

EVAN B. DONALDSON

adoptioninstitute

EVAN B. DONALDSON ADOPTION INSTITUTE

FOR THE RECORDS II:

An Examination of the History and Impact Of Adult Adoptee Access to Original Birth Certificates

Policy & Practice Perspective

July 2010

Funded and Prepared by: The Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute

Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute
120 East 38th Street, New York NY 10016
212.925.4089 NY | 617.332.8944 MA | 775.796.6592 Fax
www.adoptioninstitute.org

Executive Summary

At a time when an array of complex adoption-related concerns are being discussed from Haiti to Moscow to Beijing, within the adoption community in our country, one seemingly simple question continues to receive the most consistent, intense attention: Should adopted adults, like all other Americans, be allowed to have their original birth certificates? Indeed, for over a generation, no other adoption issue has generated more debate or caused greater division.

Today, more efforts to restore adult adoptee access to original birth certificates (OBCs) are being mounted than ever before. In the three legislative sessions that have begun since the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute's November 2007 publication of "For the Records: Restoring a Legal Right for Adult Adoptees" (of which this report is an update), OBC legislation has been introduced from coast to coast. In the 2009–2010 sessions alone, lawmakers in at least 11 states considered the issue – and in at least one, Illinois – they have enacted a statute in recent weeks significantly expanding OBC access, making theirs the seventh state to do so in the last decade. During the same period, Massachusetts has implemented a narrower OBC access law, while activists in several more states, including New Jersey and Rhode Island, have been organizing, fund-raising, and taking other steps intended to result in yet more legislation.

Though support is clearly growing for the "open records" movement, as it is often called, proponents are hardly declaring that victory is on the horizon. Most of their efforts have been unsuccessful, and many of the OBC laws that have been enacted are compromises that grant access to some adoptees but not to others; these compromises open an emotional divide among advocates on whether they are championing the majority or betraying those left behind.

A major reason such compromises are offered – and why more states have not enacted access legislation – appears to be that much of the debate has been muddied by misunderstandings about the history of the issue, misconceptions about the parties involved, and mistaken concerns about the consequences of changing the status quo. It is commonly argued during the legislative process in every state, for instance, that OBCs are sealed to protect the anonymity that birthmothers were promised, and that changing the rules now would undermine their lives and be harmful in other ways (such as increasing the number of abortions). An examination of the research and other evidence, however, shows that all those assertions are flawed or incorrect.

This paper examines the most current evidence related to restoring adult adoptee access to original birth certificates, updating the Adoption Institute's 2007 *For the Records* report.

A lengthy examination and analysis of the arguments on both sides of the debate leads to these primary findings:

- **Barring adopted adults from access to their original birth certificates wrongly denies them a right enjoyed by all others in our country, and is not in their best interests for personal and medical reasons.**
- **Alternative solutions to providing adopted adults access to their OBCs, such as mutual consent registries, are ineffective and do not adequately address the needs of adopted persons.**
- **The overwhelming majority of birthmothers do not want to remain anonymous to the children they relinquished for adoption and support (or do not oppose) those children's access to their OBCs.**

- **Providing adult adoptees with access to their original birth certificates does not threaten the integrity of adoptive families or the institution of adoption; indeed, the evidence suggests that the opposite is the case.**
- **In other countries and in U.S. states that have restored adopted adults' access to OBCs, or never sealed these records at all, there is no evidence of any of the significant negative consequences critics predict.**

Based on these findings, the Adoption Institute recommends significant changes in current adoption law and policy in order to restore adopted persons' rights to information about their origins and heritage – and to achieve equality for the members of all families, regardless of how they are formed.

Recommendations

- ***Every state should restore unrestricted access to original birth certificates for all adult adoptees, retroactively and prospectively.*** The experiences of many other countries, of U.S. states where birth certificates have never been sealed from adopted persons, and of those states that have restored access, all indicate that there are few if any problems when access is granted. There is no significant legal, experiential or factual rationale for denying adopted adults the right to access their OBCs – a right that is enjoyed by all non-adopted Americans. Allowing access with the provision for contact preference forms is a practical solution that affords birthparents a greater opportunity to express their wishes – and therefore greater “protection” than they currently have with sealed records.
- ***State laws that provide access to original birth certificates to a limited number of adult adoptees should be amended to enable them all to obtain these documents and thereby be treated equally.*** Allowing some adopted citizens access while denying it to others is inequitable on its face. The evidence in states that place restrictions on who may obtain OBCs is the same as it is in states that allow universal access; i.e., none of the predicted negative consequences occur. So there is no substantive reason to prevent an expansion of their laws to include all adopted persons once they reach the age of majority.
- ***No agency, attorney, social worker or other adoption professional should promise birthparents that their identities will remain concealed from their children.*** There is no constitutional, legally enforceable “right to privacy” for birthparents from the children they created. Some states that sealed OBCs in the past have opened them and more are likely to do so in the future. Moreover, courts may open records upon petition and, finally and most pointedly, it is becoming increasingly possible for birthparents (among others) to be found via the internet, through search professionals, and with other modern resources. As a consequence of all those factors, it is clear that anonymity cannot be assured with any certainty; promises of lifelong confidentiality are therefore contrary to best adoption practices.
- ***A national adoption registry should be implemented to enable all adopted persons and their birthparents, no matter where they reside, to participate.*** Registries should not ever be viewed as an alternative to access to OBCs, and the evidence is clear that state-specific mutual consent registries are generally ineffective. A well-publicized national registry, however, would allow adoptees, birthparents and other family members to find each other across state lines, thereby mitigating some current problems and playing an important role until all states restore the right of adopted adults to access their original birth certificates.
- ***Confidential intermediary services should be available throughout all states, even after original birth certificates access is restored.*** Many if not most adopted persons, birthparents and other involved parties prefer to search and make contacts themselves – but some want or need help. Confidential intermediaries can be valuable resources to provide

guidance and support for those who are unsure about making contact to obtain information or to arrange a reunion. Ideally, these services should be either subsidized by the state or made available at a very reasonable cost to participants.

Conclusion

Some opponents of restoring access to original birth certificates cast adult adoptees' desire for this basic information about themselves as a matter of curiosity, a simple interest that can be satisfied through other means, while others express seemingly substantive concerns about the implications of altering current law. Some proponents of unsealing OBCs focus on search, reunion and medical information as the key issues, while others say the bottom line need not include any of those issues because the debate is really about equal rights and social justice.

Wherever one stands, this much is clear: The laws on the books in most states do not benefit the vast majority of the affected parties, and therefore should be changed. Modern adoption practice, with its emphasis on openness, honesty and family connections should be the operating model. It is time to end the secrecy that has not only resulted in shame and stigma for nearly everyone concerned, but also has undermined the institution itself by sending a signal from the very start – at the time a birth certificate is issued – that adoption has something to hide.

EVAN B. DONALDSON

adoptioninstitute

March 5, 2012

Written testimony regarding SB 296, respectfully submitted to the Connecticut Select Committee on Children by Adam Pertman, Executive Director of the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute:

Thank you for reviewing this testimony on SB 296, restoring the right of adopted persons to obtain copies of their original birth certificates upon reaching the age of majority. The issue you are examining is far more important than most people perceive it to be, both in practical terms for the tens of millions of Americans that it stigmatizes – I refer here to both birthparents and adopted people – and symbolically, because we keep secrets about things we are ashamed of or embarrassed about. So, when we seal birth certificates, we send the clear signal that adoption is somehow a lesser way of forming a family, because it has something to hide from the very start.

Thank God, we are emerging from the period of our history in which people actually believed that was true, a period in which adoption was a shadowy secret, in which we denigrated nearly everyone touched by this wondrous institution, in which we even turned the words “you’re adopted” into an insult. My children are not an insult, and neither are anyone else’s, regardless of how they came into a family or why they left one. But some remnants of those dark days remain, and sealed birth certificates are one such remnant.

It is also difficult to learn much about secrets. As a result, many myths, misconceptions and stereotypes have come to be widely accepted – even by some professionals in the adoption field. The Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, which I am proud to head, has no formal ties with any interest group. It is an independent and nonpartisan research, policy and education organization that was created for just one reason: to provide accurate, research-based information for practitioners, policymakers, journalists and others so that we, as a society, can shape better laws, policies and practices to improve the lives of everyone touched by adoption, especially children.

I’d like to start by offering an obvious observation, one I hope you will keep in mind as you listen to the testimony of those who want to retain the status quo. It is simply this: The critics of restoring the right to access records warn that approving this law will set off an array of dire consequences – from ruined lives, to increased abortions, to fewer adoptions, and on and on. Whether the critics are right is no longer the subject of conjecture or speculation. A half-dozen states around the country have done what you are considering doing, while two states (Kansas and Alaska) never sealed their records.

So now, we can see with our own eyes what calamities might have transpired as a result. And the answer, very simply, is “none.” The newspapers in those very diverse states – from Alabama to New Hampshire to Tennessee to Oregon – contain no horror stories about stalker adoptees or weeping women. The statistics in those states show no inkling of rising rates of abortion or falling rates of adoption.

EVAN B. DONALDSON

adoptioninstitute

All this information, and far more, is contained in two comprehensive, research-based reports issued by the Adoption Institute. They are entitled "For the Records I" and "For the Records II" and are available for reading/download at no charge on our website. The addresses are <http://tinyurl.com/RecordsI> and <http://tinyurl.com/RecordsII>. I can also provide printed copies of these reports upon request.

Viscerally appealing arguments can be made by anyone, on any subject. Compelling anecdotes and singular experiences can be produced by any side, in any argument. So, in order to form the best possible laws, policies and practices, it is vital that we examine real evidence, solid research, and broad-based knowledge. Here, in bullet form, are a few things that we do indeed know. I will steer away from any disputed findings, and will stick to only those confirmed by hard data, widely accepted studies, or pervasive experience. Upon request, I am happy to provide supporting materials for the record:

* First, as you may already know, it is a historical fact that adoption-related records – in Connecticut and across the United States – were closed explicitly to protect adopted children from the stigma and shame of illegitimacy, and to prevent birthmothers from trying to see their children again; in addition, on a practice level, some social workers also wanted them closed to protect the biological mothers from the stigma and shame of unwed motherhood. The clear legislative and professional intent was to prevent access to those records by the public, not by the parties to an adoption themselves. Historically, the notion that birth certificates were sealed to ensure the anonymity of birth mothers is untrue, irrespective of whether providing anonymity is a good idea or not.

* Second, it needs to be stressed that adopted people are not stalkers, ingrates or children in search of new mommies and daddies. They are simply adults who want the same information the rest of us receive as a birthright. In his book "Roots," Alex Haley wrote: "In all of us there is a hunger, marrow deep, to know our heritage, to know who we are and where we have come from. Without this enriching knowledge, there is a hollow yearning; no matter what our attainments in life, there is the most disquieting loneliness." Research, experience and instinct all affirm Haley's eloquent observation. And adopted people are not exempt from the laws of nature. They love their parents – that is, their adoptive parents – just as much and are just as loyal as if they had been born to them. But a growing majority wants to know about their genetic, medical and cultural roots.

Adopted persons who obtain their original birth certificates in states where that is permissible may or may not form relationships with their biological kin; those decisions are up to the adults involved, and I believe it should not be the role of government to make the decision for them. Moreover, many if not most adult adoptees do not even make contact; for them, just having the most basic information about themselves is enough; it makes them feel they are treated equally, and it makes them feel whole. The fact is that access to their documents has become an issue that is separate from the question of "search" anyway. That is because, as a result of the Internet and other modern-day resources, many if not most adoptees who want to find their birth relatives can do so with or without their original birth certificates. One other detail relating to adoptees: They are wrong when they complain that they are the only Americans whose records are automatically sealed, and cannot be opened without court approval. In fact, the same process applies to people placed in the Federal Witness Protection Program.

EVAN B. DONALDSON

adoptioninstitute

* Third, the notion that a lack of anonymity leads women to have abortions rather than place their children for adoption is fiction. It may sound correct intuitively but, in fact, just the opposite appears true in practice; it appears that women are at least as likely to carry their babies to term and place them into adoptive homes if they believe they will have ongoing knowledge about what happened to those children. The evidence is in the growing number of states where adoption records have most recently been unsealed, and it extends much further and for much longer: In Kansas and Alaska, the only states in which records were never closed, there consistently have been fewer abortions and more adoptions than in states that border them or in the country as a whole.

* Fourth, on the critically important question of the birthmothers' desires, the research is unambiguous: Every study I am aware of relating to whether they want anonymity clearly shows that the vast majority do not – and that applies to those who were verbally assured of anonymity as well as those who were verbally assured they would one day have contact with the children they bore; yes, many women were promised exactly the opposite of anonymity, but those promises are seldom publicly discussed.

Depending on the study, between 80 percent and 95 percent of birth mothers do indeed want some level of information or contact with the lives they created. That doesn't mean they want to give up their privacy, but there's a huge difference between privacy and secrecy. And it doesn't mean they necessarily want the information or contact right away – some only want it years later, when they've had enough time to deal with the personal and emotional consequences of their action or, increasingly often, when they discover they have genetic or medical information they want to share. It is also highly significant that only a tiny percentage have taken advantage of the opportunity to say "no" to the release of birth certificates and other records in all of the states that have unsealed them in recent years.

The Adoption Institute has conducted the most comprehensive study to date on birthparents; I would be happy to provide a copy to you upon request, or you may view it at: http://adoptioninstitute.org/research/2006_11_birthparent_wellbeing.php.

Even among those who truly thought they wanted anonymity at the time of placement, the majority eventually change their minds. Life is not a snapshot, after all, and few of us would want to live forever with the decisions we made at the age of 17, or even 25. Yet the core argument against allowing access to birth certificates is predicated on the mistaken belief that birthmothers are of one mind – and it will never change. This is not only a fundamental misunderstanding of research and experience, on a human level it assumes a woman can carry a child and then part with it and just "move on," as though she has given away an old record player. That view – essentially relegating women to the role of baby-making machines – pervaded adoption for generations. Thank God, it is changing radically and adoption practices are being reshaped in comprehensive, historic ways as a result. The bottom line is that birth certificates remain sealed in most of our country today because of lingering myths and mistaken stereotypes.

EVAN B. DONALDSON

adoptioninstitute

* Finally, denying access to birth certificates contradicts the stated desires of almost everyone directly affected, and it flies in the face of majority opinion throughout the United States. That applies to birthmothers, who seldom choose not to be contacted in states where they can state a preference; it applies to adopted people who – once they are adults – appear to overwhelmingly favor access to their records; it applies to a large and growing number of adoptive parents, a clear majority of whom have already told their children about their origins anyway; and, according to a national survey, it applies to the American public as a whole. The survey, which had a 3 percent margin of error, asked this question: “Should adopted children be granted full access to their adoption records when they become adults?” Eighty-four percent responded, “yes.”

I respectfully ask you to put aside the aberrational anecdotes, emotional appeals, and corrosive myths on which too much public policy relating to adoption has been based for far too long. Instead, please examine the research. I believe that, after you do, you will come to the same conclusion as that 84 percent.

Thank you very much.



Adam Pertman, Executive Director
Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute