Queerness has only just become visible in Asian American studies. Before the mid-1990s few if any publications appeared on LGBT Asians in America. In the field of history itself, the dearth is even more pronounced. While queer texts in the past twenty years have multiplied significantly in literary criticism and cultural studies, in Asian American history they remain scant in number. So legitimated have queer studies become in some disciplines that those who do not identify as LGBT are taking up queer topics as a mark of edge and intellect. One faculty member in American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California went so far as to note that all scholars now must take into account queer theory and queer possibilities if they hoped their work to be seen as rigorous. Yet in Asian American studies, the LGBT experience remains marginal. In Asian American history in particular, the number of people specializing in queer studies might be counted on one hand. While five is better than zero and the Asian American LGBT experience is no longer in complete darkness, the field still remains in desperate need of robust growth even as the small numbers do tremendous intellectual work.

The dearth of queer historians can hardly be blamed on the individual Asian Americanist. A legacy of disincentives inhibits the historian from pursuing LGBT Asian America as a research area. In 2000, Susan Lee Johnson noted that despite the fact that scholarly inquiry into the history of sexuality has “exploded” in the past two decades, including the birth of the Journal of History of Sexuality in 1990, relative silence on sex and sexuality has reigned in the history of the North American West. Doubters assert that sexuality is “private,” “individual,” and without historical significance since it is a “trivial pursuit” motivated by “prurient” interests.¹ Within Asian American studies as well, founders of the field have severely restricted the proliferation of queer possibilities. Frank Chin, Jeffrey Paul Chan, and their yellow brethren no doubt dissuaded many from even touching queer topics with their homophobic diatribes of the 1970s.² Award-winning journalist and independent scholar Helen Zia remembers
being subjected to a “lesbian trial” when fellow community organizers, both Asian and African American, invited her to a meeting to discuss her sexual orientation. If she were a lesbian she would “harm” their “organizing efforts.” In that moment she remembers “stepping into the closet and slamming the door shut” to preserve her activist family.3

Writing about queer desires might additionally seem blasphemous in a field that has historically interpreted sexuality as a site of oppression. In the earliest publications on Asian American sexuality by historians such as Mary Roberts Coolidge, Yuji Ichioka, and Lucie Cheng Hirata, men languished painfully in bachelor societies and women endured forced sex work. These works laid the groundwork for later publications by Asian Americanists Robert Lee and George Anthony Peffer who highlighted sexually oppressed Asian men and women in America. Notably, in 2003 Madeline Hsu illuminated how Chinese men steeped in a tradition of homosocial interaction may not have been as deprived as more insistently heteronormative histories have declared.4 Yet single-sex communities continue to appear as sites of deprivation in the popular imagination. As late as 2014, the award-winning journalist Nicholas Hune-Brown wrote of Chinese bachelor societies as “strange, often unhappy places”—“neighbourhoods of grown men living together, sleeping in bunk beds.” Indeed, no amount of recent “gay streaming,” the mainstreaming of gay characters on television, could eradicate the presumption that a bachelor society would be anything but oppressive.5 Moreover as Asian Americanists criticize representations of emasculated Asian men as “fag-gots,” embracing the “homo” within ourselves might be akin to subscribing to the stereotype.6

Being a queer historian seems to have financial consequences as well.7 Even as America seems more accepting of gays and lesbians in recent years, in at least two faculty searches at research universities—one in Indiana and another in Texas—the dean refused to hire the search committee’s top candidate who were each visibly queer historians specializing in LGBT history. While Nayan Shah described the “dramatic” development of the history of Asian American sexuality broadly since 1990, no wonder that works specifically on queer sexuality are still small in number.8 Even if the historian-in-training decides to brave the barriers ahead of her in queer studies, she will likely find herself with compromised employment options, unable to convince the most powerful that a queer should be teaching LGBT history to America’s young adults.

