

No. 159

**Representations of Asians in the American
Public Imagination : The Problems of
Representation as a Problematic***

Ryan Bishop

Senior Fellow, The American Studies Centre
The National University of Singapore
11 Arts Link
Singapore 117570

Tel: 8744854
E-mail: ascrb@nus.edu.sg

* This paper was presented in a Seminar at the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore on March 15, 2001.

ISSN0129-8186
ISBN 981-3033-53-3
All rights reserved 2001

The *Working Papers Series* is edited by a committee comprising **Maribeth Erb , Selina Chan and Stephen Appold**. This series was established by the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore in 1973, as a forum for staff members, graduate students and visitors to the department to circulate their work in progress. Please refer to the back for a list of all past working papers.

All orders may be directed to:

Chopsons Private Limited
(Book Services Division)
No. 1 Sennett Avenue
Singapore 467013
Tel: 65 4483634
Fax: 65 4481071
e-mail: chopsons@singet.com.sg

Select Books
19 Tanglin Road, #03-15
Tanglin Shopping Centre
Singapore 247909
Tel: 65 732 1515
Fax: 65 736 0855
e-mail: selectbk@cyberway.com.sg

**Representing “Representations of Asians in the American Public Imagination”:
The Problems of Representation as a Problematic**

Ryan Bishop

“No more than philosophy or science, literature is not an institution among others; it is at once institution and counter-institution, placed at a distance from the institution, at the angle that the institution makes with itself in order to take a distance from itself, by itself. And if literature maintains some sort of privilege, it is in part by reason of what it thematizes about the event of writing, and in part because of what, in its political history, links literature to that principle authorization to ‘say everything’ whereby it is related in such a unique fashion to what is called truth, fiction, simulacrum, science, philosophy, law, right, democracy.” – Jacques Derrida

This paper began as an exploration of teaching American literature and culture in Asia. Therefore, the *topoi* of pedagogy (teaching), content (American literature and culture) and context (in Asia) were explicitly in play. My initial approach emphasized context because I wished to provide a comparative analysis of teaching a course about representations of Asians in the American public imagination in two different settings: in a US and in an Asian context. Although I will address this issue, it will be from a somewhat oblique angle. And while a typology of pedagogy, content and context sounds neat and tidy, the categories’ integrity does not hold up well when one looks at it closely. That is, issues of pedagogy almost always entail contextual and content issues. So, I have decided to limit the work of this paper to one particular nexus of concerns that allows me to consider all three categories simultaneously: that is, the problems associated with getting students to understand representation as a problematic, in the standard Foucauldian sense of the term.

The range of representations of Asians in the American public imagination reveals immediately the problematic of representation. From railroad coolies to cunning corporate executives, from enemy-in-our-midst to model minority community, from evil seductress to eroticism incarnate, and from tyrannical despot to last hope in the Cold War “domino” theory, Asians and the nations they come from have figured prominently in American popular culture, national politics, and international policy. As the 1997 Senate committee hearings on campaign financing attest, not to mention the neo-Cold War tribulations afflicted on Chinese-American nuclear scientist Dr. Wen Ho Lee, Asian-Americans remain under suspicion of having loyalties that reside with their “home” nations and cultures in a way few other

ethnic groups do. The course “Representations of Asians in the American Public Imagination” examines the historical experience of Asian-Americans and the many, often contradictory, roles they (and by extension Asians) have played in the collective national psyche and places the given representations within the cultural-historical contexts in which they emerged. In so doing, we explore how these representations have functioned in the nation’s vision of itself; that is, how mainstream national anxieties and desires have manifested themselves in and through the varied representations of Asians and Asian-Americans. These representations of Asians, especially during the 20th century, tell us much more about US national policy and concerns about national identity, however, than they do about the countries, cultures and peoples they portray.

While such a statement might be applicable to a number of “ethnic” or “minority” groups, it is especially so for Asian-Americans because of several specific factors that uniquely mark their position within recent US history. Primary among these is the fact that East and Southeast Asia became sites for American imperialism and the continuation of the doctrine of Manifest Destiny. These interventions led not only to increased immigration from these areas but also to an increased interest in the people and cultures of these regions as they became a springboard for the US to realize its perceived historical project in the 20th century. The US, as a result, was engaged militarily in this part of the globe for nearly a hundred years. Such cannot be said for any other site from which large numbers of immigrants have come (although good cases can be made for Central and South America as having structurally similar interactions with the US).

The fact that both China and Japan emerged early in the 20th century as formidable military, political, and (occasionally) economic rivals in this region, as well as globally, further lends import to the role Asians and Asian cultures have played in the collective American psyche. The promise of vast Asian markets for the consumption of US goods also stimulated engagement with the region. (The Chinese market is something the US has salivated over since the first official trading expedition led by John Greene in 1785 and was used as further legitimization for US intervention in the Philippines in the 1890s.) Additionally, the unique position of Asian-Americans results from their being a significant non-Caucasian immigrant group, and one largely found on the West Coast far from the cultural power centers

on the eastern seaboard. With the concentrated military, economic, and political interest in Asia, this immigrant group has garnered more scrutiny, and suspicion, than any other from the late 19th century to the present. When these factors are combined with the “Orientalism” prevalent in popular culture, as well as in academia and high culture, a potent mix of real and imagined threats and desires accrued around Asian cultures and peoples, and especially these immigrant communities.

Four main issues about representations need to be constantly and consistently reinforced, regardless of pedagogical context; that is, whether taught in the US or Asia.

1) The representations tell us much more about mainstream US national identity concerns than they do about the people or cultures being represented. As Gregory Bateson reminds us, the division of the perceived universe into parts and wholes is a useful, and perhaps necessary, tool for human cognition, but *no necessity determines the division*. That is, we determine which difference constitutes a difference significant enough to make a difference, and this becomes the basis for cultural, diacritical representations.

2) But simply because the representations tell us more about those performing the representations than it does about those being represented, this does not mean that we are necessarily concerned with intentionality and agency because they coalesce too easily with naïve notions of representation, misrepresentation and conspiratorial accusations. Instead, we focus on the event of representations within any given text as an intertextual result of the various discursive, material, social and political concerns of a given cultural-historical milieu.

3) The representations examined by the course are by no means always negative or derogatory; in fact, they are often the opposite. Further, whole sets of representations about the same group usually contain massive inconsistencies and contradictions. (What one often experiences with these representations is a point Virginia Woolf makes about the books on women she finds in the British Museum: that women are generally regarded by male authors as either goddesses or monsters. Often the pattern for representations of alterity reveals the represented as either disproportionately admirable or despicable, beautiful or ugly, cultivated or savage, superhuman or subhuman: rarely ever simply human.)

4) The US is not exceptional in the practice of this representational regime. All cultures engage in representations of other cultures to address their own specific needs, desires, fears, hopes, and concerns while simultaneously constructing visions of themselves through what they believe themselves not to be. But because of the unique global position the US currently occupies, it is important to place its representations under special scrutiny, especially as these representations enter the flow of global popular culture.

To reinforcing these ideas, students can think along the lines of an economics of Representation: who gets to represent whom? Whose representations have currency, count, get circulated, are consumed, and have value? And whose do not? The course is interested in how these representations operate at specific moments and specific ways, but also, by implication, how they shape our daily reality – how representations in general construct our quotidian “common-sense” versions of experience. Or, to put this in other terms, one goal of the course is for students to make the self-reflexive, critical turn for themselves. By rendering what is implicit in specific cultural representations as explicit, they can determine to what extent they wish to be complicit with them.

In both the US and the Asian contexts, however, problems with the teaching of representations as a problematic exist. On one level, students find it difficult to break out of the traditional, positivist view of representation and misrepresentation, and thus they wish to concentrate on the US as the hegemonic misrepresenter of Asians. This *a priori*, that the representation merely and simply represents or distorts whatever is present, operates in both classroom contexts, despite its Aristotelian antecedents. Explicitly examining the operations of Aristotle’s representation can go some way toward clarifying both where their “common-sense” views have come from and why they hold them dear. But gaining any sort of critical distance about *how* representations function in a given culture and what they do within that culture proves difficult -- even when, for example, it is the Aristotelian representation of the processes of representation. And this situation holds despite the fact that students have a fairly clear sense of identity politics and its stakes, or perhaps even because of their working knowledge of identity politics.

At another level, increased information technology literacy allows students now to be quite comfortable with the way images and information shape one’s

perception of the self and others. It also provides marginal comfort with other notions, such as simulacra, useful to accessing the problematic of representation. IT can, and should, aid a more nuanced and sophisticated reading of representations. Having said this, however, it is just barely the case, and more disconcertingly, rarely the case that IT leads to this kind of introspection and critical evaluation. In fact, the problems emergent from the positivist view of representations are often reinforced by IT, where the belief that these are “only images” (or “only representations”) reinscribes its attendant belief in the necessity of getting the “real” representations “right” once one emerges from interactions with cyberselves in cyberspace. All of this to say that two areas familiar to our students today and that should enable critical engagement with representation – i.e., identity politics and cyber-attributes – have largely served to reinforce an unproblematic view of the operation of representations.

To get a sense of how the course attempts to address many of the issues about representation raised earlier, as well as some of the problems just presented, we can turn to the well-trod ground of the many manifestations of “Madame Butterfly.” A useful question to begin with is *why* has this simple and simplistic story of cross-cultural, interracial “love” (for lack of a better term) captured the American public imagination for over 100 years? From Pierre Loti’s 1880s travel fantasy to *Miss Saigon* and the current Geisha craze glutting bookstores? One answer is because it *isn’t* the *same* story; that is, the many variations on the same theme tell us something about the US and its own anxieties and desires at specific moments as revealed in the discourses deployed. Yet another answer is that it *is* the *same* story, one that tells the US a very comfortable and comforting tale about its position in relation to the rest of the world. Both answers begin to shed some light on the problematic of representation while proving pedagogically beneficial at several different levels.

The “Madame Butterfly” trope is productive in the classroom not only because it has been operative from the 1880s until the present, or because of its different variations and what they reveal about the US at given cultural/historical moments, but also because several manifestations of it address explicitly the power of representation and its relation to knowledge. It is important to note here that I am not advocating an either/or approach here, but rather a both/and approach.

Getting at the materials through a close examination of the moment of production provides excellent cultural-historical analytic possibilities. We can, for

example, look at a specific early set of manifestations of the “Madame Butterfly” story and find a densely intertextual, cross-cultural group that reveals many of the tensions in the US about expansionism vs. isolationism in the fin-de-siecle moment. But this textual group also reveals tensions about the nature and verity of representation itself at the same moment. This set begins with Pierre Loti’s popular travelogue about Japan, *Madame Chrysanthemum*, published in 1887, and then shifts to the US prime mover of this tale, John Luther Long’s “Madame Butterfly,” which was serialized in 1898 in *Century Magazine*. Long’s story was dramatized, at his behest, by David Belasco in 1900. Giacomo Puccini attended a London performance of the play, and it became the basis of his opera *Madama Butterfly* in 1902, with a libretto drawing on Loti, Long and Belasco. So Long’s version of Loti’s encounter with a “temporary Japanese wife” had three specific and different avatars in three different media (novella, theater, and opera) in a matter of four years. And the differences between the versions reveal a great deal about the then contemporary US debates regarding expansionism and imperialism. The primary intervening event during the trajectory of Long’s texts is, of course, the Spanish-American (Cuban-Filipino) War.

Before the war essentially ended the debate about the moral, ethical, and material viability of an explicit pursuit of imperial expansion, a number of leading American intellectuals and industrialists spoke in opposition to such inter-nationalist adventures. William James suggested rather colorfully that the US was about to “puke up its heritage” in the pursuit of imperialism. Such caution against US hubris can also be found in the first Long text, the serialized novella. Once we work past all of the Orientalist clichés and reductivist cultural pronouncements, we find a Pinkerton with little to recommend him and who comes in for more than a modicum of authorial rebuke, especially with regard to his cavalier and caddish treatment of Cho-Cho San. If the relationship is read as a metonym of sorts for US-Other interaction in a semi-imperial setting, then we have a cautionary tale about unintended consequences, about how arrogance and ignorance destroy innocence. While this is all still wildly condescending, there is no delusion about US agency, culpability, and exploitation in these matters. These are the very qualities, of course, that are elided once the story takes the relationship into the realm of romantic love, as the play and opera do. In a very short time, then, we witness in the various Long texts a move away from overt criticism of US engagement in imperialistic actions – a criticism that reflects the

debates of the contemporary moment – to an erasure of such national and individual doubts through the insertion of romantic love, much as the Spanish-American War essentially quelled debates about the US role on the global stage.

More usefully, however, many of these early “Madame Butterfly” manifestations provide extended examination of representations and how they do or do not work. By concentrating on this preoccupation in the texts themselves, the course can inductively access the problematic of representation. Pierre Loti’s travelogue proves especially fecund in this regard. On first meeting his fiancée, he claims “Heavens! Why, I know her already! Long before ever setting foot in Japan, I had met with her, on every fan, on every teacup.” (56) Later when he wonders whether or not this particular Oriental woman can “actually think,” Loti asks, “Is it a woman or a doll?” (64) – reversing the direction of the representation by moving from the corporeal to the porcelain. This movement reveals the extent to which representation and the world interpenetrate and infuse one another in Loti’s text, in spite of his efforts to keep them separate.

In fact, Loti himself is a painter, and claims that he can “draw from nature,” (298) by which he means in a 19th century form of European realism. Because he has been able to “master . . . a few notions of perspective” and can draw objects as he “sees them, without giving them distorted and grimacing attitudes,” Loti claims to amaze his Japanese subjects by “the air of *reality*” he can put in his sketches. (298) Although Loti contrasts his form of representation with the stylized, “faulty” images produced by Japanese art, his rhetoric undermines the stability of these oppositional categories, for it is this same stylized and distorted Japanese artistic production that has allowed him to “know” his bride before he even meets her, a point he often invokes.

The ground beneath Loti’s representational feet begins to pitch and buck, causing him to grow increasingly insecure in his knowledge of his rented wife, himself and the world. Even his “realistic” drawings are imbued with a cultural bias, as he finds they portray a “French look” to his Japanese subjects. The ennui that permeates the final portions of the text, in fact, centers on the excess of meaning generated by the continuum of representations he has encountered, and the book becomes an extended meditation on the ramifications of the instability of representation. Both paint and prose fail him in his endeavors to capture “the extreme

antiquity” and “the perfect cleanliness” (300) of his setting. In despair, he claims, “No, all of this cannot be expressed, but remains undemonstrable, undefinable.” (300) In a final act of visual representation and remembrance, Loti wishes “to carry away” with him “an ornament, a specimen of the Japanese tattooers, who have a delicacy of finish which is unequalled.” (325) Both the corpus of the text and the corpus of the author, then, carry traces and marks revealing the problematic of representation.

Long’s 1898 novella similarly engages in some mimetic reflection and oddities. He spends an inordinate amount of textual space rendering the ways Cho-Cho San butchers English, and in the process makes the rural Japanese woman speak a dialect that sounds peculiarly like the representations of “Black speech” deployed in 19th century minstrel shows – perhaps the most complex and bizarre set of interracial representations in US history. Cho-Cho San sings a song Pinkerton taught her that is a variation of the nursery rhyme “Rock-a-by baby,” which in her mutilated version goes: “Rog-a-by, bebbby, off in Japan/ You jus’ a picture off of a fan.” (20) The representational density increases as it becomes more of a closed circuit, for the chirographic representation of speech contains referents from Loti, in which Cho-Cho San identifies herself in an infantilized and vaudevillian manner as “just a picture off of a fan.” But consider the distance our petite heroine travels with regard to her linguistic skills in just a few years, when this female Japanese version of Step’n Fetch turns into the full-throated Italian warbler of Puccini’s arias, from a libretto penned with Long’s assistance. How and why do such dramatic changes in the character and her language occur? What might they tell us about their moments of production and initial reception? What might they tell us about the amazing elasticity of the representation of language invoked by Long? What do they tell us about the protean, shape-shifting nature of representations?

Some sixty years after Puccini’s opera hit the stage, it entered cinema, once again, as a film about the making of a film version of the opera in the 1962 Hollywood production, *My Geisha*. Because this is a film about the making of a film, it is overtly concerned with cinematic mimesis, the authenticity of representation and the maintenance of the tradition of “high” culture. The director of the film within the film, in fact, wishes to make an “authentic” version of Puccini’s *Madama Butterfly*, and to do so he wants to use “real” Japanese settings, “real” Japanese actors, and an untrained “geisha” to play an “authentic” Cho-cho San. The director in the film explains, “I’m

going to use a *real* Japanese girl. That's the kind of picture it's going to be: real." Before we delve into some of the issues surrounding representation embedded in the movie's premise of a Hollywood film presenting an authentic version of an Italian opera based on an American novella, itself based on a French travelogue, and which seeks this authenticity not in Italy or the US or France but in the site where the texts are *set*, we can turn to some other approaches to the film in this course.

Gina Marchetti (176-201) usefully reads *My Geisha* in terms of women's issues in so far as Japanese women are portrayed as embodying a feminine ideal that the US has supposedly lost. Given the context of the moment of production, Marchetti's take works very well indeed. The late 1950s, early 1960s found the status and stability of the very recently constructed "nuclear family" threatened by the perceived autonomy of women. Simone de Beauvoir's pioneering book *The Second Sex* was translated into English in 1953; Helen Gurley Brown's *Sex and the Single Girl* appeared in 1962, and Gloria Steinem established *Ms. Magazine* in the early '60s. These publications, among many other such markers, signaled to mainstream US culture a shift in the relative position and power of women, and Hollywood, ever conservative despite its liberal reputation, responded with several films about the genteel and submissive nature of Japanese women.

Although Marchetti tends to concentrate on the contrasts between Japanese and US women in *My Geisha*, placing the film in the larger context of contrasting Japanese and US cultures as a whole also proves useful. The film's representations cut in a number of different ways and work on many levels at once. Because the 1949 revolution in China changed dramatically the post World War II, emergent Cold War political landscape in Asia as far as US policy was concerned, US audiences were presented with a stream of films that completely subverted the propagandistic onslaught they experienced during the war, which vilified the Japanese and made heroic the Chinese. The 1950s, therefore, found Hollywood films engaged in the rehabilitation of Japan and Japanese culture on a grand scale, and *My Geisha* easily and productively fits this mold. Within a mere ten years or so, in US cinematic representations, the Japanese went from having a culture that almost demanded extinction to one that could be productively emulated. By examining the representations of women as indicative of US anxieties about female autonomy at

home, students can readily move to reading the representations of Japanese culture writ large as indicative of US anxieties about political ideology and power abroad.

But if we add the constant concern the film displays about the nature of representation to the mix, we see again how fully fused pedagogy, content and context are. Because it is a film about filmmaking and the desire to simultaneously create an “authentic” version of Puccini’s opera while documenting a culture disappearing under the influence of US occupation forces and global presence, *My Geisha* returns again and again to representation and knowledge formation. One of the major themes and concerns of this film is “authenticity,” which assumes a stable reality that the representation seeks to reproduce faithfully. The crux of the movie concentrates on gender and race as emergent from nature and reality but largely manifested as performative and cultural products that can and do belie inherent natural qualities. This slippage provides a useful wedge into the problematic of representation as a problematic.

But the organization and articulation of Hollywood films as supposedly “just entertainment” makes it difficult for students to see the slippage and, therefore, the problematic. Despite the classroom situation and context, students still suspend their disbelief enough to become invested in *My Geisha* and moved by it. Why? Potential answers drive straight to the heart of the problems of representation delineated earlier. Is the most useful answer simply the seamless blend of ideology and entertainment? In both the Asian and the US contexts, I often propose the theorem that the higher the entertainment quotient, the higher the ideology quotient – or rather, the higher the *intended* entertainment quotient, the higher the ideology quotient. Interestingly enough, however, students are not similarly bound up with the narrative of the Rodgers and Hammerstein musical *Flower Drum Song* or *Charlie Chan in the Secret Service*, for example, which provide enough entertainment distance from the representations for students to more readily read them in critical terms. That is, these other films have enough distance from the contemporary manifestations of classic Hollywood narrative that still mark cinema today that these films do not meet students’ expectations of what they believe entertainment to be. The entertainment-ideology ratio seems more productive in my Singaporean context, however, than in the US because reading against the grain of a text is a rather novel experience for Singaporean students. Being told that the textual intent is not necessarily of primary

import, and that the unintentional is just as vital, offers many Singaporean students some issues and challenges they seem to relish. But if students can begin to think along those lines, then the problematic of representation as a problematic becomes less difficult to recognize.

Because information technologies operate in much the same cultural and intellectual space for students that entertainment does, IT provides similar promise and pitfalls in accessing this problematic. To make it easier for students to read cultural productions for unintended content, we can find some specific IT examples that function in oddly productive ways. I am thinking here specifically of Lili™ Version 1.2, the computer-generated Video Jockey on MTV who is presented as “powered by Ericsson,” the telecommunications company. Because she is on MTV and flogs the cellular phones of her creator (phones, which by the way, carry her image on them), Lili is simultaneously an IT and entertainment product *and* advertisement. Her webpage describes her as a “svelte cyber VJ,” who is “hip . . . sexy, Asian and single.” Her “mission in life,” as webpages tend to sound increasingly like a parody of the Miss America contest, is “to be the voice of Asia’s youth.” To aid her in this virtuoso ventriloquist act, Lili has been programmed to speak Mandarin, Hindi and English, depending on the market she is addressing, or perhaps speaking for.

Reading Lili’s various subject and object positions reveals the problematic of representation quite clearly. For the more immediate concerns of this course, Lili embodies the genetic transmogrification of race wrought by Japanese *manga* and *anime*, through which doe-eyed, small-nosed, angular-jaw-lined, and Barbie-doll-figured females are widely read as a representation of the ideal Japanese female. So, Lili does double duty in Asia, as both a J-pop object of desire *and* Euro-pop object of the same. But, as is often the case with pop culture, she simply reinscribes the male projection of the Japanese female as an object of desire, the same one we see in Cho-Cho San. How Lili™ Version 1.2 came into being resembles how Cho-Cho San came into existence. Vestiges of Madame Butterfly reside in Lili™ Version 1.2 because she is the product of similar synchronic and diachronic processes of projection and fetishization. These are the processes of perceived, or assumed, corporeal and cultural traits that coalesce in Madame Butterfly’s various manifestations. These

processes reside at the heart of representation as a problematic: that is, how representations function not simply as reflections of reality but as constitutive of it.

A closing anecdote neatly illustrates this point. I was discussing cyber-Lili with my tutor for this course, a Cambridge-trained Singaporean male reared on J-pop culture. When I mentioned that the characters in Japanese *anime* sport exaggerated Caucasian features that have become “Japanese” solely through representation, repetition, commodification, and circulation, he was more than slightly taken aback. His shock of recognition was not so much the mistake of confusing the representation with the thing itself, or the map for the territory, but rather a realization that we cannot know either the map or the territory without one another. His insight into how representation operates was the giddy flight from the tyranny of the copula (how things *are*) to the brief reprieve of the modal (that things *could* have been, and *can* be, otherwise). In this one moment, the perils and promise of the problematic of representation *as problematic* manifested themselves. In the classroom, one prays for such moments and naively prepares for them.

REFERENCES

Bateson, Gregory

1979 *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. Toronto and New York: Bantam Books.

Derrida, Jacques. *Points . . . Interviews*

1974-1994 Elisabeth Weber (ed.). Stanford, California: Stanford UP.

Long, John Luther

1969 (1898) "Madame Butterfly." New York: Garrett Press.

Loti, Pierre.

1915 (1887) *Madame Chrysanthemum*, Laura Ensor (trans.). London and Boston: KPI.

Marchetti.

1993 Gina. *Romance and the "Yellow Peril."* Berkeley: U of California P.

Jack Cardiff

1962 *My Geisha*. Producer. www.mtvasia.com/TV/Show/VJLili/index.html

Department of Sociology
Working Papers Series

1. Riaz Hassan and Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Ethnic Outmarriage Rates in Singapore: The Influence of Traditional Socio-Cultural Organisation"*, 1972, 26pp.
2. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"Urban Involution: The Social Structure of Southeast Asian Towns"*, 1972, 19pp.
3. Erik Cohen, *"Social Ecology -- A Multidimensional Approach"*, 1972, 97pp.
4. Noeleen Heyzer and Wee Gek Sim, *"Trade Union Leaders in Singapore"*, 1972, 92pp.
5. Peter S.J. Chen, *"The Political Course of Singapore"*, (in English and Chinese), 1972, 23pp.
6. Chan Heng Chee and Hans-Dieter Evers, *"National Identity and Nation Building in S.E. Asia"*, 1972, 29pp.
7. Peter Weldon, *"Indonesian and Chinese Status Differences in Urban Java"*, 1972, 41pp.
8. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Austroasiatic Subgroupings and Prehistory in the Malay Peninsula"*, 1972, 63pp.
9. Aline Wong, *"Job Satisfaction among Higher Non-Expatriate Civil Servants in Hong Kong"*, 1972, 64pp.
10. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Modernisation in Singapore: Changing Values and the Individual"*, 1972, 16pp.
11. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"An Outline of Temiar Grammar"*, 1972, 41pp.
12. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Social Stratification in Singapore"*, 1973, 99pp.
13. Peter D. Weldon, John S. Western and Tan Tsu Haung, *"Housing and Satisfaction with Environment in Singapore"*, 1973, 30pp.
14. Mochtar Naim, *"Penghulu di Minangkabau (Penghulu as Traditional Elite in Minangkabau)"*, 1973, 31pp.
15. Michael A.H. Walter, *"A Comparative Examination of Systems of Kinship and Marriage in Fiji"*, 1973, 41pp.
16. Hans Dieter-Evers and Daniel Regan, *"Specialisation and Involvement: The Modernising Role of Doctors in Malaysia and Indonesia"*, 1973, 33pp.
17. Myrna L. Blake, *"Kampong Eurasians in Singapore"*, 1973, 45pp.
18. Mak Lau Fong, *"The Forgotten and the Rejected Community -- A Sociological Study of Chinese Secret Societies in Singapore and West Malaysia"*, 1973, 150pp.
19. Erik Cohen, *"Southeast Asian Urban Sociology -- A Review and a Selected Bibliography"*, 1973, 53pp.
20. Thelma Kay, *"Group Cohesion and Productivity among Dockworkers -- A Study of Stevedores in Singapore"*, 1973, 28pp.
21. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"Industrialisation and the Family Type: An Overview"*, 1974, 45pp.
22. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"Changing Patterns of Minangkabau Urban Landownership"*, 1974, 45pp.
23. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Social and Psychological Aspects of Fertility: Findings from Family Planning Research in Singapore"*, 1974, 27pp.
24. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"The Role of Professionals in Social and Political Change"*, 1974, 28pp.
25. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Prehistory and Ethnology in Southeast Asia: Some New Ideas"*, 1974, 2pp.
26. Mochtar Naim, *"Voluntary Migration in Indonesia"*, 1974, 41pp.
27. Lawrence Babb, *"Walking on Flowers in Singapore -- A Hindu Festival C: in Aram Yengoyan and Alton L. Cycle"*, 1974, 46pp.
28. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Indigenous Religious Systems of the Malay Peninsula"*, 1974, 27pp.
29. Aline K. Wong, *"Women as a Minority Group in Singapore"*, 1974,
30. Michael A.H.B. Walter, *"Co-operation in East Fiji: A New Traditionalism?"*, 1974, 30pp.
31. Aline K. Wong, *"The Continuous Family Revolution in China -- Ideology and Changing Family Patterns"*, 1974, 28pp.
32. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Riaz Hassan, *"Some Social Concomitants of Interethnic Marriage in Singapore"*, 1974, 28pp.
33. Riaz Hassan, *"Symptoms and Syndromes of the Developmental Process in Singapore"*, 1974, 11pp.
34. Hans-Dieter Evers and Riaz Hassan, *"Studies on Social Stratification in Southeast Asia"*, 1974, 141pp.
35. Pang Eng Fong and Thelma Kay, *"Change and Continuity in Singapore's Industrial Relations System"*, 1974, 27pp.

36. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"Field Theory as a Conceptual Framework for Divorce Study"*, 1974, 25pp.
37. Riaz Hassan, *"International Tourism and Intercultural Communication: The Case of Japanese Tourists in Singapore"*, 1974, 23pp.
38. Riaz Hassan, *"Towards a Dialectic Anthropology -- A Comment on Professor M. Freedman's Paper, Social and Cultural Anthropology"*, 1974, 7pp.
39. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"Urbanisation and Urban Conflict in Southeast Asia"*, 1974, 16pp.
40. Michael A.H.B. Walter, *"The Gardening Game"*, 1975, 15pp.
41. Frederic C. Deyo, *"Organisation and Its Socio-Cultural Setting: A Case Study of Structural Compensation in an Atomistic Society"*, 1975, 31pp.
42. Mak Lau Fong, *"Chinese Secret Societies in Ipoh Town, 1945-1969"*, 1975, 17pp.
43. Vivienne Wee, *"A Preliminary Account of 'Buddhism' in Singapore"*, 1975, 56pp.
44. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"The Cultural Logic of Singapore's 'Multiracialism'"*, 1975, 34pp.
45. Eckehard Kulke, *"Social Class and Primordial Loyalty in Rural India -- An Approach to the Study of Indian Untouchables"*, 1975, 31pp.
46. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Elites and National Development in Singapore"*, 1975, 15pp.
47. Riaz Hassan, *"Social and Psychological Implications of High Population Density"*, 1975, 30pp.
48. Rory Fonseca, *"Planning and Land-use in Singapore"*, 1975, 26pp.
49. Lawrence A. Babb, *"Thaipusam in Singapore: Religious Individualism in a Hierarchical Culture"*, 1976, 19pp.
50. Rory Fonseca, *"Growth, Transition and the Urban Environment; A Reference Frame for Singapore"*, 1976, 19pp.
51. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Asian Values in Modernising Society: A Sociological Perspective"*, 1976, 17pp.
52. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"A Sociolinguistic Profile of Singapore"*, 1976, 20pp.
53. Michael A.H.B. Walter, *"On Transitional Society"*, 1976, 20pp.
54. Frederic C. Deyo, *"Marital Status, Job Orientation and Work Commitment among Semi-Skilled Female Workers in Singapore"*, 1976, 20pp.
55. Frederic C. Deyo, *"Decision-Making and Supervisory Authority in Cross-Cultural erspective: An Exploratory Study of Chinese and Western Management Practices in Singapore"*, 1976, 24pp.
56. John R. Clammer, *"Sociological Approaches to the Study of Language and Literacy in Southeast Asia"*, 1976, 28pp.
57. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Ecological Distribution of Social Pathology in Singapore"*, 1977, 28pp.
58. Aline K. Wong, *"The Value of Children and the Household Economy -- A Review of urrent VOC Studies in the Developing World"*, 1977, 24pp.
59. Chiew Seen Kong, *"Educational and Occupational Attainment of Singapore's Chinese Women and Men"*, 1977, 24pp.
60. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Population Policy and Social Science Research on Population in Singapore"*, 1977, 28pp.
61. Michael A.H.B. Walter and Riaz Hassan, *"An Island Community in Singapore: A Characterisation of a Marginal Society"*, 1977, 44pp.
62. Stella R. Quah, *"The Unplanned Dimensions of Health Care in Singapore: Traditional Healers and Self-Medication"*, 1977, 22pp.
63. John R. Clammer, *"Islam and Capitalism in Southeast Asia"*, 1978, 22pp.
64. Robert G. Cooper, *"Second World First: The Study of Films and the Use of Film in Social Studies"*, 1978, 20pp.
65. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Ethnicity and Fertility: The Case of Singapore"*, 1978, 25pp.
66. Rolf E. Vente, *"Urban Planning and High-Density Living. Some Reflections on their Interrelationship"*, 1979, 13pp.
67. William S.W. Lim, *"A Case for Low-Rise High-Density Living in Singapore"*, 1979, 13pp.
68. Mak Lau Fong, *"Subcommunal Participation and Leadership Cohesiveness of the Chinese in 19th Century Singapore"*, 1984, 23pp.
69. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Huey Tsyh Chen, *"Towards an Information Society: Changing Occupational Structure in Singapore"*, 1985, 29pp.
70. Ko Yiu Chung, *"Industrial Workers and Class Formation: A Study of Chinese Industrial Workers in North China, 1900-1937"*, 1986, 31pp.
71. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Between Isthmus and Islands: Reflection on Malayan Palaeo-Sociology"*, 1986, 43pp.
72. Habibul H. Khondker, *"Is There a Dependency Paradigm?"*, 1986, 55pp.

73. Mak Lau Fong, *"The Locality and Non-Locality Organising Principles: A Technical Report on the Taxonomy of Chinese Voluntary Associations in the 19th Century Straits Settlements"*, 1986, 33pp.
74. Chua Beng Huat, *"Reading Foucault as a Conservative"*, 1986, 40pp.
75. Vivienne Wee, *"Material Dependence and Symbolic Independence: Constructions of Melayu Ethnicity in Island Riau, Indonesia"*, 1986, 46pp.
76. Habibul Haque Khondker, *"Famine Response: The 1984-85 Ethiopian Famine"*, 1986, 38pp.
77. Allen J. Chun, *"Conceptions of Kinship and Kingship in Classical Chou China"*, 1986, 50pp.
78. V. Selvaratnam, *"Ethnicity, Inequality and Higher Education in Peninsular Malaysia: The Sociological Implications"*, 1987, 44pp.
79. Trevor O Ling, *"Buddhism, Confucianism and the Secular State in Singapore"*, 1987, 42pp.
80. Mak Lau Fong, *"The Social Alignment Patterns of the Chinese in 19th-century Penang"*, 1987, 32pp.
81. Allen J. Chun, *"Durkheim Reconsidered: A Critique of Primitive Structuralism"*, 1987, 30pp.
82. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Process and Structure in Temiar Social Organization"*, 1987, 46pp.
83. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"Confucianism and the Chinese Family in Singapore: Continuities and Changes"*, 1987, 32pp.
84. Tatsuko Takizawa, *"Facets of Musical Activities in Singapore"*, 1987, 35pp.
85. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Notes on the Deep Sociology of Religion"*, 1987, 37pp.
86. Habibul Haque Khondker, *"The World According to Wallerstein"*, 1987, 48pp.
87. Mak Lau Fong, *"Solidarity Models: A Sociological Framework For Comparative Criminal Organization"*, 1988, 29pp.
88. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Grammar and Polity: The Cultural and Political Background to Standard Malay"*, 1988, 51pp.
89. Viswanathan Selvaratnam, *"Limits to Vocationally-Oriented Education in the Third World"*, 1988, 36pp.
90. Vivienne Wee, *What does 'Chinese' mean?: an exploratory essay*, 1988, 41pp.
91. Geoffrey Benjamin, *The unseen presence: a theory of the nation-state and its mystifications*, 1988, 55pp.
92. Tong Chee Kiong, *Perceptions and boundaries: problematics in the assimilation of the Chinese in Thailand*, 1988, 30pp.
93. Alan J Chun, *Toward a political economy of the sojourning experience: the Chinese in 19th century Malaya*, 1988, 39pp.
94. Chua Beng Huat, *Public housing policies compared: US, Socialist countries and Singapore*, 1988, 41pp.
95. Eddie C. Y. Kuo and Bjorn H. Jernudd, *Language management in a multilingual state: the case of planning in Singapore*, 1988, 45pp.
96. Ho Kong Chong, *The community study: a discussion of the method with modifications for research in Singapore*, 1988, 44pp.
97. Tan Ern Ser, *Employing organizations and the dynamics of social mobility in Singapore: an analytical framework and empirical analysis*, 1988, 43pp.
98. Mak Lau Fong, *Singapore Chinese traditional voluntary associations: convergence vs divergence*, 1989, 36pp.
99. Tong Chee Kiong, *Centripetal authority, differentiated networks: the social organization of Chinese firms in Singapore*, 1989, 36pp.
100. Chan Kwok Bun and Ho Kong Chong (eds), *Explorations in Asian sociology. 100th special issue*, Singapore: Chopmen Publishers 1991, 54pp.
101. Eddie C. Y. Kuo, *Ethnicity, polity and economy: a case study of Mandarin trade and the Chinese connection*, 1990, 36pp.
102. Chua Beng Huat, *Fashion shopping: programs, stages and audience*, 1990, 29pp.
103. Georg Stauth, *Revolution in spiritless times: an essay on the inquiries of Michel Foucault on the Iranian Revolution*, 1991, 54pp.
104. Chua Beng Huat & Eddie C. Y. Kuo, *The making of a new nation: cultural construction and national identity in Singapore*, 1991, 43pp.
105. Alfred Choi, *Policing domestic disturbances: a research review of police response*, 1991, 40pp.

106. Vineeta Sinha, *Some notes on 'temple'-building and image-worship in Indian religion, in historical perspective*, 1991, 50pp.
107. Ho Kong Chong, *Studying the city in the new international division of labour*, 1991, 43pp.
108. Georg Stauth, *Critical theory and pre-Fascist social thought*, 1991, 35pp.
109. Zhang Xin-Xiang, *A methodological critique of Marx's theory of surplus value*, 1991, 37pp.
110. Lee Siew Peng, *Class and noise tolerance: some ruminations*, 1991, 39pp.
111. Paulin Tay Straughan, *Screening for early detection of cervical cancer: the relationship between social integration and preventive health*, 1992, 34pp.
112. Lian Kwen Fee, *Stratification in Maori society in the 19th century*, 1992, 40pp.
113. Eddie C. Y. Kuo, *Confucianism as political discourse in Singapore: the case of an incomplete revitalization movement*, 1992, 29pp.
114. Syed Farid Alatas, *Some problems of indigenization*, 1992, 46pp.
115. Zhang Xin-Xiang, *Crime and control: a neo-rational choice approach*, 1993, 43pp.
116. Tan Ern Ser, *Theorising the dynamics of industrial relations and trade unionism: lessons from the Singapore case*, 1993, 31pp.
117. Roxana Waterson, *What to celebrate in the United Nations Year of Indigenous Peoples?*, 1993, 55pp.
118. Zhang Xin Xiang, *Education as a vehicle for social stratificational change: the case of Singapore*, 1993, 38pp.
119. James V. Jesudason, *Statist democracy and the limits of civil society in Malaysia*, 1993, 40pp.
120. Filomeno V. Aguilar Jr, *Nouns that sail through history: reified categories and their transcendence in Marx's social theory*, 1994, 50pp.
121. Syed Farid Alatas, *Post-colonial state: dual functions in the public sphere*, 1994, 45pp.
122. Chua Beng Huat, *That imagined space: nostalgia for the kampung in Singapore*, 1994, 39pp.
123. Habibul H Khondker, *Globalization theory: a critical appraisal*, 1994, 42pp.
124. Kwok Kian Woon, *Social transformation and the problem of social coherence: Chinese Singaporeans at century's end*, 1994, 39pp.
125. Chua Beng Huat, *Culture, multiracialism and national identity in Singapore*, 1995, 36pp.
126. Nirmala Purushotam, *Disciplining differences: 'race' in Singapore*, 1995, 33pp.
127. Chua Beng Huat and Tan Joo Ean, *Singapore: new configuration of a socially stratified culture*, 1995, 40pp.
128. Paulin Tay Straughan and Tan Ern Ser, *Shiftwork, job satisfaction, and turnover propensity: nurses in a Singapore hospital*, 1996, 26pp.
129. Habibul Haque Khondker, *Competing paradigms and conflicting theories in the studies of the development of Asian NICS*, 1996, 37pp.
130. Geoffrey Benjamin, *Rationalisation and re-enchantment in Malaysia: Temiar religion 1964-1995*, 1996, 52pp.
131. Selina Ching Chan, *Negotiating and tradition: the identity of indigenous inhabitants in Hong Kong*, 1996, 43pp.
132. Geoffrey Benjamin, *Affixes, Austronesian and iconicity in Malay*, 1997, 31 pp.
133. Chua Beng Huat and Ananda Rahah, *Hybridity, Ethnicity and Food in Singapore*, 1997, 24 pp.
134. Kay Mohlman, *Home-base Workplaces and Workplace Domesticities: A Socio-Spatial Analysis*, 1998, 28pp.
135. Paulin Tay Straughan, *The Social Contradictions of the Normal Family: Challenges to the Ideology*, 1999, 18pp.
136. Vineeta Sinha, *Colonial Encounters: Transplanting "Western Medicine"; Ousting "Traditional" Healing?* 1999, 42pp.
137. Tong Chee Kiong and Lian Kwen Fee, *The Nationstate and the Limits to Globalization in Southeast Asia*, 1999, 30pp.
138. Chia Hwee Kim Karen, *Experiencing Sacred Spaces: The Negotiation of Authenticity by Tourists and Worshippers*, 1999, 45pp.
139. Leong Wai Teng, *Consuming the Nation: National Day Parades in Singapore*, 1999, 16pp.
140. Maribeth Erb, *What is a Tourist?: Tourists and Other Spirits in the Manggaraian World*, 1999, 28pp.
141. Syed Farid Alatas and Vineeta Sinha, *Teaching Classical Sociological Theory in Singapore: The Context of Eurocentrism*, 1999, 34pp.
142. Thomas Menkhoff and Jochen Wirtz, *Local Responses to Globalisation-The Case of Singapore*, 1999, 34pp.
143. Johannes Han-Yin Chang, *China: An Unintended Transformation of Class Stratification*, 1999, 32pp.

144. Srilata Ravi, *"Antivoyages-Reflections on women travellers' writings"*, 1999, 18pp
145. Goh Pei Siong Daniel, *Space, Meaning and A "Neighborhood" Charismatic Fundamentalist Church*, 1999, 30pp
146. Ng Tang Nah, *The Effects of Science Education on National Economic Growth in The World and Singapore*, 1999, 21pp
147. Md.Mizanur Rahman, *The Asian Economic Crisis and Migrant Workers: The Case of Bangladeshi Workers in Singapore*, 1999, 33pp
148. Vineeta Sinha, *Socio-Cultural Theory and Colonial Encounters: The Discourse on Indigenizing Anthropology in India*, 2000, 38pp
149. Chua Beng Huat, *Taiwan's Present/Singapore's Past Mediated by Hokkien Language*, 2000, 19pp
150. Michael Hill, *'Asian Values' as Reverse Orientalism: The case of Singapore*, 2000, 34pp.
151. Hans-Dieter Evers, *Epistemic Cultures: Towards a New Sociology on Knowledge*, 2000, 16pp.
152. Roxana Waterson, *A Toraja Pilgrimage: The Life of Fritz Basiang*, 2000, 46pp.
153. Tan Ern Ser, *Globalization and National Industrial Relations Systems: Theoretical Implications from the Singapore Case*, 2000, 12pp.
154. Thomas Menkhoff and Lena Kay. *Worlds Apart? Reflections On The Relationship Between Small Entrepreneurs And External Change Advocates In Singapore*, 2000, 22pp.
155. Michael Bourdillon. *Children's Right and Children's Labour*, 2000, 22pp.
156. Yasser Mattar. *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Towards an Ecological Perspective*, 2000, 30pp.
157. Alwyn Lim. *'Intelligent Island Discipline: Notes on Culture, Governance, And Subjectivity'*, 2000, 50pp.
158. Woon-Ping Chin. *'The Mystery Of The Postcolonial Woman'*, 2001, 20pp.
159. Ryan Bishop. *Respresentations of Asians in the American Public Imagination: The Problems of Representation as a Problematic*. 2001, 20pp.