In Indonesia, light skin has been the desirable color for as long as we can document. As this book will make clear, in some of the oldest surviving Indonesian literature, such as the epic poem *Ramayana*, adapted in the late ninth century from its Indian origin, light-skinned women were the dominant beauty norm of the time. In both the Indian and Indonesian versions of *Ramayana*, beautiful women are described as having white shining faces, like the full moon. One thousand years later during the early twentieth century when Dutch colonialism fully matured in Indonesia, images of Caucasian white beauty were used to illustrate the epitome of beauty in advertisements published in women’s magazines. When Japan took over as the new colonial power in Indonesia from 1942 to 1945, they propagated a new *Asian* beauty ideal, but white remained the preferred skin color. In postcolonial Indonesia, particularly since the late 1960s when the pro-American president Soeharto reigned, American popular culture has become one of the strongest influences against which an Indonesian white beauty ideal is articulated and negotiated. These transnational circulations of beauty ideals throughout different historical periods have undoubtedly helped maintain the light-skinned preference and configure not only beauty, but also racial, gender, and skin color discourses in Indonesia. The popularity of skin-whitening products—ranked first among all revenue-generating products in the cosmetics industry in Indonesia—is further evidence of such light-skinned preference.

I will trace these circulations of beauty images from different countries to Indonesia from precolonial to postcolonial periods and explain how transnational circulations of beauty ideals help shape the construction of race, gender,
and skin color in Indonesia. Moreover, I offer a fresh perspective on the transnational construction of categories of identity by telling this story through the lens of “affect” and emotion. By affect, I refer to philosopher Teresa Brennan’s definition of the term as the “physiological shift accompanying a judgment” (2004, 5). It is how the body cringes at the sight of a feared subject or jolts as it catches a glimpse of a beautiful being. Understanding when, how, and why bodies feel certain affects toward specific bodies allows us to understand the larger social structures within which the meanings of these bodies and their responses make sense. In essence, this book is a theoretical exploration of the ways in which human emotions are made visible in and circulated through the representations of beauty images that travel across different geographical locations and how they help shape discourses and hierarchies of race, gender, and skin color transnationally.

Thus, I will pay careful and critical attention to how ideals of beauty that travel transnationally circulate “feelings” about people of specific race, skin color, and gender. It is through these feelings that meanings of race, gender, and skin color are registered. Anchoring my analysis in theories of affect and feminist cultural studies of emotions, I argue that race, gender, and skin color are affectively constructed. Pointing out the importance of feelings, senses, and affects in the processes of subjectivity formation in a transnational context, this book furthers our current understanding of race, gender, and skin color as visually and socially constructed.

SEEING AND SENSING

“Seeing is believing,” the old saying goes. And even a postmodern philosopher such as Judith Butler who complicates the phrasing of the simple adage (“the visual field is not neutral to the question of race; it is itself a racial formation, an episteme, hegemonic and forceful”) would agree on the importance of a visual field in our claim “to know” (1993, 17). According to both versions, the production of knowledge (and racial formation), or, perhaps, “truths,” is inseparable from the structures within which our visual apparatus interprets the visual field, manipulated as it may be.

Scholars have argued that for people without visual impairments, vision is the most developed and most important faculty of all human senses; humans are visually oriented (Tuan 1974/1990, 6; Blauert 1983 quoted in Rodaway 1994, 92). Being seen, however, can be a double-edged sword. Although feminists operate under the premise that “being seen” is politically advantageous and desirable, race and feminist cultural studies scholars Sara Ahmed and Jackie Stacey caution that being seen may also lead to the unwanted effect of surveillance (Ahmed and Stacey 2000, 16).
Like seeing, sensing is also an epistemic apparatus. Sensing provides us with the means through which we make sense of the “real” world and how to live in it (Rodaway 1994, 7; Davidson 2003, 92). Geographer Paul Rodaway defines senses as:

not merely passive receptors of particular kinds of environmental stimuli but . . . actively involved in the structuring of that information and . . . significant in the overall sense of a world achieved by the sentient. In this way, sense and reality are related. (1994, 4)

Thus, senses, as a critical apparatus in the process of knowledge production and subjectivity formation, “provid[e] us with both information about a world around us and, through their structure and the way we use them, . . . mediate that experience” (Rodaway 1994, 3). Because senses function as a tool of knowing, they are never innocent and are always historically, politically, and socially specific (Rodaway 1994, 7).

To rely on one’s senses and render them useful in the process of knowledge production, however, is not to suggest that we cannot question their validity (Jaggar 1989, 163). Feminist philosopher Alison Jaggar pointed out, “emotions are not presocial, physiological responses to unequivocal situations, they are open to challenge on various grounds” (1989, 163). Thus, emotions are no more “authentic” than “reason” (Harding and Pribram 2009, 5–6). Nor can they function as a better “epistemological authority” in the process of knowledge production (Skeggs 2000, 28). Both emotion and reason are equally important and are inseparable from each other (Tuan 1977, 10; Jaggar 1989, 165). Indeed, going back to the ancient Indian tradition, feeling has been framed as something inseparable from thinking (Santoso 1980, 15). Incorporating emotions into our scholarship thus demands that we carve out “an epistemological basis” for their existence in our research (Harding and Pribram 2004, 882).

This book’s examination of the circulations and representations of the human emotions in imagery representing beauty aims to reveal the ways in which power relations are articulated in gendered, racialized, colored, and transnationalized terms. The theoretical lens of affect helps us to do this because affect is articulated, circulated, and performed through relations of power (Harding and Pribram 2004, 17). Emotions can even function to obscure power relations and make them seem natural in everyday lives (Probyn quoted in Harding and Pribram 2009, 6). Considering affect as a system of power thus refers to the ways in which ideology of emotions regulates who can feel what, when, and how. Jaggar explains this clearly:
When unconventional emotional responses are experienced by isolated individuals, those concerned may be confused, unable to name their experience; they may even doubt their own sanity. Women may come to believe that they are “emotionally disturbed” and that the embarrassment or fear aroused in them by male sexual innuendo is prudery or paranoia. When certain emotions are shared or validated by others, however, the basis exists for forming a subculture defined by perceptions, norms, and values that systematically oppose the prevailing perceptions, norms, and values. By constituting the basis for such a subculture, outlaw emotions may be politically and epistemologically subversive. (1989, 160)

This book’s attempt to map the gendered and racialized ideology of emotions represented in images of beauty thus speaks to its desire to chart how “power operates through affect” (Grossberg quoted in Harding and Pribram 2004, 872). By way of examining which signifiers are being used in which representations for which affective purposes, I intend to expose how affect functions as an apparatus of power that does the work of naturalizing various social hierarchies including racial, gender, and skin color hierarchies, in a transnational context. As such, I will make visible how power enters the domain of the emotions, or what Butler (1997a) called the “psychic life of power,” and thus implicitly elucidates the ways in which we may be able to break free from the grip of power that enters, resides, and circulates within the sphere of emotions. In short, the book is an exploration of what anthropologist Catherine Lutz calls “emotion as an ideological practice” (1988, 4).

I emphasize the importance of sensing/feeling in the act of seeing. It is “see[ing] through an embodied, feeling engagement.” The act of seeing is thus simultaneously an exercise of sensing because, as geographer Divya Tolia-Kelly pointed out, “we cannot ‘see’ and ‘feel’ separately; . . . aesthetics in representations are about emotions as much as they are about form, visual grammars permeate with visceral narrations of embodied values.” That is, I frame feeling as not simply a “context to seeing” (Tolia-Kelly 2007, 340). Rather, feeling is a way of seeing the world.

WHY BEAUTY?

In this book, I render beauty an important subject of inquiry because it allows me to expose the simultaneous and intersecting ways in which racial, gender, skin color, transnational, and emotional/affective discourses work together in producing and maintaining power hierarchies. Hence, I employ beauty ideology as a critical lens to examine how whiteness, when viewed, articulated, and framed
within the notion of female beauty, took on its gendered meanings. Certainly, in women's studies, the notion of beauty ideology as a discriminatory tool among women has been widely accepted. Some feminist scholars term discrimination against “ugly” women “look-ism” in order to expose the ways in which “beauty expectations are systemic” (Chancer 1998, 83). Some would even consider beauty or look-ism more dangerous than racism and sexism—the larger institutional structures upon which it hinges—because we are aware of discrimination based on race and sex, we are rather unaware or “unconscious” about discrimination based on looks (Etcoff 1999, 25). Beauty ideology has indeed been used to keep modern women in their subordinate place (Wolf 1992). This is because the never-ending beauty rituals, in Foucauldian terms, “discipline” women’s bodies differently from men’s and even manufacture them as “docile bodies” (Bartky 1990, 69–75).

Scholars suggest that beauty becomes a discriminatory tool because of its capital form. Sociologist Lynn Chancer, in working with Pierre Bordieu’s notion of “cultural capital,” argues that beauty can be “worked at and worked for: looks are not merely ascribed but more and more frequently achieved” (1998, 118). Women are therefore invested in working at and for beauty because, as a form of capital, beauty is “transformable into other types of capital, such as economic capital or money. The amount of beauty a woman possesses may help her land a well-paying job or marry a high-status, wealthy man” (M. Hunter 2005, 5).

Of particular interest for me is the increasingly popular use of skin-whitening creams, particularly in Indonesia. Historically, it must be noted, skin-whitening products were not limited to African or Asian peoples; nor are they a recent invention of capitalism and the global cosmetics industry. From race scholar Richard Dyer’s research, we learn that women in ancient Greece were already concerned with whitening their skin (1997, 48). Women during the Roman Empire used ceruse and white lead to whiten their skin. In Elizabethan England (sixteenth to early seventeenth century), ceruse was used for the same purpose (Sherrow 2001, 241). Some other ingredients used were mercury, lemon juice, egg whites, milk, and vinegar (Etcoff 1999, 101). Indeed, because ingredients such as lead and mercury are poisonous, women have died because of these practices (Sherrow 2001, 86).

In the North American context, women have also practiced whitening routines. Historian Kathy Peiss noted that during the early nineteenth century, white women were sharing recipes for skin whiteners and until the twentieth century were the target market for bleaching creams. In the mid-nineteenth century, the press began to notice the use of skin whiteners among African Americans (Peiss 1998, 9, 41, 149). Until the early twentieth century, African Americans continued to be targeted for whitening products with damaging chemicals, including
mercury, which was banned in the United States only in 1974 (Sherrow 2001, 242).

In Asia and Africa, whitening practices have also been historically popular. The Egyptian queen Cleopatra would take milk baths to whiten her skin (Dyer 1997, 48; Sherrow 2001, 35). In the ninth to twelfth centuries, Japan’s Heian period, women used rice flour (oshiroi) and white lead to whiten their skin (Etcoff 1999, 101). In thirteenth-century China, rich women would use “Buddha’s adornment”—thick paste applied to their face during the winter that they removed in spring (Sherrow 2001, 76). In modern Zimbabwe, skin whiteners were used until they were banned in 1980 (Burke 1996, 120).

These examples of whitening practices that have existed in various geographical locations and historical periods provide the context for rethinking the issue of beauty and skin color in a transnational context. That women in various nations, including Indonesia and the United States, have admitted to desiring light skin so that they can look “beautiful”; and the fact that skin-whitening products are popular in many nations, such as Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Ivory Coast, the Gambia, Tanzania, Senegal, Mali, Togo, Ghana, Vietnam, Malawi, Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia, Japan, China, Saudi Arabia (and the list goes on), provides overwhelming evidence that a beauty discourse that privileges light-skinned women circulates transnationally. Indeed, thinking transnationally is not only important but also inevitable. The materials gathered in this book came from three countries: the United States, from the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.; Indonesia, from Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (the National Archive of the Republic of Indonesia), and Perpustakaan Nasional Indonesia (the National Library of Indonesia) in Jakarta; and the Netherlands, from the KITLV library in Leiden and KIT library in Amsterdam.

In proposing and employing a different way of seeing beauty—one that relies on, makes visible, and is facilitated by feelings—this book produces different knowledges, histories, and understandings about beauty, racial, gender, and skin color discourses, particularly in Indonesia. That is, I reframe the complexity of beauty practices as neither victimizing nor empowering but rather as a mode of feeling and managing these feelings in a transnational context.

WHY INDONESIA?

Does the widespread use of skin-whitening cosmetic products point to a universal experience of race, and/or gendered race? Scholars have questioned this, pointing instead to the local histories in which race is constructed. As race scholars Perry Hintzen and Jean Rahier have written, although in the United States subjectivity is deeply racialized, “perhaps, in other national spaces, race is
overwhelmed by other ways of knowing, other discourses of being, other subjectivities” (2003, 15). This suggests that scholars who are interested in race, racial formation, and racialization and have focused on the American model may not fully conceptualize race in other places and in a transnational context. Focusing on Indonesia whose history is very different from that of the United States thus allows me to expand our understanding of and offer a different knowledge about how race, gender, and color are constructed. Moreover, Indonesia would seem to be an excellent example for proving their suspicion: the specificity of Indonesian racial history, racial (un)consciousness and racial make-up, and the fact that most people in contemporary Indonesia do not think through the lens of race, are often used to dismiss attempts to discuss race and color issues there. Although this book takes issue with that stance by insisting on the importance of racially signified skin color in Indonesia, the book does show the multiple ways in which the construction of racially signified skin color in Indonesia is different from the “lighter-the-better” construction of skin color so prevalent in the U.S. context. For example, in chapter five, I discuss the Indonesian approval of a so-called Japanese white skin color but disdain for “Chinese” white skin color. Moreover, other categories of identity such as gender, also matter in our understanding the meanings of skin color. Thus, while women are expected to care for their skin color and are considered beautiful when their skin is light, men are not. In Indonesia, light skin color is associated with femininity. Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to view Indonesia as a closed society with only local or national explanations for its gender and racial attitudes. Framing the issue of beauty in a transnational context allows me to identify the specificity of race in Indonesia with a specificity that is transnational.

Indonesia, located in the southeast of Asia with neighboring countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei, East Timor, New Guinea, and Australia, is a modern and postcolonial invention. It was established as a nation-state only after its independence in 1945. Prior to that, it was colonized by the Dutch who ruled over various kingdoms, scattered throughout this vast archipelago that consists of 17,508 islands (6,000 inhabited). Hence, the geographical boundaries of today’s Indonesia are mostly a legacy of Dutch colonialism. Dutch colonialism also helps explain, as Southeast Asian specialist Benedict Anderson pointed out, why Indonesians of Sumatran ethnicity would consider Malaysia’s Malays, with whom they share language, religion, and ethnicity, “foreigners,” yet consider the Ambonese in Eastern Indonesia, with whom they share no such commonalities, as fellow Indonesians, belonging to the same “imagined community.” This is so simply because they were colonized by the same colonizer (Anderson 1983/2006, 120–121). Even Indonesia’s insistence on “integrating” Irian or West Papua into Indonesia was due partly to the fact that Irian was once a Dutch colony and thus
became part of the Indonesian imaginary. In contrast, East Timor, an island that was once colonized by the Portuguese but was then "occupied" by Indonesia in 1975, is now an independent country.

Even the word itself, Indonesia, is a European invention. It was only in 1850, in the *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, that its co-editor, James Richardson Logan, created the name “Indonesia,” selecting from one of the two names—“Indonesia” (Indian archipelago) and “Malayonesia” (Malay archipelago)—that his co-editor, George Samuel Windsor Earl, had proposed in an earlier article in the same journal (Anshory 2004). Logan chose Indonesia but changed the letter *u* to *o* to make it sound better. Then, because he persistently used the word Indonesia in his publications, the word became more and more popular. In 1884, Djerman Bastian used “Indonesia” to title a book he wrote about the archipelago (Stoddard 1966, 278). And by 1913, when one of Indonesia’s twentieth-century nationalist heroes and founder of *Indonesische Persbureau*, Ki Hajar Dewantara, began to use the word “Indonesia” in his newspaper to refer to this geographical location, it was evident that the name had taken hold (Anshory 2004).

The national language of Indonesia is Indonesian (*Bahasa Indonesia*). It has been acknowledged as the national language since 1928; however, it was only in 1942 with the beginning of Japanese occupation that Indonesian achieved the “de facto status of official language”; and in 1945, following the country’s independence, Indonesian officially became the country’s national language (Sneddon 2003, 9). Indonesian is a language that was derived from “high” or “formal” Malay. The “low” form of Malay was spoken, at least until the early twentieth century, alongside approximately 550 dialects including the most-widely spoken dialect, Javanese, and Chinese (Sneddon 2003, 5). Certainly, circulations of people and objects from various places influenced the rich and shifting languages spoken in Indonesia. For example, the Old Javanese language, or *Kawi* (written prior to the fifteenth century), was a dominant language among the Javanese literati and people of the royal courts prior to European colonization (Phalgunadi 1995, 5). The Dutch and Portuguese then brought their languages to the archipelago in the sixteenth century adding to the variety of languages already spoken.

Indonesia is a big country both in terms of its size (crossing three time zones) and its population (it is the largest Muslim country and the fourth most populous country in the world with an estimated 238 million people in 2010). Some theorists suggest that the “original” inhabitants of Indonesia, possibly about 30,000–40,000 years ago, were dark-skinned people (Vlekke 1960, 8; Mirpuri 1990, 19), and that migrations of people from various locations to the archipelago have contributed to the mixture of people in today’s Indonesia (Mirpuri 1990,
Historian Jean Gelman Taylor, however, suggests that differences that exist in today’s Indonesia are not a result of migrations by different races of people, but rather they reflect the different ways in which people adapted to changes brought about by transnationally circulated objects and people; she argues that the predecessors of most of today’s Indonesians came from Southern China (J. Taylor 2003, 5–7).

Nonetheless, Indonesia has a long history of transnational circulations of people that continues to the present day. Encounters with Indians, Chinese, and Arabs during the precolonial period; the experience of Dutch colonialism that differs significantly from English and French colonial models; and the experience of Japanese colonialism and encounters with American culture in the contemporary period make Indonesia unique and an important site of analysis. Based on 2004 data, foreign workers (not necessarily Caucasian) in Indonesia number about 20,000 (6,000 executives, 11,600 professionals, 1,200 supervisors, 500 technicians, and the rest, “other”). More than half of these workers live in Jakarta.

This examination of the construction of race, gender, and skin color in Indonesia stands on the shoulders of prominent scholarship on race and gender in Indonesia (Stoler 2002; Gouda 1995; Hellwig 1994; Locher-Scholten 1986, 1992, 2000; Foulcher and Day 2002). However, these studies on race and gender in Indonesia have tended to focus on colonial and postcolonial periods. In contrast, I broaden the focus by examining the transnational history of skin color, racial, and gender formation in Indonesia in the precolonial period and then trace these formations through to the present day.

**STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK**

This book has as its anchors the field of feminist cultural studies of emotions and affect theories. Each chapter offers theoretical frameworks that build on and enrich existing theories on senses, feelings, emotions, and affects. I need to clarify here that I use the notion of “senses” as a theoretical placeholder to which I hook other theoretical concepts related to “sensing,” such as affects, feelings, emotions, and “sensing” concepts specific to Indonesia and South/Southeast Asia such as rasa and malu. Hence, I interweave, work with, and build on these concepts at different moments, creating a tapestry of theories of emotions in the process. Simultaneously, these theoretical concepts help explain and move forward the historically specific narratives told in every chapter.

In chapter one, “Rasa, Race, and Ramayana: Sensing and Censoring the History of Color in Precolonial Java,” I introduce the theoretical concept of rasa and deploy it to construct a historical account of skin color and gender hierarchies in late-ninth-century and early-tenth-century Java, prior to European
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colonization. The choice to begin my story with a precolonial period reflects my attempt to refrain from (re)producing a “Eurocentric” text in which the beginning of history is marked by (encounters with) Western/colonial history (Shohat and Stam 1994). Unfortunately, materials from and about this particular period are scarce. There are, however, a limited number of precolonial Old Javanese-language kakawin (poems) that have been translated into modern Indonesian and English. To this end, I chose to analyze one of the most popular epic stories from that period, *Ramayana*.

Through a reading of the Old Javanese adaptation of the Indian epic poem *Ramayana*, chapter one argues that color hierarchy already mattered prior to European colonialism and was articulated through affective vocabularies attached to notions of beauty. The chapter argues that the conflation between lightness and light skin as desirable and darkness and dark skin as undesirable is registered through *rasa*. That is, in *Ramayana*, women with light skin color are represented with positive *rasa* as beautiful and desirable, whereas people with dark skin color are represented with negative *rasa* as undesirable and often terrifying.

I define *rasa* as a dominant emotion found when encountering (and in) performative events and characters that provoke our “affective trajectories” and previously “deposited memory elements” (Higgins 2007, 47). I distinguish *rasa* from its theoretical affiliations of affect and emotion in that, while affect is understood as bodily reactions to certain experiences, and emotion is the social expression of that affect, *rasa* is the emotion that underlies and is attached to a performative event/representation. *Rasa* can be found in the text itself as well as felt by the audience reading the text/performance/representation.

In chapter two, “Rooting and Routing Whiteness in Colonial Indonesia: From Dutch to Japanese Whiteness,” I work with the concept of emotion and develop this further as “colonial emotionology.” Emotion, unlike affect, registers at the level of the social interpretation of these bodily shifts (Conradson and Latham 2007, 236). Thus the expressions of emotions are usually, except for facial and tonal expressions that are deemed more universal, culturally specific (Thrift 2008, 181). In this sense, emotions are ideologically mediated (Harding and Pribram 2004, 875).

Because expressions of emotions are filtered through ideology, I develop a theoretical concept I call “colonial emotionology” to help us understand the ways in which subjectivity formation functions as an effect of ideology of emotions. Attaching notions of emotions to ideology certainly bespeaks and reveals the ways in which emotions function as an apparatus of power that does the work of naturalizing social hierarchies. Particularly, I focus on the construction of two categories of whiteness during two colonial periods: Dutch and Japanese whiteness. (The third and fourth categories of whiteness, Indonesian whiteness and
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Cosmopolitan whiteness, are discussed in chapters three and four respectively. I define “colonial emotionology” as the ways in which ideologically permitted emotions as an articulation of the self serve the interests of the colonial empire.

Moreover, in this chapter I further argue that the conflation between race and skin color in colonial Indonesia was affectively rooted in Dutch colonialism (1900–1942). The Japanese colonizer (1942–1945) then challenged and rerouted this conflation. Japanese people propagated their version of white beauty that is rooted not in their white race but in their white skin color. The argument is based on historical and discursive analyses of beauty advertisements published in women's magazines such as *De Huisvrouw* (1938–1939), *De Huisvrouw in Deli* (1933–1935), *De Huisvrouw in Indie* (1933, 1936, 1937, 1940–1941), *De Huisvrouw in Nord Sumatra* (1939–1940), and *Vereniging van Huisvrouwen Cheribon* (1936); Japanese propaganda periodicals, such as *Djawa Baroe* (1943–1945) and *Almanak Asia Raya* (1943); and the “native,” Chinese, and Arab periodicals *Bintang Hindia* (1928), *Fu Len* (1938), *Keng Po* (1933, 1938), *Pewarta Arab* (1933), and *Soeara Asia* (1943–1944).

Moving beyond the colonial periods of Indonesian history, chapter three, “Indonesian White Beauty: Spatializing Race and Racializing Spatial Tropes,” develops a concept of emotionscape. This takes us to the second half of twentieth-century Indonesia during the post-Independence era under Soekarno until the end of Indonesia’s second president Soeharto’s regime in 1998. Here, our focus shifts to the importance of space, particularly during the nation-building period, and shows how various spatial tropes and the affective meanings they signify were visually deployed in advertisements to construct the racialized self and other. That is, I argue that the nationalized geographical space of Indonesia became a useful signifier to provide meanings for an “Indonesian” white beauty category. The deployment of such spatial tropes is implicit in and relies on the transnational production of affects about these places and the racial categories that are signified by them. Moreover, in highlighting the importance of spatial tropes that provide meanings for race and skin color, this chapter provides evidence for the construction of a category of whiteness I call “Indonesian white.” This construction reshapes the relationship among concepts of gender, race, skin color, space, and nation.

This attachment between space, race, and emotions is articulated through the theoretical concept of emotionscape. Emotionscape helps us understand better the ways in which emotions travel and circulate transnationally and form a landscape—a repertoire and a repository—of dominant feelings about certain objects (i.e., race, place, skin color, white beauty) to which these emotions (i.e., fear, happiness, love) are attached. I define emotionscape as a repository of culturally scripted and socially acceptable emotions that circulate transnationally.

In chapter four, “Cosmopolitan Whiteness: The Effects and Affects of Skin-Whitening Advertisements in a Transnational Women’s Magazine,” I employ discourse and semiotic analyses (Leiss et al. 1986, 150) to decode the meanings of various “signs” in whitening advertisements published in the Indonesian edition of *Cosmopolitan* magazine and tanning advertisements in the American *Cosmopolitan* during the years 2006 to 2008. Here, I challenge the assumption that “white” can only mean Caucasian white. I argue that it is “Cosmopolitan whiteness” (a category of whiteness that is different from, yet may include, Caucasian whiteness) that is being marketed through these whitening ads. Whiteness is not simply racialized or nationalized as such, but transnationalized. It is represented as, or equated with, “cosmopolitanness,” embodying transnational mobility and transcending race and nation. In this chapter, I also argue that gender, race, and skin color are “affectively” constructed.

