Surfing the Waves of Identity

Surfing the Waves of Identity:

Asian Representations on the American Stage

By

Yoon Mi Sohn

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Surfing the Waves of Identity: Asian Representations on the American Stage

By Yoon Mi Sohn

This book first published 2025

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-0364-5259-9
ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-5260-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book stems from my dissertation, and I am sincerely grateful to my professors whose expertise and insights enriched my research throughout this challenging journey. I am profoundly thankful to Dr. Mary Bogumil, Dr. Patrick McGrath, Dr. Michael Molino, Dr. Jacob Juntunen, and Dr. Satoshi Toyosaki for their guidance. I also extend wholehearted thanks to Dr. Miseong Woo, Dr. Eunhee Kwon, and Dr. Junesick Yoon for their invaluable support and advice during the early stages of my journey. I cherish the moments spent discussing my work and exploring questions with them, and their encouragement continues to inspire me.

I'm also thankful to my friends from grad school who inspired me with fresh perspectives. In particular, I am heartily grateful to Seong-woo Choi and Sunghee Pak, whose unwavering support was a constant source of encouragement throughout my academic journey.

My wonderful friends have enriched my life by keeping me energized with coffee, chocolate, cookies, wine, beer, and humor. From them, I have gained immense vigor and joy. Special thanks to my partner in crime, Charlotte Frischkopf; the detail-oriented master, Byung-chan Kim; and the funny photo competitor, Sue Ji.

My family, to whom this book is dedicated, patiently waited and encouraged the completion of each step of my growth with love. Mom, I deeply respect and love you for nurturing my abilities and encouraging my dreams, believing in me all those years, and helping me achieve my goals. I owe deep thanks to Kyungmin, whose steadfast support lifts me whenever I feel down or drained of energy. For my dad, grandfather, and grandmother, who could not witness all my growth and achievements, I hope their spirits can share in my joy and accomplishments.

사랑하는 우리 엄마 은정 씨, 모자란 딸이 하나하나 목표를 달성할 수 있도록 가르침을 주시고 그 오랜 시간 믿어주신 당신을 깊이 존경하고 마음 깊이 감사드려요. 항상 아끼고 애정하는 경민, 침울해지고 기력 잃을 때마다 항상 힘 보태주니 번번이 고맙고 든든하다. 그리고 저의 성장과 성취를 미처 다 지켜보시지 못한 아빠, 할아버지, 할머니께서 영혼만이라도 제 성취를 함께 기뻐해 주셨으면 합니다.

Last, I extend my gratitude to all those who may be wondering why they did not make it into this section—your mystery remains unsolved. And to coffee—the true MVP—for keeping me wide awake.

WAVE 0.
EURO-AMERICAN MISREPRESENTATION OF ASIA AND ASIANS

(1) Misrepresenting Asia and Asians in History

Historically, Asia and Asian cultures are viewed as exotic, mystical, and mysterious. Furthermore, Asia is often misconceived as a single country with various homogenized cultures, distorting the diverse realities of Asia. However, Asia is a vast continent encompassing various intricate elements such as ethnicities, languages, nations, cultures, politics, etc. Despite this, Asia has historically been defined through an ontological and epistemological lens, primarily in the context of power dynamics within Europe and America. The term "the Orient" has frequently been employed in cultural and intellectual spheres. Regardless of its prevalence, I opt to utilize the term Asia because the familiar term carries colonial and neocolonial associations, perpetuating simplistic, stereotypical, and demeaning notions. The derogatory term essentially designates the East in relation to Europe, while the term "Oriental" refers to an object from "the Orient." This ambiguity leads to complications in usage and interpretation, particularly when the term is applied inconsistently to vastly different cultures, regions, or ethnic groups under a single reductive label. In the British context, the Orient indicates South Asia due to colonies in the area, while in the United States, it conjures notions of "the Far East (primarily China and Japan)" —often with a pejorative connotation.[1]

Addressing the challenges posed by the ambiguous and Eurocentric nature of its representation, Edward Said articulates in his work *Orientalism*. He contends that Orientalism originated as "a field of learned study in Europe," where the Occident designated the Orient in the pursuit of imperial power, emphasizing Oriental differences from the Occident, irrespective of the authentic Orient.[2] Beyond its initial terminology, Orientalism does not denote an objective reality but rather a conceptual framework encompassing perspective about the Oriental others as perceived by the Occidental

[1] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (Vintage Books, 1994), 1.
[2] Said, 49.

observer. According to literary scholar Klara Szmańko, the Orientalist theories functioned to create a mirrored reflection of the Occident, relying on contrived and distorted images of the Orient. Szmańko additionally notes that the Occident was perceived as "rational, moral, mature, restrained, masculine, and courageous," whereas the Orient was ascribed precisely the opposite characteristics, being depicted as "irrational, immoral, immature, hypersexed, feminine, and cowardly."[3]

One might contend that the genesis and efficacy of Orientalism are confined only to Europe. However, James S. Moy, a scholar specializing in Asian American theatre, refutes this notion by highlighting its extensive prevalence in the U.S. He emphasizes that elements of imperialist and Orientalist tradition from Europe, coupled with authoritative perspectives on the Other, are discernible in early American history, including "genocide and the internal colonization of native American lands" and the "importation of black slaves."[4] Historian Lon Kurashige further argues that Orientalism not only constructed representations of Asian races but also laid the groundwork for "the formation of white racial identity from the founding of the United States." [5] This conceptualization has led Europeans to frequently exoticize Japan and sexualize Japanese women, while U.S. culture has nurtured a deep-seated anti-Chinese sentiment, reducing Chinese bodies to mere sources of labor. Although one may acknowledge the outdated nature of the term "Oriental," its imperialist and racist connotations often go unrecognized.[6] The endeavor to phase out its usage was propelled by a political and cultural movement among Asian Americans. According to Asian Studies scholar Diane C. Fujiro, the term "Asian American" was introduced in 1968.[7] Frank Chin and his co-editors of *Aiiieeeee!*, an anthology of Asian American literary pieces, argue against the term's inadequacy, emphasizing that the stereotype of the Oriental,

---

[3] Klara Szmańko, "Performing Towards Visibility: Maxine Hong Kingston's *Tripmaster* Monkey" in *Invisibility in African American and Asian American Literature: A Comparative* Study (McFarland & Company, Inc., 2008), 96.

[4] James S. Moy, *Marginal Sights: Staging the Chinese in America* (University of Iowa Press, 1993), 7-8.

