UC Santa Barbara
Journal of Transnational American Studies

Title
Excerpt from Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5jw4h66v

Journal
Journal of Transnational American Studies, 3(2)

Authors
Shigematsu, Setsu
Camacho, Keith L.

Publication Date
2011

DOI
10.5070/T832011607

Copyright Information
Copyright 2011 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at https://escholarship.org/terms

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Excerpted from Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho, eds., *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010). Published with the permission of the University of Minnesota Press (http://www.upress.umn.edu/).

Introduction

Militarized Currents, Decolonizing Futures

Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho

Militarized Currents forges a collaboration that examines how militarization has constituted a structuring force that connects the histories of the Japanese and U.S. empires across the regions of Asia and the Pacific Islands. Foregrounding indigenous and feminist perspectives and the scholarship of people of color, this anthology analyzes militarization as an *extension of colonialism* and its gendered and racialized processes from the late-twentieth to the twenty-first century. By examining how former and current colonial territories of Japan and the United States, such as Guam, Okinawa, the Marshall Islands, the Philippines, and Korea, have been variously impacted by militarization, the articles collected here illuminate how their colonial histories constitute the conditions of possibility for ongoing forms of militarization. This collection thus expands our understanding of how these political geographies across Asia and the Pacific have been militarized, demonstrating how contemporary processes of militarization are linked with residual and ongoing effects of colonial subordination.

In this introduction, we outline why we seek to foster cross-regional dialogues and cross-disciplinary methods of analysis by demonstrating how currents of militarization and demilitarization connect and divide people with potentially common interests. We purposely choose the metaphor of currents to signal how militarization operates across temporal and spatial boundaries, as contemporary military technologies are informed by past and projected imperialist imperatives. Bringing together contributions from sixteen international and U.S.-based scholars, we explore the discursive, embodied, historical, and institutional processes of militarization. Specifically, we focus on how people across Asia and the Pacific Islands have variously been impacted and mobilized by the forces of

militarization and how demilitarization constitutes a crucial part of larger decolonization movements.

In the first section of this introduction, we highlight the importance of the relationship between U.S. and Japanese imperialisms in understanding the current state of militarization. We then offer a discussion of how dominant periodizations and paradigms obscure the uneven effects of violence and the embedded heteronormative structures of militarized logics. In this critical assessment, we examine how institutionalized divisions of time (periodizations), configurations of space (regions), and disciplinary knowledge formations (area studies) marginalize counterhegemonic subjects of knowledge. Moreover, we discuss how such knowledge formations obscure the need for resisting the ways that peoples, lands, and waters have been categorized and claimed by imperialist–militarist endeavors. Given the racialized–gendered patterns of mass destruction produced through the advancement of militarized logics, our anthology advances the *current* value of indigenous, people of color, and feminist-oriented demilitarizing coalitions as critiques of and alternatives to militarized worlds of the twenty-first century.[1]

Engendering Empires

The regions now called Asia and the Pacific Islands share a history of colonial rule by Japan and the United States. Imperialist wars initiated by these respective nation-states created wartime and postwar conditions of military invasion, occupation, and violence through which the peoples of these regions have struggled and survived. The parallels and interconnections between U.S. and Japanese imperialisms together constitute an important site of analysis to comprehend the current state of geopolitics, militarized movements, and migrations since the twentieth century. The clashing of the Japanese and U.S. empires variously devastated and made claims to liberate colonized subjects from the other competing imperialist power(s). Despite the formal attempts to demilitarize Japan in the postwar era, the remilitarization of Japan has been on the horizon since the onset of the cold war. Memories of the Asia-Pacific wars continue to haunt current constellations of militarization.[2]

Naoki Sakai, a leading critic of Asian area studies and a contributor to this anthology, argues that American and Japanese colonialisms sustained each other's existence through a "trans-Pacific arrangement." Under the

postwar–cold war U.S. security system, he asserts that this arrangement was "marked by the complicity of the United States and Japan that effectively disavowed and continues to disavow the past of colonial atrocities; without this the two countries would not have the relationship as they do today."[3] These atrocities and their lingering effects include Japan's militarized sex-slavery system in World War II and the U.S. nuclear-testing campaign in the Marshall Islands in the postwar era. Japan's sex-slavery system exemplifies how militarization operates simultaneously with colonialism, with the creation of "comfort stations" as a *militarized organizing logic* that combined regulated heterosexual rape with the concerns of hygiene and the health of soldiers.[4] The establishment of comfort stations across the Japanese Empire demonstrates how the militarization of sexuality was a direct outcome of empire building and colonial technologies of rule. As several of our contributors demonstrate, the "comfort women" system was directly linked with subsequent forms of organized U.S. militarized prostitution, pointing to the interpenetration of these imperialist systems.[5]

Memories of such militarized violence traverse the Pacific, as toxic currents and legal cases make their way to the shores of the U.S. coasts and courthouses.[6] As Lisa Yoneyama's work has demonstrated, redress for Japanese war crimes has recently been raised within U.S. courts by naturalized Asian American subjects, pointing to the transnational attempts for reparations by former subjects of the Japanese Empire.[7] While not necessarily addressed within the logics of war crimes and redress, Marshall Islanders similarly continue to negotiate with the United States to demand various forms of compensation for the sixty-seven atomic tests conducted in the Marshall Islands.[8] As Marshall Islanders Lijon Eknilang and James Matayoshi declare, "we continue to fight for justice, as survivors."[9] While some Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders separately raise the specter of empire in U.S. national and transnational contexts, little work has been done to address and analyze the ways in which such calls for justice, however construed, are also connected through militarized currents and circuits. An attention to the interrelated dynamics between the United States and Japan, including their mutual disavowal of colonial violence, thus helps us to explore the ways in which "rulers, agents, and colonized people shaped empires; and the economic and cultural processes in which imperial formations played a part."[10] In our attention to the specific relationship between U.S. and Japanese empires across Asia and the Pacific, we emphasize the need to tease out the tensions between the specificities

of local configurations of colonialism as well as the "homogenizing force and collaborative alliance among various colonizers at different historical moments under shifting geopolitical configurations."[11]

The overseas expansion of the Japanese and the U.S. empires converged temporally as part of a reactive process of inter-imperialist competition. Japan's formal empire building began in the wake of the Sino–Japanese War in 1894 and 1895 with its colonial expansion into Kwantung, Taiwan, and Korea. Japan's earlier annexation of Hokkaido (1869) and Okinawa (1879), as many scholars have argued, "laid the groundwork for later imperialist expansion."[12] Formal colonization of territories proceeded with the acquisition of former German colonies in Micronesia in 1914, which included the Caroline, Marshall, and northern Mariana Islands, followed by World War II conquests in Melanesia and Southeast Asia.

Japan attempted to justify its expansionist policies in terms of an anti-Western imperialism, expressing a conscious attempt to resist and overcome Euro-American colonialisms even as Japan imitated and learned from them. In writing about the specificity of Japanese colonialism, Leo T. S. Ching writes that we must understand the "inter-imperialist relationship that situated and determined the particular form of Japanese imperialism in the world system."[13] The rise of Japanese imperialism was an inter-imperialist configuration of power that was cohered by an attempt to negate its "Western" external forces of constitution.

Japanese discourses of racial and cultural superiority contended with Euro-American discourses of white supremacy, at times seeking to include and assimilate other Asians and at other times redefining an inter-Asian hierarchy.[14] As Gerald Horne argues, the racial regimes of the British and the U.S. empires *enabled* Japanese claims to be imperial liberators and posed a significant ideological threat to Euro-American global supremacy.[15] As is well known, Japan used the slogan of the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" and called for pan-Asian solidarity. Whatever euphemisms and contorted dialogics were used in promoting Japanese imperialism, perceptions of racial and gendered hierarchies were intertwined with other motives for colonization. As Japanese colonialism spread into the Asian continent and the Pacific Islands, the government simultaneously built the military force required to protect its homeland and its newly conquered resources.[16] Japanese colonialism was fundamentally militarist in character, as evidenced in its violent invasion of territories, from Nanjing to the Philippines.[17] As Lewis H. Gann writes, economic

and military expansionism necessitated Japan's "creation of vast defensive networks thrust ever farther outward."[18] In the narrativizing of Japan's militarized colonial history, the semantics of "defense" are deployed to naturalize aggression. By the onset of World War II in 1941, Japan had created a network of militarized sites in the *nan'yō*, or the south seas, to maintain Japan's eastern flank and support Japanese attacks against U.S. colonial possessions in the Pacific, such as Guam, Hawai'i, and Wake Island.[19]

In many respects, Japan viewed the Pacific Islands under its wartime rule as the last bastions of defense against the "east," that is, U.S. colonialism in particular and Western tyranny in general. The logics of strategic deterrence and military necessity were extended to Japan's colonies in East and Southeast Asia, where colonial populations were recruited as militarized labor to protect the Japanese homeland.[20] As subjects of Japan's biopower and governmentality, for example, Takashi Fujitani argues that the conscription of Korean "volunteer" soldiers in 1938 occurred in part because of the intensification of conflicts, the disavowal of racism, and the promotion of shared ancestry between Japanese and Koreans. But it would be Japan's transformation of its racist discrimination toward Koreans from an "unabashed and exclusionary 'vulgar racism' to a new type of inclusionary and 'polite racism' that denied itself as racist" that would lead to the incorporation of Koreans into the multiethnic Japanese Empire.[21] As compared to the U.S. wartime conscription and confinement of Japanese Americans, Fujitani asserts that Japan was similarly "forced to begin a process of including these previously despised populations into their nations in unprecedented ways, while at the same time denouncing racial discrimination and even considering these peoples as part of the national populations and, as such, deserving life, welfare, and happiness."[22] Fujitani's astute observations about the ways in which nation-states govern their subjects through inclusionary forms of racism are instructive for how we might critique the militarization of soldiers' lives and deaths across the Japanese and U.S. empires.

