

**The Voices of Amerasians: Ethnicity, Identity, and
Empowerment in Interracial Japanese Americans**

by

Stephen L. H. Murphy-Shigematsu

ISBN: 1-58112-080-X

DISSERTATION.COM



2000

Copyright © 2000 Stephen L. H. Murphy-Shigematsu
All rights reserved.

ISBN: 1-58112-080-X

published by
Dissertation.com
USA • 2000

www.dissertation.com/library/112080xa.htm

The Voices of Amerasians:
Ethnicity, Identity, and Empowerment in
Interracial Japanese Americans
Stephen L. H. Murphy-Shigematsu

A thesis submitted in partial
completion of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
Harvard University
Graduate School of Education
Program in Counseling and Consulting Psychology

November 25, 1986

To my dear father, Frederick Peter
Murphy

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has developed from the desire to articulate the voices of Amerasians. The motivation grew as each person who participated in the study expressed themselves so openly and honestly concerning their deepest beliefs and emotions. The hope of sharing the lives of these persons with others kept this project alive.

Fellow students lent their support and committee members showed trust and faith. Richard Katz, my advisor, served as teacher and mentor and first believed in the importance of this study; Kiyoko Morimoto, who taught me about pain and dignity; and Chester Pierce who guided and inspired me.

My family nourished me and supported me even when they couldn't understand the things which I had to do. This study honors my family for they gave me an appreciation of my heritage and the freedom to explore and express it. Margaret Murphy was especially instrumental in helping me to trust in myself, and my mother Toshiko Shigematsu Murphy and China Igarashi encouraged and tolerated me through the long process.

This study was also supported by the American Psychological Association Minority Fellowship Program and the Japanese American Citizens' League Henry and Chiyo Kuwahara Memorial Scholarship.

Abstract

Amerasians are persons of American and Asian ethnic heritage who have appeared as a group mainly in the past forty years. Beginning with the massive involvement of the United States in the Occupation of Japan, thousands of Amerasians have been born from Japan to Vietnam. In the U.S. they are the children of approximately eighty thousand American/Asian couples who have come here since that time.

This study sought to examine the lives of Amerasians in the United States. The primary research questions centered around finding the nature of Amerasian issues and concerns which are encountered in growing up in the U.S. How Amerasians attempted to resolve these issues and concerns was a major focus of the thesis.

As an exploratory study with the goal of generating hypotheses on the nature of Amerasian identity and experience, a qualitative research method was used. In-depth individual interviews were conducted with a semi-structured interview schedule. Ten Amerasians with first generation Japanese mothers and White American fathers were interviewed. All were between the ages of twenty three and thirty three, were raised on the East Coast or in the Midwest in non-Japanese American communities, and attended colleges on the East Coast.

Data was analyzed for themes using grounded theory. Themes of early experience were family issues, race and culture, assimilation, and difference and isolation. These themes articulate concerns of childhood and adolescence around being from an international, interracial, and intercultural family. Racial experiences and cultural differences were identified as formative and respondents describe their attempts at dealing with often confusing and painful feelings and experiences.

The themes of resolution were roots, community,

self-definition, and integration. Respondents expressed their desire to learn about their cultural heritage as a growing and powerful influence in their lives and the need to connect their struggles with others who were involved in similar issues and conflicts. The forms of resolution involved accepting and asserting their authentic self image in society through their own definition of their unique racial and cultural experience.

The themes express both joys and sorrows of their lives as Amerasians. Resolutions are not final solutions, but part of the process of their struggles for empowerment and healing for self and society. The data is analyzed for its contribution to understanding issues of ethnicity and identity in the face of the emerging presence of interracial and intercultural families in Asian American communities. The lives of Amerasians are explored for their messages concerning the development of unique forms of racial and cultural expression.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vi
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Historical Background and Literature Review.....	5
Meeting in Japan	
To the United States	
Interracial Persons as Marginal	
Interracial Persons as Multicultural	
Interracial Identity	
Interracial Japanese Americans	
Afroasians	
Eurasians	
III. Methodology	40
IV. Data Results.....	51
Themes of Early Years	
Family Issues	
Race and Culture	
Assimilation	
Difference and Isolation	
Themes of Resolution	
Roots	
Community	
Self Definition	
Integration	
Data Summary	
V. Discussion.....	132
The Historical Moment, Empowerment and Healing	
Ethnic and Racial Identity	
Asian Americans	
Interracial Japanese Americans	
Ethnicity and Community	
Marginality and Multiculturalism	