[5] Lon Kurashige, "Theory and History" in *The Oxford Handbook of Asian American History*, ed. David K. Yoo and Eiichiro Azuma (Oxford University Press, 2016), 245.

[6] Madison Park, "U.S. Government to Stop Using These Words to Refer to Minorities," *CNN*, May 22, 2016. https://www.cnn.com/2016/05/22/politics/obama-federal-law-minorities-references/index.html.

[7] Diane C. Fujiro, "Black Militants and Asian American Model Minorities: Contesting Oppositional Representation; or, On Afro-Asian Solidarities," *Kalfou* 2, no. 1 (2015): 97, ProQuest.

whether positive or negative, was offensive.[8] However, the complete replacement process took much more time. According to American journalists' reports, it is in 2016 only when former President Barak Obama signed a bill to eliminate derogatory terms such as "Oriental" and "Negro" from federal laws.[9]

(2) Asians on American Stage

The majority of early Asian immigrants were from China; consequently, Chinese characters appeared earlier than other Asians on the American stage created by Euro-American dramatists. As per Moy's examination of Asian representation within the American context, the latter half of the nineteenth century marks the initiation of Euro-Americans portraying Chinese characters in their plays as commodities intended for the entertainment of Euro-American audiences.[10] During the mid-nineteenth century, Chinese immigrants were predominantly portrayed as mere laboring bodies or perceived as threats to white laborers' job opportunities and their families' finances in the Euro-American public sphere.[11] The genesis of this imagery and the concurrent anti-Chinese sentiment within dramatic productions coincided with the discovery of gold in California in 1848. Around this period, plays written by Euro-American dramatists inscribed racial stereotypes and myths concerning Asian immigrants on the American stage. Notably, *Kim-Ka* (1852), produced by the Ravels, a performing troupe that immigrated from France and settled in New York City, stands as the earliest surviving piece featuring Chinese characters in America.[12]

Subsequently, Euro-American playwrights embarked on the creation of Chinese characters. *Ah Sin* (1876), a frontier drama co-authored by Bret Harte and Mark Twain, is a piece as the inaugural play to center around a Chinese protagonist.[13] Despite Harte and Twain's purported attempt at "a

[8] Frank Chin et al., "Preface" in *Aiiieeeee! An Anthology of Asian-American Writers* (Howard UP, 1974), 97.
[9] Stephany Bai, "President Obama Sings Bill Eliminating 'Oriental' from Federal Law," *NBC*, May 20, 2016. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/ president-obama-signs-bill-eliminating-oriental-federal-law-n577811.
[10] Moy, *Marginal,* 15-17.
[11] Robert G. Lee, *Orientals: Asian American in Popular Culture* (Temple University Press, 1999), 9.
[12] Dave Williams, *The Chinese Other 1850-1925: An Anthology of Plays* (University Press of America, 1997), 1.
[13] Williams, 39.

sympathetic portrayal of the Chinese,"[14] the character Ah Sin predominantly serves as "a plot-advancing device" and "a mechanism"[15] rather than as an active subject involved in the conflicts with other characters. In Henry Grimm's *The Chinese Must Go* (1879), animosity towards the Chinese and their enterprises reflects the prevalent anti-Chinese sentiment amid the changing economic landscape of American labor forces in the 1870s. These theatrical productions consistently reinforce Chinese marginality and the portrayal of an isolated, alien presence commodified for the entertainment of Euro-American audiences. Moy argues that those Euro-American playwrights intentionally diminished the visibility of their Chinese characters, despite the pivotal roles and reliance on Chinese laborers in the early development of the American West. He further notes that the competition between Chinese immigrants and the white labor force led to the development of particular mechanisms designated to regulate and restrict their representation.[16] Rendered invisible and marginalized, Chinese characters in *Ah Sin* and *The Chinese Must Go* were imbued with attributes of labor and moral depravity by Euro-American dramatists. Simultaneously, similar plays, conceived, produced, and consumed as commodities, cemented dramatic and conceptualized notions of Chinese-ness with fixed inherent attributes. Moreover, this Euro-pejorative concept of Chinese-ness has informed broader ideas of Asian-ness, especially when Asian voices were marginalized and unable to articulate themselves. This tradition of Asian American representation laid the groundwork for the creation and consumption of well-known Chinese American characters such as Fu Manchu or Charlie Chan by the public.

Scholars examine and elucidate these fictional characters within the framework of Asian American representation in popular culture.[17] Dr. Fu Manchu is a prominent figure in the novels of Sax Rohmer. Achieving substantial popularity with the first three novels—*The Insidious Dr. Fu Manchu* (1913), *The Return of Fu Manchu* (1916), and *The Hand of Fu Manchu* (1917)—Rohmer's success led him to relocate to the U.S., where he continued the Fu Manchu series until 1959, marking the publication of

[14] Moy, *Marginal,* 31.
[15] Moy, 26.
[16] Moy, "Asian American Visibility: Touring Fierce Racial Geographies" in *Staging Difference: Cultural Pluralism in American Theatre and Drama*, ed. Marc Maufort (Peter Lang Publishing, 1995), 192-93.
[17] Refer to "Wave 2" for further discussion on Fu Manchu. Additionally, Korean American playwright Young Jean Lee challenges the stereotypical and racist imagery of Fu Manchu in her 2003 play *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, which can be found in "Wave 4."

the last novel. Fu Manchu emerged as the first universally recognized Chinese character and an archetype of villainy, illustrating Yellow Peril hysteria, as well as embodying Orientalist and colonial authority over the Other.[18] Charlie Chan is a Chinese American fictional character, created by Derr Biggers and serialized in the *Saturday Evening Post* from 1925 to 1932. Chan is portrayed as a heroic and intelligent detective, dedicated to investigating and solving crimes in the mystery series. Initially conceived as an alternative to Yellow Peril, Chan, however, began to face criticism in the 1970s and 1980s from scholars in popular culture and media studies who perceived him as reinforcing Asian stereotypes. Charles J. Rzepka, for instance, points out that Chan came to "personify the status assigned Asian American citizens by the dominant white culture."[19]

(3) Waves: Staging Asians in Asian American Theatre

Challenging this imaginative and arbitrary conceptualization and representation, Asian descendants in the U.S. began articulating their perspectives and ensuring their own representation. Their efforts were fueled by calls for change inspired by various U.S. diversity movements, including the Civil Rights and feminist movements. Simultaneously, Asian American communities underwent a significant transformation, marked by the issuance of the Immigration Reform Act in 1965. It led to the elimination of the old quota system against Asians, and Southern and Eastern Europeans, and the growth of the Asian American population. These shifts laid the groundwork for Asian American activism. Influenced by and aligned with these movements, Asian Americans established organizations for political activism, and Asian American theatre companies were founded to promote Asian American artists. While a few Asian American dramatists had produced works in Hawaii before the 1960s, the first wave of Asian American drama is characterized by the establishment of Asian American theatre companies on the mainland during this period.[20]

In classifying these plays, two terms are commonly employed: generation and wave. Roberta Uno uses the term generation, while David Henry Hwang

---

[18] Lee, *Orientals*, 113-17.

