Title

Pluralistic Realities and Tenuous Paradigms: Critical Examinations of Race and "Normativity" in Japanese/American Multiethnic and Multiracial History

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4j3997h8

Author

Ong, James Man

Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Pluralistic Realities and Tenuous Paradigms: Critical Examinations of Race and "Normativity" in Japanese/American Multiethnic and Multiracial History

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Asian American Studies

by

James Man Ong

2014

ABSTRACT OF THIS THESIS

Pluralistic Realities and Tenuous Paradigms: Critical Examinations of Race and "Normativity" in Japanese/American Multiethnic and Multiracial History

By

James Man Ong

Master of Arts in Asian American Studies

University of California, Los Angeles, 2014

Professor Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Chair

In both the US and Japan in recent decades, multiethnicity has become an increasingly significant phenomenon for Japanese/Americans. Though relative minorities in the past, mixed individuals have become an emerging demographic as successive generations of individuals of Japanese and non-Japanese ancestry have transgressed social barriers, ethnic racial boundaries and national divides, blending diverse ancestries and cultures into unique syntheses. While individuals may be independently optimistic about this burgeoning diversity, others have resisted, at times violently. Multiethnic and multiracial Japanese/Americans have historically faced prejudice and discrimination on the basis of their fraught racial positionality. Despite improvements, this thesis argues that racial violence continues to tacitly resonate in the present, thus refuting the notion that the US has become a "post racial society." This project analyzes past and contemporary systems in both the US and Japan in order to identify and critically analyze structures of racial power which circumscribe mixed experiences.

The thesis of James Man Ong is approved.

David K. Yoo

King-Kok Cheung

Robert Chao Romero

Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2014

For anyone who has ever felt lost, hurt or challenged because they were seen as "in-between."

You and your stories are valuable.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements:

There are far too many people I wish to thank for helping me get this project completed and for supporting me throughout the process in various capacities.

First and foremost, I am deeply and utterly indebted to my chair and advisor, Lane Ryo Hirabayashi. Without his gracious support and kind advice before entering the UCLA Asian American Studies Program, I would not have had nearly the confidence that I did. Moreover, this project would have never gotten off the ground were it not for his insight and knowledge of the materials. Lane has done so much more than endowed knowledge; he has also been an invaluable source of moral and intellectual support. His generosity knows no bounds. He has encouraged me with many opportunities to teach, create, do research and learn at a level that was extremely rigorous and rewarding. I was truly blessed to meet him.

My committee members King-Kok Cheung and David Yoo deserve huge praise. Their constructive suggestions about both the content and form of the overall project were invaluable. I cannot thank them enough for their tremendous support and for taking extra time needed to give me direct feedback through multiple drafts. I would especially like to thank Professor Cheung for all her advice on the very early drafts of these chapters during my first year in the program.

I would also like to thank my committee member Robert Chao Romero in particular. I respect Professor Romero for so many reasons, both professional and personal. His mentorship and moral support really gave me the final boost I needed. As I was coming to the end of the first draft, the professor reminded me of the importance of this scholarship beyond myself and my immediate field. He and I share the same vision of what mixed-race studies can do in terms of starting critical conversations within the academy and between folks in our communities.

While not attached to the project in a direct advisory role, I cannot thank Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu enough for his guidance. Before speaking with him, I never truly thought that studying my mixed heritage was a) something of intellectual value and b) something worthwhile to others. Beyond his prodigious scholarship, for which this thesis draws from liberally, the time he has taken to mentor me through all things academic and personal has had a tremendous impact on my spiritual development. As I come to terms with the implications of my work in my own life, he has been a constant and unfailing source of inspiration and support. I could never properly express my gratitude or thank him for his scholarship and care.

I also need to thank Paul Spickard, Curtiss Takada-Rooks, and Cindy Nakashima for their help over the last few years. Professor Spickard really went out of his way to encourage and connect me with good people just as I was coming to know there was such a thing as mixed-race studies. He truly made me see a new side of myself and the worth of my experiences. Without him, I would have been literally lost as a person with ideas but nowhere to go. His scholarship was some of the very first I read and has since left a lasting impact on the way I approach my

Chapter I: Introduction, Structure, Theoretical Framework, and Research Goals

> The boundaries between people disturb me. When we see the world as Us versus Them, drawing firm lines of nations, races, genders, or religions, we construct barriers that we are willing to fight and kill to defend. I try to make these boundaries more pliant, permeable, and flexible. I am a Japanese who is also American; I am Westerner and Easterner; I am a man who takes care of kids; I am a Catholic who is Buddhist. I identify with all these groups, not confining myself to any. I live with these tensions, these apparent contradictions. I claim many identities yet refuse to be limited by any of them…Living in multicultural communities with the complexities of our times demands that we develop a perspective, a consciousness, a worldview, and identities that take into account the whole planet, acknowledging the interconnectedness of all beings.[1]

Growing up mixed in both Japan and the United States, between separate cultural influences and between interconnected racial systems, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu thoroughly understands the dimensions of race and power surrounding multiethnic Japanese Americans and Amerasians. With great mindfulness, the professor is meditating on the future of "mixed-race" with a sense of optimism and trepidation. This view comes from both his professional and lived experiences. As someone who is intimately connected to the academic field and has witnessed firsthand the limits of individual agency within biased systems, Stephen looks towards change in the present while remaining mindful of trials in the past. His story, as well as those of thousands of others, offers critical perspectives of the everyday practices and structures which have created and continue to create ideological and material boundaries between *monoethnicity* and *multiethnicity*.

This thesis examines constructions of identity and processes of racial formation which marginalized multiethnic Japanese Americans and Amerasians during the Japanese American incarceration, the occupation of Japan and the postwar era in both nations. Within these three distinct fields, I will demonstrate how power emerges from the ways individuals, communities and "state" apparatuses conceptualize and operationalize monoethnic/racial "normativity" vis-à-vis multiethnicity. This project analyzes acts of oppression and violence to show how certain

articulations of ethnic, racial, cultural and legal identity create forms of subjectivity for those recognized and marked as ethnically or racially mixed.

Mixed individuals can assert and empower themselves by making personal meaning of and finding wholeness in their embodied diversity.[2] This project praises those who posit "alternative" identity formation processes and venerates the accomplishments of various mixed-race movements. At the same time, while acknowledging positive change, it outlines the limitations of individual agency due to structural and social hegemony.[3] The power to mark *racial difference* in relation to what some consider "normative" monoethnic Japanese phenotype and cultural identity is undoubtedly marginalizing and often violent. I argue that multiethnics are "othered" by monoethnic constructions of identity which inherently racialize and invoke social distance. Whether mixed-race is seen as a negative or positive characteristic, the recognition of difference through the imposition of "normativity" is a consequentially omnipresent dimension of social interactions and institutional processes.

Together, these substantive case studies reveal the severity of racial violence in the past and the continued social displacement of multiethnic individuals in the present. These narratives complicate the supposedly unilateral dynamics of racial hegemony by demonstrating how power and subjectivity emerge from both mainstream discourses and ethnic group-specific "subdominant discourses."[4] Thus, this project shows how the engagement of ethnic, racial, social and legal "normativity" and socially constructed identities have oppressed mixed individuals through various means with varying outcomes.

Theoretical Framework: Discursive Normativity and Multiethnic Racialization

My original contribution to the field is the framework of *discursive normativity*, the notion that ethnic/racial identity is always conceptualized differently due to the existence of

multiple "normativities" yet is perpetually engaged in ways that marginalize multiethnics, and *multiethnic racialization*, systemic practices which inconsistently identify and mark mixed individuals as "a part of" or "apart from" certain racialized groups because of ambiguous phenotype or political ascription. These two concepts illustrate ways racial logic is reinvigorated and redefined in direct response to the mixed "racial other." Their ambiguity adds additional layers of complexity to these processes and causes acts of discrimination which are arguably unique to multiethnic experiences.

The construction of "normativity," as well as the perception of *racial difference*, depends on the interpretation of racial meaning. Despite hypothetical fluidity, our ethnic identity is principally defined by distinguishable physical traits rather than cultural or experiential substance.[5] As beings in racial societies, Michael Omi and Howard Winant argue that "racial common sense" over-determines other factors of identity formation; to wit, race delimits what can be considered "authentic" ethnic identity based on phenotype.[6] Since race is an embedded dynamic of structural functionality and everyday civil society, institutions and individuals interpret and impose ostensibly fixed socio-political meaning and boundaries according to specified racial classifications.[7]

However, individuals, groups and national bodies interpret racial meaning in relation to multiethnicity with significant variance. Rather than a single meaning, these entities create emergent, subjective, overlapping and often incongruous definitions of race which impose multiple parameters of ethnic, national and cultural "normativity." While the process is never consistent, the sense of *distance* between monoethnic and the multiethnic "racial other" is a constant variable. Conversely, the recognition of *racial difference* in relation to prevailing

monoracial ethnic, cultural, and national identities, while again varied, is a fundamental

dimension of social exchanges.

Foremost, visual interpretation of racial identity depends upon both the enactor's

understanding of racial meaning as well as the multiethnic individual's phenotypical variance.[8] If

someone looks racially ambiguous in regards to the referenced ethnic group (i.e. looks Japanese

or not compared to those considered monoracial), they can be easily differentiated. This occurs

for the great majority of individuals in this thesis, particularly for someone like Dennis Tojo

(chapter II) who appears Caucasian, has a Japanese last name and was thus easily distinguishable

amongst his monoethnic peers. On the other hand, if one is able to "pass," they may avoid this

kind of visual judgment altogether, such as Virgil Westdale (chapter II, IV) who was only

identified as Japanese through legal means. At the same time, interpretations of phenotype can

elide or suppress complex identities. Mitzi Carter (chapter IV) has a rich cultural background but

is often assumed to be "only Black" because of her African American phenotype.

Legal ascriptions can racially identify those who are otherwise unrecognizably mixed.

Even though one may not look mixed or Japanese, records such as birth certificates or some

other form of official documentation can indicate racial hybridity. Citizenship laws are one of the

clearest examples of this dynamic. It is especially significant since laws affect both individuals

and groups. Chapter IV illustrates how those who fall outside "normative" parameters of highly

racialized Japanese citizenship are politically and socially marked for being unable to fulfill them.

Furthermore, though race was not officially recorded in the family register (*koseki)*, this

document identified many Amerasian children as "fatherless," which could also potentially

signify mixed ancestry.

Those who may or may not make claims to their Japanese ethnicity can be recognized as "other" because of their cultural multiplicity and/or lack of "proper" cultural capital.[9] The children of Marie Lee and Jean Lew (chapter II), though perhaps able to racially "pass" because of their Japanese and Chinese ancestry, were identified as mixed since they did not possess Japanese language skills, nor were they connected to the ethnic community. During different periods of her life, Akemi Johnson (chapter IV) has felt pressured to authenticate her "Japaneseness" and perform to the expectations of others because of her given name. Norma Field (chapter III, IV), through no fault of her own, was subsequently marked by the public discourse surrounding Amerasians during her childhood. Conversely, Lane Hirabayashi (chapter IV) was sometimes unfairly scrutinized despite his active participation and contributions to the San Francisco Japanese American community because of his ambiguous phenotype.

Moreover, the interpretation and consequence of "normativity" depends on the level of analysis. Who determines and manages these definitions has everything to do with power and positionality. Parameters of Japanese ethnicity vary depending on the person imposing them; some may see identity as principally physical while others may emphasize cultural or experiential attributes. Personal interpretations can reify structural hegemony, especially if institutions or communal entities have a strong influence over public opinion; in postwar Japan (chapter IV), individual views generally resonated with "state" rhetoric. What's more, personal opinions may conflict with "state" views; while the WRA defined mixed individuals as racially Japanese, other Japanese Americans sometimes disagreed with this categorization (chapter III).

Furthermore, the way "normativity" is engaged depends on the context and actors involved. Both the conceptualization of race and subsequent actions depend on inconsistent and circumstantial variables. Since phenotype is highly individualized and there is no single "mixed-

race type," recognition and thus racialization are not universal processes.[10] The perception of racial phenotype also inherently changes as mixed individuals move between different contexts and are thus subjected to different "normativities." Some may posit culture over race and be more accepting of hybridity while others may not. This is particularly applicable for multiethnics whose phenotype seems highly ambiguous. The severity of discrimination may vary depending on the level of interaction. Finally, being legally or socially marked as "other" may be more or less significant in a given context. The determination of "normativity" from a "state" or community entity may be more consequential than personal acts of aggression, but the opposite may be true as well; both laws as well individual prejudice have proven to be traumatic, totalizing and adverse.

Clearly, there is no universal way to define identity, nor are multiethnics differentiated from monoethnics by a single method of classification. In sum, the idea of "normativity" is fraught because it depends on a myriad of systemic and situational factors. Whole groups as well as individuals can be subjected to one, some, none or different combinations of these social, cultural and political dynamics. However, what remains salient is the sense of distance posited by the construction of monoethnic "normativity" and inversely, multiethnic "anormativity."

The *racialization* of m*ultiethnics* augments these ideological dynamics by operationalizing notions of "blood purity" to maintain distinctions between monoethnics and those positioned anomalously in-between racial groups. Multiethnics often display high levels of physical variability which disrupt prevailing criteria of identity (namely phenotype associated with the possession of cultural capital and a form of group affiliation) and racial group formation processes.[11] Omi and Winant argue that mixed individuals complicate these dynamics by diverging from "racial expectations." As the authors note, "we [society] utilize race to provide

clues about *who* a person is. This fact is made painfully obvious when we encounter someone whom we cannot conveniently racially categorize – someone who is, for example, racially 'mixed' or of an ethnic/racial group we are not familiar with."[12] As a result, Japanese/American multiethnics are judged by multilateral, multilayered and multivalent dynamics.[13] This can lead to conflict as multiethnics are either unfairly evaluated by "monoethnic" standards or by separate rubrics which compulsively treat them as "other."

Since multiethnics may not readily follow these conventions, they are racialized in ways that often elide their plurality or judge them illogically. Multiethnics can be racialized as monoracial or ethnic (i.e. seen as just Japanese *or* Caucasian), intersectional (i.e. seen as Japanese *and* Black), "part" (i.e. possessing a "racial deficit," *not* recognized as "whole" Japanese) or "other" (i.e. completely ambiguous). Some may make assumptions or cite discernible racial "difference" to hold Japanese/American multiethnics to different cultural standards.[14] Phenotype can also be particularly consequential for those of certain physical compositions, especially "minority-minority" mixes, because of preexisting racial hierarchies.[15] This dynamic is particularly important because of its relation to structural racism between broader racial groups. Racialized legal definitions, cultural characteristics or names can force certain identities while eliding the intricacies of plurality. These processes also reconstitute the supposed legitimacy of broad racial categories by further privileging phenotype as the key constituent of identity.[16] Multiethnics may be racialized in completely different ways by separate actors in the same context or when they enter different "racial ecologies."[17] In sum, these inconsistent processes impose and deny identity based on visual judgment.

Categorical binaries can also marginalize multiethnics by identifying them as "parts" rather than "wholes." Omi argues that paradigms inevitably generate inequalities by reinforcing

dualistic logic and the rigidity of color lines.[18] Instead of valuing individual diversity, Cynthia Nakashima believes race paradigms cause actors to either lump *all* multiethnics into a nebulous "othered" group or force them into a single ethnic category.[19] These binaries also tend to essentialize hybridity as a hyper-positive or hyper-pathologized trait. Though trite, the exaggerated "tragic mulatto" or "best of both worlds" tropes are often unwittingly used to frame multiraciality as inherently "better or worse," but never "normal."[20] Gendered stereotypes that objectify mixed women as hyper-sexualized, loose and exotic are also common.[21] To wit, racial and ethnic paradigms limit the ways pluralistic identity can be expressed or legitimated.[22]

Multiethnic Asian Americans may possess intersectional social identities that are informed by historical Asian/American race politics.[23] According to Wei Ming Dariotis and Laura Kina, the complex social and political positionality of Asian/Americans cannot be completely divested from multiethnic experiences.[24] While they may share similarities, mixed individuals also have, "histories, social locations and therefore identifications that differ from others with Asian ancestry as well as from those of their multiracial counterparts who are not of Asian heritage."[25] Orientalist discourses in tandem with the racialized nature of names, phenotype and cultural capital in Asian/American communities potentially affect *anyone* who embodies Asian ancestry.[26]

Multiethnics can also be associated with monolithic images conflating ethnic and national belonging. The notion of *nations tied to bodies and bodies tied to nations* seems particularly evident when comparing the separate systems of the incarceration and postwar occupation. While linked to multiple populations, multiethnics were imprisoned in the US and ostracized in Japan for being associated with the "enemy nation." In the presented case studies, many

individuals are marked by their association with distinct ethnic groups *and* by the interpretation of their ancestry holistically.

Though interpretations and reactions to mixed-race invariably change, the sense of anomaly remains salient. These discursive identity formations invariably mark multiraciality as both "the same" and/or "other," creating forms of subjectivity which enable social distancing.[27] Michel Foucault suggests power and subject formations are derived from such entrapping modes of inquiry and objectification.[28] Admittedly, *racial difference* is not always interpreted or internalized negatively. Many multiethnics, including this scholar, cherish the sense of empowerment that comes from having a "mixed" perspective.[29] At the same time, the imposition of "otherness" can also lead to exclusion, ostracism and violence.

Thus, power emerges from the ability to conceptualize, legitimate and impose definitions of Japanese identity and rationalize these complex sociopolitical boundaries.[30] While multiethnics may be culturally or politically indistinguishable from monoethnics, others can subjectively and interchangeably use "normative standards" to perpetuate the state of "otherness" or actively pathologize *racial difference*.[31] Race also affects the ways monoethnics posit *racial difference* towards and between mixed individuals as power is distributed unevenly based on racial composition (i.e. those of Black ancestry are at a particular disadvantage).[32] Though far from universally applicable, as beings in racialized societies, the imposition or unconscious operation of *discursive normativity* and *multiethnic racialization* creates the potential for inequity and oppression. In the end, individual *agency* is tied to negotiations with asymmetrical definitions, standards and social structures.[33]

The following chapters analyze various power dynamics which have specifically affected mixed Japanese Americans and Amerasians. These narratives illustrate the complexity and

variability of interpersonal, communal and structural race dynamics as well as the multifaceted nature of these constructed phenomena. Mixed individuals exist on the ideological margins of ethnic groups and societies where race as a concept is not only divergently conceptualized but definitions of identity are erratically, subjectively and intermittently engaged. Rather than starkly dualistic, there exists a broad range of possible outcomes, noting that multiethnics may be subject to some, none or many forms of oppression. For some, discrimination can be a minor inconvenience; for others, it can be highly detrimental.

Structure

Each of the chronologically arranged body chapters presents a unique set of variables and approaches to this stated framework. The racial dynamics and processes within each field demonstrate how the concept of "normativity" emerges differently between *and* within the specified spatial and temporal contexts of camp, the occupation and postwar social-scapes.

Chapter II focuses on the dualistic imposition of racial identity by "state" policies and social conventions during the incarceration era. While multiethnics were legally recognized as racially "Japanese enough" to be imprisoned by the War Relocation Authority, some were met with hostility from other Japanese Americans who perceived them as racially "non-Japanese." Testimonies of prejudice, trauma, and painful family separations indicate that multiracial individuals suffered considerably at the hands of these incongruent yet totalizing racial standards.

Chapter III shows how Amerasians were marginalized by parameters of racialized citizenship and nationality during the American occupation of postwar Japan, demonstrating a similar pattern of state and social xenophobia on the other side of the Pacific. During this period, though recognized as Japanese to an extent, they were neither legally nor socially accepted as fully part of the national polity. Moreover, their "partial ancestry" became the locus of structural

violence. Between 1946 and1952, perplexing, ill-defined and incredibly biased naturalization laws left many Amerasians in a state of virtual statelessness, as only a select few were able to attain full legal rights. Thousands of mixed children were orphaned, abandoned, and in extreme cases, left to die as a direct result of political indifference and compounding social ostracism. Even after laws were amended, Amerasians were ostensibly denied "social citizenship" and access to essential institutional services, education and employment because of their legally and historically marked racial difference.

Chapter IV digresses from broad historical overviews and instead focuses on interpersonal racialization dynamics in greater detail, emphasizing the importance of examining symbolic as well as direct forms of violence. In these personal histories, it becomes clear that the idea of "authenticity" is constantly reinterpreted and rearticulated because of specific micro variables. Individual experiences of oppression provide invaluable evidence for elucidating the persistence of subtle racial dynamics in acts of misidentification and microaggressions. While this type of trauma may seem less overtly discriminatory or trivial in comparison to violence in previous decades, it is important to consider how such "soft violence" also perpetuates inequality on the basis of race.

Terminology

The terms *monoethnic*, *multiethnic*, *multiracial* and *Amerasian* are used liberally throughout this thesis. *Monoethnicity*, as defined by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cindy Nakashima, is a social construct used to organize individuals into groups based on shared cultural practices, histories, spatial origins, ancestral genealogies and senses of "peoplehood" under single identities.[34] Therefore, *multiethnicity* represents the amalgamation of two or more of these purportedly exclusive socio-political categories. Conversely, *multiraciality* (alternatively

11

mixed-race) signifies the mixing between racial groups, emphasizing the historical boundaries and purported "blood purity" between the races.[35] *Amerasian* specifically refers to Asian/Americans of mixed ancestry born as a direct result of US military actions in the Pacific. Pearl S. Buck first coined the term to describe the orphans, "war victims" and often illegitimate children of American soldiers and women of occupied populations.[36] Thus, Japanese Amerasians are linked to specific, politically-loaded transnational histories.[37]

While this thesis deals with racial as well as ethnic dimensions, I primarily use the term multiethnic since those who are multiracial are inherently multiethnic while the reverse is not necessarily the case. Furthermore, I do not want to disregard the significance of mixing between different Asian groups nor overlook the fact that interethnic and interracial dynamics operate similarly. Multiracial is generally only used when it is specified in the source material. "Amerasian" is used to refer to very specific individuals. Generally, names in this thesis are presented with given name first, family name second. Since chapter III deals with the Japanese geopolitical space, I use the Japanese system of family names first, given names second.

Methodology

This thesis concurrently engages qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Demographic and historical overviews provide breadth while qualitative analysis offers vital insight that cannot be adequately captured by quantitative analysis alone. Since variables such as phenotype differ widely between individuals, close analysis is essential.[38] My project culls data from primary sources such as interviews, demographic studies, manuscripts and media resources.

This mixed methodology engages multiple levels of analysis to show the depth, scope and complexity of these issues. While chapters II and III focus on the totality of mainstream social conventions, chapter IV provides much needed nuance and detail. Chapter III, for example,

focuses on structural dynamics, government policies and multiple localities to show the scope

and scale of oppression towards Amerasians as a group. To supplement broader macro analysis,

qualitative analysis addresses the particularities of individual experiences. Chapter IV analyzes

microaggressions and internal processes to delineate the significance of idiosyncratic dimensions.

In chapter II, I use a balanced approach, utilizing primary source archival data, official policies

records and oral histories to capture camp experiences from various angles.

Though admittedly problematic, my project treats Japanese and other ethnicities as

monolithic concepts. Certainly, this thesis cannot account for every variable or the complexity of

all identity formations.[39] Furthermore, I also assume Japanese ancestry is a reasonably salient

factor for either the mixed individual or the external observer. By doing so, I am able to draw

direct material and indirect ideological connections between these contexts.

Global Mixed-Race

This project offers only a glimpse into the various social, political and racial dimensions

of the incarceration, postwar Japan, and the decades that followed. Moreover, multiethnicity is

not new or exclusive to Japanese or Asian/Americans; the phenomenology of mixing is diverse,

age-old, and truly global. While obvious differences exist, there are striking parallels between

worldwide mixed experiences and subsequent issues of race, group formations and belonging.

The history of racial mixing in the United States is exceptionally bleak and violent.

American Indian populations have suffered untold destitution at the hands of colonial settlers and

forced integration.[40] The black/white paradigm emerged during the slave era when anti-

miscegenation laws (enacted state-by-state since 1660) and mechanisms such as the "one-drop-

rule" were used to brutally separate the races and oppress mixed African slaves through

hypodescent.[41] In the 1880s, "Blackness" remained demonized as ideologies of "blood

contamination," emergent racial classifications and Jim Crow laws prevented mixed individuals from transgressing social boundaries.[42] While "whiteness" can also be disaggregated in regards to historical discrimination towards mixing with Irish, Italian and so-called "lesser-whites," color lines and racial hierarchies aimed at discouraging intermixing with Blacks have been markedly more violent, enduring well beyond the annulment of anti-miscegenation laws.[43] According to Reginald Daniels and Carla Bradshaw, continued acceptance of the black/white paradigm obscures centuries of "multi-Blackness," flattening the complexity of white/Black mixing and more recently Afro/Asian Americans.[44]

Though limited, mixing is not new to Japan. Interracial intimacies have occurred since initial contact between Europeans and populations in the Western domains of the Japanese archipelago. For many centuries, intermixing was an exceptional phenomenon. *Konketsuka* (blood mixing) between European men and Japanese women was relatively rare, transitory and isolated.[45] The shift from *sakoku* (national isolation) exclusion to modernization via Meiji reforms, the importation of Western ideas and the legalization of interracial marriage in 1873 signaled levels of tolerance towards mixing despite European and Japanese racial sentiments.[46] These pre-Pacific War intimacies were generally limited to those of privileged classes who had intimate contact with foreigners, such as the Helms of Yokohama.[47]

Multiethnicity was an important part of Asian/American migration histories. In many ways, mixing and *mestizaje* are foundational components of collective identity in many Latin American nations.[48] Japanese *dekasegi* (migrant workers) who immigrated to Mexico, Peru and Brazil after 1900 experienced varying degrees of integration because of external hostility and self-imposed communal insularity.[49] Over time, cultural and racial "Japaneseness" became redefined and hybridized in these new environments. In Brazil for instance, though seemingly

positive, "physical ethnic markers" have maintained degrees of social distance for both mixed and non-mixed Japanese who adopt culturally Brazilian identities.[50] Despite common origins, Japanese/Brazilian laborers who travel to Japan for work are often discriminated against for being "culturally unassimilable"[51] In Sonora, Mexico, Chinese/Mexican couples and interracial children became targets of the violent *anti-Chinista* campaigns following the Mexican Revolution. Chinese/Mexicans were not only disavowed by Mexican nationals as the "wrong type of *mestizaje*" because of Eurocentric "*blanco-criollo*" ideology, popular culture images and political propaganda depicted them as pathologized, "less-than-human" aberrations unworthy of Mexican bloodlines.[52]

Some early Asian American communities formed as a direct result of interracial mixing. Around 1910, many Punjabi immigrants and Mexican women who had fled from Mexico during the revolution intermarried in California's Imperial Valley.[53] Since both groups were similarly oppressed, they cultivated strong support systems, subsequently fostering deep relationships and displaying extraordinary resilience by circumventing anti-miscegenation laws.[54] Around this same time, Mexicans and Filipinos formed unions in San Diego. Shared experiences of racialization, segregation and cultural overlaps led to solidarity movements which facilitated cross-communal networks and relationships. This mixing resulted in the unique hybridized "Mexipino" identity.[55] These narratives illustrate how certain mixed identities form as a result of localized circumstances and are foundational to certain Asian/American histories.

Amerasian children in Japan, Korea and Vietnam were similarly victimized by racialized political and social systems.[56] As symbolic "products of war," many were associated with traumatic histories, social issues and racial abjectivity. Amerasians abandoned during the Korean War were subjected to the racial biases of ethnocentric policies and cultural beliefs which framed

Korea as a "one race nation."[57] Their internationally publicized despondency eventually became a political liability, urging the Korean government to hastily change adoption legislation and create lasting international adoption infrastructures.[58] Thousands of Amerasian children (some estimate as many as 100,000) were abandoned and rendered social outcasts during and after the Vietnam War.[59] Racism, as well as political apathy from both the US and Vietnamese governments, ostensibly denied Amerasians of their rights and livelihoods by creating permanent barriers to education, employment and social inclusion.[60]

While tied to these global histories, the scope of my study is limited to particular localities, temporalities, individuals and systems. Though drawing direct parallels between these global histories may be impossible, the discussion of power formation in relation to "in-between" populations is one that is both historically and broadly relevant.

Immediacy of the Issue

As this thesis will outline in greater detail, interracial mixing in Japan and the US has shifted from a relatively isolated to a widely pervasive social phenomenon. Demographically speaking, multiethnicity can no longer be viewed as marginal but an undoubtedly central topic for Asian American communities. Census data and substantial quantitative evidence signify the exponential growth of the multiethnic Japanese American demographic and the inevitability of change in the coming decades. Larry Shinagawa and Gin Pang's 1988 statistical analysis showed that by 1977, just 3% of national and 9.7% of California marriages were interethnic or interracial.[61] However, Asian Americans had remarkably high outmarriage rates. By 1980, though most Asian Americans were still practicing endogamy, outmarriage had become a noticeably common trend, especially when compared to other racial groups. Incredibly, Japanese Americans already showed a 46.6% outmarriage rate, mostly with Caucasians and Chinese.[62]

Aside from gender, nativity was a telling factor; just 14.4% of US born Japanese compared to 42.1% foreign born were intermarried.[63] Their findings also indicated correlations with educational achievement, socio-economic status and high levels of integration.[64]

The 1990 Census continued to illustrate this explosive multiethnic population growth. Though only 3.4% of the total national population, multiracial births overall (including Asian Americans) had increased by 260% since the early 1970s.[65] By 1992, multiethnic Japanese American births were approaching monoethnic rates.[66] These staggering findings showed just how obsolete the Census' five-race framework had become.[67]

By the new millennium, the Asian American population in total had increased 48% from 6.6 to 10.2 million individuals. Had multiethnic Asian Americans been included, the population increase would have been 72%. Thus, as of 2000, 1.6 million of *all* Asian Americans claimed mixed ancestry, representing roughly 13.5% of the total population. The majority of "in combination" (two or more races/ethnicities) and "alone" (monoethnic) Asian Americans were settled throughout the West, most living in California. Japanese Americans were split between 30.7% multiethnic and 69.3% monoethnic with a 52% outmarriage rate. Asian and Pacific Islander populations overall showed enormous increases in interethnic *and* interracial marriages.[68] Mixed Asian Americans represented 24.3% of the overall national "two or more races" demographic. This is significant considering Asian Americans in total were only 2.4% of entire US population.[69] This demographic shift had become so evident that media outlets such as USA Today dubbed multiethnicity as "the new norm."[70]

The most recent Census confirms the trajectory of this exponential growth. As of 2010, of the 17.3 million Asian Americans in the US, 2.6 million reported themselves as Asian and "one or more additional races," meaning 15% of *all* Asian Americans now claim mixed heritage.

Japanese American statistics confirm the inevitability of ethnic demographic change: astonishingly, the monoethnic population saw a 1.2% decrease; inversely, the multiethnic population showed a 55.9% increase, surpassing all other Asian American groups by a wide margin. To put this in perspective, of the 1.3 million Japanese Americans currently in the United States, 41% reported being Japanese and "one or more other race."[71]

Based on this data, it is clear that mixed Asian/American populations are growing with incredible momentum.[72] High rates of interethnic/interracial births and outmarriage beg the questions: When the multiethnic population eclipses the monoethnic, how will individuals define ethnicity and identity? While mixed populations are increasing, are systems of categorization shifting as well? Will ideas about race truly diminish or will power structures simply change?

As a whole, the trajectory of these narratives signifies growing acceptance yet continued discrimination towards mixed individuals in both the US and Japan.[73] During earlier eras, "state" and prevailing social attitudes towards mixed-race minorities were overtly violent and ubiquitous. Many mixed *Nisei* in rural and urban areas of the West Coast experienced overt hostility and social ostracism, forcing many to reject their Japanese heritage and disassociate themselves from other Japanese.[74] Though demographically marginal, relatively frequent testimonies of abuse indicated strong aversions to multiethnicity and interracial unions. Postwar Japan was also a period of pervasive juridical and social prejudice. Links between politics, citizenry and social inclusion established a direct correlation between racial subjectivity and materially violent conditions.[75] Recent decades have seen markedly more favorable outlooks, treatment, and even praising of multiethnicity in both nations. While the precedent set by *Loving vs. Virginia* (1967) overturned formal legal oppression, forms of condescension, harassment, job discrimination and social exclusion continue to perpetuate racial prejudice.[76]

This sweeping change has, for the most part, allowed mixed individuals much more freedom in expressing their plurality without the threat of physical transgressions. Contemporary narratives suggest the growth of the mixed population has fundamentally changed the way multiethnicity is viewed, moving from a pathologically negative to an almost revered quality. Despite growing diversity, however, problems persist.