While Japan lost much of its imperial domain and militarized power in the war's aftermath, it later regained its economic hegemony since the 1960s under the protection and dominion of the U.S. military forces based in Okinawa and the Japanese mainland. Supplying the U.S. military through the Korean and Vietnam wars enabled Japan's economic recovery, alongside investments in a variety of fishery, industrial, and trade programs in Asia and the Pacific. Japanese tourist investments and tuna

canneries, for example, predominate in some areas of the Pacific.[23] As one recent study demonstrates, Japan is "the largest source of Asian tourists and tourism investment in the Islands."[24] Japanese tourism in particular would not have occurred without the nostalgia associated with former Asian settler communities and wartime battlegrounds; the paradisiacal allure of island lifestyles and settings; the American military's presence to assure the "safe" travel of Japanese and non-Japanese tourists; and, increasingly, the advertisement of the Pacific as utopic sites of heterosexist and homoerotic desire.[25] Discourses of militarism and tourism are thus inextricably linked in Asia and the Pacific not only by a shared history of American and Japanese imperial violence but also by "a wider network of articulations that create the fundamentally modern tensions between work and leisure."[26] Presenting itself as a nation of commerce, travel, and peace rather than as a nation of war, Japan continues to disavow its imperial past and present. With the seventh largest military budget in the world (based on 2008 expenditures), Japan's militarized logics of expansion continue with the drive to change Article Nine of the Constitution and to reform its postwar security treaty with the United States.[27] The contorted logics of "defense" have been manifested through the deployment of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces to Afghanistan and Iraq over the past decade.

Japan's perception of these regions as militarily strategic, then, historically and contemporaneously parallels U.S. justifications for the colonization of lands beyond its continental borders. Following from its wars of colonial expansion in Native America, U.S. overseas colonial expansion similarly advanced its own rhetoric of civilization, nationhood, and race.[28] Since the Spanish–American War in 1898, the United States colonized islands in the Caribbean and in the Pacific, viewing each possession as a strategic site for advancing American economic and military interests.[29] These islands included Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Caribbean, and Guam, eastern Sāmoa, Hawai'i, and the Philippines in the Pacific.[30] The United States established coal stations, communication lines, and naval harbors throughout these islands. Colonial forms of education, health, and public policy were imposed in America's overseas empire, racializing nonwhite settler populations as inferior, creating native elite and police collaborator classes, and excluding most native populations from white circles of influence, residency, and power.[31] Clearly, multiple discourses of othering determined the direction of and responses to American "civilization" projects in the Caribbean and the Pacific.[32] The means and effects of

anticolonial movements likewise differed across the Pacific, from Filipino armed resistance toward the U.S. military invasion of the Philippines to Hawaiian-organized petitions against the U.S. annexation of Hawai'i.[33]

After World War II, Japan's new geopolitical position and image was managed by U.S. imperial designs. In *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama argue that the United States presented itself as a "liberator" of Japanese wartime colonialism, attempted to erase narratives of prior Japanese rule in Asia and the Pacific, and strove to make invisible the multiplicity of experiences and remembrances of the war.[34] The imperial myths of liberation create what Yoneyama calls an "already accrued debt" to the United States, which continues to fashion the United States as a "liberator" of Japanese colonialism rather than as a nation of war crimes associated with colonial takeovers and occupations.[35] As evidenced in post–World War II Micronesia, for example, David Hanlon asserts that "Americans expected that their role as liberators would secure a welcome reception and an extended period of goodwill from grateful, needy, debilitated local populations."[36] This interplay of colonial legacies continues to animate a sense of indebtedness to the United States as the "rescuer" for many postcolonial subjects, such as the Filipinos and Chamorros who currently serve in the U.S. military.

Moreover, the United States furthers its national image in its colonies like Guam and Hawai'i as familiar, necessary, and normal, attempting to marginalize long-standing calls for indigenous, national, and women's self-determination movements on the one hand and violent histories of American and Japanese imperial conquests on the other.[37] As Elaine H. Kim and Chungmoo Choi argue, because of the installation of U.S. military bases throughout Asia and the Pacific at the end of World War II, South Korea and other former Japanese colonies have "never had an opportunity to decolonize in the true sense of the word."[38] While these self-determination movements have been articulated differently across generations and genders, they must face the difficult task of addressing and critiquing the intersections of American and Japanese colonialism and militarism.[39] Understanding the interconstitution of Japanese and U.S. colonialism is imperative for building transnational decolonization and demilitarization movements. In Okinawa, for example, Okinawan perceptions of American military bases were "formed through constant friction with and bleeding of their own memories of [Japanese] empire, making this base-produced modernity difficult to critique."[40] By promoting "dual

decolonization," a position that critiques these imperial histories, Hideaki Tobe states that one can begin "to vanquish the multiple layers of colonialism" associated with American, Japanese, and even Okinawan colonial processes and attitudes.[41]

Taking Tobe's dual-colonization paradigm a step further, we believe that it is imperative to understand local demilitarizing efforts *in relation to* other movements to decolonize Asia and the Pacific Islands. As we write this introduction, Japan and the United States have been negotiating to transfer American military personnel and their dependents from Okinawa to Guam.[42] According to one U.S. military report, the Pentagon chose Guam because the island's location "provides strategic flexibility, freedom of action, and prompt global action for the Global War on terrorism, peace and wartime engagement, and crisis response."[43] While Hawai'i, the Marshall Islands, and Okinawa remain some of the most militarized sites in the Pacific, the U.S. military has begun to amplify Guam's "strategic" significance, underscoring "the increasing geopolitical importance of Asia to Washington as well as the Pentagon's priority to project power from American territory rather than foreign bases."[44] It is now estimated that the Pentagon plans to spend $15 billion in construction and transfer costs, whereas the Japanese government intends to commit $6 billion. In support of these funds, President Barack Obama signed into law H.R. 2647: Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 on October 28, 2009. H.R. 2647 now grants the U.S. military $734 million to fund the construction of military facilities in Guam.[45] Additionally, the U.S. military projects that anywhere from eight thousand to fifty-five thousand American military personnel, along with militarized technologies of surveillance and warfare, will be relocated from one island colony to another by 2012.[46]

Despite the American military's often-secretive disclosures about its relocation plans, news about this move has raised several alarming issues for Chamorros and Okinawans alike. First, Japan and the United States have not allowed Chamorros and Okinawans to participate in this process, let alone entertain the wider question of political status and sovereignty debates in Guam and Okinawa. Second, active American military propaganda campaigns are under way in the islands and elsewhere, depicting militarized departure and militarized settlement in terms of "economic progress" for the indigenous and settler populations of Guam and Okinawa. In particular, the U.S. Air Force and Navy and the U.S. Department of Interior are sponsoring conferences to attract businesses from

Australia, Japan, New York, and San Francisco to consider how they might profit from this massive move of military personnel and technology.[47] Third, while Okinawan women welcome the demilitarization of their bodies and lands, that understanding comes with the knowledge that Chamorros and others will be further militarized in more ways than one. As Ronni Alexander exclaims, "The relocation of US soldiers from Okinawa to Guam might mean relief for Okinawan women but would at the same time threaten the very existence" of Chamorros.[48] With the U.S. military already holding nearly one third of Guam's lands, increased militarization would constrain, if not impede, Chamorro efforts to attain greater cultural, economic, and political sovereignty. Furthermore, Guam and Okinawa have yet to receive governmental apologies, monetary redress, or reconciliatory arrangements for the various deaths, environmental damages, and land displacements committed by American and Japanese military forces since World War II.

