



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Assembling Asian American Men in Pornography: Shattering the  
Self toward Ethical Manhoods

Celine Parreñas Shimizu

Journal of Asian American Studies, Volume 13, Number 2, June 2010,  
pp. 163-189 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jaas.0.0082>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/383724>



# ASSEMBLING ASIAN AMERICAN MEN IN PORNOGRAPHY

*Shattering the Self toward Ethical Manhoods*

celine **parreñas shimizu**

IN RECENT YEARS, TWO PORNOGRAPHIC VIDEOS identify a crisis of masculinity for Asian American men in U.S. popular culture. University of California at Davis Asian American studies professor Darrell Hamamoto's political pornography *Yellowcaust: A Patriot Act* (2004) and its companion documentary, James Hou's *Masters of the Pillow* (2004), received attention from the popular media, packed audiences in large theaters of the prominent Asian American film festivals, and toured widely on the college campus circuit from 2004 to 2007.<sup>1</sup> Together, they present an Asian American anxiety regarding castrated heterosexual manhood, which they propose to solve with the making and framing of pornography as a racial project.<sup>2</sup> In defining sexuality as a site of racial injury, their solution privileges access to what feminist media critic Michele Wallace plainly calls "macho" in reference to gender hierarchy and heteronormative phallic power.<sup>3</sup> Unlike these films' figuration that sexual fantasies about whiteness are indications of colonialism upon the deepest parts of the self, I evaluate fantasies as much more unwieldy. Fantasies about race and sexuality are "wishes"—they make sense of the past as constitutive of pleasure, express desires for better possibilities, and exercise the power of the imagination to reorganize the inequities of the real. As such, enacting fantasies involve the doing and undoing of power.

In looking at the gender dynamics expressed in the fantasy-productions<sup>4</sup> of *Yellowcaust* and *Masters of the Pillow*, my project attends not

only to how they describe Asian American masculinity—the characteristics, traits, and qualities that describe how one is gendered male—but manhood itself, or the inner life of being and becoming male as well as the performance of maleness. What makes a man a man is not only his ability for virility but his being as a self and his formation as a subject in relations with others. Aiming to free our conceptions of manhood from the poles of vilified lack and valorized macho, I look to representations of Asian American men engaged in intimate sexual acts to map an ethics of manhood. Ultimately, I show how sexual screens provide opportunities for men to make choices that shapes the self and relations with others where sex expresses not only pleasure and power but also care for self and others.

### ASSEMBLING ASIAN AMERICAN MEN IN PORNOGRAPHY

“The point of having an Asian-American man being with an Asian-American female Hamamoto says is to send a message, ‘about as explicit as you can get, that this is the natural order of things: Asian man, Asian woman, together. Asian-American man, Asian-American woman, together.’”

—Darrell Hamamoto, in Nick Wong,  
*Ka Leo O Hawaii*, October 29, 2003, 1

In 2004, Darrell Hamamoto completed a short film that garnered the attention of mainstream media in prime time and late-night shows hosted by Jon Stewart and Jay Leno, along with Hollywood industry newspapers such as *Variety* and others like the *Los Angeles Times*.<sup>5</sup> In these national media venues, Hamamoto came closer to fulfilling his plans to become an Asian American Larry Flint who would fund other Asian American political projects with profits from his full-length pornography title *Skin On Skin* and other works.<sup>6</sup> The short video *Yellowcaust: A Patriot Act* is a pornographic film informed by Asian American race politics. The filmmaker and professor of Asian American studies “wanted to [create] pure unadulterated physical pleasure between a Yellow couple to cut against the grain of our common history rooted in U.S. imperialism and the systematic acts of genocide that have been inflicted upon us in order to sustain that

social order.”<sup>7</sup> His use of the term “Yellow” indicates the Asian American power movement’s appellation for politically conscious Asian Americans, an apt use for a film that claims to be the first pornographic film to feature Asian Americans in racially explicit terms. So years later, as the butt of jokes and object of puzzlement, why take Hamamoto’s pornography up? The film persists, with a life of its own in classrooms across the country and in images on the Internet in ways that need comment beyond ridicule or puzzlement for this moment in Asian American media visibility.

In *Yellowcaust*, the professional Cambodian American woman porn star Leyla Lei and amateur Korean American man Chun Lee perform explicit hard-core sex acts. Following the conventions of other gonzo films or professional-amateur pornography—the most popular form of contemporary pornography today—the acts are shot from a variety of angles in the standard motel-room setting. However, unlike the traditional gonzo form, which initiates an amateur woman into the porn industry, *Yellowcaust* features a professional woman and amateur man. Here, it is the Asian American male who stars as the fetishized object to disrobe, reveal, and expose his sexuality. Notably, too, the filmmaker is not the actor featured in *Yellowcaust* but rather inserts himself in the sex acts via the intertitle text, which classifies the actions performed by the couple.

Looking back, the filmmakers’ centralizing of Asian American male sexual problems and using porn to address them generated considerable response. Hamamoto and Hou indeed succeeded in opening up large-arena discussions of how Asian American men “lack the success of Asian American women . . . in interracial relationships—a sensitive fact” of Asian American gender relations.<sup>8</sup> Galvanized by the issues identified in the film, students and festival programmers organized panels of scholars, filmmakers, and activists to accompany the screening, opening public conversations about race, sexuality, gender, and representation focused on the problems of Asian American men. As documented in the media by blogs and festival Web sites, many faced controversy and “tedious” bureaucracy to get the porn event funded and sponsored.<sup>9</sup> The impact of the film continues. The Center for Asian American Media blogger Tracy Wang today ponders what may be Hamamoto’s most effective intervention: to combat sexual lack with sexual presence through pornography. She says that “Asian American

Studies Professor Darrell Hamamoto at U.C. Davis brought up an excellent point when he asked his class what and who exactly from the mass media did they fantasize sexually about and why. Consensus of his class was that Asian Americans just didn't have a role in their fantasies when it came to pulling figures from popular media."<sup>10</sup> Here, when fantasy is simply the ideology of victimization by racism, it benefits a particular approach, of what Viet Nguyen calls "remasculinization"—the process by which men aspire to gain the patriarchal power and heterosexual privilege that have been historically denied to them (as exemplified by writer Frank Chin and the nationalist patriarchal platform advocated in the 1980s).

Years after the two films' national tours, I take up these twin projects in order to identify the patriarchal aspirations central to and persistent in approaches to solving Asian American manhood's sexual and representational problems and the role of women as a fetish for the replacement of the penis and the phallus in social castration. Premised on the belief that Asian American men have been victimized by the *repressive* power of sexuality and racist regimes of representation, both films propose a patriarchal heroism for the filmmakers and a heteronormative prescription for sexuality. That is, to use Kaja Silverman's words, "women are exchange objects that confer symbolic privilege upon the male subject."<sup>11</sup> The sexual encounter with the Asian female occurs within the social context identified by the filmmakers as her hypersexuality and hypervisibility and the Asian male's asexuality and invisibility. The sex acts in *Yellowcaust* then are confrontations with this difference.

However, male subjectivity is privileged as the one in need of care not only by her but in the name of Asian Americans as a racial group. She, the fetishized white male object of desire, serves him out of his unpleasurable and unwanted position. For Hamamoto, racism must be addressed as the force that gets in the way of Asian American male phallic identification. It also justifies his assertion of possessing her. For Kaja Silverman, the use of women to define men as the producers and representatives of their social fields is the most rudimentary articulation of the Law of the Father, or reproductive kinship relations, that govern our dominant fiction.<sup>12</sup> If these films attempt to access macho, why is it important for Asian American men to measure up to normative criteria and vilify the position of lack?

By examining the sexual labor and gendered acts in Darrell Hamamoto's *Yellowcaust*, I show its focus on the sexual victimization of Asian American men while treating Asian American women as bridges for securing conventional manhood. This actually further embeds Asian American men in lack and strengthens the gender and sexual hierarchy that they attempt to critique for their exclusion. Thus, I argue that gender hierarchy and the heteronormative ideal in the position of asexuality and effeminacy, or straitjacket sexuality for Asian American men, remains a powerful disciplining mechanism in the attempt to address their sexual and screen problems. We need to reimagine and reimage Asian American masculinities without reinforcing heteronormativity, what I define as the restrictive roles for men and women that uphold and privilege heterosexuality while discouraging new ways of reinventing gender and sexuality. These films articulate male aspirations for phallic (symbolic) and penile (literal) power that ultimately disserve the formulation of socially viable, ethical masculinities for Asian American men as well as ignore the pain, anger, and frustrations of their assignation outside the norms of heterosexual masculinity.

### DISSONANCE IN DARRELL HAMAMOTO'S *YELLOWCAUST*

In a film that proposes to solve Asian American male sexual problems, men register as passive and perverted in the sense of inadequately meeting the norm. The Asian American male filmmaker's intertitle texts in *Yellowcaust* frame the traditional gonzo porn sex acts. We see the personal histories of the actors (Korean American male adoptee and female Cambodian American) scroll along a litany of wartime atrocities committed against various Asian countries and peoples by the United States. While conventional heterosexual acts including kissing, cunnilingus, and fellatio on a sofa unfold, followed by missionary, cowgirl, reverse cowgirl, and doggy-style positions on a motel-room bed, we hear the ghostly wails of a massacre while we read text about the "kill[ing] of 200,000 Filipinos at the dawn of the twentieth century . . . yet in the eyes of the colonized, every American soldier is P. Diddy or Brad Pitt." Here, racism shapes sexuality repressively—and rears its head in the sexual intimacies between an Asian man and woman. As a film made by a Japanese American man, the

film does not account for coethnic exploitation such as Japanese atrocities against Filipinos and Koreans or the long history of strife between Chinese and Japanese. These include historical scenes of sexual violence across ethnicity and gender.

The “money shot,” or the visible evidence of male ejaculation, appears with intertitles, too. Hamamoto names for us its significance in declaring the importance of sex between Asian Americans as a “reclaiming [of] pleasure. . . . [T]he joy of Yellow bodies will not be denied by the State. . . . [D]espite all efforts of eradication . . . Yellow people endure.” Here, the images function as background while the text guides us into a particular definition of the sex acts as redemptive of racial wounding by white structures of power. Among Asian Americans, sexuality is rendered in harmonious terms. In effect, the intertitle texts act as Hamamoto’s sexual interventions, functioning as a form of colonizing the meaning of sex for these two specific actors. And it is a form of “cock-blocking” for the younger male Asian American actor whose experiences and contributions are rendered derivative to the filmmaker’s agenda and a simplification of what sex could be for the Cambodian American woman.

The movie suggests that Asian American sexual problems can be solved by achieving Asian American male pleasure within an Asian American heterosexual coupling. The filmmaker’s text privileges not only sexual reproduction for Asian Americans but also the importance of heterosexual racial identity within the context of state racism and genocidal acts. Within this context, the money shot functions very specifically. After the money shot, the male actor shifts his gaze from the woman to the camera as she examines his ejaculation on her belly. The film ends with a close-up of the younger Asian American male’s face as childlike in his thoroughly happy smile.

In his 1998 essay “Joy Fuck Club: Prolegomenon to an Asian American Porno Practice,” Darrell Hamamoto describes Asian American racial colonization through the controlling mechanism of sexuality. Here he points to how Asian Americans desire whiteness that his “anticolonial porno” practice aims to critique. In the essay, he promotes a totalizing understanding of how sexual images work. Supposedly, they dominate Asian American spectators’ most private fantasies so that they desire white-

ness and despise themselves. For Hamamoto, colonialism at the level of sexuality and love compels and warrants an Asian American pornographic practice when Asian American spectators undergo a kind of “self-alienation that has its material source in a sex/race/power regime *so total in scope and depth* that it reaches into the unconscious, shaping the stuff of erotic imagination.”<sup>13</sup> Hamamoto’s solution to this problem is to create videos representing sexual liberation in order to achieve a kind of social liberation. For Hamamoto, the unconscious, as a site where racism takes hold, must meet another image: Asian American men, rather than white men, with Asian American women. He defines in this way the power of sexual images conventionally as acting upon their viewers rather than using them to transform and learn about one’s self and others, especially in relation to manhood. How can sexual images at the site of production and consumption teach us about what happens when an Asian American man hailed as asexual/effeminate then finds himself as a lead actor in porn?

Hamamoto calls the juxtaposition of hard-core sex with the sounds of atrocity and suffering meant to symbolize Western imperialism “dissonance” with sexual pleasure as political theater.<sup>14</sup> However, a central dissonance remains unexplored and underexamined in *Yellowcaust*. The concept of dissonance usually describes conflict, and in social psychology, cognitive dissonance describes the process of recognizing the presence of conflicting ideas in the self—such as in the experience of pleasure during pain or what Nalini Ambady names as the possession of two identities in conflict.<sup>15</sup> For example, *Yellowcaust* occurs within a certain context of dissonance in terms of race and gender. Asian American men benefit from positive racial stereotypes and are in turn punished by negative gender stereotypes. So this moment of dissonance in the Asian American man’s sexual act—where he recognizes his stereotyping as asexual while experiencing the physicality of a sexual act—is, for Hamamoto, political. But how? Is the sex act political for the Asian man because he is no longer sexually absent but sexually present? But what comprises his sexual presence? Or what does Chun Lee bring to these scenes beyond how Hamamoto wants him to function? And how about Leyla Lei?

