

Asian American Religions in a Globalized World

Sylvia Chan-Malik and Khyati Y. Joshi

The United States is a religious nation. Social scientific tracking for the past sixty years has continually proven the secularization thesis wrong: Not only have religion and the sacred not disappeared—a notion advanced since the Great Awakening—but in an age of deindustrialization and war, the number of individuals associated with religion and the sacred have continually increased.¹ Even those who claim not to explicitly “belong” to any particular religion or denomination have some sort of faith; according to a 2012 Pew Survey, of the one-fifth of Americans who check “none” on surveys in regards to religious preference, 70% say they believe in God or a universal spirit, while 37% describe themselves as “spiritual but not religious.”² Indeed, such an ongoing, perhaps increasing, prevalence of religion has led to pronouncements of a “post-secular” age in the post-9/11 era, both in the U.S. and Europe, specifically in the ways religious communities exert influence in and upon the putatively secularized environments of the West.³ At the same time, despite the ubiquity of the myth that we are in a post-racial moment in both political and cultural discourse, the United States remains, inexorably, as Toni Morrison once wrote, a “wholly racialized society.”⁴ Race remains a central determinant of where we live, whom we trust, what we do, and how we believe.

It would seem, then, that the study of race and religion would go hand in hand, especially in fields like Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies. Yet while three decades of intersectionality theory have led scholars across the social sciences and humanities to be attentive to the junctures of race, class, gender,

SYLVIA CHAN-MALIK is Assistant Professor of American Studies and Women’s and Gender Studies at Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

KHYATI Y. JOSHI is Associate Professor of Education at Fairleigh Dickinson University.

sexuality, and nation, encounters between race and religion remain consistently underexamined and under-theorized. This is partially the result of disciplinary boundaries, but it also reflects an ongoing inability—and at times, the unwillingness—of many in Ethnic Studies fields to acknowledge the salience of religion, and vice versa, for those in Religious Studies to recognize the importance of race. While the reasons for these evasions—some of which will be detailed here—are varied and shifting, the lack of engagement between race and religion has created increasingly evident blind spots not only within Ethnic Studies and Religious Studies fields, but beyond academia as well, regarding, for example, issues of civic and political participation, social justice activism, and the emergence and evolution of new subjectivities and identities in our contemporary age.

In this special issue of *Amerasia Journal*, “Asian American Religions in a Globalized World,” we explore the engagements between race and religion upon, across, and through the dynamic and heterogeneous terrains of Asian America. The essays gathered here demonstrate how religion and the sacred constitute central logics and networks through which Asian Americans have created (and continue to create) local, national, and transnational modes of racial-religious belonging, which then, in turn, influence *how they operate* as racialized subjects within the U.S. To paraphrase the late Stuart Hall, we contend that religion is a modality through which race and racism are understood and lived, while race is a modality which deeply influences one’s encounters and engagements with religion and the sacred.⁵ Taken together, the works in this special issue reveal how a critical discourse around race and religion facilitates robust insights into processes of subject, community, cultural, and political formation. We hope these insights will instigate conversations in and beyond Asian American Studies as to how encounters between race and religion operate upon and in relation to state and cultural power, and the prevalence of neoliberal logics that now define U.S. economic policies and the boundaries of cultural and political citizenship.

While we look forward to more work in these areas, we want to emphasize that there is already a rich scholarly discourse around Asian American religions. One of the central pleasures of developing and editing this issue has been the opportunity to highlight the existing scholarship, and to observe how new scholars have come to engage and build upon this work. Indeed,

much has changed since “Asian American religions” emerged as a field of inquiry in the 1980s and 1990s. In particular, as “Islam” and the “War on Terror” have become common sense terms in the national vocabulary over the course of the last decade. Thus, certain racializing logics have become central to the ways religious communities with ties to South Asia and the Middle East—e.g., the geopolitical regions associated with “terror” in the national imaginary—have come to be seen and see themselves. Yet beyond the subjugation of these communities, we are interested in tracking the vibrant formations of lived religion within Asian American communities both as a result of, and in spite of, the racializing practices of state power. Indeed, it is the vibrancy and variety of religious practices that we view as the unifying thread across the study of Asian American religions.

In what follows, we offer a history of the early scholarship on Asian American religions, followed by a consideration of how the post-9/11 landscape has shifted and expanded the field. We end with some thoughts concerning the future directions of its study and the ways in which the essays here illuminate this path.