At the same time, however, the entire military relocation process has offered opportunities for greater communication, interaction, and solidarity among Chamorro and Okinawan organizations. These collective partnerships and political trajectories are a historical first for both societies, as Guam and Okinawa form new transoceanic alliances in the face of encroaching militarization. Women's groups have especially taken the lead in educating each other about militarized violence in their respective homelands. For example, Guam's Fuetsan Famalao'an has organized numerous conferences, film screenings, and village meetings on the topic of gendered and racialized military violence.[49] At one of the recent village sessions, a supporter for a demilitarized Okinawa recently compared the militarized landscapes of Guam and Okinawa. Representing Okinawa Women Act Against Military Violence, she expressed, "I don't know how much the people of Guam realize the impact of having a big military concentration in a small island. Guam is half the size of Okinawa, where we have 28,000 troops and 22,000 families. The military presence is creating serious problems."[50] One ongoing problem concerns Guam's militarized value as an American "buffer zone" from perceived hostilities in the "East," much like how Japan employed the *nan'yō* as a strategic line of defense against Western colonialism. Nevertheless, the realities of Guam, or any other American militarized territory, becoming another site of military battles or nuclear warfare are real. As Julian Aguon argues, regional and national reports suggest that "Guam is fast becoming the first-strike

target in any altercation between the US and China and/or North Korea."[51] As the United States continues to remilitarize areas in Asia and the Pacific Islands, the cases of Guam and Okinawa illustrate the need to analyze their militarized conditions in relation to each other and their intersecting colonial currents. As the efforts of these women's groups demonstrate, cross-regional dialogue can foster opportunities for the sharing of critical information, the creating of transnational solidarities, and the demilitarizing of societies.

Lest our political project for a demilitarized Asia and Pacific be misunderstood as either unique or utopic endeavors, it would behoove us to remember that calls for self-determination are always ongoing, if not highly contested, processes across these regions. While Chamorros and Okinawans form new alliances in ways that can be read as both progressive and productive, this is not to say that their case should serve as a model for demilitarization per se. Although they raise critical questions about the intertwined nature of American and Japanese empires, we should recall that processes of demilitarization are often informed by competing political interests, opposing class, gender, and racial hierarchies, and shifting power relations. In forging any connections among Asians, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders, then, we should see these efforts on an issue-by-issue basis so as not to reproduce colonial and militarist structures against others.[52]

In Hawai'i, for example, Asians and Asian Americans have often assumed hegemonic status by virtue of their significant economic and political occupations, as well as by their majority status as settlers.[53] Their identification as "locals" particularly masks the presence of Hawaiians and the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, reifying the myth of "multicultural harmony" so deeply associated with the people of the archipelago. Couched within and against a longer history of white missionary settlements and plantation economies, Asians and Asian Americans frequently contend with what Haunani-Kay Trask calls "intra-settler competition"; that is to say, non-Hawaiian intrasettler claims for equality, mobility, and parity attempt to erode native Hawaiian articulations for political sovereignty, if not for the very restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom.[54] Commenting on the roots of intrasettler colonialism, Trask asserts that the "history of our colonization becomes a twice-told tale, first of discovery and settlement by European and American businessmen and missionaries, then of the plantation Japanese, Chinese, and eventually Filipino rise to dominance in the islands."[55] While an

awareness of these uneven power dynamics has risen over the years, as evidenced in Trask's critique of Asian settler colonialism, it remains to be seen as to what kinds of cross-cultural and cross-regional alliances may prove resilient in a post–September 11 Hawai'i.[56] Familiar questions need to be asked: Who has the power to speak for whom and why? What theories and methods of resistance does one advance and why? What kind of knowledge is produced in these efforts, and how might oral, written, and digital forms of communication affect the production, distribution, and representation of such knowledge? Above all, what are the probable advances and potential pitfalls involved in undertaking coordinated cross-regional struggles to secure demilitarized futures?[57]

As the United States directs and leads multinational military alliances in the so-called war on terror, these questions increase in relevance as we critique and confound allegiances to militarized power. With the current U.S.-led invasions and occupations of Iraq and the Middle East, our anthology seeks to analyze how imperialist militarization is sustained through the normalization of militarized subjectivities and desires.[58] As the contributors demonstrate, the United States has historically designated moments of national crisis to naturalize the patriotism and war-waging subjectivities and desires of its populations. With the onset of the so-called war on terror, U.S. Naval Admiral William J. Fallon states that U.S. militarization efforts have consequently increased across Australia, India, Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, and the United States, as areas that constitute "continuing security challenges" for the United States.[59] The admiral's proclamations are disturbing not only because of America's ongoing militarist expansions but also because of the global nature in which the normalization of mass-militarized violence—American or otherwise—has spread. While our contributors do not offer a uniform conceptualization of the ways in which we can analyze the normalization of militarization, their studies show how militarization may be productively transformed, if not altogether contested and overcome.

We must understand, however, that long before the advent of these recent militarized conflicts, the United States defined its national interests not along the borders of the continental United States but in Asia and the Pacific. Hence to circumscribe our understanding of "America" to the continental United States—as previous paradigms have tended to emphasize—is myopic in terms of the reach of American empire. This circumscription also runs the risk of miscalculating the formative role that

U.S. militarization plays in shaping the historical displacements and migrations of the populations we now refer to as Asian American and Pacific Islander. Asian and Pacific Islander displacements, dispossessions, and migrations to America have been punctuated by U.S. wars in Asia and the Pacific, and thus U.S. war waging has become an integral, if not naturalized, part of the grammar of these (im)migration narratives.

Although transnational studies have marked significant developments in understanding these narratives since the 1990s, these paradigm shifts have not systematically engaged with U.S. and Japanese colonialism and militarization as a *structuring force* of (im)migrations, displacements, and diasporas, much less examined how the latter operates as a specific modality of neocolonialism. Despite the interconnections between these two empires, few studies engage in cross-regional and cross-disciplinary dialogues about them. *Militarized Currents* calls attention to this lacuna by examining how these competing empires engendered and racialized the ongoing conditions of militarization across and through these regions. We trace and interrogate these modes and processes of militarization in increasingly globalized contexts of colonial and neocolonial economies that link militarism to tourism and humanitarianism. In so doing, we embrace the opportunity to interrogate these processes and militarized circuits by forging transregional and transdisciplinary collaborations, which, we believe, can generate potentially transformative methodologies of knowledge production.

Tracing the Colonial Legacies of Contemporary Militarization

There is an abundant array of studies about the histories of militarism and colonialism, respectively. Across fields and disciplines such as diplomatic and military history, political science and international politics, peace and conflict studies, military sociology, and feminist and gender studies, militarism as a political ideology and hierarchical organization of political economy and society has been studied across various national and historical contexts. Classic studies of modern militarism, such as Alfred Vagat's *A History of Militarism: Civilian and Military* (1937), exemplify the liberal view of the importance of the distinction between civilian and military powers and interests.[60] Contemporary scholars of militarism have increasingly emphasized how militarism has evolved far beyond efficiently "winning wars" or preserving national security to become a

system of self-perpetuation and self-aggrandizement, such that the distinction between "civilian" and "military" may no longer be as relevant in understanding how militarism operates.[61] In *The Sorrows of Empire*, Chalmers Johnson describes militarism as a "phenomenon by which a nation's armed services comes to put their institutional preservation ahead of achieving national security or even a commitment to the integrity of the governmental structure of which they are a part."[62] As Jean J. Kim astutely points out, "The idea that militarism and civilian life are divorced may mystify the fact that the U.S. is a country constantly at war and constantly in denial of this fact."[63]

While empire building takes on many forms, we recognize militarism as a constitutive institution and ideology of empire. Since militarism still persists in nation-states that are not historically expansive, empire-building nations, we seek to distinguish how current forms of militarization are linked to empire and the racialized gendered legacies of colonialism.[64] Our anthology analyzes these dynamic processes of militarization, their transformations, and emergent technologies with attention to their transpacific conditions.

Over the past few decades, scholarly literature on women in the military and the militarization of women's lives has offered tremendous insight on how militarization requires the cooperation and support of women, such that the notion that militarism remains exclusively a matter for men, or a masculine domain, is no longer tenable. Cynthia Enloe's pioneering work on gender and militarization provides a rich foundation for comparative analyses of the gendered dynamics of militarization and theorizes how militarization operates as a complex process, transforming institutions, economies, and relationships. While we maintain a thematic focus on the gendering practices of militarization, our anthology emphasizes the conjunction of race, gender, colonialism, and empire, extending the analytic trajectory of studies of militarization that have not engaged with its imbrications with colonialism and the gendered, racial structures of neocolonial practices.[65]

Studies of militarism and militarization in the post–cold war era have posited a paradigm shift from modern to postmodern forms of military organization.[66] Whereas the modern military was characteristically composed of both conscripted and professional ranks directed toward winning wars, the postmodern military is said to be less tied to the nation-state, increasingly "androgynous," and more fluid and permeable with civilian

society. [67] The promotion of racial and gender diversity in the military and the increasing use of corporatized militias and contract security companies have been cited as evidence of increasingly expansive strategies of militarization. These shifts correspond and converge with the emergence of neoliberalism and globalization, representing the select incorporation of diversity, hybridity, and flexibility as markers of postmodernity. Such changes within militaries have not remained uncontested. Controversies abound regarding issues such as the commercial privatization of militaries, the recruitment and retention of gays and lesbians in the military, the roles of women in combat, and various forms of sexual harassment in the military.

While recognizing these shifts and rearticulations, our volume interrogates this categorization of postmodern militarization and questions whether gender and racial diversity have significantly or substantively altered heteronormative and racialized relations of power. Although the term "postmodern" (as well as "postcolonial") often denotes a posterior temporal and critical relationship, our volume seeks to demonstrate how *racialized and gendered colonial economies* continue to structure and overdetermine putatively postmodern and neoliberal forms of gender and racial diversity. We therefore pursue the claim that, for many people, colonialism has not ended but has been rearticulated, muted, and unmoored through discourses of neoliberalism, postmodernism, postcolonialism, and "antiterrorism." For example, our contributors investigate how the volunteer entry of indigenous people, (post)colonial subjects, and women into the military is conditioned by heterosexist logics and racialized class structures. By demonstrating how militarization continues to operate as a colonial technology that produces desiring subjects and regulates intimate familial, interpersonal, and sexual relations, our anthology illuminates the (neo)colonial conditions of the global present.

In this era of globalized militarization, we ask to what extent have discourses of gender and race been altered, transformed, and rearticulated? Are extant binary, heterosexist, and heteronormative notions of masculinity and femininity obsolete in the context of emergent militarized gendered economies and bodily practices? In what ways might we need to reformulate a spectrum of concepts that can deal adequately, for example, with *militarized female masculinities*, and in what ways are these racialized?[68] If contemporary modes of militarization are characterized by an increasing permeability with civilian life, are current practices of resistance to militarization no longer the most effective means of demilitarization?

In an era scholars have referred to as global or globalized militarization, we seek to decipher and contest the ways in which militarization has been normalized as inevitable.[69] Given emergent conditions of local and global militarization, we call for innovative and transformative methods of analysis that might foster coordinated, collective, and even unexpected forms of insurgency to forward the unfinished project of decolonization.

Theorists and writers engaged with anticolonial movements and postcolonial studies have produced a corpus of concepts and analytical tools that recognize the interworkings of race and gender as integral to the historical formation of colonialism and the identities of colonial and postcolonial subjects.[70] Often, due to institutional disciplinary limitations, studies of colonialism have attended to colonial literatures and the problems of anticolonial nationalism without sustained attention to the imbrications between militarism, colonialism, and identity formation. While recent scholarship on Japanese colonialism has demonstrated a "stronger emphasis on the variety of responses and experiences of the colonized," we wish to highlight how these complex conditions and memories inform *current* protests against remilitarization and the resurgence of Japanese militaristic nationalism.[71]

By building on and expanding existing lines of inquiry, this collective project aims to extend our understanding of militarization by demonstrating a cross-fertilization of ethnic and critical race studies, feminist and indigenous analyses, and cultural and transdisciplinary studies of militarization. Teresia Teaiwa's pioneering article, reprinted here, provides insights into the *engendering of nuclear colonialism*. She demonstrates how the Marshallese term "bikini" and images of bikini-clad female bodies function to obscure the unseen effects of U.S. nuclear devastation in Bikini Atoll, the Marshall Islands, as well as project an objectified heterosexual female body. As Teaiwa writes, "Nuclear testing is just one—albeit a most pernicious one—of the many colonial phenomena and processes that affect the Pacific region." These forms of nuclear colonialism not only displace the Marshallese from their homelands but also violently constrict indigenous cultures and ways of life, polluting the surrounding waters and lands and making sustainable fishing and farming challenging for generations to come.[72] As Jibā B. Kabua observes, "We Marshall Islanders must develop political will at every level, in every organization, for every situation, to *manage* the changing times in which we live."[73]

Kabua's call for agency, autonomy, and action are well heeded given that the militarization and nuclearization of the Marshall Islands has increasingly

"served to 'nuclearize' and nucleate the Marshallese family structure, recentering land and power around patriarchal and capitalist structures."[74] These transformations stem in part from a complex past of chiefly rule, imperial hegemony, matrilineal heritage, and indigenous resistance in the Marshall Islands. Teaiwa's article is reproduced here because one crucial aspect of this past—that is, the dual violence of American and Japanese colonialism and militarism—continues to haunt generations of Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders in the Marshall Islands in gendered and racialized ways that demand our attention and intervention. Referring to the transnational processes of remembrance and forgetting in the Marshall Islands, Greg Dvorak argues that "we are not asked to remember the mass [World War II] graves where Japanese, Korean, and Okinawan bodies were buried by the thousands, not implored to know where the houses of Marshallese chiefs once stood, and not reminded that this is Marshallese land."[75]

In a global era of heightened nuclear testing and threats, it is prudent that we remember the violence of nuclearism throughout the world, challenge all corporations and nation-states involved in the proliferation of nuclear technologies of death, and examine the gendered and racialized implications of these events on the lives of everyday people. That the United States continues to endanger lives with its presence of nuclear technology and warfare in the Pacific testifies to the American policy view of the region as a place whose populations are of little significance. Japan itself once considered dumping its industrial nuclear waste in the Mariana Trench in the 1970s, choosing to place nuclear toxins far from Japan's population but closer to Pacific Islander populations. Because of international protest, however, Japan was denied access to the Mariana Trench.[76] Indeed, it is precisely this current desirability of the Pacific—a region simultaneously commodified and exploited for its visible militarist and tourist value yet ultimately made invisible in its human diversity and complexity—that warrants our interrogation of normalizing structures of authority and governance and our foregrounding of indigenous forms of contestation and survival. As Teaiwa states, the Pacific "still churns with its colonial and nuclear legacies."

Decolonizing Bodies of Knowledge: A Cross-Regional Dialogue

Our anthology is concerned with Asia and the Pacific Islands, themselves problematic terms, whose boundaries and locales have been shaped by competing histories of colonialism and militarism. They are regions that,

when juxtaposed for purposes of policy and research, frequently fall under the rubric of "Asia-Pacific."[77] The Asia-Pacific label is known more for its designation of countries on the Pacific Rim than for countries in the Pacific itself. In this geographical configuration, attention is paid to Pacific Rim countries like Chile, Hong Kong, and Singapore, whereas an examination of countries in the Pacific like Nauru, Fiji, and Sāmoa are often lacking. The Asia-Pacific term, while useful for economic analyses of industries in East and Southeast Asia, Latin America, and North America, often makes invisible the multiplicity of Pacific Islander contributions to these regional economies and polities. As Arif Dirlik observes, "Pacific Islanders, with whom the Pacific was initially identified, have been largely marginalized" by the ideology of Asia-Pacific.[78]

This marginalization has much to do with economic perceptions of Pacific lands and peoples as "small" and "isolated" relative to the Rim countries, hence producing a discourse that trivializes Pacific Islander forms of agency, capital, and labor across the region.[79] Pacific Islanders, though, are not the only societies made invisible by the Asia-Pacific rubric. With its focus on American and Asian "Rim" countries, one might presume that societies from these areas are included in dialogue about the Asia-Pacific. This is rarely the case, as the term actually favors discussions about "commodity flows and military-political relationships that would restructure the Asia-Pacific into a coherent region of economic exchange" and reflects the security interests of the more powerful Rim nations.[80] Peripheral to these debates are the roles of everyday peoples in the appropriation, contestation, or deliberation of regional and global hegemonies. With few exceptions, discourses concerning the Asia-Pacific have been structured around the idea of a region of economic, military, and political interest, as perceived by the Rim countries.[81] This anthology thus forwards counternarratives to the dominant ideology and power relations that are typically obscured through the reification of "Asia-Pacific" by analyzing what Ella Shohat calls the "multichronotopic links" between peoples who inhabit and are variously invested in the transformation of these regions.[82] With its attention to spatial–temporal relations, investigating "multichronotopic links" allows us to recognize implicit nationalisms in the production of knowledge and to challenge the ways in which universities erect disciplinary borders and quarantine interconnected fields of inquiry.[83]

Although the title of the volume might suggest that equal attention is devoted to Asia and the Pacific, we are aware that the volume is weighted

heavily toward the Pacific versus East Asia and Southeast Asia. However, our purpose in doing so is not to intervene simply within the existing configuration of American and Asian studies, but rather to dialogue and analyze *across* these academic fields, geopolitical areas, and spatial–temporal relations to demonstrate precisely the artificial nature of such divisions when we consider the transregional movements, maneuvers, and logics of militarization. Our purpose in centering the Pacific in our volume is to provide a rearticulation of how the Pacific has been historically seen by Asian and American studies paradigms as an open frontier to be crossed, domesticated, occupied, and settled. Indeed, such regional divides are linked to the militarized logics of security and thus should be scrutinized cautiously, not mimetically replicated.