In “Sex and the Asian Man,” David Pierson quotes Hamamoto, revealing the dominance of the repressive hypothesis in his problem identifica-

tion: "I refuse to allow Asian Americans to be passive victims. . . . There has been a slow-motion 100 year holocaust of the Asian people. . . . We need access"<sup>16</sup> of which making porn is part, for it asserts heterosexual coupling as the normal to which we should aspire. Herein, Hamamoto indicates a passive victimization to which he responds via pornography as an assertion of phallic and penile power through heterosexual coupling that also problematically naturalizes same-race pairing.

Moreover, it is also an uncritical assertion of presence as opposite to absence. For Hamamoto, pornography seemed to promise more than the professoriate in terms of impact and reach: "I've written thousands of words, whole books about our exclusion from American culture. . . . I began to realize: Nobody's listening to me. . . . This project has done more to draw attention to these issues than all my other efforts combined."<sup>17</sup> In his understanding of teaching and his filmmaking, the evaluation of dissonance does not occur. In his interpretation, the self is centered as the victim that must rise up, speak its pain, and claim its power. It is a solid identity that is gained, rather than an opening of a learning process about race, sex, and the self in the movies. In this solution, any visibility is viable. Dissonance is feared, yet it is precisely the place where men may account for themselves.

These films, which privilege hegemonic masculinity, are made in the context of and in response to, according to their authors, Asian American culture's repression of sexuality as well as the effeminization and desexualization of Asian American men as part of a racist regime. But how do they account for their gendered power, especially over women? Or the specific fantasies and wishes that the actors bring to these sexual scenes from their particular sexual subjections? James Hou, a former student of Hamamoto's and director of *Masters of the Pillow*, concurs with Hamamoto: "The general consensus is we're stereotyped in a way that dehumanizes our identities as men and especially in terms of our sexuality, it's never displayed on screen or explored. It's always repressed."<sup>18</sup> Within this context, which places importance on Asian American men defending their sexual power and viability in sociality, their films attempt to unbridle the repression of sexuality for Asian American men. For Hou, Hamamoto speaks of and shows sexuality within this silencing context—and there is a gendered dynamic here where male subjectivity is of utmost concern. He says that

it is “difficult for Asian Americans to take huge risks because of cultural baggage. . . . That’s why I applaud Hamamoto for taking a risk. Put your opinion out there, make it known and see where the chips fall.”<sup>19</sup> But the position of victimization within sexuality and race does not account for how Asian American men can and must emerge with masculine identities that account for their complicity and conflicts with domination as well as the richness of sexuality to which we bring our own experiences and undergo our own transformations.

### **MALE NARCISSISM: JAMES HOU’S *MASTERS OF THE PILLOW***

In *Masters of the Pillow*, James Hou begins with a shot of the title page of Hamamoto’s essay “The Joy Fuck Club: Prolegomenon to an Asia American Porno Practice,” where we glimpse the argument regarding Asian Americans sharing “the collective sexual imaginary dominated by whiteness.” Hamamoto introduces himself, establishing a smarmy presence throughout the documentary. “I am a Ph.D., professor of Asian American studies at UC Davis,” while we see him on campus, in his office among books by Asian American feminists such as *Dragon Ladies Breathe Fire* by Sonia Shah and *Defending Pornography* by anticensorship scholar Nadine Strossen. With young Asian American students in the classroom, he discusses how Asian women in porn movies are always paired with white European American men and how he will bring together Asian American women and Asian American men—“a very fine sister here and a fine looking Asian male,” he says, “filming them having sex.” The camera cuts to students listening and shifting in their seats with discomfort. In the video, Hamamoto is supported by a young Asian American male media activist who assesses the context for such images: “A lot of Asian girls, screwed by everyone and their cousin. When you do find an Asian man, he’s gay and he’s a bottom.” In this discussion, Asian women are objects for male play and ownership. They do not have sexual agency—they do not express desire but are simply used by men, and it functions as an indication of Asian American male victimization by white men. Accordingly, Asian women are to be returned to Asian coupling. Meanwhile, the absence of gay Asian manhood and the bottom position are rendered undesirable within the normative criteria prominent in the movie’s heteronormativity.

Through representation such as *Masters of the Pillow*, we can see how Asian American men can simultaneously experience stress, pressure, and pain as well as demonstrate complicity in the domination that produces their subjectivities not only in relation to women but also in how they define viable Asian American manhood as the opposite of asexuality and effeminacy or gayness. Asian American men as desexualized and effeminized in representation are differently racialized from Asian American women, who are hypersexualized and hyperfeminized. Women, however, as I argue in *The Hypersexuality of Race: Performing Asian/American Women On Screen and Scene*,<sup>20</sup> engage their interpellation by negotiating its misnaming and recasting it with their concrete experiences in representation. The men in *Masters of the Pillow* and *Yellowcaust* counter their misnaming with another misnaming if they do not acknowledge their existence as agents of power and violence. Rendering oneself as victim achieves not what Judith Butler calls a proper “accounting of the self.”<sup>21</sup> If the problematization here is so severely flawed so as to miss men’s possession of gender power, the practices recommended do not reflect the possibilities of formulating responsible, ethical, moral, and sexually desirable manhoods, on and off screen. Rather than deriving lessons from a concrete project—the pairing of an Asian American man and woman—the lesson about this pairing is already decided before the camera rolls. We are shown what needs doing rather than experience what can be remade and imagined anew, in exploring what Kath Albury describes as “possible sexual stories that can be tried on for size”<sup>22</sup> through pornographic practice.

This is why James Hou’s documentary is important to assess—how can the practice that emerges from the problematization lead to an ethical heuristic for Asian American manhood? If we try Hamamoto’s solution of presenting Asian American men an opportunity to display their sexuality, what do we learn and discover about what Asian American men want and need? Jay Leno recounts Hamamoto’s critique as follows: “Asian men experience low self-esteem” and thus need representation in porn to alleviate the pain. This comedic reading offers precise analysis. *The pornographer’s privileging of conventional masculinity reveals a lack of security in manhood outside those norms*. However, the critique falls away when *The Tonight Show* created a spoof where Asian American men and women attempt to

get it on but Godzilla interrupts them and chases them naked down the street. Leno says it was fun to shoot.

In *Masters of the Pillow*, we see Hamamoto attempt to pick up his male star at SFO airport, but Hamamoto cannot find him. So the camera follows him as he moves from the lower-level arrivals to upper-level departures while talking on a cell phone—“Where are you? What do you look like?”—with no success of finding his actor, who finally meets him at the car, all loaded up without Hamamoto’s help. This subtle ridicule of Hamamoto contextualizes his presentation of the movie’s goal: “making a porn sends a message that this is the actual order of things—Asian man and Asian woman together—Asian American man and Asian American woman together.” This claim is immediately followed by an interview with his considerably younger girlfriend, Funie Hsu, who, when asked about their age difference, says her twenty-something peer group finds him “easy to talk to . . . he acts immature—not fifty.” The description of immaturity from his closest collaborator Hsu bookending his declaration discredits Hamamoto as he goes on about how white male supremacy in a patriarchal society determines who can choose sex partners. His platform identifies a system of sexual colonialism that sees Asian female outmarriage to the master race. “A white male sex complex won’t permit” Asian male competition, he continues. In this sequence, Hou establishes Hamamoto as easy-going and silly. Hsu concludes her part by describing Hamamoto as into “popular culture and he won’t judge you.” Hou then interviews a set of established and respected intellectuals and cultural producers who provide contextual information that ultimately and (seemingly) unwittingly support Hamamoto’s claims regarding Asian American male sexual problems.

Tony-award winning playwright David Henry Hwang, prominent film festival director Chi-hui Yang, celebrated film directors Justin Lin and Eric Byler, and renowned Berkeley Asian American feminist professor Elaine H. Kim chime in on Hamamoto’s project of proposing the solution to Asian American men’s sexual problems through pornography. They confirm the lack of Asian American male representations in the media: Lin critiques the racially fetishized presence of Asian Americans in the media; Byler diagnoses the lack of Asian American power at the site of film reception; and both

Kim and Hwang attest to racism in the representations but question the appropriateness of porn as a solution. Through the documentary's editing, they provide the discursive context for Hamamoto to declare: "Given [the problems mentioned by those above] why wouldn't Asian people have an alienated consciousness?" For him, no one has come out with an agenda for regaining Asian American wholeness again, and his pornography project is an actual agenda for confronting Asian American sexual domination by white racism that we are waiting for.

Critics of Hou have commented on how the documentary demonstrates a "reluctance to question Hamamoto more on his controversial opinions and methods, which occasionally makes the film feel as though it's a de facto endorsement of such beliefs."<sup>23</sup> To help identify both *Masters of the Pillow* and *Yellowcaust's* project of male narcissism in the name of racial freedom for the whole, I ground it in the discourse of gender hierarchy and heteronormativity in Asian American sexuality studies. I also provide a larger intertextual context by presenting other Asian American cultural productions that focus on men in order to map how others frame and address these sexual problems of racialization. The first example takes up the debate between male and female genders in the establishment of Asian American literary studies. Frank Chin, Jeffrey Paul Chan, and the editors, in their introduction to *Aiiieeeee!* (the foundational Asian American movement literary collection), privilege normal, white masculinity that negates feminist and queer critique.<sup>24</sup> According to Asian Americanist and feminist literary critic King-Kok Cheung, the critical battle in early Asian American literature between Frank Chin and Maxine Hong Kingston centered on gender. Cheung explains how Chinese American male critics responded with vehement anger to Kingston's *Woman Warrior*, particularly regarding its feminist centering of women's experiences, as part of a Western "feminization" of Asian American men.<sup>25</sup> Cheung identifies how the critiques that uphold manhood or womanhood in this battle are "wishes for self-empowerment . . . remain in thrall to the norms and arguments of the dominant patriarchal culture, unwittingly upholding the criteria of those whom they assail."<sup>26</sup> Cheung compels us to ask, in the site of performance and cinema, if we can better use the genre of representation, and its attendant tasks of representing reality or alternatives to it,

to rethink our visions for other racialized masculinities and femininities beyond the eunuch and the fetish. The racial heteronormativity in *Yellowcaust* takes the form of male narcissism that centers the penis and the phallic economy, exemplified in the representation of male orgasm as emotional and political joy. Who does this catharsis serve if it leads to a compulsory heterosexual demand that Asian American women occupy a derivative sexual object status to men? Is this dominant heterosexuality for men good if it is a fearful heterosexual response to the attribution of queerness and male effeminacy for Asian American men?

### SHATTERING THE SELF IN SCENES OF THE SEX ACT

Unlike maintaining a coherent and cohesive self, I assert the importance of embracing the shattering of the self in scenes of the sex act so as to intervene in the binary understanding of manhood as penile power. The identity of asexuality is not simply countered by the occurrence of penetrative sexuality in the act. Its significance is generated in the moments prior, during, and after as ones that require reading and analysis. As the first heterosexual Asian porn star Keni Styles attests, “The whole size issue is ridiculous. You don’t just (have sex) with your penis. You use your whole body, your attitude, your presence.”<sup>27</sup> Sexuality cannot be limited to the penis or penetration. Similarly, identities do not travel coherently through the sex act but undergo in that encounter instability and even shattering. As such, an opportunity to disassemble the self within racist regimes can be taken up in a new self-assembly rather than an aspiration to phallic power or white patriarchal manhood and the literal power of the penis. This is precisely why I take up these specific films, which created a great stir in the beginning of the twenty-first century.

In a work meant to undo the female misrepresentation and male invisibility of Asian American sexualities, the professional-amateur gender dynamic, the casting of a passive man served by an aggressive woman repeats the stereotypes of Asian male passivity and Asian female sexual power. Closing on the ecstatic face of the Asian American man shows how the film is profoundly male in its interests by celebrating male orgasm as racial and sexual healing for the sake of group emancipation. This occurs

in the professional and servile hands of a woman relegated even more severely to a sexually limited role. The psychic life of sexual colonization is redeemed through the money shot. At the level of the racial and representational, the transformation occurs in the man's climax and not in the physical or emotional aspects of the encounter between the man and the woman. Leyla Lei even seems to sense her marginalized role in the story here as she indicates her desire to start her own production company as well.

In reading closely the sexual labor of the film and its performers, the overall character of the man is that of the eager sexual virgin. His sexual retardation is helped by the professional woman who initiates him into the sexual world. The emotions of the sex acts arise from these clearly delineated roles as determined by the casting. An on-line review comments, "The interaction between the adult actors seemed dull because (the male actor) Chun's nervousness is so evident," while Lei takes charge with a professional calm.<sup>28</sup> At some point she suggests various positions to help Hamamoto refocus their interrupted sex scene. All the while she is tender and kind, rather than domineering, lending to an assured stance that Funie Hsu comments on as a kind of confidence and professionalism in Lei, especially when finding out that her parents know about her work and plans for expanding stardom. The woman's calm confidence and the man's palpable anxiety present a very visible contrast.

How does this confident and assured Asian female sexuality and anxious and nervous Asian male sexuality produce a gender dynamic in *Yellowcaust* and *Masters of the Pillow*? The *Asian Week* review offers a harsh critique by asking, "Why does [*Masters of the Pillow*] fall limp?" The critic Phillip Chung demands more from the filmmaker, focusing on the compelling figure of Chun Lee, the amateur actor. Why did Chun Lee agree to engage in "sex with a stranger?" What did his family and friends think of his "foray into porn"?<sup>29</sup> Chung points to the emotional centrality necessary for us to understand the Asian American male's history beyond a superficial registry of his presence as a Korean American man. Where is his particularity in the scene, beyond the intertitle text that simply lists his background as adoptee? How is he and his sexual specificity narrated and his bodily image dramatized? In *Masters of the Pillow*, we indeed see

Chun Lee request that their camera leave in order to complete the sex act away from the documentary eye.

