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ABSTRACT

Since the end of the Korean War (1950-1953), approximately 200,000 Korean children have been sent abroad for adoption. Two thirds of these children arrived in the United States, and they constitute the earliest and largest group of international adoptees in this country. The intention of this paper is to foreground theoretical understandings of kinship and family to produce new insights into transracial and transnational families. The term transnational captures the international nature of their family formation vis-à-vis intercountry adoption. At the same time, the term transracial highlights the inter-racial nature of the family formation as an estimated 75% of adoptees entered white families. This interrogation contends Korean adoption occurred to aid the reproduction of the heterosexual, white, middle class family. I also explore how the adoptive family also subverts heteronormative constructions of family not only through its non-genetic creation, but also for its transraciality – the dislocation adoptees’ experience in identity formation as racially Asian/culturally white subjects.
“I identify myself as Korean American, with an emphasis on the American in the present, but an emphasis on the Korean in the past, possibly. I’m an American because I was raised in America and America is the culture I know, but I identify my blood with Korea. I identify myself as an adoptee, first and foremost, and I think that has had the greatest influence on my life, because if I wasn’t an adoptee, I wouldn’t be an American.”

- Adam Carlson

The tensions Adam Carlson mentions in the epigraph are not unique. His story is part of a larger phenomenon of Korean intercountry adoption. Since the end of the Korean War (1950-1953), approximately 200,000 Korean children have been sent abroad for adoption. Two thirds of these children arrived in the United States, and they constitute the earliest and largest group of international adoptees in this country. This paper interrogates the normative family, focusing on transracial and transnational families. The term transnational captures the international nature of family formation vis-à-vis intercountry adoption. The term transracial highlights the inter-racial nature of these adopted kinship ties as an estimated 75% of adoptees entered white families.

In my broader research, I argue that Korean adoptive families are postmodern, queer formations. Traditional American families are conceived of as same-race, genetically related, two-parent households. On the one hand, Korean adoption frequently occurs to aid the reproduction of the heterosexual, white, middle-class family as adoptees primarily entered white families. Only married couples are allowed to adopt from Korea, and adoptees are usually culturally absorbed into their parents’ households. On the other hand, Korean adoptive families are queer and postmodern, meaning that they are non-normative. The notion of adoptive families as queer derives from how Korean adoptive families circumvent genetic reproduction. These

---

2 Judith Butler (1993) notes queer theory’s fluidity, asserting: “If the term ‘queer’ is to be a site of collective contestation…it will have to remain that which is, in the present, never fully owned…redeployed, twisted, queered from a prior usage”; Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of “sex” New York, NY: Routledge, 228.
families remain marked bodies due to the parents’ disengagement from sexual reproduction. Additionally, the visible transracial nature of these families disrupts heteronormative constructions of sexuality, family and kinship.\(^4\) The deployment of queer theory aids my interrogation of the disjunctures and contradictions of the adoptive Korean family. This particular kinship structure simultaneously reifies heteronormative families while raising new questions concerning the monoraciality of the family. Rather than arguing adoptive families remain queer formations in their desire for normativity, I am invested in how queer theory exposes the contradictions found in kinship and sexual reproduction in my examination of the tensions produced by race, ethnicity, and culture within adoptive kin formations.

At the same time, I orient my understanding of adoptive families as postmodern in the work of sociologist Judith Stacey. She (2006) notes:

> Under postmodern conditions, processes of sexuality, conception, gestation, marriage, and parenthood, which once appeared to follow a natural, inevitable progression of gendered behaviors and relationships, have come unhinged, hurting the basic definitions of our most taken-for-granted familial categories – like mother, father, parent, offspring, sibling, and of course, ‘family’ itself – into cultural confusion and contention.\(^5\)

I argue a broader understanding of postmodern families is needed to include hetero- and homo-normative and non-normative kinship structures. The observable transracial character of adoptive families highlights the fact that reproduction occurred through the circumvention of genetic reproduction. Adhering to conventions of the heteronormative family as heterosexual kin formations, adoptive families also destabilize understandings of normative kinship through its non-genetic production.