Messages for Parents	
Racial Prejudice and Identity	
Different	
Implications for Counseling	
VI. Conclusions and Implications for Research.....	183
Bibliography.....	186

I. Introduction

Through the massive upheavals of war, imperialism, and migration, individuals from different ethnic groups are increasingly drawn and thrown together in intimate contact. How differences in race and culture are resolved in these situations is a question which confronts men and women. Cultural and social change emerge as major challenges brought on by the movement of people across traditional boundaries which have separated individuals into distinct groups.

The issues of race and ethnicity are often magnified when examining the borderland where groups come together in intimate relations. As peoples of diverse groups come together within a society, intermarriage becomes a growing phenomenon. What happens to the children of these couples is a subject which is at the cutting edge of race relations. It speaks to broader issues of what happens at the personal level when individuals challenge boundaries of ethnic groups, and how questions of race, culture, and identity are resolved.

Social scientists have attempted to describe the process of movement across cultures as it affects groups and individuals. Persons who are born from cross-cultural contacts have been seen first through the lens of marginality (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937). This view recognized the often harsh realities of being in-between cultural groups and not fully belonging to either. The position of being unable to claim allegiance and be accepted has been seen as causing conflicts of ambivalence and insecurity.

With the expansion of consciousness brought about in part by the liberation struggles of oppressed peoples in the post World War II era, a new vision emerged. Through this lens the person of two or more ethnic backgrounds is seen as one who enjoys the benefits of more than one culture, greater objectivity, and flexibility (Adler, 1974; Ramirez, 1977). He or she engages

in the process of synthesis of cultures which symbolizes the challenges of contemporary societies in dealing with and developing diversity. They also symbolize the universal or international perspective or world view which is becoming increasingly necessary for global survival.

These perspectives on the person whose life springs from the union of individuals from different ethnic groups, leave many questions unanswered. Is marginality one possible response, and multiculturalism another? How do some individuals become marginal and others multicultural? How do individuals resolve problems of marginality and receive the benefits of multiculturalism? Is being multicultural really just another form of being marginal?

In some countries there are official groups of interracial persons, such as the Metis in Canada and the Mixed-Race in South Africa (Gist and Dworkin, 1976). However, in the United States, persons of interracial backgrounds have generally been classified as belonging to the group of color. While once identified by such terms as "mulatto", the official recognition of interracial persons was terminated in an attempt to maintain a racially divided society with clear boundaries and distinctions between groups.

The racial situation in the United States has been based primarily on relations between the dominant Whites and the Blacks, the largest minority. With other ethnic groups, such as large numbers of Asian Americans, entering the racial picture, it is important to explore how they experience and resolve race relations on a personal and community level. The definitions and boundaries which are created, challenged, and changed, are significant to a deeper understanding of race and culture in the United States.

Two national groups whose relations have become increasingly significant over the past forty years are Japanese and Americans. Beginning in the Occupation of post-war

Japan, Americans and Japanese have established intimate relations, married, and created children. The majority of these families have come to the United States. Approximately eighty thousand couples and their children have come since 1947. These families cross not only racial, cultural, and religious barriers, but national ones as well.

In the continental United States, anti-miscegenation laws which worked with prejudice to keep Japanese Americans and other Americans apart, were finally abolished in the late forties. Since that time persons of Japanese ancestry have intermarried to the extent that approximately half of the marriages involving Japanese Americans are intermarriages. This obviously means that a large part of those with Japanese heritage in the U.S. will be interracial.