If *Masters of the Pillow* presents an inadequate telling of the sexual problems Asian American men and women face in terms of racialization, Chung expresses related dissatisfaction with *Yellowcaust* as well. He finds it “just plain boring. . . . Lee and Lei engage in the standard sex found in adult films but there is no energy, no joy, and nothing would suggest this as a revolutionary act in any way. It’s devoid of all sexiness. It feels as passionate as someone mowing the lawn.”<sup>30</sup> What is revolutionary about *Yellowcaust*, according to Hamamoto, is that it shows “the natural order of things” or the achievement of racial belonging and recognition that same-race partnering supposedly enables. But we don’t see it. Instead, the story told about the sexualization of race is male bewilderment and female expertise. The story of the confusion, pain, joy, and happiness of the racial experience is unengaged. Would partnering with other races in the film show more about the process of racialization?

In my work on race and pornography, I find that Asian American women must play the version of Asian women that spectators expect, and their resistance occurs in performances that exceed these demands. For example, pre-1950s white women in yellowface costume and makeup established a particular standard—both visible and performative—that Asian women also perform. Similarly, how can we identify racialization if we do not see it against other racializations? We see the gendering of race in the form of female servility and male domination, albeit through inaction on his part. Thus, in Hamamoto’s work, sexuality is defined without more careful consideration of gender and its varying inflections for men and women; therefore, the possibility that what is sexually empowering for men may be disempowering to women is not considered.

Here, the emergence of the male Asian American as sexual actor in representation essentializes sexuality rather than indicates its potential role in the production of identity. The production of an ethical identity is crucial in crafting politics out of pornography, however. To follow Kath Albury, who turns to Foucault’s “late work on ethics, which frames an ethical sensibility as ‘care for the self’ and ‘care for the other/others,’”<sup>31</sup> she works to consider porn in ethical terms rather than a paranoid reading that

already seeks to “uncover secret meanings and hidden subtexts but does not consider the ways that other readers might reshape or make sense of the texts that it ‘exposes.’”<sup>32</sup> Similarly, I am concerned with manhood as formed by an ethical process made available for analysis in representing the experience of sexual acts.

In an article in which he “defends” himself against his critics, Hamamoto defines sexuality as “the sheer majesty and oceanic pleasure that lies in potential within this boundless realm of human expression.”<sup>33</sup> Such a definition relies on sexuality as intrinsic, transcendent, and based on a natural drive rather than a force that is shaped by the dialectic of subject formation—in the interchange of both individual (internal) and social (external) forces. Instead, Hamamoto frames Asian American (male) sexuality as coherent and victimized. He says that “Asian American sexuality . . . [is] warped by Euro-American colonization, occupation, and genocide in Asian countries; exclusion, expulsion and incarceration in the United States.”<sup>34</sup> Such a definition of sexuality is not only simplistic but restrictive for disallowing the complexity of desire, including heterosexuality, and unequal relations across different categories and experiences as well as the way we use different sexual acts to remake ourselves, our pasts, and our future worlds of desire. Sexuality—as racialized neither negatively nor positively in terms that are inherent and given—works as a living social force that requires individuals and institutions to act and interact in order to make its meanings. The solution of representation and visibility for Asian American men in pornographic roles ultimately leads us to stereotyped logics of racial representation. Positive images cannot simply undo the negative, especially when they do not uniformly affect Asian Americans. It is at the site of gender where we see this inequality.

In terms of a theory of representation under which *Yellowcaust* operates, the equation of positive versus negative images ultimately disserves the way sexuality works on Asian American men in a more complex way. Can any positive or negative image do justice to the experiences of sexuality by Asian American men on and off screen? How does the sexual fantasy offered by *Yellowcaust*, as it comes tinged with genocide and racial atrocity, exceed group identification? That is, Hamamoto’s definition of sexuality is so limited it does not reimagine power. It is simply about sexual

liberation on screen as social liberation on scene. But even our desires and pleasures can involve one's subjugation, or its agent, and cannot simply be, but must also engage the binds of power and domination. So it seems that Hamamoto actually unwittingly demonstrates this through the film's gender dynamics. Does the film ultimately desire for Asian American women to occupy traditional roles but not for other men and only for Asian American men? Must the remasculinizing act assert Asian American men's ownership of Asian American women?

In "Queering Asian American Masculinity," Crystal Parikh describes the "incomplete incorporation"<sup>35</sup> of Asian American men into heteronormative definitions of masculinity. This exclusion allows for the "possibility for redefinition" of a feminist and queer friendly, even heterosexual, masculinity or what she broadly calls an "alternative subject formation."<sup>36</sup> The lack of representation of Asian American men in heterosexual pornography indeed represents such an opportunity. That is, Asian American men's near-invisibility in heterosexual pornography actually provides another opportunity for them to redefine their images in popular culture. They could appear in pornography in a different way, as in Greg Pak's *Asian Pride Porn* (2000), a fake commercial that features playwright David Henry Hwang marketing an Asian American porn series that empowers Asian American viewers through its reclaiming of stereotypes such as the Chinese delivery boy as erotic object. With a wink, Pak's film smartly offers racialized porn that alleviates guilt for the politicized Asian American viewer. Hamamoto's work focuses specifically on the Asian American presence in pornography, but because Asian American men have so few opportunities to establish their own representations, the field for redefining existing roles must remain wide open. More precisely, the direction in which Hamamoto takes us enables us to think more deliberately about the role of race in eroticism and how to think about representation not only as the articulation of historical inequality but how it can be productive as well.

Because sexuality in representation has disciplined Asian American men, must the solution to their subjugation also be found in sexual representation? Hamamoto's formula to address the lack of sexually affirming images by showing Asian American men having sex on screen seems similar to my approach in *The Hypersexuality of Race*. However, while

both our works focus on sexuality, they differ in gender-object priorities. Whereas *Hypersexuality* shows how the sexual subjection of Asian American women finds its undoing in sexual representations by Asian American women, who use the tools of their subjugation to recast and rewrite their roles, *Yellowcaust* men use tools of domination that assign women sexual object roles, and male power over women becomes the basis for establishing the male racial self. Thus, Hamamoto's project forces us to take seriously the ways in which the sexualizations of Asian Americans differ according to gender.

While Hamamoto's definition of sexuality and representation remain organized by a binary framework, he provokes and widens what I consider a productive debate. He opens up the space for me to articulate the urgent need for recasting how we measure manhood beyond sexual virility and conventional gender norms. *Yellowcaust's* dissemination certainly accomplishes an important goal of helping us to see concretely how sexuality is a key issue in the gender formations of Asian Americans and how sexuality, especially sexual acts and practices in representation and in everyday life, are understudied sites in Asian American studies. His definition of sexuality in moving image representation, however, simplifies the more complex and unwieldy operation not only of desire and fantasy but of the multivalent possibilities of interpretation present in the consumption of any image.