Many scholars have written about the present issues affecting multiethnic Asian/Americans. Omi and Winant argue the US has and continues to be a highly color-conscious society where racial hegemony operates as social and political "common sense."[77] Stephen Masami Ropp and Paul Spickard note that race is still part and parcel of everyday interactions with and amongst Asian/American groups.[78] Conversely, Velina Hasu-Houston and Williams-Leon suggest mainstream and ethnic group-specific aversions to ambiguity continue to marginalize mixed-race individuals. The "gate-keepers of race," they argue, "cling to the belief that race is Black or White, that race can be pure; that, in order to be racially correct and socially acceptable, they must run from the monster (multiethnics), demand conformity, and keep difference in the closet."[79] "Blood-regulations" used to distinguish ethnic groups from others make exclusivity an expected yet problematic determinate of social inclusion in Asian American communities. While ethnic solidarity aims to cultivate empowerment, it also propagates "rules of authenticity" which can mute plurality.[80] Spickard suggests that during the politicized era of Asian American activism in the 1960s, multiethnics were "part of this map… insofar as they were willing to eschew connections to other identities."[81] In Japanese American communities, "race work," projects aimed at creating and disseminating collective group identity, illustrates the dualism of positive ethnic-specific movements.[82]

19

Whether or not there is juridical acceptance or social tolerance, individuals, communities and "state" apparatuses still consciously or unwittingly frame ethnicity as something static, singular and principally phenotypical while exceptionalizing multiraciality.[83] Instead of treating ethnicity as a combination of ancestry, cultural knowledge and experience, antiquated racial paradigms and beliefs in "purity" continue to essentialize identity around the body.[84] Thus, while perspectives of multiethnicity have changed for the better, race continues to dictate requisite categorizations and perpetuate exclusionary practices.

Research Goals

Rather than attempting to delineate the complexity of identity, this thesis reveals the ways racial formation process, binary categorizations and constructions of Japanese ethnic identity affect multiethnics in the past and present. These specific and historically significant narratives also trace the changing racial dynamics.

With a stretch of the imagination, one could argue that "everyone is mixed." Mixing has always occurred whenever individuals of two or more seemingly exclusive identities create a child who embodies these separate cultural and physical traits.[85] Taken in stride, assuming current permutations of ethnicity and race are fixed and given the current trajectory growth, overwhelming portions of the US will "become mixed" by century's end. In anticipation of these inevitable developments, misguided scholars, media figures and politicians have objectified multiethnics as "new" byproducts of ethnic diversity. According to them, mixed-race will apparently break down the barriers of prejudice, bridge groups, ameliorate racial discrimination and usher in a "colorblind, post-racial" society where race will be of little to no consequence.[86]

Despite the reality of diversity and the historically situated nature of contemporary identities, race is as significant as ever.[87] Rather than creating stability, multiethnicity reveals the

instability of these porous systems by problematizing simplistic logic.[88] Instead of flattening

difference, mixed-race delineates the entrenched, variegated nature of racial inequality that has

always existed within and beyond Asian/American communities.

In direct critique of the notion of a "post-racial" society, this thesis provides critical tools

for identifying multiethnic-specific structural inequalities as well as the constructed nature of

race and related identity formations. Mixed-race simultaneously reveals the instability of race as

well as its power to over-determine. Furthermore, the treatment of multiracials in these narratives

suggests that race remains an embedded structural and social dynamic with significant

consequence.[89] In other words, while multiraciality exposes the socio-politically constructed

nature of racial identities making them ostensibly *meaningless*, violence illustrates how race

remains an indisputably *meaningful* dimension of life.

Moreover, I critique the framing of multiethnicity as a teleological phenomenon.

Assuming "mono" or "mixed" identities have ever been static ignores temporality and the

perpetual reconfiguration of these categories. At the same time, to argue there are "too few"

persons or "too many variables" stymies the potential of creating flexible "ethnic histories" and

the usefulness of evidence of recurring, rather than isolated, patterns of violence.

I hope to reveal how the power of race is renewed, reinvigorated and embedded by

constructions of "normativity" and individuals' inability or refusal to see ethnicity as a

constantly developing concept. These temporally, spatially and experientially divergent threads

force us to recognize and reconcile with the vast diversity in our populations. Reflexively

embracing multiethnicity as a valuable component of Japanese/American history broadens the

scope of meta-narratives, recognizes the discriminatory sensibilities of ethnic "normativity,"

adds critical depth to the intricate terrain of identity politics, and anticipates the inertia of current

demographic trends. Scholars, citizens and individuals must question what it means to be *a community, a nation,* to have an *ethnic identity*, what ideas these concepts enact, what limits they impose, what "acceptance" truly entails and what costs these dynamics exact.

[1] Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2012), 220.

[2] There is a vast literature that covers various dimensions of multiethnic identity formation. Please refer to the following books for theories and perspectives: Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole* and *The Voices of Amerasians: Ethnicity, Identity, and Empowerment in Interracial Japanese American,* Cynthia Nakashima and Teresa Williams-Leon, *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, Velina-Hasu Houston and Teresa K. Williams, *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials, Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997), Maria P. Root, *The Multiracial Experience* and *Racially Mixed People in America.*

[3] Scholars such as Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, Bruce Hoskins and Paul Spickard suggest that while multiethnics of Japanese ancestry are able to engage pluralistic identities, whether mixed-race is seen as a positive or negative trait, racial identities and external judgments of ultimately influence perceptions of "authenticity."; Bruce Calvin Hoskins, *Asian American Racial Realities in Black and White* (United States: First Forum Press, 2011), 3, 17; Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, *The Voices of Amerasians: Ethnicity, Identity, and Empowerment in Interracial Japanese Americans* (Dissertation, Harvard University, 1986)*,* 35, 65, 154; Yen Le Espiritu, "Possibilities of a Multiracial Asian America," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 28; Paul Spickard, "The Illogic of American Racial Categories," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 14; Amy Iwasaki Mass, "Interracial Japanese Americans: The Best of Both Worlds or the End of the Japanese American Community?" in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 268-274.

[4] Paul Spickard, "What Must I Be? Asian Americans and the Question of Multiethnic Identity," *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials, Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 50-54.

[5] Many scholars note how concepts like race and ethnic emerge from individual variables such as ancestry, geographic origin, kinship, culture, a sense of collective commonality and phenotype as well as the mediation of factors such as social environment, class, gender, legal validation, historicity, temporality, geo-political circumstances and personal interpretation.; Paul R. Spickard, *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 12, 13; Teresa Kay Williams "Race-ing and Being Raced: The Critical Interrogation of 'Passing,'" *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal 23*, no. 1 (1997): 61- 64; Spickard, "The Illogic," 12-18; Fredrick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2005), 59, 60, 71, 84, 85; Spickard, "What Must I Be?,*"* 50-54; Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 3.

[6] Cynthia L. Nakashima, "Voices from the Movement: Approaches to Multiraciality," in *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier,* ed. Maria Root (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996)*,* 83- 89; Paul Spickard, "Who is an Asian? Who is a Pacific Islander? Monoracialism, Multiracial People, and Asian American Communities," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 20; Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Race Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s,* Second Edition (New York, New York: Routledge Press, 1994), vii, 15, 22-23, 55-60; Rodgers Brubaker, "Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism,*" Annual Review of Sociology* 34 (2009): 26-28.

[7] Omi and Winant, *Race Formations,* 11, 15, 55, 56.

[8] Wei Ming Dariotis and Laura Kina, preface to *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, eds. Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), xv; Theresa K Williams,

"Prism Lives: Identity of Binational Americans," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 290; Spickard, "What Must I Be?," 43-60.

[9] Williams, "Prism Lives," 294-296.

[10] Cynthia L. Nakashima, "Invisible Monster: The Creation and Denial of Mixed-Race People in America," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 177; Maria P. Root, "The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as a Significant Frontier in Race Relations," in *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier*, ed. Maria Root (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996), xx; Espiritu, "Possibilities of," 25-28.

[11] Cynthia L. Nakashima, "Servants of Culture: The Symbolic Role of Mixed-Race Asians in American Discourse," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 35; Nakashima, "Voices from Movement," 93; Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 102, 107.

[12] Omi and Winant, *Race Formations*, 59, 60.

[13] Michael Omi, foreword to *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), xii; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 16, 10.

[14] Rebecca Chiyoko King- O'Riain, *Pure Beauty* (Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 74-115.

[15] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 28; Jennifer Lee and Frank D. Bean, "Reinventing the Color Line: Immigration and America's New Racial/Ethnic Divide," *Social Forces* 86, no. 2 (December 2007): 567, 579; Mary C. Waters and Tomás R. Jiménez, "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges," *Annual Review of Sociology* 31 (2005): 110; Tomas Jiménez, "Negotiating Ethnic boundaries: Multiethnic Mexican Americans and Ethnic Identity in the United States," *Ethnicities* 4, no.1 (2004); Christine C. Iijima-Hall and Trude I. Cooke Turner, "The Diversity of Biracial Individuals: Asian-White and Asian-Minority Biracial Identity," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans,* eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); Hoskins, *Racial Realities,* 1.

[16] Paul R. Spickard, "Does Multiraciality Lighten? Me-Too Ethnicity and the Whiteness Trap," in *Crossing Lines: Race and Mixed Race across the Geohistorical Divide*, eds. Marc Coronado, Rudy P. Guevarra, Jr., Jeffery Moniz, and Laura Furlan Szanto (Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa MESO and Sasha Briar Newborn/Sabine Design, 2003), 45-62.

[17] According to Root, "racial ecologies" refer to the inherent racialized nature of the spaces we inhabit.; Maria P. root, "Within, Between, and Beyond Race," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria Root (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1992), 3-5; Root, "The Multiracial," xvii.

[18] Omi, "Foreword," ix-xi.

[19] Nakashima, "Voices from the Movement," 87, 88.

[20] Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, "Miscegenating Discourses: Critical Contexts for Mixed Race Asian American Art and Identity," in *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, eds. Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), 5; Clara K. Bradshaw, "Beauty and the Beast: On Racial Ambiguity," in *Racially Mixed People in America*, ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 83; Nakashima, "Servants of Culture*," 41, 42, 44; Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 80, 93.

[21] Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 168, 170.

[22] Michael C. Thornton and Harold Gates, "Black, Japanese, and American: An Asian American Identity Yesterday and Today" in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 94; Kina and Dariotis, "Miscegenating Discourses*," 19.

[23] Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race, Rearticulating Ethnicity," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 4-8; Teresa Kay Williams, "Race as Process: Reassessing the 'What are You?' Encounters of Biracial Individuals," in *The Multiracial Experience,* ed. Maria P. Root (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1996), 197; Spickard, "Who is an Asian?," 13, 22.

[24] Wei Ming Dariotis, "Both Buffer and Cosmopolitan Eurasians, Colonialism, and the new "Benevolent" Globalization," in *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, eds. Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), 163; Kina and Dariotis, "Miscegenating Discourses," 9; Spickard, "Illogic," 12, 14, 15.

[25] Root, "Within, Between," 10.

[26] For a more thorough explanation of Orientalism, please refer to the work of Edward Said.; Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (United States: Random House, Inc., 1978), 5, 12, 15, 20; Nakashima, "Voices from the Movement*,"* 83-89; Spickard, "Who is an Asian?," 20.

[27] Michel Foucault, "Subject and Power," *Critical Inquiry* 8 (1982): 778, 781, 79; Velina-Hasu Houston and Teresa K. Williams, "No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-decent Multiracials," in *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials, Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): vii, ix, x; Williams, "Race as Process*,"* 199, 202, 208, 209; Williams, "Prism Lives," 282; Hoskins, *Racial Realities,* 2-4; Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 176.

[28] Foucault, "Subject and Power," 777.

[29] Christine C. Iijima-Hall, "Best of Both Worlds: Body Image and Satisfaction of a Sample of Black-Japanese Biracial Individuals," in *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials, Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 92, 93; Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 3, 4, 214, 220.

[30] Omi, "Foreword," xi.

[31] In addition to obvious power relations through structural racism, on the ideological level, many scholars note how tropes such as the "tragic mulatto" and "the best of both worlds" create monolithic polarities delineating "otherness." Both tropes create unrealistic expectations, purport the ascendancy of racial paradigms, and encourage the objectification of multiethnic bodies; Nakashima, "Servants of Culture," 36-44; Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 162-178.

[32] Iijima-Hall and Gates, "The Diversity of."

[33] Michael Thornton and Teresa Williams-Leon argue that while the meaning derived from personal experiences is vital for self-constitution, external interpretations of one's "social identity" invariably prescribe and extract potentially divergent meaning.; Williams, "Race-ing," 61-64.

[34] Williams-Leon and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race," 9.

[35] Root, "Within Between*,"* 3, 6-11; Omi and Winant, *Race Formations*, vii, 1, 2.

[36] Sue-Je Lee Gage, "The Amerasian Problem: Blood, Duty, and Race," *International Relations* 21, no. 1 (2007): 89.

[37] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 21, 414.

[38] Maria Root, "Multiracial Asians: Models of Ethnic Identity," *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials, Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 31, 34-37.

[39] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 183.

[40] Patrick Wolfe, "Forum Essay: Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race," *American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (2001): 890.

[41] Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 160-166; Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 240; Spickard, "Illogics*,"* 16,17.

[42] Wolfe, "Land, Labor, and Difference," 897, 882, 883.

[43] Hoskins, *Racial Realities,* 8, 11; Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 5, 280, 318; Spickard, "Illogics," 15-17.

[44] Reginald G. Daniel, "Passers and Pluralists: Subverting the Racial Divide," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 91, 93; Bradshaw, "Beauty and Beast," 81.

[45] Gary P Leupp, *Interracial Intimacy in Japan: Western Men and Japanese Women 1543-1900* (London: Continuum Books, 2003), 7, 9.

[46] Leupp, *Western Men and Japanese Women,* 10, 214.

[47] Leslie Helm, *Yokohama Yankee: My Family's Five Generations as Outsiders in Japan* (Seattle: Chin Music Press, 2013), 41, 50-60.

[48] Please refer to any number of sources that deal with this immense topic which cannot be covered in the scope of this thesis.

[49] Daniel M. Masterson and Sayaka Funada-Classen, *The Japanese in Latin America* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 61, 69, 70, 82; Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Akemi Kikumura-Yano and James A. Hirabayashi, "The Impact of Contemporary Globalization on Nikkei Identities," in *New Worlds, New Lives: Globalization and People of Japanese Descent in the Americas and from Latin America in Japan,* eds. Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Akemi Kikumura-Yano and James A. Hirabayashi (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2002).

[50] Jeffrey Lesser, "Introduction: Looking for Home in All the Wrong Places," in *Searching for Home: Japanese Brazilians and Transnationalism,* ed. Jeffrey Lesser (United States: Duke University Press, 2003), 1-4; Jeffrey Lesser, "Japanese, Brazilians, Nikkei: A Short History of Identity Building and Homemaking," in *Searching for Home: Japanese Brazilians and Transnationalism,* ed. Jeffrey Lesser (United States: Duke University Press, 2003); Takeyuki Gaku Tsuda, "When Minorities Migrate: the Racialization of the Japanese Brazilians in Brazil and Japan," in *Asian Diasporas: New Formations, New Concepts,* eds. Rhacel Salazar Parrenas and Lok C.D. Siu (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007), 226, 228, 239.

[51] Takeyuki Gaku Tsuda "Homeland-less Abroad: Transnational Liminality, Social Alienation, and Personal Malaise," in *Searching for Home: Japanese Brazilians and Transnationalism,* ed. Jeffrey Lesser (United States: Duke University Press, 2003), 123-144.

[52] Robert Chao Romero, *The Chinese in Mexico: 1882-1940,* (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 2010)*,* 88-92, 160-166.

[53] Karen Isaken Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1994), 63, 64, 65.

[54] Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices,* 74, 116.

[55] Rudy P. Guevarra Jr., *Becoming Mexipino: Multiethnic Identities and Communities in San Diego* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press, 2012), 6-12,131, 139-152.

[56] Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Lives and Monoethnic Myths: American-Japanese Amerasians in Japan," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001)*,* 209, 210; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem."

[57] Eleana J Kim, *Adopted Territory: Transnational Korean Adoptees and the Politics of Belonging* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010), 46, 53, 62, 63.

[58] Kim, *Adopted Territories*, 44, 48, 66, 71.

[59] Kieu-Linh Caroline Valvarde, "From Dust to Gold: the Vietnamese Amerasian Experience," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 144.

[60] Valvarde*, "*Dust to Gold," 147-148; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem*."*

[61] Larry Hajime Shinagawa and Gin Yong Pang, "Intraethnic, Interethnic, and Interracial Marriages Among Asian Americans in California, 1980," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 33 (1988): 100

[62] Shinagawa and Pang, "Marriages Among Asian Americans*,"* 100.

[63] Ibid., 103.

[64] Ibid., 107.

[65] Root, "The Multiracial," xv.

[66] Root, "The Multiracial*,"* xv; Root, "Models of Ethnic*,"* 29.

[67] Root, "The Multiracial," xvii.

[68] Teresa Williams-Leon, "Check All that Apply: Trends and Prospectives Among Asian-Descent Multiracials," in *New Faces in a Changing America: Multiracial Identity in the 21st Century*, eds. Loretta I Winters and Herman L. DeBose (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc. 2003), 160.

[69] Jessica S. Barnes and Claudette E. Bennett, "The Asian Population: 2000; Census 2000 Brief," US Census Bureau Web, http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/c2kbr01-16.pdf; Terrance Reeves and Claudette Bennett, "The Asian and Pacific Islander Population in the United States: March 2002. Current Population Reports, P20-540," US Census Bureau Web, http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/p20-540.pdf; Nicholas A. Jones and Amy Symens Smith, "The Two or more Races Population: 2000; Census 2000 Brief, " US Census Bureau Web, http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-6.pdf.

[70] Puente, Maria, and Martin Kasindorf, "Front Page: The New Face of America: Blended Races Making a True Melting Pot." *USA Today*, September 7th, 1999, http://www.usatoday.com/.

[71] Elizabeth M. Hoeffel, Sonya Rastogi, Myoung Ouk Kim, and Hasan Shahid. "The Asian Population: 2010; Census 2010 Brief," US Census Bureau Web, https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf; Nicolas A. Jones, "The Asian Population in the United States: Results from the 2010 Census," US Census Bureau Web, http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/pdf/2012-05-02_nickjones_asianslides_2.pdf.

[72] U.S. Census Bureau, "2010 Census Shows America's Diversity" US Census Bureau*,* Thursday, March 24th, 2011, http://www.census.gov/; US Census Bureau, "2010 Census Shows Asians are Fastest-Growing Race Group" US

Census Bureau*, Wednesday, March 21st, 2012, http://www.census.gov/; US Census Bureau, "2010 Census Shows Multiple-Race Population Grew Faster than Single-Race Population" US Census Bureau*, Thursday, September 27th, 2012, http://www.census.gov/; Leon, "New face of America," 158-160.

[73] Akemi Kikumura and Harry H.L. Kitano, "Interracial Marriage: A Picture of the Japanese Americans," *Journal of Social Issues* 29, no. 2 (1973): 72-79; Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Lives Monoethnic Myths," 213-215.

[74] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, chapter 3

[75] Yukiko Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 146.

[76] Williams-Leon and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race."

[77] Omi and Winant, *Race Formations,* 1-4.

[78] Steven Masami Ropp, "Do Multiracial Subjects Really Challenge Race?: Mixed-Race Asians in the United States and the Caribbean," *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials*, *Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997), 5; Spickard, "Illogic*,"* 12-23.

[79] Houston and Williams, "No Passing Zone," vii, ix.

[80] Rebecca Chiyoko King- O'Riain, "'Mirror, Mirror, on the Wall' Mapping Discussions of Feminism, race, and Beauty in Japanese American Beauty Pageants," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans,* eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 164-168; King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty,* 3, 7, 75.

[81] Espiritu, "Possibilities," 25-34; Spickard, "Who is Asian?," 19, 20.

[82] King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty*, 1-7.

[83] Williams, "Prism Lives," 290-303; Root, "The Multiracial," xxvii, xxv; Spickard, "What Must I Be?," 45; Spickard, "Illogic*,"* 20, 21; Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 166; Williams, "Race as Process," 193; Bradshaw, "Beauty and Beast," 78.

[84] Mass, "Interracial Japanese," 268-274.

[85] Ropp, "Do Multiracial Subjects," 4; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 4; Spickard, "Illogics," 20.

[86] Nakashima, "Servants of Culture," 42; Omi, "Foreword," xii; Omi and Winant, *Race Formations*, 1, 5; Mike Hill, *After Whiteness; Unmaking an American Majority* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2004), 34; David A Hollinger, *Post Ethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York, New York: Basic Books, 1995, 2000), 3, 4; Wilbur C. Rich, *The Post-Racial Society is Here: Recognition, Critics and the Nation-State* (New York, New York: Routledge Press, 2013).

[87] Williams, "Prism Lives*,"* 283; Root, "The Multiracial"*,* xix; Williams, "Race as Process," 193, 209; Omi and Winant, *Race Formations*, 1, 2; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 10, 16; Spickard, "Illogic," 13; Williams and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race."

[88] Omi and Winant, *Race Formations*, 12, 21, 55; Spickard, "Illogic," 15.

[89] Omi, "Foreword," ix-xiii.

Chapter II: The Double Enforcement of Color Lines:
Multiethnic Japanese Americans and Interracial Families during the Incarceration

This chapter explores multiethnic experiences during the Japanese American incarceration, complicating the prevailing racial discourses that underpinned formal policies and the internal group dynamics of various camp communities. My analysis seeks to demonstrate the existence of a dual process of racialization which subjected multiracial individuals to contradictory, uneven applications of racial and cultural "normativity" with subsequently injurious results.

In the backdrop of much broader systemic violence of the incarceration itself, receptions of and prejudice towards multiethnic Japanese Americans indicates a general uneasiness towards racial hybridity. Such anxieties were guided by the belief that Japanese ethnicity was something singular, totalizing and tied to specific physical characteristics. While multiethnic individuals were defined as inherently "other" by both "the state," in the direct form of the Western Defense Command and later the War Relocation Authority (WDC/WRA), as well as the imprisoned Japanese population, definitions of racial and cultural "authenticity" operated incongruently. In other words, despite how one observer perceived the race of multiethnic prisoners (I am using alternative terminology to "internee" in accordance with scholars critical of euphemistic language),[1] these interpretations often conflicted with diametrically opposed frames of reference. To wit, though state policy criminalized mixed individuals as "Japanese," they were often rejected by other prisoners for being "non-Japanese." As a result, formal and informal racialization practices left multiethnics in a state of perpetual marginalization, rendering them vulnerable to the violence of imprisonment and social ostracism. Given the evidence, I argue that simply *being* multiethnic caused indiscriminate violence.

The WDC/WRA criminalized *all* Japanese Americans on the basis of race, initially and unrepentantly ignoring the fraught positionality of mixed-race individuals. The basic formula for imprisonment conflated race with nationality and culture, automatically classifying *all* Japanese in America as "loyal Japanese subjects."[2] This rationale included interracial families and individuals who were in *any* way Japanese. As Lisa Nobe notes, "the state" made "no distinctions between 'certain' Japanese Americans and others," and as such, multiethnic children, adolescents, and adults were unscrupulously criminalized alongside other "enemy aliens."[3] Regardless of background or previous proximity to monoethnic Japanese Americans, multiethnics were judged on the basis of blood quantum alone. Moreover, the power of race as a binary construction elided individual identity formations.

At the same time, these individuals faced hostility from imprisoned Japanese Americans, though through a different racial lens: prevailing beliefs of racially defined "ethnic authenticity" often meant exclusion rather than acceptance for multiethnics.[4] Within camp, race came into play in the sense that regardless of background, individuals who did not look or act in a culturally appropriate "Japanese" manner could be readily "othered" by strictly policed color lines.

The presented case studies indicate in-group Japanese American and out-group mainstream Euro-American racial attitudes towards multiethnic Japanese Americans were both damaging and violent. The dualistic processes of racialization, imposed by "state" policy and ethnic group social conventions, subsequently resulted in a sort of dual process of violence as well; multiethnics' lives were forcibly uprooted and destroyed by the forced evacuation, only to be further oppressed by the camp community. Hostilities and prejudice in the forms of verbal harassment, emotional abuse, family separation, personal detriment and physical transgressions existed in various camps. While not every multiethnic prisoner was subjected to these acts of

violence, multiple occurrences suggest that racism and prejudice during the incarceration was not one-dimensional, unidirectional or experienced equally amongst all inmates.

These dual racialization processes not only marginalized multiethnic excludees on the basis of legality, demeanor and racial affiliation, this marginality became the impetus for prejudice and resentment. In the end, they were simply perceived as "too Japanese" by the WRA/WDC *and* "not Japanese enough" by fellow inmates. Thus, in addition to the adversities of imprisonment, multiethnics and Japanese Americans involved in interracial relationships faced further trauma. Though the multiethnic population was demographically small, making these incidents seemingly trivial given the enormity of the incarceration, the frequency and nature of this racial prejudice merits careful analysis.

Drawing evidence from secondary scholarship, archival evidence such as the Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (JERS), official WDC/WRA policies and memos, Manzanar's Children's Village records and oral histories, this chapter will approach multiethnic racialization from multiple angles. First, analysis of pre-war era attitudes towards interracial intimacies within and beyond the Japanese American community will contextualize the state of social intolerance leading up to the incarceration. Next, given the laden positionality of multiethnics as "similar" yet "different" from the imprisoned Japanese population, examination of formal WRA policies and JERS records will underscore the unyielding racial justification of the incarceration and the subsequent consequences. Finally, various oral histories will detail the traumatic, detrimental effects of social ostracism. 442nd veteran Virgil Westdale's story closes the chapter, showing ways systemic racism legally and literally arrested the development of Japanese American lives beyond the confines of camp.

This engagement of qualitative and quantitative evidence illustrates the complexity of racial politics during this era, providing broad and intimate lenses into the tangible effects of multiethnic racialization processes. Though far from universal, these issues were common enough to occur in several different camps and substantive enough to linger in memory decades later. What remains consistent between these experiences, between the enactors and those being enacted upon, is how legal and social racialization was based off of the notion of "authenticity" engaged in similar yet *dualistic* ways. Thus, the incarceration not only serves as one of the clearest examples of racial bigotry towards Japanese Americans as a whole but also serves a way to examine the consequences of "ethnic authenticity" predicated on notions of "racial purity."

By integrating examinations of individual experiences, formal policy and broad social attitudes during this indisputably definitive period in Japanese American history, I can illustrate how processes of racialization and paradigmatic framings of identity based on "ethnic authenticity" are enduring dynamics. Furthermore, this analysis complicates the apparent simplicity of racial dynamics surrounding the incarceration. By casting new light on this narrative, scholars can simultaneously disclose past modes of multiethnic racialization and problematize forms of mainstream and ethnic group hegemony.

Venerating the individual and their narrative is a vital component of remembering suffering and loss. Renowned Japanese American scholar Harry Kitano believes that measuring the costs of imprisonment as a whole is extremely difficult and that, "traces of the experience are probably still a part of every person who went through the trauma."[5] This observation underscores the importance of looking at these marginal experiences despite their uncommon and varied occurrence. The oral histories and historical records we do have offer additional

perspectives of camp, elucidating aspects that may have been overlooked in past and providing evidence of enduring ostracism against multiethnic Japanese Americans.

Pre-War Socialscapes

Historians suggest Japanese Americans were relatively hostile or at best indifferent towards interracial intimacies and multiethnic offspring during the pre-war era. Spickard notes there is little mention of miscegenation in historical meta-narratives since *Issei* outmarriage rates were extremely low (just 3.1% of men and 2.3% of women). Thus, mixed Japanese American issues seem relatively insignificant.[6] While mixed populations were relative minorities within the entirety of the Japanese American population, scattered evidence of stigma and ostracism indicates widespread of hostility towards multiethnics. Spickard suggests violence towards interracial families was frequent and strikingly transparent. Color lines dictating "Japanese racial purity" were visible and staunchly guarded, so much so that multiethnics were often compelled to live outside the ethnic community and disassociate themselves from kin.[7] Many reportedly lived away from Japanese Americans because of bad experiences or fear of reprisal.[8] Racism, stigma and harassment (even within the family) were generally predicated on beliefs of cultural incompatibility and "blood impurity."[9] Prejudiced attitudes commonly materialized into the disassociation of intermarried sons and daughters, abandonment or exclusion of mixed children and physical violence. The racial premise of these transgressions is particularly apparent when examining non-Caucasian mixes; those who were part Black or Latino often faced comparatively more discrimination.[10] The palpability of these racial attitudes and general hostility from within Japanese American communities remained salient through the 1940s and was also documented beyond ethnic enclaves.[11]

Mainstream Euro-American condemnation was particularly evident in legal policies. Precedents set by anti-miscegenation laws, compounded by widespread discrimination against Japanese Americans due to economic competition in general, further discouraged interracial intimacies.[12] Furthermore, federal laws were explicitly created to stem the foreseeable encroachment of the *Issei* and *Nisei* on white populations and punish those who crossed color lines. One such disciplinary tactic was the 1922 Cable Act which permanently stripped women who married non-naturalized "alien" Japanese of their US citizenship until overturned in 1931.[13] These gendered laws were buttressed and exacerbated individual anxieties. Though *Nisei* were markedly more open to interacting with other groups compared to their progenitors, external social stigma discouraged such relationships as many outright condemned interracial intimacy.[14] John E. Rankin, the notoriously intolerant Democratic congressman from Mississippi, publicly condemned the small but growing multiethnic Japanese population in Hawaii as "subhuman mongrels."[15] Not only did the perilous "rainbow society" threaten white racial purity, it was said to be composed of dangerous beings of "a different racial stock."[16] Soon after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Rankin hysterically proclaimed, "The only way the Japs in this country could be 'assimilated' is through [sic] intermarriage with white Americans!" For this very reason, he claimed that interracial mixing was an act of political and social subversion. In his own words, the rising "threat" of "'Jap-lovers' who desired to mix yellow and white blood" necessitated an even more stringent policing of "racial blood stocks."[17] Though the extent to which his words reflect popular opinion is unclear, contempt at the state-level was rather evident. While mainstream attitudes towards Japanese Americans in general were undoubtedly racist, prejudice towards interracial mixing was also prominent.

Multiethnic Japanese and intermarried couples were left in a precarious position; neither the mainstream nor Japanese communities were willing to accept them and many unabashedly denounced their very existence, foregrounding sustained prejudice in the coming decades.

Decisions to Incarcerate "In-between Americans" and "State" Racialization

Racial anxieties towards multiethnic Japanese Americans were evident in the official wording of War Relocation Authority policies. Though acknowledged as only "part," mixed *Nisei* and *Sansei* were racialized on the basis of partial ancestry and seen as "Japanese enough" to warrant criminalization. Spickard estimates that following Executive Order 9066, at least 1,400 intermarried couples, some with families, and roughly 700 individual multiethnic Japanese Americans were incarcerated.[18] Though non-Japanese spouses and relatives were not forcibly imprisoned, they could enter camp voluntarily. However, few had the ability or resources to accompany their Japanese family members.[19] Significant others were ostensibly forced to choose between their romantic and familial commitments or freedom. The majority of incarcerated multiethnics were *Nisei* children. Astonishingly, according to official policy, individuals could be imprisoned for having as little as 1/8th "Japanese blood," analogous to the racial logic of the one-drop rule.[20] While very few, if any, were of this composition (Japanese had hardly been in the US long enough to have a third generation), the prevailing racial logic behind this policy was clear; *no one* of Japanese ancestry would escape the incarceration.

