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Dear Professor Mennel:

I am writing to request subvention money for my book, *Campaigns of Knowledge: US Tutelary Colonialism in the Philippines and Occupation Japan*, to be published by Temple University Press in Fall 2019. The book is currently about 125,000 words and has fifteen illustrations. Because of the size of the book, the projected cost is $45 in paperback which will make it too expensive for scholars who want to purchase it and it will also be out of line of academic books in cultural studies which range from $25-$35. With a subvention of $2500 the book could be priced at $39.95; with a subvention of $4,500 it could be priced at $29.95.

I would like to request $1000 from the Center for the Humanities. I plan to use additional funds I have from a Center for the Study of Race Relations course grant ($1000) and supplement it in order to have at least $2500.

I chose to send my manuscript solely to Temple University Press because it has been a forerunner in Asian American studies, starting with Elaine Kim’s pathbreaking *Asian American Literature* (1982) and continuing with works of scholars like E San Juan. My book will be part of the Asian American History and Culture series that was founded in 1991 and that is currently publishing established and new scholars, particularly in the field of transnational Asian American studies to which my book belongs. Many books in the series such as William Wei’s *The Asian American Movement* and Yen Le Espiritu’s *Asian American Panethnicity* are required reading for courses in Asian American studies.

I am including a summary of the book, the signed contract, as well as a letter from the editor explaining the need for subvention. If you need further information, please email me at malini@ufl.edu. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Malini Johar Schueller

Professor, University of Florida Research Faculty, 2017-2020
This book argues that beginning in 1898 the creation of a suitable pedagogical subject through schooling emerged as a central biopolitical technology of U.S. power overseas, one deployed in the colonization of the Philippines and the occupation of Japan (which scholars agree was largely a US occupation). Although temporally separated, in vastly different sociopolitical landscapes, and with disparate agendas, the creation of a new school system in the Philippines and educational reforms in Japan, both with stated goals of democratization, speak to a singular vision of America as savior following a politics of violence with a pedagogy of recovery. Schooling was conceived as a process of subjectification, of creating particular modes of thought, behaviors, and aspirations that would render docile subjects, amenable to American-style colonialism in the Philippines and occupation in Japan.

*Campaigns of Knowledge* uses a contrapuntal method, putting educational documents of the colonial and occupation archive in conversation with native literary and cultural texts that register these subjectifications. U.S. educational policies in the Philippines and Japan were contrasting projects of Orientalist racial management. Filipinos were little brown brothers awaiting uplift and deemed fit for industrial education like African-Americans and Native Americans. The Japanese were victims of cultural excess, needing decivilization and re-education. Major Filipino and Filipino-American, Japanese and Japanese-American writers have offered fictional, cinematic, and autobiographical responses to the tutelary project and its legacies. Representations of the classroom, encounters with American texts, teaching, and the desire for colonial knowledge reveal a complex interplay of assent and coercion while simultaneously challenging discourses of racialization and imperialism that undergird the rhetoric of tutelage.

After an introduction setting up the theoretical basis of the book at the intersection of Asian-American studies, U.S. empire studies, critical race studies, pedagogical theory, and postcolonial studies, chapter one focuses on the Filipino pedagogical subject between 1900 and 1925 as it emerges in statements of educators. The annual reports of directors of education are documents of colonial management including summations, hesitancies, and reflections on teachers’ efforts. The chapter analyzes representations of Filipino “racial character” and formulations of ideal Filipino subjects in the annual reports and H.C. Theobold’s *The Filipino Teacher’s Manual*.

Chapter two examines overlaps and differences between forms of nationalism articulated in early readers for the Philippines compiled by American teachers and the *The Philippine Readers* series authored by Camilo Osias, first Filipino superintendent of schools. It demonstrates how Osias, despite his position within the colonial hierarchy, used the readers to articulate an anti-imperial, independence-now Filipino nationalism through what I call “collaborative dissent.”

Chapter three turns to Filipino fiction to trace how the specter of colonial education haunts the short stories of Edith Tiempo and Gilda Cordero-Fernando who wrote for a Filipino audience. The stories register the legacy of colonial tutelage through their Filipino teachers of English who are “unhomely,” steeped in Anglo-American culture. They register the legacy of the tutelary project ambivalently. Tiempo through her tormented educators estranged from local forms of gender expression, and Cordero-Fernando by eulogizing educators while simultaneously expressing the bankruptcy of neocolonial knowledge.
Chapter four addresses the reworkings of the pedagogical subject by three Filipino-American writers: Carlos Bulosan, Bienvenido Santos, and R. Zamora Linmark. Bulosan and Linmark explore possibilities of “decolonial” thinking, epistemologies offering alternatives to discourses of colonial tutelage. In his folkloric short stories and his fictionalized autobiography *America is in the Heart* (1943) Bulosan posits the community as a space of gendered subaltern resistance to colonial knowledge; Linmark in *Leche* (2011) both poses and questions the possibilities of “unlearning” in a hyper-experiential world where globalization and neocolonialism coexist; Santos dystopically registers in *The Volcano* (1965) the incorporation of colonial knowledge as melancholia, resulting in estrangement from fellow natives.

Chapter five turns to the construction of the Japanese pedagogical subject in educational policy documents, textbooks, and popular manuals produced during occupation. In light of Japanese fascism, a specific Orientalism was marshaled to explain Japanese deviance: Japanese cultural practices inherently lent themselves to totalitarianism. This chapter examines key occupation documents: *Report of the US Educational Mission to Japan* and the required high school history volumes published under the direction of the Supreme Commander for Allied Powers (SCAP). The Japanese were Orientalized as conformist, obsequious, and un inventive but with enough cultural erasure, potential subjects of capitalist democracy.

Chapter six examines how Japanese and Japanese-Americans registered these tutelary imperatives in their fiction and film, reflecting the landscape of postwar devastation and hope, imperial occupation, wariness about Japanese nationalism and forgetting of Japan’s colonial violence. Kojima Nobuo’s story “The American School” (1955), Masahiro Shinoda’s film *MacArthur’s Children* (1984), and Nobuko Albery’s novel *Balloon Top* (1978) upset the unblemished narrative of loving, democratic tutelage by questioning its assumptions about Japanese character while simultaneously distancing themselves from Japanese nationalism; Julie Otsuka’s *When the Emperor Was Divine* (2002) uses intersectional historical memory to link the tutelage of internment camps to occupation.

Chapter seven utilizes ethnographic research of oral histories of Japanese schooled under occupation in light of theorists who argue that memory is social. I suggest that while their memories often meshed with the rhetoric of occupation in critiquing Japanese wartime nationalism they simultaneously expressed cynicism about the “education for democracy” promulgated by SCAP. These messy accounts questioned the occupation goal of molding Americanized subjects and demonstrated an ambivalence toward the tutelary project.

The epilogue sketches US subjectification through education in other sites and addresses the implications of this subjectification today. Pacification through schooling remains a strategy of neoliberal imperialism: NGOs like The Initiative to Educate Afghan Women, institutions like the American University of Iraq, and projects such as Beauty Without Borders help reformulate pedagogical subjects for U.S. occupation.

In interweaving issues of imperialism, race, and biopolitics through an interdisciplinary methodology this work participates in concerns important to humanistic inquiry. By situating Asian-American literary and cultural production within the ambit of US colonial tutelage the book significantly widens the trajectory of Asian-American studies, which has traditionally been nation bound and which, with the exception of Victor Bascara’s *Model-Minority Imperialism*
(2006) and Jodi Kim’s *Ends of Empire* (2010) has not seen empire as central; it also contributes to the nascent field of postcolonial education studies.