CONVIVIAL VIOLENCE: CONTEMPORARY TRANSNATIONAL LITERATURE OF CARE AND SOCIAL CONTROL

A Dissertation

by

SEUL LEE

Submitted to the Graduate and Professional School of

Texas A&M University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Marian Eide
Committee Members,	Mary Ann O'Farrell
	Vanita Reddy
	Kristan Poirot
Head of Department,	Maura Ives

August 2021

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Conviviality, a term usually connoting cheerfulness, has become an explanatory term that returns to its etymological roots, "living together," that refers to an extant multicultural and diverse coexistence. Focusing on the human capacity to manage living with difference, everyday interactions are central to an analytic and thematic concept of conviviality. Because conviviality is an inherently optimistic term, the inequities latent in the pursuit of conviviality have been significantly under-investigated. This project turns to feminist care ethics, critical race and queer theories, and postcolonial and transnational studies to understand how the valuation of relationships and care required by convivial living can be violent to certain subjects. Hence, *Convivial Violence* explores the violent intersection of conviviality and care in contemporary transnational literature.

This study proposes the concept of "convivial violence" to describe the naturalized ethical expectation to maintain individual and social relations in the form of care. The social practices of care, from mundane care labor to cosmopolitan coexistence, can be violent in their effects: not in the obvious modes of war or crime, but in the invisible modes of injustice and inequity, which can themselves have equally deleterious impacts. This project treats with nuance the conditions of convivial violence in which minoritized subjects (i.e., women, migrants, and queer subjects) cannot articulate feelings of injustice. The works produced by Kazuo Ishiguro, Han Kang, Ruth Ozeki,

Deann Borshay Liem, Tomer Heymann, Arundhati Roy, Michael Ondaatje, and Mohsin Hamid present the vast differences of Asian transnational experience, cohering around accommodating the expectation projected onto Asians and their labor in the service of cohabitation. These authors present the costs of care, shifting our attention from the expectation of convivial labor to the violations it imposes on care workers in various roles. Collectively, addressing the concept of convivial violence sheds light on the tensions and differences necessary to create that normality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been completed without the guidance and support of my committee chair, Dr. Marian Eide, whose care encouraged and sustained me throughout the arduous processes of writing. Dr. Eide's faith in my project dispels my insecurity and affirms my confidence in my intellectual capacity. I also thank my committee members, Dr. Mary Ann O'Farrell, Dr. Vanita Reddy, and Dr. Kristan Poirot for their support. Dr. O'Farrell's ideas are always splendid, imbuing me with fresh inspirations. Dr. Reddy motivates me to scrutinize intimacies as well as to be more meticulous in defining ideas. Dr. Poirot's critical eye strengthens my dissertation. I am grateful to have had these wonderful teachers during my Ph.D. years at TAMU.

My gratitude to Dr. Jong Sung Park, Dr. Eun Kyung Park, and Dr. Gil Young Oh, all of whom led me to pursue higher education and taught me the joy of studying literature during my undergraduate and master's degree years.

My Lit Lab friends at Texas A&M University are great supporters. I especially thank Kimberly Clough and Kyung Lin Bae—my brilliant best friends. I also thank Gisele Cardoso de Lemos, whose insight contributed to analyzing the characters in Arundhati Roy's novel. In addition, TAMU Writing Center consultant Tiffany supported me to keep me punctual in my writing; my dissertation could not have been completed without her.

Special thanks to the film director Deann Borshay Liem, whose generosity enabled me to complete my chapter on Korean adoption.

Finally, I could not finish my doctoral degree without love of my parents—Kang Sun Lee and Young Nam Kim. Also, thanks to my sister Ji Young and my brother In-Jae! They always back my dreams and endeavors with tremendous patience and support.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professor Marian Eide (chair), Professors Mary Ann O'Farrell and Vanita Reddy of the Department of English, and Professor Kristan Poirot of the Department of Communication.

All work for the dissertation was completed by the student, under the advisement of Marian Eide of the Department of English.

Funding Sources

This work was made possible in part by the Melbern G. Glasscock Graduate Research Fellowship from Texas A&M University's Melbern G. Glasscock Center for Humanities Research, and by the Research Enhancement Award from Texas A&M University Department of English.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the film *Parasite* (2019), director Bong Joon Ho encapsulates the intricate class inequality in contemporary South Korean society by depicting the parasitic relationship between the rich Park family and the destitute Kims. On the surface, the two families seem to have no point of contact: their difference, for instance, is visualized in the location and occupation of vertically- and horizontally-oriented living places: the Parks' hilltop mansion, which enjoys a full sky view, is contrasted to the Kims' semi-basement home, which sees limited sunlight. By chance, however, the Kims infiltrate the Parks' household one by one as private tutors, a private driver, and a housemaid. "The Care"—a membership-based service company fabricated by the Kims—enables their opportunistic access to the Parks' affluent lives at the same time it allows the Parks to easily replace care providers. When these two different social classes interact in close contact, the film exposes an unexpected scenario: the rich are parasitic upon the care labor provided by the poor, from the preparation of meals to effortless commutes to work or shopping. The Park family's naïve geniality and conviviality are sustained not just by their money, but also through their advantageous outsourcing of care from the "otherized" people whose lives also depend on care provided by other subjects (i.e., women).[1] Yet this uneven distribution and benefit of care is the elephant in the room,

[1] I use the term "otherized" to refer to those who are traditionally minoritized (including women) and to the conditions of abjection that characterize their lives. I avoid the term

which enables everyday interactions between the Parks and the Kims. Hence, when the elephant can be no longer dismissed in the film's climatic birthday party sequence, *Parasite* reveals that the Parks (the host of the party but concurrently the *care-parasites*) discard the abject Kims (seemingly the parasite yet actually the exchangeable *host-bodies*) to maintain their comfortable lives.

The birthday party in *Parasite* stages two different modes of people's everyday lives: the day after a heavy rainfall flooded the Kims' and other poor peoples' households, the Parks are buoyant to think of hosting an impromptu birthday for their son. Mrs. Park invites all her acquaintances, including Jessica and Kevin (the daughter and son of the Kims) who are at a temporary shelter. The jolly Mrs. Park, after making her rounds to the wine shop with the driver Mr. Kim, makes a phone call to her friend in the car: "Today the sky's so blue, and no pollution! Thanks to all the rain yesterday.…that rain was such a blessing!" In contrast, Kevin, made reflective by unexpected calamities, narrates almost to himself as he views the garden birthday party: "Even for a sudden gathering, they're so cool and look so natural.…Do I fit in here?" The impromptu gathering seems successful until a man living in the basement bunker—covertly self-imprisoned for over four years in the Park household basement to avoid debt collectors—kills Jessica as a revenge for disturbing his parasitic relationship with the rich family. The situation might have reflected only the poor's struggles if it were not for Mr. Park, who draws attention to the conditions of the poorer Kim family and draws

---

"Other" here to differentiate my position from the discourse on the Other from Jacques Lacan and other psychoanalytic thinkers.

lines of exclusion, expelling Mr. Kim especially from the equal subject of convivial coexistence. Mr. Kim, infuriated by his employer's detachment, erupts into violence. In this moment, Mr. Kim draws Mr. Park into the theater of spectacular violence as if it were a party (parallel to the birthday party) that should be enjoyed by all. The conviviality of the Parks and the Kims' care labor masked the actual violence of their disparate economic conditions. The spectacular violence of this culminating moment exposes the structural violence on which the entire film's premise is built. The tragedy is that the deep care-parasitic structure of society minimally disturbs the rich family's lives: Mr. Park's death is considered an accident, and the Kims' assiduous labor to seek a wealthy, better life remains impossible to attain in the society wherein conviviality veils imbalance, normalizing the conditions of those who benefit the most.

Showcasing economic disparity in Korea and its accompanying absurd care dependency, *Parasite* is a timely reminder of how vital the care-economy is to keeping society alive and making lives more convivial. Prophetically, the film foreshadows how the privileged depend upon care labor while those who provide care (i.e., the essential workers) sacrifice their lives at the forefront of risky situations, a situation made increasingly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic. Care is required more than ever, yet is rewarded only by calling those care providers "heroes," which naturalizes the cost of such care by equating it to an individual's ethics—the glib language that not only elides the inadequate healthcare system but also imposes an endless duty on an individual level. This ethical expectation and assignment of care to some subjects inform a certain disparity and injustice in the anticipation of convivial improvement of difficult

situations. Of course, this expectation does not exert direct violence. However, the way conviviality from simple cheerfulness to interactions required for coexistence is expected and managed raises a question of how care for conviviality reinforces affective pressure that eventually leads to perpetrating violence.[2] Namely, conviviality exploits people in a convivial way.

This dissertation, *Convivial Violence: Contemporary Transnational Literature of Care and Social Control*, articulates how violence intersects with care and conviviality in contemporary transnational literature from across Asia. *Convivial Violence* develops Paul Gilroy's idea of conviviality, which derives from his observations of the already-existing diversity in urban cities in which different groups' "racial, linguistic and religious particularities do not…add up to discontinuities of experience or insuperable problems of communication" ("Multiculture" 40). Thereby, he proposes the concept of conviviality "to refer to the processes of cohabitation and interaction that have made multiculture an ordinary feature of social life…[A]n interest in the working of conviviality will take off from the point where 'multiculturalism' broke down" (*Postcolonial Melancholia* xv).[3] In response to problems perceived in the concept and

[2] For more in-depth definition of the term, see the "Conviviality" section.

[3] I recognize that Gilroy makes a strong connection between the etymological sense of the word (to live and feast together) and its present denotation (cheerfulness) without defending or theorizing this seemingly arbitrary association. While Gilroy does not mention Ivan Illich and his *Tools for Conviviality* (1973), the intellectual tradition of the study of conviviality should consider doing so. Illich used the term "conviviality" to refer to tools instead of people, in order to promote a vision of modern society where "*modern technologies serve politically interrelated individuals*" (xxiv). The reason why I insist upon connecting Illich and Gilroy is how they relate conviviality to the word

practice of multiculturalism or cosmopolitanism, conviviality has become a significant explanatory term to illuminate the human capacity to live with social difference.[4] Unlike large institutional or top-down structures central to liberal multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism, everyday interactions are central to an analytic and thematic concept of conviviality.

In this dissertation, the selected transnational Asian texts evince conviviality as it emerges through maintaining care relationships, from mundane familial care to cosmopolitan and multicultural coexistence. I argue that the orientation toward conviviality can be violent to minoritized and otherized subjects. The "transnational," to follow Norma Alarcon's definition, is an analytical framework that "enables a nexus for critical intervention across and between nation-states and opens up a ground for the critique of the representations, practices, and discourses that emerge in the conjunctural constitutiveness of historical subjects (147).[5] "Trans" means across, beyond, or through

---

convivencia, a Spanish word meaning "shared life." *Convivencia* provides a complex association with practices and negotiations for coexistence.

[4] A collection of studies in *Conviviality at the Crossroads: The Poetics and Politics of Everyday Encounters* (2020) comprehensively demonstrates the dialogue between conviviality, cosmopolitanism, and creolization that traces "the histories of their theoretical treatment as well as the conditions of their emic uses" (Hemer et al. 2). Although the concept of creolization is seemingly less related to cosmopolitanism and conviviality, hybridization or intermingling of people and culture suggests social negotiations embedded in the colonial encounters between differences.

[5] Francoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih argue that transnationalism occurs within and across the major, the local, and the global against the homogenizing force, considering that cultures are already hybrid. For them, "the minor and major participate in one shared transnational moment and space structured by uneven power relations" and thus minor transnationalism must "take a horizontal approach that brings postcolonial minor cultural formations across national boundaries into productive comparisons, and engage with multiple linguistic formations" (7, 11).

a state of place; my dissertation uses the frame "transnational" to encompass writers and texts that cannot be neatly tied to the rigid national borders.[6] In other words, I use "Asian" in a transnational sense to encompass not just the continent but also Asian peoples who have settled across the globe. The selected texts indicate the vast diversity of Asian transnational life and also display "different voices" (to borrow from Carol Gilligan's work, which I will address below) from across Asia, in which the presumed value of collectivity complicates care relationships. The texts under review suggest that Asian cultures are unified in valuing collectivity over individuality even when the particular Asian subject lives outside the continent and writes about non-Asian cultures. The heterogeneity of the chosen writers' backgrounds and their interests should not be simplified to solely pan-ethnic Asian and Asian diasporic writers.[7] To specify, the dissertation takes into account, first, the expectation that Asian writers will address Asian subjects (an expectation resisted by writers such as Ishiguro and Ondaatje), and, second, that any imperial impulse within Asia (such as Japan's early twentieth-century

[6] Some of the authors in my research are viewed as Asian Anglophone writers (Kazuo Ishiguro, Michael Ondaatje, Arundhati Roy, and Mohsin Hamid) and some are Asian American artists (Ruth Ozeki and Deann Borshay Liem). I include a Korean novelist (Han Kang) and an Israeli filmmaker (Tomer Heymann).

[7] In the American context, the imaginary that views the nation-state as a homogeneous entity renders "the orientalist construction of cultures and geographies from which Asian immigrants come as fundamentally 'foreign' origins" while erasing their heterogeneity (Lowe 5). Concurrently, Lisa Lowe argues "for the Asian American necessity to organize, resist, and theorize *as* Asian Americans," but equally importantly inscribes "this necessity within a discussion of the risks of a cultural politics that relies on the construction of sameness and the exclusion of differences" (68).

project of colonial cohesion) should not overshadow the diversity of populations and experiences across the continent.

In acknowledgement of this diversity, the texts under consideration here present the vast differences of Asian transnational experience while cohering around accommodating the expectation projected onto Asians and their labor in the service of cohabitation.[8] What brings these writers and their texts together is how they stage scenes of care that produce sociality in the name of loyalty, familial love, queer affiliation, and everyday cosmopolitanism. Like Bong Joon Ho, these authors present the costs of care, shifting our attention from the expectation of convivial labor to the violations it imposes on care workers in various roles. The attentive subjects are represented as regretful, unhappy, or outraged in the course of performing conviviality. The care practiced in the "right" way, portraying conviviality from the perspective of social normativity in each

[8] I view labor as the compulsory expenditure of difficult physical, mental, or emotional effort for which the agent may be compensated but from which they cannot amass economic, social, or emotional profit or wealth. Also, labor involves and contributes to forming relationships that demand emotion, affect, and acts of interactions. Regarding (affective) labor and care, Johanna Oksala writes: "First, affective labor denotes care work that is not commodified, such as child rearing at home or looking after sick or elderly members of the family....Second, affective labor can also be care work or reproductive labor that is commodified and as such productive labor....Third and fourth, affecive labor denotes waged and unwaged labor that does not directly reproduce labor power but instead aims at producing affects" (290). Although Oksala makes distinction between different forms of affective labor with regard to analyzing "political consequences, power relations, and forms of exploitation," she acknowledges Hardt's and Negri's contribution making it "impossible to maintain the distinctions among productive, reproductive, and unproductive labor [because all] forms of labor today must be recognized as socially productive and understood as part of biopolitical production" (291, 286). See Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, Penguin, 2004.

text, reveals that well-intentioned care sustains problematic asymmetrical systems (e.g., class and gender subordination, exclusionary institutions of heteronormative family and reproductive injustice, and Euro-America -centric cosmopolitanism). Sometimes unintentionally, literature discloses that care practices intended to produce conviviality do more harm than good.

Thus, I propose the concept of "convivial violence" to describe the naturalized psychological pressure on minority subjects in an ethical expectation to maintain individual and social relations. By convivial violence, I mean both 1) the kinds of harm inflicted in seemingly sociable ways (the adjective "convivial" modifies violence) and 2) the harm received by subjects who are expected to be the custodians of cheerful coexistence. I argue that the convivial violence occurs not only against care providers but also against those of socially lesser status (those who receive care as well), who are vulnerable to the normativity of care expectations. The major ideas of conviviality, care, and violence in my development of convivial violence work together intricately in the negotiation and performance of conviviality. My emphasis points to the delicate interactions of conviviality and care within the convivial situation or imposed compulsory conviviality, which eventually exerts violence.

Two overarching questions motivate my research: What if care, as a moral principle and practice that prioritizes relationships, can itself be a form of violence? What if conviviality in care relations, or a convivial structure within contemporary society, masks hierarchical control? I propose that conviviality demands mediation of conflict through the voluntary subordination or enforced silence of those already

oppressed. Convivial violence reinforces each individual's hierarchical position through affirmative discourses in convivial environments that reduce the feeling—but not the impact—of injustice for perpetrators and recipients alike. Addressing the concept of conviviality enables us to consider the more nuanced account of violence played out in care relations. In this regard, the thematic concern of how we might approach a conviviality that seems to sustain inequality and perpetuate violence places the concept of conviviality in dialogue with queer and affect theories, feminist ethics of care, and the discourse of postcolonial and transnational studies.[9] As I will develop further below, my conceptual approach complicates the emphasis on connection in care ethics by revealing care as a site of social control. Equally importantly, approaching conviviality with insights from postcolonial and transnational studies contributes to how scholars analyze

[9] The transnational turn in literary studies understands the limit posed by postcolonial theories that center around nation-formation as resistance against imperial force. Sara Ahmed, in *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality* (2000), states that postcoloniality is "a failed historicity" that universalizes the chronology of heterogeneous colonial times (10). Critics such as Aijaz Ahmad and Stuart Hall question when the postcolonial was/is by interrogating the term "post"colonial. Hall argues that the postcolonial begs questions of episteme of dividing colonial/postcolonial and the chronology of the postcolonial period. He asks: "Is Britain 'post-colonial' in the same sense as the US? Indeed, is the US usefully thought of as 'post-colonial' at all?…Is Latin America 'post-colonial', even though its independence struggles were fought early in the nineteenth century, long before the recent stage of 'decolonisation' to which the term more evidently refers, and were led by the descendants of Spanish settlers who had colonized their own 'native peoples'?" (245). These questions suggest that postcolonial critics assume that there is a clear-cut epistemological division between colonial and postcolonial under the colonial rule or system. This thinking, however, often excludes the United States or Israel from the postcolonial imaginary. Further, the rigid distinction of postcolonial chronology that is assumed to happen after the Second World War narrows our understanding of the long history of global flows and antithetical struggles that could begin at least at the sixteenth century.

violent historical and material conditions that shape current everyday encounters with difference. Little work on these aspects of care has been done by existing studies on conviviality.[10] That is, studies that give primacy to harmonious diversity run the risk of neglecting difference and imposing hegemonic, dominant norms and uniformity. My readings of works produced by Kazuo Ishiguro, Han Kang, Ruth Ozeki, Deann Borshay Liem, Tomer Heymann, Arundhati Roy, Michael Ondaatje, and Mohsin Hamid elucidate various modes of care—interpersonal, familial (both biological and chosen), community-based, and cosmopolitan—that support and resist the expected normativity of coexistence.

Conviviality

Building on and expanding Gilroy's conviviality, the convivial turn concerning "human modes of togetherness" appears in many disciplines (Nowicka and Vertovec 342). Focusing on fleeting encounters with difference in spaces such as parks and cafes, disciplines in cultural studies, sociology, and cultural geography describe conviviality as "everyday multiculturalism" wherein people with difference practice and negotiate "diversity in specific situations and spaces of encounter" (Wise and Velayutham 3). Some studies shift their focus to domestic households in urban areas, wherein domestic

[10] Regarding the existing conviviality scholarship's limits in considering power inequalities among different peoples, see Linda Lapiņa, "Besides Conviviality: Paradoxes in Being 'at ease' with Diversity in a Copenhagen District," *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2016, pp. 33–41; and Gill Valentine, "Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter," *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. *32*, 2008, 323–37.

care laborers and their employers mediate gender and power relations as well as "the affective side of sociality" (Rzepnikowska 19).[11] This body of research descriptively and prescriptively promotes social cohesion; it views conviviality optimistically.

My own position, based on the literary representations of conviviality in this dissertation, is less optimistic. I argue that conviviality entails potential ambivalence immanent in "the nature of interaction" (Wise and Novel 424). The problem I address is inherent in the transnational roots of the concept itself. The etymology of the word "convivial" stems from the Latin *convivere,* a combination of the prefix *con* [with] and the word *vivere* [live] that means "to live together." The word *convivere* has also developed into the word *conviva*, meaning an individual who "feasts with others." The current English term "convivial" denotes only a cheerful atmosphere influenced by the Latin *conviva*.[12] Yet the Spanish word *convivencia* sustains the original Latin meaning;

---

[11] See Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez, "Creolising Conviviality: Thinking Relational Ontology and Decolonial Ethics Through Ivan Illich and Édouard Glissant," in *Conviviality at the Crossroads: The Poetics and Politics of Everyday Encounters*, edited by Oscar Hemer, Maja Povrzanovic Frykman, Per-Markku Ristilammi, Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, pp. 105–24; and Nicolas Wasser, "Situating Affect in Brazilian Female Domestic Labour," *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2019, pp. 118–34.

[12] Ian Newman's *The Romantic Tavern: Literature and Conviviality in the Age of Revolution* (2019) studies forms of conviviality by exploring tavern culture in eighteenth-century Britain. Focusing on the original meaning of conviviality as the enjoyment of festivity, Newman argues that tavern culture emphasizes accommodating others' desires and orients towards sociability. He contends tavern cultures affected "modes of literary production and more familiar forms of writing such as lyric poetry and the novel…as part of a social network" (5). Andrews Y. Malcome similarly focuses on the original meaning of conviviality as a festive emotion, but he illuminates the corrective function of laughter and conviviality represented in Victorian literature. Malcome states that "laughter…stigmatises eccentric behaviour and encourages a deviant's return to the tribal fold," which reinforces social cohesion (41). See my

it also refers to the history of Medieval Spain from 711-1492, in which Christians, Muslims, and Jews coexisted. In Spain, the Convivencia was considered the Golden Age, but it did not necessarily include total harmony among those three different groups. Gampel Benjamin suggests that Convivencia represented "a pluralistic society where communities often lived in the same neighborhoods, engaged in business with each other, and affected and inflected each other with their ideas" (11). This description assumes a harmonious polity. However, Thomas Glick argues: "To the extent that both Jews and Muslims were expelled, they were never assimilated by Christian society, and hence it is easy to argue that they were never acculturated either…they were indeed integrated; and integration, a process of normalization of day-to-day interactions, provides the immediate social context for cultural exchange" (4). What this society implies to the study of conviviality is the importance of understanding *conflict* despite the urge to idealize different groups' togetherness. Conviviality comprises cheerfulness and conflict in the mode of cohabitation and subsequently demands an imperative to negotiate tension.[13] Although I consider the "with-ness" in conviviality as signifying an ethical frame since it suggests the interdependency of human relations, I argue that the valuation of togetherness can impose concealed violence predicated on existing social hierarchies and the normative implication of coexistence.[14]

---

analysis of a hijra community and the role of laughter as the community's disciplinary correction and community bond in Chapter Four.

[13] I further articulate the close tie between convivencia and cosmopolitan living in Chapter Five.

[14] Raymond Boisvert examines the transition in philosophy from its emphasis on autonomy to interconnection, provoked by William James's focusing on grammatical

In this respect, an individual's openness to others cannot be the sole attribute that constitutes conviviality. Mingling with others demands affective labor and care for the sociality and creation of belonging or world-making. Thus, what has hitherto remained unexplored in the discourse of conviviality is two-fold: (1) the dimensions of inequality, and (2) the work of care in conviviality. Sérgio Costa and Latin America-based scholars have recently started exploring the relationship between conviviality and inequality in terms of "material," "power," "environmental," and "epistemological" asymmetries in the negotiation within convivial interactions (Costa 28). Little attention has been paid, however, to the challenges of conviviality and the duty to care imposed on the Asian diaspora, though the literature of Asia and its diaspora makes the violence of this imperative visible.[15] The Asian and Asian Diaspora literature chosen for this project illustrates how "certain people within a particular society, immigrants among them, become marked as ethnics at the same time that they occupy socially inferior positions (Chow 33).[16] As I demonstrate in Chapter Five, Asian subjects living outside of Asia are

---

particles such as "co-" and "with." Boisvert states that conviviality suggests "the metaphysical, the biological, the social, and the moral aspects of existence" (60).

[15] Rhacel Salazar Parreñas's *Servants of Globalization: Migration and Domestic Work* (2015) makes visible the international division of reproductive labor and its inequality, constituting racialized and gendered labor in the household across the globe: "A return to reproductive labor inequalities in our discussion of the 'care chain' allows us to better account for the constitution of transnational, regional, and local inequalities in the commodification and racialization of the household division of labor in globalization" (30). My discussion of queer Filipino care laborers in Israel in Chapter Four complicates Parreñas's emphasis on gendered care labor.

[16] I agree with Ray Chow who states: "There are, naturally, many ways of thinking about ethnicity that are not necessarily focused on labor....But in actual practice in the contemporary world, whereby ethnicity often designates foreignness (which is, in turn,

considered “perpetual foreigners” who are marked as being out-of-place. The association of Asians with foreignness, migrancy, and low-wage workforce obliges Asian subjects to be more attentive. However, this obligation does not derive from confirming the Asian stereotypes but indicates a survival strategy for Asians in the West and their way of producing cosmopolitan care for living together.

Conviviality discourses stress acknowledging “how markers of difference are negotiated in contests of power asymmetries and subsequently impact patterns of inequality within convivial configurations” (Nobre and Costa, “Politics of Conviviality”). The emphasis on difference differs from Gilroy’s attention to “unpredictable mechanisms of identification” that animates conviviality instead of sticking to “closed, fixed, and reified identity” (*Postcolonial Melancholia* xv). Gilroy’s caution about the reification of difference or “essential” identity reflects his critical response to multicultural policies that celebrate diversity through compartmentalization and assimilation of difference.[17] However, as I articulate in my chapter on transnational

---

understood as social inferiority), the linkages between certain types of labor and ethnicity are ineluctable” (33).

[17] Homi Bhabha in *The Location of Culture* (1994) emphasizes the distinction between diversity and difference by noting the emphasis on assimilation in the former term and presenting the latter term as close to Jean-François Lyotard’s concept of the *differend*—the concept that incorporates conflict in difference: “a differend would be a case of conflict, between (at least) two parties, that cannot be resolved for lack of a rule of judgement applicable to both of the arguments. One side’s legitimacy does not imply the other’s lack of legitimacy” (Lyotard xi). For Bhabha, cultural diversity implies a “mythic memory of a unique collective identity” while cultural difference “focuses on the problem of the ambivalence of cultural authority: the attempt to dominate in the *name* of a cultural supremacy which is itself produced only in the moment of differentiation” (34). Sara Ahmed points out how multiculturalism both promotes cultural diversity and erases racial differentiation through the discourse of hybridity. She states that hybridity

adoption, banal versions of everyday interactions, in domestic and public spaces, take place on the basis of the actual labor performed primarily by those who have been historically minoritized. The assumption that negotiations occur without tensions relies precisely on performed conviviality. Therefore, we should understand how difference generates certain subjects' attentive mode, as well as whose labor is taken for granted in the historically, culturally, and politically layered power relations.

For this reason, it is equally important to examine the affect, emotion, and care—whether paid labor or not—that keep conviviality alive. Magdalena Nowicka states that the scholarship on everyday conviviality leaves "the intimate and kin relationship untouched" (29). She continues: "This [neglected] interest corresponds to the devaluation of domesticity and home as irrelevant to politics and social life. Conviviality in private seems given, while in public it needs to be achieved. It has to do with visibility and invisibility of inequality and power" (29). The role of affect and emotional bonds are largely dismissed in the current scholarship of conviviality; Nowicka attributes this omission to the "Western modern social imaginary" that views "an individual as a social being" (17).[18] Yet even very private, intimate, everyday-life interactions are marked by

---

is "a form of sociality," an imperative to live with others (*Cultural Politics* 134). Multiculturalism demands the imperative to "love" difference and indeed interprets its love for difference as a sign of progress and cultural diversity insofar as differences are instanced as a national ideal.

[18] Nowicka approaches conviviality through the lens of courtesy, civility, and individuality, revealing their regulatory normativity that maintains a certain social order and generates a quasi-equal, convivial situation that elides structurally uneven systems. I argue that politeness paves over inequities while exerting its demands on agents inequitably. With politeness one can imagine *c'est normal,* while disregarding the tensions and differences necessary to create that normality.

power. Therefore, an affective dimension in the private convivial scene should be critically considered as a social and political site.

It is crucial to understand that a seemingly personal expression of civility or care takes place within and through the normative expectations of social institutions, norms, and values that govern everyday interactions occurring from the intimate to the public: both scales of connection must be considered in the conviviality imperative. Yet the normativity of care has long been assumed in the philosophical tradition, an assumption that masks inequities and structures of violation. I turn to care ethics to address the intricate dynamics of care and conviviality that turn out to be violent, tied up by relations of power and inequality.

Care Ethics

The core values of feminist care ethics prioritize relationships as moral concerns. An ethic of care, according to Carol Gilligan, explicates "a cumulative knowledge of human relations" that "self and other are interdependent" (74). Gilligan's influential work *In a Different Voice* (1982) argues that the caring perspective observed in women's voices demonstrates values that are different from, but equally important to, the traditionally prioritized value of justice in moral theory. This claim points out the male-centered and rule-based orientation in the tradition of moral theory, but also addresses a

contextualized understanding of circumstances when making a moral judgement.[19] A robust discourse in feminist philosophy, following Gilligan's work, has spanned the intervening forty years.[20] The earliest care ethics locate women's daily experiences—from mothering to nursing—as a model for women's moral expression. Sara Ruddick in *Maternal Thinking* (1989), for instance, argues that maternal work is responsible for social preservation and growth by its emphasis on "preservative love, nurturance, and training" (17). Women learn these values throughout their lives, and this way of knowing "requires a patient, sympathetic listening to the complexities and uncertainties of another's experience quite unlike the acceptance of the given terms required for abstraction" (96). Although the significance of both Gilligan's and Ruddick's work brings to the fore the care which is devalued as women's work and commonly cast as weakness, these earliest care theorists have been accused of gender essentialism, which neither helps improve the unevenly-distributed care labor nor offers nuanced gendered, raced, and classed experiences of care.[21] The Korean novelist Han Kang, however,

---

[19] Chapter Two articulates Gilligan's claim of women's moral development. I point out some moral dilemmas derived from the emphasis on a proximate relationship as normative reflection of social expectation that works through the very care relations.

[20] See Nel Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, U of California Press, 1984; Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*, Ballantine, 1990; Joan Tronto, *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethics of Care*, Routledge, 1993; Margaret Urban Walker, *Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations after Wrongdoing*, Cambridge UP, 2006; and Fiona Robinson, *The Ethics of Care: A Feminist Approach to Human Security*, Temple UP, 2011.

[21] Linda J. Nicholason, for instance, notes that gender is not the only social organizing principle; hence, factors such as race, class, and histories should be incorporated in understanding moral perspectives. Similarly, Joan Tronto states that there runs the risk of overlooking "the condition of subordination" that causes women's different moral concerns if care is defined as a women's ethics ("Beyond Gender Difference" 241).

clearly expresses not only the devaluation of women's care labor, but also the extent to which care can itself be a form of violence, imposing normative standards on dissident bodies in *The Vegetarian* (see Chapter Two).

No doubt, as I discuss in the complex care-parasitic structure of society in the film *Parasite* and as is apparent through the enormous but unevenly-distributed care demand in the difficult time during COVID-19, some people do benefit from the problematic system of inequality. Care is not just an individual's expression of morality or ethics, but the structure of inequality that places the burden of care (promoted as an individual's ethics) onto otherized subjects. In this respect, the critique of gender essentialism and other concerns for difference lead care ethics to think beyond proximate, personal care. Joan Tronto in *Moral Boundaries* (1993) insists on placing an ethic of care in its political context to understand how care functions within "the structure of social values and moral boundaries that inform our current ways of life" (64). What differentiates Tronto's view of care from earlier care ethics is her emphasis on the work of power in care—who cares for whom?—and thus requires thoughtful understanding of the condition and situation involved in care as well as the intersections

---

However, as the COVID-19 pandemic made evident internationally, women's labor is an unacknowledged infrastructure that collapses under the demand for increased public and domestic care. Gilligan's argument is easily dismissed, yet its implications are everywhere visible in women's daily practices. For this reason, I consider the crucial work of what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak calls "strategic essentialism" which refers to a "*strategic* use of a positive essentialism in a scrupulously visible political interest," aiming for disrupting dominant (and exclusionary) values and norms (*In Other Worlds* 205). In Chapter Three, I examine how transnational adoptees mediate such strategic essentialism. While my focus there is on racial identity, the implications of gender are crucial.

of gender, race, and class. This attention illuminates those in charge of care (i.e., women, people of color, and migrants) and how care is devalued through the relations of power.[22] Connecting back to the concept of conviviality, it is important to recognize that care involves conflicts in interacting with others for a better relationship or a better mode of togetherness. The inescapable conflicts and unevenly-distributed care responsibility should be incorporated in care ethics, requiring "a deep and thoughtful knowledge of the situation, and of all of the actors' situations, needs and competencies" (Tronto 136). As I argue in Chapter Four, Tomer Heymann's documentary *Paper Dolls* makes the masquerade of conviviality evident in the lives of queer Filipino care providers in Israel whose labor serves an aging population as well as a national imaginary of liberalism, a fiction that covers the actual abjection of Palestinians.

At stake in care ethics are the normative implications embedded in this moral perspective. Care demands amicable relationships for coexistence; it presupposes that care is morally right and thus assumes that satisfying the needs of others resolves

[22] In *Greed, Lust & Gender: A History of Economic Ideas* (2009), Nancy Folbre accounts for non-market-driven labor, particularly focused on how women's care work has been largely ignored in capitalist societies. On the one hand, society's "normative encouragement for women to devote themselves primarily to the care of others" imposes "restrictions on women's freedom to compete" (xxii). On the other hand, the costs of care are literally and figuratively demanding, since caregivers' value "depends not merely on the work performed but also a relationship between provider and recipient that develops over time" (311). Namely, naturalized and gendered care work expects women to tend to those in need despite how much society devalues their labor. This assumption persists while complicating the subject of exploitation. Catherine Rottenberg argues that the disavowal of the value of reproduction and the care work in neoliberal rationality expunges "gender and even sexual differences among a certain strata of subjects" in care work while it "produces [a] new form of racialized and class-stratified gender exploitation" (332).

conflict. The act of normalizing conflict in care relations renders an individual's adherence to care as morally desirable, yet care can be also complicit in structures of violence. Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* and Han Kang's *The Vegetarian* narrate the ways that certain structural modes of care make individuals comply with social norms, eventually feeding broader inequities in the service of convivial social relations. In this respect, it is significant to understand the choreography of care, the idea of good (more specifically, living a good life), and the material conditions that cause *convivial violence* out of good intentions but that violate both carers and the cared-for in unexpectedly harmful ways.[23]

Feminist approaches to emotion and affect inspire my conceptual framework on convivial violence. Conviviality as a mode of cohabitation calls attention to everyday emotions and affects as they illuminate fluid, contingent socializing forces as well as the material or empathetic relationships that enable or impair care. Sara Ahmed's account of emotions as effects of "social and cultural practices" reveals that emotions "surface" in individual and collective bodies (*Cultural Politics* 9). It is the way emotions circulate in bodies and worlds that connects an individual to the collective and the nation-state. Considering that emotions are feelings orientated towards someone or something, this means that emotions are not an individual's independent dispositions, but they are the

[23] Living a good life demands the subject to be attuned to "the direction promised as a social good, which means imagining one's futurity in terms of reaching certain points along a life course" (Ahmed, *Promise of Happiness* 71). Lauren Berlant, in *Cruel Optimism* (2011), demonstrates how people's attachment to the *fantasy* of the good life binds people to live in the cruel state of the now.

very evidence of attaching an individual to outer things; simply put, emotions are the way of forming sociality. The reverse also occurs: an individual's psyche and social arrangements are constituted by the repeated effects of social practices and the mobilization of emotions. Yet these effects can exert violence against those who cannot (or will not) conform to the predominant norms, social and cultural practices, or negotiations within communities and kin relations. My exploration of the nuanced, contingent emotional relationships between individuals and the world shows how emotions—regret (Chapter Two), adoptee predicament (Chapter Three), queer abjection and hope (Chapter Four), and strangers' alienation (Chapter Five)—expose how individuals mediate togetherness, however violent maintaining such conviviality might be. These emotions—whether individuals are cognizant of them or not—are the effects of power structures and routinized violence.

While Ahmed prefers to use the word *emotions* to indicate "how we come into contact with objects and others" (*Cultural Politics* 208), emotions can be interchangeable with the term *affect*: I understand affect as an energy that is moved to or by the effects of the bodily, psychic, and social encounter.[24] The affective turn in feminist and queer discourses signals their turn to the ordinary and the everyday. The ordinary, according to Kathleen Stewart, is "a shifting assemblage of practices and practical knowledges" that constitutes the fluid form of life (1). For Lauren Berlant,

[24] Affects, to follow Gutierrez-Rodriguez's definition, are "intensities, sensations and bodily reactions disturbing, but also stretching and reaffirming, power relations" (*Migration* 5). Affects are energies that emerge "through contact and encounter…a relational force" (5).

affect is a "scene of sociality" (*Cruel Optimism* 12). Therefore, ordinary affects are *forces* that animate relationships (whether optimistic or antagonistic).[25] The concept of convivial violence owes itself in part to Berlant's idea of "cruel optimism" that elucidates people's affective endurance for "the good life"—a notion occurring as an effect of the neoliberal restructuring of contemporary society.[26] That is, people's attachment to the idea of the good life turns their lives into crisis or impasse, but sticking to the fantasy of the good life makes people belong to the present and makes their lives bearable. Interestingly, Berlant uses the term "conviviality" to describe situations that coerce people into living in a condition of anticipatory optimism though there is nothing actually promising in their conditions; it is the performance of this optimism as conviviality that makes the present bearable (but that is all). As a departure from Berlant, however, my primary focus on convivial violence rests on that performativity (I call it care knowing it is also labor, for conviviality is demanding and thus violent) to uphold an individual's everyday interactions and relationships. *Convivial Violence* attends to the

[25] Martin F. Manalansan in *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora* (2003) examines how queer subjects forge relationships through the lens of the everyday. Manalansan states that the narratives of the everyday display "the rich intricacies of the commonplace and how these stories intersect or come up against modern institutions such as the nation-state. Everyday life intersects and engages with the intimate, the private, and the search for home in modern life" (91).

[26] Under neoliberalism, which reduces the role of state and applies market-driven ideology to all sectors, an individual should be "autonomous, entrepreneurial, and endlessly resilient, a self-sufficient figure," taking on all the responsibilities of life for themselves (Chatzidakis et al. 12). Giroux and Evans view the system of neoliberalism as "organized for the production of violence" since it, for instance, "wages a war of the poor—and does so removed from any concern for social costs or ethical violations" (20).

violence perpetrated and imposed upon the expectations of an individual to societal conviviality in the form of care.

Violence

Violence varies with regard to kind, scale, and frequency. To understand what constitutes violence is one way to grapple with its processes and impacts. Most people think that violence refers to physical harm against a person, group, or community. This is what Slavoj Zizek calls subjective violence, which has both an identifiable agent and a victim. Subjective violence may be instantly discernible in a random, singular incident, like a crime or an airstrike. However, subjective violence can also be inflicted, for instance, out of systemic racism or structural inequality, as is apparent in *Parasite*. At worst, some subjective violence may not be identified as violence when the agent attains the level of the nation-state and acts according to justified motives (e.g., the war on terror). When we delimit our understanding of violence to a physical act, we might miss its broader roots and its far-reaching impacts—not only the actual force but also any metaphorical, symbolic, epistemological, and psychological violations—on victims. In this sense, violence as a physical force is a narrowly-defined concept and violence as violation (both personal and structural) is a broader term.[27] In her sharp exploration of violence in twentieth-century literature in *Terrible Beauty* (2019), Marian Eide rightly notes that violence is slippery and ubiquitous, and thus her primary focus lies on the

[27] See Vittorio Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice*, 2007.

"spectacular, the louder forms of public destruction" to understand "how political violence both masks and reveals forms of quiet or slow violence" (26).[28] Although I acknowledge the importance of articulating subjective, spectacular violence, I take structural violence as my primary consideration to elaborate upon "convivial violence": As an *imperceptible and mundane form of violation endemic to moral expectations of care and orientation towards conviviality*.

Structural violence has been the point of concern for many scholars in various disciplines, examining in either more general terms (encompassing race, gender, sexuality, or class) or using more specialized terms, such as settler colonialism or neoliberal capitalism. Systemic and routine violence can be classified as structural violence that constitutes the current ideological, political, and economic conditions of the world (i.e., neoliberal, democratic, capitalistic society). Both Zizek and Gyanendra Pandey argue that structural violence is often invisible because of its function as part of our economic and political system (Zizek) and its large scale sanctioned by the nation-state (Pandey). As Zizek states, systemic violence is already intrinsic in the conditions of capitalism due to the system's "'automatic' creation of excluded and dispensable individuals from the homeless to the unemployed" (14). Berlant, by addressing the structural inequality in the liberal nation-state, describes "ordinary violence" that

[28] Rob Nixon, through an environmental lens, proposes the concept of "slow violence" to describe "delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all" (2). The significance of Nixon's concept is its call for recognizing the prolonged temporality in violence and its calamitous consequences.

indicates “actual and social death as well as the taken-for-granted negation of subordinate populations” (“Uncle Sam” 147). Similarly, Henry Giroux and Brad Evans articulate “normalized violence” that generates some subjects as functioning and others as disposable in “cultures of cruelty,” by which term they designate regimes of neoliberalism. All this structural violence directs us to the way certain subjects are conceived as excluded, subordinated, and disposable to the system in which they reside and that they maintain.

The issue is that people do not identify structural violence as violence because it becomes a naturalized and congenial part of communities, societies, and nation-states. Structural violence is sustained by close collaboration with social norms, ideals, customs, and routine practices. I argue that care, including expectations of both providing and receiving care, is a structural practice that seeps into every social relation. Vittorio Bufacchi argues that the idea of integrity in the concept of violence refers to a “amoral” sense of “unity or wholeness” (46). However, in my second chapter, I suggest that the structural mode of integrity imposes wholeness and is promoted as a social good, which is considered as a way to expect conviviality. This structural and social moral integrity (because of its imperative for unity) obliges individuals to conform to the prevailing social normativity (and their compliance is performed through care). Concurrently, if an individual’s moral integrity opposes social integrity, agonistic or even extremely violent consequences can result. The dilemma is that both an individual and social moral integrity have their own moral reasons (see Chapter Two). *Convivial*

Violence explores this moral and ethical dilemma occasioned by the pursuit of conviviality.

My particular contribution to the study of violence expands the idea of how violence may be justified on benevolent principles. The concept of "convivial violence" builds on structural violence and expands its egalitarian scope to its care dimension. Violence that seems benevolent varies depending on the impetus. Chandan Reddy articulates that the liberal state legitimates state violence in the name of protecting "equality" and "rights." Although state-sanctioned violence is horrific, the pretext—equality—generates an egalitarian impression.[29] Likewise, economically-driven violence masks its exploitation through the care work of humanitarian aid. Violence laden in positive values suggests its top-to-bottom structure and the (ethical) brutality in its core. In contrast, as opposed to the reverse orientation in structural violence, the concept of convivial violence sheds light on the unquestioned acceptance of the affectionate ethical

[29] The rhetoric of paternal benevolence was one pretext for colonial occupation; nowadays the narratives of benevolence and promises of inclusion are deployed in the discourse of the international division of labor, citizenship, and human rights to veil economic exploitation and the state's sovereign violence against other nations and peoples. See Gayatri Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, Macmillan Education, 1988, pp. 271–313; Inderpal Grewal, "'Women's Rights as Human Rights': Feminist Practices, Global Feminism, and Human Rights Regimes in Transnationality," *Citizenship Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1999, pp. 337–54; Chandra Mohanty, "'Under Western Eyes' Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles," *Signs*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2002, pp. 499–535; and Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Duke UP, 2007.

stance in care dimensions and its quotidian pervasiveness from the individual to the global.

In this dissertation, I demonstrate that the narratives of an individual's loyalty, familial love, friendship, and cosmopolitan care represent violence in the way that they demand labor, intimacy, and service that are especially rooted in uneven power relationships. Pandey states that the practice of coexistence is not benevolent, especially in an uneven relationship: "the idea of coexistence, in the form of tolerance, of unity in diversity, and the accommodation of multiple traditions and ways of being, means little or nothing…for those who find themselves at the bottom of the heap" (*Routine Violence* 171). As I stated earlier, conviviality demands mediation of conflict through the voluntary subordination or enforced silence of the already oppressed; either way, the expectation and maintenance of conviviality rely on the otherized subjects' affective ability to cooperate in harmony or endure the tension of conflict. As Sara Ahmed notes, "some forms of violence remain concealed *as* violence, as effects of social norms that are hidden from view" (*Cultural Politics* 193). At times, violence is not understood to be violence or justified "on the grounds of the absence of consciously-felt suffering" (193). Likewise, I consider the mundane psychic expression of the dominant parties, and their relevant psychological pressure on the historically minoritized subjects, whether conscious or not, as convivial violence. Eventually, to address the concept of convivial violence is to question what is normalized in living together at the cost of caring and prioritizing relationships. That is, convivial violence has an affective cost—an embodied pressure and dilemma—for convivial living. *Convivial Violence* enables us to rethink

how conviviality is possible from the intimate to the global in the orientation, situational process, and end goal of conviviality.

Last but not least, *Convivial Violence* examines contemporary transnational literature particularly focusing on Asian and Asian diaspora cultural productions that demonstrate the conditions of convivial violence and how people confront, refuse (either to receive or bestow), and practice care within familial and global contexts. Asian and Asian diaspora literature invokes often ignored affects that minoritized subjects suppress every day to be attentive to the imposed dominant norms of societies outside the Asian continent. Conviviality entails the social responsibility to keep the powerful from noticing the means necessary to create a cheerful coexistence across differences. Literature punctures this balloon of not knowing, making evident the care labor that goes into making convivial conditions possible. My research foregrounds literature because its mediations do not just reflect lived conditions but offer both critique and alternate modes of ethical living. The power of literature, particularly regarding fictional imagination, lies in its ability to think *otherwise* and envision an alternative world.

Literature allows readers to work through theoretical questions by means of a set of particulars. We access alternative conditions when we work through a question or a idea in the world-creating forms of the literary. Pheng Cheah, for instance, calls for understanding "world literature's normativity as a modality of cosmopolitanism that responds to the need to remake the world as a place that is *open* to the emergence of peoples that globalization deprives of world" (19). Or, as Zadie Smith argues, the role of fiction makes an explicit "invitation to enter a parallel space…in which you have

imagined access to whatever is not you" and displays unintelligible subjects in its world ("Fascinated to Presume"). The subjects in the selected texts come into being in their production of the most necessary kind of labor for conviviality in their situations and living conditions. This labor is both resistant to and sometimes complicit in the intricate matrix of oppression or assimilation to the dominant nationalist or cultural norms. My methodological strategy employed in this project is to closely read minoritized subjects' everyday interactions to trace the complexity of being bound to care and their negotiations of material and social relations. My close reading teases out and highlights the tensions and differences necessary to create the putative convivial normality. I also employ an intersectional approach to interrogate various matrices of power and oppression, enabling me to examine the contextual and the situational that minoritized subjects grapple with regarding their care predicament.[30] Examining cultural productions with methods of close reading and an intersectional approach enables us to envision alterity that may amend the extant regulatory and exclusionary orientation embedded in violent convivial living.

Altogether, my attitude to the convivial is ambivalent. I share Gilroy's utopian vision for coexistence across difference while at the same time bearing witness to the invisible efforts that the semblance of this conviviality requires and the violations that cheerfulness often masks. My desire for a utopian version of conviviality does not rule

[30] Kimberle Crenshaw coined "intersectionality" to provide an analytical lens of conceptualizing "race as a coalition between men and women of color" as well as "means for dealing with other marginalization" (1299).

out the necessary critique. Rather, I find that the literary facilitates both witnessing the violations entailed in conviviality and also imagining the productive, specific, and agential means for an equitable conviviality such as Gilroy imagines. In contrast to Gilroy's position, thereby, I am joining a feminist disposition (articulated by Ahmed with the "feminist killjoys" who kill the genial mood and challenge social order) in which the imperative to cheerfulness is recognized to be harmful.[31]

Chapter Outline

The basic structure of the dissertation takes a funnel shape based on various modes of care for conviviality, from familial, intimate, and proximate care to the care extended to strangers. I structure its analytical arrangement from family to state relations, with regards to how care conforms to or attests to the normative expectations of an ideal family, community, or nation-state. Indeed, modes of care are multidirectional and take various modalities to nurture and repair the web of relations that constitute everyday sociality and the world. For instance, in *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence* (2020), Chatzidakis et al. contend that care not only means "the work people do when directly looking after the physical and emotional needs of others" but it also indicates "a social capacity and activity involving the nurturing of all that is necessary for the welfare and flourishing of life" (5). It is important to recognize our interdependency and (in the Butlerian sense) our vulnerability, which

[31] See Sara Ahmed, "Feminist Killjoys (And Other Willful Subjects)," *S&F Online*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2010, sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_01.htm#text1.

indicate humanity's essential conditions that expose the need of an ethics of care to support coexistence (Butler, *Precarious Life*). In this respect, it is dangerous to delimit our idea of care relations and practices to those that occur in relationships of close proximity. Furthermore, as Pratt and Rosner point out, the family model is "easily redeployed internationally; women and children are particularly effective vectors for sentimental politics" and thus we need to extend an ethical boundary of care towards the world (12). Through this arrangement, we can see how idealized care relations from within a family model are projected onto (and distinct from) a global scale, and we can acknowledge the ways care providers and recipients are violently affected by expectations in the family, community, and nation-state.

To briefly encapsulate the care scope of each chapter, my focus on care in Chapter Two centers on proxy care in the domestic sphere that shows classed and gendered care for convivial relationships with the owner of the household and family members. Chapter Three is about transnational adoptees' labor to meet the expectations of their adoptive and birth families, illustrating their experience of the normative violence of straddling familial belonging and citizenship. The familial care scope is broadened to an alternative affiliation in Chapter Four that attests to Israeli and Indian nation-states' Muslim exclusion and marginalization of other subjects (i.e., queer people). In both Chapters Three and Four, I compare a documentary film and a novel. This comparison is not to argue that a film or a novel is more useful or accurate to the questions I am posing. Rather, they work in different registers where documentary claims responsibility to reality and truth-telling and the novel performs imaginative work

in relation to these realities and the abstract claims of the truth. Primarily, I focus on the situations that characters and peoples grapple with to maintain conviviality represented in each medium. The final chapter explores an everyday cosmopolitan form of care practiced by and towards strangers. As each chapter demonstrates, caring responsibilities move beyond familial structures to the world of strangers. Also, how I define the scope of violence leads me to use the terms of both labor and violence to describe convivial violence. In Chapter Two and Chapter Four, I explicitly address convivial violence. In Chapter Three and Five, I describe labor as an alternative form of convivial violence because of the situations that pressure adoptees or strangers to perform conviviality. The following paragraphs outline each chapter in detail, illustrating how care practiced in the domestic sphere to the stranger-world responds to or contests convivial living.

Chapter Two, "Enforced Conviviality," sets forth my theoretical account of ethical orientation in the imaginary convivial future that can be violent to those who bear the duty to care. The chapter articulates the ethic of care within the context of personal integrity to argue that structural modes of care compromise individual integrity by serving convivial social relations that mask broader inequities. I explore the normative reflection of social expectation in care relations which sustain a convivial future; care providers, conversely, are responsible for an idealized futurity while being excluded from that convivial vision. My reading of Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* (1989) and Han Kang's *The Vegetarian* (2007) informs not only my theory of classed and gendered care, but also illuminates the subtle forms of naturalized care violence grounded on trusted care labor. I pay particular attention to the convivial scenes of

banquet and family feast represented, respectively, in Ishiguro's and Han's novels, to describe how the seemingly inclusive meetings are constrained to the ordered hierarchy of those who hold power and how care perpetuates the expected social hierarchy. Drawing on feminist philosophies of care from Carol Gilligan, Joan Tronto, and Margaret Urban Walker, I argue that structural modes of violence are embedded in pervasive care ethics. In Ishiguro's novel, the butler's management of his emotion and his bantering, and in Han's novel, the maternal figures' care, demonstrate how conviviality demands care in exchange for coexistence. Furthermore, the contradictory care ethics seen between two female characters in *The Vegetarian* shows that "ethics…illuminates how literary works grapple with problems that pervade a world of competing values" (Black 3). As Shameem Black argues in *Fiction Across Borders* (2010), fiction envisions alterity while avoiding representational violence to social difference. Han's description of the female characters' two opposing care ethics, which do not compromise to suit one another, provides the novel's capacity to envision alternative ethics that cannot be easily understood as either right or wrong in living with difference.

Chapter Three, "Adoptee Labor for Conviviality," addresses transnational adoption as a care practice that masks militarist history by attending to the Korean adoptees described in Ruth Ozeki's *My Year of Meats* (1998) and Deann Borshay Liem's *Geographies of Kinship* (2019). Drawing on Gilroy's view of conviviality as an ordinary feature of social life in multicultural society, I question the actual labor that maintains multicultural communities. The existing study of conviviality, as Alina Rzepnikowska

points out, pays less attention to the realm of private space and assumes that difference is not a significant matter in family relations. This chapter reveals that the discourse of humanitarian care plays a crucial role in mediating the state's violence through the problematic gesture of transnational adoption. I uncover inequalities and violence behind transnational Korean adoption, in which the values of care and coexistence veil adoptees' labor for their subject-building as well as how they negotiate conviviality in their adoptive and Korean birth family relations. I thus examine transnational adoptees and their families, bringing into focus transnational adoptees' navigation and management of and in difference. Adoptees take on convivial labor to enact *with-ness*, revealing that the conditions of their living demand a burdensome labor. This unacknowledged violence structures adoptees' quotidian living, mediating their racial, ethnic, and cultural difference to contest the exercise of violent normativity that decides citizenship and belonging. In Ozeki's novel, a family of transnational adoptees are represented as a multicultural family, but the perspective of the adoptive parents dismisses the difficulty of adoptee integration as well as the violence that causes the availability of transnational adoption. Liem, in contrast, focuses on four adult adoptees' voices and their journeys to build their identity. In doing so, Liem radically questions the ethics surrounding transnational adoption and the notion of a better life. The juxtaposition of the two texts illuminates how important it is to incorporate the perspective of adoptees (the seeming care recipients) who are putatively mobilized to promote multiculturalism and convivial relations between nation-states, and who are thereby subject to the unacknowledged violence of care in adoption.

Chapter Four, "Non-Normative Care Affiliations," discusses Tomer Heymann's *Paper Dolls* (2006) and Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* (2017). I examine an alternative form of kinship exemplified in the relationship of *baklas* in Israel (queer Filipino care-workers) and the community of *hijras* in India (who identify themselves as feminine people assigned male or intersex at birth). The queer subjects in both Heymann's and Roy's texts demonstrate that their communities of care are based upon interdependency. Yet Filipino care providers performing quasi-familial care, as well as the hijras' relationality, maintain the dominant social norms and regulations, which bind the subjects into normativity. This chapter explores the binding mechanism that turns the need to care into something violent. I discuss whether conviviality as a form of coexistence can either play a normative role for social institutions or disrupt the existing social order through kinship outside of dominant social norms and regulations. In the context that both Israel and India attempt to homogenize their populations, this chapter ultimately explores how both baklas and hijras form contingent care affiliations to strategically disrupt the imposition of homogenized familial ideals and the dream of cosmopolitan living.

Chapter Five, "Rethinking Cosmopolitan Care and Planetary Conviviality," investigates an *attached* value of conviviality in the concept of cosmopolitanism. What I suggest by attaching the value of conviviality to cosmopolitanism is its tendency to demand peace and unity in the political use of the term, thus producing *janissaries* of cosmopolitanism. Chapter Five examines a fantasy of cosmopolitanism in Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient* (1992) and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant*

Fundamentalist (2007). Building on Lisa Baraitser's framework of maintenance, I develop the concept of strangers' care that maintains a cosmopolitan future even as the care-practice itself alienates strangers from cosmopolitan coexistence. The chapter demonstrates how conviviality in cosmopolitan vision does not include marginalized strangers as equal citizens of the world because it helps maintain Western hegemony. I argue that the focus on smaller-scale conviviality performed by marginalized strangers not only illuminates those strangers' cosmopolitan care that promotes living with difference, but also encourages violence, which is the labor of conviviality because of the arduous labor that conditions marginalized strangers as attentive beings. The final part of this chapter explores the scenes of eating together (going back to the original meaning of conviviality), wherein both marginalized strangers (Kip in Ondaatje's novel and Changez in Hamid's) indicate the possibility of alternative cosmopolitan conviviality that is cognizant of difference. In literature we are able to experience hope without knowing its content; at the same time literature demands that we begin to imagine the content to our hopefulness.

CHAPTER 2

ENFORCED CONVIVIALITY AND THE VIOLENCE OF CARE

This chapter considers the ethic of care, within the context of personal integrity, to argue that certain structural modes compromise integrity in the service of convivial social relations that mask broader inequities. I use the term "integrity" as a metaphor of moral architecture. I suggest that there are two forces that form moral integrity. First, moral integrity is a social force of integration that makes individuals adhere to social norms. Second, an individual's adherence to their own moral principles may oppose social normativity, signifying that individual's moral singularity. Together, an individual's and social values build an agonistic moral architecture. To make my case, I draw on feminist philosophies of care in the tradition inaugurated by Carol Gilligan to note structural, transnational modes of violence embedded in pervasive care ethics.[32] Specifically, I draw on two Asian and Asian diaspora novels, Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* (1989) and Han Kang's *The Vegetarian* (2007), to investigate the tensions between moral integrity, the duty to care, and social hierarchies.[33] My readings

[32] The earliest work of Carol Gilligan, Sara Ruddick, and Virginia Held established the foundation of care ethics. This body of feminist care ethics has informed care as a moral viewpoint that values relationship. Joan Tronto further pushes an ethic of care to interrogate the political context of care, stressing how the relations of power produce gendered, raced, and classed care. Margaret Urban Walker's work takes political violence into account to restore moral relations after wrongdoings.

[33] Although Deborah Smith translated *The Vegetarian* in 2015 and contributed to making the novel internationally acclaimed, I found some omissions and mistranslations in Smith's work. Thus, I inserted my own translations when her translation overlooks Han's important word choices and phrases that may cause English-language readers to

of these texts not only inform my theory of classed and gendered care (in which I consider the normative reflection of social expectation in care relations) but also proffer an intervention in the subtle forms of naturalized care-violence in the social imagination of a convivial future. In what follows, I lay out two scenarios from the novels that make concrete my theoretical claims before reviewing the ethic of care and discussing the two novels.

The two geographically and temporally disparate novels of Ishiguro and Han can be wedded together through the socially marginalized characters' (Stevens in *The Remains of the Day* and In-hye in *The Vegetarian*) regret about their adherence to their own care ethics. In their attempts to enact their ethics of care, their practices actually accommodate the putative social normativity that causes self-abnegation. Their regret is amplified in the face of a dilemma: whether they should stick to their lifelong ethics, however unbearable those ethics are, if those ethics nevertheless create better relationships with others. In *The Remains of the Day*, for instance, Ishiguro showcases the changing status of Britain's global power before and after the Second World War through Stevens's nostalgia for the past glory and in his service of a new American employer, Mr. Farraday. Stevens, a butler, thinks that serving an English aristocrat, Lord Darlington, is a very dignified position; his pride, therefore, dwells in performing a butler's duty to care—but his new employer considers that duty to be obsolete. The

misinterpret Han's ideas. Since this chapter does not explore translation problems, see Kim Wook-Dong, "The 'creative' English Translation of *The Vegetarian* by Han Kang," *Translation Review*, vol. 100, no. 1, 2018, pp. 65-80.

conflict arises when Stevens confronts Mr. Farraday's demand for a different kind of labor: the confrontation slowly draws Stevens into doubting the dignity of his butler's duty, and his reconsideration of his past makes him realize that he has strictly repressed his caring emotions at work. His hindsight feeling of regret occurs in the contradiction between having once believed in a triumphant moment and his current sense of sacrificed emotion.

Stevens remembers the turning point of his professional life: when he heroically orchestrated the banquet for the international conference of 1923 at Darlington Hall. The conference was an important site for Lord Darlington to make moral appeals to modify the Versailles Treaty in favor of Germany. Stevens no doubt believed his employer's moral virtue, for Lord Darlington was a great gentleman. During the banquet, however, Stevens's father faced imminent death; eventually Stevens failed to be by his father's side for the sake of his professional duty. Ishiguro describes the stark contrast between the European gentlemen's "convivial" smoking room and his father's place of death, where "the smell of roasting" from the servants dominated the smell of death.[34] Stevens's notion of dignity, in this case, relies on his adherence to carrying out his duty to care according to the expected workplace ethics, even as his personal feelings unconsciously betray his calm professionalism. In such conflicting ethical situations, how Stevens maintains his butler's duty signals his "ability to inhabit" the professional

[34] Kazuo Ishiguro, *The Remains of the Day*, 111. All references to *The Remains of the Day* are given in parentheses in the text as *RD* with page numbers.

role, "however surprising, alarming or vexing" (*RD* 43). It is a stark example of an individual's unswerving loyalty to his own set of values.

The Vegetarian, set in contemporary South Korean society, conjures a world of violence perpetrated by kinship, in which familial care violates the protagonist Yeong-hye's ethical singularity. Ethical singularity, in my view, recognizes a moral investment at odds with communal expectation. It is particularly complex in communal cultural contexts wherein the assertion of individuality threatens community cohesion. Ethical singularity, an expression of personal integrity, is in an agonistic relation to communal values. In this instance, Yeong-hye tries to live by her moral values—non-violence to all life—by avoiding eating meat. Yeong-hye's decision, however, is incongruent with the normative values of her family; therefore, the men in her family exert violence to subordinate her moral integrity to their communal value of conviviality.[35] This macabre family conflict occurs at a seemingly benign family feast: Yeong-hye's family gathers to celebrate her mother's birthday and her sister's move to a bigger house. This family reunion is an annual event to share amiable news, but the underlying aim is to reprimand Yeong-hye for her refusal of meat, as well as her indifference to her wifely role as reported by her husband, Mr. Cheong. While sharing conversation and food, the family briefly reproaches Yeong-hye for her timidity in partaking in a feast prepared by her caring sister, In-hye. In-hye sets the table with dishes of fish and meat based on her

[35] The English usage of the word "conviviality" refers to cheerfulness, but its Latin root comprises the meaning of coexistence: *con* [with] and *vivere* [live] that means "to live together." I use the term "conviviality" to indicate both cheerfulness and an interaction for coexistence. See Gilroy (2005) and Boisvert (2010).

memories of Yeong-hye's favorite food. Every family member, one by one, encourages Yeong-hye to try In-hye's well-prepared food, appealing to Yeong-hye through their concern for her health and for her relationship with Mr. Cheong. Nevertheless, Yeong-hye is unmoved by her family's emotional appeal; eventually, her anguished father forcefully shoves a sweet-sour pork morsel into his grown-up daughter's mouth. This action leads to Yeong-hye's suicide attempt. The façade of familial care dissolves before the father's patriarchal tyranny. His brutal attempt to subordinate his unruly daughter is masked as concern regarding her particular eating habit. Equally importantly, though less obvious, the novel depicts Yeong-hye being cared for in unintentionally destructive ways by her well-meaning sister, In-hye.[36]

The benevolent family feast turns into the clash between two different care orientations: Yeong-hye's refusal of food consumption serves her own ethical investment in animal welfare, but her female kin's display of care and responsibility serves the familial relationship. This clash showcases how difficult it is to maintain an individual's ethical singularity when it opposes the dominant social, cultural, and familial morality. It also implies that care responsibility can turn into violence, as exemplified in In-hye's retrospection as she looks back on the unpredictable

[36] Scholars have paid little attention to the care dilemma represented between Yeong-hye and In-hye. Particularly, there is rare engagement in examining the character In-hye. This lack of attention can be attributable to her maternal personality, which seems understandable and intelligible compared to the inexplicable character Yeong-hye. Thereby, critics attempt to analyze Yeong-hye's vegetarianism as resistance to male violence symbolized in meat eating habits (Cornelia Macsiniuc) or her female body as a vector for questioning female embodiment and sexuality (Caitlin Stobie).

development of the family feast, which resulted in a chain of tragic events for both Yeong-hye and herself. Against her expectations and intentions, In-hye's carefully-prepared food causes violence to her sister, as her male family members enlist In-hye's ethic of care in Yeong-hye's subordination to convivial relations. Becoming mortally anorexic and having been divorced by her husband, Yeong-hye is isolated to the extent that In-hye becomes the last person who never gives up caring for her. In-hye is also harmed by the breakdown of her family as well as her concern for her sister's health violates this sister's ethical project.

This chapter explores the following questions: what does it mean to provide care in the service of a larger moral imperative if that care does harm to oneself? What if care alienates care providers from the structure of conviviality, ironically making them participate in violating others? The above examples from Ishiguro and Han illustrating instances of when the duty to care exacts unpredictable cost that causes regret in care providers. These instances spur me to problematize care imperatives in terms of self-sacrifice for the duty to care as well as ethical violations in the practices of care. Although conflict is endemic in considering moral concerns, a crucial aim, according to Carol Gilligan, is to minimize hurt. Her influential work *In a Different Voice* (1982) has elucidated caring perspective as equally important as the universal ethical principle of justice, when the object is to promote sustainable life. Gilligan argues that the core values of feminist care ethics prioritize relationality and interdependence. However, characters such as Stevens and In-hye demonstrate how care imperatives can emerge from an individual's valuation of relationships. Stevens prioritizes his relation to Lord

Darlington, whose morality, to Stevens, is worth pursuing; thus, he blindly devotes himself to serve and align with Lord Darlington. For In-hye, her primary care relations revolve around her family members. She attends to their well-being to the extent that she cannot recognize how she herself suffers from such care. As I will elaborate further in the following paragraph, Gilligan notes that the "moral ideal of self-sacrifice and care" goes wrong because "the conflicting truths of each person's feelings [make] it impossible to avoid hurt"; therefore, "both integrity and care must be included in a morality" (165). Despite Gilligan's separation of self-sacrifice from idealized care, moral dilemmas occur in individuals' choices of how to resolve their conflicting responsibilities: sometimes moral dilemmas occur beyond individuals' capacity to make a moral judgment predicated on social inequalities and cultural normativity. Hence, being true to oneself when practicing care—to follow Gilligan's view of mature care—cannot be an easy task. Stevens and In-hye could not realize their ideal of self-abnegation in a situation they are also called to serve the prevailing social and cultural expectations. That is, hierarchical structure in class and gender limits Stevens's and In-hye's standing position to refuse the duty to care.

The significance of Gilligan's "different voices" is that different sexes approach moral dilemmas from different perspectives: men from an ethic of justice, women from an ethic of care. Although Gilligan notes that the "different voice" is "characterized not by gender but theme," her findings suggest that girls' and women's moral judgments were misunderstood in psychological theory: tracing childhood moral development, she finds that girls' decisions reflect the needs of others when solving a moral dilemma,

while boys' decisions reflect the rule of law and adherence to justice systems. Based on women's narratives of their lived experiences, Gilligan proposes three stages of moral development in an ethic of care. The first stage involves egocentric self-care; the second stage involves care that centers others' needs; the final stage attempts to balance care of the self and care for others. As these developmental steps indicate, the third stage presupposes inclusive, self-responsible care when making a moral decision to take care of others. Gilligan assumes a symbiosis of balanced care-types. In contrast, Ishiguro and Han propose that an individual's belief in self-care can be oppressive to their duties as a care provider; further, these ethics may come into irreconcilable conflict. Even if an individual recognizes such oppression, she might not have other choices available to her. In other words, the perception of self-care relative to the concept of integrity can be contingent on the circumstances in which care is controlled by the dominant expression of power relations. In addition, Gilligan ultimately argues that men and women—despite their different approaches to the moral dilemma—come to a mature stage at which "intimacy and truth converge in the discovery of the connection between integrity and care" through personal experiences and choices (157-58). Thus, "Recognizing the dual contexts of justice and care, they realize that judgment depends on the way in which the problem is framed" (167). Gilligan, in other words, points to the "contextual nature" in which morality and truth are situated. Ishiguro and Han, however, point to the conflict in moral contexts.

The novels of Ishiguro and Han raise questions about Gilligan's model: what does her frame of linear moral developmental theory signify when the contextual reality

restricts an individual's moral choice? What if the moral choice enacted in the mature stage of an ethic of care reveals conflicting ethical problems? Gilligan's narrative of her sample group, whether they are women or men, demonstrates that there is no way to avoid hurting others in moral decisions.[37] However, the vital consideration for her is that an individual's choices should be inclusive and morally responsible. In response to Gilligan's placing of care as a moral position, Joan Tronto proposes that "if such caretaking is the quintessential moral task, the context within which conflicting demands occur will be an important factor in determining the morally correct act" ("Beyond Gender Difference" 249). Tronto, in *Moral Boundaries* (1993), recognizes "care as a political concept" that marks intersections of social hierarchies and power relations (168). It is important, then, to understand different forms of care that operate to meet the needs of others affected by different social, cultural, and political normativity.

Accordingly, this chapter interrogates power relations within the practices of care that alienate care providers from social conviviality: who produces what conviviality for whom.[38] I use the term conviviality in two ways in this chapter. First, it can mean political and cultural cheerfulness situated in the present moment; second, it can refer to amiable relations with family as well as with strangers. In family relations, conviviality is comprised of small-scale normative practices that exploit care-labor based on social

[37] It should be noticed that the sample group she chose for the study of the third stage of moral development was college students—educated subjects who elected to take a course on moral and political choice.

[38] The framework of conviviality should recognize the striations of labor and power in social coexistence across diverse populations that appear inclusive.

norms and hierarchies. Sociopolitical conviviality is constituted through the normalized exploitation of care from such social differences in various domains, including the political, economic, and cultural. Conviviality mobilizes an individual's feeling close to what society premises as the putative convivial future; conviviality demands care in exchange for coexistence. In this respect, the violence of care is a naturalized psychological or emotional pressure upon care providers, which occurs not necessarily through physical or verbal coercion but via an ethical expectation to maintain normative individual and social relations. Care-violence also entails the exercise of physical force or hierarchical power over others (including those who are cared for) in the process of a provider performing care. That is, the violence of care occurs not only against the subject of care providers but also against those of socially lesser status, who are vulnerable to the normativity of care that supports the extant social and cultural system of power relations. In the following sections, I articulate the principles and practices of Stevens's and In-hye's moral vision and how their care complicates care ethics.

Problematic Integrity and Ethical Responsibility in *The Remains of the Day*

The duty to care as a principle can result in unforeseen injustice, even when caring is conducted with integrity. Ishiguro's novel portrays such unforeseen injustice through the changes of Stevens's duty to care, symbolized by the changing ownership of Darlington Hall and how Stevens confronts past wrongs by accepting a new duty to care. The structure of the novel demonstrates the transformation of Stevens's proximity to Englishness: from his complete alignment of self with butlership/Englishness to a

separation of self from profession. This shift is caused by the estate's new American owner, Mr. Farraday.

In the prologue, Mr. Farraday challenges Stevens's principle and practice of dignity, firstly by making Stevens travel away temporarily from Darlington Hall, and secondly by expecting him to engage in the "affectionate sport" of bantering. Stevens resists this alteration of his professional duty, stating, "I must say this business of bantering is not a duty I feel I can ever discharge with enthusiasm. It is all very well, in these changing times, to adapt one's work to take in duties not traditionally within one's realm; but bantering is of another dimension altogether. For one thing, how would one know for sure that at any given moment a response of the bantering sort is truly what is expected?" (*RD* 16). Stevens's reluctance to adopt a new skill stems from two sources. His invocation of tradition implies that bantering is not in line with English class and role distinctions. In the novel, Stevens's notion of dignity lies on "a butler's ability not to abandon the professional being he inhabits," which is truly possible for English butlers due to their capacity for emotional restraint (*RD* 43). In contrast, bantering is an imported service from America, brought about by the "changing times," that requires emotional reciprocity between equals or near-equals. Further, as indicated by Stevens's question, bantering requires subjective judgment. Stevens's remark is not only indicative of his attachment to Englishness but also suggestive of the order involved in the previous era's clearly bounded care duty. If Lord Darlington's days represent the vertical authority structure that does not involve a lower-level individual's perspective, the present day seemingly suggests the leveling of such hierarchized order, allowing or even

expecting an employee's subjectivity. Thus, what Stevens means by "another dimension" is not just a matter of emotional labor but a revelation of one's self in terms of professional identity. Under these conflicting concepts of duty to care, Stevens's journey depends on adjusting his concept of dignity, however reluctant and evasive the narrative demonstrates him to be.[39] I argue that his unreliability demonstrates his coping mechanism of his class-marked role as a butler and the evidence of the violence of care in the service of following societal normativity.

This tension between the ethics of professionalism in the old world and the new speaks to the question of integrity and self in the practice of care. Stevens's pride in his sense of professionalism derives from his alignment with people of privilege whose lives seem impactful and worthwhile; accordingly, serving those people transmits a belief that

[39] Stevens's unreliable narrative has been an object of scholarly concern regarding his subjectivity and the ethical implications of Ishiguro's novel. Stevens's subordination of his private self to his professional self is not only costly but also ethically problematic because it excuses his service to the Nazi sympathizer Lord Darlington. Amit Marcus, for instance, defines Stevens's self-deception as an indication of the "*conservative* type," which "stems from his wish to preserve his former self-image and world-view" especially within his relations to his father, Miss Kenton, and Lord Darlington (132). While Marcus explores the disparity between Stevens's self and his belief that does not fit into the changed reality, Michel Terestchenko considers the ethical implication of such self-division. Terestchenko demonstrates the destructiveness of Stevens's withdrawal of his self from the social function by applying Jean-Paul Sartre's "bad faith" to the analysis of the character. By destructiveness, Terestchenko means wicked actions without evil intentions: "Harming others results from the combination of the situational social factors and an acknowledgment of the legitimacy of authority which leads people to be absent from themselves, to abandon their true selves, to fragment and to partition their personality" (88). While Terestchenko's criticism on Stevens's servile obedience is scathing, he and many others agree that *The Remains of the Day* opens up ethical explorations about the narrative subject and content.

he is doing honorable tasks. Accommodating himself to serving his employer's admirable judgment is considered "loyalty *intelligently* bestowed," which is how Stevens conceptualizes self-care and dignity (*RD* 206). Yet ambivalence occurs in the discrepancy between the effect and the value Stevens gains due to the very practice of self-effacement.[40] In Stevens's memory of the events that are supposed to catalog triumphant moments that exemplify dignity, Stevens's remembered feeling—albeit restrained—contradicts his narrated self-achievement. An anecdote about the international conference illustrates how Stevens resolves his conflicting responsibilities as both a butler and a son by choosing to prioritize his professional position. His justification is clear: Stevens believes that his employer holds the conference based on a "desire to see 'justice in this world,'" thereby reasoning that serving justice is a better ethical choice for the common good (*RD* 74). The whole structure of the household

[40] Stevens's attentiveness to the needs of aristocrats requires emotional restraint in any circumstances because of their supposedly weighty involvement in the political and social realm. In return, Stevens believes that his care plays a role in enhancing civilization and humanism, justifying his controlled emotional labor as part of professionalism. Even so, his labor is inadequately compensated, as revealed by his anxiety about traveling expenses at the beginning of the novel: "For even taking into account my employer's generous offer to 'foot the bill for the gas,' the costs of such a trip might still come to a surprising amount considering such matters as accommodation, meals, and any small snacks I might partake of on my way" (*RD* 10). Besides cost issues, he encounters many problems oriented towards his own needs rather than others' needs. His concern about a traveling costume is related matter, since most of his suits were handed down by Lord Darlington and other guests he once served. These seemingly trivial anxieties involved in the preparations of a short trip prove that Stevens's entire life has been dependent on his employer's generosity for his living in exchange for his service, situating him at a low-wage status within the hierarchically classed society.

functions to run the conference smoothly with utmost care. Hence, as a butler of Darlington Hall, Stevens takes charge of maintaining the integrity of the household care. Within his professional principle, Stevens's father's critical illness is an unforeseen contingency that challenges the smooth operation of household duty, yet this very challenge validates Stevens's ethic as an ability to adhere to his professional role. Stevens, therefore, can say that the weighty "pressures" and "sad associations" he experienced strengthen his professional development. A few years after the conference incident, however, he realizes that the professional development he assumed would come to fruition has not. That is, his realization of contradiction occurs during the present narrative moment.[41] The inconsistency between the narrated achievement and the experienced feeling demonstrates the conflicting truths of the professional world Stevens inhabits: professionalism violates his integrity of the self because the whole structure and flow of household care suppresses Stevens's private emotions. Nevertheless, Stevens's idea of dignity naturalizes the oppression, for such dignity values emotional restraint. Stevens's achievement, in this regard, is paradoxical because it demands self-deception.

The problem inherent to Stevens's concept of dignity is that it emphasizes an individual's responsibility and ability to reduce the feeling of injustice, instead of critiquing the existing unjust structures of power relations. The sense of nobility attached

[41] Stevens's uncontrolled facial uneasiness, noticed by Lord Darlington ("You look as though you're crying"), belies Stevens's assertion of self-care (107). Sara Ahmed argues that emotions "are not 'after-thoughts' but shape how bodies are moved by the worlds they inhabit" (*Promise of Happiness* 230).

to the butler's dignity aestheticizes a butler's care in order to enhance his employer's position, dignity, or interest. When I say that Stevens aestheticizes his past labor, I mean that he elevates his care work, especially in retrospect, to the level of the sublime. Care is an act of great dignity, the embodiment of a philosophical principle. Therefore, the more difficult the situation the butler encounters, the more skillful the art of attentiveness or more heroic the act of care he demonstrates. Yet the concept of dignity does not establish equivalent values between the employer and the employee, for a butler must sublimate emotional and psychological pressures into outward-facing dignity toward his employer. The convivial atmosphere of the smoking room at the successful end of Lord Darlington's conference exemplifies inequity in the exclusionary nature of dignity.

The pretext of the aristocrats' gathering at the conference is their "care for the well-being of Europe" after witnessing Germany's suffering; they find it imperative to set up a "strong moral case" by freezing German's reparation payments so that justice prevails on the basis of moral restoration (103). The rhetoric of moral restoration that speaks for the defeated appeals to the universal claim of goodness, but in reality Lord Darlington's and other participants' object of concern is recovering a single disgraced German gentlemen's dignity (i.e., Lord Darlington initiates the conference after witnessing his friend Herr Karl-Heinz Bremann's suffering). The peace and justice this dominant class claim mask a hierarchized normativity through which gentlemen can keep their position of noble rank, but this idea is voiced through the ethic of care: for a friend and for the Continent. And it has integrity in the sense of being true to Lord

Darlington's principles of moral justice regarding Germany's suffering. What the aristocrats have dismissed is the duty to care for others outside one's immediate community: the victims of Nazi doctrines.

As Margaret Urban Walker notes, "moral relations are seated in and expressed through social relations. More often than not, in human societies the extant moral order will to a great extent track or implement a social order that privileges some over others. Not all 'participants' are equal in most human social and moral orders" (26). That is, if the dominant group's claim of goodness does not seek to repair the existing moral order and social normativity, the conviviality of the world—peaceful coexistence—is itself limited and exclusionary. The young Cardinal, a conference participant, offers a statement confirming the surface level truth of the conviviality permeated in the conference without acknowledging the cost of Stevens's diligent attendance upon the conference guests: "But we could still have chaps like you taking messages back and forth, bringing tea, that sort of thing. Otherwise, how would we ever get anything done? Can you imagine it, Stevens? All of us rooted in the soil?" (*RD* 110). The Cardinal imagines everyone as plants, wishing there would be no "wars and boundaries" between people, but his imagination cannot cross boundaries of class.

The conviviality of the old world minimizes social differences yet maintains its ethos on the exploitation of other peoples' care and service. In this blatantly exclusionary world, the practice of care perpetuates the ordered hierarchy of those who hold power. Not only does keeping one's privileged position in a system of injustice justify oppression, but it also reinforces the system requiring servants' care to keep

conviviality alive and well. In this context, convivial violence occurs in a form of dignified duty. Stevens's subordination of his life to dignity may be an exemplar of what Gilligan labels "the danger of ethics abstracted from life" (104). It is this abstract value's effect that misguides Stevens to subjugate his emotions in service of the conviviality of Lord Darlington's commitment to the global significance.[42] However, it may be undeniable that the normativity of the house Stevens inhabits and his close proximity to Lord Darlington make his care unquestionable. The closeness of Stevens's relationship to Darlington Hall and his Lordship creates a professional sense of affective flow between the self and the community; this proximity, tethered by care, delimits Stevens's choice and suspends his judgment about his employer's amoral acts. Stevens's strong commitment to Lord Darlington strengthens the affective flow of dignity, which obscures the violence of care through its imaginary equation of caring with goodness.

However, Ishiguro, through the narrator Stevens, uses the particular word "convivial" to dramatize the irony lodged between the word's jovial sense and the narrated situation. This irony indicates that Stevens is excluded from the structure of conviviality in Lord Darlington's era. For Ishiguro, then, the ethic of care must be both mutual and outward oriented, two conditions that trouble Stevens's conservative and

[42] The word "convivial" appears twice in *The Remains of the Day*. As we have already observed, the first use of the word occurs after Stevens's father's death to contrast it with the cheerful atmosphere in the conference participants' smoking room. The second use occurs at another triumphant moment of Stevens's practice of dignity: Stevens fails to prevent the head housekeeper, Miss Kenton's, acceptance of a marriage proposal by prioritizing his service for Lord Darlington's arrangement of the meeting with the German Ambassador, the British Prime Minister, and the Foreign Secretary.

hierarchical sense of the dignity of care. For this reason, Stevens's claim, made after a long retrospection during his journey, that he cannot say he made his own mistakes is only partially true: "He [Lord Darlington] chose a certain path in life, it proved to be a misguided one, but there, he chose it…As for myself, I cannot even claim that" (*RD* 249). Stevens concludes that his life dedicated to dignity is built upon the falsehood of his employer's wrong deed. He reflects that Lord Darlington at least had the "privilege" of choosing his own life, as opposed to his own much more constrained choices. Certainly, Stevens has to follow a social order imposed upon him. However, it is his paradoxical self-care through an act of self-abnegation (in the cause of dignity) to the oppressive care duty that leads him to "trust" Darlington's idea of order. In other words, self-abnegation is both a reflection of the hierarchical social expectation and Stevens's chosen ethics. The ethics guides Stevens's acts whenever he encounters the conflict between different applications of his professional ethic, dignified care. Stevens ought to carry out his employer's orders because it is the ethical orientation of his job. Thus, when Lord Darlington orders Stevens to dismiss two Jewish maids, the integrity of his professional self does what is supposed to be right, even though his inner morality opposes it. What Stevens thinks he is doing right (his workplace integrity) contradicts what he thinks morally right (his subjective integrity). The discrepancy of these two contradictory integrities is a type of violence Stevens must endure even though he did not, in the moment, realize he was undergoing such violence. Miss Kenton labels that conflict:

> "Why, Mr. Stevens, why, why, why do you always have to pretend?"

> I gave another laugh at the ridiculous turn the conversation had suddenly taken. "Really, Miss Kenton," I said, "I'm not sure I know what you mean. Pretend? Why, really….Really, Miss Kenton…" I picked up the tray on which I had gathered together the used crockery. "Naturally, one disapproved of the dismissals. One would have thought that quite self-evident." (*RD* 158)

His lack of certainty in his selfhood (which is why Miss Kenton expresses anguish about Stevens's pretense) makes Stevens use the third-person singular pronoun "one" instead of "I" in the conversation. The use of "one" indicates Stevens's passivity about his judgment. And it is morally problematic if he exempts himself from moral judgment through his detached use of pronoun "one" when addressing his wrong past choice in the present narrative moment: "Really—one has to ask oneself—what dignity is there in that?" (*RD* 250). With these rhetorical choices, Ishiguro indicates that Stevens should admit his error at the point of "after-thought" temporality.

In addition, even if Stevens could not resist Lord Darlington's wrong order in the past, his duty indicates that he does not include care for certain others (i.e., the Jewish maids whose vulnerability is multiplied with regard to the intersection of race, gender, and class) in his professional concept. Stevens justifies his duty to care based on his belief in Darlington's high-minded claims to be working toward peace and economic justice. Despite the fact that Stevens acknowledges Lord Darlington's complicity with the injustices of the Nazi party, the butler's passive complicity in dismissing the two Jewish maids illuminates how conviviality works problematically. Lord Darlington's act of caring for Germany's postwar social and economic instability, along with Stevens's

excuses for his employer, together demonstrate two things: their care reveals narrow boundaries of care relations exclusive to more socially advantaged people. It also exposes the problem in normative care because it presupposes the cost of conviviality, represented in the dismissal of the maids and Stevens's disavowal of his inner moral integrity. In other words, care in Lord Darlington's frame of putative conviviality works by discounting classed, gendered, and racialized structures of power. Hence, Stevens should broaden his concept of duty to care beyond the limit of the dominant's normativity of social relations. Conversely, he should learn *disloyalty* that ruptures his limited professionalism or expands it to encompass those he manages, the maids.

Stevens's realization of the deceptiveness of his dignity, instead, guides him in a new ethical direction after his emotionally charged confession with the ex-butler in the pier scene. Stevens had not recovered from his heartbreaking parting with Mrs. Benn when an ex-butler interrupts his retrospection at the pier.[43] The ex-butler takes on the role of narratee as Stevens shares his current predicament: the service he provided for Lord Darlington is no longer appropriate for his new employer, nor is it satisfactory for Stevens. Instantly, the two men are intimately united through butlership and old age. The presence of the ex-butler is minimal, but his function is far greater because his position as the narratee reveals Stevens's truth as well as Stevens's frame for self-justification. In response to Stevens's distress and his dilemma, the ex-butler recommends that he retire

[43] The purpose of taking a journey, for Stevens, is to persuade Miss Kenton (now called Mrs. Benn) to return to work at Darlington Hall. On the surface, his aim looks like a business trip, but Stevens eventually realizes his emotional ties to her.

and keep looking forward instead of looking backward. To lean on this "cheerful fellow" stranger's advice, what Stevens does—the best he can do—is to reframe and repair his notion of care by accepting that his new care duties must include bantering, and also by orienting himself toward the future. James Phelan and Mary Patricia Martin argue that Stevens's acceptance of bantering indicates substantial progress; seeking human warmth is a "sign" that he is going to "learn about the sharing of human emotion" (107). This hopeful view, according to their claim, reflects the readers' desire to see moral progress in Stevens by analyzing the ex-butler as a "stand-in" for the author and his audience.[44] Their ethical reading of Ishiguro's final scene suggests a particular tendency in anticipation of ethical satisfaction: an emotionally affirmative turn toward the future. It is as if Stevens's emotional devastation can be resolved by developing the ability to share human warmth and build a convivial relationship with Mr. Farraday. In this reading, there is a certain correlation between human warmth and ethics; further, this correlation resonates with an ethic of care as long as Stevens's new care work (bantering) is built upon the integration of self-care and care for others. But what lies in the future regarding Stevens's unresolved ethical evasion of his past and his unchanged status as a butler? I suggest that Stevens's self-realization at the pier indeed means that he understands the need to take responsibility for his choices (he demonstrates his

[44] By the authorial audience, Phelan and Martin mean an "author's ideal audience." They state that this "audience is synonymous with 'implied reader' but distinct from both the narratee (the audience addressed by the narrator) and the 'narrative audience,' the observer position that flesh-and-blood readers occupy within the world of the fiction" (108).

agency in his declaration of accepting bantering as a butler's new duty), yet Stevens's confession after the conversation with the ex-butler excuses himself from ethical responsibility through the removal of his self from his past actions.

After observing the convivial coexistence of strangers at the pier gathering to enjoy the evening lights, Stevens thinks that there is some truth in the ex-butler's claim. The truth, however, works differently for each of them, as the ex-butler's and Stevens's position are different. Unlike the ex-butler, Stevens has to return to his position, and his situation seems worse than before. Stevens confirms that Mrs. Benn has no desire to return to Darlington Hall. As he further confesses, Stevens's strong attachment to Lord Darlington consumes all of his loyalty so that nothing is left for serving Mr. Farraday. Nonetheless, Stevens has to stay at Darlington Hall like "part of the package," for his new American employer paid for a "genuine old-fashioned English butler" within a "genuine grand old English house" (*RD* 126). Stevens's options are limited: he has narrow personal relations and is navigating their changes; he is also economically dependent on his American employer. Thus, making the best of the remains of Stevens's day demands him to assume futurity as goodness, a value imposition new to him. Stevens's introspection towards an affirmative turn reveals the convivial violence of a new era as well as his self-justification for his questionable ethics:

> After all, what can we ever gain in forever looking back and blaming ourselves if our lives have not turned out quite as we might have wished? The hard reality is, surely that for the likes of you and I, there is little choice other than to leave our fate, ultimately, in the hands of those great gentlemen at the hub of this world

> who employ our services. What is the point in worrying oneself too much about what one could or could not have done to control the course one's life took? Surely it is enough that the likes of you and I at least *try* to make our small contribution count for something true and worthy. And if some of us are prepared to sacrifice much in life in order to pursue such aspirations, surely that is in itself, whatever the outcome, cause for pride and contentment. (*RD* 250-51)

Stevens's narration simultaneously conceals and reveals his ethics with regard to his past deeds (note the repeated passive pronoun, "one") and the future practice of the duty to care. He acknowledges that due to his class position he has "little choice" in managing his life. Even if reciprocating banter between employer and employee seems to suggest a horizontal relationship, bantering does not change the fact that the role of butler Stevens has to perform is a commodified act that meets an American entrepreneur's expectation of a "real" English butler. Additionally, reciprocity of humor does not necessarily grant Stevens's equality, since it is another attentive skill based on the American employer's cultural normativity and social relations. The American-owned Darlington Hall is a new world to Stevens, where jovial expressions are a new dominant value. After observing some strangers' swift convivial mood at the pier, Stevens begins to associate the skill of bantering with human warmth. While he assures the ex-butler that he will practice bantering as "something true and worthy," he still prefers the idea of sacrifice in his concept of dignity. The vestige of self-sacrifice for the sake of value results from the ethical evasion of his past practices of care on the one hand ("whatever the outcome," his act is worthy). On the other hand, emotional conviviality attached to a new duty to

care obscures the violence of care thrust upon people of lesser status. Stevens must navigate new cultural expectations for conviviality, the display of cheerfulness in banter.

Refusal of Care and Ethical Living in *The Vegetarian*

Ishiguro's novel foreshadows a convivial turn as a new dominant expression of U.S.-led global power, implying an elusive form of the violence of care through its metaphoric use of bantering. Han's novel further suggests a more complicated violence of care in the form of ethical living in postcolonial South Korea.

The Vegetarian weaves together three short stories to illustrate a model of environmental care and its violent consequences that destroy family relations and an individual's mental and physical stability. Each short story reveals the Kim family and their reactions to a series of events through the perspective of two sisters, Young-hye and In-hye: the first story is narrated by Young-hye's husband Mr. Cheong, the second by her brother-in-law, and the third by her elder sister In-hye. The first part of *The Vegetarian* depicts Mr. Cheong's violent rejection of his wife, Yeong-hye, due to her neglect of mundane care routines. Her neglect specifically serves her ethical investment in nonviolence to animals and the natural environment. The subsequent story, "Mongolian Mark," portrays the brother-in-law's artistic approach to Yeong-hye's Mongolian mark, a symbol of ethical purity, which results in him sexually abusing Yeong-hye during her ethical experiment in which she tries to become a non-human

being.[45] The final section, "Flaming Trees," elucidates In-hye's caring for the now invalid Yeong-hye, who is hospitalized in a mental institution because of her tenacious refusal of food and physical care. Yeong-hye's perspective is never narrated directly, and each of the narrators' limited points of view displays the impossibility of understanding Yeong-hye's vegetarian ethic. This incomprehensibility leads to problematic familial care imperatives that attempt to normalize Yeong-hye's diet, as if care itself can justify violating another's ethical decision in order to restore normative expectations and communal relations. *The Vegetarian*, in this regard, invokes the ethical problems surrounding care practices.

Yeong-hye's and In-hye's contradictory responses to care ethics exhibit how women's care is made to be responsible for domestic and social conviviality. Society renders women's subjectivities and their care functional by entrusting the state's futurity to women's social reproduction of familiar ties and cultural practices in general. Upholding such domestic and social conviviality can be understood as care, which is oriented toward a developmental future ontology. Or, as Sara Ruddick rightfully claims, it is in maternal work that society demands women preserve children's lives, foster their growth, and raise them to be socially acceptable in order to sustain the collective (17). The future-oriented social imaginary dictates that Yeong-hye maintain the wifely or (future) motherly role, following what her mother and her sister have practiced in their lives. In-hye's and Yeong-hye's conflicting care ethics evince two different women's

[45] Mongolian marks are blue-gray spots that commonly appear on the buttocks of Asian infants and disappear as they grow.

care responses to the structural mode of care normativity, resulting in agonistic effects to both In-hye and Yeong-hye. Yeong-hye's vision supports the care of animals in the service of planetary welfare, while In-hye is recruited to sustain the family as a part of a national project. These two unbending ethics stand out in the novel's final part, "Flaming Trees."

In "Flaming Trees," In-hye encounters an ethical predicament. In-hye has only thirty minutes to persuade Yeong-hye to eat some food, otherwise she must transfer her sister from the mental hospital to the general one in order to prolong Yeong-hye's life. Feeling a mixture of regret, sorrow, and frustration during those thirty minutes, In-hye recalls the time when she betrayed Yeong-hye's trust a month prior:

> "If you promise to eat I'll get you discharged." She [In-hye] couldn't fail to notice how the light went out of Yeong-hye's eyes then. "Yeong-hye. Answer me. All you need to do is promise."
>
> Yeong-hye twisted away from her sister. "You're just the same," she whispered, her voice barely audible…."No one can understand me…the doctors, the nurses, they're all the same…they don't even try to understand…they just force me to take medication, and stab me with needles." Yeong-hye's voice was slow and quiet, but firm.
>
> In-hye couldn't hold herself back any longer.

"You!" she yelled. "I'm acting like this because I'm afraid you're going to die!"[46]

During Yeong-hye's hospitalization in the mental institution, she fosters an idea that becoming a tree would serve her moral imperative to do no harm to the planet. To pursue this idea, she completely stops taking food. For Yeong-hye, the daily preparation of food and the act of eating are a primary human violence imposed in order to maintain human life at the expense of other kinds of lives.[47] Yet, as her mother and sister insist, Yeong-hye has to eat to live. Put differently, the life sustained by the act of eating entails the death of other non-human beings, plants and animals alike, deemed as properly sacrificial in the care of human life. In this regard, care and violence are intimately tied by their normalized consumption of some living beings to sustain other beings' lives. Yeong-hye's arboreal aspiration is a radical ethical project that attempts to put her outside the cycle of care and the violence of eating.

Yeong-hye's decision, however, is incomprehensible to In-hye: Yeong-hye is not a non-human being, but very much a human. From In-hye's ethical perspective, life is what a living human being has to do no matter what; In-hye's concept of responsibility

---

[46] Han Kang, *The Vegetarian*, translated by Deborah Smith, 162. When I use my own translation, my references refer to Han Kang's original, *채식주의자* (Chaesikjuuija), Changbi Publishers, 2007, given in parentheses with the author's last name and the page number. Otherwise, all references to *The Vegetarian* are given in parentheses as *V* plus page numbers.

[47] In Krys Lee's conversation with Han Kang, Han states that "Violence is part of being human" that prevails in everyday life, since "[e]ating meat [and] cooking meat…embody a violence that has been normalized" (64).

and care cannot allow Yeong-hye to give up her life. This principle hinders her in understanding the implication of her seemingly innocuous practices of care: how she cajoles Yeong-hye to eat, and even how she prepares a vegan diet, are oppressive to Yeong-hye. In-hye could not imagine how violent her authoritative conditional statement is, because she is the one who holds power within the relationship with Yeong-hye. Also, as a proxy to cure Yeong-hye's invalid body, In-hye is morally authorized to enforce her requirement to care against Yeong-hye's refusal of such care-based coercion. This incompatibility between Yeong-hye and In-hye demonstrates the conflicting values of care ethics and further complicates In-hye's normative moral care. Her own ethic becomes increasingly ambivalent.

To understand In-hye's intricate care dilemma depicted in the novel's third part, it is important to examine the gender conditions in post-1945 South Korea that constitute the contemporary context of Han's novel. *The Vegetarian* describes the late 1990s or early 2000s in Korean society, following the military dictatorships of the 1960s-80s. Compared to the three-decade military junta, the political era of a new millennium represented a seemingly convivial time that prioritized civil rights and political, economic, and cultural well-being. Political advances in women's rights also increased.[48] Compared to the militarized patriarchy of the past (which is represented by Yeong-hye's father, who was awarded "the Order of Military Merit" for his activities in the Vietnam

[48] In their study of gender politics in contemporary Korea, Ju Hui Judy Han and Jennifer Jihye Chun state that the increase of female representation in government has secured "key constitutional reforms and legislative policies promoting women's rights and gender equality" since the 1990s (246).

War), contemporary gender conditions seem to indicate a significant improvement. Nevertheless, the gendered ideals continued even after the military regimes; Han describes quotidian violence against women who are not autonomous but who serve the nation as wife and mother. The emphasis on feminine virtue and sacrifice in the novel must be understood in this specific historicity.[49]

The legacies of the Park Chung Hee dictatorship of 1963-1979 laid the groundwork of contemporary gender hierarchy and the gendered division of labor in the service of industrial modernization and masculinization of South Korea. As Jin-kyung Lee illustrates, Park appropriated the discourse of loyalty and filial piety to accomplish collective material prosperity and, in the wake of independence from Japanese imperialism, to become a "sovereign, mature adult nation" which positions itself "to help other nations rather than be helped, as it had been in the past" (659-60). South Korea's participation in the Vietnam War, in particular, gave Park's government a chance to

[49] Attributing the emphasis on feminine virtue to the Confucian tradition in East Asia can flatten the historical and political power dynamics that constitute the gendered ideal in South Korea. For instance, Cornelia Macsiniuc frames Yeong-hye's family as a "traditional Asian family" that leads her to analyze Yeong-hye's vegetarianism as a resistance to "custom and tradition" (104, 105). Although it is remarkable to examine gender ideology in eating practices, Macsiniuc's general remarks of "ancestral memories of human savagery" and her representation of Yeong-hye's father as "ancestral posture of the 'hunter'" indicate a lack of concern for Korea's sociopolitical and historical context (108, 112). Her binary view constructs South Korea as a *backward* nation, as if meat eating practices in Western cultures do not also have gender implications in the hierarchical social structure (as evidenced in Ruth Ozeki's *My Year of Meats* [see Chapter Three]). Instead, as Seungsook Moon argues in *Militarized Modernity and Gendered Citizenship in South Korea* (2005), careful consideration is needed as to how tradition is mobilized and re-emphasized at particular historical moments.

rebrand and masculinize the nation-state. The government utilized the discourse of peace and prosperity to justify its legitimacy as well as the ethical breaches involved in Korea's participation in the war. Even so, the Park government enlisted more value-oriented ideological apparatuses; the value of loyalty and filial piety legitimized social hierarchy in various sectors and prioritizes familism over individual autonomy.[50] The alignment of filial piety with national loyalty emerged as an effective means to govern the population.

In turn, the nation-state imposed the primary duty to care onto family—a starting point toward fostering filial piety and loyalty to the nation. They encouraged gendered normative ideals such as the masculinized father and the domestically virtuous mother. The military culture further shaped people's daily lives while effacing women's economic strength through the state-led normative ideal of "husband-provider and dependent-housewife."[51] The militarized national identity erased women's actual efforts to revive the economy. Female labor was a major force in industrial sectors from the 1960s to the 1970s, but as Jin-kyung Lee states, "the state and social discourses centered on both military labor…and male industrial labor…[made] the masculine body the

[50] Familism is an ideology that places priority on the value of family. As Sungmoon Kim states, familism serves to "strengthen the state's authority by ensuring that governmental and familial authorities complement and reinforce each other" (476).

[51] See Seungsook Moon, "The Production and Subversion of Hegemonic Masculinity: Reconfiguring Gender Hierarchy in Contemporary South Korea," in *Under Construction: The Gendering of Modernity, Class, and Consumption in the Republic of Korea*, edited by Laurel Kendall, U of Hawai'i P, 2002, pp. 79-114.

fulcrum of militarized modernization" (662).[52] As Nancy Folbre demonstrates in *Greed, Lust and Gender: A History of Economic Ideas* (2009), women's economic vulnerability manifests the costs of care since morally-coded family obligation and affection have generated care as nonmarket-driven labor.[53] Whereas the gendered division of labor hardly existed in the agrarian-based family structure in prewar Korea, later the ideal of the housewife made rural women view themselves as housewives even as they provided labor for family subsistence. A rapid shift into a modern capitalist nation was made possible by the costly reconfiguring of a gendered hierarchy that violates women's subjectivity in order to maintain an imposed ideal role as primary caregivers. A state ideology of familism masks actual social and domestic violence.

Such militarized normativity, in tandem with its manufactured ideals of women's virtue, enforced women's responsibility for household caring and constructed the integrity of domestic maintenance. This peculiar yet naturalized situation is exemplified in In-hye and Yeong-hye's childhood home. As a household head, Yeong-hye's father displays his authority by habitually beating his children. He had expected economic gain from his participation in the Vietnam War, but when he returned to South Korea he was reduced to practicing carpentry for living. The militarist promise of material prosperity

---

[52] Cynthia Enloe in *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire* (2004) interrogates the militarized politics in the 1970s that "cheapened" women's labor even as it relied on the women's labor force in light industry.

[53] Folbre states: "Care for dependents is costly, and emotional attachments make primary caregivers 'prisoners of love' unable or unwilling to threaten withdrawal of their services.…Their value depends not merely on the work performed but also on a relationship between provider and recipient that develops over time" (311).

failed him; he enacts his disappointment by abusing his children in order to affirm his masculine authority. He particularly targets Yeong-hye because of her gentle yet inflexible personality, which cannot deflect her father's temper. Unlike Yeong-hye, In-hye could avoid her father's beatings, for as the eldest daughter she is the one who often prepared a "hangover soup" for her father in place of their exhausted mother. That is, the duty to care is transmitted to the eldest daughter on behalf of her mother, who takes part in economic activities by running a small grocery store. In-hye's sense of responsibility and care enabled her to avoid her father's beatings and to keep the household in order. Yet she later believes that her toil was a sign of cowardice that could not confront oppressive patriarchal power: "Now, with the benefit of hindsight, In-hye could see that the role that she had adopted back then of the hard-working eldest daughter had been a sign not of maturity but of cowardice. It had been a survival tactic" (*V* 163). Her empathy towards an emotionally and physically drained mother not only indicates her premature understanding of women's endurance, but also represents her inadvertent co-option of the patriarchal system. Yet this very empathy is also prescribed by an ethic of care in this patriarchal context. In-hye's care is elicited by the wounds of her mother and sister, but the resultant care labor she performs only maintains the existing patriarchy. As the word "tactic" denotes above, women are compelled to foster affective investments simply for protection in a tyrannical household. As for Yeong-hye, who does not know how to appease her father's short temper, she becomes the most vulnerable target of patriarchal abuse.

In-hye's attentiveness to the needs of others may maintain family relations, but her care overlooks Yeong-hye's hardship at the cost of family unity. In-hye's inability to recognize Yeong-hye's suffering exposes Yeong-hye to enduring violent situations. For instance, In-hye could not understand why the nine-year-old Yeong-hye wanted to run away from home when they got lost in the mountains. Yeong-hye's refusal to return to the house means death or at least hardships equivalent to her home life, since for her home is a place of pain that leads her to think of death as a possible flight. Yeong-hye is, to borrow Sarah Ahmed's term, an "affect alien" who cannot go along with her family's principles just to maintain the integrity of the household. Ahmed describes "affect aliens" as "those who are alienated by virtue of how they are affected by the world or how they affect others in the world" (*Promise of Happiness* 164). These people refuse to get along with what is perceived as socially good or refuse to be oriented toward the putative *happiness*. Thereby, others accuse affect aliens of generating bad feelings or killing the mood. The community or society these subjects inhabit alienates them insofar as they do not go along with the social expectations. In-hye's affectionate concern for her sister's safety implies that her care is in accordance with the familial and social normativity, hindering Yeong-hye's flight.

While In-hye's care imperative works to put off her realization of her feelings of alienation from the oppressive normativity of the house, Yeong-hye realizes her position as a stranger at an earlier age. Besides Yeong-hye's endurance of her father's beatings, what she cannot bear the most is the mixture of strange feelings emanating from and affected toward the people closest to her. In a scene that describes her repeated dreams,

she expresses gruesome feelings of being a murderer or being murdered. Despite the dream's ambiguity about who kills whom, she senses the familiarity of violent acts:

> *Incomprehensible you may be. From the past, I was afraid to see someone cut on a chopping board. Even if that someone is my sister or my mother. I cannot explain why. Just intolerable loathing. So I rather used to be affectionate to those people. It wasn't my mother or sister being murdered or they were murderers in yesterday night's dream. Yet a similar feeling.* (Han 37, my translation, italics original)[54]

The passage suggests that the act of caring entails the violation of others, which may not be perceptible to those people who are accustomed to existing within the violent normativity that structures the order of things according to power. Han stresses Yeong-hye's dreams by using italics as well as fragmented sentence structures that distinguish the different narrative perspectives. In doing so, Han allows Yeong-hye's several dreams to speak with the voice of unaccountable repression, through fragmented articulations only. What is remarkable in this dream is Yeong-hye's confession that she showed more affection to those of her intimates who prepare food in a manner that seems violent to

---

[54] Smith's translation omitted Yeong-hye's incomprehensible fear emanating from the novel's maternal figures. Here I transcribe her translation: "*Intolerable loathing, so long suppressed. Loathing I've always tried to mask with affection. But now the mask is coming off*" (36). And the original in Korean: *이해할 수 없겠지. 예전부터 난, 누군가가 도마에 칼질을 하는 걸 보면 무서웠어. 그게 언니라 해도, 아니, 엄마라 해도. 왠지는 설명 못해. 그냥 못 견디게 싫은 느낌이라고밖엔. 그래서 오히려 그 사람들한테 다정하게 굴곤 했지. 그렇다고 어제 꿈에 죽거나 죽인 사람이 엄마나 언니였다는 건 아니야. 다만 그 비슷한 느낌.* (37)

her. Yeong-hye's sensitivity to violence reveals that even her mother's and sister's use of a kitchen knife, an ordinary care activity of cooking, provokes Yeong-hye's fear and abhorrence. It is not just her father who routinely inflicts violence on Yeong-hye; these caring people—the maternal figures—also cause her to feel estranged. Caring for others through the preparation of meals, for Yeong-hye, is an extension of supporting the hierarchized order between humans and non-humans, masked by the affectionately-arranged foods of carnivorous or vegetarian diets alike. Yeong-hye's affection towards In-hye or her mother represents her concealed fear of becoming the prey of society at large, resonating with Yeong-hye's mother's reproach to her daughter in the hospital: "Look at yourself, now! Stop eating meat, and the world will devour you whole" (*V* 56). Thus, the dream implies that Yeong-hye represses her alienation at home even within maternal care relations.

Yeong-hye refuses the care that draws subjects (humans and animals) into the hierarchical order and binds one's mind to the reciprocal care chain. Yeong-hye's sensitivity to the violence of care derives from her traumatic experience in eating a dog-meat soup at an early age. She begins to realize the convivial coexistence of violence and care from an incident when her dog bit her leg. In keeping with the way Yeong-hye's father exerts his authority through violence, he brutally executes the dog to reestablish the order of rank on behalf of the injured daughter. After Yeong-hye's father slowly and painfully kills the dog, he holds a community feast to share the dog-meat and to show the re-establishment of the interrupted family order. Indeed, this spectacular violence of killing and consuming the dog with community members demonstrates

systemic violence, which is embedded in the mundane habit of eating.[55] The cheerful feast veils the brutal process of constructing the social hierarchy. Further, her father's violence is easily justified, in the mind of the community, for the recovery of Yeong-hye's wound. The conviviality of the village is maintained through collusion with violent perpetrators.[56] While trying not to care about the lingering images of the dying dog, Yeong-hye unwillingly ate her entire bowl of soup, thus becoming, through the act of eating, one of the many perpetrators of violence. She had to comply with the system of hierarchy for the everyday conviviality of the family and community. The carnivorous feast is one aspect of the naturalized violence against marginalized beings whose lives can be easily consumed for the sake of care, conviviality, and maintaining the existing order. Yeong-hye thereafter adamantly insists on a vegetarian diet and refuses the consumption of food to free herself from the chain of violence.

---

[55] Marian Eide, in *Terrible Beauty* (2019), provides a thoughtful distinction between spectacular violence and systemic or structural violence. According to her, subtle forms of violence (quiet or slow violence) are distinguished from physical violence, which she calls "spectacular violence because it is visible and shocking. In contrast, quiet and slow violence are often referred to as structural violence: social arrangements that produce harm in inequitable proportion, but which are not always immediately evident in the way that spectacular violence is" (27). Eide suggests that "contemplating the obvious signs of violence" enables our understanding of structural violence that generates outbursts of spectacular violence: "where violence is symbolic or structural, it is also often treated as natural and acceptable; it may take an eruption into spectacular violence to reveal the structural basis for brutality" (28).

[56] Considering that the word conviviality stems from the word "*conviva*," meaning "the one who feasts with others," practices of having a meal together involve manufacturing normativity to live together.

Yeong-hye's ontological attempt to become like a tree works at the expense of care responsibilities, resulting in both cutting ties with her family and becoming incomprehensible to them. Removing proximity and exempting oneself from care responsibility is impossible to imagine where the duty to care is culturally normative. The chain of care adheres to the life of women so tightly that Yeong-hye's choice of being inattentive to routinized care is framed as "irresponsible" and "insane" by her husband and even In-hye. In other words, her choice of refusing normativity labels her "invalid."

In her explanation of normative violence in *Bodies that Matter* (1993), Judith Butler describes the subject who is a "constitutive outside to the subject" as "an abjected outside" (3). The forming of a subject's intelligibility occurs through the simultaneous production of a domain of abjection. This abject other exists in a way normativity constitutes the domain of the subject. In this regard, Yeong-hye's subject is unintelligible in a domain of normativity. Yeong-hye resists the regulatory mechanisms of naturalized hierarchy embedded in meat-eating and, more broadly, rejects the subordination of her subjectivity to the gendered ideal. Yeong-hye stops the reiteration of care practices; as a result, the effects of cultural normativity neither work for her nor recognize her experiment as accountable. Normative violence occurs in the form of social power to frame a different way of life as problematic and to marginalize the markers of social differences.

Conversely, in response to Yeong-hye's inability to live inside the normativity, the relational and gendered cultural normativity calls upon In-hye to take care of her

sister. Compared to Yeong-hye, In-hye seems a *normal* subject who obtains intelligibility through the repetition of norms—endurance and care—that structure her entire life. In-hye, as the only family tie left to Yeong-hye, becomes what Eunjung Kim calls a "proxy for cure."[57] In a culture that values communal unity, the society assigns to healthy family or community members (usually women) the task of becoming "curative agents." As Kim clarifies, "A proxy…exhibits devotion to cure and the continued manifestation of the desire for a painless, normatively shaped and functioning body, as if to stop wanting a normal body is itself morally corrupt, even pathological" (83). Therefore, In-hye feels frustrated when encountering Yeong-hye's furious refusal of care, because In-hye perceives her caring as her morally expected duty whereas Yeong-hye challenges such cultural normativity.

In a cultural context in which moral integrity is socially constructed to perform the duty to care for relationality and collectivity, a care provider should carry on her responsibility to care even if that care is against a care receiver's needs. In-hye, as a subject who resides within social norms for her survival, becomes both a perpetrator of the normative violence and a violated subject who is tied to the violence of care. She has developed *maternal affection*, a life-long responsibility and sacrifice for others, believing that it is morally right to care for others. Performing the duty to care also generates a fantasy that she lives a successful life carrying out the roles of daughter,

[57] In *Curative Violence* (2017), Kim proposes the concept of "curative violence" to describe the exercise of force ostensibly to cure disability or illness, or otherwise better the Other, but it actually serves South Korea's putative vision of a healthy, rehabilitated nation.

wife, and mother. However, care as moral integrity and as sustaining futurity blinds In-hye's realization that her subjectivity is violated to the extent of dysfunction. In-hye realizes her "already dead life" after experiencing her presumably normal and successful life losing its orderliness (Han 201, my translation).[58] The normativity of care has enabled her to endure her life by attaching a value of goodness to the way it enables the care provider to go along with living. In-hye does her best to do what she believes to be morally responsible for living with her family and living a socially-expected *good life*. Though her absolute devotion to an ethic of care embodies the dominant ethos for women, In-hye is nonetheless marginalized by that same system. In-hye's endurance of domestic rape by her husband is an exemplary of her marginality. Although In-hye's husband regards his sexual violence as trivial—"Just put up with it for a minute," he says (*V* 169)—her body viscerally reacts to his violence by discharging blood from her vagina. After this incident, In-hye realizes that her married life is "devoid of happiness and spontaneity. A time that she'd so far managed to get through only by using up every last reserve of perseverance and consideration. All of it self-inflicted" (*V* 166). This reflection circulates another realization that "she had never really lived in this world…Even as a child, as far back as she could remember, she had done nothing but

[58] In the original, Han articulates that In-hye (or her life) "had been dead for a long time," a stern indication of self-introspection that "her exhausted life was no more than a drama or a ghost" (201, my translation). The original in Korea: "자신이 오래 전부터 죽어 있었다는 것을. 그녀의 고단한 삶은 연극이나 유령 같은 것에 지나지 않았다는 것을." Smith translates the original in the following way: "Her life was no more than a ghostly pageant of exhausted endurance, no more real than a television drama" (*V* 170).

endure" (*V* 167). Her life is dependent on the coercive normativity that makes it difficult even to recognize her suffering. If it were not for Yeong-hye, In-hye could not imagine the problematic care ethics that constitute her life and subjectivity. Even if In-hye realizes that the gendered care normativity does violence to her, she has to carry on her duty to care because of her son's vulnerability and dependency on her care.

Care maneuvers women into sustaining the state's future as their prime responsibility by compelling them to be responsible for social reproduction and social relations. What makes life livable and sustainable—what makes convivial living in postcolonial South Korea—is women's sacrifice. Cultural normativity constructs moral integrity based on self-sacrifice, care for social justice, and conviviality for some privileged people. Women bear this care labor, believing it is responsible caring for themselves and others. In-hye—in line with her enduring life of performing care—continues her role as a care provider for Yeong-hye and her son. In-hye chooses what she believes to be a morally right and inclusive act, similar to what Gilligan views as a morally mature performance. Whereas Gilligan's view of integrity is carrying on and keeping one's moral belief based on the integration of the care of the self and care for others, In-hye's integrity (as a representative of communal integrity) violates Yeong-hye's ethical singularity, which refuses to be integrated into the integrity of the community. So there is a dilemma: enacting one kind of integrity ruptures another one. Though In-hye's integrity and care are conventionally considered mature and appropriate, they nevertheless hurt and exclude Yeong-hye's own ethic of practicing care of the self and care for others.

In this regard, In-hye and most readers who cannot experiment with other forms of life as Yeong-hye does are complicit in building a normative morality, since a convivial future is grounded on trustworthy care labor. In-hye has no choice but to cling to her ethic of care and think of her child, because abandoning her responsibility is a "crime, cruel and irresponsible….the truth of the matter [is] something she simply felt, horribly clearly" (*V* 186). Tied by her position as a care provider, In-hye resumes her normative role of caring, which is core to the integrity of the material world she inhabits. The price of this decision is to detain Yeong-hye's defiant body within the oppressive human world, thus to become responsible for a "frighteningly chill form of life" (*V* 174). This is the truth In-hye insists upon in contrast to Yeong-hye's truth—however incomprehensible—which is symbolically represented at the end of the novel. In the ambulance that transports Yeong-hye to the general hospital, In-hye gazes out the window: "The trees by the side of the road are blazing, green fire undulating like the rippling flanks of a massive animal, wild and savage. In-hye stares fiercely at the trees. As if waiting for an answer. As if protesting against something. The look in her eyes is dark and insistent" (*V* 188). The wild trees reflect her attempt to control Yeong-hye's wild protests against her care. The green flames on the side of the road seem furious and heated, unlike the green flames In-hye, burdened by care, saw at the mountain path when she tried to commit suicide a few months prior. Unlike the trees' flaming that might embody Yeong-hye's fury, the flames In-hye encountered neither had "warmth" nor "comfort" but "they were merciless" (*V* 174). In-hye infers the truth from those chilling flames of trees that it is morally wrong to refuse her life, for "the trees had refused to

accept her" (*V* 174); so she persistently stares at the trees, as if they might translate for her the truth that Yeong-hye envisions through radical vegetarianism.

It is Han Kang's ethical response to two conflicting truths about care ethics that she does not depict the reconciliation of those two female characters. Their suffering remains unaccountable to one another, just like In-hye feels the flaming trees as "wild and savage." Yeong-hye's silence—a sign not of madness but of difference—firmly resists the normative violence of demanding intelligibility, productivity, and desiring futurity. Even if Yeong-hye's silence is perceived as insanity, she as a subject experimenting with other forms of ethical living belies "assumptions about the primacy of speech, actions, coherence, independence, and intentionality as providing evidence of agency and subjectivity" in the interpretation of madness either "as political rebellion or as helpless surrender without meaning" (*Curative* 146). Han Kang also does not dismiss In-hye's suffering—not to praise her maternal affection but to consider how socially-coded, gendered care labor is both responsible for an idealized futurity and simultaneously excludes those care providers from that same convivial vision.

To conclude, my aim of this chapter is to not only elucidate gendered and classed care labor—normative violence and social expectation—but also to articulate convivial violence that assigns the burden of sustainable futurity with a form of care, whether it be exchanging banter or preparing food. Convivial futurity does not reconcile violence inflicted upon social differences affected by extant power relations and social hierarchies. The conflicting truths and forms of self-care addressed throughout this

chapter demonstrate that an ethic of care needs to have a broad contextual scope of moral integrity relative to care.

CHAPTER 3

ADOPTEE LABOR FOR CONVIVIALITY WITHIN THE OBSCURED VIOLENCE IN THE BENEFICENCE OF CARE

In her memoir *Fugitive Visions: An Adoptee's Return to Korea* (2009), Korean adoptee writer Jane Jeong Trenka sees an intimate affiliation with the seemingly disparate subjects of Korean military wives, camp town women, comfort women, and transnational adoptees in that they are subject to the violence of militarism and its production of racially and sexually discriminated subjects. She writes:

> One step away from a Korean-American woman married to a white man, one more or the same step away from a Korean military wife with a soldier husband. Another step away from a war bride. Another step: war booty. Step: camp town prostitute. Step: *comfort woman*. Step again: *comfort child*. (68-9)

Fugitive Visions records her *outsider* feelings and experiences of an adoptee's unsettling identity in both America and Korea; she claims that she is a "monster," signifying the failure of transnational Korean adoption premised on the narratives of rescue and a better life in America through white acculturation. The memoir addresses her sixth return to Korea, fleeing from her failed marriage with a white man who feels at ease with Asian women but perhaps would have had a better family life if he married a white woman. Her speculation of stereotypes of Asian women eventually leads her to think of whether she is "interchangeable with any other Asian bride" as she "had been interchangeable with any other Asian child available for adoption" (75). While Trenka reveals her

struggles to fit into the white normativity that has shaped her life in the United States, she further displays her fugitive feeling through the putative images of "a global citizen, a true cosmopolitan, a person who has accumulated the riches of culture and experience" projected onto her in Korea (186). These fugitive feelings, along with her weaving the above-mentioned subjects together—despite each subject's different historical narratives and specificities—raise a collective problem of being mobilized to "comfort" someone other than themselves. Her poetic bonds between a "comfort woman," "camp town prostitute," "war booty," and "war bride" scathingly uncover the overlapping violence of war, state violence, and global power relations, which are less visible in the rhetoric of adoption couched in terms of benevolence and multicultural inclusion.

This chapter examines the incongruous subjects Trenka brings to an affinity as an entry point to articulating the forgotten link between militarism and transnational Korean adoption. Recent scholars of critical adoption studies and transnational feminists have demonstrated the assemblage of U.S. militarism and what Christina Klein calls "Cold War Orientalism" that propels the racially integrative project of transnational adoption as well as the U.S.-Korea military violence against Korean women, respectively.[59] While scholars such as Soojin Pate, Jodi Kim, Patti Duncan, and Kori A. Graves have

[59] In *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination 1945-1961* (2003), Klein observes that the family has been used to represent the microcosm of the nation; thereby, "the idea of the multiracial, multinational family as a metaphor for the international interdependence" was promoted for the extension of U.S. power over Asia during the Cold War (187). A logic of family enabled the familial bond possible (white parents and Asian children) while eliding the uneven political and economic power in the policies of multicultural integration.

addressed Korean adoption in terms of U.S. militarized humanitarianism, military prostitution, and Amerasian issues, the violent connection between adoption and militarism is "only implicit or absent in traditional analyses of transnational adoption," as David Eng argues (105).[60] At stake is how the violent U.S. domination abroad is invisible in the ways America builds a multicultural and humanitarian image through transnational adoption. The U.S. ethical imperatives of saving children, having better relations with Asia, and constructing a multicultural society not only mask the military cause of transnational adoption but also create the parallel structure of the loss incurred upon both adoptee and birth mother. It is that parallel structure that matters in this chapter.

My intervention in the discussion of transnational Korean adoption, informed by transnational feminists and adoption scholars, attempts to foreground the analytical concept of conviviality to investigate the question: how do transnational adoptees negotiate conviviality in adoptive family relations as well as in their relation to their

[60] Katherine H.S. Moon's *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations* (1997) has become a foundational work that illuminates the creation of military camptowns (and state-endorsed camptown prostitution) by the stationing of U.S. military troops. Ji-Yeon Yuh and Grace Cho have examined the history behind Asian diaspora regarding military brides. See Ji-Yeon Yuh, *Beyond the Shadow of Camptown: Korean Military Brides in America* (2002), and Grace M. Cho, *Haunting the Korean Diaspora: Shame, Secrecy, and the Forgotten War* (2008). Recent adoption studies demonstrate comprehensive research on the legacies of the Korean War, humanitarian child rescue, and Korean birth mothers. See Eleana Kim, *Adopted Territory* (2010); Arissa Oh, *To Save the Children of Korea* (2015); Hosu Kim, *Birth Mothers and Transnational Adoption Practices in South Korea* (2016); Kim Park Nelson, *Invisible Asians* (2016); and Kimberly McKee, *Disrupting Kinship* (2019).

Korean birth family? Conviviality is the idea proposed by Paul Gilroy as an alternative to multiculturalism, which refers to large institutional and cultural structures. In contrast, conviviality points to "the processes of cohabitation and interaction that have made multiculture an ordinary feature of social life" (xv). Gilroy observes an extant social diversity against the backdrop of a breakdown in multiculturalism in post-imperial Britain. He emphasizes individuals' concrete interactions as they navigate a social life with difference, a navigation he calls conviviality. Since Gilroy's work, a convivial turn in many disciplines examines this, perhaps idealized, capacity to live with difference in social spaces.[61] Yet conviviality as a mode of coexistence, while offering a hopeful alternative to multiculturalism's anodyne erasure of difference, elicits the question of power between uneven relations.[62] The assumptions that drive the banal version of multicultural interactions featured in the realm of daily life elide the actual labor that maintains cosmopolitan community, labor performed primarily by those who have been traditionally minoritized. It is this labor that is my primary concern. Alina Rzepnikowska points out that the existing literature of conviviality largely "focuses on encounters with difference in public and semi-public spaces, [and] private spaces as sites of convivial interaction have been largely overlooked" (2). While the dichotomy between public and private becomes blurred when it comes to examining labor, the oversight reveals the

[61] See Amanda Wise and Greg Noble, "Convivialities: An Orientation," *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2016, pp. 423–31.

[62] Linda Lapiņa explores the gaps in the existing study of conviviality by asking: "whom an ethos of conviviality serves (more than others), who claims and reaps benefits from it and whose perspectives (dis-) appear in, or behind, conviviality" (39).

assumptions that forms of difference may be managed by an individual level of intimacy and care or, at worse, that difference is not a significant matter in family relations. My work is to bring into focus that private labor to navigate and manage difference.

Gilroy's idea of conviviality needs more critical elaboration with regard to familial and intimate relations. Conviviality as a mode of coexistence elicits the question of power in the uneven relations, especially in the relationship between adoptee and adoptive parents. This is particularly the case when a language of multiculturalism simultaneously celebrates racial differences and disavows racial inequalities.[63] Kristi Brian, by examining Korean children adopted into white families, points out the need to focus on "hegemonic assumptions and myths about the *ease* of incorporating Korean and other transracial adoptees into white families and communities" (53). That is, the structural inequalities are inherent in the transnational adoptive family, and neither adoptees' assimilation nor adoptive parents' colorblindness can solve the existing prioritization of whiteness that dismisses difference. Without being critical of difference, conviviality's focus on an individual's mundane interactions fails to grasp the power imbalance that imposes superficial convivial relations on the less powerful, as observed by Brian's study of transnational Korean adoptee incorporation.

Despite the need for conceptual development, conviviality is a necessary term for this project because of my focus on how adoptees negotiate everyday coexistence with

[63] Regarding diversity without oppression, see Joyce M. Bell and Douglas Hartmann, "Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of 'Happy Talk,'" *American Sociological Review*, vol. 72, 2007, pp. 895–914.

difference in intimate relations: conviviality is where affective labor meets multiculturalism in dealing with and in difference. Thereby, it is salient to examine adoptees' labor of accommodating coexistence not only in their childhood but also in their adult lives, since the labor of living together with difference continues into adulthood. The dialogue between conviviality and adoption calls attention to the adoptee who is tasked with producing *comfort* in interactions with their transnational adoptive family and the birth family.[64] I particularly examine Korean adoptees represented in Asian American cultural products: Ruth L. Ozeki's *My Year of Meats* (1998) and Deann Borshay Liem's documentary film *Geographies of Kinship* (2019). I juxtapose these cultural texts to illuminate how, while the novel promotes multiculturalism through Korean adoptees, the film focuses on the voices of adoptees to expose unacknowledged violence and uninterrogated care in adoption.

Obviously the two texts are separated by two decades and are in different forms; most importantly, *Geographies of Kinship* is adoptee-authored, while *My Year of Meats* is not. These differences, however, highlight the importance of attending to adoptee (especially adult adoptee) voices: the juxtaposition elucidates what is elided or stressed, celebrated or denounced. Despite the shared imperatives of these works, Ozeki and Liem

[64] Eleana Kim argues that transnational adoption is "invoked as the actualization of ideals of humanitarianism and the promises of multiculturalism, and adoptees are regarded as potential representatives of postnational cosmopolitanism" (8). This view is largely derived from privileging the perspectives of adoptive parents who try to "rewrite family scripts to naturalize the 'artificial kinship' of adoption" (10-11).

differ in the production of cultural products relating to the adoptee issue.[65] As I will demonstrate in the next section, Ozeki presents transnational adoptees as a sign of American multiculturalism. *My Year of Meats* is a complex novel that deals with multiple issues, but for the purposes of this chapter, I focus on the representation of transnational adoptees, which is part of showcasing the diverse families in America.[66] Ozeki illustrates the Beaudroux family—a white family with an unusual number of transnational adoptees (two Amerasian among nine South Korean adoptees and an adoptee from Brazil)—as a microcosm of how multicultural coexistence occurs out of the U.S. history of racism and militarism. Ozeki describes the children of American GIs and Korean prostitutes to reveal the U.S. violence against Asian people, only to reify existing stereotypes about adoptees and birth mothers.[67] The documentary impulse in the novel plays a crucial role in invoking transformative change within women

---

[65] Anne Anlin Cheng characterizes documentary desire as "a mode of knowledge [that] carries certain pedagogical assumptions…and reinforce[s] faith in the 'history lesson'" (120). *My Year of Meats* is Ozeki's debut novel that signals her career transition from a documentary filmmaker to a novelist; yet the novel manifests a strong documentary desire for truth that leads to pedagogical impacts on its audience. Thus, the novel employs a montage technique of blending various forms of faxes, memos, and references to scholarly sources as a kind of hybrid genre.

[66] Under the cover of documentary production, the novel covers the issues of the unethical meat industry and its violent impacts on women's bodies, as well as American multicultural inclusion and the nation's violence based in race and gender categories.

[67] Although not all adoptees, especially Amerasian subjects, are children of camptown women, international adoption agencies utilize the images of camptown women and children to increase altruism and sentimentality for their supposed abjection. In *Geographies of Kinship*, the interview cut of Molly Holt—a daughter of Harry Holt—demonstrates that the Holt international adoption agency actively visited camptowns to make prostitutes mothers give up their children.

transnationally, but it inadvertently points to the importance of perspectives during the search for documentary truth. Ozeki's depiction of adoptees performs a celebratory multicultural integrity and emphasizes women's affective bond, which shows exclusivity in its liberal, middle-class affective boundary.

Liem's documentary tells the exact other side of adoption stories by prioritizing the voices of adoptees. Her film maps out four adult adoptees' journeys to Korea, asking the fundamental question of what makes adoption occur in the first place. The film represents each adoptee's search for their own adoption histories, placing them as witnesses to the violent political and economic turmoil in South Korea. Liem unveils the parallel structure of U.S. multicultural joviality: the postcolonial aftermath of Korea epitomized by the Korean War and the American military occupation in the context of the Cold War. The adult transnational Korean adoptees tell the other truth of how the *ease* of adoptee integration derives from assumptions about benevolent care and expectations of multicultural coexistence. That is, adoptee voices reveal how the discourse of humanitarian care mediates the state's violence through the inclusive gesture of transnational adoption. While Liem seeks a comprehensive documentary search of the Korean adoption trajectory, using archival footage and interview cuts from adoption scholars and activists, she stresses that her film depicts "a history" that cannot cover "all [adoption] histories."[68] While the personal opens up onto the historical, the

[68] I conducted a personal interview with Borshay Liem at the Center for Asian American Media Festival (CAAM Fest) and the Korean American Adoptee Adoptive Family Network (KAAN) conference. Liem's statement is addressed during the interview's Question and Answer session.

adoptees' ongoing search for identity demonstrates the limits of complete recuperation of the past that might privilege some perspectives over others. Nonetheless, in the film, adult adoptees call for solidarity among adoptee, birth mother, and even the single parent who is encouraged to give up their child for adoption.[69] The call for solidarity, I argue, evokes the limits of the ethics of care as it is currently conceived in offering ethical ways of forming adoptive family. Care ethics need to consider how to respond to the need of the marginalized others in the structural matrix of power.

In the first section of this chapter, I examine how *My Year of Meats*, in the service of affirming an adoptive mother's positive outlook toward multicultural diversity, fails to subvert stereotypes surrounding transnational adoption. I present U.S.-Korea military violence against Korean women and children as a form of reproductive injustice, revealing the novel's limitations in the frame of transnational women's alliances. In the second part, I analyze *Geographies of Kinship* to show adoptees' struggles to contest the burden of beneficence of care in adoption. I attend to adoptee voices and their convivial labor. Ultimately, I articulate the injustice and violence in the discourse of care ethics in transnational adoption and the veiled power dynamics in multicultural coexistence.

Reproductive Injustice and Transnational Adoption in *My Year of Meats*

[69] *Geographies of Kinship* departs from Liem's previous films—*First Person Plural* (2000) and *In the Matter of Cha Jung Hee* (2010). If these two films explore Liem's personal search for identity, belonging, and loyalty, *Geographies of Kinship* calls for a collective effort to change the problematic Korean welfare policy as well as end transnational adoption.

The novel explores several major themes, such as the problems of commercialized media, the unethical meat industry, and that industry's violent impacts on minority groups of gender, race, and class.[70] This wide range of thematic coverage begins as the novel's protagonist, Jane Takagi-Little's works as a documentary director of *My American Wife!*, a television cooking show sponsored by a U.S. beef lobby organization (BEEF-EX). The show targets a Japanese audience in order to sell U.S. beef in Japan. Jane, as a biracial Japanese American, coordinates white, middle-class, heterosexual American wives and their home foods to feature "authentic" American family values "symbolized by red meat."[71] Yet Jane approaches the show from a documentary desire to represent real America (read: exotic and diverse) to her Japanese audience. Jane's documentary impulse creates discord between her desire to feature the *idea* of American multicultural diversity through the family and the sponsor's pressure to display the *idealized* white family. Jane further finds out that red meat is not a wholesome food: the use of the DES (diethylstilbestrol) hormone, in fact, violates human and animal bodies (Jane is herself a DES-exposed woman's daughter). This finding leads her to produce another documentary, "My Year of Meats" (the same title of the novel) that exposes the toxicity of DES on reproductive systems and the hormonal

[70] David Palumbo-Liu describes Ozeki's novel as "ambitious" because it seeks "all sorts of…positive action—anticorruption, anticorporate, antimisogynistic, antichauvinist, antiracist, antisexist" that ends up "a failure to deliver on its promises" (54). This failure further calls into question the protagonist's ethics not because of "her lack of sincerity, but on her failure to account for her inconsistencies" (54).

[71] Ruth L. Ozeki, *My Year of Meats*, Penguin Books, 1998, 8. Citations in parentheses hereafter.

disorders it can cause. It is the violence perpetrated onto bodies of animal and minority subjects alike that drives Jane to form a solidarity with American wives, fighting against the capitalist profit motive in production and reproduction, as well as their entrenched racism and sexism. Further, Jane befriends Akiko Ueno, who is a wife of the cooking show's executive director John Ueno; the show eventually encourages Akiko to leave the sexually abusive John and emigrate from Japan to America. Overall, the novel not only evinces a documentary desire for truth but also aims to induce positive change, especially for women.

What I problematize is Ozeki's appropriation of stereotypes and emotional authenticity to subvert the problems she perceives in the various industries in question, as well as the pedagogical changes that Jane aims to promote through her documentary. This ethos is expressed by Jane: "you have to make things up, to tell truths that alter outcomes" (360).[72] Jane acknowledges the complexity of truth-telling, but she also believes that fiction would show a greater truth than the facts. For example, Susie Flower—the American wife of the first episode—condones Jane's shame of fabricating the reality as "happy-go-lucky," because it turned out to be true in Susie's life. Ozeki deploys American wives' perspectives and voices to support Jane's use of clichés and stereotypes of social difference to enhance the authenticity of the TV show. Indeed, authenticity is one of the essential criteria in producing the cooking show, since the more

[72] I acknowledge the distance between the author and the novel's character. However, in Ozeki's interview attached in the novel, she notes her closeness to Jane: "Jane's process of discovery mirrors mine [Ozeki's], and the reader's process mirrors Jane's" (7).

the TV show constructs authenticity, the more it becomes marketable to Japanese wives who are potential consumers of American meat and American values. In other words, authenticity enhances the consumption of what is represented as true and desirable. The problem is that Jane stands at the moral center of the novel. Embodying the opposite values of the novel's antagonist—the racist and sexist John—Jane feels morally entitled to advocate for what she thinks as American truth and value, even as her limited ethical scope is elided. Further, her playing with stereotypes, despite its success in conveying authentic feelings to American wives and Akiko, fails to critique the history of such stereotypes. This is partly because the historical context is merely represented as the show's background, and the targeted audience (read: Japanese wives) receives only affect without having to acknowledge the history behind the stereotypes. I focus on how the novel portrays a transnational adoptive family through Southern stereotypes and common adoption narratives of child rescue as a critique of U.S. violence against non-white peoples; I address how this critique is consumed by Akiko as a representation of exotic America. Although the novel shows complexity in how Jane grapples with the violence pervasive in and perpetrated by America, the novel privileges women's pedagogical transformation and therefore dismisses the purpose of showing adoptee history. Thereby, I fill in the gaps of Jane's understanding when she appropriates the image of adoptees as the children of American servicemen and Korean prostitutes by grounding these narratives in the history of transnational Korean adoption.

The Beaudroux episode is considered authentic by Akiko, who receives "meat duties" from John to watch *My American Wife!* and rate the program based on "General

Interest, Educational Value, Authenticity [to name a few]" (21). Akiko sees conviviality between adoptive parents and adoptees in their family interactions. The novel portrays the Beaudroux episode in the form of a fax memo. The memo describes the episode's opening credits, which start with an image of *Gone with the Wind* and the Southern music of Zydeco in the background. Then the camera zooms in on each family member, beginning with the parents, Grace and Vern, ending with the twelfth child, Chelsea, then providing a wide shot of the family, "lined up in front of the plantation house" (66). The Beaudroux episode's opening scene exemplifies Jane's use of Southern stereotypes and its parallel juxtaposition of varying shades of adoptees.[73] Akiko, viewing the portrayal of jubilant adoptees' living in the plantation house, feels its authenticity rather than its problems, and consumes the American exoticism represented therein. For instance, Zydeco plays a role in shaping the authentic affective dimension in Akiko's mind. The authenticity—priming the affect provoked by convivial family interactions with the "happy, humid music of the bayou"—invokes imaginary feelings in Akiko (78). It is as if the song of Bobby Joe wants to tell a story to her even though she cannot understand the lyric; it is as if she could adopt Korean children to fill what is "missing" in her house: "It would be nice to raise a child in a rough 'n' tumble family. Maybe she and 'John' could adopt" (78). Akiko wants to mimic the American wife, Grace, who likes

[73] As the novel later portrays, the description of happy kids helping to renovate the former slave cabins or to harvest kudzu roots echoes Big Sam's voluntary acceptance of his slave position, which supports white plantation owners' belief in beautified relations between slave owners and slaves in *Gone with the Wind*.

Zydeco and has adopted children; she considers adopting "Ten Korean children" as an alternative remedy for her sterile body (99).

What remains problematic in the affective consumption of American exoticism is the commodification of the origin of the exotic (i.e., creole culture, Southern slavery, non-white transnational adoptees) while obscuring their violent history. It is worth noting that Akiko's feeling of authenticity is made available only because of her blindness to Jane's critique of Southern slavery through the implications of Southern stereotypes. Jane further attempts to convey the adopted kids' tragic histories in the Beaudroux family history, but Akiko is blind to (or does not care about) the historical implications of the adopted Korean children in America. All these attempts to deliver what constitutes American exoticism are subsumed for consumption, through which the Other's history is disconnected and erased. Akiko's Japanese background shields her from the history of the plantation as well as the implications of Korean adoptees. It may be authentic for Akiko to see jovial coexistence among Korean children in Grace's and Vern's family, but such a warm and homely feelings are constructed at the cost of the disrupted lives of adoptees and birth families by U.S. Cold War geopolitics, postcolonial nation-building, and reproductive injustice. Additionally, Akiko does not see her ambition to care for a Korean adoptee on a domestic level as echoing the history of Japanese colonialism in Korea.

To understand this obscured violence, we should examine the histories of Korean adoptees in the Beaudroux family:

> Joy was first. She was five…They [Grace and Vern] found her in a Christian adoption magazine. She was the Amerasian daughter of a GI and a Korean prostitute. She'd been abandoned at the age of three and a half on the steps of a Catholic church with a note attached to her wrist that read, "This girl's mother is a whore and her father is an American. God, please raise her for me. Thank you very much." (70)
>
> Several of the children were biologically related. Elvis was Joy's younger brother, who was six months old when Joy was abandoned. Joy was beside herself when, after an arduous and expensive search in Korea, seven-year-old Young Bum was discovered cleaning rooms at the brothel where their mother had worked before she died. His father was African-American, and his skin was darker and his hair curlier than the rest of the Korean siblings. (74)

In the Beaudroux episode, Jane provides the family history, with brief descriptions of adoptee information, to convey how Grace and Vern think of adopting children. The passages represent two Amerasian adoptees whose histories reflect U.S. militarism in Korea. As the passage indicates, Joy is a child of American GI and a Korean woman. The note attached to her wrist contains an accusatory tone about her mother and implores the reader to rescue the baby. Yet it is assumed that Joy is abandoned not by her birth mother but by someone else, since the memo is written in the third person. Further, as Elvis's story implies, Joy's and Elvis's birth mother tried to keep her babies but died young. The novel's short adoptee descriptions do not tell further about the birth mothers' narratives nor the GI fathers' care responsibility. Rather, Joy and Elvis are

assumed to need a place of care, just as Grace imagined adopting children from "Korea and Vietnam who don't have anyone to care for them" (69). This narrative of child rescue in transnational adoption, as Karen Dubinsky scathingly describes, hides the cause of adoptee's violent displacement: "First you destroy our country, and then you rescue our children" (qtd. in Duncan 293). In the process, the child rescue narrative not only promotes U.S. multicultural inclusion by rescuing (mixed-raced) children but also masks a form of reproductive injustice: some subjects' family-making is made possible at the cost of others' exclusion from parenting roles.

The Beaudroux's family-making is founded on what Shelle Colen calls "stratified reproduction."[74] On the one hand, Grace and Vern think it is not right to have more than two children of their own. On the other, adoption meets their desire to have more kids while reducing the "population explosion" which is "the single most underdiscussed issue in the world" (69). Grace, from her ethical imperative for saving the world, states the solution: "folks should just replace themselves…one kid for each parent" (69). Accordingly, they start adopting children from Korea, which becomes a "yearly event." Assuming that Grace and Vern married no later than the 1970s, the adopted children from Korea were born between 1970s and 80s—a period when military governments violently suppressed human rights under the name of economic

[74] Stratified reproduction indicates "a transnational system of power relation that enables privileged women to bear and nurture children while disempowering those who are subordinated by reason of class, race, and national origin" (McKee 3).

development.[75] Thus, it is important to examine this particular historical context that allows Grace to adopt children from Korea.

Transnational Korean adoption began as a resolution to rescue mixed-race children whose presence seemed to indicate U.S. occupation and undermine the postcolonial Korean nationalist ideology of racial purity.[76] GI humanitarianism (GIs fathered mixed-raced babies and were often the first people who adopted the babies) and the proliferation of stories and photographs of war orphans led the existence of mixed-race children to conceal the cause of child-rescue. Instead, American's morally-driven adoption had taken part in and supported American Cold War policy.[77] That is, GI humanitarianism created a beneficent image of American servicemen to sugarcoat military and political domination over the occupied territory, which was the beginning of

[75] Their family plan occurred at the peak of civil rights movement in 1968; they hatched the plan while standing under the statue of the Rebel cavalryman and his "Negro" manservant.

[76] There are some different views between whether the Korean War was the starting point of Korean adoption or whether Korean adoption should be located within the context of U.S. military occupation in Korea that signals American Cold War imperialism. See Pate's *From Orphan to Adoptee* (2014). Kori Graves argues that "Mixed-race children constituted a relatively small part of the total number of displaced or orphaned children in Korea, but they occupied a significant place in the nation's nascent transnational adoption plans.…the removal of mixed-race children was the impetus for the first wave of large-scale US-Korean adoptions" (123). Arissa Oh, by pointing out the male-centered family registry (*hoju*) system, states that mixed-race children were "stateless nonpersons who would never find legal or social acceptance" (7).

[77] As Laura Briggs claims, the visual image that evokes the need of rescue is a "finely honed trope" in "shaping popular support in the USA for a variety of public policy and foreign policy initiatives" (180). The international adoption organizations founded by Pearl S. Buck and Harry Holt supported anti-communism and liberal democracy.

Korean international adoption. In addition, the Korean government was economically dependent upon humanitarian aid, the processes of which stimulated international adoption.[78] The parallel to this dependency on foreign currency for adoption was camptown prostitution in U.S. military bases, itself founded on the existing Japanese "comfort women" system.[79] The utilization of Korean women's and children's bodies became more institutionalized in the Park Chung Hee junta (1963-1979). This period signified several important features in transnational Korean adoption, for the demographics of adoptees shifted from mixed-raced children to full-Korean. Also, camptown (*kijich'on*) prostitution became more systematically operated for economic gain. In other words, Korean adoption was predicated upon the nation-state's biopolitics—who is worthy of state protection—and the military violence against Korean women endorsed by the U.S. *and* Korea.

---

[78] Patti Duncan states that transnational Korean adoption "introduced between US $15 and 20 million each year into the South Korean economy. By the 1980s, transnational adoption had become a thriving and profitable consumer-oriented industry" (292).

[79] Kun Jong Lee states that "many of the former comfort women…were also taken over by the U.S. military" when U.S. forces took over the existing Japanese military bases in Korea in 1945 (20). Grace Cho also argues the continuity between the comfort women system and the camptown prostitution system for the U.S. military in *Haunting the Korean Diaspora*. The term "comfort women" refers to the Imperial Japanese Army's large-scale war crimes against girls and women from Korea, China, Philippines, the Netherlands, and Australia. However, Korean feminists use "comfort women (*wianbu*)" to comprehensively refer to women *mobilized* and *forced* to provide sexual entertainment or to serve the sexual desires of foreign soldiers. According to Na Young Lee, the use of "comfort women" to "refer to military prostitutes serving American soldiers signals the widespread acceptance of camptown prostitution as an inevitable means to entertain foreign soldiers" (112). The existence of military prostitutes may suggest the sexual labor as voluntary, but many women were forcibly mobilized into such labor due to political necessity.

The body politic of women and children was integral to gaining foreign currency during the Park regime.[80] The government aggressively arranged camptown women for American servicemen "to advance the 'friendly relations' of both countries and to keep U.S. soldiers, 'who fight so hard for the freedom of the South Korean people,' happy" (Moon 1-2). As Katherine Moon argues, Korea's economic growth was made possible by exploiting the sexual labor of camptown women, who were forced to reconcile and advance U.S.-Korea military relations as "personal ambassadors," the nationalist euphemism that framed women's sexual labor as nation-building. Concurrently, the Korean government cooperated with U.S. military government's VD management to protect American servicemen's health and to control the population of mixed-race children. Thus, state-endorsed reproductive control occurred in the name of a "camptown clean-up campaign (or Purification movement)" in 1971-76.[81] This campaign violated women's autonomy and women's bodies through forced medical

[80] See Seungsook Moon, *Militarized Modernity and Gendered Citizenship in South Korea* (2005), and Jin-kyung Lee, *Service Economies: Militarism, Sex Work, and Migrant Labor in South Korea*, U of Minnesota P, 2010. Chapter Two in this dissertation discusses women's labor in South Korea during the military dictatorship.

[81] Jeong-Mi Park's research extensively demonstrates how the United States Forces Korea (USFK) demanded camptown improvements that resulted in the systematic control of VD examinations and treatments, including the use of detention centers for sexually transmitted diseases. These extensive regulations evince the joint responsibility of the two nation-states that violated camptown women's human rights. In 2014, one hundred twenty-two camptown women filed a claim for compensatory damages against the Korean government that had forcibly mobilized the "comfort women for U.S. troops" for their military alliance and means for earning foreign currency. The second court decision in 2018 recognized a violation of human rights by the government; the case is pending in the Supreme Court as of 2019.

treatments and punishments. Some of the children born from these women were sent to America, Europe, and other developed areas.[82] To maintain uneven power relations with the U.S. and to structure its own economic modernity, the Korean government perpetrated legal, medical, economic, and social violence against women and children. Representing Amerasian adoptees as babies of GIs and Korean prostitutes, without articulating the very violent history behind the circumstances of their birth, only accumulates discrimination. This history of institutionalized violence has been obscured in the narrative of child rescue from the supposedly *backward* nation to the more *progressive* America, generating the ideological and epistemic production of white adoptive parents' benevolent care.

I tease out the concealed violent history of Korean adoptees and camptown women by analyzing the descriptions of Joy and Elvis in the novel. Although this part of their history is not explicit, Jane points to America's tendency to forget histories of slavery and racial exclusion. The metaphoric use of the Japanese plant kudzu in parallel with Korean adoptees living in plantation house is one example that conveys Jane's gestures toward showing the violent side of America. Jane writes that kudzu was introduced to America in 1876 to "rehabilitate" "depleted Southern soil" because of its strong growth capacity (76). However, it has become overgrown and out of control; its "economic and practical uses have been forgotten. Mostly, nowadays, its only use is

[82] Hosu Kim elucidates the history of Korean birth mothers in relation to the link between camptown women and transnational adoption. She states, "adoption became the norm for mixed-race children in military camptowns, as affirmed by the striking fact that only 25% of kijichon mothers raised their children themselves" (46).

metaphoric, to describe the inroads of Japanese industry into the nonunionized South" (76-77). The underlying logic that refers kudzu to "an invasive weed" is its threatening capacity to take over American land, echoing a racist fear of Asian growth that may engulf white residents.[83] Jane's arrangement of the kudzu section in the Beaudroux episode is at odds with her critique of America's deceitful treatment of Asians. In the novel, the Japanese crew informs Vern of the value of kudzu, which signals the commodification of Asian exoticism that yields profits. This new discovery not only offers profitable cash crops to Vern, but more importantly, it works to inculcate Grace to recognize the value of seeing "things from another angle" (83). Put differently, the novel's arrangement of the adoptee history relative to the documentary interlude of kudzu information leads to Grace's epiphany to affirm racial diversity; Grace's family becomes a true multicultural family that recognizes racial difference.

The abrupt shift of Grace's realization of Asian value and her own colorblindness displays the importance of interacting with people of difference (i.e., Jane and the Japanese crew) because it brings new perspectives and progressive changes: "She had never thought about race when she was growing up, and now she saw that she'd been blind to it. The colors had been all around her, endlessly complex, with shades as variegated as the genetic spectrum could permit" (82-83). That is, Ozeki conveys how the show turns pedagogical to Grace, who is limited by living inside of white

[83] Lisa Lowe expounds on the contradictions within the inclusion of Asian immigrants for the U.S. nation-building project, the development of capitalism, and the exclusion of Asians by delimiting their citizenship in the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. See *Immigrant Acts* (1996).

normativity—whiteness as the norm. However, it is questionable whether her change is necessarily ethical. Grace feels relieved to hear that her Black Amerasian son Elvis is hanging out with "the black kids: "That was good.…Elvis had a peer group" (83). She expects Elvis's assimilation into a Black community as broadening the color spectrum. Yet Grace is culturally blind, for she understands only American terms of diversity. The half-African American and half-Korean Elvis does not have an alternative to navigating Korean culture in America. Grace's affirmation of Elvis's hanging out with Black kids demonstrates the erasure of his Korean birth mother and Korean culture; instead, Elvis assimilates into Americanized Black culture. Further, Grace takes the position of speaking for adoptees while adoptee voices are underrepresented in the novel's third-person narrative perspective. Or, adoptee voices are audible only to affirm their successful living with white family: "We had to go through a lot"; "I guess we're proud" (73). Even Grace's most uneasy daughter, Joy, has been transformed as a talented American citizen whose "outbursts of obstinacy" Grace translates as "sensitivity to music" (71). Joy's obstinacy (a sign of adoptee struggles) is further translated as a teenager's rebellion: "I got it pierced to bug you [Grace]" and concludes: "exotic is good" (332). This rough and tumble mother-daughter relationship is stressed as a facet of the American multicultural family, engulfing adoptees' violent history and difficulty in adapting to American society.

In the novel, a transnational adoptive family as a representation of American multiculturalism works to give hope for women with reproductive problems, which leads to promoting adoption. Akiko imagines adopting Korean children; Jane also thinks of

adopting a child as a remedy for her infertile body affected by DES. Besides the Beaudroux episode, Jane features the family of a lesbian couple with biracial children as representative of American diversity. The novel, or at least Jane's selection of a diverse American family, promotes multiculturalism—a hybridity of racial, cultural, and even queer—inside the family. For Jane, promoting diversity empowers women from patriarchy and makes progress, as the novel shows women's collective support to expose the violent meat industry. Shameem Black, in this regard, claims that the novel shows the methods of feminist alliance to politicize maternalism. Black states, "Ozeki's characters seek to divorce maternalism from the patriarchal assumptions in which it is often embedded. When the novel ends with Akiko on the verge of childbirth and Jane on the brink of international adoption, both Jane and Akiko envision themselves as mothers, but not as wives" (233). The novel, however, never critically questions transnational adoptees' living in predominantly white communities, nor allows them to think of their birth culture. Rather, Ozeki chooses to use Grace's perspective to describe how her children are happy; Joy's voice is only heard when it supports women forming connections: "So she [Jane] wants to adopt, huh? Cool" (333). Joy's affirmation of adoption enables what Black views as maternalism divorced from patriarchy. Yet these ideal mothers remain within the boundaries of the upper-middle class and normative nuclear family, demonstrating their participation in a gendered hierarchy.

Ozeki offers readers a happy ending because she believes it has a transformative effect. Jane gains success in her career as a documentary filmmaker, and she gains the promise of domestic fulfillment through her love with her boyfriend and her plans to

form a family. Akiko migrates to America, hoping to make her baby an "American wife." It seems Jane's documentary desire to show exotic America satisfies its aim and even provides pedagogies to women in the novel. Jane sees optimism in diversifying America: "native species are migrating, if not disappearing…Being half, I am evidence that race, too, will become relic. Eventually we're all going to be brown, sort of.…Now, oddly, I straddle this blessed, ever-shrinking world" (15). Jane's euphoric and comic tone contains her authorization to speak out against discrimination even when her experiences do not know or belong to the people suffering from discrimination. Sometimes, Jane's appropriation of stereotypes is problematic because of her distance—a contradictory posture that negates her appeal to women's affective bond. For instance, Jane imagines herself in a "1960s porn set…sort of post-Vietnam nostalgia-porn thing. A quick little R and R fantasy in Tokyo or Seoul" (52). She even jokes about fabricating her mother as a "prostitute on the streets of Tokyo" (235). Jane's stereotypes may intend to imply U.S. militarism in Japan, Korea, and Vietnam. However, her comic satire is too light to convey the severity of military violence against women, as I have briefly articulated in this section. Eventually, Ozeki's alternative maternalism endorses gendered racial hierarchy and stratified reproduction, since the dark side of camptown women is invisible in America. In addition, Jane's post-racial optimism does not consider transnational adoptees' struggles to living with and in difference in America, wherein structural racism shapes the everyday lives of non-white subjects. Thus, the following section will examine transnational adoptees' labor for multicultural conviviality by attending to four adoptees' voices in *Geographies of Kinship*.

Convivial Labor and Adoptee Subjectivity in *Geographies of Kinship*

Deann Borshay Liem's *Geographies of Kinship* contains the narratives of four adult adoptees: Estelle Cooke-Sampson, raised in Washington DC; Lena Kim, raised in Sweden; Dae-won Kim, raised in Switzerland; and Jane Jeong Trenka, raised in Minnesota. All were adopted by white parents except for Estelle, a Black-Korean biracial subject, who was raised in an African-American military family. The film opens with Estelle's voiceover that she has no acknowledgement of being part of Korea. Estelle then asks: "What happened and how did it happen?" Estelle's question, though it consists of seven simple words, is not easy to answer because of its multiple implications. Does "it" refer to her own circumstance as a mixed-race child who lived in an African-American community in America? Does she indicate the Korean War and the political forces that displaced her connection to Korea? Is her question singular or does she ask on behalf of a collective? The film opening with a simple yet unsettling personal question of belonging resonates with the three other adoptees' searching for their missing constitutive identities. Liem's film displays the identity quandary of adoptees of different ages and nationalities, indicating the structural problem of transnational adoption. The personal loss and displacement reverberate from Korea's postcolonial aftermath that prioritized economic development over the lives of women and children. Hence, *Geographics of Kinship* is structured by these personal narratives and affects that eventually illuminate the silenced, violent history behind transnational Korean adoption.

In this section, I examine the adoptees' life of negotiations: between adoptive parents' expectations of assimilation and adoptees' resistance to the erasure of Asian

genealogy; between unbelonging in Euro-America and Korea. I argue that adoptees' lives of negotiations should be read as labor for conviviality, the affective labor produced to live together, containing *distinctive adoptee subjectivity* in both an adoptive family/community and a birth family/community. That is, the adoptee's convivial labor manifests adoptee agency to negotiate and envision multiple identities and ways of belonging.

Scholars such as David Eng and Jodi Kim contend that adoptees perform "ideological labor" that reinforces the idealized notion of family and kinship in the West. Adoptee labor is ideological in that it "consolidate[s] the *affective* boundaries of the white, heteronormative middle-class nuclear family," and this family-building obscures the reproductive labor exploitation of women of color (Eng 109). The mainstream adoption rhetoric of love elides concerns about why adoptee babies are more valued in white nations than their birth nations.[84] Jodi Kim argues that Asian stereotypes such as "filial piety" and the "model minority" determine "the desirability and availability of Asian female babies" which prescribe the ideological labor of adoptees (181). The rhetoric of the model minority expects adoptees' mediation of racial and ethnic difference in the context of multiculturalism and colorblindness. The expectations in the age of multiculturalism promote love that overcomes race or cultural origin, but at the same time a glib recognition of difference is conveniently utilized when anti-essentialist

[84] Kit W. Myers articulates the symbolic violence in the discourse of adoptive love that reproduces "'real' (legible adoptive) families" while "precluding the importance of past and future identities of adoptees, acknowledgment of birth parents, and complex (non-heteronormative) family structures" (176).

love is not sufficient for a fictive familial relationship. Adoptees' ideological labor results from adoptive parents' erasure of racial history, their colorblindness, and their presupposed expectations of Asian cultural elements (i.e., obedient, hard-working, and agreeable). In this respect, adoptees straddle the putative expectations of ideal family and the Asian model minority myth, which generates affective and psychic predicaments in their conditions of existence.

Adoptees' psychic predicament occurs between their memories of birth parents or country and their adoptive parents' denial of their past, which demands adoptees' total assimilation into the parents' culture. Kimberly McKee points out that adoptive parents' fear that the birth mother may reclaim the child often causes them to regard the adoptee's past as a vacuum. To the adoptive parents, orphans signify renounced children; this formulation not only confirms their moral imperative but also reduces their anxiety. That is, orphans should be disconnected from their past origins so that adoptive parents can invest love for their orphan babies' fresh start. This erasure of birth mothers and Korean genealogy takes adoptees' cultural assimilation for granted without considering adoptees' everyday racialization in a (mostly) white community.[85] Conversely, the naturalized expectations of adoptee assimilation lead to adoptees either splitting their identity or maintaining their Korean identity in secret. In *Geographies of Kinship*, Dae-won made a strict difference between his two identities, Swiss and Korean; Jane Jeong Trenka felt ingratitude toward her adoptive family as she wanted to know her

[85] Adoptive parents' celebration of difference refers only to "tokenized moments of inclusivity with little to no historicity of racial injustices," McKee argues (108).

past, so she secretly contacted her birth family. Adoptees' curiosity about their past engenders feelings of disloyalty and sadness in living with an adoptive family. David Eng refers to this affective cost as racial melancholia.[86]

However, Eng's racial melancholia may flatten the "multiplicity" of adoptee identity and generalize transnational adoptee experiences.[87] Transnational Korean adoptees complicate the normative assumptions about what they have lost and what they cannot attain. Lena Kim's lived experiences represented in Liem's film, for instance, invert the reasoning of racial melancholia since she has an unattainable past while living in current proximity to white family community: "I feel very rooted and close with my family here. And I feel happy with my childhood but I have this loss and also I have this curiosity. So I want to search for my birth family.…I tried and nothing came of it." Lena's identification with whiteness and her simultaneous curiosity about her Korean side indicate her investment in both white and Asian sides of her identity. Despite her adoption documents containing omissions and fabrications that hinder her attempts to locate her history in Korea, Lena not only accepts her identity within the white Swedish

[86] Eng argues that racial melancholia observed in Asian immigrants (including transnational adoptees) derives from "social and psychic structures of loss" (115). The losses—homeland, language, people—must be mourned, but to the extent that Asians are viewed as perpetual foreigners in the U.S., they "are denied the capacity to invest in new people, places, and ideals…[and this failure] to invest in new objects is a crucial part of Freud's definition of melancholia" (116). Thus, Asian Americans' melancholia demonstrates the unresolved psychic oscillation between the lost objects and unattainable whiteness (i.e., not quite white and not quite Asian). This oscillation vexes Asian American's identification and belonging.

[87] See Kim Park Nelson's *Invisible Asians: Korean American Adoptees, Asian American Experiences, and Racial Exceptionalism* (2016).

community but also imagines that her birth mother is inside her: "I felt that when I grew older, I came more close to her [birth mother] because I was changing into a woman, like she must have been when she had me. I was looking myself in the mirror, and I was thinking, 'I'm seeing her.' So it feels like I've met her in the mirror." From Eng's view, the losses of transnational adoptees might cause perpetual depression because what is lost is unimaginable and thus unmournable. Yet Lena's desire to hold on to what seems impossible to find (her Korean roots and birth mother) is imagined through the physicality reflected in the mirror.[88] When Lena sees her mother in the reflected image of herself in the mirror, Lena lets go of, and labors for, togetherness with the lost objects. In this spirit, instead of confining adoptees to melancholia, I will focus on adoptee agency and their struggles for conviviality.

The concept of what José Esteban Muñoz calls "disidentification" proffers the way to not pathologize minority subjects' melancholia relative to their complex and often ambivalent identities and identifications. Disidentification is "a strategy that works on and against dominant ideology.…this 'working on and against' is a strategy that tries to transform a cultural logic from within…valuing the importance of local or everyday struggles of resistance" (Muñoz 11-12). Muñoz sees disidentification as a way to empower minority identities, as opposed to the dominant ideology of assimilation

[88] The metaphor of mirrors serves to indicate an adoptee subject's "divided subjectivity" that provokes "questions about inherited traits and family resemblances" in an adoptive family (E. Kim 92). Mirrors also represent adoptees' nostalgia. As Lena Ahlin argues, it is the way adoptees try to cohabit with the lost objects or "bridge the gap between the past and the present not in order to inhabit the past, but to use it as a springboard to the future" (2).

imposed on them. This disidentifying strategy not only affirms what is considered misfitting the dominant norms, ideologies, or cultures but also gains transformative power through the very "working on and against" the dominant public sphere. In the context of transnational adoptees' cases, their quotidian living conditions constitute adoptees' struggles to mediate their racial, ethnic, and cultural difference and their belonging to their identification group. Adoptees are both *outside* and *within* a dominant racial ideology. Adoptees carry out labor to reconcile their difference and simultaneously conform to the expectations of adoptive family to perform *togetherness*. As I briefly state, Dae-won's strict division of his Swiss/Korean identities demonstrate his effort to maintain his Korean identity, whereas keeping it secret is another type of labor he performs when living with adoptive family. In a different way, Lena's mirror statement demonstrates her way of constructing the impossible past through the imaginary physical resemblance with her birth mother, making the fictive past and origin as part of her life. These two different adoptee labors—whether it be to reduce adoptive parents' anxiety or to reconcile both white and Korean aspects of adoptee subjectivity—demonstrate the complexity of adoptee convivial labor that troubles the dominant expectation of adoptee conformity.

Adoptees' convivial labor is to enact "with-ness" for both the lost and the newly-formed family relations, which does not necessarily mean total assimilation. Rather, an adoptee's curiosity toward their past and their attempts to keep in touch with their birth family undermine the adoptive family's expectation of a happy, convivial family. I argue that adoptees' convivial labor encompasses adoptees' negotiations to resist or go along

with the expectations of the adoptive families/communities as well as in the birth families/communities when adoptees return to their birth nation. Adoptee convivial labor expresses the adoptee's way of togetherness, which includes happiness but also conflict in navigating a way to live with difference not dictated by white or Korean culture. In other words, to borrow Muñoz's claim of disidentification as a strategy for performativity and world-making power, adoptee convivial labor re-envisions adoptee identity in familial and social relations. *Geographies of Kinship* shows adoptee labor in the narratives of adult adoptees.

Liem's film elucidates adoptees' convivial labor in the alienating living conditions of the transnational adoptive family. Estelle's "life of servitude" is exemplary of the adoptee coping mechanism of living together in alienation. Estelle was *rescued* by General Cooke-Sampson after the Korean War, which caused her to take on care labor based in gratitude. Estelle's difference—whether it be a recognizable physical difference or her awareness of her adoptive father's altruism—generated alienation within her family: "I didn't look like my mother. I didn't look like my father. I didn't look like my brothers. The other kids always think that I was Chinese." Without any Asians around her, she identified herself as African-American and tried to be "agreeable" to the circumstance. Estelle devoted herself to the family by doing chores and living a "passive" life. Nonetheless, she recalls that she never received affirmation from her adoptive family. In the footage that covers her search through the St. Paul orphanage in Korea, Estelle talks about how Sister Agnes's memory of her emotionally moved her: "I was a very sweet little girl, and it was the first time anyone had ever said a kind word

about me as a child." In Estelle's articulation of her adolescence, it is evident that her desire for family intimacy had not been satisfied despite her efforts for family conviviality. Estelle's conformity to passivity did not make her happy. She eventually decided to get away from her family's expectation (that she would stay in domesticity) by seeking higher education. Despite the expectations of gratitude being unspoken, Estelle's attentive labor demonstrates how the idea of an adoptive family's benevolence in adopting a war orphan creates the condition of Estelle's caring for the adoptive family. Also, she moves away from bondage by turning towards the care of herself (by seeking education and knowledge of her past), which should be understood as convivial labor to constitute her subjectivity apart from family assimilation.[89]

Geographies of Kinship also reveals the four adoptees' lived experiences of convivial labor that continues in their country of origin. As much as adoptees struggle to negotiate subject formation in the adopted place, their return to Korea also brings up the question of belonging. When transnational adoptees who were sent overseas during the 1950s-70s return to South Korea in the 80s and afterwards, they realize that Korea is one of the largest baby-export countries in the name of global humanity, despite its economic growth. As the film shows, adoptees' return provokes Korea's use of the euphemism "cultural ambassadors," which frames transnational adoptees in a way meant to remove the shameful image of the baby-sending nation. This trope operates to impose a duty on

[89] Estelle's voice is invaluable because, as Graves states, "Very little evidence exists that allows us to know how the Korean black children of the first generation of Korean transnational adoptions sorted out the challenges of identity formation" (177).

adoptees: they must be a bridge between Korea and the rest of the world. The term echoes the euphemism used for camptown women ("personal ambassadors") whose subjecthood had been located outside of the nation-state's protection. The difference is that transnational adoptees are commonly recognized as *privileged* cosmopolitans, as they are considered having better lives than if they had remained in Korea. The contradictory subject positions of adoptees—at once poor orphans and privileged cosmopolitans—render a complex question of what it means to be Korean transnational adoptees in their homeland.

The film illuminates the adoptees' emotional crisis during in their return to Korea, showing glimpses of many challenges that complicate their identification and belonging. Dae-won's PTSD, for instance, demonstrates the adoptee's life of liminality even after he achieved his return to Korea:

> The very first time I went back to Korea…I felt comfortable, I felt at ease. For the very first time also I didn't stand out of the crowd. I didn't tell my parents and in '94 I met my birth mother in Korea and a lot of people asked me, so how did you experience it, you know? They all thinking you know, oh there must be very emotional and so on. I think back, there is so much emotion. It's too much for somebody and that means they go numb. They can't feel anything anymore.…Of course everybody was crying but was it crying because I was sad? I don't know. Maybe I was crying because everybody expected it.…After I found my birth mother I tried to talk to my parents but it was a catastrophe. It was just kind of like the world crashed. I was diagnosed basically with PTSD, Post

> Traumatic Stress Disorder. I just didn't want to live anymore.…I convinced myself maybe not today but I wanna live another 10 days.

In Dae-won's statement, he discusses two elements that cause his PTSD. First, the overflowing emotions when meeting his birth mother numb his feelings, though he feels the need to act in accordance with the others' sad moods. Second, the failure to mediate the coexistence of both his Korean mother and Swiss parents, especially to the adoptive parents, brings about his sense of collapse. In Switzerland, Dae-won's convivial labor is to pretend he is a total Swiss to assuage his adoptive parents' anxiety about his difference. When he returns to Korea, however, his strategy is no longer needed because he does not stand out, at least at the surface level. He feels familiarity as he blends in with the Korean people and culture, but this familiarity provokes deep sadness in his effort to repress his Korean identity in Switzerland. His family reunion brings up mixed feelings of anger and loss, which hinder his ability to register emotions. Thus, Dae-won performs convivial labor to show the emotions expected of him: sadness and happiness. Yet his capacity to manage conviviality fails when two worlds need to reconcile, since he has families in both Korea and Switzerland.

Adoptees' return to their birth country does not authenticate their "natural" belonging to Korea. Rather, adoptees' reconnection to their birth country elicits power dynamics that do not accept the coexistence of two situations (two nations, families, languages, cultures), whereas the adoptee subject signifies multiculturalism. Tensions occur when white parents' altruism is limited to poor orphans, and their care ethic is not broadened to birth families and nations, because adoptees' connection with birth families

destabilizes the constructed normalcy of an adoptive family.[90] Moreover, when adoptees return to Korea having white parents and different citizenship, they are treated as temporary visitors to birth families and nations alike. With regard to cultural assimilation, adoptee incommensurability works either to racialize adoptees or to count as multicultural diversity in the West. In Korea, only an adoptee's physical appearance (if they are not Amerasian subjects) allows them to blend in. These tensions manifest the exercise of violent normativity that subjugates the adoptee and excludes the ambiguity of their subjectivity. The multiplicity of adoptee subjectivity may restrict them to being either authentic Korean or otherwise. However, McKee rightfully argues that "adoptees cast off the need to be an 'authentic' subject based on the cultural scripts and norms that historically render them as outliers" by accepting "the various intersections they inhabit" (94). McKee's argument verifies where conviviality is involved in adoptee's seeking for their space of belonging.

In fact, many adoptees transform their emotional and psychic trauma into activism, solidarity, and supporting adoptee rights. When adoptees reunite with birth families, they realize the structural problems of patriarchy and social stigmatization against single, unwed mothers that fuels the primary reasons these mothers relinquish their children.[91] Jane Trenka expresses that she understands her birth mother's struggle

[90] McKee argues that adoptive parents' desire for normalcy confirms the fictiveness of the family, thereby making it possible to render the transnational adoptive family as queer.

[91] See Shannon Bae, "Radical Imagination and the Solidarity Movement between Transnational Korean Adoptees and Unwed Mothers in South Korea," *Adoption & Culture*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2018, pp. 300- 315.

and failure to keep her child with an abusive husband; Trenka also realizes that her own two sisters lost their children to adoption under circumstances in which an ethic of abandonment is demanded. An ethic of abandonment was an encouraged social value in Korea under the economic-driven, male-centered development; it proposed to provide better lives for children and lead to the relinquishment of childcare.[92] Having five transnational adoptees in her family, Jane is active in efforts to end transnational adoption, bring the unwed mother issue to the fore of Korean society, and increase the preservation of family: "I think in order to reduce the rate of adoptions of children who are being sent overseas from Korea we primarily have to take care of the single mothers. I was so lucky to know the love of my Korean mother. I think that helped me to be more sympathetic to the families that lost their children and also the unwed mothers who are struggling to keep their children." Jane is president of the organization TRACK (Truth and Reconciliation for the Adoption Community of Korea) that investigates adoption practices to create a better future for Korean families. Considering that transnational Korean adoption substantially disrupts the lives of adoptees and birth families, Jane's

[92] This ethic was culturally encouraged not to prioritize individuality but to emphasize the value of collectivity and relationality. Individual subjectivity becomes secondary to the betterment of a nation's future. The military regimes encouraged the duty to devote oneself to the nation, to the community, and to the family by elevating the male-centered hierarchy in determining individuals' everyday conduct. Thus, married women and widows were forced to give up their children (mostly daughters) to better support male family members; unmarried women were sent to factories to support their brothers, wherein these working poor women were exposed to sexual violence; sexually harassed working poor women fell into prostitution due to moral condemnation and poverty while their money sustained family care. Based on these vicious cycles, child abandonment was considered an ethic to offer better environments (i.e., education, wealth) to children.

call for the preservation of family challenges the ethics conceived in adoption, as I discuss below.

The end credits of *Geographies of Kinship* return to the issue of Amerasian adoptee subjectivity. Liem situates Estelle's story at the opening and ending of her film, reflecting how the social stigma attached to mixed-race children initiated Korean transnational adoption. It also reflects how mixed Korean adoptees' marginality effaces their existence in the memory of Korean people. Liem focuses on Estelle's ongoing efforts for a personal archival search. Estelle appears on a missing persons' show, does a DNA test, and travels to an orphanage for mixed children. Searching for adoptee identity is contingent on the existing documents: adoption files are too often inaccurate, and the desire for kin brings unexpected hope and disappointment. Estelle's appearance on the TV show enables the possibility of her finding her siblings, named David and Angie. Liem uses still shots of Estelle's meeting with Angie and her daughter to convey how adoptee reunion generates hope and anxiety. The camera juxtaposes the photograph of Estelle's birth mother and Estelle's own face, illuminating their resemblance. Angie's daughter confirms that Estelle is family: "Mommy, it's like looking in the mirror." To verify the relation between Estelle and Angie, they consent to take a DNA test, as this new science offers a chance to "provide a sense of truth or promise," redefining "what reconciliation or reunion means" (Kopacz 341). In Estelle's case, the DNA testing, however, fails to reunite her with her possible biological birth family. Estelle says: "Angie and David were definitely related. I was not. I had thought maybe now my heart could rest that I had my family.…I was adopted once, I don't want to be adopted twice."

To Estelle, searching for her genealogy never ends; her enduring search, as the film shows, is not individual. Estelle's interactions with other mixed-race adult adoptees evince the collective effort to constitute adoptee subject formation and to build their own social space, leading to publicizing transnational adoptee histories of exclusion, especially of mixed-race subjects.

Transnational/racial adoptees' unsettled belonging and their activism therefore contest the assumed moral value surrounding adoption.[93] The dominant discourse of humanitarian rescue and care in adoption wields its moral value to rationalize child displacement and acculturation. The presupposed vulnerability of (orphaned) babies and valuation of (white) family-building fuel the continued practices of adoption. The guiding principle of a care ethics that values relationality supports the continuation of transnational adoption, for as Janet Shapiro says, it appeals to ethical ways of "listening to what people are saying" while "keeping in mind the broader social and structural contexts surrounding international adoption" (342). By arguing that care ethics offers a

[93] The dominant, pro-adoption view insists adoption aids children who live in deplorable conditions. Yngvesson states that transnational child adoption derives from the "development discourse…in a postcolonial world in which child adoption operated in conjunction with other forms of aid" (233). There is also a view that international adoption plays a role of cultural bridge. Susan Soon-Keum Cox, a director of Holt International Children's Services states: "The shrinking of the global community has made adoption across national boundaries more acceptable as a way of meeting the needs of children without families.…[I]nternational adoption has led to greater cultural acceptance of adoption in children's birth countries and has promoted higher levels of in-country adoption" (qtd. in Freundlich 65). As demonstrated, humanitarian aid and the anticipation of multicultural family and nation making provide an ethical ethos for adoption agencies.

"values bridge" among the adoption triad (adoptive family, adoptee, and birth family), Shapiro proposes that an ethics of care should accommodate adoptive parents' and adoptees' formation of family life.[94] Still, the emphasis on understanding the child's birth country to smooth out adoptees' *transition* to their adoptive families displays the valuation of adoptive parents' family-formation. Hence, care ethics in adoption should pay more attention to the root problems that render children orphaned from both family and country, and that silence of adoptee experiences of displacement as violence.

To conclude, adoptees' quotidian lives of negotiating between two nations, families, and identities are far from (Ozeki's character) Jane's euphoric, cosmopolitan straddling of Americanness and Asianness. Nor do transnational adoptees advocate for adoption, despite biracial adoptee Joy's affirmation of adoption as a "cool" thing in Ozeki's novel. The promotion and consumption of "authenticity" in the Beaudroux family episode contradicts adoptees' feelings of inauthenticity that condition everyday living in the West and Korea. In this regard, the sentimentalism surrounding adoption, especially in the epistemic formation of vulnerable orphans and Western rescue, accommodates the interest of securing white paternalism over *backward* countries while simultaneously promoting multiculturalism. Yet multicultural conviviality needs to

[94] Shapiro states that adoptee-adoptive parents' family formation is complex and can generate "medical, social, educational and psychological challenges"; thereby, the ethically-informed social welfare practitioner should focus on: "(1) understanding the relevant social and structural contexts in various sending countries that may have shaped the child's pre-adoptive experience and be associated with current developmental challenges, and (2) an orientation…that emphasizes…working with parents and children…[for] the construction of a family narrative that supports relationship development and family identity" (342).

consider racial hierarchy and power relations even in the intimate domain of the multicultural family.

In the Korean context, as showcased in Liem's film, adoptees' aspirations for kin search and activism demonstrate their resistance to the presumed value of an ethic of abandonment. This value, oriented from patriarchal and repressive military regimes that prioritize economic development over human rights, encourages individuals (women and children) to sacrifice for the collective good. An ethic of abandonment occurs from the predominant belief that child relinquishment provides a better life for the kid. Yet such an ethic stems from the collective complicity to build an economically wealthy nation-state by erasing social problems from sight. Therefore, Jane's call for solidarity between adoptees and their unwed mothers points to the problems of a developmental telos that dismisses adoptees' affective labor and birth mothers' sexual or reproductive labor. *Geographies of Kinship* illuminates the most unheard voices of Amerasian adoptee subjects whose unsettled personal histories need solidarity and hope. From this reason, I want to point out how Ozeki's view of transnational women's alliance silences adoptee voices to promote multicultural conviviality in America, thus reinforcing gendered, classed, and racial hierarchy around transnational adoption. By examining both Ozeki's novel and Liem's film, this chapter articulates the stakes of inequalities and violence behind transnational Korean adoption, in which the values of care and coexistence veil adoptees' losses, their convivial labor, as well as the reproductive injustices done to them.

CHAPTER 4

NON-NORMATIVE CARE AFFILIATIONS AND QUEER CONVIVIALITY

Chapter Four examines the convivial labor performed by transnational/racial adoptees in a multicultural family site. While transnational adoption challenges the traditional notion of family that is based on biological ties, adoptees carry out ideological, affective, or what I view as convivial labor in order to accommodate the normative expectations of the family. In this chapter, my focus shifts to queer kinship outside the dominant normative institutions through the form of interdependency.[95] Judith Butler contends that practices of kinship "emerge to address fundamental forms of human dependency, which may include birth, child-rearing, relations of emotional dependency and support…(to name a few)" ("Is Kinship" 15). Thereby, kinship is not "fully autonomous sphere, proclaimed to be distinct from community and friendship" (Butler 15). What is significant in Butler's claim is the potential form of kinship—whether it be community or friendship—outside normalization by the state. The goal of this chapter is to investigate how cultural productions illuminate often unintelligible forms of communal living—which I view as alternative kinships. I demonstrate whether conviviality as a form of coexistence can either play a normative role for social institutions or disrupt the existing social order through friendship.

[95] By "queer," I use it semantically to articulate undefinable and performative aspects of gender non-conforming subjects since identities are contingent upon social and cultural changes. Methodologically, I use the term queer to undermine the dominant, normative systems and power structures.

This chapter interrogates non-normative affiliations formed through care by exploring the possibilities and limitations of kinship outside of dominant social norms and regulations. I pay particular attention to gender variant subjects, focusing specifically on *baklas* and *hijras* as they are represented in two cultural products: Tomer Heymann's documentary film *Paper Dolls* and Arundhati Roy's novel *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. Baklas and hijras are subjects who are considered to be neither men nor women in the Philippines or "a third sex" in India, respectively. They occupy distinct subject positions that are marginalized yet resist the rigid social conventions of gender and sexuality. It is their queerness in terms of the intersection of race, class/caste, and religion that renders their lives precarious within and across national contexts. Their liminality, in fact, makes it possible to generate communities of care based upon a mutual understanding of interdependency. I argue that for baklas and hijras, an ethic of care is integral in the maintenance of daily conviviality for themselves and others. Both Heymann's and Roy's texts make visible through the trope of family and care how social control works. I examine how such control and the structural violence behind the convivial scenes are resisted and the conditions under which these queer subjects form an alternate alliance of communities of care. I argue that the queer subjects' performance of conviviality—fostering togetherness and life—stems from social exclusion and violence. The performed conviviality—friendship and coexistence—uncovers asymmetries of caring relations and oppressive social conditions.

While I have chosen to focus on baklas and hijras in this chapter because of some shared conditions, their lives and the roles they perform differ significantly. Heymann's

film showcases the lives of the Paper Dolls, a Filipino drag performance troupe living in Tel Aviv, Israel. Each member of the troupe had migrated seeking to actualize their queer desire. The director documented the troupe members—Giorgio, Sally, Cheska, Jan, Chiqui, and Rika—from 2001 to 2005, capturing the multiplicity of their lives as drag performers and as care-workers for elderly Orthodox Jewish men. The film was made during the outbreak of the Second Intifada (Palestine's insurrection against Israel, which started in 2000) that generated a hostile political climate against Israel's supposed terrorist populations. In this violent political climate, the film compellingly highlights the tension experienced by the migrant baklas between fear of deportation and hope for sexual freedom, as well as the director's growing friendship with the troupe. My focus lies in the migrant baklas' multiple care relations with their employers and their friends (Filipino caregivers and the director Heymann) to examine how they manage the demand for care to live as carers and develop convivilaity enabled by an ethic of care.

Roy's novel, compared to Heymann's film, depicts epic narratives of minority subjects—hijras, Dalits, Muslims, and Kashmiri freedom fighters—who are struggling against assimilitating into India's social institutions of gender, caste/class, religion, and ethnicity. *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* narrates India's shift to a neoliberal society by intertwining the stories of people who were abused and excluded from India's modernization. While the novel unwinds its story of social minorities' living in contemporary India with a non-linear plot structure, its primary thread is the story of the character Anjum. I mainly focus on Anjum who conforms to neither gender in a binary category nor to be integrated into a biological family and a hijra community. To become

a hijra, Anjum abandons her filial relationship and enters a hijra household called "the *Khwabgah* (dream place)." While Anjum and other gender variant people seek shelter under a hijra community, she eventually leaves the household and creates an alternative accommodation in a graveyard. It is Roy's depiction of two communities of care that elicits my interest as Anjum's graveyard shelter presents a productive possibility of liminal subjects' non-coercive coexistence.

Both texts consider the subjects (migrant baklas in Israel and hijras in India) at the margins of national symbolic context of a Jewish state and Hindu nation, respectively, while illuminating queer subjects' caring relations. These people are rendered as both 'other' and 'Other' in the modern, neoliberal scope of nation-states, yet care and their relationality allow spaces for queer living.[96] In *Paper Dolls*, I argue that queer Filipino caregivers become both the constitutive agents who transform Israel's structuring of society into a queer-friendly cosmopolitan place and the consumed Other for familial and social conviviality in Israel. While hijras in Roy's text are the marginal subjects in India, Roy demonstrates the ways in which they live with difference through the character Anjum. It is by examining the conditions and power dynamics of care

[96] To be 'other' is to be included into the structural logic of the nation-state, and to be 'Other' is to be considered excluded from this logic. According to Julia Kristeva in *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (1982), the Other exists as an alter ego within the subject, rendered through repulsion and exclusion. The Other is relegated to a place of non-language, thereby becoming monstrous, abject, and excessive. As the radically excluded being who collapses meaning, the Other becomes the remainder, the surplus, or to borrow Jacque Derrida's term, the trace that marks writing under erasure—"[e]rases it while producing it" (212).

relations that I explore who or what structurally benefits from the conviviality maintained by care.

Conviviality, to follow Gilroy and others, indicates the dynamics involved in living together with difference. Exploring conviviality requires two levels of investigation: (1) how does conviviality emerge at the state level and how is state-level conviviality be maintained? (2) how does conviviality manifest on a personal level? In the context represented in both the works of Heymann and Roy, one commonality is the prevalence of various forms of spectacular violence (i.e., terror, the state of exception, and communal violence) that occurs as a result of the respective nationalist homogenizing movements of Israel and India. The violence heightens the precarity of the Other, rendering the networks of interdependency crucial to everyday survival and coexistence. As both baklas and hijras fall out of institutional protection, their need for other forms of help prompts the development of alternative communities of care. Nevertheless, interdependency and violence also work together in maintaining the extant hierarchy and normative institutions. That is, conviviality is maintained through an interpersonal level of violence. The normative familial expectations placed on care workers as well as the hijra's relationality reinforce and bind the subjects of violence all the more precariously. The needs of the elderly in *Paper Dolls* and the needs of hijras naturalize the need to care. The expectations of care then become normative. This chapter explores the binding mechanism that turns the need to care into something violent and contingent. The particularity of convivial violence is that its relationality renders both baklas and hijras accomplices in supporting the very normative institutions

of family structure. Hence, this chapter examines what form of care can produce both interpersonal and state-level conviviality despite exclusionary intersectional violence of normative kinship, sexuality, and care economies.

The first section of this chapter will elaborate on the violent conditions under which these particular groups of queer subjects seek alternative communities of care. The precarity of their living conditions demands the need for focusing on the diverse care affiliations wherein everyday intimacy and care both perpetuate and disrupt the structural violence and hierarchy. The second part of the chapter examines Heymann's and Roy's texts to argue that various forms of caring relations reflect to social changes—violent or not—that demand ethics of care as a significant factor in forming care affiliations. At stake in both *Paper Dolls* and *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* is the pivotal concern of being bound not by blood but by care and solidarity. In what follows, I analyze queer subjects' precarity as it is influenced by the political and economic structures of the nation-state since those subjects' (un)belonging to state protection facilitates care affiliations. The comparison of the contexts of both Israel and India foregrounds patterns of abuse of the Other sanctioned by the nationalist agendas ostensibly supporting a unified statehood.

National (Un)Belonging and Precarity

While Heymann and Roy both frame their texts within the context of intensified border controls against Muslim and other minority populations after the September 11, 2001 terror attacks, it is worth noting that the vitriolic treatment of Muslims in Israel and

India dates back before the establishment of both nations. The 9/11 attacks escalated and condensed extant Islamophobia, lending to Israel and India linguistic, political, and moral frameworks to continue subordinating Palestinian and Muslim populations. Indeed, Muslim exclusion and marginalization—as the overtly targeted marginalized group—are necessary to the polity of both the Zionist project and Hindutva. Although South Asian historian Satadru Sen cautions that the histories of Jewish and Indian nation formations differ significantly, Sen argues: "A comparison is not only rewarding as an exploration of overlapping pasts, it may be urgently needed in the current political circumstances. In both India and Israel, the political mainstream has become nakedly committed to a racially-structured monopoly upon the state" (693). On this matter, these two nations are comparable as to how they are "forged in struggle" to "nationalize different elements of the social and intellectual body of the putative national community" (Pandey, *Remembering Partition* 17). While Zionism appeared as a political movement to establish the land of Israel in the late nineteenth century, and while Hindutva as a Hindu nationalism was born in the 1920s, both ideologies share Orientalist and thus colonial epistemology in their roots. Whereas (European) Jews' longing for nationhood derived from pervasive marginalization and Nazi persecution, and Hindu nationalism derived from anti-colonial reaction, Madhavrao Sadashivrao Golwalkar, a prominent ideologue of the organization Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), saw that the lack of nation-states (based on religion and single racial or ethnic

people) was the shared cause of Jewish and Hindu sufferings.[97] Both Zionism and Hindutva perceive a strong national body as a way to mitigate European persecution and British colonialism. In the process, Zionism erases the Palestinian presence by conceiving Palestine as vacuum. Similarly, Hindu nationalism tries to deny or homogenize the multiplicity of minorities in India.[98]

The process involved in constituting these modern nation-states entails the question of who can be a rightful citizen in the national symbols represented in Zionism and Hindutva; national inclusion involves either erasing the plural bodies of extant communities or converting them into one homogenous national community.[99] The way these states legitimize the newly formed nationhood has taken violent form by disrupting majority-Muslim geopolitical hegemony in Palestine and the Indian subcontinent, creating the structural Muslim abjection and displacement. Sen, however, observes that India has not yet achieved the exclusive Hindu-only nation regardless of the Hindu Right's aspirations. India, as a liberal-secular nation-state, integrates minorities (*tolerance* imbricated in institutional hierarchy), whereas Israel structurally excludes the Palestinian-Arab minorities from "key positions and resources," as "Israel's objectives, symbols, and politics are built on the fact that it is the state of the Jewish people"

---

[97] See Sen, "Fascism Without Fascists?"; Sumantra Bose, *Secular States, Religious Politics: India, Turkey, and the Future of Secularism,* Cambridge UP, 2018; Atalia Omer and Jason Springs, *Religious Nationalism: A Reference Handbook*, ABC-CLIO, 2013.
[98] See Partha Chatterjee, "History and the Nationalization of Hinduism," *Social Research*, vol. 59, no. 1, 1992, pp. 111–49.
[99] Recognizing the legacy of European genocide and the precarity of Jewish lives over millennia need not conflict with a critique of Israel's particular settler colonial manifestation of the Zionist project.

(Ghanem et al. 254, 258). Whether considered through a secular or a religious lens, Israel regards itself as the only democratic nation in the Middle East, thereby constructing its own exceptionalism. In a similar vein, India identifies itself as the world's largest democratic state. But its claim entails an obvious contradiction between its homogenizing nationalism and the ideal of democratic inclusion. Nevertheless, particular kinds of modern concepts—democracy, statehood, citizenship, and human rights—provide a means of internally justifying exceptionalism for both Israel and India.[100] Their growing partnership is predicated on guarding liberal democracy against those who threaten these nations' modern progress; thus, they authorize regulation of social difference.[101] In turn, their biopolitical management of the subjects of difference either incites the process by which non-normative beings become legible subjects in the national political imaginary or perpetrates the violence of marginalization.

The precarious living of both baklas and hijras is salient to other instances of other minorities under the control of right-wing politics. Heymann's documentary, for instance, showcases how queer Filipino subjects come into legible beings in Israel's

[100] I understand modernity to refer to the belief in progress, individualism, and freedom developed by political, economic, social, philosophical institutions of the Enlightenment, bureaucracy, secularization, and capitalism. To follow Dipesh Chakrabarty's view, the "phenomenon of 'political modernity'—namely, the rule by modern institutions of the state, bureaucracy, and capitalist enterprise—is impossible to think of…the genealogies of which go deep into the intellectual and even theological traditions of Europe" (4). I view nation-building as a salient factor to examine the promises of inclusion (citizenship and rights) as to how the classification of certain subjects are mobilized in the scope of the nation-state. In the twenty-first century, one measure of modernity is queer friendliness often used as a mask for enacting other forms of exclusion.

[101] See Satadru Sen, "Ethnocracy, Israel and India," *History and Sociology of South Asia*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2015, pp. 107–25.

labor market. This visibility, however, cannot be separated from their Palestinian exclusion. As the film's opening credits illustrate, Israel's Palestinian displacement allowed approximately 300,000 foreign workers to fill low-wage jobs formerly held by Palestinians. Scholars show that the first Intifada (1987-1993) marked an increase of foreign workers recruited to Israel.[102] After the first Intifada, the living conditions of Palestinians worsened; Palestinian employment and mobility decreased due to "a new network of militarized checkpoints, an escalation in the policy of military closure, and decreasing numbers of work visas for Palestinian laborers working inside Israel" (Stein 520–21). There were few Filipino care-workers in Israel in the 1980s, but the striking influx of foreign workers after 1993 marked their replacement of the Palestinian workforce. The second Intifada further provoked Israeli employers to hire foreign workers over Palestinians. Two Intifadas and closures of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip generated a substantial growth of foreign laborers at the expense of Palestinian banishment.

Not only does Israel's deliberate diminishment of the Palestinian work force promote the steady inflow of foreign workers from elsewhere in Asia and from Africa, Israel's ethno-nationalism effects the simultaneous inclusion and exclusion of migrants. Although Filipino care-workers are valued subjects who legally enter Israel to work,

[102] See David Bartram, "Foreign Workers in Israel: History and Theory," *The International Migration Review*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1998, pp. 303–25; Michael Ellman and Smain Laacher, *Migrant Workers in Israel—A Contemporary Form of Slavery*, Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network and International Federation for Human Rights, 2003.

they are treated as temporary laborers who may be subject to deportation at any moment. Non-Jewish people are not considered possible citizens of the Jewish state; it is beyond a matter of rightful citizenship, for non-Jewish peoples are outside the national imaginary. Israel's indentured labor system and deportation practices demonstrate the exclusionary nature of its acceptance of foreign workers. As Lidia Averbukh states, "The paradoxical combination of utmost necessity of labor migration into the Israeli labor market and the strict non-recognition of foreigners as residents appears to be less contradicting" (91). The Zionist strict restriction of non-Jewish peoples enables this paradox: the presence of foreign migrants who will not have a significant territorial claim to citizenship in their new place. Rather, the influx of migrant workers and their vulnerability to fraught situations (i.e., being sent to a detention camp) share a similar vulnerability to displacement as the Palestinians, which reflects the Zionist desire to preserve the state of Israel as a Jewish nation. Israel's Palestinian occupation, as well as the Zionist project overall, adversely affects migrant laborers who are treated as expendable and are without legal protection.

While hijras have long been marginalized and excluded in Indian society in terms of Hindu heteronormative nationalist formations, the inclusion of hijras into the national symbolic order buttresses the state's regulation of minority subjects.[103] India's promise

[103] Kira Hall in her research of hijras' language practices notes that the use of sexual insults and curses demonstrates hijras strategy to trouble gendered space. Hijras are situated outside two-gender dichotomy; their impotency locates them outside family lineage and social prestige and even becomes a source of fear that interrupts family genealogy. Hijras, however, appropriate their very liminality through verbal plays that do not adhere to either side of gender (i.e., crossing the boundaries of gendered language by speaking obscene words and cursing). Hall argues that hijras subvert "the linguistic

of inclusion coexists with the nation-state's management of marginalized people's life and death. How India structures its modern nation-state relies on the policies of militarization to secure political power. As Roy illustrates, the 9/11 terror in the United States intensified the Hindu Right's mobilization of anti-Muslim sentiment in an effort to make India a Hindu nation: "The planes that flew into the tall buildings in America came as a boon to many in India too. The Poet-Prime Minister of the country…warned that what had happened in America could easily happen in India and that it was time for the government to pass a new anti-terrorism law as a safety precaution."[104] Doubling down on national security allowed heightened policing of people. Roy illustrates the policing of people in the many instances of hijras encountering dangerous situations. The epitome can be found in the Gujarat terror. In that situation, Pakistani terrorists are accused of perpetrating a railway coach attack. The accusations motivate massacres, lynch mobs, rapes, and the detention of Muslims in Gujarat. In the attack, Anjum, then a tourist, was caught up in the hysteria and barely secured her life. Anjum was recognized among Muslim corpses by Hindu mobs, but the hijras' ominous power, derived from their abjection, saved her life. Ironically, only through the recognition of the hijra's position of marginality in Hindu culture can Anjum be included, and her life supported. That is, the cost of being included entails reinscribing social prejudice upon other, lesser groups.

---

ideologies associated with both femininity and masculinity in order to survive in a hostile world" (452).

[104] Arundhati Roy, *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, Knopf, 2017, 45-46. Pages in parentheses hereafter.

Kinship and Interdependency

In the different form of precarity faced by those who are excluded, existing family connections provide neither care nor validate their queer belonging. The conventional family is structured by blood ties or legally recognized relationships and functions as a political and regulatory site of social reproduction. Across many cultures, heterosexual nuclear households have been privileged over others. This model, in fact, becomes an ideal type in western society, which also functions to regulate social belonging and citizenship. Family and kinship, to be sure, are ideological constructs that have been scrutinized extensively in many disciplines.[105] My aim is not to review all kinship literature but to address plural forms of families based on non-married, non-sexual relations to account for queer relationality. As I will expand on below, queer is a salient term in exploring families outside the ideal type. In this context, however, queer family does not necessarily mean same-sex marriage. While expanding on queer studies' turn to focus on the everyday by focusing on care as the central ethics of forging relationships, I am wary of the celebratory optimism in showcasing alternative forms of

[105] Black feminists' research on African American's extended kin is one ready example. Instead of focusing on valuing bloodlines, the notion of extended kin creates community-based Black solidarity linked by associations of sisterhood and brotherhood rather than the "dehumanizing effects of slavery" (Collins 55). Moreover, the women-centered kin unit facilitates the networks of care among "othermothers" who share mothering responsibilities. This sisterly interdependency is the way to counteract the systemic discrimination and violence against Black people; it also challenges the ideal of traditional family that "assigns mothers full responsibility for children and evaluates their performance based on their ability to procure the benefits of a nuclear family household" (197).

kinship, which may be ultimately be conscripted into the predominant exclusionary institutions of marriage, reproduction, and legal rights for inclusion.

Regardless of this concern, the study of queer family has provided valuable insights and a striking critique of the very notion of family and the use of kinship terminology. Kath Weston's research on a choice-based family formulated by lesbians and gays in America around the 1980s argues that queer relationships are not always associated with sexuality and procreation but promote the networks of friendship. In opposition to biological families and their related values, the notion of choice confers agency on the constituents of relationships, elevating independence above other family obligations. The emphasis on friendship foregrounds the idea that "genes and blood appear as symbols implicated in one culturally specific way of demarcating and calculating relationships" (Weston 105). Weston further points to the potential of families of choice claiming that they "do not systematically produce gendered divisions of labor or relations stratified by age and gender" since "gay families are not structured through hierarchically ordered categories of relationship" (206). This claim needs more interrogation in terms of interpersonal power relations and hierarchy evident even in queer care relations, as I will demonstrate in the next section. But above all, the rhetoric of choice elides white privilege and race and class issues, opening the need for radical inquiries about alternative kinship constituted by intimacy, friendship, and care.[106]

[106] Lisa Duggan coins the term "homonormativity" to describe assimilationist tendencies of integrating LGBT subjects into heteronormative society by granting marriage, legal rights, and productivity, replicating and privileging the values of heteronormativity. David Eng underlines inequality and oppression in queer kinship and unfolds how "race is exploited to consolidate idealized notions of family and kinship in the global North,

Recent scholarship has begun to explore diverse familial forms, particularly those structured by intimacy and care and those that foreground everyday need-based relations. Traci M. Levy, by applying the framework of feminist ethics of care, defines families as groups of people "*formed by emotional intimacy and the willingness to participate in the activities of care and/or genetic ties*" (48). Levy's bringing care ethics into the discourse of family emphasizes the responsibilities for caring shared between intimate relations. Such responsibilities bind people and motivate them to continue enduring relationships. To Levy, intimacy originates from the closeness of living based on "a long, robust, and extensively cultivated relationship" (49). Proximate care is what Levy necessitates in judging intimate relations. Nonetheless, it registers neither distance care nor temporality of relationship within the concept of intimacy, which results in delimiting other non-normative intimacies. Shelley Budgeon and Sasha Roseneil call attention to varied practices of intimacy and care that take place "between friends, non-monogamous lovers, ex-lovers, partners who do not live together, partners who do not have sex together, [and] those which do not easily fit the 'friend'/ 'lover' binary classification system" since intimacies within these networks of relationships sustain social lives as well as decenter the primacy given to conjugal or sexual partnerships (138). Budgeon and Roseneil underline everyday experiences and practices of care

---

for instance, through…the outsourcing of productive as well as reproductive labor, and the importation of care workers from the global South" (10). The exploitation of bodies of women of color through surrogacy validates the regression of queer families that value biological genealogy. See Sharmila Rudrappa, *Discounted Life: The Price of Global Surrogacy in India*, New York UP, 2016.

carried out beyond the relationships that elide the categories of the legally recognizable or sexually binding family. Such recognition of affiliations with care points to a necessary reconfiguring of what constitutes the family for daily living; it also betokens the need for considering why care matters.

Locating care as the fundamental constitution of family emphasizes the mundane ethical dimension of caring and being cared for in the era of neoliberal capitalism, labor migration and diaspora, and globalization. The forms of transnational family, fictive kin, or various relationality unrepresentable in the linguistic taxonomies of kinship, maintain relationships by and through care. This care may not be in the form of proximate care, nor function to naturalize biological genealogy. Still, care matters to queer affiliation, which may be "transitory and fleeting, and may not coalesce into an easily intelligible or quantifiable form of political coalition, but it nevertheless produces moments of affective relationality that open the door to new ways of conceptualizing the self and others" (Gopinath, "Archive, Affect" 167). It is everyday care that forges relationships and disrupts normativity even if the queer affiliation is transitory, fleeting, and unintelligible. My concerns rather uncover the contexts that demand the emergence of alternative relations. It is an ethical project to consider whether these alternatives replicate the violence of normativity on those who engender care affiliations. People, especially the marginalized, organize communities of care to resist against, or to survive, social, historical, and political violence. Yet the contradicting desires, needs, and different hierarchies in their care relations are often overlooked. Therefore, my analysis of the care relations represented in Heymanns' and Roy's texts seeks to account for the

complexities and contradictions that occurred in the affiliations of care. It explores negotiations of care at the interpersonal level. The queer subjects' struggles and desires for queer living, conversely, expose fictions of conviviality like those that manifested in Israeli and Indian societies wherein homogenizing national and communal ideal pushes away non-normative beings.

Queer Migrants and Fictive Kinship in *Paper Dolls*

The presence of queer Filipino caregivers in Israel demonstrates the complex ties between national and global exploitation of care for sustaining family life. The existing literature of Filipina/o labor diaspora focuses on the transnational links between people by providing care labor, which Rhacel Salazar Parreñas and Arlie Hochschild call "global care chains."[107] Filipina/o care-workers migrate transnationally to support families in the Philippines and to assist the nation-state economically. The migrant baklas in *Paper Dolls* likewise provide racialized labor in the global level and fulfill filial and social obligations at the national. Simultaneously, these people are queering the normative assumptions around gendered care and heteronormative family and kinship. As queer studies scholar Martin Manalansan states in his "Queering the Chain of Care Paradigm" (2008), those queer migrants suggest an alternative framework about the relationship between care and gender. To challenge the assumption that non-normative

[107] Hochschild defines global care chains as "a series of personal links between people across the globe based on the paid or unpaid work of caring" (131). As the term "chain" suggests, there is uneven distribution of and access to care, mostly from the Third World to the First World.

people's care labor is "inauthentic," Manalansan asks: "Are these care workers inauthentic because as biological men they are not 'equipped' to fulfill the 'natural' womanly role of caring? Or is it more accurate to say that their feelings are less grounded in normative domesticity and filial attachments?" ("Queering"). Such questions are another way of voicing the representation of male queer care laborers in *Paper Dolls*. Both articulations complicate the predominant equation of women with roles of domesticity and care.

Manalansan argues that queer migrants not only conduct the routine of caring for others but also perform "care of the self," which means cultivating a sense of self through the practices of Filipino queerness, *bakla*.[108] Bakla is the social category that incorporates effeminacy, cross-dressing, and homosexuality, indicates a desire to become a woman through transformative performances. According to Oscar Tantoco Serquina, baklas are "tragic and comedic" figures because of the social stigma attached to effeminate men as "deviant and devil-possessed" (206). Yet these subjects negotiate

[108] According to Michel Foucault, the care of the self has its long history dating back to the ancient Greek culture. It is the art of existence and the way to cultivate one's self through which one ought to attend to oneself. Yet the 'care' in the care of the self "implies a labor," which has the same intensity "employed in speaking of the activities of the master of a household" or "the tasks of the ruler" (Foucault 50). The care of the self does not mean that one is immersed in oneself. Instead, its practice works to intensify social relations and to promote "a system of reciprocal obligations" (54). Despite an allusion of individualism, the care of the self indicates the realization of the need, foregrounded on the idea that "[e]veryone must discover that he is in a state of need" (57). In this vein, Manalansan's use of the term "care of the self" suggests that Filipino baklas find delight in their selves through their transformative performance; it might also imply that individual care of the self is, in fact, a way to build social relations through the very affirmation of the self.

the fixed category of gender through the flamboyant expressions of gender stereotypes and the initiation of shifting selves. In this regard, migrant baklas represented in Heymann's film provide a new perspective regarding family, social duty, and care itself. If these migrants seek their queer freedom in flight from social discrimination imposed upon them in their homeland, their migrancy does not simply add to the narrative of the global care chain driven by family values. Rather, the queer caregivers' friendship in Israel allies against the normative violence and supports their queer desire.

Certainly, Manalansan's emphasis on the migrant baklas' pursuit of self-cultivation, desires, and pleasures makes their agency intelligible adding to complicating gendered care drain from the Third world to the First world. The Filipino baklas "are reconfiguring family and social networks, as well as negotiating stigma and ostracism" ("Queer Intersections" 236). Nevertheless, Manalansan's analysis of those subjects' mundane care work and its condition needs more interrogation. First and foremost, the queer migrants in the film identify themselves as women and use the trope of father-daughter when they refer to paid care relations with their clients. The nuclear family model is still a primary framework when approaching care in domesticity despite gender fluidity performed by queer caregivers. Further, we cannot dismiss the social and political context under which these queer subjects are *tolerated* in Israel. While they might strive for queer freedom and achieve agency, the exploitative nature of care work and the working conditions remain intact. I do not mean to erase their agency. Rather, I want to highlight their negotiations to grapple with the demand for care, and therefore it is important to acknowledge the inhospitable circumstances that structure the care

laborers' emotional undercurrents of alienation and constraint. Thus, in this section, I will examine the migrant baklas' multiple care relations formed to grapple with and sustain queer migrant living.

Migrant baklas' precarity multiplies as non-normative queer, temporarily indentured, laborers. However, care maintains the sustainability of migrant baklas' lives in Israel. Valerie Francisco-Menchavez argues that the community of care is fundamental for Filipina/o migrants to survive under the conditions of marginalization and precarity in which they build their networks of care. Her idea of the community of care foregrounds the practices of "Filipino cultural traditions of fictive kinship and *bayanihan* (camaraderie)" in which "being with" is an important factor in interpersonal relations (101). Queer Filipina/os' caring relations create the possibility of non-normative affiliations. Their caring relations demonstrate what anthropologist John Borneman calls the kinship of care by displacing the existing institutions of marriage, blood-related family, and heteronormative kinship.[109]

Queer Filipina/o caregivers create contingent care relations, which I view as non-normative kinships of care. The relations are contingent depending on the status of migrants' care contract and their legal status; termination of care employment or abrupt displacement are prevalent among care migrants. This very unpredictability, however, generates an alternative form of care relations. By non-normative, I mean that the

[109] See John Borneman, "Caring and Being Cared For: Displacing Marriage, Kinship, Gender and Sexuality," in *The Ethics of Kinship: Ethnographic Inquiries*, edited by James Faubion, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001, pp. 29-46.

connection between care individuals is based upon interdependency and an ethics devoid of the promises of reproduction and futurity. The paid care relations are particularly queer since both caregivers and employers are displaced from each family due to gender non-conformity and infirm state, respectively. Migrant baklas enter Israel as men to accommodate gender segregation expectations in the ultra-orthodox Jewish community. Yet, they complicate the biological conception of women and women's labor by embodying the ways in which the household care work is outsourced in "new forms of class-based and racialized gender stratification and exploitation" (Rottenberg 343). The elderly, as well, represent non-productive subjects, dependent on outsourced caregivers' labor while living separated from their descendants.

In the film, Sally is the very definition of this kind of paid relationship as family. She views herself as "his [the client named Haim] only daughter" in response to the director's enquiring whether she is like a wife to him.[110] Sally's response—while suggesting that caregivers' role of a substitute child grounds on the nuclear heteronormative family model—indicates several aspects: first the traditional sense of family care and support is waning, but the trope of the family as a value naturalizes outsourcing care. Conversely, this value binds Filipina/o caregivers. Sally's statement that she is Haim's only daughter implies that the proxy caregiver, who currently "lives with" Haim is *doing* family more than the family that is biologically and legally linked.

[110] The use of gender pronouns in this chapter follows the way queer subjects identify themselves as women.

Hence, she generates an affective filial bond to practice mundane works, such as cleaning the house, feeding, bathing, and exercising the elderly.

The daily care embodies the ethics of responsibility based on filial love which is explicitly articulated when Heymann interviews Sally:

Heymann: Who do you miss the most?

Sally: My mother.

Heymann: Is that the hardest part?

Sally: Of course, because I know she's not feeling well. And I can't take care of her. I take care of other people. It's very difficult for me. All the time. It's not because of work. I worry about all old people. It's out of love.

Heymann: When do you think about your mother?

Sally: When? When I prepare his food. When I bathe him. If I were in the Philippines, I would do this for my mother.

Sally states that caring is not just labor but an ethical practice based on and beyond the filial obligation. Sally, whose original name is Salvador, identifies her subject as a woman by trying to transform her "male" body through transvestism and hormones. To live as queer, Sally left the Philippines unable to take care of her own mother. However, her concern for the elderly allows both care of the self and care for others. Sally's relationship with Haim demonstrates the ideal kinship of care. Sally's care relation with Haim is mutually supportive for self-development. She not only does domestic work but also learns Hebrew to attend to Haim's needs and to speak on Haim's behalf, whose voice is lost due to throat cancer. Equally, Haim encourages Sally to learn Hebrew and

to read poems to share his appreciation of Sally's ambiguous gender and "the gift of life." Although Haim admitted that he never saw transsexual people before, he accepts Sally because her care enables him to take care of himself. This mutual understanding of interdependency makes kinship of care possible.

A substantial portion of the film pays attention to this ideal relationship between Sally and Haim because it manifests quotidian conviviality. However, this conviviality owes in large part to Sally's full devotion to Haim and his thoughtful consideration of her. The film's footage captures how their conviviality is constantly negotiated by each individual's capacity to manage social tension. For instance, Sally could not attend Christmas Mass, an essential religious ceremony for the Philippine community, due to Haim's scheduled surgery. She gives up her holiday to be with and attend to Haim in a critical moment. In a reciprocal fashion, Sally asks Haim to let her visit the Philippines since she has not seen her mother for six years. Sally's request is accepted, and warm-hearted humor is exchanged as a sign of a resolved conflict. It is worth note that asking for a temporary leave is not a simple task; it took Sally six years to see her mother. It is because of the employer's understanding of coexistence ("we've been living side by side") that settles Sally's demand without tension. In other terms, the conviviality in the paid care relation between Sally and Haim is entirely predicated on an individual's kindness and empathy.

In this respect, there are limitations to approaching conviviality in paid relations through individuals' management of goodwill. Fortunately, Sally regards her care labor as an ethic of care for the elderly. Satisfying the needs of Haim meets the social

expectations of her labor and filial responsibility. This integration constitutes the understanding of agency and interdependency. Conversely, without this understanding, the expectation of convivial relations in paid contracts demands that care laborers compromise their autonomy by supplying ambiguous boundary between the role of care-workers and the role of filial duties. An invalid elderly person's daily life is entirely reliant on caregivers, which ultimately blurs the expectations and the extent of the responsibilities that care laborers bear. The importance of interdependency does not necessarily oblige one-directional caregiving with constant attention. Filipina/o caregivers stress their love—a culturally invested and a value-laden concept—for the elderly, which propels them to be attentive twenty-four hours a day, six days a week. This is the general condition of the work, and it is unsustainable by Israelis alone. Kathleen Woodward claims that "the Paper Dolls do not regard this dimension of their work as exploitative but rather as meaningful" because they "plainly declare that honoring old people through giving care is a basic value of Filipino culture" (40, 41). Even if Filipina/o caregivers are practicing their cultural values, the systemically arranged working hours are already exploitative; the caregivers take all the burdens of caring. The caregivers regarding their work as "meaningful" rather indicates their way of caring for themselves, a way of carrying out the burdens of the routine with dignity.

The intersection of the matrix of power (i.e., race, class, and ethnicity) in paid care relations ultimately hinders reciprocal care. Paternal generosity from clients may inflict pressure on caregivers. A queer caregiver, Rika, expresses that her client can help her insofar as she is assimilated into Jewish culture: "He said he will help me. I can stay

here. I will study the Bible. I will cut my hair. I will remove the earrings. I will wear a "kippa" (skullcap) and wear the clothes they wear. They want me to become religious." That is, Rika has to abandon her female impersonation and her Catholic religion, all of which are at the very core of her transmigrant identity. Besides, the power imbalance of such a paid relationship can easily lead to the deterioration of its moral grounding. Employers have the power to betray caregivers' devotion and care and have them deported. The abrupt termination of the care contract creates a sense of antagonism. In the film, Cheska and Jan resent their clients' replacement of Filipino caregivers despite their commitments to the elderly over five years.[111] Cheska gets deported from Israel. Jan migrates to England. Eventually, Sally also leaves Israel after Haim dies as she becomes an illegal migrant. The power relation embedded in a paid care contract disrupts the ties between caregivers and elderly clients, undermining queer Filipino migrants' efforts to create a kinship of care as stable.

The structural violence of care contracts, as well as racial and sexual hierarchies, however, strengthen the bonds within the intra-queer Filipino group. Although most live-in caregivers reside in the clients' house, they spend at least one off-day with other

[111] The role of a substitute child is easily replaceable as demonstrated by the conversation between Heymann and Jan:

> Jan: My employer doesn't like me. He has a new Filipino. I cried a lot.
>
> Heymann: Why?
>
> Jan: It's not easy after six years. It's like a father and a mother.
>
> Heymann: Were you that attached to him?
>
> Jan: Yes. That's how Israelis are. No matter how long you take care of them and love them, it ends like that.

migrant baklas by either performing drag performances or staying in their apartment. As it is narrated in the beginning of the film: "I need some fun, so do my friends. We want to perform." The troupe, Paper Dolls gathers together from a desire to make a space that embraces migrant baklas' hybrid non-belonging status. As Giorgio describes it, the name of the troupe is inspired by a paper doll—a metonym for an inauthentic human being that functions as a substitute for a human in a costume play. The value of a paper doll is only obtainable when someone is playing with it. The troupe's performance entails a broad concept of bakla that emphasizes "the idea of beauty as a process where selves are made and remade in such public events" (*Global Divas*, ix). The performance signifies both shifting identities as queer subjects and indentured migrants. In this way, the migrant baklas' drag show is a form of self-affirmation. In the society outside of such shows, they are considered neither real men nor real women. In the Israeli community, they occupy a space of simultaneously belonging and non-belonging. As queer non-citizen foreign workers, these individuals construct an affiliation by care to tenuously affirm their lives in Israel. In other words, care redefines the concept of family for baklas amid the social prejudice and even the heightened threat of terror represented in the film. The care circulated in and by the troupe does not contain dramatic devotion and love. Instead, queer Filipinos give and receive the pleasures of being-with—chatting, singing, and performing gender fluidity and beauty—as a performance of strength to live with difference.

While capturing Filipino care laborers' multiple care relations, the film's representation presents Heymann's emotional and ethical engagement with his subjects'

everyday struggles. The film itself, however, exerts a form of convivial violence precisely through the way it offsets the troupe's struggles by highliting their sexual liberation. It is undeniable that Heymann and the migrant baklas have developed friendships by sharing quotidian interactions. Despite the initial lack of understanding Filipino baklas' queer desire, the director's curiosity about the troupe leads to the growing attachment to queer Filipino subjects, developing a mutual ethic of care with one another. During the documentary production, Heymann repeatedly expresses strange feelings towards queer Filipinos saying he is not used to seeing queer people; their female impersonation is even *repulsive* to him. When the film ultimately displays Heymann's female impersonation, it reveals his feelings of both embarrassment and empowerment. In so doing, the film becomes a *bildungsroman* of queer affirmation on the part of both Heymann and Israel. The troupe plays a significant role in Heymann's recognition of self and his portrayal of the sexually progressive aspects of Israel, resulting in his own coming out.

The film's cinematography and editing juxtapose queer caregivers' struggles with their queer affirmation in Israel to illuminate migrant baklas' friendship and their sexual freedom. The significance of Heymann's liberation narrative is the juxtaposition of two lives in the film: Heymann's queer life is affirmed while Filipinos' queer life is excluded due to Israel's deportation policy. The cinematic construction of queer Filipino caregivers' struggles and their feelings of liberation in Israel ironically exposes queer

emancipation for Heymann's as well as Israel's pinkwashing.[112] The alluring optimism created in the ending credits may convey the Paper Dolls' continued friendship in a new place. Yet such a convivial ending elides the fact that each troupe member is relocated, rejected from Israel as a caregiver and as a queer subject. The abrupt migrancy and contingent community-building exemplify the Paper Dolls' living as migrant baklas. The director's use of Filipino's camaraderie, especially resuming their performance as "Paper Dolls' from Israel" shows their resilience not only as care migrants but also as aspirational queer subjects. Nonetheless, the convivial ending is co-opted by queer affirmation of Israel.

Consoling the Unconsoled in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*

In *Paper Dolls*, the migrant baklas' practices of care allow various forms of care affiliations, yet their position at the intersection of state inclusion/exclusion makes those affiliations more precarious. Roy's novel, in contrast, delineates the inclusion of the excluded by constituting an outside to the normative Indian social order. *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* weaves the stories of marginalized people with the story of Anjum. Anjum, as a Muslim hijra, embodies a gender, class, and religious border character who refuses to fit into the social schema. Anjum's voluntary decision to enter a community of hijras at the age of fifteen is significant, considering the peripheral position of hijras. It reveals Anjum's defiant and non-normative character, and helps justify her leaving "the

[112] Pinkwashing refers to a deliberate use of sexual liberation to promote (oppressive) political ends. See Sarah Schulman, *Israel/Palestine and the Queer International*, Duke UP, 2012.

Duniya," (the real world) despite her parents' normalizing attempts. Further, as the novel's beginning scene portrays, Anjum's loneliness and isolation when she initially takes up residence in a graveyard indicate she belongs neither to the hijra community nor to the Duniya. Anjum's non-belonging among both the community of hijras and *ordinary* people signals a productive possibility in being excluded. Concurrently, her graveyard home becomes a gathering place for those excluded from the real world. In this section, I wish to further explore care practiced in both the hijra community and Anjum's graveyard place to demonstrate how Anjum provides a place to gather all of the "fragments of Partition and its violent legacy" and a "utopian vision for addressing communal division with cosmopolitan community" (Eide 138). I argue that Anjum's decision to challenge the social protocol imposed upon hijras and other marginalized people makes caring solidarity possible in the context of Hindu nationalism. Before exploring this solidarity more fully, it is important to articulate the significance of becoming a hijra and the role of a hijra community.

Anjum's becoming a hijra showcases contradictions of the hijra subject. The act is a revelation for Aftab (the name Anjum received from her parents and used until she left them) both fascinating and tragic senses.[113] The hijra subject, according to Roy, is a

[113] In the earlier part of the novel, Roy depicts Anjum's play with her name by signifying her transgressive capacity to becoming rather than limiting her identity: "It doesn't matter. I'm all of them, I'm Romi and Juli, I'm Laila and Majnu. *And* Mujna, why not? Who says my name is Anjum? I'm not Anjum, I'm Anjuman. I'm a *mehfil*, I'm a gathering. Of everybody and nobody, of everything and nothing" (8). The name follows the gendered divide just like Aftab means sun/sunshine while Anjum means star and it is a male as well as a female name. Anjum, however, refuses such division and opens herself up to possibilities to reach out to others: "Is there anyone else you would like to invite? Everyone's invited" (8). Both names—despite being gendered—connote their

"female trapped in a male body" (20). Hijras are born male or intersex but identify with the feminine. Aftab—diagnosed as having "*Hijra* tendencies" by a local doctor—has disidentification with the gender imposed by society, or at least by his parents (21). Thus, when he runs into Bombay Silk, a tall hijra woman wearing shiny lipstick, he wants to *be* her. He is instantly fascinated by the way Bombay Silk is dressed and the way she walks—a way that a "normal" woman would not. Aftab learns that there is a place called the Khwabgah where "*blessed* people, came with their dreams that could not be realized in the Duniya" (57). He realizes that this household signifies another universe that enables him to live as something besides a man. That is, it would allow him to become a *hijra*, which signals the renouncement of how "ordinary" people live or perform culturally and socially in gendered ways. In this community, however, Aftab is precluded from interacting with his parents or forming his own family.[114] He becomes a member of hijras under the hijra guru Kulsoom Bi, one of the seven hijra household heads in India. As neither men nor women, hijras make a living by offering blessings of fertility at the ceremonies of births and marriages. Yet their ceremonies are often viewed as obscene and hilarious, known as a "ritual of reversal"—hijras transforming their "impotence into the power of generativity" (Nanda 5). Even at the cost of rejecting the

---

linkage in a sense that Anjum guides the marginalized people (like a star) and brings light to their lives like the sun.

[114] Gayatri Reddy in *With Respect to Sex* (2005) states that hijra identity is associated with "asexuality and the absence of marital relationships." Further, entering the hijra community means that hijras "are expected to cut off all ties with their natal families" (150).

outside social order, including a normative family, caste/class, and a proper profession, Aftab believes he would be happy to *be a* hijra.

I use the name "Aftab" intentionally to refer Anjum's identity before becoming a hijra to indicate the disparity between Aftab's aspiration to be a woman from the *outsider's* view and the struggle inflicted by *her* own body after becoming a hijra. Aftab does not understand this gap when a hijra friend, Nimmo, reveals the impossibility for the hijras to find happiness:

> Who's happy here? It's all sham and fakery," Nimmo said laconically, not bothering to look up from the magazine. "No one's happy here. It's not possible.…what are the things you normal people get unhappy about? I don't mean *you*, but grown-ups like you—what makes them unhappy? Price-rise, children's school-admissions, husbands' beatings, wives' cheatings, Hindu-Muslim riots, Indo-Pak war—*outside* things that settle down eventually. But for us…The war is *inside* us. Indo-Pak is *inside* us. It will never settle down. It *can't*. (27)

For Nimmo, normal people's aspirations are directed toward outside things—economic power, child-education, marriage life, and politics. Nimmo thinks that these "*outside* things" will be stabilized eventually. Yet hijras' unhappiness never settles down due to the war waging over their bodies. Nimmo attributes the hijras' unhappiness to an "inside" problem—a problem engendered from a body that refuses happiness. Such internal conflict is evident even on Anjum's most joyous day: her eighteenth birthday when hijras gather to feast together. While Anjum is elated to wear a *sari*, her masculine

reaction saps her joy through a sign of bodily pleasure. Every hijra knows this contradictory, self-inflicted pain. Nimmo, thereby, was right to claim that hijras are incapable of happiness and even "Happiness Hunters" who "feed off other people's happiness" by soliciting money in ceremonial occasions (28). Despite gender essentialism evidenced in Nimmo's assertion, I cite her statement to stress the need for hijras' interdependency and communal living predicated on their unresolved happiness.

Hijra bonds are a vital part of hijra identity and survival. Gayatri Reddy contends that hijra "authenticity" is "evaluated in terms of belonging" to the relations between *guru-chela* (disciple) and extended hijra kin (143). The guru-chela relationship is reciprocal and mutually beneficial in that it provides protection and loyalty for one another. Hijra family, in other words, authenticates and makes possible the hijra way of life. Without an affiliation with a guru and other fellow hijras, hijras cannot receive social and economic support labeled as "orphans." There is no exception in this bounded unit that is constituted by "a notion of caring, indexed principally through a temporal (and spatial) dimension of 'being there' rather than biogenetic connection" (Reddy 151). Hijra kinship is a notable example among the various affiliations that do not adhere to the notions of the nuclear, heterosexual family. Hijra ties have affinities with gay and lesbian kinships in western society, which are constituted by agency represented and manifest families of choice. To a certain extent, these alternative families are located outside the traditional construction of family, but these new alternatives may also replicate social normativity.

Hijra kinship—despite being organized by care—is still structured by hierarchy and obligation echoing or iterating social norms and beliefs of Indian society. Serena Nanda notes that "the themes of hierarchy, respect, respectability, and reciprocity" are critical in the hijra household "as they are in Indian society in general" (38). Hijras' communal living strictly follows the principle of seniority—a ranking system determined by the duration of time enlisted in the hijra community. Seniority as an organizing principle and social control works through the reciprocal circulation of caring and being cared for. As mentioned earlier, an individual hijra must choose her guru to form a relationship of belonging. Chelas pay entry fees and do household chores in exchange for a hijra guru's responsibility to provide a sanctuary as well as emotional, economic, and social protection. This relationship is "modeled after traditional family relationships," which are often idealized and necessitate obligations in maintaining their hierarchical structure (Nanda 45). The following statement represents how the social order operates in the hijra community:

> [The] dependence of *hijras* on their community is entirely consistent with the values and organizational principles of Indian society: a willingness of individuals to submit to hierarchy, a combining of resources and expenditures (as in a joint family) as a means of economic adaptation, and a conviction that there is no security without a group....[F]or *hijras*, being independent of the group means not freedom, but social suicide. (Nanda 48)

Nanda's account of these relational lives demonstrates that interdependency and care are expressed through one's "willingness" to submit to hierarchy. Care and obligation stick

together as norms of hijra living so that failure to follow the rules may imply communal exile to those who could not conform to the organizational principles. The ideologies and values of Indian society structure the community of hijras even if these subjects are considered outside of normative institutions. Hijra kinship, on the one hand, complicates what is perceived as normative family driven by its non-conformity. On the other hand, hierarchy and the workings of cultural and social power restrict many facets of life within the community, making communal living and care subject to a similarly rigid normativity in hijra kinship. In this respect, the hijra community is contradictory, just like hijras' conflicting gender identity, for it has its own hierarchical and delimiting system that resembles the conventional social order.

Roy's novel showcases the hierarchy and restriction operative in the hijra community through Anjum's noncompliance to the hijra expectations, anticipating Anjum's self-exile. Anjum's insubordination is triggered by her "ambitions" to "live like an ordinary person" (33). Anjum, in the novel, wants to be a mother and help the poor by returning to the Duniya, yet her ambitions are considered unreasonable by other hijra peers. Anjum's desire rather incites "a flurry of merriment" to other hijras who think it is nonsensical: "which Poor would want to be helped by *us*?…they all giggled at the idea of intimidating poor people with offers of help" (60). This ostensibly harmless form of joviality demonstrates hijras' self-contempt and their compliance with the rules and caste positions inscribed upon as a hijra subject. The giggles performatively reject the absurd thoughts proposed by Anjum. Such levity plays a dual role in this scenario: it connects Anjum and her peers through hijra bonds, while also binding hijras to the community

rules through a shared code of humor. Anjum's hijra friends consistently treat her noncompliance with levity as if it is a quotidian drama occasionally happening in the hijra community. When Ustad Kulsoom Bi calls a meeting to address Anjum's transgression of hijra rules, everybody convivially disregards Anjum's protestation as if it demonstrates a whimsical side of hijra character:

> She [Kulsoom Bi] then went on to make a case for principled living and iron discipline, the two things that according to her were the hallmark of the Khwabgah…[T]he central edict of the Khwabgah was *manzoori*. Consent.…The Almighty has sent our Anjum back to us, she said. She won't tell us what happened to her and Zakir Mian in Gujarat and we cannot force her to. All we can do is surmise. And sympathize. But in our sympathy we cannot allow our principles to be compromised. Forcing a little girl to live as a boy against her wishes, even for the sake of her own safety, is to incarcerate her, not liberate her.…"She's *my* child," Anjum said. "*I* will decide. I can leave this place and go away with her if I want to." Far from being perturbed by this declaration, everybody was actually relieved to see a sign that the old drama queen in Anjum was alive and well. They had no reason to worry because she had absolutely nowhere to go.…Talking back to Ustad Kulsoom Bi in this way was considered unacceptable. Even for someone who had survived a massacre. (57-58)

Hijra conviviality reinforces the community's boundary while disallowing disobedience that has occurred in hijras' relational lives. "Principled living and iron discipline" ultimately override other concerns in this community. The integrity of the

hijra principle centers on the idea of "consent," and it signifies two things. Consent initially operates to provide agency to an individual (i.e., an individual's consent to become a hijra and to enter a hijra community). Yet as soon as an individual enters the hijra community, the idea of consent is ceded to the community, and is contingent upon the community's hierarchy. Hence, "talking back" to the hijra guru goes against the rule because the guru's decision becomes the general consensus. Furthermore, Anjum's declared intention of leaving the community relieves tensions since nobody believes the possibility of such an assertion: "They had no reason to worry because she had absolutely nowhere to go." There are no negotiations in the rule of "consent." The coded hijra mode of living expects Anjum be a convivial subject by subduing conflicts. This expectation is taken for granted since the unbending communal rules are based on the hijra's notion of care. What is ultimately dismissed is an individual's agency. The hijras' sympathy never fully reaches the level of understanding that recognizes Anjum's trauma. The act of Anjum departing from conviviality undercuts the integrity of the community, thereby it is treated as psychologically problematic, or as Dr. Bhagat diagnosed it: "*Patient formerly of outgoing, obedient, jolly-type nature now exhibits disobedient, revolting-type of personality*" (60).

Anjum's skepticism of communal compliance among the hijras calls into question of the conviviality pursued by the community and Indian society at large. Anjum's non-compliance with the hijra principles results from her experience of the Gujarat massacre. As described earlier in this chapter, Anjum secures her life only through her abject status in the view of the Hindu mobs. Instead of identifying Anjum as

a human being, Hindu nationalists translate Anjum's subject as "Sister-fucking Muslim Whore *Hijra*" and decide her fate through Hindu religious belief (66). To recognize Anjum as a Muslim means that her future follows the fellow Muslim corpses; to recognize Anjum as a hijra translates her into a Hindu myth that preserves her life for fear of bringing bad luck. By being associated with the Hindu mythic figure, Anjum secures her life while offering "Butcher's luck" to those who execute Muslim carnage (67). This deprivation of Anjum's agency that is subject to the notions of societal, communal, or religious rules causes her trauma and anger. Anjum realizes "a mad insurrection against a lifetime of spurious happiness she felt she had been sentenced to" (61). After this traumatic experience, Anjum desires radical care as well as she wants to provide care to others. The care she receives from the community, however, does not allow her singularity. Anjum's adopted daughter Zainab refuses her precisely because of the reason that "Mummy's never happy" (61). To be happy implies that Anjum needs to euphemize her life just as her "Flyover story" converts hijras' routinized, violated living into hilarity so that her daughter may laugh and sleep well.[115] The "spurious happiness" foregrounded in Anjum's realization, is the very make-believe of naturalized brutality perpetrated in society that constitutes ordinary conviviality. Therefore, Anjum leaves the

[115] Flyover story is a comical rewritten version of Anjum's adversity that occurred in 1976. Indira Gandhi's declaration of Emergency allowed for the random arrest of people; hijras become easy targets of police brutality because of their social marginality. The story indicates how one's life-threatening incident takes place absurdly so that it becomes material for a farcical tale at bedtime.

hijra community to reject routine conviviality that delimits an alternate living against the notion of Indian society.

Anjum once again moves from the Khwabgah to the Duniya to oppose the restrictions and the social order. Her strategy is an oxymoron. Her first step is transforming a graveyard into her shelter.[116] This transformation signifies ultimate exclusion from the social structure, or as Anjum describes it: "This place where we live, where we have made our home, is the place of falling people. Here there *is* no *haqueeqat* [reality]. *Arre*, even *we* aren't real" (88). Graveyards occupy perhaps the most marginalized space in the real world—the site of the non-living. Graveyards are also makred by their non-Hindue status as they are for Christian and Muslim burial. Even so, Anjum names her "unprepossessing" and "run-down" place Jannat, "paradise" (62). The word "paradise" indicates the place of peace and happiness; paradise often indicates a celestial place in contrast to the earthly world. Thus, there is a locational opposition between the terrestrial and the heavenly. Even if the graveyard is a heavenly place, it is not a place for the living but for the dead. However, Anjum blurs the relationship between those contradictions and makes her place a border zone. It is this work of

[116] Anjum is based on a real person, Mona Ahmed. Echoing Anjum's life, Ahmed was born in Old Delhi, mistaken to be a boy, and became an icon of the Third Gender. Ahmed also took refuge in the graveyard after her guru took away her foster child. The graveyard became a shelter for those who needed a place. See, Siddharth Sivakumar, "'The Ministry of Utmost Happiness': Is Arundhati Roy's Anjum, Dayanita Singh's Mona Ahmed?" *Huffpost*, May 30, 2017. https://www.huffingtonpost.in/siddharth-sivakumar/the-ministry-of-utmost-happiness-is-arundhati-roys-anjum-da_a_22114468/. See also, Asmita Bhutani, "The Life and Times of Mona Ahmed: India's Most Iconic Trans Person," *Feminism In India*, August 9, 2018, feminisminindia.com/2018/08/09/mona-ahmed-history/.

contradiction that creates livable places for the excluded who cannot fit into the state's exclusionary systems or who cannot stand a deadly reality, going beyond the national and territorial logic. For instance, hijras who "had fallen out of, or been expelled from, the tightly administered grid of Hijra Gharanas" seek a place inside Anjum's residence (73). Saddam, who lost his father to Hindu mobs, shares the guest house and provides funeral services for the dead whose bodies are rejected by the Duniya or cannot be claimed for various horrifying reasons.

The guest house eventually becomes the participatory caring place by providing the home for Miss Jebeen the Second, the abandoned baby of an indigenous rape victim. Miss Udaya Jebeen's biological mother is a Maoist defender against the Indian government's military attack to dispossess her tribe's land. Jebeen's biological mother was left unprotected and isolated in the forest to either fight or die, and is no longer alive. Furthermore, she could not provide motherly love to Jebeen since the baby reminds her of sexual violence perpetrated by Indian police. It is an inevitable decision to abandon Jebeen by severing her connection with the abused lives of Maoist tribes people. Under the protection of Anjum's place, Jebeen has "six fathers and three mothers" including Anjum who actualizes her desire to have a baby (433). Without recourse to blood ties or the existing legal institutions, sympathy and care forge ties between Jebeen and her adopted family. This ethics of care based on survival and interdependency underlies the alliance with Tilo and Musa who are associated with the Kashmir independence struggle. These relationships demonstrate that Anjum's guest house provides an alternative zone for both the living and the dead who are/were

excluded from the normative world. Anjum's place challenges the Indian nation-state's violent abuse of others by presenting the solidarity of the excluded across gender, religion, region, and politics.

What is remarkable in Roy's alternative vision is her refusal to portray each character as a helpless victim who needs protection by the government. Instead, the characters in Anjum's guest house build their strength to resist the state's oppression of the marginalized under the pretext of national security. This solidarity appears naïve, an impression replicated by the novel's gesture toward a happy ending. This gesture, nonetheless, conveys a blessing for the young who must manage the aggravated Indian political situation. Under the destructive demand of Hindu assimilation or Muslim subjugation, Roy's characters struggle not to be compromised by the state's sovereignty. The depiction of a Kashmir military fighter, Musa, implies that he would choose to die anonymously and be buried in an unmarked grave just like his comrades in Kashmir. These marginalized lives do not promise much happiness. Nevertheless, the Jannat Guest House presents a path for undermining the tightly regulated grid of religion, ethnicity, caste, and gender.

In the end, care affiliations constituted by both baklas and hijras reveal ways to create sites for care that permit queer desire and queer living even against the backdrop of both Israel's and India's violent exclusion of minorities. The documentary film *Paper Dolls* conveys that care is essential for migrant baklas to live under Israel's conditional acceptance. Israeli people are outsourcing Filipino care laborers while treating them as transient and temporary. These care-workers' labor contributes to both maintaining and

complicating the normativity of family in Israel. On the one hand, Filipino care laborers conduct the filial ethics of care for elderly clients by acting like substitute children and regarding the elderly as parents. On the other hand, these care-workers are only ever proxy carers to the elderly, demonstrating that being *with-ness* maintains mundane living perhaps even more than the family normativity expected in a biological family. It is evident that the normativity of care and family thrusts queer Filipino caregivers into exploitative chains of care. Contingent care affiliations, however, fashioned by migrant baklas enable quotidian queer living. For migrant baklas, care is both demanding labor and a strategy for grappling with their liminal subject position as the sexually and racially Other. Migrant baklas' negotiations of care dynamics contribute to sustaining familial care and constituting queer modernity of Israel. Yet Filipino baklas' queer migration and friendships wherever they cross borders (i.e., those of nation and gender) evince their resistance against Heymann's translation of their bodies as a backdrop for Israel's sexually progressive image.

When Heymann's documentary film offers a friendly but limited site for caring in the artistic world, Roy envisions a radical queer space that opens to those on the social margins as an alternative to regulatory regimes of sexual, racial, religious, caste/class, and ethnic categorization. Roy visualizes what I call "ordinary impossibility." As discussed in this chapter, Anjum desires to become a mother. This seemingly ordinary desire is considered impossible simply because her ambition is incompatible with the dominant norms of Indian society that prevent hijras from forming families. Despite the set boundaries, Anjum practices ordinary impossibility in her graveyard. She constructs

"a People's Pool, a People's Zoo and a People's School" wherein care is ubiquitous among those in the old graveyard (406). Anjum's desire attempts world-making as opposed to the limitations imposed by the society she inhabits. Gayatri Gopinath offers notable elaboration about the notion of "the impossible" in this context. As Gopinath contends, "'Demanding the impossible' points to the failure of the nation to live up to its promises of democratic egalitarianism and dares to envision other possibilities of existence exterior to dominant systems of logic" (*Impossible Desires* 20). In Roy's novel, Anjum aspires to impossibility and ultimately performs it; she further invites others to practice participatory care whether they are together or separated spatially. The care affiliation proposed by Anjum and Roy allows cosmopolitan connectivity to forge impossible solidarity against violent nationalist movements. Conviviality thrives through this ordinary envisioning and practicing of care.

CHAPTER 5

RETHINKING COSMOPOLITAN CARE AND PLANETARY CONVIVIALITY

Cosmopolitanism, whether it derives from a moral, cultural, or political orientation, imagines that people are interconnected as citizens of the world. Although the ethical values of interdependence and human relationality inhere in cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan ideals and practices have shown their limits partly because of their contradiction between exclusionary normativity and benevolent toleration of the Other. Largely cultivated by Eurocentric norms yet claimed as universal, this contradiction appears in the disparity between subjects who are naturally considered world citizens and others who are not, even as these others contribute to diversity. Scholars, therefore, have accounted for those who are excluded in a cosmopolitan vision: a marginality (Homi Bhabha), silenced and marginalized voices (Walter Mignolo), and invisible cosmopolitans (Emily Johansen).[117] The focus on less-intelligible cosmopolitan subjects not only unmasks how existing cosmopolitan ideals stem from and maintain Western

[117] James Clifford's "Travelling Cultures" discusses how the notion of travel classifies "certain classes of people" as cosmopolitan and "the rest" as local (108). The former, according to Clifford, are considered the privileged Western male, whereas the latter are the "servants, helpers, companions, [and] guides" who accompany Western travelers (106). While those accompanying servants and helpers secure the seeming independence of Western travelers, their labor and even presence are erased in the concept of travelers partly "because of their race and class, and because theirs seemed to be a dependent status" (Clifford 106). Clifford argues that these unintelligible travelers have different cosmopolitan viewpoints and thus invite new conceptions of cosmopolitan subjects. While I do not follow Clifford's view of the accompanying subjects as "local," I find the differentiation of cosmopolitans (and the rest) as insightful for it demonstrates how cosmopolitanism is tied to the privileged, dominant culture.

hegemony, it also points to cosmopolitanism on a smaller scale (conviviality) performed by marginalized strangers, whom I call *adjunct strangers*. The unintelligibility of adjunct cosmopolitan strangers reveals that cosmopolitanism undervalues its dependency on care labor owed by those subjects, exposing that they are not considered fellow citizens and that their right to stay in the cosmopolitan world is conditional. My primary attention in this chapter foregrounds care from those who are perceived as strangers whose labor maintains their relation to a cosmopolitan world and promotes living with difference.

Although this chapter does not aim to develop the concept of strangers, the idea of adjunct strangers explains an unequal status of living or belonging that underpins cosmopolitanism. In *Strange Encounters* (2000), Sara Ahmed elaborates that strangers are not necessarily unknown subjects (outsiders) to people in the given community or place, but they are more likely *recognized* by people as not belonging: "To name somebody as a stranger is already to recognize them, to know them again: the stranger becomes a commodity fetish that is circulated and exchanged in order to define the borders and boundaries of given communities" (150). That is, the way strangers are produced manifests how differentiation constructs and reinforces the imagined self, community, and nation. In this functional role of strangers, I deploy the adjective "adjunct" to modify the concept "stranger" to stress the labor employed to build a cosmopolitan world. The adjunct indicates a supplement that makes up for a lack. When people are considered adjunct, they are integral to fill a role or position to support other

people or systems that are considered essential.[118] Applying this logic to the concept of cosmopolitanism, the word "adjunct" demonstrates how some others exist to supplement cosmopolitanism and are readily effaced because of their supplementary status.[119] The concept of adjunct strangers helps account for the labor—the care necessary for living together—of subjects who are recognized as out-of-space beings yet who do contribute to cosmopolitan plurality.

This chapter therefore investigates the ways in which adjunct strangers are produced by assumptions embedded in cosmopolitan conviviality. In exploring the link between care and strangers, I develop the concept of strangers' care that both maintains a cosmopolitan future and alienates strangers from coexistence. I support this concept through my analysis of two Asian diaspora novels: Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient* (1992) and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007). My readings of these novels specify the violence intimately related to cosmopolitan conviviality, which naturalizes strangers' care. To do so, I will explicate the subtle violence imposed upon strangers in the form of a dilemma as to whether they should keep up relationships for conviviality's sake. It is through this ethical quandary that the violence of

[118] Cf. note 117, demonstrating how less privileged people are not registered as cosmopolitan despite their integral labor for travel.

[119] Jacques Derrida in *Of Grammatology* describes supplement as "a surplus, a plentitude enriching another plenitude, the fullest measure of presence" (144). Concurrently, supplement exists as the word denotes, which "adds only to replace…as if one fills a void.…the supplement is an adjunct, a subaltern instance which takes-(the)-place. As substitute, it is not simply added to the positivity of a presence, it produces no relief, its place is assigned in the structure by the mark of an emptiness" (145).

conviviality occurs to adjunct strangers whose cosmopolitan responsibility is weighted more seriously than that of effortless, Western cosmopolitans.

Both *The English Patient* and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* showcase strangers' care despite their having been excluded from the already cosmopolitan world in which they struggled to attain conviviality.[120] The Asian migrant subjects of Kirpal Singh (Kip) in Ondaatje's novel and Changez in Hamid's call into question the cosmopolitan obligation that falls unevenly to the adjunct stranger. These two characters overlap one another: they become cultural *converts* as they provide service for the British Empire and the American-led financial imperialism in the respective contexts of the Second World War and post-9/11. As a well-trained Indian Sikh sapper enlisted in the British Army, Kirpal removes bombs in Italy to rehabilitate the devastated civilization caused by European imperialism. Likewise, selected as a promising human resource, Changez devotes himself to working at a valuation firm in the United States to support its financial system. They both believe that their labor will bring world peace (in the case of Kirpal) and help the world progress financially (in the case of Changez). However, these expectations are contradicted when the world they belong to refuses their belonging as equal citizens of the world. The betrayal of their sincere beliefs occurs when each empire

[120] By "already cosmopolitan world," I mean the state of living together enabled by transnational movements that had/have constituted diverse ethnic, racial, and religious coexistence despite many problems violent histories—colonial, imperial, or chattel slavery—have demonstrated. Paul Jay in *Global Matters* (2010) expands our scope of globalization by arguing that globalization has long prehistory of trade and territorial expansion, colonization, imperialism, and decolonization sped up by modernity since at least the sixteenth century.

exerts its capital and military power over Asian countries, causing each character to come to an impasse of either continuing their care-labor for conviviality or leaving their cosmopolitan settings. Eventually, Kirpal and Changez refuse their adjunct strangers' position in West-centered cosmopolitanism and return to their home countries.

Cosmopolitanism breaks down in both these novels in their particular contexts: the Second World War and 9/11. In the global contexts these novels both explore how, under the slightest strain, the Western ethical and philosophical legacy of cosmopolitanism devolves into hegemonic nationalism. Changez, for example, embraces the cosmopolitan culture of Manhattan. But following the attacks on the World Trade Center, he observes first a growing nationalist Islamophobia and then the U.S. military attack on Afghanistan. Similarly, Kirpal observes the Allies' joyous reaction to the dropping of the atomic bomb and believes that this level of disproportionate violence would not be possible were the Americans targeting Europe. The two characters' responses make evident a paradox at the heart of cosmopolitanism. They witness a kind of militant cosmopolitanism, which entails invasion and violence, evince the power imbalance latent in cosmopolitan ethics. Further, American militarism and its attendant *democratic* nation-building presume a universal ideal, which is actually imposed on vanquished nations as if that ideal were cosmopolitan.[121] Cosmopolitanism works militaristically, as we will see in the next section, to putatively advance inclusiveness, progress, and freedom. Catherine Lu describes cosmopolitanism's "hegemonic and

[121] The "War on Terror" is the political phrase that aims to ensure global security and human rights but legitimizes the U.S. invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq.

imperialistic tendencies" as "the penchant for monism" (251). Citing monism, Lu emphasizes cosmopolitanism's actual failure to account for cultural difference. Rather, the harmonies that emerge in the guise of cosmopolitanism are generated coercively by the powerful. In this enforced normative vision of unity or ultimate inclusivity, there are differently-appreciated and -integrated subjects, like Kirpal and Changez, whose complex affiliations resist this monistic version of coexistence. Both novels evince this resistance by illuminating how Kirpal and Changez grapple with domination and exclusion even as their care labor is exploited to produce conviviality. In this regard, Ondaatje's and Hamid's novels invite us to question the role of care in building a putative cosmopolitanism.

The core principle of care ethics values moral attention to human vulnerability and dependency, especially when centered on interpersonal relationships. Based on this principle, cosmopolitan or global care seeks to address care responsibility beyond nations and communities. Fiona Robinson, for instance, describes a global care that "demands an awareness of social relations as a starting point for ethical inquiry and a commitment to using those relationships as a critical tool for uncovering, and beginning to address, the relations of oppression and subordination which exist at the global level" (165). Robinson departs from earlier care ethics' (i.e., Carol Gilligan's and Sara Ruddick's) emphasis on intimate, private, and domestic care relations. She sees the limits of how Gilligan essentializes care as women's morality; Robinson further argues that earlier care ethics are parochial as they delimit their attentiveness to personal relations. Thus, Robinson's global care broadens the scope of care to distant strangers in

order to address macro social problems. Nevertheless, her attempt to go beyond the dichotomy between private and public or domestic and international stresses the latter macro approach; it results in dismissing the level of intimate and quotidian care within personal and global relations.

Moreover, global or cosmopolitan care is associated with humanitarian aid with the emphasis on (Western) peoples' obligation or duty to care. Although Robinson underscores that global care should be neither paternalistic nor derived from charity, her theory demands that "those who are powerful have a responsibility to approach moral problems by looking carefully at where, why, and how the structures of existing social and personal relations have led to exclusion and marginalization" (46). Her approach provides more heft to exposing the structure of exclusion and oppression that causes human suffering globally. That is, Robinson argues that care ethics should understand and respond to the cause of dependency of the excluded and marginalized peoples, which has been made by historically asymmetrical power relations. Likewise, Sarah Clark Miller calls for incorporating care ethics with Kantian ethics of obligation, saying that "the aim of caregivers' enacting the duty to care is to help cultivate, maintain or restore agency and self-determination" (151). Although the discourse of cosmopolitan care foregrounds ethics based on contextual, local networks of care, it presupposes entitled Western peoples' attentiveness to the needs of the supposedly non-Western peoples; not vice-versa. In other words, cosmopolitan care posits care moving from the powerful to the lesser privileged (presumably distant others); it does not consider

multidirectional care made by often invisible migrated, displaced, or indentured subjects from the less privileged world.[122]

What is missing in the current discourse of cosmopolitan care is that marginalized (or formerly colonized) subjects are erased, yet they are used to promote cosmopolitanism. These peoples are enmeshed into the Western world due to extant structures of oppression; they undertake care labor within personal and global relations. Their care has been naturalized to the extent that it seems insignificant from the perspective of the dominant culture. Yet they are enlisted into care work in such a way that they do violence to themselves, their own communities, or their interests and solidarities. Instead of acknowledging care from marginalized peoples, the dominant mode in care theory is to demand that we care for those in need while ignoring the extent to which the dominant rely on the care of those marginalized subjects, from the quotidian to the global scale. My intervention in care theory and cosmopolitanism is to articulate the mode of care practiced by the less-powerful who are brought into the imperial cosmopolitan world. I address both the structural and the intimate that, yoked together, exploit adjunct strangers' cosmopolitan care. In the following section, I describe the concepts of cosmopolitanism and conviviality to explain why adjunct strangers are registered to perform care labor in the empire.

---

[122] Robinson's recent article demonstrates her shift of attention to the transnational care flow exemplified as care workers from the global South to North. See Robinson, "Care Ethics and the Transnationalization of Care: Reflections on Autonomy, Hegemonic Masculinities, and Globalization," in *Feminist Ethics and Social Policy: Towards a New Global Political Economy of Care*, edited by Rianne Mahon and Fiona Robinson, UBC Press, 2011, pp. 127-44.

Cosmopolitanism and Conviviality

Conviviality and cosmopolitanism are closely bonded. Rooted in the Latin *con* (together) and *vivere* (to live), the Spanish word *convivencia* contains a closer denotation of coexistence than the current English usage of conviviality, which is associated with festive and jovial ambiances. Convivencia, as a historical Spanish term, refers to the Golden Age in which Christians, Jews, and Muslims lived together in medieval Spain, from 711-1492. Although "the Golden Age" implies a peaceful coexistence among three different religious groups, Spanish historians describe the Convivencia as "a pluralistic society" with conflicts (Benjamin 11). This unique coexistence was ironically made available by the Muslim conquest of the Iberian Peninsula; the subsequent diminishment of the extant Christian powers allowed the Jewish and Muslim communities relative freedom. Christians and Jews were "granted freedom to pursue any occupation as long as it did not involve hegemony over Muslims" (Benjamin 14). That is, these three different communities lived side-by-side but not on equal terms—a conditional coexistence. The conditions themselves allowed everyday interactions among different groups of people and cultures; thus, conviviality as coexistence was formed in terms of conditional living. This seeming coexistence lasted until Christians overpowered Muslims and demanded total acculturation from Jews and Muslims, otherwise expelling them from society. The idealistic view of the era of Convivencia and its end suggests two important implications. First: Convivencia foreshadows militaristic cosmopolitanism. On one hand, stranger-invaders may allow plurality in society, and toleration is key to maintain coexistence so long as the power hierarchy remains

unchanging. On the other hand, the original host requests conversion to strangers for their stay in foreign territory; coexistence is expected by removing the origin of conflict: difference. Second: in this regard, the normative implication of coexistence either employs toleration and assumes that there is an order of hierarchy, or it dismisses difference and postulates that difference hinders peaceful living together.

Cosmopolitanism entails these two implications and demonstrates the problematic oscillation between military expansion with tolerance, and coexistence without difference. In approaching the concept of cosmopolitanism, Mignolo proffers a critical insight by historicizing cosmopolitanism, starting from the sixteenth century when the idea of "planetary conviviality" emerged and was forged in tandem with modernity and coloniality.[123] The planetary conviviality project, which is read as cosmopolitanism, manifests "the process" or "the orientation" of cosmopolitanism that has legitimized militarism and imperialism: the universalization of Christianity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, imperialism in the eighteenth to the early twentieth centuries, and the current neoliberal globalization initiated in the late twentieth century (Mignolo 722-23). The modern global connection was violently established on the Atlantic commercial

[123] Mignolo does not define his use of the term "planetary conviviality" in either "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis" (2000) or "Border Thinking and Decolonial Cosmopolitanism" (2018). Yet he relates conviviality to the sixteenth-century Spanish theologian Francisco de Vitoria's inquiry about international relations, which was enabled by discovery and development of the New World and the subsequent question of the rights of people. In Vitoria's frame of reference, "convivial" derived from his vision of planetary community with religious and colonial Others. Nonetheless, there is "the civil and spiritual order of society," and religious difference became a reference point to thinking of "the right to possess, the right to dispossess, [and] the right to govern those outside the Christian realm" ("The Many Faces" 729, 730).

circuit through Christian missionaries and the expansion of capitalism through slavery (itself later replaced by indentured labor). Histories of cosmopolitan projects elucidate the processes of how a set of Western ideologies and institutions manages the world through militarism, demanding entry into foreign territory or acculturation to the perspective of those in power. In these processes, those with power take conviviality for granted in their expectations that assimilation or acculturation follow the Western social imaginary. The belief in civilization and imperialism supports these expectations, designating those with power as entitled world citizens who may have unrestrictive access to the world whether they are the host or the guest.

So how does belonging work for less-privileged subjects, especially strangers who are expected to follow the host's normative expectations of coexistence? Normativity in the concept of cosmopolitan conviviality establishes uneven perceptions of who is perceived as a rightful world citizen and who is not, within and across the boundaries of nation-states. Marginalized strangers are produced as an exclusionary effect of differentiation through epistemological and material worlding of the Other. In this respect, I want to focus more on the subject of the stranger to speculate about living with difference, especially in an imperial context. As indicated in the Spanish Convivencia, conditional living is expected of less-powerful communities; in this conditional expectation, violence is immanent in the calculation of marginalized subjects' subordination or exile. If these people refuse acculturation and invariably are forced into displacement, are there any places that do not demand conditional living for the less-privileged stranger? For instance, Immanuel Kant's vision of perpetual peace proposes

that hospitality is the cosmopolitan right given to a stranger, who must share possession of the surface of the earth; therefore, on the condition that a stranger behaves peacefully, their host should not show hostility to strangers:

> As in the previous articles, we are concerned here with *right,* not with philanthropy, and in this context *hospitality* (a host's conduct to his guest) means the right of a stranger not to be treated in a hostile manner by another upon his arrival on the other's territory. If it can be done without causing his death, the stranger can be turned away, yet as long as the stranger behaves peacefully where he happens to be, his host may not treat him with hostility. It is not the *right of a guest* that the stranger has a claim to (which would require a special, charitable contract stipulating that he be made a member of the household for a certain period of time), but rather a right to visit, to which all human beings have a claim, to present oneself to society by virtue of the right of common possession of the surface of the earth. Since it is the surface of a sphere, they cannot scatter themselves on it without limit, but they must rather ultimately tolerate one another as neighbors, and originally no one has more of a right to be at a given place on earth than anyone else. (82, italics original)

What intrigues me about Kant's hospitality is his conditional logic for accepting strangers. Kant's provision of hospitality does not quite anticipate the violence of conditional living expected for less-privileged peoples, since he assumes that both hosts and strangers tolerate one another equally. However, interpretations and practices of

toleration and peaceful conduct are subject only to those with power, for the conditions exist to maintain the standing hierarchy.[124]

Indeed, the conditional acceptance of strangers itself signifies violence and suggests other problems. Kant dismisses the potential legal and social discrimination against those non-belonging Others. These people at least can avoid being treated as enemies insofar as they act peacefully, but their presence cannot avoid being treated differently and differentially. Further, all strangers should not be conflated into a single category of strangers, since uneven global power differentiates strangers among strangers. As Ahmed notes, it is dangerous to see "everyone as a stranger," since it hides the "political processes whereby some others are designated as *stranger than other others*" (*Stranger Encounter* 6). When these problems intersect one another, strangers' friendly behavior that allows them to stay in a given place is unevenly distributed through a kind of labor. This labor is attached to strangers as markers of stranger identification. It is therefore in Kant's conditions of hospitality that the structural violence of treating non-residents as perpetual strangers is legitimatized in the practices of cosmopolitanism.

The limits posed by Kant's cosmopolitanism indicate an economy of registering and circulating strangers through friendly labor or the labor of conviviality. The

[124] Derrida, in *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (2001), problematizes Kant's conceptualization of hospitality under the universal law. He raises the question of state sovereignty that draws hospitality into a realm of law since it provides a reason to be political: the rights of residence are contingent upon the state policy and the interpretation of strangers as rightful citizens.

conditional acceptance placed upon a marginalized stranger demands not merely an epistemological level of producing friendly gestures, but an ontology—a mode of existence—of being an attentive being in a foreign land. In this regard, strangers' labor to show peaceful intentions and actions should be read as a mode of care, which I call cosmopolitan care. Care from the conditioned, adjunct subjects is essential for them to be integrated into the community in which they reside, and wherein they are designated as being out-of-place while simultaneously serving to generate cosmopolitan places in an ordinary sense. These subjects need to endure the dominant culture's "affective states," which may "include the racialized, gendered and imperially imbued ambivalence affect," in order to perform cosmopolitan care, which can be "an arduous temporal practice that entails the maintenance of relations with ourselves and others through histories of oppression that return in the present again and again" (Baraitser 53-54). Often, the affective states that prevail in specific places may not be amicable for strangers or conducive to friendly conduct. This arduous labor is attached to adjunct stranger-others; their care is a form of difference that simultaneously integrates and excludes stranger-others in their displaced places. The following section will articulate what constitutes strangers' care, and how care designates strangers, by focusing on the character Kirpal Singh in *The English Patient*. Kirpal's care labor toward maintaining convivial relations with others suggests how his labor veils inequality but seemingly produces conviviality.

Strangers' Conviviality and Care in *The English Patient*

Ondaatje's *The English Patient* is regarded as cosmopolitan literature in its representations of friendship and care beyond nationality, as they appear in Europe during the Second World War. In the novel, four people—the English patient (Almásy), Hana, Caravaggio, and Kirpal Singh (Kip)—stay together at the Villa San Girolamo in Italy, where a "damaged building and the burned and shelled remnants of the earth" provide shelter for the displaced strangers.[125] These four characters of different nationalities have experienced their own losses and are unable to let go of traumatic memories even as they become more attentive to one another. [126] Mutual care plays an indispensable role in restoring faith in human connection. Therefore, through such care, the novel displays an everyday cosmopolitanism, which can be interpreted as what Paul Gilroy terms conviviality: strangers' mundane interactions not inscribed by such identities as race, nationality, and ethnicity. Gilroy argues that conviviality "introduces a measure of distance from the pivotal term 'identity'," and "[t]he radical openness that brings conviviality alive makes a nonsense of closed, fixed, and reified identity" (*Postcolonial Melancholia* xv). In the novel, conviviality arises through the seeming suspension of the fixed grid of identity onto the common ground of these strangers' solidarity as they experience violent war and work towards peace.

---

[125] Michael Ondaatje, *The English Patient*, 43. All references to *The English Patient* are given in parentheses in the text as *EP* with page numbers.

[126] For Hana, it was the death of her father while she was nursing war patients; for Kip, it was the death of the fatherly figure Lord Suffolk; for Caravaggio, it was the torture that takes away his thief identity; and as for Almásy, it was the death of his lover Katharine Clifton.

Yet *The English Patient* deserves critical attention to the way Ondaatje describes conviviality—and its destruction—as its narrative tension reveals that the structural inequality buried in imperial cosmopolitanism disrupts individual conviviality, which is also largely dependent on Kirpal's cosmopolitan care. The contrast between the expectation of happy cosmopolitanism and Kirpal's anger after hearing about the atomic blasts in Japan forms the climax of the tension. The novel shows the peak of the convivial mood right before the explosions during Hana's birthday celebration, a nice dinner with wine prepared by Kirpal. The strangers all anticipate a hopeful future. What awaits them is long-desired news: the end of war as the result of the explosions in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Kirpal Singh suddenly aligns with the suffering of Asian peoples and can no longer align with Hana, Caravaggio, and the English Patient. This shift occurs as he realizes the absurdity between the Western countries' celebration of peace obtained by atomic bombing and his years of removing bombs to save lives: "What have I been doing these last few years? Cutting away, defusing, limbs of evil. For what? For this to happen?" (*EP* 285). He senses his foolishness in believing in equality after learning about Western ideology and normativity: "You and then the Americans converted us. With your missionary rules. And Indian soldiers wasted their lives as heroes so they could be *pukkah*. You had wars like cricket. How did you fool us into this?" (*EP* 283). His antagonism ultimately prompts him to leave the villa. Kirpal's personal relations with the strangers at the villa (a "receding palace of strangers") are interrupted by the political (reconfirmation of the power imbalance between West and East); it raises the question of whether strangers can coexist without ever encroaching

upon scripts of race, ethnicity, and nationality. Hence, it is important to explore how an individual produces conviviality despite their problematic structural living conditions. I radically claim that friendship and care contribute to enduring structural injustice, and that they can transform conditional strangers into cultural converts.

Primarily, it is necessary to examine how adjunct strangers are violently integrated in the displaced place. Caren Kaplan in *Questions of Travel* (1996) contends that discourses of travel often obscure "historically specific exchanges, travels, and circulations, masking the economic and social differences between kinds of displacement in a homogenized 'cosmopolitanism'" (102). This insight remains pertinent when conflating displaced people into the same category of strangers, since it gives an impression that strangers are given hospitality on equal terms. However, Kirpal's displacement and integration in a foreign territory marks difference and violence, as his accustomed invisibility otherwise translates into the familiar abject Other. From the inception of his displacement, *choice* is not an option for Kirpal; he is drafted into the British army as substitute for his brother, who has been put in jail due to refusing recruitment. Moreover, Kirpal is translated into "Kip" in the process of integration:

> The name had attached itself to him curiously. In his first bomb disposal report in England some butter had marked his paper, and the officer had exclaimed, "What's this? Kipper grease?" and laughter surrounded him. He had no idea what a kipper was, but the young Sikh had been thereby translated into a salty English fish. Within a week his real name, Kirpal Singh, had been forgotten. He hadn't

> minded this. Lord Suffolk and his demolition team took to calling him by his nickname, which he preferred to the English habit of calling people by their surname. (*EP* 87)

The passage describes how the dominant group accepts the marginalized stranger only through both abjection and erasure of colonial difference. Integration of strangers does not mean that they share a sameness with others. Instead, the dominant people place an authorized unfamiliarity onto strangers to define the boundaries between *us* and *them*; that is, strangers are accepted through the authorization of the strangers' unfamiliarity. Kirpal's Indian name signifies, to English people, the colonized Other's unfamiliarity. Thus, they convert Kirpal into "Kipper," which is quite unfamiliar as a human name but nevertheless quite acceptable. The name "Kip" inscribes stereotypes of South Asian people as it implies that he is oily like the fish after which he is named, which adds a measure of racism to the team's seemingly convivial affection. The pun is immediately circulated as humor. As Amanda Wise puts it, humor "plays a major role in production and maintenance of consensus, sociality, and solidarity, while also enacting and defining forms of hierarchy and power" (482). Kirpal's presence gets naturalized firstly through his violent translation and then through his endurance of unamusing humor. Kirpal's endurance is part of what Wise calls "convivial labour," which means to play along with the dominant white group's norm to get along within the integrity of the given space; otherwise, he risks being cast out from the English sapper's society.[127]

[127] Amanda Wise defines "convivial labour" as "the act of working out a means to function 'together' on a daily basis" (496).

Despite Kirpal's violent cosmopolitan experiences, the shared conviviality built with some people steers him to accept the normative expectations of being a convert.[128] The way in which Kirpal is integrated into Lord Suffolk's team entails a friendly illusion to convert Kirpal into a functional stranger. Lord Suffolk and his team accept Kirpal because of his competence in bomb-dismantling techniques even as they demand his assimilation with the nickname. For these people, Kirpal is identified not by his race but by his potential to be an expert in defusing bombs. Due to such acceptance, Kirpal develops loyalty to Lord Suffolk and wants to prove his usefulness. This defense mechanism, which he operates in order to survive in invisibility, makes Kirpal inclined to form a strong attachment to Lord Suffolk, whose human warmth generates a quasi-familial feeling to him. Accordingly, Kirpal's attachment and individual relationality propel him to be responsible for the British Empire's victory. Kirpal acts like "a dutiful son" under Lord Suffolk's guidance and care; personal intimacy obscures the structural violations of translating Kirpal's subjectivity into a competent abject Other and thrusting

[128] Kirpal's cosmopolitan experiences are starkly different when comparing to Almásy's understanding of becoming strangers. To Almásy, displacement proffers fluidity, agency, and transcendence from difference. Almásy habitually regards himself and his desert explorers as "the planetary strangers," or he identifies himself with Kirpal as "international bastards" based on his mobility to cross borders "not to belong to anyone, to any nation" (*EP* 244, 177, 139). However, Almásy and his desert friends are the assemblage of multi-national cartographers and spies whose work serves imperialism. These strangers do not feel alienated because the material and political power supports their presences as natural in a foreign land. Almásy's notion of planetary strangers erases power differential; his statement of "international bastards" appropriates non-privileged strangers' experiences of oppression by aligning himself with Kirpal through a shared quality of displacement: "born in one place and choosing to live elsewhere" (*EP* 177). Almásy's words, "choosing to live elsewhere," dismiss Kip's unhappy displacement and obscures Almásy's complicity in helping the German spy.

him into risking his life for these Europeans' war. Hana precisely points out such injustice: "In spite of the kindness in such people they were a terrible unfairness. He could be all day in a clay pit dismantling a bomb that might kill him at any moment" (*EP* 272). In other words, the development of individual caring relations lessens the degree of an individual's feeling injustice, which cultivates Kirpal's military service for the British Empire.

Through such intimacy, the conditional living attached to Kirpal is further reinforced to produce the adjunct stranger's ontology of being peaceful and useful for integration and the consolidation of caring relations. Correspondingly, when Kirpal first appears in the villa, Hana has already recognized him as the familiar stranger: "She saw one of the men was a Sikh. Now she paused and smiled, somewhat amazed, relieved anyway" (*EP* 63). Hana was amazed to see a Sikh other but relieved immediately because she *knows* that the Sikh *functions as a conditioned stranger* in a foreign land. Kirpal only comes into the villa when his duty allows him to do so or "when invited in, just a tentative visitor" (*EP* 75). Even among strangers, Kirpal is the only figure that perceives himself as a visitor, thus he knows he needs to show peaceful conduct by being useful. Growing intimacy between the strangers then adapts to Kirpal's friendly mode of being as habit. In one instance, Hana inscribes Kirpal's colonial otherness through friendly gestures of getting comfort from him. For Hana, Kirpal is a "still bed" to curl her up like a "good grandfather." He is the "brownness of a rock, the brownness of a muddy storm-fed river" that makes him step "back from even the naïve innocence of such a remark" (*EP* 105). As the narrator describes, if Kirpal's story were a white hero

narrative, “The successful defusing of a bomb ended novels. Wise white fatherly men…were acknowledged…But he [Kirpal] was a professional. And he remained the foreigner, the Sikh” (*EP* 105). No matter how Kirpal saves people’s lives, the word “professional” removes Kirpal’s human character and marks only his actions. Although Hana finds Kirpal like a good grandfather, she idealizes and benefits from the colonial Other’s politeness and care—a continuation of protecting the situated places and peoples. Kirpal provides service, comfort, and protection due to being marked out as a stranger-Other, making him stuck in the cycle of care.

The routinized care practiced by Kirpal is cosmopolitan care as a mode of maintenance for the place he inhabits and the people he interacts with. Indeed, maintenance care is an everyday pattern attached to Kirpal as an adjunct stranger. In *Enduring Time* (2017), Baraitser examines care by offering an acute framework of maintenance that involves arduous practices of maintaining relations in difficult time. To Baraitser, it is the very capacity to hold on to relations that enables living in the unbearable present time, showing the resilience produced by maintenance care. From this view, maintenance has two paradoxical temporal forms: the axes of sustained and ongoing temporalities that eventually lead to the promise of the future. Maintenance allows existing conditions or states to continue (i.e., to be functional). It also keeps someone or something “buoyant” (i.e., to be supported). Accordingly, maintenance is “durational practices…[and] forms of labour that maintain the material conditions of ourselves and others, maintain connections between people…people and places, and social and public institutions…that constitute the systems of sustenance and renewal that

support life" (Baraitser 49). The adjective "durational" modifies the practices of care: maintenance never occurs momentarily. Rather, it requires endurance and repetition that enable the present moment to continue. Thus, maintenance is care labor because of its persistent demand for attentiveness to the ongoing conditions to sustain what constitutes life. On this matter, Baraitser attunes us to the affirmation of the resilience of maintenance—an affirmation that grasps the durational temporal dimension of care. Yet when the mode of maintenance becomes the condition for adjunct strangers' living in the marked space of imperial violence, how do these subjects hold on to the present moment wherein the time of practicing maintenance puts them into impasse? This positive affirmation of maintenance as a sign of resilience points to the everyday conviviality maintained on an individual level, but the question remains unaddressed regarding who maintains the structural, dominant systems for someone else's renewal of life.

Kirpal's attentive mode of life certainly demonstrates that maintenance care is disproportionately assigned to adjunct strangers. That is, caring work for maintaining the world is distributed to the adjunct strangers who must prove their functionality. Caravaggio grapples with the mechanisms of power in Kirpal's everyday practices of care—clearing danger and repairing the world—by questioning the primary beneficiary of Kirpal's sacrifice: "Kip will probably get blown up one of these days. Why? For whose sake? He's twenty-six years old. The British army teaches him the skills and the Americans teach him further skills and the team of sappers are given lectures, are decorated and sent off into the rich hills. You are being used" (*EP* 121). Kirpal's transnational movement from India to England and Italy aims to provide cosmopolitan

care: as a world citizen, Kirpal shares his responsibility to repair the world. In reality, Kirpal and his companion sappers encounter a foreclosed life at any moment situated in an evacuated city or muddy water; their time seems stuck, just as they struggle to freeze a giant, highly explosive bomb for hours. Kirpal's labor involves temporal flux: the situation is pressing, yet he feels trapped in a suspended time between himself and the enemy bomb. Kirpal's time is suspended between life and death as he fights against the enemy's logic within the bomb while the outer world keeps moving on. The world moves forwards by strangers' durational practices of clearing the remnants of the imperial project of planetary conviviality through the colonial Other's maintenance care. Although Kirpal generates the present time of the world by liberating a place and a people from death, he is never freed from estrangement either during his dismantling bombs or after the successful removal of the danger. He remains a stranger locked in the cyclic maintenance care. Baraitser likens maintenance with "unbecoming time" because it gives "primacy to duration over difference, endurance and persistence over transgression, the slowness of chronic time over rupture" (11). Unlike the progressive telos embedded in the time that seems to lead us to cosmopolitanism, maintenance care supports the dominant time that promises progress and cosmopolitanism; it makes the caring subject exists in a circular caring time to ensure the continuation of the progressive time. In other words, in a frame of developmental time, it does not matter which person or whatever amount of time is involved in the practices of maintenance care, because maintenance signifies function, which is performed by adjunct strangers.

This structural bind is concealed and reinforced by the animated conviviality that maintains relations. Power differentials are never apparent, and the seeming insignificance of difference shapes the way four strangers live together and share joviality. Politics seems suspended in the villa, either for the characters' peaceful coexistence or due to each character's inability to confront the trauma caused by politics. Nevertheless, even if an individual subject treats identity as insignificant, Kirpal remains an exception. His difference already remains in the recognition among Hana, Caravaggio, and Almásy, whose identities do not come up in their everyday interactions. Kirpal's difference is either celebrated or denied for the maintenance of conviviality, especially within the most caring relationship with Hana. When Hana receives comfort from Kirpal, she inscribes difference to him: "She imagines all of Asia through the gestures of this one man. The way he lazily moves, his quiet civilization" (*EP* 217). Hana also arbitrarily translates Kirpal as an epitome of self-sufficiency without recognizing his suffering living as a colonial other: "she knows this man beside her is one of the charmed, who has grown up an outsider and so can switch allegiances, can replace loss" (*EP* 271-72). But Kirpal's self-sufficiency and calmness is not an innate quality that originates from his racial, ethnic, or religious background. His calmness is the result of the racially discriminatory conditions he must live in. What matters in this utilization of Kirpal's difference, without a sense of political oppression, is the denial of imbalance in the racial oppression in larger social structures, even in a quotidian conviviality. Even when political processes need to be addressed, Hana avoids considering the politics brought up by Kirpal's talk by thinking: "The feuds of the world.

She walks into the daylight darkness of the villa and goes in to sit with the Englishman" (*EP* 217-18). Hana refuses to differentiate the mechanisms of oppression in Asia, as she thinks all politics causes conflict; hence, she enters "the daylight darkness of the villa" in which caring activity brings her into comfortable obliviousness of power, difference, and political turmoil (*EP* 218).

This avoidance of politics may maintain individual relations, at least until maintaining conviviality becomes violent labor to the adjunct stranger. The novel shows that the suspension of identity could not last, for eventually it is disrupted by a violent revelation of the works of power in service to the cosmopolitan project. Kirpal realizes that America or Britain "would never have dropped such a bomb on a white nation" but on the "brown races of the world" (*EP* 286). The villa's conviviality ruptures as the war abruptly ends with the atomic bombing of Japan. Although the war comes to the end, the global politics of its ending confirm the inequality that perpetuates the violence of difference. Kirpal's belief in the European cosmopolitan project, constructed by his own intimacy with English people, belies his endurance of maintenance care. The suspension of identity ends—"He isn't an English man"—and Kirpal can no longer remain calm and protect peaceful relations in the villa again (*EP* 285). Hana tries to keep Kirpal from leaving the villa by reminding him of their relation: "Kip, it's *me*. What did we have to do with it? He is a stone in front of her" (*EP* 288). For Kirpal, the villa's conviviality becomes a microcosm of how European planetary conviviality is maintained. After he realizes his stranger's position among others, peaceful relations are no longer acceptable. Kirpal was part of the world but not in the same way as others. Kirpal's weeping,

shocked face conveys his struggle to accept reality. His dilemma belongs only to him: to choose whether he wants to continue the relations or not. An ethical form of convivial violence occurs to him: either accepting conversion (becoming Kip instead of Kirpal Singh) or leaving. He makes the decision: he "has left the three of them to their world, is no longer their sentinel" (*EP* 286). Kirpal Singh discontinues cosmopolitan care, refusing to become a conditioned, adjunct stranger. He breaks out from the temporality of maintenance care by rapidly leaving behind the place in which he was stuck.

Reluctance as a Sign of a Dilemma in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*

The English Patient demonstrates how the imperial cosmopolitan project rests on converting other racially and culturally different subjects into the normativity and maintenance of Western civilization. The displaced Indian sapper becomes accustomed to the prevalent racism in the places he lives and works, but affectionate interactions with Lord Suffolk and the strangers in the villa convert him into being loyal to those people and the imperial system to which he and they belong. The conviviality that arises within these caring relations conceals the structural violation of Kirpal's conditional living. If Ondaatje's novel depicts colonial subjects' conversion as a condition to live in an imperial cosmopolitan space, Hamid's novel exposes the continued conditional living of marginalized strangers occurring in a contemporary multicultural society. This conversion is a state of what the character Changez calls "a modern-day janissary" under

the United States capital globalization.[129] In this section, I examine an analogy between janissaries and adjunct strangers. The concept of janissaries provides a useful metaphoric frame to address how adjunct strangers turn into conditioned converts whose care and service do harm to their identity and community. I investigate Changez's psychic dilemma, which is caused simultaneously by his affiliations to both America and Pakistan and by his care for those surrounding him. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* delineates this dilemma as an expression of care and the ethical obligations placed upon adjunct strangers for their relations with intimate others.

The Reluctant Fundamentalist interrogates cosmopolitan hospitality in post-9/11 America. The novel uses a dramatic monologue—a form in which a speaker addresses a silent listener to convey the speaker's storytelling—to shape a narrative structure (here, of a host and a guest) between Changez and the silent American interlocutor. The outer narrative frame contains a single day in Lahore, Pakistan, and describes the present moment of Changez's engagement with a stranger. Changez leads a stranger through his story about living in America; in the inner frame, Changez's host role is reversed as he tells of his experience as a guest—an aspirational migrant who tried his best to assimilate into American society. Changez studied at Princeton, worked at a valuation firm named Underwood Samson, and met his love, Erica, who embodies the upper-class white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. Changez's successful integration into American society, however, was troubled after 9/11 as his Muslim Pakistani identity is read as a sign of

[129] Moshin Hamid, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, 152. All references to *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* are given in parentheses in the text as *RF* with page numbers.

violence. He found that his stay in America was dependent on the benevolence of the host. Based on these experiences, Changez's hospitality towards the American stranger is a doubling or mirroring of what Changez felt during his stay in the United States: by controlling narratives, voices, and representations of people and cultures, he becomes the host. The silent interlocutor, who seems to be an undercover agent, feels unease with Changez's overbearing yet polite hospitality. For Changez, it is his care for (Am)Erica that enables his cordial service to the unknown stranger, whether his service brings harm or not. In this regard, the tension between the host and the guest calls into question the possibility or limitation of hospitality and cosmopolitan care. Therefore, understanding Changez's care requires understanding Changez's experience as the insecure stranger that he in turn bestows onto the American stranger.

First, it is vital to understand the cause of Changez's troubled identity that eventually leads him to leave the United States. The watershed moment occurs in Changez's business trip to Chile as he interacts with Juan-Bautista—the chief of the publishing company that Changez assesses for its financial value. Unlike his enjoyment of cosmopolitan privilege working as an agent of Underwood Samson (abbreviated, U.S.), Changez's business in Chile marks his critical change as he confronts his conditional living in America as an adjunct stranger by experiencing accumulated racial profiling after 9/11. Particularly, his recognition of a precarious situation in Pakistan under America's policies of the war on terror activates a profound identity crisis: he wonders whether he belongs "in New York, in Lahore, in both, in neither" (*RF* 148). Changez is expected to carry on with his job despite his inner struggle. Juan-Bautista, by

sensing Changez's dilemma, informs Changez that he is complicit in supporting America's cosmopolitan financial business: "'Does it trouble you…to make your living by disrupting the lives of others?'" (*RF* 151).[130] He even likens Changez's auxiliary function within America's financial imperialism to the figure of the janissary, inducing Changez's enlightenment: "I was a modern-day janissary, a servant of the American empire at a time when it was invading a country with a kinship to mine and was perhaps even colluding to ensure that my own country faced the threat of war" (*RF* 152). Changez withdraws from the Chile project, causing his mentor Jim great consternation: "In wartime soldiers don't really fight for their flags, Changez. They fight for their friends, their buddies. Their team" (*RF* 153). Yet Jim's metaphorical claim of Changez's loyalty demonstrates how loyalty without any recognition of difference has been naturalized during Changez's work at Underwood Samson. The implication of Changez's realization means that his stay in America is no longer valid. He refuses the violent living conditions (i.e., the subjugation of his difference), yet he concludes: "It was right for me to refuse to participate any longer in facilitating this project of domination; the only surprise was that I had required so much time to arrive at my decision" (*RF* 156). What is striking is that Juan-Bautista's revelation of Changez's

[130] Juan-Bautista's statement implies the U.S.-backed military coup in Chile of September 11, 1973, which disrupted President Salvador Allende's democratic socialism. The United States not only acquiesced to the coup but also took in part in destabilizing Allende's government through economic control. As a result, Augusto Pinochet seized power, leading to seventeen years of dictatorship. See Peter Kornbluh, "Declassifying U.S. Intervention in Chile," *NACLA Report on the Americas*, vol. 32, no. 6, 1999, pp. 36-42.

janissary status comes as surprise to Changez. This surprise I attribute to the paradoxical subject position of janissary.

Juan-Bautista's remark about janissaries lays bare the exclusionary aspect of militaristic cosmopolitanism in the concept of inclusion. The figure of janissary signifies the very paradox in cosmopolitan living, based on their origin and their role. Janissaries originated when the Ottoman Empire converted kidnapped Christian boys into a sultan's elite corps, beginning in the fifteenth century. Janissaries were slaves under the Ottoman Empire, despite the benefits they could gain by going through elite training and becoming a sultan's intimate corps. As Godfrey Goodwin puts it, "They were trained…to form the future military and civil leadership" but "these elite officers were slaves even though they were converts to Islam" (30). A meritocratic system based on military discipline and prowess gave janissaries an opportunity to climb the ladder of success, albeit with a few restrictions that signaled their difference. For this reason, what is essential in the concept of janissaries is that they "were not free men…but were enmeshed as an integral part of the structure of a corporate state in whose overthrow lay their own demise" (Goodwin 33). Janissaries are paradoxical subjects in terms of betrayal because of their (in)voluntary "conversion." Although most janissaries were forcefully recruited as Christian levies, prestige and wealth made them adapt to Ottoman culture. Becoming converts, loyal janissaries participated in destroying their own Christian civilization; conversely, their disloyalty brings them danger in residing in the Ottoman corporate state. This paradox is maintained insofar as janissaries align themselves to the empire and perform the services the empire expects. From this

perspective, janissaries are conditioned strangers because their right to reside in the situated place depends on their loyalty and service, which eventually cause them to exert violence against their original families and communities. Nonetheless, janissaries' ethnic, religious, and cultural differences constitute a plurality of the situated place—a sign of cosmopolitan coexistence.

To be a modern-day janissary in the reversed context of a Muslim migrant living in contemporary, predominantly Christian, America signifies a continuation of the demand for loyal subordination within coexistence. The novel stages the extreme case of violent subjugation happening in the most intimate moment: the sex scene between Erica and Changez. It allegorically implies how (Am)Erica accepts the Muslim Other only through his conversion to Christianity. After 9/11, Erica's dead ex-boyfriend Chris (i.e., standing for Christianity) preoccupies Erica's mind as she retreats from political insecurity. Changez, to pull through this relational impasse, asks Erica to think of him as Chris: "I was Chris and she was with Chris" (*RF* 105). Erica and Changez make love insofar as he becomes a substitute for Chris, making Changez "both *satiated* and *ashamed*" (*RF* 106, italics original). To be intimate with (Am)Erica demands Changez abandon his Muslim identity, which confirms how it is fundamentally impossible for him to satisfy Erica's ideal: "a religion that would not accept me as a convert" (*RF* 114). If the novel shows a religious conversion as an ultimate, yet failed, way to connect with Erica, Hamid suggests an alternative: the way in which a modern-day janissary cannot notice the financial realm's ostensible meritocracy and its demand for loyalty, a more subtle and systematically legitimate way of subordinating difference.

The enlistment of a modern-day janissary into America seems not forceful, but that is an illusion. Economically, strangers' migration to the U.S. is a form of involuntary displacement, for the U.S. holds a superior position in global capitalism. Finance is a means by which America exerts its power and domination over the world, enabling Americans as the world's "ruling class" or "members of the officer class of global business" (*RF* 65). Meritocracy, however, promises acceptance, opportunity, and reward to worthy strangers. The system of Underwood Samson epitomizes its logic: "If you do well, you'll be rewarded. If you don't, you'll be out the door. It's that simple" (*RF* 35). Giving Changez the impression of "a seasoned army officer," Jim instructs him in the working expectation at Underwood Samson (*RF* 6). Depending on Changez's professional service and ability, he is either rewarded or expelled. Jim's statement interpellates Changez's conditional living in the United States. Changez should follow certain, expected roles in order to be integrated into America, otherwise he will be "out the door." Most importantly, meritocracy turns a matter of belonging into an individual's capacity to assimilate to society, while concealing the structural inequality and power hierarchy embedded in strangers' conditional living. Strangers are trained to learn that their service produces maximum return and makes the world more interconnected, as their difference of religion, ethnicity, and nationality are welcomed in American corporate fundamentalism. This manipulation embedded in American cosmopolitan inclusion works powerfully to both structure economic dependency and veil its origin of dependency through putative inclusion.

Indeed, the integration of strangers to the American empire is alluring because the cultural diversity pervasive in its society creates an ambience of welcome difference. Changez admitted to the stranger that he felt like he became "*immediately* a New Yorker" (*RF* 33). Urdu speaking taxi drivers, a Pak-Punjab deli, and the South Asian LGBT parade generates feelings of home in Changez. The vibrancy of migrants and tourists encapsulates the "*cosmopolitan* nature of New York" (*RF* 48, emphasis in original). Even Changez's workplace represents this ideal of diversity: his cohort of five colleagues includes two women and two people of color. That is, a banal conviviality prevails and generates easy interactions with strangers in a cosmopolitan city like New York, while the histories of racial and ethnic differentiation do not appear on the surface of conviviality. Emily Johansen, in her study of conviviality as a sign of neoliberal cosmopolitanism, argues that the everyday encounters of difference merely accustom white people to difference instead of leading a radical change toward anti-racism. Mundane exposure to difference becomes banal, or as Johansen states, "difference becomes convivial as long as that difference adheres to pre-existing social mores" (102). Johansen's acute analysis of the banality of conviviality suggests the subtle translation of difference into way of pleasing white people. As an adjunct stranger, Changez is more susceptible to such subtle translation. Changez cannot confront conversion because confrontation signifies the end of peaceful conduct; it is against the ethical expectation of diversity. Conviviality is built upon the unequal translation of strangers whose refusal may, at worst, signal violence, or at least cause adverse impacts on building and maintaining relationships.

Changez's desire for belonging at the initial stage of his integration into American society blinds him to such violence of conversion. Changez is even willing to provide the labor of conviviality, accommodating the expectations from the people he cares about and from the space to which he belongs. That is, the violence of conversion is coated by care and perpetrated through care relations. Conversely, his relationships with Jim and Erica are shaped by their preconception about Changez's difference. For instance, Jim recruits Changez because he anticipates Changez's relentless competition for success. Jim's prediction inscribes Changez as "hungry," assuming that Changez has suffered from poverty and alienation based on his Asian background: "I [Jim] never let on that I felt like I didn't belong to this world. Just like you"; "I was dirt poor" (*RF* 70). Although Changez feels uneasy about how to respond to Jim, he deftly covers up his discomfort so as not to make Jim uncomfortable: "I was always uncertain of how to respond. The confession that implicates its audience is…a devilishly difficult ball to play. Reject it and you slight the confessor; accept it and you admit your own guilt" (*RF* 70). Changez understands that Jim's false assumption derives from his empathetic alignment with Changez based on non-belongingness. Yet how Changez understands Jim's way of standing by him is enforced under the convivial situation of Jim's care, whereas Jim enjoys the privilege of giving care to Changez. Changez cannot confront their misconstrued alignment; instead, he accepts Jim's patronizing care to maintain the relationship and get a sense of belonging: "Jim sat with his arm around the back of my chair in a way that made me feel—quite literally—as though he had taken me under his wing. It was a good feeling" (*RF* 71). The dilemma is that Changez's longing for

belonging not only enables Jim's problematic care but also allows Changez to be Erica's "official escort," a role of protection for Erica who feels loss after losing Chris, and a status change for Changez who feels a loss of prestige.

The relationship between Erica and Changez is established on each other's *longings*, which are two different desires with the same nature. For Erica, Changez reminds her of a "strong sense of home" or "a-big-family vibe" that makes him seem reliable or constant (*RF* 19). For her, the loss of Chris signifies the loss of stability; she presumes that Changez's difference (i.e., assumptions about Asian self-sufficiency and big families) stands for what she lacks. For Changez, Erica reminds him of what he used to belong to: "the very same social class that my [his] family was falling out of in Lahore" (*RF* 85). Becoming Erica's escort brings to Changez a sense that he is part of the inner circle of upper-class New York society. Thus, Erica and Changez, spurred by their own longings, seek in one another nostalgic substitutes. Changez's role of escort satisfies the expectation of Erica, who needs "someone to play" a role like Chris had. Yet, the level of intimacy is not the same, since she thinks of the dead Chris as her lover and Changez as her friend. Changez, in contrast, provides his care to Erica in order to be more intimate with her. In these unarticulated, contradicting expectations, Changez's politeness plays a crucial role as a labor for conviviality.[131]

[131] Magdalena Nowicka, in her examination of banalities of multicultural settings, elucidates that politeness and courtesy function to maintain "a particular social order" as a means of "regulating living together" ("Fantasy of Conviviality" 22). The fantasy created by politeness is a creation of "quasi-equality" that ensures others get a sense of equality and belonging even as inequality attached to difference remains unchanged. Although Nowicka's analysis on courtesy refers to generic manners performed by

Changez's attentiveness is his way of caring for Erica to shape a mutual affection and sense of belonging. Erica, however, labels his care as politeness, generating a psychological distance between them that does not meet Changez's expectations for intimacy: "'I don't think,' she said finally, 'I've ever met someone our age as polite as you.…Not *boring* polite. Respectful polite. You give people their space'" (*RF* 25). Erica associates Changez with "polite" and "kind" as a mark of his difference, compared to the common "American undercurrent of condescension" (*RF* 55). Further, she consumes Changez's care by translating it as service, which hinders reciprocal care. Changez is willing to change to adapt to a new relationship (assuming the role of Chris) whereas Erica is not. In effect, Erica feels at ease with Changez because she assumes that he does not demand her to change. Erica's self-preservation, in contrast to Changez's self-enforced assimilation, designates a power inequality in their relationship. This asymmetry gains little recognition by Erica as Changez represses his unease, enabling the relationship to continue through the silencing of his discomfort: "words had abandoned me. Instead, my thoughts were engaged in a struggle to maintain a facial expression that would not appear idiotic" (*RF* 25). In other words, Erica calling Changez polite not only identifies his functioning role but also reinforces the normative expectation of conviviality that maintains the (asymmetrical) status quo of their relationship.

(white) people, her view further suggests how politeness may also become a normative expectation for certain differentiated people to maintain conviviality.

For a stranger like Changez, the reason he accommodates the expected roles is to secure his right to coexistence and to maintain relationships both personal and, metaphorically, geopolitical. Yet his care for Jim and Erica results in the appropriation of his difference; conversely, his care for fellow Muslim subjects threatens his stay in the United States. This impasse is the structurally-imposed violence that presents the adjunct stranger only two options (i.e., loyalty for one country over the other) under conditional living. Further, the contemporary situation in America makes him stuck living under erasure: "Living in New York was suddenly like living in a film about the Second World War; I, a foreigner, found myself staring out at a set that…in grainy black and white.…I felt treacherous for wondering whether that era was fictitious, and whether…it contained a part written for someone like me" (*RF* 115). Changez's presence as an adjunct stranger is exemplified in the metaphor that he is a part of the set (American society) but not quite part of the story. Changez, in this backdrop of nationwide exclusion, wants to hold onto caring relations. Yet Erica terminates the possibility of his maintenance care by vanishing. And Changez is fired when he is no longer "Jim's fair-haired boy" after the termination of the Chile project (*RF* 95). Overall, Chagnez resolves an adjunct subject's existential dilemma by going back to Pakistan: "I had returned to Pakistan, but my inhabitation of your country had not entirely ceased, I remained emotionally entwined with Erica"; "[I]t is not always possible to restore one's boundaries after they have been blurred and made permeable by a relationship: try as we might, we cannot reconstitute ourselves as the autonomous beings we previously imagined ourselves to be" (*RF* 172, 173-74). Changez's account of his emotional entanglement with (Am)Erica, even though

he is in Pakistan, leaves room for a cosmopolitan relationship based on interdependence. By way of conclusion, I next address what may or may not be possible for an alternative planetary conviviality exemplified in Ondaatje's and Hamid's ambivalent, open endings.

Care Cognizant of Difference

As discussed throughout this chapter, the return to their home countries of Kirpal and Changez evinces the exclusionary and violent tendencies of Western cosmopolitanism. Interestingly, however, both *The English Patient* and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* depict enduring ties with cosmopolitanism even after the two characters return to India and Pakistan. Ondaatje and Hamid stress the memories that both Kirpal and Changez share with the people they care about; the memories enable their emotional connection to the West even at a distance. Each novel's aesthetic emphasis on the present narrative moment draws attention to an ethical responsibility for envisaging cosmopolitanism by rejecting the Western, monistic version of coexistence. It cannot be denied that the return of Kirpal and Changez reclaims their agency without the subjugation of difference. But what comes after the reclamation of agency is a question presented not only to the characters in the novels but also to readers. Both novels' ambivalent endings leave room for imagining the possibility of alternative conviviality.

Ondaatje's ending presents Kirpal's disconnection from Western values and the reconstitution of his quotidian life in India. Kirpal's refusal of the Western way of life is evidenced through him becoming a doctor—following his family tradition—as well as his feeling at ease with the people who share cultural and ethnic similarity with him.

Concurrently, Ondaatje describes the impossibility of total disconnection from Kirpal's memories shaped in the West, especially with Hana. Kirpal's reluctance to respond to Hana's letters, as well as his reflections upon her, exemplify such difficulty of disconnection: "He sees her always, her face and body"; "*Now* there are these urges to talk with her *during a meal*" (EP 300, 301, emphasis added). It should be noted that Kirpal misses having meals together (i.e., Latin *conviva*), which makes him desire to talk with Hana. Thereby the evening meal scene at the very end of the novel presents an imaginative connection between Kirpal and Hana: "And so Hana moves and her face turns and in a regret she lowers her hair. Her shoulder touches the edge of a cupboard and a glass dislodges. Kirpal's left hand swoops down and catches the dropped fork an inch from the floor and gently passes it into the fingers of his daughter" (*EP* 301-2). Ondaatje joins two separate sequences to show the parallel continuity of one action to another. The first sequence occurs in India. During the meal, Kirpal watches his daughter struggling with her cutlery, which she drops from her hand; this action is paralleled with Hana dropping a glass, which occurred in Canada. The two separate locations and actions are enigmatically connected by Kirpal's gestures of swooping down and catching the dropped object. This cosmopolitan connection is made available by imagination and care. The ending of *The English Patient* does not offer a full reconciliation between Kirpal and Hana; yet the fragmentary and ambiguous visual connection between them provokes readers' poetic response to cosmopolitan relationality. The ending echoes what Changez claims: "it's not always possible to

restore one's boundaries after they have been blurred and made permeable by a relationship."

Hamid's ambiguous ending demands an even more active engagement of cosmopolitan envisioning, activated by Changez's hospitality toward an American agent and his resistance against American financial imperialism. As soon as Changez returns to Pakistan, he becomes a university lecturer who advocates for Pakistan's independence in its economic and international affairs by disengaging from the United States. This standing position labels him as an anti-American; the American stranger visits Lahore possibly to interrogate whether Changez is a terrorist or not. For Changez, his hospitality is to persuade the American stranger that he "should not imagine that…Pakistanis are all potential terrorists, just as we should not imagine that you Americans are all under-cover assassins" (*RF* 183). Because of the two contradictory aims (one is to confirm Changez's terrorist identity, the other is to deconstruct such an image), an undercurrent of tension inheres in their interactions. The seeming convivial sharing of a cup of tea and dinner seems to dissolve a mutual suspicion, but there is something menacing in Changez's hospitality that includes a "carnivorous feast" and "predatory delicacy." The aggressive but still hospitable gesture towards the American stranger not only points to Changez's resistance against America's domination by reversing the host role, but also initiates a conversation between the two.

Changez's hospitality seems violent in its stern refusal of America's care that structurally consolidates Pakistan's economic dependency while gaining ethical superiority and military stretch. Changez refuses the United States' putative

cosmopolitan care that assumes that Pakistanis are "always burdened by debt, dependent on foreign aid and handouts," since such an assumption reproduces an American version of political and economic assimilation and representational violence (*RF* 101). The seeming one-sidedness of Changez's hospitality strategically doubles the American sense of care that is not cognizant of difference. Changez's knowledge of both Pakistani and American sides, however, acknowledges such difference, for he knows that his own playing to assumed suspicions makes the American stranger feel (un)ease. The intentional bestowing of uneasiness to the stranger is rather a stylized objection against how America disrupts the lives of others by inflicting "death so readily upon the inhabitants of other countries, [and] frighten[ing] so many people so far away" (*RF* 182). America's security and cosmopolitan care come only after it exercises such violence. Hence, however aggressive it may be, Changez's hospitality does not aim to induce violence. He, as a "believer in non-violence" (*RF* 181), exposes himself to risk (the risk of being interrogated and even killed) and exchanges conviviality. Judith Butler in *The Force of Non-Violence* (2020) argues that "nonviolent forms of resistance can and must be aggressively pursued" to block violence (21). From this perspective, the final sentence of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*—"Given that you and I are now bound by a certain shared intimacy, I trust it is from the holder of your business cards" (*RF* 184)—appeals to readers' belief that it is now the decision of the audience of Changez's storytelling whether to further continue violence or initiate a non-violent cosmopolitan relationship.

CODA:

THE GLOBAL PANDEMIC CRISIS AND CONVIVIALITY

In the global pandemic crisis, structural problems have become increasingly visible within the seemingly convivial (i.e., free, multicultural, and diverse) society in which we are gathered to fight a common threat of illness. In that society, the accumulated problems—racism, xenophobia, the exploitation of an essential but disposable labor system, and the crisis of both medical and educational care, to name a few—intersect to demand differential levels of care. The problems I address in this dissertation seem disparate, but they have intersectional impacts to vulnerable subjects in every society, including immigrant minorities and indentured laborers. Since the pandemic's spread in early 2020, for example, Asian and Asian diasporic people in the U.S. and elsewhere have been experiencing increased violence, blamed for spreading the virus worldwide. Yet this population simultaneously provides essential care-labor and maintains society at the risk of their lives and health. The irony of becoming both a source of fear (and thus justification for hatred) and also being labeled "essential" magnifies notable Asian stereotypes—"yellow peril" and "model minority"—which stem from the preconceived assumptions about Asian values. The Atlanta shootings that occurred in March 2021, targeting women of Asian descent, made more visible the violence in expectations of care from diasporic Asian workers. *Convivial Violence* dispels these insidious intersectional matrices of mythic knowledge-making, and the structural violence attendant on those myths, by analyzing different voices from across Asia represented in contemporary transnational literature. The different voices included

here point to the material and affective conditions that make the practices of care complicit in or disruptive to the dominant mode of living together, attesting to repair and alter the world into a more inclusive and cognizant world of difference.

Throughout this project, I claim that conviviality demands care in exchange for living together. Yet, as I illustrate through the example of *Parasite* in the Introduction, an individual's care should be invisible to make the society a seamless entity, thereby making the dominant individual or culture feel at ease without thinking about the invisible labor responsible for that ease. Making care invisible is the means through which the dominant can believe in the complete independence of an individual, impervious to the very care and labor provided by the community and the nation-state, care that supports that seeming independence, progress, and conviviality. *Convivial Violence* addresses minoritized subjects' feelings of pressure in the practices of performing conviviality, making a case for how imperceptible and everyday forms of violation pervade the moral expectation of care and alignment towards conviviality. As I mentioned above, structural problems are increasingly visible during the pandemic crisis because the dominant becomes more outspoken when their normal life of ease gets unstable. Disrupting conviviality—just like Mr. Park and other rich people inflicting and avoiding violent crime at the party in *Parasite*—racism and xenophobia emerge to draw the line of who is considered protectable or allowed to be "equal" and who should be out the door, as I also demonstrated in my last chapter.

Published during the pandemic, Cathy Park Hong's memoir *Minor Feelings: An Asian American Reckoning* (2020) was timely, describing minor feelings as an

accumulated, mundane form of racialized non-cathartic emotions that constitute Asians' ontological status in America. Minor feelings, Hong states, are "the racialized range of emotions that are negative, dysphoric, and therefore untelegenic, built from the sediments of everyday racial experience and the irritant of having one's perception of reality constantly questioned or dismissed" (55). While Hong articulates irritants, which produce melancholic feelings in Asians living in America wherein the society constantly reminds them of their place, I view the minor feelings as demonstrating the experiences of conditional living of minoritized and otherized subjects. *Convivial Violence* centralizes marginalized subjects' feelings of regret, identity quandary, abjection, and alienation as the reactions to inequity in conviviality and their negotiations to produce both belonging and world-making.

Hence, each of this dissertation's chapters uncovers culturally and historically silenced subjects who are excluded from the putative notion of familial to societal conviviality. Chapter Two articulates how classed and gendered care alienates care providers from their pursuance of larger, anticipated conviviality as well as how their care can be violent to themselves and other minoritized subjects. *The Remains of the Day* and *The Vegetarian* demonstrate the normative social control embedded in the duty to care and how such care upholds inequity in the societal vision of a convivial future. Chapter Three scrutinizes the violent history of transnational Korean adoptees whose diaspora results from U.S. militarism and Korea's postcolonial repercussions. The juxtaposition of Ozeki's *My Year of Meats* and Liem's *Geographies of Kinship* reveals two care ethics: in Korea, an ethic of abandonment is encouraged, considered as a

greater good for the adoptee and societal conviviality; in the U.S., white people's care is expressed as humanitarian aid and colorblind love which obscure the root conditions (militarism; geopolitical and economic imbalance) that allow them to adopt Korean kids. The four Korean adult adoptees in Liem's film refuse to see either ethic as actual care, stating that these forms of care mask the exploitation of adoptees as objects of economic development (Korea) and as tokens of multicultural coexistence (America).

Chapters Two and Three explore the violent intersection of care and conviviality working in the domestic household and (un)doing family. The final two chapters broaden the scope of care beyond the family. Chapter Four examines diasporic queer Filipino caregivers in Israel and hijras in India to consider how they create belonging in the face of state-sanctioned discrimination and exclusion. Queer subjects in *Paper Dolls* and *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* form an alternative kinship, which mimics and challenges the existing heterosexual family institutions. In this respect, queer subjects' care can also follow the normative expectations that maintain the dominant social norms and regulations, which bind the subjects into normativity. However, both baklas and hijras desire a radical queer community and demonstrate how their care can be contingent and politically disruptive against the imposition of homogenized norms and ideals. Chapter Five compares *The English Patient* and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* to explore cosmopolitan forms of care for planetary living. I focus on an Indian Sikh sapper who served to remove bombs in Italy during the Second World War and a Pakistani Muslim who sought the American Dream before 9/11; I explore why they both repudiate the West. In that chapter, I argue that conviviality in the Euro-American-centric

cosmopolitan vision generates the subject of marginalized strangers understood as living in peace and unity within a diverse community while dismissing the care they perform to make cosmopolitan living possible. Both novels' endings, and how they show the possibility of potential hospitality, enables us to rethink cosmopolitan care for planetary conviviality.

To conclude, this dissertation contributes to ethical theory across disciplines by foregrounding quandaries that stem from conviviality in care relations. In my explorations of contemporary transnational literature, the values and practices of care unintentionally generate violations demanding the cost of emotional, psychic, and physical predicaments. These various responses to care as violence, while living in ever-increasing global interdependence, complicate our understanding of care as value and practice. Ultimately, *Convivial Violence* aims to advocate literature's ability to envision multiplicity of the marginalized peoples and their everyday struggles to care for global conviviality, and to intercede in the discourse of feminist ethics of care by addressing the violence involved in under-recognized care practices.

WORKS CITED

Ahlin, Lena. "Nostalgia, Motherhood, and Adoption: Two Contemporary Swedish Examples." *Humanities*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2019, pp. 1–11.

Ahmad, Aijaz, "The Politics of Literary Postcoloniality." *Race & Class*, vol. 36, no. 3, 1995, pp. 1–20.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion.* Routledge, 2014.

———. *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. Routledge, 2000.

———. *The Promise of Happiness*. Duke UP, 2010.

Alarcon, Norma. "Conjugating Subjects in the Age of Multiculturalism." *Mapping Multiculturalism,* edited by Avery F. Gordon and Christopher Newfield, U of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 127–48.

Andrews, Malcome Y. "Laughter and Conviviality." *Victorian Comedy and Laughter: Conviviality, Jokes and Dissent*, edited by Louise Lee, Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, pp. 37–47.

Averbukh, Lidia. "Foreign Workers in Israel: How Ethno-Nationalism Prevents Structures of Representation." *Momentum Quarterly—Journal for Societal Progress*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2016, pp. 88–96.

Baraitser, Lisa. *Enduring Time*. Bloomsbury, 2017.

Berlant, Lauren. *Cruel Optimism*. Duke UP, 2011.

———. “Uncle Sam Needs a Wife: Citizenship and Denegation.” *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, edited by Russ Castronovo and Dana D. Nelson, Duke UP, 2002, pp. 144-174.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.

———. “Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism.” *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities*, edited by Laura Garcia-Moreno and Peter C. Pfeiffer, Camden House, 1996, pp. 191–208.

Black, Shameem. “Fertile Cosmofeminism: Ruth L. Ozeki and Transnational Reproduction.” *Meridians*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2004, pp. 226–56.

———. *Fiction Across Borders: Imagining the Lives of Others in Late Twentieth-Century Novels*. Columbia UP, 2010.

Boisvert, Raymond D. “Convivialism: A Philosophical Manifesto.” *The Pluralist*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2010, pp. 57–68.

Brian, Kristi. *Reframing Transracial Adoption: Adopted Koreans, White Parents, and the Politics of Kinship*. Temple UP, 2012.

Briggs, Laura. “Mother, Child, Race, Nation: The Visual Iconography of Rescue and the Politics of Transnational and Transracial Adoption.” *Gender & History*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2003, pp. 179–200.

Bufacchi, Vittorio. *Violence and Social Justice*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex.”* Routledge, 1993.

———. *The Force of Non-Violence: An Ethico-Political Bind*. Verso, 2020.

———. “Is Kinship Always Already Heterosexual?” *differences*, vol. 13, no 1, 2002, pp. 14–44.

———. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. Verso, 2004.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton UP, 2000.

Chatzidakis, Andreas, et al. *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence*. Verso, 2020.

Cheah, Pheng. *What Is a World? On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature.* Duke UP, 2016.

Cheng, Anne Anlin. “Memory and Anti-Documentary Desire in Theresa Hak Kyung Cha’s *Dictée*.” *MELUS*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1998, pp. 119–33.

Cho, Grace M. *Haunting the Korean Diaspora: Shame, Secrecy, and the Forgotten War*. U of Minnesota P, 2008.

Chow, Rey. *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Columbia UP, 2002.

Clifford, James. “Travelling Cultures.” *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler, Routledge, 1992, pp. 96–116.

Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Routledge, 2000.

Costa, Sérgio. “The Neglected Nexus between Conviviality and Inequality.” *Novos estudos*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2019, pp. 15–32.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1241–99.

Derrida, Jacques. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Translated by Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes, Routledge, 2001.

———. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Johns Hopkins UP, 1997.

———. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass. U of Chicago P, 1978.

Duggan, Lisa. “The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism.” *Materializing Democracy*, edited by Russ Castronovo and Dana Nelson, Duke UP, 2002, pp. 175–94.

Duncan, Patti. “Genealogies of Unbelonging: Amerasians and Transnational Adoptees as Legacies of U.S. Militarism in South Korea.” *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho, U of Minnesota P, 2010, pp. 277–308.

Eide, Marian. *Terrible Beauty: The Violent Aesthetic and Twentieth-Century Literature.* U of Virginia P, 2019.

Eng, David L. *The Feeling of Kinship*: *Queer Liberalism and the Racialization of Intimacy*. Duke UP, 2010.

Enloe, Cynthia. *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. U of California P, 2004.

Folbre, Nancy. *Greed, Lust & Gender: A History of Economic Ideas.* Oxford UP, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. *The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of The History of Sexuality*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1988.

Francisco-Menchavez, Valerie. *The Labor of Care: Filipina Migrants and Transnational Families in the Digital Age*. U of Illinois P, 2018.

Freundlich, Madelyn. *Adoption and Ethics: The Market Forces in Adoption*. Child Welfare League of America, 2000.

Gampel, Benjamin R. "Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Medieval Iberia: *Convivencia* through the Eyes of Sephardic Jews." *Convivencia: Jews, Muslims, and Christians in Medieval Spain*, edited by Vivian B. Mann et al., George Braziller in association with The Jewish Museum, 1992, pp. 11–37.

Geographies of Kinship. Directed by Deann Borshay Liem. Mu Films, 2019.

Ghanem, As'ad, et al. "Questioning 'Ethnic Democracy': A Response to Sammy Smooha." *Israel Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1998, pp. 253–67.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.* Harvard UP, 1982.

Gilroy, Paul. "Multiculture in Times of War: An Inaugural Lecture given at the London School of Economics." *Critical Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2006, pp. 27–45.

———. *Postcolonial Melancholia.* Columbia UP, 2005.

Giroux, Henry A., and Brad Evans. *Disposable Futures: The Seduction of Violence in the Age of Spectacle*. City Lights, 2015.

Glick, Thomas F. “Convivencia: An Introductory Note.” in *Convivencia: Jews, Muslims, and Christians in Medieval Spain*, edited by Vivian B. Mann et al., George Braziller in association with The Jewish Museum, 1992, pp. 1–9.

Goodwin, Godfrey. *The Janissaries*. Saqui, 1994.

Gopinath, Gayatri. “Archive, Affect, and the Everyday: Queer Diasporic Re-Visions.” *Political Emotions: New Agendas in Communication*, edited by Janet Staiger, et al., Routledge, 2010. pp. 165–92.

———. *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures*. Duke UP, 2005.

Graves, Kori A. *A War Born Family: African American Adoption in the Wake of the Korean War*. New York UP, 2020.

Gutierrez-Rodriguez, Encarnacion. *Migration, Domestic Work and Affect: A Decolonial Approach on Value and the Feminization of Labor*. Routledge, 2010.

Hall, Kira. “‘Go Suck Your Husband’s Sugarcane!’ Hijras and the Use of Sexual Insult.” *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*, edited by Anna Livia and Kira Hall, Oxford UP, 1997, pp. 430–60.

Hall, Stuart. “When was ‘The Post-Colonial’? Thinking at the Limit.” *The Post-colonial Question: Common Skies and Divided Horizons*. edited by Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti, Routledge, 1995, pp. 242–60.

Hamid, Mohsin. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. Harcourt, 2007.

Han, Ju Hui Judy and Jennifer Jihye Chun. “Introduction: Gender and Politics in Contemporary Korea.” *The Journal of Korean Studies*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2014, pp. 245–55.

Han Kang. *채식주의자* (Chaesikjuuija). Chang-bi, 2007.

———. *The Vegetarian*. Translated by Deborah Smith, Hogarth, 2015.

Hemer, Oscar, et al. “Conviviality Vis-a-Vis Cosmopolitanism and Creolisation: Probing the Concepts.” *Conviviality at the Crossroads: The Poetics and Politics of Everyday Encounters*, edited by Oscar Hemer, et al., Palgrave, 2020, pp. 1–14.

Heymann, Tomer, director. *Paper Dolls*. Claudia Films, 2006.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. “Global Care Chains and Emotional Surplus Value.” *Justice, Politics, and the Family*, edited by Daniel Engster and Tamara Metz, Routledge, 2013, pp. 130–46.

Hong, Cathy Park. *Minor Feelings: An Asian American Reckoning*. One World, 2020.

Illich, Ivan. *Tools for Conviviality*. Harper & Row, 1973.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *The Remains of the Day*. L&OD, 1989.

Jay, Paul. *Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies*. Cornell UP, 2010.

Johansen, Emily. “The Banal Conviviality of Neoliberal Cosmopolitanism.” *Neoliberalism and the Novel*, edited by Emily Johansen and Alissa Karl, Routledge, 2017, pp. 95–114.

Kant, Immanuel. *Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings on Politics, Peace, and History*. Edited by Pauline Kleingeld, translated by David L. Colclasure, Yale UP, 2006.

Kaplan, Caren. *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement.* Duke UP, 1996.

Kim, Eleana. *Adopted Territory: Transnational Korean Adoptees and the Politics of Belonging*. Duke UP, 2010.

Kim, Eunjung. *Curative Violence: Rehabilitating Disability, Gender, and Sexuality in Modern Korea*. Duke UP, 2017.

Kim, Hosu. *Birth Mothers and Transnational Adoption Practice in South Korea: Virtual Mothering*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Kim, Jodi. *Ends of Empire: Asian American Critiques and the Cold War*. U of Minnesota P, 2010.

Kim, Sungmoon. "Beyond Liberal Civil Society: Confucian Familism and Relational Strangership." *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2010. 476–98.

Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*. U of California P, 2003.

Kopacz, Elizabeth. "From Contingent Beginnings to Multiple Ends: DNA Technologies and the Korean Adoptee 'Cousin'." *Adoption & Culture*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2018, pp. 336–52.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Columbia UP, 1982.

Lapiņa, Linda. “Besides Conviviality: Paradoxes in being ‘at ease’ with diversity in a Copenhagen district.” *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2016, pp. 33–41.

Lee, Jin-kyung. “Surrogate Military, Subimperialism, and Masculinity: South Korea in the Vietnam War, 1965-73.” *Positions*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2009, pp. 655–82.

Lee, Krys. “Violence and Being Human: A Conversation with Han Kang.” *World Literature Today*, vol. 90, no. 3/4, 2016, pp. 62–66.

Lee, Kun Jong. “The Black Amerasian Experience in Korea: Representations of Black Amerasians in Korean and Korean American Narrative.” *Korea Journal*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2015, pp. 7–30.

Lee, Na Young. “The Construction of U.S. Camptown Prostitution in South Korea: Trans/Formation and Resistance.” 2006. U of Maryland, College Park, PhD dissertation.

Levy, Traci M. “Families as Relationships of Intimacy and Care.” *Justice, Politics, and the Family*, edited by Daniel Engster and Tamara Metz, Routledge, 2013, pp. 42–58.

Lionnet, Francoise, and Shu-Mei Shih. “Introduction: Thinking through the Minor, Transnationally.” *Minor Transnationalism*, edited by Francoise Lionnet and Shu-Mei Shih, Duke UP, 2005, pp. 1–26.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics.* Duke UP, 1996.

Lu, Catherine. “One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism.” *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2000, pp. 244–67.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Different: Phrases in Dispute*. Translated by Georges Van Den Abbeele, U of Minnesota P, 1998.

Maciniuc, Cornelia. "Normalising the Anorexic Body. Violence and Madness in *The Vegetarian*, by Han Kang." *Meridian Critic*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2017, pp. 103–17.

Manalansan, Martin F. *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora.* Duke UP, 2003.

———. "Queering the Chain of Care Paradigm." *The Scholar and Feminist Online*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2008. sfonline.barnard.edu/immigration/manalansan_01.htm.

———. "Queer Intersections: Sexuality and Gender in Migration Studies." *IMR*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2006, pp. 224–49.

Marcus, Amit. "Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*: The Discourse of Self-Deception." *Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2006, pp. 129–50.

McKee, Kimberly D. *Disrupting Kinship: Transnational Politics of Korean Adoption in the United States*, U of Illinois P, 2019.

Mignolo, Walter D. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-Polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." *Public Culture*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2000, pp. 721–48.

Miller, Sarah Clark. "Cosmopolitan Care." *Ethics and Social Welfare*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2010, pp. 145–57.

Moon, Katharine H.S. *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations*. Columbia UP, 1997.

Moon, Seungsook. *Militarized Modernity and Gendered Citizenship in South Korea*. Duke UP, 2005.

———. "The Production and Subversion of Hegemonic Masculinity: Reconfiguring Gender Hierarchy in Contemporary South Korea." *Under Construction: The Gendering of Modernity, Class, and Consumption in the Republic of Korea*, edited by Laurel Kendall, U of Hawai'i P, 2002, pp. 79–113.

Munoz, Jose Esteban. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. U of Minnesota P, 1999.

Myers, Kit W. "'Real' Families: The Violence of Love in New Media Adoption Discourse." *Critical Discourse Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2014, pp. 175–93.

Nanda, Serena. *Neither Man nor Woman: The Hijras of India*. Wadsworth, 1999.

Newman, Ian. *The Romantic Tavern: Literature and Conviviality in the Age of Revolution*. Cambridge UP, 2019.

Nicholason, Linda J. "Women, Morality, and History." *An Ethic of Care: Feminist and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Mary Jeanne Larrabee, Routledge, 1993, pp. 87–101.

Nixon, Rob. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard UP, 2011.

Nobre, Marcos, and Sérgio Costa. "#4: Politics of Conviviality." Mecila: Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America, https://mecila.net/es/.

Nowicka, Magdalena. "Fantasy of Conviviality: Banalities of Multicultural Settings and What We Do (Not) Notice When We Look at Them." *Conviviality at the*

Crossroads: The Poetics and Politics of Everyday Encounters, edited by Oscar Hemer, et al., Palgrave, 2020, pp. 15-42.

Nowicka, Magdalena, and Steven Vertovec. "Comparing Convivialities: Dreams and Realities of Living-with-Difference." *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2014, pp. 341–56.

Oh, Arissa. *To Save the Children of Korea*. Stanford UP, 2015.

Oksala, Johanna. "Affective Labor and Feminist Politics." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2016, pp. 281–303.

Ondaatje, Michael. *The English Patient*. Vintage, 1992.

Ozeki, Ruth L. "A Conversation with Ruth Ozeki." *My Year of Meats*. Penguin, 1998, pp. 6–14.

———. *My Year of Meats*. Penguin, 1998.

Palumbo-Liu, David. "Rational and Irrational Choices." *Minor Transnationalism*, edited by Francoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih, Duke UP, 2005, pp. 41–72.

Pandey, Gyanendra. *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*. Cambridge UP, 2001.

———. *Routine Violence: Nations, Fragments, Histories.* Stanford UP, 2006.

Parasite. Directed by Bong Joon Ho, Universal Pictures, 2020.

Park, Jeong-Mi. "Liberation or Purification? Prostitution, Women's Movement and Nation Building in South Korea under US Military Occupation, 1945-1948." *Sexualities*, vol. 22, no. 7-8, 2019, pp. 1053–70.

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. *Servants of Globalization: Migration and Domestic Work.* Stanford UP, 2015.

Pate, Soojin. *From Orphan to Adoptee: U.S. Empire and Genealogies of Korean Adoption.* U of Minnesota P, 2014.

Phelan, James, and Mary Patricia Martin. "The Lessons of 'Weymouth': Homodiegesis, Unreliability, Ethics, and *The Remains of the Day*." *Narratologies*, edited by David Herman, Ohio State UP, 1999, pp. 88–109.

Pratt, Geraldine, and Victoria Rosner. "Introduction." *The Global and the Intimate: Feminism in Our Time*, edited by Geraldine Pratt and Victoria Rosner, Columbia UP, 2012. pp. 1–27.

Reddy, Chandan. *Freedom with Violence: Race, Sexuality, and the US State.* Duke UP, 2011.

Reddy, Gayatri. *With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identity in South India*. U of Chicago P, 2005.

Robinson, Fiona. *Globalizing Care: Ethics, Feminist Theory, and International Relations*. Westview Press, 1999

Roseneil, Sasha, and Shelley Budgeon, "Cultures of Intimacy and Care Beyond 'the family': Personal Life and Social Change in the Early 21st Century." *Current Sociology*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2004, pp. 135–59.

Rottenberg, Catherine. "Neoliberal Feminism and the Future of Human Capital." *Signs*, vol. 42, no 2, 2017, pp. 329–48.

Roy, Arundhati. *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. Knopf, 2017.

Ruddick, Sara. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace.* Ballantine, 1990.

Rzepnikowska, Alina. *Convivial Cultures in Multicultural Cities: Polish Migrant Women in Manchester and Barcelona*. Routledge, 2020.

Sen, Satadru. "Fascism without Fascists? A Comparative Look at Hindutva and Zionism." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 38, no. 4, 2015, pp. 690–711.

Serquina, Oscar Tantoco. "Out and About: Migrant Bakla, Perverse Intimacies, and the Musical of Migration in Liza Magtoto's Care Divas." *Kritika Kultura*, vol. 27, 2016, pp. 199–248.

Shapiro, Janet. "Ethically Informed Practice with Families Formed via International Adoption: Linking Care Ethics with Narrative Approaches to Social Welfare Practice." *Ethics & Social Welfare*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2012, pp. 333–50.

Smith, Zadie. "Fascinated to Presume: In Defense of Fiction." *The New York Review of Books,* 24 Oct. 2019. www.nybooks.com/articles/2019/10/24/zadie-smith-in-defense-of-fiction/.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. Methuen, 1987.

Stein, Rebecca L. "Explosive: Scenes from Israel's Gay Occupation." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2010, pp. 517–36.

Stewart, Kathleen. *Ordinary Affects.* Duke UP, 2007.

Stobie, Caitlin E. “The Good Wife? Sibling Species in Han Kang’s *The Vegetarian*.” *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2017, pp. 787–802.

Terestchenko, Michel. “Servility and Destructiveness in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day*.” *Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2007, pp. 77–89.

Trenka, Jane Jeong. *Fugitive Visions: An Adoptee’s Return to Korea*. Craywolf, 2009.

Tronto, Joan. “Beyond Gender Difference to a Theory of Care.” *An Ethic of Care*, edited by Mary Jeanne Larrabee, Routledge, 1993, pp. 240–57.

———. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. Routledge, 1993.

Walker, Margaret Urban. *Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations after Wrongdoing*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Weston, Kath. *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*. Columbia UP, 1991.

Wise, Amanda. “Convivial Labour and the ‘Joking Relationship’: Humour and Everyday Multiculturalism at Work.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2016, pp. 481–500.

Wise, Amanda, and Greg Noble. “Convivialities: An Orientation.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2016, pp. 423–31.

Wise, Amanda, and Selvaraj Velayutham. “Introduction: Multiculturalism and Everyday Life.” *Everyday Multiculturalism*, edited by Amanda Wise and Selvaraj Velayutham, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 1–17.

Woodward, Kathleen. “A Public Secret: Assisted Living, Caregivers, Globalization.” *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2012, pp. 17–51.

Yngvesson, Barbara. “Placing the ‘Gift Child’ in Transnational Adoption.” *Law & Society Review*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2002, pp. 227–56.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Violence.* Profile Books, 2008.