In view of the historical distance between persons of Japanese ancestry and others, this group of interracial Japanese Americans raises many issues in race relations and cross-cultural understanding. They bring out questions of the nature of identity and ethnicity in a diverse society. As people from different ethnic groups are increasingly brought together across the world, we must continually examine and seek to understand those who cross and challenge the existing boundaries of ethnic and racial groups. A study of biracial Japanese Americans in the U.S. will hopefully stimulate thought and examination of these issues.

As intermarriage becomes more acceptable in the U.S. the fate of the children assumes greater interest. How children achieve a blending and acceptance of their seemingly diverse and sometimes dissonant parts is a question which demands articulation. How these individuals navigate differences, derive feelings of community, and come to a sense of ethnic identity are also important concerns of ethnic communities. The nature of the conflicts and issues which are encountered is of special significance to parents and other family members.

In a society which does not recognize interracial identity, the question of what happens when a person is of Japanese and White heritage is traditionally answered that the individual is considered to be Japanese. But from the Japanese or Japanese American point of view the person may be regarded as White. As the Japanese American community struggles to define itself in the face of changing times which see relatively little immigration and high outmarriage, so may the biracial Japanese American struggle to find his or her place relative to this and other groups.

Persons of Japanese/White ethnic background are thrust into the borderland of ethnicity, race and culture, and must somehow find belonging and a secure sense of self. Their stance toward ethnicity is of interest as questions of what happens to the children in intermarriage are repeatedly asked. The nature of their conflicts and resolutions bear on issues of great importance in terms of the intermixing of people and the preservation of culture, and the meaning of race. Their experiences speak to the state of race relations and intercultural understanding in the United States. Hopefully, this study will provide some new insights into these questions and articulate the struggles inherent in this particular experience of being human.

II. Historical Background and Literature Review

Meeting in Japan

At the end of the war Japan lay devastated in population, devoid of commodities, food supplies, and physically destroyed by massive bombing. Thousands of American men participated in establishing U.S. bases and the Occupation government which created numerous employment opportunities for Japanese citizens. The Occupation also shook the male dominated social structure of Japan, with the legalization of female equality. While family laws no longer maintained such practices as main family authority over adult children, young female adults were called upon to forsake traditional roles and to leave home to make a living. Numerous women began to live away from home and send money to support the rest of the family.

American men met women from a culture long on tradition and short on cross-cultural relations. Most encounters occurred in the service industries that appeared around American bases, where jobs often required a certain level of education, English proficiency, and "proper" conduct (Kim, 1977). Many Japanese maintained a closed attitude toward out-marrying with the ideology of keeping a pure racial bloodline. Historically, each Japanese family must approve the background of the chosen or arranged spouse. The family line could thus remain "unpolluted" by such "impurities" as mental illness, tuberculosis, or non-Japanese heritage.

When young women started having social contact with members of the U.S. military occupation forces, individual families began to face issues of race relations and intermarriage. These relations were usually unacceptable, and if they became serious, the women were threatened and disowned. Strong emotional feelings were generated by interracial relations and families faced serious crises when young women became

involved with American men. Some families also objected because of the imminent loss of their daughter to the foreign land following marriage. Women who went out with Americans were stigmatized by family, neighbors, fellow workers, and friends who showed little understanding of their plight.

Occupation authorities who encouraged dating, relations with prostitutes, and even informal living arrangements, were opposed to marriages between Americans and Japanese (Worden, 1955) When American men tried to marry with Japanese women authorities blocked them by refusing marriages at the U.S. Consulate. Although Congress had passed the War Brides Act in December 1945 which facilitated GI's in bringing home spouses and children from overseas, it did not apply to those marrying Japanese (Spickard, 1983). It excluded wives of "racially ineligible" groups, referring to the discriminatory 1924 Immigration Act which closed all immigration from Asia. Therefore, the Consulate refused permission to marry on the grounds that the wives could not enter the United States even if married to an American (Burkhardt, 1983).

It took considerable pressure before Congress finally passed the McCarran-Walters Act in late 1952. While this bill had little effect on immigration in general and continued to effectively block most non-European immigration, it did allow Japanese wives of U.S. citizens to enter the country as non-quota immigrants. So seven years after European wives of Americans were allowed to enter the United States, Japanese women, their American husbands, and children started to come by the thousands (Kim, 1977).

These legal restrictions were just part of the barriers which couples had to overcome to be married and come to the U.S. Harassment through transfers, denial of promotion, and even threats of court martial were encountered. Officers were

accused of treating requests to marry as requests for transfer. Once surmounting these hurdles, couples faced an endless set of documents and red tape delays which caused most couples to miss the brief periods before 1952 in which Congress opened immigration for Japanese wives of Americans (Spickard, 1983).

Many couples chose to live together, often with the promise or expectation of marriage as soon as it was allowed. The American policies forced GI's and Japanese women to choose informal, unsanctioned relationships instead of marriage (Burkhardt, 1983). These policies reflected the attitudes of the times in the States and Japan against interracial marriage. Japanese had never intermarried in large numbers and there existed a prevailing belief in the racial purity of the Japanese people. In the U.S. many states still had laws prohibiting marriage between Whites and Asians (Kikumura, 1973).

These couples also met with hostility and rejection from many Japanese. As people in the U.S. would do when they encountered these couples, many Japanese stereotyped the women who were with Americans as prostitutes or as sexually immoral.

Being with the former enemy provoked in many, especially Japanese men, resentment of the women's ability to secure material goods and to sustain a relatively high lifestyle, which was not possible for other Japanese at that time. These women were often cut off from economic and emotional support of their families, sometimes disowned, and harassed by others (Kim, 1977).

These attitudes and policies contributed to the great pain and anguish which afflicted many abandoned wives and orphaned children. Children raised by single mothers in Japan who were deserted by their fathers faced great struggles. The story of Amerasians in Japan is an especially disturbing one, characterized by the neglect and prejudice of the people and governments of both countries. Amerasians have encountered

poverty, discrimination, prejudice, stigmatization, and denial of marital and educational opportunities (Strong, 1978; Hemphill, 1982). More than any other minority group in Japan, they have been maliciously stereotyped in the mass media, including popular literature, films, and comic books (DeVos and Wetherall, 1974).

The racial attitudes of the Japanese toward White and Black Americans has been transferred in essence to Amerasians. Those with White fathers have been viewed with ambivalence, depending in part on the attractiveness of their personal features to the Japanese. Those with Black fathers have been viewed more negatively and have encountered perhaps the most severe prejudice of any people in Japan. In recent years, Amerasians of middle class two parent homes have found more acceptance. Several Amerasians have become popular entertainers and models as many Japanese admire Amerasian physical characteristics. Still, the Japanese set the Amerasian apart as different and not Japanese.

The patriarchal nature of Japanese society also excludes children without a Japanese father. Only if the child was declared to be born outside marriage would they be registered with a Japanese name. Until the recent passage of reform legislation the Amerasians born of Japanese mothers encountered numerous barriers to citizenship (Wagatsuma, 1967, 1973, 1976, 1978; Lebra, 1976; Strong, 1978).

The terms which Japanese have used to refer to Amerasians are interesting to mention. Originally, the term *ainoko* was used. Literally, the term meant "child in between" or "born between" (Sanseido, 1952). It was a pejorative term and portrayed the contemptuous feeling that the child did not belong to the Japanese and also did not belong to the Americans. Later, the term came to be defined also as meaning the "mixed child", which suggested slightly more positive attitudes (Lebra, 1976). *Konketsuji* also came to be used. This term meant

literally "mixed blood infant". It was a term also used for animals and although considered better than *ainoko* was still seen as a negative term (Fleming, 1984). Presently the term which is used by most Japanese, *haafu*, is an adapted form of the English word "half." It is also used by Amerasians to describe themselves. Although it recognizes the Japanese part it still emphasizes one as only half Japanese and not fully a part of the group.

Underlying this discussion of terms is the reality of the reservation of most majority Japanese to refer to Amerasians simply as *Nihonjin*, or Japanese persons. They betray the same fear of contamination by "foreign" or "inferior" elements that many majority groups show. Amerasians in Japan have faced a pervasive national attitude which promotes the myth of Japanese racial purity, and national policies which are aimed at maintaining this myth. The attitudes expressed by Prime Minister Nakasone, denying the existence of minorities in Japan, and attributing the greatness of the Japanese, relative to the United States, to their racially pure society, depict this chauvinism (Boston Globe, Nov. 11, 1986). Minorities in Japan have suffered greatly from this prejudice which continues to afflict many Japanese people and prevents the country's move toward greater tolerance, appreciation, and cultivation of diversity both domestically and globally.

Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine this issue further, it is important to say that although there are increased numbers of elite Amerasians from upper-class business families, many Amerasians in Japan struggle with severe prejudice and discrimination. They are a part of the approximately 170,000 Amerasians in the Philippines, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand, and Laos, many of whom have been fathered and abandoned by American citizens living in these countries while carrying out official U.S. government policies (Burkhardt, 1983). Until recent highly publicized legislation designed to aid

the entry of Amerasians into the United States (Seto, 1982), which has actually affected very few Amerasians, the American government has done nothing to help them. They are a reminder of the human tragedy of a forgotten people who represent the dark side of the coming together of two peoples, and the neglect and racism of American and Japanese people and governments.

To the United States

Since 1947, more than 70,000 Japanese/American married couples have come to the United States. For most, this was seen as a natural step. American husbands desired to return home and Japanese wives hoped to escape discrimination in Japan for themselves and their children. The U.S. was seen as a more favorable place to raise Amerasian children, because it was believed that they would encounter less prejudice.

The reception which these families received when coming to America varied. Some were welcomed and strongly supported by the husband's family. For others, their greeting was cold because of the attitudes against interracial marriage, and prejudice against Japanese. The families of the husbands were often rejecting on the basis of racial difference and their attribution of loose sexual behavior by the women which had trapped the men into bringing them to America. These were the worst and most tragic cases (Kim, 1977).

Many people expected these marriages to fail. Certainly, the women found hardship in prejudice, loneliness, and homesickness. Problems in communication and cultural differences arose and frustration was felt in learning English and new and strange ways of doing things. The media commonly depicted these marriages as problematic and the women as the "loneliest brides in America" (Smith, 1952; Michener, 1955).

These couples entered a country in which persons of Japanese ancestry had been subjected to years of social and legal discrimination. The inability of the couples to secure the rights of marriage and entry into the United States until seven years after those Americans who married to European women, provides some indication of the racial situation which they encountered. During the war, the racial prejudice toward Americans of Japanese ancestry had culminated in the unprovoked massive incarceration of the entire West Coast population in American concentration camps. While the loyalty of the Japanese Americans was clearly demonstrated during the war, winning respect and acceptance, strong prejudice remained and many Japanese/American couples encountered hostility and rejection.

Despite the unfavorable sociopolitical climate, social scientists used small scale research studies to paint a positive impression of Japanese/American marriages (Strauss, 1954; Schnepf, 1955; Kimura, 1957; Connor, 1976). They showed the strengths in some marriages and their relative harmony and stability. Researchers noted the economic and psychological independence of the women before marriage and their lack of family obligations as facilitating their adjustment. The strength and adaptability of the Japanese wives was seen in contrast to the stereotype of the docile and submissive woman. Those divorces which were observed were believed to have occurred because of factors other than racial or cultural differences.

These studies helped to verify the presence of relatively successful and well functioning couples. They focused on intact families who were from areas where there are relatively large concentrations of Japanese Americans. This research also focused on the strengths in some of these relationships. The strong motivations to surmount difficulties and the resilience and independence of some of these Japanese women can be

observed in these studies.

A report from a West Coast research project revealed a wide range of degrees of adjustment by Japanese women married to Americans (S. Kim, 1975). The women were classified into four types:

"newcomers" - who were extremely vulnerable

"homemakers" - who were in stable marriages

"unstablers" - who were separated, deserted, divorced, or in crisis

"subculturals" - who were adjusted after a period of instability

This study attempted to document the complexity of the various degrees of adjustment and maladjustment found in this population.

The troubled side of many marriages involving American military personnel and Asian women also became documented in reports from social service workers. They were identified as a probable high-risk mental health group by various committees who were targeting special needs groups of Asian Americans (e.g. First National Conference on Asian American Mental Health, 1972). The National Inquiry on the Needs and Problems of Asian Wives of U.S. Servicemen in 1975 reported numerous cases of extreme domestic violence against the women. The inquiry highlighted the severe problems of those Asian women who became known to human service providers through problems of physical abuse, neglect, severe depression, suicide and suicide attempts (Kim, 1977).

A report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1979 emphasized these and other concerns, such as low socio-economic level, low educational background, lack of marketable skills, and problems of single parent families. Unlike other reports which tended to minimize the problems, this one emphasized the massive adjustments required of the Japanese wife in coming to the U.S. The lack of organized services available to alleviate these strains and pressures was revealed as an area of special concern (Kim, 1979).

In problematic marriages, one cause of trouble appears to be the realization that individuals incorrectly viewed their partners in stereotype before marriage. The inability to accurately assess the strengths and weaknesses and desires of their potential partner was enhanced by the language barrier which most couples experienced. Communication problems because of the wife's limited English, and the husband's and children's limited Japanese caused extended hardship and emotional distance. Many women appeared to suffer from lowered self esteem and feelings of being inept and inferior to White American women, and of being an embarrassment to their children (Kim, 1981).

These various studies and reports suggest that there is no simple picture that can be drawn of Japanese women who have married to Americans in the years following the end of the war and in subsequent years. There clearly are happily married and well adjusted families. There are also many with problems serious enough to merit the initiation of several social service programs specifically targeting their needs (Sue & Morishima, 1982). In both cases there are massive adjustments required of the couples in making the move from Japan to the U.S.

There does appear to be an unmet need which the American military and human service communities have not filled. Couples require more assistance in making the difficult transition to the United States. Those who suffer from mental stress and other problems as a result of the unique and difficult strains and pressures which they face, need help in making the massive transitions and adjustments required of them. Past efforts have established several social service programs which have all died due to lack of funding.

Many younger Japanese/American couples have met under different conditions from those which the first couples encountered. American men who marry Japanese are not all connected with the military, and Japanese men are also

marrying with American women, creating new types of marriages. Most research on Japanese/American couples focuses on those who met in Japan through the husband's connection with the military and who may differ considerably from other Japanese/American couples.

Although not addressing the children directly, these reports on Japanese/American marriage also cast light and shadows on Amerasians. Some researchers citing impressionistic evidence of racial prejudice and other unique problems, called for research on the children (Kim, 1984; Connor, 1976). The reports of families troubled by domestic violence, divorce, and low socio-economic status also clearly indicate the need for attention to the children (Kim, 1981).

Although many parents assumed that their children would not encounter problems once they were away from Japan, other people seem to have assumed from the beginning that the children of Japanese/American couples would encounter identity conflicts. Some regarded the anti-Japanese prejudice in the U.S. as adversely affecting the kids. It also became quickly apparent that the Japanese women who married Americans were not always welcomed and accepted by Japanese American communities, so that those who lived near these communities were seen as likely to be rejected by Japanese Americans as well as by Whites and Blacks (Kitano, 1969; Morishima, 1982).

As interracial persons in the United States, Amerasians have encountered conditions which were based on the history of interracial relations and marriage. There is a body of social science literature on interracial persons which is informative to examine as a way of providing a base of understanding for our study. The literature directly on interracial Amerasians will also be examined in detail for its implications in the direction of this research endeavor.

Interracial Persons as Marginal

Interracial persons have often been viewed in social science and popular literature as problematic. The early beliefs of the incompatibility of races, fears of mongrelization, and of creating idiots, eventually gave way to a fear that interracial persons were destined to live marginal lives due to their precarious position in the social world (Kovel, 1971). The personality type was seen not as a biological consequence of racial intermixture but as a social phenomenon resulting from the fact of divided loyalties (Reuter, 1931; Kovel, 1971).

The theory of marginality was developed partly from the study of interracial persons early in the century and heavily influenced popular views of interracial persons (Stonequist, 1937). The theory depicted interracial persons as caught between two social groups of which the person could never fully be a part. Seeing oneself from these two conflicting sides and points of view created ambivalence, self-consciousness, malaise, and hyper-sensitivity. Because a person's social status was constantly called into question a person was seen as developing inferiority feelings, isolation, not belonging and a certain degree of maladjustment (Park, 1928, 1931, 1937).

This theory developed from the analysis of cultures coming together through massive immigration, colonization, and wars. The conflict which was created was seen as leading persons to a position between two cultures in which one was not fully or permanently accommodated to either. In attempting to adjust to one's situation the three choices available were seen as:

- 1) assimilation into the dominant group
- 2) assimilation into the minority group
- 3) adjusting to a middle group.

In the United States the healthy solution was seen as adjusting to one's place in the minority group (Stonequist, 1937, 1939, 1942). Other theorists described this third choice as

"apathetic reaction" and as a retreat from conflict situations of the other two choices (Child, 1943).

These writings should be viewed in the context of the prevalent social theories of determinism and genetic superiority of White people. They do not advocate a belief in racial equality, and positive statements about interracial people refer to their superiority to the group of color but inferiority to Whites. Further, this body of work promotes a world view of the superiority of European culture and the natural desirability of assimilating into this dominant culture. This view denigrates the value of non-White races and cultures.

Problems were seen as occurring when there were major differences between groups involved. Also they would occur when the person tried to pass in the dominant group or when passage into the dominant group was blocked by social barriers. They could also occur when an individual attempted to identify with both his own and the dominant group. An ideal solution was seen as accepting leadership of the colored group (Stonequist, 1937).

Later work emphasized the problems of interracial persons, claiming that they suffered from a variety of identity and adjustment conflicts (e.g. Gordon, 1964; Piskacek, 1973). Their lack of a definite place in society meant that they were doomed to the unhappiness of the lack of a secure sense of belonging. Written from the perspective of both the dominant group as well as ethnic minority group, interracial persons were seen as missing the inclusion in the dominant group and also the gifts of ethnicity.

Children of mixed couples were said to develop serious psychological and emotional problems, value conflicts, and temperamental conduct due to the cultural differences between parents and prejudice and discrimination that prevails toward individuals of mixed ethnic backgrounds (Gordon, 1964). One extreme case of these studies selected a psychiatric population of

interracial persons and showed how they suffered from devaluation of color, resentment of both parents, an inability to identify with either, and resentment of siblings whose racial characteristics were seen as more favorable (Teicher, 1962).

Children of mixed marriages were described as suffering from a variety of identity and adjustment conflicts and lacking a strong social network (Vander Zanden, 1963). Parents were supposedly unable to provide a stable and coherent identity that comes from knowing who and what you are. Children therefore developed ambivalence toward both social and cultural groups. Because of their background they were viewed to be subject to more cultural diversity and unlikely to identify with any given ethnicity. It was also felt that they did not consider ethnic boundaries as important and were more likely to engage in intermarriage themselves (Murguia, 1982).

Problems were attributed to the prejudices which often arose in a parent when the first child was born. Children were seen as victims of the inability of parents to accept each other's racial background and to compromise and attempt to integrate cultural backgrounds. Children who have seemingly escaped from racism in their early years were believed to have encountered it when they became of the age when dating and mating were important to them (Adams, 1973; Mann, 1977).

Since the time when the marginality theory was first proposed as a model for conceptualizing the lives of interracial persons, a sense of futility has pervaded views of the choices before them. In trying to reach a secure sense of a racial identity, it was suggested that they used common compensatory mechanisms, such as:

- 1) overidentification with one race as defense against identity confusion
- 2) negative identification and rejection of one race
- 3) standstill solution leading to alienation (Piskacek, 1973)

Therefore, it was between that if the children tried to