[19] Charles J. Rzepka, "Race, Region, Rule: Genre and the Case of Charlie Chan," *PMLA* 122, no. 5 (2007), 1463-64, JSTOR.

[20] Josephine Lee, "Asian American Drama" in *The Cambridge Companion to Asian American Literature*, ed. Crystal Parikh and Daniel Y. Kim (Cambridge UP, 2015), 90.

Esther Kim Lee*, A History of Asian American Theatre* (Cambridge UP, 2006), 1.

and Esther Kim Lee prefer the term wave.[21] Although Hwang does not explicitly state his choice of term, Lee notes that wave "connotes artistic movements and style" in relation to the artists' "attitude and preparedness."[22] I adopt the term "wave" to underscore the "artistic movements and style" in Lee's interpretation. Additionally, the term helps avoid confusion between artistic classification and immigration classification. Following Hwang and Lee's terminology, I examine the four waves that have emerged on the mainland U.S. to date: roughly the first wave started in the 1970s, the second in the 1980s, the third in the 1990s and early 2000s, and the fourth wave since the late 2000s. Nonetheless, this classification faces inherent challenges and complexities just as Amy Ling, a scholar of Asian American Studies, argues difficulty in defining and delineating Asian American literature.[23] Similarly, in the realm of Asian American plays, I encounter intricacies and difficulties in the process of selecting and categorizing. Consequently, my selection of playwrights and plays may not strictly adhere to the classification of the waves. Instead, it is guided by a specific focus, which centers on the formation and evolution of Asian American identity in alignment with the evolving waves of Asian American drama.

The essential clarification of Asian American identities involves understanding rigidity and fluidity. I characterize a rigid identity as one marked by the obsessive or compulsive consciousness exhibited by Asian characters, more prominent in the first and second waves. Despite presenting contrasting claims to identity, characters in these periods commonly seek a singular, cohesive identity—either distinctly Asian or exclusively American. Conversely, characters in the third and fourth waves endeavor to identify themselves as Asian Americans while acknowledging various factors contributing to their identities as well as nationality and race. However, this does not imply an abandonment of racial and cultural considerations. Instead, these characters view race as equally significant alongside other factors in shaping their identities. They engage in the negotiation and evolution of their identities concerning other racial groups, responding to contingent or unexpected events such as accidents, encounters with others, crimes, diseases, and more.

---

[21] Roberta Uno "Introduction" in *Unbroken Thread: An Anthology of Plays by Asian American Women*, ed. Roberta Uno (University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 7.
David Henry Hwang, "Forward" in *Version 3.0: Contemporary Asian American Plays*, ed. Chay Yew (Theatre Communications Group, 2011), x-xii.
Lee*, A History*, 125.

[22] Lee*, A History*, 125-26.

[23] Amy Ling, "Recent Asian American Fiction, Drama, and Film" in *Transformation: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy* 6, no. 2 (1995): 3.

In this context, it is crucial to distinguish a fluid identity in the third and fourth waves from the terminology employed by David Henry Hwang. In his 1989 essay, Hwang expresses his attempt to "evolve a multicultural model."[24] The full implications of his stance become clearer in his later semi-autobiographical play, *Yellow Face* (2007). This play reflects Hwang's stance on the casting of a Eurasian role in *Miss Saigon* and delves into discussions about race, assimilation, and heritage. Hwang, as the playwright, disagrees with his father, HYH, but ultimately acknowledges his father's perspective at the play's conclusion, asserting "Cuz that was Dad's dream: a world where he could be Jimmy Stewart. And a white guy—can even be an Asian."[25] Hwang's statement suggests a color-blind multiculturalism that eliminates race. However, fluid identities, salient in the third- and fourth-wave plays, do not erase racial and ethnic differences, although these factors are not the sole determinants of one's selfhood. Even if individuals attempt to deny racial differences, they cannot escape historical, socio-economic, and political experiences such as unequal political power, labor exploitation, socio-political marginalization, and so forth, inseparable from race. Eliminating such differences, as E. San Juan highlights, "dismisses the view that inequality is historically and socially constructed."[26] Rather than eliminating races, third- and fourth-wave playwrights subdivide concepts of racial, ethnic, historical, and cultural differences because "the shared experiences of Chinese, Japanese and Filipinos can no longer apply to the IndoChinese refugees, the Korean and Pakistani merchants of New York, and the rich Hong Kong speculators of today."[27] In essence, a fluid identity in this study denotes that one's identity constantly changes and evolves based on beliefs and values influenced by race, ethnicity, culture, religion, class, education, accidents, crimes, etc. The four chapters in this book illustrate aspects of both rigid and fluid identities across the four waves.

Following this introduction, I will delineate and explore, within the next four chapters, how Asian American dramatists and their plays are categorized into four waves during specified periods, with each chapter focusing on one wave. Then, I will reiterate the Asian American identity construction in drama, emphasizing the intersection between artistic movements and socio-political contexts in the U.S.

---

[24] David Henry Hwang, "Evolving a Multicultural Tradition," *MELUS* 16, no.3 (1990), 16, 18, https://doi.org/10.2307/467559.
[25] David Henry Hwang, *Yellow Face* (Dramatists Play Service, 2008), 63.
[26] E. San Juan Jr., "Multiculturalism v.s. Hegemony: Ethnic Studies, Asian Americans, and U.S. Racial Politics," *The Massachusetts Review* 32, no. 3 (1991): 475, JSTOR.
[27] San Juan, 469.

WAVE 1.
RIGIDLY EXPRESSING IDENTITY
FROM THE 1970S

(1) The Post-1965 Movements and the First Wave

The perception of Asia in the United States has been shaped by Orientalist conceptions originating in Europe, giving rise to racial stereotypes and myths aligned with both American history and the history of Asian immigration. Examining plays from the nineteenth century reveals that Euro-American playwrights perpetuated the Orientalist tradition of misrepresenting Asian individuals. These misconceptions and racial stereotypes were ingrained in the American public as authentic and unchanging attributes. Frustrated by the prevalence of these misconceptions, first-wave dramatists embarked on artistic endeavors to explore the authentic identity and uncover the significance of Asian experience in the U.S.