Among nonprofit organizations charged with bringing history to a broader public, we see the continued discounting of sexuality. One queer history museum took down its extremely popular sex toys exhibit that highlighted sexual pleasure as political power, due to fears that an exhibit case displaying a cityscape of dildos standing erect would dissuade politicians and banks from giving their support. More recently, when I was introduced as a possible resource for an Asian American historical society as a historian specializing in sexuality, the program director responded, “Ooh la la,” with eyebrows raised followed by a chuckle. The response signaled the organization’s devaluation of the history of sexuality as opposed to labor or politics, in its public programming and exhibits. For sure, queer history continues to face widespread public perception as illicit or recreational, but never as a serious intellectual endeavor.
Many attribute the Asian American community’s reluctance to take on sexuality to the presumption that Asians are culturally conservative. Religious studies scholars attribute the Asian community’s refusal to accept same-sex sexuality to Confucianism and Christianity. In 2005 Alain Dang and Mandy Hu, in their survey for the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce, declared that homophobia and transphobia were “a problem” within Asian Pacific American communities. Community denial fuels the continued erasure of queers in history. Though plainly visible evidence has pointed to people of prominence such as Margaret Chung and Yone Noguchi as likely queer, scholars of Asian descent have refused to address individual sexuality until recently. Because heteronormativity compels people to presume that it must be better to be seen as “normal” than to carry the stigmatized label of queer, documenting a historical figure as queer requires definitive evidence of same-sex sexuality.

As much as many of us have come to believe that Asian culture is at the root of Asian American homophobia, the political scientist Cathy Cohen’s argument that a racially marginalized community such as African Americans striving for respectability within racist America would less likely embrace queerness may just as powerfully apply to an immigrant population. Asians too struggle for acceptance in white America as they grapple also with the ignominy of shame within their own communities. Ironically, throughout numerous Asian countries, same-sex sexualities and queer genders existed acceptably before Western imperialism mandated strict moral codes that restricted native customs and people.

While naysayers of queer history also cite a lack of sources for its documentation, the real trouble may lie in how materials deemed historically significant are collected and catalogued. If we imagined sex and love to be as crucial in understanding American politics as presidents, we would have more archives and libraries dedicated exclusively to sexuality and desire. Since the 1990s as well, technological developments in research tools such as LexisNexis have transformed the accessibility of source material on sexuality through instantaneous keyword searches using terms such as “crime against nature,” “fellatio,” and “buggery.” Historians of sexuality no longer have to search court documents and newspapers page by page as if looking for a needle in a haystack.

The most accessible records, however, can also be the most problematic. Because same-sex sexuality has a longer history of criminalization rather than acceptance, queers most readily appear in arrest records and court proceedings. Before World War II, men in their thirties having sex with young men in their late teens, and sometimes younger, appeared in criminal records all too often. In graduate school in the 1990s, a classmate also specializing in queer history confided in me, “What do we do with these sources?” Cases that suggested sexual abuse, rape, and violence upon male children seemed tricky to bring up in a field struggling for intellectual legitimacy, not to mention during a time when homophobes insisted homosexuality and pedophilia to be one and the same. Yet these very same cases, if we dare to engage them, hold untold stories of race, sexuality, power, and disability.

In 1912 Dong Pok Yip appeared before the California State Supreme Court in hopes of appealing his conviction of assault on nine-year-old Albert Hondeville. He had
originally been charged with an attempt to commit sodomy but was convicted instead of the lesser offense of “simple assault.” Dong Pok Yip contended that with the jury’s acquittal of the higher offense, there remained no evidence that showed an intent to commit any other sort of assault. A Portuguese American bookkeeper by the last name of Rodrigues had spied the two sitting together on the Antioch Pier. Dong Pok Yip appeared to be teaching Hondeville how to fish. When Dong put his arm around Hondeville and whispered something in his ear, Rodrigues grew suspicious. Dong then helped Hondeville to his feet and the two walked hand-in-hand toward an oil tank near some brush about a foot in height. Rodrigues followed and found them stooping. Dong in at the back of Hondeville and holding his waist. He noticed the “back of the boy’s overalls hung down” and the “Chinaman’s trousers unbuttoned in the front.” When the two saw the peeping Rodrigues, they quickly stood up. Hondeville slipped on one of the suspenders of his overalls and Dong buttoned up his pants.¹⁴

In contrast to Rodrigues’s account, the nine-year-old Hondeville testified that he was facing Dong the entire time. Dong had, in fact, made a “disgusting proposal” regarding his sister, promised to give him two dollars, and then exposed his penis. The court had decided to allow Hondeville’s testimony after some deliberation about his questionable intelligence, which they characterized as “retarded mental development.”¹⁵

