PROJECT MUSE®

Settler Colonial Studies, Asian Diasporic Questions

Iyko Day, Juliana Hu Pegues, Melissa Phung, Dean Itsuji Saranillio, Danika Medak-Saltzman

Verge: Studies in Global Asia, Volume 5, Issue 1, Spring 2019, pp. 1-45
(Article)

Published by University of Minnesota Press

➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/807272/summary>

Convergence

Settler Colonial Studies, Asian Diasporic Questions

■ INTRODUCTION: ON DECOLONIAL RELATIONALITY

The study of settler colonialism in Asian American, Asian Canadian, and Asian diaspora studies offers important challenges to long-standing rubrics of racial “minority” politics, immigration and citizenship rights, and conceptions of national and transnational mobility. Since the groundbreaking publication of *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i* in 2008 (which grew out of a special issue of *Amerasia Journal* in 2000) (Fujikane and Okamura 2008), there has been a decisive shift toward interrogating the role Asian communities play in extending or disrupting the structural dynamics of colonial dispossession, displacement, and disposal that are imposed on Indigenous populations in the Americas, Australasia, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Islands. This shift represents a critical reorientation that requires that we grapple with the complex interplay of race and Indigeneity, compelling us to challenge Asian settler mythologies—particularly those that celebrate early Asian labor migrants as “pioneers,” while ignoring their complicity with colonial expansion and the genocidal elimination of Native peoples and cultures. It similarly requires rejecting, in a Hawaiian context, romanticized invocations of “local” identity that conflate Asian and Indigenous identities and erase Asian responsibility in the ongoing theft of Native Hawaiian lands.

The often vexed questions that surround the intersection of Asian and Indigenous positionalities were posed during a roundtable discussion that took place at the Association for Asian American Studies annual conference in San Francisco, California, from March 28 to 31, 2018. Under the heading “Settler Colonial Studies, Asian Diasporic Questions,” roundtable participants took stock of the settler colonial turn as Asian American, Asian Canadian, and Indigenous scholars. In their comments, revised

versions of which are compiled in this *Field Trip*, participants emphasized the historical specificity and spatial heterogeneity of Asian–Indigenous cultural, political, legal, and economic crossings in Alaska, Hawai‘i, the continental United States, Canada, and Japan.

The five contributors to this *Field Trip* demonstrate the crucial ways Asian diaspora studies can engage in a politics and poetics of relationality anchored by respect, indebtedness, and gratitude toward Indigenous communities. “Relationality,” in this sense, does not participate in what Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012, 19) denounce as “settler moves to innocence,” which understands decolonization only in the abstract rather than facing the “uncomfortable task of relinquishing stolen land.” Nor is relationality about absolving settler colonial guilt. Instead, as Malissa Phung (2015, 66) explains, “the conversation of decolonizing Asian–Indigenous relations moves away from prioritizing settler colonial guilt and sorrow, seeking absolution for that (liberal) guilt, and transforming colonial complicity into an actionable project that attempts to decolonize and improve relations.” Writing from a Canadian settler context, Phung emphasizes that a politics of relationality centers on indebtedness rather than reconciliation, shifting the emphasis toward ways Asian Canadians can acknowledge and express gratitude for “the acts of kindness, compassion, and hospitality that Indigenous communities such as the Nuuchah-nulth and Nlaka’pamux peoples have historically shown to Chinese settlers” (Phung 2015, 66). This sense of relationality recalls Glen Coulthard (Yellowknives Dene) and Leanne Simpson’s (Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg) conceptualization of “grounded normativity,” a placed-based ethics of reciprocity, knowledge production, and practice of relating to people and nonhuman life-forms in nonexploitative ways. As Coulthard and Simpson (2016, 254) propose, “our relationship to the land itself generates the processes, practices, and knowledges that inform our political systems, and through which *we practice solidarity*.”

The decolonial praxis of Asian–Indigenous relationalities is difficult work, one whose urgency was conveyed by Dorothy Christian’s (Secwepemc and Syilx) and Rita Wong’s absence from our roundtable. As frequent collaborators, they planned to discuss their longtime activism for water justice on the unceded territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations territories, also known as the greater Vancouver region of British Columbia. They had to cancel their travel plans to direct their efforts to oppose construction of the Site C Hydroelectric Dam on the Peace River in Northern British Columbia, which will destroy the sacred burial sites, hunting grounds, and medicinal areas of the Treaty 8 First Nations. Among their efforts, Christian and Wong

organized to support the legal struggle of the West Moberly, Prophet River, and Blueberry Ridge First Nations. Their work exemplifies the importance of wresting notions of “economy” from the narrow profit-motive of the colonial state–finance nexus. In an op-ed opposing the dam, Wong (2018) calls for a “solidarity economy,” which captures the spirit of grounded relationality that resonates throughout the contributions in this *Field Trip* feature:

A solidarity economy is the economy of the future. This is an economy that understands and responds intelligently to our interconnectedness through air, land, and water. When we understand that water is life, we see the connections between the fights against Kinder Morgan, the fish farms, the dams, and fracking as one united force to build an economy based on human health and well-being that, in turn, relies on a baseline of respect for land and environment.

As Wong and our contributors make clear, our present moment of state violence, environmental degradation, and rampant development demands that we build decolonial relations of place-based solidarity.

■ WORKS CITED

- Coulthard, Glen, and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. 2016. “Grounded Normativity/Place-Based Solidarity.” *American Quarterly* 68, no. 2: 249–55.
- Fujikane, Candace, and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds. 2008. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Phung, Malissa. 2015. “Asian–Indigenous Relationalities: Literary Gestures of Respect and Gratitude.” *Canadian Literature* 227: 56–72.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 1, no. 1: 1–40.
- Wong, Rita. 2018. “Connecting the Dots between the B.C. Budget and a Solidarity Economy.” *Georgia Straight* (Vancouver), March 16. <https://www.straight.com/news/1045821/rita-wong-connecting-dots-between-bc-budget-and-solidarity-economy>.

Settler Colonial Critique, Transnational Lessons

IYKO DAY

During a visit to New York in 1982, the wife of the Canadian ambassador to the United States remarked that “for some reason, a glaze passes over peoples’ faces when you say Canada” (Rosellini 1982). This telling observation, if expanded to include glazed American responses to *Asian Canadian* and *settler colonialism*, captures my initial foray into the study of Asian racialization and the transnational dynamics of settler colonialism in Canada and the United States almost two decades ago. That these words are much less likely to be met the same way today is an indication of the dramatic evolution in the study of settler colonialism within and beyond North America. Taking into consideration the evolving orientation of settler colonial studies in both Canada and the United States, my goal in this *Field Trip* essay is to comment on the specific interplay of Asian racialization in North America against broader debates, including the relation of settler colonial studies to Native and Indigenous studies, the status of race and anti-Blackness, and the conceptualization of land and labor as critical touchstones in the field of settler colonial studies. My discussion is also organized to emphasize the role of nationalist paradigms in order to chart their influence on critical articulations of race, Indigeneity, colonialism, and imperialism.

■ IMPERIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL DISCONTENTS

While most would grant that the existence of unincorporated U.S. territories—the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico—is undeniably colonial, the settler coloniality of the continental United States has been less readily acknowledged. When I began research into race and British settler colonialism in North America in the early 2000s, the United States was largely figured as a powerful empire rather than a settler colony. Indeed, the publication of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s *Empire* in 2000 reinforced the tendency to disarticulate U.S. imperialism from settler colonialism. Even as their work proclaimed the end of nation-based imperial projects, their concession that “the US does indeed occupy a privileged position in [deterritorialized] Empire” (xiv) propelled ongoing debates in Americanist disciplines over the designation of the twentieth century as “the American century,” seizing the mantle previously held by Britain during the nineteenth century. In Asian American studies as well, scholars have been tracking the imperial dimensions of U.S. territorial expansion across the Pacific since the nineteenth

century. From atomic bombs and chemical weapons, military occupations and outposts, and “hot war” interventions in Korea and Southeast Asia during the so-called Cold War, the United States is synonymous with imperial violence.

My point here is not to deny U.S. imperialism but rather to observe the difficulty of articulating imperialism and colonialism in relation to the United States. Because colonialism is typically associated with nations designated as inferior, backward, or with diminished sovereignty, the self-understanding of the United States as both imperial superpower and settler colony is somewhat counterintuitive. Indeed, to designate the United States as a settler colony seriously undercuts the exceptionalist mythology of U.S. revolutionary independence from the British—even as this independence is itself a signal feature of settler colonialism. As in other settler colonies, what distinguishes the United States from other colonial formations is that large-scale settlement is an end in itself; settlers seek to permanently replace Indigenous peoples and remake the land in their own image. British settler rule is thus the common colonial objective that connects the continental United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Kenya, and Northern and Southern Rhodesia (now Zambia and Zimbabwe). This is also the reason, as Werner Beirmann and Reinhart Kössler (1980, 115) explain, revolutionary independence movements in settler societies that seek to break away from the imperial metropole “cannot, in any sense, be considered of an emancipatory nature, but rather as a defence of atavistic forms of exploitation.” What is perhaps most exceptional about the United States is its development as a settler colony *and* empire, which makes it possible to speak of the continental United States as a British settler colony and Hawai‘i and Alaska as U.S. settler colonies—the reproductive logics of settler colonialism being continually rewritten onto new sites of colonial invasion. The very meta-level plurality of settler colonial dynamics has often confounded the articulation of race and colonialism that are nevertheless integral to the United States’s imperial development.

Canada’s self-understanding as a settler colony has been subject to slightly less repression, due in part to the historical antagonism between French and English “founding” nations and the determined resistance of First Nations to colonial dispossession and capitalist accumulation and development. Nevertheless, what has historically undermined the critique of settler colonialism are perceptions that Canada is itself threatened by U.S. and British imperial relations of domination. With respect to the United States, Canadian nationalism largely turns on a sense of moral superiority over its slave-holding southern neighbor while playing its

largest victim. Thus, in Margaret Atwood's (1972) view, Canadian culture is reducible to a collective theme of *survival*, whether it be the survival of arctic winters, internment camps, or U.S. imperial encroachments. As Roy Miki (1998, 47–48) rejoins, “the leap from the phenomenality of the particular . . . to the generality of theme is a manoeuvre that could succeed only by eliminating multiplicity and difference.” The structures of racism and colonial dispossession are thus rendered merely facets of a shared “multicultural” experience in which difference is homogenized as sameness.

The British metropole has also played a significant role in establishing the fictions of settler national culture in Canada. With the establishment of Canadian citizenship in 1947 in the face of a collapsing British empire, Canadianist scholarship increasingly identified with a “postcolonial” national identity. As a case in point, the editors of the popular volume *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* include Canada, New Zealand, and Australia in their delineation of “non-European” and “non-Western” postcolonial nations (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 2002). Their exclusion of the United States from this problematic list reinforces the erroneous view that U.S. imperialism somehow negates colonialism. Thus, in the editors’ schema, Alice Munro is as much a “postcolonial” writer as Lee Maracle (Tsleil-Waututh). As Bronagh Clarke (2006, 8) explains of the editorial rationale, “they argue that though it has been suggested these colonies are particularly ‘complicit with the imperial enterprise,’ such complicities in fact ‘occur in *all* post-colonial societies.’” In effect, histories of genocidal violence and dispossession of Indigenous peoples are collapsed into a universal Canadian thematic of postcolonial “survival.” As Anna Johnston and Alan Lawson (2000, 365) charge, the “postcolonial” rebranding of settler-invader colonies functions as a “strategic disavowal of the colonizing act, whereby ‘the nation’ is what replaces ‘the indigenous’ and in doing so conceals its participation in colonization by nominating a new ‘colonized’ subject—the colonizer or settler-invader.” Such blatant effacements create the conditions of possibility for the former prime minister of Canada to formally apologize to Indigenous survivors of the residential school system in 2008 and, a year later, to declare that Canadians “had no history of colonialism” (Coulthard 2014, 106). These points speak to the pervasive tactics of settler disavowal that Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein (2016) refer to as “colonial unknowing.”

The purpose of the foregoing section is to demonstrate that nationalist rubrics of colonialism and imperialism have been responsible for collapsing Indigenous histories and cultures into a “postcolonial” Canada

or obscuring them within the vast, outwardly expanding terrain of U.S. “empire.” My larger point here is to highlight the need to be alert to nationalist fictions and other forms of “colonial unknowing” that can emerge in the study of settler colonialism—a point that Danika Medak-Saltzman (Anishnaabe) also makes in her *Field Trip* essay. While the field attempts to build on the long-standing project of Native and Indigenous studies, it is also important to recognize, as Robert Warrior (Osage) insists, that “too often settler colonial studies *stands in* for Indigenous studies . . . [but] they are not the same thing” (quoted in O’Brien 2017, 251). For instance, the emphasis on the structural logics of colonial elimination in the field of settler colonial studies can function to displace Indigenous resistance and survival. As Ojibwe scholar Jean O’Brien counters, “Indigenous resistance to colonial power structured through racial imaginaries continues to override the logic of elimination” (254). Thus, while Patrick Wolfe’s (1999, 2) influential theorization of settler colonialism as a “structure not an event” remains useful, the critical focus on colonial power structures can marginalize the impact of decolonial resistance and potentially inhibits the urgent work of rearticulating colonialism and imperialism.

■ BEYOND THE ASIAN MIDDLE MINORITY THESIS

Encompassing the recruitment and exploitation of Chinese labor, anti-Asian immigration policies, and the West Coast expulsion and incarceration of Japanese civilians during World War II, anti-Asian policy and public sentiment have unfolded in virtual lockstep in Canada and the United States. But what accounts for the transnational scope of this anti-Asian rhyme? My research has sought to make sense of these parallels by investigating the role that British settler colonialism plays in the process of racial formation in Canada and the United States. This has meant moving beyond familiar approaches to Asian racialization as a derivative form of anti-Blackness. From Claire Jean Kim’s theory of Asian Americans’ triangulated relation to Blackness and whiteness to Susan Koshy’s conception of a single hierarchical axis in which Asian Americans have moved progressively away from a racialization associated with Blackness toward an ethnicization associated with whiteness, these theories rely on what Colleen Lye (2008, 1733) refers to as “the historical agency of a racism that is foundationally antiblack.” However, this foundationalism is complicated in a transnational North American framework where very distinct trajectories of anti-Blackness must be accounted for, particularly the absence of plantation-based slavery in Canada. In my book *Alien Capital*, I make the claim that the mirrored arc of Asian racialization cannot be entirely attributable to an inherited legacy or second-order version of

anti-Black racism. Instead, I argue that Indigeneity and settler colonialism play a vital role in the process of racial formation.

I connect Asian racialization to a settler colonial value regime that relies on an ideology of Romantic anticapitalism. Romantic anticapitalism is an ideology that misperceives capitalism as an opposition between the concrete, sensory, natural world and the abstract, intangible, nonsensory dimension. From Henry David Thoreau's representation of Walden Pond as a refuge from the corruptions of modernity to Chris McCandless's pursuit of the Alaskan wilderness in rebuke of the materialism of his upbringing, Romantic anticapitalism shapes racialized notions of purity and impurity, authenticity and inauthenticity, the natural and the unnatural. In *Alien Capital*, I argue that a settler colonial ideology of Romantic anticapitalism constructs Asians as the racialized embodiment of the destructive abstractions of capitalism by projecting a kind of perverse, excessive efficiency onto their bodies. Figured alternatively as cheap labor or as efficient model minorities, Asian racialization has consistently turned on notions of excessive economism. In the nineteenth-century context of railroad building, the temporal excess associated with Chinese bodies through their higher rate of exploitation combined with the perversity associated with the nonreproductive spheres of Chinese homosocial domesticity. This rendered Chinese labor a quantitative, temporal threat to the qualitative and normative temporality of white social reproduction. From the standpoint of Romantic anticapitalism, the temporally excessive and fungible character of Chinese labor was the foundation upon which Asians have been associated with a destructive value regime. On the flip side of the economic abstraction tied to Asian racialization, Romantic anticapitalism imagines Indigenous peoples as entirely outside of capitalism or time, inviting a Romantic settler identification with Native peoples that Shari Huhndorf (2001) calls "going Native."

■ TRIANGULATING RACE, INDIGENEITY, AND SETTLER COLONIALISM

As tense discussions at the Association of Asian American Studies annual conference made clear, the question of whether descendants of African slaves or other racialized migrants are "settlers" remains contested and has given rise to alternative concepts and frameworks to differentiate non-Indigenous racialized subjects. These include Jodi Byrd's (2011) concept of "arrivants," the usage of *settlers of color* (Pulido and David Lloyd 2010; Phung 2015), and my use of the term *alien* (Day 2016). Despite nomenclatural differences, the crucial point reinforced by all these concepts is to consider how transatlantic slavery and racialized labor migration are

integral to the settler colonial mode of production that reproduces Indigenous dispossession and racialized disposability (Day 2015). My book presents a theory of British settler colonialism in Canada and the United States that operates as a triangulation of symbolic positions that include the Native, the alien, and the settler. The distinctions between alien and settler are by no means stable or fixed but are meant to emphasize the role of territorial entitlement that distinguishes them. In this sense, these positions should not be understood as identitarian categories but rather as political orientations to Indigenous land. The alien may not only be complicit with the settler colonial regime but may eventually inherit its sense of sovereign territorial right.

This triangulated approach opens up a critical view of racial and colonial dynamics that remain obscured within a binary Native–settler critical framework. For example, a binary approach limits a view of the racial and colonial dynamics that conditioned the enslavement of African slaves by Indigenous Nations or that gave rise to the collusion of African and European laborers in their attacks on Indigenous Nations during Bacon’s Rebellion. A binary approach also denies the Indigeneity of African slaves, conjoining Blackness to enslaved labor rather than land. As Robin Kelley (2017, 268) explains, “[this approach] presumes that indigenous people exist only in the Americas and Australasia. African Indigeneity is erased in this formulation because, through linguistic sleight of hand, Africans are turned into Black Americans.” Lastly, while a focus on triangulated relation is admittedly messy, it seeks to move away from both Black and Native exceptionalisms, which, as Grace Hong (2017, 275) notes, “risk replicating the totalizing narratives of liberal political modernity that are in fact where such logics of exceptionalism originate.” This standpoint allows for the interrogation of both racial and Indigenous incommensurability and relationality, while exposing the governing logics of white supremacy embedded in a settler colonial mode of production.

Iyko Day is associate professor of English and critical social thought at Mount Holyoke College. She is the author of *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism* (2016).

■ WORKS CITED

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. 2002. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Atwood, Margaret. 1972. *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: House of Anansi.

- Biermann, Werner, and Reinhart Kössler. 1980. "The Settler Mode of Production: The Rhodesian Case." *Review of African Political Economy* 18: 106–16.
- Byrd, Jodi A. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clarke, Bronagh. 2006. "Canadian Citizens as Postcolonial Subjects? Reading Robert Kroetsch's "The Lovely Treachery of Words." *Critical Survey* 18, no. 3: 5–18.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Day, Iyko. 2015. "Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiracism, and Settler Colonial Critique." *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 2: 102–21.
- Day, Iyko. 2016. *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hong, Grace. 2017. "Comparison and Coalition in the Age of Black Lives Matter." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 20, no. 2: 273–78.
- Huhndorf, Shari. 2001. *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Johnston, Anna, and Alan Lawson. 2000. "Settler Colonies." In *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 360–76. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kelley, Robin D. G. 2017. "The Rest of Us: Rethinking Settler and Native." *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2: 267–76.
- Lye, Colleen. 2008. "The Afro-Asian Analogy." *PMLA* 123, no. 5: 1732–36.
- Miki, Roy. 1998. *Broken Entries: Race, Subjectivity, Writing*. Toronto: Mercury Press.
- O'Brien, Jean M. 2017. "Tracing Settler Colonialism's Eliminatorial Logic in *Traces of History*." *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2: 249–55.
- Phung, Malissa. 2015. "Asian-Indigenous Relationalities: Literary Gestures of Respect and Gratitude." *Canadian Literature* 227: 56–72.
- Pulido, Laura, and David Lloyd. 2010. "In the Long Shadow of the Settler: On Israeli and US Colonialisms." *American Quarterly* 62, no. 4: 795–809.
- Rosellini, Lynn. 1982. "Not Your Usual Ambassadorial Pair." *New York Times*, July 8, sec. B, 8.
- Vimalassery, Manu, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein. 2016. "On Colonial Unknowing." *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell.

Settler Orientalism

JULIANA HU PEGUES

In this *Field Trip* essay, I consider Indigeneity and racialization in conversation, with two overlapping and contingent investments: the imbrication of imperialism and settler colonialism and the interdependent stakes for the fields of Asian American and Native and Indigenous studies. Based on my current research, I examine Alaska as a liminal space, a connective and contradictory node, lodged between multiple imperial and colonial vectors. Although Alaska's prominence is well known as part of Russia's imperial history, by the mid-eighteenth century, British, American, and Spanish colonial interests also extended into the area, motivated by the fur trade, in particular, the Chinese market for sea otter and fur seal pelts (as opposed to other markets focused on land mammals). A century later, after the shift to American territorial possession, Alaska was viewed as a key component of an envisioned overseas empire, resulting in an overriding Asian racialization for the Indigenous peoples residing there. It is this racial discourse I focus on for this essay, and, in conversation with the theme of decolonial relationality invoked in Iyko Day's introduction and Glen Coulthard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's (Coulthard and Simpson 2016; Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2017) formulation of "grounded normativity" as a place-based and Indigenous-informed ethical reciprocity, I assert that the imperial desires of the U.S. settler nation-state manufactured a competing form of relationship between Indigenous peoples and Asian immigrants, an Orientalist fiction meant to foreclose decolonial possibilities.

In 1867, U.S. secretary of state William Seward orchestrated the sale of Alaska from Russia with neither Native permission nor participation. Seward long considered Alaska a crucial possession in the informal empire he envisioned for the United States, an expansion that included not only Alaska but also Hawai'i, the Philippines, several Caribbean islands, and the Panama Canal. Sure of Alaska's benefit to U.S. economic interests, Seward negotiated the purchase of Alaska with neither presidential nor congressional approval. Alaska remained a U.S. territory for nearly a century, making it an excellent site of study for the complementary and contentious relationship between empire and settler colonialism. Alongside a host of government officials, Seward conceived of Alaska Native peoples as separate from American Indians through a common Asian ancestry, Asian racialization allowing Seward to reconfigure Alaska Natives not as indigenous to the Americas but as part of an expansive

and anticipatory vision of American imperial hegemony. Via temporal linkage to an Asian past, he situated Alaska outside of national boundaries, intrinsically as colonial space.

