

人種アイデンティティの選択ゲーム —人種アイデンティティの構築と変遷の研究—

福来 寛

(カリフォルニア大学准教授)

〈要約〉

この論文は、人種カテゴリーが必ずしも生物・遺伝子学的に固定された概念ではなく、社会・政治的に構築されたものであり、そしてその定義が極めて流動的であるという性格を検証するものである。そして、個人レベルでの人種アイデンティティに焦点をあて、流動する人種アイデンティティの構築性・個人的選択について理論化 (Theory of Racial Identity Transformation) を試みた論文である。

人種カテゴリーの構築と定義は1790年に実施されたアメリカ全国調査 (U.S. Census) に始まる。一般に言われる白人、黒人そしてアジア人という人種項目は、アメリカ政府が政治的に構築した概念である。またその歴史も新しい。例えば、黒人 (Black) という人種カテゴリーは、1850年に初めて用いられたものである。それ以前は、社会的地位 (social status) によって区分され、カテゴリーは、税金を払えるフリーホワイト (free white)、奴隷 (slave)、その他 (all other persons) の3グループに限られていた。そして、契約で渡米したヨーロッパ移民の多くは、当時白人とみなされず、「その他」としてカテゴライズされていた。黒人の人種カテゴリーは、1850年以後、ブラック (100%黒人)、ムラート (白人と黒人の混血児)、クアドルーン (4分の1混血児)、オクトルーン (8分の1混血児) と分別化されるが、20世紀に入ると、ムラートを含む混血分類は取り払われ、ブラック (黒人) だけが再び使用されるようになる。その後、人種カテゴリーによる分別は変遷を続け、2000年には、ブラックまたはアフリカ系アメリカ人 (African American) という2種類の人種名称がつけられた。

白人アイデンティティの定義は、18世紀後半の狭義の定義 (フリーホワイト) から、歴史的に定義幅が徐々に広がってきた。例えば、現在の人種定義では、中近東・北アフリカの移民や子孫も、白人カテゴリーに含まれる。個人レベルでの人種アイデンティティの選択肢も、同時に広がってきている。1960年までは、国勢調査官が観察や質問を通して人種アイデンティティが決定したが、それ以降は、個人申告が主な決定手段と認められている。

この研究は、混血人 (Racially Mixed)、白人の血 (祖先) を持たない人々、そして白人以外の人種祖先を持つ人たちが、白人のアイデンティティを宣告し、白人にパス (Passing: 同化) していることを証明するものである。彼等は、白人に同化することで、「白人クローン」と呼ば

れる。白人アイデンティティーの選択性の拡大や、白人クローンの増加とその同化現象は、白人カテゴリーを頂点とする、アメリカの人種ピラミッド階層の構築をさらに強固なものにし、アメリカ社会における人種差別をさらに増長にする役割を担っているのである。

RACES PEOPLE PLAY: THE THEORY OF RACIAL IDENTITY TRANSFORMATION

Hiroshi Fukurai

Associate Professor of Sociology

University of California, Santa Cruz

hfukurai@ucsc.edu

Abstract

This paper examines the fluid and de-centered nature of race and racial identity and advances the theory of racial identity transformation. By using college survey data on racial identity and reported racial ancestry, the theory of racial identity transformation is discussed and developed in this paper. The study first begins with a critical analysis of the government's definition of race, substantiating that racial transformation has been directed towards continuously expanding the definitional boundaries of the white race. The process of identifying individuals' race has also gone through various administrative changes and modifications, making it easier to claim white identity. While census takers were historically responsible for data collection and determination of one's race, the post-1960 census allowed individuals to designate their own racial identity. I argue that the relaxation of the identification methods further expanded racial boundaries and the cultural terrain for the mass-production of "whites" - as if they were "cloned" by statutory designations.

My analysis supports the continually expansive terrain of white identity, and the present paper attempts to develop a theoretical framework, especially in relation to the whiteness, in which the selectivity of white identity then fosters a kind of game schemes that people routinely engage in forming their own racial identity - the selection and deselection of identity based on their perception of societal costs, benefits, and risks in a given situation and socio-cultural setting in their everyday interactions.

Introduction

Several years ago, a group of undergraduate students and I conducted student surveys and asked college respondents to racially classify a number of famous individuals, all of whom were known to have mixed racial backgrounds. Specifically, the survey questionnaire asked more than a thousand students to racially classify the following celebrities – Andrei Agassi (a tennis player), Mariah Carey (a singer), Tiger Woods (a golfer), Saddam Hussein (a former Iraqi ruler), Dean Cain (a TV star), Raquel Welch (an actress), and Ludwig van Beethoven (a composer) to one of six racial groupings: (1) white, (2) black, (3) Native American, (4) Hispanic or Latino, (5) Asian/Pacific Islander, and (6) others.

The findings were surprising, and some results were unexpected. For instance, while 76% of students indicated that Andrei Agassi is white, merely 2% said that Saddam Hussein is white – 85% indicated that Hussein belonged to "other" race. As widely known in the media, Andrei Agassi's father came from Iran, just north of Iraq where Saddam Hussein ruled until his ouster in 2003. Carey, Woods, and Beethoven all have been known to share black ancestry, while Cain who played a superman on TV has a Japanese mother, and Raquel Welch has Hispanic parents. The surveys revealed that 69% and 45% of students responded that Tiger Woods and Mariah Carey are black, while the majority of students indicated that Beethoven, Raquel Welch, and Dean Cain are white (89%, 78%, and 57%, respectively).

The questionnaire also asked students to racially classify Jesus Christ, and 34% indicated that he is white, whereas exactly half of students said that he belongs to other race. The results were more surprising when students were also asked to racially classify people in the following countries: (1) India, (2) Israel, (3) Egypt, (4) Pakistan, (5) Brazil, (6) Iraq, (7) Samoa, (8) Columbia, and (9) Turkey. The 1977 governmental directive and its 1998 revision from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide the governmental definition of race and racial classification, indicating that Middle Easterners such as Israelis, Egyptians, Iraqis, and Turks are now considered as members of the white race (Fukurai and Krooth, 2003). Asian or Pacific Islanders (API) also include people with origins in the Far East, Southeast Asia, Pacific Islands, and the Indian subcontinent, including India and Pakistan. Hispanics are defined as those of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin. While Brazil is considered to be a non-Spanish nation because of the Portugal history, the directive and its revision both indicate that people in Brazil may be classified as members of Spanish-origin along with those in Columbia.

While only 24% and 7% of students indicated that Indians and Pakistanis are Asian (64% and 75% said that they belong to other race), equally small proportions of students also indicated that Israelis, Egyptians, Iraqis, and Turks are white (21%, 8%, 7%, and 34%, respectively). On the other hand, the great majority of students indicated that people in Brazil and Columbia belong to a Hispanic group (68% and 76%, respectively), while 68% said that Samoans are members of Asian and Pacific islanders (23% said that they belong to other race). Our surveys found that racial groupings of celebrities or perceived racial classification of people in many nation-states of the world failed to reflect the U.S. governmental definition of racial membership and ethnic affiliations.

Another surprising example of racial identity and racial designation involves the racial identity of Koreans who came to the U.S. as international adoptees in 60s and 70s. One of my graduate students examined social and cultural adjustments of ten Korean children who were originally adopted by ten white American couples and brought to the U.S. soon after their births in Korea. Her interviews of those ten adoptees revealed that they racially identified themselves as whites, not Korean, or other members of Asian or Pacific Islanders (Kim, 2000). While they were born in Korea and their "biological" parents were indeed Korean, their racial identity in America seems to transcend their "ethnic" affiliation and choose the same racial identity of their white American parents.

This paper examines the fluid and unsettling nature of race and racial identity and develops the theory of racial identity transformation. My research demonstrates that some people are placed in a privileged position to be able to select or deselect their racial identity, -- oftentimes irrespective of their knowledge of their own racial ancestry or genealogical roots. I also argue that the selective nature of racial identity and a relative individual freedom to engage in selecting and deselecting their own racial identity often lead to the development of a kind of mind games or racialized schemes in forming their own racial identity. The game of what I call "races people play" then provides the conceptual scheme or theoretical approach in understanding racial politics and racial struggles that people "play" or engage in the determination of their racial identity. This conceptual approach also suggests that individuals are often forced to, or even "privileged" to play a racialized game in determining their own racial identity on the basis of their perception of relative costs, benefits, and risks in a given situation and socio-cultural setting in their everyday human interactions. By using college survey data on racial identity and reported racial ancestry, the theory of racial identity transformation is developed and discussed in the following section.

Race as Social Construction

The notion that race is a social construction and a politically derived concept has been widely expressed in the literature of anthropology, sociology, and socio-psychological studies (Haney-Lopez, 1994; Karst, 1995, pp.267-281; Wright, 1995; Johnson, 1996; Payson, 1996). Since race is neither a biological nor genetic concept, so called biological and premodial races such as "Negroid," "Mongoloid," and "Caucasoid" have no scientific foundation (Haney-Lopez, 1994, p.13; see also *Saint Francis College v. Al-Khazraji*, 481 U.S.504, 610, n4, 1987). Scientific critiques of race and its construction have indicated the myths and fallacies of creating racial categories, emphasizing that: (1) racial categories are biologically and genetically underinclusive, indicating that the physical characteristics, genetic traits, and biological propensities associated with any particular race are also found in all other populations designated by other racial categorizations; and (2) racial differences and identifications are overconclusive, suggesting that the presence of more physical and genetic variations exists within a racially defined group than between populations assigned to different racial groupings and categories (Cavalli-Sforza et al., 1994). Anthropological studies have indicated that genetic variations are generally more attributable to geographical differences and spatial separations of populations than any clear division among "racially" classified or identified categories (Nei and Roychoudhury, 1982, p.18; Tooby and Cosmides, 1990, p.35).

U.S. Census and Historical Transformations of Racial Categories

Social and anthropological studies also indicate that biological divisions of race such as white, black, and Asian (or Caucasoid, Negroid, and Mongoloid) are rooted in the Eurocentric knowledge and imagination of the Middle Ages, in which the known territory and the world geography only encompassed Europe, Africa, and the Near East, thereby excluding from the three major "races" the people of the North American continent, the South American continent, the Indian subcontinent, East Asia, Southeast Asia, Oceania, and South Pacific (Haney-Lopez, 1994, p.12). Even recently, the U.S. Supreme Court has seemed to recognize the socio-political conception of race, stating that "[t]he particular traits which have generally been chosen to characterize races have been criticized as having little biological significance. ... It has been found that differences between individuals of the same race are often greater than the differences between the "average" individuals of different races. These observations and others led some, but not all, scientists to conclude that racial classifications are for the most part sociopolitical, rather than biological, in nature" (*Saint Francis College v. Al-Khazraji*, 481 U.S. 604, 610 n.4, 1987).

Historically speaking, racial categories and groupings that were derived and used in the U.S. also reflect the mythical and ambiguous nature of racial definitions and classifications. From the first 1790 U.S. Government Census, race questions appeared on every census. Analysis of the census classification of race shows that, more than the last two hundred years, the U.S. government has continuously categorized individuals into a set of discrete, mono-racial categories and classifications, and that the census has constantly adjusted, readjusted, and modified the list of available racial classifications and definitions.

U.S. slavery was the baseline of the classificatory scheme for race relations after the American Revolution. The first 1790 U.S. Census, for example, distinguished only white, slave, and others and defined the "white" population as a status group to include individuals who owned property and paid taxes to local and federal governments, thereby excluding the overwhelming majority of European immigrants who came to the U.S. under various conditions of servitudes. From 1790 to 1830, there were also pockets of free "slaves" in both North and South, and the 1830 census accommodated, dividing "Negro" into slaves and free colored persons. The term, "black," however, did not appear until the 1850 census when the slaves and the free colored persons were further divided into Mulatto and black. The 1850 U.S. Census also expanded the definition of white to any individuals with European origins, regardless of property holdings or legal status.

Following the near-complete defeat of Native American tribes and the import of Chinese labor to build the transcontinental railroad and to work in the California gold fields, the 1870 census added Indian and Chinese. Japanese were added with the U.S. opening of Japanese ports in 1868 linked to trade to the West coast in 1890. The 1890 census also extended racial classifications by adding Quadroon and Octoroon to the racial categories of white, black, Mulatto, Chinese, Japanese, and Indian. The definition of blacks now included persons having three-fourths or more black blood. Mulatto was reserved for persons having from three-eighths to five-eighth black blood; Quadroon included those having one-fourth black blood; and Octoroon referred to persons with one-eighth or any trace of black blood (Williamson, 1980, p.xii-xiii).

The 1900 census definitions, however, eliminated Mulatto, Quadroon, and Octoroon and returned to five basic racial categories because of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537, 1896) and the logic of biracial stratification and segregation between blacks and whites. In the 1910 and 1920 census, Mulatto reappeared; but it disappeared again in 1930, while four new racial categories were added to the list, including Mexican, Filipino, Hindu, and Korean, along with the undefined category called "other." The 1940 Census then eliminated Mexican, and the 1950 census also deleted Hindu and Korean. The 1960 census

then added new racial categories such as Hawaiian, Part Hawaiian, Aleut, and Eskimo and reclassified Indian as American Indian; however, the 1970 census deleted Part Hawaiian, Aleut, and Eskimo and changed Negro to "Negro or black." Both the 1980 and 1990 Census added a number of new racial categories such as Guamanian, Samoan, and Vietnamese, reinstated Korean, Eskimo and Aleut as racially classified groups, and reclassified Indian as Asian Indian. With respect to ethnicity, Hispanics had never been considered as a racial group, though Mexican was once considered a racial category in 1930 but disappeared thereafter. The 2000 census finally recognizes Mexicans and other Hispanic categories as distinct ethnic, not racial, groups.

Every census since 1790 relied on varying standards of racial classification and different sets of racial categories. The continuous struggle to create and redesignate the set of racial categories by the federal government suggests that there was no universally established, concrete set of discrete, social or hereditary characteristics which set people of different "races" apart, and that future racial categories may remain historically influenced, subject to further contestation and revision.

Racial classification and categories used in the 1990 and 2000 census are no exceptions. The most recent racial definition and racial categories were defined by Directive No. 15, "Race and ethnic standards for federal statistics and administrative reporting," which was promulgated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on May 12, 1977, as well as the revision to Directive No. 15 entitled as "Revision to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity" issued by OMB in February, 1998. Both directives, for example, specify that the white refers to "[a] person having origins in any of the original people of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East." [1]

According to this definition, Iraq's Saddam Hussein and Libya's Moammar Kadafi are indeed considered and classified as white by the U.S. federal government. Similarly, Turkish immigrants, Armenian refugees, so called Middle Eastern Zionists and Palestinians, and Moroccans from the Northwest coast of Africa can also be considered as white and members of the racial majority in America.

Racial Classifications in Other Countries and Societies

The same groups, however, are often not considered as the member of the dominant racial group outside the U.S. In Holland where the general population is considered white according to the U.S. governmental standards of racial classification, for example, Turks and Moroccans constitute two of the largest minority groups (de Vries and Pettigrew, 1994). They have been discriminated against in employment, education, and housing, and

affirmative action programs have been specifically established to assist them in attaining equal education and employment opportunities. According to the 1990 data, for example, there were 204,000 Turks and 169,000 Moroccans, constituting 1.3% and 1.1% of the population in Netherlands. Their unemployment rate was 42% and 44%, the highest among four major ethnic minorities (de Vries and Pettigrew, 1994, p.181). Turks and their descendants have also been discriminated against in Germany and they have been subject to continual racial attacks by neo-Nazis and skin-heads (Whitney, 1992; Fisher, 1993; Tomforde, 1994, p.13). Similarly, in the final five years of communist rule after the forty-two years of communist domination in Bulgaria, the government began a program of discrimination against ethnic Turks in the midst of declining industrial productivity and increasing economic isolation from the world economy. This discriminatory governmental program was only reversed by the democratic government following the end of communism (Ludwikowski, 1995, pp.42-44).

In Japan, Iranians and other Middle Easterners are treated as deviant minority groups whose members are often considered to be involved in a variety of criminal activities, including drug trafficking, gambling, and illegal sales of prohibited commodities including handguns (Adrian, 1992; Nishimuro, 1995). They have also been subject to selective prosecution by Japanese law enforcement agencies and have been discriminated against in housing and employment (Kajita, 1995; Mori, 1997).

The Kurds, Iran's minority groups, have also been discriminated against in Turkey and other Middle Eastern countries (Goldman, 1994, pp.44-45). Ironically, when members of the Kurds migrate to the U.S., they begin to share the same racial identity as Turks, transcending the ethnic and racial differences in their native countries.

Similarly, the category, "black," as a supposed distinct racial group, entails no universalistic standard or homogeneous unit. In England, for example, South Asian immigrants from Bangladesh, Pakistan, and some parts of India are considered as black and placed at the bottom of the social hierarchy, even within the black community, because of their non-Christian religious beliefs and practices (Robinson, 1993; Small, 1994). In the United States, on the other hand, the same group is classified by the government as members of Asian and Pacific Islanders and constitutes an integral part of the so called "model minority" group (see generally Takaki, 1987).

In Brazil, the government classification of race includes white, black, yellow, and mulatto, in which nearly one million Japanese Brazilians, the largest Japanese community outside Japan, are classed as members of the yellow race (Sansone, 2003). Similarly in Cuba, the national government devised the four major racial classification schemes,

including white, black, Mongoloid, and Mestizo. Similar to the Brazil classifications, Asians are classified under the racial category of Mongoloid, whereas the mixed race between white and black are classified under the Mestizo category (Ring, 1972).

Physical appearance or visible phenotypical characteristics are not the only methods of devising race and racial classification. In certain Latin American countries, the acquisition of wealth is most likely to determine one's racial categorization in which one's wealth can make him/her become "white" (Sowell, 1983, p. 101). In the Caribbean, too, economic wealth and demographic conditions led to the development of a highly defined and sophisticated racial hierarchy based on one's wealth and skin color, while in the U.S. biracial stratification of race, largely due to the one-drop-of-blood criterion, classified all blacks as such, rather than falling in some other classification (Sowell, 1983, p. 105).

The term race is also used differently in other societies. In Britain, for example, the court has recently declared that the Scots are a different race from the English because of their separate church and legal and educational systems (Bowditch, 1997, p.4). In the litigation in which a senior English policeman, because he was English, brought a race discrimination case against the police for an assigned senior Scottish post, the unanimous decision of the tribunal affirmed that the English and the Scots are separate racial groups defined by reference to national origin. The ruling also flies in the face of the previous industrial tribunal ruling in Glasgow in early 1997, holding that four airline stewards had no case in asserting that British Airways had discriminated against them because they were Scots (Bowditch, 1997).

Similarly, the Burakumin, the largest minority group and historically-outcast communities in Japan, are visibly and phenologically indistinguishable from the "average" Japanese, but they are considered an uniquely different race from the non-Burakumin population (De Vos and Wetherall, 1983). The Burakumin are deemed to be outcasts and of a different race because their ancestors were employed in professions that were considered ritually unclean, such as disposing of the dead, herding cattles, and tanning hides of dead animals. Ooms (1996) examined the origins of discrimination against the Burakumin population, concluding that increasingly institutional discrimination, abetted by racial theories designed to justify the emerging practice, transformed a partially segregated, functional status group into a district outcast and racial minority.

These are some examples of different social designs of racial classification and civic treatment of different racial groups. A critical analysis of racial classification is of great importance because societies routinely invent and adopt racial classifications that are closely intertwined with the distribution of wealth, opportunities, and legal protections

(Fukurai and Krooth, 2003). Despite the pervasive nature of race and racial classification, however, there has been little research examining the fallacies and fictions on which notions of race depend. Few researchers have asked the critical question of what race is and how racial identity is socially maintained and politically constructed.

The following section examines the fluid and amorphous nature of race and racial identity. The analysis demonstrates that people possess certain degrees of freedom in selecting, deselecting, and inhabiting new racial identity, oftentimes regardless of their knowledge of their own racial ancestry and genealogical roots. The paper then attempts to develop a theoretical framework - the racial identity transformation - in which the selection and deselection of racial identity leads to the development of a kind of game schemes that people routinely engage in forming their own racial identity. That is, people engage in selecting and deselecting racial identity based on their perception of costs, benefits, and risks in a given situation and social setting in their everyday human interactions.

Empirical Analyses

From 1996 to 2000, several college surveys were conducted to examine the racial identity, ancestral race, and racial identity transformation of college students. The research site is the University of California, Santa Cruz, and more than 1,600 students participated in the surveys. In the surveys, the respondents were asked to identify their racial identity and ancestral roots. The racial category options are identical to the census classification of race, except that the Hispanic group was also added as one of categorical racial options in order to separate Hispanic whites from non-Hispanic whites. Specifically, two questions were asked to obtain information on respondents' self-identified race and their ancestral race: (1) "What is your race or ethnicity? Please identify only one group" and (2) "Considering your ancestors, would they include any of the following? Please identify all that apply."

The first question is designed to obtain responses to self-reported racial identity in which the same governmental measurement of race and racial classifications are employed in the present research. The second question asks respondents' ancestral race in terms of the same governmental racial categories. This question is also designed to obtain the multiplicity of racial backgrounds for racially mixed individuals. The respondents were given the six possible options to identify their race or ethnicity: (1) white, (2) black, (3) Native American, (4) Latino, Chicano, Hispanic, (5) Asian & Pacific Islanders, and (6) others. The ancestral questions also relied on the same list of six categorized groups to

obtain information on respondents' ancestral race.

Analysis of Racial Identity and Identity Transformation

The following analysis substantiates the fluidity and selectivity of one's racial identity and ethnic affiliation, suggesting that one's racial identity does not necessarily reflect that of the same identical racial ancestry. Table 1, for example, shows respondents' self-identified race and ancestral race. The first three columns of Table 1 show (1) the six different racial categories; (2) a total number of self-identified respondents for different racial groups; and (3) percentages of respondents in each racial group. Of 1,644 total respondents, 709 respondents identified themselves as white, which is 43.1% of the total sample. Similarly, 56 respondents claimed that they are black (3.4%), while only 8 students said that they are Native American (0.5%). Similarly, 19.3% and 25.4%, and 8.3% of respondents claimed as Hispanics, Asian and Pacific Islanders (Asian thereafter), and others, respectively.

The next two columns (fifth and sixth columns) show the total count of ancestral race and the percentage of each racial ancestry identified by survey respondents. For instance, of 1,644 total respondents, 911 respondents said that they have white ancestors (55.8%). While there were only eight self-identified Native Americans in the study, 278 respondents said that they have Native Americans as part of their ancestors (17.1%). The total number of ancestors (2,418) also exceeded the sample size, i.e., the total number of respondents in the study (1,644), indicating that on an average, every individual has approximately 1.5 ancestral mixedness and racial hybridity.

The next five columns (seventh through 11th) show the breakdown of self-identified race by ancestral race. For example, 97.1% of self-identified white respondents indicated that they had white ancestors, suggesting that 2.9% of self-identified whites did not have white ancestors, but nevertheless they identified themselves as white. Similarly, 3.8% of self-identified white also indicated that they had the black ancestors, while almost one of every six self-identified whites said that they had a Native American ancestor (17.9%). Hispanics (5.1%) and Asians (3.9%) are also included as ancestral race for self-identified whites.

For self-identified black respondents, 44% said that they had white ancestors, while all of them indicated that they shared black ancestors. Two of every three self-identified black also shared Native American ancestors (67.3%). Hispanics (13.5%) and Asians (13.5%) are also part of ancestral race among self-identified blacks.

Among self-identified Native Americans, 87.5% had white ancestors along with 12.5%

for blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. It is important to note that there were only eight self-identified Native Americans in the sample of 1,644 respondents, although 278 respondents indicated that they shared Native American ancestry. For Hispanic respondents, more than one of every four Hispanic respondents had white ancestors (25.8%), while 6.8% of self-identified Hispanics also had black ancestors. Interestingly, for Hispanic respondents, the degree of ancestral mixedness for blacks (6.8%), Native Americans (22.3%), Asians (5.5%), and other races (9.7%) are similar to those of self-identified whites (3.8%, 17.8%, 3.9%, and 9.7% for blacks, Native Americans, Asians, and others, respectively). Another important similarity between whites and Hispanics is the percentage of self-identified whites and Hispanics who failed to have the ancestors of their own self-identified race. For example, 2.9% of self-identified whites did not have the white ancestors, while 4.2% of self-identified Hispanics did not have Hispanic ancestors, but nevertheless they identified themselves as white or Hispanic, respectively.

The total percentage for ancestral race also shows the extent of racial mixedness for five major racial groups (see the bottom total in Table 1 for each racial group). Both self-identified blacks (253.8%) and Native Americans (237.5%) had the highest level of racial hybridity, suggesting that as an average, every black and Native American individual has two distinct racial ancestors outside their self-identified race. For blacks, the two largest mixed ancestries come from white (44.1%) and Native American (67.3%), while the largest ancestry for Native Americans comes from white (87.5%). The extent of racial mixedness is the lowest for self-identified Asians (119.7%).

The last five columns (12th through 16th) show the breakdown of ancestral backgrounds by racial self-identity. For example, 75.8% of those who had white ancestors (i.e., white descendants) identified as white, suggesting that almost one of every four individuals with white ancestors identified as non-white (2.6% for black, 0.8% for Native Americans, 9.0% for Hispanics, and 4.4% for Asian). For those who shared black ancestors, only 44.8% of them identified black. This finding suggests that the majority of those who shared black ancestors did not identify as black, negating the widely-held belief of the persuasiveness of the one-drop rule. More than one of every four individuals with black ancestry chose white as their racial identity (22.4%), followed by 18.1% for Hispanics. The finding also suggests that, as far as black racial identity is concerned, racial "emigration" or exodus from being "black" to "white" is the greatest and most salient, perhaps reflecting the societal emphasis on whiteness as a valued trait, property, and privilege (Harris, 1993).

Among those who had Native American ancestors, almost half identified as white (46.8%), followed by Hispanic (26.0%) and black (13.2%). Only 2.6% of those with Native

American ancestry self-identified Native American. For those with Hispanic ancestry, only 74.2% identified as Hispanic. Among other major racial groups, Hispanic descendants identified as white (8.7%), Asian (6.2%), black (1.8%), and Native American (0.3%). Among individuals with Asian ancestry, 81.4% identified as Asian.

The finding shows that, similar to the breakdown of self-identified race by racial ancestry, almost three out of every four individuals who shared white and Hispanic ancestors chose their racial identity as white and Hispanic, respectively (75.8% and 74.2% for whites and Hispanics). Among individuals with black ancestry, 44.8% identified themselves as black. Nevertheless, the racial identification is the smallest among all racial groups, except Native Americans (only 2.6% of Native American "descendants" identified as Native American – 97.4% of them identified as members of other racial groups), once again negating the pervasiveness of the one drop rule and supporting the notion of whiteness as a social privilege and valued trait in American life.

Among four major racial groups, the largest preferred racial identity is found to be white. Even among black descendants, as noted above, more than one of every five individuals with black ancestors (22.4%) identified as white, not black. The findings also suggest that the large proportion of black descendants transformed their identity, perhaps constituting those who "pass" as a member of the racial majority, once again negating the social reality of widely shared beliefs of the one-drop rule applied to the black descendants.

Table 2 also indicates the "error" of predictive accuracy and identification mismatches between racial identity and reported ancestral race. The table also shows different stratification patterns among major ancestral races. The second column, for example, shows that the predictive error of one's racial identity because the racial identity failed to accurately reflect the racial ancestral background. The statistical figures are based on the findings shown in Table 1. Table 2 also suggests that individuals with white ancestral backgrounds are most likely to be economically well-off than those with non-white ancestral roots. While those with Asian ancestry are more likely to identify their political views with Republican party (21.6%), those with white ancestry are also the second largest group to show the political affiliation with the Republican party (13.2%). The ancestral roots thus influence the socio-political views differently. The finding also suggests that, while there are considerable variations of the selectivity of racial identity among different racial ancestral groups, social class and political ideology are also closely tied to racial ancestral identification and affiliation.

TABLE 1

RACIAL IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION: RACIAL IDENTITY AND ANCESTRAL BACKGROUNDS⁽¹⁾

Race	Self/Identification		Ancestral Backgrounds			Racial Immigration (%)					Racial Emigration (%)				
	N.	%	N.	% Responses	% Cases	Whites	Blacks	Nat/Am.	Hisp.	Asians ²	Whites	Blacks	Nat/Am.	Hisp.	Asians
<u>Race:</u>															
1. White	709	43.1	911	37.7	55.8	97.1	44.1	87.5	25.8	9.5	75.8	22.4	46.8	8.7	5.4
2. Blacks	56	3.4	120	5.0	7.4	3.8	100.0	12.5	6.8	.5	2.6	44.8	13.2	1.8	1.4
3. Native Americans	8	.5	278	11.5	17.1	17.9	67.3	87.5	22.3	1.0	.8	.9	2.6	.3	.4
4. Hispanics	317	19.3	409	16.9	25.1	5.1	13.5	12.5	95.8	6.1	9.0	18.1	26.0	74.2	3.4
5. Asians/Pac. Is.	417	25.4	513	21.2	31.4	3.9	13.5	25.0	5.5	99.0	4.4	1.7	1.5	6.3	81.4
6. Others	137	8.3	187	7.7	11.5	9.7	15.4	12.5	9.7	3.6	7.4	12.1	9.8	8.7	8.0
Total	1,644	100.0	2,418	100.0	148.3	137.5	253.8	237.5	165.9	119.7	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0

1: Multi-response programs in SPSS/X are used for empirical analyses (SPSS Inc., 1990, pp.465-472)

2: Asians also include Pacific Islanders.

TABLE 2

RACIAL ANCESTRY AND SOCIO-POLITICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Race	Predictive Error	Parental Income (%) ¹				Death Penalty (%)		Political View (%) ²		
		<10,000	<50,000	<75,000	>75,000	% Support	% Oppose	Repub.	Democ.	Indep
<u>Ancestral Race:</u>										
1. White	2.9%	4.0	35.4	23.0	37.6	44.6	55.4	13.1	68.0	18.9
2. Blacks	0.0%	10.0	54.0	16.0	20.0	42.3	57.7	6.3	70.0	28.8
3. Native Americans	12.5%	6.9	51.9	19.9	21.2	46.0	54.0	9.9	73.4	16.7
4. Hispanics	4.2%	7.2	60.6	15.9	16.2	45.3	54.7	5.6	81.1	13.2
5. Asians/Pac. Is.	1.0%	4.2	38.6	21.0	36.3	34.2	65.8	21.6	50.7	27.7
6. Others	--	9.3	43.7	19.9	27.2	42.2	57.8	11.1	70.6	18.3

1: Parental income is subdivided into the following: (1) less than \$10,000, (2) \$10,000-49,999, (3) \$50,000-74,999, (4) \$75,000 and over.

2: Political views are subdivided into the following: (1) Republican, (2) Democrat, and (3) Independent.

The Theory of Racial Identity Transformation

Many critical scholars have been persuaded that race is socially constructed. The present analysis substantiated that racial identity, the individual recognition of racial affiliation, belonging, and membership, is also socially constructed. While race has long been considered as a critical concept which was built upon multiple value-based assumptions about genetics, socio-biology, functionalism and even a Platonic philosophical position concerning the ability to know the central nature of who groups of people are, the sense of racial belonging and one's decision to choose his/her membership are not always based on logically or genealogically rationalized knowledge. Rather, despite the presence or absence of knowledge of their ancestral roots or genealogy, racial affiliation and identification is found to be extremely fluid, particularly in racial groups outside of black race and affiliation. In fact, racial identity with the white race is found to be the most dominant form of identity mobilization, indicating the significant racial exodus of black descendants to non-black racial groups, and trans-mobilizing racial identity to white identity.

In examining the transformation and the unstable and de-centered nature of racial identity, race is thus a concept with no genetic or biological meanings; however, it is filled with cultural meanings, and the political apparatus including the U.S. Government then is empowered to provide "legitimate" and "rational" guidelines concerning what characteristics to look for in race and how we are to respond to those cultural meanings and identity mobilization.

Racial mobility, which I designate "racial cloning," then takes on two forms of identity transformation and replication – racial emigration and racial immigration. Racial emigration occurs when individuals release their original and ancestral racial identity and settle into another alien racial identity. For example, the majority of individuals with black ancestral roots "emigrated" from black to non-black racial identity, in which more than one of every five black descendants (22.4%) transmigrated to become white. In fact, only 45% of individuals with black ancestry were "un-mobilized" or are being "forced" to retain their original black identity (44.8%).

The determination of the original racial identity may be based on the rule of hypodescent (i.e., a "one-drop-of-blood theory) or legal and political definitions of racial groups of a given historical moment or in specific geographical regions (e.g., 32nd "miscegenation" rules were once enforced in many Southern states) (Fukurai and Krooth, 2003). Racial immigration, another form of the racial identity pattern, appears when individuals move to inhabit a new racial identity and discard an old identity based on

ancestry. That is, a person's current racial identity overrides previous racial identity on the basis of racial ancestry. For example, almost 97% of all whites maintained their white origins, while the overwhelming majority of white descendants settled into "white" as their racial identity. Thus, 3% of "whites" came from non-white origin or designated or "cloned" themselves as whites (2.9%). As well, almost 4% of "whites" immigrated from black origin (3.8%).

"Racial passing" may be the most salient feature of racial identity transformation. For example, a group of whites who were aware of their lack of white ancestry -- as well as those who were aware of their black ancestral roots -- settled into, and inhabited, a white identity, suggesting that they are "passing" as members of the white race.

Racial passing or "cloning" is not limited to be the distinguishing feature of the white race. Racial immigration into a new identity, lacking racial ancestry of their chosen race, takes place among all racial groups. A small proportion of individuals who claimed to be Hispanic lack Hispanic ancestry, for example. The only group in which racial re-identification failed to occur is "black," as no non-black individuals inhabit "black" as their new racial identity.

The size and racial composition of population in the U.S. may come to turn on the redefinition and selection of being "white." My analysis focused on the socio-cultural and political-legal production of being "whites" and its transformation, in which cultural manifestation of whiteness becomes imbedded in the possible future production and selection/deselection of characteristics of "whites." The future identity of "whites" will then undoubtedly go through dramatic transformations and reproductions.

The present research suggests that racial immigration and racial emigration are part of a continual, simultaneous socio-historical process, in which racial identity stabilizes and solidifies the racial hegemony of those claiming to be white. And racial cloning in the form of racial "immigration" and racial "emigration" may become the dominant determinant in influencing the size and the future composition of the "white" population in America.

Conclusions

The study began with a critical analysis of the government's definition of race, substantiating that racial transformation has been directed towards continuously expanding the definitional boundaries of the white race. The first 1790 U.S. Census, for example, defined the "white" population as a status group to include individuals who owned property and paid taxes to local and federal governments, thereby excluding the overwhelming majority of European immigrants who came to the U.S. under various

conditions of servitudes. The 1850 U.S. Census, then, expanded the definition of white to any individuals with European origins, regardless of property holdings or legal status. Given the fluid and unsettling nature of racial definitions, various immigrant groups filed lawsuits in American courts, claiming that their ethnic status should be subsumed under the definition of whites -- in order to obtain legal privileges, freedom, and property rights. Today, the governmental definition of the "white" includes "[a] person having origins in any of the original people of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East" (Fukurai and Krooth, 2003). Historical analyses thus indicate that the definition of whites has gone through various socio-legal vetting, and that the definitional terrain of the white race has now been expanded to include many non-European immigrants and communities.

In addition to socio-political processes that expanded the legal definition of the white, the process of identifying individuals' race has also gone through various administrative changes and modifications, making it easier for many immigrant communities to claim their white identity or socially become "white clones." For example, while census takers were historically responsible for data collection and determinations of one's race, the post-1960 census allowed individuals to designate their own racial identity. The relaxation of the identification methods further expanded racial boundaries and the cultural terrain for the mass-production of "whites" - as if they were "cloned" by statutory designations.

My research on race thus led to the findings that the discrepancies of the racial ancestry and racial identity may certainly show the extent to which individuals are given great degrees of freedom in determining their racial identity within existing racial categories. Racial mobility and the fluid nature of racial definitions may be responsible for differing patterns of racial identity picked from groups of different ancestries; and such racial mobility may take place at both individual and structural levels. At an individual level, each individual may determine racial identity of their choice, regardless of knowledge about one's ancestral history. At a structural level, the government and legal apparatus continue to expand definitions of the white race, creating the socio-legal boundaries within which individual can freely choose and determine their racial identity.

The paper finally ends with a theoretical framework, in which the selection and deselection of racial identity then leads to a development of a kind of game schemes that people routinely engage in forming their own racial identity - the selection and deselection of identity based on their perception of costs, benefits, and risks in a given situation and social setting in their everyday interactions. Future research must shed further critical lights on the extent to which racial identity transformation takes place at individual and

personal levels, suggesting that the expansive definitions of whiteness and the loosely imposed method of measuring racial identity lead to the further proliferation of those who inherit and inhabit the white racial identity in America.

Acknowledgement

This study on racial identity and transformation emerged from several years of my cooperative work and discussions with others. Here I wish to recognize the help and contributions of those scholars: Professor Haruhiko Kanegae at Senshu University who contributed his expert knowledge in Burakumin and the plight of foreign workers in Japan; late Professor Emeritus Dr. John Kitsuse at the University of California, Santa Cruz; Professors John Brown Childs and Herman Gray of the Sociology Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz; and Attorney and legal scholar Dr. Richard Krooth of Jury Logistics, Santa Cruz and Berkeley. My appreciation is also extended to Dr. Kaoru Kurosawa of the Psychology Department at Chiba University and Professor Emeritus Kokichi Shoji at the University of Tokyo for their continuing support, encouragement, and assistance.

Notes

1. Other racial groups and Hispanics as an ethnic group are defined in the following: American Indian or Alaskan Native: "A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliations or community recognition"; Asian or Pacific Islander: "A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa"; Black: "A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa"; and Hispanic: "A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race" (see Office of Management and Budget Directive No. 15, "Race and ethnic standards for federal statistics and administrative reporting" (as adopted on May 12, 1977)).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adrian, Jeremy. 1992. "Fear eats the soul in little Tehran: Arrests of illegal Iranian aliens in Tokyo, Japan," *Businessweek*, n3585, p. 30d, October 5.
- Bowditch, Gillian. 1997. "Scots and English are different races, tribunal decides," *London Times*, March 29, p.4.

- Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi L. et al. 1994. *The history and geography of human genes*.
- De Vos, George A. and William O. Wetherall. 1983. *Japan's Minorities: Burakumin, Koreans, Ainu and Okinawans*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- de Vries, Sijiera and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 1994. "A comparative perspective on affirmative action: Positieve Aktie in the Netherlands," *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 15: 179-199.
- Fisher, Marc. 1993. "Germans link deaths to far-right climate," *Washington Post*, June 4, at A20.
- Fukurai, Hiroshi and Richard Krooth. (2003). *Race in the Jury Box: Affirmative Action in Jury Selection*. N.Y.: SUNY Press.
- Goldman, Olivia Q. 1994. "The need for an independent international mechanism to protect group rights: A case study of the Kurds," *Tulsa Journal of Comparative and International Law*, 2: 45-89.
- Haney-Lopez, Ian. 1994. "The social construction of race: Some observations on illusion, fabrication, and choice," *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 29: 1-62.
- Harris, Cheryl. 1993. "Whiteness as property," *Harvard Law Review*, 106: 1709-1791.
- Johnson, Alex M. 1996. "Destabilizing racial classifications based on insights gleaned from trademark law," *California Law Review* 84: 887-952.
- Kajita, Takamichi. 1995. "Characteristics of the foreign workers problem in Japan: To an analytical viewpoint," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies* 27:1-26.
- Karst, Kenneth L. 1995. "Myths of identity: Individual and group portraits of race and sexual orientation," *UCLA Law Review* 43: 263-369.
- Kim, Tae-Eun. 2000. "Survey questionnaire on racial identity of Korean adoptees," unpublished UCSC paper.
- Ludwikowski, Rett R. 1995. "Fundamental constitutional rights in the new constitutions of eastern and central Europe," *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law* 3:73-162.
- Mori, Hiromi. 1997. *Immigration policy and foreign workers in Japan*. London: Macmillan.
- Nei, Masatoshi and Arun Roychoudhury. 1982. "Genetic relationship and evolution of human races," *Evolutionary Biology* 14: 1-16.
- Nishimuro, Kunio. 1995. "Interpreting justice: Foreigners and crime in Japan," *Look Japan* 41-4-7.
- Ooms, Herman. 1996. *Tokugawa Village Practice: Class, Status, Power, Law*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Payson, Kenneth E. 1996. "Check one box: Reconsidering Directive No. 15 and the

- classification of mixed race people," *California Law Review* 84: 1233-1291.
- Ring, Harry. 1972. *How Cuba Uprooted Race Discrimination*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
- Robinson, V. 1993. "Race," gender, and internal migration within England and Wales," *Environment and Planning* 25: 1453-1465.
- Sansone, Livio. 2003. *Blackness without Ethnicity: Constructing Race in Brazil*. New York: Palgrave.
- Small, Stephen. 1994. *Racialized Barriers: The black experience in the United States and England in the 1980s*. NY: Routledge.
- Sowell, Thomas. 1983. *The economics of politics of race: An international perspective*. New York: W. Morrow.
- Takaki, Ronald. 1987. *From different shores: Perspectives on race and ethnicity in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tomforde, Anna. 1994. "Neo-Nazi hate shifts from Turks to Jews," *The Guardian*, May 28, at 13.
- Tooby, John and Leda Cosmides. 1990. "On the universality of human nature and the uniqueness of the individual: The role of genetics and adaptation," *Journal of Personality* 58: 17-67.
- Whitney, Craig R. 1992. "Caldron of Hate: A special report – East Europe's frustration finds targets, immigrants," *New York Times*, November 13, at A1.
- Wright, Luther Jr. 1995. "Who's black, who's white, and who cares: Reconceptualizing the United States' definition of race and racial classification," *Vanderbilt Law Review* 48: 513-569.