

This article was downloaded by: [92.236.86.211]

On: 08 November 2014, At: 03:36

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Children's Geographies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cchg20>

Intercountry adoption of children from Asia in the twenty-first century

Peter Selman^a

^a Visiting Fellow, School of Geography, Politics and Sociology, Newcastle University, Claremont Bridge Level 5, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK

Published online: 05 Nov 2014.

To cite this article: Peter Selman (2014): Intercountry adoption of children from Asia in the twenty-first century, *Children's Geographies*, DOI: [10.1080/14733285.2015.972657](https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2015.972657)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2015.972657>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Intercountry adoption of children from Asia in the twenty-first century

Peter Selman*

Visiting Fellow, School of Geography, Politics and Sociology, Newcastle University, Claremont Bridge Level 5, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK

This article reviews the trends and developments in intercountry adoption from Asian countries as an example of the transnational movement of children, with profiles of three key states, South Korea, China and Vietnam. The second half of the article looks at current issues in intercountry adoption in the light of discussions at the Hague Special Commission of June 2010, and the article concludes with a consideration of the future of intercountry adoption from Asia.

Keywords: adoption trends; Asia; child trafficking; transnational migration; intercountry adoption

Introduction

Intercountry adoption was 'born' in Asia. The large-scale adoption of Asian children by Western parents dates back to the 1950s and the aftermath of the Korean War. Since then, more than 165,000 South Korean children have been adopted in the USA, Canada, Australia and Europe. Even before that children were adopted from Japan to the USA and other countries in the aftermath of the Second World War and there had been adoptions from Colonial China in the 1930s, most famously by Pearl Buck (Conn 1996). For many years Asian countries accounted for more than half the children sent for intercountry adoption to the USA and Europe (Altstein and Simon 1991). However, in recent years much of the adverse publicity about intercountry adoption has been linked to corruption and child trafficking in Asian countries including Cambodia, China, India, Nepal and Vietnam, and Asia now accounts for only a third of all adoptions (Table 1).

The aim of this article is to present a brief history of intercountry adoption from Asia, with a more detailed account of the movement of children in the twenty-first century, using data from 23 receiving countries. The second half of the article will consider current issues in intercountry adoption in the light of the 2010 Hague Special Commission, which was preceded by a day on 'the abduction, sale and traffic in children' (Hague Conference on Private International Law 2010, 28). The article also considers outcomes of intercountry adoption, issues of ethnic and racial identity and the future of intercountry adoption.

Between 1948 and 1969 over 30,000 children were adopted in the USA, with annual numbers approaching 2000 in the 1960s. From 1970 onwards annual totals rose rapidly – to over 10,000 in 1987 (Altstein and Simon 1991). A similar growth is to be found in several European countries (Selman 2006, 188). Lovelock (2000) has written of two waves of intercountry adoption: the first,

*Email: pfselman@yahoo.co.uk

Table 1. Intercountry adoption to selected receiving countries: 1998–2011: By Rank in 2004 – peak year in bold – and proportion from Asian states of origin in 2004.^g

Country	1998	2001	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	% from Asia in 2004
USA ^a	15,774	19,237	22,884	20,679	17,438	12,149 ^b	9,320	43%
Spain ^c	1487	3428	5541	4,472	3156	2891	2573	46%
France ^c	3769	3094	4079	3977	3271	3504	1995	26%
Italy ^c	2374	1797	3402	3188	3977	4130	4022	7%
Canada	2222	1874	1955	1535	1614	1660	1514	65%
<i>5 Top States</i>	25,626	29,430	37,861	33,851	29,456	24,334	19,424	42%
Netherlands ^c	825	1122	1307	816	767	705	528	70%
Sweden ^c	928	1044	1109	879	793	729	538	66%
Norway	643	713	706	448	304	343	304	56%
Denmark	624	631	528	447	395	419	338	47%
Australia	245	289	370	421	270	222	215	85%
TOTAL to 23 states ^{d,e}	31,875	36,391	45,299	39,460	34,479	28,814	23,413	42%
% to USA	49%	53%	51%	52%	50%	42%	39%	
% to Europe	41%	39%	41%	42%	43%	50%	51%	
% from Asia ^f	n/a	n/a	42%	43%	35%	35%	36%	

Source: Statistics provided by Central Authorities of the 23 receiving states.

^aFigures for the USA are by fiscal year (October–September). For FY2012 total = 8668.

^bThe 2010 total includes 1090 humanitarian visas for Haiti. Without these, the US total is 11,059.

^cTotals for 2012 are lower. The total for all 23 states in 2012 was 19,338: 1669 for Spain; 1569 for France; 3106 for Italy; 488 for Netherlands and 466 for Sweden. The provisional estimate for 2013 is 16,100 from 20 countries.

^dThirteen other countries are included in the totals: Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Luxembourg, Malta, New Zealand, Switzerland, the UK and Andorra (from 2001).

^eThe total does not include Austria or Asian receiving states such as Japan and Singapore, due to problems accessing reliable data over this period.

^fAsia excludes Kazakhstan and other Eurasian countries – if these are included the proportion from Asia 2004–2011 rises by 1–2%.

^gUp-dates to the data in Tables 1 and 2 can be found on the Hague web-site at <http://www.hcch.net/upload/selmanstats33.pdf> or on request from the author at pselman@yahoo.co.uk.

a largely humanitarian response to the predicament of children in ‘war-torn’ countries; the second, commencing in the mid-1970s driven by falling fertility rates and a decline in the number of ‘healthy Caucasian infants’ available for domestic adoption. This coincided with changes in gender relations and reproductive policies in the 1960s manifested in the legalisation of abortion and the lessening of stigma against single parenthood (Hoksbergen 2000).

From 1970 to 1989, Asian countries came to dominate intercountry adoption in most receiving countries, with Korea alone accounting for over 50% of all orphan visas granted in the USA between 1972 and 1987 (Altstein and Simon 1991, 14–16). Adoptions from Asian countries accounted for more than 60% of all intercountry adoptions to Sweden in the period 1971–1988. In the 1980s, four of the seven countries sending most children worldwide were Asian: Korea, India, Sri Lanka and the Philippines. These four countries accounted for more than half of all intercountry adoptions between 1980 and 1989 (Kane 1993, 330).

Global numbers reached 20,000 a year by the late 1980s (Kane 1993), but by then several countries were experiencing a decline in annual totals as a result of falling demand – for example in the Netherlands, where there had been much publicity about the problems parents were encountering (Hoksbergen 2000, 95) – or supply, with major cutbacks in the number of children sent by Korea after 1987 and an ending of adoptions from Indonesia and Sri Lanka. By the early 1990s, Altstein and Simon (1991, 191) were predicting an end to growth in intercountry

adoption despite the surge of adoptions from Romania (Selman 2009a, 52–53), but from 1994 annual totals rose rapidly in most receiving states as China and Russia emerged as new sources (Selman 2002) and adoptions from Vietnam increased with the number of children sent to France rising to 1343 in 1998.

The global number of intercountry adoptions peaked at over 45,000 in 2004, having doubled in the previous 10 years (Selman 2006), but subsequently fell to less than 30,000 from 2010. The rise was largely driven by the rapid increase in the number of children from China and the subsequent decrease in global numbers has likewise been the consequence of a major reduction in numbers from China since 2005 (Table 3). The decline in adoption from China accounted for 70% of the overall fall between 2005 and 2009, when the fall in numbers from China, Russia and Korea was offset by a rise in numbers from Ethiopia, Vietnam and Guatemala (until 2008). This decline was accompanied by changes in the characteristics of children moving for adoption.

Characteristics of children adopted across borders in the new millennium

It is sometimes assumed that all intercountry adoptions from Asia reflect son preference or cultural pressures on women to abandon or relinquish female infants. The preponderance of female infants in early adoptions from China is well known (Johnson 2004; Smolin 2011) and in 2008 a majority of children adopted from China, India and Nepal in the USA and Western Europe were girls. In Korea girls have for some years been the preference in domestic adoption. The proportion of female adoptees from China has changed in recent years, falling from 95% in 2005 to 74% in 2009 (Table 3). This seems to be continuing with the proportion of girls falling to under 60% in France from 2010. Boys are now a majority of intercountry adoptions from China in some European countries, as more older and special needs children are adopted, while boys account for two-thirds of all intercountry adoptions from Korea.

It is also often assumed that it is mainly babies and young infants who are placed for adoption from Asian countries, but this is true for only a minority of countries, notably Korea, Vietnam and Taiwan. The proportion of Asian children aged five or more adopted in the USA doubled from 2005 to 2009 and the proportion from China increased from 1.4% in 2005 to 10% in 2009 (Table 3). In the Philippines, Brazil and several European countries, a majority of children are now over the age of five (Selman 2012b, 391). There is also much variation between receiving countries with 53% of children arriving in Italy aged five or over, compared to less than 20% in the USA. These changes have been accompanied by an increase in the number of children with 'special needs', which will be discussed further later in this article.

Asian states of origin

Between 2003 and 2011 China was the origin of more than 60% of children sent from Asian countries, but this proportion has fallen from 71% in 2004 and 2005 to around 50% from 2008. In 2005 adoptions from Asia accounted for 47% of all intercountry adoptions, but this fell to 35% in 2008 as the number from China, India and Korea declined. Table 2 presents the annual totals for the Asian countries sending most children between 2003 and 2011. There are other Asian countries, for example Indonesia and Sri Lanka, which now send few children for adoption but were in the top 10 sending countries in the 1980s (Kane 1993).

There are also major variations in the countries to which Asian states send children. Korea and Taiwan have always sent a clear majority to the USA, while a majority of children from Thailand have gone to European countries or Australia. The root of these variations lies in the history of relations between sending and receiving countries. There is also variation over time when

Table 2. Top Asian states of origin: countries sending 1000 or more children for intercountry adoption between 2003 and 2011, ranked by total sent in those years – peak year in bold – and proportion sent to the USA.^e

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2008	2010	2011	2003–2011	% to USA 2005
China	11,226	13,403	14,493	10,744	5975	5480	4418	79,577	55%
Korea	2308	2241	2121	1815	1392	1154	961	14,653	77%
Vietnam	936	488	1198	1370	1739	1279	704	10,927	7%
India	1173	1083	873	847	759	615	628	7708	37%
The Philippines	406	414	503	476	600	516	512	4591	54%
Thailand	490	499	465	419	385	316	261	3613	16%
Taiwan	222	188	240	262	368	410	318	2664	59%
Nepal	194	265	188	410	405	170	155	2071	33%
Cambodia	308 ^a	94 ^a	110 ^b	194 ^b	215	95	64	1353	5%
ALL ASIA ^c	17,566	18,963	20,472	16,845	12,141	10,365	8,323	129,822	57%
All countries	41,535	45,299	43,710	39,460	34,479	28,814	23,413	323,373	52%
% of all	42%	42%	47%	43%	35%	35%	36%	40%	
Kazakhstan ^d	860	888	843	714	732	518	149	6142	90%

Source: Numbers are calculated from data on countries of origin in statistics provided by the 23 receiving states.

^aThe 2003 and 2004 totals for Cambodia include 40 and 16 from the UK – these are approved applications and some of the applicants did not in fact receive a child from Cambodia as the UK subsequently suspended adoptions from the country. The number of adoptions from Cambodia peaked in 2000 at 655 (400 from the USA).

^bIn their submission to the Hague Special Commission of 2005, Austria reported 21 and 13 adoptions from Cambodia in 2005 and 2006. These are not included.

^cTotals are minima as some receiving countries do not give totals if under 5 p.a.

^dKazakhstan is defined as European by several countries including the Netherlands, Spain and the USA and has not been included in the ALL ASIA total.

^eUp-dates to the data in Tables 1 and 2 can be found on the Hague web-site at <http://www.hcch.net/upload/selmanstats33.pdf> or on request from the author at pselman@yahoo.co.uk.

some countries suspend adoptions from particular states of origin, as is the case for the USA and Cambodia in 2005. The proportion of Vietnamese children going to the USA has varied from 49% in 2007 to less than 1% in 2005 and none in 2011 and 2012 (Table 4).

Country profiles

Discussion of adoption from Asia runs the risk of over-generalisation about very different countries. This section will review in detail the individual experience of three Asian countries in the twenty-first century, with a brief glance at their history of intercountry adoption where appropriate and an exploration of concerns about corruption and the trafficking of children.

The struggle to counter corruption in intercountry adoption on a global scale begins with the 1993 *Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption* (henceforth ‘the Hague Convention’) which sought ‘to establish safeguards to ensure that intercountry adoptions take place in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights as recognised in international law’ (p. 1 Article 1a).

The Hague Special Commission met for 8 days in June 2010, attended by over 80 countries. The first day was devoted to an examination of the ‘abduction, sale and traffic in children in the context of intercountry adoption’, which Smolin (2006, 2007b, 2010a) has called ‘child laundering’, where illegal activities are hidden behind apparent adherence to the Hague Convention procedures, such as free and informed consent and cooperation and communication between relevant authorities. The gathered countries were addressed by Smolin (2010b) and by Benyam Mezmur, an Ethiopian human rights lawyer who has written on the issues of child trafficking (Mezmur

2009, 2010), and shown a film from *Terre des Hommes* and UNICEF about five families in Nepal who lost their children to illegal intercountry adoption.

The issue of malpractice in intercountry adoption has been raised in relation to several Asian states. In addition to Nepal, concern has been expressed about the activities of unscrupulous agencies and lawyers in Cambodia, China, India and Vietnam. The Special Commission established an informal working group 'to consider the development of more effective and practical forms of co-operation between States to prevent and address specific instances of abuse' (Hague Conference on Private International Law 2010, 5). To many people the explanation of the downward trend in intercountry adoption lies in the failure to prevent such abusive practice and the reluctance of sending countries to continue being involved (Smolin 2011, 50). Other issues discussed at the Special Commission included the need to establish in all cases a clear separation of intercountry adoption from contributions, donations and development aid, to prevent situations in which countries – or institutions within a state of origin – felt pressured into providing children for adoption in return for such donations.

By 2000, 41 countries had contracted to the convention, of which only 3 (Mongolia, the Philippines and Sri Lanka) were from Asia. By June 2013 the total had risen to 90: 7 of the top Asian states of origin (Table 2) had ratified, and Nepal and South Korea had signed. Taiwan is precluded from the Hague Conference on Private International Law and so has neither signed or ratified any of the Hague conventions.

South Korea

By 2010, the total number of Koreans adopted abroad since 1953 was about 165,000 out of an estimated total of international adoptions of over 950,000 (Selman 2012a, 4). This makes Korea the largest single source of children to date. Two-thirds of these went to the USA, where the number of Korean 'orphans' entering the country peaked at over 6000 per year in the mid-1980s. Initially, many of the infants placed were of mixed race – the fathers being US military servicemen (Choy 2007) – but by the 1970s there were very few mixed race children (Sarri, Baik, and Bombyk 1998) and in 2004 90% of the adoptees (intra- and intercountry) were children of single mothers (Rahn 2005).

Since the Seoul Olympics of 1988, there has been constant talk in Korea of a reduction in and eventual end of intercountry adoption. However, after a steady fall to 2057 in 1997, the numbers rose again despite a new 20-year plan to phase out intercountry adoption by the year 2020. In 2006 the number of adoptions from Korea fell below 2000 for the first time in 40 years, and 2010 saw the lowest annual number of adoptions since 1968, with domestic adoptions being at a higher level for the fourth year running. From 2011 numbers fell below 1000 per annum and the provisional total for 2013 is less than 300.

Korea is now a rich country with one of the lowest fertility rates in the world and the government has called on citizens to have more children (Sudworth 2010). The adoption ratio (adoptions per 1000 live births) peaked at 13.3 in 1985 when there were nearly 9000 adoptions, but although adoption numbers have fallen, the ratio in 2005 (4.6) was as high as in 1980 and more than 5 times the level recorded for China. Despite the high level of economic development and education, there is a continuing problem over the stigma of unmarried parenthood, and in the absence of a comprehensive welfare system, it has been difficult for a poor single mother to keep her child (Rahn 2005).

Over the past five years there has been increasing criticism of the Korean government by Korean writers (Lae 2007) and from adoptees themselves (Hubinette 2006; Trenka 2007), a pattern found in many other states of origin. One manifestation was the establishment in 2007 of Truth and Reconciliation for the Adoption Community of Korea (TRACK) aimed at

pushing the South Korean government to set up an independent truth and reconciliation commission to study the 50-year history of international adoption from South Korea. In 2007 the Korean government promised increased support for birth mothers and a drive for more domestic adoptions, supported by payments from the state, and in 2011 announced plans to end its intercountry adoption programme from 2012 (Tae-hoon 2011). On 5 August 2012, the *Special Adoption Act* came into effect. This law prioritises domestic adoptions and endeavours to reduce the number of South Korean children adopted abroad. In May 2013, South Korea finally signed the Hague Convention, 50 years after the first recorded intercountry adoption.

China

In the period 1980–1989, Kane (1993) reported less than 100 children sent abroad from mainland China, although three times that figure were sent from the small territory of Hong Kong, from which children had been adopted in the 1950s and 1960s (Feast et al. 2013). China began to allow foreigners to adopt ‘orphaned’ children on ad hoc basis in the late 1980s (Tessler, Gamache, and Liu 1999), but formal approval did not come until 1992, when China passed a law ‘officially granting foreigners the right to adopt and setting up protocols for doing so’ (Evans 2000, 17). From that year the number going to the USA began to rise sharply. In the USA, Canada and the Nordic countries China became the main source of children for adoption by the turn of the century, while in Spain the annual number received rose from 261 in 1999 to 2753 in 2005. Since 2005 the number of children sent for adoption by China has fallen by more than 60% (Tables 2 and 3). By the end of 2011 there had been over 130,000 intercountry adoptions from China, but the recent decline suggests that China may not pass the total of 165,000 achieved by South Korea in its longer history as a sending country.

Some fear that the decline in adoptions from China, when the demand remains high, is already leading to child buying or trafficking (Meier and Zhang 2008; Smolin 2011), fuelled by the large donations to orphanages. The remarkable rise from the mid-1990s seems to be associated with the opening up of China to the West and growing revelations about the number of abandoned children resulting from the One-Child Policy which had been enacted a decade earlier in 1979 (Johnson 2004). This had led to large numbers of babies being abandoned in public places, as there was no legal avenue by which birth parents could place their children for adoption. The modification of the policy to ‘one son/two children’ (Rojewski and Rojewski 2001, 4; Dowling and Brown 2009) did little to reduce the rate of abandonment, but ensured that those ‘abandoned’ were girls, predominantly second daughters, most of whom were not unwanted by their mothers (Johnson 2004). Johnson (2002, 2012) emphasises that it was government population policy not Chinese culture that led to the abandoned babies, overcrowded orphanages and the suppression of domestic adoption. Restrictions on domestic adoption were ‘the result of birth planning efforts to prevent adoption from being used as a loophole whereby birth parents adopt out daughters in order to be able to try for a son’ (Johnson 2002, 379). There is a need for more research into domestic adoption as numbers seem to have fallen in recent years.

In the early years China had a particular appeal for many Westerners because, in contrast to most other sending countries, there was an acceptance of older parents and of single women and men as suitable to adopt. Furthermore, most available children were ‘healthy young infants, free of ties to birth families’ (Dorow 1999, 98). The fact of abandonment was cited as positive by some US agencies as it seemed to make it unlikely that birth parents could ever intrude on the adopted family.

It has been estimated that as many as a third of all ‘Chinese’ adoptions in the USA in the 1990s were by single unmarried women. Thus, a new source of ‘demand’ was developing which was a factor in the growing popularity of international adoption in many countries.

China ratified the Hague Convention in 2005 and in 2006 the China Centre for Adoption Affairs (CCAA) announced new guidelines (Bellock and Yardley 2006), which stated that prospective adopters must be a couple of one male and one female who have been married for at least two years and have had no more than two divorces between them. This guideline reflected a growing concern that many 'single' adopters were in same-sex relationships. China now operates an online system for the placement of children, which allows single women to apply to adopt children with special needs. Table 3 presents data for 2005–2009, provided by the CCAA, and shows the steady increase in the proportion of children with special needs – which includes older children and those with minor health problems – from 9% in 2005 to 49% in 2009.

The reasons for the dramatic fall in the number of children sent for intercountry adoption has been attributed to many factors, but at root seems to be simply that there are now very few healthy infants in Chinese orphanages and that there are many Chinese wanting to adopt these. China now seems to encourage or at least allow domestic adoption and this will mean that the number of younger children is likely to continue to fall and that in most receiving countries waiting times will increase further. Johnson (2012) argues that China should not be sending any such children if it respects the Hague principle of subsidiarity.

The number of children sent rose in 2010 but fell again in 2011 (Table 2) and it remains unclear whether the next decade will see further reductions in – and eventually an end to – intercountry adoption or a consolidation at a lower level with a shift in emphasis towards special needs adoption. China has concrete benefits from the continuation of intercountry adoption in the short term through savings on the cost of institutional care and the substantial amount of revenue it brings in (Johnson 2002; Luo and Bergquist 2004), including the required donation to the child's orphanage, currently 35,000 rmb (c \$5000). If intercountry adoption from China does continue, it will be very different from the pattern of the first twelve years.

Table 3. International adoptions from China 2005–2009. Ten countries receiving most children; proportion of children adopted in 2009 who had 'special needs'. Data provided by CCAA for Hague Special Commission of June 2010.

Country	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005–2009	% Special needs in 2009
USA	7933	6138	4736	3515	3029	25,351	61%
Spain	2608	1909	1269	738	817	7341	9%
Canada	928	748	496	294	379	2845	40%
Netherlands	667	367	330	297	297	1958	66%
Sweden	432	335	248	198	255	1468	69%
France	439	331	178	139	95	1182	13%
Norway	284	204	136	78	104	806	28%
Denmark	230	163	111	76	73	653	38%
Belgium	196	147	111	45	78	577	54%
Australia	138	112	93	57	55	455	5.5%
TOTAL ^a	14,221	10,646	7858	5531	5294	43,550	49%
% female	95%	91%	85%	75%	74%		
% aged 5 and over	1.4%	3.4%	5.8%	9.4%	10.9%		
Special needs	9%	20%	30%	47%	49%		

Source: CCAA submission to Hague Special Commission. Available from: http://www.hcch.net/upload/wop/adop2010pd05_cn.pdf. Figures do not include adoptions from Hong Kong SAR (30 in 2005; 19 in 2009), which were submitted separately.

^aChina also sent children to a further eight countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy (from 2009 only), New Zealand, Singapore and the UK.

Vietnam

There had been a ‘trickle of adoptions’ (Lovelock 2000, 922) from Vietnam to the USA since before the 1960s, but the adoption of Vietnamese ‘orphans’ accelerated during the long Vietnam War and peaked with the fall of Saigon on 30 April 1975, in the months leading up to which over 2000 infants and children, many of them of mixed ancestry, were airlifted from Vietnam and adopted by families around the world in the notorious ‘Operation Babylift’ (Martin 2000). At least 2500 children were adopted in the USA between 1971 and 1978. Inter-country adoptions ended with the withdrawal of American forces and there were few adoptions in the 1980s, but the numbers increased in the 1990s, reaching 2500 worldwide in 1998. Since then, international adoption from Vietnam has been surrounded by controversy and accusations of corruption. In the 20 years from 1991 to 2010, more than 26,000 children were sent for adoption, the majority to France and the USA.

Throughout its history, France has been a key receiving country, reflecting the colonial legacy that predated the war itself. Between 1993 and 1999 more than 7000 Vietnamese children were adopted in France, but in 2000 adoptions were suspended in the light of reports of corruption (Selman 2000, 528). In the USA the number of ‘orphan’ visas granted for Vietnam rose to 766 in 2002 when the USA also imposed a moratorium, having noted for some years that document fraud was widespread. In 2003 Vietnam halted adoptions to many countries, while it reviewed its policies and implemented bilateral agreements. In the USA more than 2000 visas were issued in fiscal years 2001–2003, but only 28 in 2004–2005. The numbers rose again from 2006 after such an agreement was signed, with over 800 visas issued in 2007 (Table 4). Since 2007 Vietnam has been the second most important source of children for intercountry adoption from Asia after China (Table 2).

However, concerns over adoption from Vietnam continued and a report by ISS (2009) concluded that there was a need for

... not only far-reaching legislative changes ... but also a fundamental change in outlook, including in particular a total divorce between ‘humanitarian aid’ or other financial contributions and the inter-country adoption of those of its children who may require this measure. (ISS 2009, 10)

Table 4. Adoption from Vietnam 1998 to 2012. Nine countries receiving more than 500 children during the period; peak year in bold.

Country	1998	2001	2004	2005	2008	2010	2011	1998–2011	% of All	2012
USA (FY)	603	737	21	7	751^a	9	0	6181	34%	0
France	1343^b	44	363	790	284	469	264	5904	32%	76
Italy	0	36	6	140	313	251	142	1769	10%	41
Canada	79	131	6	3	111	171	90	1159	6%	43
Sweden	186	78	16	92	50	7	0	1009	5%	0
Ireland	0	10	16	92	182	10	0	773	4%	0
Denmark	58	62	13	72	39	34	23	634	3%	3
Spain	0	9	0	0	65	320	178	606	3%	41
Germany	51	120	13	9	6	8	2	582	3%	3
TOTAL ^c	2471	1300	488	1198	1739	1279	704	19,204		214

Source: Numbers are calculated from data on countries of origin in statistics provided by those states, which received children from Vietnam between 1998 and 2012.

^aThe highest annual total for the USA was 828 in 2007.

^bIn 1998 54% of adoptions were to France.

^cTotal includes adoptions to Belgium (279) and Switzerland (250) with smaller numbers going to the UK, New Zealand and the Netherlands.

Downloaded by [92.236.86.21] at 03:36 08 November 2014

In June 2010 the US Department of State announced that international adoption from Vietnam was suspended until new legislation was introduced and shown to be effective (Graff 2010). Similar action was taken by Sweden and Ireland. In contrast, the numbers remained high in Italy and France and rose in Spain (Table 4). Vietnam has now passed new legislation and in 2011 ratified the Hague Convention with effect from February 2012. The USA has, however, maintained its moratorium and in FY 2012 granted no visas for children from Vietnam, despite its ratification.

Current issues in intercountry adoption: racial, ethnic and cultural identity

There are an increasing number of studies on the outcomes of intercountry adoptions, and to date large-scale surveys are said to show that such children do as well as children in general or same race adoptions (Juffer and van IJzendoorn 2005) but that there are problems associated with late placement from an institution. Juffer and van IJzendoorn (2009) report on a longitudinal study of children from Colombia, Sri Lanka and South Korea and a meta-analysis of 270 empirical studies on adjustment, noting the 'massive catch-up and gains in all developmental domains' (187) and concluding that 'adoption – as an alternative for institutional care – is a very successful intervention in children's lives' (187), but that those adopted at older ages had a greater risk of disorganised attachment and more problems at school, confirming the findings of Rutter et al. (2009) that such children will need substantial support over a long period of time.

However, there has also been much publicity for a Swedish study (Hjern, Lindblad, and Vinnerljung 2002; Lindblad, Hjern, and Vinnerljung 2003) which used national registers for the cohort born in 1970–1979 to compare 11,320 intercountry adoptees (8700 of whom were born in Asia, most in Korea or India) with 2343 Swedish-born siblings, 4006 immigrant children and a general population of more than 850,000 Swedish-born residents.

After controls on socio-demographic characteristics, intercountry adoptees were found to be more likely than Swedish-born children to attempt suicide; experience a hospital admission for a psychiatric disorder; commit a crime or be involved in alcohol and drug abuse. Critics have argued that the indicators used were of severe problems which affect only a small minority of the population and that the findings are determined by a small group of adoptees with multiple disorders, but the authors' calls for improved post-adoption support seem well justified. Such findings have not been replicated in other destination countries, raising questions about the particular situation of adoptees in Sweden.

International adoption from China has already generated many publications (Johnson 2002, 2004; Tan 2004; Dorow 2006). Much of the writing has come from adoptive parents (Evans 2000; Buchanan 2005) or focused on adoptive parents' experiences (Tessler, Gamache, and Liu 1999; Rojewski and Rojewski 2001). Most of the children are still quite young and hence there are no longitudinal studies following them into their older years, but there are a number of studies of the adoptees as children (Tan 2006; Tan, Marfo, and Dedrick 2010). The only research on older Chinese adoptees involves women adopted in the UK from Hong Kong in the 1960s who have been studied at age 50+ years (Feast et al. 2013). Some have argued that the outcomes for Chinese adopted children will be better than those from earlier cohorts, but this remains a speculation and the growth in placement of older and special needs children means that initial findings may prove premature. Even where 'outcomes' are good, many adoptees experience problems with their ethnic, cultural and racial identity. Dalen (1999) concluded that most international adoptees managed well, but that 25–30% had 'some problems linked to language, learning, identity and ethnicity' (Dalen 1999, 37).

Much of the literature on ethnic and racial identity in intercountry adoption has focused on adoption from Asian countries and on the influence of bicultural socialisation. In their study

West Meets East, Tessler, Gamache, and Liu (1999) outlined four approaches used by American parents to introduce and nurture a sense of culture and heritage in children adopted from China: **acculturation** – focusing on the Chinese; **alternation** – balancing Chinese versus American; **assimilation** – encouraging an American identity and **children's choice** – allowing the child's wishes to lead. More recently, the issue of identity and ethnicity has been explored in a report from the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute (McGinnis et al. 2009), which is primarily concerned with adoptees from Korea.

Some commentators have argued that children adopted trans-racially or internationally are likely to have problems in the area of social identity: 'if children are uprooted from their own culture, their sense of ethnic identity may become confused or conflicted' (Huh and Reid 2000, 75). Shiao and Tuan (2008) examined ethnic identity development among Korean adoptees, focusing on the exploration of ethnicity in early adulthood, when many left the protective environment of their white adoptive parents. 'Even more than adolescence, this life stage initiates a higher level of exposure to ethnic status, racial stereotypes, personal independence, and opportunities for both experimentation and maturity' (1024). Their study of 58 young adult Korean adoptees (Shiao and Tuan 2007) found that different cohorts of adoptees reported different levels of ethnic exploration. For those born in the 1970s non-exploration was the norm, while the younger adoptees (born in the 1980s and 1990s) were substantially engaged in ethnic exploration and much more involved in cultural heritage activities.

There has also been the testimony of adoptees themselves. There are a growing number of books collecting the stories of adoptees exploring their identity (Cox 1999; Von Melen 2000; Trenka, Oparah, and Shin 2006), but the voice of adoptees is increasingly found in individual accounts on adoptee websites, such as AKA (<http://www.alsoknownas.org>). Many of these point to the importance of *racial* identity and the experience of racism by many young adoptees. In all, 80% of Korean adoptees in the Evan B. Donaldson study reported racial discrimination from strangers and 75% from classmates. Lindblad and Signell (2008) interviewed Swedish female adoptees from South Korea and Thailand and found that they were exposed to a wide variety of degrading attitudes related to their foreign appearance, an experience explored further by Hubinette and Tigervall (2009).

Some argue that problems of identity will be less for the new generation of Chinese adoptees as compared to the children adopted from Korea in the 1970s and 1980s, because they are being brought up in a much more open atmosphere where parents pay more attention to such issues and encourage their children to learn about their culture. But evidence from the personal stories of adult Korean adoptees (Trenka 2003, 2009; Trenka, Oparah, and Shin 2006) and the findings from Sweden on the problems of adopted people in early adulthood (Hjern, Lindblad, and Vinnerljung 2002; Lindblad, Hjern, and Vinnerljung 2003) should remind us that a true picture of the 'success' of Chinese adoptions will only emerge in the future. Kupel (2010) notes that 'issues related to race and identity continue to define many Asian adoptees' hardship as children, adolescents and adults'. Therefore, there is a need for improved post-adoption services, informed by the experience of adult adoptees, for the Chinese adoptee generation as they grow up.

Adoptees' search for identity is also reflected in the rising numbers of adoptees returning to their homeland, exemplified by the Adoptee Gatherings in Seoul in 2004, 2007 and 2010 (Kim 2007, 2010). It has been estimated that more Korean adoptees visit their homeland each year than are now sent abroad in the same period. Most pay only a short visit, but some have returned to live in Korea, working with returning adoptees and raising awareness of issues in intercountry adoption. The Evan B. Donaldson study noted that Korean adoptees found return visits helpful and that nearly half had looked for their birth families (Yngvesson 2010). Kupel (2010) notes that adoptees from the Philippines and Vietnam often find less support for return visits than the Korean adoptees, who now have a network of support in Korea as well as their adopted countries.

Will Chinese adoptees feel the same way when they reach adulthood? How will these young women feel about their early history of abandonment because of their gender? Will those adopted by single women have a different experience from those adopted into more conventional two parent families? Even if the objective outcomes are good, there may be resentment about the process of intercountry adoption, just as today adult Koreans are calling for an end to international adoption (Trenka 2007). Although there have been few adult 'reunions', Ponte, Wang, and Fan (2010) have reported on the experience of younger adoptees visiting China with their parents, an increasingly common pattern, seen by some as meeting the needs of adoptive parents rather than their children. Many parents are over-anxious in encouraging adoptees to search for ethnic identities through 'homeland visits' and 'heritage tours', but this can lead to fear of new abandonment if the children are too young. Most adoptees prefer to undertake their own search at a later age, often after they leave home. Nevertheless, the Evan B. Donaldson study (McGinnis et al. 2009) concludes that positive racial/ethnic identity development is most effectively facilitated by 'lived' experiences such as travel to native country, attending racially diverse schools and having role models of their own race/ethnicity.

Too little attention has been paid to the situation of birth parents in intercountry adoption and there is a need for more exploration of the views of mothers in sending countries. Bos (2007) in her study of intercountry adoption in South India suggests that many children are 'relinquished' by young unmarried mothers in poverty with little support available before or after their decision. Dorow (1999) collected together letters written by Korean birth mothers at Ae-Ra-Won mother and baby home to their children relinquished for intercountry adoption and Han (2010) has followed this with a collection of stories written by birth mothers at the home.

One area of concern is the pressure brought on women to relinquish their children, not least by religious organisations seeing the children as being 'saved' by Christian families. In Taiwan mothers have for many years been encouraged to give a child away in return for receiving free maternity care. These pressures are well documented in domestic adoption and have led to an apology to Australian birth mothers from the 1960s. Such pressures have also been noted in the USA, where Fessler (2006) has written the story of the million and a half women who surrendered children for adoption in the decades before *Roe v. Wade*. We are also beginning to understand more about women who abandon their children. In her book, *Wanting a Daughter, Needing a Son*, Johnson (2004) looks at the stories of 247 Chinese families where the mother had abandoned a child.

The experiences of birth mothers are also described in the writings of their children and their adoptive parents. Jane Trenka's birth mother took the initiative in contacting her daughter and Jane subsequently met her and moved back to Korea (2003, 2009). Rollings (2008) adopted two girls from India who had been sold by their father, an experience shared by David and Desiree Smolin, who discovered that the 'orphan' girls they adopted had been stolen from their first family (<http://adoptinginternationally.com>). This emerging focus on those who 'lose children in adoption' is developed most recently in Laura Briggs' book *Somebody's Children* (Briggs 2012).

The voice of birth mothers is, therefore, finally being heard and provides a testimony to the problems of intercountry adoption and the need to revisit the debate about human rights in this area. As David Smolin has noted, 'Only when the adoption system equally values the human dignity of birth families, children and adoptive parents will the system be compatible with the basic principles of human rights' (2007a, 453). The battle for such rights has only just begun and will be most successful where birth mothers work with adult adoptees to change social attitudes.

The future of intercountry adoption in Asia

By 2011, the annual number of intercountry adoptions worldwide had fallen to the lowest point since 1995. The global total fell by 48% between 2005 and 2011 and the number of children from Asia by 60%. Asia remains the continent sending most children, but the proportion from Asian countries has fallen from 47% in 2005 to 35% for 2008–2011. Some argue that African countries, whose contribution has risen from 8% to 24% over the same period, could replace Asia as the main source of children in the future. The characteristics of children sent have also been changing, with more older children and more special needs children being sent.

As the global numbers fall, fears have been raised about an increase in ‘trafficking’ as demand remains high in the face of falling supply and questions are being asked about the future of intercountry adoption in the light of the persistence of corruption despite the efforts of the Hague Convention. In the USA, where the number of intercountry adoptions fell by 60% between 2004 and 2011, some critics (Smolin 2006, 2010a; Graff 2008) have argued that intercountry adoption should be ended unless radically reformed, but there are also a growing number of advocates who argue strongly for efforts to reverse this downward trend in the interests of children (Bartholet 2011; Carlson 2011).

Central to this debate is the question of when and why intercountry adoption is needed. The Hague Convention stresses the importance of subsidiarity; that is, that solutions should ideally aim at enabling the child to remain in the care of his or her family of origin and that domestic measures should be given preference over those that may be available outside the country. In principle the number of intercountry adoptions could be reduced by more attention to support for grandparents and other forms of kinship care and by encouraging in-country adoption, together with a greater social acceptance of unmarried parenthood and support for single mothers. This seems to be of particular relevance for Asian countries, many of which have experienced rapid economic growth, so that Korea and Taiwan now have a level of income which, combined with very low fertility, seems more characteristic of receiving countries, but is also true of China where for many years there have been large numbers of couples wishing to adopt the dwindling supply of young healthy infants in orphanages (Johnson 2012). Others have argued that intercountry adoptions need not involve severing links with the birth family and that ‘open’ intercountry adoption should be encouraged and international fostering explored (Fronek and Cuthbert 2012).

If intercountry adoption does continue, we must

ensure that ICAs are only carried out within the vision of the Hague Convention, with full consideration of the principle of the *best interests of the child*, and a determination to press for more open adoptions in which a child can retain links with and pride in her country of origin and, where possible, her birth family. (Selman 2009b, 592)

The experience of Korean adoptees and birth mothers in uniting to press for changes in the law (<http://justicespeaking.wordpress.com>) may point a new direction for the future and offer a new perspective on the meaning of intercountry adoption for all those who are involved.

One step towards this could be a new research agenda that builds on the accounts given by adoptees and birth mothers to explore alternatives to intercountry adoption and how these can be built into the child support systems of each country. There is also still much to be learned about the factors influencing the outcomes of intercountry adoption. Do Asian children fare better in multiracial societies such as Singapore or the USA than in more homogeneous societies such as Sweden and Norway? Will matching become more important as children are placed at older ages? How do we ensure that prospective adopters are fully informed about likely problems? Although they no longer dominate the global movement of children, countries of Asia with their long experience of intercountry adoption have an important part to play in developing

such research and ensuring that the rights of the child finally become central to such adoption in the years ahead. Increasingly such research is likely to be influenced by – and often carried out by – adult adoptees, a majority Asian, who now comprise at least half of the million intercountry adoptions that have occurred since the Second World War (Selman 2012a). This can be seen in the many recent publications by those adopted from Asian countries (Williams Willing 2004; McGinnis 2005; Hubinette 2006; Trenka, Oparah, and Shin 2006; Park Nelson, Kim, and Peterson 2007; Dohle 2008; Trenka 2009). Such research may also help us to understand the structural conditions by which children become available for adoption (Briggs 2012) and seek to ensure that cultural and economic circumstances in all Third World countries change so that ‘it will be the exception when a child’s only chance for a satisfactory upbringing exists with a family thousands of miles from its birthplace’ (Hoksbergen 1991, 156).

References

- Altstein, H., and R. Simon. 1991. *Intercountry Adoption: A Multinational Perspective*. New York: Praeger.
- Bartholet, E. 2011. “International Adoption: A Way Forward.” *New York Law School Review* 55: 687–699.
- Bellock, P., and J. Yardley. 2006. “China Tightens Adoption Rules for Foreigners.” *New York Times*, December 20.
- Bos, P. 2007. *Once a Mother: Relinquishment and Adoption from the Perspectives of Unmarried Mothers in South India*. Nijmegen: Radboud University.
- Briggs, L. 2012. *Somebody's Children: The Politics of Transracial and Transnational Adoption*. London: Duke University Press.
- Buchanan, E. 2005. *From China with Love: A Long Road to Motherhood*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Carlson, R. 2011. “Seeking the Better Interests of Children with a New International Law of Adoption.” *New York Law School Review* 55 (1): 773–779.
- Choy, C. C. 2007. “Institutionalising International Adoption: The Historical Origins of Korean Adoption in the United States.” In *International Korean Adoption: A Fifty-Year History of Policy and Practice*, edited by K. J. S. Bergquist, M. E. Vonk, D. S. Kim, and M. D. Feit, 25–42. New York: Haworth Press.
- Conn, P. 1996. *Pearl S. Buck: A Cultural Biography*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, S. 1999. *Voices from Another Place: A Collection of Works from A Generation Born in Korea and Adopted to Other Countries*. Seoul: Yeong & Yeong.
- Dalen, M. 1999. *The Status of Knowledge of Foreign Adoptions: A Summary of the Results of Key Foreign-Adoption Research Projects in Scandinavia*. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Dohle, A. 2008. “Inside Story of an Adoption Scandal.” *Cumberland Law Review* 39 (1): 131–185.
- Dorow, S. K. 1999. *I Wish For You A Beautiful Life*. Minnesota: Yeong & Yeong Book Company.
- Dorow, S. K. 2006. *Transnational Adoption: A Cultural Economy of Race, Gender, and Kinship*. New York: University Press.
- Dowling, M., and G. Brown. 2009. “Globalisation and International Adoption from China.” *Child & Family Social Work* 14 (3): 352–361.
- Evans, K. 2000. *The Lost Daughters of China: Abandoned Girls: Their Journey to America and their Search for a Missing Past*. New York: Tarcher/Penguin Putnam.
- Feast, J., M. Grant, A. Rushton, and J. Simmonds. 2013. *Adversity, Adoption and Afterwards: A Mid-Life Follow-up of Women Adopted Hong Kong*. London: BAAF.
- Fessler, A. 2006. *The Girls Who Went Away: The Hidden History of Women Who Surrendered Children for Adoption in the Decades Before Roe V. Wade*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Fronek, P., and D. Cuthbert. 2012. “The Future of Inter-Country Adoption: A Paradigm Shift for This Century.” *International Journal of Social Welfare* 21 (2): 215–224.
- Graff, E. 2008. “The Lie We Love.” *Foreign Policy*, November/December.
- Graff, E. 2010. “Anatomy of an Adoption Crisis.” *Foreign Policy*, September.
- Hague Conference on Private International Law. 2010. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Special Commission on the Practical Operation of the 1993 Hague Intercountry Adoption Convention (17–25 June 2010)*: The Hague: Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference.
- Han, S. 2010. *Dreaming a World: Korean Birth Mothers Tell Their Stories*. Minnesota, MN: Yeong & Yeong Book Company.
- Hjern, A., F. Lindblad, and B. Vinnerljung. 2002. “Suicide, Psychiatric Illness and Social Maladjustment in Intercountry Adoptees in Sweden: A Cohort Study.” *The Lancet* 360 (9331): 443–448.

- Hoksbergen, R. 1991. "Intercountry Adoption Coming of Age in the Netherlands: Basic Issues, Trends and Developments." In *Intercountry Adoption: A Multinational Perspective*, edited by H. Altstein and R. Simon, 141–158. New York: Praeger.
- Hoksbergen, R. 2000. "Changes in Attitudes in Three Generations of Adoptive Parents." In *Intercountry Adoption: Development, Trends and Perspectives*, edited by P. Selman, 86–101. London: BAAF.
- Hubinette, T. 2006. *Comforting an Orphaned Nation: Representations of International Adoption and Adopted Koreans in Korean Popular Culture*. Seoul: Jimoondang.
- Hubinette, T., and C. Tigervall. 2009. "To Be Non-White in a Colour-Blind Society: Conversations with Adoptees and Adoptive Parents in Sweden on Everyday Racism." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 30 (4): 335–353.
- Huh, N. S., and W. J. Reid. 2000. "Intercountry, Transracial Adoption and Ethnic Identity: A Korean Example." *International Social Work* 43 (1): 75–87.
- ISS (International Social Service). 2009. *Adoption from Vietnam: Findings and Recommendations of an Assessment*. Geneva: ISS.
- Johnson, K. 2002. "Politics of International and Domestic Adoption in China." *Law and Society Review* 36: 379–396.
- Johnson, K. A. 2004. *Wanting a Daughter, Needing a Son: Abandonment, Adoption, and Orphanage Care in China*. St Paul, Minnesota: Yeong and Yeong Book Company.
- Johnson, K. A. 2012. "Challenging the Discourse of Intercountry Adoption; Perspectives from Rural China." In *Intercountry Adoption: Policy, Practice, and Outcomes*, edited by J. L. Gibbons and K. S. Rotabi, 103–117. London: Ashgate.
- Juffer, F., and M. H. van IJzendoorn. 2005. "Behavior Problems and Mental Health Referrals of International Adoptees: A Meta-Analytic Approach." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 293: 2501–2515.
- Juffer, F., and M. H. van IJzendoorn. 2009. "International Adoption Comes of Age: Development of International Adoptees from a Longitudinal and Meta-Analytical Perspective." In *International Advances in Adoption Research*, edited by G. Wrobel and E. Neil, 169–192. London: John Wiley.
- Kane, S. 1993. "The Movement of Children for International Adoption: An Epidemiological Perspective." *The Social Science Journal* 30 (4): 323–339.
- Kim, E. J. 2007. "Remembering Loss: The Koreanness of Overseas Adopted Koreans." In *International Korean Adoption: A Fifty-Year History of Policy and Practice*, edited by K. J. S. Bergquist, M. E. Vonk, D. S. Kim, and M. D. Feit, 115–129. New York: Haworth Press.
- Kim, E. J. 2010. *Adopted Territory: Transnational Korean Adoptees and the Politics of Belonging*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kupel, N. J. B. 2010. *Asian Adoptees and Post-Adoption Services in Massachusetts: Data from Providers and Reflections from Adult Adoptees*. Boston: Institute for Asian American Studies Publications. Paper 4.
- Lae, Cho Jeong. 2007. "The Shame of Korea's Orphan Exportation." *The Hankyoreh*.
- Lindblad, F., A. Hjern, and B. Vinnerljung. 2003. "Intercountry Adopted Children as Young Adults – A Swedish Cohort Study." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 73 (2): 190–202.
- Lindblad, F. and S. Signell. 2008. "Degrading Attitudes Related to Foreign Appearance: Interviews with Swedish Female Adoptees from Asia." *Adoption and Fostering* 32 (3): 46–59.
- Lovelock, K. 2000. "Intercountry Adoption as a Migratory Practice: A Comparative Analysis of Intercountry Adoption and Immigration Policy and Practice in the United States, Canada and New Zealand in the Post WWII Period." *International Migration Review* 34 (3): 907–949.
- Luo, N., and K. J. S. Bergquist. 2004. "Born in China: Birth Country Perspectives on International Adoption." *Adoption Quarterly* 8 (1): 21–39.
- Martin, A. 2000. "The Legacy of Operation Babylift." *Adoption Today* 2 (4). <http://www.adoptvietnam.org/adoption/babylift.htm>.
- McGinnis, H. 2005. *Intercountry Adoption in Emergencies: The Tsunami Orphans*. New York: Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute.
- McGinnis, H., S. Livingston Smith, S. D. Ryan, and J. A. Howard. 2009. *Beyond Culture Camp: Promoting Healthy Identity Formation in Adoption*. New York: Evan B. Donaldson Institute.
- Meier, P., and X. Zhang. 2008. "Sold into Adoption: The Hunan Baby Trafficking Scandal Exposes Vulnerabilities in Chinese Adoptions to the United States." *Cumberland Law Review* 39 (1): 87–130.
- Mezmun, B. 2009. "Intercountry Adoption as a Measure of Last Resort in Africa: Advancing the Rights of a Child Rather Than a Right to a Child." *International Journal of Human Rights* 6 (10): 83–104.
- Mezmun, B. 2010. "The Sins of the Saviours: Trafficking in the Context of Intercountry Adoption from Africa." Paper presented at the special commission of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, The Hague, Netherlands, 17–25 June 2010.

- Park Nelson, K., E. Kim, and M. Peterson, eds. 2007. *Proceedings of the First International Korean Adoption Studies Research Symposium*. Seoul: IKAA.
- Ponte, I. C., L. K. Wang, and S. Pen-Shian Fan. 2010. "Returning to China: The Experience of Adopted Chinese Children and Their Parents." *Adoption Quarterly* 13 (2): 100–124.
- Rahn, K. 2005. "Single Mothers Face Discrimination." *The Korea Times*, March 1.
- Rojewski, J., and J. Rojewski. 2001. *Intercountry Adoption from China: Examining Cultural Heritage and Other Post Adoption Issues*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Rollings, J. 2008. *Love Our Way*. Sydney: Harper Collins.
- Rutter, M., C. Beckett, J. Castle, E. Colvert, J. Kreppner, and M. Mehta. 2009. "Effects of Profound Early Institutional Deprivation: An Overview of Findings from a UK Longitudinal Study of Romanian Adoptees." In *International Advances in Adoption Research*, edited by G. Wrobel and E. Neil, 147–167. London: John Wiley.
- Sarri, R., Y. Baik, and M. Bombyk. 1998. "Goal Displacement and Dependency in South Korean-United States Intercountry Adoption." *Children & Youth Services Review* 20 (1–2): 87–114.
- Selman, P. 2000. *Intercountry Adoption: Development, Trends and Perspectives*. London: British Association for Adoption & Fostering.
- Selman, P. 2002. "Intercountry Adoption in The New Millennium: The 'Quiet Migration' Revisited." *Population Research & Policy Review* 21: 205–225.
- Selman, P. 2006. "Trends in Intercountry Adoption: Analysis of Data from 20 Receiving Countries." *Journal of Population Research* 23 (2): 183–204.
- Selman, P. 2009a. "From Bucharest to Beijing: Changes in Countries Sending Children For International Adoption 1990 to 2006." In *International Advances in Adoption Research for Practice*, edited by G. Wrobel and E. Neil, 41–69. London: John Wiley.
- Selman, P. 2009b. "The Rise and Fall of Intercountry Adoption in the 21st Century." *International Social Work* 52 (5): 575–594.
- Selman, P. 2012a. "Global Trends in Intercountry Adoption: 2001–2010." *Adoption Advocate* 44: 17 pp. <https://www.adoptioncouncil.org/publications/2012/02/adoption-advocate-no-44>.
- Selman, P. 2012b. "The Global Decline of Intercountry Adoption: What Lies Ahead?" *Social Policy and Society* 11 (4): 381–397.
- Shiao, J. L., and M. H. Tuan. 2007. "A Sociological Approach to Race, Identity, and Asian Adoption." In *International Korean Adoption: A Fifty-Year History of Policy and Practice*, edited by K. J. S. Bergquist, M. E. Vonk, D. S. Kim, and M. D. Feit, 155–170. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Shiao, J. L., and M. H. Tuan. 2008. "Korean Adoptees and the Social Context of Ethnic Exploration." *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (4): 1023–1066.
- Smolin, D. 2006. "Child Laundering: How the Intercountry Adoption System Legitimises and Incentivises the Practices of Buying, Trafficking, Kidnapping, and Stealing Children." *Wayne Law Review* 52 (1): 113–200.
- Smolin, D. 2007a. "Intercountry Adoption and Poverty: A Human Rights Analysis." *Capital University Law Review* 36: 413–453.
- Smolin, D. 2007b. "Child Laundering as Exploitation: Applying Anti-Trafficking Norms to Intercountry Adoption Under the Coming Hague Regime." *Vermont Law Review* 32 (1): 1–55.
- Smolin, D. 2010a. "Child Laundering and the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption: The Future and Past of Intercountry Adoption." *University of Louisville Law Review* 48 (3): 441–498.
- Smolin, D. 2010b. "Abduction, Sale and Traffic in Children in the Context of Intercountry Adoption." Paper presented at the special commission of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, The Hague, Netherlands, June 2010.
- Smolin, D. 2011. "The Missing Girls of China: Population Policy, Culture, Gender, Abortion, Abandonment and Adoption in East Asian Perspective." *Cumberland Law Review* 41 (1): 1–65.
- Sudworth, J. 2010. "South Koreans Told to Go Home and Make Babies." *BBC News*, Seoul, January 20.
- Tae-hoon, L. 2011. "New Law to Restrict Adoption by Foreigners." *The Korea Times*, June 30.
- Tan, T. X. 2004. "Child Adjustment of Single-Parent Adoption from China: A Comparative Study." *Adoption Quarterly* 8 (1): 1–20.
- Tan, T. X. 2006. "History of Early Neglect and Middle Childhood Social Competence: An Adoption Study." *Adoption Quarterly* 9 (4): 59–72.
- Tan, T. X., K. Marfo, and R. F. Dedrick. 2010. "Early Developmental and Psychosocial Risks and Longitudinal Behavioral Adjustment Outcomes for Preschool-Age Girls Adopted from China." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 31 (4): 306–314.

- Tessler, R., G. Gamache, and L. Liu. 1999. *West Meets East: Americans Adopt Chinese Children*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Trenka, J. 2003. *The Language of Blood: A Memoir*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Historical Society.
- Trenka, J. 2007. "Korean Adoptees from Abroad and Birth Mothers Protest Overseas Adoption." *The Hankyoreh*, August 5.
- Trenka, J. 2009. *Fugitive Provisions: An Adoptee's Return to Korea*. Minneapolis, MN: Graywolf Press.
- Trenka, J., J. Oparah, and S. Y. Shin. 2006. *Outsiders Within: Writing on Transracial Adoption*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Von Melen, A. 2000. "Strength to Survive and Courage to Live." In *Intercountry Adoption: Development, Trends and Perspectives*, edited by P. Selman, 499–512. London: BAAF.
- Williams Willing, I. 2004. "The Adopted Vietnamese Community: From Fairy Tales to the Diaspora." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 43 (4): 648–664.
- Yngvesson, B. 2010. *Belonging in an Adopted World: Race, Identity, and Transnational Adoption*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.