While the Supreme Court upheld the decision of the lower court maintaining the simple assault conviction, Dong Pok Yip’s case provokes a number of questions not easily answerable in a historical context uniformly understood as anti-Asian and homophobic. If Dong Pok Yip had just miraculously gotten away with the “intent to commit the felonious crime against nature,” it seems absurdly bold for him to further attempt to reverse the decision of the lesser offense of simple assault. Dong Pok Yip’s fishing lesson for Albert Hondeville and his acquaintance with his sister appear unusually friendly in a world in which whites appeared fearful and antagonistic toward Chinese. Moreover, how did Rodrigues suspect that Dong Pok Yip was “trying to use the boy as [a] female” had he not himself had some familiarity with anal sex? Finally, how is it that a “Chinaman” could be found not guilty of sodomy through the dissenting account of a child “not even of ordinary intelligence” as opposed to supposedly more reliable testimony from a white bookkeeper?

If we think sociologically, no occurrence, including what might appear to be anomalous, is random or simply an act of individual free will. Events and outcomes are embedded in a sociocultural context to make perfect sense in that given moment. Dong Pok Yip’s case appeared as one of more than a handful in the early decades of the twentieth century in which an Asian man appeared to persuade a judge or jury that he was not morally degenerate even when caught literally with his pants down. As individual or private sex acts might appear, piecing them together to create a collective statement about race, gender, or desire remains the task of the historian of sexuality. The knot of Dong Pok Yip and his seeming contradictions if untied would likely reveal new complexities in the Asian American experience.

As early as 2003 Peter Boag had tackled a number of these court cases and placed them within a larger queer history of the Pacific Northwest. Two years later Nayan Shah
gave more focused attention to these records, the majority involving Asian Indian men playing the active or insertive role in sex with white youth. Both argued that persecution of South Asian men as sodomizing white boys reflected a growing fear around the influx of immigrant men in the Pacific Northwest. Interestingly, these cases clearly defied established notions of the historically emasculated Asian men.16

Indeed, when the cultural critic Tina Takemoto closely analyzed the sparse records remaining on a confirmed gay Japanese immigrant, Jiro Onuma, incarcerated at the Topaz concentration camp during World War II, she brought new insight into sources typically read as American patriotism or perseverance in Japanese American history. By starting with the presumption that “gays in Topaz” in fact existed, she read dandyism, queer camp, alienation, and subversion in photographs historically viewed as evidence of Americanization among Japanese in the United States.17

Despite the significant potential of reframing history through the lens of marginalized desires, queer actors in Asian American history remain few and far between. Chris Friday in 1994 may have been the first historian to acknowledge the existence of queer desires among early Asians in America in his book on labor in the canned salmon industry. Just a few lines suggested same-sex intimacies taking place among Filipinos in the Pacific Northwest.18 Not until 2002 would Eric Wat then publish what may have been the first booklength oral history on Asian American queer history. Wat deliberately chose to present his interviews as interviews rather than embed them in the conventional format of a linear narrative since history is “not linear or always progressive.”19 While Wat’s book plays a foundational role in queer Asian American history, it hardly registers in the professional field of history, perhaps in part because of its format, the trade versus university press that published his book, or his position as an independent scholar with no academic affiliation. Three years later, Judy Wu declared in her book that Margaret Chung, considered to be the first Chinese American surgeon and the founder of the hospital of Western medicine in San Francisco Chinatown, may have been a lesbian.20 While Wu’s assertions about Chung’s sexuality are more speculative than certain, her publication blasted open the possibility of queer Asians in American history before the 1960s when LGBT Asians became suddenly visible in social protest movements. In 2012, my own book on Yone Noguchi and his intimate affairs exposed the existence of same-sex desire and love among Japanese immigrants at the turn of the nineteenth century.21 In the midst of these few published works, unpublished manuscripts on queer Asian and Pacific Islander history, such as dissertations by Trinity Ordona and Alice Hom, additionally fill an egregious void.22

Perhaps precisely because of the marginal status and resulting dearth of literature within queer Asian American history, the field borrows heavily from developments in the interdisciplinary field of queer studies. Queer Asian American historians incorporate theories from psychoanalysis, performance studies, literature, visual studies, and countless other disciplines to theorize and bring better context to private desires and sex acts in the past. These cross-disciplinary linkages enable the queer Asian Americanist to more successfully clarify and articulate the profound ideological significance of sexuality in history in the midst of intellectual opposition.
For example, the literary critic Andrew Leong proposed an “epistemology of the pocket” as opposed to the queer theorist Eve Sedgwick’s “epistemology of the closet.” Leong describes the pocket as a smaller space that “due to its proximity to the body, ought to be more ‘private,’ but because of its placement on the body, is subject to public view.” It accommodates only partial concealment, since “you can hide a body in a closet but not in a pocket.” Leong added, “For propertied, Anglo-American men with rooms of their own, the closet might be an appropriate figure for the possession of a hidden identity. The pocket might be more fitting for the countless others with more precarious relationships to individual property and identity: colonized peoples who have had their property taken from them; people who have been treated as property; aliens ineligible for citizenship; migrant workers.”

For queer Asians who sought to keep their desires private particularly in early Asian American history, Leong’s proposed pocket serves as a useful metaphor for their all-too-small shelter, which rendered them visible even as they hoped to be invisible. Historians of queer Asian America rely on these ill-fitting pockets, calling attention to parts protruding that persons more tasteful might respectfully ignore.

While unearthing queer people in history seems difficult, some have had more success “queering” familiar histories of Asian America steeped in unaltering heterosexuality. In 2002 Melinda De Jesus “reclaimed queerness” by illuminating the homoerotic potential in Carlos Bulosan’s America Is in the Heart and Bienvenido Santos’s Scent of Apples, two classic texts in Filipino American history. Four years earlier, Daniel Y. Kim went so far as to queer even the aforementioned openly homophobic forefather of Asian American studies, Frank Chin, due to his obsession with men and their masculinity, both white and yellow. Andrew Leong, the previously cited theorist of the “pocket,” also brought to light the queer and often unacknowledged “failures” of the Issei or the Japanese immigrant world in his translation of Shoson Nagahara’s 1925 novel Lament in the Night. Many more who are queering the Asian American canon are, as De Jesus asserts, “speaking the unspeakable.”

As history drags its heels to the queer ball, others largely in English and cultural studies have enthusiastically taken up LGBT topics in a veritable explosion of works in the new millennium. David Eng, Martin Manalansan, Gayatri Gopinath, and Jasbir Puar all published groundbreaking books in queer Asian American studies. A younger generation of scholars such as Eng-Beng Lim and Nguyen Tan Hoang are upending standard tropes of oppression in their works by foregrounding queer Asian camp and pleasure even within postcolonial operations of power and desire.

Scholarly publication on queer topics began most significantly in the 1990s outside the field of history, with Amerasia Journal, the first academic journal in Asian American studies. Its special issue titled “Dimensions in Desire,” published in 1994, contained eighteen entries and inspired a second generation of queer Asian Americanists hoping to study sexuality in the field. A little over twenty years after the journal’s first issue in 1971 and ostensibly the birth of Asian American studies as an academic field, the inclusion felt long overdue. Yet, if we consider the professionalization of the much older academic discipline of U.S. history in the 1890s and the rise of queer studies within the
field in the 1980s, Asian American queer history seems to have arrived at warp speed. *Amerasia*’s editor Russell Leong would republish the “Dimensions in Desire” as a book retitled *Asian American Sexualities* with eight additional entries later in 1996. Two years later David Eng and Alice Hom produced a second edited collection on queer Asian America. Both anthologies, while interdisciplinary, had just one essay on queer Asian American history out of fifty entries total, though several more were historical in content in the form of an interview or memoir.26

Notably, before academia decided to open its doors to queer studies, Asian American activists joined with other queer people of color to self-publish their own experiences, in hopes of changing the heteronormative discourse around race, inequality, and gender. Radical women and feminists literally set up printing presses in their home to establish publishing houses such as Kitchen Table.27 Lesbian and bisexual Asian women writers contributed to anthologies dedicated to women of color through poetry and prose. A number of writers such as Willyce Kim, Kitty Tsui, Merle Woo, and Chea Villanueva published their own single-authored books throughout the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s.28 Then, in 1994 Asian Pacific Islander lesbian and bisexual women produced an anthology of over one hundred entries under the editorship of Sharon Lim-Hing, titled *The Very Inside*. She began thinking about producing the book in the summer of 1990 as she walked home in defiant anticipation of the local teenagers calling her “chink” in Somerville, Massachusetts. After arriving home, in the heat of her apartment, and with the neighbor’s dog barking incessantly, Lim-Hing in her discomfort decided that Asian and Pacific Islander lesbians should have a book of their own. At the time Asian women’s writings appeared only as two or so contributions as part of women of color anthologies or as tokens toward diversity in white anthologies. There did exist an earlier anthology of Asian American lesbians titled *Between the Lines* with just six contributors from Santa Cruz. The publication, however, was out of print and hard to obtain. Lim-Hing sought to create something as large as Gloria Anzaldúa’s and Cherrie Moraga’s *This Bridge Called My Back* to speak to Asian Pacific bisexual and lesbian women’s strength, beauty, creativity, and rage so that these women would be more than just “a blip on the graph at the intersection of ‘race’ and sexual preference, nor . . . the hub of triple oppressions.”29

Six years later, Quang Bao and Hanya Yanagihara published another anthology titled *Take Out* with the support of the Asian American Writer’s Workshop in New York. More artistry and less activism motivated their publication, which the editors hoped would force readers “to reevaluate [their] conceptions of gay Asian America.” The collection comprised articles mostly by men since the editors decided to not “worry too much about gender equity” since it was “far better to sacrifice quantity for quality.”30 Despite the editors’ less-than-feminist impulse, writings in *Take Out*, along with the numerous creative works published earlier, fill up an otherwise undernourished field with a slew of primary sources that can be used in teaching and writing about Asian American queer history.

First-person queer and Asian American publications continue today, perhaps more robustly in the trade press rather than in the academic world. In 1997, Al and Jane Nakatani published *Honor Thy Children*, a memoir of the loss of their three sons, of
whom two were gay. A decade later Thomas Beatie, whose father was of Filipino and Korean descent, would also come out with his own memoir after storming the daytime television circuit as the “pregnant transman.” Two years earlier the legal scholar Kenji Yoshino used his own sexuality as a springboard to discuss how coerced conformity stood as the final barrier to civil rights. In 2012 Marsha Aizumi authored Two Spirits, One Heart for her transgender son Aiden.31 Countless blogs from queer Asians also fill the Internet to expound upon the importance of community engagement and queer empowerment through personal experiences.

No doubt queer Asian America has grown tremendously in the past two decades. In universities across the nation, queer and Asian student groups are cropping up. In the San Francisco Bay Area alone, four institutions—University of California at Berkeley, San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, and Stanford—all have student-run organizations that program and mount educational workshops centered around LGBT Asian issues. As more teenagers are arriving at college being already out, a growing queer field in Asian American studies will only engage and compel these youth craving to see themselves in the curriculum. For them, a reading assignment in queer Asian American studies can be earth-shattering. For others who do not identify as LGBT, learning about queer studies is life-changing in its transformative potential. Queer Asian American studies can eradicate sex negativity within the Asian American community and radicalize how people interact with one another. Theorists have pushed queer studies to be about revolution, building upon work from activists in the 1970s and 1980s who sought to up-end normative notions of desire, propriety, and success. In this version, women would shave just a part of their heads and wear combat boots and men might dye their hair pink and purple and wear glitter lip gloss. Gay men and lesbian would have sex with each other, all the while still identifying as gay or lesbian. Most importantly, queers would band together to eradicate poverty, stamp out racism, and protest Western imperialism. All would not always work out perfectly, but these fairies, butches, and trannies would put their all into transforming the world into a queer nation.

As queer Asian American history forges ahead with a limited number of works in the field, the publications are nearly always informed by the most recent developments in both queer studies and ethnic studies. Notably postmodern, transnational, and post-colonial from its beginnings, queer Asian American history uncovers queers broadly without ascribing to more limited categories of “gay” and “lesbian” and elucidates queer ways of thinking, all the while insisting on the radical potential of a queer nation that is also Asian American.

Notes
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