---


For the purposes of this paper, I will explore how the adoptive family also subverts heteronormative constructions of family through its transraciality – the dislocation adoptees experienced in identity formation as racially Asian/culturally white subjects. Unlike other scholars examining transracial adoption, I argue transraciality is not necessarily a paradoxical or celebratory moment. Instead, transraciality provides a framework to critically examine how racial difference functions within the family as well as how issues of race/ethnicity and culture impact identity construction. While other scholars examine how the presence of Korean adoptees disrupts dominant patterns of intra-racial family formation and normative beliefs regarding kinship, this inquiry differs in its deployment of queer theory to examine parental desires to mimic real kinship and gain legitimacy under the traditional kinship rubric.

This scholarship will interrogate how racial difference within the family illustrates the disjunctures rendered by transraciality. I will first examine the racialization of the adoptive family. Second, I further define transraciality and its relationships to understandings of the family as a queer, postmodern unit. Lastly, to aid my exploration of transraciality, I engage four adult Korean adoptee anthologies: Seeds from a Silent Tree: An Anthology by Korean Adoptees

---


7 Aware Michael Awkward (1995) also deploys the term transraciality in regards to racial performativity, which I argue is one aspect of the culturalization process. In other words, culturalization is the way in which adoptees gain access to cultural whiteness and Korean/Asian (American) culture; Negotiating difference: Race, gender, and the politics of positionality. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Additionally, within the context of transracial, domestic adoption, adoption scholar and activist John Raible deploys the term transracialization to “describe a positive outcome that can happen when a person of one race spends a lot of time with individuals of another race” in order to understand a possible “alternative to the more typical socialization process known as racialization”; What is transracialization? John Raible Online. Retrieved May 15, 2011, from http://johnraible.wordpress.com/about-john-w-raible/what-is-transracialization. Moreover, Richard M. Lee posits the existence of the “transracial adoption paradox,” which occurs when “[adoptees] are perceived and treated by others, and sometimes themselves, as if they are members of the majority culture”; The transracial adoption paradox: History, research, and counseling implications of cultural socialization. The Counseling Psychologist, 31(6), 723.
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(1997); Voices From Another Place: A Collection of Works From a Generation Born in Korea and Adopted to Other Countries (1999); After the Morning Calm: Reflections of Korean Adoptees (2002); and Once They Hear My Name: Korean Adoptees and Their Journeys Toward Identity (2008). Seeds from a Silent Tree and Voices from Another Place are the first two Korean adoptee edited anthologies. Tonya Bishoff and Jo Rankin’s Seeds from a Silent Tree (1997) is heralded for its assertion of adoptee agency to generate and represent a text reflective of the myriad of voices found in the adoptee community-at-large. Voices From Another Place (1999) edited by Susan Soon-Keum Cox, was produced to coincide with the first International Gathering of the First Generation of Korean Adoptees in September 1999 in Washington D.C. After the Morning Calm and Once They Hear My Name are two well-known anthologies edited by adoptive parents as well as adoption practitioners and professionals in the field. Analyzing the four anthologies, I examine adoptees’ articulation of specific instances of transraciality as they reflect on their childhood and adulthood negotiation of their racial, ethnic and cultural identities.

