [American Studies monograph series 106] (Heidelberg: Universitätverlag Winter, 2003), 129.


105 Su-Ching Huang, “‘We just Cooked Chinese Food!’: Gastronomic Mobility and Model Minority Discourse in David Wong Louie’s Novel *The Barbarians Are Coming*,”


108 This proverb may be better known by the more common variant, “Der vorem in khreynt meynt az dos lebn iz zis;” but the version cited above is the one my father always used, and the one with which I grew up.


113 Citing Asako Nakai, Tatsumi describes the central role played by a copy of *Connecticut Yankee* found unexpectedly in the “war-torn Vietnamese forest” by the narrator in an important Japanese nonfiction novel by Takeshi Kaiko, *Kagayakeru Yami*.
(translated into English under the title Into a Black Sun): “This unusual discovery leads the narrator to imagine Twain’s novel to be really a neo-imperialistic ploy to spread the light of civilization,” Tatsumi writes. “While the period of postwar reconstruction helped the Japanese people sympathize with the character of Huck Finn, that of high economic growth at the critical point of the Vietnam War invited us to turn from Huck to privilege instead the narrative of Hank Morgan.” Takayuki Tatsumi, “Editor’s Column,” Mark Twain Studies 1:1 (October 2004): 3–4. The journal also has a useful compendium of abstracts of books, dissertations, and English-language essays published during the last three years by Mark Twain scholars in Japan.


117 Email to author from Jay Mechling (and attached syllabus for course), 20 November 2004.

118 International partnership grants that have been awarded and guidelines for applications are available at the ASA web site (www.theasa.net).

119 ASA International Partnership grants can support everything from sharing books, videos and curricular materials, to developing student and faculty exchanges, collaborative courses, joint degree programs, and collaborative research projects. Details on how to apply may be accessed at http://georgetown.edu/crossroads/AmericanStudiesAssn/newsletter/archive/newsarchive/intgrant.htm, accessed 13 November 2005.

120 Annette Kolodny, In Search of First Contact: The Peoples Of The Dawnland, The Vikings Of Vineland and American Popular Culture, unpublished manuscript, “Preface,” 1.


122 The international forum on “The War Prayer” that we are co-editing will appear in the forthcoming issue of Mark Twain Studies.

123 I am grateful to the foundations and institutions that supported my trips to conferences and universities in Asia between 1999 and 2005. These include the Fulbright Commission, the Kyoto American Studies Summer Seminar, the U.S.-Japan Friendship Commission, Ritsumeikan University, the Tokyo American Center, Japanese Association for American Studies, Kyoto University, Doshisha University, Keio University, Kyoto Koka Women’s University, Waseda University, the Kansai Mark Twain Circle, the American Studies Association of Korea, Korea University, the English Language and Literature Association of Korea, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, the U.S. China Education Trust, Fudan University, Yunnan University, the U.S. Embassies in Tokyo, Seoul and Beijing, Academia Sinica in Taiwan, and the National Science Council of Taiwan. I wish there were space to thank the many individual scholars whose hospitality and generosity made these visits so memorable. I am deeply in their debt. I am also grateful to the Fulbright Commission, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the
U.S.-Japan Friendship Commission, the Japanese Association for American Studies, the American Studies Association of Korea, the U.S. China Education Trust, the Asia Foundation, and, of course, the American Studies Association, for having sponsored trips by Asian scholars to U.S. to annual meetings of the American Studies Association and to American universities.

124 For more on Wright at the World Columbian Exposition, see, http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/1469/flw_jp.html; for more on Wright and Japan, see Kevin Nute, *Frank Lloyd Wright and Japan: The Role of Traditional Japanese Art and Architecture in the Work of Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1994); and Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio Foundation (Corporate Author), Melanie Birk (Editor), *Frank Lloyd Wright’s Fifty Views of Japan: The 1905 Photo Album* (San Francisco, Ca.: Pomegranate Artbooks, 1996).