However, soon after the enactment of Executive Order 9066, WRA officials became conflicted over the laden racial justification of imprisoning mixed Japanese/Americans. Memos between DeWitt and other officials illustrated both concern as well as a lack of consensus.[21] Obviously, the military could not incarcerate half an individual to placate those who perceived them as a threat. At the same time, some WRA officials believed they could not allow "good

Americans" to be exposed to the evils of "foreign cultural ideas." On July 12, 1942, Major

Herman Goebel Jr. addressed these concerns and announced a mixed marriage policy which

would release mixed Japanese Americans and interracial families under certain conditions:

> [the] Mixed marriage non-exclusion policy is predicated upon the desirability of providing the issue thereof [i.e. Amerasian children] with an opportunity for rearing in a non Japanese environment… (It is) reasonable to reward them the privilege [sic] of remaining within the excluded area. To send them to a War Relocation Project would only 'expose them to infectious Japanese thought.'[22]

Further details regarding the WRA/WDC's stance on mixed marriages and the ensuing policy

were also outlined in DeWitt's *Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast, 1942: Final Report.*[23]

The policy was fraught with gender and racial bias from the start. Sardonically, the

policy's promise of "fair treatment" for "loyal Americans" only applied to those with mixed

ancestry (who were now seen favorably), *not* to the other 80,000 other *Nisei* Americans sitting

behind barbed wire. Foremost, freedom was predicated upon establishing racial "whiteness." It

was generally believed that Japanese spouses of White Americans, and by extension their

offspring, were inherently "less threatening" since they were allegedly more Americanized.[24]

The mixed marriage policy demanded that multiethnics prove their "whiteness" through their

family history.[25] Mixed adults had to have 50% or less Japanese blood and be able to

demonstrate they had come from a non-Japanese background.[26]Additionally, this process was

incredibly gendered. For children, the gender of the Japanese parent significantly influenced

chances for release. To qualify, children also had to have 50% or less Japanese blood. If they had

a Japanese mother, they were more likely to secure release and were allowed to provisionally

return to the West Coast within the Exclusion Zone. Spickard notes the WRA was far less

scrutinizing of these cases since officials believed the influence of non-Japanese fathers

(specifically Caucasian fathers) superseded the influence of Japanese mothers.[27] Conversely, it

was less likely for multiethnics with Japanese fathers to leave camp. Those who were released were forbidden from reentering the Exclusion Zone. Officials reasoned that Japanese patriarchs were inherently overbearing and endowed their children with "un-American" cultural characteristics during childhood.[28] What's more, perceived racial composition had an enormous impact on determining "Americanness"; in principle, the mixed marriage policy did not apply to individuals with non-Caucasian parents.[29] In Rohwer, Arkansas, officials targeted only certain "national and racial types" for early release. Caucasian mixes could leave camp with relative ease while those of Mexican or Latin ancestry were often denied.[30] However, this practice was inconsistent. Records from Jerome, Arkansas indicate that mixed individuals with Latin or Spanish ancestry could secure release.[31] Couples with no children, despite citizenship, were unable to leave camp with the exception of military service.[32] Eugene Filson, a Caucasian man who had lost his job before the war because of his mixed marriage, and Emily Yaeko Nishimura were split apart during the evacuation. Emily was denied resettlement clearance because the couple did not have any children, though she was eventually able to live outside the Military Exclusion Zone in Chicago.[33]

Ironically, the mixed marriage policy was clearly predicated on race rather than nationality; freedom was generally granted on the basis of racial "whiteness" rather than nationality. This exposes a great irony of the "military necessity" of the incarceration itself. While racial overtones were ubiquitous, Japanese Americans were illegally imprisoned on the grounds of presumed loyalty to the empire of Japan.[34] Thus, these "emancipatory" mixed marriage policies were not only inconsistent but also gendered, racist and seemingly arbitrary.[35] Though permits and releases increased after of 1943 at the behest of Dillon Myer (head of the WRA), General Dewitt maintained that allowing Japanese spouses and mixed children to return

to the West Coast on the basis of loyalty ostensibly undermined the fundamental rationale for imprisoning the *Nisei*.[36] From these complex, convoluted interplays of racial hegemony, it is clear that the multiethnic issue remained a charged topic those who saw them both as a threat and connected to the mainstream. Altogether, these policies ended up reifying racist rhetoric and reestablishing ethnic color lines more severely. Despite concerns and attempts to resolve wrongdoing towards multiethnics and interracial couples in the camps, special treatment potentially exacerbated resentment from other inmates. More to the point, by the time they had gotten to camp, the damage had already been done.

The Cost of Imposing Race, Mainstream Receptions

Beyond the obvious injustice of imprisonment, the incarceration enacted enormous amounts of social, psychological and emotional violence on the multiethnic inmates and their estranged families. This study can only begin to address these experiences. Spickard's "Injustice Compounded" and the works of Roger Daniels provide further detail and more exhaustive analysis, illustrating the trauma of the incarceration in much greater detail. Family case files from Tule Lake and Poston created as part of JERS also provide vivid background information specifically related to mixed experiences.

The Colorado River Camp Family Survey and mixed marriage policy release records reveal a number of interesting points regarding the evaluation criteria and the diversity of incarcerated families. Among other factors such as financial standing and established plans post-release, individuals were primarily examined to judge their "Americanness."[37] Many mixed-race prisoners and interracially married Japanese Americans were evaluated based on their physical appearance. In these surveys, officials judged applicants for "looking" a certain way and established loyalty by indicating their non-Japanese phenotype.[38] For instance, in Dorothy

Etsuko Oh's case file, the surveyor commented that Dorothy "could pass as a Korean" and looked more like her Korean husband than other Japanese.[39] This was not an isolated practice. Other case files in Richard Nishimoto's survey contain similar notes such as, "[she] looked more like her Filipino husband" or "[he] was less Japanese looking than Caucasian."[40] Thus, racial phenotype became a central means of securing early release. Shibutani Tamotsu's Tule Lake records illustrate the diversity of the mixed-race families. Japanese Americans, both male and female, were married to a diverse range of partners of different ethnic backgrounds such as Caucasians, Filipinos, Koreans and African Americans. Several *Nisei* and one *Issei* mixed marriage appeared on Shibutani's March, 1943 "troubled families" case list.[41]

The effects of imprisonment caused deep trauma for multiethnics. Many were separated from their family and imprisoned alone without the protection of close kin.[42] Some had a merely symbolic connection to their Japanese ancestry, having little to no prior contact with other Japanese Americans.[43] Lawrence Palea only learned about his estranged Japanese father during his removal when authorities discovered he was of mixed Japanese and native Hawaiian ancestry. Prior to the war, he lived with his Hawaiian mother and non-Japanese step-father.[44] Despite growing up in a non-Japanese home environment, Lawrence was still sent to Tule Lake alone. Records indicate he made a "poor-adjustment" and had a very difficult time living amongst a community he had no prior association with.[45] Other imprisoned multiethnics came from exceptional backgrounds. Carlos Antonio-Gomez, an *Issei* of mixed Portuguese and Japanese ancestry, was sent to Tule Lake. Carlos was born in 1897 to a Portuguese father and Japanese mother in Kobe Japan, where he lived and worked until he came to the US in his early 20s.[46] In California, he met his wife Mildred Gomez and married out of state due to anti-miscegenation laws. Soon after his imprisonment, Carlos began protesting his removal on the

grounds of his mixed ancestry, Caucasian wife, and Portuguese citizenship.[47] However,

authorities were suspicious of his upbringing in Kobe. Furthermore, they claimed his Portuguese

citizenship did not overshadow his obvious cultural and ancestral connections. Eventually,

Carlos was denied clearance because he did not possess US citizenship; the only consolation

offered was that Mildred could "voluntarily" join him.[48] By maintaining the totalizing racial

justification for the incarceration, "the state" could indiscriminately criminalize interracial

families and their offspring for their ancestry.

The separation of partners and the fracturing of interracial families tested marriages,

denied children of their parents and essentially destroyed families.[49] This is in contrast to

Japanese Americans who were incarcerated along with kin and established communal networks.

That is not to say that Japanese American families did not suffer equally. However, multiethnics

were less likely to have such comforts.[50] According to statistical data, one-quarter of

intermarried couples divorced, a markedly higher figure than endogamous Japanese relationships

at the time.[51] Families and couples with Japanese husbands were more likely to stay united,

though doing so resulted in greater economic loses.[52] Entering camp meant abandoning property,

businesses and assets for the uncertainty of imprisonment. On the other hand, far fewer non-

Japanese husbands (majority Caucasian) joined their Japanese wives or families in camp,

voluntarily or otherwise.[53] Given WRA policy, it is cruelly ironic that the pretext for the early

release of multiethnic families depended on the non-Japanese patriarch since, statistically

speaking, these husbands were more likely to abandon them.[54] Internal familial racial and gender

dynamics may have also been a factor.

Though families ostensibly split at the agency of the individuals themselves, policies

offered few options and none were particularly positive. Stewart Ikeda recalls his mother simply

38

walking out on the family after arriving at the horse stables of Santa Ana Assembly Center, later

stating, "Hell, the Japs asked for it."[55] The WDC/WRA seemed to have little regard for the

destruction of these families. Yuriyo Torrez and Ethel Taylor were both seven months pregnant

when they were taken from their husbands who ultimately abandoned them in camp (no

judgment should be passed on the quality of these relationships given the extreme duress).[56] Fred

Korematsu's extreme attempts at "passing" to stay with his Caucasian partner demonstrate the

risks couples were willing to take to maintain their partnerships.[57] Yukio Matsuda's wife

Laverne initially signed a waiver that denied her entrance into camp, though she later appealed.[58]

Soon, Laverne wanted to leave Tule Lake but refused to do so without her husband. Frustrated

after multiple appeals and failed attempts, citing the fact that they lived away from the ethnic

community before the war, Laverne eventually left without Yukio, though records suggest a

potential rift had developed between the couple.[59] Others faced difficulties because of

convoluted legal statuses. *Nisei* Robert Kobayashi and his common-law Caucasian wife Mary

Curtiss ran into problems since their marriage was not officiated. Though Mary never took the

Kobayashi name, the two had lived together for over a decade prior to removal.[60] These legal

complications made it impossible for Mary to join Robert at Tule Lake. The couple tried to

obtain a marriage license but were apparently denied due to anti-miscegenation laws.[61] Once in

camp, George Nakamura, his wife Dorothy Jean, and daughter Donna experienced internal

family strife. While George was relatively happy to be around his extended family, Dorothy Jean

soon became despondent and wanted leave camp as soon as possible. They ran into several

barriers before leaving.[62] While many families left early on, others waited until they could return

to their homes in California. Many feared poor treatment. Others refused to leave in order to

keep their families intact.[63] Harry Saburo Uyeda, a Kibei, and his African/Portuguese wife Leleta

went through incredible hardship to maintain their marriage. Before camp, they had been shunned by other Japanese Americans because of their marriage, forcing them to distance themselves from the ethnic community.[64] Though ostracized, the couple found comfort and support in each other. This intimate bond was broken when Harry was imprisoned at Tule Lake. Leleta petitioned insistently for her husband's release but was repeatedly denied. Eventually, she moved to Klamath Falls to be near Harry. After several failed attempts at securing release, Leleta joined him in camp.[65] Their example is particularly striking as it illustrates the immense challenges individuals faced attempting to maintain their mixed families.

These policies separated families at an enormous emotional cost, giving little consideration to individual's backgrounds prior to removal or the consequences of forcing these individuals into a community with which they were not associated. While Japanese American families also faced immeasurable trauma, the racial politics of the incarceration quite literally destroyed interracial families. Furthermore, the normal struggles of camp life were compounded by additional stigma attached to their complex social positioning.

Fortunately, not all marriages and families ended in tragedy, nor did all interracial families suffer during their imprisonment. Estelle Ishigo entered Heart Mountain with her husband and was received rather positively by fellow prisoners.[66] Moto Shimada Prince was an *Issei* woman who married American Consulate Edward Prince and raised three multiethnic children in Tokyo before the war. Eventually, Edward and the children returned to the US. In 1923, Edward passed away and Moto moved to the States to be with her children who had all come of age and married with Caucasians.[67] After Pearl Harbor, despite her connection to the consulate, Moto was investigated by the FBI as a suspicious individual. She was then sent to Tule Lake where she garnered a reputation as a charismatic and generally well-liked individual.

40

Camp officials praised her affable personality and ability to make a successful adjustment.[68]

Kenzo Maekawa, a *Nisei*, his Caucasian wife Maybelle and their daughter Joan Kiyo were able

to stay together and maintain their integrity with the loving support of their extended family.[69]

Some families approached separation pragmatically, choosing to have the non-Japanese spouse

stay out of camp to protect their property and retain some semblance of their former lives.[70]

George Matsuda left his Caucasian wife Frances and child in Sacramento to operate the family

apartment building. After a quick appeal, he was able to rejoin his family outside the Exclusion

Zone in March, 1943.[71] Others made due given the circumstances. The Sadamune family story

demonstrates the multiple layers of complexity interracial families presented to camp authorities.

Before the incarceration, Kahuishu Sadamune and Clara Mary Braieta, an American of

Portuguese ancestry, ran a grocery in Oakland, California. The couple had four multiethnic sons:

Alfred and Raymond, who were already in the army, and Clarence and Frances, who were

imprisoned along with Kahuishu at Poston.[72] Clarence and Frances, ages 21 and 17 at the time,

filed several requests on behalf of the family. While the father and two sons went to camp, their

mother remained in Oakland to shore up financial matters and planned to join them the following

July, 1942. Initially, the sons requested their mother come live with them. However, their father

suspected their mother Clara was having an affair and consequently wanted to return to Japan

alone. In a later statement, after she had moved to Poston for a brief period, the sons asked that

their mother be allowed to return to Oakland in order to reestablish their home in anticipation for

the family's release, which was granted in September 1942. Others may have acknowledged the

overwhelming emotional cost of imprisonment and separated to spare their partners.

Internal Communal Tensions

Beyond the predictable trauma associated with interrupted lives, lost property and the distressing conditions of imprisonment, social prejudice from fellow prisoners enacted further torment. Spickard notes that within camp, multiethnics (as well as non-Japanese spouses) were often harassed by "distrustful full-blooded Japanese" who saw them as outsiders.[73] Many interracial families had lived away from Japanese American communities to explicitly avoid confrontation. A University of California report on Tule Lake noted that incidents of harassment and negativity towards intermarried relationships likely increased because they were cast back to the community in such close proximity.[74] Rose Hayashi witnessed beatings and commented, "The other Japanese thought they were inferior and they did not get along with them."[75] Some violence was apparently triggered by outright disapproval of interracial mixing.[76] Although evidence is sparse and the exact definition of "harassment" is open to interpretation, it is reasonable to assume some violence was racially motivated. Though incidents seem isolated and at times merely anecdotal, it is clear is that racist attitudes were present and incidents occurred with relative frequency.

Mariko and Harry Chang's story illustrates internal communal hostility and the kinds of issues that arose for interracially married Japanese Americans who were forced to integrate. In her youth, Mariko was raised around other co-ethnics in a culturally Japanese environment. After her parents' passing, she met and married Harry Chang, a Chinese American. Since Harry grew up among other Chinese, neither associated much with Caucasians much before the war. At the same time, neither Mariko nor Harry felt completely accepted by other Chinese or Japanese. Mariko was sent with her sisters to Tule Lake while Harry stayed behind in Seattle to maintain their laundry business.[77] Once in camp, Mariko faced discrimination from both family and peers.

Her extended family constantly reminded her of their disapproval of her interracial marriage. Though she eventually moved barracks and roomed with other *Nisei* women, her situation did not improve. Mariko was incessantly harassed for having a Chinese husband and felt openly ostracized. Rather than softening, her aunts and uncles made no attempts to hide their negative views, calling her a "shameful embarrassment" to the family. Their dislike was so strong that they blamed Mariko for hurting their daughters' chances at marriage simply by association.[78] Comments on her case file suggest Mariko had been able to previously avoid harassment when she was with her husband in Seattle. Problems and direct confrontation only occurred once she was forced to live in close proximity to other Japanese Americans.[79] Letters from Harry cited his concern over the emotional damage caused by these experiences.[80] Mariko eventually left camp to work in the Spokane sugar beet fields, only to be arrested some time later for rejoining her husband within the boundaries of the Exclusion Zone.[81]

Mosako Kagitani and his wife Maria, who was of Mexican ancestry and citizenship, tried to secure release for the sake of their daughter, Conseulo Kagitani. At home, their five children were immersed in Latin culture and primarily spoke Spanish with their mother and father who had learned the language from working with Mexican laborers.[82] In Poston, language barriers and cultural misunderstanding caused understandable hardship. Conseulo had a difficult time in school because was not accepted by peers, likely due to language difficulties but also potentially because she was mixed-race.[83] Despite her best efforts, she was reportedly very irritable and felt tremendously isolated. Conseulo's teacher, Ms. Steignbaugh, appealed to camp authorities regarding the situation. She had a close bond with Consuelo and actively helped the family apply for release, even offering to adopt their daughter just to get her out of Poston.[84] However, the

family refused to be separated. Unfortunately, the Kagitanis were denied release due to lack of financial resources.[85]

The extreme case of two related Japanese/Chinese families illustrates the kind of tension some interracial families felt after being placed in an unwelcoming community. *Nisei* sisters Marie and Jean had already been ostracized by the Japanese American community in Tacoma, Washington due to a family incident during their childhood.[86] This encouraged them to make friends with Chinese rather than other Japanese Americans. Eventually, Marie married Howard Lee and Jean married Hing Lew. For the nine-year leading up to the war, the group lived in close proximity to one another in Chinatown.[87] The couples started large families with six children in total. Appallingly, Marie and Jean were both pregnant during their forced removal.[88] Once in camp, the sisters experienced "terrible mental and physical strain." Neither they, nor their mixed children could read or write in Japanese and only the mothers could speak the language.[89] They felt utterly disconnected from other families and inmates and others unremorsefully harassed the family. The sisters recalled, "Most inhabitants look upon us with curiosity and some even point our children out and tell their friends they are not 'pure' Japanese."[90] According to their correspondence letters, they felt like "total strangers … we do not belong among the Japanese."[91] Though proud of their interracial families, they suffered from the burning anxiety of feeling objectified by other inmates. After several appeals, the families were released in late 1942.

Trends of isolation, harassment, and high numbers of orphaned mixed Japanese children suggest that racial prejudice had not diminished in camp. Resentment seems to have gained strength rather than subside. Prejudice and tensions remained ardent and tangible, making social dynamics and daily experiences in camp decidedly difficult.

Voices of Multiethnic Prisoners

Manzanar Children's Village records and assorted case files offer a more detailed perspective of violence during the incarceration. Multiethnic orphans, already carrying baggage, also faced the difficulties of isolation, separation, and social stigma individually.[92] According to Kathy Irwin's research, many of these children were born from "illegitimate" circumstances and subsequently surrendered or abandoned.[93] The relatively high percentage of mixed children in these pre-war orphanages was apparently due in part to Japanese and Americans' reluctance to adopt them.[94]

Helen Whitney's fieldwork provides precise demographics of the Children's Village population. Of the 101 children on record, nineteen were of mixed ancestry (five were assumed mixed based on observation).[95] This group was quite diverse, representing Mexican, Indian, Filipino, Italian, Irish, and French backgrounds. Incredibly, the three part-Indian children apparently had only one-quarter Japanese ancestry.[96] The official fourteen children ranged from six months to sixteen years, averaging just five years old. Irwin suspects that prevailing pre-war apprehension towards multiethnicity accounts for the relatively high percentage (19%) of the overall Manzanar orphan population. While multiethnics never exceeded more than 5% of the entire Japanese American population before the "biracial baby boom" of the 1960s, they were clearly overrepresented in the Children's Village.[97] Regarding camp social dynamics, Irwin writes, "mixed children had a particularly hard time at the Children's Village because they faced rejection by the larger racial ethnic community, not only for being orphans but also for not being (or looking) 'pure Japanese.'"[98] Though very young at the time, orphan Takato Matsuno remembered monoethnic children and even some staff being outwardly hostile.[99] During his interview, he recalled multiethnic children visibility sticking out, making them easy targets for

harassment.[100] Alienation and even mild trauma, such as being picked-on, potentially left lasting scars. Race was certainly a factor. The very existence of the Children's Village further elucidates the underlying racist justification of the incarceration; most of these children were abandoned and raised in non-Japanese home environments. Cultural distance could free other multiethnics, presuming blood equated cultural influence as officials implied. More importantly, the incredibly young average age of these monoethnic and multiethnic orphans hardly substantiated them as a "threat." The following testimonies provide more intimate perspectives and specific evidence indicating larger trends of violence during this time.

Dennis Tojo Bambauer's narrative illustrates the damage inflicted by the imposition of race *and* the presumption of "race impurity." Born Dennis Tojo to a Euro-American father and *Nisei* mother in 1934, he was sent to the Children's Home Society in Los Angeles soon after his birth.[101] The make-up of this orphanage was entirely Caucasian save Dennis, who thought himself to be Caucasian as well.[102] Prior to his incarceration, Dennis was almost entirely removed from any semblance of a Japanese identity. His only experience came from one year of foster care with a Japanese American family.[103] At such a young age, race and ethnicity were not significant factors of his life. The WRA completely ignored his non-Japanese background and incarcerated him along with many other orphans. In 1942 at the age of eight, he became one of the first children accompanying superintendants Lillian and Harry Matsumoto to arrive at the Manzanar Children's Village.[104] Soon after his arrival, Dennis' physical differences became a focal point of prejudice.[105] Being perceived as phenotypically "non-Japanese," noticeably taller than his peers, and having the name "Tojo" (which was used as an insult in reference to Japan's dictator), made him an easy target.[106] The staff treated him compassionately but adjusting to and gaining acceptance from his peers was onerous, not only because he felt out of place, but because

others treated him as an outsider.[107] Teasing, name-calling, and harassment made his already

taxing imprisonment more difficult.[108] In July 1943, after one year, he was able to leave

Manzanar after officially establishing his Caucasian ancestry and was adopted by the Bambauer

family.[109] Dennis reentered a world hostile towards his Japanese ancestry and was called the

"yellow Jap" by his Caucasian schoolmates.[110] Dennis' narrative suggests that the visibility of

phenotype easily marked him for ostracism based on the perceived lack of "ethnic authenticity."

The incarceration not only caused Dennis hardship but also brought to bear the depth of

his ethnic/racial difference. First and foremost, as a prisoner, he experienced the same trauma as

other Japanese Americans.[111] His experiences at the Children's Village were some of his first

interactions with Japanese Americans profoundly altered his self-perception.[112] Being sent to

Manzanar disrupted his prior sense of self; while he felt Caucasian, he was racially defined by

both the WRA and other inmates as "other." Though records clearly identified his mixed

ancestry and showed he was not raised in a "threatening Japanese environment," racialized

policies arbitrarily invoked his "Japaneseness" and negated these facts. Dennis believes his racial

difference also played a significant role in how he was treated.[113] He did not see himself as

Japanese, but this did not stop others from degrading his "otherness." "Being mixed, half-

Caucasian, I was kind of different, and they used to tease me [about] being [a] half breed."[114]

Dennis experienced the double enforcement of color lines which concurrently ignored the reality

of his positionality. Despite hardship, Dennis has many fond memories of camp. He was

supported by other orphans who banded together to protect one another.[115] It took many years

before he was able to reconcile with "both halves" of his identity and often eschewed

conversations about his ethnicity.[116] Dennis was eventually able to reconnect and take pride in

his Japanese ancestry, joining other Japanese Americans in collectively remembering camp and

retelling the story of racial injustice.[117] Racialization from these multiple sources demonstrates the material consequences of such laden social positionality in camp.

Though only a child at the time, Ronald Kawamoto's narrative shows how the subjective application of race decimated interracial families. The Kawamotos were torn apart by Executive Order 9066 which sent family members to separate camps.[118] His mother Teresa Rose Kawamoto, who was of Mexican ancestry, was pregnant at the time and thus not required to enter camp. The remainder of the family, however, including his father Yoshi, grandparents, and sisters Hanako and Sylvia, were all sent to Santa Anita. Unwilling to abandon her family, especially in light of to Ronald's imminent birth, Teresa voluntarily accompanied them. Ronald was born on June 17th, 1942 at the Santa Anita Assembly Center. Teresa was given permission to return to San Diego with infant Ronald soon after their arrival at Poston.[119] Upon her departure, she was detained because officials refused to let Ronald leave, ostensibly because he was racially Japanese. Ronald apparently could not return to Poston since his father had already entered active military service and the rest of the family relocated to Shelby, Mississippi.[120] At this point, Ronald was either surrendered or taken away from his mother.[121] There are hand written records that show mother and child were given official "evacuee" designation numbers at Santa Anita. However, there are no records indicating they ever received an official "family number" at their final destination.[122] His siblings and father did receive these designations, meaning that mother and baby Ronald were somehow missed during processing. While this may be assumed as a conscious act of wrongdoing, it is important to consider this could have been clerical error without malicious intent.[123] The first official record of Ronald's existence in camp was when he was transferred to the Manzanar Children's Village as an "orphan" on February 4th, 1943. Though he certainly had a family, the infant remained in camp alone until the end of the war.[124]

Ronald is featured in some of Ansel Adam's Children's Village photos which further verify this separation.[125] Though the Kawamotos were eventually reunited, the scars of separation remained for decades while the lack of official records obscured the existence of this injustice.

Ronald's story demonstrates how racial hysteria and discriminatory laws caused enormous suffering for interracial families. WRA policy was unable or unwilling to recognize the fraught positionality of interracial families, the difficult choices they had to make and the likelihood of family fracturing. Policies made it virtually impossible to keep interracial families intact. The institutional segregation of the Japanese American population inadvertently caused the unnecessary estrangement of Ronald from his family. Forced abandonment and the orphaning of a child with a family was an outrageous act of injustice. The emotional trauma of losing their child and the infant's isolation during his formative years was damaging. Given the choice between "voluntary" imprisonment and the utter loss of their lives or the complete division of a family with some strained semblance of normalcy, either decision was undoubtedly onerous. According to Spickard, many marriages and families ended in permanent rather than temporary separation.[126] Other interracial families faced similar challenges. An anonymous individual, never knowing he was part Japanese, stumbled upon lost family records and discovered his "hidden identity." From scant details, he learned that his estranged grandfather was actually a Japanese *Nisei* who married his Caucasian grandmother in the 1920s.[127] Their daughters (his mother and aunts) adopted their mother's American name so they could "pass" and avoid prejudice, attend school, and marry more easily.[128] During the forced evacuation, their father decided to register himself as "single" (verified via WRA documents and photographs) and deliberately distanced himself in order to protect his family.[129] Conversely, the daughters were forced to hide their identity and deny their kinship to avoid imprisonment.[130] Though the

family maintained correspondence, he eventually cut off contact and never returned home.[131] Other stories suggest that when faced with such difficult choices, some non-Japanese spouses simply deserted their families.[132] Stories like the Kawamotos demonstrate how governmental policy caused tremendous violence by disrupting the integrity of interracial families.

Isamu Noguchi, the famous Eurasian artist, voluntarily entered Poston in an act of solidarity where he faced racism from the WRA and disillusionment from fellow inmates. As a caveat, I hesitate placing too much emphasis on his mixed-race as the direct cause of hostility; his status as a celebrity and ability to leave camp at his discretion was more likely the reason for resentment. Soon after Pearl Harbor, Noguchi left New York for the West Coast to start the *Nisei* Writers and Artists Mobilization for Democracy in anticipation of impending backlash.[133] Noguchi was emphatic about protecting his co-ethnics' civil rights and expressed a strong sense of affinity with the community. Robert Maeda notes this conviction is quite remarkable since Noguchi spent the first part of his life in Japan and the following decades relatively disconnected from West Coast Japanese Americans.[134] Initially, he hoped to use his influence to bring awareness of injustice. Later, he decided to enter Poston and aid the community through outreach.[135] Since he was not living on the West Coast, his imprisonment was entirely voluntary. The WRA officially designated Noguchi as a "volunteer" and not an "evacuee," legally allowing him to leave camp as he pleased (his celebrity status presumably subverted the racial justification regardless of his Japanese upbringing).[136] While optimistically using the terms "we" and "war victims" to collectively reference the community, he eventually grew despondent. At some point and without warning, the WRA revoked Noguchi's clearance and designated him a prisoner.[137] After months of protest and legal counsel, he was released. This special treatment, however, created friction with others. Some apparently equated his "privilege" with unjust freedom.[138]

50

Though he thought of himself as *Nisei*, Noguchi became conscious of the existing color lines. In his essay "I Became *Nisei*," Noguchi lamented a "haunting sense of unreality… of not quite belonging."[139] His mixed identity may have also unwittingly associated him with "whiteness" rather than his self-proclaimed *Nisei* identity. Moreover, his seniority and political views often clashed with fellow *Nisei*.[140] Noguchi's status as a communal outsider seemed to further encourage suspicion of his motives.[141] While this particular case study is unique, it is clear that Noguchi's mixed ancestry was partly responsible for his "othering" temporary imprisonment and potential despondence with the community.

Japaneseness beyond Camp

As a pre-war multiethnic Japanese American born away from West Coast ethnic enclaves, Virgil Westdale (born Virgil Nishimura) was for the most part able to "pass" and escape social prejudice until the war. Since the family was isolated from other Japanese in Indiana, their father did not feel the need to endow his children with cultural knowledge or encourage them to have a strong Japanese identity.[142] Virgil and his siblings thus grew up with only vague notions of "Japaneseness"; they spoke only English, attended the same schools and churches as their Caucasian neighbors and did not represent themselves as Japanese beside their family name.[143] He eventually pursued his dream of becoming a career pilot and worked very hard to attend flight school.[144] Virgil believes his ambiguous phenotype allowed him to integrate with relative ease.[145] This disassociation eventually led him to legally change his name from "Nishimura" to the transliterated "Westdale," further removing evidence of his Japanese ancestry. While some might consider this a conscious attempt at "hiding," he believed this new moniker was simply a more accurate and appropriate reflection of his self-identity.[146] Though

Virgil felt removed from his Japanese ancestry, legal recognition soon made his mixed identity a bitter reality.

Virgil was not spared from the violence of state-sponsored prejudice during the war. The Japanese American incarceration and "sting" of racialization consequently made him painfully aware of the consequences of having Japanese ancestry. Although he was born an American citizen and raised away from "dangerous" Japanese cultural influences, his *partial* ancestry made him culpable by default.[147] In 1942, the War Department deemed him "a security threat" and stripped Virgil of his pilot's license.

> "It didn't matter that I had been born an American and had been raised to be as honest and patriotic as any of our Caucasian neighbors. It didn't even matter that I had an excellent reputation at the flight school. My government was treating me as untrustworthy. Suddenly, I was a second class citizen… I felt moral anguish of being half Caucasian and half Japanese."[148]

This incident took a traumatic toll on Virgil's emotional well being.[149] Five months later, his license was reinstated and he enlisted in the Army Air Corp. Virgil's career was destroyed for a second time soon after; rather than serving as a pilot, he was drafted into the 442nd combat team for front line combat.[150] Joining the army was his first real experience with Japanese Americans; before, his only point of reference was his father. Due to war era hysteria and the racism of "state" policies, Virgil's mixed identity was ignored in favor of imposing a singular racial identity. Not unlike the experiences of "monoethnic" Japanese Americans who were incarcerated or drafted into the 442nd, Virgil's case shows the extent of "state" race projects which ubiquitously enforced unjust racial logics to undermine the legal rights of citizens. Racism not only ruined the lives of thousands of other Japanese Americans without taking into account the particularities of cultural upbringing, it brought to bear the power of juridical authority over multiethnic individuals.

Conclusions

  Utilizing individual narratives concurrently with quantitative data has contextualized and situated dynamics of multiethnic Japanese racialization linked by the discursive application of "normativity" by both "the state" and other Japanese American prisoners. The construction of race at institutional, communal and individual levels varied greatly. While multiethnics were seen as racially "Japanese" from "state" perspectives, others obviously did not agree with this stance. Conversely, many Japanese Americans did accept mixed individuals. Others were hesitant to welcome those who had lived on the margins or outside ethnic communities before the war. Some simply racialized multiethnics as "non-Japanese" because they were seen as "impure." Thus, "normativity" in legal, social and cultural senses was discursively constructed and enforced in ways that were contradictory but nonetheless marginalizing of multiethnics.

  These narratives present an alternative perspective of the Japanese American incarceration and demonstrate the deterministic omnipresence of race in the treatment of multiethnics during this era. While many multiethnic individuals had already been shunned by the Japanese American community for *not being* Japanese, they were imprisoned for perceivably *being* racially Japanese. Regardless of legality or lived experiences, multiethnics and interracial family members were always viewed as "other" by diametrically opposed points of view. Evidence from these records and case studies may seem disparate or even incongruent but as a whole, they demonstrate common themes of oppression through the imposition of "fixed" yet highly problematic views of ethnic identity. The racialization of multiethnic Japanese excludees and interracial families in these various contexts was premised squarely upon the judgment of

"race purity" as a way to police color lines and maintain group barriers. Though the multiethnic population in camp was small, the frequency of incidents and variability of discrimination suggests the enforcement of normativity was common but by no means universal. Being simultaneously positioned as "threats" and "outsiders" on all sides subjected multiethnics to undue scrutiny and suffering. Historically situating the study of mixed-race during this important period of Japanese American history elucidates early and potentially enduring patterns of tension towards from within and outside the ethnic community.

---

[1] Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga, "Words Can Lie or Clarify: Terminology of the World War Two Incarceration of Japanese Americans," Web-publication, 2009, http://www.nps.gov/tule/forteachers/upload/Words_Can_Lie_or_Clarify.pdf

[2] Roger Daniels, *Prisoners without Trial: Japanese Americans in World War II* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 4.

[3] Catherine Irwin, *Twice Orphaned: Voices from the Children's Village of Manzanar* (California State University, Fullerton: Center for Oral and Public History, 2008), 1.

[4] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 55.

[5] Harry Kitano, "The Effects of the Forced removal on the Japanese Americans," in *Japanese Americans: From Relocation to Redress*, eds. Rodger Daniels, Sandra C Taylor, and Harry Kitano (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991), 157.

[6] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 51*.*

[7] Ibid., 62.

[8] Richard S. Nishimoto, "Survey of Mixed Marriages: Poston Relocation Center," 1942. Survey and Release Notes. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkeley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder J6.15 (17/43). The Japanese American Evacuation   and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b134j06_0015_17.pdf, http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b134j06_0015_17.pdf; Shibutani Tamotsu, "Case Documents (TL-1-35) by Family Name: Tule Lake Relocation Center," March, 2 1943. Case Files. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:1. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_1.pdf, http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_3.pdf, http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_4.pdf, http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_5.pdf.

[9] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 62.

[10] Ibid., 42.

[11] Ibid., 63.

[12] Ibid., 70.

[13] Ibid., 71.

[14] Ibid.

[15] John Howard, *Concentration Camps on the Home Front: Japanese Americans in the House of Jim Crow* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 59.

[16] Howard, *Concentration Camps,* 59.

[17] Ibid., 62.

[18] John L DeWitt, U.S. Army Western Defense Command, *Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast, 1942: Final Report* (Washington DC: GPO, 1943); Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 53.

[19] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 53.

[20] Paul Spickard, "Injustice Compounded: Amerasians and Non-Japanese Americans in World War II Concentration Camps," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 5, no. 22 (1986): 14-18; Williams, "Race as Process," 199.

[21] John L. DeWitt, "Memo to John McCloy Regarding Mixed Marriages and Resettlement," February 15, 1943. Memorandum. Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (University of Washington Libraries, Collections. Microfilm A7378, Reel 1, Box 2, Frames 0482-0485, Items 526-529. Denshou Archives, denshod-i67-00002), http://archive.densho.org/main.aspx.

[22] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 6, 7; Dewitt, *Final Report.*

[23] DeWitt, *Final Report.*

[24] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 54.

[25] Herman P. Goebel, "Herman P. Goebel Memorandum Regarding the Potential Release of Mixed Marriage Families from the Japanese Internment Camps," July 12, 1942. Memorandum. James Y. Sakamoto Papers, 1928-1955 (University of Washington Special Collections Accession No. 1609-001, Box 10/17. Digital Collections, ID PNW02072) http://digitalcollections.lib.washington.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/pioneerlife/id /159 17/rec/1;Howard, *Concentration Camps,* 112*;* DeWitt, "Memo to McCloy."

[26] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 8.

[27] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 53.

[28] Ibid., 54.

[29] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 6.

[30] Howard, *Concentration Camps,* 112.

[31] Ibid.*,* 112.

[32] Goebel, "Memorandum Regarding"; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 8.

[33] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Filson, TL-5: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:1. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_1.pdf.).

[34] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 8.

[35] Ibid., 9.

[36] Ibid., 10.

[37] Nishimoto, *Survey of Mixed Marriages, Poston.*

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Tamotsu Shibutani, "Family Case Documents (TL-1-3, 5, 9-10, 17, 22, 35, 37, 41): Tule Lake Relocation Center," March 27, 1943. Family Listing. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkeley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder R 21.07:6. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0007_6.pdf), http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0007_6.pdf.

[42] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 12.

[43] Ibid., 15.

[44] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Paela, TL-25: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:4. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_4.pdf.).

[45] Shibutani, *Paela, TL-25.*

[46] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Gomez, TL-6: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:1. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_1.pdf.).

[47] Shibutani, *Gomez, TL-6.*

[48] Shibutani, *Gomez, TL-6, appendix ii.*

[49] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 395*.*

[50] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 12.

[51] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 106.

[52] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 15.

[53] Ibid., 12.

[54] Ibid*.,* 15.

[55] Stewart David Ikeda, "Mixing Stories," in *Last Witnesses: Reflections on the Wartime Incarceration of Japanese American,* ed. Erica Harth (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 97.

[56] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 13.

[57] Ibid*.,* 14.

[58] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Matsuda, TL-18:Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:4. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_4.pdf.).

[59] Shibutani, *Matsuda, TL-18.*

[60] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Kobayashi, TL-15: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library*.* BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:3. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_3.pdf.).

[61] Shibutani, *Kobayashi, TL-15.*

[62] Tamotsu Shibutani *Nakamura, TL-23: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:4. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_4.pdf.).

[63] Nishimoto, *Survey of Mixed Marriages, Poston*.

[64] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Uyeda, TL-29: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:5. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_5.pdf.).

[65] Shibutani, *Uyeda, TL-29,* 1-3.

[66] *Days of Waiting*, directed by Steve Okazaki. (1991; Farallon Films).

[67] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Prince, TL-12: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library*.* BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:3. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_3.pdf.).

[68] Shibutani, *Prince, TL-12.*

[69] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Maekawa, TL-16: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library*.* BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:3. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_3.pdf.).

[70] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 14.

[71] Tamotsu Shibutani*, Matsuda, TL-27: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:5. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_5.pdf.), 1-2.

[72] Nishimoto, *Survey of Mixed Marriages, Poston,* 29.

[73] Spickard*, Mixed Blood*, 55.

[74] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 16; Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 49.

[75] Spickard, "Injustice Compounded," 16.

[76] Ibid., 17.

[77] Tamotsu Shibutani, *Chang, TL-4: Case Documents.* Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:1. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_1.pdf), 1-2.

[78] Shibutani, *Chang, TL-4.*

[79] Ibid., 7.

[80] Ibid., Appendix ii, iii.

[81] Ibid., Agenda Item, Appendix.

[82] Nishimoto, *Survey of Mixed Marriages, Poston,* 70.

[83] Ibid., 70.

[84] Ibid. 70-71.

[85] Ibid., 70.

[86] Ibid., 39-40.

[87] Ibid., 40.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Nishimoto, *Survey of Mixed Marriages, Poston*, 40, appendix.

[91] Nishimoto, *Survey of Mixed Marriages, Poston*, 40.

[92] Irwin, *Twice Orphaned*, 3-8.

[93] Ibid., 253.

[94] Ibid*.,* 253*.*

[95] Helen Elizabeth Whitney, *Care of Homeless Children of Japanese Ancestry During Forced Removal and Relocation* (Thesis, University of California School of Social Welfare, 1948, Print.), 65, 66.

[96] Whitney, *Care of Homeless*, 66.

[97] Irwin*, Twice Orphaned,* 9.

[98] Ibid., 9.

[99] Ibid., 254.

[100] Ibid., 166.

[101] Dennis Bambauer, Interview by Richard Postashin. *Manzanar National Historic Site Collection.* Denshou: the Japanese American Legacy Project, August 12, 2009; Irwin, *Twice Orphaned*, 255.

[102] Bambauer Interview, 2009.

[103] Irwin, *Twice Orphaned*, 258.

[104] Ibid., 1.

[105] Ibid., 259.

[106] Bambauer Interview 2009; Daniel A. Nakashima, "A Rose by Any Other Name: Names, Multiracial/Multiethnic People, and the Politics of Identity" in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 113; Irwin, *Twice Orphaned,* 261, 268

[107] Ibid., 261.

[108] Ibid., 261-263.

[109] Ibid., 265.

[110] Dennis Bambauer, Interview by John Allen. *Manzanar National Historic Site Collection.* Denshou: The Japanese American Legacy Project, November 6, 2002.

[111] Bambauer Interview, 2002; Bambauer Interview, 2009.

[112] Irwin *Twice Orphaned*, 254.

[113] Ibid., 264.

[114] Ibid., 261.

[115] Bambauer Interview, 2009

[116] Ibid.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Irwin, *Twice Orphaned*, 273.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Ibid., 277

[121] Ibid., 277.

[122] Ibid., 274.

[123] Alice Yang-Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2008), 9.

[124] Irwin, *Twice Orphaned* 273, 277.

[125] Ibid., 278.

[126] Spickard, *"*Injustice Compounded*,"* 14.

[127] Karen L. Ishizuka, *Lost and Found: Reclaiming the Japanese American Incarceration* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 140.

[128] Ishizuka, *Lost and Found*, 141.

[129] Ibid., 141.

[130] Ibid., 142.

[131] Ibid.

[132] Ikeda, "Mixing Stories," 79.

[133] Robert J. Maeda, "Isamu Noguchi: 5-7-A, Poston, Arizona," in *Last Witnesses: Reflections on the Wartime Incarceration of Japanese American,* ed. Erica Harth (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 154.

[134] Maeda, "Isamu Noguchi," 155.

[135] Ibid., 157, 158.

[136] Ibid., 158.

[137] Ibid., 160.

[138] Ibid.

[139] Ibid., 161.

[140] Ibid..

[141] Ibid., 166.

[142] Virgil W. Westdale and Stephanie A. Gerdes, *Blue Skies and Thunder: Farm Boy, Pilot, Inventor, TSA Officer, and WWII Soldier of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team; Memoirs of a Japanese American* (Bloomington, Indiana: iUniverse, 2009, 2010), 2, 9, 56.

[143] Virgil W. Westdale "An Evening with Virgil Westdale," Center for Japanese Religions and Culture Hapa Japan Database Project and The Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences. University of Southern California Leavey Library, Los Angeles, CA. 12 Feb 2013. Lecture; Westdale, *Blue Skies*, 9-26.

[144] Westdale, *Blue Skies*, 73-97.

[145] Daniel, "Passers and Pluralists," 91; Bradshaw, "Beauty and Beast," 80; Westdale, Lecture*.*

[146] Westdale, *Blue Skies,* 83.

[147] Ibid., 80.

[148] Ibid., 81.

[149] Ibid., 82.

[150] Ibid., 98.

Chapter III: Abject Political and Social Citizens: Japanese Amerasians in Occupied Japan

A June 28, 1946 Japanese radio broadcast announced the birth of the first "official" mixed baby, gesturing to the hundreds of interracial intimacies taking place between American GIs and domestic Japanese women and foreshadowing the births of thousands more Amerasians in the years to come.[1] Hailing the child "a symbol of love and friendship between Japan and the United States: 'a rainbow across the Pacific,'" such an optimistic outlook was arguably delusional. In reality, these children were met with widespread ambivalence and animosity from various Japanese "state," US occupational force and communal level apparatuses in the immediate postwar era and ensuing decades of redevelopment. Though the first Amerasian child was born "officially" in the summer of 1946, it would be at least four years before major legislative measures offered substantial relief from this crisis.[2]

This chapter focuses on the fraught positionality of Amerasians as tenuous legal and social citizens as well as the forces which maintained boundaries between "pure" and hybrid "impure" bodies. Amerasians were often positioned as tenuous members of the overwhelmingly ethnically homogenous Japanese nation and denied the right to naturalize in the process. Racial ambiguity within a nation where race was explicitly coupled to institutional and social ordering practices posed significant challenges to the idea of "racial purity."[3] Markers of mixed-race in relation to "normative" legal and social identity invariably rendered Japanese Amerasians vulnerable to structural violence and social discrimination in various forms.

During the postwar era, widespread poverty, violence, vice and death were present facts of daily life. Extensive destruction, unimaginable loss, stigma towards *hibakusha* survivors of the atomic bombs, conditions of *kyodatsu* (exhaustion and despair), the rise of black market economies, national humiliation under the occupational forces, massive food shortages and other

nationwide crises made the plight of Amerasians just one of many equally immediate societal dilemmas.[4] While comparatively marginal in scope, this particular narrative warrants explicit attention as it elucidates forms of violence specific to multiethnics caught between multiple racial systems and emergent "normativities." Beyond the brutality of denying social inclusion on the basis of highly racialized citizenship laws, Amerasians who could eventually claim citizenship remained stigmatized as war-children, fatherless outcasts, and racially inferior beings.[5]

The association of "racial impurity" with ambiguous phenotype had undeniable consequences. Through deliberate and conscious marking, multiethnics become "othered" by the intersection of "fixed" yet unevenly operationalized racial and legal identity formations. Official SCAP policy (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, the governing foreign body of the occupation forces), Japanese state rhetoric calling for the protection of "*Yamato* blood purity" and rampant individual prejudice made interracial intimacy not only taboo but virtually illegal.[6] Ostracism was not limited to the physical pathologizing of multiraciality; Amerasians were viewed as the literal embodiment of national defeat, the humiliating occupation, and the failures of the imperial system.[7]

As illicit and undesirable individuals, multiethnics were further marginalized by fraught citizenship laws. Under notions of *ju sanguinis,* which establishes citizenship patrilineally, membership both in "the nation" and society was both gendered but racially biased.[8] Moreover, while nationality is meant to provide citizens with basic social and political protections, the Japanese government's denial of these essential rights to "stateless" individuals produced the very mechanisms of oppression which perpetuated their marginality. Paths to citizenship were convoluted and few were able to gain basic legal protections until the passing of the Japanese

Nationality Law of May 4, 1950. This law finally allowed Amerasian children to become naturalized through their mothers. These major legal changes coincided with the passing of the McCarran Walters Act of 1952 in the US, subsequently allowing GIs and Japanese women to legally marry and extend their civic privileges to their now officially recognized interracial families.[9]

By this time, however, damage had already been done to hundreds of Amerasians and their families. Moreover, racial sentiments affixed to individual perceptions of nationalism were not simply ameliorated with the passing of laws. Prejudice, political indifference, scape-goating and inadequate laws had a range of short and long-term effects. On both sides of the Pacific, cruelty and apathy towards Amerasians from families, state apparatuses, and fellow citizens translated into abandonment, physical harassment, and, in extreme cases, death.[10] Ideologies of "racial purity" continued to be associated with "social citizenship" well after the occupation as continued racialization denied Amerasians equal access to public resources and civic engagement. Thus, Amerasians were perpetually "othered" and excluded by forms structural *and* social racism; while they were *in* the nation of Japan, they could never be *of* the national polity.

This chapter will examine how the interplay of various hegemonies and legal conceptualizations of racial "normativity" resulted in acts of oppression towards multiethnics.

Historical scholarship and oral histories reveal how the complexity of "statelessness," the unwillingness to extend legal protection and subsequent aggression had truly adverse effects. Drawing heavily from the works of Koshiro Yukiko, John Dower, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, and William Burkhardt among many others, I will explore the contextual background which foregrounded postwar racial systems and the structural mechanisms that enacted and enabled oppression. I argue the visibility of mixed phenotype and associated legal status allowed those

considered monoethnic to easily designate and enforce ideas of "normative" race, ethnicity and citizenry. By doing so, like the previous chapter, I hope to expand the discussion of multiethnicity beyond isolated incidents and show how mixed-race is a focal point of social and structural power.

This chapter will open with a brief overview of the dualistic, racial ideologies of Japan's provisional government and the occupying forces. After outlining particular citizenship and nationality laws, I will move onto the analysis of discrimination and overt resistance towards interracial intimacies and Amerasians. I will then utilize narrative evidence to demonstrate specifically how the conflation of citizenship, race and national identity was undeniably injurious and foreseeable. The chapter will close by examining dynamics of "social" citizenship in relation to what Lisa Cacho calls "racial rightlessness" and "social death" in the following decades. Japanese Amerasians continued to be haunted by legacies of the war in their daily lives, facing difficult challenges in education, employment and routine cultural rituals such as relationships because of their racial difference. This suggests that social intolerance and injustice persisted well after juridical citizenship was granted.

The End of Japanese Colonialism and the Racial State(s) of the Occupation

During the Pacific War (大東亜戦争, *daitoasensou)*, Japanese militarists actively cultivated the racial superiority of the Japanese nation, stoking the fires of ethnocentrism through its colonialization of Asian nations. The violent annexation of Taiwan in 1895, Korea in 1904, the installment of the puppet *Manchuko* regime in Manchuria in 1931, and the conquering of various territories throughout the Pacific at the onset of the empire's formal military campaign (including the Philippines, Guam, French Indochina, Indonesia, and to a lesser extent Burma and Thailand) were all collectively framed under the auspices of the "Greater East Asian Co-

Prosperity Sphere" (大東亜共栄圏, *daitoakyoueiken*), the notion of creating an empire to keep

"Asia for Asians."[11] Akin to Manifest Destiny, such an ambitious enterprise and its promise of

liberating Asian from Western powers through Pan-Asianism was, in reality, far from

benevolent.[12] The Pacific War was principally guided by strong, highly ethnocentric racial

ideology. The eradication of foreign influences domestically, the violent exploitation of colonial

subjects (particularly Koreans in Japanese cities) and the extraction of resources and abstract

labor throughout Asia was rationalized by the notion of Japanese racial superiority.[13] The

"Japanization of Asia," as John Dower puts it, was not only about the struggle between the

Orient and the Occident; it was considered by many to be a war of total oppression, pure

brutality and unspeakable atrocity by an Asian nation over others. [14] Many regarded Japanese

military aggressions as motivated by the desire for the "purification" and "cleansing" of Asian

populations to allow "proper" (Japanese) races to control the region.[15] As evidenced by atrocities

such as the "Rape of Nanking" and the treatment of American POWs, race underpinned the

military's view of both the racial superiority of its own soldiers and the inferiority of other

"lesser races."[16] "*Yamato* master race" ideology was not restricted to the battlefield; it was also

the premise of propaganda and political rhetoric at home and in the colonies.[17]

While some scholars argue that Japanese militarists had adopted the "Western" notion of

race by this point, Takezawa Yasuko notes that certain classification systems should be

considered domestic constructions.[18] Takezawa suggests that some race formations were not

based upon perceivable phenotypical difference but rather markers tied to certain occupational

characteristics and localities.[19] One simply has to look at the long history of caste systems which

racialized "polluted" *burakumin* (部落民) to see how abjectivity was generated within

phenotypically indistinct populations.[20] Further complicating the straightforward conception of

race in a black/white sense and refuting the supposed universality of Eurocentric models, Takezawa encourages scholars to consider the enormous loss of life caused by intraracial violence between Japanese and occupied Asian populations.[21] Hirano Katsuya's critical analysis of the *Ainu* genocide argues that the tools of empire which created the mythos of Japanese superiority and national unity were incredibly racialized.[22] Historicism and ethnocentrism, as ideological practices used by politicians and scholars, utilized linguistic and anthropological frameworks to "naturalize" the inferiority of the *Ainu* in order to justify violent appropriations of native lands.[23] Overt differentiation in labels such as *komin* (皇民- imperial subject), *shinmin* (臣民 - loyal, national subject) and *dojin* (土人-ground people, aborigines) brimmed with eugenics sentiments, normalizing ideas of *Ainu* primitiveness while reinforcing Japanese modern uniqueness.[24] The power of this domestic paradigm within the boundaries of the empire was evident and clearly destructive. Racial ideology directed inward at colonial subjects and outward towards foreign bodies suggests that race was an integral mechanism of structural organization and aggressive imperialism leading up to the occupation era.

The United States military was also guided by racial sentiments through Orientalism. As the previous chapter demonstrated, hatred and the supposed "inferiority" of the Japanese reputedly ran so deep that it justified the illegal mass incarceration of over 110,000 Japanese and Japanese Americans.[25] Racism was also a predominant component of military organization which divided the armed forces into segregated units. White supremacy and the demonization of the "Yellow Empire" fueled the brutality of soldiers and rationalized the utter "extermination" of what many had deemed a lesser race.[26] Beliefs about Japanese racial inferiority were so engrained that so-called "experts" made ludicrous claims about the physical ineptitude of the average Japanese soldier even before the war; some theorized that Zero pilots were not only

mentally incompetent but had "racial defects of the tubes of the inner ear, just as they are generally myopic," giving them a defective sense of balance and other sensory deficiencies.[27]

Though only a cursory look at the extensive literature on the Pacific War, it is clear that each military used race and nationalist discourse to both demonize and valorize.[28] Racial attitudes on both sides can be unmistakably surmised by the overabundance of degrading propaganda which depicted world leaders and opposing populations with stereotypically over-exaggerated or hyper racialized features.[29] These sentiments were part and parcel of both military systems which would soon restructure the Japanese state and society.

During the war, the "problem of mixed blood" was a specifically troubling issue for Japanese military leaders and government officials. Those who were sent abroad to settle in the colonies were to maintain insularity from the indigenous population, yet the looming threat of interracial intimacy hovered in the minds of those tasked with preserving the "superior qualities" of the *Yamato* bloodline.[30] As Dower notes, "intermarriage with native peoples was to be avoided at all costs- not merely because mixed-blood children were generally inferior, but also because intermarriage would destroy the psychic solidarity of the *Yamato* race."[31] Furuya Yoshio, a medical doctor, wrote about the need to maintain this racial image and the innate qualities of the Japanese body to serve as an archetype for other nations.[32] Though this valorization hid the sadistic undertones, intermixing became a significant concern for military officials in regards to the thousands of soldiers stationed throughout the empire.[33] Regardless of taboos and disciplinary repercussions, sources estimate that in Southeast Asia alone, "70,000-100,000 illegitimate children were fathered and abandoned by Japanese soldiers by the end of the war."[34] To turn the highly derogative belief of mixed abjectivity on its head, experts claimed the infusion of Japanese blood into Asian societies would benefit these "backward" nations. Well

after the war in 1952, Diet member Fujiwara Michiko and several corresponding news reports claimed that mixed-race in Indonesian and Sumatran populations posed no problems since Japanese ancestry made these individuals "superior beings." Such statements were not only caustic and completely self-serving; they elided the violence wrought by colonial projects.[35]

"Blood myths" tied to nationalism thus became the pretext for both civil and social inclusion as members *of* the imperial Japanese state. Colonial era *jus sanguinis* ideology in turn shaped postwar notions of "acceptability" by determining the political and social "authenticity" of citizens on the basis of race. [36] Though it may be difficult to determine the extent to which individuals were indoctrinated with these ideas, the conflation of blood and citizenry was a cornerstone of formal policy and mainstream social mores.

An Occupied Japan

Race became an important dynamic that guided interactions between the occupying and defeated populations. The demonizing rhetoric of the past, at least on the surface, would have to be modified in order for these groups to interact during the reconstruction.[37] Koshiro argues that wartime discourses did not suddenly disappear with the signing of treaties. On the contrary, these dualistic racial formation systems and social meanings tied to phenotype and nationality were instead thrown into flux.[38] The question of race became an obstacle for both SCAP and the provisional Japanese government. "Japanese racial superiority" rhetoric on such a grandiose scale was no longer acceptable public discourse. Yet, the idea of "purity" and the conscious separation of racial groups remained vivacious on all sides.[39]

Each government initially opted for policies that superficially omitted overt discussions of race while implicitly maintaining color lines. SCAP, as the ruling body at the time, made several formal and informal anti-fraternization policies which ebbed and flowed in levels of

enforcement over the course of the occupation. Fraternization between the races was fervently discouraged on the basis of "natural" incongruence. Mention of race was publicly censored though it remained in the language of some military communiqué.[40] Animosity between soldiers and the domestic population following a series of high profile robberies and rapes by American troops in Yokohama validated these rigid boundaries out of a sense of pragmatism. However, the stance toward anti-fraternization fluctuated as it became clear that military personnel would have to interact with Japanese communities. Soon, SCAP orders shifted from emphasizing "natural" (racial) incompatibility to "cultural" incongruence as the root cause of existing tension.[41] While the removal of official barriers ameliorated anxieties for some, it reinforced feelings of animosity for others. Cultural exchanges were met with feelings of uneasiness and curiosity. According to certain individuals, embracing the occupation forces would put the Japanese on equal standing with Americans.[42] Others felt disgraced by in their perceived downgrade in racial prestige.[43] One Black soldier noted positive treatment in Japan compared to segregation at home; rather than being judged on the basis of his race, he was met warmly and treated as an "outsider" just like "any other American."[44] SCAP created official spatial segregation regulations for Japanese women in 1946 to prevent interracial intimacies, barring them from public spaces such as mess halls. This resolidified the barrier between the conqueror and the conquered while fueling anti-American sentiments at this open subordination.[45]

Beyond outright banning racial propaganda in 1945, SCAP also discouraged discussion of race in print and media, especially when it came to the topic of interracial mixing. Regulations prohibiting the explicit mention of race in the media eventually became more relaxed towards images that enhanced American benevolence.[46] Mention of *Yamato* superiority was discouraged in public life. The Japanese provisional government continued more or less implicitly to maintain

a sense of racial superiority through projects aimed at protecting "blood purity." The regulation

of prostitution and use of "undesirable" women, rather than "morally righteous" ones, to

"appease and comfort" American soldiers was one such example.[47] This coincided with the

popular beliefs that all women who fraternized with American men were inherently prostitutes.

Such women were often stigmatized for crossing racial boundaries, making interracial dating,

marriage, and especially births widely unacceptable.[48] By 1949, socially inferred color lines

remained. Soldiers and officials were, however, gradually encouraged to engage in activities and

relationships that promoted amity between the two nations, ostensibly to stimulate the necessary

alliance needed for future wars in the Pacific.[49] Though friendship was now encouraged, SCAP

remained cautious. Official and informal social and political forms of discouragement continued

to draw boundaries in order to keep groups properly distanced.

Race remained vibrant and underwritten at the national level. As Koshiro notes, in the

flurry of intercultural and interpersonal exchanges, race was an irreducible social dimension used

to order and classify bodies. She believes a more "insidious racism" lurked beneath the surface

of these interactions. "Perceived racial differences between the Japanese (and other Asians) and

white Americans remained intact, ultimately hampering the fullest range of interactions between

the two sides."[50] The pre-war union of race and nation remained more or less salient in political

and cultural practices. For many Japanese, physical appearance was essential for determining

who was and was not part of the occupational forces.[51] Anti-fraternization laws further

emphasized this visible separation of the races (a phenomenon never enforced to the same extent

during the occupation of Germany).[52] Between the two groups, Koshiro argues that "notions of

innate superiority and inferiority, both intellectual and physical, not only determined

uncompromising American attitudes towards the Japanese but shaped the two people's views of

each other and other peoples of the world."[53] Together, these mutually exclusive systems of

racial ideology were replicated in daily interactions and conducive to the tense racial ecology.[54]

It is also important to consider the potential disparity between public and national level

views of race.[55] SCAP's white supremacist rhetoric, though toned down in the later years,

continued to cultivate the pejorative idea of the "white man's burden" within the military

structure.[56] Many soldiers may have shared this view. Individual Japanese expressed both

positive and negative views of other racial groups. On the ground, whether exchanges were

friendly, pessimistic, or violent, race was a part of daily life and not limited to those who directly

interacted with occupation officials. News of violent transgressions and mistreatment by soldiers,

especially physical attacks against women, heightened tensions and fears associated with foreign

bodies.[57] While the ability to demarcate superiority and inferiority was skewed due to obvious

imbalances of power, it seems clear that *racialized bodies tied to nation* was a ubiquitous

concept which made it easy to distinguish such divides.[58]

However, this monolithic divide was soon complicated and more sharply defined by the

propagation of mixed children. Despite ordinances, taboos and the threat of ostracism, interracial

intimacies continued.[59] Social and legal mechanisms were not enough to stymie the inevitability

of mixing bodies and subsequent relationships. Amerasians posed challenges for discourses

which had previously relied on easily distinguishable physical markers to define national

belonging.[60] The question was, would they be *accepted* and by whom? If they remained in Japan,

would they be able to integrate or be viewed as "others"?

As previous scholars have already noted, ideas of nationality and race as one in the same

survived the war relatively intact. Anti-miscegenation was never officially codified into Japanese

law (unlike the US). Maintaining racial boundaries was nevertheless a priority for both

governments. Sadly, the prevailing reality was that *neither side* wanted to deal with these interracial offspring.[61] The seven year period between 1945 and 1952, the start of the occupation to the year when constitutional amendments finally allowed legal marriage between GIs and war brides as well as Amerasian naturalization, was a time in which de facto "stateless" children regularly faced violence, neglect and abandonment without the aid of civil protections.[62] Before 1952, the Amerasian plight stirred few into action. Problematic citizenship laws not only limited legal rights but created highly detrimental barriers which prevented social integration.

Defining Racialized Citizenship

How identity and ethnicity were defined in postwar Japan was invariably linked to how nationality was legally defined. The debate over the language in the 1946 Constitution was of paramount concern. Coming right out of the colonial period, nation/subject language such as *jinshu* (人種- race), *shuzoku* (種族- race, species) and *minzoku* (民族- people, race, nation) were still in frequent use. However, their exact meaning was convoluted and somewhat interchangeable in their legal and social use.[63] Exactly how these terms were defined became a point of contestation between intellectuals, politicians and SCAP officials. Some pushed for "total racial equality," defining citizenship in a broad yet ill-defined universal sense, hoping vague language would endow rights to formally colonized populations and domestic minorities such as the *Ainu* and *Eta* castes.[64] Phrases like "fundamental civil rights to Japanese subjects," "all natural people are equal before the law" and "the sovereignty of the people" were used in early drafts of the constitution to create sweeping non-discrimination clauses. These were meant push total political, economic and social tolerance regardless of race, class, creed, sex, social status, origin, or caste.[65] In the final 1946 draft, language remained nebulous. Articles used words like "*jinshu* (race)" without thoroughly defining them.[66] Some interpreted this as

70

connoting the dichotomy between races in the Western black/white paradigmatic sense while others argued that "race" referred to distinctions between *all* ethnic groups within Japan's national boundaries.[67] Perhaps an expected irony, ambiguous wording led to ambiguous interpretation and caused alarming issues of nationality for established ethnic groups. *Burakumin* remained largely oppressed even after the constitution had become officiated.[68] Territorial redistribution meant Okinawans, who were seen as inferior by both Japanese and Americans, now resided outside the national boundaries. They were by law "non-Japanese" and thus exempt from citizenship.[69] Koreans who remained in occupied Japan suffered immensely. While unequal quasi-Japanese citizens as colonial subjects, the return of Korea's national sovereignty immediately rendered them a visible and separate racial group in the eyes of the law. Even before sovereignty was returned, Koreans living in Japan were considered *sangokujin* (三国人, third nationals) and highly discriminated against as an "inferior" race.[70] When these new naturalization laws were enacted, Koreans who had made Japan their home (willingly or not) were stripped of their largely superficial Japanese citizenship and denied legal protection. Viewed as societal burdens, especially after groups like the Korean Resident League refused to accept integrated schooling (shoot-to-kill orders were issued during the ensuing riots in Kobe in 1947), Korean denizens had became aliens in a country that had once forced them there and now loathed their very presence.[71] Evidently, citizenship laws were implicitly replete with racialized dynamics, making it easy to endow privileges to some and deny those who could be labeled ethnically non-Japanese.

Amerasians challenged the simplicity of this seemingly straightforward insider/outsider nation, Japanese/other Asian race binary. The ambiguity of citizenship laws, however, posed a number of challenges during the early years. Though not codified into formal law, mixing was

widely discouraged and nearly impossible to officiate. This forced the "illicit" children of

interracial unions to remain juridically invisible.[72] Amerasians were not granted citizenship and

offered virtually no civil protections since they were decidedly "non-Japanese." Gaining

citizenship was not impossible. However, paths were greatly impeded. In the US, while

California was overturning its anti-miscegenation laws by 1948, many states maintained the

unconstitutional practice. It was somewhat paradoxical that SCAP was considering the

possibility of allowing mixed marriages abroad while it was still virtually banned at home.[73]

Prospects on the Japanese side were even less encouraging. Interestingly, Meiji era intellectuals

argued that the nation could benefit from the practice of racial mixing as it would add

"advantageous physical characteristics" to the Japanese gene pool so that average citizens could

compete with international populations.[74] Such ideas had been long abandoned. By this point,

many believed the preciousness of the "Japanese racial quality" was something that could not be

defiled by racial mixing. As Koshiro notes, though scattered, Amerasians became a virtual pariah

group as their phenotypical dissimilarity and visible legal standing doubly marked them as

abject.[75]

Early estimates of the mixed population were extremely polarized. In 1948, initial

surveys conducted by the Institute of Population Problems of the Japanese Ministry of Welfare

estimated the "occupation baby" population to be anywhere from 1,000 to 4,000 individuals,

though the chief of the Children's Bureau of the Ministry of Welfare believed the figure could

have been as high as 150,000.[76] Renowned Amerasian activist Miki Sawada believed that as

many as 200,000 Amerasian children were born during the occupation, though some believed

this to be a gross exaggeration.[77] In subsequent years, the Children's Bureau and other ministries

conducted further surveys and settled on a more conservative figure of 5,000, substantially lower

than previous estimates but nonetheless indicative of a substantial population (also keeping in mind these statistics only included officially documented children).[78]

According to Article 2 of the Nationality Law of May 4, 1950 (Law No. 147), Japanese civil codes extended citizenship to Amerasians in only three cases:

> "(1) if the persons father was a Japanese citizen when that person was born; (2) if the father was unknown or stateless and the mother was Japanese; (3) if both parents were unknown or stateless and the child was born on Japanese soil."[79]

In all three scenarios, citizenship was intimately tied to the idea of race and dictated by what Lee Gage cites as *ju sanguinis* "right of blood" national membership.[80] Clause (1) made the idea of race tied to citizenship not only transparent but also gendered. This article was largely inapplicable since most Amerasians had Japanese mothers. Clause (2), while perceptively the most flexible, was not without issues, particularly since it legally established illegitimacy. In the first two clauses, the connection between race and nationality was unmistakable; patrilineal heritage determined whether Amerasians were considered Japanese. The final clause (3) which actually used territoriality to establish citizenship was applicable to the thousands of orphaned Amerasians who faced innumerable challenges as a result of abandonment.

US occupational jurisdiction and immigration laws conversely barred Amerasians and their Japanese family members from obtaining US citizenship. Military policy evidently allowed soldiers to avoid responsibility entirely; Amerasians could only receive US citizenship if the father admitted paternity and they were not required to by law.[81] Since most children were left in Japan without their fathers, these citizenship rules generally did not apply.[82] SCAP actively intervened in interracial intimacies by discouraging relationships and denying marriage licenses. The 1945 War Brides Act for the most part applied to only European and Chinese war brides.[83] Prior immigration acts which banned migration from Japan were still in effect; beyond denying

the entry of Japanese war brides, section 13(c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 prevented the adoption of "mixed alien children" (those with at least one-half non-Caucasian blood).[84] In May 1946, SCAP ruled that all marriages that took place in Japan were under Japanese civil jurisdiction and would not be legally recognized under US law.[85] Men could not bring their new families home and there was little encouragement to do so. Within Japan, marriage between Japanese women and American GIs became unfeasible. If conducted under Japanese civil code, the Amerasian child would be recognized as American rather than Japanese due to nationality under clause (1). While paternity was quite obvious, GIs were not legally obligated to act responsibly and bring their children to the States. Many did admit this connection and tried to maintain some semblance of a family in Japan, but others were discouraged by legal barriers, social opposition, cultural dissonance and other deterrents. Sometimes, GI fathers did legally marry their Japanese partners, giving their child American citizenship, only to abandon their new family later on.[86] In this situation, existing laws made it difficult for Japanese women to pass on their naturalization because courts "legally upheld" the matrimony of the now absent father, making the child ineligible under clause (2).[87] Thus, most if not virtually all Amerasians were born illegitimately.[88] Convoluted and racially biased citizenship laws in both the US and Japan put Amerasians in a precarious position between nations where the path to claiming membership in either was unclear and burdened with inconsistencies.

Application of Japanese law was at times uneven. In some cases, Japanese authorities automatically assumed that *all* Amerasians born during the occupation had American fathers. Under this assumption, fathers could not be considered stateless or "unknown" since they were citizens of the United States.[89] By extension, Amerasians were then classified as US citizens and could not claim Japanese citizenship via "statelessness" under clause (2) or (3), even though

abandonment was quite rampant. Most Amerasians certainly could not afford to travel to

America and claim this assumed citizenship; as infants, this was totally impossible. Even if they

could leave Japan as adolescents and were lucky enough to know who their father was, how to

contact him and how to establish paternity, US immigration authorities would have likely denied

their claims due to territoriality and standing immigration laws.[90] Lee Gage notes that even after

the creation of the Amerasian Act of 1982 (Public law 97-359), Japan was excluded from the list

of eligible territories.[91] Attempts to revisit and reintroduce a bill that included Japan and also the

Philippines was shot down with the Amerasian Homecoming Act of 1987, reattempts in 2001,

and again in 2004. As of 2014, according to the Department of US Citizenship and Immigration

Services and US State Department, Japanese Amerasians remain excluded from the list,

signaling the continued denial of US culpability.[92]

While all families faced challenges, many persevered and prevailed against the odds.

Some families, such as the Shigematsus, were able to legally marry at the US Consulate under

extraordinarily limited circumstances. In 1947, Truman signed Public Law No 126, which

allowed "ineligible alien brides" with the expressed desire to enter the United States with their

American husbands to legally marry under US law. However, they were required to complete the

process within an unrealistically limited thirty-day window between July 23rd and August 22nd.[93]

Congress later established an additional eighteen month period between 1950 and 1952 before

the McCarran Walters Act of 1952 allowed legal marriage across the board.[94] More important

than legal recognition, the Shigematsu children were lovingly accepted and cared for by their

extended family.[95] In an attempt to protect their children, some single mothers consciously

claimed their children as "illegitimate" births. Though their mothers were Japanese citizens, civic

rights could not be extended to Amerasians if the farther was known.[96] Under clause (2) of the

naturalization law, "fatherless" children were allowed to claim their mother's citizenship but were ultimately stigmatized by their recorded "illegitimate" birth in the family register *(koseki, 戸籍)*.[97] Race and specific distinction of mixed-race were not recorded on the *koseki* (or later in US adoption records for orphans), making it difficult to accurately distinguish Amerasians from other illegitimate births after the 1950s. Nevertheless, these records marked Amerasians and carried baggage. Sometimes, mothers were forced to make separate registers for their mixed children, further underscoring this legal visibility.[98]As we will see later on, the significance of the *koseki* as a demographic and social organization tool had an enormous correlative impact on Amerasian's ability to participate in Japanese society. Though myriad pathways to Japanese and American citizenship were technically accessible, the feasibility of actually attaining these rights was not only exceedingly difficult but potentially marginalizing.

The American Joint Committee for Assisting Japanese-American Orphans, mainly as a political gesture in an effort to stem anti-American sentiments in the face of "Communist propaganda," attempted to amend US immigration law to allow international adoptions.[99] The 1953 Refugee Act created a special quota that allowed 500 adoptions per year. However, there was little demand for mixed children in the US. By 1955, the AJC had completed only 15 adoptions total.[100] Moreover, these maneuvers did not address the underlying issues in Japan or the US; racism and citizenship were not simply legal but social problems as well.

Obviously, laws were fraught and the complications of these policies soon became clear. Regardless of demand and the obvious challenges these families faced, both government bodies were slow to act. [101] After protest and appeal, the War Brides Act was first amended in 1947 and again in 1948 to rectify strict territorial requirements, sanctioning a limited number of legal marriages and thus extending US citizenship to Amerasian children in a restricted capacity.[102]

More encompassing legislation on the US side occurred in 1952 with the McCarran Walters Act, allowing larger quotas of families to emigrate under new immigration policies. The 1950 Japanese nationality law obviously had many problems. Incremental changes to these various laws slowly gave Amerasians their deserved rights, either by allowing them to naturalize or become legal sons and daughters.

These changes were realistically too late and often counteracted by social stigma. While legal changes should have encouraged tolerance of mixed-race individuals, discrimination and bias remained stalwart. Couples were discouraged from officiating marriages and social barriers prevented Amerasian children from enjoying their rights even if they possessed citizenship.[103] By 1952, painful separations and violence had already plagued many families.[104]

Beyond Legality, Defining a Social Citizen

As previously mentioned, Japanese nationality was politically defined along racial lines. According to So-Im Lee and Koshiro, social inclusion as "a Japanese" was predicated on the notion of *kokumin* (国民, literally "those *of* the nation") in reference to individuals of "pure" Japanese ancestry.[105] While the equalizing language of the 1947 constitution appeared inclusive, it failed to coherently define or address the evident racial restrictions of *kokumin*.[106] Despite their known presence in local communities, Amerasians' visible "racial impurity" marked them as social outsiders.[107] Even if Amerasians could meet the rigid or detrimental citizenship requirements, they were not considered *of* the nation. Many were subsequently disenfranchised, deprived of equal access to public institutions and ultimately repressed in their attempts lead "normal" social existences.[108] Koga Yukiyoshi, a famous socio-psychologist and vocal critic of such hegemony at the time, recognized the pseudo-scientific nature of racialized Japanese national identity and its connection to citizenship. Protesting against growing social resentment,

he fervently appealed for changing these highly civil structures and the disparities they normalized.[109] Without changing discriminatory institutional practices, social acceptance could not materialize. This *ju sanguinis* ideology of "proper birth right" ostensibly denied those seen as racially "non-Japanese" from inclusion in the national polity while simultaneously justifying their ostracism.

Objects of Scorn

Perceived physical aberration and legal standing distinguished Amerasians within their communities and their families. Phenotype was the most obvious marker of difference as sensitivity to "racial purity" substantiated the boundaries between the Japanese populace and military occupying forces.[110] Racial visibility not only established a connection between Amerasian children and the occupying forces, it also predisposed beliefs of their assumed illegitimacy.[111] Furthermore, the notion of "white skin supremacy" heightened discrimination for non-Caucasian Amerasians; Black Amerasians were often seen as particularly unsightly and the most socially unacceptable.[112] Social labels and associated imagery bolstered prejudice. While phenotype allowed for easy differentiation, it is also important to understand how physical marking went beyond racial prejudice, namely in the ways Amerasians were perceived as "living reminders" of the war and national subjugation.[113] The Japanese government and SCAP attempted to nullify memories of the war and flatten past atrocities through practices of historical amnesia.[114] Amerasians by their very existence brought back these tabooed memories. Detrimental popular images and rhetoric made it difficult to imagine them as anything besides social outcasts, mongrels and pathological byproducts of the war.[115] Terms such as *ai no ko* (合の子, child of meeting; cross breed), *panpan no ko* (パンパンの子, child of a prostitute) and

*konketsuji (*混血児 mixed "impure blood") were synonymous with Amerasian bodies. These terms inflated physical difference by associating hybridity with delinquency and inferiority.[116]

Their mothers also faced incredible stigma and abuse. Americans often viewed *panpan*, women who associated themselves with servicemen, as subservient, pitiful and eroticized objects.[117] During this time of extreme poverty, thousands of "liberated" women sought the opportunities these relationships potentially offered. Many women worked within *panpanshima* (areas of sexual service) as professional companions or operated independently.[118] Women sometimes willingly worked as escorts or consorts (also known as *onriiwan* – "only one," being loyal to a single client), hoping to further their status. Others worked for financial gain out of desperation. It would be wrong to essentialize these women as all having the same intentions or overlook the reality of destitution.[119] This work also came with attached stigma. Besides being labeled as outright "whores" by both servicemen and fellow Japanese, violence was not uncommon. Many were blamed for symbolizing the state of national subservience to whites.[120] Of course, most women abstained from such activities and had romantic relationships with American men. However, pervasive stereotypes caused others to draw false assumptions about *any* woman who associated with the occupational forces.[121]

Many experts offered their opinions of the "Amerasian problem" and the unavoidable prospect of a permanent mixed population. American attitudes were rather straightforward; some GIs fought to keep their families together while others simply abandoned them.[122] Political apathy, discouragement and unwillingness to change legislation indicated that many US officials felt these children were not an American problem. Domestic Japanese attitudes were extremely mixed. Furuya Yoshio of the National Public Health Institute stated in a 1953 lecture that mixed children with non-Asian traits (i.e. mixed Caucasian or African American) would create

detrimental social problems, "leaving a scar on Japanese society for many generations."[123]

Wandering hazardously close to a Eugenics stance, he noted that "Black blood" posed an

exceptional danger (a consensus among many "experts"). In his words, the dilution of "Black

blood" would take, "1000 years before it was subsumed by the Japanese race."[124] Furuya also

went as far as to use IQ tests, cross referenced with international surveys, to prove Amerasian's

mental inferiority. The results were inconclusive. A Tokyo University survey concluded that

environmental factors, rather than biology, lowered IQs. However, Amerasians were apparently

given to overly temperamental dispositions and divergent skin color indicated an inherent lack of

"Japaneseness."[125] In a separate Yokohama based test conducted by the Central Counseling

Center for Children, to the dismay of surveyors, an Afro/Japanese boy ended up outscoring all of

his monoethnic and multiethnic peers.[126] Based on a later 1954 survey, the Institute of

Population Problems of the Ministry of Welfare concluded that mixed were generally lower in

intelligence, had higher rates of mental deformities and were host to a number of other physical

drawbacks, citing their racial difference as the cause of "hereditary defects."[127] Fujiwara

Michiko of the Diet's Socialist left-wing party campaigned for the total segregation of these

"idiot" mixed children from Japanese schools. She believed their low mental capacities and

erratic emotional tendencies would pose significant problems for other students and the

education system as a whole.[128] With a more dynamic yet equally problematic view,

psychologist Sei Kazuo complicated the simplicity of the Japanese/outsider paradigm by

disaggregating race domestically. Sei noted that there was indeed a racial hierarchy which placed

Japanese between whites and Blacks but put mixed individuals below the Japanese due to their

hybrid "deficiencies."[129] Others, such as conservative social commentator Oya Soichi, tried to

approach the situation optimistically. He argued that multiethnics could become Olympic

athletes or beauty queens because of their "innate" physical prowess and thus be "useful contributors" to Japanese society.[130] While inescapably objectifying, Oya's whimsical views were also unrealistic as physical aptitude was not a universal trait, nor could all Amerasians enjoy celebrity status. Arguing on behalf of Black Amerasians explicitly, writer Hirabayashi Taiko argued that acknowledging Japan as a historically "mixed Asian nation" would enable society to transition away from the idea of race as a totalizing measurement of identity.[131] Perplexingly, she also believed Amerasians should inevitably assimilate and that "black skin color" would ultimately vanish after a few generations to "enrich the Japanese racial stock."[132] These sentiments and perspectives clearly lacked consensus. Although these debates indicated tepid desires to reconsider the meaning of Japanese identity, they also confirmed the racialized nature of the national polity and prevailing social beliefs in "blood purity." Whether racism was explicit or implicit, Amerasians as a labeled group were never viewed as "normal" or part of the Japanese mainstream without biased stipulations.

The Consequences of Juridical Racism, Growing up in "Social Death"

To further frame the state of Amerasian marginality prior to 1952, I am using Lisa Cacho's reading of Judith Butler's *Frames of War* to define "social death." In her explanation of how social value is assigned and denied, Cacho notes that laws create "morality" and dictate who is "deserving" of inclusion as equal citizens along racial lines.[133] As an ideological construct, race renders certain bodies vulnerable to systems and leads to the creation of structures which "criminalize and subjugate race itself."[134] Using Cacho's analysis of criminalization to describe the scenario in postwar Japan, to be mixed-race and thus legally marked meant one was not only excluded from society but "otherness" became the very basis of structural marginalization. Thus, the law itself criminalized the "abject" states of existence it created.[135] Butler's words

81

"something living that other than life" describe those dehumanized by perpetual exclusion which in the end deems them "undeserving" citizens. Cacho states, "To be ineligible for personhood is a form of *social death*; it not only defines who does not matter, it also makes mattering meaningful."[136]

In the case of Amerasians, this analysis applies in three ways. First, they were *legally defined* as "undeserving" of Japanese identity or recognition as citizens due to racial plurality. Second, as a legally "othered" population, Amerasians were subjected to violence for *being perceived* as "racially unfit" regardless of the fact that laws and social conventions created their abject status. Finally, color lines continued to distinguish those who "mattered" from those who did not, rendering racially mixed individuals "ineligible for personhood" and unworthy of societal benefits.

These institutional racial binaries *and* racialization practices were encoded into essential mechanisms of national and civic belonging. Amerasians' liminal positionality was due to the visibility of their problematic citizenship status perpetuated by their legal racialization as "non-Japanese." Beyond the dynamics that governed formal citizenship, race also dictated whether Amerasians could partake in forms of "social citizenship." Without citizenship or recognition as Japanese, most children who remained in Japan were subjected to multiple forms of ostracism. Many women who became intimately involved with American GIs were disowned from their families.[137] Couples were physically harassed, denied entry into social circles and experienced unabashed displays of condemnation.[138] Abandoned women had to face shame and stigma alone. Superior officers, chaplains and fellow soldiers often discouraged GIs from attempting to marry or maintain their interracial relationships.[139] Veterans testified that commanders would sometimes block promotions or force transfers as a deterrent.[140] Families were discouraged by

the bureaucracy and difficultly of naturalization processes.[141] These barriers might explain why

some GIs preferred (or were encouraged) to have fleeting rather than permanent relationships or

why women voluntarily surrendered their children to orphanages.

Without a doubt, Amerasian children suffered the most. Complete abandonment by one

or both parents was not uncommon. In some extreme cases, children were left to die on the

streets.[142] Darrell Berrigan's account in the June 19, 1948 *Saturday Evening Post* depicts some

remarkably ghastly scenes:

> "[they, mothers] usually attempted to hide the child's paternity or kill or abandon it
> because of the stigma attached to occupation motherhood…
>
> Babies with un-Japanese pigmentation are found dead in refuse heaps. More are found
> alive in crowded railroad stations, in the park in front of the emperor's palace, and in
> public paths… The foundlings who survive – most of those picked up in parks in
> stations have pneumonia – are taken to one of the public or semi-private orphan homes
> in the city. Most of the homes I have visited are dirty, shabby places…
>
> Recently the police arrested the owners of two homes and charged them with starving to
> death more than 100 babies, many of them occupation babies."[143]

While destitution and despair were normal postwar experiences, these examples depict some of

the appalling consequences structural oppression. Sawada Miki, the *Mitsubishi Zaibatsu* heiress

who became a renowned activist and opened the Elizabeth Saunders Home and other orphanages

in an effort to protect these children, was initially prompted into action because of these

egregious conditions. According to one account, during a fateful train ride, Sawada opened an

overhead luggage compartment and a dead Amerasian child fell out onto her lap.[144] Lucky

children were sent to overcrowded orphanages. Our Lady of Lourdes Home in Yokohama

housed large numbers of Amerasian youth well into the 1950s.[145] More fortunate youth were

adopted by extended family or raised by their single mother.[146] Attaining any sort of social

citizenship seemed unfeasible as racism and prejudice in public discourse shunned their very existence.

Not all experiences were burdened with misfortune. Many Amerasians were loved and cherished by their families. Norma Field, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu and Margo Okazawa Rei all recall positive experiences growing up in Japan thanks to the protection and care of kin.[147] An Ebony Magazine series followed the story of a terminally ill mother who wrote letters of hope for her soon to be adopted daughter Toshiko, encouraging her to grow into a strong woman in her absence.[148]

Marked Voices

The following brief case studies provide more intimate details of the types of "othering" and violence Amerasians often endured during and following the occupation. It should go without saying that experiences were diverse; some were able to easily adjust and led very fulfilling lives while others faced constant misfortune.[149] To quote Burkhardt,

> "It is difficult to generalize about the *Konketsuji* response to their marginal situation because there would be major differences in outcome according to race, sex, age of the cohort; whether they were reared in an urban or rural setting; in an institution or with their natural mothers, maternal relatives, or others; under economically stable or impoverished conditions: and whether they are stateless or having *koseki* problems."[150]

While spatially scattered, incidents collectively allude to common patterns of prejudice and injustice resulting from strict categorizational paradigms and racialization. Hirano Imao, a well-known Japanese/French Eurasian activist born in Japan before the war, argued Amerasians had a birthright to claim Japan as their nation and an obligation to fight for inclusion. However, immense resistance to social integration was indisputably deterring.[151] Amerasians were shuttled into categories that not only enacted various forms of marginality shuttled but maintained discourses of "normativity."[152] As Lily Anne Welty notes, the visibility of empire and impurity

was inescapable; agency over one's identity was dictated by conscious exclusionary and distancing practices.[153] In the end, the degree of discrimination was contingent upon variables such as one's background, family history, ancestry and class.

Kozeki Keiko faced appalling prejudice because of her Black ancestry. Born out of wedlock in 1948 to a Black GI father and Japanese mother in Kyushu, Keiko grew up far away from the immediate influences of the occupation. As an infant, she was abandoned by her parents but fortunately adopted by her mother's cousin.[154] Raised as her daughter in a strictly Japanese environment, Keiko was in all respects culturally indistinguishable from her peers. As she grew older, she became increasingly aware of her distinguishable phenotype. Keiko noticed and internalized external discrimination and the acerbic disdain of her Black ancestry.[155] Not only was she labeled *panpan no ko,* she was also called *kuronbo*, an extremely derogatory term literally meaning "black [colored] person."[156] Although Keiko wanted to live like an "ordinary Japanese," she knew hostility towards Amerasians made this impossible.[157] She was internally tortured; in her heart, she felt she was Japanese but on the outside, people only saw her racial difference and judged her accordingly.[158]

> "それなのに、冷たい目でじろじろ見たり、かげでこそこそいったり、「くらんぼ」「捨子」「パンパンの子」「土人」"

> "Because of this [physical difference], others would stare with cold eyes. They would utter words like "[black epithet]," "orphaned child (written character for "trash")," "prostitute's child," "native" (referring to skin color, word used to similarly describe *Ainu*).[159]

Keiko also became the target of physical harassment. Cruelty from peers was not only quotidian but notably gratuitous. She devoted an entire chapter of her memoir to discuss an episode involving a group of regular bullies who assumed that because she was Black, she must have

black urine (黒か小便の出よるぞ – "black urine surely comes out").[160] Something so simple

and "harmless" as a schoolyard insult was replete with racism. Another chapter focuses on the

resentment of her own body (私の身体はどうして黒い- "why is my body black?").[161] Holding

a lifelong grudge, Keiko was reluctant and even resented the idea of meeting her biological

mother. Over time, she felt she should eventually meet her if the opportunity arose.[162] When she

finally did, she received a horrific welcome. Recalling their fateful meeting:

> "「私だって、あなたたちの姪じゃない。あなたたちと同じ血が私の身体の中に
>
> も流れっているのよ！」すると、母がこういったんです。「若き日のあやまちが
>
> うだからね　ホホホ」"

> "But I am not your niece! [Referring to the fact her aunt had raised her]. Your blood, the
> very same blood, flows through my body!" I exclaimed. My mother laughingly retorted,
> "You were the biggest mistake of my youth!"[163]

According to Welty, teasing by kith and kin was a common experience among Black Amerasians

due to their pathologized phenotype.[164] Keiko's phenotype played a pivotal role throughout life,

receiving particularly harsh backlash because of her race. In a way, her case was somewhat

fortunate since was she adopted by her extended family rather than simply abandoned. Keiko's

narrative demonstrates the ways racial hierarchies in postwar Japan permeated into public life

and the daily of treatment Amerasians of Black ancestry in particular.

　　　During childhood, Norma Field was torn between the positive influence of her family and

the detrimental imposition of racial categorization in public spaces. As previously mentioned,

Norma's mixed generation born immediately after the war were marked by the legacies of

conflict, stigmatized for possessing the facial "imprint of America's domination."[165] Fortunately,

Norma's Tokyo based family created a safe space within their home and nurtured her to have a

positive outlook of her Japanese identity.[166] Despite support, legal citizenship, and self-

confidence, the nativist public world strained these private feelings by challenging Norma's right to claim this identity in social spaces. The pain of leaving her zone of comfort and entering a hostile world made her acutely aware of how personal identity can clash with public perceptions.[167] This push and pull caused Norma to lament her positionality as "other" and wish she could simply pass within the mainstream.[168] As much as she wanted to be Japanese, the emotional cost of trying to integrate left lasting imprints. Others experienced similar treatment beyond the safety of kin. In an emotional interview, Ishiyama Hitomi recalled the pain of harassment and ridicule during her youth. Raised by her grandmother, Hitomi attended Catholic school to avoid discrimination. However, on her way to and from school, other children would throw rocks, spit on her, and call her "half-breed," which threw her into depression.[169] The conflict between private and public identities reaffirms the challenges postwar Amerasians faced when trying to claim and legitimize their position in the nation in later years.

Morioka Kaoru faced a combination of class and racial discrimination during his upbringing. Born in Kyoto in 1946, his Caucasian GI father was redeployed to Korea when Kaoru was still an infant and never returned. Rather than abandon her child, his mother left her disapproving family to raise Kaoru alone.[170] Rejection from extended kin was a common experience for many women with Amerasian children.[171] Kaoru was brought up by his single mother in poverty, facing harassment for not only for looking "racially inferior" but also being lower-class.[172] Even though he was raised as culturally Japanese, spoke only Japanese and eventually naturalized, Kaoru was the target of intense bullying.[173] Eventually, his mother remarried to a man who remained indifferent about his Amerasian stepson. Weary of living an "othered life," Kaoru longed to "escape" to America to find acceptance.[174] After immense protest from his friend Hirano Imao who compelled him to stay and continue the fight for Amerasian

87

rights, Kaoru left for the United States on a Pearl Buck Foundation grant. Kaoru was glad to leave a nation that would not accept him, stating, "I didn't want any part of Japan, because Japan didn't want any part of me."[175] Evident from this testimony, social labels and harassment tied to the challenges of abandonment and mixed ethnicity were definitive for both mothers and their children. Kaoru's struggle became so burdensome he felt it was necessary to leave his family and the only life he knew in hopes of finding acceptance.

The Perpetuation of "Social Death"

Not surprisingly, amendments to Japanese naturalization laws did little to stem social prejudice in the 1950s and 60s. William Burkhardt believes that had marriages been legally permitted sooner, violence would have been less pervasive. At least then, children would have had citizenship.[176] Scholars note that others continued to demonize "racial/ethnic impurity" under the pretense that Amerasians came from disreputable backgrounds. While culturally indistinct from their peers and possessing some kind of citizenship by 1952, fellow Japanese did not always afford them equitable social positions.[177] As Burkhardt notes, persistent barriers impeded structural assimilation and epitomized the notion of "social death." For instance, social stigma associated with their *koseki* and phenotype prevented many Amerasians from accessing essential institutions.[178] This in turn would affect life trajectories. Though racial discourse influenced institutional and interpersonal interactions, not all Amerasians lived troubled lives in these later decades. Most were likely challenged by these systems in some way.[179]

Marginalization was apparent in the ways Amerasians were denied welfare and the benefits of public institutions. According to Wagatsuma, social services were lacking despite the obvious need for support. Reports indicated frequent episodes of violence, beatings, stoning and abuse by peers; in some extreme cases, Amerasian's purported "physical sexual exoticism"

caused a number of sexual assaults.[180] In the early 1950s, debates loomed over whether to integrate or segregate Amerasians from public schools. Sentiments were far from unanimous. Some felt that integration was cruel and would subject these children to unnecessary harassment. Parents of mixed children generally wanted them to be recognized as equal citizens and placed into schools with monoethnic students. A few bigots motioned at the idea of separate asylums (収容, *shuuyou*) to keep "bad social influences" from distressing others.[181] Opinion surveys of students and parents in Yokosuka City, Kanagawa prefecture and Chiba prefecture yielded conflicting results: some parents threatened to pull their student out of school completely if Amerasians were allowed to attend, some demanded their child not be forced to share desks with Amerasians, others consciously requested their child be placed with mixed children as a sign of support, some students were open to making friends and a few refused to associate with Amerasians altogether.[182] Kanagawa Prefecture legalized a full integration policy in November 1952 which allowed mixed students with citizenship to attend school.[183] National legislation soon followed. Not surprisingly, between 20 to 30% of new Amerasian students were not officially naturalized, prompting authorities to simultaneously force *koseki* and school registration.[184] Integration was looked at apprehensively. Fears of imminent backlash and bullying were so strong that the Ministry of Education decided to make special teacher training guides for handling and counseling multiethnic students.[185]

In the decades that followed, the centrality of the *koseki* directly hampered economic and social mobility. Entrance into school and tracks into higher education relied on these records. The stigma of illegitimacy, as a supposed indicator of "bad character," barred some children from being able to attend certain schools, creating serious disparities early on.[186] This in turn made it difficult for Amerasians to find employment as adults. In addition to a lack of formal

education, many believed Amerasians were unqualified for professional jobs because they were emotionally unstable and lacked intelligence. According to Burkhardt, some took "undesirable" jobs in night clubs as entertainers, waitresses, and bar hostesses. Some even became involved criminal rings and prostitution.[187] Though easy to overlook as a form violence but arguably just as important, many Amerasians found it difficult to engage in deep relationships. While legally able to marry, rejection and disapproval of mixed-race from potential companions or friends was a painful and perpetual reality.[188] High rates of unemployment in the 1970s also corroborate these long-term effects of "social death." The power of war memories and this racialized legal status thus haunted Amerasians in their future endeavors. This linkage between legal disadvantage and expansive social inequity perceptibly transgressed the issue of citizenship, making it difficult if not impossible to live without the burdens of with racial and structural inequality.

Anecdotal accounts capture some of the challenges Amerasians faced in the 1960s and 70s. *E,* an unidentified man who was fostered by his distant kin, suffered from shame of his physical appearance and illegitimacy, feeling isolated from both peers and his adopted family.[189] Soon, he turned to a life of crime; a trend the media claimed was on the rise in the 1970s following a series of high profile thefts by Amerasians.[190] Decades after the war, deep racial sentiments remained potent. Akiko, a woman who was abandoned at an orphanage in Kobe as a child, was once approached by an old woman who told her, "little *konketsuji*, you should not have been born. There is no place for you here, your mother should have killed herself with shame… yes your own mother didn't want you, you shameful thing."[191] Before his suicide, a young man named Hiroshi sent letters to Miki Sawada blaming himself for his difficult past. His internalized racism was so strong that, out of desperation, Hiroshi ended his life to stop the

immense suffering he believed he caused others.[192] In Okinawa, due to continued US military presence throughout and following the Vietnam War, Amerasian issues become markedly more complex as international and domestic politics, colonial histories and racial ideologies circumscribed the island population.[193] In an ironic series of events, Junichi's (Kashiasu) rejection from school had a silver lining. Growing up in a supportive family, he was recognized early on for his physical abilities. Though Junichi did well and was supported in school, he was denied entrance into college. Instead of following this path, he turned his talents towards a career as a successful boxer.[194] The recent 2013 documentary *Hafu: the Film* follows the lives of four native born multiethnic Japanese. Though conditions have undoubtedly improved by the turn of the century, the film reminds viewers that barriers to social integration, employment, education and marriage have not completely disappeared.[195] Instead, as will be discussed more directly in the following chapter, racial prejudice has become less overt but remains deeply entrenched in structural and cultural mechanisms which continue to trouble new generations who are of mixed ancestry.

Conclusions

Identity in postwar Japan was laden with conflations of race, citizenship and nationalism. Amerasians, made visible by phenotype and legal standing, became associated with painful legacies of the war, national subjugation and racial inferiority due to perpetuated beliefs in Japanese "racial purity." As a result of convoluted *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis* regulations imposed by both the US occupational forces and the Japanese government, Amerasians were left virtually "stateless" for several years. Certainly, isolation and trauma had both immediate and lasting effects on Amerasian identity. More importantly however, these narratives and historical records illustrate the omnipresence of race and power in both structural and colloquial practice; being

91

recognized as outside the "normative" boundaries civic paradigms and subsequently racialized by this hegemony was enough to condemn Amerasians to lives of suffering.

Discursive constructions of both legal and racial "normativity" attached to citizenship and social inclusion proved to be violently detrimental. Amerasians existed between opposing political systems and lived in racially charged social environments in which parameters of acceptance were both convoluted and highly discriminatory. Ideologically, these children were seen by the occupational authorities and the Japanese population as "symbolic representatives" of the opposing national body. Rather than being included within the Japanese polity, Amerasians were inherently "othered" by their racial difference and marked physical embodiment of the occupation. Politically speaking, these children vexed citizenship laws. The initial denial of citizenship, based on shifting notions of territoriality and ethno-nationalism, disregarded Amerasians as culturally indistinguishable from monoethnic Japanese and instead used encoded racial logic, resulting in direct and indirect forms of "social death" and violence. While they were undoubtedly born to parents of both nations, domestic Japanese laws made legal naturalization extremely difficult even after amendments were made to the racialized 1950 Nationality Law because they were seen as inherently "not Japanese." Conversely, anti-Asian immigration laws made it virtually impossible for Amerasians to inherent citizenship or come to the US until after 1952. Though there were pathways to citizenship, most were convoluted and burdened with immense challenges.

Stigma associated with various forms of legal marking, made clear by the existence of denigrating social labels, manifested into harassment, physical violence, abandonment and barriers to social inclusion. The visibility of phenotype and prevailing notions of "racial purity" further marked Amerasians.[196] Even after the majority of multiethnics who remained in Japan

were able to naturalize, racial prejudice prevented them from enjoying a sense of "social citizenship." Deliberate resistance and systems of inequity persisted through the 1950s and well into the 1970s, arguably predetermining their life trajectories as virtual second-class citizens.[197]

Immense social and legal pressures seemed to doom these individuals from the beginning. Political indifference, social prejudice and racialized structures not only marked these children for "social death" but created the formal and informal mechanisms that perpetuated "normativity" vis-à-vis Amerasians' "unworthiness" of acceptance into the Japanese nation. Though there were many families who faced relatively low levels of hostility and Amerasians who were warmly accepted, other narratives are laden with tragedy. The consequences of racial and political "normativity" thus went beyond prejudice and exacted very material consequences.

Amerasian remained in the public eye during the 1970s, paradoxically represented by the dualistic phrases "*Konketsuji buumu"* (Mixed-race boom) and *"Konketsuji mondai"* (Mixed-race problem). Opportunistic media interests looked for young, attractive Amerasians to become music talents and models to arouse the nation's sexual fascination.[198] Groups such as the *Golden Haafu*, a popular singing collective of the 1970s, exemplified the acceptance of mixed individuals as permanent components of the Japanese nation, if only to exist as objects of capital interest.[199] At the same time, Amerasians were blamed for various social problems. Studies conducted during the late 1960s concluded that less than half of the estimated 25,000 mixed children in Japan came from two parent households (considered a sign of stable home environments and an indicator of "good character").[200] According the Koshiro, the media blamed the "natural" maladjustment of Amerasians as a leading cause of youth degeneracy which led to criminal behavior.[201] Wagatsuma corroborated with the findings of other scholars who viewed Amerasians as delinquents. "Given all this, it is not surprising that most of these children are

emotionally insecure, immature, dependent, passive, or even apathetic and often harboring

hatred." He recognized the reality that most Amerasians would have a hard time finding

employment and many would have difficulties maintaining meaningful relationships.[202] While

there may be some truth in these conclusions and validity in the perpetuation of these social

tropes promoting a "success" and "ineptitude" polarity, it is important to consider the causality

of oppression and the systems that marginalized Amerasians in the first place. Instead of

considering the violence of the past and present as isolated incidents, it is more productive to see

how the emergence and generation of marked abjectivity stemmed from racist structural and

cultural hegemony.