THE FAMILY, RACIALIZATION, AND IDENTITY FORMATION

The history of secrecy surrounding adoption continues the pathologization of adoptive families in the twenty-first century. Thus, it remains no surprise that domestic adoptive families were originally formed via race-matching to shield their abnormality for any visible


10 The second gathering was held in Stockholm, Sweden in 2001. The third, fourth, and fifth gatherings were held in Seoul, South Korea in 2004, 2007, and 2010. Since the second gathering, the Gatherings have been organized by the International Korea Adoptee Association planning committee, which includes representatives from worldwide adult Korean adoptee organizations.

difference would mark the family as deviant. This race-matching remained so stringent that families and babies would be matched not only based on race and phenotype, but also matched via the religion of both the adoptive and biological parents. Nonetheless, the transracial adoption of Korean children to white American couples was not the first case of transracial adoption in the nation as the United States historically placed Native American and black children with white parents. The transracial placement of black children to white families first began in 1948 in Minnesota, when white foster parents adopted a black child.\(^\text{12}\) In 1972 when the National Association of Black Social Workers spoke against transracial adoption, deeming it “racial and cultural genocide.”\(^\text{13}\) Six years later, the Indian Child Welfare Act (1978) provided tribes’ control over the adoption of Native American children, whereby no Native American children can be placed for adoption without his/her tribal consent.

Unlike the transracial domestic adoption of black children by white parents in the United States, Howard Simon and Rita Alstein (2000) note the adoption of Korean children “does not carry the historical ‘baggage,’” even though “there are other issues of wealth, power, race, deception, kidnapping, class exploitation, colonialism, and imperialism.”\(^\text{14}\) Nevertheless, understandings of race remain directly implicated in the adoption of Korean children. Asian children are considered the “safe” option and more marketable not only because of the model minority myth, but also the belief Asians are better able to assimilate into white culture.\(^\text{15}\)

---


\(^\text{13}\) Fogg-Davis, *The Ethics of Transracial Adoption*, 3. Legal theorist Randall Kennedy (2004) also explores the controversy surrounding how this specific form of transracial adoption encourages the cultural extinction of black and Native American culture while at the same time risks charges that this practice fails to provide the adoptee a strong, positive racial/ethnic identity; *Interracial intimacies: Sex, marriage, identity, and adoption*. New York, NY: Vintage. Additionally, legal scholar Dorothy Roberts (2002) examines transracial adoption in relation to the child welfare system; *Shattered bonds: The color of child welfare*. New York, NY: Basic Books.


Since the controversy concerning “racial and cultural genocide” first arose, the United States government and adoption agencies sought to mitigate criticism by encouraging adoptive parents’ cultural competency. One result of this new emphasis is the deployment of what sociologist Heather Jacobson (2008) terms “culture keeping” – “[the partial replication of] the cultural education internationally adopted children would receive if they were being raised within a family of their own ethnic heritage.”\(^{16}\) While culture keeping along with other multiculturalism techniques may be one avenue for parents to ensure this erasure of knowledge does not occur, this practice serves to provide only certain aspects of the culture to the adoptee. For example, Jacobson found many mothers of Chinese adoptees held the belief of a static Chinese culture and in seeking authentic Chinese culture.\(^{17}\) Feminist anthropologist Barbara Katz Rothman (2005) echoes this sentiment concerning the commodification of culture, writing: “Background and country and decoration are all fine – they are the sanitized ‘ethnicity’ we find so charming.”\(^{18}\) Similar to the existing critiques of culture keeping, I argue this practice risks what bell hooks (1992) terms as “eating the other,” when culture becomes representative of a singular Orientalized perspective.\(^{19}\)

Nevertheless, multicultural approaches arose from the 1990s onwards, and prior to this, adoptive parents were told to assimilate their children and “raise them as their very own.” As a result, many Korean adoptees recount instances where their parents elided familial racial difference, underscoring the notion that transracial adoption is racial and cultural genocide. For example, Becca Higgins Swick (2008) notes: “I was raised as a Caucasian. By that I mean that when we talked about family things, we always talked about my mother’s and my father’s

\(^{17}\) Ibid., pp. 113.
\(^{18}\) Rothman, *Weaving a Family: Untangling Race and Adoption*, pp. 47.
families, so my being Korean was never introduced into the picture.”

Therefore, while asserting genocide is extreme, this claim underscores the importance of recognizing racial and cultural differences within transracial, transnational adoptions.

The elision of racial difference between parent and adoptee ignores the history of racialization in the United States. Racialization occurs as adoptees encounter how race informs their lived experiences and interactions with institutions and society-at-large. African American Studies scholar Kimberly McClain DaCosta (2011) discusses the “racialization of the family” – “how racial premises came to be buried in our understanding of family, in which genetic-phenotypic sharing is coded to signify cultural sharing, intimacy, and caring.” Through the “racialization of the family,” the monoraciality of the family is reified, whereby the family is a singular unit joined through genetics. In this respect, families deviating from this norm remain subject to public surveillance. Seeking to enter the heteronormative kinship structure and gain legitimacy, these families desire to remedy difference to demonstrate their “normalcy.” This occurs at the expense of the child as seen in Swick’s comment concerning how she was “raised Caucasian.” To be raised Caucasian only highlights the white privilege operating in her life, whereby whiteness is the unnamed norm.

THE IMPACT OF TRANSRACIALITY

Capturing the racialization that the adoptive family and, more specifically, the adoptee undergoes, I utilize the term transraciality to denote the racial, ethnic and cultural nuances experienced throughout the adoptee’s lifetime. Transraciality occurs as a result of processes of

---

culturalization and re/racialization. These processes remain in continuous dialogue with one another to construct the adoptee’s hybrid identity. Culturalization accounts for the forced de/Koreanization adoptees experience in childhood due to their status as family dependents vis-à-vis the deployment of parental racial blindness. Forms of racial blindness include: not addressing racial difference, refraining from activities related to the child’s ethnicity, and living in a racially isolated area.

I deploy the term culturalization instead of assimilation or acculturation to account for the extreme racialization adoptees undergo within the family as adoptees do not learn from their parents how to negotiate racial difference even as the family remains a site for learned behavior. This process renders the adoptee as a “blank slate” ready for a new identity upon his/her adoption. For example, Jessica Freedman (2007) writes: “I realize that even though our physical appearance may be similar, I’m still very different from them because unlike them, I have an American last name, I have an American – I am an adopted Korean-American girl.”

Kari Ruth (1999) echoes this sentiment, noting: “I get mistaken for a Korean a lot.” Culturalization ensures the continual emphasis of the adoptees’ (white) Americanness vis-à-vis racial blindness performed within the nuclear family.

Re/racialization occurs as adoptees voluntarily assert a Korean/Asian American identity. Re/racialization is written this way to mark the disjuncture between involuntary racialization and the racialization adoptees actively seek out in adulthood. Adult adoptees undergo re/racialization as they explore their Korean heritage as agents of the types of Korean culture and history they

---


choose to consume versus as children responding to parental influence, such as attending culture camps or attending language school from a young age. Multiple opportunities are presented to adoptees as they enter the re/racialization process. For example, adoptees may engage with the adult adoptee population in local, national or global adult adoptee organizations. Adoptees may even return to South Korea and search for their biological parents/families and/or engage more directly with Korean culture. Visits to South Korea may be facilitated by adult adoptee Korean organizations or adoption agencies post-adoption services. At the same time, adoptees may also choose not to partake in a recognized community and instead learn more about South Korea through other means, such as taking East Asian studies classes at their local university. The abovementioned examples are not exhaustive. Rather, these examples are meant to provide some understanding into how adoptees continue to negotiate their racial/ethnic identity.

LOCATING TRANSRACIALITY IN ADOPTEE WRITINGS

The nuances and complexities of adoptee identities are clearly demonstrated in their autobiographical writings. I explore how transraciality affects the adoptee’s formation of self through an interrogation of Seeds from a Silent Tree: An Anthology by Korean Adoptees (1997); Voices From Another Place: A Collection of Works From a Generation Born in Korea and Adopted to Other Countries (1999); After the Morning Calm: Reflections of Korean Adoptees (2002); and Once They Hear My Name: Korean Adoptees and Their Journeys Toward Identity (2008).26 I selected the four texts as they are the most well known anthologies and are representative of the wider adult Korean adoptee community in comparison to memoirs. In my review of these texts, two subthemes related to transraciality emerged: re/birth and inauthenticity as a result of the culturalization and re/racialization processes, respectively. Marking the start of

26 Bishoff and Rankin, Seeds From a Silent Tree...; Cox, Voices From Another Place...; Wilkinson and Fox, After the Morning Calm...; Korean Culture Network, I Didn’t Know Who I Was...; and Lee, et al., Once They Hear My Name...
adoption, re/birth signals the disruption of adoptees’ lives as Korean nationals when they were reborn as Western subjects vis-à-vis the airplane journey from Korea to the United States. I write the term re/birth in this particular way to signal the disruption that occurs in the lives of adoptees. Moments of inauthenticity experienced by adoptees are rooted in their re/racialization and their overall negotiation of racial, ethnic, cultural and national identities from childhood to adulthood.

Selected examples from these texts are not to demonstrate or reify adoptees’ as melancholic subjects of loss, desiring to reconcile their American lives with their Korean pasts. Instead I draw from adoptees’ experiences to examine how transraciality directly functions in their lives as identity is continually evolving. For example, adoptees efforts to gain entrance into a strict racialized notion of “American,” the adoptees negotiate processes of involuntary racialization in the United States. Yet, their attempts to gain language fluency in Korean or access a Korean cultural identity remain bounded by their American cultural upbringing. Nevertheless, I caution against presuming adoptees that exist within this fraught space are illegible subjects. I argue that adoptee’s are legible subjects even as they negotiate their transraciality. Adoptees are agents of their own experiences, exercising control over their life choices and responses to racism, for example, as children and adults, even if at points this agency is constrained by their adoptive parents during childhood and adolescence.

Re/Birth: De/Koreanization vis-à-vis Culturalization

“At the age of 4, Lee Hyun Joo was sent to America to be adopted. Her name became Crystal Chappell. Like thousands of other Korean adoptees, her birth family and culture were left behind. Not until she was a young adult did she realize that something was missing from her life.”

Korean American adoptees have pasts prior to their arrival to the United States. However, because this entry marks the start of their lives into their adopted families adoptees shed their Korean names and language for a new name and the English language, adoptees gain first names like Thomas, Adam, Rebecca, and Jennifer and last names like Murphy, Smith, Robinson, and Marshall. This practice remains indebted to practices of racial blindness, which includes a lack of culture keeping. The quote above from Crystal Lee Hyun Joo Chappell (1997) reflects this re/birth – the beginning of (a new) life in becoming American. Chappell lost her memories upon entering the United States, noting: “I came to believe that I had been born on the day I was adopted, at age 4.”

Korean adoptees are removed from their roots, history and culture as Koreans en route to a new history and culture and the roots of their adoptive parents.

Given new names, new identities, Korean American adoptees become objects, lacking agency, without a past, history or roots. For example, adopted at age six, Amy Mee-Ran Dorin Kobus (1999) recalls that she was unaware of what was happening upon her arrival, noting: “My escort pushed me toward a group of white people and said in Korean, ‘This is your new family.’ She then turned and walked quickly away.” This reflection is followed by her description of her adoption as an “uprooting and transplanting from Korea to America.” Confounded with a new name, language, culture, and family, adoptees are in flux neither here nor there. Instead, adoptees are primed for reinvention in their re/birth. In this regard, Higgins Swick notes that her
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29 Ibid., 126.
31 Ibid., 43.
mother was told to “Americanize” her by the social worker. Her parents never encouraged ethnic identity exploration. Todd Knowlton (2008) echoes this sentiment, writing: “My parents never tried to bring Korean influences into my upbringing. We had Chinese food, maybe once a year, never had a bowl of rice.” While location may impact his parents’ ability to access Korean culture and food, at the same time, however, Chinese food remains implicitly connected to a sense of “Koreanness” due to the ways in which the construction of “Asianness” remains reductive in the United States.

Earlier I discussed the impact of the family as a social space for learned behavior. In the case of adoptees, it is not surprise then that the earliest discussions of transraciality are mentioned in their reflections on childhood and adolescence. Wayne A. Berry (1997) notes that while growing up in a small Minnesota town, he wanted to be an American and how his only memories are of life in the United States after he was re/born as a Western subject. In addition, seeking to “fit in” as an American, Dorin Korbus denied her ethnic heritage while growing up. Stereotyping Asians as quiet and passive, she sought to become American through her outspokenness. This internalized behavior is also reflected in how she sought to perfect her American English accent and utilized of a white face powder to construct physical whiteness.

Negative body image reflects how female adoptees had limited access to positive Asian role models by the end of the twentieth century. For example, Ami Inja Nafzger (2008) writes: “I dyed my hair blonde and wanted green contacts. I wanted to be very, very white to fit in with

32 Higgins Swick, Becca, 76.
35 Dorin Korbus, Hello Good-Bye Hello.
36 Ibid., 44.
37 Ibid.
my peers and the popular people.”

Her performance of whiteness is symptomatic of “aesthetic assimilation.” Nancy Caraway (1991) defines aesthetic assimilation as the subjugation of a Black woman’s “Blackness” as a result of an internalized racism whereby whiteness equates beauty. Double eyelid surgery, skin whitening creams, and hair straightening are some of the few methods utilized by non-white women striving to embody the white, Western, feminine ideal. Negative body image reflects how female adoptees, including Dorin Korbus, had limited access to positive Asian role models in their nuclear families and local communities. While their performance for whiteness bestows a hypervisible status to the adoptee as seen in Dorin Korbus’ use of face powder, the desire for invisibility reflects the yearning to be part of the dominant ideal – whiteness.

Aesthetic assimilation is reiterated in YoungHee’s (1997) narrative within *Seeds from a Silent Tree* (1997) as she recounts her obsession with her body image and her desire to be white. She writes: “I obsess over white women. I compare every inch of my body to theirs…Theoretically I was white, my family is white, the community I grew up in was white” (emphasis added). YoungHee’s cultural whiteness prominently figures into her low self-esteem and lack of positive racial/ethnic identity. Like Dorin Korbus, her struggle is not unique as many female Korean adoptees write about their desire to have larger, rounder eyes, non-coarse hair, and a more prominent nose. Internalized self-loathing impeded to her ability to gain a

40 Ibid.
43 Ibid., 86.
positive sense of self throughout adolescence, which manifested itself in her “hatred of other Asians because they forced [her] to see [herself] in them.” At the end of her narrative, YoungHee acknowledges that her internalized oppression resulted from her cultural white upbringing where she realized that “looking a certain way was more valued.” Corresponsingly, Ellwyn Kauffman (1997) remembers how “the mirror was the inescapable reminder of where I had come from.” The quotes from YoungHee and Kauffman in particular demonstrate the damaging affects of culturalization. The performative nature of the family serves as a site of racial erasure vis-à-vis parental desire for legibility and legitimacy.

While the internalization of white beauty standards shaped female adoptees’ assimilationist practices, male adoptee narratives focus more on their struggles to be “all-American” and recount the use of the terms “Chink,” “gook,” and “Jap” to describe them. Even though these epithets appear gender neutral, the historical deployment of racialized stereotypes in the United States remain highly gendered and the nerdy Asian male or the use of the epithets remain tied to origin stereotypes castigating Asian American men as either the “yellow peril” or “model minority.” For example, Todd D. Kwapisz’s (1999) poem lists numerous perceptions Americans have of him due to his ethnicity – “the one who started WWII or the Vietnam War,” “martial art experts,” and “the exchange student with my host family.”

44 Ibid., 88.
45 Ibid.
Jim Milroy (1999) echoes the need to assert his belonging in the United States, writing: “People will believe that stones are cars before they’ll accept that my brother, or sisters, or father or mother are my real family.”

Additionally, comments that locate the male adoptee as Other remain linked to their phenotype. Moreover, the visible racial/ethnic difference marks adoptees as something “not quite right” when examining the family in its totality. For example, seeking legibility into the framework of American childhood, Berry notes: “I thought I was the only Korean adoptee who grew up on a farm, played high school football and had a Caucasian girlfriend.” This quote demonstrates how racial difference informs his life experiences. The salience of race also pervades the writing of Jared Ingalls (1997), who writes: “Meeting other Asians always felt strange to me and a little uncomfortable because of my own sense of insecurity being an Asian, it made me feel a little distant from other Asians.”

Negotiating their transraciality, Korean American adoptees assertion of Americanness is seen in their valorization of white physical characteristics and denial of the salience of race. This internalized racism may negatively impact the development of positive self-esteem. In the negation of their Koreanness, adoptees sought to “pass” and be viewed as an individual who belongs in a portrait of America. Transraciality remains central to understanding the process of identity formation as encounters not only with family members and the community, but also with strangers implicitly influence how adoptees cultivate a sense of self. While I am not interested in reifying a standard “positive” ethnic identity, I remain engaged with how transraciality impacts adoptees’ negotiation of identity. Recognizing the tension produced by transraciality, Mary Lee

---

51 Berry, Completing My Puzzle…, 121.
Vance (2002) writes: “Regardless of how white we may think we act, dress or speak, to everyone else we are not white nor will we ever be considered white. We can never assimilate.”\textsuperscript{53} Other adoptees echo this belief when reflecting on their relationship with the Asian American community. For example, Ruth also writes: “I get mistaken for a Korean a lot.”\textsuperscript{54} Similarly, for Freedman, even when she is surrounded by other Asians, she writes: “I realize that even though our physical appearance may be similar, I’m still very different from them because unlike them, I have an American last name, I am an American – I am an adopted Korean-American girl.”\textsuperscript{55} The reader witnesses how adoptees negotiate their transraciality to understand that to be “inauthentic” is to create their own nuanced Korean American adoptee identity. The historical conflation of Americanness with whiteness and the adoptee’s cultural whiteness formulates his/her outsider within status.\textsuperscript{56}

As adoptees’ negotiate their legibility as Americans, for many, a trip to South Korea raises the possibility of closure and a greater understanding of an individual’s sense of self and remains reflective of adoptees’ re/racialization. However, for others a trip to South Korea is not necessarily wanted nor needed. An individual’s choice does not make one more or less Korean, but reflects what it is – choice. Travel to South Korea can occur a myriad of ways, but some adoptees return to the ROK via homecoming programs.\textsuperscript{57} Other adoptees return to South Korea to teach English, volunteer at an orphanage or attend university to learn Korea and perhaps pursue an advanced degree. Although returning to South Korea is not a critical component in the adopted Korean narrative, many adoptees correlate recovering their past with their return to the

\textsuperscript{53} Vance, M. (2002). To be of credit. In H. S. Wilkinson & N. Fox (Eds.), \textit{After the morning calm: Reflections of Korean adoptees} (pp. 78-83). Bloomfield Hills, MI: Sunrise Ventures, 82.
\textsuperscript{54} Ruth, Kimchee on White Bread, 75.
\textsuperscript{55} Freedman, Create our own identification, 127-128.
\textsuperscript{56} I draw upon Patricia Hill Collins’ (2000) work regarding black women; \textit{Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment} (Second ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
“motherland.” The return is symbolic, a tangible link to his/her biological parents. Nevertheless, I reiterate that a return to the Republic of Korea does not necessarily equal a positive experience as many reflect upon whether they are truly authentic Koreans.

Journeys to South Korea may spark new questions surrounding adoptees’ Americanness and Koreanness. Perceived as “Koreans” based on countenance, adoptees remain outsiders within a country, where for the first time, they “blend in.” For example, after returning to South Korea, Berry notes that he is not a true Korean. His comment captures what many adoptees discuss, the differences between themselves and “Korean Koreans” or “Asian Asians.” For Berry, a true Korean understands the cultural nuances of Korea and speaks fluent Korean in the eyes of many adoptees. Echoing Berry’s differentiation between native Koreans and adoptees, Mark Fermi (1999) also questions his ability to claim that he is Korean. Fermi writes: “Korean people ask me if I am Korean. I said, ‘Yes, I am’ and question their reaction to my answer. I know I am Korean, although some of my actions do not show it. I can only say a few words in Korean.”

To this end, cultural whiteness affirms Americanness, while inhibiting adoptees’ ability to become true Koreans, which for adoptees remains inextricably linked to fluent language proficiency and comprehension of Korean cultural nuances. Wary of claiming an “authentic” Korean prototype exists, I contend adoptees remain cultural outsiders because transraciality erased an ability to claim Korean cultural capital with the ease of a South Korean national.

The negotiation between being not a true Korean is reflected in how cultural whiteness affirms Americanness. Nafzger writes: “Everyone is Korean, so physically you look like you belong. I felt that way for a while, but the moment you open your mouth, it’s obvious you don’t

---

really belong.”59 Located as cultural outsiders in South Korea, Knowlton notes he is “feeling more Korean” as a result of embracing his Korean heritage and culture, but he also has seen a shift in how his mannerisms are less animated in comparison to his adoptive family.60 Katie Hers (2002) furthers this notion, noting that for many Koreans “being Korean” is equated to having Korean parents, hearing Korean spoken at home, and knowing what Korean food tastes like.61 For Korean American adoptees, their experiences remain predicated upon their transraciality and adoption status. Unlike other Asian Americans, adoptees lived experiences are profoundly influenced by the primacy placed on adoptee status as this remains a turning point in their lives. Concluding her narrative, Whitney Tae-Jin Ning (1999) recognizes that there is “no singular model” of identity.62 Thus, feelings of inauthenticity do not negate one’s Americanness or Koreanness. Instead, the transracial composition of the adoptee’s family provides him/her a unique vantage point to experience the normalizing nature of whiteness as well as direct access to a culturally white identity. Adoptees’ remained marked for their transraciality – forever looking like “the person who does not belong” within their monoracial, white families.

CONCLUSION

Even as this paper focused on how transraciality is deployed in adoptees lived experiences, I argue this focus sheds light onto the ways in which the adoptive family desires to enter the heteronormative family structure as seen in the culturalization process. An interrogation of transraciality also accounts for the disruption of the family as a monoracial, genetically related unit. According to John Terrell and Judith Modell: “Adoption is…a

59 Nafzger, Ami, 28.
60 Knowlton, Todd, 66.
phenomenological category betwixt categories, a category that straddles the fence, a category in…society that dooms those who fall within it to be both kin and non-kin – real and ‘fictive’.\textsuperscript{63}

Situated at the borderlands of kinship, adoptive families are at a crossroads challenging the heteronormative ideal of family.

Furthermore, unlike other Asian Americans, adoptees’ lived experiences are profoundly influenced by their adoptee status which remains a turning point in their lives, providing access to white privilege, something unbeknownst to many people of color in the West. While this inquiry centers on the estimated 75% of adoptees who entered white families, I recognize a deeper exploration of adoptees that entered black and Asian families is necessary. I contend the application of transraciality to these family formations will produce new insights into how processes of racialization occur in the United States. Transraciality exposes both the heteronormative and racially normative nature of adoptive families as well as the transgressive and disruptive nature of these kinship units.

\textsuperscript{63} Terrell and Modell, Anthropology and Adoption, 158.
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