Ultimately, Hamamoto comes up with an equation regarding sex/race and cinema that reduces race and sexuality to subordination and domination.<sup>37</sup> Such an analysis simplifies the complexities of Asian Americans' representation and of their sexual object choices and experiences. For example, Jessica Hagedorn and Peter X. Feng both describe viewing practices that reject the narrative lines of Hollywood movies that present Asian American characters as simply bad. Rather than following the lesson filmmakers may be teaching regarding Asian American subservience or malevolence, spectators have the power to turn away, reject the moral, or invent alternative fantasies. Pornography is met by people who can and do make their own meanings from these works and perspectives. The film *Yellowcaust* operates under the assumption that representation has the power to dictate sexual and social realities, but it does not directly account

for how cross-race allegiances and intimacies can be part of antiracist spectatorial practices as well.

Thus, we need a psychoanalytic map of sexuality in terms of race and a broader definition of representation that accounts for the incoherence of fantasy articulated there—as well as the dissonance and narcissism that define our sexual, racial, and gendered problems. That is, we need an understanding of sexuality that accounts for the unwieldy dynamic of the subconscious ways we make sense of our sexual realities as well as an understanding of representation not simply prescribed as good and bad images. The terrain of representation in terms of fantasy, consciousness, and the unconscious may be explained via Kaja Silverman's theorization of what she terms the “dominant fiction,” and here I emphasize its production in terms of the social categories and experiences of race, class, gender, and sex. In theorizing the process of consent in Gramscian hegemony, Silverman argues that “the ideology of a particular class cannot simply impose itself upon a *socius*; in order to command collective belief it must intersect with the society's reality which does not belong to any class.”<sup>38</sup> Society's reality is determined by individuals and group epochs—this is most clear when Silverman defines the dominant fiction to “consist of images and stories through which a society figures consensus.”<sup>39</sup> The dominant fiction is “significantly inflected by the ideologies of gender, class, race and ethnicity,”<sup>40</sup> which, Silverman argues, call upon the male subject to see himself and the female subject to recognize and desire him only through the mediation of images of an unimpaired masculinity. It urges both the male and female subject to deny knowledge of male castration by believing in the commensurability of the penis and phallus, actual and symbolic father.<sup>41</sup> How does this process occur, or not, in the scenes between Leyla Lei and Chun Lee?

In the examples from *Yellowcaust* above, heteronormativity is claimed as a right. While the exclusion from heteronormative standards of masculinity creates a great deal of pain, how can racial anger about masculinity produce an aesthetic that does not simply hold up identities that require the subjugation of others? In an essay on the comic series *Secret Asian Man*,<sup>42</sup> Tasha Oren describes how anger can be a powerful and useful emotion if part of a productive critical project—wherein content also

shapes the form in a fashion so original as to shock our assumptions of what emotions are proper to Asian American men. Hamamoto's film does not achieve this. After a screening of *Yellowcaust*, Phillip Chung writes: "At a post screening Q&A session, (Darrell Hamamoto's girlfriend and a *Yellowcaust* cameraperson) Hsu said simply seeing an Asian American man and woman having sex is what makes the project revolutionary. That's like saying simply seeing two Asian American leads in [a] feature film is enough to make it revolutionary. But I like to think quality still matters even in the world of porn. If the revolution is going to be televised, it has to be worth watching." Beyond visibility, quality and content matter—as does form. How will these actors contend with their problems, whether racial, sexual, or gendered? Moreover, how will these heterosexual figures converse with queer people and others whose subjectivities and futures are entwined in terms of group identity and individual relations?

In the documentary *Masters of the Pillow*, the cultural producers David Henry Hwang, Justin Lin, and Eric Byler all insist upon the achievement of great art in the work. Hwang proposes that any stereotype must be countered by three-dimensionality. Lin and Byler insist that the work must be compelling—defining good art as necessary to political work in representation. In *Masters of the Pillow*, we see Hamamoto's presence as coitus interruptus, what I termed earlier as a form of "cock-blocking" for the sexual actors in the film. When they begin to shoot, Hamamoto says to Leyla Lei: "You look beautiful, lovely." And to Chun: "She's warmed up, nice and hot. Prepared for you. Fresh! She is beautiful. You're a very lucky guy." "You're a hot dude too," he says, somewhat extraneously. The couple does not affirm the compliments but meets him with silence and discomfort. Later, as the couple entangles in the bed, Hamamoto interrupts the sex scene to insert himself directorially. Upon the couple's disentangling, Hamamoto addresses and directs Chun to do it "doggy style" now. At this awkward moment, Chun is certainly not passive although we can see that he is now palpably nervous and full of anxious energy as he walks off to the side of the screen and away from the bed. As they stop, Hamamoto comments: "She's so sexy"—again inserting himself as both actors catch their breath mid-coitus. Leyla Lei gives in to the break in the proceedings and smiles, returns to follow Hamamoto's instructions. Hamamoto's

presence is extraneous to the sexual dynamics between the two actors—it is a problematic one that does not account adequately for his power in the scene as a director. His interruptions generate discomfort. This is the extent of the sex we see in Hou’s documentary. Chun asks for Hou and his documentary collaborators to leave. At this halt in the action, we then hear Hamamoto once again attempt to insert his directives for the meanings of the scene: “Asian men definitely have it. No doubt about it—even as it’s been repressed, suppressed, and denied.” We conclude with his verbal insistence and the assertion of his unchanged agenda even as we see the sex stop dead.

The repressive hypothesis shows up as the wounding of Asian American manhood that shapes sexual practices in Hamamoto’s project. Byler says: we need to retrain Asian American men to have sex, to retrain Asian Americans how to have sex. Not just: “I want to be your friend but just ask women to go out.” Byler says refuse your assignation and play in the heterosexual game—up your self-image to participate. In this vein, Hamamoto insists upon the evolutionary step of the work—to push the discourse to a much higher level through the porn project. David Henry Hwang expresses skepticism and asks if what we will see in the porn transcends regular porn, or is it simply two bodies? Indeed, what do we learn about Asian American bodies entwined here? This is the question that needs asking rather than accepting the sight of Asian American heterosexual coupling as correction to the Hamamoto assessment that “we are more than we are made out to be.” Hou asks Leyla Lei what is the difference between Asian men and white men as sexual partners. Lei says white men are rough and Asian men are more tender, there’s more love. Hamamoto asks if Chun’s doing “good”? How about his dick? It is a question that once again ensures a cock-block, as he inserts himself in the sex through verbal intrusion. We then see Hamamoto share his dreams in a close-up: “Someday I hope to be the Asian American Larry Flint—to have stores, a website, DVD, products, everything. I want to buy the *Hustler* building—occupy that building with my name up there as Hamamoto Enterprises Worldwide.” The fantasy extends to his assessment of the responses to his work. He repeats often that the response to his work is “overwhelmingly enthusiastic from everyone in their early 20s-to mid 70s—that it’s a project

that's long overdue. Asia is the most densely populated part of the world. Asians are the masters of the pillow," to which the film concludes. Here the film ends not with what we discover through the sexual acts between the Asian American man and woman but with Hamamoto's articulation of his desire for the phallus—to achieve symbolic and literal power of conventional and dominant manhood in the form of capitalist ownership of part of pornography as industry.

