UC Santa Barbara
Journal of Transnational American Studies

Title
Threatening “the Good Order”: West Meets East in Cecil B. DeMille’s The Cheat and John Updike’s Terrorist

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6p306627

Journal
Journal of Transnational American Studies, 3(2)

Author
Freeman, Bradley M.

Publication Date
2011

DOI
10.5070/T832007092

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

Peer reviewed

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

Threatening "the Good Order": West Meets East in Cecil B. DeMille's *The Cheat* and John Updike's *Terrorist*

BRADLEY M. FREEMAN

Near the end of Cecil B. DeMille's 1915 film *The Cheat*, the Japanese character, Tori (Sessue Hayakawa),[1] manages through deception and manipulation to land the white male, Richard Hardy (Jack Dean), in jail. In this way, Tori threatens the only markedly Western relationship between Richard and his wife, Edith Hardy (Fannie Ward), in the film. After Edith goes behind her husband's back in order to ask Tori for a favor, Tori seduces, deceives, and nearly rapes Edith. She then shoots him in order to escape his home. However, Richard is charged with this attempted murder because he stumbles onto the scene of the shooting afterward. Edith then apologizes for and even confesses her deceptive interactions with Tori to Richard in a jail cell. Shortly thereafter, the intertitles read, "East is East and West is West and never the Twain shall meet."[2] This passage from Rudyard Kipling's "The Ballad of East and West," a poem that was published nearly thirty years prior to the film's production, serves to remind the viewer that the Hardys' problems are the predictable result of a meeting between two irreconcilable spaces.

The intertitles suggest that this film is less about a group of individuals, a series of events, or even America's growing influx of immigration than about immutable and irreconcilable spatial separation. Of course, splitting the globe into two entirely distinct Western and Eastern spaces was crucial to the imaginary construction of an American space. And in light of what Eric Hayot in a recent issue of *PMLA* calls "the transnational turn" in literary studies,[3] critics must explore the way in which American aesthetics deploy and reinforce this imaginary divide in order to create a unified American space. In both Cecil B. DeMille's film *The Cheat* and John Updike's much later novel *Terrorist* (2006), we encounter a monolithic "East" that threatens an overly idealized and territorially insecure America.[4] By spanning nearly a

hundred years, these two narratives stand as important bookends to the long twentieth century, a century marked by this entirely problematic territorial divide.[5]

At the beginning of this long twentieth century, America was forced to come to terms with a flood of new immigration. Indeed, anxieties spread as the national community threatened to look, act, and speak differently. In the midst of these changes, spatial constitution and territorial integrity gained a renewed precedence in the national imaginary. For this reason, legislators began to dramatically restrict immigration, and these restrictions eventually culminated in the harsh conditions of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Act, an act that severely limited and nearly halted all immigration into the US. In the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, America appears to be a nation predicated on racial diversity. But even in the midst of this supposed diversity, the war on terror revives a menacing East and recodes anxieties about Asian immigration onto the Muslim population in the Middle East. Religious and cultural difference, then, revamp the national self by (re)articulating a dangerous Other. In terrorism, this threatening specter of the East continues to haunt the US with territorial dissolution. September 11th, of course, epitomizes this threat in that it reveals a deceptive Eastern Other bent on American destruction. In this way, both DeMille and Updike articulate unique but similar anxieties about an Eastern Other. Furthermore, in the wake of these anxieties, both artists imagine a territorially secure US through spatial projection.

The Cheat registers the significance of spatial separation in the American narrative and, more importantly, it reveals more particular anxieties about spatial divides and territorial boundaries shortly after the turn of the century. In his book *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*, Aristide R. Zolberg notes, "a concatenation of changes associated with the globalization of capitalism and the demographic revolution in the final decades of the nineteenth century induced a sudden and worldwide escalation in the number of people on the move internationally."[6] Zolberg goes on to write that "the United States was by far the leading destination, receiving more than six times as many immigrants as second-ranking Argentina" (205). This sudden increase in transnational mobility was marked by a mysterious but telling prohibition on Eastern immigration.

Throughout the many debates that surrounded trends in immigration during the first half of the twentieth century, the Chinese Exclusion Act remained intact, greatly restricting and controlling the possibilities of Eastern immigration.[7] The Exclusion Act of 1882 was instated because "in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese Laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof."[8] This legislation essentializes a phenomenological normalcy and blatantly displays the anxieties that would shape legislation throughout the first half of the twentieth century. This "good order" is multivalent and mutable in the texts that I analyze, and it morphs in the national imaginary as well. While white heterosexual couples, patriarchy, and productive labor constitute normalcy and therefore the "good order" in DeMille's film, Updike's much

later text reluctantly allows for difference and interracial sex but still guards against Islamic religion.[9] Miscegenation, then, and religious difference threaten the nation's compositional integrity. And these shifting structures of normalcy, which undergird territorial construction, animate these narratives.

In the Exclusion Act, Chinese immigration troubles the preexisting order of American territory, and thus this act anticipates the rhetorical stance of Kipling's poem. The discursive language of an eternally separate West and East proliferated around the turn of the century. But even beyond this proliferation of discourse, Roger Daniels observes, "When the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed there were probably about 125,000 Chinese living . . . in the United States. That number dropped steadily until . . . 1920."[10] These burgeoning anxieties about Eastern immigration reinvigorated the importance of this territorial divide and helped to delimit and idealize an American space.

In both DeMille's film and John Updike's novel, this territorial splitting informs the construction of an American identity. While Updike's Egyptian American protagonist, Ahmad, is portrayed in a much more sympathetic light than DeMille's antagonist, Tori, the overall narrative still relies on these spatial divisions. Ahmad's Eastern religion and consequent terrorist activity pose a major threat to New York City throughout the course of the novel. In the end, the white Westerner, Jack Levy, must persuade Ahmad to pass through Western space without the intent of destruction. In the twenty-first century, New York City signifies the interracial space that DeMille's Richard dreads nearly a hundred years earlier, and yet these imagined Eastern spaces continue to threaten "the good order" of America. In both of these texts, Western spaces signify a normalized and productive space that must be protected at all costs. Eastern spaces, however, signify a much more problematic and, as Alice Maurice notes, elusive and mobile space with entirely different phenomenological implications.[11] Moreover, Eastern spaces and subjects are uniquely vulnerable to and even constituted by deceptive mobility and spatial irregularity, providing an anxious and contentious counterpoint to the nearly ubiquitous surveillance of the West.[12] In the beginning of the twentieth century, this West–East division separates and marks Eastern subjects for the West, but this same separation recurs nearly a hundred years later to ensure the securitization of an interracial America.

In these narratives, subjects are linked to and constituted by surrounding spaces in order to enact relations of power and security. In a series of lectures titled *Security, Territory, Population*, Michel Foucault attempts to triangulate the dynamics of power by utilizing three points of focus that highlight the relationship between subjects and their enveloping spaces. He writes, "at first sight and somewhat schematically, we could say that sovereignty is exercised within the borders of a territory, discipline is exercised on the bodies of individuals, and security is exercised over a whole population."[13] In this passage, Foucault underscores the importance of territory, individuals, and population in the exercise of power. Moreover, Foucault

makes it quite clear that these three structures are intimately linked and essential to any critical analysis of the overall dynamics of power. In this same way, the construction of a national identity involves the demarcation and, at least to some extent, control of territory, individuals, and the population. For the purposes of this paper, space and territory will be used interchangeably in order to signify this close link between subjects and their surrounding spaces. Similarly, Foucault's entire analysis of bio-power tracks the close correlations between power, space, and the subject without noting how the subject is constructed within these surrounding spaces. We must remember, however, that the subject is rooted in and constituted by surrounding spaces in order to perpetuate this West–East division and propel the larger discourses of power. In these processes, the regulation of bodies and therefore sexuality culminates in a manufactured normalcy, but a more in-depth analysis of bio-power allows us to see the way in which the nation simultaneously imagines and constitutes this normalcy and thus the "good order." In this light, the West—and, more specifically, the US—relies on these subtle but productive associations in order to construct national identities, not to mention the securitization mechanisms that reproduce and ensure these national identities.

In the work of DeMille and Updike, the imaginative and ontological construction of a distinctly "Oriental" space reflects the narcissistic delimitation of an American identity, space, and normalcy.[14] Edward Said's classic critique of Western Orientalism lends a great deal of critical leverage to this thesis. Said writes, "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (2). Similarly, *The Cheat* and *Terrorist* render narratives structured around this perpetual projection of the Orient. Said's analysis, however, does not adequately address the historical role of space in American discourses of knowledge. By focusing on the two-fold thesis that Britain and France "were the pioneer nations in the Orient and in Oriental studies . . . the American Oriental position since World War II has fit—I think, quite self-consciously—in the places excavated by the two earlier European powers" (17), Said appears to be less interested in the fact that the Orient shaped the American imagination long before World War II, which this paper will take up in some detail. Furthermore, the study of the Orient was both reinvigorated and reshaped by anxieties about increasing trends in immigration in the beginning of the twentieth century.

This marked increase in transnational mobility, which historically surrounded the production of *The Cheat*, intensified the role of space in the study of the Orient. Said writes, "the very power and scope of Orientalism produced . . . a kind of second-order knowledge—lurking in such places as the 'Oriental' tale, the mythology of the mysterious East, notions of Asian inscrutability" (52). Indeed, this "second-order knowledge" permeates our understanding and our experience of space. In these texts, the West connotes a very productive and even legible space, and the East is shrouded in mystery and inscrutability. In both narratives, New York constitutes phenomenological normalcy. The enclaves of Eastern space, however, represent the

exotic, problematic, and strangely eccentric Other space. These enclaves constantly mark and separate Tori and Ahmad, effectively shrouding them in this mystique. Said briefly adumbrates the role of space: "In other words, this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space which is 'ours' and an unfamiliar space beyond 'ours' which is 'theirs' is a way of making geographical distinctions that can be entirely arbitrary . . . their territory and their mentality are designated as different" (54). Individuals identify familiar and unfamiliar spaces with very particular pronouns—consequently, the familiar space categorizes "us," while the unfamiliar space categorizes the Other or "them." The aesthetics of DeMille and Updike marshal this close connection between spatial division and psychological projection.

As New York represents unmarked normalcy, order, and an obsession with materialism, the East is structured as an elusive and often immaterial Other. In Updike's novel in particular, the Eastern religion, Islam, becomes an unparalleled immaterial force that threatens the material space of the West. And as America continues to develop into a country that is based on surveillance, discipline, and regulation, anxieties develop about the Orient's ability to elude and escape these Western structures of power. After all, "the Oriental lived in a different but thoroughly organized world of his own, a world with its own national, cultural, and epistemological boundaries and principles of internal coherence" (40). Tori's home and Ahmad's mosque are constituted by an entirely different epistemological and phenomenological space—and this separate space is incompatible with New York. Shortly after the turn of the century, the potential overlapping of Western and Eastern spaces caused a great deal of anxiety within the administrative population, and these anxieties led to the harsh statutes of Angel Island (Ellis Island's West Coast counterpart). Angel Island was a much stricter immigration station than Ellis Island precisely because of the large majority of Eastern immigrants. Daniels writes, "Angel Island existed to . . . isolate and impede the immigration of Chinese . . . and . . . other Asians."[15] The prioritization of Asian exclusion, despite an increase in overall immigration, stems from these supposed epistemological and ontological distinctions that threaten the very constitution of Western space.

In *The Cheat* and *Terrorist*, Eastern subjects and spaces constantly jeopardize the production, safety, and constitution of Western spaces. That is to say, Eastern homes and mosques are places of phenomenological eccentricity—even when encapsulated in a larger supposedly Western space like New York. Eastern spaces are organized around unnaturalness and deception. Both Tori and Ahmad move with deceptive and almost supernatural mobility in Western and Eastern spaces. Even the titles of these texts signify anxieties about "trickery" and deception. Nonetheless, these anxieties evolve with time, and thus these texts share certain assumptions while addressing entirely different historical moments. Notably, these texts have nearly a century between them, and therefore the cultural stereotypes that appear in *The Cheat* take on an almost entirely new form and shape in *Terrorist*—especially in the wake of globalization and the war on terror. That being said, in both texts,

Oriental spaces threaten Western spaces and remain essential to the construction of a national identity.

Raced Space, or Why the Twain Shall Never Meet

In 1915, the year that DeMille created *The Cheat*, interracial space was not an entirely new threat. After all, America did not begin as, nor was it ever, an entirely white space. However, recent trends in immigration had slowly begun to transform the historically static continental divides. These shifts in migratory possibility reconstituted the importance of space in the American imagination. Immigration and migration brought more and more "foreigners" into urban areas in the United States. Daniels describes the state of immigration: "between 1905 and 1914 almost 9.9 million immigrants were enumerated entering the United States, more than in any 10-year period before or since" (45). Similarly, Zolberg notes that "challenging established boundaries of identity, the 'new immigration' set off contentious debates over whether the newcomers could ever change enough to cross them."[16] In the wake of increasing mobility and migration, many white Americans had a distinctly territorial reaction to the "new immigration." Moreover, space became a polemical and unruly identity marker for Westerners. Territorial identification was called into question as supposedly white territory was flooded with alterity.

The film's composition, then, should be read as a fraught response to this "meeting" between Western and Eastern spaces. Indeed, this meeting created a bridge between spaces and thus enabled the possibility of miscegenation and even assimilation. Sumiko Higashi rightly maintains that "*The Cheat* is a statement about the impossibility of assimilating 'colored' peoples, no matter how civilized their veneer, and it warns against the horrors of miscegenation."[17] Higashi's invaluable work on DeMille's film suggests that this narrative responds directly to the all-too-common Western anxieties about miscegenation. Similarly, Robert G. Lee insists that "*The Cheat* . . . constructed and deployed the imagery of sexual relations between Asian men and white women in order to interrogate and ideologically resolve the twin crises of family and nation."[18] Critics like Gina Marchetti also observe that "*The Cheat* can be looked at as a raw and direct call for racist exclusionism and a necessarily sadistic restraint of the newly independent woman."[19] These critics highlight the film as a contentious site of racism, miscegenation, and sexism. While more formal critics have noted the film as a cinematic achievement, others have reconstructed more trenchant analyses of the social anxieties embodied within the film. Nonetheless, critics have not yet fully addressed the problematic marks of immigration and spatial division on this film. For this reason, this analysis magnifies DeMille's attempt to draw a rigid territorial divide, which in turn allows him to envision a unified American space that is threatened by these Eastern spaces.

Throughout this film, Tori's shadowy home embodies the threat of Eastern space. The first sequence opens with a very dark shot of Tori working at his desk with

his lamp on. DeMille, of course, was known for his lighting—Higashi notes that "although [DeMille] borrowed the Victorian trope of darkness and light from a rich tradition of pictorial realism, the director achieved international renown with inventive lighting in combination with color tinting in *The Cheat*."[20] Tori's personal space exhibits a darkness that matches his devious expression, and thus DeMille immediately organizes and defines Tori's space as a dark and deceptive one. Shadows constantly pass over Tori emphasizing this element of deception and "trickery." The shot ends with Tori branding a statue with his personal symbol (the symbol of the gate), Tori's mark of ownership, which foreshadows Edith's later branding in the film.

This first sequence of shots introduces us to both characters by juxtaposing the Western space against its Eastern counterpart. In contrast to Tori's office, Richard Hardy's space seems well-lit: He is at the center of the shot separated from relative darkness behind him. Subsequently, only a few shadows pass over Richard. He occupies a well-defined and practical space, where he works and analyzes ticker tape. Whereas Tori wears a devious expression and looks just past the camera in his opening shot, Richard nods in affirmation with an earnest expression, holding the ticker tape in his hands at the end of the shot. Richard's portrayal confirms the productive and earnest nature of Western space.

At the Red Cross Ball, which Edith asks Tori to hold at his residence, Tori's home is shaded with different colors than the Western space. The Hardys' home is well lit, but Tori's space is consistently offset by a different hue (sometimes blue and sometimes a yellowish red). It is also clear, once Richard and Edith enter Tori's home, that private space can be created very easily. During this party, Tori and Edith go into what appears to be Tori's room, and Tori slides the door shut, closing them off from the rest of the party. As if performing a magic trick, Tori instantly relocates himself and Edith into a private space. Furthermore, he hides the both of them within this distinct space. A shoji screen, an incense box, and shadowy lighting mark the room as different than normal Western spaces. DeMille links Tori's space to sliding doors and shifting walls; thus, he plays on these Asian stereotypes of "trickiness" and deception. Tori shows Edith the incense box, revealing the Oriental space to be both exotic and deceptive. The shot exhibits this strange lighting and smoke in order to mark Tori's home. The new space both enamors and seduces Edith, but her sudden discovery, shortly following this scene, that she has lost all of the Red Cross's money disrupts her fixation.

Early on in the film, the Red Cross charity entrusts Edith—as the treasurer—with ten-thousand dollars. Edith takes the money but secretly invests it in D. and O. Stock. Even after her husband refuses to invest in the company, Edith chooses to follow the advice of Richard's friend who insists that Richard has made a mistake by not investing. Edith, then, by ignoring her husband and investing this money, embodies the "new woman."[21] The film makes it clear that Edith cannot, or at least should not, handle money, and therefore it articulates obvious anxieties about the

new woman and her potentially mobile position within the economic structure. Furthermore, as I will note in greater detail later on, the film connects this new woman to a threatening East. After all, Tori accompanies Edith to every Red Cross event and clearly exercises influence in her various decisions. In many of these scenes, Tori even appears to influentially whisper into Edith's ear, which suggests that this influence is sexually charged.

Once inside Tori's room, standing next to the shoji screen, Edith overhears Richard's friend, who recommended and enabled her investment, ask Richard for money because the investment has fallen through. It is during this exchange that Edith learns she has lost all of the Red Cross money. Tori and Edith see the shadows of Richard and his friend outlined on the screen. Richard tells the friend, "I wish I could help you—but I couldn't raise a dollar tonight to save my life." He has no idea that Edith and Tori are on the other side of the screen. Tori and Edith, then, inhabit the inside and the outside simultaneously. While remaining hidden and undetected, they listen in on the conversations of partygoers. Edith and Tori inhabit an Eastern space that enables them to monitor and spy on the Westerners undetected. Indeed, the Eastern space allows for a deceptive imbrication between polarized spaces. The Asian space is, again, marked as deceptive, "tricky," and elusive. Near the end of this scene, in this very same room, Tori conjures up an exceedingly real vision of a newspaper that outlines all of the trouble that Edith will be in for losing the Red Cross money. The Oriental space exhibits what Alice Maurice calls "magical transformation."[22] Edith, disturbed by this vision, agrees to an unspoken deal proposed by Tori. In this unsaid deal, Edith explicitly agrees to an exchange in which Tori will give her the ten-thousand dollars that she owes the Red Cross in return for a sexual favor. Through this exchange, Tori initiates the potential for an interracial threat.

Once Edith and Richard leave Tori's house, they immediately return to the normalized space of their own household. The Hardys' colonial-style house lacks the shifting walls and sliding doors that make up Tori's place of residence. At one point, many of Tori's guests walk through an exotic garden before they arrive at his house. Tori's environment requires the transitional space of the garden, and so the Westerners leave their naturalized environments through this transitional space. As they pass through this space, the white Westerners look around in amazement at all the shrubbery. The Westerners transition from what Michel de Certeau calls the "legitimate space" to the "alien space" in this scene.[23] The whole shot exhibits a spectacle that the Westerners walk through in awe. Yet the "legitimate space," of course, recalls the "good order" of legislation and therefore normalcy. For these reasons, no transition or tunnel marks the Hardys' entrance into their own home; instead they immediately transport into this familiar space.

This film transports Eastern space into a "normal" Western context. It is not a film about Western, or more specifically North American, space in an Asian or Eastern context. Tori moves to New York, and he brings Asian space with him. As the sexual

exchange suggests, Tori's presence in New York represents and also symbolizes the interracial threat to Western space. Tori represents the Orient, but he also paradoxically represents the possibility of interracial space. Higashi's description of Tori's opening scene begins to gesture in a similar interpretive direction: "Tori, costumed in a Japanese robe, is shown in low-key lighting as he inscribes his mark, a shrine gate, on an objet d'art. (Curiously, the Japanese term for a shrine gate is *torii*.) The film thus emphasizes the racial 'Otherness' of the Asian merchant."[24] The film does mark Tori as the Other, but we should not ignore the significance of his Japanese name. The gate, as de Certeau suggests, represents the threat of movement between legitimate and alien space. Through Tori's character, DeMille represents and eventually manages all the potential threats of the East. In this way, Tori takes on the role of the Other while simultaneously and also paradoxically representing the threat of miscegenation, interracial space, and movement between raced spaces. Furthermore, during the attempted rape, Tori brands Edith with the symbol of the gate and thus recognizes Edith as the potential site for interracial space.

Just as Tori's interactions with Edith seem to signify the threat of miscegenation, they serve to (re)move Edith from her Western context. In their first scene together, Tori comes to Edith's home, and they leave the Hardy household together. Tori and Edith, then, attend another Red Cross event together. At this event, they are shot alone together against the backdrop of trees (symbolizing a movement from the home to the exotic). Later on in the film, at a party, Tori again takes Edith away from her friends, and he escorts her out onto the terrace. He continually removes her from these Western contexts in order to be alone with her. He utilizes this opportunity to listen to Edith complain about her husband, but Richard "catches" them outside. Once again, when Edith and Richard attend the Red Cross Ball, Tori takes Edith away from her friends and into a separate room. Tori constantly moves Edith between spaces and, thus, threatens the hold Western space has on Edith. Marchetti writes in some detail about the threat of the new woman, but she fails to highlight the role of space in seducing this new woman.[25] Edith is attracted to the Orient precisely because it allows her to cheat and deceive her husband. As suggested previously, DeMille ingeniously connects the threat of the new woman to the threat of Eastern immigration.

DeMille intertwines these threats within the narrative and thereby neutralizes anxieties about immigration and the new woman by the end of the film. Higashi suggests that "the Anglo-Saxon stockbroker appears pedestrian in contrast with the Oriental merchant who projects wealth, power, and mystery."[26] Likewise, Western space seems pedestrian in comparison to the exotic and mysterious space that is Tori's home. The West may be legitimate as de Certeau would put it, but it is not nearly as attractive to Edith. These anxieties about the new woman and the new immigration can be traced back to these deeply entrenched concerns about urban change. As the threat of more and more Asian, or alien, space was mounting in the

States, DeMille responded with a film that manages both the Oriental subjects and, subsequently, Oriental space.

In the crucial confrontation scene, all of these threats culminate in Tori's home. When Edith finally gets the money—from her husband—to pay Tori back (rather than fulfill the sexual favor), she deceives her husband with a kiss. She has not told him why she needs the money or where she is going. The scene is prefaced with an intertitle: "The Cheat." The darkness of the room reminds us of deception and perhaps even Tori's opening scene. For this reason, DeMille does not need to shoot Edith transitioning between spaces. Once she gets to Tori's home, Edith is faint and clearly ready to renege on her part of the agreement. Tori, however, will not allow her to renege. He states, "You cannot buy me off." He then locks her in his room—where the scent box, again, marks the Eastern space. Edith rebukes, "If you keep me here—I will kill myself." Tori then pulls out a gun but laughs as he offers it to her. He clearly does not think she will commit suicide. At this point, Edith realizes that she cannot stand his room and the Oriental space. He then proceeds to grab her by the hair and brand her with the symbol of the gate as she tries to escape. Of course, this could only happen in an Eastern space, where Edith is tricked, locked in, and deceived by both Tori and her surroundings. Finally, Edith appears to realize the sexual dangers and deceptiveness that underlie both Tori and Oriental space. As a result, she grabs the gun off the floor and she shoots Tori.

Once he reveals the threatening seduction of Eastern space, DeMille reauthorizes American patriarchy by calling Richard to the rescue. Richard walks, even strolls, through Tori's garden as he literally crosses the gate and transitions between spaces. He only briefly observes his surroundings, as if looking for Edith, but he does not seem alarmed as he walks very casually. Finally, he sees Tori's shadow on the shoji screen, which should be read as a figure of the stereotype of Oriental projection. In this essential shot, Richard confronts the Asian space and the "trickery," deception, and mystery behind it. Richard faces the shoji screen and, for just a moment, Tori's shadow stands as the symmetrical opposite, or Other, to Richard. DeMille literally splits the two in this shot in order to mark Tori as Richard's direct opposite. Richard, then, investigates the scene and notices blood on the shoji screen. He becomes filled with rage as he realizes what has happened. He rips through the Asian space and figuratively colonizes it. That is to say, Richard exerts power in Tori's home and seemingly conquers the Oriental space. After he tears through the screen, Richard disrupts and overcomes Tori's "trickery" and deception.

Once Richard colonizes Tori's Eastern home, DeMille must differentiate Western space as a nonthreatening site of productivity. Thus, Edith crosses back over the tunnel and into Western space and eventually her home. Richard takes the blame for shooting Tori and, ultimately, ends up in jail. Edith—shamed by her branding—does not want to risk people finding out about her mark. In this way, she refuses to explain what happened in order to release Richard from jail. In the jail, we find a space that best resembles the Asian space in the film. Shadows spread across the

walls of the jail cell, and the entrance is blocked by a sliding door. This similarity couples the two spaces as containing grounds for those who break the law. Shortly after Richard is framed in his jail cell, the intertitle text reads, "The East is East and West is West and never the Twain shall meet." Edith pleads with Tori to help Richard, but he refuses to do so. At this point in the film, DeMille has managed the threat of Eastern space through Richard's colonization, but DeMille has yet to authorize and prioritize Western space over its Eastern opposite.

DeMille very productively turns to the trial scene in order to reprioritize Western space. His shots of the courtroom exhibit a space full of older Western and white characters (aside from the seemingly Asian characters who represent and support Tori). The scenes are all naturally lit. It appears as though the roof was removed so that the sun would provide light for the production set (not an unusual practice in early Hollywood cinema). Nonetheless, this natural light contrasts this space against the dark space that Tori inhabits throughout the film. Furthermore, there is no gate or transition space people use to gain entry into the courtroom—they are simply there. When Tori lies about being shot by Edith in the courtroom, it seems that the crowd nearly believes that Richard shot him—again, revealing the deceptive and seductive character of Eastern subjects. Of course, this becomes a problem as the trial begins to move to a verdict.

During the verdict, DeMille constructs a Western space that is incompatible with Tori's deception. Edith cannot handle the lie any longer, so she reveals her branding to all of the court and explains what actually happened. She makes her plea to the crowd as they become filled with rage because of Tori's deception. Eventually this riot is quieted and "the indictment against . . . the defendant is dismissed." In the last few shots of the film, there is no room for Tori; instead Richard and Edith embrace as they walk through a well-lit crowd of Western faces and toward the camera. In this last sequence, the Western space projects clarity, productivity, and justice. Whereas Tori's space signifies "trickery," mystery, and deception, the Western space appears to naturally produce truth and justice. While Tori and Oriental space simultaneously represent interracial space and movement between spaces, DeMille quickly defuses that threat with a rigidly white American space in these last shots. DeMille, then, reauthorizes and reorganizes the Western space as definitively white. In the wake of increasing migration and immigration, DeMille asserts the white identity through spatial representation. Thus, the story is caught up in what de Certeau calls "these operations of marking out boundaries."[27] DeMille negotiates and overcomes the threat of the Eastern Other and Eastern space through these operations, and, in turn, he both protects and idealizes white American space as a utopian possibility.

The Materialist Divide, or Why the Terrorist Is Still a Cheat

Nearly a century after DeMille's film quite blatantly demonized the Far East, John Updike constructs a much more sympathetic character, who is meant to draw our critical attention to the West's assumptions about the East, in his novel *Terrorist*. Updike utilizes an Egyptian American protagonist, Ahmad, who is nothing like Richard Hardy, and thus Updike's narrative lacks the clear-cut ingenuous propaganda that pervades *The Cheat*. Furthermore, Ahmad's very existence realizes the threat of miscegenation that DeMille condemns throughout his film. And while Updike's novel is both sympathetic toward the Middle East and even critical of the West, many of the anxieties that undergird *The Cheat* resurface at crucial points in Updike's narrative. Updike's novel already presumes an interracial America, but Ahmad and the East still represent the threatening penetration and potential destruction of Western space.

Despite a much more nuanced account, Updike's novel reveals the deeply embedded territorial concerns that surround American conceptions of the East, even in the wake of globalization. When Ahmad insists in conversation with his high-school counselor, Jack Levy, "I am not a foreigner. I have never been abroad,"[28] he represents what Arjun Appadurai calls a deterritorialized subject.[29] Ahmad's father is from Egypt and his mother is Irish, but Ahmad was born in New Jersey. Unlike Tori, Ahmad has never set foot outside of the United States; nonetheless, Updike still identifies Ahmad with the East. At one point, Ahmad says to Jack, "Even the oil, they despised us, cheating the Saudi prince of their people's birthright."[30] This passage marks one moment of many where he identifies with the East as the familiar space that constructs the collective and divisive pronoun "us." In the era of supposed cosmopolitanism, migratory patterns (beyond what DeMille could have ever imagined) have created the deterritorialized subject and therefore revived, but also complicated, previous constructions of American identity.

In this particular case, Ahmad identifies with a country that he has never even seen. Despite telling Jack that he is not a foreigner, Ahmad finds his identity in his Egyptian heritage and rarely makes reference to his Irish background or America. Nonetheless, Appadurai argues that the deterritorialized subject somehow diminishes the role of geographical space. He writes, "in those cases where territory seems to be a fundamental issue, such as in Palestine, it could be argued that debates about land and territory are in fact functional spin-offs of arguments that are substantially about power, justice, and self-determination."[31] Indeed, Appadurai suggests that the technological advancements and mass migration of an era defined by globalization have relinquished the role of space in subject formation. Appadurai, then, extracts the power struggle from material concerns so that he can transpose it onto a more general discussion of "power, justice, and self-determination."

It is my contention, however, that these texts reveal the influence of space on the American imaginary. Zolberg insists, "American responses [to the 9/11 attacks]

are being cast primarily within a classically Westphalian framework: calls for a crash program to enhance each state's capacity to police its territorial borders, to identify and neutralize foreign origin enemies within, and to improve intelligence abroad."[32] Zolberg's delineation of a Westphalian program critiques the two cornerstones of this reference-frame: territorial control and the complete exclusion of nondomestic influence. In other words, the twenty-first century has brought about a distinctly territorial response to the "threat of terror." Despite what Susan Buck-Morss calls "global imminence," which "refer[s] to the fact that in our era of global capital . . . there is no spatial outside, no 'Other' of peoples,"[33] these narratives continue to construct a "spatial outside." Indeed, in the wake of September 11th and proliferating anxieties about terrorism, this spatial outside comes, again, to the fore. This Westphalian framework, then, culiminates in renewed attempts to manage, secure, and dominate an American population through legislation like the Patriot Act.[34] Indeed, this war on terror supposedly requires new means of technology, special systems of punishment, and unique judicial measures. It is in this thoroughly globalized world with the supposed potential for complete deterritorialization that Updike, much like DeMille, consistently and imaginatively constructs an Eastern space that threatens the US.

Ahmad is associated with an ontologically distinct Eastern space that Updike contrasts against the materialistic space of America. In the beginning of his novel, Updike filters the narration through Ahmad's perspective. He writes, "*Devils*, Ahmad thinks. *These devils seek to take away my God*. All day long. . . . *What else is there to see?*"[35] Updike immediately underscores the phenomenological eccentricity in Ahmad's worldview. Whereas the Westerners at Ahmad's high school experience the world as a set of materialist forces, Ahmad experiences a world inflated with spiritual dimensions that are inaccessible to the Western subject. Ahmad "seeks to soften the Prophet's words, to make them blend with human reason, but they were not meant to blend: they invade our human softness like a sword" (7). Indeed, the Eastern religion cuts through the Western Enlightenment and eventually threatens the materialist forces of the Western world. Updike describes the high school from Ahmad's perspective: "The halls of the high school smell of perfume and bodily exhalations, of chewing gum and impure cafeteria food, and of cloth" (7). Again, Ahmad purposefully resists and even despises the "impure" materials that form this empirical matrix for the West. Updike makes it very clear that Ahmad is an unnatural fit for these Western spaces.

Territorially, then, Ahmad is constantly marked by a spiritual or immaterial East. Updike persistently ties Ahmad's spiritual existence back to Eastern spaces. Ahmad's time in the charismatic African American church serves to remind the reader of his displacement within Western contexts. Ahmad critiques, "The windows of this church, blasphemously assigning God a face, and gesturing hands, sandaled feet, and tinted robes—in short, a human body with all that is unclean and encumbering about it—are blackened by decades of industrial soot and made further indecipherable"

(14). Ahmad is out of place in this church and, more importantly, he is struck by the visibility or materiality of the church. That is to say, God's face should not be visible. Moreover, the Western subjects are associated with the industrial and the productive, which is, again, morally problematic for Ahmad. Ahmad's existence stands as a critique of, but also a definite threat to, the industrial pursuits of the Westerner. These pursuits, of course, are "indecipherable" to Ahmad's Eastern God. Even while he critiques the materialism of the West, Updike foregrounds the ideological divide and subsequent incompatibility of these worldviews.