In my work, I examine the widespread desires of non-Natives in the late nineteenth century in their imagining Native origins in Asia and the particular place Alaska holds in that imaginative construction. If Edward Said's (1978) foundational postcolonial scholarship argued that the construction of the Oriental revealed little about the actual lives of people in the Arab and Asian worlds and instead represented the logics and desires of European colonialism, how does the formulation of the Alaska Native in relation to a different notion of Oriental inform the contours and intent of American colonialism? How are racialized and gendered constructions central to the colonial and settler colonial project in Alaska? Conversely, how are Western knowledge and the construction of race and gender informed by the historical demands of empire and settler colonialism? I attempt to think alongside Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd's (2011, 39) formulation of transit of empire, wherein Indianness functions as an imperial sign that facilitates colonial incorporation while simultaneously reiterating the "lamentable but ungrievable" figure of the Indian. In the case of Alaska, however, Indianness is at times overlaid with, and at other times oppositionally juxtaposed to, an abstract and signifying Asianness. Byrd locates the origin of U.S. empire with the birth of the nation-state and its prior and continuing colonization of Indigenous people, lands, and knowledges and, further, demonstrates that U.S. overseas empire from the 1890s to the present transfers a paradigmatic Indianness onto the colonized to justify and naturalize a notion of colonial benevolence over the constructed backward and uncivilized "Natives." I am interested in the U.S. imperial project in Alaska as another transfer point that complicates and deepens the interplay between primitivist and Orientalist discourses through notions of internal and external consolidation and, ultimately, witnesses the deferral and disavowal of Alaska Native peoples' claims to Indigeneity by constructing a temporal and spatial separation enabled through the sign of the Asian other.

During and following the acquisition of the United States's first non-contiguous territory, Alaska was alternately configured as an imperial space through the emphasis on Alaska Native peoples as distinct and exceptional, racial notions that hinged on Asian lineage. Government officials proffered racial categorization, albeit shifting and uneven, of Alaska Native peoples as Asian in arguing the case for Alaska's purchase. The colonial imaginary that linked Asians and Alaska Native peoples through a racialized intimacy was fortified and extended through a broad

compendium to the state archive, authored by a diverse group of informal actors including missionaries, ethnographers, and tourists. This diverse cohort repeatedly constructed Alaska Native peoples' ancestry as, to use the parlance of the time, "Asiatic," "Mongolian," or "Oriental," to justify fluid and overlapping imperial and settler colonial ambitions for Alaska as a territory and future state. In particular, touristic first-person observations expanded the American grammar of colonialism, naturalizing racial discourses of ambiguity and exception, all undergirded by notions of Asianness, for Alaska Natives. Of the roughly two dozen most popular Alaska travelogues published during this period, all remark on Asian attributes or origins for Alaska Native peoples.

This Orientalist relationship was extended to Indian affairs, setting a precedent for Alaska Native exceptionalism that rendered illegible nation-to-nation status in favor of limited rights gained through assimilated individualism. Alaska came into American possession a few years prior to the formal end of the U.S. policy of treaty making with Indigenous nations, and no treaties were signed between the United States and Alaska Native peoples. Instead, Indigenous Alaskans occupied an ambiguous legal status marked specifically by a racialized discourse of civility.¹ In 1872, the commissioner of Indian affairs, Francis A. Walker (1872), using the logic that Alaska Natives were not Indian but of Asian ancestry, argued that the Office of Indian Affairs's jurisprudence should not be "extended unnecessarily to races of a questionable ethnical type" (4). Walker's administrative refusal located the rights, and therefore political strategies, of Alaska Native peoples as distinct from other Indigenous groups in the United States, which further hindered sovereignty and facilitated land dispossession. This is an omitted yet crucial aspect of the historic and contemporary political and legal distinction between "Alaska Native" and "American Indian," a separation initially constituted through Asian racialization.

What the commissioner's rationale both conceals and reveals, however, is that by refusing Alaska Natives status as Indians, he limited the ability of Alaska Native peoples to make land claims as nations of people. Instead of viewing Alaska Natives as the autochthonous inhabitants of Alaska, government officials viewed them as having origins elsewhere, which placed them on a trajectory from those Asiatic beginnings to an American settler future, while everything in between was transitory. Land is lost here, figuratively and materially. Jodi Byrd argues that the figure of the Indian functions as a transit, a transferable paradigm through which U.S. empire acquires lands and territories, while simultaneously disavowing the attendant violence enacted upon Indigenous peoples. This process

is rehearsed through Walker's reasoning, but unlike Byrd's supposition that this transit pivots on a production of Indianness, in this instance, Indigenous dispossession is orchestrated through Asianness. Rather than articulate this as a break, as American boosters of Alaska were keen to do, we might view the recursive nature of this exceptionalism, evident throughout and a key feature in the *longue durée* of colonialism in the Americas, with (mis)recognition embedded in the originary moment of Christopher Columbus's hailing of the Indio. Indigeneity and Orientalism have consistently been enfolded within settler and imperial ambitions and machinations, and Alaska, rather than the hinge to the post-1890 age of American overseas empire, makes impossible sequential or causal conclusions. The figure of the Indian is always already an attempt at dispossession through Asian belonging, and ironically, the categorization of "Alaska Native" separate from "American Indian," an alterity born from this moment of racialization within the Office of Indian Affairs, echoes four hundred years of imperial violence and dominion wrought through settler Orientalist logics.

By the close of the nineteenth century, the colonial imaginary relating Alaska Natives to Asians started to fracture, driven by anxieties produced by the arrival of Chinese immigrant workers in Alaska. Although early historical records reveal that Asians traveled to Alaska during the Russian colonial period, large numbers of predominantly male Asian laborers arrived in Alaska within the first twenty years of the American colonial period (Buchholdt 1995; Inouye, Hoshiko, and Hashiki 1994; Guimary 2006). Successive waves of Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinx migrants followed the U.S. colonial expansion of industry into Alaska, working as highly mobile and temporary workers in resource extraction economies such as canning, logging, and mining. Looking to travel narratives, outside of a few authors' fleeting remarks on cannery workers, there is no sustained engagement with the Asian workers arriving in the territory and certainly no connection between the assimilative promise of Asian racialized Natives and the presence of Asian laboring bodies, even when they are traveling on the same ships as tourists. More curious, even as missionaries praised Alaska Natives' capacity for Christian assimilation based on perceived Asian cultural traits, no effort was made by missionaries to interact with Asian migrant laborers (Woodman 1890, 110–11; Young 1927, 437). Herein lies a spatial contradiction: though Asian racialization signaled an assimilative proclivity for Alaska Natives, and even while Asian laborers were essential to the economic foundation of the territory, Asians were consistently disregarded as part of its space, even in plain sight. Gendered racialization is a critical aspect of this conundrum: the

almost exclusively male population of Asian migrant workers provided necessary labor for the territory yet forestalled the futurity of a white settler state. The Asian migrant men who labored in Alaska could reproduce settler colonialism neither racially nor biologically. Asian labor in Alaska revealed both the dream and nightmare of settler colonialism, a reminder that an exploitable racial class provided the material base for settlement but also limited the white futurity of that settlement. Indigenous Alaskans, in contrast, were recognized as inhabitants of Alaskan space, yet, belonging to a constructed Asian past, failed temporally, an Orientalist version of the pernicious myth that Jean O'Brien (2010, xxi) has succinctly summarized as "Indians can never be modern." Within this construction, the violence required to occupy land already inhabited was not located within settler colonial ambitions but blamed on notions of primitive Native culture fundamentally at odds with modernity. One a temporal displacement and the other a spatial contradiction, settler Orientalist logics situated both Alaska Native peoples and Asian immigrants outside of the place of Alaska, impeding and disrupting the place-based possibilities offered by Coulthard and Simpson's (Coulthard and Simpson 2016; Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2017) grounded normativity.

These two juxtapositional logics, of settler colonial time and space, worked in tandem to simultaneously conceal and authorize the land dispossession and labor exploitation essential to the settler colonial project. Not only relational but also differential, these discourses made incoherent the connections between the very people being colonized and racialized. Relationships were unrecognizable when Asians could never be "here" and Alaska Natives could never be "now." Previously and abstractly associated through an imperial discourse of racialization, by the early twentieth century, Asian and Native peoples in the territory were discursively separated under settler colonial machinations, even as they lived and labored in close proximity. As Asian origins became less useful for selling the settler colonial future of Alaska, the overriding fascination with an Indigenous Asianness became recursively tied to justifying settler colonial pasts, that is, the imperial settlement of North America. Alaska's exceptionalism shifted to an exemplary status as the enduring "last frontier," and the invalidation of Indigenous claims facilitated through Asian ancestry would find a lasting articulation in the Bering Land Bridge theory.

Alaska's colonial settlement was made possible through spatial and temporal logics that located Indigenous inhabitants and Asian immigrants outside the proper gendered racialization for the state's settler futurity. Indigenous and immigrant contingencies, discursive and material, are crucial to understanding both the function and concealment of

imperial and settler colonial statecraft. The parsing of settler logics into distinct yet relational spatial and temporal modalities underscores the need for deep and sustained analysis on the differential effects of settler colonialism, as well as the conjoined stakes for Asian American studies and Native and Indigenous studies. This examination demonstrates not simply an incorporation of Asian Americans into Alaskan history but a radical reconfiguration of Asian American studies by insisting that settler colonialism is not simply a productive optic but the overarching and foundational framework through which to understand America's historical formation, including constructions of race, gender, and citizenship. To truly understand Asian experiences in Alaska (and America), we must apprehend not only imperial histories and circuits but also the ways in which Asian America is always conditioned by and through settler colonialism. Doing so allows us to recognize both Asian complicity and failure within settler colonial structures, an understanding imperative to Asian American accountability to grounded relationalities with Native peoples, on Native land, through Native epistemologies, and under Native governance.

Juliana Hu Pegues is assistant professor of American Indian studies and Asian American studies at the University of Minnesota.

■ NOTES

Thank you to Iyko Day for her vision and leadership in organizing this *Field Trip* conversation. I am especially thankful for her incisive and generous engagement with my work and for the excellent feedback and dialogue I received from my roundtable co-panelists: Lee Ann Wang, Dean Itsuji Saranillio, Malissa Phung, and Danika Medak-Saltzman.

1. In Article III of the 1867 Treaty of Cession between Russia and the United States, a distinction was made between the “uncivilized tribes” and other “inhabitants of the ceded territory,” and only the second group was designated to obtain rights to be admitted as citizens of the United States. See Case and Voluck ([1984] 2002, 6).

■ WORKS CITED

- Buchholdt, Thelma. 1996. *Filipinos in Alaska, 1788–1959*. Anchorage, Alaska: Aboriginal Press.
- Byrd, Jodi A. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Case, David S., and David A. Voluck. (1984) 2002. *Alaska Natives and American Laws*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press.

- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Coulthard, Glen, and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. 2016. "Grounded Normativity/Place-Based Solidarity." *American Quarterly* 68, no. 2: 249–55.
- Guimary, Donald L. 2006. *Marumina Trabaho: A History of Labor in Alaska's Salmon Canning Industry*. Lincoln, Neb.: iUniverse.
- Inouye, Ronald K., Carol Hoshiko, and Kazumi Hashiki. 1994. *Alaska's Japanese Pioneers: Faces, Voices, Stories—A Synopsis of Selected Oral History Transcripts*. Fairbanks: Alaska's Japanese Pioneers Research Project.
- O'Brien, Jean M. 2010. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resurgence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Walker, Francis A. 1872. "Conditions of the Inhabitants of Alaska." 42nd Cong., 2nd sess., H.E.D. 197.
- Woodman, Abby Johnson. 1890. *Picturesque Alaska: A Journal of a Tour among the Mountains, Seas, and Islands of the Northwest, from San Francisco to Sitka*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.
- Young, S. Hall. 1927. *The Mushing Parson*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Fleming H. Revell.