Hence, if in chapters two and three I rely on beauty ads to chart the historical shift of white beauty ideals during two colonial periods and the post-Independence era, in chapter four, I “read” these advertisements as “texts” using a discourse analysis to uncover their operating racial, gender, and skin color discourses. Moreover, I also add another layer of analysis by employing theories of affect and cultural studies of emotions. Thus, I decode not only the meanings of these images, but also the emotions represented by the gendered and racialized models in these ads.

In chapter five, “Malu: Coloring Shame and Shaming the Color of Beauty,” I use the concept of *malu* (Indonesian word for shyness, embarrassment, shame, or restraint and propriety) as a lens through which I make sense of my interviews with forty-six Indonesian women and to argue that women’s decision to practice (or not practice) skin-whitening routines is shaped by what I call “the gendered management of affect.” The theoretical genealogy of “gendered management of affect” can be found in theories that frame affects, emotions, and feelings as a disciplinary technique: how we feel matters because this shapes how and what we do about our feelings (Harding and Pribram 2002; Ahmed 2004a, 2010). This
chapter illustrates the gendered ways in which emotions and affects are managed and argues that performing beauty practices such as whitening one’s skin is a manifestation of the gendered management of affects. Specifically, whitening practices reveal the gendered ways in which the feeling of *malu* is managed. Thus, chapter five points to the centrality of emotions in women’s experiencing and negotiating discourses of beauty, race, skin color, and gender in their daily lives. These interviews reveal how affects and emotions function to naturalize difference and social hierarchies in a transnational context.

I end with a conclusion that pulls the chapters together to provide the theoretical implications of the book. By making affective production visible in the process of racial formation and showing the ways in which the meanings of race are registered through affect/emotion/feeling/uraa/malu, this book reworks the notion of race and suggests how race could be useful as an analytical category in a transnational context. That is, focusing on subjectivity formation as an effect of ideology of emotions affords me the possibility to show that by anchoring my analysis on affect theories, I am able to productively use the analytical category of race in a transnational context and in the process rethink the notion of “race,” i.e., as affectively constructed. Certainly, this move toward “affect” studies is important particularly because key studies that highlight the ideological work and material consequences of race (Omi and Winant 1994; Winant 1994, 2001; Dyer 1997; M. Hunter 2005) have overlooked the ways in which feelings contribute to and are central in the gendered processes of racialization and subjectivity formation in a transnational context.

As a whole, this book adds to existing literatures on globalization by pointing out the importance of emotions in narratives of globalization. That is, although there has been much written on how people and objects that travel across national boundaries help transform the physical, cultural, social, racial, political, and financial landscape of the places they have traveled to and from (Appadurai 1996; Lowe 1996; Ong 1999; Sarker and Niyogi De, 2002; Shohat 1998), little attention has been given to how circulations of people and ideas across national boundaries influence “the gendered management of affects”: how people manage their feelings along gendered lines. The few exceptions that have begun to chart emotions in global context do not focus on Indonesia (Grewal 2005; Harding and Pribram 2009) or on racialized beauty (Wieringa 2007; Lindquist 2009).

In some ways, this book indeed attempts to paint a different picture of globalization. This book represents globalization as a narrative that is deeply embedded in the ebbs and flows of the formation of the nation rather than as “one-way” (cultural imperialism by the West) or “two-way” directions of power (both the West and the East influencing each other). Indonesia has never been an idyllic place to begin with. Even prior to the European conquest, transnational
circulations of people, ideas, and images from different parts of the world, such as India, have all colored, quite literally, the cultural and physical landscape of Indonesia. Indonesia has indeed been a constantly changing place that keeps reconfiguring itself, and globalization is certainly one of the dominant narratives that could help explain these changes.

It certainly is possible to read the chapters in this book in whichever order serves one’s needs best. Each chapter is indeed meant to stand on its own: it is written to represent distinct historical periods, countries, and sites of analysis. The specific sites and historical periods that are discussed in this book are meant to provide fragmentary snippets of societies that would become, are, and continue to be parts of Indonesian society at different moments in history. However, this book may best be read linearly: the chapters are organized to build on each other conceptually and, in some ways, to provide a sense of historical time. Each chapter focuses on different theoretical modalities of affect/feeling/emotion/ sense/rasa/malu and each further strengthens my argument that race, color, and gender are affectively constructed in a transnational context. In whichever way this book is read, I hope it can serve its purpose as an exercise to theoretically mine the representations of human emotions with an open mind.