The initiation of the first wave was facilitated through playwriting competitions and workshops endorsed by Asian American theater companies in the late 1960s and early 1970s.[1] Unlike other literary genres, the evolution of Asian American drama is a relatively recent development. In the "Introduction" to *Unbroken Thread*, Roberta Uno underscores production as the catalyst for discussing this recent growth. While the dissemination of other genres is relatively straightforward, the progression of drama requires a focus on tangible production elements, such as actors, costumes, and a physical setting.[2] Moreover, the development of the first wave aligns with concurrent Asian American movements after the Immigration Reform Act of 1965. During this period, various diversity movements, including the Civil Rights and feminist movements in the late 1960s and early 1970s, confronted the Eurocentric and androcentric societal

[1] Esther Kim Lee, "Contemporary Asian American Drama" in *The Cambridge History of Asian American Literature,* ed. Rajini Srikanth and Min Hyoung Song (Cambridge University Press, 2016), 406.
[2] Roberta Uno "Introduction" in *Unbroken Thread: An Anthology of Plays by Asian American Women*, ed. Roberta Uno (University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 4.

norms, influencing the Asian American movements.[3] The establishment of the Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA) in 1968 played a pivotal role in shaping the first wave drama for the aforementioned reasons. In her 2015 study, Diane C. Fujiro elucidates the transformations brought about by AAPA. The organization introduced the term "Asian American" to replace the imperialist and racist term "Oriental," contributing to the establishment of *Amerasia Journal*, the first journal for Asian American studies, at Yale University.[4] Given these circumstances, the primary objective of the first-wave drama was to disseminate the experiences of Asian Americans and challenge notions of marginality and invisibility. The predominant themes in first-wave plays often revolve around historical narratives, utilizing realism to depict experiences from the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. Through this task, playwrights aimed to articulate the challenges faced by marginalized and alienated Asian immigrants, indirectly challenging the misrepresented identity of Asian Americans by staging these historical situations.

(2) Representing Asian-ness in Historical Plays

First-wave playwrights are predominantly Chinese and Japanese Americans—a characteristic shaped by Asian immigration history, particularly the national origins of early settlers, their adaptation and assimilation, and the formation of the second generation.

Genny Lim stands among the playwrights who brought to life the stories of early Chinese immigrants in U.S. history. Through her 1981 play, *Bitter Cane*, she depicts a diasporic community of Chinese contract laborers on a sugar plantation in Kahuku, Hawaii, in 1882. The male characters—Lau Hing, Kam, Fook, and Wing—arrived in Hawaii to alleviate the poverty of their families in China. Alongside Li-Tai, the sole female character, the laborers uphold Chinese customs, traditions, and values. Their commitment to preserving Chinese culture renders them seemingly unassimilable into American society. While their claims to American identity may appear feeble, the play reveals the unique circumstances that shape their exclusion and amplifies the voices of the Chinese characters.

---

[3] Amy Ling, "Recent Asian American Fiction, Drama, and Film" in *Transformation: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy* 6, no. 2 (1995), 1, JSTOR.
[4] Diane C. Fujiro, "Black Militants and Asian American Model Minorities: Contesting Oppositional Representation; or, On Afro-Asian Solidarities," *Kalfou* 2, no. 1 (2015): 100, ProQuest.

With their voices, the characters function as subjects actively pursuing their desires. Kam, a cane cutter in his thirties, for instance, openly expresses his longing for wealth and aspires to accumulate a substantial amount of money, aiming to carve a better life for himself out of poverty. Nevertheless, he realizes that achieving his dreams is impossible:

> KAM. (gravely) […] When you think of what we left to come here, it makes no difference. Back home we'd plow the field and pray for rain. Even though we might not eat, at least it's our land. Here, we don't starve, but we work like oxen for some other sonavabitch's land. Not only that, we don't live like normal men. [sic][5]

As per historian Ronald Takaki, the planters viewed the workers merely as a means to enhance their profits, resulting in the severe exploitation of Chinese workers under stringent restrictions.[6] Kam's circumstances vividly exemplify this historical reality. Despite their strenuous efforts on the plantation, the laborers earn meager wages, a significant portion of which goes toward settling the debts incurred during their journey to Hawaii. The planters perceive them solely as laboring entities, devoid of the recognition of their humanity, aiming to sustain a workforce that functions like "oxen." After toiling on the plantation, Kam comes to the sobering realization that his initial hopes for financial success are unattainable and that the inhumane treatment by the planters will persist until his death. During a particularly arduous day, this dilemma reaches a climax, and Kam exclaims, "I may be an insignificant speck, but I got some feelings!"[7] This marks a crucial moment in which he asserts his humanity, echoing the notion of being "excluded from the body politic."[8] His outcry underscores the reality that exclusion from the body politic is not merely a legal or political condition, but an existential and desperate one. Yet it goes unheard by the planters, further intensifying Kam's exclusion.

Unlike the biased image of unassimilable Chinese immigrants, this play portrays the laborers' efforts. Specifically, Kam attempted to embrace American culture by turning to religion for solace. He delved into the Bible, engaged in prayer, and sought comfort or redemption through conversation

---

[5] Genny Lim, *Paper Angels and Bitter Cane: Two Plays by Genny Lim* (Kalamaku Press, 1991), 87.
[6] Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Little, Brown and Company, 1989), 24.
[7] Lim, 88.
[8] Josephine Lee, *Performing Asian America: Race and Ethnicity on the Contemporary Stage* (Temple University Press, 1997), 138.

with priests amid inhumane circumstances. Unfortunately, his encounters only highlights the exclusion of Christianity, as the figure of "some limp haole hanging from a cross" failed to comprehend him rather than offering consolation or redemption.[9] Adding to the distress, Father Romero callously threw a statue of Kwan Kung, a mystical Chinese deity, which Kam had brought from China.[10] Kam's potential assimilation through religion could have started if he had found peace and acceptance within Christianity. Faced with a lack of solace or inclusion in America, Kam cannot help clinging to Chinese culture and resorting to vices such as gambling, opium, and interactions with prostitutes to alleviate his suffering under the dual burden of exploitation and exclusion. Similar to Kam, the other Chinese laborers in the play express frustration and hopelessness, leading them to succumb to the same vice without any opportunities to break free from this ceaseless cycle of exclusion and exploitation.