Our project therefore questions the effects of dominant paradigms and periodizations that privilege neocolonial forms of knowledge production through the consolidation of area studies during the cold war. For, as Jodi Kim argues in *Ends of Empire*, the cold war is not simply a matter of periodization but has served as a regulatory form of knowledge production.[84] The disavowal of colonial atrocities and ongoing militarized occupations were necessarily linked through a race for global dominance that crushed movements for decolonization during the overlapping postwar–cold war periods. The postwar, cold war, and post–cold war dominant periodizations obsfucate an alternative genealogy of arrested decolonization and demilitarization. In order to further demilitarizing and decolonizing alliances, we call for collaborative strategies of knowledge production that understand the political effects of such regional and national divisions.[85]

In framing the temporal and geographical scope of this anthology, then, we advocate the cautious use of the labels "Asia," the "Pacific" and "Asia-Pacific." After all, centuries of Asian and Western colonial rule have renamed as "feminine," transformed as "other," or altogether suppressed indigenous place names of these regions.[86] For this reason and others, our collection foregrounds hitherto subordinated and postcolonial bodies of knowledge that have remained marginalized and repressed under the imperial regimes of Japan and the United States and their attendant institutionalized divisions of "area studies" knowledge production. Instead, we seek to traverse purposely these constructed areas with a heightened call to engage with the knowledge produced by the peoples that reside and move across these areas. Following the directive of the Tongan scholar Epeli Hau'ofa, we focus on "how people, ordinary people, the forgotten people

of history, have coped and are coping with their harsh realities, their resistance and struggles to be themselves and hold together."[87] With our concentration on Pacific Islanders, Asians, and Asian Americans, we draw critical attention to the agents of these societies and to the ways in which they articulate histories of resistance and struggle, foregrounding the perspectives of intellectuals from these regions and locales. Given these broad parameters, we specifically explore the experiences of Chamorros, Filipinos, Hawaiians, Japanese, Koreans, Marshallese, and Okinawans under the nexus of colonialism and militarism. While these peoples and societies do not comprise a comprehensive representation of these regions, we hope that this collection provides both a critique of area studies and a departure point for further transpacific dialogue.[88]

By addressing the interlinked Asian, Asian American, and Pacific Islander relations under the dual histories of U.S. and Japanese empires, we believe that area studies, ethnic studies, and interdisciplinary studies can be enriched methodologically, theoretically, and politically. As the Filipino Pohnpeian critic Vicente M. Diaz asserts, Asian American inquiry "must strive to comprehend the kinds of historical and political struggles that Native Pacific Scholars are trying to articulate, just as Native Pacific Scholars need to understand the specificities of Asian histories as they are bound up with the American imperial project among and amidst Native Pacific Islanders in the [U.S.] continent and in the Islands."[89] These points of convergence, as Yen Lê Espiritu argues, also "demand that we refashion the fields of American studies and Asian American studies, not around the narratives of American exceptionalism, and immigration, and transnationalism, but around the crucial issues of war, race, and violence—and of the history and memories that are forged from the thereafter."[90]

This kind of trajectory can foster discussions not only about U.S. militarization across Asia and the Pacific but also about a move beyond the "afterlife" of area studies paradigms that have been shaped by histories of American and Japanese empires. Paraphrasing Walter Benjamin's notion of "afterlife," H. D. Harootunian and Masao Miyoshi observe that we now face the afterlife of area studies, a perspective that surpasses "the older global divisions inaugurated after World War II that informed the organization of knowledge and teaching of regions of the world outside Euro-America."[91] Neither the nation-state category nor communist studies and modernization studies—paradigms central to the development of area studies—can any longer sustain *as natural* the global divisions of the world.[92] Indeed,

as the historian Gary Y. Okihiro notes, the "boundaries separating ethnic studies, American studies, and area studies will be even less distinct than they appear in the present, judging from the movements within those fields," an act embraced and elaborated by the contributors of this volume.[93]

In bringing together a range of scholars and theorists who represent and articulate alternative locations and modes of knowledge production in Asia and the Pacific, *Militarized Currents* thus forwards analyses of militarization emanating from scholars and subjects situated in these colonial and postcolonial locations, introducing a generation of emergent voices who build on the pioneering work of our contributing scholars such as Katharine Moon and Naoki Sakai in Asian studies, and Teresia K. Teaiwa and Jon Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio in Pacific studies, and Walden Bello in globalization studies, among others. In doing so, we aim to create a space for dialogue across and between Asian studies, Pacific studies, feminist and gender studies, and American studies scholars, who might otherwise not be familiar or engaged in scholarship from other fields. We intend to build bridges between different scholars, writers, and activists concerned with militarization and emphasize the potentiality for transregional demilitarized movements.[94]

Part I of our anthology, "Militarized Bodies of Memory," opens with Jon Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio's "Memorializing Puʻuloa and Remembering Pearl Harbor." Given the symbolic significance of Pearl Harbor as the official beginning of World War II, we chose to open with Osorio's article, which provides a countermemory and counterdiscourse to the master historiographical narratives of Japan's "surprise attack" on the United States. By foregrounding the Hawaiian naming of Puʻuloa, the imposed colonial renaming of Pearl Harbor is unsettled. As noted already, the American naming can be understood as a process of militarized colonization inscribing and claiming possession of the altered and now-prohibitive militarized terrain. Osorio begins with Hawaiian song and poetry that recalls another system of values and epistemologies of the place known as Puʻuloa. Through a recounting of his own familial genealogies that intimately connect American militarism with Hawaiian dispossession and anticolonial movements, Osorio eloquently explores the complex dynamics of memory and the different forces of identity formation and divergent desires across four generations of his family.

Osorio's article is followed by Teresia K. Teaiwa's "Bikinis and Other S/pacific N/oceans." We offer a reprint of this 1994 article to emphasize

the path-breaking postcolonial critique forwarded by indigenous Pacific Islander scholars like Teaiwa and others whose recognition is often obscured due to the ongoing marginalization of Pacific Islander and indigenous studies within the fields of Asian, Asian American, and American studies.[95] Teaiwa writes that the "bikini bathing suit manifests both a celebration and a forgetting of the nuclear power that strategically and materially marginalizes and erases the living history of Pacific Islanders." Teaiwa's paradigm-shaping analysis of militarist, nuclear, and touristic discourses on Bikini Atoll, Marshall Islands, demonstrates the feminization and sexualization of nuclear colonialism, elaborating how empires have been engendered through the deformation and violation of Pacific Islander bodies, whose bodies of memory are too rarely seen or heard.[96]

Following from Teaiwa's thematics of visibility and invisibility, Michael Lujan Bevacqua marks the invisibility of Guam historically and contemporaneously as representative of what he describes as the "banal coloniality" of its official "organized unincorporated" status as a U.S. territory. In his chapter, "The Exceptional Life and Death of a Chamorro Soldier: Tracing the Militarization of Desire in Guam, ~~USA~~," Bevacqua analyzes the high levels of Chamorro military participation and patriotism by elaborating a genealogy that connects the production of Chamorro desire to join the military to the century-long legacy of colonization. A diasporic Chamorro writer, poet, and scholar, Bevacqua's chapter challenges the normalization of the U.S. military presence that occupies more than one third of the landmass of Guam. Bevacqua incisively theorizes the uncanny and haunting residues of the intermingling of deaths of Chamorro soldiers and the desire for subjecthood for those who live and die in the immediacy of the U.S. colonial militarized presence.

Vernadette Vicuña Gonzalez's chapter, "Touring Military Masculinities: U.S.–Philippines Circuits of Sacrifice and Gratitude in Corregidor and Bataan," theorizes the intertwined economies of tourism, militarism, and colonialism as a thread that links the economies of Hawai'i, Guam, and the Philippines. Gonzalez meticulously analyzes the raced and gendered visual narratives of the American military in two touristic sites in postcolonial Philippines: Corregidor Island and Bataan. In her reading of these two tourist destinations, Gonzalez demonstrates how racialized masculinity and heroism are deployed in appeals to "remember properly." In these two sites, the act of touring historical battlefields and military routes is simultaneously an emotional and ideological remembering of a benevolent

American protector and an erasure of Japanese imperial violence and occupation. This act, as Gonzalez asserts, provides a selective reiteration of the Philippines' continuing "special relationship" with the United States as its former colonizer. In these intensely patriotic places, monuments that portray the homosocial bonds of men at war, mutual suffering, and interracial camaraderie of American and Filipino soldiers demonstrate how masculinized heroism and imperial nostalgia function in narrativizing how occupiers and empires are engendered and remembered.

The four chapters in part II, titled "Militarized Movements," thematize how social movements and migrations of bodies have been simultaneously militarized, racialized, and sexualized. The chapters here demonstrate how militarization operates as a transnational structuring force that has remained undertheorized as a process that has defined, shaped, and regulated Asian and Pacific Islander displacements and diasporas and the formation of transnational resistance, demilitarization, and decolonization movements that cross these regions. Thus, while we emphasize that militarization moves beyond the institution of the military, as a transregional and global force, we wish to highlight how it is also a force that structures subjectivity and human relations in the most intimate forms. That is to say, we underscore how militarization operates as a regulating logic and institutionalized practice in terms of familial and sexual relations and infuses and structures various political, resistance, and decolonization movements. All the chapters here demonstrate as well how the dual colonial histories of Guam, Korea, Okinawa, and the Philippines from the late nineteenth century to the twentieth century articulate through contemporary political movements for demilitarization as part of the longer process of decolonization.

This part opens with Wesley Ueunten's chapter, "Rising Up from a Sea of Discontent: The 1970 Koza Uprising in U.S.-Occupied Okinawa." Ueunten provides a transnational perspective on Okinawa's past and ongoing militarized colonial condition. As a territory that has been colonized by Japan and the United States and continues to remain under de facto shared rule by the U.S. military and the Japanese government, Okinawa represents the coarticulation of this complementary and dual neocolonial system. Despite the fact that Okinawa comprises only 0.6 percent of Japanese national territory, 75 percent of U.S. military bases in Japan are concentrated in Okinawa. Although Okinawa was officially reverted from U.S. military governance back to the Japanese government in 1972,

its economy, territory, and peoples remain subordinate to the U.S. military's commanding presence that occupies approximately 11 percent of its lands and 19 percent of Okinawa's main island. Ueunten's chapter explores the shared links between Okinawan, African American, and Third World movements in response to U.S. imperialism and militarism. Central to this chapter is an analysis of the Koza Uprising by Okinawans on the night of December 20, 1970. In the midst of the rebellion, Okinawans purposefully refrained from harming African American soldiers, saying that they were "the same as us." Ueunten's chapter explores a shared Third World consciousness against U.S. imperialism that bridges U.S. racial politics and Okinawan discontent under U.S. military rule as an aftereffect of Japanese colonialism. As an Okinawan diasporic scholar and activist, Ueunten's work demonstrates how Okinawan colonial identity can be productively examined in relation to people of color in the United States who have been incorporated into and have lived under the conditions of U.S. militarism.

Ueunten's chapter is followed by a reprint of Katharine Moon's instructive article, "South Korean Movements against Militarized Sexual Labor." Moon's chapter rigorously demonstrates the overlapping conditions and complicities among the Korean government, the Japanese "comfort women" system, and the U.S. military in regulating the sexual exploitation of specific classes and groups of South Korean women. In this chapter, Moon comparatively analyzes the historical context and politics of two movements against militarized sexual labor, namely, the *chŏngsindae* movement (also known as the comfort women movement) and the *kijich'on* movement, the movement that is concerned with the conditions of sex workers in U.S. military camptowns. Through her analysis of these two movements, Moon examines the many connections that link the formation of these movements, which include the colonial occupation of Korea by Japan and the military occupation of South Korea by the United States. As Moon's work indicates, some of the same women who were *chŏngsindae* (comfort women) for the Japanese imperial system later became sex workers for the U.S. military. Moon's pioneering research on the militarization of sexual relations in South Korea brings to bear how the violent and coerced militarization of women's sexuality can lead to the formation of new political movements.

Keith L. Camacho and Laurel A. Monnig's coauthored chapter, "Uncomfortable Fatigues: Chamorro Soldiers, Gendered Identities, and the Question of Decolonization in Guam," analyzes the formation of militarized

masculinities in Guam. Specifically, Camacho and Monnig explore the interrelated processes of militarization and masculinization among Guam's Chamorro men in the U.S. Armed Forces. This chapter foregrounds the voices of decolonization activists, military recruiters, and soldiers who speak to the complex conditions of their gendered incorporation into the U.S. military and how they struggle against and with their subordinated status. This chapter illustrates unexpected forms of resistance that militarization produces at the nexus of militarized masculinities and demilitarization movements. Camacho and Monnig argue that the processes of militarization and decolonization are constitutive states of contradiction and pose questions for possibilities of resistance against U.S. militarism in Guam and elsewhere.

Continuing on the thematic of racialized masculinities, Theresa Cenidoza Suarez's chapter, "Militarized Filipino Masculinity and the Language of Citizenship in San Diego," examines the multiple and competing meanings of heteronormative manhood among Filipino navy veterans and their families. Suarez examines how Filipino masculinity is constructed within a transnational context overshadowed by U.S. military culture and U.S. imperialism. Specifically, she explores how Filipino militarized masculinity emerges as a necessary and tenuous construction and not exclusively as a male-gendered or male-gendering project. Rather, Suarez argues that Filipino masculinity is constituted through the co-constructions of heteronormative womanhood and childhood, roles imagined and lived within a transnational domestic sphere inescapably militarized and domesticated. Suarez's chapter does much to demonstrate how Filipino American migration to the United States has been regulated through processes of militarization, which she theorizes as constituting "militarized diaporas."

The final part of the anthology, "Hetero/Homo-sexualized Militaries," brings together four chapters that examine the sexualized economies produced and regulated by military practices. This part begins with Naoki Sakai's chapter, "On Romantic Love and Military Violence: Transpacific Imperialism and U.S.–Japan Complicity," which cogently describes the historical, political, and philosophical intimacies between Japanese and U.S. imperial projects. Sakai's chapter theorizes how the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized—which is mediated through the threat and use of military violence—is narrativized and practiced in heterosexualized terms. Sakai discusses how the underlying and constant threat of violence along with the imminent threat of rape is repressed, converted,

and represented in the cinematic form through an economy of heterosexual romance that produces the spectrality of love and seduction. Sakai's chapter does much work to elaborate the relationship between American and Japanese imperialism and how the "universality" of Japanese colonial discourse must be subordinated to the status of a particular in contrast to the reiterated claims of American imperialist universalism. Sakai's chapter provides a historical and theoretical contextualization of the connections between contemporary forms of militarization in South Korea and Japan in relation to Japanese colonialism in Korea and the U.S.-supported militarization of Japan and South Korea.

Insook Kwon's chapter, "Masculinity and Male-on-Male Sexual Violence in the Military: Focusing on the Absence of the Issue," offers the first English-language translation of her groundbreaking study of male-on-male sexual violence in the contemporary South Korean military.[97] Kwon examines the conditions of such male-on-male sexual conduct and homoerotic practices based on surveys and firsthand interviews with military personnel. She also analyzes the mass media and the official military responses to this phenomenon, commenting on the reasons for the public silence surrounding this issue. Given South Korea's mandatory conscription system, Kwon's feminist-informed analysis concludes that the sanctioned masculinity in the military—and how it is practiced and engendered—should be a major issue for those concerned with gendered inequality and sexual violence.

Kwon's chapter is followed by Fumika Sato's pioneering work on women in the Japanese Self-Defense Forces.[98] Sato's chapter, "Why Have the Japanese Self-Defense Forces Included Women?: The State's 'Nonfeminist Reasons,'" analyzes how and why women have been incorporated into the Japanese Self-Defense Forces (SDF) from the 1950s to the present. In her chapter, Sato argues that the feminization of the SDF through its incorporation of women is not motivated by feminist reasons, but that the institutional logic remains heterosexist. Sato's study of the gendering of the SDF provides a salient example of how the feminization of the marketing of the SDF works to create the image of the Japanese military as "peace-makers." As a Japanese feminist scholar, Sato's study also provides a useful counterpoint for considering the significant difference in Japanese feminist responses to women's incorporation in the military compared to U.S. liberal feminist arguments for women's equal treatment and opportunity in the military.

Sato's chapter, along with Kwon, Suarez, Gonzalez, and Camacho and Monnig's work, is one of five chapters in the volume that focuses on gendered, militarized, and racialized identities. While the chapters by Suarez, Camacho and Monnig, and Gonzalez demonstrate the intersectional approach to racialized gender and colonialism representative of an emergent generation of scholars, their juxtaposition with the work of Kwon and Sato also reveals the methodological discrepancies and gaps between methodologies (in both area studies and social sciences) that do not emphasize the racialization of gender or the insights of queer studies. Nevertheless, we see the inclusion of such work as valuable precisely in order to generate cross-disciplinary and transregional dialogues across the Pacific with scholars working outside the U.S. academy.

Patti Duncan's chapter, "Genealogies of Unbelonging: Amerasians and Transnational Adoptees as Legacies of U.S. Militarism in South Korea," draws from a body of feminist scholarship on U.S. militarism in Asia. Duncan's chapter analyzes representations of the experiences of Amerasian children of military camptown women and the transnational adoption of their children as part of the legacy of U.S. militarism in South Korea. As the nation that has the highest rate of transnational adoptions, Duncan argues for an analysis of the relationship between "unidirectional" adoption and Amerasian children, given the latter's presumed association with the militarized sex industry and the U.S. occupation of their homeland. The militarized sexual relations between U.S. military personnel, sex workers, and civilians produces children that are the living reminders of continuing occupation. Militarization is thus a force that has produced generations of abandoned and adopted multiracial children through militarized sexual relations. Within this context, the militarization of bodies and subjectivities continues to incite new alliances in the current struggles to demilitarize the future for generations to come.

Bello's closing chapter, "From American Lake to a People's Pacific in the Twenty-First Century," maps out the current expanse of what he calls America's "transnational garrison state" as it impacts Asia and the Pacific. But more importantly, Bello's chapter offers a vision of alternatives to U.S. militarism that is increasingly showing signs of strain throughout these regions and forwards a case for demilitarizing and denuclearizing the "Asia-Pacific." By concluding this collection with this call for demilitarization, we want to affirm the power of people's struggles for decolonized futures that expand beyond the places currently named "Asia" and the

"Pacific." It is our hope that the future direction of research and scholarship will also converge and combine with the efforts to demilitarize the currents of empire.