This ideological divide registers in Ahmad's social interactions with his high-school friend, a woman to whom he is sexually attracted, Joryleen, and her boyfriend, Tylenol. In the depictions of Joryleen and Tylenol, Updike critiques Western materialism. He describes Ahmad's condemnation of Tylenol in some detail: he "does not so much blame the boy—he is just a robot of meat, a body too full of its juices and reflexes to have a brain—as he blames Joryleen" (17). Whereas all other Americans are composed of crude materials and primitive drives, Ahmad is composed of immaterial and "spiritual" drives toward cleanliness. These pointed descriptions recapitulate Ahmad's alterity while simultaneously recoding the supernatural and "deceptive" stereotypes of *The Cheat*. The deceptive and even magical elements that mark Tori translate into the spiritual and immaterial forces of Ahmad. Ahmad insists that "*the world is difficult*, he thinks, *because devils are busy in it, confusing things and making the straight crooked*" (11). Ahmad's phenomenological experience of devils and other spiritual forces transform his spiritual worldview into a quasi-magical or "unseen" experience of the world. In other words, while Tori's Eastern home is encoded with shifting spaces and darkness, Ahmad's existence is encoded with devils and unseen forces. In this way, Updike transposes Eastern stereotypes onto cultural (or religious) differences, yet these stereotypes remain essential to the construction of the Western subject as well as Western spaces.

Whereas Western spaces are productive and constantly monitored, Eastern spaces are deceptive and hidden throughout the novel. When Jack responds to Ahmad in the guidance office, he calls Shaikh Rashid "the Imam of this hard-to-find place" (38). This strange description reflects nothing in Ahmad's descriptions of or directions to the mosque. Jack instantly assumes that this mosque is difficult to find because it is in a crowded and confusing part of New Jersey. The Eastern space hides within the confines of the Western city. Ahmad notes this contrast: "How strange, Ahmad thinks that the conversation, in the open air, has been reported here, in the closed space of this inner-city mosque, whose windows have a view of only brick walls and dark clouds" (234). Ahmad juxtaposes Shaikh Rashid's isolated or "closed-off" mosque against the open Western space that this mosque can only represent as "dark clouds."

While he focalizes the majority of the novel through Ahmad's perspective, Updike filters part of the narrative through the Secretary of Homeland Security. In stereotypical fashion, the Secretary is paranoid about the nation-state. He insists,

"This mob's collective gaps and irregularities form a perfect rough surface whereupon the enemy can grow one of his tenacious, wide-spreading plots" (44). "The enemy" has the ability to wedge a developing plot into a Western gap; Updike utilizes a strange metaphor that implies the East's ability to both create and wield spatial irregularity at the cost of Western space. Similarly, Jack's sister-in-law, Hermione, who works for the Secretary, speaks of terrorists, "'They hate the light,' Hermione tells him loyally. 'Like the cockroaches. Like bats. The light shone in darkness,' she quotes, knowing that Pennsylvania piety is a way to his heart, 'and the darkness comprehended it not'" (49). Hermione uses a clichéd biblical trope, but the Easterner, again, represents a site of darkness and potential invisibility. In Updike's narrative, both Ahmad and the Secretary of Homeland Security—seemingly polarized characters—connect Ahmad and, more generally, the East with invisibility. Ahmad is attracted to invisibility because it foregrounds the spiritual and the transcendent, but the Secretary essentializes this attraction to invisibility in order to suggest that deception and moral blight are an ineluctable part of Ahmad's being. Through both associations, however, Updike highlights an impulse that runs against the materialist grain of Western ideology. Thus, these Eastern spaces and subjects are always at odds with these American spaces.

Once he decides to enact the terrorist plot, Ahmad's resolve is unshakable precisely because Ahmad's Eastern religion literally distorts his perspective. The narrator notes, "The slaglike dark weight nagging within him skews his view of the world, and bedecks each twig and telephone wire with jewels he has never before noticed" (252). Updike paints an Eastern religion that both reshapes and distorts the Western world that surrounds Ahmad. His ideological perspective is constantly associated with the supernatural. Updike persists, "The experience, so strangely magnified, has been, Ahmad feels certain, supernatural" (254). Ahmad's spiritual (or Eastern) existence wears against "the distracting geography of New Prospect" (275). As a predictable and convenient result, Ahmad cannot maneuver the Western space without his Eastern lens.

Ahmad's critique of Western space arises from a "distorted" ideological perspective, and eventually it is through this amalgamation that Ahmad justifies the plan to bomb the tunnel. At one point, Ahmad tells Joryleen that "it makes no difference which President is in. They all want Americans to be selfish and materialistic, to play their part in consumerism. But the human spirit asks for self-denial. It longs to say 'No' to the physical world" (72). America represents the physical, the corporeal, and the materialistic, and it is for this reason that Ahmad submits to Shaikh Rashid's plan to disrupt and even destroy this nonspiritual space. Ahmad calls the "explosion . . . a pinprick, a little opening that admits God's power into the world" (305). The "pinprick," or "little opening," similar to Tori's branding of the gate onto Edith, symbolizes this problematic contact between the West and the East. This explosion would open up Western space to its Eastern counterpart. Moreover, through this explosion, Ahmad would disrupt the productive and

materialistic space of the West and thereby give "life . . . to a dead country" (274). Ahmad's very existence actualizes the interracial threat that Tori represents throughout *The Cheat*. Unlike Tori, however, Ahmad seeks to undo the apparent damage caused by the "mixing" between races. Updike's America now represents the interracial space that DeMille feared, and thus the explosion signifies an altogether different confrontation between Western and Eastern spaces. This confrontation now threatens the interracial space that defines America, and Updike's East jeopardizes America's territorially secure existence. Therefore, Ahmad's desire to disrupt this Western space confirms the Secretary of Homeland Security's earlier anxieties about the East's proclivity for spatial irregularity and destruction.

Once Ahmad begins to actualize the plan by driving the bomb-ridden truck toward the Lincoln Tunnel, however, Jack successfully intercepts Ahmad. Updike writes that Ahmad was "confused, conditioned not to show a teacher disrespect. . . . Jack Levy yanks open the passenger door . . . and hoists himself up" (288). Jack, then, manages to "confuse" the "conditioned" Easterner, and thusly he gains entry into the truck. It is in this truck—a distinctly Eastern space marked by "furtive anonymity, a generic blankness" (247) and "four tons of explosives" (289)—that the final encounter between Western and Eastern spaces takes place. Indeed, Jack's "abrupt intrusion" (289) can be read alongside Richard's colonization of Tori's home. Both Ahmad and this truck represent the potential threat to Western space, and so the narrator describes Manhattan: "the great city, Satan's heart. Lit from the east, its towers loom in shadow from the west, a dust of haze radiant between them" (293). In this suggestive description, Updike echoes a variation of the Kipling quotation from *The Cheat* and draws on this anxious confrontation between the West and the East.