The play refrains from introducing American planters and priests as characters, directly interacting with the Chinese characters. The presence of these faceless Americans is conveyed only through the dialogues and remarks of the Chinese characters, illustrating deficient communication between the Chinese and the Americans. This setting mirrors historical situations where early immigrants faced challenges communicating with Americans due to language barriers. However, the play unveils a more intricate problem beyond the language barriers, revealed through the absence of American characters. Fook, tasked with supervising the laborers, occupies a position between the Chinese laborers and the American planters. Nevertheless, the other Chinese laborers view Fook merely as another exploiter rather than a mediator. This perception assimilates him into the capitalist framework of the planters, justifying his exploitation of fellow Chinese laborers for personal gain.

As a consequence, China becomes not only the birthplace of these laborers but also the destined final chapter of their arduous lives. Though their prospect appears grim, the Chinese laborers cling to a hopeful vision of returning home someday. By contrast, Lau Hing nurtured dreams of making a permanent life in Hawaii. His ghostly presence lingers, born from his tragic suicide after Li-Tai refused to flee Kahuku with him. Despite having a wife and son waiting in China, Lau Hing chose never to return. Although he intended to live out his days in Hawaii, his spirit longs for his ashes to be carried back to his home. Li-Tai entrusts Lau Hing's ashes to his son Wing, who has journeyed from China to Hawaii in search of his father,

[9] Lim, 66.
[10] Lim, 67.

tasked with ensuring a "safe burial."[11] Her remark implies that even Lau Hing—who refused to come back because of his Chinese relatives' disapproval over his mixed heritage—perceived this foreign land as no place for his eternal rest. The new world, with all its promises, remained a realm of exile, where potential belonging was denied and peace, even in death, remained elusive.

One of the prevailing sentiments among the Chinese characters in this play is disillusionment. They appear to find themselves condemned to harsh labor and financially ensnared by their employers.[12] While historian Sucheng Chan asserts that "Asian Americans allegedly failed to assimilate" and were "considered deficient or deviant,"[13] Lim's play portrays situations where the Chinese immigrant characters lack opportunities to feel welcome or affiliated with American society. Consequently, they inevitably identify themselves as Chinese and strive to preserve their cultural heritage.

While *Bitter Cane* demonstrates the isolating situations faced by Chinese immigrant characters in Hawaii, Lim's *Paper Angels* (1978) delves into Chinese characters' yearning to become Americans. Compared to *Bitter Cane*, this play provides a deeper portrayal of American characters' attitudes toward Chinese immigrants. Specifically, it presents the narratives of American and Chinese characters at the Angel Island Immigration Detention Center in San Francisco Harbor in 1915, prior to the immigrants' entry into the United States. Historian Timothy Fong notes that the anti-Chinese sentiment of the 1880s resulted in discriminatory legislation, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.[14] Reflecting this historical context, the play is permeated by sinophobia, vividly dramatizing the experiences of Chinese immigrants.

Remarkably, this play presents two opposing perspectives on identity and history. For instance, conflicting views arise between Chin Gung and Henderson in an indirect and silent manner, as neither engages in a direct argument. This is also partly because immigrants are not in a position to argue back against American officials like Henderson, a guard at the detention center. Henderson articulates his rationale for the widespread anti-Chinese sentiment and exclusion perpetrated by Euro-Americans:

---

[11] Lim, 106.

[12] Ling, "Recent Asian American Fiction, Drama, and Film," 8.

[13] Sucheng Chan, "Asian American Historiography" in *Asian Americans: Experiences and Perspectives*, ed. Timothy Fong and Larry H. Shinagawa (Prentice-Hall, 2000), 44.

[14] Timothy P. Fong, The History of Asians in America" in *Asian Americans: Experiences and Perspectives*, ed. Timothy Fong and Larry H. Shinagawa (Prentice-Hall, 2000), 15-16.

> HENDERSON. I've been on this Island ever since it opened in 1910. I'm so sick of Chinamen […] America is for Americans, they don't belong here! If they keep coming, there won't be any jobs left for decent white men. […] Do you think they'd fight for Uncle Sam? Hell, no.[15]

In his soliloquy, Henderson extensively reveals the disdain that fueled racist and discriminatory legislation, including 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, driven by "fear of an invasion by 'yellow hordes.'"[16] A crucial aspect of his argument lies in his perception of how Americans can be identified. He refutes the idea that the Chinese shared historical experiences and memories with Americans. This suggests that exclusion and alienation of Chinese or other Asian people partly stemmed from discourses seeking to define American national identity in contrast to other nations during the nineteenth century. The fundamental question preceding this distinction of national identities is what defines an American. Until the early twentieth century, a common criterion for differentiating nationalities was racial identity, as seen in the cases of the Chinese or the French.[17] This criterion did not seamlessly apply to America. However, it served to define and reinforce American national identity by selecting the Chinese as an "Other" since "race is a principal signifier of social differences in America."[18] Moreover, James S. Moy contends that the early use of the Orient aimed to define American-ness to "justify the extermination of native Americans and the institution of slavery [sic]."[19] From the Euro-American perspective, it was deemed justifiable in order to enforce racially discriminatory legislation on Others, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Chinese immigrants. Grounded in the concepts of imagined nationhood and legislative racism, Henderson argues that the Chinese lack the historical memories necessary for Americans to share or recognize nationhood and, therefore, cannot be considered true Americans. Faced with the challenge of identifying American-ness, Euro-Americans sought to affirm their identity by emphasizing the racial, social, and cultural differences of the "Other." In this context, the Chinese emerged as suitable candidates for implementing this divisive strategy.

---

[15] Lim, 38.
[16] Ling, "Recent Asian American Fiction, Drama, and Film," 7.
[17] Robert G. Lee, *Orientals: Asian American in Popular Culture* (Temple University Press, 1999), 6-7.
[18] G. Lee, 7.
[19] James S. Moy, *Marginal Sights: Staging the Chinese in America* (University of Iowa Press, 1993), 10-11.

In contrast to Henderson, Chin Gung articulates that he played a role in American history as one of early immigrants. He arrived on the U.S. mainland and participated in the California Gold Rush and the construction of the railroads.

> CHIN GUNG. […] I've moved all around this country. After rails, we followed the seasons—like geese, always looking for better climate, better conditions. […] I know this land, I ache for her sometimes […] but I'm in love with this land. I want to die in America.[20]

Chin Gung's four-decade journey in the U.S. mirrors the experiences of Chinese laborers during the late nineteenth century. Not only did he witness historical events, but he also narrates his life post-railroad construction, resembling ordinary challenges faced by non-Asian immigrants striving to survive and establish roots in America. Despite the hardships, anti-Chinese sentiment, and moments of frustration, Chin Gung harbors a deep love for his new country and aspires to spend his life there. To realize this dream, he decided to return to China to bring his wife and re-enter the U.S. Chin Gung's love for and desire to live in America contradict the Euro-American discourses of nationality and nationhood conveyed by Henderson. However, the Chinese Exclusion Act obstructs Chin Gung's return. Fong, a middle-aged peasant also awaiting entry, shares historical facts and his sentiment about this law, emphasizing its exclusionary nature: "no laborers, according to the Chinese Exclusion Act. That's why I'm here. On account of the law. Now that their railroad's built, their factories are humming, and the harvest is in, it's time to kick us coolies out by our butts!"[21] In the nineteenth century, Chinese laborers were initially welcomed in the U.S. for economic reasons. Yet, they faced escalating racist, political, and economic conflicts with Euro-Americans as sinophobia grew. Discriminatory laws, such as heavy taxes and denial of naturalized citizenship, were enacted to protect Euro-American laborers against Chinese competition.[22] These tensions culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, deterring Chinese immigration to the U.S. Despite Chin Gung and Fong's active participation in American history, they become the Chinese immigrants whom American immigration officials seek to dissuade.

On the other hand, certain Chinese immigrants found themselves compelled to forsake their authentic identity in order to become Americans. Despite the Chinese Exclusion Act barring the entry of Chinese laborers,

[20] Lim, 34-35.
[21] Lim, 19.
[22] Takaki, *Strangers*, 80-82.

U.S. law ensured the admission of Chinese sons born to Chinese Americans.[23] This gave rise to a distinct group of Chinese individuals, exemplified by Lee, who resorted to paying for a fabricated identity to circumvent restrictions and gain entry into the U.S. Lee, a young Chinese man, aspires to embrace an American identity, seeking economic success to bring honor to his family. He eagerly awaits approval to establish a life in America with his wife and baby, who was born in the detention center.

> LEE. *(resentfully)* I am Lee Sung Fei, not *(Gesturing at the burnt contents in the spittoon)* this Moy Fook Sing or whatever his name is! I am from Shekki not from Sunning. I am a scholar, not a merchant's son![24]

Lee has purchased a counterfeit American born Chinese identity—known as a "paper son"—and meticulously studies a coaching book detailing the intricacies of this false persona. According to Takaki, these coaching papers, purchased by "paper sons," consists of forged birth certificates and other details about fake personas' families, encompassing family members' names, birth and death dates, and other particulars.[25] Lee must adopt the identity of Moy Fook Sing, but this presents his dilemma: he must shed his true identity as Lee to attain American citizenship, yet he despises the fabricated persona he purchased. In the play's culmination, Lee is successfully released from the detention center and, under the guise of Moy Fook Sing, immigrates to the U.S. with his wife and son. This situational irony underscores the exclusionary and contradictory nature of immigration system and legal status that Chinese immigrant characters face.

Another instance of situational irony appears in Chin Gung's narrative. Unlike Lee, his reentry is thwarted not by a failed inspection but by contracting "liverfluke" [sic] during his stay in the deplorably unsanitary detention center.[26] Faced with despair, Chin Gung takes his own life before his deportation. His suicide highlights the significance of American identity as a matter of life or death for him, directly challenging the dominant discourse advocated by Henderson through the narrative of his life.

Objectification of Chinese characters by Americans is another significant subject in *Paper Angels*. Echoing the faceless planters' behavior in *Bitter Cane*, this issue is implicitly conveyed through the Chinese characters' status as laboring bodies—welcomed as sojourning laborers but excluded as citizens. In addition to it, Miss Gregory, a Methodist missionary,

---

[23] Takaki, 235.
[24] Lim, 10.
[25] Takaki, *Strangers*, 236.
[26] Lim, 36.

embodies another form of objectification. She exemplifies objectification ingrained in benevolence, religion, and language through her treatment of a Chinese girl, Ku Ling. Upon discovering that Ku Ling, allowed entry into the U.S., had been deceived and sold into prostitution, Gregory intervenes to prevent her deportation back to China. Gregory pledges to take Ku Ling under the church's care, giving her the Christian name Ruth.[27] Alongside the issue of the name, power over language emerges in the interactions between Ku Ling, Miss Gregory, and Miss Chan. Ku Ling learns of the deception through Chan, the interpreter, but remains unaware of the custody arrangement because Gregory communicates exclusively with Chan on this matter. Cognizant of Gregory's authority and the resulting power imbalance, Chan interprets only when prompted and Gregory selectively instructs her on what to convey. Consequently, Ku Ling remains oblivious to the custody issue—arguably a far more significant matter. This exclusion through language and the ensuing erasure of Ku Ling's subjectivity empowers Gregory to unilaterally decide the girl's fate, further enacting the objectification at the heart of her actions.

Furthermore, Miss Gregory demonstrates behavior that is more self-serving than altruistic, betraying the very ideals of missionary work. After successfully carrying out her seemingly benevolent act, Gregory disregards Ku Ling's opposition. Although Ku Ling rejects the new name and insists on retaining her own, Gregory remains indifferent to her protests and does not seek interpretation from Chan to understand the girl. Gregory's demeanor reveals a performative quality to her benevolence, implying that she needs pitiable subjects upon whom to stage her own virtue. She adeptly exploits the language barrier between Ku Ling and herself and leverages her superior social status over the interpreter to accomplish the mission seamlessly. Despite Ku Ling's protests, she exists as a mere bodily object, stripped of subjectivity. This scene involving Ku Ling and Gregory illustrates the limited opportunities for Chinese immigrants to engage with Americans, reinforcing a perception that Asian immigrants are unadaptable to American society.

Historically, Japanese laborers constituted another Asian racial group that immigrated to the United States subsequent to the Chinese. The Japanese migration was influenced by the social transformation brought about by the Meiji Restoration in 1868.[28] Predominantly composed of young men from the farming class, most Japanese migrants settled in Hawaii and along the Pacific Coast on the mainland.[29] The twentieth century added

[27] Lim, 49.
[28] Takaki, *Strangers*, 42-46.
[29] Takaki, 45-46.

layers to the identity crisis of Japanese Americans, shaped by war, internment, and shifting national loyalties. These evolving conditions prompted first-wave Japanese American playwrights to depict the acute struggles of individuals in this community during pivotal historical moments.