Indigenous and Asian Relation Making

MALISSA PHUNG

■ GENEALOGICAL DISCLOSURE AND THE POLITICS OF TERRITORIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Whenever I begin a public talk on Indigenous and Asian relations, I often perform a version of the following land and community acknowledgment:

Before I begin, I'd like to acknowledge my status as an uninvited guest on the territories of the Huron-Wendat, Mississauga, and Haudenosaunee peoples. These are the lands upon which I currently live and work, though I've also been teaching on Anishnaabe and Algonquin territory as well. I also want to mention that the knowledge that informs my work has been

shaped by my experiences as a second-generation settler descendant of Sino-Vietnamese refugees who have resettled on the territories of the Cree, Blackfoot, Métis, Nakado, and Tongva peoples.

What follows this preface is an acknowledgment of the land upon which the public meeting or conference is taking place. The practice of territorial acknowledgment has become a scholarly and activist custom in settler colonial societies like Canada or the United States to acknowledge the Indigenous territory (or, if any, treaty) upon which public engagements in the academy are taking place, a trend that is being followed in a variety of spaces, such as political rallies, academic email signatures, or even public readings and author interviews organized by local bookstores with a social justice mandate. This is typically a gesture of respect, and sometimes it carries a pedagogical function, as some of us sitting in such an audience may not know whose lands we are currently occupying. But recently, Indigenous academics like the Métis scholar and blogger Chelsea Vowel (2016) have argued that while performing these acknowledgments may powerfully disrupt and unsettle how settlers have come to relate to the land as being emptied of Indigenous presence or priority, once these acknowledgments become common practice in formal institutional spaces, they also run the risk of becoming tokenistic gestures that have little commitment to producing any real change.

In light of these criticisms, this is how I have come to perform this practice at this stage of my life and research: I approach it as a practice of genealogical disclosure rather than a display of territorial knowledge that deserves an empty activist pat on the back. I disclose where I have been living, working, and learning as an uninvited guest, and I carefully detail where my diasporic community comes from. I reveal that after occupying the class status of colonial intermediaries, my ethnic Chinese relatives were expelled from Vietnam when tensions between China and Vietnam ramped up after the U.S. empire pulled out of Saigon. I also list the communities that my family and I have been living among ever since they left Vietnam and Hong Kong as Cold War refugees of the Vietnam War. I do this to lay claim to the ethical duties and responsibilities that I believe migrants and refugees like my family and I have to Indigenous communities who have also experienced ongoing displacement and dispossession, just in case any members from these communities may be listening in the audience and would like to ask me how I have been working to honor these relations—otherwise, who is this territorial acknowledgment really for?¹ Woven into a reflective territorial acknowledgment, genealogical disclosure is a gesture of respect and gratitude, but in laying claim to

the status of an uninvited guest, it also acknowledges a power differential. None of these communities invited me or my family to live in these places. As stateless refugees who benefited as colonial intermediaries in Vietnam, our Canadian and American citizenship rights have since been allocated to us from settler state powers that control and dominate the sovereignty and land rights of this list of communities and nations. Thus I perform territorial acknowledgment in this way to publicly announce the community displacements and debts that my family and I have incurred simply by living and working in these territories. That is how I have come to frame the diasporic sense of precarious resettlement that migrants and refugees like my family have experienced due to the legacies of empire, war, and global capitalism.

Understandably, genealogical disclosure may appear too individualistic to effect any substantive change in the scholarly and activist movement to conceptualize and build Indigenous and Asian relations. Self-identifying as an uninvited guest, settler of color, or Asian settler ally also risks repeating the egocentric theatrics of antioppressive approaches that inevitably center the guilt and responsibility of systemic discrimination on the individuals that benefit from various privilege systems (namely, white supremacy, heteronormativity, patriarchy, capitalism, and able-bodiedness). However, when practiced in the context of Indigenous and Asian community members exchanging our migration narratives to lay bare our connected yet distinctive experiences of displacement and dispossession, it is a necessary first step toward building Indigenous and Asian relations, particularly in situations of racial conflict and colonial misapprehensions,² that would require a lifelong commitment on our part to initiate more conversations and understanding between these communities if it is to accomplish any meaningful change. I stand behind this practice for the potential it carries to inspire and advocate for much-needed intergenerational allyship and solidarity actions between our communities in Canada.

Furthermore, genealogical disclosure is a practice of both vulnerability and accountability, a public detailing of family migration narratives to reveal to whom we are related, to whom we live among, and to whom we remain indebted.³ This is what pushes genealogical disclosure beyond the individual self: it is a concept shaped by Indigenous principles of kinship and visiting that require us to disclose all of our relations to make clear the connections and responsibilities we have to any interrogating community and the land and its sentient and nonsentient inhabitants.⁴ In my engagement with Indigenous critical theory and the conversations I have been privileged to have with scholars, mentors, and peers working

in the field, I have learned how important it is to frame how we come to know what we know and how and why we relate to the knowledges that we produce. Where we come from matters in what we claim to know. Where we come from tells a genealogy that requires a narrative format, a disclosure of the personal, a revealing of the relations we have or do not have to the places and communities we have come to settle among in order to build sustaining ways of life. Such storytelling practices contextualize us and demonstrate both the limits and the motivations behind our knowledge making and pedagogy, whether in the academy and/or in our communities. This is a strategy that has come to ground my research and shape how I approach this field of knowledge making.

■ THE SETTLER OF COLOR CRITIQUE

In the time that I have been working at the intersection of Indigenous, settler colonial, Asian diaspora, Asian Canadian, and Asian American studies, I have been following a terminology debate that has developed over the past decade and a half regarding the colonial positionality of migrant, diasporic, and racialized minorities in settler societies like Hawai'i, Canada, and the United States. On one hand, a survey of the literature reveals that several scholars have taken a strong exception to the settler of color critique, contending that the term *settler*, when applied to migrant, diasporic, and racialized minorities, reinforces power binaries, lacks historical specificity, confuses migration with colonialism, or fails to account for the involuntary conditions of migration (see, e.g., Takagi 2005; Sharma and Wright 2008–9; Barker 2009; Veracini 2010; Byrd 2011; Wolfe 2013; Day 2016). Meanwhile, other scholars have taken an unequivocal stance in assigning a settler colonial status to these migrant communities, conceptualizing various ways to engage yet nuance and contextualize the term in their theoretical and political projects (see Trask 2000; Fujikane and Okamura 2000, 2008; Lawrence and Dua 2005; Thobani 2007; Haig-Brown 2009; Phung 2011; Saranillio 2013).⁵ Such a terminology debate is quite common to any new area of focus as scholars work to define the parameters of their object of study; for example, such rigorous conceptualizing has also dominated (critical) refugee and diaspora studies. In the literature that crosses the fields of Indigenous, settler colonial, and Canadian/American studies, there have been poignant criticisms raised about uncritically applying the settler terminology to black diasporas and Asian racialized migrants who were forcibly brought into these colonial and racial capitalist societies. In fact, we now have a plethora of alternate terms to work through that have been insightfully theorized by Indigenous academics and scholars of color, terms such as *arrivant* and

arrivant colonialism (Byrd 2011); *alien* and *alien capitalism* (Day 2016); *Asian settler ally* and *Asian settler colonialism* (Fujikane and Okamura 2000, 2008; Saranillio 2013); *Creole Indigeneity* (Jackson 2012); *nonpreferred* or *undesired immigrants* (Thobani 2007); *minor settler/co-colonizer* (Huang 2015); *refugee settler* (Lê Espiritu 2018); or simply *colonizer*,⁶ all terms conceptualized so as not to assign all newcomers the same level of colonial agency as historically egregious, violent colonizers. However, whatever the term, whatever the conceptual approach, whatever adjective used to describe these various overlapping, “co-constitutive”⁷ genealogies of precarious resettlement and forced migration, most of these scholars would agree that non-Indigenous resettlement remains predicated on the displacement and dispossession of Indigenous peoples.⁸

In his book *Why Indigenous Literatures Matter*, Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) reminds us to center this fundamental loss—the loss of Indigenous lives and lands and livelihoods—in our theorizing and understanding before we proceed to emphasize all the relationalities and structural oppressions that your fill-in-the-blank settler and Indigenous communities share. As he puts it, “we must honestly and clearly name that history before we can untangle the complications that different newcomer populations have brought into that relationship, or before we can look for the alliances and connections between marginalized communities” (Justice 2018, 12). He further advises that naming these communities as settlers does not have to negate any of the different reasons that migrants enter settler colonial society; it does not have to erase all the ways in which migrants have also suffered or produced relations of kinship, love, and political solidarity with Indigenous peoples (10–12). Of course, these complexities happened. Not all settlers were or are equally violent. But what also happened and what continues to happen regardless of colonial intent or choice is a whole range of Indigenous losses and alienation due to the systemic non-Indigenous appropriation of land and territory (Justice 2018).

■ DECOLONIAL ACTIONS AND EPISTEMOLOGIES

There has been a concerted effort in academia to distance our work from the personal, an attempt to steer clear of the unproductive navel gazing and finger pointing that has been associated with identity politics. I understand these aversions, as I have attended activist and academic events in the Canadian context in which conversations about addressing the legacies of settler colonialism inevitably privilege the guilt of (white) settlers over more pressing Indigenous concerns over the effects of ongoing settler colonialism: such as the degradation of land and water; language

loss and enforced cultural assimilation; adequate housing, education, and health care on remote Indigenous reservations; missing and murdered Indigenous women across the nation; and the systemic overpolicing and high incarceration rates of Indigenous peoples. But once we accept our complicities in ongoing Indigenous displacement and dispossession, once we swallow that colonial guilt, we should get over ourselves and do something about it.⁹ My research on this topic has been profoundly influenced by the critical and creative works of Indigenous authors and Asian settler allies writing on both sides of the border: people like Lee Maracle (Stó:lō), SKY Lee, and Larissa Lai; Haunani-Kay Trask (Kānaka Maoli) and Candace Fujikane; and Dorothy Christian (Secwepemc/Syilx) and Rita Wong (see, e.g., Maracle 1990; Lee 1990; Lai 2014, 2017; Trask 2000; Fujikane 2018; Christian and Wong 2017). What I have learned from these authors and land defenders is that if Indigenous and Asian relationality is going to serve anyone other than those working in the field of (Asian) settler colonial studies, then our conceptual frameworks must center political solidarity actions with Indigenous peoples.¹⁰ And if we wish to build solidarity with Indigenous peoples, that solidarity cannot exist only in the individual or human realm, because that solidarity is an insufficient model when it comes to addressing Indigenous loss and dislocation from the land.