Jack eventually foils Ahmad's intended destruction of the Lincoln Tunnel. A few moments after Jack worries that he has "become a drag on the world, taking up space" (304), Ahmad chooses, at the very last minute, not to enable the explosive. Shortly thereafter, "the tunnel's bright mouth grows to swallow him and his truck and its ghosts; together all emerge into the dull but brightening light of another Monday in Manhattan. Whatever was making the traffic in the tunnel so balky, so maddeningly sticky, has dispersed at last, dissolved on an open paved space among apartment buildings of modest height and billboards and brick row houses and, several blocks distant, fragile-looking glass skyscrapers" (307). Through this "abrupt intrusion," which is loaded with theological overtones, Jack convinces Ahmad to expose the ghosts of his Eastern religion and the threat of Eastern space to the brightening light of Manhattan. Updike's Easterner, who sought to disrupt the interracial space of America, must submit to the final securitization of Western space. Only once Jack persuades Ahmad to abjure the mission and therefore thoroughly colonizes this Eastern space, can Jack "welcome [Ahmad] to the Big Apple" (308). Thus, Ahmad finally enters the ultimate Western space, which "could be a nameless spot in Northern New Jersey; only the silhouette, dead ahead, of the Empire State

Building, once again the tallest building in New York, signifies otherwise" (307), but only once he leaves the Eastern space behind. Moreover, only Jack—the ideal Westerner—can lead Ahmad home. Updike writes, "Ahmad lets himself be guided, taking the left turn. The path is straight. 'You're driving like a pro,' Mr. Levy tells him" (309). Finally, Ahmad chooses to take the properly "straight," secure American path.

Updike ends this novel by suggesting that Ahmad only truly enters the American space once he overcomes the ideological distortion of his Eastern religion. On the final page, Updike writes, "Ahmad wants to focus amid the yellow taxis and the traffic lights and the pedestrians clustered at every corner, on this novel world around him" (310). Ahmad enters into an entirely new phenomenological space. And this new world is epitomized in a "great city [that] crawls with people . . . scuttling, hurrying, intent on the milky morning sun upon some plan or scheme or hope they are hugging to themselves . . . each one of them . . . fixed upon self-advancement and self-preservation" (310). Jack finally admits Ahmad into this American space organized around diversity, productivity, and preservation, and thus Ahmad no longer stands as a threat to the thoroughly materialistic and materialized West. Although America constitutes an interracial space, this rhetoric of the threatening East persists throughout Updike's novel. Ahmad is ultimately accepted into the Western world (a feat that DeMille would have never forgiven), but this acceptance is based on a rigid rejection of an imagined East—an ontologically distinct space organized around phenomenological eccentricity and deception. While Updike criticizes the overly materialistic West, this critical lens is ultimately neutralized by the implication that a materialistic West is better than a dangerously deceptive and elusive East. Moreover, this novel reprioritizes a properly Western space as a site of utopian possibility and, again, reasserts that this space must be protected from the threat of the East at all costs.

Imagining an American Space

Highly significant and fraught spatial confrontations take place at the center of these narratives. While Updike structures an interracial and therefore entirely different West than DeMille, they both compose a rigid ontological divide between these opposing spaces. The very composition of Eastern space threatens the productivity and securitization of Western spaces. DeMille's narrative warns against the incipient trends of immigration and the possibility of interracial space near the beginning of the twentieth century. Updike's novel presupposes an interracial twenty-first-century America but warns similarly against a confrontation with this imagined East. In these recurring warnings, the far-reaching effects of Orientalism are quite clear: even in a supposedly cosmopolitan and thoroughly globalized world, Eastern spaces represent a threat to a territorial America. Moreover, the Orientalist agenda has a distinctly spatial component that cannot be overlooked in favor of the more general discourses

of knowledge. Instead, the spatial divide that buttresses and perpetuates these discourses of knowledge requires closer examination.

Throughout these narratives, Eastern spaces and characters connote deception, invisibility, and spatial irregularity. Despite spanning an entire century, both Updike and DeMille portray an East that "endangers the good order of . . . the territory."[36] Indeed, they conjure up a threatening East in order to imagine a unified American space. And while Amy Kaplan, quite rightly, "emphasize[s] the collapse of boundaries between here and there, between inside and outside, and the incoherence as much as the coherence that the anarchy of empire brings to the making of U.S. Culture,"[37] DeMille and Updike imagine a coherent, stable, and idealized American space. In other words, these narratives gloss over the inherent instability and incoherence of American boundaries in order to construct a territorially secure America. In doing so, these narratives represent a larger attempt in American aesthetics to naturalize and reinforce this territorial divide and thus to resolve the incoherent and unstable spatial history of America.

Notes

I would like to thank Cami Freeman and Ryan Friedman for their support and insight throughout the revision process. Thanks also to the reviewers of the *Journal of Transnational American Studies* for their helpful comments on this essay.

[1] Despite the fact that the revised intertitles call him Haka Arikau from Burma, I will use "Tori" in my analysis. Tori was Japanese in the original release, but both his name and his country of origin changed in the wake of World War I. Sumiko Higashi notes that "the villain's ethnic, if not racial, identity was altered in the 1918 reissue that is presently in circulation," and this change occurred because "Japan fought on the side of the Allies." Sumiko Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille and American Culture: The Silent Era* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 101. Nonetheless, the interchangeable "ethnic" identity reveals a "one-size-fits-all" stereotype that shifts only in the midst of political necessity and national interests. In this way, Japanese, Burmese, and—as my analysis of *Terrorist* suggests—even Egyptian identities signify an equally menacing East. Therefore, at times, my analysis will reference a monolithic East that envelops each of these identities precisely because in these texts a threatening East denies and outright ignores many of the differences that separate each of these national identities and cultures.

[2] *The Cheat*, dir. Cecil B. DeMille (Jesse L. Lasky Feature Play Company, 1915).

[3] Hayot insists that this "transnational turn" requires a more diverse and localized understanding of Asian American and East Asian Studies. He writes, "the encounter between Asian American studies and East Asian studies, those long-standing institutional antagonists, allows us to see the ways in which a threatened breakup into a multiplicity of . . . national or subnational locations, and ethnic matrices in the fields themselves can

be read . . . as the becoming that reconstitutes the fields, each to each, from their encounter." Eric Hayot, "The Asian Turns," *PMLA* 124, no. 3 (2009): 910. Hayot's article is important precisely because American nationalism and racial stereotypes rely on a monolithic East that papers over localized difference and nuance, and thus to counter this problematic means of projection, we must insist on a more elaborate account of difference and multiplicity within Asian American and East Asian Studies. For more on the transnational turn in American Studies, see also 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, no. 1 (2005): 17–57.