Hamamoto's demands for Asian American men to be considered viable pornographic subjects and his goal to achieve visibility involve narcissism, defined in the simplest terms as the assertion of the self as central, important, and a love object.<sup>43</sup> Narcissism is not the right solution for the ethical dilemma of Asian American sexual problems, which need care and concern for the self and others. Indeed, the political act of making demands for social recognition by those without access to it requires a self-centralizing frame. However, narcissism can lead to the repression of others, in this case non-heteronormative subjects or practices and the return of the sexually powerful/servile Asian American woman. Placing Asian American men in a forum, in this case pornography, where they are not represented fulfills the search for oneself in representation, but when that representation is not problematized for its marginalization of others, then it becomes an affirmation of a desire for the way things are. If, as Michael Warner alerts us in Crystal Parikh's work, ego-erotics are present in all identity politics, how then do we assess the necessity of narcissism and the possible costs to others? That is, if narcissism is essential for Hamamoto to assert the importance of Asian American male heterosexual representations in pornography, is it acceptable for individual self-love to forsake love for racial community, including women? Ultimately, Hamamoto rejects Parikh's identification of the potentiality for alternative masculine subject formation—as powerful for redefining Asian American masculinity—for a form of racial compulsory heterosexuality that ultimately aspires to the self-serving, or to fulfill a form of male narcissism that forsakes others within the very racial group for which the case of inequality is made.

How do we make sense of this oft-played performance of speaking for others or further rendering them into marginality within Asian American genders and sexualities? First, we revisit Adrienne Rich's classic essay

“Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence”<sup>44</sup> and Gayle Rubin’s foundational essay “Thinking Sex,”<sup>45</sup> as they both carefully consider the importance of hierarchies of normalcy. While Adrienne Rich’s analysis of pornography hails an era where pleasure in pornography for women can be more deeply theorized, she effectively identifies the force of sexual normalcy as so powerful that one cannot get out of it regardless of entry into other spaces of privilege. Such is the nature of what Rich calls “compulsory heterosexuality,” what she defines as the domestication and disciplining of women to serve men sexually so that the love for women, including the self that prioritizes women-identification rather than male-identification, becomes completely outside the norm.<sup>46</sup> In the case of Hamamoto, compulsory heterosexuality is not only unquestioned but privileged as a way of being to which Asian American men must aspire.

Gayle Rubin’s “Thinking Sex” allows me to clarify how *Yellowcaust* fails to explore the possibilities for reimagining Asian American masculinity. The film subscribes to a definition of sexuality as a natural, transhistorical, and unchanging inherent force in all of us. Sexuality, as the work of Foucault helps us identify, is historically produced into hierarchies of acts and identities. For Rubin, sexual morality has quite a lot in common with racial hierarchy, so that sexual hierarchies are actually hierarchies of race as well.<sup>47</sup> When Hamamoto’s *Yellowcaust* privileges the form of male heterosexuality that does not address gender inequalities in that experience, the costs of racial narcissism are revealed. In the name of racial grievance, the film does not address hierarchies within racial identities and sexual acts. Instead, the focus remains on securing phallic and penile power. A more ethical masculinity would account for one’s power and privilege as well as one’s subjugation. *Yellowcaust* and its making-of documentary *Masters of the Pillow* presumes that the racial problem is really the feminine—based on an inherent gender hierarchy. As such, the solution to this problem is the adding of the phallus, which ultimately reproduces heterosexism and gender hierarchy. As such, both heteronormative sexuality and gender hierarchy organize the perceptions, projections, and imaginings of Asian American manhoods in these movies. For these Asian American male producers, this crisis leads to solutions that actually deepen and further emphasize Asian American masculinity as lacking.

## CONCLUSION

By engaging the films above, I offer an ethical form of manhood that uses sexual intimacy as the opportunity for reflection and uses representation as a process of exploration rather than an imposition of fantasies and identities. Ethical manhoods are formed in the shattering of the self through intimacy, particularly in the sexual encounter as sites for disassembling and reassembling one's identity, occurring only with reflection in the work of sexual representation. If the sexual act witnesses the shattering of the coherency of the self in *jouissance*—what Juliana Chang translates from Jacques Lacan as the simultaneity of enjoyment and trauma in the racial scene of subject formation<sup>48</sup>—it offers in my study the opportunity for evaluating the self in relation to others and the social world.

Manhood is authored by the self in many sites including the moment of intimacy, in the context of one's conditions, and thus affords the opportunity to reflect upon the meaning of the sex act and its implications for and beyond the self. The following questions emerge from my own reflections on these films. They are designed to identify how scenes of sexual acts explicitly show what comprises an ethical manhood: What are the conditions for developing Asian American manhoods on screen? How are these social forces mapped, in terms of individual and social arrival into this moment of sex as the opportunity to form an ethics of manhood? How do the gestures and acts performed by the men on screen formulate Asian American masculinities good for Asian American men and the social relationships contextualizing their subject formation? How does the experience of masculine anxiety lead to imagining and creating new worlds that directly confront and critique the hierarchies of masculine subjectivities? Or in other words, how does Darrell Hamamoto's or James Hou's images of the male body and fantasy inform their filmmaking?

I study Asian American male engagements with pornography, the genre intent on arousing pleasure, for in it we see crystallized the powerful search not only for the penis but a specific kind of wrestling with phallic power's elusiveness. The U.S. porn industry undergoes an absence of Asian American men in straight porn and a prominence of Asian American bottoms in gay porn. At first glance and in the literature, the framework of asexuality/effeminacy seems a precise diagnosis for Asian American men in

this multibillion dollar industry of representation. Pornography, however, tells us about not only the power of cinema in relation to fantasy but about the centrality of the body and the penis in our ideas about manhood as well. In Hamamoto's work, sex acts are finite and predictable lessons about manhood and not an opening into the unpredictability of the body and the psyche when engaging another. Men hold a lot of pain in this area of inquiry, and Hamamoto and Hou encourage Asian American men to be conscious of their victimization, but not their power. For those deprived of manhood in American culture, we need to go beyond identifying men as simply the object upon which power operates but as subjects capable of action. In order to better attend to the problem of sexuality, men must also recognize themselves as causes for and as agents of power through their own actions. To escape a racial narcissism that may be good for one person or constituency, but negative for others, one has to formulate an ethical manhood that de-centers oneself and accounts for one's role in the encounter of power in and out of sexual and cinematic representation.