It was Rita Wong via Indigenous thinkers and artists like Loretta Todd (Métis/Cree) who first helped me recognize that our conceptual frameworks for understanding the place of racialized immigrants in the Canadian nation-state has been limited to “the filter of racialized categories rather than through the lens of immigrants’ relations to indigenous land” (Wong 2008, 164). She raised this important criticism eleven years ago in her influential essay “Decolonizasian: Reading Asian and First Nations Relations in Literature,” and it is a point that has stuck with me ever since. In addition to standing in solidarity with Indigenous peoples and remaining vigilant of all the ways in which settler colonial structures and institutions work to produce their physical and political disappearance, which are necessary and urgent solidarity actions, I urge us also to follow in the footsteps of Asian settler allies like Rita Wong, Larissa Lai, and Candice Fujikane by challenging and expanding our ways of relating to the land, and of course doing something about it. At the risk of cultural appropriation, I suggest that we not only respect Indigenous peoples and their claims to sovereignty, assisting them in whatever ways are asked of us, but that we also unlearn colonial-capitalist ways of relating to the land and learn from Indigenous “place-thought epistemologies” to guarantee our collective planetary survival (Watts 2013). And one way to participate

in this process is to heed the epistemological call in Dorothy Christian and Rita Wong's (2017) *Downstream: Reimagining Water* project, which outlines

an intergenerational, interdisciplinary, culturally inclusive, participatory water ethic . . . [that] arises from spiritual responsibilities, from a deep appreciation for human dependence on water for a meaningful quality of life, and from an ecologically grounded realization that individual well-being is predicated upon interdependence with other humans and living creatures, all of whom need healthy water to coexist together on and with Earth. (18)

If we are going to continue to theorize and map out our settler colonial frameworks in the perpetuation of Indigenous loss and dislocation, we should acknowledge the ways in which we have also come to relate to our objects of scholarly inquiry through practices of genealogical disclosure, and we should also take action and become more aware of our epistemological relationalities, that is, how we have been taught to relate to the land and its waterways and all of its sentient and nonsentient beings as property rather than kin.

Malissa Phung is a professor of communication and literary studies at Sheridan College (Ontario, Canada). Her research on Indigenous and Asian relations has appeared in the Aboriginal Healing Foundation series *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the Lens of Cultural Diversity*; scholarly journals such as *Canadian Literature* and *Asian Diasporic Visual Cultures and the Americas*; and an unpublished PhD dissertation titled "Reaching Gold Mountain: Diasporic Labour Narratives in Chinese Canadian Literature and Film."

■ NOTES

1. At the 2012 Native American Indigenous Studies Association conference, I attended a panel in which one of the presenters awkwardly thanked the Mohegan tribe for hosting them without ascertaining whether any Mohegan members were sitting in the audience. At the end of the panel, a community elder stood up and reminded the audience that the attendees were never granted any official welcome from the tribe, an anecdote that lends support to the criticisms raised by Indigenous scholars that territorial acknowledgments serve the needs of settlers more than the communities being acknowledged. Therefore, in the context of public territorial acknowledgments, I always self-identify as an uninvited guest, a respectful and mindful protocol that I have observed among Indigenous scholars such as Alice Te Punga Somerville (Maori) as

well as non-Indigenous scholars visiting the territories of other nations, tribes, and communities.

2. On July 30, 2016, an incident of racial and class discrimination toward Indigenous patrons that resulted in a public apology by a Chinese restaurant owner unfolded on social media and the national news circuit in Canada. At the Kum Koon Garden in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Ellen Rae, an Oji-Cree woman from Sandy Lake First Nation in northern Ontario, was on vacation with her boyfriend and friends; they had stopped at the Kum Koon Garden for a meal, where they were told that they had to pay first before they would receive their order, a policy that was not applied to the other, mostly white patrons eating at the restaurant. While this single anecdote could not possibly represent the views of the entire Chinese community in this prairie region of Canada, it is more telling of the dominant racial and colonial stereotypes and concomitant overpolicing and high incarceration rates of Indigenous community members that taught the Chinese staff to single out these Indigenous patrons as potential food thieves who would shirk the responsibility of paying for their meals. See *CBC News* (2016).

3. The limited space of this chapter prevents me from fully explicating what I mean by indebtedness in the main body of the essay. It is a concept that I am working on for my next book project, *Making Kinship: Remembering and Honouring Indigenous-Asian Relations of Indebtedness*, in which I track stories of care, mutual respect, political solidarity, and hospitality exchanged between Indigenous and Asian communities that date back to 1788 in North America. In this new work, I invoke a concept of indebtedness from reading literary and cultural representations of Indigenous and Asian relation making as a historical relationality that comes with ethical duties and responsibilities to the land and all of its inhabitants. As Larissa Lai via Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) has usefully argued, Indigenous and Asian communities are subject to the same colonial and neocolonial forces, but not in intensity or scale; building on their theorization of kinship across difference, I claim that Indigenous and Asian communities share a historical kinship across colonial and racial differences, a constructed kinship substantiated by this archive of Indigenous and Asian indebtedness that contains historically based narratives of how members of each community have helped each other. In short, I propose that such narratives of Indigenous and Asian indebtedness function as a powerful relation building tool. See Lai (2014) and Justice (2008).

4. In a forthcoming book chapter that I have cowritten with Jennifer Adese, we connect the practice of genealogical disclosure to the action of

storytelling and the Cree and Métis laws of *wahkohtowin* (kinship) and *kiyokewin* (visiting). The laws that guide Cree and Métis peoples to visit and care for their relations form the basis of relation building between the living and nonliving, the human and nonhuman, across time and space. We further recognize that these laws were once and can continue to be extended to other humans, that is, non-Cree and non-Métis humans. See Adese and Phung (forthcoming).

5. For a more comprehensive literature review and analysis of this debate, see Day (2016) and Saranillio (2013).

6. Glen Coulthard (Yellowknives Dene) has recommended a return to the term *colonizer*, because the ways in which the term *settler* has been taken up as an identity category by left-leaning scholars and activists has become for him historically unmoored from the violent histories of colonialism and structures of power; therefore, for Coulthard, the term *colonizer* attends more specifically to power structures and does not subsume all newcomers into the same violent status. However, should colonial violence be the only determining factor to ascertain any newcomer's positionality in the intersecting structures of settler colonialism and global capitalism? For example, even if the wealthy Chinese newcomers residing predominantly on the unceded territories of the Coast Salish peoples could not be referred to as violent colonizers, does the process of their resettlement, albeit complicated by the legacies of war, imperialism, white supremacy, and global capitalism, not contribute to the ongoing effects of Coast Salish displacement and dispossession? I simply question at what point Chinese newcomers under Coulthard's formulation would cease to be "new" to these lands and thus extricated from all the power structures that sustain Indigenous displacement from the land. For more on Coulthard's position on this issue, see Justice (2018, 12).

7. As a discussant on a panel on settler colonial relationalities at the 2018 Association of Asian American Studies conference, Juliana Hu Pegues usefully suggested that we conceive of settler/migrant and Indigenous relations through a co-constitutive rather than a juxtapositional frame.

8. I have never been one to abide by reductive binary systems of thought, but for scholars working on Indigenous and diasporic relationalities, could our conceptual projects not attend to the multiple genealogies that emplace migrant and racialized bodies in intersecting power structures? Perhaps we need all of these conceptual frames of reference to best account for the ways in which contemporary Asian Canadians born or arriving after 1967, for example, may hail from labor genealogies of displacement and dispossession but also wittingly or unwittingly

reinforce the settler colonial state by simply paying taxes, owning or renting Crown property, and thus enjoying the full social and civic benefits that were once denied to all nonwhite migrants until race and ethnonational origins were removed as factors from Canada's immigration system in 1967.

9. Of course, the practice of genealogical disclosure that I have been advocating will only have any substantive meaning if it is coupled with community engagement. My rationale for reconceiving the custom of territorial acknowledgment as a storytelling practice of genealogical disclosure is to turn these repeated public pronouncements often limited to academic spaces into a lifelong political project of visiting and building actual relationships with these communities and finding out ways that members of my diasporic and academic community who live in these areas can support their concerns and challenges.

10. At conference panels that I have attended on this topic, I have noticed a trend to ascribe the origins of settler colonial studies to white settler scholars like Lorenzo Veracini and Patrick Wolfe. And as my colleagues in this volume have rightly pointed out via Indigenous scholars like Robert Warrior (Osage), this scholarly field often replaces or displaces Indigenous studies when their political goals and analytical approaches cannot be conflated. Some would argue that this subfield of Asian settler colonial studies may be repeating the same sleight of hand. But I contend that the field of settler colonial studies as I have been researching and analyzing it has come out of a long intellectual and cultural history of Asian engagement with and citation of Indigenous thinkers, writers, and activists. Thus the goal of such projects has always been to emphasize and honor our relations. A reading of any of the Asian settler ally scholars whom I have cited in this paper would make this relationality clear.

■ WORKS CITED

- Adese, Jennifer, and Malissa Phung. Forthcoming. "Where Are We From? Decolonizing Indigenous and Refugee Relations." In *Critical States of Refuge*, edited by Thy Phu and Vinh Nguyen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Barker, Adam J. 2009. "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State." *American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 3: 325–51.
- Byrd, Jodi. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- CBC News. 2016. "Winnipeg Restaurant Owner 'Terribly Sorry' after Indigenous Patrons Told to Pay up Front." August 5. <https://www>

- .cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/kum-koon-restaurant-ellen-rae-bill-1.3708295.
- Christian, Dorothy, and Rita Wong. 2017. "Introduction: Re-Storying Waters, Re-Storying Relations." In *Downstream: Reimagining Water*, edited by Dorothy Christian and Rita Wong, 1–25. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Day, Iyko. 2016. *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Fujikane, Candace. 2018. "Settler Allies in Indigenous Economies of Abundance: Critical Settler Cartography as Relational, Embodied Practice." Paper presented at the conference of the Association for Asian American Studies, San Francisco, CA, March 29–31. https://www.academia.edu/36321436/_Settler_Allies_in_Indigenous_Economies_of_Abundance_Critical_Settler_Cartography_as_Relational_Embodied_Practice_excerpted_from_Mapping_Abundance_Against_the_Wastelands_of_Capital_Indigenous_and_Critical_Settler_Cartography_in_Hawai'i_forthcoming.
- Fujikane, Candace, and Jonathan Y. Okamura. 2000. "Whose Vision? Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai'i." *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2.
- Fujikane, Candace, and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds. 2008. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Haig-Brown, Celia. 2009. "Decolonizing Diaspora: Whose Traditional Land Are We On?" *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry* 1, no. 2: 4–21.
- Huang, Yu-ting. 2015. "Between Sovereignties: Chinese Minor Settler Literature across the Pacific." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jackson, Shona. 2012. *Creole Indigeneity: Between Myth and Nation in the Caribbean*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. 2008. "'Go Away, Water!': Kinship Criticism and the Decolonization Imperative." In *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*, edited by Janice Acoose et al., 147–68. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. 2018. *Why Indigenous Literatures Matter*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.
- Lai, Larissa. 2014. "Epistemologies of Respect: A Poetics of Asian/Indigenous Relation." In *Critical Collaborations: Indigeneity, Diaspora, and Ecology in Canadian Literary Studies*, edited by Smaro Kamboureli and Christl Verduyn, 99–126. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier.
- Lai, Larissa. 2017. "Saturate/Dissolve: Water for Itself, Un-Settler Responsibilities, and Radical Humility." In *Downstream: Reimagining Water*,

- edited by Dorothy Christian and Rita Wong, 259–69. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Lawrence, Bonita, and Enakshi Dua. 2005. "Decolonizing Anti-Racism." *Social Justice* 32, no. 4: 120–43.
- Lee, SKY. 1990. *Disappearing Moon Cafe*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Lê Espiritu, Evyn. 2018. "Vexed Solidarities: Vietnamese Israelis and the Question of Palestine." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 29, no. 1: 8–28.
- Maracle, Lee. 1990. "Yin Chin." *Canadian Literature*, no. 124: 156–61.
- Phung, Malissa. 2011. "Are People of Colour Settlers Too?" In *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the Lends of Cultural Diversity*, edited by Ashok Mathur, Jonathan Dewar, and Mike DeGagné, 289–97. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2013. "Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–4: 280–94.
- Sharma, Nandita, and Cynthia Wright. 2008–9. "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States." *Social Justice* 35, no. 3: 120–38.
- Takagi, Dana Y. 2005. "Faith, Race, and Nationalism." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 7, no. 3: 271–88.
- Thobani, Sunera. 2007. *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. 2000. "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i." *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2: 1–24.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vowel, Chelsea. 2016. "Beyond Territorial Acknowledgments." *âpihtawikosisân* (blog), September 23. <http://apihtawikosisan.com/2016/09/beyond-territorial-acknowledgments/>.
- Watts, Vanessa. 2013. "Indigenous Place-Thought and Agency amongst Humans and Non-Humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go on a European World Tour!)." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 2, no. 1: 20–34.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 2013. "Recuperating Binarism: A Heretical Introduction." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–4: 257–79.
- Wong, Rita. 2008. "Decolonizasian: Reading Asian and First Nations Relations in Literature." *Canadian Literature* 199: 158–80.