[4] In this passage, I surround the word "East" with quotes but, for the purposes of utility, I will not do so after this initial usage. Regardless, we must keep in mind that the East problematically represents a generalized space and identity that encompasses a wide range of ethnic "others" for the intertwined purposes of identity and territory construction in the US. Moreover, while a global conception of the East certainly retains traction throughout the twentieth century, the US shifts these projections of "Easternness" onto different countries as political priorities and economic considerations change over time.

[5] For more on the long twentieth century, see Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century* (New York: Verso, 1994).

[6] Aristide R. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 200.

[7] While the Chinese Exclusion Act directly limited the entrance of Chinese immigrants, it also paved the way for future foreign policy and legislation. In this way, it registers a larger trend of stringent and racialized immigration restrictions that would be evident in the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, which limited Japanese immigration, and the aforementioned Johnson-Reed Act of 1924.

[8] US Congress, *Chinese Exclusion Act*, 47th Cong., 1st sess., 1882.

[9] I say that Updike only reluctantly allows for interracial sex precisely because these sexual relations almost always take place outside the confines of marriage and therefore result in hazardous and temporary relationships that appear to lack any substantial meaning.

[10] Roger Daniels, *Guarding the Golden Door: American Immigration Policy and Immigrants since 1882* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 23.

[11] See Alice Maurice, "What the Shadow Knows: Race, Image, and Meaning in *Shadows* (1922)," *Cinematic Journal* 47, no. 3 (2008): 66–89.

[12] Sabine Haenni similarly remarks on the way in which New York City's Chinatown functioned as an anxious counterpoint to New York City. She writes, "Chinatown was

indeed associated with such polymorphousness and magical transformations. . . . however . . . while such representations may have originated in a latent fear of 'Chinese' polymorphousness . . . films dealing more directly with Chinatown . . . allowed the white spectators to imagine a complex white social formation." See Sabine Haenni, "Filming 'Chinatown': Fake Visions, Bodily Transformations," in *Screening Asian Americans*, ed. Peter X Feng (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002), 25. Indeed, many of the essays in Peter X Feng's important anthology productively explore the ways in which early film constructs, reinforces, and refracts Asian stereotypes.

[13] Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, trans. Graham Burchell and ed. Michel Senellart (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 11.

[14] I mean to marshal the term "Oriental" in the same critical and self-conscious fashion that Edward Said does throughout his work. However, I will not use quotations in later usage. See Edward Said, *Orientalism* (1978; repr., New York: Vintage, 2004).

[15] Daniels, *Guarding the Golden Door*, 25.

[16] Zolberg, *Nation by Design*, 208.

[17] Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille*, 130.

[18] Robert G. Lee, *Orientals: Asian Americans in Popular Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999), 118.

[19] Gina Marchetti, *Romance and the "Yellow Peril": Race, Sex, and Discursive Strategies in Hollywood Fiction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 32.

[20] Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille*, 3. For a more detailed and holistic discussion of color tinting in *The Cheat*, see Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille*, especially 1–6, and chapter 6 entitled "Set and Costume Design as Spectacle in a Consumer Culture: The Early Jazz Age Films."

[21] Shortly after the turn of the century, a new kind of woman emerged from a series of societal and cultural shifts in the nation's institutional framework. Wendy Kline notes, "New opportunities in education, work, and recreation, as well as evidence that women were controlling conception and limiting family size, allowed for the emergence of a 'new woman.' Sleek, sexy, and modern, she neglected domestic duties and child rearing and, as a result, generated a concern that women were rejecting the duties of their race." See Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 29.

[22] Maurice, "What the Shadow Knows," 73.

[23] Michel de Certeau, "Spatial Stories," in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (1984; repr., Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 126. In his essay "Spatial Stories," de Certeau sheds a great deal of light on the importance of space within narrative. He insists that a "narrative activity, even if it is multiform and no longer unitary, thus continues to develop where frontiers and relations with space abroad are

concerned. Fragmented and disseminated, it is continually concerned with marking out boundaries" (125). De Certeau argues that narratives are always caught up in structuring and delimiting spaces—and DeMille's film quite obviously justifies this claim.

[24] Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille*, 101.

[25] Both Higashi and Marchetti write extensively about the role of the "new woman" in DeMille's film. See especially Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille*, 87; and Marchetti, *Romance and the "Yellow Peril"*, 32.

[26] Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille*, 129.

[27] De Certeau, "Spatial Stories," 122.

[28] John Updike, *Terrorist* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006), 35.

[29] See Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), especially 37–38.

[30] Updike, *Terrorist*, 295.

[31] Appadurai, *Modernity at Large*, 21.

[32] Zolberg, *Nation by Design*, 457.

[33] Susan Buck-Morss, *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left* (London: Verso, 2003), 93.

[34] The Patriot Act allowed the government to access telephone taps, email messages, and other previously protected records with relative ease. Indeed, the 2001 legislation registered a broader trend in the war on terror, which increased surveillance and regulation in the guise of protective measures for US citizens.

[35] Updike, *Terrorist*, 3.

[36] US Congress, *Chinese Exclusion Act*.

[37] Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 15.

Selected Bibliography

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Arrighi, Giovanni. *The Long Twentieth Century*. New York: Verso, 1994.

Buck-Morss, Susan. *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left*. London: Verso, 2003.

The Cheat. Dir. Cecil B. DeMille. Jesse L. Lasky Feature Play Company, 1915.

Daniels, Roger. *Guarding the Golden Door: American Immigration Policy and Immigrants since 1882*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004." *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 17–57.

Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population*. Trans. Graham Burchell and ed. Michel Senellart. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Haenni, Sabine. "Filming 'Chinatown': Fake Visions, Bodily Transformations." In *Screening Asian Americans*, ed. Peter X Feng, 21–52. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002.

Hayot, Eric. "The Asian Turns." *PMLA* 124, no. 3 (2009): 906–17.

Higashi, Sumiko. *Cecil B. DeMille and American Culture: The Silent Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Kline, Wendy. *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Lee, Robert G. *Orientals: Asian Americans in Popular Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999.

Marchetti, Gina. *Romance and the "Yellow Peril": Race, Sex, and Discursive Strategies in Hollywood Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Maurice, Alice. "What the Shadow Knows: Race, Image, and Meaning in Shadows (1922)." *Cinematic Journal* 47, no. 3 (2008): 66–89.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 2004.

Updike, John. *Terrorist*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.

US Congress. "Chinese Exclusion Act (1882)." *Our Documents*. http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=47.

Zolberg, Aristide R. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.