Notes

1. Andrea Smith, "American Studies with America: Native Feminisms and the Nation-State," *American Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (2008): 312.

2. As Sabine Frühstück's work illuminates, negotiating the history and representations of the Imperial Japanese Army is very much integral to contemporary processes of rearticulating the identity of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. Sabine Frühstück, *Uneasy Warriors: Gender, Memory, and Popular Culture in the Japanese Army* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

3. See Naoki Sakai's chapter in this volume, "On Romantic Love and Military Violence: Transpacific Imperialism and U.S.–Japan Complicity." See also Naoki Sakai, "'You Asians': On the Historical Role of the West and Asia Binary," *The South Atlantic Quarterly, "Millennial Japan,"* 99, no. 4 (2000): 789–817.

4. Yuki Tanaka, *Japan's Comfort Women: The Military and Involuntary Prostitution During War and Occupation* (London: Routledge, 2002); "The Comfort Women: Colonialism, War, and Sex," Special Issue of *positions: east asia cultures critique* 5, no. 1 (1997); *Journal of Asian American Studies* 6, no. 1 (2003); George Hicks, *The Comfort Women: Japan's Brutal Regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1985).

5. See the chapters by Katharine H. S. Moon (chapter 6), Naoki Sakai (chapter 9), and Patti Duncan (chapter 12).

6. Lisa Yoneyama, "Traveling Memories, Contagious Justice: Americanization of Japanese War Crimes at the End of the Post-Cold War," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 6, no. 1 (2003): 57–93.

7. Ibid.

8. Lijon Eknilang and James Matayoshi, "Rongelap Survivors," in *Life in the Republic of the Marshall Islands: Mour ilo republic eo an majōl*, ed. Anono Lieom Loeak, Veronica C. Kiluwe, and Linda Crowl (Majuro, Marshall Islands: University of the South Pacific Centre and Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 2004), 130.

9. Ibid., 131.

10. Craig Calhoun, Frederick Cooper, and Kevin W. Moore, "Introduction," in *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, ed. Craig Calhoun, Frederick Cooper, and Kevin W. Moore (New York: The New Press, 2006), 1.

11. Leo T. S. Ching, *Becoming Japanese: Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 19. An example of

such a collaborative alliance is cited by Mark Selden and Laura Hein. "The United States also used Okinawa as a nuclear arsenal throughout the postwar era, both before and after reversion, with secret Japanese government approval" (22). Laura Hein and Mark Selden, "Culture, Power and Identity in Contemporary Okinawa," in *Islands of Discontent: Okinawan Responses to Japanese and American Power*, ed. Laura Hein and Mark Selden (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), 1–35.

12. Alexis Dudden, "Introduction," in *Japan's Colonization of Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), 2.

13. Ching, *Becoming Japanese*, 24.

14. Li Narangoa and Robert Cribb, "Introduction: Japan and the Transformation of National Identities in Asia," in *Imperial Japan and National Identities in Asia, 1895–1945*, ed. Li Narangoa and Robert Cribb (New York: Routledge, 2003), 1–22.

15. Gerald Horne, *White Supremacy and the Japanese Attack on the British Empire* (New York: New York University Press, 2004), vii.

16. Andrew Gordon, *Labor and Imperial Democracy in Prewar Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 23.

17. Nicholas Tarling, *A Sudden Rampage: The Japanese Occupation of Southeast Asia, 1941–1945* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001).

18. Lewis H. Gann, "Western and Japanese Colonialism: Some Preliminary Comparisons," in *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945*, ed. Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), 502.

19. Mark R. Peattie, "The Nan'yō: Japan in the South Pacific, 1885–1945," in *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945*, 203; Tomiyama Ichiro, "The 'Japanese' of Micronesia: Okinawans in the Nan'yô Islands," in *Okinawan Diaspora*, ed. Ronald Y. Nakasone (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 57–70.

20. Aiko Utsumi, "Korean 'Imperial Soldiers': Remembering Colonialism and Crimes against Allied POWs," in *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, ed. T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 199–217; Michael Weiner, *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

21. Takashi Fujitani, "Right to Kill, Right to Make Live: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans During WWII," *Representations* 99, no. 1 (2007): 17.

22. Ibid., 33.

23. Jane C. Desmond, *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999), 13.

24. Ron Crocombe, *Asia in the Pacific Islands: Replacing the West* (Suva, Fiji: IPS Publications, University of the South Pacific, 2007), 171.

25. American Friends Service Committee, "AFSC Hawai'i Gay Liberation Program: Activist Materials Addressing Tourism," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 8, no. 1–2 (2002): 211.

26. Teresia K. Teaiwa, "Native Thoughts: A Pacific Studies Take on Cultural Studies and Diaspora," in *Indigenous Diasporas and Dislocations*, ed. Harvey and Charles D. Thompson (London: Ashgate, 2005), 16.

27. Japan ranked seventh in military spending in 2008, after the United States, China, Britain, Russia, and France, and tied with Germany to account for 3.2 percent of the world's military expenditures, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. China's military expenditure surpassed Japan's for the first time in 2006, making China the largest military spender in Asia. Petter Stålenheim, Noel Kelly, Catalina Perdomo, Sam Perlo-Freeman, and Elisabeth Sköns, "Military Expenditure," in *SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) 2009 Yearbook: Armaments, Disarmaments and International Security* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Available at http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2009/05/05A (accessed December 5, 2009).

28. Joanne Barker, "For Whom Sovereignty Matters," in *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, ed. Joanne Barker (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 4.

29. Ediberto Román, *The Other American Colonies: An International and Constitutional Law Examination of the United States' Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Island Conquests* (Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 2006), 33.

30. For a selection of key essays on Pacific issues, see David Hanlon and Geoffrey M. White, *Voyaging Through the Contemporary Pacific* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).

31. See Eileen H. Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity: The Nisei Generation in Hawaii* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); and Catherine Ceniza Choy, *Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino American History* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003).

32. Julian Go, "'Racism' and Colonialism: Meanings of Difference and Ruling Practices in America's Pacific Empire," *Qualitative Sociology* 27, no. 1 (2004): 44.

33. On these subjects, see respectively, Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States and the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006); and Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2004).

34. T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama, "Introduction," in *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, 3.

35. Lisa Yoneyama, "Traveling Memories, Contagious Justice," 81.

36. David Hanlon, *Remaking Micronesia: Discourses over Development in a Pacific Territory, 1944–1982* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998), 24.

37. Kathy E. Ferguson and Phyllis Turnbull, *Oh, Say, Can You See?: The Semiotics of the Military in Hawai'i* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), xiv.

38. Elaine H. Kim and Chungmoo Choi, "Introduction," in *Dangerous Women: Gender and Korean Nationalism*, ed. Elaine H. Kim and Chungmoo Choi (New York: Routledge, 1998), 3.

39. Nomura Koya, "Colonialism and Nationalism: The View from Okinawa," in *Okinawan Diaspora*, 112–19.

40. Hideaki Tobe, "Military Bases and Modernity: An Aspect of Americanization in Okinawa," *Transforming Anthropology* 14, no. 1 (2006): 93.

41. Ibid. See also Nomura Koya, *Muishiki no shokuminchishugi* (Colonialism's unconscious) (Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shoten, 2005).

42. See Scott Saft and Yumiko Ohara, "The Media and the Pursuit of Militarism in Japan: Newspaper Editorials in the Aftermath of 9/11," *Critical Discourse Studies* 3, no. 1 (2006): 81–101.

43. Society of American Military Engineers, *Guam Military Build-up Program* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007), 2.

44. Eric Schmitt, "Secretary Gates Visits Guam Military Base," *The New York Times*, May 30, 2008, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/30/world/asia/31guam.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss (accessed November 23, 2009).

45. See "Obama OKs 734M for Buildup," *Pacific Daily News*, October 30, 2009, http://www.guampdn.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/200910300300/NEWS01/910300327 (accessed November 23, 2009).

46. Julian Aguon, *The Fire This Time: Essays on Life under U.S. Occupation* (Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2006), 10.

47. "Guam Hosts Talks on Military Buildup," *Air Force Times*, August 24, 2007, http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2007/08/ap_guambuildup_070824 (accessed July 1, 2008).

48. Ronni Alexander, "Confronting Militarization: Intersections of Gender(ed) Violence, Militarization and Resistance in the Pacific" (paper presented at the 49th annual meeting of the International Studies Association, San Francisco, Calif., March 26, 2008).

49. *Fuetsan famalao'an* literally means "the strong women" in English.

50. Mar-Vic Cagurangan, "Activists Bare Report on GI Atrocities Against Japanese," *Marianas Variety*, January 28, 2008, 1.

51. Aguon, *The Fire This Time*, 9.

52. J. Kehaulani Kauanui, "Asian American Studies and the 'Pacific Question,'" in *Asian American Studies After Critical Mass*, ed. Kent A. Ono (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 134.

53. Jonathan Y. Okamura, *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), 62; Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, ed., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

54. Haunani-Kay Trask, "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony," *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2 (2000): 4.