History of the Field

In 1996, *Amerasia Journal* published its first special issue dedicated to religion. Entitled “Racial Spirits,” the issue marked a pivotal point in the burgeoning field of Asian American religions.⁶ Three central strands of study contributed to the emergence and development of Asian American religions, as spotlighted in the issue. In the first strand, Asian Americans working and studying at theological schools and seminaries, mainly on the West Coast, began asking questions about how race impacted Asian American Christian organizations, groups, congregations, and people. Many of these scholars and theologians were involved with the Asian American Movement and Third World struggles, and sought to investigate encounters between religion and political activism. Scholars such as Roy Sano and Julia Name, among others, brought a critical consciousness about race to bear on their theological visions, while certain seminaries, such as the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, were among the first places to encourage and facilitate discussions about and around Asian Americans, race, and religion. The second strand developed in the early 1980s and continued through the 1990s. Ethnographic in its approach, this strand was made up of richly descriptive individual case studies on Indian, Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, and Ko-

rean immigrants. Most of the scholars in this strand were not working in or in relation to Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies fields; some took an Area Studies approach to their communities of inquiry and did not engage issues of race and racism. Further, in the early 1990s, Harvard University's Pluralism Project, which focused on Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh communities, began making its mark by mapping Asian American communities across the country.

The third strand consisted of mostly second- or third-generation Asian American scholars across various fields who wanted to study the impact of religion upon Asian American subjectivities, communities, and culture. While aware and interested in the Asian American Movement, many in this strand were not shaped directly by participation in Asian American activism and/or organizing. From varying ethnic, geographic, sexuality, gender, and class backgrounds, this cohort of scholars generated diverse and multiple approaches to the study of Asian American religions, reflective of what Lisa Lowe called the "heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity" of Asian America in the mid-1990s.⁷ In the larger context of the field of Asian American Studies, and, more precisely, in Asian American cultural critique at that time, this heterogeneity brought fresh subjectivities and new objects of inquiry to the field. Yet it also instigated a fair amount of hand wringing about "the state of the field," particularly in regard to the legacies of ethnic nationalism, community activism, and the progressive-radical politics of Third World struggles in the 1960s and 1970s. As Glenn Omatsu noted in his well-known essay "The 'Four Prisons' and the Movements of Liberation," despite a growing interest in Asian American Studies and Asian American identities, "There has not been a corresponding growth in consciousness about what it means to be Asian American." Omatsu encouraged a new generation of Asian Americans to look beyond "individual advancement" and retrain their focus on "the collective liberation of all peoples."⁸

The three strands, with their ambiguities, were reflected in the essays collected in "Racial Spirits," which began with an introduction entitled "Critical Reflections on Asian American Religious Identity." The issue included essays exploring a wide range of topics: Chinese Protestant nationalism in the U.S., Filipino folk spirituality and immigration, Buddhism in the U.S., Sikh *kirpans* (ceremonial swords), and Asian American evangelical college students (by Rudy Busto, who revisits his influential piece, "The

Gospel According to the Model Minority?," in this issue). Those involved with "Racial Spirits" eventually went on to create the Asian Pacific American Religions Research Initiative (APARRI), a group led at the time by Jane Naomi Iwamura and Paul Spickard. Iwamura and Spickard envisioned a scholarly community advancing the interdisciplinary study of Asian Pacific Americans and their religions, as well as an organization that would serve as research incubator and support network for scholars of Asian American religions, particularly those interested in examining the intersections of religion and race. Through conferences, mentoring, and collaboration, APARRI continues to promote the professional development of scholars and the growth of Asian American religions as an area of research and inquiry.

The publication of "Racial Spirits" and subsequent founding of APARRI in 1996 indicated, as already mentioned, the growing number of Asian American scholars working on topics of religion across various disciplines, racial contexts, and ethnic communities, both in university and seminary settings. This growth of interest in the study of Asian American religions occurred within the larger context of the expansion of Asian American Studies as a field, as departments and programs developed and publications increased. By the late 1990s, one could posit that, while far from having complete institutional acceptance or recognition beyond academic settings, Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies were becoming increasingly acceptable and recognizable fields of study.

Yet while these developments were occurring in tandem, aside from APARRI and individual scholars doing work on Asian American religious communities, religion, and religious subjectivities, such research remained largely obscured in Ethnic Studies fields. Painting in broad strokes, one might say that Asian American Studies scholarship and teaching retained Omatsu's approach, utilizing Marxist frameworks and advancing a radical-progressive framework of racial liberation as central to the political project of the field. Within community activism and political engagement, much of the work being done at that time focused around issues of cultural representation and the concerns of an entrepreneurial class, e.g., the glass ceiling. Although there were undoubtedly exceptions, one could posit that both the scholarly discourse and political engagements of Asian Americans during the 1990s were marked by a certain myopia: the approach was either to capitalize upon the "wounded

attachments” of Asian exclusion, internment, and xenophobia in order to advance a radical-progressive politics that did not reflect the broader political desires of an increasingly heterogeneous Asian American community, *or* to engage forms of activism and engagement that only served the needs of middle-upper-class Asian American communities by protecting their relative privilege. Yet despite certain elisions in Asian American Studies regarding religion, new works and publications continued to emerge, such as David Yoo’s *New Spiritual Homes: Religion and Asian Americans* (1999) and three anthologies produced by scholars directly and indirectly involved with APARRI: Pyong Gap Min and Jung Ha Kim’s *Religions in Asian America: Building Faith Communities* (2001), Iwamura and Spickard’s *Revealing the Sacred in Asian America* (2003), and Tony Carnes and Fenggang Yang’s *Asian American Religions: The Making and Remaking of Borders and Boundaries* (2004).

The writing and research contained in these aforementioned publications, mostly begun and/or completed before the millennial turn, reflected the shifting racial and religious landscapes not only of Asian America, but of the nation as a whole. As “multiculturalism” emerged as part and parcel of the nation’s identity at the close of the 1990s, religious communities also increased in size and scope. Asian America witnessed a flourishing of religious institutions and organizations, mostly started by upwardly mobile immigrant communities who brought with them an influx of capital which led to the new construction of churches, temples, and mosques. One might argue that such an influx occurred in the contexts of what Susan Koshy has called “ethnic particularism”: Asian ethnic communities self-segregating into ethnically homogenous, class-based communities, as opposed to—as Asians had done in the past—attempting to assimilate into whiteness.⁹ This shift, Koshy argued, represented the changing face of white supremacy in the multicultural 1990s, and was reflected through new ethnic religious formations across the country: new moneyed enclaves in places like Silicon Valley and Monterey Park in California, Flushing, Queens in New York, Edison and Fort Lee in New Jersey, as well as struggling communities of refugees and migrant workers in urban centers like Minneapolis, New York, and Oakland. Throughout these transitions, transnational and diasporic Asian subjects fostered close ties not just to their national and/or ethnic communities, but to religious communities both at home and abroad.

In scholarship, these new formations fostered growth in the study of Asian American Christian communities, particularly Asian American evangelical congregations and second-generation Asian American evangelicals—both communities which had been steadily increasing over the past fifteen years. Earlier studies had focused on Chinese immigrants and second-generation Chinese Americans alongside the broader rise of Christian evangelicalism in the U.S.¹⁰ From the late 1990s onward, new work on Asian American Christianities has examined complex processes of ethnic formation, identity work, and religious participation in the individual lives of Asian Americans and congregations. A large portion of this body of scholarship observes the growing number of Asian American college students joining evangelical student groups, with many studies exploring the relationship between religiosity and racial identity. While early studies in this area focused on Chinese American students, the topic of Korean American participation in collegiate evangelical organizations now makes up the bulk of this area of scholarship. In addition, one of the central findings in this body of research is how many second-generation Asian American college students find refuge in evangelicalism, in a space where they perceive themselves not to be raced.¹¹

Yet, as with most of the previous work on Asian American religions, research on Asian American Christianity focused on East Asian communities, primarily Chinese and Korean. This coincided with what some considered an East Asian bias in the larger field of Asian American Studies, which was coming under increased scrutiny and debate, as questions of Asian American panethnicity became central to discussions concerning the future of the field. Thus, alongside debates concerning the political orientations of Asian American identities and communities, the close of the 1990s also brought about discussions regarding issues of inclusion *vis-à-vis* the presence of non-East Asians within Asian America, particularly in regards to South and Southeast Asian communities.¹² In addition, postcolonial discourses were now central to the field, and new flows of migration, digital networks, and shifting geopolitical configurations expanded notions of Asian American identity, belonging, and politics. Furthermore, conversations also ensued concerning how to make issues of gender and sexuality more central to the fields, and how scholars might articulate transnationalism and diaspora as critical frames of reference. Amid these multiple fracturings,

many wondered whether Asian American panethnicity was still possible. And would religion further exacerbate such fracturings by placing additional limitations around how “pan-Asian” we could be?

9/11 and Asian American Racialization

Such debates and questions shaped the context in which scholars in Asian American Studies and Asian American religions responded to the attacks of 9/11. In the aftermath of the attacks, there was a renewed political urgency concerning the “racialization” of Muslims, Arabs, and anyone perceived to be Muslim and/or Arab. Suddenly, there was a hypervisibility of Orientalized Muslim bodies, Muslim terrorists, oppressed Muslim women, and Islam as the enemy. Many drew parallels between Muslim, Arab, and South Asian communities and Japanese Americans during World War II, with some calling the increased surveillance and policing of Muslim, Arab, and South Asian communities a type of “virtual internment.”¹³ South Asians and Arab American communities, who had previously been at the margins of Asian American scholarship, suddenly became the central to conversation in the field. In a sense, 9/11 functioned as a revitalization of Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies, as scholars well versed in histories of racialization and Orientalizing frameworks could apply their expertise towards post-9/11 political exigencies.

These exigencies shaped scholarly responses in two specific ways. Firstly, Asian American scholars tended to focus on the racialization of religion in a manner that portrayed Arabs and Muslims, and those perceived as such, as racialized subjects, emphasizing their interpellations through state violence and legal discourses. Thus, for example, when Muslims, Arabs, Sikhs, and South Asians were attacked and targeted for their perceived religious affiliations, their narratives were framed through discourses of empire, Orientalism, and racism. These accounts offered much needed critiques of how the legacies of U.S. imperial power and whiteness shaped national responses to the crisis, and were extremely productive in addressing the political urgencies of the post-9/11 years. Secondly, Muslims, Arab, Sikhs, and South Asians were situated as communities with whom Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies scholars and activists might form political coalitions. Frameworks of “collective liberation”—reminiscent of early paradigms of revolution-

ary struggle—operated alongside discourses of Orientalism and postcolonialism to identify those racialized through the logics of terror as political allies.

Yet as important as these contributions were, they at times enfolded Muslim, Arab, and South Asian communities into the “food group” model of Ethnic Studies, adding Muslims, Arabs, and South Asians into conversations about race as the latest victims of U.S. racism and imperialism. Much of the scholarship on post-9/11 racialization ignored the role of religion and the sacred, in particular with regards to how religious subjectivities constituted a central lens through which many in the aforementioned communities understood and countered racialization and racism. For example, while much work addressed hate crimes directed at Muslims and Sikhs, few scholars actually investigated how such acts of racist violence were addressed within temples and mosques, or how fear of state violence shifted enactments of religious practices, rituals, and belief. Further, there was little investigation into intra-ethnic, inter-religious, and interracial engagements, between African American and South Asian and Arab American Muslims, or between Hindu and Muslim communities in the U.S. In other words, while “religion” became a worthwhile subject of study as a marker of racialization, religion as an expression of faith, an encounter with the sacred, and/or a mode of belonging and embodiment, remained unexplored. Thus, whereas work on the racialization of Islam and Muslims provided much needed data and discourse around the racialization of religion and state power, it at times replicated the objectifying discourse around these communities that it sought to displace.

Despite this underexamination of religious subjectivities, we view the scholarly corpus addressing the racialization of Islam discussed above as a powerful and generative addition to the field of Asian American religions. If anything, such conversations have prompted increasing interest in alternative models and frameworks for antiracist and social justice work, in which religion and faith need not be sidelined, and are at times, as Joseph Cheah discusses in his autobiographical essay in this issue, central to one’s political activism. By situating this corpus within the larger trajectory of the study of Asian American religions, we are hopeful that scholars, theologians, activists, and anyone else interested in the topic will continue the conversations on the lived realities of race and religion—as well as gender, sexuality, class, and citizen-

ship—in order to articulate the new subjectivities and networks that characterize the study of (as the title of this special issue pronounces) “Asian American Religions in a Globalized World.” We contend that in order to truly think about how to mobilize communities for the work of antiracism, on local, regional, national, and transnational scales, it is necessary to examine work on the racialization of religion along with work that explores how meanings are made *within* religious communities. Simply put, we need to situate the role of the sacred in people’s lives in order to engender candid conversations around freedom, justice, and liberation.

Asian American Religions: Present and Future

It is important to note that this issue emerges in a vastly expanded field of scholarly work on Asian American religions, the content and scope of which we would like to momentarily highlight here. While this literature has been extremely varied, we would venture to say that scholars of Asian American religions, over the course of the last two decades, have been in conversation with broader debates around immigration, racial formation, religion, and Asian American identity, culture, and community. Many have investigated the relationships between race, ethnicity, and religion across generational difference—e.g., immigrant, second, and third generations—and shown how dynamic processes of immigration engender negotiations between generations and modifications of religious identity. Such works reveal how these shifts are not only processes accompanying immigration, but the ways in which new religious identities develop when people pass their faith on to future generations. Studies have also shown that religion plays an integral role in community formation, and have employed a “lived religion” analysis to show how religion intersects with race, gender, and class, among other facets of identity. Employing transnational frameworks, scholars have increasingly focused on South Asian Sikh, Muslim, and Hindu religious communities. Issues of gender and the challenges confronting female religious practitioners, scholars, and leaders have also come to the fore of various conversations both within and beyond the academy.¹⁴ Finally, in addition to this scholarly body of work, interest in Asian American religions has also led to organizational and institutional formations. In addition to APARRI, groups such as the Pan-Asian North American Women in Theology and Ministry (PANAAWTM),¹⁵ and the Asian North American Religion,

Culture, and Society Group (ANARCS) support emerging scholarship and theological work on Asian North American religious practices and faith communities.¹⁶

The rich collection of writings that make up this special issue draw from and build on the wide range of work discussed in this introduction. Through the essays featured here, we seek to showcase the vibrancy and diversity of the contemporary scholarship on Asian American religions. Drawn from different disciplines, religious subjectivities, and political orientations, our authors offer analyses that articulate the complexities of faith, spirituality, and religion in Asian America, and the nuanced, yet powerful, ways race and religion operate in both private and public spheres. Section one, entitled “Interracial Religious Intersections,” features pieces that take intersectional approaches in addressing race, ethnicity, and religion. The opening essay, “Reflections on the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life’s *Asian Americans: A Mosaic of Faiths* Data and Report,” provides a backstory to the 2012 Pew Report with some of the Asian American religion scholars who provided data analysis and feedback for the study. Using key points from the report (which included data on Asian American Christians, Buddhists, and Hindus, as well as the religiously unaffiliated), Jane Naomi Iwamura, Sharon Suh, Janelle Wong, and guest editor Khyati Joshi discuss the strengths and weaknesses of Pew’s study, while offering their own critical considerations of the project. In the second piece, “‘A Space for the Spiritual’: A Roundtable on Race, Gender, and Islam in the United States,” guest editor Sylvia Chan-Malik moderates a conversation between three leading female scholars working on issues of race, gender, and Islam in the U.S. Evelyn Al-sultany, Su’ad Abdul Khabeer, and Maryam Kashani address key terms employed in conversations about Islam in America, Islamic feminism in the U.S., and how they attend to intersections of race, gender, and religion in their work. The final essay in section one is Philip Deslippe’s “The Hindu in Hoodoo: Fake Yogis, Pseudo-Swamis, and the Construction of African-American Folk Magic,” which shows how aspects of Hinduism, particularly yoga, became part of African American folk magic in the early part of the twentieth century. Deslippe explores how the engagements between African American occultism and an imagined India in early twentieth century U.S. popular culture highlighted an interesting space for South Asians in the American racial binary.

Section two, titled “Reorienting Christianity,” begins with Rudy Busto revisiting his landmark essay “The Gospel Accord-

ing to the Model Minority?," first published *Amerasia's* "Racial Spirits" issue in 1996. Busto's original argument viewed racial and religious identity (Asian and Christian) in a competitive relationship. Almost two decades later, Busto's ideas have changed as the scholarship on Asian American students joining evangelical college student organizations has skyrocketed, now comprising one of the largest subfields within Asian American religions. Here, Busto reflects upon the complex interplay between the reasons why Asian American students join evangelical organizations, categories of racial and religious identity, and the ways that social scientists and theologians approach these topics. In "Colored Faith: Vietnamese American Catholics Struggle for Equality within Their Multicultural Church," Thien-Huong Ninh highlights the struggles of the Vietnamese American Catholic community in Orange County's Little Saigon, which had long been restricted from forming its own parish while other ethnic groups had been permitted to do so. Ninh's analysis shows that in the context of the official multicultural frameworks employed by the Diocese of Orange County, Vietnamese Catholics have been racialized as a threat. Finally, to close, Joseph Cheah provides personal reflections on being both an Asian American scholar and theologian and how his faith is the reason for his activism.

While we hope the diversity and multiplicity of Asian American religions shines through in these pieces, we also acknowledge certain gaps and omissions in the issue, and hope that they serve as impetus for others to take up their investigation and analysis. In particular, we had hoped to showcase work highlighting religious identity formation and faith in LGBTQ Asian American communities and/or that which examined issues of sexuality in shaping the intersections of race and religion. Also, we acknowledge the absence of works which compare and examine relationships between various racial and ethnic communities and religious traditions. We believe comparative scholarship in Asian Americans religions can produce urgently needed insights into, for instance, how religion both facilitates and forecloses the possibilities of Asian American panethnicity, or the varying ways in which religion supports or counteracts anti-Asian racism and/or racism writ large.¹⁷

Ultimately, the central contention of this special issue is this: We need work that takes seriously the roles of religion, spirituality, and the sacred in the formation of new subjectivities, new geographies of political activism, and new modes of belonging in

Asian America and beyond. We hope this issue sparks broader conversations on how to move beyond outdated ways of thinking that dismiss religion as antiquated and divisive, and, instead, work towards more robust analyses that reflect the material realities of contemporary Asian American communities.

Notes

1. The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey—Religious Affiliation: Diverse and Dynamic* (Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, 2008).
2. Pew Research, Religion and Public Life Project, "'Nones' on the Rise," October 9, 2012; available online at: <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>.
3. Jurgen Habermas, "Notes on a Post-Secular Society," *New Perspectives Quarterly* 25:4 (2008): 17-29. See also Philip Gorski, David Kyuman Kim, John Torpey, and Jonathan VanAntwerpen, eds., *The Post Secular in Question* (New York: NYU Press, 2012).
4. Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992).
5. We are drawing upon Stuart Hall's formulation: "Race is a modality through which class is lived." From Stuart Hall, "Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance," in *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism* (Paris: UNESCO, 1980): 305-345.
6. See David K. Yoo, ed., "Racial Spirits: Religion & Race in Asian American Communities," *Amerasia Journal* 22:1 (1996).
7. Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996).
8. Glenn Omatsu, "The 'Four Prisons' and the Movements of Liberation: Asian American Activism from the 1960s to the 1990s," Karin Aguilar-San Juan, ed., *The State of Asian America: Activism and Resistance in the 1990s* (Boston: South End Press, 1994): 19-70.
9. Susan Koshy, "Morphing Race into Ethnicity: Asian Americans and Critical Transformations of Whiteness," *boundary 2* 28:1 (2001): 153-194.
10. See Fenggang Yang, "Chinese Conversion to Evangelical Christianity: The Importance of Social and Cultural Contexts," *Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review* 59:3 (1998): 237-257.
11. Russell Jeung, for example, observes that as Asian Americans students make Christianity the locus of their identity, they are able to escape identifying with racial backgrounds; see Jeung's book *Faithful Generations: Race and New Asian American Churches* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005). At the same time, religion serves to not only preserve ethnicity, but also to support insularity in young Korean Americans; see Jerry Z. Park, "Ethnic Insularity Among 1.5- and Second-Generation Korean American Christians," *Development and Society* 42 (2013): 113-136. Sharon Kim's book *A Faith of Our Own: Second-Generation Spirituality in Korean American Churches* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2010) explores why

second-generation Korean American college students disproportionately join Korean ethnic campus ministries as compared to pan-Asian, multiracial, or predominantly white campus ministries. Intergenerational issues in congregational settings arise with second-generation Korean Americans and Chinese Americans who find the immigrant church to be hierarchal and unresponsive to their spiritual and cultural needs.

12. See Lavina Dhingra Shankar and Rajini Srikanth, eds., *A Part, Yet Apart: South Asians in Asian America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).
13. Hatem Bazian, "Virtual Internment: Arabs, Muslims Asians and the War on Terrorism," *The Journal of Islamic Law and Culture* 9:1 (2004): 2-26.
14. See Rita Nakashima Brock, et al., eds., *Off the Menu: Asian and Asian North American Women's Religion and Theology* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2007).
15. PANAATM employs a Christian-based theological focus to address the concerns of those preparing to engage in church and social ministries.
16. ANARCS is a part of the American Academy of Religion.
17. See Carolyn Chen, *Getting Saved in America: Taiwanese Immigration and Religious Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).