The Obscenity of Settler Colonialism

DEAN ITSUJI SARANILLIO

In September 2000, then governor of Hawai'i Benjamin J. Cayetano, who was and still is celebrated as the first Filipino American governor of a U.S. state, removed the nine Native elected trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) and appointed his own trustees to office. OHA is a state agency responsible for managing and administering trust monies generated from the "ceded public lands trust" to Kānaka 'Ōiwi (Native Hawaiians). This was largely in response to, but not required by, the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Rice v. Cayetano*. Cayetano argued for the trustees to step down voluntarily or risk OHA's termination. Eiko Kosasa and Ida Yoshinaga (2000) point out that this was actually the direction of the then senior senator Daniel Inouye, to "facilitate the control of OHA by the state and away from the electoral process." In response, a protest of an estimated 150 people was held directly in front of the governor's mansion. What garnered the most public attention was Haunani-Kay Trask's sign, which read, "FUCK BEN." Cayetano, in his typically reactionary way, argued in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* that Trask and others should be embarrassed and ashamed since there were children present at the protest: "Their actions reaffirm my decision to appoint people who will discuss issues critical to native Hawaiians in a rational, meaningful and productive way." Trask responded, "It was an obscene word to describe an obscene man, namely the governor, who has committed an obscene act." Not allowing Cayetano to claim settler innocence out of a seeming concern for Hawaiian children, Trask clarified just who was victimizing who in the newspapers: "Hawaiian children are going to suffer from the actions of Governor Cayetano. And that is obscene" (Shapiro 2000).

One year later, as a response to 9/11 and the call for war that ensued, Trask argued at an antiwar forum at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, "The United States is angry because somebody came back and blew up their World Trade Center. I would be angry, too. But what made them do that? It is the history of terrorism that the United States unleashes against Native people all over the world." Trask, who, on September 11, was in Durban South Africa attending the United Nations Conference on Racism as a plenary speaker, said she was shocked watching the events unfold and that the first words out of her mouth were what Malcolm X said when asked about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in 1963: "Chickens have come home to roost." Elaborating on what this meant to her, Trask contended, "What it means is that those who have

suffered under the imperialism and militarism of the United States have come back to haunt in the 21st century the same government.” She explained that the United States began the twentieth century with the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom and begins the next one trying to install a new government in Afghanistan. She further noted that U.S. foreign policy makes use of state-sponsored terrorism to impose U.S.-friendly governments in countries like Chile, El Salvador, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Guatemala, and Vietnam: “Everywhere, the United States has overthrown leftist governments. Everywhere, the United States has overthrown Native governments. Why should we support the United States, whose hands in history are soaked in blood?” Her comments were reprinted in the local newspapers and immediately criticized.

Trask responded by challenging her critics—specifically Governor Benjamin Cayetano, OHA chairman Clayton Hee, and contributing editor to the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* John Flanagan—to public debate. Flanagan declined to comment; Hee responded that he would not engage in a public debate with Trask; Cayetano responded by saying that “a debate would only give credibility to what is an incredibly arrogant and irresponsible person.” Trask responded calmly and directly to Cayetano, “I have statistics and books and if [Cayetano] wants to criticize me, let him come up and present his evidence. I am a scholar. Where is his scholarship?”

I begin by framing some of the back-and-forth discussions between Trask and Cayetano to give you a sense of the particular form of Asian settler colonialism that shapes the political landscape of Hawai‘i to which she was responding. This is obviously distinct from white settler colonialism, as Cayetano is able to protect his settler innocence by framing himself as Filipino, as someone who has faced racial discrimination, at the same time that he continually asserts his colonial authority by calling for a need to “move on” and forget Kānaka ‘Ōiwi self-determination. Under colonial conditions that relegate Native peoples to anachronistic space, at once aiming to eliminate Native political agency while villifying such resistance, this essay aims to examine the ways that the term *settler* emerges in Hawai‘i to at once challenge non-Native peoples and offer alternatives to operating within a colonial structure. To quote Malcolm X (1965, 164–65), someone Trask often studied, through “skillful manipulation of the press, they make the victim look like the oppressor and the oppressor look like the victim. . . . If you’re not careful, the newspapers will have you hating the people who are being oppressed, and loving the people who are doing the oppressing.”

Trask’s article “Settlers of Color and ‘Immigrant’ Hegemony: ‘Locals’

in Hawai‘i” has been the starting point for much of the work on settler colonialism in Hawai‘i (Trask 2000, 2008). Arguments that an analysis of settler colonialism emerged, instead, from white scholars are erroneous, at least in the context of Hawai‘i (see Kauanui 2016).¹ Some criticisms of scholarship using an analysis of settler colonialism elide this fact, presuming that the theoretical framing of settler colonialism originates solely from white male scholars. In a 2014 article cowritten with Corey Snelgrove and Jeff Corntassel titled “Unsettling Settler Colonialism,” Rita Dhamoon argues, “There’s something interesting too as people of colour are entering this discussion, often on terms set by white scholars and activists. . . . It is not Indigenous peoples who are anxious whether people of colour are defined as settlers” (11–12). Dhamoon and her cowriters argue that scholars of color identify as settlers to “alleviate white anxiety” and, in so doing, perform support for Native people while obscuring Native voices. What gets lost in this conversation is the work of Native feminist scholars, such as Trask, who have critically initiated such conversations. Accordingly, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (2016) intervenes in common genealogies of settler colonialism that begin with Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini, arguing that there are multiple genealogies of settler colonialism, including those that originate in Palestinian scholarship and, for Hawai‘i, in the work of Trask. Trask often explained that she was herself informed by the same scholarship and activism in Palestine. Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel argue that scholarship on settler colonialism displaces Native voices, yet, ironically, their argument erases the public and academic work of a Native feminist scholar such as Trask.

Recent scholarship has further generated productive debates around settler-colonial critique and its efficacy. Jodi A. Byrd (2011, xxxviii–xxxix), for instance, argues, “It is all too easy, in critiques of U.S. settler colonialism, to accuse diasporic migrants, queers, and people of color for participating in and benefiting from indigenous loss of lands, cultures, and lives and subsequently to position indigenous otherness as abject and all other Others as part of the problem, as if they could always consent or refuse such positions or consequences of history.” In a Hawaiian context, my sense of the efficacy of the work of Trask and others is not so much in the chiding of groups for the asymmetrical power relations that constrain agency and constitute marginalized positions. Rather, Trask’s critique emerges in a moment where certain Asian groups hold political and economic power and enact such power in a manner that actively opposes Hawaiian struggles for self-determination (Cayetano 2009, 445; see also Saranillio 2013).

Trask invites non-Natives to support Native movements and politics,

as opposed to only working within an American colonial system. In other words, Trask's theorizing of settler colonialism goes beyond exposing complicity, offering instead new pedagogies—different ways of knowing, being, and responding to—of the living force of the colonial past in the present. Pushing beyond binary conceptions of power—oppressor–victim, white–nonwhite, settler–Indigenous, settler–migrant—the intricate *relationality* of power shows how multiple binaries organize and layer differences within the settler state. As Trask (2006, 67) has argued,

the color of violence, then, is the color of white over Black, white over brown, white over red, white over yellow. It is the violence of north over south, of continents over archipelagoes, of settlers over natives and slaves. Shaping this color scheme are the labyrinths of class and gender, of geography and industry, of metropolises and peripheries, of sexual definitions and confinements. There is not just one binary opposition, but many oppositions.

As one of the first scholars to utilize relational analyses of settler colonialism, Trask's work is not easily reducible to a settler–Native binary. In the foregoing quote, Trask does not collapse enslaved peoples with settlers or deny systems of anti-Asian violence.² Instead, she highlights the existence of multiple binary oppositions underpinned by a structure of white heteropatriarchy to show that differential locations relative to white supremacy and its ongoing effects *un-settle* supposedly natural or inevitable alliances between historically oppressed groups.

And while Trask's political style is both to call out and to call in, her critique is still more relational than Othering, tracing liberal strategies of past movements against white supremacy and their damaging impact on contemporary Hawaiian politics. Trask (2000, 47–48) elucidates the dominant ideology that underpins U.S. statehood in Hawai'i:

Ideology weaves a story of success: poor Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino settlers supplied the labor for wealthy, white sugar planters during the long period of the territory (1900–1959). Exploitative plantation conditions thus underpin a master narrative of hard work and the endlessly celebrated triumph over anti-Asian racism. Settler children, ever industrious and deserving, obtain technical and liberal educations, thereby learning the political system through which they agitate for full voting rights as American citizens. Politically, the vehicle for Asian ascendancy is statehood. . . . Because the ideology of the United States as a mosaic of races is reproduced in Hawai'i through the celebration of the fact that no single "immigrant group" constitutes a numerical majority, the post-statehood euphoria stigmatizes Hawaiians as a failed indigenous people whose conditions,

including out-migration, actually worsen after statehood. Hawaiians are characterized as strangely unsuited, whether because of culture or genetics, to the game of assimilation.

What the history of Hawai'i thus demonstrates is how opposition to white supremacy without an analysis of settler colonialism can often renew and expand a structure of U.S. occupation initiated by white settlers. In the poststatehood moment, the rise of liberal politics green-lights large-scale land development projects, which heightens displacement and desecrations against Kānaka 'Ōiwi. The Democratic Party, indeed, relies on a master narrative of anti-Asian oppression on the sugar plantations and valiant military service during World War II, which all too often serves as an alibi for continued acts of Native dispossession and marginalization. By reflecting on the failures of liberal strategies for resistance, we can see how settler colonialism often shapes and constrains our political imaginations in ways that allow for movements seeking reprieve from white supremacy, whether knowingly or unknowingly, to collude in Native dispossession.

In thinking through capacious strategies for coresistance, I look to the work of Grace Lee Boggs, who as a part of the Black radical tradition, argued against imagining racialized groups as “oppressed masses” and sought instead to see them as empowered communities capable of making moral choices (Boggs 1998, 152, 149). Boggs and her comrades stated that movements require not only resistance but *reflection*, and she challenged those concerned with radical transformation to do the hard work of beginning with themselves. Through a notion of dialectical humanism, they aimed at both an individual and a collective level for a way of becoming a “more ‘human’ human being,” primarily so that politics and strategies for resistance do not solidify into a trap for oneself or others. Together they created space for growth by being open and vulnerable to challenge, to demand another mode of being than the good citizen-subject defined by the state.