Momoko Iko's *Gold Watch* (1972) portrays lives of Japanese immigrants during World War II, particularly in 1941 and 1942, when their dual identity threatened to their safety. In this context, the play delves into the perspectives of two American-born Japanese boys navigating the challenges of being caught between two worlds. Often regarded as the genesis of Asian American drama, *Gold Watch*—"inaugural play produced by East West Players"—explores intricate issues of diaspora and identity within the Japanese immigrant community.[30] The narrative unfolds against the backdrop of the forceful relocation of Japanese Americans from their homes under the "Civilian Exclusion Order 9966."[31] Tadao Murakami and Hiroshi Tanaka, American-born sons of Masu Murakami and Tanaka, grapple with their conflicted identity and the generational gap with their parents, while the parents strive to realize their American dreams.

> HIROSHI. The Imperial Way cannot be defeated. It is the only way! […] I believe Pearl Harbor was Japan's way of letting America know that she must be respected. […] We, I mean, Japan, does in Asia only what white people do all over the world. […] Who will lead the yellow people of Asia?[32]

Hiroshi's argument unveils his risky standpoints on the war, which is led by his identity crisis. Tanaka sent Hiroshi to Japan with the expectation that the boy would embrace and preserve his Japanese identity. This decision does not imply Tanaka's inability to assimilate into America; instead, it reflects the unsettled identity experienced by Japanese immigrants. Takaki elucidates that it was a prevalent practice for Japanese parents to send their American-born children to Japan, driven by concerns about potential challenges such as forced deportation or severe racial discrimination. The parents expected that they could consider the option of returning, if necessary, by sending their children to learn the Japanese language and

---

[30] Velina Hasu Houston, "Introduction" in *The Politics of Life: Four Plays by Asian American Women,* ed. Velina Hasu Houston et al. (Temple University Press, 1993), 21.
[31] Momoko Iko, "Gold Watch" in *Unbroken Thread: An Anthology of Plays by Asian American Women*, ed. Roberta Uno (University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 141.
[32] Iko, 125.

culture in their homeland.[33] Takaki's explanation resonates in the play, particularly in the conversation between Tadao and Masu about the prospect of returning to Japan. The discrimination and restrictions imposed on Japanese Americans intensified following the attack on Pearl Harbor by the Imperial Japanese Army.[34,35] In response to Tanaka's apprehensions and the surge of legislative racism, Hiroshi was sent to Japan and enrolled in a Japanese school for four years. This period coincided with the era of Imperialism, suggesting that Hiroshi defined and formed his identity through interactions with peers at school, in the neighborhood, and within his family during his time in Japan. This experience stands in stark contrast to the circumstances in America, where Hiroshi faced instances of racial discrimination and the resulting self-contempt. Hiroshi likely encountered a profoundly different framework for defining his selfhood in Japan, becoming captivated by and immersed in this new perspective. However, this perspective does not solely comprise positive elements. Imperial Way, mentioned in Hiroshi's speech, sought political power for a military government that promoted totalitarianism, militaristic, and aggressive expansionistic ideals in Japan in the 1920s and 1930s by eradicating individualism among its citizens. This ideology and philosophy influenced and supported the Imperial Army, which Hiroshi wants to join. As evident in his speech, the boy aligns himself with Japan's expansionist doctrine—centered on the invasion and domination of other Asian nations and the defeat of the United States. His perilous perspective suggests that Hiroshi confronted anti-Japanese sentiment prior to his time in Japan, likely through interactions with various racial groups, leaving him with limited opportunities to establish his identity in affirming ways.

Adding to the complexity, the generational gap and conflicts with his parents hinder Hiroshi from shaping an American identity. His parents, having firmly established their identities as Japanese, hardly comprehend the cultural and adolescent angst of their American-born children. Hiroshi expresses to Tadao, a younger individual who has not experienced Japan, both his disillusionment with the U.S. and his desire to join the Imperial Army. Meanwhile, the adults voice concerns about the perilous nature of Hiroshi's convictions, while the FBI suspects him of espionage. Amidst the younger generation's internal struggle between American and Japanese identities, the Japanese community contends with an additional challenge

[33] Takaki, *Strangers*, 216.
[34] Iko, 134.
[35] Meirion and Susie Harries, *Soldiers of the Sun: The Rise and Fall of the Imperial Japanese Army* (Random House, 1994), 180, 191, 259.

despite their loyalty to the U.S.: the enforced relocation to an internment camp in Portland.

Influenced by Hiroshi, Tadao argues that the family should move to Japan, believing it a better option than staying in America. The subsequent dispute between Tadao and Masu sheds light on the complexities of identity and heritage. Both Hiroshi and Tadao romanticize Japan, grappling with legislative racism. In contrast, Masu counters his son by recounting his life in Japan—marked by starvation, child abuse, and child neglect—which highlights that Japan is not as ideal a place as his son envisions.[36] It is noteworthy and ironic that the American-born child identifies with an unexperienced Japan, while the Japanese-born father finds a sense of belonging in America.

The divergence between Masu and Tadao is reflected in their contrasting views on Masu's gold watch. Following Masu's refusal to return to Japan, he passes the watch on to Tadao, who persists in advocating for the family's return. Tadao inquires about the watch's origin because he expects it to be a tangible link to their Japanese heritage, reinforcing his sense of Japanese identity. However, Masu did not inherit anything from his father, who mistreated and abandoned him. Instead, he purchased it upon arriving in Seattle. Consequently, for Masu, the watch symbolizes a fresh legacy that the family is forging in the United States. To emphasize this new legacy, Masu declines the idea of returning to Japan, reminding Tadao: "You have grown up…right here."[37]

The gold watch embodies a familial and spiritual legacy for Tadao, quickly becoming a treasured keepsake. Masu's death shortly after the clash with Tadao—defending his family and farm from raiders—intensifies the artifact's role as a symbol of sacrifice and legacy. According to Josephine Lee, Masu's gold watch "symbolizes the passage of a spiritual legacy from father to son" "as infused with a particular idea of history: a fantasy of connectedness."[38] This legacy extends beyond the family, presenting a broader spiritual and historical significance, as Lee notes. The notions of "the passage" and "connectedness" pertain to a potential history that Asian Americans will shape, challenging racism through Masu's profound attachment to America, underscored by his emphasis on "right here."[39] Stephen H. Sumida similarly

[36] Iko, 135-36.
[37] Iko, 134.
[38] Josephine Lee, *Performing Asian America: Race and Ethnicity on the Contemporary Stage* (Temple University Press, 1997), 148.
[39] Iko, 134.

interprets Masu's rejection of his son's request as the demeanor of someone "who discovered America."[40]

First-wave drama, exploring the challenges of early immigration history, can be characterized as a process of establishing personal and cultural connections with homelands or ancestors. Playwrights bring to life the experiences and emotions of their grandparents or parents in their works. Their playwriting enables Asian American spectators to comprehend the reasons behind previous generations' adoption of a traditional and protective stance toward the younger ones, as well as their efforts in fostering bonds across generations and communities. Specifically, Genny Lim acknowledged her lack of understanding regarding her parents' "traditional, protective, and closed-mouthed" approach to their background until she delved into research on immigration history and Asian American life.[41] Josephine Lee further emphasizes the significance of history plays, highlighting their role as "a site of collective formation," that facilitates intergenerational dialogue and further inspires collective action rooted in a shared historical consciousness.[42]

On the other hand, within the Asian American communities, first-wave plays re-present Asian-American-ness, challenging the misconceptions and misrepresentations formed by Euro-American playwrights since the late nineteenth century. First-wave playwrights depict environments where characters grapple with survival while embracing the desire to become Americans. Leveraging a sense of connectedness and collectivity within historical contexts, playwrights aim to reinforce how the present identity of Asian Americans is shaped in response to the misrepresented imagery of perpetual aliens.

(3) Contemporary Asian American Sensibilities

In contrast to the aforementioned playwrights who illuminate the past of Asian immigrants, Frank Chin shifts the focus to his contemporary young Asian Americans in *The Year of the Dragon* (1974). Chin not only portrays Chinese Americans life but also reflects prevailing sentiments about Asian

---

[40] Stephen H. Sumida, "*Gold Watch* by Momoko Iko" in *A Resource Guide to Asian America Literature*, ed. Sau-ling Cynthia Wong and Stephen H. Sumida. (The Modern Language Association of America, 2001), 216.

[41] Genny Lim, "Paper Angels" in *Unbroken Thread: An Anthology of Plays by Asian American Women*, ed. Roberta Uno (University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 11-12.

[42] Lee, *Performing*, 147.

Americans that markedly differ from those expressed by the previously addressed playwrights. His characters articulate more assertive and derisive emotions, a departure from the grief, uncertainty, and insecurity delivered by Lim's and Iko's characters. The play centers on the domestic conflicts of the Eng family, serving as a representative exploration of the question of Asian American identity. It highlights the "deep generation divides in which second-generation Asian American protagonists are caught between adhering to traditional Asian values and assimilating into American-ness."[43] Moreover, the distinctive character of Pa, the authoritative and self-centered father, exacerbates the generational and cultural clashes within the family. Additionally, the setting of Chinatown heightens the characters' identity crises and confrontations.

Chinatown emerges as a consequence of marginalization and social exclusion. During the early decades of the twentieth century, as legal and social restrictions—such as prohibitions on landownership—intensified for the Chinese, immigrants established ethnic enclaves and thereby led marginal existences. These enclaves, which evolved into ghettos in cities like New York and San Francisco, were marked by negative imagery projected by Euro-American perspectives, portraying the Chinese as "unhealthy, unassimilable, and undesirable."[44] Over time, this negative depiction transformed, as mainstream media began promoting these areas as "a quaint and mysterious section in the city"—places where one could "wander in the midst of the Orient while still in the Occident," thereby fueling the profitability of tourism in Chinatown.[45] Within and around this setting in San Francisco, the domestic and cultural conflicts of the Eng family, along with identity crises, unfold.

Fred, the eldest son in his forties, acutely illustrates an identity crisis. Born in China, he left the country as a baby and was raised in America. The opening of Act One features Fred Eng's soliloquy, which presents an objectified and commodified portrayal of Chinatown and its residents to fulfill the expectations of non-Asian American tourists:

> FRED. We'come a Chinatowng. Folks! Ha. Ha. Ha…Hoppy New Year! Fred Eng, "Freddie" of Eng's Chinatown tour'n'travoo. [. . .] Allaw week Chinee New Year. Ssssshhh Boom! Muchee muchie firey crackee! [. . .] But you're my last tour of the day, folks. And on my last tour of the day. No

[43] Josephine Lee, "Asian American Drama" in *The Cambridge Companion to Asian American Literature*, ed. Crystal Parikh and Daniel Y. Kim (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 91.
[44] Takaki, *Strangers*, 246.
[45] Takaki, 246-47.

> hooey. I like to let me hair down. Drop the phony accent. And be me. Just me. [sic][46]

This scene reflects Fred's ambivalence towards the English language. While he is fluent in English, he deliberately and exaggeratedly adopts "the phony accent," embodying "a few Ah Sins, bland and childlike as Bret Harte's immortal hero."[47] His affected accent, commodified to amuse tourists, heightens his sense of isolation and foreignness—much like Ah Sin entertains the Euro-American audience through feigned incomprehension. To meet customers' expectations of the Orient, Fred narrates a traditional New Year's Day celebration in fake pidgin English, turning it into both an attraction and commodity, alongside Chinatown's culinary and olfactory offerings. Josephine Lee aligns the spectators' gaze with the tourists', both holding the power to reduce the Asian individual to an object of consumerism and voyeurism.[48] Taking a more radical stance, Sau-ling Cynthia Wong views Fred's linguistic strategy as "cultural pornography," catering to tourists' fantasies.[49] Aware of the reality of tourism, Fred cannot resist acting out during work, reverting to his authentic self only after the last tour of the day. His abandonment of the fake pidgin not only illustrates the "explicit reality of tourism" but also mocks the imagery of "the Chinese goof," challenging tourists' and audiences' prejudices.[50]

Fred personifies an intense confrontation seemingly irreconcilable between two worlds, experiencing a profound identity crisis. While his physical appearance denotes his Chinese ethnicity, his innermost self aligns with the identity that he asserts by insisting on "Just me" as an American man raised in American culture. For Fred, Chinatown implies a confinement of familial duties in addition to its broader ethnic and cultural significance. Unwilling to remain in Chinatown or become a tour guide, he aspired to be a professional writer, but his father compelled him to work for the family business before he completed his college education. Although his endeavor

---

[46] Frank Chin. "The Year of the Dragon" in *The Chickencoop Chinaman AND The Year of the Dragon* (University of Washington Press, 2002), 71.
[47] Takaki, 247.
[48] Lee, *Performing*, 27-28.
[49] Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, *Reading Asian American Literature: From Necessity to Extravagance* (Princeton University Press, 1993), 59.
[50] Robert Ji-song Ku, "'Beware of Tourists If Look Chinese' and Other Survival Tactics in the American Theatre: The Asian(cy) of Display in Frank Chin's *The Year of the Dragon*," *The Journal of American Drama and Theatre* 11, no. 2 (1999): 80, ProQuest.