55. Ibid., 2–3.

56. Dean Itsuji Saranillio, "Colonial Amnesia: Rethinking Filipino 'American' Settler Empowerment in the U.S. Colony of Hawai'i," in *Positively No Filipinos Allowed: Building Communities and Discourse*, ed. Antonio T. Tiongson, Jr., Edgardo V. Gutierrez, and Ricardo V. Gutierrez (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006), 140.

57. Vilsoni Hereniko, "Indigenous Knowledge and Academic Imperialism," in *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts: An Invitation to Remake History*, ed. Robert Borofsky (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), 86.

58. See Mary L. Dudziak, ed., *September 11 in History: A Watershed Moment?* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003).

59. William J. Fallon, "Statement before the House Armed Services Committee on U.S. Pacific Command Posture," House Armed Services Committee, March 9, 2006, 3. H.R. 2647: Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, 109th Congress.

60. Alfred Vagats, *A History of Militarism: Civilian and Military* (New York: Meridian Books, 1959). Revised edition of 1937 edition.

61. Ismael Hossein-Zadeh writes, "The power and influence of militarism is exercised indirectly, that is, through formally civilian organs of the state structure" (27). Ismael Hossein-Zadeh, *The Political Economy of U.S. Militarism* (New York: Palgrave, 2006).

62. Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), 23–24.

63. Kim emphasizes for the importance of maintaining "a critical perspective on the function of this division; to judge the content, practices, and quality of phenomena assigned to both [civilian–military] categories; and to analyze the ethical dilemma of maintaining or challenging (or both) the practical outcomes that the existence of the category 'military' facilitates." We thank Jean Kim for this comment.

64. Many scholars have deployed the term "militarization" to emphasize the *process* by which formerly nonmilitary aspects of society, culture, and economy become increasingly influenced by militaristic values (Vagats, *A History of Militarism*). Cynthia Enloe writes, "Militarization is a step-by-step process by which a person or thing gradually comes to be controlled by the military *or* comes to depend for its well-being on militaristic ideas. The more militarization transforms an individual or society, the more that individual or society comes to imagine military needs and militaristic presumptions to be not only valuable but also normal. Militarization, that is, involves cultural as well as institutional, ideological and economic transformations." Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 3. Glen Hook's definition emphasizes the relevance of understanding how

militarization is a transnational process: "The concept of militarization can be used to bring into critical focus the increase in size, strength or influence of the military as a dynamic process with international or even transnational implications" (18). Glenn D. Hook, *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan* (New York: Routledge 1996); Catherine Lutz, *Homefront: A Military City and the American 20th Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001); Catherine Lutz, "Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis," *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 723–35.

65. Despite the growing body of literature on gender and the military, Gwendolyn Hall has pointed out that there persists a dearth of analyses that examine the intersectionality of how gender and race are continually at work in structuring the composition, evaluation, and representation of the military. Although Hall is specifically concerned with the lack of attention to women of color in the U.S. military, we can extend her critique to how studies of gender-related issues in the military have often neglected the ways in which gender is racialized and the ways in which race is gendered. Gwendolyn Hall, "Intersectionality: A Necessary Consideration for Women of Color in the Military?" in *Beyond Zero Tolerance: Discrimination in Military Culture*, ed. Mary Katzenstein and Judith Reppy (Boston: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 143–62. See Setsu Shigematsu, Anuradha Bhagwati, and Eli Painted Crow, "Women-of-Color Veterans on War, Militarism and Feminism," in *Feminism and War: Confronting Feminism and Imperialism*, ed. Robin Riley, Chandra Mohanty, and Minnie Bruce Pratt (London: Zed Press, 2008), 93–102.

66. Charles Moskos, John Allen Williams, and David Segal, ed., *The Postmodern Military: Armed Forces After the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

67. Ibid., 1.

68. For a pioneering study of "female masculinity" see Judith Halberstam, *Female Masculinity* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998); Judith Halberstam, "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Men, Women, and Masculinity," in *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory: New Directions*, ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 344–67.

69. Asbjorn Eide and Marek Thee, ed., *Problems of Contemporary Militarism* (London: Croom Helm, 1980). See also Peter Wallensteen, Johan Galtung, and Carlos Portales, ed., *Global Militarization* (London: Westview Press, 1985); Cynthia Enloe, *Globalization and Militarism* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).

70. Some classic studies we refer to are Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); Ann McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995); and Ann Laura

Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

71. Sandra Wilson, "Bridging the Gaps: New Views of Japanese Colonialism, 1931–1945," *Japanese Studies* 25, no. 3 (2005): 295. Shin and Robinson's volume seeks to demonstrate the "complexity and diversity of colonial modernity, hegemony and identity formation" in colonial Korea (18). *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, ed. Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Robinson (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001). Ichiro Tomiyama, "Japan's Militarization and Okinawa's Bases," trans. Wesley Ueunten, *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 1, no. 2 (2000): 349–56.

72. Jibā B. Kabua, "We Are the Land, the Land Is Us: The Moral Responsibility of Our Education and Sustainability," in *Life in the Republic of the Marshall Islands: Mour ilo republic eo an majōl*, ed. Anono Lieom Loeak, Veronica C. Kiluwe, and Linda Crowl (Majuro, Marshall Islands: University of the South Pacific Centre and Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 2004), 187.

73. Ibid., 189.

74. Greg Dvorak, "'The Martial Islands': Making Marshallese Masculinities between American and Japanese Militarism," *The Contemporary Pacific* 20, no. 1 (2008): 69.

75. Ibid., 79.

76. See Crocombe, *Asia in the Pacific Islands*, 168, 341–42.

77. Arif Dirlik, "The Asia-Pacific Idea: Reality and Representation in the Invention of a Regional Structure," *Journal of World History* 3, no. 1 (1992): 56.

78. Ibid., 56.

79. See Epeli Hau'ofa, "Our Sea of Islands," *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (1994): 147–61.

80. Rob Wilson and Arif Dirlik, "Introduction: Asia/Pacific as Space of Cultural Production," in *Asia/Pacific as Space of Cultural Production*, ed. Rob Wilson and Arif Dirlik (London: Duke University Press, 1995), 6.

81. Dirlik, "The Asia-Pacific Idea," 56.

82. Ella Shohat, "Area Studies, Gender Studies, and the Cartographies of Knowledge," *Social Text* 20, no. 3 (2002): 69.

83. Ibid.

84. Jodi Kim, *Ends of Empire: Asian American Critique and the Cold War* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

85. The East Asia–U.S.–Puerto Rico Women's Network Against Militarism is an example of such a transregional demilitarizing effort. We affirm the need to create transregional alliances to further what Kuan-Hsing Chen points to as the "incomplete project of decolonization" (47). Kuan-Hsing Chen, "Introduction: The Decolonization Question," in *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, ed. Kuan-Hsing Chen (New York: Routledge, 1998), 1–53.

86. Nerissa S. Balce, "The Filipina's Breast: Savagery, Docility, and the Erotics of the American Empire," *Social Text* 24, no. 2 (2006): 90.

87. Epeli Hau'ofa, "Epilogue: Pasts to Remember," in *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts: An Invitation to Remake History*, ed. Robert Borofsky (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), 458.

88. Shirley Hune, "Through 'Our' Eyes: Asian/Pacific Islander American Women's History," in *Asian/Pacific Islander American Women: A Historical Anthology*, ed. Shirley Hune and Gail M. Nomura (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 11.

89. Vicente M. Diaz, "To 'P' or not to 'P': Marking the Territory Between Pacific Islander and Asian American Studies," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 7, no. 3 (2004): 184.

90. Yen Lê Espiritu, "Thirty Years AfterWARd: The Endings That Are Not Over," *Amerasia Journal* 31, no. 2 (2005): xviii.

91. H. D. Harootunian and Masao Miyoshi, "Introduction: The 'Afterlife' of Area Studies," in *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, ed. Masao Miyoshi and H. D. Harootunian (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002), 14.

92. Bruce Cummings, "Boundary Displacement: The State, the Foundations, and Area Studies during and after the Cold War," in *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, ed. Masao Miyoshi and H. D. Harootunian (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002), 265.

93. Gary Y. Okihiro, *The Columbia Guide to Asian American History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), xiv.

94. The editorial collaboration between Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho, who are respectively trained as an Asian–Japan studies–Asian American studies feminist scholar and as a historian of Pacific Islander Studies is an example of the kind of cross-disciplinary and cross-regional dialogues we hope to generate.

95. See Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge," *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001): 315–42.

96. Teresia K. Teaiwa, "On Analogies: Rethinking the Pacific in a Global Context," *The Contemporary Pacific* 18, no. 1 (2006): 73.

97. Translation from the Korean language publication, chapter 5 of *The Republic of Korea Is the Military* (Paju City, Korea: Chungnyunsa, 2005), 247–82.

98. Sato Fumika, *Gunji soshiki to jendâ: jieitai no joseitachi* (Military organization and gender: the women of the self-defense forces) (Tokyo: Keio University Press, 2004).