Where Trask begins by revealing the forms of knowledge and entrenched identities that uphold Asian settler colonialism in Hawai'i, the work of Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua builds on Trask and marks a turn in this field by offering a plurality of possibilities that might emerge when diverse settler groups work in place-based affinity with Kānaka 'Ōiwi. Goodyear-Ka'ōpua (2013) illustrates in her book *The Seeds We Planted* just how Native movements and educational work address current problems. By rebuilding Hawaiian governance, foodways, and economies, they create and imagine alternative power relations to settler colonialism: “The

marginalization and suppression of Indigenous knowledges has gone hand in hand with the transformation and degradation of Indigenous economic systems and the ecosystems that nourish us. Conversely, settler-colonial relations might be transformed by rebuilding, in new ways, the Indigenous structures that have historically sustained our societies” (127). Goodyear-Ka’ōpua’s work aims for nonstatist forms of deoccupation, which help cultivate mutual respect by setting the conditions of possibility to be determined by the land, urgently critical in a moment of ecological crisis (see Goodyear-Ka’ōpua, Kuper, and Peter, 2018). Candace Fujikane, through community and activist work, has theorized the term *settler ally* to be capacious, as opening ways of being in Hawai’i that coexist settler colonialism and occupation: “The term ‘settler’ roots us in the settler colonialism that we seek to rearticulate so that we never lose sight of those conditions or our own positionality or the privileges we derive from it. At the same time, however, the term encompasses the imaginative possibilities for our collaborative work on ea and land-based decolonial nation-building. For there is joy, too, in these practices of growing ea.”³ As the work of these scholars and activists illuminates, placing Asian diaspora and Native histories together opens new lines of inquiry, allowing for their different historical and geopolitical forms of oppression to be understood as interdependent in ways that produce possibilities outside of the constrained logics of U.S. empire.

Dean Itsuji Saranillio is an associate professor in the Department of Social and Cultural Analysis at New York University. His teaching and research interests are in settler colonialism and critical Indigenous studies, Asian American and Pacific Island histories, and cultural studies. His book titled *Unsustainable Empire: Alternative Histories of Hawai’i Statehood* (2018) shows that U.S. statehood was neither the expansion of U.S. democracy nor a strong nation swallowing a weak and feeble island nation but the result of a U.S. nation whose economy was unsustainable without enacting a more aggressive policy of imperialism.

■ NOTES

1. Studies that narrate the critique of settler colonialism without acknowledging Haunani-Kay Trask not only decenter a Native feminist scholar but actively erase her numerous contributions. Examples of such work include Rohrer (2016) and Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel (2014).

2. Some argue that Asians in Hawai’i are not settlers and do so by equating a history of Asian labor exploitation on Hawai’i’s plantations

with African histories of enslavement. Such analyses can unintentionally erase the specificities of *chattel slavery*. An example of such flattening of distinctions can be found in Ortega (2017).

3. See Candace Fujikane's Facebook page at <http://www.facebook.com/candace.fujikane>; see also Fujikane (2016).

■ WORKS CITED

- Aikau, Hokulani. 2010. "Indigeneity in the Diaspora: The Case of Native Hawaiians at Iosepa, Utah." *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3: 477–500.
- Bacchilega, Cristina. 2007. *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Boggs, Grace Lee. 1998. *Living for Change: An Autobiography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Byrd, Jodi A. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cayetano, Benjamin J. 2009. *Ben: A Memoir, from Street Kid to Governor*. Honolulu: Watermark.
- Compoc, Kim. 2010. "Filipinos and Statehood: Reflections on American Assimilation and Settler Complicity." Master's project, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Compoc, Kim. 2017. "Emergent Allies: Decolonial Hawai'i from a Filipino Perspective." PhD diss., University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Fujikane, Candace. 2005. "Foregrounding Native Nationalisms: A Critique of Antinationalist Sentiment in Asian American Studies." In *Asian American Studies after Critical Mass*, edited by Kent A. Ono, 73–96. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Fujikane, Candace. 2008. "Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai'i." In *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura, 1–42. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Fujikane, Candace. 2016. "Mapping Wonder in the Māui Mo'olelo on the Mo'o'aina: Growing Aloha 'Āina through Indigenous and Settler Affinity Activism." *Marvels and Tales* 30, no. 1: 45–69.
- Fujikane, Candace. 2012. "Asian American Critique and Moana Nui 2011: Securing a Future beyond Empires, Militarized Capitalism and APEC." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 13, no. 2: 189–210.
- Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noelani. 2013. *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noelani, Kenneth Gofigan Kuper, and Joakim “Joejo” Peter. 2018. “Together We Are Stronger: Hawaiian and Micronesian Solidarity for Climate Justice.” Unpublished manuscript.
- Isaki, Bianca. 2011. “HB 645, Settler Sexuality, and the Politics of Local Asian Domesticity in Hawai‘i.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 2: 82–102.
- Kaomea, Julie. 2006. “Indigenous Studies in the Elementary Curriculum: A Cautionary Hawaiian Example.” *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36, no. 1: 24–42.
- Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. 2008. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. 2012. *Hokulani Aikau, Chosen People, a Promised Land: Mormonism and Race in Hawai‘i*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. 2016. “‘A Structure, Not an Event’: Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity.” *Lateral: Journal of the Cultural Studies Association* 5, no. 1. <http://www.doi.org/10.25158/L5.1.7>.
- Kosasa, Karen K. 2011. “Searching for the ‘C’ Word: Museums, Art Galleries, and Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i.” In *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture*, edited by Fiona Bateman and Lionel Pilkington, 153–68. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Labrador, Roderick N. 2015. *Building Filipino Hawai‘i*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Lyons, Laura. 2011. “From the Indigenous to the Indigent: Homelessness and Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i.” In *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture*, edited by Fiona Bateman and Lionel Pilkington, 140–52. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Malcolm X. 1965. *Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements*. Edited by George Breitman. New York: Grove Press.
- Onishi, Yuichiro. 2012. “Occupied Okinawa on the Edge: On Being Okinawan in Hawai‘i and U.S. Colonialism toward Okinawa.” *American Quarterly* 64, no. 4: 741–65.
- Ortega, Nadine. 2017. “Settler Colonialism Still Defines Power in Hawaii: Who Benefits from Our Continued Disunity in Hawaii? A Handful of Mostly White Men.” *Honolulu Civil Beat*, November 20.
- Ringor, Kristy Hisako. Forthcoming. “The War at Hanapepe.” PhD diss., University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.
- Rohrer, Judy. 2010. “Attacking Trust: Hawai‘i as a Crossroads and Kamehameha Schools in the Crosshairs.” *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3: 437–455.
- Rohrer, Judy. 2016. *Staking Claim: Settler Colonialism and Racialization in Hawai‘i*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2016.

- Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2010a. "Colliding Histories: Hawai'i Statehood at the Intersection of Asians 'Ineligible to Citizenship' and Hawaiians 'Unfit for Self-Government.'" *Journal of Asian American Studies* 13, no. 3: 283–309.
- Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2010b. "Kēwaikaliko's Benocide: Reversing the Imperial Gaze of Rice v. Cayetano and Its Legal Progeny." *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3: 457–76.
- Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2013. "Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 304: 280–94.
- Shapiro, Treena. 2000. "Some Protest Trask's Obscene Language." *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, September 13.
- Snelgrove, Corey, Rita Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. 2014. "Unsettling Settler Colonialism: The Discourse and Politics of Settlers, and Solidarity with Indigenous Nations." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 3, no. 2: 1–32.
- Teves, Stephanie Nohelani. 2012. "We're All Hawaiian Now: Kanaka Maoli Performance and the Politics of Aloha." PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Trask, H. K. 2000. "Writing in Captivity: Poetry in a Time of De-Colonization." *Wasafiri* 12, no. 25: 42–43.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. 2006. "The Color of Violence." In *The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*, 81–87. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. 2008. "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i." In *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura, 45–65. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Yoshinaga, Ida, and Eiko Kosasa. 2000. "Local Japanese Women for Justice Speak Out against Daniel Inouye and the JACL." *Honolulu Advertiser*, February 6.
- Yoshinaga, Ida. 2004. "Pacific (War) Time at Punchbowl: A Nebutsu for Unclaiming Nation." *Chain* 11, Summer.

Settler Colonialism and Phantasmagoria: On Asian, Asian Diaspora, and Indigenous Intersections

DANIKA MEDAK-SALTZMAN

When it comes to considering the history of United States–Japan relations, the narratives constructed about Commodore Matthew C. Perry’s “opening” of a “closed” Japan (by way of gunboat diplomacy and unequal treaties, in 1853 and 1854, respectively) are as well known as they are celebratory. Yet Perry’s arrival was not the first time an English speaker from North America arrived on the Japanese archipelago during the period of national seclusion (*sakoku*), under rumored (and unevenly enforced) penalty of death. In fact, in 1848, a mixed-blooded Chinook man, who was grandson of Chief Comcomly, intentionally shipwrecked himself off the coast of Hokkaido, interacted with some Indigenous Ainu people, was then was turned over to the samurai at Matsumae and from there was sent to Deshima (the small Nagasaki island where the Dutch were allowed to trade with Japan), where he taught English before being returned to the United States. This seafarer was Ranald MacDonald,¹ and one of his English pupils was none other than Moriyama Einosuke, a key translator between Perry and the Tokugawa shogunate five years later. In the United States this is a largely overshadowed history, and MacDonald’s role in Perry and the United States’s success has been relegated to being little more than a footnote to the story, if it appears at all. As a scholar trained in both Japan studies and Native American and Indigenous studies, I find this story compelling for two key reasons. First, I see the current relative obscurity of MacDonald’s role in this larger history as evidence of the phantasmagoric quality of history and mythmaking in settler societies—where the need to erase, obscure, and overwrite Indigenous experiences and their significance remains intractable. Second, MacDonald’s story is further evidence that supports a significant number of oral histories about Native people’s interactions with other Indigenous communities across the northern Pacific.

In our present moment, marked by a turn in Asian studies and Asian American studies toward employing frameworks of Indigeneity and settler colonialism, it is important to acknowledge that when I first began working at the intersections of Japan studies and Native studies, such work was not necessarily welcomed by either field. At that time, there was considerable resistance within Native studies to focusing on transnational Indigenous subjects. Many were rightly concerned that a more global lens might result in American Indian and Native American concerns and issues

being overshadowed. Meanwhile, my desire to discuss Japanese colonial history, particularly that of Japan's "development" of Indigenous Ainu homelands in and around Hokkaido, from a Native studies perspective was viewed with suspicion in Japan studies. This meant that on a number of occasions, I was told, on one hand, that my work was not Native studies, by those who saw Native studies and Japan studies as entirely unrelated subjects. And, on the other, that my engagement with Japan studies subjects was being clouded by my Native studies perspective—suggesting that I was seeing what I wanted to see, not what was there. Where I did find support was among my mentors and friends and a select group who inspired my work with their own engagement with and creation of interdisciplinary scholarship.

Before the current shift in these fields toward considering Indigeneity and formations of settler colonialism more globally, it was not uncommon for people to assume that my interest in examining how Asian, Asian American, and Indigenous experiences have overlapped, dialogued, and influenced each other was focused on Chinese laborers on the railroad or Japanese internment camps. Indeed, most critical discussions of Native–Asian interactions in the United States to this point *have* centered around these two moments in the larger narratives of national expansion and wartime removal; however, and as the other essays in this *Field Trip* indicate,² there are many other instances of peoples in Asia, peoples of Asian diasporas, and Indigenous peoples interacting—instances that Paul Lai and Lindsay Claire Smith have called “alternative contact” in their special issue of *American Quarterly* (AQ) in 2010.³

To my mind, the AQ special issue on alternative contact marked the beginning of a more sustained and vigorous consideration of the importance of engaging with Indigenous presence in fields outside of Native studies. Although a number of important works engaged, to varying degrees, with these intersections well before this time,⁴ the sea change we have seen over the last decade has been remarkable. Work in this area has blossomed, expanding and enriching the scholarly landscape with, for example, critiques of Asian settler colonialism and analysis of the value regimes central to settler colonial capitalism that have grown out of the racial triangulation of Native–settler–alien—thanks in large part to scholars like Jodi Byrd and Iyko Day. This shift has blossomed alongside a marked intellectual investment in, and growth of, Native American and Indigenous studies, owing in no small part to the work undertaken by so many to create the field's premier academic venue, the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA). Alongside this, we have witnessed tremendous strides in Indigenous rights, from the United

Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples being adopted in 2007⁵ to the Japanese government's 2008 recognition of Ainu as an Indigenous people of Japan, and beyond.

■ THE SETTLER COLONIAL TURN

The past two decades have seen a tremendous uptick in scholarship that takes up and engages with settler colonialism and settler colonial theory. This framework demands that we consider how this particular political formation makes the rapid rise of modernity in and among settler states possible precisely because of the ongoing access to Indigenous lands, labor, and resources required for the rapid rise of the settler state. Although explicit discussions of settler colonialism have been ongoing in Indigenous studies for some time, more recently, the term *settler colonialism* and its theoretical underpinnings have also been implemented in the literature about Japan's colonization of Hokkaido. For example, in his 2016 discussion the case of Hokkaido and the role of the *oyatoi gaikokujin* (foreign experts) in the process of Japan's "northern development," Katsuya Hirano (2016, 330) writes, "The Japanese settler-colonization of Hokkaido was . . . facilitated by the joint forces of the Japanese state and US experts and technology." Indeed, the most recent books in English about Ainu people, including ann-elise lewallen's (2016) *The Fabric of Ainu Indigeneity: Ainu Identity, Gender, and Settler Colonialism in Japan*, have joined Hirano's use of the term and built on the work of Michele Mason (2012), whose significant study *Dominant Narratives of Colonial Hokkaido and Imperial Japan: Envisioning the Periphery and the Modern Nation-State* explores the dearth of "meaningful engagement with the pernicious effects of Japan's colonial project in Hokkaido on Ainu communities" (3). To be clear, Mason's work does not specifically use the term settler colonialism, even as she highlights some of the ways that colonization efforts in Hokkaido were borne differently by Ainu people and *wajin* (ethnically Japanese people). Mason writes, "appropriation of Hokkaido produced devastating effects on Ainu communities" at the same time that these "early national and imperial state projects fundamentally defined Japan as a modern nation-state" (3). By framing the development and formation of the Japanese nation-state as possible because of Japan's colonial project in Hokkaido, Mason's engagement grounds and anticipates Japan studies' engagement with settler colonial theory. The field is moving closer to recognizing that the history of Japanese interventions into Ainu homelands must be examined from the position that these experiences were as consequential for Ainu peoples as they were crucial to the success of the Meiji state's national modernization campaigns, because

the success of the Meiji state's national modernization campaigns was premised on the violent dispossession of Ainu peoples.

This move toward engaging settler colonial theoretical frames in examinations of the colonization of Hokkaido requires that we consider the challenges attendant to the usage of this term proposed in Indigenous studies, wrestling with what Alissa Macoun and Elizabeth Strakosch call “the ethical demands of settler colonial theory” in their article of the same name. Arguing that these movements toward settler colonial theory “may be animated by and in sympathy with major developments in critical Indigenous theory, and global Indigenous activism,” Macoun and Strakosch echo a key contention among Native studies scholars, namely, that settler colonial theory, when used uncritically, refocuses scholarly attention away from the myriad ways that settler colonialism has impacted, and continues to impact, Indigenous peoples and thereby functions to concentrate scholarly attention back onto settlers and settler concerns. To paraphrase Osage scholar Robert Warrior (2017), in many cases, using settler colonial perspectives becomes a stand-in for engagement with Indigenous studies. It is critically important to remember that these are *not* the same thing. While the intent may be to address Indigeneity by using a settler colonial framework, in many cases, this becomes a means of redirecting our attentions toward the goals of the colonizer, the role of the settler, and the systems of oppression inaugurated by and key to the maintenance of settler colonialism. As Ojibwe scholar Jean M. O'Brien points out, when Patrick Wolfe describes settler colonialism as a project of eliminating Native peoples, what is concerning is that his description can be misunderstood as a claim that Native people are, will be, or have been eliminated, thereby maintaining the settler logic of the vanishing Native at the same time that it “denies modernity to Indian peoples” (O'Brien 2017). Moreover, she argues, Wolfe's claim that settler colonialism is a structure, not an event, indicates that Native peoples are *destined* to vanish, while also suggesting that settler colonialism is a permanent structure that has no end point. To be sure, pointing to this inherent contradiction in Wolfe's framing, O'Brien is not concerned with whether this inherent contradiction was Wolfe's intention; rather, her goal is to underscore how a focus on settler logics and formations serves to discourage thinking about, engaging with, and considering what Indigenous peoples have been saying about how this has impacted, and continues to impact, their communities. Preventing serious engagement with Indigeneity and Indigenous studies is precisely how settler colonialism functions.

My forthcoming book *Specters of Colonialism* ventures into and takes up this conversation to present a theory that aims to intervene in and

recenter the existence and experiences of Native peoples in settler colonial contexts. It does so by arguing that our attempts to engage with the consequences of colonialism are always already haunted by the ghosts of colonial goals and ideologies that I call the specters of colonialism. They haunt with a purpose and aim to prevent serious engagement with and deep consideration of the human toll of colonialism and its ongoing consequences. By obscuring the traces of colonial histories and logics, the specters of colonialism function to keep scholars and laypeople alike from engaging in a full and nuanced way with the human costs and consequences of colonialism, particularly as they pertain to Indigenous peoples. We must therefore approach archives and historiographies “otherwise,” by considering the experiences of Indigenous peoples, even when, or especially when, they have been erased from the record of settler regimes marked by tremendous ongoing violence and unprecedented flux.

■ SPECTERS OF COLONIALISM

The early challenges to my work in Asian studies and Native studies forced me to reckon with the disconnect between what I was seeing and attempting to describe and what was presented in the historical record. It was haunting theory that allowed me to articulate an alternative to dominant, colonial historiography and move beyond assumptions that “we can never know” about the contributions of Native peoples, nations, epistemes, science, and so on. Assumptions such as these justify not looking for or acknowledging Native presence, experience, and significance in the archives, in oral histories, and so forth, thereby allowing the phantasmagoric colonialist narratives to remain intact and insulated. By inverting familiar understandings of postcolonial and cultural haunting theory (which assert that the ghosts of figures in history can aid in the recovery of that which has been obscured in the construction of history) and the historical trace (the theory that narratives of the past remain indelible no matter how hidden, silenced, or ethereal they may be), I seek to critique how, unlike its utility in examining experiences of other marginalized groups, established haunting theory and its blanket application to Indigenous contexts does not function to liberate hidden Indigenous histories. Rather, it simply upholds colonialist fantasies about Native ghosts and the supposed inevitability of Native disappearance. In doing so, I aim to reveal how repressed colonial logics continue to haunt our world in the wake of (settler) colonial projects. The framework of specters of colonialism provides an alternative to seeing Native pasts and presents as ghostly and instead produces a lens for examining Indigenous experiences that is more appealing and compelling from a Native studies

perspective, as well as for Indigenous peoples still grappling with the very real effects of being “vanished” by colonial design. Although seeking to vanquish the specters of colonialism requires that we examine phenomena and Native experiences across geopolitical boundaries, choosing to refer to these phenomena as the “specters of colonialism” might seem an odd choice for an Indigenous studies framework, if only because it conjures particular European ghosts in the process. But this intellectual genealogy offers a significant means of considering ghostliness and the nature of haunting. For my purposes, that which haunts is not singularly embodied but rather is the spirit of an idea. While Marx and Engels speak about the “specter of communism” that haunted Europe and Derrida about the spirit of Marx and the Marxist inheritance, I assert that the specter haunting our world is our colonial inheritance made manifest. Haunting, and phantasmagoria, in this sense, are the spiritual excesses of linear, teleological, and empiricist historiography.

I began this essay with a brief sketch of Ranald MacDonald’s story because it is a particularly salient example of the (real and imagined) roles that Native peoples played in the way U.S. and Japanese diplomatic relationships unfolded and developed. Inserting the unofficial role of this Chinook adventurer into the American exceptionalist narrative about Perry “opening” Japan helps to erode the persistent narrative of great dead white men who succeed, on their own, on behalf of the settler nation. Such erosion highlights the efforts, ingenuity, and desires of Indigenous people as relevant complicating elements, entities, and factors. How does MacDonald, a Native person who played a role that ultimately impacted the rate and manner in which another Indigenous population was disenfranchised by a settler state, change how we think about this historical moment, complicity, trends, and Native/Asian convergences? By further nuancing and complicating our understandings of this particular conjuncture, and broadening our thinking beyond what the specters of colonialism wish us to see, we might begin to envision how consequential an “Indigenist presence” has been in the unfolding of history (Morrison 1992). I end here by suggesting that any scholarly engagement with settler colonialism that does not also consider the impacts of these experiences from the perspectives of Indigenous peoples, or that does not thoroughly engage with Indigenous studies scholarship, is always already haunted by the specters of colonialism.

Danika Medak-Saltzman is assistant professor of women’s and gender studies at Syracuse University.

■ NOTES

1. Of course, his name did not have the same burger chain connotations then as it does today.
2. Particularly those of Juliana Hu Pegues and Dean Itsuji Saranillio.
3. For a more robust analysis of this special issue and the rise of interest in “alternative contact,” see Tiongson’s (2018) unpublished manuscript.
4. In English, see Siddle (1996) and Yaguchi (1999).
5. The United States, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand all objected to, and voted against, UNDRIP.

■ WORKS CITED

- Hirano, Katsuya. 2016. “Settler Colonialism and the Making of Japan’s Hokkaido.” In *Routledge Handbook of the History of Settler Colonialism*, edited by Edward Cavanagh and Lorenzo Verancini, 327–38. London: Routledge.
- Iwawaki, Ann-Elise. 2016. *The Fabric of Ainu Indigeneity: Ainu Identity, Gender, and Settler Colonialism in Japan*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Mason, Michele. 2012. *Dominant Narratives of Colonial Hokkaido and Imperial Japan: Envisioning the Periphery and the Modern Nation-State*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morrison, Toni. 1992. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- O’Brien, Jean M. 2007. “Tracing Settler Colonialism’s Eliminatorial Logic in *Traces of History*.” *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2: 249–55.
- Siddle, Richard. 1996. *Race Resistance and the Ainu of Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Tiongson, Antonio T., Jr. 2018. “Asian American Studies, Comparative Racialization and Settler Colonial Critique.” Unpublished manuscript.
- Warrior, Robert. 2017. “Home/Not Home: Centering American Studies Where We Are.” *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2: 191–219.
- Yaguchi, Yujin. 1999. “The Ainu in U.S.–Japan Relations.” PhD diss., College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.