Lee Gage describes the plight of Amerasians as one of both political apathy and racial

ostracism replicated throughout the Pacific. "The imaginings of authenticity and legitimacy of

race, blood and citizenship are simultaneously entangled and denied within the history and

context of this law," concluding later that, "the Amerasian case serves as a model for how

identity politics, race and blood politics, and notions of humaneness, as well as who is deserving

of protection and citizenship, are constructed."[203]

Today, beliefs in the importance of national homogeny and collective identity formations

aimed at promoting the unity (and superiority) of Japan seem like natural recourse in a nation

that is, in reality, overwhelmingly ethnically homogenous.[204] However, the zealousness of this

"monoethnic myth" purporting absolute uniformity and willful denial of the "other" (Koreans,

Okinawans, and Amerasians) demonstrates conscious aversions to the suffering of marginal

groups and the mechanisms which distance these significant populations from the mainstream.[205]

Regardless of ancestry, kinship or clear cultural similarities, constructions and

maintenance of Japanese racial "normativity" along group and national boundaries had direct

implications at national, communal and interpersonal levels. The management of citizenship and thus social inclusion through dividing practices was totalizing, paralyzing and embedded by the normalization of Amerasian "anormativity." The negative visibility of multiethnic phenotype and "statelessness" not only endowed "the state" with the capacity to control and define "proper citizenry" but it encouraged average citizens to become gate-keepers of race. Thus, visibility became a literal trap. The ability to designate their lack of "authenticity" constantly defined Amerasians as bodies *in* Japan but never entirely *of* the nation.

This analysis of postwar Japan and the creation of institutionalized racial structures and practices ties these transnational narratives to the broader dialectic of power and race. Despite being virtually culturally identical, even Wagatsuma unapologetically asserts, "they (Amerasians) are definitely not Japanese physically, and this is a considerable problem in a society of highly homogenous and prejudiced people."[206] Perceptions of race and national "acceptance" seem to make the benefits of legal citizenship tenuous as structural and social regulations continued to frame Amerasians as "non-Japanese." This provocative historical example illustrates the extent and power of racialization and binary identity formation processes over multiethnic bodies and their obvious consequences.

---

[1] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 146, 159; Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 125.

[2] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 125.

[3] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 159.

[4] John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War Two* (New York: Norton and Company, 1999), 35, 45, 54-63, 88, 97, 148; Andrew Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan: From Tokugawa Times to the Present* (New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 227, 228, 233.

[5] William R. Burkhardt, "Institutional Barriers, Marginality, and Adoption Among the American-Japanese Mixed Bloods in Japan," *Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 3 (1983): 522, 523; Hiroshi Wagatsuma, "Mixed-Blood Children in Japan: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Asian Affairs* 2*,* no. 2 (1976): 9; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 161, 174, 200; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem," 87, 88.

[6] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 69, 56.

[7] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Monoethnic Myths*, 208.

[8] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 96, 111, 160, 180.

[9] U.S., 82nd Congress, U.S. *Public Law 82-414: Immigration and Nationality Act [McCarran Walters Act]* (Washington, DC: GPO, June 27, 1952); Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 120, 180, 184.

[10] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 523.

[11] Gordon, *A Modern History*, 118, 121, 123, 210.

[12] Sue-Je Lee Gage and James Kang-McCann and Gregory Diggs-Yang, "Before There was 'Asian America,' There was 'Amerasian': Applying Critical Pedagogy to Argue for Cross-Racial Bridging," *Mixed Race in a Box, The Asian American Literary Review* 4, no. 2 (2013): 16, 17; John Dower, *War Without Mercy: Race & Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986), 7.

[13] Gordon, *A Modern History,* 154, 220; Dower, *War Without*, 104; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 8, 21.

[14] Dower, *War Without*, 7.

[15] Ibid., 13, 41-45, 284, 285, 263-265.

[16] Dower, *War Without,* 22, 41- 45, 49-52; Iris Chang, *The Rape of Nanking*: *The Forgotten Holocaust of WWII* (New York, New York: Penguin Books, 2007).

[17]John Dower, *Japan in War & Peace: Selected Essays* (New York: New Press, 1993), 271; Dower, *War Without*, 211-213.

[18] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 9; Yasuko Takezawa, "Race Should be Discussed and Understood Across the Globe," *American Anthropological Association* (2006): 1.

[19] Takezawa, "Race Should*,*" 1.

[20] Ibid., 2.

[21] Ibid., 1, 3.

[22] Katsuya Hirano, "The Politics of Colonial Translation: On the Narrative of the Ainu as a 'Vanishing Ethnicity,'" *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 4, no.3 (2009): 1-3.

[23] Hirano, "Politics of Colonial*,"* 2-10.

[24] Ibid., 7-10.

[25] Dower, *War Without*, 9, 79-82.

[26] Ibid., 71, 72, 147-180, 159 160.

[27] Ibid., 102, 103 .

[28] Dower, *War and Peace*, 260, 283; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific* 1.

[29] Dower, *War Without*, 185, 187.

[30] Ibid., 275.

[31] Ibid., 275.

[32] Ibid., 276.

[33] Ibid., 277.

[34] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 175.

[35] Ibid., 176.

[36] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 159; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem*,"* 87, 89.

[37] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 2.

[38] Ibid., 6, 50.

[39] Ibid., 2, 6, 7.

[40] Ibid., 21,22.

[41] Ibid., 4, 51.

[42] Ibid., 54.

[43] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 50; Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, 104.

[44] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 52.

[45] Ibid., 61, 80.

[46] Ibid., 63, 65, 66.

[47] Ibid., 69.

[48] Ibid., 69.

[49] Ibid., 72, 76.

[50] Ibid., 6, 7.

[51] Ibid., 6.

[52] Ibid., 60.

[53] Ibid., 7

[54] Ibid., 11, 12, 13; See Previous Chapter.

[55] Ibid., 49.

[56] Ibid., 17.

[57] Ibid., 52, 68, 80.

[58] Ibid., 8, 9.

[59] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 61-68.

[60] John Lie, *Multiethnic Japan* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001), 100; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem," 89; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 159.

[61] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 8.

[62] Ibid., 96, 111, 160, 180, 159-200.

[63] Ibid., 96,111.

[64] Ibid., 96-98.

[65] Ibid., 98, 99, 103, 104, 105 .

[66] Ibid., 107.

[67] Ibid., 97, 107.

[68] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 524; Takezawa, "Race Should," 2, 3; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific* 108, 109.

[69] Lie, *Multiethnic Japan*, 100, 101; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific* 110, 111.

[70] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 112-114.

[71] Ibid., 114-116.

[72] Ibid., 8.

[73] Ibid., 160.

[74] Ibid., 160, 172.

[75] Ibid., 161-165.

[76] Ibid*.,* 161, 164.

[77] Ibid., 164.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 155, Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 180.

[80] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 159; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem," 87, 89.

[81] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 162.

[82] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 133.

[83] Lily Anne Yumi Welty, "The Occupation, Gender, and Military Industrial Intimacy," *UCLA Asian American Studies Center* (Forthcoming publication, 2013), 7; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 198.

[84] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 184.

[85] Ibid., 157.

[86] Welty, "Occupation," 11; Wagatsuma, "Mixed-Blood Children*,"* 9; Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 526.

[87] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 533.

[88] Welty, "Occupation," 10.

[89] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 155.

[90] Ibid.

[91] United States, 97th Congress, *U.S. Public Law 97-359: Immigration and Nationality Act, amendment; certain children of U.S. Citizens, Admission [Amerasian Act]* (Washington, DC: GPO, October 22, 1982); Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 534; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem*,"* 98, 99.

[92] U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *21.7 Petition for Amerasian*. Current Law; U.S. Department of State. *9 FAM 42.24 Amerasians Eligible Under Public Law 100-202*; *U.S. Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual Volume 9 – Visas*. Current Law; Gage, "The Amerasian Problem," 68, 87, 99.

[93] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 526; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 157, 158*.*

[94] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 526; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 147, 157, 158.

[95] Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, "Celtic Samurai: Storytelling a Transnational-Transracial Family Life" in *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, eds. Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), 50-57.

[96] Spickard, *Mixed*, 155.

[97] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 528, 529; Welty, "Occupation," 7.

[98] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 180, 214; Wagatsuma, "Mixed-Blood Children*,*" 9.

[99] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 185, 199.

[100] Ibid., 187, 188.

[101] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 123-133.

[102] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 133; Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 6, 7.

[103] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 162.

[104] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 133.

[105] Soo im Lee, "The Cultural Exclusiveness of Ethnocentrism: Japan's Treatment of Foreign Residents," in *Japan's Diversity Dilemmas: Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Education*, eds. Soo im Lee, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, and Harumi Befu (Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse Books, 2006), 110.

[106] William Wetherall, "Nationality in Japan" in *Japan's Diversity Dilemmas: Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Education*, eds. Soo im Lee, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, and Harumi Befu (Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse Books, 2006), 30.

[107] Wetherall, "Nationality*,*" 46.

[108] Wetherall, "Nationality*,*" 35, 45; Lee, "Cultural Exclusiveness," 111.

[109] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 194.

[110] Ibid., 153.

[111] Wagatsuma, "Mixed-Blood Children," 9.

[112] Wagatsuma, *"*Mixed-Blood Children," 9, 10; Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 153.

[113] Koshiro, 159, 166.

[114] Lily Anne Yumi Welty, "Advantage through Crisis: Multiracial American Japanese in Post World War II Japan, Okinawa, and America 1945-1972*."* (Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2012), 80; Lie, *Multiethnic Japan,* 219.

[115] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 153.

[116] Hiroshi Wagatsuma, "Some Problems of Interracial Marriage for the Japanese," in *Interracial Marriage: Expectations and Realities,* eds. Irving R. Stuart and Lawrence E. Abt (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973), 262; Wagatsuma, "Mixed Blood Children*,"* 12; Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Lives Monoethnic Myths*,"* 207-210.

[117] Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, 132.

[118] Ibid., 133.

[119] Dower, *Embracing Defeat,* 134, 135; Welty, "Occupation*,"* 2-9.

[120] Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, 138, 139; Wagatsuma, "Mixed-Blood Children*,"* 12; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 168.

[121] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 123-157.

[122] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific*, 198; Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,"* 528.

[123] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 165.

[124] Ibid., 165, 166.

[125] Ibid., 171.

[126] Ibid.

[127] Ibid., 171, 173.

[128] Ibid., 178.

[129] Ibid., 167.

[130] Ibid., 175.

[131] Ibid., 177.

[132] Ibid.

[133] Lisa Marie Cacho, *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2012), 4.

[134] Cacho, *Rightlessness,* 4.

[135] Ibid., 4.

[136] Ibid., 1-6.

[137] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 133-136; Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 529.

[138] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 135, 136.

[139] Ibid., 133, 134.

[140] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 526.

[141] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 134.

[142] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 8.

[143] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 525; Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 152.

[144] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 10; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 163.

[145] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 152; Wagatsuma, "Some Problems*,*" 261.

[146] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 152.

[147] *Doubles: Japan & America's Intercultural Children*, directed by Reggie Life (1995; Global Film Network Inc.); Murphy-Shigematsu, "Celtic Samurai."

[148] Ebony Magazine*,* "Letters of a Dying Mother to her Baby," *Ebony Magazine,* July, 1954: 16-25.

[149] Ebony Magazine, 535-538.

[150] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 535

[151] Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Lives Monoethnic Myths," 209; Welty, "Advantage*,*" 137; Wagatsuma, "Some Problems*,*" 263.

[152] Welty, "Occupation*,"* 21.

[153] Welty, "Advantage*,"* 47.

[154] Keiko Kozeki (小関桂子), *Nihonjin Keiki: Aru Konketsu shoujo no shuki;* 日本人桂子：ある混血少女手記 [Japanese Keiko: The Memoirs of a Mixed Blood Girl] (Tokyo: Bunka Housou Shuppanbu, 1967), 15.

[155] Kozeki, *Nihonjin*, 39, 40, 41.

[156] Welty, "Advantage*,*" 81.

[157] Welty, "Advantage," 94.

[158] Kozeki, *Nihonjin,* 10, 11,

[159] Ibid., 11.

[160] Ibid., 21-25, 31.

[161] Ibid., 39-41.

[162] Ibid., 97, 98.

[163] Ibid., 111, 112.

[164] Welty, "Advantage*,*" 128.

[165] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 12.

[166] Ibid., 15.

[167] Ibid., 18, 23.

[168] Ibid., 16.

[169] *Doubles*

[170] Welty, "Advantage*,*" 126.

[171] *Doubles*

[172] Welty, "Advantage*,"* 125.

[173] Ibid., 128

[174] Ibid., 126

[175] Ibid., 139

[176] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 526.

[177] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 156; Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 527, 539.

[178] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 528.

[179] Spickard, *Mixed Blood* 156; Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 540.

[180] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality*,*" 527; Wagatsuma, "Some Problems*,*" 262, 263.

[181] Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 179.

[182] Ibid., 179, 181.

[183] Ibid., 180.

[184] Ibid., 180, 181.

[185] Ibid., 181, 182.

[186] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 528.

[187] Ibid., 532, 536.

[188] Ibid., 533.

[189] Ibid., 530.

[190] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 530, 536; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 215.

[191] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 530.

[192] Ibid., 537

[193] Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, "Ethnic Identity of Okinawa's American-Japanese Mixed Ancestry Minority," International Ryukyus Studies Forum (Naha, Japan, August 10, 1991); Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 214.

[194] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 531.

[195] *Hafu- The Film;* ハーフ, directed by Megumi Nishikura and Lara Perez Takagi (2013; Tokyo, Japan: Japan Foundation and CAAM, Theatrical Release).

[196] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 153.

[197] Wagatsuma, "Mixed-Blood Children," 12.

[198] Wagatsuma, "Some Problems," 261; Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Lives Monoethnic Myths," 211.

[199] Jane H. Yamashiro, "Hafu" in *Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Society*, ed. Richard T. Schaefer (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2008), 570; Wagatsuma, "Some Problems," 261.

[200] Spickard, *Mixed Blood,* 151; Wagatsuma, "Some Problems," 261.

[201] Burkhardt, "Barriers, Marginality," 536; Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific,* 215.

[202] Wagatsuma, "Some Problems," 262-264

[203] Gage, "The Amerasian Problem," 87,99

[204] Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Japan and the Monoethnic Myth," *Melus* 18, no.4 (Winter 1993): 65, 66.

[205] Murphy-Shigematsu, "The Monoethnic Myth," 65-76; Lie, *Multiethnic Japan,* 130, 131.

[206] Wagatsuma, "Some Problems," 263.

Chapter IV: Multiethnic People in Monoracial Spaces:
Postwar Mixed Japanese/American Oral Narratives

This final chapter focuses on the analysis of selected multiethnic Japanese/American oral

histories across various temporal, social, and geographic contexts. These personal narratives

elucidate a range of divergent yet interrelated multiethnic racialization processes based on

perceptions of "otherness" and perceived breakages from mainstream identity formations in

interpersonal interactions. Outlining precisely how psychological aggression and

microaggressions operate as forms of racial violence at the individual level is relatively

challenging. Moreover, the nuances of these processes are not always transparent. To the point,

affect and "soft" racism should not be trivialized as "circumstantial" but concrete evidence of

enduring racial dynamics. While the previous two chapters treated multiethnics as an "imagined

group" to some extent and focused around specific historical events, the following chapter

deconstructs the complexity of individual perspectives and constructions of identity. Doing so

demonstrates how "normativity" and racialization emerge from a combination of macro and

micro factors, immediate contexts and lived experiences.

By analyzing these interpersonal contexts through various theoretical lenses, this chapter

accomplishes three things. First, qualitative analysis exposes and identifies a wide range of

subtle racialization processes that might otherwise go overlooked without the evidence provided

by intimate personal interpretations. Second, close examination of individuals reveals the

detrimental effects of psychological violence and forms of discrimination that may not seem

overtly problematic. Third, these examples will thoroughly illustrate how individual agency is

often confronted by external observers who are not only guided by the logic of racial paradigms

but interchangeably and contradictorily impose parameters of ethnic "authenticity." In all, these

conclusions suggest the construction of "normativity" at the individual level is inherently

discursive. Individuals either reify prevailing cultural conventions or reinvent them at their discretion

These narratives reflect the growing diversity of Japanese/American community and complicate "standard" definitions of ethnicity by demonstrating its fluidity as both an analytic and sociocultural practice. Though limited in scope, the evidence provided by this cursory sampling recognizes that neither multiethnicity nor related prejudice are universally imagined or operationalized. Instead, this study suggests identity formations are highly particularistic, multivalent and ultimately contingent upon complex variables *as well as* structural power. At the same time, it also indicates that multiethnic individuals are inevitably enfolded into systems where racial logic and binary thinking guide behavior, actions, microaggressions, misidentifications and identity impositions. Despite divergent contexts, the notion of "ethnic authenticity" as a "fixed" racial concept remains a consistent and unwittingly detrimental dynamic of these stories.

This chapter will demonstrate how the ability to dictate "authenticity" in interpersonal exchanges can be both racializing and disempowering. The nuances culled from qualitative analysis also show how power can be unknowingly perpetuated by individual constructions "normativity" and the mundane rituals of daily life.[1] This approach is vital for understanding how hybrid individuals are perceived and treated in societies where individuals continue to use race to overdetermine identity at the personal as well as structural level.[2]

An analysis of case studies from Stephen Murphy-Shigematu's *When Half is Whole* through number of theoretical frameworks illustrates the discursive fluidity of racial/ethnic "normativity" as a concept and the conditions that can shape tensions. In addition to delineating forms of resistance to these systems, these stories also show the limits of individual *agency.*

Though limited, these narratives show how certain identity formations can affect multiethnics'

social relationships, communal membership, employment, and political inclusion, representing

experiences that are familiar to many others and potentially indicative of broader trends. Akemi

Johnson's narrative demonstrates the power of names and their potential to force a monoethnic

identity or invite prejudice. In more ways than one, names create preconceived notions of

"normativity" and negate self-conceptualizations. A return to Norma Field's story reveals the

importance of family for the cultivation of positive self-identity and to combat public rhetoric.

Throughout her life, Mitzi Carter has been defined by individuals using the logics of the

black/white racial paradigm, which consistently racialized her as "only Black" based on her

physical appearance. Mitzi's narrative shows how the vestiges of historical racial politics can

negate the complexity of an individual's cultural identity and agency. Despite clear foundations

in the Japanese American community, Lane Hirabayashi experienced tension and uncertainty

over his "right" to be a community representative during his youth. He and other multiethnics are

often seen as "lacking" some innate hereditary characteristic which qualifies them for communal

membership, at least publicly. Finally, a second look Virgil Westdale's story at later parts of his

life shows the ways in which systemic racialization can legally impose a racial identity, yet said

individual can also reject such external categorization through strong resolve.

Imagining Alternative Identity in Postwar Japanese American Communities

Since the 1950s, Japanese Americans outmarriage rates of have increased significantly,

thus making multiethnicity an increasingly acceptable, if not visible, trend.[3] As Tinker, Kitano,

Kikumura and Spickard note, though mixed individuals have faced challenges over the past

several decades, barriers between Japanese Americans and other racial groups have become

noticeably more transgressible as ethnic culture becomes increasingly symbolic.[4] Consequently,

the meaning of what it means to be "Japanese American," culturally or physically, has become a sharply debated and polarizing topic. While it is clear that discrimination towards multiethnics has stymied, as the number of "pure" individuals steadily dwindles, many still to emphasize *racial difference* by characterizing ethnic identity as largely based on phenotype *in tandem* with "authenticating" cultural characteristics.[5]

Without a doubt, ethnic identity formation processes are incredibly complex, non-linear and particular to the individual. For multiethnics,' definitions are as numerous and diverse as the individuals creating "alternative" definitions.[6] It is clear from the literature that ethnicity and identity are fluid, conscious, ever-evolving and contextually situated phenomenon.[7] Identities can and will change over the course of a lifetime depending on an individual's lived experiences or reactions to changing environments. At the same time, multiethnics must also negotiate with others who posit the validity of race. The following case studies demonstrate this nuance of multiethnic experiences, violence, racialization and resistance.

The Power of Names: Social and Legal Challenges for Multiethnics with "Ethnic" Names

Akemi Johnson has deeply contemplated the significance of her name and the presumptions it provokes. As a multiethnic *yonsei* brought up in Marin County in the 1980s, Akemi was relatively removed from a Japanese identity, both generationally and culturally.[8] However, the declarative nature of the given name made the imposition of ethnic Japanese identity inescapable.[9] Whether or not she felt any affinity, the seemingly "natural" association of culture and "ethnic monikers" brought undesired scrutiny. Throughout her life, Akemi felt discouraged by persistent judgments of character.[10] While she saw herself as indistinguishable from her peers, others noticed her physical difference cued by her "foreign sounding" name.[11] Racialization as "Asian" also made her feel pressured to form certain relationships in college.

This process of self-discovery was both intimidating and empowering as she learned to appreciate the Japanese culture she had always been associated with. At the same time, she was further conflicted since her Caucasian friends did not understand her supposed return to her "ethnic roots"[12] Akemi eventually moved to Japan and Okinawa, becoming linguistically fluent and culturally proficient in the process.[13] However, despite the acquisition of "authentic cultural capital," she never felt totally comfortable claiming her Japanese identity; while able to appreciate all parts of her ancestry, she felt constantly "othered."[14] She eventually embraced the gap between the identity that was externally imposed and the cultural diversity she possessed, proudly representing the growing diversity of the global *Nikkei* community.[15]Akemi Johnson's story demonstrates the consequences of names and their potential to invite assumptions of character and scrutiny over one's right to embody a self-designated identity, ultimately denying multiethnics right to choose their identity free of external judgments.

Akemi Johnson's name was both empowering and frustratingly consequential. The imposition of ethnicity her youth simultaneously strained her relationships and initially facilitated the rejection of her Japanese heritage. The unsettling prejudice of peers' and strangers' racial expectations kept Akemi from ever feeling comfortable fully claiming a Caucasian, Japanese, or mixed identity. As Murphy-Shigematsu and Christine Iijima-Hall suggest, becoming "hyper-ethnic" in order to prove one's authenticity through language or cultural knowledge acquisition is one way multiethnics can reclaim surrendered identities.[16] Nakashima and King O' Riain note these "cultural badges" and "ethnic tools" allow multiethnics to combat discrimination and assert agency, forcing others to at least validate them as culturally proficient.[17] In many ways, Akemi benefited from connecting with her Japanese heritage. However, even after cultural acquisition, enduring beliefs regarding "appropriate" phenotypes

and cultural "authenticity" can make it difficult for multiethnics to claim and validate particular identities.[18] Furthermore, pressure to authenticate and appropriate a Japanese identity was potentially done out of anxiety rather than her own volition.[19] The expectations of others who associated Akemi Johnson's name with assumed cultural traits was both unsettling and anxiety inducing, forcing her to prove "Japaneseness" through unfair judgments of phenotype.

Her given name also caused varying degrees of discomfort. Families can be essential sources of support, but they can also cause us to have negative outlooks of their hybridity. Murphy-Shigematsu believes certain parenting methods can force mixed children to assume a particular ethnicity while eschewing others. Whether or not the child wants to express singularity (monoethnic) or plurality (multiethnic), the projection of identity onto a child can inadvertently discourage them from creating one that fits their needs as someone who embodies multiple cultural and ethnic backgrounds.[20] While Akemi wanted to maintain a Caucasian identity as a youth, her given name inherently connoted Japanese ancestry.[21] What's more, she felt a divide between herself and the identity her parents endowed, leading to feelings of fracturedness.[22] Their decision may have seemed inconsequential, but it forced Akemi to assume an ethnicity and the consequences of conflicting mainstream perceptions. This is not to say that parents should not give their mixed children ethnic names, but they may be forced to deal with perceived incongruity.

While names can cause internal struggles, they also carry inherent social and legal ramifications. Names, especially "ethnic" ones, can encourage certain assumptions about one's cultural knowledge or predispose character judgments.[23] According to Akemi, her name is more than a title; it associates her with traditions, histories and stereotypes.[24] As Murphy-Shigematsu argues, though names can give mixed individuals more flexibility, ethnic monikers also carry

inherent baggage, images and ideas powerful enough to eclipse plurality.[25] Unfair scrutiny of "authenticity" guided Akemi's decisions to associate with particular individuals, join certain organizations and embrace a Japanese identity she did not previously possess.[26] The constant reaffirmation of her Japanese ancestry potentially forced her to perform to the racial expectations of others in both private and public settings.[27] Daniel Nakashima argues that legal names not only possess a gendered quality but an unconscious prejudice because they are "officially" binding and totalizing.[28] In social interactions, names are used to match and authenticate particular phenotypes with cultural demeanors. Those with multiple characteristics may be more vulnerable to biased evaluation.[29] Moreover, the gendered nature of surnames potentially overlooks the mother as an agent of cultural conditioning.[30] In legal contexts that call for personal information, mixed individuals generally cannot escape assumptions of ethnic singularity. According to Nakashima's research, "paper prejudice" can skew the accuracy of demographic data as well as the objectivity of employment selection processes if one's name "doesn't fit the part." This ironically causes unconscious discrimination through the conscious privileging of certain racial types.[31] Thus, like in the case of Akemi Johnson, names can not only affect self-representation but conceivably limit access to communities or resources.[32]

Eclipsing the Private Self: Family, History, and Public Views

Norma Field's sense of self was profoundly impacted by the perception of her mixed Japanese identity in both private and public spaces. Raised in postwar Japan, the positive influence of her family impeded the effects of external discrimination. Like thousands of other Amerasian children born during the occupation, Norma was marked and stigmatized as a part of "growing social problems."[33] Norma's family and her mother in particular maintained a safe space within the privacy of their home. Despite pride in her Japanese heritage and legal status as

a citizen of Japan, the gaze of the public world unsettled this private identity. [34] Norma was thus caught in a state of conflict; public views challenged her ability to be a "real" American or Japanese, yet internally, she felt torn between identifying with either the "colonizer" or "the defeated nation."[35] Spending the remainder of her youth in Japan, the tension of childhood followed her to the United States. She maintained her sense of Japanese identity, eventually becoming a renowned scholar of Japanese culture and literature at the University of Chicago.[36] Norma's story demonstrates the complexity of negotiating private and public identities in the face of racial hegemony.

Norma's narrative speaks to the importance of family as a shield against discrimination and a catalyst of positive identity development. Root and Murphy-Shigematsu stress the importance of studying family dynamics as they are highly influential during early identity development stages.[37] According to Bradshaw, family integrity can have a direct influence on a multiethnic individual's sense of self.[38] Many rely on parental guidance to make sense of their cultural and ethnic heritage. Murphy-Shigematsu argues this is particularly true for transnational families such as Norma's.[39] At the same time, divergent methods of child rearing and disharmony between parents can cause children to internalize racism.[40] Prejudice towards a child or parent because of phenotypical differences or cultural barriers can have obvious detrimental effects.[41] Fortunately, Norma had the love and understanding of her family. She believes their support helped her cope with the daily struggles of being seen as a "social problem" and existing between two cultural worlds.[42] Though merely speculation, had her family been close-minded, she might have suffered deeper trauma.[43] Norma's narrative demonstrates the potential of family as a source for cultivating positive outlooks on multiethnicity.

Norma and other Amerasians also faced racialization due to their association with particular historical movements as "products of war." Tropes and ensuing stereotypes routinely correlated Amerasians with distinctly violent histories and national discourses throughout the Pacific.[44] Cathy Schlund-Vials believes "war babies" often cannot separate their personal identity from public perceptions and the aftermath of conflict.[45] As the previous chapter discussed, subsequent generations of Japanese Amerasians were marked by this history of violence as latent reminders of painful pasts.[46] During the next American wars in Korea and Vietnam, Amerasian children were seen as racially impure and remnants of agonizing conflict.[47] Between these war narratives, skin color and the gender of the parent played an enormous role in gauging Amerasians' proximity to "the oppressor" and distance from the domestic population. Undoubtedly, history and political discourse can affect identity development.

Thus, Amerasians' mixed phenotype had everything to do with one's acceptability and treatment. While the evolution of mainstream terminology in Japan has shifted from the derogatory *ai no ko* to *konketsuji* to the tenuously positive *haafu* in the 1970s and the now the empowering *daaburu*, social prejudice and the potential for "othering" on the basis of racial difference remains a daily frustration.[48] The fact that multiethnics can be so easily racialized in their ethnically "homogenous" society by these cultural terms tied to racial formations demonstrates the tenuousness of agency *regardless* of positive outlooks.[49] Complicity with this oversight perpetuates the "othering" of individuals like Norma Field who were condemned for their hybridity and the legacies of their birth.

When Race Trumps Culture: Multiethnic Racial Hierarchies and notions of "Blackness"

Mitzi Uehara Carter has endured discrimination throughout her life because of her Okinawan cultural background and mixed Okinawan/African American ancestry. During her

childhood in the South and later while a teacher in Japan, most only saw her as a Black woman, an identity she has come to positively embrace.[50] At the same time, the fixation on her phenotype largely eclipsed her mixed roots and diverse cultural upbringing. Mitzi's Okinawan mother encouraged her to be conscious of her Okinawan, Japanese, and American ancestries.[51] While she had a resolute self-awareness, others often assumed incongruence between her phenotype and cultural identity. In both the US and Japan, she was judged in various ways. Most Americans could not differentiate between Okinawan and Japanese cultural markers and were ignorant of their unique qualities and enormous differences.[52] In Japan, she was recognized as both "a part" and "apart" from other Japanese who recognized the cultural differences and viewed Okinawans pejoratively.[53] Thus, racialization manifested in complex interplays of cultural and racial xenophobia.[54] Despite these challenges, Mitzi proudly embodies "a disruptive mixture" of both her Black and Okinawan identities. As a minority-minority, Mitzi has had to reconcile with two historically loaded identities and systems that marginalized her culturally and racially.

Mitzi's story demonstrates the power of colorism in the present day. As a remnant of the historical colorism that dictated the nation for centuries, some scholars argue that mixed "minority" Asian Americans are similarly judged and treated as *only* minorities because of their skin color.[55] Thornton argues the endurance of the "one-drop rule" forces those who are "part" Black to have a completely "Black identities," often causing spectators to assume a natural dissonance between certain race types and cultural characteristics, though they are not always acceptance as black by co-ethnics.[56] Moreover, other scholars believe "multiethnic racial hierarchies" disadvantage "minority-minority" multiethnics by reifying mainstream racial practices and trivializing cultural as a factor of identity; in essence, they are a "minority" within a "minority."[57] Iijima-Hall posits the existence of a "two drop rule"; Black/Asians generally face

110

harsher scrutiny than those with lighter complexions, are more susceptible to racial judgment and often cannot "code switch" between their multiple ethnic identities.[58] This suggests enduring beliefs of "blood impurity" oppress those of minority mixtures in particular. Phenotype denies minority-minority multiethnics the ability to choose or assert a cultural identity without immense scrutiny since culture continues to be tied to biological exclusivity.[59] Despite possessing the same (or more) cultural markers that determine "ethnic authenticity" for *Sansei* or *Yonsei* Japanese Americans, for instance, Afro/Japanese are often denied acceptance as more Japanese than Black.[60] Furthermore, forced singular racial identity situates these individuals in a cruel paradox; if they adopt a Black identity or attempt to "pass" as Japanese, they can be accused of "ethnic betrayal" by either constituency.[61] Other multiethnic Afro/Japanese have expressed similar frustration at the totality of perceived "ethnic purity" and subsequent internal conflicts that can occur even if they attempt to choose one race.[62] Mitzi's narrative demonstrates the maliciousness of the black/white paradigm and its potential to not only disregard the complexity of multiethnic diversity but cause harsher discrimination of certain mixes, particularly those of non-white backgrounds.

Beyond completely disarming agency, objectification and pathologizing of the multiethnic body is undoubtedly violent and degrading. Imposing race and forcing a singular identity inherently limits one's ability to perform a desired or complex identity.[63] Hyper consciousness of Blackness via the "one-drop rule" often obscures the nuances of cultural upbringing.[64] As an easy distinguisher of "authenticity," skin color may not only deny ownership over Japanese heritage but promote negative racial stereotypes.[65] Subsequently, assumptions of cultural ineptitude are inevitably detrimental. Thus, physical cues still play a pivotal role in one's "cultural authenticity."[66] This negative view of the body can, according to Gates and Thornton,

cause multiethnics to internalize feelings of shame or self-denial which can accumulate over a lifetime.[67] Their research indicates some Afro/Japanese never feel comfortable identifying themselves as Black due to the sense of racial incongruence.[68] Hyperawareness of race is particularly problematic for mixed women. Gendered tropes of females' hyper sexuality or seemingly positive exoticness are not only objectifying but also damaging.[69] Mitzi Uehara Carter's cultural and racial complexity has been flattened and judged by forms of intersectional discrimination. In the US and Japan, her phenotype and Okinawan culture have been met with apprehension, misunderstanding and total disregard by those who simply racialized her as Black.

The Right to Representation, The Right to Community: Multiethnics as Leaders

Lane Hirabayashi's experiences within activist and academic circles in the Bay Area during the 1970s and 80s reveal subliminal anxieties towards multiethnics who actively claim membership in ethnic communities or hold positions with potential influence. Lane is a renowned Asian American scholar and community advocate; he is currently the Aratani Endowed Chair of Japanese American Studies at UCLA, working extensively on a broad range of community projects and scholarship.[70] His father, James Hirabayashi, was a celebrated Japanese American Third World Strike political activist, professor and pioneer of ethnic studies, serving as the first dean of the department at San Francisco State University.[71] Lane's uncle, Gordon Hirabayashi, is a household name and is nationally recognized for publicly challenging the constitutionality of the incarceration during his landmark legal case, *Hirabayashi v. the United States* (1943).[72] All three men have embedded roots in various Japanese American communities and have made tremendous contributions to the growth of the academic field.

Despite Lane's accomplishments, he has long felt a sense of tension regarding his ability to self-designate his ethnic identity. Lane's last name and phenotype distinguished him as

112

ethnically Japanese, making him a target for teasing during childhood.[73] At the same time, his

father's strong influence instilled a sense of pride in his ancestry. James believed the

Hirabayashis were indebted to the Japanese American community for their support of Gordon

during the incarceration and thought they should return the favor.[74] Lane eventually became

influenced by the Third World Strike ideology of ethnic self-empowerment. Soon, he began

spending more in San Francisco Japantown with his father, cultivating a deeper appreciation for

his family history.[75] During college, Lane took an independent study course that met in

Japantown and focused on lectures by various community organization leaders.[76] Lane began to

self-identify more and more as an Asian American and Japanese American specifically, feeling a

sense of acceptance because of his involvement with various Japanese American organizations,

such as the Japanese Community Youth Council. He also had the support of others who were

involved in Asian American communities across the city.[77] On occasion, Lane would run into

strangers who made underhanded gestures at his mixed heritage.[78] Though not explicitly hostile,

Lane was keenly aware of their implicit judgments and, "a kind of, 'you prove yourself first'

attitude. All rather subtle, but I felt that attitude was there from time to time."[79] As an adult, a

few fellow Japanese Americans made decidedly more direct scrutinizations of his mixed

ancestry.[80] When he took his first teaching position at San Francisco State in 1983, one peer

opined that Lane was not as qualified as others to be a representative of the ethnic community or

Japanese American studies.[81] Even after establishing himself as an Asian American Studies

scholar and making undeniable contributions to the community, ignorant spectators tacitly

questioned his "ability" to "properly" represent Japanese American experiences.[82]

Around this same time, Lane become more involved with others of mixed Japanese

American ancestry. Feeling empowered, he firmly asserted his right to self-designation and

challenged others' patronizing attitudes. While some colleagues with good intentions wanted to include multiethnics as unquestionably Japanese, Lane wanted to be recognized for his contributions and pushed back against being defined by peers.[83] This push and pull caused feelings of tension. He constrictively used this sense of tension to challenge notions of ethnic "normativity" by valuing his unique lived experiences and defining himself in ways that reflected how he viewed his place as a mixed Japanese American.[84] He recognized that oppression can come from simplistic, essentializing constructions of identity generated within the ethnic community itself; while Asian Americans have been victims of structural violence, some have reified this prejudice by perpetuating the same system of blood-based racial categorization to dictate internal communal boundaries.[85] Time and time again, Lane pointed out the contradictions of others who believed biology equated "authenticity" regardless of cultural knowledge.

What's more, he criticized the notion that mixed-race "threatened" the integrity of the Japanese American community following the "biracial baby boom."[86] He implored Japanese Americans to exercise reflexivity and question the biological basis of such claims early on in the conversation. Troubling yet resilient notions of "racial impurity" disregarded the vital perspectives Lane and those of mixed ancestry had to offer.[87] As his career progressed, multiethnicity became less of an issue as he became recognized for his accomplishments and comfortable with who he was as a unique individual.[88] Coming full circle, Lane now teaches a class at UCLA about multiethnic Asian/American experiences and their importance to the field. Lane Hirabayashi's journey of self realization has given him a critical view of the issues underlying monolithic identity formations and internal community dynamics.

Lane pushes back against the conflation of phenotype and cultural "authenticity" which

discourage mixed Asian Americans from affirming their place in their respective communities,

symbolically or otherwise. Though the dualistic imposition of race challenged his resolve and

ability to define his Japanese American identity on his own terms, these experiences also gave

him a productive critical viewpoint.[89] In many ways, his narrative alludes to fundamental

tensions surrounding debates over "ethnic purity" and public representation. As "symbols" of a

collective identity, multiethnics in positions of influence may have to contend with the pressure

and politics of "proper" representation.[90] In Lane's case, his positionality as a multiethnic

individual working in what many considered a monoethnic vocation caused subtle

apprehension.[91]

Those like Lane who have deep affinities to their diverse ancestry can feel pressured to

possess particular "cultural badges" or perform identity because of excessive scrutiny.[92]

According to King-O'Riain, "blood-purity" is often *the* rubric for inclusion in communal

activities such as Japanese American beauty pageants.[93] While intrinsically gendered and

objectifying, the exhibition of "idealized racial types" as a form of ethnic representation makes

the relationship between phenotype and culture naturally contested.[94] This "race work" illustrates

the centrality of the physical body as a focal point for in-group identity formation processes and

exclusionary practices.[95] "Race work" in Japanese American beauty pageants exemplifies this

conflict over collective representation and "blood purity." Excessive criticism over multiethnic

women's participation in these festivals reveals this anxiety over deciding who can be considered

"adequate" community representatives.[96] Multiethnic contestants may feel Japanese and be

qualified based on their contributions or cultural knowledge but implicit "race standards" can

cause subjective bias.[97] While the aspiration to maintain the integrity of these contests in the face

of mainstream marginalization of Japanese American women is understandable, the fact remains that additional scrutiny and desires for a "pure" beauty Queen is racially prompted.[98] All said and done, many mixed women are welcomed into these pageants and win. Today, there have been a number of mixed queens in the Los Angeles *Nisei* Week Festival and San Francisco Cherry Blossom Festival.[99] The questioned acceptance of multiethnics in public positions, however, indicates the privileging of physicality as the most significant criteria of "authenticity"; if one does not look "full Japanese," one cannot or *should not* be a representative of the ethnic group.[100] Lane Hirabayashi's struggle similarly connotes the privileging of phenotype, rather than equitable evaluations of character or merit, for determining "fixed" group boundaries.[101]

Passers not Pluralists: Whiteness Disarmed

Even if multiethnics are unaware of and do not prioritize an ethnic identity, racialization can still be a mechanism of disempowerment. Virgil Westdale's unique childhood experiences encouraged assimilation and an indifferent attitude towards his Japanese ancestry. According to Bradshaw, depending on one's experiences or physical similarities with a specified ethnic group, some multiethnics feel pushed to acculturate into the mainstream or "pass" as monoethnic to avoid scrutiny.[102] As we have seen with other cases, most notably Akemi and Lane, both given and surnames are powerful mechanisms of ethnic identification. However, Virgil's phenotypical ambiguity and Americanized name made him relatively indistinguishable as Japanese.[103] This is striking in contrast to the other cases in this chapter; in social settings, Virgil did not face scrutiny and was, more or less, accepted as Caucasian. On the other hand, "state" race projects indiscriminately racialized him due his legally recognized Japanese ancestry.[104] The consequences of legal racialization for Japanese Americans during this time, as the chapter II outlined, were incredibly traumatic. Furthermore, while some multiethnic prisoners were not

116

even cognizant of their hybridity, "state" policy made their racial difference a bitter and forced reality. Like other mixed and monoethnic *Nisei,* Virgil was forced to come to terms with the implication of being Japanese when it prevented him from pursuing his career or engaging his rights as a citizen, demonstrating the power of external racial systems.

Interestingly, despite these experiences, Virgil Westdale's story demonstrates that ethnicity is not a prioritized identity for *all* mixed Japanese. Now at the age of 96, being Japanese is just one of his many self-designated characteristics.[105] Participation in the 442nd encouraged a deeper appreciation of his Japanese roots and his experiences later in life only strengthened this affinity. Virgil also prioritizes his identity as an American, veteran, inventor, pilot, father, son and citizen as well, not *just* as ethnically Japanese.[106] Based on what Root defines as "emergent contexts," Virgil has acknowledged his connection to these legacies yet has chosen to self-identify in a way that does not let ethnicity overshadow his self perception.

Though some may see this as internalized racism or "ethnic betrayal," I would like to offer an alternative. The pains and trials of identity politics should not be assumed as universally definitive experiences for all multiethnics lest we risk undermining our goal of venerating individual agency. While debates over "authenticity" and the pursuit of empowerment are necessary for combating and dismantling structures of power, not everyone will be interested in these issues or should be expected to take up this cause. Multiethnics who do not see the relevance or ascendency of race in their lives should not be automatically considered enactors of these systems. It is clear that race and ethnicity inform many aspects of multiethnic lives; Virgil is no exception. Nevertheless, I believe multiethnics have the right to prioritize other identities, disregard the consequences of racial imposition and remain disassociated from these imperative struggles as they see fit. Just as multiethnics should be allowed to express their views and assert

117

their identities freely, those who choose a monoethnic label or practice complacency must be

tolerated. Despite his experiences with racism, Virgil Westdale does not let his Japanese or

mixed ancestry limit his self-perception or allow them to be *the* preeminent aspect of identity. To

him, it is one of many identities.

Conclusions

This chapter has analyzed individual case studies to demonstrate the complexity of

contemporary identity formations, interpersonal dynamics, racialization processes and forms of

psychological oppression. Understanding the engagement of "authenticity" at the personal level

reveals how discursive constructions of "normativity" can deny individuals' capacity to choose

their own identities, access resources, claim group membership, relate to kin or assert agency.

These narratives state the obvious; ethnic identity continues to be a powerful mechanism

of self and communal conceptualization. Murphy-Shigematsu notes the importance of grouping

and group connections as fundamental functions of Asian American communities and our society

as a whole.[107] Both multiethnic and monoethnic individuals use these social constructions to

position themselves and others around them. Inclusion, a sense of commonality and

differentiation are all dimensions of the same process and desire to categorize in order to

understand the world.[108]

At the same time, understanding the formation of "normativity" in personal interactions

with institutions and individuals illustrates the complexity, variability and discursivity of racial

formation at the micro-level. Mixed people are at constant odds with systemic groupings as well

as individuals who consciously and unconsciously mirror these sensibilities.[109] Individuals

interchangeably use race and culture to delineate parameters of ethnic identity in ways which can

trivialize or exclude those who possess characteristics which make them "whole" individuals of

multiple groups.[110] Individuals often unknowingly engage and reify the binary sensibilities of structural race projects, such as the black/white paradigm. Conversely, following these mixed individuals' experiences over time shows just how unstable the idea of "normativity" can be. Over a lifetime, we are subjected to and racialized by some, none or many of these dynamics which are in constant flux.

As evidenced by these narratives, identity is far from a universal concept. Some mixed individuals have positive experiences while others experience trauma, some assert a monoethnic identity while others refuse categorization entirely. Ethnicity may be a defining factor for some while others may be relatively unaware of its salience. At the same time, these ostensibly fluid concepts can be conceptualized and engaged as "fixed" phenomena with immediate and perhaps not-so-obvious effects.[111] Judgments based on visual representation and subsequent cultural assumptions with no regard to pluralism can be violent and unsettling. Anxiety, stress, conflicts between the personal and "mainstream," and pressures to "*be*" one something and "*not*" something else can be quite injurious. While acts of alienation may be perceived as innocuous offenses (or self-prescribed), despondency and psychological trauma should not be trivialized but seen as demonstrative of the persistent power of race. By exploring the nuances of individual stories, we can identify the shortcomings of contemporary cultural, social and political definitions which frame ethnicity as singular and physically defined to maintain power over and distance between individuals.

---

[1] Root, "Models of Ethnic Identity," 31, 34, 37.

[2] Jeff Yoshimi, "Hapas at a Los Angeles High-school: context and Phenomenology," *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997), 142.

[3] See Census and the outline in Chapter 1 for a further explanation.

[4] Paul Spickard, *Japanese Americans: The Formation and Transformations of an Ethnic Group* (United States: Twayne Publishers, 1996, 2009), 158-160; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, Chapter 3, Chapter 4; John N. Tinker,

"Intermarriage and Ethnic Boundaries: The Japanese American Case," *Journal of Social Issues* 29, Number 2, (1973): 49-65; Kikumura and Kitano, "Interracial Marriage,"67-81.

[5] Maria P. Root, "Factors Influencing the Variation in Racial and Ethnic Identity of Mixed-Heritage Persons of Asian Ancestry," in *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, eds. Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 61-70; Spickard, "What Must I Be?" 43-60; Kina and Dariotis, "Preface," xv; Williams-Leon and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race," 8.

[6] See the literature of: Maria Root, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, Teresa Williams-Leon, Cynthia Nakashima, Paul Spickard, and others. Fully explicating the contours of multiethnic identity formation is not possible in this thesis and would be an entire project in and of itself.

[7] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 33, 56, 112, 177; Root, "Factors Influencing," 64; Espiritu, "Possibilities*,*" 31, 32.

[8] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 177.

[9] Ibid., 176.

[10] Ibid., 175, 176.

[11] Ibid., 181.

[12] Ibid., 183.

[13] Ibid., 184.

[14] Ibid., 188.

[15] Ibid., 190.

[16] Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 87; Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 81, 85, 172.

[17] Nakashima, "Voices from Movement*,*" 83; King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty,* 100.

[18] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 154; Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 188-189; Espiritu, "Possibilities*,*" 28.

[19] Espiritu, "Possibilities," 32.

[20] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 61; Williams, "Prism Lives*,*" 286, 287.

[21] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 177.

[22] Ibid., 191.

[23] Nakashima, Daniel, "A Rose*,*" 113.

[24] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 177.

[25] Ibid., 177.

[26] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole* 179-183.

[27] Ibid., 191.

[28] Nakashima, Daniel, "A Rose," 113.

[29] Ibid., 114.

[30] King-O'Riain*, Pure Beauty,* 92; Nakashima, Daniel," A Rose*,*" 114.

[31] Nakashima, Daniel, "A Rose*,*" 112.

[32] Ibid., 116.

[33] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 8,12.

[34] Ibid., 15.

[35] Ibid., 13-16.

[36] Ibid., 16,21.

[37] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 162; Root, "Factors Influencing*,*" 66.

[38] Bradshaw, "Beauty and Beast," 84; Root, "Factors Influencing," 63.

[39] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 36, 53.

[40] Ibid., 55, 61.

[41] Root, "Factors Influencing*,*" 61.

[42] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 15.

[43] Ibid., 10.

[44] Kina and Dariotis, "Preface," 12.

[45] Cathy J. Schlund-Vials, "Lost in their 'Fathers' Land': War, Migration, and Vietnamese Americans*," in War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, eds. Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), 98; Kim, *Adopted Territories*.

[46] Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 113.

[47] Eleana J. Kim, "Producing Missing Persons: Korean Adoptee Artists Imaging (Im)Possible Lives," in *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, eds. Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), 75; Valvarde, "Dust to Gold," 146, 147; Kim, *Adopted Territory*, 45.

[48] *Hafu- The Film*; Murphy-Shigematsu, "Multiethnic Lives Monoethnic Myths," 206.

[49] Williams-Leon and Nakashima, *"Reconfiguring Race," 6.

[50] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 119-123.

[51] Ibid., 119.

[52] Ibid., 118.

[53] Ibid., 117,130.

[54] Ibid., 126, 128.

[55] Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 82.

[56] Murphy-Shigematsu , *Voices,* 28; Lee and Bean, "Reinventing the Color Line," 567, 579; Waters and Jiménez, "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation," 110; Jiménez, "Negotiating Ethnic Boundaries," Hoskins, *Racial Realities,* 1.

[57] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 155; Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 82.

[58] Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 81-89.

[59] Ibid., 82.

[60] Thornton and Gates. "Black Japanese," 97; Hoskins, *Racial Realities.*

[61] Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 86- 90.

[62] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 128.

[63] Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 83.

[64] Ibid., 84.

[65] Spickard, "The Illogic," 17; Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 123.

[66] Spickard, "Who is an Asian?," 14; Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity," 89, 86; Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 165.

[67] Thornton and Gates, "Black Japanese," 101; Espiritu, "Possibilities of," 28, 29; Nakashima, "Servants of Culture," 39; Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 163.

[68] Hoskins, *Racial Realities*, 1-3; Thornton and Gates, "Black Japanese," 97.

[69] Nakashima, "Invisible Monster," 168.

[70] Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence with Author, October 19, 2013; Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 59.

[71] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 48; Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[72] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 47; Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[73] Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, "The Best of both Worlds? Reflections on the Bi-Cultural Experience." *Echoes from Gold Mountain: An Asian American Journal* no 3 (1982), 76; Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 51, 52.

[74] Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[75] Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, "Understanding the Hapa Experience," *Pacific Ties, UCLA's Asian/Pacific Newsmagazine,* October, 1982; Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[76] Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[77] Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, "Understanding the 'Happa' Experience," *The New York Nichibei,* March 9, 1984; Hirabayashi, "Understanding (1982)"; Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence

[78] Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 55; Hirabayashi, "Understanding the Happa (1984)."

[81] Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[82] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 44, 45.

[83] Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[84] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 46; Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[85] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole,* 49, 50; Hirabayashi, "Understanding (1982)."

[86] Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, "Is the JA Community Disappearing?" *Pacific Citizen*, December 17, 1993, B15.

[87] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 55; Hirabayashi, "Understanding the Happa (1984)."

[88] Hirabayashi, Personal Correspondence.

[89] Murphy-Shigematsu, *When Half is Whole*, 50, 57; Hirabayashi, "Understanding the Hapa (1982)."

[90] King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty,* 79.

[91] Hirabayashi, "Is the JA?," B15.

[92] Nakashima, "Voices from Movement," 84.

[93] King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty*; Ropp, "Do Multiethnic Subjects*,*" 4.

[94] King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty,* 4, 75, 79.

[95] Ibid., 78, 99.

[96] Ibid.*,* 77-93.

[97] Ibid., 78.

[98] Ibid., 82, 95.

[99] Ibid., 87-89, 216-226.

[100] Williams, "Race-ing," 64.

[101] King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty,* 2.

[102] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 70; Bradshaw, "Beauty and the Beast*,*" 79.

[103] Westdale, *Blue Skies and Thunder,* 83.

[104] Ibid., 83.

[105] Ibid., 9.

[106] Ibid., 267.

[107] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 80.

[108] Ibid., 93.

[109] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices,* 143; Williams-Leon and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race*,*" 3.

[110] Iijima-Hall and Turner, "The Diversity."

[111] Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 33, 56, 112, 177; Root, "Factors Influencing," 64.

Chapter V: Conclusion and Potential Implications of this Study

This thesis has examined interpersonal, communal and structural dynamics during the Japanese American incarceration, occupation of Japan and recent postwar decades in both nations to demonstrate operations of power and racial violence directly related to multiethnicity. Within these distinct fields, I have shown many ways race has been used to create and frame cultural, ethnic and legal "normativities." Various actors *discursively* engage these "normative" concepts to *differentiate* and *racialize* those who are identified as "in-between" idealized monoethnic "racial types." This *subjectivity* forces multiethnics to negotiate with biased, constantly shifting social contours and endure the seemingly insurmountable challenges of structural and ideological marginality.[1]

In sum, these three fields illustrate how multiethnic Japanese/Americans exist in systems where discursive perceptions of race overdetermine definitions of Japanese identity, enable forms of oppression and veil the complexities of pluralistic experiences. During the Japanese American incarceration, mainstream institutional entities and coethnics within the camps defined racial identity from opposing and ultimately contradictory angles, leaving multiethnics in a precarious state of perpetual ostracism. While WRA/WDC policy destroyed mixed families and illegally imprisoned individuals with *any* Japanese ancestry, other Japanese sometimes marginalized and violently scrutinized "half-breeds" and Japanese involved in interracial relationships. Amerasians in postwar Japan were caught between conflicting political systems where citizenship and national belonging were highly racialized. Complex laws and inadequate legal protection, compounded by extreme social prejudice, left Amerasians vulnerable to violence and "social death" which proved to be fatal for some and a lifelong struggle for others. Finally, more recent individual narratives illustrate various forms of marginalization perpetuated

by individuals who continue to frame Japanese identity as inherently static, singular and racially determined. These perspectives delineate both symbolic and direct forms of marginalization that persist in the minutia of daily life through social, communal and institutional interactions.

Analyzing these particular dimensions allows us to problematize the idea of race in significant ways. While the instability of race as a concept and process is evident from its discursive formation in relation to multiethnicity, the dynamic reconstruction of "normativity" as a mechanism of oppression demonstrates its tremendous power. Thus, as shown by its fluctuating reproduction throughout this thesis, while race is a *meaningless* social construction, its social *meaning* remains incredibly consequential.[2]

Furthermore, the direct and indirect parallels made between these three fields show how multiethnicity is a truly global phenomenon. Though these systems operated independently on opposite sides of the Pacific during and immediately following the war, similar legal and ideological dynamics emerged in response to the racial "other." Postwar social shifts, coinciding with the arrival of war brides and the waning racial barriers for Japanese Americans in the US on the one hand and the rapid internationalization of Japan after the reconstruction on the other, have fostered the growth of multiethnic populations in both nations. Moreover, the increasing frequency of transnational exchanges as well as social interactions between ethnic groups makes these connections directly related rather than simply abstract.[3]

As a whole, these narratives present a range of consequences that can occur when ethnic identity is defined as inherently "fixed" and subsequently affixed to idealized phenotypes, legal ascriptions and national discourses. Their temporal trajectory also indicates the changing nature of racial oppression towards mixed Japanese Americans. While racial violence, juridical oppression, social ostracism and the enforcement of "blood purity" were quite pervasive in the

124

past, unconscious reification of race paradigms and cultural biases continues to marginalize multiethnics. Though markedly less violent, many structural and social processes still problematically frame ethnicity and "Japaneseness" as intrinsically dichotomous, monolithic and phenotypical.[4] Furthermore, symbolic and direct violence still occurs with disconcerting frequency.

Perhaps now more than ever, individuals of mixed Asian ancestry can posit pluralistic identities and be accepted by their peers. Many scholars have written compelling arguments about the advantages of being mixed, the possibilities of "third-space" identities and the disrupted potential of "mixed consciousness" as a deconstructive tool.[5] Individuals can disrupt these sensibilities and posit "alternative" identities. However, external judgments and the primacy of mainstream group formation practices can limit and invalidate individual *agency*.

Beyond theoretical perspectives, this thesis has practical applicability. In anticipation for inevitable changes in Asian American communities, this research offers productive analytical tools which proactively, rather than reactively, address many difficult yet relevant questions pertaining to mixed identity. Japanese/American multiethnic history provides an excellent platform for engaging these critical discussions about power and marginality beyond the linearity of a black/white, mainstream/minority race framework. Moreover, as the most demographically visible group of Asian American multiethnics, analysis of these particular historical and contemporary dimensions potentially informs us of both structural and social conditions of the "every day" multiethnic experience. By elucidating multiethnic-specific racialization processes in the past, scholars can explore how these dynamics potentially influence identity development in the present and anticipate future issues surrounding ethnicity, race and nationality.

Where have we come from?

Since 2000, thanks to the laudable perseverance of activist groups like Hapa Issues Forum, Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally), AMEA (Association of Multiethnic Americans) and MASC (Multiracial Americans of Southern California) among many others, multiethnics are no longer forced to fit themselves into a single ethnic/racial category but are free to legally "check all that apply" on the Census.[6] The presence of critical mass has brought mixed-race issues for Asian Americans and other groups to the forefront of scholarly, political and media attention. With over 9 million people now reporting mixed ancestry nationally, multiethnicity can no longer been seen as a marginal phenomenon. With nearly *half* of *all* Japanese Americans now claiming mixed ancestry along with the steadily growing mixed populations in Japan, we must reconsider what "identity" and "authenticity" mean in regards to ethnicity, community, race, culture and nationality.[7] Looming questions remain: if the population swings to a multiethnic majority, what will it mean to have a Japanese/American identity? Despite prevalence, regularity and "acceptance," will mixed-race be seen as "the standard"? What implications will this have beyond the Japanese/American experience?

Over the last 60 years, attitudes towards mixed-race at the national level have shifted significantly. Not so long ago in 1991, 42% of Americans still disapproved of interracial marriages.[8] While more Americans approved than disapproved, a considerable level of intolerance remained. Though the Gallup Poll was still operating with a black/white binary of "usable" data and omitted Asians and Latinos from their surveys, the numbers are quite telling.[9] By 2010, 86% of Americans approved of black/white marriages. Based on these results, follow-up articles made bold claims like, "gagging over interracial marriage is *not* the 'conventional view.'" Many prematurely announced the "end of prejudice" and the arrival of the "post-racial

norm."[10] Though national figures still hovered at a dismally low 65% approval in 2003, monumental change seemed inevitable. Because of this momentum of mixed-race population growth around the country, it is no surprise that many optimistically anticipated the terminus of the black/white paradigm as we know it.

While we may not be "gagging," one can still see persistent backlash, objectification, and prejudice towards mixed-race individuals.[11] As some look to mixed-race studies for the answers to diversity issues, growing "acceptance" but continued insensitivity towards the issue of racial power and "normativity" in Japan and the US implies that fundamental changes have yet to occur.[12] We as a society continue to grapple with making sense of these rapid population shifts and the unrelenting racial dissonance that circumscribes interracial dynamics.

As this thesis suggests, there have been tremendous improvements. However, race remains a complex variable of social interaction and institutional practice in what is now supposedly a "post-racial era."[13] Assuming multiethnics have the ability to engage all aspects of their diverse ancestry or can overcome the rigidity of these ideologies is optimistic yet unrealistic. Moreover, such views overlook very real disparities of the past and present. Far from "color-blind," institutions, community leaders and individuals use race as a readily accepted concept and deeply ingrained organizational mechanism. Change, however, does not gurantee equality. Progress in interracial relations should not eclipse histories of violence nor should positive views of multiethnics as "the best of both worlds" overlook the fundamental issues of group formation processes which maintain monoethnicity and multiethnicity as separate, salient categories.[14]

Historically situating discrimination towards multiethnicity helps us identify the reality of enduring racial dynamics which materialize in overt and subtle ways. Certainly, juridical oppression, social ostracism, the enforcement of "blood purity" and unwillingness to reconcile

with these disparities in the past were incredibly detrimental and self-evident. Despite improvements, actors continue to deny multiethnics ownership over their diverse identities and their right to self-determination on the basis of race. Acts of differentiation, unconscious reification of race paradigms through cultural biases remain injurious and unsettling factors of daily life.[15] As Williams-Leon notes, the interrogative "what are you?" is intrusive and deceptively disarming, proposing that one "cannot possibly belong" to the groups they claim.[16] Objectification of the hybrid body as either pathologized or exceptional undoubtedly influences character judgment.[17] Racial preference can affect multiethnics' opportunities for employment, communal membership, access to resources and equal representation in political spaces designated for "singular ethnic groups."[18] The unsettling of "wholeness" and psychological oppression suggests the positionality of the "racial intermediary" is still precarious. Moreover, the possibility of ideological marginalization for non-Asian multiethnics remains perilous.

As evidenced by the presented narratives, group formations and identities are recast, relabeled and reorganized around ideas of ethnicity, race and nationality with significant ramifications. Although Larry Shinagawa, Gin Yong Pang, and John Tinker suggested that by 1980, Asian/American intermarriages, "demonstrate that race no longer remains a barrier to full acceptance of minority groups by the majority," others have clearly argued the opposite; the power of color lines have not diminished but rebounded, becoming more convoluted and difficult to define.[19] I caution skeptics; just because conditions have improved does not mean racial power dynamics at an ideological level are any less real or consequential.[20]

Thus, multiethnicity is not a gesture towards the "end of race." On the contrary, race and ethnicity are *never* stable concepts, the will to enforce them seems obstinate and ubiquitous. The growth of a mixed majority will *not* solve "the problem of race" or the limitations that paradigms

inherently emplace if we cannot recognize continued cause and effect. Racialized identities in their current manifestation *will* become more or less meaningful over time. Unfortunately, the concept of "race" and the power to "other," define and divide with totality on the basis of phenotype and ancestry does not disappear with the emergence of hybridity. The processes of "normativity" will continue to have repercussions as long as individuals and societies continue to uncritically perpetuate rigid definitions and the systems of power they uphold.

This is not to say that ethnic identity is a worthless concept. Identity politics have been enormously beneficial to Asian Americans. Under the aegis of ethnicity, Japanese Americans solidarity movements and civil rights groups have accomplished monumental feats of social justice, as evidenced by the push for Redress and Reparations. Though these tremendous accomplishments cannot be overstated, concepts such as "purity" and "authenticity" must be interrogated.

Where are we going?

In the face of change, some Japanese Americans fear the growing multiracial demographic jeopardizes the integrity of the ethnic community.[21] The potential for lost resources, dwindling political representation and declining "racial purity" seems to have unsettled a lingering few.[22] Rather than interpreting these shifts as a *loss*, one could frame this inevitable *change* as beneficial. Ethnicity should not only be interpreted racially but also culturally and experientially. Instead of assessing multiethnicity as "good or bad," we should move towards more embracive and expansive interpretations of identity and social inclusion.[23]

At the end of this study, we must consider the following questions: is ethnicity still a useful category of analysis?[24] What "given" characteristics does it assume? What limits do labels impose? In the present moment, what systems and practices prevent mixed individuals from

129

asserting complex plural identities without injury or distress? As the multiethnic population grows, will ethnicity remain a fundamental political, social or economic descriptor? How can we use "alternative" mixed-race histories to recognize structural inequalities and the instability of these concepts?[25] How can the idea of *discursive normativity* be applied beyond multiracial experiences to others who exist "in-between" groups and ideological concepts? Obviously, the growth of multiethnic populations worldwide necessitates the need to address these inquiries.

The study of multiethnic Japanese/Americans makes a critical and relevant intervention in the present moment. Now that we have reached a multiethnic critical mass in the Japanese American population and other Asian American constituencies, we have the opportunity to address these issues and think critically about their implications. We can use these perspectives to critique simplistic logic and recognize the diversity within our communities as well as our broader society.

We as individuals, as communities and as a society must engage these critical dialogues to decide what ideas we value and uphold while taking responsibility for the decisions we make. Foremost, we must reimagine group formation and prevailing beliefs about ethnic/racial identity. We should acknowledge the "reality" of present permutations while also understanding the complexities, as well as the intersections, of both multiethnicity and monoethnicity. We must see the limits of individual *agency* with regard to the idea of mixed individuals being the "best of both worlds" or the "worst of both worlds." We must not consider these individuals as "half" but "whole" individuals. We need to nurture the complexity of pluralistic identities while recognizing the extreme variation of experiences. We must accept the fact that identities and group formations, both self-empowered and imposed, continue to hold very significant meaning, for better or for worse. We must work to identify determinist racial projects that affect both

130

monoethnic and multiethnic individuals as well as the dynamics of political and cultural

hegemony that specifically affect multiethnics within ethnic communities and the mainstream.

We must examine *how* power emerges specifically in response to multiethnicity to effectively

critique systems. We as multiethnics need to recognize our own racial biases in the ways we

privilege individuals of certain racial compositions over others; we too have to fight the uneven

distribution of power amongst ourselves. Finally, we must see the applicability and relevance of

these discussions beyond Japanese Americans or even Asian Americans to anticipate the

inevitability of change due to trasnationalism, globalization and the continued prevalence of this

supposedly "new" mixed-race phenomenon.

By recognizing violence of the past and working towards these various goals, we can

learn to appreciate the flexibility posited by multiethnic experiences and the fluid reality of

ethnic and racial identity. Rather than belonging to no ethnic group, mixed people can lay claim

to many. Instead of being part of one constituent historical narrative, their stories span continents

and bridge transnational divides across the Pacific. Critically examining the limits and power

structures that arise from the existence of racial paradigms and "normative" standards will force

us to broaden and accept our ideas about culture and embodied identity.

Others view the study of multiethnicity with similar optimism. Omi believes multiethnic

scholarship disrupts the black/white racial paradigms by destabilizing one-dimensional

thinking.[26] Furthermore, these studies decenter "whiteness" as the alternative to "non-whiteness"

by exploring the diversity amongst individuals who embody a broad range of cultural and

ancestral characteristics.[27] Spickard argues that multiethnicity is a vital component of

Asian/American history and an indispensible comparative tool for the study of past and present

racial politics. Not only was mixed-race an important dynamic between mainstream and early

Asian American groups (i.e. anti-miscegenation and immigration laws), it has also been a critical dimension of internal community operations as well.[28] Given the statistical trajectory of Asian/American multiethnicity and outmarriage rates, Nakashima and Williams-Leon believe these issues reached a critical climax over a decade ago.[29] As such, there should be a permanent place in Asian American studies for this kind of scholarship.[30] Root believes mixed-race studies serves as a productive tool for ethnic studies by allowing us to uncover marginalized pasts.[31] Although the current "ethnically ambiguous Asian/American generation" has faced challenges, Dariotis and Kina believe we have also begun to use their dynamic perspectives to disrupt the field and challenge these hegemonies.[32] In their view, multiethnics are able to blend and bend race theory to create "multi-directional windows" such as Critical Mixed-Race Studies to present and address these complex issues.[33]

For decades, Murphy-Shigematsu has implored Asian American scholars to reflexively ask "who is Asian/American and why?"[34] In his opinion, one that I wholeheartedly share, Asian American Studies should be the discipline which forces these reconsiderations of popular perception, critiques the exclusiveness of binary categories, and engages these critical studies of human rights violations to uphold in the academy's self-proclaimed mission of fighting false perceptions and racial essentialism.[35] I hope this study augments the prodigious research of others.

Thus, mixed-race studies reveals the disadvantages of studying race through a straight black/white dichotomy and assuming definitions are static rather than evolving and multilateral.[36] Whether hybridity is imagined as an experiential concept, problematic trope (such as War Baby, Love Child, tragic *mulatto*) or galvanized cultural label (Amerasian, Hapa, *ha-fu, daaburu*), these concepts all refer to valuable histories of meetings, mergers and tenuous middle-

132

grounds between ideas and cultures, allowing us to deconstruct them from the inside out.[37]

Beyond encouraging inward and outward self-reflection, part of this thesis' mission of social justice is explicating how the ideological figure of the multiethnic "racial other" and material histories of oppression help us form a critical lens to critique discourses which create multiple, intersecting forms of hegemony and racial power.

Therefore, this study of multiethnicity in the context of Japanese/American experiences is less focused on creating definitions than about understanding processes and the complexity of "racial grey zones." To demonstrate scope, scale, plurality and longevity, this collective mixed narrative combines temporal, spatial and experiential threads into a critical analytical framework. By reflecting upon "normativity" and power more critically beyond the individual, we can acknowledge the reality of variability and nuance within every context as well as the broader implications. Rather than circumstantial, perhaps we can consider the possibility of a flexible "ethnic history" that gives voice to this "imagined group," suspending doubts about the anachronism of discursive analysis based on recursive experiences of "racial otherness."[38] Such a fractured narrative has its limitations and its clear advantages. This thesis attempts to create such a space for this disjointed yet insightful history.

---

[1] Maria Root, "A Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People," in *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier,* ed. Maria Root (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996), 14; Espiritu, "Possibilities of," 25-28; Root, "Models of Ethnic," 32-34.

[2] Omi, "Foreword," x.

[3] Williams-Leon and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race," 3-12.

[4] Nakashima, "Servants of Culture," 43; Omi, "Foreword," x.

[5] Houston and Williams, "No Passing Zone"; Williams, "Prism Lives," Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices.*

[6] Williams-Leon, "Check All that Apply," 158; Nakashima, "Voices from the Movement."

[7] Jones, "The Asian Population in the United States"; Hoeffel, Rastogi and Kim and Shahid, "The Asian Population: 2010 Census Brief"; US Census Bureau, "2010 Census Shows Asians"; US Census Bureau, "2010 Census Shows Multiple."

[8] G. Gallup Jr. and F. Newport, F., "For the First Time, more Americans approve of Interracial Marriage than Disapprove," *The Gallup Poll Monthly* 311, (1991):60-61.

[9] Jeffrey M Jones, "Most Americans Approve of Interracial Dating: Practice not Uncommon in US," *Gallup*, October 7th, 2005, http://www.gallup.com/poll/19033/most-americans-approve-interracial-dating.aspx; Joseph Carroll,

"Most Americans Approve of Interracial Marriages: Blacks more likely than Whites to approve of Black-White Unions," *Gallup*, August 16, 2007, http://www.gallup.com/poll/28417/Most-Americans-Approve-Interracial-Marriages.aspx.

[10] Jeffrey M Jones, "Record-High 86% Approve of Black-White Marriages: Ninety-six percent of Blacks, 85% of Whites Approve." *Gallup*, September 12th, 2011, http://www.gallup.com/poll/149390/Record-High-Approve-Black-White-Marriages.aspx; Erza Klein, "No, Gagging over Interracial Marriage is not the 'Conventional View,'" *The Washington Post Blog,* November 12, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/12/no-gagging-over-interracial-marriage-is-not-the-conventional-view/.

[11] Leilani Nishime, *Undercover Asian: Multiracial Asian Americans in Visual Culture* (Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press, 2014) 1-18; Gene Demby, "That Cute Cheerios Ad with the Interracial Family is Back," *NPR,* January 20th, 2014, www.npr.org/.

[12] Nishime, *Undercover Asian*; Nakashima, "Servants of Culture."

[13] Root, "The Multiracial," xiii-xxi.

[14] Nakashima, "The Invisible Monster."

[15] Root, "Models of Ethnic," 32-34; Root, *"*A Bill of Rights," 14.

[16] Williams, "Race as Process," 193, 203-209.

[17] Nakashima, "An Invisible Monster," 166; King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty*, 99.

[18] Nakashima, Daniel, "A Rose," 113; Murphy-Shigematsu, *Voices*, 112.

[19] Shinagawa and Pang, "Marriages Among Asian Americans," 95; Hoskins, *Racial Realities*; Tinker, "Intermarriage and Ethnic Boundaries"; Kikumura and Kitano, "Interracial Marriage."

[20] Marc P. Johnson and Kevin K. Nadal, "Multiracial Microaggressions: Exposing Monoracism in Everyday Life and Clinical Practice," in *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestations, Dynamics, and Impact,* eds. Sue, Derald Wing (Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), 124-126 133, 134.

[21] Mass, "Interracial Japanese."

[22] Kikumura and Kitano, "Interracial Marriage"; Tinker, "Intermarriage and Ethnic Boundaries."

[23] Thornton and Gates, "Black, Japanese," 94.

[24] Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1985).

[25] Min Zhou, "Revisiting Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Convergencies, Controversies, and Conceptual Advancements," *International Migration Review* 39, no. 3 (2004): 1040-1074.

[26] Omi, "Foreword*,*" x.

[27] Ibid., x.

[28] Spickard, "Who is Asian?," 13-20; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*, 27-36.

[29] Williams-Leon and Nakashima, "Reconfiguring Race," 6.

[30] Christine C. Iijima-hall, "Coloring Outside the Lines," in *Racially Mixed People in America,* ed. Maria P. Root (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992), 326; Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, "Addressing Issues of Biracial Asian Americans," in *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies,* eds. Gary Y. Okihiro, Shirley Hune, Arthur Hansen, and John Liu (Washington: Washington State University Press, 1988).

[31] Root, "Within, Between," 10.

[32] Kina and Dariotis, "Miscegenating Discourses", 3.

[33] Ibid., 6

[34] Murphy-Shigematsu, "Addressing Issues of Biracial."

[35] Ibid., 1- 5

[36] Root, "The Multiracial," xix; Omi, "Foreword*,*" xi; Nakashima, "Voices from the Movement," 88; Williams, "Prism Lives*,*" 283; Nazli Kibria, "Race, Ethnic Options, and Ethnic Binds: Identity Negotiations of Second-Generation Chinese and Korean Americans," *Sociological Perspectives* 43, no.1 (2000): 91.

[37] Dariotis and Kina, "Miscegenating Discourses*,"* 4.

[38] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London and New York: Verso, 2006), 5-7.

Work Cited

Primary Sources:

Dennis Bambauer (Tojo). Interview by John Allen. *Manzanar National Historic Site Collection.* Denshou: The Japanese American Legacy Project, November 6, 2002. archive.densho.org/

------ Interview by Richard Postashin. *Manzanar National Historic Site Collection.* Denshou: the Japanese American Legacy Project, August 12, 2009. archive.densho.org/

DeWitt, John L. "Memo to John McCloy Regarding Mixed Marriages and Resettlement," February 15, 1943. Memorandum. Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, University of Washington Libraries, Collections. Microfilm A7378, Reel 1, Box 2, Frames 0482-0485, Items 526-529. Denshou Archives, denshod-i67-00002.
http://archive.densho.org/main.aspx

Goebel, Herman P. "Herman P. Goebel Memorandum Regarding the Potential Release of Mixed Marriage Families from the Japanese Internment Camps," July 12, 1942. Memorandum. James Y. Sakamoto Papers, 1928-1955, University of Washington Special Collections Accession No. 1609-001, Box 10/17. Digital Collections, ID PNW02072.
http://digitalcollections.lib.washington.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/pioneerlife/id /159   17/rec/1

Nishimoto, Richard S. "Survey of Mixed Marriages: Poston Relocation Center," 1942. Survey and Release Notes. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkeley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder J6.15 (17/43). The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b134j06_0015_17.pdf.
http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b134j06_0015_17.pdf

Shibutani, Tamotsu. "Case Documents (TL-1-6, 8) by Family Name: Tule Lake Relocation Center," March, 2 1943. Case Files. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:1. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_1.pdf.
http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_1.pdf

------ "Case Documents (TL-10, 12-16) by Family Name: Tule Lake Relocation Center," March 7, 1943. Case Files. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:3. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_3.pdf.
http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_3.pdf

 ------ "Case Documents (TL-17, 26) by Family Name: Tule Lake Relocation Center," March 22, 1943. Case Files. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:4. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_4.pdf. http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_4.pdf

 ------ "Case Documents (TL-27-30 32-34) by Family Name: Tule Lake Relocation Center," July 21, 1943. Case Files. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder r21.08:5. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_5.pdf. http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0008_5.pdf

 ------ "Family Case Documents (TL-1-3, 5, 9-10, 17, 22, 35, 37, 41): Tule Lake Relocation Center," March 27, 1943. Family Listing. Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, University of California, Berkeley, Bancroft Library. BANC MSS 67/14c, folder R 21.07:6. The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement: A Digital Archive, cubanc6714_b266r21_0007_6.pdf. http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/jarda/ucb/text/cubanc6714_b266r21_0007_6.pdf

Government Sources:

DeWitt, J.L, U.S. Army Western Defense Command. *Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast, 1942: Final Report.* Washington DC: GPO, 1943.

United States, U.S. Army. Western Defense Command and Fourth Army Wartime Civil Control Administration. *Rules and Regulations Governing the Issuance of Permits Authorizing Certain Temporary Exemptions From the Travel Limitations and Hours of Curfew Provisions of Public Proclamation No. 3, Headquarters, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, Dated March 24, 1942*. Washington, DC: GPO, August 19, 1942.

United States, 97th Congress, *U.S. Public Law 97-359: Immigration and Nationality Act, amendment; certain children of U.S. Citizens, Admission (Amerasian Act),* Washington, DC: GPO, October 22, 1982.

United States, 82nd Congress, U.S. *Public Law 82-414: Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (McCarran Walters Act),* Washington, DC: GPO, June 27, 1952.

United States, *Loving v. Virginia*, No. 388 U.S. 1 Supreme Court of the United States, 12 June 1967.

United States, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *21.7 Petition for Amerasian*. Current Law. http://www.uscis.gov/.

United States, U.S. Department of State. *9 FAM 42.24 Amerasians Eligible Under Public Law 100-202*; *U.S. Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual Volume 9 – Visas*. Current Law.
www.state.gov/.

Census Data:

Barnes, Jessica S. and Claudette E. Bennett. "The Asian Population: 2000; Census 2000 Brief." Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, February 2002.
http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/c2kbr01-16.pdf

Hoeffel, Elizabeth M. Sonya Rastogi, Myoung Ouk Kim, and Hasan Shahid. "The Asian Population: 2010; Census 2010 Brief." Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, March 2012.
https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf

Jones, Nicolas A. "The Asian Population in the United States: Results from the 2010 Census." Presentation for the 2010 Asian Profile America Event, Washington DC, May 2, 2012.
http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/pdf/2012-05-02_nickjones_asianslides_2.pdf

Jones, Nicholas A., and Amy Symens Smith. "The Two or more Races Population: 2000; Census 2000 Brief." Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, November 2001.
http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-6.pdf

Reeves, Terrance, and Claudette Bennett. "The Asian and Pacific Islander Population in the United States: March 2002." Current Population Reports, P20-540. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, May, 2003.
http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/p20-540.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. "2010 Census Shows America's Diversity." *US Census Bureau,* Thursday, March 24th, 2011.
http://www.census.gov/.

------ "2010 Census Shows Asians are Fastest-Growing Race Group." *US Census Bureau,* Wednesday, March 21st, 2012.
http://www.census.gov/.

------ "2010 Census Shows Multiple-Race Population Grew Faster than Single-Race Population." *US Census Bureau,* Thursday, September 27th, 2012.
http://www.census.gov/.

Newspaper Articles and Media Sources:

Carroll, Joseph. "Most Americans Approve of Interracial Marriages: Blacks more likely than Whites to approve of Black-White Unions." *Gallup*, August 16, 2007. http://www.gallup.com/poll/28417/Most-Americans-Approve-Interracial-Marriages.aspx

Demby, Gene. "That Cute Cheerios Ad with the Interracial Family is back." *NPR,* January 20th, 2014. www.npr.org/.

Ebony Magazine, "Letters of a Dying Mother to her Baby." *Johnson Publishing Company*, July, 1954. 16-25.

Hirabayashi, Lane Ryo. "Is the JA Community Disappearing?" *Pacific Citizen*. Holiday Issue, December 17, 1993, sec B: 15-16.

 ------   "Understanding the Hapa Experience." *Pacific Ties: UCLA's Asian/Pacific Newsmagazine*, October, 1982, 1-2.

 ------   "Understanding the 'Happa' Experience," *The New York Nichibei*, March 9, 1984, 1-2.

Gallup, G., Jr., and F. Newport, F. "For the First Time, more Americans approve of Interracial Marriage than Disapprove." *The Gallup Poll Monthly* 311, (1991): 60-61.

Klein, Erza, "No, Gagging over Interracial Marriage is not the 'Conventional View.'" *The Washington Post Blog,* November 12, 2013. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/12/no-gagging-over-interracial-marriage-is-not-the-conventional-view/.

Jones, Jeffrey M. "Most Americans Approve of Interracial Dating: Practice not Uncommon in US." *Gallup*, October 7th, 2005. http://www.gallup.com/poll/19033/most-americans-approve-interracial-dating.aspx

 ------   "Record-High 86% Approve of Black-White Marriages: Ninety-six percent of Blacks, 85% of Whites Approve." *Gallup*, September 12th, 2011. http://www.gallup.com/poll/149390/Record-High-Approve-Black-White-Marriages.aspx

Puente, Maria, and Martin Kasindorf. "Front Page: The New Face of America: Blended Races Making a True Melting Pot." *USA Today*, September 7th, 1999. http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/USAToday/doc/408822177.html?FMT=ABS&FMTS=ABS: FT&date=Sep+7%2C+1999&author=Maria+Puente+and+Martin+Kasindorf&pub=USA +TODAY&edition=&startpage=&desc=THE+NEW+FACE+OF+AMERICA+Blended+r aces+making+a+true+melting+pot

Secondary Sources:

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities."*1983. Reprint, London and New York: Verso, 2006.

Barkan, Elliot. "Race, Religion, and Nationality in American Society: A Model of Ethnicity – From Contact to Assimilation." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 14, no. 2 (1995): 38-75.

Barth, Ernest A. and Donald L. Noel, "Conceptual Frameworks for the analysis of Race Relations: an Evaluation." *Social Forces* 40, no. 3 (1972): 333-348.

Bradshaw, Clara K. "Beauty and the Beast: On Racial Ambiguity." In *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Maria P. Root, 77-88. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Brubaker, Rodgers. "Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34 (2009): 21-42.

Brubaker, Rodgers, Mara Loveman, and Peter Stamatov. "Ethnicity as Cognition." *Theory and Society* 33 (2004): 31-64.

Burkhardt, William R. "Institutional Barriers, Marginality, and Adoption Among the American-Japanese Mixed Bloods in Japan." *Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 3 (1983): 519- 544.

Cacho, Lisa Marie. *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected*. New York and London: New York University Press, 2012.

Chang, Iris. *The Rape of Nanking*: *The Forgotten Holocaust of WWII*. New York, New York: Penguin Books, 2007.

Chock Rosa, John. "The Coming of the Neo-Hawaiian American Race: Nationalism and Metaphors of the Melting Pot in Popular Accounts of Mixed-Race Individuals." In *The Sum of our Parts*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 49-56. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Cooper, Fredrick, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2005.

Daniel, G. Reginald. "Passers and Pluralists: Subverting the Racial Divide." In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 91-107. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Daniels, Roger. *Concentration Camps: North America; Japanese in the United States and Canada during World War II*. Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1971.

------ *The Decision to Relocate the Japanese Americans*. 1975. Reprint, Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1986,

------ *Prisoners without Trial: Japanese Americans in World War II*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993, 2004.

Dariotis, Wei Ming. "Both Buffer and Cosmopolitan Eurasians, Colonialism, and the new "Benevolent" Globalization." In *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, 137-142. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

Dower, John. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War Two*. New York: Norton and Company, 1999.

------ *Japan in War & Peace: Selected Essays*. New York: New Press, 1993.

------ *War Without Mercy: Race & Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986.

Espiritu, Yen Le. "Possibilities of a Multiracial Asian America." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 25-34. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Reprint, New York: Vantage Books, 1995.

 "Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8 (1982): 777-795.

Fulbeck, Kip. *Part Asian: 100% Hapa.* San Francisco, California: Chronicle Books LLC, 2006.

Gage, Sue-Je Lee. "The Amerasian Problem: Blood, Duty, and Race." *International Relations* 21, no. 1 (2007): 86-102.

Gage, Sue-Je Lee, and James Kang-McCann and Gregory Diggs-Yang. "Before There was 'Asian America,' There was 'Amerasian': Applying Critical Pedagogy to Argue for Cross-Racial Bridging." In *Mixed Race in a Box. The Asian American Literary Review* 4, no. 2 (2013): 13-29.

Gans, Herbert J. "Symbolic Ethnicity: the Future of ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2, no.1 (1979): 1-20.

Gordon, Andrew. *A Modern History of Japan: From Tokugawa Times to the Present*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Guevarra Jr., Rudy P. *Becoming Mexipino: Multiethnic Identities and Communities in San Diego*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press, 2012.

------   "Burritos and Bagoong: Mexipinos and Multiethnic Identity in San Diego, California." In *Crossing Lines: Race and Mixed Race across the Geohistorical Divide*, edited by Marc Coronado, Rudy P. Guevarra, Jr., Jeffery Moniz, and Laura Furlan Szanto, 73-96. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa MESO and Sasha Briar Newborn/Sabine Design, 2003.

Helm, Leslie. *Yokohama Yankee: My Family's Five Generations as Outsiders in Japan.* Seattle: Chin Music Press, 2013.

Herzig-Yoshinaga, Aiko. Words Can Lie or Clarify: Terminology of the World War Two Incarceration of Japanese Americans. Essay, 2009. http://www.nps.gov/tule/forteachers/upload/Words_Can_Lie_or_Clarify.pdf

Hill, Mike. *After Whiteness; Unmaking an American Majority.* New York and London: New York University Press, 2004.

Hirabayashi, Lane Ryo. "The Best of Both Worlds? Reflections on the Bi-Cultural Experience." *Echoes from Gold Mountain: an Asian American Journal* 3 (1982): 76-78.

Hirabayashi, Lane Ryo, and Akemi Kikumura-Yano and James A. Hirabayashi. "The Impact of Contemporary Globalization on Nikkei Identities." In *New Worlds, New Lives: Globalization and People of Japanese Descent in the Americas and from Latin America in Japan,* edited by Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Akemi Kikumura-Yano and James A. Hirabayashi, 19-28. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Hirano, Katsuya, "The Politics of Colonial Translation: On the Narrative of the Ainu as a 'Vanishing Ethnicity.'"*The Asia-Pacific Journal* 4, no.3 (2009): 1-31.

Hollinger, David A. *Post Ethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. 1995. Reprint, New York, New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Hoskins, Bruce Calvin. *Asian American Racial Realities in Black and White*. United States: First Forum Press, 2011.

Houston, Velina-Hasu, and Teresa K. Williams. "No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-decent Multiracials." *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): vii-xii.

Howard, John. *Concentration Camps on the Home Front: Japanese Americans in the House of Jim Crow*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Ichioka, Yuji, *Views from Within: the Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study*. University of California at Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center Resource Development and Publications, 1989.

Iijima-Hall, Christine C. "Best of Both Worlds: Body Image and Satisfaction of a Sample of Black- Japanese Biracial Individuals." *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 87-97.

------ "Coloring Outside the Lines." In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 326-329. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Iijima-Hall, Christine C., and Trude I. Cooke Turner. "The Diversity of Biracial Individuals: Asian-White and Asian-Minority Biracial Identity." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans,* edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 81-91. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Ikeda, Stewart David. "Mixing Stories." In *Last Witnesses: Reflections on the Wartime Incarceration of Japanese American,* edited by Erica Harth, 75-98. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Irwin, Catherine. *Twice Orphaned: Voices from the Children's Village of Manzanar*. California State University, Fullerton: Center for Oral and Public History, 2008.

Ishizuka, Karen L. *Lost and Found: Reclaiming the Japanese American Incarceration.* Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006.

Jiménez, Tomas, "Negotiating Ethnic boundaries: Multiethnic Mexican Americans and Ethnic Identity in the United States." *Ethnicities* 4, no.1 (2004): 75-97.

Johnson, Marc P. and Kevin K. Nadal. "Multiracial Microaggressions: Exposing Monoracism in Everyday Life and Clinical Practice." In *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestations, Dynamics, and Impact*, edited by Derald Wing Sue, 123-144. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2010.

Johnson, Walter. *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013.

Kibria, Nazli, "Race, Ethnic Options, and ethnic Binds: Identity Negotiations of Second-Generation Chinese and Korean Americans." *Sociological Perspectives* 43, no.1 (2000): 77-95.

Kich, George Kitahara, "The Development Process of Asserting a Biracial, Bicultural Identity. In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 304-317. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Kim, Eleana J. *Adopted Territory: Transnational Korean Adoptees and the Politics of Belonging*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010.

"Producing Missing Persons: Korean Adoptee Artists Imaging (Im)Possible Lives." In *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, 75-85. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

King- O'Riain, Rebecca Chiyoko. *Pure Beauty*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

------   "Mirror, Mirror, on the Wall" Mapping Discussions of Feminism, race, and Beauty in Japanese American Beauty Pageants." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans,* edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 163-171. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Kikumura, Akemi, and Harry H.L. Kitano, "Interracial Marriage: A Picture of the Japanese Americans." *Journal of Social Issues* 29, no. 2 (1973): 67-81.

Kina, Laura and Wei Ming Dariotis. "Miscegenating Discourses: Critical Contexts for Mixed Race Asian American Art and Identity." In *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, 3-21. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

------   Preface to *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, xi-xv. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

Kitano, Harry, "The Effects of the Evacuation on the Japanese Americans." In *Japanese Americans: From Relocation to Redress*, edited by Rodger Daniels, Sandra C Taylor, and Harry Kitano, 151-158. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991.

Koshiro, Yukiko. *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Kozeki, Keiko 小関桂子, *Nihonjin Keiki: Aru Konketsu shoujo no shuki; 日本人桂子：ある混血少女手記* (Japanese Keiko: The Memoirs of a Mixed Blood Girl). Tokyo: Bunka Housou Shuppanbu, 1967.

Lee, Jennifer, & Frank D. Bean. "Reinventing the Color Line: Immigration and America's New Racial/Ethnic Divide." *Social Forces* 86, no. 2 (December 2007): 561-586.

Lee, Soo im. "The Cultural Exclusiveness of Ethnocentrism: Japan's Treatment of Foreign Residents." In *Japan's Diversity Dilemmas: Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Education*, edited by Soo im Lee, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, and Harumi Befu, 100-125. Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse Books, 2006.

Lesser, Jeffrey. "Introduction: Looking for Home in All the Wrong Places." In *Searching for Home: Japanese Brazilians and Transnationalism,* edited by Jeffrey Lesser, 1-4. United States: Duke University Press, 2003.

------ "Japanese, Brazilians, Nikkei: A Short History of Identity Building and Homemaking." *Searching for Home: Japanese Brazilians and Transnationalism,* edited by Jeffrey Lesser, 5-19. United States: Duke University Press, 2003.

Leonard, Karen Isaken. *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1994.

Leupp, Gary P. *Interracial Intimacy in Japan: Western Men and Japanese Women 1543-1900.* London: Continuum Books, 2003.

Lie, John. *Multiethnic Japan.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Maeda, Robert J. "Isamu Noguchi: 5-7-A, Poston, Arizona." In *Last Witnesses: Reflections on the Wartime Incarceration of Japanese American,* edited by Erica Harth, 153-166. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Mass, Amy Iwasaki. "Interracial Japanese Americans: The Best of Both Worlds or the End of the Japanese American Community?" In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 265-279. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Masterson, Daniel M., and Sayaka Funada-Classen. *The Japanese in Latin America*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Murphy-Shigematsu, Stephen. "Addressing Issues of Biracial Asian Americans." In *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies,* edited by Gary Y. Okihiro, Shirley Hune, Arthur Hansen, and John Liu, 111-116. Washington: Washington State University Press, 1988.

------ "Celtic Samurai: Storytelling a Transnational-Transracial Family Life." In *War Baby/ Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, 50-57. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

------ "Diverse Forms of Minority National Identities in Japan's Multicultural Society." In *Japan's Diversity Dilemmas: Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Education*, edited by Soo im Lee, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, and Harumi Befu, 75-99. Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse Books, 2006.

------ *Ethnic Identity of Okinawa's American-Japanese Mixed Ancestry Minority*. International Ryukyus Studies Forum. Naha, Japan, August 10, 1991.

------ "Multiethnic Japan and the Monoethnic Myth." *Melus* 18*, no.4 (Winter 1993): 63-80.

------ "Multiethnic Lives and Monoethnic Myths: American-Japanese Amerasians in Japan." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 205-216. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

------   *The Voices of Amerasians: Ethnicity, Identity, and Empowerment in Interracial Japanese Americans.* Dissertation, Harvard University, 1986.

------   *When Half is Whole*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Nakashima, Cynthia L. "An Invisible Monster: The Creation and Denial of Mixed-Race People in America." In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 162-178. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

------   "Servants of Culture: The Symbolic Role of Mixed-Race Asians in American Discourse." *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 35-47. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

------   "Voices from the Movement: Approaches to Multiraciality." In *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier,* edited by Maria Root, 79-97. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996.

Nakashima, Daniel A. "A Rose by Any Other Name: Names, Multiracial/Multiethnic People, and the Politics of Identity." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans,* edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 111-119. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Nishime, Leilani, *Undercover Asian: Multiracial Asian Americans in Visual Culture*. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

Omi, Michael. Foreword to *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, ix-xiii. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Omi, Michael & Howard Winant. *Race Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s,* 2nd Edition. New York, New York: Routledge Press, 1994.

Pierce, Lori. "Six Queens: Miss Ka Palapala and Interracial Beauty in Territorial Hawaii." In *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, 111-115. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

Rich, Wilbur C. *The Post-Racial Society is Here: Recognition, Critics and the Nation-State*. New York, New York: Routledge Press, 2013.

Root, Maria P. *"*A Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People." In *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier,* edited by Maria Root, 3-14. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996.

------   "Factors Influencing the Variation in Racial and Ethnic Identity of Mixed-Heritage

Persons of Asian Ancestry." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 61-70. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

------ "Multiracial Asians: Models of Ethnic Identity." *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 29-41

------ "The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as a Significant Frontier in Race Relations." In *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier*, edited by Maria Root, xiii-xxxviii. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996.

------ "Within, Between, and Beyond Race." In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria Root, 3-11. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1992.

Romero, Robert Chao. *The Chinese in Mexico: 1882-1940.* Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 2010.

Ropp, Steven Masami. "Do Multiracial Subjects Really Challenge Race?: Mixed-Race Asians in the United States and The Caribbean." *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 1-16.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* United States: Random House, Inc., 1978.

Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1985): 1053-1075.

Schlund-Vials, Cathy J. "Lost in their 'Fathers' Land': War, Migration, and Vietnamese Americans." In *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*, edited by Laura Kina and Wei Ming Dariotis, 95-100. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

Shinagawa, Larry Hajime, and Gin Yong Pang. "Intraethnic, Interethnic, and Interracial Marriages Among Asian Americans in California, 1980. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 33 (1988): 95-114.

Spickard, Paul R."Does Multiraciality Lighten? Me-Too Ethnicity and the Whiteness Trap." In *Crossing Lines: Race and Mixed Race across the Geohistorical Divide*, edited by Marc Coronado, Rudy P. Guevarra, Jr., Jeffery Moniz, and Laura Furlan Szanto, 45-62. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa MESO and Sasha Briar Newborn/Sabine Design, 2003.

------ "The Illogic of American Racial Categories." In *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Maria P. Root, 12-23. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

------ "Injustice Compounded: Amerasians and Non-Japanese Americans in World War II Concentration Camps." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 5, no. 2 (1986): 5-22.

------ *Japanese Americans: the Formation and Transformations of an Ethnic Group*. 1996. Reprint, United States: Twayne Publishers, 2009.

------ *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

------ "What Must I Be? Asian Americans and the Question of Multiethnic Identity." *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 43-60.

------ "Who is an Asian? Who is a Pacific Islander? Monoracialism, Multiracial People, and Asian American Communities." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 13-24. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Takezawa, Yasuko, "Race Should be Discussed and Understood Across the Globe." *American Anthropological Association,* (2006): 1-5.

Thornton, Michael C., and Harold Gates. "Black, Japanese, and American: An Asian American Identity Yesterday and Today." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 93-105. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Tinker, John N. "Intermarriage and Ethnic Boundaries: The Japanese American Case." *Journal of Social Issues* 29, no. 2 (1973): 49-65.

Tsuda, Takeyuki Gaku. "When Minorities Migrate: the Racialization of the Japanese Brazilians in Brazil and Japan." In *Asian Diasporas: New Formations, New Concepts,* edited by Rhacel Salazar Parrenas and Lok C.D. Siu, 225-251. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007.

------ "Homeland-less Abroad: Transnational Liminality, Social Alienation, and Personal Malaise." In *Searching for Home: Japanese Brazilians and Transnationalism,* edited by Jeffrey Lesser, 121-161. United States: Duke University Press, 2003.

Valvarde, Kieu-Linh Caroline. "From Dust to Gold: the Vietnamese Amerasian Experience." In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 144-161. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Wagatsuma, Hiroshi. "Mixed-Blood Children in Japan: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Asian Affairs* 2, no. 2 (1976): 9-17.

------ "Some Problems of Interracial Marriage for the Japanese." In *Interracial Marriage: Expectations and Realities,* edited by Irving R. Stuart and Lawrence E. Abt, 247-264. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973.

Waters, Mary C. and Tomás R. Jiménez. "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31 (2005): 105-125.

Welty, Lily Anne Yumi. "Advantage through Crisis: Multiracial American Japanese in Post-World War II Japan, Okinawa, and America 1945-1972." Dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara, 2012.

------ "The Occupation, Gender, and Military Industrial Intimacy." *UCLA Asian American Studies Center*. Forthcoming publication, 2013.

------ "Post War Amerasians." University of California, Los Angeles, Asian American Studies 191D: Multiethnic and Biracial Asian Americans. UCLA. May 1, 2013. Lecture.

Westdale, Virgil W. and Stephanie A. Gerdes. *Blue Skies and Thunder: Farm Boy, Pilot, Inventor, TSA Officer, and WWII Soldier of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team; Memoirs of a Japanese American*. Bloomington, Indiana: iUniverse, 2009, 2010.

Westdale, Virgil W. "An Evening with Virgil Westdale." Center for Japanese Religions and Culture Hapa Japan Database Project and the Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences. University of Southern California Leavey Library, Los Angeles, CA. Feb 12, 2013. Lecture.

Wetherall, William. "Nationality in Japan." In *Japan's Diversity Dilemmas: Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Education*, edited by Soo im Lee, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, and Harumi Befu, 11-46. Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse Books, 2006.

Williams, Teresa Kay. "Prism Lives: Identity of Binational Americans." In *Racially Mixed People in America,* edited by Maria P. Root, 280-303. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

------ "Race-ing and Being Raced: The Critical Interrogation of 'Passing.'" *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials. Amerasia Journal* 23, no.1 (1997): 61-64.

------ "Race as Process: Reassessing the 'What are You?' Encounters of Biracial Individuals." In *The Multiracial Experience,* edited by Maria P. Root, 191-210. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1996.

Williams-Leon, Teresa. "Check All that Apply: Trends and Prospectives Among Asian-Descent Multiracials." In *New Faces in a Changing America: Multiracial Identity in the 21st Century*, edited by Loretta I Winters and Herman L. DeBose, 158-175. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 2003.

Williams-Leon, Teresa, and Cynthia L. Nakashima. "Reconfiguring Race, Rearticulating Ethnicity." In *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Teresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, 2-12. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Whitney, Helen Elizabeth. "Care of Homeless Children of Japanese Ancestry during Forced Removal and Relocation." Master's Thesis. University of California School of Social Welfare, 1948.

Wolfe, Patrick. "Forum Essay: Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race." *American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (2001): 866- 905.

Yamashiro, Jane H. "Hafu." In *Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Society*, edited by Richard T. Schaefer, 570-572. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2008.

Yang-Murray, Alice. *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2008

Yoshimi, Jeff. "Hapas at a Los Angeles High-School: Context and Phenomenology." *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-Decent Multiracials Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997):131-147.

Zhou, Min. "Revisiting Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Convergencies, Controversies, and Conceptual Advancements."*International Migration Review* 39, no. 3 (2004): 1040-1074.

Films:

Days of Waiting, directed by Steve Okazaki.1991; Farallon Films.

Doubles: Japan & America's Intercultural Children., directed by Reggie Life. 1995; Global Film Network Inc.

Hafu- The Film; ハーフ, directed by Megumi Nishikura and Lara Perez Takagi, 2013; Tokyo, Japan: Japan Foundation and CAAM, Theatrical Release.