## Notes

1. *Yellowcaust: A Patriot Act* is the "political porn" video work by Darrell Hamamoto. It is a short video derived from the longer work *Skin on Skin*, which James Hou describes as "straightforward adult film" available to a mass audience. It is difficult to find the film commercially, and it is not listed on Internet Adult Film Database [www.IAFD.com](http://www.IAFD.com). William Nakayama. "Liberating the Asian American Libido," <http://goldsea.com/Mediawatch/Pillow/pillow.html> (accessed October 1, 2008).
2. Racial project is a concept from Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States* (New York: Routledge, 1994), to describe an effort to define and redefine racial dynamics.
3. Michele Wallace, *Black Macho and the Myth of the Superwoman* (London: Verso, 1990).
4. I use Neferti Tadiar's term so as to mark the individual fantasies of the filmmakers as not apart from larger fantasies of regimes of inequality. See Neferti Tadiar, *Fantasy-Production: Sexual Economies and Other Philippine Consequences for the New World Order* (Seattle: Washington University Press, 2004), 6.
5. *The Daily Show* aired the segment "They So Horny" featuring Professor Hamamoto. He appears as if in on the joke here and on *The Tonight Show*, where his pornography work is mocked by host Jay Leno.
6. Julie Kim, *Daily Titan* Opinion Editor, May 9, 2005: "The motive was accessibility. It's easier to make money in the multibillion dollar porn industry

- which he planned to invest in works by other Asian American moviemakers.”
7. Amy Ikeda, “Yellowcaust Director Darrell Hamamoto Interviewed,” VConline, <http://www.vconline.org/ff04/intervhamamoto.html> (accessed October 1, 2008).
  8. David Pierson, “Sex and the Asian Man,” May 12, 2004, LATimes.com, 3, <http://articles.latimes.com/2004/may/12/entertainment/et-pierson12> (accessed May 6, 2009).
  9. Nichole Ng, “Adult Film Aims to Dispel Stereotype” *Daily Titan*, CSU Fullerton, May 3, 2009, [http://apsanews.blogspot.com/2005\\_06\\_01\\_archive.html](http://apsanews.blogspot.com/2005_06_01_archive.html) (accessed December 17, 2009).
  10. Tracy Wang, Center for Asian American Media Blog, August 4, 2009, <http://festival.asianamericanmedia.org/in-depth/2009/08/04/sfiaaff-video-blog-a-peek-into-the-life-of-dick-ho/> (accessed December 17, 2009).
  11. Kaja Silverman, *Male Subjectivity in the Margins* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 36.
  12. Ibid.
  13. Darrell Y. Hamamoto. “The Joy Fuck Club: Prolegomenon to an Asian American Porno Practice,” *New Political Science* 20, no. 3 (1998): 323–345; emphasis added.
  14. Dorothy Korber, “Porn as Commentary: Film on Asian Issues Grabs Attention Stirs Debate,” *California State University Daily News Clips*, November 3, 2003, <http://www.calstate.edu/pa/clips2003/november/3nov/porn.shtml> (accessed June 6, 2009).
  15. Nalini Ambady, “Social Identities, Behavior, and Performance” talk delivered at Stanford University, October 1, 2009.
  16. Korber, “Porn as Commentary.”
  17. See *ibid.*
  18. In Andrew Sywak, “Sunset Filmmaker Examines Asian American Sexuality,” *Sunset Beacon*, May 2004, [Sunsetbeacon.com/archives/SunsetBeacon/2004edit](http://www.sunsetbeacon.com/archives/SunsetBeacon/2004edit) (accessed June 4, 2009).
  19. Ibid.
  20. Celine Parreñas Shimizu, *The Hypersexuality of Race: Performing Asian/American Women on Screen and Scene* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2007).
  21. See Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997).
  22. Kath Albury, “Reading Porn Reparatively,” *Sexualities* (2009): 12, 647, 652, <http://sexualities.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/12/5/647>.
  23. Blog on Toronto: *Masters of the Pillow* Premiere and Panel by Shuriken, YW Mafia, August 28, 2005.
  24. Frank Chin et al., *The Big Aiiieeeee! An Anthology of Asian-American Literature* (New York: Signet, 1991).

25. Maxine Hong Kingston, *Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts* (New York: Vintage International, 1989).
26. King-Kok Cheung, "The Woman Warrior versus the Chinaman Pacific: Must a Chinese American Critic Choose between Feminism and Heroism?" in *Conflicts in Feminism* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 158.
27. Jeff Yang, "Mightier Than the Sword," in SF GATE, [www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/g/a/2010/03/25/apop032510.DTL](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/g/a/2010/03/25/apop032510.DTL) (accessed April 6, 2010).
28. LeRoid, AA Rising, [Risings.com/review/Oct2004.htm](http://Risings.com/review/Oct2004.htm) (accessed May 6, 2009).
29. Phillip Chung, "Porn Losers Fail to Flesh Out Vision," *Asian Week*, June 4, 2009, [asianweek.com/2004/06/04/porn-losers-fail-to-flesh-out-vision](http://asianweek.com/2004/06/04/porn-losers-fail-to-flesh-out-vision) (accessed May 6, 2009).
30. Ibid.
31. Albury, "Reading Porn Reparatively," 1997.
32. Ibid., 648.
33. Darrell Y. Hamamoto, "On Asian American Sexual Politics," National Sexuality Resource Center, SRC.SFSU.edu [http://nsrc.sfsu.edu/MagArticle.cfm?SID=6B786CB66D85582DB9D8A70805CCA650&DSN=nsrc\\_dsn&Mode=EDIT&Article=564&ReturnURL=1](http://nsrc.sfsu.edu/MagArticle.cfm?SID=6B786CB66D85582DB9D8A70805CCA650&DSN=nsrc_dsn&Mode=EDIT&Article=564&ReturnURL=1) (accessed October 1, 2008).
34. Ibid., 1.
35. Crystal Parikh, "'The Most Outrageous Masquerade': Queering Asian-American Masculinity," *Modern Fiction Studies* 48, no. 4 (2002): 860.
36. Ibid., 890.
37. Hamamoto, "Joy Fuck Club."
38. Silverman, *Male Subjectivity in the Margins*, 20.
39. Ibid., 30.
40. Ibid., 32
41. Ibid., 42
42. Tasha Oren, "Secret Asian Man," in *East Main Street: Asian American Popular Culture*, ed. Leilani Nishime, Shilpa Davé, and Tasha Oren (New York: NYU Press, 2005).
43. Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (Charleston, S.C.: BiblioBazaar, 2007); Sigmund Freud, *On Narcissism: An Introduction* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1991).
44. Adrienne Cecile Rich, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence* (London: Onlywomen, 1981).
45. Gayle Rubin, "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality* (London: Pandora, 1992).
46. Rich, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence*, 644.
47. Rubin, "Thinking Sex", 283–284.
48. Juliana Chang, *Traumatic Enjoyment* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming).