

Emerging Paradigms in Critical Mixed Race Studies

G. REGINALD DANIEL, LAURA KINA,
WEI MING DARIOTIS, AND CAMILLA FOJAS

MIXED RACE STUDIES¹

In the early 1980s, several important unpublished doctoral dissertations were written on the topic of multiraciality and mixed-race experiences in the United States. Numerous scholarly works were published in the late 1980s and early 1990s. By 2004, master's theses, doctoral dissertations, books, book chapters, and journal articles on the subject reached a critical mass. They composed part of the emerging field of mixed race studies although that scholarship did not yet encompass a formally defined area of inquiry. What has changed is that there is now recognition of an entire field devoted to the study of multiracial identities and mixed-race experiences. Rather than indicating an abrupt shift or change in the study of these topics, mixed race studies is now being formally defined at a time that beckons scholars to be more *critical*. That is, the current moment calls upon scholars to assess the merit of arguments made over the last twenty years and their relevance for future research. This essay seeks to map out the critical turn in mixed race studies. It discusses whether and to what extent the field that is now being called critical mixed race studies (CMRS) diverges from previous explorations of the topic, thereby leading to formations of new intellectual terrain.

In the United States, the public interest in the topic of mixed race intensified during the 2008 presidential campaign of Barack Obama, an African American whose biracial background and global experience figured prominently in his campaign for and election to the nation's highest office. Yet the topic had already received considerable attention in the mainstream press as well as television and radio beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s. This was due to increased rates of racial intermarriage and the growing population of offspring from these unions. Comparatively more fluid interracial relations were facilitated by the dismantling of Jim Crow segregation and the implementation of civil rights legislation during the 1950s and 1960s. This included the 1967 elimination of the last anti-miscegenation laws in *Loving v. Virginia* and the 1965 removal of legal restrictions on immigration in the Immigration and Nationality Act (or Hart-Celler Act).

Specifically, the growing public awareness and discussions of mixed race was attributable to the multiracial movement that began in the late 1970s and gathered force during the 1980s. Individuals who maintained interracial relationships or identified as mixed race sought to have their experiences and concerns become part of the continuing societal transformation initiated during the previous decade of social movements. Those struggles were dedicated to extending the rights of and providing social dignity for people of color, women, and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer community. By the 1990s, one of the multiracial movement's key initiatives was to bring about changes in standards of official racial data collection in the US census. The goal was to facilitate the expression of a multiracial identity in contrast to existing policies that required individuals to identify with one racial background as part of the enforcement of monoracial norms.

In this inaugural issue of the journal, Rainier Spencer in "Only the News They Want to Print: Mainstream Media and Critical Mixed-Race Studies" observes that the mainstream press, for all of its

* We would like to thank Paul Spickard, Ingrid Dineen-Wimberly, Alyssa Newman, and Sheila Gardette for their feedback and recommended revisions on this article. We are also appreciative of Paul Spickard's and Steven F. Riley's assistance in compiling lists of select publications on mixed race released respectively between 1989–2004 and 2005–2013.

attention to the topic of multiraciality and the mixed-race experience, has for decades failed to engage the subject matter in all of its rich complexity. Instead, it has espoused a conservative discourse that emphasizes sentimentality, superficiality, and sensationalism over more nuanced, in-depth, and thoughtful analyses. We share in his hope that periodicals such as the *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* will be a remedy of sorts to this lack of criticality by serving as a scholarly response and counterbalance to the dangerously biased, and perhaps naïve, reporting, discussions, and representations found in the mainstream press as well as in other popular media.

WHY CRITICAL?

We have added the term “critical” to the rich and complex field of mixed race studies to indicate both a new direction and to bring together the various tributaries of the field in a new light, one that is recursive and self-reflexive. The word “critical” is taken from the fields of critical race theory and critical legal studies that were developed in the 1970s to address the role of society and culture within a racialized and race-driven legal system. Critical race theory borrows from critical legal studies as well as conventional civil rights scholarship but interrogates both fields. Critical race studies developed after the significant accomplishments of the civil rights era to address continuing racialized inequities and lack of representation of marginalized communities of color, particularly in education and public discourses. It has evolved as an interdisciplinary field that derives from the work of ethnic studies scholars and activists, including a critical examination of society and culture, the intersection of race, law, and power as well as racial justice scholarship and legal practice. Critical mixed race studies in turn encompasses these areas of analysis with an emphasis on all things related to “mixed” race. This includes renderings and studies of racial mixing, interraciality, multiraciality, transracial adoption, and interethnic alliances, among others. Ethnic studies and critical race studies are key components of critical mixed race studies and continue to advance similar inquiries and scholarly discourses about race, culture, and society.

This should not be misinterpreted to connote that previous scholarship on mixed race in the United States was somehow entirely “uncritical” or is now irrelevant and should be relegated to the dustbin. Indeed, to see the fallacy of this assumption, one only need consider, for example, the significance of work by Brewton Berry, Winthrop D. Jordan, Jack D. Forbes, Gary B. Nash, Sister Jerome Woods, John G. Menke, Judith R. Berzon, and Joel Williamson. These are examples of earlier scholarship that provided very sensitive and thought-provoking analyses of mixed race.² Furthermore, research on the topic of mixed race has a long history in terms of Latin America, particularly Brazil.³ As Jayne O. Ifekwunigwe points out in *‘Mixed Race’ Studies: A Reader* (2004), scholarly studies of mixed race across disciplines go back at least several hundred years.⁴ Indeed, the original obsession in the United States with racial mixing extends back to the colonial era and began with a meditation on both the risks and merits of the intermixing of black and white populations. This became especially evident in the genre of miscegenation narratives of early twentieth-century African American novelists such as Charles Chestnut (1858–1932), Wallace Thurman (1902–1934), James Weldon Johnson (1871–1938), Jessie Fauset (1882–1961), Jean Toomer (1894–1967), Nella Larsen (1891–1964), and Walter White (1893–1955), as well as critical studies of these and later works among scholars in literary and black studies. The discussions of this original relationship between black and white was rooted in race-based slavery and racial apartheid. Despite the perceived tension between black studies and critical mixed race studies, the former has in many ways been an ally rather than a foe. If one considers including the aforementioned and similar subsequent literary works, as well as analyses of these texts, it is apparent that black studies has played an important role in uplifting this new field.

Studies of mixed race only recently have been thought of as encompassing a distinct field of study in the United States. Many individuals began describing works as being part of the field of mixed race or multiracial studies, particularly around 2004. At that point, the number of publications on the topic reached a critical mass, that is, they began to acquire a self-sustaining viability.⁵ What has changed is that there is now recognition of an entire field devoted to the study of multiraciality and mixed-race experiences. After many important scholarly contributions from various disciplines, the field of mixed race studies has seasoned, so to speak. Scholars are looking back critically and assessing the merit of arguments made over the past two decades. Rather than being an abrupt shift or change in the field, this critical turn is an indication that scholars are now defining the contours of the field while continuing consciously to attend to specific concerns spurred by earlier works.

Critical mixed race studies places mixed race at the critical center of focus. Multiracials become subjects of historical, social, and cultural processes rather than simply objects of analysis. This involves the study of racial consciousness among racially mixed people, the world in which they live, and the ideological, social, economic, and political forces, as well as policies that impact the social location of mixed-race individuals and inform their mixed-race experiences and identities. CMRS also stresses the critical analysis of the institutionalization of social, cultural, and political structures based on dominant conceptions of “race.” In keeping with racial formation theory outlined by Michael Omi and Howard Winant, CMRS acknowledges that the concept of race invokes biologically-based human characteristics. Yet the selection of particular human features for purposes of racial signification has changed over time. Consequently, racial formation is necessarily a sociohistorical process. Accordingly, CMRS emphasizes the constructed nature of race. It stresses that racial categories and racial designations are “unstable” and “decentered” complexes of sociocultural meanings that are continuously being created, inhabited, contested, transformed, and destroyed.⁶ CMRS underscores the mutability of race and the porosity of racial boundaries and categories in order to critically examine local and global systemic injustices grounded in social processes of racialization and social stratification based on race. In so doing, CMRS interrogates racial essentialism and racial hierarchy.

CMRS also emphasizes the interlocking nature of racial phenomena with gender, sex, sexuality, class, and other categories of difference. In this intersectional framework, Candace West and Sarah Fenstermaker point out that these and other categories of difference are much more than individual characteristics or some vaguely defined and performed set of role expectations. Rather, they are ongoing phenomena that are accomplished in interaction with others and must be situated in social situations and institutional structures. The accomplishment of the identities associated with these social categories normalize and naturalize the social dynamics based on gender, sex, sexuality, class, and other categories of difference. That is, they make legitimate various ways of organizing social life. This in turn reaffirms institutional practice, the social order, and their respective power relations. The accountability of individuals to categories of difference is the key to understanding the maintenance of these dynamics. It is a mechanism whereby situated social action contributes to the reproduction of social structures and systems of domination (by extension) based on race, sex, gender, class, sexuality, among others. Their entrenched ideas, practices, explicit decisions, and procedures construct social hierarchies that exclude, control, and constrain human agency.⁷ Considering that social boundaries, hierarchies, and identities associated with social categories of difference are continually constructed and maintained in everyday life, it also follows that under certain conditions, individuals acting as singular agents or as collective subjectivities resist pressures to conform to these social forces.

All of the US racial movements of 1950s and 1960s sought to achieve these goals through political initiatives aimed at organizing and redistributing resources as well as cultural initiatives that involved interpreting, representing, or explaining racial dynamics by means of identity politics. The objective was to rescue racial identities from their distortion and erasure by the dominant society. This

was particularly evident in the radicalization of these movements through the black, brown, red, and yellow power movements in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In a similar trajectory, the assertion of a multiracial identity in the U.S. today is to rescue racial identities from distortion and erasure by incorporating *all* of one's racial and ethnic backgrounds. An objective of the mixed-race movement has been to question the imposition of as well as resist traditional monoracial categories and boundaries by expanding them to include more multidimensional configurations. Individuals thus recognize the commonalities among their varied backgrounds (integration) and appreciate the differences (pluralism). Multiracial identity formations thus seek to build on the tenets of the civil rights movement, which advocated for the recognition of the equality of difference in the manner of egalitarian pluralism. They also seek to advance the movement's integrationist goals—rejected by more radical voices among communities of color because of their assimilationist implications—by simultaneously seeking to replace this hierarchical integration with a more egalitarian dynamic.

THE FOUNDATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP

In the early 1980s, several crucial unpublished doctoral dissertations on mixed-race identity were written by scholars such as Christine C. Iijima Hall, George Kitahara Kich, Michael C. Thornton, Marvin C. Arnold, and Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu.⁸ Numerous scholarly examinations of interracial families, multiracials, and mixed-race experiences had been published by the late 1980s and early 1990s. These included key works by Francis Wardle, Jewelle Taylor Gibbs, Paul Spickard, W. S. Carlos Poston, Nelly Salgado de Snyder, Cynthia M. Lopez, Amado M. Padilla, and Maria P. P. Root.⁹ Spickard's *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America* (1989) and Root's edited volume *Racially Mixed People in America* (1992) were groundbreaking books on the topic of multiracial identities and experiences. Root's award-winning anthology, which celebrated its twentieth anniversary in 2012, was the first comprehensive examination of multiracial identity and the mixed-race phenomenon in the United States. It included co-founding editor and editor in chief of the *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* G. Reginald Daniel and co-founding editor Paul Spickard. They took part in establishing foundational discourses for multiracial studies and critical mixed race studies.¹⁰

Other seminal publications released during this period include Root's subsequent volume *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier* (1996), as well as works by Jack D. Forbes, Lise Funderburg, Karen Leonard, Gary B. Nash, and Naomi Zack.¹¹ Furthermore, Lewis R. Gordon was ahead of the curve in his aptly titled article "Critical 'Mixed Race,'" published in *Social Identities* in 1995.¹² He not only provided a compelling analysis of mixed race but also outlined many of the key concerns of what would eventually be defined as critical mixed race studies.¹³ There were also other important contributions that examined or portrayed mixed-race identity and the multiracial experience in the arts, including influential works by Kip Fulbeck, Velina Hasu Houston, James Luna, Adrienne Piper, and Valerie Soe. Velina Hasu Houston and Teresa Williams-León organized a special issue of *Amerasia* journal titled *No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-descent Multiracials* (1997). This anthology included Williams-León's and Houston's "No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-descent Multiracials," as well as performance artist Darby Li Lo Price's "Humorous Hapas, Performing Identities." These works were the first analyses of contemporary mixed-race aesthetics in theater and comedic performance, particularly in terms of multiracials of Asian/Asian American descent.¹⁴ At the same time, there was a sudden and rapid increase in novels and autobiographies on mixed race, many of which garnered widespread popular attention such as James McBride's *The Color of Water* (1997).¹⁵

By 2004, master's theses, doctoral dissertations, books, book chapters, and journal articles on the topic of mixed race across disciplines reached a point at which they could lay the foundation for further growth and innovation.¹⁶ These scholarly, artistic, and popular discourses compose part of the emerging field of mixed race studies. It is possibly the fastest-growing and one of the most controversial areas of racial and ethnic studies in the last decade of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first.¹⁷ Scholarly articles in multiracial studies have appeared over the last decade in all the flagship journals in sociology, psychology, anthropology, history, literature, as well as in other disciplines and fields of study. The number of articles published since the 1990s has grown exponentially. Even a partial list would hardly do justice to the volume of publications.¹⁸ In addition, multiracial student groups continue to flourish on several dozen colleges and university campuses. A growing number of colleges and universities in the United States offer courses on multiracial studies.¹⁹ Clearly, multiraciality is an important human experience, and the study of mixed race has become a distinct area of scholarly inquiry. Amidst the efflorescence of mixed-race discourse and activities, there have been no academic journals specifically devoted to the topic. We propose to help fill that void with the *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies*.

The research on the topic of mixed race that entered the conversation on race and ethnicity in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s made a significant contribution not only to explicating but also validating, if not celebrating, multiracial identities and mixed-race experiences.²⁰ Literary narratives, autobiographies, and film/video provided an insider's view of the interior and lived experiences of mixed-race individuals and offered a social critique. But social scientists—specifically psychologists, social psychologists, and, to a lesser extent, sociologists—provided the majority of research.²¹ Psychologists or social psychologists, who study individual and small group mental processes, would be particularly well-suited to examining multiracial identities and mixed-race experiences.²² Social or cultural anthropologists and sociologists, who employ ethnographic and other qualitative research methods, could also provide meaningful analyses on the topic. But these studies were largely absent.²³ The disciplines of sociology and anthropology as a whole were conspicuously silent.²⁴

Demographers did, however, begin to focus more attention on the subject of mixed race given the increasing rates of racial intermarriage and the growing population of multiracial offspring. They also began to grapple with the statistical implications of mixed race as grassroots advocacy organizations and multiracial-identified individuals in the late 1980s began directing their energies toward pressuring the racial state for changes in administrative procedures in collecting official data on race and ethnicity—particularly on the 1990 census—so that multiracial-identified individuals could be enumerated.²⁵ Yet collective activism surrounding multiracial identity politics was initially considered a marginal project. It was located outside the normative terrain of the racial state, the public imagination, as well as that of most social scientists even though mixed-race identity had become the basis for a nascent social movement. Accordingly, this racial project was an organized and sustained effort, however factitious, to mobilize people around a common purpose aimed at achieving broader social structural change.²⁶

Activists were unsuccessful in bringing about changes on the 1990 census. Yet their efforts intensified in the wake of the census. These initiatives were enhanced by the founding of a national umbrella organization the Association of MultiEthnic Americans (AMEA) in 1988 and Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally) in 1991. These organizations and their efforts at marshaling the various local advocacy groups and supporters were instrumental in prompting federal officials to convene the Congressional Hearings on Racial Census Categories (1993–1997) to discuss any potential changes on the 2000 census.²⁷ This did not preclude lobbying for passage of legislation—particularly at the state level—to bring about these changes. Yet the movement's action campaigns largely consisted of letter writing, phone calls, and public appearances in the media, as well as testimony at hearings.²⁸ The relatively “quiet” nature of and comparatively small number of participants in the multiracial movement,²⁹ stood in stark contrast to

the public displays of mass mobilization in boycotts, demonstrations, and sit-ins—and eventually urban uprisings—associated with the civil rights and various radical nationalist movements in the 1950s and 1960s.

Still while collective mobilization in support of mixed-race identities by the mid-1990s encompassed a full-fledged challenge to normative racial identity formations, sociologists were slow to engage in analyses of multiraciality in terms of broader social behavior and relations, as well as organizations and institutions. Political science, for the most part, failed to provide a meaningful assessment of multiraciality within the context of the state, government, politics, political systems, and political behavior. Sociologists and political scientists generally tended to view the multiracial phenomenon as symptomatic of largely isolated psychological concerns with personal identity rather than reflective of wider-ranging sociopolitical questions.³⁰ Conversely, at the time, anthropologists were more fascinated with the “everyday” as compared to organized resistance.³¹ Anthropologists, along with other social scientists, remained on the periphery of social scientific theorizing about collective action relating to mixed-race concerns.³²

In the field of ethnic studies, the topic of mixed-race identity was largely marginalized, if not ignored. Black studies scholars specifically were ambivalent, if not unreceptive, to the topic of multiracial identity. It was considered incompatible with and inimical to the canonical boundaries of the field as well as deleterious to the struggles of traditional communities of color and their monoracial imperatives. These were key founding principles that have served as a means of maintaining racial solidarity in the face of white oppression.³³ Notwithstanding similar concerns among other ethnic studies scholars, Asian American studies scholars were comparatively more receptive. This is due in part to the high rate and percentage of outmarriage among Asian/Asian Americans, as well as the large number of first-generation multiracial offspring of Asian/Asian American descent, particularly those of white and Asian/Asian American backgrounds.³⁴ The same was somewhat true of Native American studies scholars, given that “mixed blood” is an established, if often hotly debated, social category in Native American society. Some Chicana/o studies scholars were engaged in the topic of *mestizaje*.³⁵ But, Turner’s “Reconsidering the Relationship between New Mestizaje and New Multiraciality as Mixed Race Identity Models” in this issue of *JCMRS*, reassess those discussions. Turner maintains there has been a palpable disjuncture between those analyses and the conceptualization of “multiraciality” in the other disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, and history) that examine new mixed identity discourses.

This general lack of receptivity or attention to the topic of multiracial identity is due in part to the fact that US social scientists, like the individuals and communities that were the primary focus of their studies, have internalized not only hypodescent but also monoracial norms. Hypodescent necessitates identification as either white or non-white, and designates multiracials descended from European Americans and Americans of color based exclusively on the background of color. Monoraciality precludes identification with more than one racial background whether it is a European American background combined with a background of color or a combination several backgrounds of color. Both social devices have become a *sin qua non* in the US binary racial order. The accompanying “either/or” mentality induces people in the United States to reinforce, even if unintentionally, the notion that European Americans (and whiteness) and Americans of color, as well as various differences among the latter, are categories of experience that are mutually exclusive, if not hierarchical, and that have an objective and independent existence of their own.

Accordingly, one school of thought has presumed that multiracials would identify and be integrated into the US racial order as “white” (or at least no longer as racialized “others”) as has been the case with European immigrants and their descendants.³⁶ The availability of this opportunity has varied. It has depended upon the backgrounds involved as well as the historical circumstances and societal attitude surrounding them.³⁷ Another school of thought presumed that multiracials in keeping

with hypodescent would identify with their background of color.³⁸ This mindset has made scholars, like everyone else in the U.S., oblivious to the oppressive impact these social devices have on multiracial-identified individuals. It has prevented them from envisioning any collective challenges to normative racial identity formations.³⁹ Consequently, they were generally unprepared for, if not dismissive of, the emergence of multiracial identity as the basis for a social movement speaking to mixed-race concerns that would not only call into question but also successfully destabilize the strict enforcement of hypodescent and monoracial norms.

HYPODESCENT, MONORACIAL NORMS, AND MIXED-RACE CONCERNS

Winthrop D. Jordan, in his last article “Historical Origins of the One-Drop Racial Rule in the United States,” which his student Paul Spickard has edited for this inaugural issue, indicates that the dominant European Americans began enforcing rules of hypodescent during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The objective was to draw social distinctions between the dominant “white” European Americans and the subordinate “non-white” groups of color.⁴⁰ Hypodescent was implemented primarily in the area of interracial intimacy, and more specifically, interracial marriages, in an attempt to preserve so-called white racial “purity” as well as white racial privilege. It has been applied most stringently to the first-generation offspring of unions between European Americans and people of color. Frequently these “mixed” individuals, and particularly successive generations of individuals whose lineage has included a particular background of color, along with European ancestry, however, have been allowed more flexibility in terms of their self-identifications.

This elasticity has not been extended to individuals of African American and European American descent. The first-generation offspring of interracial relationships between African Americans and European Americans, as well as later generations of individuals whose lineage has included African American, along with European American ancestry, have experienced the most restrictive rule of hypodescent: the one-drop rule.⁴¹ The one-drop rule of hypodescent designates as black everyone with any African American ancestry (“one drop of blood”). This mechanism, which is unique to the United States, has historically precluded any choice in self-identification, and ensured that all future offspring of African American ancestry have been socially designated as black. The rule also conveniently functioned to exempt white landowners (particularly slaveholders) from the legal obligation of passing on inheritance and other benefits of paternity to their multiracial progeny born of coercive sexual relations as in extended concubinage or rape involving slave women of African descent. Yet these offspring were slaves contingent upon the status of the mother, not the one-drop rule. Accordingly, the rule did not increase the numbers of slaves, but rather, the numbers of blacks whether slave or free. The one-drop rule gained currency as the informal or “commonsense”⁴² definition of blackness between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. It did not become a customary part of the legal apparatus until the early twentieth century (circa 1915).⁴³ However, its legacy continued to help maintain white racial privilege by supporting legal and informal barriers to racial equality in most aspects of social life. At the turn of the twentieth century, for example, these legal restrictions reached extreme proportions with the institutionalization of Jim Crow segregation.

US attitudes toward the “dual minority” offspring of unions between African Americans and other groups of color (e.g., Native Americans) have varied. These individuals have generally been subject to the one-drop rule and monoracial formations.⁴⁴ There has been greater ambivalence displayed toward dual minority offspring whose ancestry has combined other backgrounds of color. These include Asian Indian/Mexican Americans (“Punjabi Mexicans”)⁴⁵ and Filipino/Mexican Americans (“Mexipinos”) in California.⁴⁶ These other groups of color occupy a more ambiguous position in the US racial hierarchy

compared to that of blacks. Also, membership in these groups—except perhaps in the case of Native Americans—has been less clearly defined in US law. That said, in each of these cases, monoracial norms have disallowed the recognition of multiracial identities.

Monoraciality, along with rules of hypodescent, has suppressed multiracial identities through macro-aggressions and meso-aggressions involving institutions and organizations respectively that structure the behavior of actors in the political and cultural economy. Marc P. Johnston and Kevin L. Nadal argue that the rule has also sustained micro-aggressions in the sphere of interpersonal relations, where individuals are the perpetrators.⁴⁷ Whether intentional or unintentional, these discriminatory attitudes and practices form part of what they refer to as “monoracism.”⁴⁸ Monoraciality, and its companion hypodescent, particularly in the United States, is part of what Pierre Bourdieu defines as the “doxa,” that is, the sphere of sacred, sacrosanct, or unquestioned social concepts or dogmas that have acquired the force of nature.⁴⁹ It is the lynchpin not only of US constructions of whiteness and its associated privileges, but also unearned social advantages, including cultural, social, economic, political, and other resources, which accrue to European Americans as well as traditional groups of color (“monoracial privilege”).⁵⁰

Monoracial claims originating in rules of hypodescent are the basis for normative patterns of identification in the United States. If, however, monoraciality and hypodescent go hand in hand, they are not necessarily synonymous. The impetus behind support of monoraciality and rules of hypodescent by extension, among European Americans compared to communities of color, differs considerably. European Americans historically formulated hypodescent to sustain monoracial imperatives based on the dichotomous as well as hierarchical ranking of racial (and cultural) differences in support of white racial exclusivity. George Lipsitz maintains that the resulting “possessive investment” in whiteness has been critical to maintaining white racism and racial privilege⁵¹ notwithstanding the increasing repudiation beginning in the 1960s and 1970s of notions of white racial purity that supported the ideology of white supremacy.

The unintended consequences for groups of color, especially African Americans, was that by drawing boundaries that excluded Americans of color from having contact as equals with European Americans, hypodescent has legitimated and forged monoracial group identities among the former. Their tenacious and persistent embrace of and “possessive investment” in hypodescent and monoraciality is grounded in the belief that they are necessary for maintaining solidarity, as well as community, in the continuing struggle against the inequities perpetuated by white racism, oppression, and privilege.⁵² In other words, European Americans have devised and enforced patterns of exclusion based on racial differences, that is, pluralism in support of hierarchy (inegalitarian pluralism); groups of color maintain a sense of community among themselves grounded in a positive affirmation of these differences, that is, pluralism without hierarchy (egalitarian pluralism). Consequently, an African American identity, for example, is not a mindless embrace of “the blackness that whiteness created,”⁵³ and thus an indication that individuals have been duped by hypodescent. Rather, communities of color uphold monoraciality and the accompanying dichotomization of racial differences by *rearticulating*, rather than *reproducing*, rules of hypodescent.⁵⁴ According to racial formation theory “rearticulation” involves infusing familiar concepts and ideas with new meanings and purposes. This essentially involves repetition of hypodescent with a difference in support of racial difference without hierarchy, that is, difference based on equality.

That said, multiracial identity formations interrogate monoracial norms supporting notions of white racial “purity” as well as European Americans’ investment in whiteness and its attendant privileges. They also call into question the equally profound investment communities of color have in preserving monoracial identities, a mindset that overlooks, or outright rejects, the possibility of a multiracial identity formulated on egalitarian or antiracist, that is, critical, premises. A critique of monoraciality does not, however, ignore the fact that multiraciality can be complicit, whether intentionally or unintentionally, in maintaining racist structures that oppress racialized “others” (e.g.,

racial regimes that have been premised on white racial privilege). Indeed, survey research indicates that educational attainment, occupational opportunities, and family income among African-descent Americans, for example, increases considerably with lighter skin regardless of one's identification.⁵⁵ Similar patterns have been documented among other groups (e.g., Latinas/os).⁵⁶

Michael Hughes and Bradley R. Hertel conclude that skin color continues to operate as a "diffuse status characteristic" although hair texture, eye color, as well as nose and lip shape are also important.⁵⁷ European Americans, even if only unconsciously, often select individuals of color who more closely approximate them in physical appearance, believing they are making impartial decisions based on competence or other criteria. Verna Keith, Cedric Herring, and other scholars, by contrast, hold that European Americans may consciously express a preference for individuals of color who more closely approximate their phenotypical norms as well as assumed behavioral and attitudinal characteristics.⁵⁸ Nowhere is this more apparent than in the media, entertainment industry, and world of high fashion—to name only a few obvious areas—where there are advantages that accrue to those who more closely approximate the dominant European American aesthetic pervading those cultural spheres.⁵⁹ Many individuals of color internalize similar biases when judging individuals in their own racial group and other groups of color.⁶⁰

An interrogation of monoracial norms is not, therefore, dismissive of the fact that phenotypical preferences may disproportionately benefit multiracial-identified individuals even though they are a minority of the population. This pervasive bias that favors individuals of color across racial groups who more closely approximate European Americans in physical appearance, regardless of self-identification, is not, however, in and of itself, synonymous with or indicative of openness and receptivity to a multiracial *identity*. Moreover, this critique should not be understood as a dismissal of monoracial forms of identification as illegitimate. Neither does it obviate the necessity of interrogating how mixed-race formations can reinscribe notions of authenticity that impose a multiracial identity on others who chose to identify otherwise. The main purpose is, rather, to question the external ascription of monoracial categories of identification as the norm against which all other forms of identification are deemed unacceptable.

Even the current formula, for example, which allows individuals to check more than one box in the collection and tabulation of data as in the census, puts forth the notion that multiracial-identified individuals primarily should view themselves as parts of various or multiple monoracial communities rather than also as constituents of a multiracial collective subjectivity. In fact the current census configuration was designed in part to avert that eventuality.⁶¹ That said, the monoracial (or singular racial) mindset that underpins the formation of whiteness and "other" categories of racial difference is itself reflective of an even broader "monological" paradigm premised on an "either/or" mentation,⁶² which erases complexity, multiplicity, and ambiguity.⁶³ Singularity is the norm in terms of the construction of all categories of difference encompassing race, gender, sexuality, and a host of other categories of experience including one's stance on critical social issues relating to morality and politics.⁶⁴

It is also important to point out the critical distinction between the "new" or contemporary mixed-race identities, meaning those formed largely during the post-Loving and post-civil rights era, as compared to some previous ones. Previous and contemporary identity formations involve resistance to normative configurations. However, in previous strategies multiracial individuals have frequently sought to achieve social advantages closer to those of whites in the racial hierarchy.⁶⁵ This has been true of tactics such as passing, for example, among African Americans. The phenomenon of "passing" has typically occurred when individuals of a more European American phenotype and cultural orientation have made a covert break with the African American community, either temporarily or permanently, in order to enjoy the privileges of the white community. Though commonly viewed as a form of opportunism, passing can also be considered an underground tactic.⁶⁶ As artist Adrian Piper observed in "Passing for White, Passing for Black," "...if you are not inclined toward any form of overt political

advocacy, passing in order to get the benefits you know you deserve may seem the only way to defy the system.”⁶⁷

Those individuals who were unwilling or unable to pass often distanced themselves from the black masses by forming elite groups known as “blue-vein societies.” These exclusive groups shaped and perpetuated a pernicious colorism among African-descent Americans by giving preferential treatment to individuals in who more closely resembled European Americans in terms of consciousness, behavior, and phenotype.⁶⁸ Meanwhile, after the US annexation of Louisiana and the Gulf ports of Mobile, Natchez, and Pensacola in the early nineteenth century, and the subsequent implementation of the one-drop rule, many mixed-race “Creoles of color” fought to maintain the privileges they enjoyed under French and Spanish rule. Their social status had been considerably inferior to that of whites but somewhat superior to that of blacks. Others responded by passing for white. Still others joined blacks in challenging the onslaught of segregationist policies in the Jim Crow era.⁶⁹

In the nineteenth century, some multiracials formed separate communities, either on the fringes of villages and towns or in isolated rural enclaves commonly referred to by social scientists, if not the communities themselves, as “triracial isolates.” These communities have been scattered throughout the eastern United States, particularly in the southeast. They are known to have European, Native American, and African ancestry; historically they have affirmed only their Native American and European American ancestries, and some have fought for federal recognition as Native American groups.⁷⁰ Some of these groups, including the Melungeons, have begun to affirm their African, along with their Native American and European, ancestry.⁷¹ Since the mid-twentieth century, many individuals from these communities have migrated to the cities. This trend, along with increased intermarriage (generally with European Americans), has led to the extinction of many communities and the loss of collective identity.

Admittedly, in these cases, previous identities were generated by racist pressure that rewarded whiteness and punished blackness. Consequently, they have been less a reaction to the forced denial of European American ancestry than to the denial of the privileges that have accrued to such ancestry. Though interrogating racial categories, and perhaps subverting the racial hierarchy between whiteness and blackness that buttressed those categories, these strategies were rarely aimed at dismantling the hierarchy. The contemporary multiracial identity formations, unlike these previous ones, are not synonymous with a desire to secure a social location closer to that of whites in the racial hierarchy. Rather, they contest the mutually exclusive nature of racial boundaries and also challenge the hierarchical valuation of racial (and cultural) differences.

This does not dismiss the fact that some individuals may identify as multiracial out of a desire to enhance their status in the hierarchy as have previous identities, rather than challenge that hierarchy. Those who display *critical* multiracial identities resist pressures to conform to the existing racial order, with its inequitable power relations. Many will devote their energies to developing organizations and institutions that address mixed-race concerns and will also become part of the larger antiracist struggle.⁷² Notwithstanding the historical examples in which multiracials have unequivocally sought to advance their own interests in a manner that furthered racial hierarchy, there is no substantive evidence to support any contention that individuals who embrace the contemporary multiracial identities are collectively and invariably seeking to achieve that goal.

“BETWIXT AND BETWEEN”: WHAT IS MIXED RACE?

Prior to the 1980s, identity formation of contemporary offspring of racial intermarriages had received limited attention from educators, researchers, social scientists, and mental health professionals. The extant research was outdated, contradictory, or based on small-scale case studies of children who were experiencing “problems” with identity and were referred for psychological counseling. In terms of children with black and white parentage, most professionals stressed the importance of learning to cope as African Americans, because society would view them as such. Their mental health was assessed in terms of how successfully or unsuccessfully they achieved a black identity.⁷³

Previously, it was argued that the marginality or the sense of being “betwixt and between,” which originated in the experience of being multiracial, itself was necessarily pathological. It was the source of life-long personal conflict characterized by divided loyalties, ambivalence, and hypersensitivity.⁷⁴ Admittedly, such theories emerged when the United States was significantly more hostile to the affirmation of a multiracial identity. These theorists rarely focused on the social forces that made psychological functioning difficult for multiracials. Rather, multiracial individuals were characterized as psychologically dysfunctional because this image reinforced what Cynthia L. Nakashima calls an existing “multiracial mythology” that discouraged racial blending, thereby protecting and seeking to preserve white racial purity and dominance.⁷⁵

This pathological view of marginality, based largely upon misinterpretations of sociologist Robert E. Park’s (1864–1944) “marginal man” thesis in the 1920s, supported the prevailing ideology, which prohibited or discouraged miscegenation and ignored the sociological forces that put multiracial individuals at risk psychologically. Consequently, these theories of “negative” marginality, especially the work of sociologist Everett V. Stonequist (1901–1979), distorted or ignored the nuances of Park’s actual theory of marginality. Consequently, that line of reasoning overshadowed Park’s argument that marginality and the accompanying ability to identify with more than one racial or cultural group, could imbue individuals with a broader vision and wider range of sympathies. Park did envision the marginal individual as a person who stood on the margin of two racial/cultural and often mutually exclusive and hostile worlds, and thus not fully a member of either world. He nevertheless believed that whatever alienation marginal individuals may experience could be counterbalanced by the role such individuals might play in facilitating mutual understanding between groups and between individuals from different groups. This “positive” marginality in turn would assist social scientists in gaining deeper insights into the dynamics of race and ethnic relations, and perhaps eventually how to improve them.⁷⁶

By the 1980s, a new wave of research refuted the earlier theories of “negative” marginality that stressed psychological dysfunction.⁷⁷ In turn, the concept of “positive” marginality (or liminality)⁷⁸ has gained greater acceptance among health professionals. Liminality (from the Latin *limen*, “boundary or threshold”) is typically associated with the initiation rites of adolescent youth to adulthood among traditional peoples, for example, in parts of Africa, Latin America, and the Pacific. Victor Turner theorized liminality in his work on festivals and *communitas*, as referring to those marginal social spaces outside of everyday constraints that liberate participants from routine activity. Liminality comes out of social rupture or discontinuity (pilgrimages, carnivals, religious conversions, life transitions, and holidays) and, although not always neat and tidy, the event is transformative and generative.⁷⁹ A similar dynamic can be observed in individuals who are simultaneously members of two or more racially or culturally distinct groups (multiracials, second-generation immigrants or recent migrants from country to city, and women in non-traditional female roles).⁸⁰ It is also applicable to practices, cultures, frames for knowing the world, and modes of communication—between, for instance, the divine and secular, university and workplace, private and public, linguistic and nonlinguistic.⁸¹ These

categories follow a similar path from “either/or” to “both/neither.” In this “twilight zone” the absolute truth about any pair of opposites is their inherent ambiguity as relative extremes on a continuum of grays.

The new scholarship beginning in the 1980s acknowledged that the liminality experienced by multiracials may result in various ambiguities, strains, and conflicts in a society that views racial identities as mutually exclusive categories of experience. Nevertheless, such potentially negative feelings can be counterbalanced by an increased sensitivity to commonalities and an appreciation of racial and cultural differences in interpersonal and intergroup situations.⁸² One case in point is President Barack Obama.⁸³ The immediacy of Obama’s interracial parentage, his rearing outside the continental United States, in Hawai‘i and Indonesia, by his white mother and her relatives, along with his Indonesian step-father, has imbued his consciousness with a broader vision and wider-ranging sensibilities in forming his identity.⁸⁴ To some, this has enhanced his image as the physical embodiment of the principles of inclusiveness and equity.

That said, Obama’s identity is situated in the black community and extends outward from that location.⁸⁵ This differs from a multiracial identity, which manifests itself “betwixt and between” the boundaries of “traditional” racial groups although these groups may vary depending on the region and the backgrounds involved. A multiracial identity extends outward from this liminal location contingent upon individuals’ orientation toward the groups that compose their background.⁸⁶ Despite myriad backgrounds, experiences, and identities, multiraciality has become the basis of an emergent collective subjectivity. No matter how porous, fuzzy, and thin the boundary, no matter how soft and illusive the center of that collectivity, the shared liminality based on identification with more than one racial background is an integral, fundamental part of the self-conception of multiracial-identified individuals, and a defining component of the mixed-race experience. Most multiracials will never know, meet, or even hear of each other. Yet in their minds lives the image of their communion (or imagined community), which provides connections across social and geographical space as well as across time.⁸⁷

MULTIGENERATIONAL MULTIRACIALITY AND THE LOVING GENERATION

Many scholars and critics note that the 1967 decision in *Loving v. Virginia*, which deemed all anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional, was a key turning point in the visibility of mixed-race peoples. This landmark case coincided with and was indeed catalytic in the emergence of what Maria P. P. Root has called the “biracial baby boom.”⁸⁸ Yet Rainier Spencer cautions against framing mixed race as “new and different” in ways that fail to take into consideration the extensive and centuries-old racial blending in the United States, for example, among African Americans.

Indeed, given that humans first evolved in eastern Africa millennia ago, everyone in the United States is in some sense an African-descent American, quite apart from those individuals who are also descendants of the West African Diaspora associated with the Atlantic slave trade from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. Between 90,000 and 180,000 years ago, populations from an earlier African diaspora spread throughout Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Pacific; perhaps as early as 30,000 years ago and at least as recently as 15,000 years ago they migrated to the Americas. As they adapted to various environments they evolved into geographical populations displaying differences in various bodily features. Some of the externally visible features—skin color, hair, and facial morphology—are commonly referred to as “racial traits.” Michael Banton, Steve Olson, and others have pointed out that although all humans share 99.9 percent of their genes, 0.1 percent of the genetic material of human beings expresses the physical differences among people that are transmitted from one’s ancestors.⁸⁹

But there are populations that, taken as aggregates, exhibit higher incidences of particular genetic and physical traits than do other populations, taken as aggregates. Nevertheless, the boundaries

delineating populations have always been eroded through human contact and interactions with each other—whether through migration, trade, or war. We must also contend with the fact that if you trace back twenty generations each individual has over one million ancestors that span the globe. If we trace back even further, the number of ancestors, as well as the myriad possibilities in terms of their geographical origins and “racial” composition is staggering, regardless of how one identifies.⁹⁰

Generally speaking, the smaller the proportion of any given ancestry the more probable it is that genetic material inherited from that ancestry is also proportionately smaller. For example, having one or more West African ancestors does not guarantee that individuals will transmit measurable genetic information from those forbearers or exhibit discernible West African phenotypical traits.⁹¹ Indeed, individuals may be of partial West African and West European ancestry, yet appear completely European. This “illusion” of complete “whiteness” is attributable to the fact that the human visual system is unable to perceive information at the genetic level. Technological innovation in genetic sequencing has afforded us the means to discern DNA inherited from both West African and West European ancestors.⁹² The US one-drop rule, which uses ancestry as the criterion for racial designations, has designated as black all individuals of any traceable West African ancestry irrespective of one’s geno-phenotype or racially blended ancestry.

On the one hand, critical mixed race studies places mixed race at the center of focus and encompasses analyses, portrayals, and renderings of the racial consciousness and agency among racially mixed people. It also examines social forces that inform mixed-race experiences and identities. On the other hand, the field also brings into sharp focus the extensive “racial blending” that has characterized human history from time immemorial but that has been ignored, obscured, and erased by several hundred years of Eurocentric thought supporting notions of racial (and cultural) purity. This phenomenon was shaped by new ideologies and practices that accompanied the colonial expansion of Western European nation-states beginning in the fifteenth- and early sixteenth century. Although expansion, conquest, exploitation, and enslavement have been longstanding aspects of human history, these phenomena were not supported by ideologies or social systems based on race until the beginning of West European colonialism. Increased competitiveness among the nation-states of Europe, the cultural and phenotypic differences between Europeans and the populations of the Americas, Asia, the Pacific Islands, and Africa, and the relative ease with which the European colonizers were able to dominate those populations influenced European perceptions of all non-Europeans. This in turn laid the foundation for the full development of the concept of race and racialized thinking over the course of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, which justified both the conquest as well as enslavement of Africans, particularly in the Americas.⁹³

As a consequence of Western European colonial expansion, the Americas have become the site of unprecedented combinations and blending of indigenous peoples, Africans, and Europeans, and immigrants from across the globe. In the United States, the contrast between the historical “multigenerational multiraciality” that was a corollary to Western European colonial expansion and the contemporary “first-generation” experiences of individuals who compose the “biracial baby boom” since *Loving* is underscored by the fact that the latter is frequently viewed as a more legitimate basis for a “multiracial identity.” Reasons for this are related to the repeal of anti-miscegenation laws in the 1967 *Loving* decision and the liberalization of social attitudes on race over the past four decades. Moreover, the contemporary first-generation experience originates in the context of interracial marriage and thus includes an element of choice. Marriage confers equal legal status on both parties and, by extension, equal legitimacy on both parents’ identities. Rules of hypodescent and monoracial norms, therefore, have been less consistently enforced, both in theory and in practice, in the case of their offspring many of whom have increasingly embraced a multiracial, rather than, monoracial, identity.⁹⁴

It is myopic, however, to restrict the parameters of discussions of multiraciality to the experience of first-generation individuals born since the removal of the last anti-miscegenation laws. This perspective ignores the experience of earlier generations of first-generation individuals, as well as generations of their offspring, who have struggled, and continue to struggle, to liberate their identities from hypodescent and monoracial norms. In order to better understand what has been termed the “biracial baby boom” it is thus crucial to point out the differences in historical contexts and constraints associated with previous interracial relationships and manifestations of multiraciality, particularly in terms of identity, compared to contemporary ones.

Drawing on Spencer’s research Steven F. Riley, from *Mixedracestudies.org*, summarizes, “*Loving* [vs. Virginia] neither increased the number of interracial marriages in the South nor did it create a so-called late-20th century ‘biracial baby boom’—the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 did that by increasing immigration from Asia and Latin America.”⁹⁵ In the case of mixed-race individuals of Asian/Asian American descent, we would also add that missionary history, commerce, militarization, as well as US wars in Asia and the Pacific have played significant roles in the development of mixed Asian demographics in the United States and abroad. This is not to diminish the legal and social significance of the aforementioned civil rights movement and immigration laws but rather to remind us that mixed race is not a new phenomenon.

The statistical significance of *Loving* may be limited given that it was most relevant in the Southern states and did not result in a significant growth in the numbers of black and white intermarriages, which have been very small compared to that of other groups. In 2008, black-white marriages were 14.4 percent among black men and 6.5 percent among black women. In 2010, 8.4 percent of all marriages were interracial, and only about 8.9 percent of all married blacks were wedded to a nonblack partner.⁹⁶ However, *Loving* removed the negative legal sanction and stigma associated with interracial marriage, and thus legitimized such marriages that were previously proscribed.⁹⁷ Although *Loving*’s statistical significance may be limited in terms of increased racial intermarriage, circumstances would be considerably different if those proscriptions had not been removed.

If *Loving* is often overemphasized by many scholars, activists, and the popular media as a watershed in terms of multiraciality, its significance should not be diminished by the fact that its legal impact was most applicable to black-white relations, which is a small portion of interracial marriages. All collective subjectivities have a creation mythology, that is, a symbolic and imaginative narrative that explains and speaks to deeply meaningful questions held by and about a group’s origins and sense of community. This in turn serves as a framework for the self-identity of its members, which they can present to themselves and the larger world. The power of *Loving* is therefore in its positive affectivity or emotional resonance as a historic landmark in the development of a sense of community, evident in the annual June 12th *Lovingday.org* celebrations across the United States.⁹⁸

ORGANIZATIONS, NETWORKS, AND COMMUNITY

Some of the celebratory images of multiraciality that emerged out of the mixed-race movement, a grassroots initiative for interracial families and multiracial-identified individuals, provided a space from which to address and remedy marginalization and frequently outright erasure and pathologization. These framings have been criticized for positing notions of multiracials as “happy hybrids,” “racial ambassadors,” or “postracial messiahs.” The mainstream media have also been accused of reinforcing and perpetuating these overenthusiastic images.⁹⁹ Yet the focus on individual and group valorization is an important step towards the analysis of institutional and everyday forms of discrimination originating in monoracial imperatives directed at multiracial individuals and concerns. The grassroots initiatives of the multiracial movement have had a significant impact on and indeed have helped inform the intellectual and cultural production

in the emerging field of mixed race studies. This was empowered in part by the 2000 US Census, which, for the first time, and largely through the activism of multiracial organizations, allowed multiracial-identified individuals to self-enumerate by checking more than one racial box on the census. On the 2000 census, multiracials (or the “more than more race” population) totaled 7 million or 2.4 percent of the population. Based on 2010 census data their numbers increased to 9 million people—or 2.9 percent of the population. Although multiracials still make up only a fraction of the total population, this is a growth rate of about 32 percent since 2000.¹⁰⁰

This multiracial movement was largely formed by interracial families and the coming-of-age mixed race/mixed heritage activists who founded community organizations like the San Francisco Bay Area’s iPride (1978),¹⁰¹ Chicago’s Biracial Family Network (1981), Houston’s Interracial Family Alliance (1982), Washington DC’s Interracial Family Circle (1983), Eugene Oregon’s Honor Our New Ethnic Youth (1983), Los Angeles’ A Place for Us National (1984), among others. A number of key organizations were also established during this time, such as the national umbrella organization Association of MultiEthnic Americans, founded 1988, Multiracial Americans of Southern California (MASC), founded in 1986 and incorporated in 1989, Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally) (1991), Hapa Issues Forum (1992), and Seattle’s MAVIN foundation and magazine (1998).¹⁰²

Many scholars, including the editors of this journal, have been loosely or even directly affiliated with such organizations. For example, Laura Kina served on the MAVIN board of directors (2010–2012), and Wei Ming Dariotis has served on the boards of both Hapa Issues Forum (1999–2003) and iPride (2005–2008). G. Reginald Daniel is a member and serves on the advisory board of MASC (1988–present) and has served on the advisory boards of AMEA (1989–2010), as well as Project RACE (1992–1997). Other early multiracial organizations included the Amerasian League, the Amergroid Society, the Tirah Society, and My Shoes. Periodicals such as *Interrace Magazine*, *Interracial Voice* (originally *Interracial Classified*),¹⁰³ *Metisse*, *The Multiracial Activist*, *MAVIN*, and *New People* raised awareness of mixed-race issues across the United States and were part of the 1990s burgeoning of “multiracial chic.”¹⁰⁴

The multiracial movement developed through these community activist initiatives but has encompassed a variety of organizations and concerns apart from the census. Since the height of the movement’s political activities surrounding the census debate in the late 1990s, these outlets have expanded considerably in terms of richness, diversity, and numbers. Some of this is attributable to the fact that many multiracials, who in their teens or even younger in the 1990s, are now young adults or adults who are specifically articulating mixed-race concerns. These new entities differ from many of the earlier ones, which were founded and commandeered by interracial couples to address the concerns of interracial families, including support of their multiracial offspring.

The movement has also been informed by social networking as well as student organizing in academia and heavily influenced by the scholarship of various individuals of the intersecting fields of American Indian studies, Asian American studies, the arts and new media studies, black studies, cultural studies, literary studies, history, Latin@/Chican@ studies, multidisciplinary social sciences and philosophy, among others.¹⁰⁵ Accordingly, organizations and social networks have played a vital role in forming identities, defining and debating interests, and developing institutions critical to mixed-race concerns. Yet race-based social networks and organizations in the United States typically originate in communities that already display well-established identities as collective subjectivities and have been instrumental in further developing the identities, interests, and institutions of their constituents.¹⁰⁶ In the United States, multiracials have historically been largely erased from the national racial landscape by monoracial imperatives. For the most part, race-based organizations and social networks have not originated in already existing communities. Rather, organizations and social networks that focus on mixed-race concerns have been catalytic in originating an “oppositional consciousness.”¹⁰⁷ This has not

only served as the basis for the multiracial movement but also has been instrumental in forming and informing a mixed-race collective subjectivity (or community) within the US racial order where none previously existed.¹⁰⁸

By the mid-2000s with the rise of online social networking, websites, blogs, podcasts, meet-ups, and Facebook, groups dedicated to mixed-race issues became increasingly important and to some extent gained preeminence over popular print periodicals. This culminated in resourceful websites such as Steve Riley's *Mixed Race Studies* (mixedracestudies.org) and Glen Robinson's *Mixed American Life* (mixedamericanlife.wordpress.com). Critical mixed race studies scholars have participated in the development of and been active in contributing to and been informed by the scholarly work of the multiracial movement. This can be seen in the way Andrew J. Jolivette (who also served on the board of iPride), in "Critical Mixed-Race Studies: The Intersections of Identity and Social Justice," constructs the idea of critical mixed race studies as a kind of activist coalition. Jolivette writes,

Acknowledging multiple aspects of society and utilizing multiple worldviews, this [critical mixed race studies] perspective develops the potential to create new frameworks that go beyond colorblind or post-racial movements that suggest we should be a nation where race, gender, and sexuality do not matter. By utilizing a critical mixed-race sociological framework, I believe we can link common struggles for solidarity together because multiethnic people often have to know more about all sides of themselves than people from one ethnic community.¹⁰⁹

At the same time, both scholar-activists and activist-knowledge creators have been rightfully wary of this alliance. The power in academic institutions (and in academic titles) can have a colonizing impact on community work whereas community work can "authenticate" scholarly work. Therefore, cultivating mutual respect in our community engagements requires particular attention to positionality and power. These alliances are necessary and strategic on both ends as academics lend their credentials to community organizations seeking grants, and community organizing lends credibility to scholars doing research in the community.

HYPOCRITICAL HYBRIDITY AND THE CRITICAL DIFFERENCE

As we move towards creating structures to help legitimize and codify CMRS within the academy, at the same time, we should embrace and expand on the extant new media, arts, and community-based structures. There is immense power and creativity in not always having to be accountable to the academy and in being able to tell our story unmediated by the exigencies of academic pressures and expectations. The academy, as a structure generally speaking, is not well-known for taking risks, responding quickly, being creative, or for being a structure that naturally lends itself to being inclusive of those with the least amount of power.

In the tradition of postmodernist analysis and interpretation, Gilles Deleuze's and Felix Guattari's concept of the rhizome may be a useful tool for resisting the stasis and rigidity of institutional structures. For example, they argue that "a rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, *intermezzo*. The tree is filiation, but the rhizome is alliance, uniquely alliance. The tree imposes the verb "to be," but the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, "and...and...and..."¹¹⁰ In this spirit, we see a variety of concepts and frameworks working towards diverse, and yet interrelated, aims. Some key theoretical and antiracist concepts are useful guides for CMRS work. Some of these ideas include that of "third culture" or "third-space culture."¹¹¹ Paul Spickard described this phenomenon in his analysis of Pacific Islanders, who have thrived "from several generations of racial and cultural

mixing on a footing of relative equality.”¹¹² Chela Sandoval and Daniel also encapsulated these dynamics “based on egalitarian premises” respectively employing the concepts “critical mestizaje” and “critical hybridity.”¹¹³

Postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha has been repeatedly credited with advancing the concept of hybridity. Yet this idea and related concepts, “syncretism” and “creolization,” has informed Latin American racial and cultural analyses long before hybridity became fashionable in the postcolonial studies that Bhabha helped develop in the late twentieth century.¹¹⁴ For example, early and mid-twentieth-century Latin American thinkers such as Gilberto Freyre (1900–1987), Fernando Ortiz (1881–1969), and José Vasconcelos (1882–1959), respectively in Brazil, Cuba, and Mexico,¹¹⁵ produced pioneering efforts on these topics. Their work has been severely criticized for being imbued with a racial romanticism that espouses fanciful notions of “hybrid vigor,” while euphemizing whitening and Europeanization through racial and cultural blending and thus perpetuating assimilationist ideologies.¹¹⁶ Notwithstanding those legitimate caveats, Freyre, Ortiz, and Vasconcelos were instrumental in undermining the prevailing racial thinking inherited from nineteenth-century scientific racism and biological determinism. This line of reasoning warned of the dangers of miscegenation and considered multiracials to be genetically and culturally “inferior” through notions of “hybrid degeneracy.”

Similarly, Robert C. Young states that the celebration of racial hybridity counters the colonialist obsession with racial “purity” and anti-miscegenation sentiments, which were encapsulated in such pejorative terms as “mongrelization.”¹¹⁷ Placed within a colonial cultural context, Bhabha considers hybridity as “heresy” in which a “subject...relocates the symbols of authority, reappropriates them dialogically, and redeploys them in a mixed-up discourse that displaces orthodoxy and deconstructs the rules of identify formation.”¹¹⁸ Renato Rosaldo, like many other critics, defines hybridity “as the ongoing condition of all human cultures, which contain no zones of purity because they undergo continuous processes of transculturation (mutual borrowing and lending between cultures).”¹¹⁹ Indeed, critical analyses of racial and cultural hybridity lend themselves to rendering the complexities and contradictions generated by the global circulation of peoples and cultural goods in a mediated and interconnected world. The contemporary hybrid globalized human subject, for example, is increasingly confronted with the challenge of moving among the diverse modalities of sharply contrasting cultural and ideological worlds. Accordingly, hybrid identities are not reducible to fixed formula; rather, they form a changing repertory of configurations.¹²⁰

Hybridity, mixed race, and multiraciality are not, however, inherently transcultural (or transracial) and therefore necessarily egalitarian.¹²¹ These concepts are simply integrationist and premised on the deconstruction of dichotomous notions of purity. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam point out that this deconstruction should not obscure the potentially problematic implications and impact of hybridity.¹²² It can create the illusion of equality and risks downplaying selective and inegalitarian forms of inclusion that deflect attention away from continuing patterns of exclusion and isolation premised on domination. These structures effectively maintaining forms of exploitation and control that reproduce hierarchies, racial and otherwise, in a new guise.¹²³

Within the context of Latin America, for example, national racial and cultural identities have been officially articulated as hybrid, multiracial, egalitarian, and integrationist. Yet they have been premised on hypocritically multiracial ideologies based on what Eduardo Bonilla-Silva refers to as “colorblind racism,”¹²⁴ which has maintained, rather than challenged, racial hierarchy. The celebration of hybridity within Latin America institutionalizes colorblind racism. This erasure of racial (and cultural) distinctions has deliberately masked subtle forms of selective and inequitable inclusion while diverting public attention as well as policy away from tackling continuing racial inequities based on informal pervasive exclusion. Any study of mixed race and multiraciality must, therefore, be refracted through a critical lens that explicitly scrutinizes and interrogates the potentially problematic agency and implications of hybridity. This requires being attentive to unequal

power relations and the ensuing exploitation that the implied conviviality of hybridity, mixed race, and multiraciality can easily obscure.¹²⁵

Indeed, the multiracial phenomenon in the U.S. is situated amid powerfully contradictory forces at play in the post-civil rights racial order with accompanying new dangers as well as new opportunities. This racial order is marked by continuing and deep patterns of race-based exclusion and inequality alongside increased opportunities for some blacks and other individuals of color who have been able to take advantage of the comparatively more open and inclusive social relations. So the thinking goes, these “successful” individuals have overcome obstacles through sheer determination and merit alone. They fulfill the American dream and serve as living testaments to the much-vaunted colorblind tenets espoused in the nation’s founding documents.

Conservatives have not only succeeded in enrolling some of these individuals in their ranks but these compelling “lift-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps” personal narratives also have made it possible for conservatives to frame liberals (particularly European Americans) as patronizing bigots (or racist “complainers”). Communities of color are viewed as collective self-victimizers that bemoan racial discrimination against groups, while at best significantly underestimating and at worst undermining the power of individual agency. Correspondingly, conservatives have deployed colorblind rhetoric arguing that civil rights and other initiatives eradicated ascribed markers such as race. Social inequities are now said to be largely attributable to other factors, class and culture, which are subject to change through effects of merit and achievement. Compensatory measures such as affirmative action are now considered part of a racial spoils system that at worst is a form of “reverse racism” against whites. Even the concept of multiculturalism in support of racial and cultural diversity is often believed to intensify and prolong the fixation on race and racial categories, which supposedly impedes the national project of unifying individuals as Americans.¹²⁶

The belief that the United States has transcended racism—commonly referred to as “metaracism”—along with the colorblind and more recent postracial ideology, became the cornerstone of US race relations during the last two decades of the twentieth century.¹²⁷ In 2013, this was evinced in the June 24th and June 25th Supreme Court decisions that respectively undermine the enforcement of affirmative action initiatives¹²⁸ and sections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The latter were intended to prevent certain jurisdictions, primarily among the Southern (and some Western) states, from enforcing historical practices (e.g., white primaries, poll taxes, literacy tests, grandfather clauses, etc.) designed to disenfranchise “racial minorities,” particularly blacks. Those provisions also targeted contemporary discriminatory practices, including voter ID laws and gerrymandering (or redistricting).¹²⁹ Several states have already moved to enact new voter suppression laws and redistricting in the wake of the Supreme Court decision.¹³⁰ Many observers believe this colorblind ideology influenced the dismissal of race as a mitigating factor in the unfolding of events leading to the fatal shooting of African American teenager Trayvon Martin by George Zimmerman, a neighborhood watch coordinator who identifies as “Hispanic.”¹³¹ They contend this ideology was also apparent in the July 13, 2013 not guilty verdict (by a nearly all-white jury) in the Zimmerman trial.¹³²

On the one hand, these developments indicate that the “new” racial order, which emerged in the post-civil rights era, has largely shifted away from white domination although the latter is not absent. Racial differences still serve as the basis of perpetuating social inequality and forms of exclusion.¹³³ Pervasive formal exclusion and coercion have been replaced with more informal dynamics, which are increasingly juxtaposed with patterns of selective and inequitable inclusion. This does not preclude the existence of more egalitarian, if considerably less pervasive, patterns of integration based on equality. However, it follows that integration (inclusiveness) would continue to be deeply marked by more inequalitarian dynamics given that the larger social order is still underpinned by racial hierarchy. Yet the colorblind ideology has the advantage of disregarding the overrepresentation of communities of color, particularly

blacks and Latinas/os, in the secondary labor force and among the ranks of the underemployed and unemployed. Even worse, it fosters the belief that the excluded masses of color could surmount their difficulties if only they had the character and drive to do so.

More important, this ideology has obscured the selective nature of integration in the post-civil rights era, which has made it possible for some individuals of color—particularly the more socioeconomically advantaged—to gain increased access to wealth, power, privilege, and prestige. This selective integration is also reflected in the pervasive bias that favors individuals of color across racial groups, who more closely approximate European Americans in physical appearance. In terms of blacks, this has been accompanied by a decrease in the rigid ascription of the one-drop rule in determining their social location. Overall, skin color, along with other phenotypical features, such as hair texture, eye color, as well as nose and lip shape, etc., working in combination with attitudinal, behavioral, and socioeconomic attributes, has increased as a form of “racial capital.”¹³⁴ The growth, prosperity, and increased integration of some individuals of color does not mean racism has abated. Their partial integration into the white power structure merely furthers the illusion of power sharing without actually requiring whites to give up structural control. Drawing on the work of Antonio Gramsci, Omi and Winant encapsulate the selective nature of this form of integration (or assimilation) with the term “hegemony,” which creates the illusion of equality while effectively allowing dominant groups to maintain power, control, and hierarchy.¹³⁵ This also disguises the fact that US society is still racist to the core.

On the other hand, the new racial order that has emerged in the post-civil rights era holds out the possibility of conceptualizing mixed race, as well as multiraciality and hybridity, by extension, based on egalitarian (i.e., “critical”) premises. According to Naomi Zack, this has the potential to serve as an “intellectual weapon” and “theoretical wedge”¹³⁶ in the pursuit of “colorblind antiracism.”¹³⁷ This is not to suggest that a multiracial *identity* is inherently the solution to racism. Neither does it imply that multiracial-identified individuals themselves herald the emergence of a postracial social order where identities, loyalties, and inequities by extension, based on race are a thing of the past.¹³⁸ Indeed, any such notion is dangerously misleading and naïve. Rather, it posits critical multiraciality as a *template* for engaging in a transgressive *pedagogy* and *praxis*.¹³⁹ This framework critiques racial essentialism and provides the basis for more inclusive collective subjectivities across all racial groups, including multiracials, which facilitate building other issue-based coalitions.

Notwithstanding the ambivalence, if not hostility, displayed toward a multiracial identity among traditional communities of color, as well as some antiracist European Americans—particularly white radicals—the principles that underpin critical multiraciality are very much the same ones that make it possible for European Americans to collaborate with communities of color in antiracist work. Otherwise, European Americans would be essentialized as “enemies,” who are part of the problem, rather than “allies,” who can be part of the solution. This would make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to do antiracist work. Yet coalitional politics premised on critical multiraciality creates a constructive and beneficial relationship between different groups, one marked by mutual respect and interdependence.¹⁴⁰ The shared commitment to community embraces racial and ethnic diversity, while simultaneously working toward an inclusive politics that recognizes the complexity and intersectionality of various types of oppression and how each feeds on the others in order to thrive.¹⁴¹

Consequently, the pursuit of a postracist social order in which racial distinctions would no longer determine, or at least have considerably less significance in determining, individuals’ social location in terms of wealth, power, privilege, and prestige, would be a necessary component of, if not a prerequisite to, a genuinely postracial society where racial porosity provides the foundation upon which to simultaneously construct identities grounded in the greater humanity.¹⁴² The various discourses of CMRS are dynamic agglomerations that seek to address those concerns. Like Michael Hardt’s and Antonio Negri’s notion of “multitude,” there is the potential for coordination, coalition,

and alliance among the diverse lines of thinking around mixed racialization.¹⁴³ In fact, this history of the development of CMRS is already a rhizomatic history, and one that has involved various kinds of coalitions and alliances. In writing “a history” of these multiple pathways, which have not always lead into a dominant stream or even a shared definition, it is important to be heedful of that fact so they are not erased.

In sum, CMRS focuses on mixed ethnic and racial background/heritage as well as transracial adoption populations. It is equally concerned with social justice and antiracism, and is particularly attentive to how racial groups and racial hierarchies are constructed through processes of racialization. CMRS analyzes socio-historical contexts of slavery and US colonialisms; US empire and its consequences in Asia, the Pacific, and Latin America; the rise of cosmopolitan citizens and the new globalization; the women’s, civil rights, black power, brown power, yellow power, red power, as well as the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ) movements; and the post-1967 growth in the numbers offspring from interracial marriages. In more recent decades, other historical movements and moments have continued to have an impact on the development of CMRS: the rise of multiculturalism and identity politics of the 1980s and 1990s; the multiracial movement surrounding the census debate; mixed race and indigeneity; the marriage-equality movement; and our present so-called “post-ethno/racial,” transnational neo-imperialist/globalist moment. CMRS scholars explore these issues concurrently, understanding how they intersect and are mutually constructed, such as the relationship of mixed race to queer identities, women and feminism; transnationalism and diaspora; and questions of passing as well as authenticity in relation to the narration and counter-narration of the nation and nationalisms.

CRITICAL MIXED RACE STUDIES

Critical mixed race studies encompasses interests and scholars from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, each with its own terminological lineages and associations. Settling on a universally acceptable terminology to designate critical studies of mixed race as an academic discipline will perhaps remain a point of contention. Each label could potentially include or exclude various groups: for example, how are these communities including or excluding transracial adoptees, interracial families, or monoracial people working in the field, or multiethnic individuals? With historically heteronormative underpinnings, how inclusive of queer scholarship is this new development in multiracial studies? This question of naming is really a question of setting boundaries. What we call this field of study in many ways determines the terrain of CMRS, and it is for this reason that the definition should remain fluid. In her “Bill of Rights for People of Mixed Heritage” (which was previously titled “The Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People),”¹⁴⁴ Maria P. P. Root, in the voice of the person of mixed heritage, states, “I have the right:

to create a vocabulary to communicate about being multiracial
to change my identity over my lifetime—and more than once.”

On the one hand, exercising agency and self-determination in creating a language that describes one’s own identity is a hallmark of ethnic studies; but on the other hand, the language that people of mixed backgrounds choose to describe themselves is marked by a history of distrust among communities of color, most notably in the African American community. Blood quantum concepts like “octoroon,” for example, which have often been externally imposed by European Americans, have historically been understood as and, in fact, have often been complicit in furthering a *rejection* of blackness and helping foster a concomitant social divide among African-descent Americans.¹⁴⁵

Similarly, the “right to change my identity over my lifetime” may evoke a feeling that people of mixed backgrounds may choose to “pass” for whiter or lighter than their co-ethnic family or community members, and thus gain access to privileges not available to others. Claiming a multiracial identity has frequently been criticized as an anti-black position.¹⁴⁶ The notion of self-determination also may convey a sense of sidestepping the lived realities of racial ascription.¹⁴⁷ Individuals may not have the ability to determine how they are racialized and, as Michele Elam warns of our “post-racial” moment: “Critical attention to the proselytizing of mixed race acquires some urgency, in part, because its fêting as an up-and-coming legal and experiential category has occurred in inverse relation to the perceived irrelevancy of race, in general, and civil rights campaigns, in particular.”¹⁴⁸ Thus, the challenge of what we call ourselves as people of mixed heritage and as practitioners of a discipline based on the study and explication of mixed-race experiences should attend to these historical dynamics as we move forward. Choosing a name is part of an organized effort to establish CMRS as a recognized academic discipline aimed at supporting scholarship and scholars. Establishing this structure is an important traditional legitimizing step towards academic peer-reviewed recognition, for this emergent field will allow formal systems of mentorship for graduate students and junior faculty; encourage and foster publication and research; and thus build a greater sense of scholarly community.

INTERNATIONAL AND TRANSNATIONAL CONTEXTS

The terms used to describe someone of mixed heritage—hapa, hafu, mestizo, Eurasian, Métis, mulatto, mixed-blood, among others—have different meanings depending on the country or place of origin. Moreover, each category points to distinct histories of contact among the racialized groups involved and their attendant political, social, and cultural dynamics. The term mixed race or multiracial would have a different meaning in the Caribbean basin, South America, the Philippines, and Hawai‘i where it may be more difficult to delineate racial backgrounds because of centuries of forced migration, colonization, and imperialism, which complicate the history of miscegenation and concept of racial categorization. We must also consider that in some cases, such as Japan, “race” is viewed as a Western problem/construct; and yet, one finds notions of otherness akin to the concept of race that may be completely invisible to outsiders (e.g., discrimination directed at Koreans, Okinawans, and the historic caste of Burakumin).¹⁴⁹

Critical mixed-race work reflects a turn toward comparative racializations that challenge essentialized categories of race. It is also inherently tied to colonial and imperial histories, giving it a transnational and global focus that displaces the United States from the center of critical analysis. The mixing of races is the result of various kinds of migration, both forced and volitional, and it is the outcome of imperial expansion throughout the ages. Moreover, the idea of critical mixed race is not based on essentialized racial categories or some cultural or ethnic similarities—e.g., food, customs, or language—or geographical location. Rather, it is a lens that enables an examination of the comparative processes of racialization without resorting to or privileging any single defined group identity or place in an absolute sense.

An important early comparative global examination of mixed race was provided by Noel P. Gist’s and Anthony Gary Dworkin’s edited volume *The Blending of Races: Marginality and Identity in World Perspective* (1972) and Fernando Henriques’s *Children of Conflict: A Study of Interracial Sex and Marriage* (1975). More recent publications that contribute to these analyses include edited volumes by Mark Christian, *Multiracial Identity: An International Perspective* (2000); Rosalind Edwards, Suki Ali, Chamion Caballero, and Miri Song, *International Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Mixedness and Mixing* (2012); Peter Aspinall and Miri Song, *Mixed Race Identities* (2013); and Rebecca Chiyoko King-O’Rianin,

Stephen Small, Minelle Mahtani, Miri Song, and Paul Spickard, *Global Mixed Race* (forthcoming in 2014).¹⁵⁰ The emerging mixed race scholarship is more expansive, while continuing to remain related to important work in specific geographic regions and within disciplinary contexts. We wanted to highlight the transnational focus that is currently emerging in CMRS because issues of diaspora are increasingly manifest in the study of mixed race in critical ways.

Yet US mixed-race scholarship has not always included the rest of the Americas. When we speak of mixedness or *mestizaje* in the Latin America context, this is inseparable from the history of European conquest and colonization (e.g., Spanish, Portuguese, French, Dutch, Danish, and English), the migration of Asian and Semitic populations, the enslavement of Africans, and the subsequent reframing of the mixed Spanish-Euro/African/Native/Asian people of Latin America as *La Raza Cósmica*. Canada also has distinct multiracial Aboriginal population, such as the Métis. Moreover, issues pertaining to mixed race and mixed ethnic identities are framed within a vocabulary of “visible minorities.” Both Latin American and Canadian racial history is notably different than the US framework of hypodescent and the dominant black/white polarization, yet they all originate in the European Enlightenment systems of racial taxonomy and legacies of colonialism. Like Canada, other former British colonies, such as Australia and New Zealand, are emerging as important sites of CMRS as well as of cultural productions by and about people of mixed heritage; and Great Britain itself has been the location of significant work in this field. Scholars who have had an impact on the development of CMRS in the United States include British and UK-based scholars like Jayne O. Ifekwunigwe (now in the US), Ann Wilson, Suki Ali, Sarah Salih, Denise Williams, and Elaine Bauer; and Canadian scholars like Minelle Mahtani.

Scholarship in languages other than English (e.g., Portuguese, Spanish, and French) has a long history, and there is important scholarship on contemporary mixed race in France and Spain and their former colonies. Transnational scholarship that examines newly emerging mixed-race communities, as well as those from multiple generations of colonial history includes work on Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Italy, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Nigeria, and many other regions constructed outside and beyond national boundaries. One might argue that there is a global scholarship developing to address the many historical as well as emerging mixed-race and mixed-heritage communities and the implications for the construction of nation states, global economies, and notions of tradition, ethnicity, and identity. Thorough reviews of diasporic and transnational scholarship in mixed race studies are needed to clarify and identify key trends and issues outside of the very US-centered discourse that we are describing.

COALESCING: WHO ARE WE? WHERE ARE WE GOING? WHAT NOW?

In January 2008, we began to collaborate on and lay the groundwork for what later became the inaugural conference in Critical Mixed Race Studies in 2010. Laura Kina, Wei Ming Dariotis, and Camilla Fojas met in person for the first time at a multiracial leadership retreat held at Walker Creek Ranch, just north of San Francisco in Petaluma, CA. It was an intimate gathering of twenty leaders from community organizations iPride, MAVIN, and Multiracial Americans of Southern California (MASC), along with academics and artists and filmmakers. Together these academic, activist, and artistic leaders inspired us with their diverse approaches to the issues along the multivalent axes that we identified as critical for the development of the field of mixed race studies. With the 2000 US Census no longer a primary driving and unifying force behind the multiracial movement, mixed-race studies scholars, artists, and activists were at a crossroads in the early part of the new century. On the one hand, as mentioned earlier, there was a palpable excitement and media spotlight on multiracial issues during the run-up to the election of President Barack Obama in 2008. On the other hand, many mixed-heritage or mixed-race

organizations were plagued with waning attendance and lack of financial and institutional support. There was also very little dialogue among the various regional and national organizations on how to work together towards a common goal, since a major goal had been achieved. In some cases, organizations were even competing for the same small bit of turf. There was no system for connecting or mutually supporting this work.

There had been previous attempts to institutionalize mixed-race or multiracial scholarship, notably in the form of a print *Journal of Multiracial Studies* in 2004 by UC Santa Barbara sociology graduate student Josef Castañeda-Liles to scholars G. Reginald Daniel, Paul Spickard, and Maria P. P. Root. However, that effort never came to fruition, and their idea would have to wait until the advent of online open-access peer-reviewed journals in order to become a reality. By 2008, there still was no formal organization of scholars working in the field of mixed race studies. Launched in 2011, following the inaugural 2010 Critical Mixed Race Studies conference (DePaul University Nov 5–6, 2010, organized by Camilla Fojas, Laura Kina, and Wei Ming Dariotis), the *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* is the first academic journal explicitly focused on critical mixed race studies. *JCMRS* was co-founded by G. Reginald Daniel, Wei Ming Dariotis, Laura Kina, and Paul Spickard with honorary founding credit given to Maria P. P. Root as well.

Looking back at the multiracial leadership retreat in 2008, we were asked to address three questions regarding the mixed-race movement and mixed-race studies: Who are we? Where are we going? What now? Rather than the highly-structured format typical of most conferences or retreats, the organizers of the multiracial leadership retreat (Eric Hamako, Farzana Nayani, and Ellie Nagai-Rothe) employed “open source” processes, including using theatre of the oppressed techniques, group drawings, pitching and posting ideas to a community bulletin board, as well as breakout sessions that included a hiking expedition and a conversation about Obama as a mixed-race signifier.

In one of our group drawing exercises, we were asked to each write a vision of what we wanted to be working on by the year 2010, with the goal of our ideas building towards creating a tangible gathering place of knowledge to serve various communities within the multiracial movement. On a yellow Post-it note in bold red ink, Camilla Fojas wrote “Association of Mixed Race Studies” and “Mixed Race Studies—Program, Curriculum, Writing.” Wei Ming Dariotis and Laura Kina each aligned their similarly articulated goals next to hers and the three of us committed to work for the next two years towards this vision. We set about working on the logistics of building an association for CMRS. Rather than pushing directly towards this goal, we determined that initially building a larger community would be a good basis for further work. To that end, we conceived of the inaugural Critical Mixed Race Studies Conference, hammered out a working definition for CMRS, which articulated a mission, vision, values, and goals. Building on this, we created an online and social media presence including a Facebook group for CMRS (now with over 900 members that includes several mixed-race community organizations).

INAUGURAL CRITICAL MIXED RACE STUDIES CONFERENCE 2010

Because of their positions and the political support from their colleagues and administration, Camilla Fojas and Laura Kina were able to secure institutional support (space, staff, financing, marketing) from DePaul University for the 2010 and 2012 CMRS conferences. While Dariotis had dreamt of the event being hosted by the College of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State University, arguably the birthplace of a comprehensive and institutionally supported program in ethnic studies, the financial realities of public higher education in California made this choice impractical. So it was within the perhaps unexpected space of the Midwest and the nation’s largest private Catholic university that the conference for CMRS was realized.¹⁵¹

As we began to plan the conference we thought carefully about the fact that all three of us are Asian/white women in our thirties and forties, and we all hail from the West. Conscious that multiracial black/white people, and increasingly mixed-heritage Asians have framed much of recent mixed-race community and academic discourses, we wanted to push the discussions in new directions in CMRS through our choice of keynote speakers. We selected speakers who would highlight issues of the mixed African American, Native American, and Latin@ experiences along with intersections of class, queer identity, and new methodologies in critical mixed race studies. Mary Beltrán, co-editor of *Mixed Race Hollywood*, was chosen for her critical work on Hollywood “racelessness” and the depiction of mixed-race peoples in popular culture. We invited a scholar known for his work on indigenous and queer mixed-race formation, Andrew J. Jolivette, author of *Louisiana Creoles: Cultural Recovery and Mixed Race Native American Identity* (2007) and *Obama and the Biracial Factor: The Battle for a New American Majority* (2012). We also invited artist/activist Louie Gong, then president of MAVIN and CEO of Eighth Generation, by virtue of his work on indigenous mixed-race communities. For this conference, we had originally imagined that fifty to one hundred academics would attend to grapple with the questions: Who are we? Where are we going? What do we do now? We were also curious to see if there had been a paradigm shift in the type of scholarship and the theoretical and philosophical framework surrounding multiracial issues, hence the conference title “Emerging Paradigms in Critical Mixed Race Studies.”

By summer 2010, with over two hundred proposals for presentations submitted, it became clear that there had been a seismic shift in the mixed-race studies terrain. Fojas and Kina secured additional assistance from staff and faculty volunteers from DePaul’s Latin American and Latino Studies, Global Asian Studies, the Center for Latino Research, and the Center for Intercultural Programs along with a deep line up of DePaul co-sponsors, including a major sponsor, the President’s Office of Institutional Diversity, to make CMRS 2010 a reality. We also partnered with MAVIN, a national non-profit organization devoted to community awareness about mixed-heritage peoples and families, to develop educational and community workshops for the conference, and they also helped us spread the word about CMRS.¹⁵² It was important to centralize the foundational role of community organizations even as we sought to build a legitimizing structure for academics working on multiracial issues. As Andrew J. Jolivette pointed out in his November 5, 2010, keynote address “Critical Mixed Race Studies: New Directions in the Politics of Race and Representation,”

We are clearly not, in the space of this conference, moving toward that Brazilian or South African model where mixed race equals better race or equals no race ... I hope that today, when we say Critical Mixed Race Studies, we too are forming our own critical pedagogies of resistance. In the same way that African American and American Indian women have articulated a womanist approach in distinction to a feminist approach, so too must we offer an approach that does not limit us to one category or one approach, or the ‘lowest common denominator.’ In a womanist approach one continues to be female, of color, queer, differently abled, immigrant. She can hold all these identities.

For Jolivette this new formation is critically resistant to totalizing forces. We are eager to see what develops through intersections with CMRS, parallel to it, outside and inside it, and perhaps without reference to it at all. CMRS is just one starting point from which some networks and webs can be disseminated, and perhaps against which others will organize.

The final CMRS 2010 program was filled with two full days and included 62 sessions of panels, roundtables, and seminars; multiple film screenings; three keynote addresses; a “Mixed Mixer” social event with live jazz music; a performance by comedian Kate Rigg; a community organization and vendor info fair; a book fair; a caucus; and business meetings. Ultimately, over 430 scholars and community activists came

from all over the United States, from Hawai‘i to Tennessee to New York, as well as from Canada, Korea, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. Many of the panels were at full capacity or standing room only, and we held events from morning until night on both days. While the conference was not without the hiccups and pitfalls that accompany any first-time organizing effort, in the hallways and during the breaks people were doing what we hoped they would be doing—building community and making connections.

We were honored to have senior scholars present at CMRS 2010 and representatives from community organizations across the United States. We were also joined by a strong contingent of undergraduate and graduate students from DePaul University and other Chicago-area colleges; a surprisingly high number of graduate students and junior colleagues from across the country; and a critical mass of new media artists and bloggers.

For many attendees, CMRS 2010 was a legitimizing and healing time and space on a personal and professional level. This was a space of intense emotions as people realized that they were not alone. Knowing intellectually about the work of other scholars is quite different from being able to meet them and perhaps see in them a mirror of our own identities. As one conference participant wrote,

When I came home and people asked how the conference went the one thing I kept repeating was how incredibly legitimizing this space was. To know that even when you feel a little marginalized in your department and studies, there are other people who are actively working to make this discourse serious. Even more so than just an academic conference it was really a communal space.¹⁵³

CALL FOR FUTURE ACTION

We also need to remember those who were not part of the inaugural conference in 2010: those who could not, as Louie Gong pointed out in his keynote “Half and Have Nots,” be here because they did not even have access to secondary or higher education in the first place. In addition to struggling to make certain that Native American mixed heritage and queer mixed heritage experiences and scholars were present and highly visible, we also wanted to have present those who had done so much foundational work despite their traditional disciplines ignoring, devaluing, or marginalizing it.

“Emerging Paradigms in Critical Mixed Race Studies” pointed to a generational shift that highlights an exciting yet critical moment in which mixed race 2.0 scholars, if you will, are continuing to interrogate, cross, and present innovative thinking about disciplinary boundaries by bringing together community activism and accountability with the social sciences, humanities, and the arts. At the same time, in all of this demographic and disciplinary “newness” the origins of the field are at risk of being “lost.” Primary documents need to be archived and oral histories need to be gathered. It is time for librarians, archivists, historians, and storytellers to document and reflect back on the movement’s roots in radical social change and antiracist coalition building and to secure a legacy for those who laid a foundation for CMRS. We hope that there is a library or archive willing to make a commitment to hold and care for the papers of our senior scholars, community organizations, elder artists and activists; and if not, then perhaps we need to establish the “Archives of CMRS” in partnership with a library.

We are concerned about structure because we are invested in the sustainability and academic legitimization of CMRS and, at the same time, the type of support structures that we build should be attentive to values such as “openness, collaboration, collegiality, and connectedness, diversity, and experimentation.”¹⁵⁴ With this in mind, the form of the CMRS conference is far from being firmly established or set in stone. The

November 1–4, 2012, CMRS conference at DePaul University was organized by Camilla Fojas. We made three significant changes for this iteration of the conference.

First, Fojas enlisted a programming committee (Greg Carter, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee; Michele Elam, Stanford; Camilla Fojas, DePaul; Rudy P. Guevarra Jr., University of Arizona; Rainier Spencer, University of Nevada, Las Vegas) to review submissions, develop the conference theme “What is Critical Mixed Race Studies?,” and to program the panels. Secondly, the programming committee decided to forgo the conference tradition of keynote speakers in favor of allowing the panel themes to collectively answer the conference query. Lastly, following the strong wave of community-led arts and culture efforts with events such as Hapa-Palooza: A Celebration of Mixed-Roots Arts and Ideas (Vancouver, Canada 2011), for CMRS 2012, Laura Kina partnered with Fanshen Cox DiGiovanni (Co-founder, Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival, 2008–2012), Chandra Crudup (former Family Event Coordinator, Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival), and Khanisha Foster (former Live Event Coordinator, Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival) to organize Mixed Roots Midwest. This three-night festival capped each full CMRS 2012 conference day and brought selected short films, a panel of filmmakers, and a live show featuring local and national talent whose works explore the mixed experience.¹⁵⁵

By foregrounding artistic and experimental forms as well as traditional scholarly responses, which tend to privilege the written word and analytical reasoning, CMRS seeks to be a space where other ways of knowing and sharing (e.g., affect, orality, visuality, kinesthesia, spirituality, etc.) are also embraced. For example, at CMRS 2012 an entire panel was dedicated to “Pushing the Boundaries of Mixed-Race Theorizing” with Franco-American artist Gwenn-Aël Lynn presenting research on the memory of smells in relation to hybrid identities. An ongoing challenge for both CMRS and JCMRS will be to find a way of balancing accessibility and innovation with financial sustainability and pressures of academic gatekeeping that come along with any move towards legitimization.

It is also important to note that there are various other types of creative and academic institutionalization currently taking place in the form of conferences such as Hapa Japan Conference (University of California, Berkeley 2011, University of Southern California 2012, University of Southern California 2013), Critical Ethnic Studies (University of California, Riverside 2011, University of Chicago 2013), Mixed Race in the Age of Obama (University of Chicago 2010), and, as of 2011, The Mixed Roots Academic Forum held in collaboration with Osaka University, Kyoto University, and University of Southern California.¹⁵⁶ These conferences relate to over a decade of student-led conferences such as those once held by the campus chapters of Hapa Issues Forum (HIF), those currently organized by Harvard’s Half Asian People’s Association (HAPA), and the conference, Crossing Lines: Praxis in Mixed Race/Space Studies organized by University of California, Berkeley Ethnic Studies PhD students (2012). At CMRS 2012, we were excited to hear more about the international mixed-race discourses in Canada, the UK, Japan, and Brazil. We recognize that there is still much work to be done in building a transnational and international dialogue. We are, in many ways, still at a beginning point in this regard.

We end this introduction of an emerging history on the hopeful note of looking towards our future. Once upon a time, the student-organized conferences led by undergraduates were the only places where scholars in the field of mixed race studies could emerge from our traditional departments to meet our colleagues and share our otherwise marginalized work. Now, graduate students who have had the opportunity to attend a conference organized by scholars in a field specifically named critical mixed race studies are organizing their own conferences, preparing to become the future leaders of CMRS (or whatever they choose to name the field(s) as it/they develop/develops). We hope that this version of the CMRS story told from our perspective inspires others to tell their own versions—their own narratives that may be counter to or diverge from this one. We hope, above all, that CMRS fulfills

its promise to provide a critical and fertile space in which to cultivate active examinations and interrogations of racialization and critiques of racism.

NOTES

¹ Some individuals employ “multiracial” to refer to racially heterogeneous populations (e.g., “a multiracial society”); others use the term to describe individuals of “mixed” heritage, ancestry, or background. The term “multiracial” appeared as early as 1980 as a definition of someone with more than one racial background in Christine C. Iijima Hall’s groundbreaking doctoral dissertation “The Ethnic Identity of Racially Mixed People: A Study of Black-Japanese” (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1980). This definition and terminology gained widespread usage in the late 1980s among activists in the multiracial movement particularly the membership of the Association of MultiEthnic Americans (AMEA) and affiliated organizations, A Place for US National (APN), as well as Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally) in the 1990s. Some individuals preferred the term “multiracial” in order to move as far away as possible from any association with “being mixed up,” as in “confused.” Also, others felt the term mixed race was an externally imposed label originating in West European colonialism. Moreover, many individuals believed the term conveyed that there is a subset of humans who are the products of racial mixture, when in fact a mixed-race background in the broadest sense is the norm rather than the exception among humans.

Yet Hapa Issue Forum (HIF), another important foundational organization, preferred the term “mixed race.” This was due in part to the potential confusion of “multiracial” with the meaning of “diversity” as in “multiculturalism.” Consequently, at the Third Multiracial Leadership Summit in Oakland, California on June 7, 1997, the late Ramona Douglass, then President of the AMEA, recommended that delegates alternate between the terms at the meeting in order to respect Greg Mayeda, Sheila Chung, and Cynthia L. Nakashima who were representing HIF.

In 2004 when G. Reginald Daniel, Paul Spickard, Maria P. P. Root, and University of California, Santa Barbara sociology doctoral student Josef Castañeda-Liles were thinking about launching a print journal, they decided to use the title *Journal of Multiracial Studies*. They were aware that people might think the journal was devoted to “diversity” as in “multiculturalism.” Consequently, they made it very clear in the journal description that the periodical was devoted to the topic of “mixed race” as well as interracial marriages and transracial adoption by extension. Since the terms “mixed race” and “multiracial” have currency in the field of mixed race/multiracial studies and consciousness as well as in the public imagination, we use both interchangeably in this journal.

² See Berry, *Almost White*; Jordan, *White over Black*; Forbes, “Black Pioneers”; Nash, *Red, White and Black*, which is now in its sixth edition; Woods, *Marginality and Identity*; Mencke, *Mulattoes and Race Mixture*; Berzon, *Neither White nor Black*; and Williamson, *New People*.

Greg Carter points out that early nineteenth-century European American abolitionist Wendell Phillips, well before the Civil War, defended interracial intimacy, and multiraciality by extension, in his writings. Phillips also addressed racial inequality, acknowledging that the fight for equal rights meant including everyone in the intimate making of future Americans. See Carter, *United States . . . United Races*, 45–76. There were also other later works that encompass studies of mixed race, for example, sociologist Reuter’s *The Mulatto in the United States and Race Mixture*. Yet Spencer in *Spurious Issues* and McKee in *Sociology and the Race Problem* point out that, if anything, these works are the antithesis of critical mixed race studies. They put forth a highly conservative model of mixed race that espouses notions of “hybrid vigor.” It also posits whitening and Europeanization through racial and cultural blending, that is, assimilation, as the solution to the US race problem.

Reuter’s thinking was iconoclastic as compared to that of his US contemporaries. But his perspective was very much in keeping with contemporary racist thinking in Latin America. The region was saturated during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the ideas of European and Anglo North American thinkers such as Georges Vacher de Lapouge (1854–1936), Arthur de Gobineau (1816–82), Josiah Nott (1804–73), George Gliddon (1809–57), Samuel George Morton (1799–1851), and their adherents. These thinkers expounded upon the genetic, psychological, and cultural inferiority of individuals of color (particularly individuals of African descent) as well as the evils of miscegenation. Yet Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744–1829) had contended that individuals adapted and perfected traits during their lifetime and transmitted these genetic improvements to their offspring and future generations. By the early twentieth century, the neo-Lamarckian movement, which theorized that traits, and thus culture, were acquired via local human and climatic environments, lent its support to the call for racial whitening in Brazil and other Latin American nations. Unlike Mendelian genetics (which was rediscovered in 1900), with its accompanying notions about “the fixity of race” and its racially deterministic suppositions about people of color, neo-Lamarckism offered the hope of “progress.” See Dávila, *Diploma of Whiteness*, 25; Lange, “Importing Freud and Lamarck,” 9–34.

If, according to the scientific racism dominant in this period, miscegenation and cultural blending were the disease, racial whitening through miscegenation and the Europeanization of Latin American culture was the elite’s prescription for a cure. This was not a random integration of European, African, and by extension, Native American traits, in which equal value was attached to each through a reciprocal process “café-au-lait universalism” or “metaracial brunettism.” See Nascimento, *Mixture or Massacre?*, 72. Rather, it was a contest between unequal participants manipulated by the ruling elite in order to purge Latin America of its inferior African (and Native American) traits by assimilating them until they disappeared. See also Skidmore, *Black into White*, 48–69; Stepan, “*The Hour of Eugenics*,” 69, 154–56; Graham, Introduction to *Idea of Race in Latin America*, 1–6; Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 36–39.

³ This includes Latin American writings by Freyre, *The Masters and the Slaves (Casa-Grande e senzala)*, *The Mansions and the Shanties (Sobrados e os mucambos)*, and *Order and Progress (Ordem e progresso)*; Cardoso, *Capitalismo e escravidão*; Ramos, *O negro na civilização brasileira (O negro no Brasil / The Negro in Brazil)*; Pinto, *O negro no Rio de Janeiro*; Azevedo, *As elites de cor* and *Cultura e situação racial no Brasil*; Oracy Nogueira, “Preconceito racial de marca e preconceito racial de origem”; Ribeiro, *Religião and relações raciais*; Franco, *Homens livres no ordem escravocrata*; Ianni, *As Metamorfoses do escravo* and *Raças e classes*; Cardoso and Ianni, *Cor e mobilidade*; Nascimento, *Brazil: Mixture or Massacre?*; Hasenbalg, *Discriminação e desigualdades*; Fry, “Politics, Nationality, and . . . Race in Brazil,” 83–118.

Other Latin American scholarship includes James, *The Black Jacobins*; Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica*; Mörrer, *Race Mixture . . . Latin America*; Aguirre Beltrán, *La Población negra de México*; Cabral, *La comunidad mulata República Dominicana*; Bicudo, *Atitudes raciais*; Martinez-Alier, *Marriage, Class, and Colour Cuba*; Henriques, *Children of Conflict*; Wright, *Café con Leche Venezuela*; Kinsbruner, *Not of Pure Blood . . . Puerto Rico*.

International scholarship on Latin America from this period includes Harris, *Patterns of Race . . . Americas*; Boxer, *Race Relations Portuguese Empire*; Tannenbaum, *Slave and Citizen*; Knight, *The African Dimension*, and *Slave Society in Cuba*; Degler, *Neither Black nor White*; Skidmore, *Black into White*; Solaún and Kronus, *Discrimination Without Violence*; Bastide, *Estudos afro-brasileiros*; Pierson, *Negroes in Brazil*; Wagley, *Race and Class . . . Brazil: A UNESCO Study*; Rout, Jr., *The African Experience Spanish America*; Wade, *Race and Ethnicity Latin America*.

For additional early and more recent Portuguese- and English-language resources on the topic in terms of Brazil, see Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality* and *Machado de Assis*; and Daniel and Lee, "Competing Narratives: Race and Multiraciality in the Brazilian Racial Order"; King-O'Riain, et al., *Global Mixed Race*. See also Bailey, *Legacies of Race* and Telles, *Race in Another America*; Telles and Sue, "Race Mixture: Boundary Crossing," 129–46; Telles and Bailey, "Understanding Latin American Beliefs," 1559–95.

There are also a host of other earlier and later analyses that examine the experience and identity of populations in Africa, Asia, the Pacific, and elsewhere. These include analyses of South African Coloureds; the Métis of Senegal; the Anglo-Indians in India; the Métis of Canada; offspring of US soldiers and Asian women during military campaigns during WWII in Japan and the Philippines, the Korean War and the Vietnam War; Australia's part-Aborigines; New Zealand's part-Maori; and Hawai'i's part-Hawaiians. See the "Search" menu on Steve Riley's *Mixed Race Studies* website <http://www.mixedracestudies.org/> for an informative partial list of publications on these and other populations.

Social anthropologist Virginia Dominguez's *White by Definition* was also published during this period. We should also mention even earlier pioneering work by Franz Fanon, particularly *Black Skin, White Masks* and *The Wretched of the Earth*. See McNeil's "Slimy Subjects and Neoliberal Goods" in this inaugural issue for more details on the work of Fanon. This is equally true of the often overlooked journalist, WWII war correspondent, and lay scholar Joel Augustus Rogers. His meticulous research spanned the fields of history, sociology, and anthropology, including *Sex and Race: Negro-Caucasian Mixing*; *Sex and Race: A History of White, Negro, and Indian Miscegenation*; *Sex and Race, Why White and Black Mix*; *World's Great Men of Color, Volume I*; *World's Great Men of Color, Volume II*; *Nature Knows No Color Line*; *The Five Negro Presidents*.

⁴ Ifekwunigwe, *Mixed Race Studies*, 1–29.

⁵ These data are based on G. Reginald Daniel's conversations with graduate students at the University of California, Santa Barbara, whose research focused on the topic of multiracial identity as well as conversations with colleagues at academic conferences. Creolization as well as postcolonial studies, which have included analyses of mixed race under the rubric of hybridity, have existed for quite some time, and certainly have been influential on the work of scholars in mixed race studies.

⁶ Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 19.

⁷ West and Fenstermaker, "Doing Difference," 8–37.

⁸ Hall, "Ethnic Identity Racially Mixed People"; Kich, "Eurasians: Identity Development"; Thornton, "Social History of Multiethnic Identity"; Arnold, "The Effects of Racial Identity"; Murphy-Shigematsu, "Voices of Amerasians."

⁹ Salgado de Snyder, Lopez, and Padilla, "Ethnic Identity Cultural Awareness," 277–82; Wardle, "Sensitive to Interracial Children," 53–59; Gibbs, "Identity and Marginality," 265–78; Spickard, *Mixed Blood*; Poston, "The Biracial Identity Model," 152–55; and Root, *Racially Mixed People*.

This period also includes work on mixed race in the ground-breaking research on transracial adoption by the late Rita J. Simon. See, for example, Simon and Altstein, *Transracial Adoption: A Follow-Up and Transracial Adoptees and Their Families*; Simon, Altstein, and Melli, *The Case for Transracial Adoption*. Her later works include Simon and Roorda, *In Their Own Voices: Transracial Adoptees, In Their Parents' Voices*, and *In Their Siblings' Voices*. There was a growing body of new literature specifically on interracial marriage. See, for example, Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan, "New Trends," 209–18; Rosenblatt, Karis, and Powell, *Multiracial Couples*; Root, *Love's Revolution*.

¹⁰ The *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* was co-founded by G. Reginald Daniel, Wei Ming Dariotis, Laura Kina, Maria P. P. Root, and Paul Spickard through the University of California eScholarship platform. It was launched in 2011, with the first issue released in 2014. See http://escholarship.org/uc/ucsb_soc_jcmrs.

¹¹ Root, *Racially Mixed People* and *The Multiracial Experience*; Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices*; Zack, *Race and Mixed Race* and her edited volume *American Mixed Race*; Forbes, *Black Africans and Native Americans* and *Africans and Native Americans*; Rodriguez, *Puerto Ricans*; Nash, "Hidden History Mestizo America," 941–64; Funderburg, *Black, White, Other*; Haizlip, *The Sweeter the Juice*; and Williams, *Life on the Color Line*. David Theo Goldberg's *Racist Culture* included thoughtful analyses on the topic of mixed race. See also Goldberg, "Social Formation of Racist Discourse," 295–318, and "Semantics of Race," 543–69.

Works by UK sociologists were also published during this period. See for example, Wilson, *Mixed Race Children*; Tizard and Phoenix, *Black, White, or Mixed Race?* UK scholars Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, and Robert J. C. Young made important contributions to research on hybridity during this period. See, for example, Hall, "New Ethnicities," 252–59, "The Local and the Global," 19–40, "Old and New Identities," 41–68, and "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," 222–37; Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic*, "The End of Anti-Racism," 191–209, and "Diaspora and Detours of Identity," 299–346; Young, *Colonial Desire*.

¹² Gordon, "Critical 'Mixed Race'?", 381–95. See also *Her Majesty's Other Children*, 55–57, 62–67.

¹³ By 2000, Lewis R. Gordon, along with Paul Gilroy and David Theo Goldberg, had contributed additional work to the growing body of literature that includes discussions of mixed race. See Gordon, "Mixed Race . . . Whiteness and Shadows"; Gilroy, *Against Race*; Goldberg, *The Threat of Race*.

¹⁴ Fullbeck, *Banana Split: 25 Stories* (1991), *Some Questions for 28 Kisses* (1994), *Game of Death* (1991); Houston, *Asa Ga Kimashita (Morning Has Broken)* (1981), *American Dreams* (1984), *Tea* (1987), *Broken English* (formerly *The Melting Pot*) (1991); Luna, *Half Indian/Half Mexican* (1991); Piper, *Cornered* (1988); Valerie Soe, *Mixed Blood* (1992). Houston and Williams-León, "Introduction: No Passing Zone," vii–xii, and Darby Li Po Price, "Humorous Hapas, Performing Identities," 99–111. In 2008, ethnic studies professor and performance artist Price, along with Emmy-Award winner, comedian/performer, and professor of Media, Teja Arboleda followed up with *Crossing the Line: Multiracial Comedians* (2008), a documentary that analyzes how mixed-race comedians mediate multiracial identities and humor. Over the past decade, the number of multiracial performance artists has grown considerably. Many of these individuals have showcased their work at the Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival and other public venues.¹⁵ Other publications include Scales-Trent, *Notes of White Black Woman*; Appiah, *In My Father's House*; Haizlip, *The Sweeter the Juice*; Williams, *Life on the Color Line*; Senna, *Caucasia*; Bowman, *White Chocolate*; Walker, *Black, White, and Jewish*; and Smith, *White Teeth*. In Appendix A of this inaugural issue Paul Spickard and Steven F. Riley have compiled partial lists of books that include discussions of race and multiraciality released in English during these formative years. The [view] link following each publication goes directly to Riley's website, which includes a detailed description of the work.

¹⁶ A comprehensive list of publications on the topic of mixed race in English can be found on Riley's *Mixed Race Studies* website: <http://www.mixedracestudies.org/>.

¹⁷ Ifekwunigwe, *Mixed Race Studies*, front matter. In Appendix B of this inaugural issue, Riley has compiled a partial list of publications, specifically books, which incorporate material on race and multiraciality beginning during this period.

¹⁸ Riley has provided a link to an extensive data base of over 3,000 articles (<http://www.mixedracestudies.org/wordpress/?cat=12>), including the most recent publications in English.

¹⁹ In 1980 and into the early 1990s, Terry Wilson, a University of California, Berkeley professor of Native American and Ethnic Studies, taught "People of Mixed Racial Descent." This was the first course of its kind in the United States. Several of the course's early instructors, such as doctoral student Cynthia L. Nakashima, went on to write leading texts on the multiracial experience. In 1989, G. Reginald Daniel followed Wilson's course with "Betwixt and Between," which compares the multiracial experience in the United States with that in various parts of the world. He has been teaching the course every year since 1989. He first taught the course at the University of California, Los Angeles and subsequently at the University of California, Santa Barbara. In spring 1992, Teresa Williams-León taught "The World of Amerasians," which was the first course in the United States specifically devoted to the study of multiracials of partial Asian/Asian American descent. The course is now part of the University of California, Santa Barbara Asian American Studies curriculum and appears under the title "Multiethnic Asians." The course was subsequently taught by Paul Spickard when he was a faculty in and chair of the Department of Asian American Studies. The following are among the various colleges and universities that have offered courses in multiracial studies: Brigham Young University-Hawai'i, Brown University, California State University, Hayward, California State University, Northridge, DePaul University, Harvard University, Mills College, Roosevelt University, San Francisco State University, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, San José State University, Santa Barbara City College, University of California, Berkeley, University of California, Davis, University of California, Los Angeles, University of California, Santa Barbara, University of California, San Diego, University of Hawai'i, University of Maryland, University of San Francisco. In the early 2000s, Wei Ming Darity, consulting editor of *JCMRS*, and Andrew Jolivette, a member of the *JCMRS* Editorial Review Board, were hired by San Francisco State University to teach in the area of multiracial studies in the Department of Asian American Studies and Department of American Indian Studies respectively. In fall 2013, *The Asian American Literary Review* included a synchronous classroom initiative along with its inaugural issue entitled "AALR Mixed Race Initiative." Throughout the month of October, over 100 university classrooms across the US and abroad streamed and shared teaching material on the topic of mixed race. AALR is planning a similar initiative for spring 2014. See *The Asian American Literary Review*, <http://aalmag.org/>.

²⁰ Ifekwunigwe, *Mixed Race Studies*, 8–9.

²¹ See Root, *Racially Mixed People in America*, 1992.

²² Scholars in social work whose research encompasses human development, psychotherapy, counseling, public administration, program evaluation, and community development could also have provided meaningful studies on multiracial identity and the mixed-race experience. Yet scholars in these fields devoted little attention to the subject matter in the foundational research. LeVonne Gaddy's *A Guide for the Racially and Culturally Mixed* (1987) was one of the first examinations of the contemporary multiracial phenomenon written from a social work perspective. Other early work included Brown and Douglass's "Making the Invisible Visible," 323–40.

Kelly F. Jackson has done pioneering research in social work. See "Ethical Considerations Social Work Research," 1–10; "Beyond Race," 309–26; Jackson, Wolven, and Aguilera, "Mixed Resilience," 212–25; Jackson, et al., "Role of Identity Integration," 240–5; Jackson, "Participatory Diagramming," 414–32; Jackson, "Living the Multiracial Experience," 42–60. Kristen A. Renn, Paul Shang, Marc P. Johnston, C. Casey Ozaki, and others have researched the little explored topic of multiracial students in higher education and organizations in terms of developmental and service needs, which dovetails with this research in social work. See Renn and Shang, "Editors' Notes," 1–4; See also Girard, *Diversity Is Me*.

²³ "Social" and "cultural" anthropology overlap to a considerable extent. The term "cultural anthropology" encompasses an approach that is particularly prominent in the United States and associated with the pioneering work of Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict. It emphasizes the coherence of cultures, including their rules of behaviour, language, material creations, and world views as well as the need to understand each on its own terms. "Social anthropology" has mainly developed within Britain since the early years of the twentieth century. Historically, it has been heavily informed by intellectual traditions emanating from continental Europe, especially France. It examines how contemporary humans behave in social groups and tends to focus on social institutions and their interrelationships. In Europe, social anthropology is frequently distinguished from cultural anthropology. In the United States social anthropology is commonly subsumed under cultural anthropology or sometimes under the designation of sociocultural anthropology, which began to appear in the literature in the 1950s and more frequently since the late 1960s. Today social and cultural anthropologists, and individuals who integrate both emphases, are normative in the discipline.

See Hilary Callan, "Social and Cultural Anthropology," *Discover Anthropology*, <http://www.discoveranthropology.org.uk/about-anthropology/what-is-anthropology/social-and-cultural-anthropology.html>.

Karen Leonard, who wrote *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans* (1992), and France Winddance Twine are exceptions among anthropologists. Twine teaches in sociology. Yet her training is in anthropology, and some of her early work was completed before she became a faculty in sociology: *Just Black? Multiracial Identity in the U.S.* (1990), a documentary produced with Jonathan F. Warren and Francisco Ferrandiz; "Brown-Skinned White Girls," 214–43; Warren and Twine, "White Americans, the New Minority?" 200–18; and *Racism in a Racial Democracy*. The latter is based on Twine's doctoral dissertation titled "Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Cultural Politics of Everyday Racism in Rural Brazil" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994).

²⁴ Jack Niemonen examined all racial and ethnic relations articles (677 articles in total) published over a twenty-seven-year period from January 1969 through December 1995 in *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces*, and *Social Problems*. He found that the articles borrow from, take for granted, accept, and indeed reify US racial commonsense or US Census definitions of race and ethnicity as opposed to critically evaluating or critiquing such definitions (Niemonen, "The Race Relations Problematic," 1997, 15, 20). An interrogation of these categories would be central to any discussion of multiracial identities and mixed-race experiences. These observations are also based on G. Reginald Daniel's examination in the early 1990s of articles in leading social science journals such as *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces*, *Journal of Social Issues*, *American Anthropologist*, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *Journal of Social Work*, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, and *American Political Science Review* as well as university textbooks on race and ethnic relations. Moreover, Daniel examined *Sociological Abstracts* to determine the extent to which discussions of multiraciality and mixed-race experiences in the United States were present or absent in studies on the topic of race.

Sociological Abstracts includes abstracts from the international literature in all areas of sociology as well as publications relevant to sociology and related disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences. Culled from nearly 2,000 serial publications, including *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces*, and *Social Problems*, the database encompasses abstracts from journal articles, conference papers, books, dissertations, plus citations to important book reviews related to the social sciences. A backfile that begins in 1952 that includes records published by the then-print version of *Sociological Abstracts* adds breadth to the database.

Daniel found that articles investigating the topic of race in the United States from 1952 to 1992, which was the year of publication of Root's *Racially Mixed People in America*, indicate limited attention to the topic of multiraciality and mixed-race experiences. The search terms "race AND (United States)" resulted in 3837 abstracts; "race AND (United States) AND (mixed race)" yielded 55 relevant results; "race AND (United States) AND (multiracial)" provided 2 relevant results both of which were duplicates of the previous search under mixed race. Some articles examined interracial marriage (23); others examined multiraciality, mixed-race offspring, and mixed-races experiences (33). Many of them focused on Hawai'i (8), a state that has historically had a high percentage of interracial marriages and multiracial offspring. Interestingly, there were several articles specifically on communities commonly referred to as triracial isolates (7). These mixed-race communities are composed of individuals of varying degrees of European, African, and Native American ancestry, who for several generations have asserted identities that resist US monoracial imperatives (See page 10 as well as 36, notes 70 and 71 of this article for additional information).

Between 1988 and 1992, there was a noticeable increase in the number of articles specifically on multiraciality, mixed-race offspring, and mixed-races experiences, and a dramatic increase from 1992 to 2013. Using the search terms "race AND (United States) AND (mixed race)," Daniel found 100 relevant results; using "race AND (United States) AND (multiracial)" he found 65 relevant articles most of them duplicates of titles found under mixed race. The growth in the number of articles in the latter search is likely attributable to the increased currency of the term multiracial in public discourse to describe the mixed-race phenomenon. During the latter period articles increasingly examine not simply a mixed-race or multiracial background but also a multiracial identity, which is seen as a viable option. Finally, Daniel's findings are also derived from his conversations with graduate students at the University of California in the 1990s who were discouraged by mentors from pursuing this line of research. These observations are also based on his conversations with faculty at the University of California and observations of responses to his public presentations on the topic of multiraciality in the early 1990s. Similar conclusions could no doubt be drawn if one were to do a perusal of research in other branches of the social sciences, for example, economics, communications studies, human geography, and so on.

²⁵ Lee, "Racial Classifications in US Census," 75-94; Chew, Eggebeen, and Uhlenberg, "American Children in Multiracial Households," 56-85; Waters, "Multiple Identities and Identity US," 23-40. Perlmann and Waters, *The New Race Question* includes many chapters by demographers.

²⁶ The first sociological explorations of these broader social structural concerns include, Daniel, "Beyond Black and White: The New Multiracial Consciousness," in *Racially Mixed People in America*, 333-41; Thornton, "Is Multiracial Status Unique? The Personal and Social Experience," in *Racially Mixed People in America*, 321-25; Mass, "Interracial Japanese Americans: The Best of Both Worlds or the End of the Japanese American Community?" in *Racially Mixed People in America*, 265-79; and Stephan, "Mixed-Heritage Individuals: Ethnic Identity and Trait Characteristics," also in *Racially Mixed People in America*, 50-63, "Ethnic Identity Among Mixed-Heritage People in Hawaii," *Symbolic Interaction* 14, 3 (Fall 1991): 261-77, and "After Inter-marriage: Ethnic Identity among Mixed-Heritage Japanese-Americans and Hispanics" (with Walter G. Stephan), *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51(2) 1989: 507-19. This is equally true of Teresa Williams-León whose graduate training is in Asian American Studies (MA) and sociology (PhD). She teaches in Asian American Studies, and most of her prominent work on multiraciality was published as an Asian American studies scholar. See, for example, "Prism Lives: Identity of Binational Amerasians," in *Racially Mixed People in America*, 280-303, and "Race as Process: Reassessing the 'What Are You' Encounters of Biracial Individuals," in *The Multiracial Experience*, 191-210. Kimberly DaCosta and Rebecca King-O'Riain also provided some of the early analyses (King and DaCosta, "Changing Face, Changing Race," 227-44). However, their work might be more appropriately thought of as part of the second wave of scholarship in the late 1990s. Exceptions among political scientists include Melissa Nobles, "'Responding with Good Sense': The Politics of Race and Censuses in Contemporary Brazil" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1995), which was eventually published as *Shades of Citizenship: Race and the Census in Modern Politics* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000).

²⁷ Lee, "Racial Classifications in US Census," 75-94; Chew, Eggebeen, and Uhlenberg, "American Children in Multiracial Households," 56-85; Waters, "Multiple Identities and Identity US," 23-40. Perlmann and Waters, *The New Race Question* includes many chapters by demographers.

²⁸ For an insider's perspective on the US multiracial movement see chapter 7 in Daniel's *More Than Black?* and chapter 8 in *Race and Multiraciality*. See also Nobles, *Shades of Citizenship*; Spencer, *Spurious Issues*; Williams, *Mark One or More*; and DaCosta, *Making Multiracials*.

²⁹ Kim M. Williams, one of the few political scientists who has provided compelling analyses on questions of mixed race, argues that the multiracial movement at its height in the intense activity of the late 1990s had no more than one thousand active participants, mainly residing on the West and East Coasts. See Williams, *Mark One or More*, 4, 14-16; Williams, "Defying the Civil Rights Lobby: The American Multiracial Movement." Paper presented at Benjamin L. Hooks Institute for Social Change, Memphis, Tennessee, April 2007, 2. Yet the size of active membership is not the final determinant of what constitutes a social movement. Charles Tilly defines social movements as a series of contentious displays, performances, and campaigns by which ordinary people make collective claims on others. For Tilly, social movements are a major vehicle for everyday individuals to participate in public politics. He argues that there are three key elements to a social movement: (1) *Campaigns*: "a sustained, organized public effort making collective claims on target authorities"; (2) *Repertoire*: "employment of combinations from among various forms of political action." These include the "creation of special-purpose associations and coalitions, public meetings, solemn processions, vigils, rallies, demonstrations, petition drives, statements to and in public media, and pamphleteering; and (3) *WUNC displays*: "participants' concerted public representation of worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitments on the part of themselves and/or their constituencies." See Tilly, *Social Movements, 1768-2004*, 3-4.

Moreover, Verta Taylor's work on abeyance structures helps provide a more nuanced description of the multiracial movement during the late 1990s. Williams's description conveys the impression that the movement somehow declined or ended after that period. Reynolds Farley expressed a similar opinion in "Identifying with Multiple Races: A Social Movement that Succeeded but Failed?," The Population Studies Center (PSC), Research Report No. 01-491 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute of Social Research, 2002). Most social movements have thresholds or turning points in mobilization that scholars have taken for "births" and "deaths" or high points and low points. Taylor argues that

movements do not die, but scale down, hibernate, and retrench to adapt to changes in the political climate. Accordingly, the peak moments of mass mobilization and valleys involving quiet times in social movements are tied together and sustained through abeyance structures composed of overlapping organizations, networks of individuals, ideologies, goals, and tactics. These provide continuity from one stage of mobilization to another and lulls in intense public activity. See Taylor, "Social Movement Continuity," 761–62, 772–73; Corrigan-Brown, *Patterns of Protest*, 8; Taylor and Crossley, "Abeyance Cycles in Social Movements," (forthcoming in 2014).

Also, according to sociologists Stephen Cornell and Douglass Hartmann, the pursuit of changes in official racial classification would be considered bonds of interest, which is one of the key and yet most volatile ingredients involved in group formation. The bonds of interest may be strong, but circumstances change, and the shared interests (e.g., successfully achieving changes in official racial classification) that have previously bound individuals together disappear. The bonds of interest, which are generally of a utilitarian nature, tend to be somewhat more volatile than institutional bonds, and significantly more volatile than more elaborate cultural bonds. In contrast, identities grounded in institutions gain an inertial force that may prove longer lasting by virtue of the fact that they embed identities in sets of social relations over which the group has some influence. Their strength comes also from the fact that they not only offer a reason to act but also facilitate action. Culture tends to be even stronger because it can provide a conceptual scheme of beliefs, ideals, meanings, values, and customs that help individuals make sense of the world. Culture binds group members together as a community through the perception that they think alike, or at least view aspects of their own lives and certain critical features of the world similarly. See Cornell and Hartman, *Ethnicity and Race*, 82–89.

The formation of a culture among multiracial individuals, if such actually can be said to exist, is, however, in a very embryonic state. Moreover, considering the wide array of multiracial backgrounds, experiences, and identities, this culture, if it does evolve, will likely display myriad multiracial permutations. Yet, there is evidence of the formation of a linguistic culture among multiracial individuals that reflects the importance of self-ascription in the face of normative identities. The term "hapa" is often used as a self-identifier by mixed-race individuals of partial Asian/Asian American descent. However, it is not universally accepted and is often seen as an appropriation of a term that was originally used to describe part-Hawaiians. See Bernstein and Cruz, "What are You?," 722–45.

The word "multiracial" itself is reflective of this process. This multiracial lexicon has also included the term "monoracial," which refers to single racial-identified individuals. The term "monoracial" was previously used in psychology—particularly in black identity studies—to refer to the presence of an "in-group" or same-race reference group orientation, preference, and/or attitudinal pattern, as compared to an "out-group" ("mainstream" or European American), or multiple reference group orientation. This definition did not involve questions relating to the racial backgrounds in an individual's lineage. However, the term "monoracial" has become a mainstay in the multiracial discourse to refer to individuals with a single-racial identity as opposed to a multiracial identity. This may be due to the fact that psychologists did some of the most important foundational work on the topic of multiracial identity.

Conferences and support group meetings themselves are conduits of cultural formations, including, for example, the reading or citing of Maria Root's "Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People," and evoking the Lovings as the grand progenitors of the new interracial family and new multiracial individuals, as well as the *Loving* decision itself as a historical marker in the formation of a multiracial consciousness. Also, there have been efforts to "recover" individuals from the past, as well as cite those in the present, who have self-identified as multiracial and sometimes, individuals of a racially blended background, but who typically have single-racial identities (e.g., African American, European American, etc.). These "recovery operations" may enhance the self-esteem of multiracials. Yet, the projection of a multiracial identity on to individuals who have not actually identified as such has understandably drawn criticism from some sectors, particularly African Americans, as a form of appropriation or revisionism (Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 116).

The process of racial identity formation is also influenced by how "thick" (more comprehensive) and how "thin" (less comprehensive) identity boundaries and centers are and the degree to which they have gained sufficient inertial force to organize the social and cultural life of the group. Furthermore, the diversity of racial identities within a single racial group is important in terms of these dynamics. Multiracials variously experience their identity as "thick" or "thin." As a collective subjectivity their sense of group boundaries and centers, however, is currently much closer to the thin end of the spectrum. To some extent this dynamic can be attributed to the diffuse and multidimensional nature of multiracial identity configurations. It may also be related to the fact that a multiracial identification as the basis for a collective subjectivity is very much an emerging phenomenon. That said, identities thicken and gain inertial force as these various kinds of bonds are combined. If a significant number of institutions, cultural practices, or new interests crystallize around multiracial identities, they may thicken, the boundaries may solidify, and the centers may consolidate into a collective "third racial experience." This in turn may be catalytic in the solidification of a "third culture" that displays unique characteristics of its own originating in the many permutations on the multiracial experience. See Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 116; Cornell and Hartman, *Ethnicity and Race*, 82–89.

The West Coast, particularly California and Hawai'i, has the highest concentration of interracial couples and the largest number and highest proportion of multiracial-identified individuals. This helps to explain why the multiracial phenomenon as a racial project has had a more immediate impact on patterns of race relations on the West Coast. California, in particular, has been a major center of multiracial activism, as well as academic research, and university courses on multiracial identity. The University of California, specifically the Berkeley and Santa Barbara campuses, has the longest-standing university courses on this topic in the United States. Despite this unique regional concentration, the multiracial movement has led to noticeable changes in racial discourse in the national public sphere. Yet multiraciality has not yet become a more normative part of everyday understandings and presentations of racial identity in the national media and national consciousness. That said, the gap between California's seemingly anomalous pattern of race relations and that of the rest of the United States undoubtedly will narrow as racial intermarriages continue to increase, and if there is a continued growth in the number of individuals who identify as multiracial, an option that only has been available officially since 2000.

See Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 160; Bhattacharya, Gabriel, and Small, *Race and Power*, 66–87; Jones and Smith, *The Two or More Races Population: 2000*. US Census Bureau, Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR/01-6, 2001, 2–4; <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/C2kbr01-6.pdf>; Simmons and O'Connell, *Married-Couple and Unmarried-Partner Households: 2000*. US Census Bureau, Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-5, February, 2003. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/censr-5.pdf>, 11–12.

³⁰ Research by sociologist G. Reginald Daniel, "Beyond Black and White," 333–41, and former ethnic studies doctoral student Cynthia L. Nakashima, "Voices from the Movement," 79–100, are exceptions. Exceptions among political scientists include Nobles, "Responding with Good

Sense,” PhD dissertation which was eventually published as *Shades of Citizenship*. Other exceptions include Kim M. Williams, “Boxed In” and “Multiracialism and Civil Rights Future,” 53–60, which was published in *Mark One or More*; and Hochschild, “Multiple Racial Identifiers,” 340–53, and *Creating a New Racial Order* with Weaver and Burch. Yet Williams’s and Hochschild’s work appeared after the first wave of scholarship on multiraciality in the early 1990s.

³¹ Edelman, “Social Movements,” 285–317.

³² Ethnic studies scholar Cynthia L. Nakashima’s “Voices from the Movement: Approaches to Multiraciality,” in *The Multiracial Experience*, 79–100, and sociologists Kimberly DaCosta’s and Rebecca King’s “Changing Face, Changing Race: The Remaking of Race in the Japanese American and African American Communities,” in *The Multiracial Experience*, 227–44, were among the few social scientific examinations of these concerns during the mid-1990s. This is also the case with later research by political scientist Kim M. Williams. See “Boxed In: The US Multiracial Movement” (PhD diss., Cornell University, 2001), which was published in *Mark One or More: Civil Rights in Multiracial America* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008); “Multiracialism and the Civil Rights Future,” *Daedalus* (On Race) 134 no. 1 (Winter 2005): 53–60. This was equally true of political scientist Jennifer Hochschild. See “Multiple Racial Identifiers in the 2000 Census, and Then What?,” in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, ed., Joel Perlmann and Mary Waters (Russell Sage Foundation, 2002), 340–53, and *Creating a New Racial Order: How Immigration, Multiracialism, DNA, and the Young Can Remake Race in America*, with Vesla Weaver and Traci Burch (NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012). Yet as stated previously, Williams’s and Hochschild’s work appeared after the waves of scholarship on multiraciality in the early and mid-1990s.

Legal scholarship has included very insightful analyses on the topic of mixed race although most of these publications appeared after the early 1990s. These include Haney-Lopez, *White by Law*; Fernández, “Government Classification Multiracial/Multiethnic People,” 15–36; “La Raza and the Melting Pot,” 126–43; Hickman, “Devil and One-Drop Rule,” 1161–1265; Johnson, “Racial Mixture. . . and Civil Rights,” and *Mixed Race America*; Powell, “Colorblind Multiracial Dilemma,” 789–806; Hernández, “Value of Intersectional . . . Analysis,” 1407–37, and “Multiracial Matrix,” 1093–1176; Moran, “Loving and the Legacy,” 240–81, *Interracial Intimacy*, and “Love with Proper Stranger,” 1663–79; Robinson, “Shifting Race-Consciousness Matrix,” 231–89; and Leong, “Judicial Erasure Mixed-Race Discrimination,” 469–555, and “Multiracial Identity and Affirmative Action,” 1–32.

³³ Itabari Njeri, “Mixed Race Generation Faces Identity Crisis,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 24, VI; Jones, “The End of Africanness?: The Bi-Racial Assault on Blackness,” 201–10; R. Spencer, *Spurious Issues*, J. Spencer, *The New Colored People*.

³⁴ See Williams-León and Nakashima, eds., *The Sum of Our Parts: Mixed-Heritage Asian Americans* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001). As Kina and Dariotis point out in *War Baby / Love Child*, in the 2010 Census “2.6 million of 17.3 million Asians identified as Asian plus one or more other races, and a significant population of Asian Americans identified as interethnically mixed.” According to a Pew Research Center study, between 2008–2010, 29 percent of Asian American newlyweds also married interracially (“The Rise of Asian Americans,” 13–14, 20. <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans/>).

³⁵ See Owens, *Mixedblood Messages*, 1998; Montgomery, “Identity Politics,” 1–25; Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*; Perez-Torres, *Mestizaje: Critical Uses of Race in Chicano Culture*.

³⁶ Milton Gordon’s *Assimilation in American Life* is most representative of this perspective. See also Lee and Bean, *The Diversity Paradox*.

³⁷ See Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 19–20; See also Lee and Bean, *The Diversity Paradox*. The mixed-race person of Chinese ancestry would have very different options in the 1940s as compared to the 1880s during the anti-Chinese sentiment that culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1889. These attitudes had somewhat softened and were now directed more towards Japanese Americans. This shift was attributable in part to Japan’s aggressive actions against China in the 1940s. It was also due to the perceived threat posed by Japanese Americans to the economic interests of white Americans and to national security at the outbreak of WWII. Consequently, the mixed-race persons of Japanese ancestry would have their racial options limited during the 1940s. Both mixed-race individuals of Japanese ancestry and mixed-race individuals of Chinese ancestry would experience increased options by the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

Unlike places such as Latin America, it is still not a normative and sanctioned pattern in the United States for individuals to identify as racially white while simultaneously acknowledging African American ancestry, as has historically been the case with Native American and other ancestries of color. In fact, as long as the one-drop rule remains intact, whether formally or informally, whether through external ascription or self-ascription, it precludes or at least complicates not only a multiracial but also white identification. The only way individuals of African descent have historically succeeded in being considered white has been through racial passing, which essentially requires individuals to conceal their background and avoid any circumstances that might unravel their “racial disguise.” See Daniel, “Passers and Pluralists,” 49–55.

Nevertheless, recent research on first-generation or biracial young adults indicates that a small yet increasing number of individuals of partial African American descent—particularly those who more closely approximate a European American phenotype—embrace a white racial identity. More important, this identity has been validated through social interaction, particularly with European American peers. Such an identity does not necessarily originate in discomfort with or rejection of their background(s) of color. Rather, it can reflect the preponderance of European Americans in their social milieu and/or relative lack of contact with family members and other individuals from their background(s) of color. See “White Girl: A Dialogue on Race,” *Nightline*, ABC, May 9, 2000; Root, “Experiences and Processes,” 237–42; Rockquemore and Brunson, *Beyond Black*, 45–47; Rockquemore and Laszloffy, *Raising Biracial Children*, 7, 20–22, 118–21; Root, “Five Mixed-Race Identities,” 16; Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 282.

³⁸ Lee and Bean, “America’s Changing Color Lines,” 221–42; Lee and Bean, *The Diversity Paradox*, 31–33.

³⁹ Exceptions to this pattern among sociologists include Daniel, “Passers and Pluralists,” 91–107, and “Beyond Black and White,” 333–41. This is also true of Davis, *Who Is Black?* Both thoroughly examine the implications of the one-drop rule from a sociological perspective in terms of the suppression of a multiracial identity. This was equally true of historian Spickard’s *Mixed Blood*.

⁴⁰ The prefix “hypo” has various but similar meanings. Anatomically “hypo” means “below, beneath, or under.” Medically, it means “deficient or less than normal.” Consequently, when applied to intergroup relations, the concept is used to convey that “mixed” individuals are assigned the status of the stigmatized and subordinate background. See Meletis and Goratsa, “Derivatives of the Hellenic Word ‘Hema,’” 9.

⁴¹ Anthropologist Marvin Harris coined the term “hypodescent,” which has been interpreted as the one-drop rule given the significance and uniqueness of blackness in US law as well as racial commonsense. Harris writes, “In the United States, the mechanism employed is the rule of hypo-descent. This descent rule requires Americans to believe that anyone who is known to have had a Negro ancestor is a Negro. We admit nothing in between. ‘Hypo-descent’ means affiliation with the subordinate rather than the superordinate group in order to avoid the ambiguity of intermediate identity.” See Harris, *Patterns of Race in Americas*, 56–57.

Yet in principle, the concept is not only applicable to varying degrees of hypodescent that are less restrictive than the one-drop rule in terms of blackness (e.g., the 1/4th rule, 1/8th rule, the 1/16th rule and so on) but also to all mixed-race combinations (Davis, *Who Is Black?*, 55–8). In the 1990s, Paul Spickard, Teresa Williams-León, and Maria P. P. Root, whose work has made a significant contribution to studies of mixed-race individuals of Asian/Asian American descent, pointed out these nuances in the application of hypodescent. They made a distinction between the one-drop rule of hypodescent and similar, if less restrictive, rules in terms of other mixed-race individuals. For example, because of US Executive Order 9066 during WWII, many mixed-race Japanese American/European American offspring on the West Coast, particularly in California, along with all monoracial Japanese, citizens and aliens, were variously relocated to internment camps outside of the restricted Pacific military zone. The 1940 US Census indicates there were also sizable numbers of mixed-ancestry Korean-Japanese, Chinese-Japanese, Filipino-Japanese, Mexican-Japanese, Native Hawaiian-Japanese, and Cherokee-Japanese in California who were eligible for internment as “Japanese.” This lends credence to the argument that the measures were racially motivated, rather than a military necessity.

The camps were a temporary home for at least 1,400 intermarried Japanese Americans, and at least 700 mixed-race individuals. According to the order, anyone with one-eighth or more Japanese ancestry could be interned. There were some non-Japanese spouses who voluntarily accompanied their interracial families to the camps. There were others who remained on the outside to maintain family businesses or earn a living and such. Keeping in mind that the Japanese had only been immigrating to the United States since the mid-1880s, interracial relationships and thus multiracial offspring were not yet common enough to give rise to large numbers of individuals in the 1940s with the small fraction of Japanese ancestry stipulated by the order. The wartime restrictions were primarily applicable to the first-generation offspring of interracial marriages and most consistently applied to individuals with Japanese American fathers. This was based on the assumption that Japanese culture prevailed in the socialization of their offspring. There was greater flexibility in terms of offspring with European American fathers. It was assumed these individuals had “properly” acculturated Anglo-American beliefs, values, and customs. See Williams, “Race as Process,” 53–56.

⁴² Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation*, 106.

⁴³ Davis, *Who Is Black?*, 9–11, 55–58.

⁴⁴ See Forbes, *Africans and Native Americans*; Katz, *Black Indians*; Quan, *Lotus Among the Magnolias*; Loewen, *The Mississippi Chinese*. Rebecca Romo’s analysis of individuals of African American and Mexican descent (“Blaxicans”) indicates a similar pattern. Yet these individuals are also held accountable by African Americans and Chicanas/os/Mexicans to monoracial notions of “authenticity.” See Romo, “Between Black and Brown,” 402–26.

⁴⁵ See Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices*.

⁴⁶ Guevarra, *Becoming Mexipino*.

⁴⁷ Johnston and Nadal, “Multiracial Microaggressions,” 123–44.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 127.

⁴⁹ Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory*, 159.

⁵⁰ Nadal, et al., “Microaggressions and Multiracial Experience,” 43; Romo, “Between Black and Brown,” 121.

⁵¹ Lipsitz, *Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, 2.

⁵² Many white radicals, who have been engaged in antiracist work in solidarity with the struggles of people of color, have displayed similar attitudes. See, for example, Tim Wise, “Racism, White Supremacy, and Biracial/Multiraciality (2011).” *Insights and Outbursts* 2. September 16, 2012. <http://www.timwise.org/2012/09/insights-and-outbursts-volume-2/>.

⁵³ Anderson, *Beyond Ontological Blackness*, 13.

⁵⁴ Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation*, 99, 131.

⁵⁵ Russell, Wilson, and Hall, *The Color Complex*, 127–28, 134–62; Wade, Romano, and Blue, “The Effect of African American Skin Color,” 2550–58. Similar trends have been documented among other groups of color besides African Americans. See Rondilla and Spickard, *Is Lighter Better?*; Telles and Murguía, “Phenotypic Discrimination and Income Differences,” 682–96; Gómez, “Brown Outs,” 193–204.

⁵⁶ Hunter, “Buying Racial Capital,” 142–64; Hunter, *Race, Gender, and... Skin Tone*, 5, 8, 10, 46; Arce, Murguía, and Frisbie, “Phenotype and Life Chances,” 19–33; Darryl Fears, “Race Divides Hispanics, Report Says: Integration and Income Vary with Skin Color,” *Washington Post*, July 14, 2003, Final edition, A.03; Telles and Murguía, “Phenotypic Discrimination,” 682–96.

⁵⁷ Hughes and Hertel, “The Significance of Color Remains,” 5–20; Hagiwara, Kashy, and Cesario, “The Independent Effects of Skin Tone,” 892–98.

⁵⁸ Keith and Herring, “Skin Tone and Stratification,” 760–78; Allen, Telles, and Hunter, “Skin Color, Income and Education,” 129–80.

⁵⁹ Itabari Njeri, “Colorism: In American Society, Are Light-skinned Blacks Better Off?” *Los Angeles Times*, April 24, 1988, Home edition; Russell, Wilson, and Hall, *The Color Complex*, 134–62. See also Beltrán and Fojas, Introduction to *Mixed Race Hollywood*, 1–22.

⁶⁰ Hall, Preface to *Discrimination Among Oppressed Populations*, vii–viii.

⁶¹ In terms of the census, this could have been addressed with the implementation of a “combined format” that would include a separate multiracial identifier but would also allow individuals to check all applicable boxes corresponding to their racial backgrounds. Key organizations, particularly AMEA, its affiliates, and Project RACE, put forth that format as an option during the Congressional Hearings in the 1990s. That proposed format was not without controversy. Several traditional civil rights organizations initially objected to the proposed inclusion of a multiracial category to the race question on the census, expressing concern over how such a category might impact the tabulation of data for underrepresented groups of color for the purposes of enforcing civil rights legislation. Specifically, they argued that a stand-alone multiracial identifier would lead to a loss of numbers. Their opposition was informed in part by the perception that multiracial movement activists were merely seeking to add a stand-alone multiracial category to the race question rather than a possible combined format.

Various factors contributed to this erroneous interpretation, including media coverage and the somewhat ambiguous statements of movement leaders themselves.

Furthermore, multiracial movement activists ultimately split over the racial data collection format they sought to implement. Faced with likely opposition from both traditional civil rights organizations and various government agencies that require data on race and ethnicity, multiracial movement leadership met on June 7, 1997 in Oakland, California, and ultimately withdrew its support for the combined format. Instead, they settled on a revised model (“The Oakland Compromise”) presented by Project RACE that recommended a “check more than one box” option without a separate multiracial identifier. However, the leadership of Project RACE—perhaps under pressure from its constituents—eventually retracted support for its own revised model and returned to its original goal of implementing a “combined format.” On July 9, 1997, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the branch of government responsible for implementing changes in federal statistical surveys, announced its recommendations for “check more than one box” format without a multiracial category or any mention of the word multiracial in the race question. Officials in Washington, DC were unaware that multiracial movement leaders had arrived earlier at a similar proposal.

Following the OMB recommendations, organizations such as Hapa Issues Forum and the AMEA elicited support from traditional civil rights organizations, including the NAACP, the Japanese Americans Citizens League, and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, for the “check more than one” format. Meanwhile, Project RACE, joined by APUN (A Place for Us National) and other individual activists, continued to advocate for a multiracial category in the combined format. Their objections were based in part on the fact that individuals who checked more than one box would be retrofitted into the single-race categories comprising their ancestry for the purposes of civil rights enforcement rather than being counted as a distinct “multiple race” population. Consequently, these activists did not consider the OMB’s recommendations to be a significant advance over methods of data collection and tabulation in previous censuses. Nevertheless, the OMB’s final decision on October 31, 1997, supported the “check one or more” format. Following the OMB’s final decision, the AMEA itself was incorporated in an oversight committee that was formed to address this new format and other concerns in terms of the 2000 census (Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 230–41).

⁶² Daniel, *Machado de Assis*, 213–14, 244; Wilber, “An Integral Theory,” 71–92, *The Marriage of Sense and Soul*, 141, and *Integral Psychology*, 278.

⁶³ Daniel, *Machado de Assis*, 213–14; Wilber, “An Integral Theory,” 71–92.

⁶⁴ Colker, *Hybrid*, 1–10; Daniel, *Machado de Assis*, 244; Wilber, “An Integral Theory,” 71–92.

⁶⁵ For example, multiracials in South Africa mobilized around Coloured identity during the early twentieth century in an attempt to prevent further erosion of their few existing privileges in the face of increasing restrictions that would culminate in legalized apartheid in the mid-twentieth century. Their preference would have been assimilation into the white community. Denied that possibility, they sought increased social rewards, however few, superior to blacks but inferior to those of whites. See Adhikari, *Not White Enough, Burdened by Race*, and “Hope, Fear, Shame, Frustration”; Goldin, *Making Race*; Lewis, *Between Wire and Wall*; Van der Ross, *Rise and Decline of Apartheid*.

⁶⁶ Daniel, “Passers and Pluralists,” 92–94, *Machado de Assis*, 118–20, and *More Than Black?*, 49–55. Passing has frequently been associated with the adoption of a “virtual” white racial identity by individuals whose “actual” identity is that of African Americans based on legal definitions of blackness originating in hypodescent. See Goffman, *Stigma*, 48–51. They have pirated an identity that allows them to escape racial subordination and gain privileges and status that are not “rightfully” theirs. See Ginsberg, “Introduction: The Politics of Passing,” 3–5. As compared to dramatic frontline battles waged against racial inequality, passing may appear on the surface to be a form of opportunism, selling out, or full acceptance of the racial status quo. And passing certainly can exact a heavy emotional toll. If viewed as part of a spectrum of tactics, however, it is clear that passing is an underground tactic, a conspiracy of silence that seeks to best oppression at its own game. Passing exposes not only the political motivations behind racial categories (Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 49–55) but also racial difference as a continually emerging distinction devoid of any essential content. It attests to the fact that whiteness can be donned by someone who has mastered the art of racial cross-dressing and disguise (Ginsberg, “Introduction: The Politics of Passing,” 3–5).

⁶⁷ Piper, “Passing for White, Passing for Black,” 9. That said, Ingrid Dineen-Wimberly found that between 1862 and 1919, when racial rules were still somewhat in flux, these mixed-race individuals had “racial options.” For many, the advantages of assuming positions of civic and political leadership in the African American community and in the struggles of black people held greater “allure” than the perceived benefits of passing for white. See Ingrid Dineen-Wimberly, *By the Least Bit of Blood: The Allure of Blackness among Mixed-Race Americans of African Descent, 1862–1919* (forthcoming in 2014).

⁶⁸ Blue-vein societies flourished in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in cities such as Charleston, Philadelphia, Nashville, Louisville, New Orleans, Boston, New York, Atlanta, and particularly Washington, D.C., to mention only a few. Though such elites vigorously opposed any forms of segregation that would restrict them to African American social spaces, they understood themselves to be a privileged class of a stigmatized minority. Thus, many were sympathetic to the plight of less fortunate African Americans. See Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 55–67.

⁶⁹ During the colonial period, the experience of multiracials in the lower South (“Latin” North America), particularly Louisiana and the Gulf Ports of Mobile, Pensacola, and Natchez, differed from that in the North and upper South (Anglo-North America). This region, which was settled by the French and Spanish, was comparatively more tolerant of miscegenation. There were legal barriers to interracial marriages. Yet rape, temporary extramarital relations, extended concubinage and common-law unions between white men and women of color were approved, if not encouraged, by prevailing, unwritten mores. In addition, Europeans granted multiracials an intermediate status and privileges inferior to those of whites but superior to those of blacks.

These circumstances changed after France and Spain ceded this territory to the United States through the Louisiana Purchase Treaty of 1803 and the Adams-Onís Treaty of 1819. Overwhelmed by an English-speaking majority, individuals of French and Spanish cultural orientation (or Creoles) of all racial backgrounds remained aloof from the new arrivals, who they correctly perceived as threatening their cultural and political survival. They fought to maintain French (or Spanish) civil law, their unique cultural traditions, the teaching of French (or Spanish) in public schools and Creole dominance over local and regional governments. For their part, Anglo Americans concentrated on securing economic, political, and social dominance by minimizing cultural differences between themselves and their European Creole counterparts in order to build a united racial white front against all individuals of African descent. The implementation of the one-drop rule, which reversed the intermediate status mixed-race Creoles of color had maintained during the French and Spanish regimes, was part of their

strategy for achieving this objective. The ternary racial order was gradually replaced with a binary one, which by the early twentieth century designated as black all individuals of African descent. Multiracials were relegated to the subordinate status of blacks, deprived of citizenship, politically disenfranchised, and eventually segregated from whites. The implications of blackness in US jurisprudence played themselves out in Louisiana in the landmark 1896 Supreme Court decision involving a Creole of one-eighth African American descent, Hommeré A. Plessy. In the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision, the Court conceded that legal definitions of blackness varied from state to state and was thus beyond its jurisdiction. It nevertheless took brief “judicial notice” of what was assumed to be racial common sense: A black person was anyone with any amount of African American traceable descent. *Plessy* set a judicial precedent for future rulings on legal definitions of blackness. It also established Jim Crow segregation in public railway transportation and, shortly thereafter, in public facilities and schools (Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 109–10, 130–33).

⁷⁰ There is no certainty about the origins of these communities. They probably evolved from frontier settlements that became magnets for runaway slaves, trappers, homesteaders, adventurers, deserters, outlaws, outcasts, and nonconformists of all racial backgrounds. Examples include the Lumbees in North Carolina, the Melungeons found primarily in northeastern Tennessee, southwestern Virginia, and southeastern Kentucky, and the Ramapo Mountain People around the border of New York and New Jersey (Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 69–73).

⁷¹ Anita Puckett examines the identity and experiences of core members of the Melungeon identity movement, who are typically educated, middle-class professionals residing outside the geographical confines of Southern Appalachia. She compares these individuals with the typically poor rural Melungeons who live in areas where the stigma of being Melungeon still remains somewhat intact. She points out that the former can embrace a Melungeon identity with few, if any, negative social consequences; the latter are more likely to experience oppression based on their Melungeon identity. Conversely, Puckett contends that claims of oppression and marginalization in one’s ancestry and notions of “exotic” and “mysterious” racial origins may hold considerable appeal for the former (135). Embracing a Melungeon identity therefore may be catalytic in differentiating these individuals from the masses of middle-class whites as a shield from the discomfort they feel due their white racial privilege (143). Puckett maintains that movement members embrace a multiracial background that acknowledges African ancestry as a component of that mixed-race composition. She and others maintain, however, that neither African culture nor African origins are articulated as prominent parts of Melungeon heritage. See Puckett, “The Melungeon Identity Movement,” 135–6. Puckett states, “The movement thus seems contradictory, embracing multiracial ancestry as a means of deconstructing whiteness, but excluding Africanness from meaningful participation in its ideology”... “and mapping of relations to place” (136, 138).

⁷² Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 190–91.

⁷³ Hall, “Please Choose One,” 250–64.

⁷⁴ Park, “Human Migration,” 881–93; Stonequist, *The Marginal Man*, 10–11, 24–27.

⁷⁵ Nakashima, “An Invisible Monster,” 164.

⁷⁶ Park, “Human Migration,” 881–93; Stonequist, *The Marginal Man*, 10–11, 24–27.

⁷⁷ Root, “Within, Between, and Beyond Race,” 3–11; Williams-León and Nakashima, “Reconfiguring Race,” 3–10; Wright and Wright, “A Plea for a Further Refinement,” 361–68; Poston, “Biracial Identity,” 152–55.

⁷⁸ Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 106–7; Turner, *The Ritual Process*, 94–130; Trubshaw, “The Metaphors and Rituals of Place and Time: An Introduction to Liminality or Why Christopher Robin Wouldn’t Walk on the Cracks.” Originally published in *Mercian Mysteries*, no.22 (February 1995). *At the Edge*. Created 1996; updated November 2008. <http://www.indigogroup.co.uk/edge/liminal.htm>.

⁷⁹ Turner, *The Ritual Process*, 94–130.

⁸⁰ Trubshaw, “Metaphors Rituals of Place and Time.”

⁸¹ Whalen, “Introduction: Rhetoric as Liminal Practice,” *RHETOR1* (2004).

<http://www.cssr-scsr.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/RhetorLWhalen-e.pdf>.

⁸² Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 106–7, 113–4, 214; Root, “Resolving ‘Other’ Status,” 185–205; Williams-León and Nakashima, “Reconfiguring Race,” 3–10; Adler, “Beyond Cultural Identity,” 23–40; Antonovsky, “Toward a Refinement,” 57–67; Goldberg, “Qualification of Marginal Man,” 52–58; Green, “Re-examination of Marginal Man,” 167–71; Kerckhoff and McCormick, “Marginal Status,” 48–55; Park, “Human Migration,” 881–93; Poston, “Biracial Identity,” 152–55; Wright and Wright, “Plea for Further Refinement,” 361–68.

⁸³ For an extensive list of over 400 publications on Barack Obama see Riley’s *Mixed Race Studies* website: <http://www.mixedracestudies.org/wordpress/?cat=63>.

⁸⁴ Obama, *Dreams from My Father*, xv, 23–25, 30–33.

⁸⁵ Obama has never said he *identifies* as multiracial. This was underscored when he checked only the “Black, African American, or Negro” box, rather than multiple boxes, on the 2010 census. See Sam Roberts and Peter Baker, “Asked to Declare His Race, Obama Checks ‘Black,’” *New York Times*, April 2, 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/03/us/politics/03census.html?_r=0; Mark S. Smith, “Obama Census Choice: African-American,” *Huffington Post*, April 2, 2010. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/02/obama-census-choice-afric_n_524012.html. To the disappointment, if not chagrin, of MAVIN, one of the nation’s multiracial advocacy groups, Obama cautioned about a multiracial identity in conversation with organization representatives who were hoping to capitalize on his multiraciality as part of their documentary film *Chasing Day Break*. See Elam, *Souls of Mixed Folk*, xiv. In the media Obama is generally referred to as black or African American, rarely as multiracial or biracial.

⁸⁶ Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 93–113; Rockquemore and Brunnsma, *Beyond Black*, 40–52; Anzaldúa, *Borderlands*, 77–91; Renn, *Mixed Race Students in College*, 67–93; Wallace, *Relative/Outsider*, 121–25, 147–52; DaCosta, *Making Multiracials*, 138–43.

⁸⁷ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6; Cornell and Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race*, 86, 96; See also DaCosta, *Making Multiracials*, 147–8, and Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 114. Daniel’s chapter “Neither Black nor White: A Multiracial Collective Subjectivity” in *More Than Black?* provides a theoretical framing for understanding group formation among multiracial-identified individuals. Despite claims to the contrary, the existence of a sense of group identity among multiracial individuals does exist. This has borne itself out at support group meetings and conferences, as well as events such as the Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival, the Critical Mixed Race Studies Conference, and other outlets. Moreover, survey and ethnographic data backup this conclusion although considerably more research with larger samples needs to be conducted.

The presence of a broader collective subjectivity among multiracial-identified individuals does not preclude simultaneous identification with other specific ones based on various multiracial backgrounds as indicated by Hapas Issues Forum and other similar entities. This makes all the more sense given the differential racialization of the monoracial groups of color that compose multiracial-identified individuals' backgrounds. These help inform the accompanying differences through which their multiracial experiences are refracted, which in turn give rise to commonalities or affinities based on those differences. See Castañeda-Liles, "Multiracial... Orientation Scale"; Da Costa, *Making Multiracials*, 134–43, 147–8, 150–53; Jones, "Who Are We?" 139–62; Newman, "Colorblindness and Formation Collective Identity."

⁸⁸ "Biracial Baby Boom" is a term coined by Maria P. P. Root to describe the growing number of multiracial offspring born following the 1967 US Supreme Court decision in *Loving v. Virginia*, which overturned the last anti-miscegenation laws in the United States.

⁸⁹ Banton, *Racial Theories*, 1; Philipkoski, "Gene Map Presents Race Concerns," *Wired*, February 16, 2001.

<http://www.wired.com/science/discoveries/news/2001/02/41619>; Jorde and Wooding, "Genetic Variation," s28–s33; Olson, *Mapping Human History*, 32–48; Olson, "Why We're All Jesus' Children: Go Back a Few Millenniums, and We've All Got the Same Ancestors," *Slate*, March 15, 2006. <http://www.slate.com/id/2138060/>.

Approximately 0.1 percent of the 3 billion bases of human DNA (an estimated 10 million) are locations of common genetic variations that differ from individual to individual, which are called single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). Most SNP patterns have been preserved for thousands of years, despite the reshuffling of DNA that occurs with each new generation. Still, SNPs tend to occur in different patterns in various populations and are typically inherited in clusters called haplotype blocks. Like SNPs, varieties of haplotype blocks occur at different frequencies in diverse regions of the world, which has enabled population geneticists to reconstruct the history of human migration. Of all polymorphisms, only a small percentage is different as a function of ancestry. These are called AIMs (Ancestry Informative Markers). AIMs are specific genetic polymorphisms that contain information about population structure, inter- and intra-individual diversity, and the history of the human species. While SNP patterns do not reveal anything about the function of the genes, they can provide information about an individual's continent (s) of ancestry and, by extension, human paths of migration throughout history. See Daniel and Haddow, "All Mixed Up," 311–50.

⁹⁰ The molecular portrait of humanity that emerged from the 2003 publication of the initial conclusions of the Human Genome Project and Human Genome Diversity Project reiterated the limited relevance of race as a biological concept and portrays humans not as fixed "racial" essences but rather, the end result of extensive "racial" blending. This confirmed what scientists have been saying for over half a century. See "An Overview of the Human Genome Project (HGP)," <http://www.genome.gov/12011238>; "Human Genome Project Goals," <http://www.genome.gov/11006945>; Cavalli-Sforza, Menozzi, and Piazza, *History and Geography Human Genes*, 377–78; Jobling, Hurles, and Tyler-Smith, *Human Evolutionary Genetics*, 27.

The new genomic research has made genetic testing more widely available and affordable to the public. As mixed-race scholarship began in the early 1990s, the tests were not as sophisticated and comprehensive as current ones. Yet this new genomic research has made an important contribution to mixed race studies. Indeed, it has motivated countless individuals across the racial and ethnic spectrum interested in genealogical research to have their DNA tested by numerous companies. These firms charge a fee for collecting samples by having individuals swab their cheeks and mail the sample for DNA analysis to determine their genealogy.

One type of ancestral DNA analysis traces DNA along one of two lines—the paternal Y chromosome line or the maternal mitochondrial line. Both males and females can take the mitochondrial test whereas only males can take the Y-chromosome test since that chromosome is found only in males. Evolutionary biologists believe humans derive their Y chromosomes from an imagined "Y Adam" and their mtDNA from an imagined "mt Eve." Individuals' mitochondrial DNA is a copy of their mother's, their mother's mother's, and so on, which reaches back to the dawn of humanity. The male's Y chromosome is identical to that of his father, and can provide accurate information about an individual's father's, his father's father's, and so on back indefinitely through all ancestral generations on the Y-chromosome line. Yet Y-DNA or mtDNA tests suffer from limitations. Each utilizes proprietary computer programs to trace respectively only one of an individual's ancestors—either paternal (Y-DNA) or maternal (mtDNA) lines—as well as their descendants and siblings (same sexed siblings for Y-DNA or all siblings for mtDNA). In other words, these mitochondrial DNA and Y chromosome analyses focus on one of the ancestors from whom individuals have inherited DNA, which leaves out a majority of their antecedents. Humans derive most of their nuclear DNA from all the other reproductive females and males at that time in pre-history, and so on. Consequently, each individual's family lineage is much greater than one ancestral line.

The new autosomal DNA test can pinpoint the geographical origins and estimated percentages of an individual's genes that are inherited from ancestors originating in populations in Asia, Europe, Africa, and in aboriginal America. One company, DNAPrint Genomics, now defunct, maintained that it could use DNA to determine phenotypical traits such as skin and eye color, thus providing more detail to a particular individual's genetic portrait. Their web site made claims of 100 percent accuracy in blind, company-administered tests. Indeed, their DNA tests led to the 2004 conviction of an African American suspected of serial murders in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Based on eyewitness testimony and the assumption that most serial killers are white males, police initially were searching for a white suspect. However, DNAPrint Genomics offered to examine a DNA sample taken from the crime scene. The company's conclusions were that the suspect was not European American but rather, a medium- to dark-skinned African American who was 85 percent sub-Saharan African and 15 percent Native American. The DNA matched a sample given voluntarily to the police by Derrick Todd Lee, a man with an extensive criminal record. Lee was convicted and sentenced to death based in part on this DNA analysis.

See Daniel and Haddow, "All Mixed Up," 311–50; Richard Willing, "DNA Tests Offer Clues to Suspect's Race," *USATODAY.com*, August 16, 2005, http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-08-16-dna_x.htm. Dana Hawkins Simons, "DNAPrint's DNA Witness Test Provided Break in the Louisiana Multi-Agency Homicide Task Force Serial Killer Case"; "World's First Genomics-Derived Test For Forensics Redirected Investigation with Dramatic Results." June 5, 2003. <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/DNAPrint%27s+DNAWitness+Test+Provided+Break+in+the+Louisiana...-a0131709614> and "Getting DNA to Bear Witness: Genetic Tests Can Reveal Ancestry, Giving Police a New Source of Clues," *US News & World Report*, June 15, 2003. <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/culture/articles/030623/23dna.htm>.

A caveat of these DNA tests is that the terms "ancestry" and "genetic diversity" have emerged as alternative ways of referring to differences that have historically come to be known as racial ones. Critics have argued that such tests are at best predictive of geographical ancestry, and may be no more accurate in conveying human genetic variation than traditional racial categories. Genetic markers attributed to one group or region are present in others. The inherent danger is that race and racial differences are resurrected as concrete biological facts, encoded within human DNA.

See Koenig, Lee, and Richardson, "Introduction: Race and Genetics," 1–20; Wailoo, Nelson, and Lee, "Introduction: Genetic Claims," 1–12; Ziba Kashef, "Genetic Drift," *ColorLines*, October 3, 2007. http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/10/genetic_drift.html; Daniel and Haddow, "All Mixed Up," 311–50. Dorothy Roberts points out that the "new genetics" has been a cause for celebration and concern in terms of the connection between race, pharmacology, justice, genealogy, and intelligence. The research is far from perfect and can easily be interpreted by the lay public and even by some less conscientious scientists as a proxy for race at time when the same new genetics is arguing that the concept of race has no basis in science. See also Roberts, *Fatal Invention*, 55–80, 226–58, 287–312.

That said, genealogical research in one of the fastest growing trends. The ease of DNA testing, and along with information available on the Internet, including genealogical websites, coupled with heightened interest among lay and professional genealogists, is revealing the extent of racial intermingling over the centuries. These findings may have the unintended consequence of reifying the link between ancestry, biology, and identity. Yet, increased awareness of the myriad ancestors in one's genealogy and DNA inherited from them also calls into question any lingering notions of racial purity. This may prompt larger numbers of individuals to display more fluid or porous monoracial, if not actual multiracial, identities. See Daniel, "Race and Multiraciality: From Barak Obama to Trayvon Martin," (forthcoming in 2014).

⁹¹ Davis, *Who Is Black?*, 19–23.

⁹² In 1953, James Watson and Francis Crick first devised DNA's double helix shape. They relied heavily on theory, intuition, and "Photo 51." The latter was a vague image of DNA produced by x-ray diffraction. Improvements in X-ray based imaging have yielded considerably clearer visualizations. However, the technique uses diffracted light. Consequently, the images of DNA it produces are not actually photographs but more a rendering. Now, for the first time, Enzo di Fabrizio, a researcher at the University of Genoa, Italy, has captured direct photos of DNA. This technique pulls strands of DNA between two small silicone pillars, and then photographs them via an electron microscope. At this point, the technique actually photographs seven strands of DNA wrapped into what is referred to as a "cord." That is because the electrons emitted by the microscope are too powerful to take a picture of a single strand without destroying it. A lower-power electron scope could likely solve that problem. With improved sample preparation and better imaging resolution, scientists could directly observe DNA at the level of single bases. This will no doubt make it possible to observe nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), haplotypes, and Ancestry Informative Markers (AIMs) in individual genetic sequencing (e.g., visually discerning differences between genetic information derived from West African and West European ancestors as well as other genetic differences).

See Ryan Grenoble, "DNA Photo Shows Double Helix for the First Time (PHOTOS)," *Huffington Post*, December 2, 2012. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/02/dna-photo-double-helix_n_2219803.html.

⁹³ Smedley, *Race in North America*, 14–16; Wilson, *Racism*, 37–47.

⁹⁴ This has historically been true of policies at the National Center for Health Statistics, and to a lesser extent, the Census Bureau. The former previously classified blended children in terms of the "minority" parent; the latter classified them in terms of the father's racial/cultural identity. In the 1980s, both agencies shifted to a formula relying on the identity of the mother. Many multiracial children who have European American mothers, therefore, were designated as "white," but in neither case were they designated as "biracial." Beginning in the mid-1960s, however, some adoption agencies described blended children as "racially mixed" or "biracial" in order to attract white adoptive parents by appealing to their Eurocentric bias (Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 104–5).

⁹⁵ Riley, "Don't Pass on Context"; R. Spencer, *Reproducing Race*, 105–108.

⁹⁶ Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends Report, *Marrying Out One-in-Seven New U.S. Marriages Is Interracial or Interethnic*, June 4, 2010; revised June 15, 2010, 4, 11; Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends Report, "The Rise of Intermarriage: Rates, Characteristics Vary by Race and Gender"; February 16, 2012, 5; Qian and Lichter, "Changing Patterns Interracial Marriage," 1071.

⁹⁷ There were several judicial antecedents, if not, precedents, to *Loving*. In terms of jurisprudence, a precedent is a principle established in a previous legal case that is either binding on or persuasive for a court when deciding subsequent cases with similar concerns or facts. This was not necessarily the case with the decision rendered in *Loving*. The legal antecedents to *Loving* included *Perez v. Sharp* (1948), which removed antimiscegenation statutes in California, and *McLaughlin v. Florida* (1964), in which the US Supreme Court unanimously ruled against the constitutionality of Florida's cohabitation statute, which prohibited habitual cohabitation between two unmarried individuals of the opposite sex, if one was black, and the other, white. The decision overturned *Pace v. Alabama* (1883), which had declared such statutes constitutional. *McLaughlin* did not, however, overturn the other part of Florida's anti-miscegenation law prohibiting racial intermarriage between whites and blacks. Such statutes were only declared unconstitutional in *Loving v. Virginia* (See Moran, *Interracial Intimacy*, 79–81, 92–6).

Prior to *Loving*, the racial state regarded interracial intimacy as a private rather than public matter. This was part of the state's tactic of deflecting attention away from the contradictions between its espousal of freedom and justice and the empirical realities of Jim Crow segregation, including antimiscegenation statutes. Interracial intimacy thus became central to the debate on the relationship of private matters to the public sphere of civil rights activism. Many activists wanted interracial intimacy to be considered a public matter as part of the promotion of equal rights and social justice, particularly in terms of black-white relations. They endeavored to achieve this primarily through popular culture, but also through litigation. Activists hoped to expose the pervasive racism in the legal system of a nation that trumpeted itself as the arsenal of democracy to the rest of the world. See Lubin, *Romance and Rights*, ix–xxi, 66–95, 151–59; Moran, *Interracial Intimacy*, 239, 249–50. The *Loving* decision did not, however, derive from the civil rights movement itself although the changing climate engendered by the movement paved the way. It originated in a law suit filed by an interracial couple, Richard Loving, who was European American, and his wife Mildred Jeter, who was an African-descent American. They took their case to the Supreme Court, which ruled anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional.

⁹⁸ Frederickson, "Role of Positive Emotions," 218–26; Watson and Naragon, "Positive Affectivity," 207–15.

⁹⁹ Each of these tropes variously assumes as a fact or at least insinuates that multiracial individuals are automatically imbued with special temperamental qualities, which make them ideally suited as the solution to racism and racial inequality, and ultimately as vehicles in the pursuit of a universal humanism that transcends race. See the "happy hapa" stereotype described in Kina and Dariotis, *War Baby/Love Child*, 13–4. See also Thornton, "Policing the Borderlands," 105–27; Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 178–9; Hollinger, *Postethnic America*, 21, 42, 182; R. Spencer, *Reproducing Race*, 3, 183–212, and "Only the News They Want to Print" in this inaugural issue of *JCMRS*; McNeil, *Sex and*

Race Black Atlantic, 92–93, 105; McKibbin, “The Current State of Multiracial Discourse” in this inaugural issue of *JCMRS*; Carter, *United States... United Races*, 140, 161–90; Squires, *Dispatches from Color Line*, 168–81; DaCosta, *Making Multiracials*, 123–4; Joseph, *Transcending Blackness*, ix–36, 155–72.

¹⁰⁰ A data processing error in the 2000 census resulted in an over count of the “Two or More Races” population by roughly 1 million people (about 15 percent) nationally. This was almost entirely due to misreporting of respondents who, for example, checked “white” or “black” but also wrote in “Hispanic” or the equivalent in “Some Other Race.” These individuals identified as “white Hispanics” or “black Hispanics,” not “two or more races.” Comparisons between the 2000 and 2010 census in terms of these combinations should be approached with caution. “Some Other Race” combinations (e.g., “white and black or African American” or “white and Asian,” should be more comparable across censuses.

See US Census Bureau. “Table 3. Annual Estimates of the Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin for the United States: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2007.” NC-EST2007-03. Release date May 1, 2008. http://www.census.gov/popest/data/historical/2000s/vintage_2007/index.html; US Census Bureau. “We the People of More Than One Race in the United States.” CENSR-22. Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Issued April 2005. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs/censr-22.pdf>; US Census Bureau. *2000 Census Redistricting Data Summary File: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Technical Documentation*. PL/00-1 (RV). Issued March 2001. <https://www.census.gov/rdo/pdf/pl94-171.pdf>; US Census Bureau. *2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File: 2010 Census of Population and Housing, Technical Documentation*. PL/10-2 (RV). Issued January 2011. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/pl94-171.pdf>; Mike Stuckey, “Multiracial Americans Surge in Number, Voice: Obama Candidacy Focuses New Attention on Their Quest for Understanding,” NBCNEWS.com, May 28, 2008. <http://www.nbcnews.com/id/24542138/#.UnX-hVNVV-yk>.

¹⁰¹ In 1979, interracial couples in Berkeley founded iPride (Interracial/Intercultural Pride) to provide general support for interracial families. Their more specific purpose was to petition the Berkeley public schools to reflect the identity of their offspring by including a multiracial designator on school forms. Their efforts resulted in the Berkeley public schools adopting “interracial” as a new identifier on school forms for the 1979–80 school year, making it the first such designator in US history. In 1980–81, however, California state education officials restricted the category to internal district uses only, citing federal reporting requirements that did not permit such a classification. See Fernández, “Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Census, Statistics US House,” 191–210; Fernández, “Government Classification,” 15–36.

iPride is the oldest support organization still operating. Yet the first such organization was Citizens for Classification of Interracial Children (CCIC), which was formed on October 19, 1978, in Seattle, Washington. Along with the support it provided interracial families and multiracial individuals, CCIC also sought to get the federal government to include an “interracial” category on all official forms, including the upcoming 1980 census. The CCIC was successful in getting the Washington State Human Rights Commission to submit a policy recommendation to the Seattle Board of Education to permit public schools to include a category for multiracial children on school forms. However, it does not appear to have succeeded in getting compliance with this recommendation. In addition, the organization had ceased operations by the time activists in iPride and other organizations began mobilizing for changes on the 1990 census (Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 157–8).

¹⁰² The complexities of multiracial identity are not limited to individuals of partial African descent but encompass varied backgrounds. And, the multiracial movement has encompassed a wide variety of organizations and concerns apart from the census. However, the movement targeting the census was disproportionately composed of black-white couples—particularly those involving European American women and African American men—and their offspring. Though only a small percentage of the larger national population of interracial families, their overrepresentation is due to the unique legacy of attitudes and policies that have crystallized around blackness in race relations—and more specifically, racial jurisprudence—in the United States. Yet the key leadership of the movement was disproportionately composed of multiracial adults.

Further beyond the leadership and membership of the educational and support groups, there is a wider circle of participants, readership of multiracial publications, and other devotees who have played a greater or lesser part in the movement; further beyond that, there is a general constituency of potential supporters who are vaguely sympathetic to the movement’s objectives. Though this larger constituency includes individuals from various class backgrounds, the movement originated as the result of political projects and interventions led largely by professionals and white-collar workers. Indeed, the leadership and advisory boards of two organizations MASC and iPride not only consisted of a disproportionate number of individuals with MA and PhD degrees, but also included a cadre of academics—the largest among all of the support groups. Most of these scholars have been in the vanguard of new research on interracial relationships and multiracial identity. This also enhanced the credibility of the movement through public speaking, appearances in the media, and testimony at congressional subcommittee hearings organized (held between 1993 and 1997) to discuss the collection and tabulation of official racial/ethnic data. See Bhattacharyya, Gabriel, and Small, *Race and Power*, 60–87; Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 159.

¹⁰³ In 1992, Charles Byrd established “Interracial Classified” to solicit classified ads and provide readers with the inside scoop on the mixed-race, interracial community. In 1994, the name was changed to “Interracial Voice.” In 1995, the publication went online. This change was due to confusion about the publication’s purpose, as well as a shift in that purpose toward advocacy in terms of the concerns of multiracials and interracial couples. This first e-zine of the multiracial movement was quite significant. Byrd, the editor/publisher, brought a passionate and iconoclastic viewpoint to the movement.

In 2003, the journal became inactive. However, articles are still accessible through the website archives under the name of “Mr. Charles Michael Byrd.” <http://www.zoominfo.com/s/#!search/profile/person?personId=1905034&targetid=profile>.

¹⁰⁴ Williams-León and Nakashima, “Reconfiguring Race, Rearticulating Ethnicity,” 4.

¹⁰⁵ American Indian/Native American studies (e.g., Jack Forbes, Gerald Vizenor, Terry Wilson, Andrew J. Jolivette); Asian American studies (e.g., Teresa Williams-León and Cynthia L. Nakashima); the arts and new media studies (e.g., Mary Beltrán and Camilla Fojas, Velina Hasu Houston, Kip Fulbeck, Lezley Saar, Teja Arboleda, the Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival organized by Fanshen Cox DiGiovanni and Heidi Durrow); Latin@/Chican@ Studies (e.g., Gloria Anzaldúa, Rafael Pérez-Torres); multidisciplinary social sciences (e.g., Katya Gibel Azoulay, Christine Iijima-Hall, W. S. Carlos Poston, George Kitahara-Kich, Maria P. P. Root, Marvin Arnold, Ronald C. Johnson, Phillip Brown, Michael Thornton, Francis Wardle; Rebecca King-O’Rianin; Kimberly DaCosta); Black studies (e.g., Lewis Gordon, Rainier Spencer, Michele Elam, Jared Sexton); history (e.g., Paul Spickard, Gary Nash); literary and cultural studies (e.g., Werner Sollors, Rebecca Walker; Caroline Streeter); and philosophy (e.g., Naomi Zack), among others.

¹⁰⁶ Taylor and Whittier make similar arguments about feminist organizing in “Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities,” 104–30.

¹⁰⁷ Mansbridge, “The Making of Oppositional Consciousness,” 1–19; Morris and Braine, “Social Movements Oppositional Consciousness,” 20–37.

¹⁰⁸ Brown and Douglass, “Making the Invisible Visible,” 323–40; Backstrom, Huttenlocher, Kleinberg, and Lan, “Group Formation . . . Large Social Networks,” 44–54; Marx, “Contested Citizenship,” 159–60; Cornell and Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race*, 73–80, 85–89, 98, 101, 122; Wimmer, “Making Unmaking Ethnic Boundaries,” 970–1022; Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 112–16.

¹⁰⁹ Jolivéte, “Critical Mixed-Race Studies,” 25.

¹¹⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 27.

¹¹¹ The term “third culture” was coined by US social scientist Ruth Hill Useem to describe children (“third culture kids”), particularly the offspring of missionaries, who accompanied their parents to societies outside of the United States. Before World War II, the majority of third-culture children came from missionary and business families. After World War II the composition encompassed missionary, business, government, and military families. These third culture individuals have spent a significant part of their developmental years outside the parents’ culture. Notwithstanding the challenges in adjusting to and integrating their complex surroundings and experiences, third-culture individuals frequently build relationships to all of those cultures, while not having full ownership in or identification with any particular one. Moreover, the third culture transcends the culture of the society in which the association takes place and the cultures of the participants therein. The third culture becomes a bridge between two or more cultures, including that of the host nation(s) and that of the participants. See Useem, Useem, and Donoghue, “Men in Middle of Third Culture,” 169–79; Pollock and Van Reken, *Third Culture Kids*, 13–26. The presence of a third culture is typically experienced only when individuals are engaged in joint cultural encounters and endeavors for an extended period of time. Short term and superficial engagements such as that of tourists may provide “third culture moments” but do not generally serve as the basis of a third culture. Teresa Williams’s “Prism Lives: Identity of Binational Amerasians” (1992), which appeared in Root’s *Racially Mixed People in America*, first applied this term to multiracials in her examination of the mixed-race offspring of interracial and international military families in Japan and the United States.

The concept of third culture has also been applied to artists working with computer and other technologies. Their work is often informed and inspired by innovations and discoveries taking place in science. They also display an interest in discourse among cultural critics and commentators in the humanities relating to the meaning of these discoveries and innovations and their impact on culture and society. Scientists are able to relate to and understand their work primarily because they share the same repertoire: computers. Because their work and tools are in constant flux, they are forced to articulate the reasoning and meaning informing the art they produce. This has traditionally been the role of art critics and historians. This creates room for an active dialogue with both humanists and scientists. Thus they are placed in between these “two cultures,” which promises the emergence of a third culture. The accompanying hybridization promises the emergence of a third culture. See Vesna, “Towards a Third Culture of Working in Between,” 121. See also Brockman, “The Third Culture.” 1991. http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/

Some of the discussion concerning third-culture phenomena can be traced back to C. P. Snow’s famous May 7, 1959 lecture at Cambridge titled “The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution” (London: Cambridge University Press, 1959). Snow critiqued the polarization of the “two cultures”—literary intellectuals on the one hand and scientists on the other. He argued that this divide was not merely an English phenomenon but “a problem of the entire West.” See Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 3. He noted that “at one pole we have the literary intellectuals ... at the other scientists, and as the most representative, the physical scientists” (4). Snow predicted that this split would have disastrous consequences. Therefore, he proposed a revised educational system oriented toward closing the gap between the cultures (Snow 12–22). In the second edition of *Two Cultures*, in 1963, Snow added a new essay, “The Two Cultures: A Second Look,” where he imagined the emergence of a new “third culture” in which dialogue between literary intellectuals and scientists would close the gap between the two cultures. This in turn would help shape the consciousness of the larger society. See Snow, *Two Cultures: and a Second Look: An Expanded Version of the Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 1963), 50.

Similarly, Davy’s *Towards a Third Culture* criticizes dominant rational scientific consciousness where humans are “able to study the processes of nature in fine analytical detail and thus to gain control over them, but ... are strangers in a universe which has lost human meaning.” See Davy, *Toward a Third Culture*, 51. Davy believes a humanizing countercurrent in the form of a “third culture” is needed. It “will retain the particular virtues of the scientific outlook—disciplined thinking, respect for facts, testing by experiment—but it will use them differently ... it will be ... also a religious and an artistic culture” (93). This third culture will serve as a “corrective to the tendencies of science...to lose sight of the whole human being” (104).

More broadly, the concept or third culture interrogates the “monological” paradigm premised on an “either/or” mentation, which seeks to erase complexity, multiplicity, and ambiguity. Singularity is the norm in terms of the construction of all categories of difference encompassing race, gender, sexuality, and a host of others including one’s stance on critical social issues relating to morality and politics. It is emblematic of a collective shift from the modern Eurocentric worldview. The latter is a peculiarly Western point of view that accompanied Europe’s rise to global dominion beginning in the sixteenth century. It considers Europe as a self-contained entity and transcendental nexus of all particular histories by virtue of its unprecedented accomplishments in materialist rationalism, science, and technology, and the extremes to which it thus progressed into the outer reaches of “modernity.”

The epistemological underpinnings of this Eurocentric paradigm, and ultimately the entire modern worldview, originated in what Pitirim Sorokin called the “sensate” sociocultural mode. The ascendancy of the sensate paradigm originated during the Renaissance and was preceded by the ascendancy of its “ideational” counterpart during the rise of Christianity in the medieval era. The sensate worldview supports the belief that the external world has a logical order, which is the interplay of calculable forces, discernible rules, and measurable bodies—the empirical, rational perspective on nature. In contradistinction to this “either/or” mentation, Sorokin’s third culture mentality (“idealistic culture”) reflects a “both/neither” perspective. It is premised on the “centrality of the middle,” which combines aspects of both ideational and sensate modes. It interrogates the dominant “either/or” paradigm which delineates these two modes into antagonistic categories of experience, thus impeding or precluding entirely a sense of mutuality between them. See Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, 226–30, 272–

83; Seidman, Introduction to *The Postmodern Turn*, 8–9; Wilber, *A Brief History of Everything*, 69–70, “An Integral Theory of Consciousness,” 71–92, and *Integral Psychology*, 167, 272, 278.

¹¹² Spickard and Fong, “Pacific Islander Americans Multiethnicity,” 1365–83.

¹¹³ Sandoval, *Methodology of Oppressed*, 82; Daniel, *Machado de Assis*, 121.

¹¹⁴ Lund, *The Impure Imagination*, 47–48.

¹¹⁵ See Freyre, *The Master and the Slaves, The Mansion and the Shanties, Order and Progress*; Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica*, and Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint*.

¹¹⁶ See, for example, Skidmore, *Black into White*, 44–77; Nascimento, *Brazil, Mixture or Massacre?*, 72–80; Stabb, “Indigenism Racism in Mexican Thought,” 405–23; Miller, *Rise and Fall of Cosmic Race*; Trigo, “Shifting Paradigms,” 85–111; Cass, “Fashioning AfroCuba: Fernando Ortiz.”

¹¹⁷ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 5.

¹¹⁸ Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 225.

¹¹⁹ Rosaldo, Forward to *Hybrid Cultures*, xi.

¹²⁰ Shohat and Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, 1–54; Williams and Chrisman, Introduction to *Colonial Discourse Post-Colonial Theory*, 17; Paolini, *Navigating Modernity*, 49–62; Bongie, *Islands and Exiles*, 3–24; Tiffin, Introduction to *Past the Last Post*, vii–vi.

¹²¹ Integration broadly defined is a process in which substantial interaction takes place between various racial and ethnic groups and leads to a reduction of boundary perception. However, there are two types of integration. Egalitarian integration does not assume that any particular group is more valuable than any other and seeks a population that is phenotypically and culturally a transracial/transcultural blend of all its antecedents (Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint*, xi). Inegalitarian integration, known as assimilation, assigns value to one tradition and one people and seeks the elimination of all others. The goal is to increase commonalities by requiring subdominant groups to adapt to the racial and cultural norms of the dominant group with the goal of losing their racial and cultural distinctiveness. See Daniel, “Assimilation or Transculturation?” 44–48.

¹²² Shohat and Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, 38–44.

¹²³ Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, 124–32, 143–6; Shohat and Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, 38–44.

¹²⁴ Bonilla-Silva, *Racism Without Racists*, 25.

¹²⁵ Lund, *The Impure Imagination*, 32; Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 170, 177, and *Race and Multiraciality*, 214–5.

¹²⁶ Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 210–13.

¹²⁷ Kovel, *White Racism*, xi, xxix, xxx–xxxiii, liv–lv, 211–30, 234, 247; Korgen and Brunsmma, “Avoiding Race or Following Racial Scripts,” 191–93.

¹²⁸ Miranda Leitsinger, “Supreme Court Ruling Encourages Supporters—and Opponents—of Affirmative Action,” *NBC NEWS.com*, June 24, 2013. http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/06/24/19119553-supreme-court-ruling-encourages-supporters-and-opponents-of-affirmativeaction?lite&ocid=msnhp&pos=1.

¹²⁹ This also had implications for Latinas/os, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, especially in Texas and the Southwest, where similar practices were in place. Adam Liptak, “Supreme Court Invalidates Key Part of Voting Rights Act,” *New York Times*, June 25, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/26/us/supreme-court-ruling.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

¹³⁰ Sarah Childress, “With Voting Rights Act Out, States Push Voter ID Laws,” *Frontline*, June 26, 2013. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/government-elections-politics/with-voting-rights-act-outstates-push-voter-id-laws/>.

¹³¹ Zimmerman’s father, a retired Magistrate Judge, is a European American. His mother, a former deputy court clerk, is a Peruvian, who describes herself as African-descended (or Afro-Peruvian). Zimmerman was identified as “white” in the initial police report. Later it was learned Zimmerman identifies as “Hispanic.” The media have variously described Zimmerman as white, Hispanic, white and Hispanic, and white Hispanic.

See Julianne Hing, “The Curious Case of George Zimmerman’s Race,” *Colorlines*, July 22, 2013. <http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/07/The-Curious-Case-of-George-Zimmermans-Race.html>; Suzanne Gamboa, “Trayvon Martin Case: George Zimmerman’s Race Is a Complicated Matter,” *Huffingtonpost.com*. March 29, 2012. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/29/trayvon-martin-casegeorg_n_1387711.html.

“White Hispanic” does not necessarily indicate Zimmerman is being described as “biracial” as would be the case with “white and Hispanic.” Rather, it is more a reflection of official terminology used in the collection of data on race and ethnicity. For example, the census ethnicity question (question 5) asks individuals whether they are of “Hispanic origin” or “Non-Hispanic origin.” Hispanic is not among the categories on the race question (question 6), which includes white, black, Indian or Alaskan Native, as well as several Asian and Pacific Islander categories. Individuals may be “white” in the race question and “Hispanic” in the ethnicity question (e.g., a white Hispanic). Respondents are allowed to check more than one race on the race question. Individuals such as Zimmerman, who are of partial Hispanic descent, are neither permitted to check both Hispanic and non-Hispanic origins on the ethnicity question, nor are they provided with a Hispanic identifier in the race question (Daniel, *Race and Multiraciality*, 225, 234).

¹³² Ta-Nehisi Coates, “Trayvon Martin and the Irony of American Justice,” *The Atlantic*, July 15, 2013. <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/07/trayvon-martin-and-the-irony-of-american-justice/277782/>; Marjorie Cohn, “Key Mistakes Sway Jury in Zimmerman Trial,” *Truthout*, July 17, 2013. <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/17620-zimmerman-vs-martin-racial-profiling-and-self-defense>; Darren Lenard Hutchinson, “Race, Justice, and Trayvon Martin,” *MSNBC.com*, July 15, 2013. <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/07/15/race-justice-and-trayvon-martin/>; G. Flint Taylor, “Racism, the U.S. Justice System, and the Trayvon Martin Verdict,” *Huffington Post*, July 18, 2013. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/g-flint-taylor/racism-the-u-s-justice-sy_b_3612241.html.

¹³³ As mentioned previously, groups of color still maintain a sense of community based on a positive affirmation of these differences, that is, pluralism without hierarchy, notwithstanding extant patterns of exclusion in the larger society based on racial differences, that is, pluralism based on hierarchy.

¹³⁴ Daniel, *More Than Black?*, 155–57; Hunter, *Race, Gender. . . Skin Tone*, 5, 8, 10, 46; Hunter, “Buying Racial Capital,” 142–61; Hagiwara, Kashy, and Cesario, “The Independent Effects of Skin Tone and Facial Features,” 892–98.

¹³⁵ Gramsci, *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, 263; Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation*, 66–69, 84, 115, 148.

¹³⁶ Zack, *Race and Mixed Race*, 99.

¹³⁷ Daniel, *Machado de Assis*, 150.

¹³⁸ There is no consensus on the term “postracial.” MSNBC’s Chris Matthews perhaps encapsulated the most common perception of its meaning in his comments about Obama’s January 27, 2010 State of the Union address. Matthews stated that he “forgot” Obama was black. In other words, it was noteworthy to Matthews that a black president was addressing a room of mostly European Americans and how the issue of race was noticeably absent as compared to the time when he was growing up when racial divisions were pervasive and ever-present.

See Associated Press, “Chris Matthews on Obama: ‘I Forgot He Was Black,’” *MSNBC*, January 27, 2010.

http://www.politico.com/blogs/michaelcalderone/0110/Matthews_I_forgot_he_was_black_tonight_for_an_hour.html.

¹³⁹ Williams, Nakashima, Kich, and Daniel, “Being Different Together,” 359–79; Daniel, “Race, Multiraciality, Election of Barack Obama,” 48–50; Andrew J. Jolivette, “Critical Mixed Race Studies: New Directions in the Politics of Race and Representation” in this inaugural *JCMRS* issue.

¹⁴⁰ Steinhorn and Diggs-Brown, *By the Color of Our Skin*, 222–3.

¹⁴¹ Hutchins and Kaahumanu, “Bicoastal Introduction,” xxii–xxiv.

¹⁴² King and Smith, *Still a House Divided*, 191, 208; Uzodinma Iweala, “Race Still Matters: Obama’s Success Doesn’t Mean that America is ‘Post-racial.’” *Los Angeles Times*, January 23, 2008. <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/jan/23/opinion/oe-iweala23>.

¹⁴³ Hardt and Negri, *Multitude*, 99, 189, 218.

¹⁴⁴ The original bill was published in *The Multiracial Experience*. It was titled “A Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People.” In 1993, the title was changed to “Bill of Rights for People of Mixed Heritage.” See Maria P. P. Root, <http://www.drmariaroot.com/>.

¹⁴⁵ S. Spencer, *Race and Ethnicity*, 33.

¹⁴⁶ Sexton, *Amalgamation Schemes*, 1; R. Spencer, *Reproducing Race*, 139–52.

¹⁴⁷ People frequently criticize Root’s “Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People” for being an overly effusive celebration of individual agency (or “rights”) in terms of mixed-race identity while dismissing or downplaying the structural constraints on that agency. What they fail to grasp is that the bill is not simply a manifesto supporting individual agency. It is overall engaged in a radical critique and indictment of the intertwining forces of racism at the micro- and macro-levels. Moreover, it points to the important but frequently overlooked power of individual resistance to those forces as a potent although not singular vehicle for social structural change. In 2004, the importance of this commitment to social struggle is further articulated in Root’s “Multiracial Oath of Responsibility.” It is even more explicitly antiracist in sentiment and language. See Maria P. P. Root, <http://www.drmariaroot.com/>.

¹⁴⁸ Elam, *The Souls of Mixed Folk*, xiv.

¹⁴⁹ Max Fisher, “American Teacher in Japan Under Fire for Lessons on Japan’s History of Discrimination,” *Washington Post*, February 22, 2013. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/02/22/american-teacher-in-japan-under-fire-for-lessons-on-japans-history-of-discrimination/>. See also Kurokawa, “Markers of the ‘Invisible Race,’” 32–52; and Sung Yup Lee, “Changing Faces,” i, 53–74.

¹⁵⁰ Gist and Dworkin, *The Blending of Races*; Henriques, *Children of Conflict*; Telles and Sue, “Race Mixture: Boundary Crossing,” 129–46; Edwards, Ali, Caballero, and Song, *International Perspectives on . . . Mixedness and Mixing*; Aspinall and Song, *Mixed Race Identities*; King-O’Riain, Small, Mahtani, Song, and Spickard, *Global Mixed Race*.

¹⁵¹ “Facts & Stats.” *DePaul University Newsroom*, accessed March 1, 2012.

http://newsroom.depaul.edu/depaulfactsstats/FactsandStats_2_412_2554.html.

¹⁵² MAVIN Foundation, “MAVIN—About—Purpose,” accessed February 29, 2012, <http://www.mavinfoundation.org/about/mission.html>.

¹⁵³ CMRS 2010 participant evaluation form, e-mail message to cmrs@depaul.edu, November 8, 2010.

¹⁵⁴ This list of proposed values for CMRS is based on a call for a statement of values in the field of Digital Humanities (DH). This may seem like an odd pairing. Yet both fields have emerged during a highly digital age where defining “big tent” boundaries and the contours of a field is influenced by how technology structures the way in which we connect or do not connect with each other. As such, we cannot simply look at structures or content but also how values unite us. See Spiro, “This Is Why We Fight,” 16–35.

¹⁵⁵ A special program at the 2012 Critical Mixed Race Studies Conference, Nov 1–3, 2012, was the Mixed Roots Midwest Presentation of Short Films, Panels and a Live Event. The Mixed Roots Midwest: Selected Shorts featured: *Silences* (2006), Octavio Warnock-Graham; *Crayola Monologues* (2003), Nathan Gibbs; *Mixed Mexican* (2010), Thomas P. Lopez; *Nigel’s Fingerprint* (2003), Kim Kuhteubl. The CMRS program described these critically acclaimed short films as taking on “themes of racism, familial relationships, the Census, and how we define ourselves in a world focused on categorizing people by color.” The Mixed Roots Midwest: Filmmakers Panel featured: Jeff Chiba Stearns (*One Big Hapa Family* 2011), Kip Fulbeck (The Hapa Project 2001–2006), and Kim Kuhteubl (*Nigel’s Fingerprint*, 2003). The panel was described as “Three filmmakers discuss their journeys from pre-production through post-production, and what inspired them to tell stories of the mixed experience.” The Mixed Roots Midwest: Live Event was billed as an “energetic, thought-provoking evening of spoken word artists from Chicago’s own 2nd story, and a preview of Fanshen Cox DiGiovanni’s solo-show-in-progress: *One Drop of Love: A Daughter’s Search for Her Father’s Racial Approval*. These artists meld performance with an exploration and critical analysis of what it means to have a mixed identity.”

¹⁵⁶ Mixed Roots Japan. “About,” *Mixed Roots Japan* on Facebook, accessed January 14, 2013, <https://www.facebook.com/groups/mixedrootsjapan/members/>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adhikari, Mohamed, ed. *Burdened by Race: Coloured Identities in Southern Africa*. Cape Town: UCT Press of Juta and Company, 2009.
- . “Hope, Fear, Shame, Frustration: Continuity and Change in the Expression of Coloured Identity in White Supremacist South Africa, 1910–1994.” PhD diss., University of Cape Town, 2002.
- . *Not White Enough, Not Black Enough: Racial Identity in South Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press; Cape Town: Double Storey Books, 2005.
- Adler, Peter S. “Beyond Cultural Identity: Reflections on Cultural and Multicultural Man.” In *Topics in Cultural Learning*, Vol. 2, edited by Robert W. Brislin, 23–40. Honolulu: East-West Center, 1974.
- Aguirre Beltrán, Gonzalo. *La población negra de México, 1519–1810: Estudio etnohistórico*. Mexico, D.F.: Ediciones Fuente Cultura, 1946.
- Allen, Walter, Edward E. Telles, and Margaret L. Hunter. “Skin Color, Income, and Education: A Comparison of African Americans and Mexican Americans.” *National Journal of Sociology* 12, no. 1 (2000): 129–80.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Anderson, Victor. *Beyond Ontological Blackness: An Essay on African American Religious and Cultural Criticism*. New York: Continuum, 1995.
- Antonovsky, Aaron. “Toward a Refinement of the ‘Marginal Man’ Concept.” *Social Forces* 35, no. 1 (1956): 57–62.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *In My Father’s House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Arboleda, Teja, and Darby Li Po Price. *Crossing the Line: Multiracial Comedians*. Entertaining Diversity, Inc., 2008.
- Arce, Carlos, Edward Murguía, and W. Parker Frisbie. “Phenotype and Life Chances Among Chicanos.” *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 9, no. 1 (1987): 19–32.
- Arnold, Marvin Carnell. “The Effects of Racial Identity on Self-Concept in Interracial Children.” PhD diss., Saint Louis University, 1984. ProQuest (8418608).
- Aspinall, Peter J., and Miri Song. *Mixed Race Identities*. Houndmills, Basingstoke Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Azevedo, Thales de. *As elites de cor: Um estudo de ascensão social*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1955.
- . *Cultura e situação racial no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1966.
- Backstrom, Lars, Dan Huttenlocher, Jon Kleinberg, and Xiangyang Lan. “Group Formation in Large Social Networks: Membership, Growth, and Evolution.” In *KDD’06 Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD, International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 44–54. Philadelphia, August 20–23, 2006.
- Bailey, Stanley R. *Legacies of Race: Identities, Attitudes, and Politics in Brazil*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- . “The Race Construct and Public Opinion: Understanding Brazilian Beliefs About Racial Inequality and Their Determinants.” *American Journal of Sociology* 108, no. 2 (September 2002): 406–39.

-
- Banton, Michael. *Racial Theories*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Bastide, Roger. *Estudos afro-brasileiros*. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1973.
- Beltrán, Mary, and Camilla Fojas. "Introduction." In *Mixed Race Hollywood*, edited by Mary Beltrán and Camilla Fojas, 1–22. New York: New York University Press, 2008.
- Bernstein, Mary, and Marcie de la Cruz. "What Are You?: Explaining Identity As a Goal of the Multiracial Hapa Movement." *Social Problems* 56, no. 4 (November 2009): 722–45.
- Bhattacharyya, Gargi, John Gabriel, and Stephen Small. *Race and Power: Global Racism in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Berry, Brewton. *Almost White: A Study of Certain Racial Hybrids in the Eastern United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Berzon, Judith R. *Neither White nor Black: The Mulatto Character in American Fiction*. New York: New York University Press, 1978.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Bicudo, Virgínia Leone. *Atitudes raciais de pretos e mulatos em São Paulo*. Edição organizada por Marcos Chor Maio. São Paulo: Editora Sociologia e Política, 1945/2010.
- Bongie, Chris. *Islands and Exiles: The Creole Identities of Post/Colonial Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. 2nd ed. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Bowman, Elizabeth Atkins. *White Chocolate*. New York: Forge Books, 1999.
- Boxer, Charles Ralph. *Race Relations in the Portuguese Colonial Empire, 1415–1825*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Brown, Nancy G., and Ramona E. Douglass. "Making the Invisible Visible: The Growth of Community Network Organizations." In Root, *The Multiracial Experience*, 323–40.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique. *Capitalismo e escravidão no Brasil Meridional*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro, 1962.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, and Otávio Ianni. *Cor e mobilidade social em Florianópolis: Aspectos das relações entre negros e brancos numa comunidade do Brasil Meridional*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1960.
- Carter, Greg. *The United States of the United Races: A Utopian History of Racial Mixing*. New York: New York University Press, 2013.
- Cass, Jeremy Leeds. "Fashioning AfroCuba: Fernando Ortiz and the Advent of AfroCuban Studies, 1906–1957." PhD diss., University of Kentucky, 2004.
http://uknowledge.uky.edu/gradschool_diss/375/.
- Castañeda-Liles, Josef Manuel. "The Multiracial Reference Group Orientation Scale (MRGOS): A New Scale for Use with Mixed Race Populations." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 2012. ProQuest 3545113.
- Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi Luca, Paolo Menozzi, and Alberto Piazza. *The History and Geography of Human Genes*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Chew, Kenneth S. Y., David Eggebeen, and Peter R. Uhlenberg. "American Children in Multiracial Households." *Sociological Perspectives* 32, no. 1 (1989): 56–85.
- Christian, Mark. *Multiracial Identity: An International Perspective*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

-
- Colker, Ruth. *Hybrid: Bisexuals, Multiracials, and Other Misfits under American Law*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.
- Corrigall-Brown, Catherine. *Patterns of Protest: Trajectories of Participation in Social Movements*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Douglas Hartmann. *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1998.
- Cottrol, Robert J. *The Long, Lingering Shadow: Slavery, Race, and Law in the American Hemisphere*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2013.
- Cox DiGiovanni, Fanshen, writer and performer. *One Drop of Love: A Daughter's Search for Her Father's Racial Approval*. Solo Performance Piece, 2012. See <http://www.onedropoflove.org/>.
- DaCosta, Kimberly McClain. *Making Multiracials: State, Family, and Market in the Redrawing of the Color Line*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Daniel, G. Reginald. "Assimilation or Transculturation? The Dynamics of Ethnic Relations Reconsidered." *Unity and Difference: A Journal of Writers, Artists, and Students* 1, no.1 (1999): 44–48.
- . "Beyond Black and White: The New Multiracial Consciousness." In *Root, Racially Mixed People in America*, 333–41.
- . *Machado de Assis: Multiracial Identity and the Brazilian Novelist*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012.
- . *More Than Black? Multiracial Identity and the New Racial Order*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.
- . "Passers and Pluralists: Subverting the Racial Divide." In *Root, Racially Mixed People*, 91–107.
- . "Race and Multiraciality: From Barack Obama to Trayvon Martin." In *Race and the Obama Phenomenon: The Vision of a More Perfect Multiracial Union*, edited by G. Reginald Daniel and Hettie V. Williams. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2014.
- . *Race and Multiraciality in Brazil and the United States: Converging Paths?* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.
- . "Race, Multiraciality, and the Election of Barack Obama: Toward a More Perfect Union?" In *Obama and the Biracial Factor: The Battle for a New American Majority*, edited by Andrew J. Jolivette, 31–59. Bristol, UK: Policy Press, 2012.
- Daniel, G. Reginald, and Gary L. Haddow. "All Mixed Up: A New Racial Commonsense in Global Perspective." In *Color Struck: Essays on Race and Ethnicity in Global Perspective*, edited by Julius O. Adekunle and Hettie V. Williams, 311–50. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010.
- Daniel, G. Reginald, and Andrew Michael Lee. "Competing Narratives: Race and Multiraciality in the Brazilian Racial Order." In King-O'Riain *et al.*, *Global Mixed Race* (forthcoming in 2014).
- Dávila, Jerry. *Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917–1945*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Davis, F. James. *Who Is Black? One Nation's Definition*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.
- Davy, Charles. *Toward a Third Culture*. London: Faber and Faber, 1961.
- Degler, Carl N. *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1971.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Dineen-Wimberly, Ingrid. *By the Least Bit of Blood: The Allure of Blackness Among Mixed-Race Americans of African Descent, 1862–1919* (forthcoming in 2014).

-
- Dominguez, Virginia R. *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1986.
- Edelman, Marc. "Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30, no. 1 (2001): 285–317.
- Edwards, Rosalind, Suki Ali, Chamion Caballero, and Miri Song, eds. *International Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Mixedness and Mixing*. Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge, 2012.
- Elam, Michele. *The Souls of Mixed Folk: Race, Politics, and Aesthetics in the New Millennium*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Erasmus, Zimitri, ed. *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place: New Perspectives on Coloured identities in Cape Town*. Cape Town: Kwela Books, 2001.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lan Markmann. New York: Grove, 1967. Originally published as *Peau noire, masques blancs* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1952).
- . *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press, 1968. Originally published as *Les Damnés de la Terre* (Paris: F. Maspéro, 1961).
- Fernández, Carlos A. "Government Classification of Multiracial/Multiethnic People." In Root, *The Multiracial Experience*, 15–36.
- . "Testimony of the Association of MultiEthnic Americans Before the Subcommittee on Census, Statistics, and Postal Personnel of the U.S. House of Representatives." In Zack, *American Mixed Race*, 191–210. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1995.
- Forbes, Jack D. *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- . *Black Africans and Native Americans: Color, Race and Caste in the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- . "Black Pioneers: The Spanish-Speaking Afro-Americans of the Southwest." In *Minorities in California History*, edited by George E. Frakes and Curtis B. Solberg, 20–33. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Franco, Maria Sylvia de Carvalho. *Homens livres no ordem escravocrata*. São Paulo: Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros, 1969.
- Fredrickson, Barbara L. "The Role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology: The Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions." *American Psychologist* 56, no. 3 (2001): 218–26.
- Freyre, Gilberto. *The Mansions and the Shanties: The Making of Modern Brazil*. Translated by Harriet de Onís. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963. Originally published as *Sobrados e os mucambos* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nacional, 1936).
- . *The Masters and the Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization*. Translated by Samuel Putnam. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956. Originally published as *Casa-Grande e senzala* (Rio de Janeiro: Maia & Schmidt, 1933).
- . *Order and Progress: Brazil from Monarchy to Republic*. Translated and edited by Rod W. Horton. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970. Originally published as *Ordem e progresso* (Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1959).
- Fry, Peter. "Politics, Nationality, and the Meanings of 'Race' in Brazil." *Daedalus* 129, no. 2 (2000): 83–118.
- Fulbeck, Kip, writer, producer, director. *Banana Split*. Seaweed Productions. Video Performance. 1991.
- . *Banana Split*. Seaweed Productions. Video Performance. 1991.
- . *Game of Death*. Seaweed Productions. Video Performance. 1991.
- . *The Hapa Project*. Multiracial Identity Art Project and Photography Series. 2001–2006.
- . *Some Questions for 28 Kisses*. Seaweed Productions. Video Performance. 1994.

-
- Funderburg, Lise. *Black, White, Other: Biracial Americans Talk About Race and Identity*. New York: William Morrow, 1994.
- Gaddy, LeVonne. *A Guide for the Racially and Culturally Mixed*. Los Angeles: The Center for Interracial Counseling and Psychotherapy, 1989.
- Gibbs, Jewelle Taylor. "Identity and Marginality: Issues in the Treatment of Biracial Adolescents." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 57, no. 2 (1987): 265–78.
- Gibbs, Nathan, multimedia producer, director, and writer. *Crayola Monologues*. Animated Video. 2003.
- Gilroy, Paul. *Against Race. Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000.
- . *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- . "Diaspora and the Detours of Identity." In *Identity and Difference: Culture, Media and Identities*, edited by Kathryn Woodward, 299–343. London: Sage, 1997.
- . "The End of Anti-Racism." In *Race and Local Politics*, edited by Wendy Ball and John Solomos, 191–209. London: Macmillan, 1990.
- Ginsberg, Elaine K. "Introduction: The Politics of Passing." In *Passing and the Fictions of Identity*, edited by Elaine K. Ginsberg, 1–18. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Girard, Vanessa. *Diversity Is Me. Survival Guide for Mixed Race People*. Raleigh, NC: Lulu Enterprises, 2010.
- Gist, Noel Pitts, and Anthony Gary Dworkin, eds. *The Blending of Races: Marginality and Identity in World Perspective*. New York and London: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.
- Goffman, Erving. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Goldberg, David Theo. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993.
- . "The Semantics of Race." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15, no.4 (1992): 543–69.
- . "The Social Formation of Racist Discourse." In *Anatomy of Racism*, edited by David Theo Goldberg, 295–318. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- . *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
- Goldberg, Milton M. "A Qualification of the Marginal Man Theory." *American Sociological Review* 6, no. 1 (1941): 52–58.
- Goldin, Ian. *Making Race: The Politics and Economics of Coloured Identity in South Africa*. London: Longman, 1987.
- Gómez, Christina. "Brown Outs: The Role of Skin Color and Latinas." In *Racism in the 21st Century: An Empirical Analysis of Skin Color*, edited by Ronald E. Hall, 193–204. New York: Springer, 2008.
- Gordon, Lewis R. "Critical 'Mixed Race?'" *Social Identities* 1, no. 2 (1995): 381–95.
- . *Her Majesty's Other Children: Sketches of Racism from a Neocolonial Age*. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997.
- . "Mixed Race in Light of Whiteness and Shadows of Blackness: Naomi Zack on Mixed Race." Chapter 5 in *Existential Africana: Understanding Africana Existential Thought*, 96–117. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Graham, Richard. "Introduction." In *The Idea of Race in Latin America, 1870–1940*, edited by Richard Graham, 1–5. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated and edited by Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

-
- Green, Arnold W. "A Re-examination of the Marginal Man Concept." *Social Forces* 26, no.2 (1947): 167–71.
- Guevarra, Rudy. *Becoming Mexipino: Multiethnic Identities and Communities in San Diego*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012.
- Hagiwara, Nao, Deborah A. Kashy, and Joseph Cesario. "The Independent Effects of Skin Tone and Facial Features on Whites' Affective Reactions to Blacks." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48, no. 4 (2012): 892–98.
- Haizlip, Shirlee Taylor. *The Sweeter the Juice: A Family Memoir in Black and White*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.
- Hall, Christine C. Iijima. "The Ethnic Identity of Racially Mixed People: A Study of Black-Japanese." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1980. ProQuest (8023314).
- _____. "Please Choose One: Ethnic Identity Choices for Biracial Individuals." In Root, *Racially Mixed People*, 250–64.
- Hall, Ronald E. "Preface." In *Discrimination Among Oppressed Populations*, edited by Ronald E. Hall, vii–viii. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, 222–37. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.
- _____. "The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity." In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by Anthony D. King, 19–40. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- _____. "New Ethnicities." In *'Race,' Culture, and Difference*, edited by James Donald and Ali Rattansi, 252–59. London: Sage Publications, 1992.
- _____. "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities." In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by Anthony D. King, 41–68. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Haney-Lopez, Ian. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Harris, Marvin. *Patterns of Race in the Americas*. New York: Norton, 1964.
- Hasenbalg, Carlos. *Discriminação e desigualdades raciais no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1979.
- Henriques, Fernando. *Children of Conflict: A Study of Interracial Sex and Marriage*. New York: Dutton, 1975.
- Hernández, Tanya Katerí. "Multiracial Matrix: The Role of Race Ideology in the Enforcement of Anti-Discrimination Laws, a United States-Latin America Comparison." *Cornell Law Review* 87, no. 5 (2002): 1093–1176.
- _____. *Racial Subordination in Latin America: The Role of the State, Customary Law, and the New Civil Rights Response*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- _____. "The Value of Intersectional Comparative Analysis to the 'Post-Racial' Future of Critical Race Theory: A Brazil-U.S. Comparative Case Study." *Connecticut Law Review* 43, no. 5 (2011): 1407–37.
- Hickman, Christine B. "The Devil and the One-Drop Rule: Racial Categories, African Americans, and the U.S. Census." *Michigan Law Review* 95, no. 5 (1997): 1161–1265.
- Hochschild, Jennifer L. "Multiple Racial Identifiers in the 2000 Census, and Then What?" In *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters, 340–53. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002.

-
- Hochschild, Jennier L., Vesla M. Weaver, and Traci R. Burch. *Creating a New Racial Order: How Immigration, Multiracialism, Genomics, and the Young Can Remake Race in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Hollinger, David A. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Houston, Velina Hasu, playwright. *American Dreams*. Theatrical Play 1984.
- . *Asa Ga Kimashita (Morning Has Broken)*. Theatrical Play, 1981.
- . *Broken English (formerly The Melting Plot)*. Theatrical Play 1991.
- . *Tea*. Theatrical Play 1987.
- Houston, Velina Hasu, and Teresa K. Williams-León. “Introduction: No Passing Zone: The Artistic and Discursive Voices of Asian-descent Multiracials.” *Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): vii–xii.
- Hughes, Michael, and Bradley R. Hertel. “The Significance of Color Remains: A Study of Life Chances, Mate Selection, and Ethnic Consciousness Among Black Americans.” *Social Forces* 68, no. 4 (1990): 1105–20.
- Hunter, Margaret L. “Buying Racial Capital: Skin-Bleaching and Cosmetic Surgery in a Globalized World.” *The Journal of Pan African Studies* 4, no. 4 (2011): 142–64.
- . *Race, Gender, and the Politics of Skin Tone*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Hutchins, Lorraine, and Lani Kaahumanu. “Bicoastal Introduction.” In *Bi Any Other Name: Bisexual People Speak Out*, edited by Lorraine Hutchins and Lani Kaahumanu, xx–xxiv. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1991.
- Ianni, Otávio. *As metamorfoses do escravo: Apogeu e crise da escravatura no Brasil Meridional*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro, 1962.
- . *Raças e classes sociais no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1966.
- Ifekwunigwe, Jayne O., ed. *Mixed Race’ Studies: A Reader*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Jackson, Kelly F. “Beyond Race: Examining the Facets of Multiracial Identity Through a Life-span Developmental Lens.” *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work* 18, no. 4 (2009): 293–310.
- . “Ethical Considerations in Social Work Research with Multiracial Individuals.” *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics* 7, no.1 (2010): 1–10.
- . “Living the Multiracial Experience: Shifting Racial Expressions, Resisting Race, and Seeking Community.” *Qualitative Social Work* 11, no. 1 (2012): 42–60.
- . “Participatory Diagramming in Social Work Research: Utilizing Visual Timelines to Interpret the Complexities of the Lived Multiracial Experience.” *Qualitative Social Work* 12, no. 4 (2013): 414–32.
- Jackson, Kelly F., Thera Wolven, and Kimberly Aguilera. “Mixed Resilience: A Study of Multiethnic Mexican American Stress and Coping in Arizona.” *Family Relations* 62, no. 1 (2013): 212–25.
- Jackson, Kelly F., Hyung Chol Yoo, Rudy Guevarra, Jr., and Blair A. Harrington. “Role of Identity Integration on the Relationship Between Perceived Racial Discrimination and Psychological Adjustment of Multiracial People.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 59, no. 2 (2012): 240–50.
- James, C. L. R. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L’Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. 2nd ed. New York: Random House, 1963.
- Jobling, Mark A., Matthew Hurles, and Chris Tyler-Smith. *Human Evolutionary Genetics: Origins, Peoples, and Disease*. New York: Garland Science, 2004.
- Johnson, Kevin R., ed. *Mixed Race America and the Law: A Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.
- . “Racial Mixture, Identity Choice, and Civil Rights.” *U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights Journal* 44 (Fall 1998): 44–5.

-
- Johnston, Marc P., and Kevin L. Nadal. "Multiracial Microaggressions: Exposing Monoracism in Everyday Life and Clinical Practice." In *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics, and Impact*, edited by Derald Wing Sue, 123–44. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2010.
- Jolivéte, Andrew J. "Critical Mixed-Race Studies: The Intersections of Identity and Social Justice." In *Sociologists in Action: Sociology, Social Change, and Social Justice*, edited by Kathleen Odell Korgen, Jonathan M. White, and Shelley K. White, 24–28. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2011.
- Jones, Jennifer A. "Who Are We? Producing Group Identity through Everyday Practices of Conflict and Discourse." *Sociological Perspectives* 54, no. 2 (2011): 139–62.
- Jones, Rhett S. "The End of Africanity?: The Bi-Racial Assault on Blackness." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 18, no. 4 (1994): 201–10.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. *White over Black: American Attitudes Towards the Negro, 1550–1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968.
- Jorde, Lynn B., and Stephen P. Wooding. "Genetic Variation, Classification, and 'Race.'" *Nature Genetics* 36, no. 11 Supplement (2004): s28–s33.
- Joseph, Ralina L. *Transcending Blackness: From the New Millennium Mulatta to the Exceptional Multiracial*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013.
- Katz, William Loren. *Black Indians*. New York: Atheneum Books, an imprint of Simon and Schuster, 1997.
- Keith, Verna M., and Cedric Herring. "Skin Tone and Stratification in the Black Community." *American Journal of Sociology* 97, no. 3 (1991): 760–78.
- Kerckhoff, Alan C., and Thomas C. McCormick. "Marginal Status and Marginal Personality." *Social Forces* 34, no. 1 (1955): 48–55.
- Kich, George Kitahara. "Eurasians: Ethnic/Racial Identity Development of Biracial Japanese/White Adults." PhD diss., The Wright Institute, Berkeley CA, 1982. ProQuest (8305605).
- Kina, Laura, and Wei Ming Dariotis. *War Baby/Love Child: Mixed Race Asian American Art*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2013.
- King, Desmond S., and Rogers M. Smith. *Still a House Divided: Race and Politics in Obama's America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- King, Rebecca Chiyoko, and Kimberly McClain DaCosta. "Changing Face, Changing Race: The Remaking of Race in the Japanese American and African American Communities." In Root, *The Multiracial Experience*, 227–44.
- King-O'Riain, Rebecca Chiyoko, Stephen Small, Minelle Mahtani, Miri Song, and Paul Spickard, eds. *Global Mixed Race*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.
- Kinsbruner, Jay. *Not of Pure Blood: The Free People of Color and Racial Prejudice in Nineteenth-Century Puerto Rico*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Knight, Franklin W. *The African Dimension in Latin American Societies*. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- . *Slave Society in Cuba During the Nineteenth Century*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970.
- Koenig, Barbara A., Soo-Jin Lee, and Sarah S. Richardson. "Introduction: Race and Genetics in a Genomic Age." In *Revisiting Race in a Genomic Age*, edited by Barbara A. Koenig, Sandra Soo-Jin Lee, and Sarah S. Richardson, 1–20. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2008.
- Korgen, Kathleen Odell, and David L. Brunsma. "Avoiding Race or Following the Racial Scripts? Obama and Race in the Recessionary Part of the Colorblind Era." In *Obama and the Biracial Factor: The Battle for a New American Majority*, edited by Andrew J. Jolivéte, 191–204. Bristol, UK: Policy Press, 2012.
- Kovel, Joel. *White Racism: A Psychohistory*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1970.

-
- Kühteubl, Kim, Amy McConnell, Teyas Yew Woon, Andrew Kraulis, and Rukiya Bernard. *Nigel's Fingerprint*. VHS. Directed by Kim Kühteubl and Amy McConnell. Toronto: Dish Pictures, 2003.
- Kurokawa, Midori. "Markers of the 'Invisible Race': On the Film *Hashi No Nai Kawa*." In *Racial Representations in Asia*, edited by Yasuko Takezawa, 32–52. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 2011.
- Lange, Brad. "Importing Freud and Lamarck to the Tropics: Arthur Ramos and the Transformation of Brazilian Racial Thought, 1926–1939." *The Americas* 65, no. 1 (2008): 9–34.
- Lee, Jennifer, and Frank D. Bean. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30, no. 1 (2004): 221–42.
- . *The Diversity Paradox: Immigration and the Color Line in Twenty-First Century America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010.
- Lee, Sharon M. "Racial Classifications in the US Census." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16, no. 1 (1993): 75–94.
- Lee, Sung Yup. "Changing Faces: Colonial Rule in Korea and Ethnic Characterizations." In *Racial Representations in Asia*, edited by Yasuko Takezawa, 53–74. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 2011.
- Leonard, Karen Isaksen. *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Leong, Nancy. "Judicial Erasure of Mixed-Race Discrimination." *The American University Law Review* 59, no. 3 (2010): 469–551.
- . "Multiracial Identity and Affirmative Action." *Asian Pacific American Law Journal* 12, no. 1 (2006–2007): 1–34
- Leroy, Justin, director and editor. *Chasing Daybreak: A Film About Mixed Race America*. Seattle: MAVIN Foundation, 2006.
- Lewis, Gavin. *Between the Wire and the Wall: A History of South African "Coloured" Politics*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1987.
- Lipsitz, George. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Loewen, James W. *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Lopez, Thomas P., producer. *Mixed Mexican*. Video Production, 2010.
- Lubin, Alex. *Romance and Rights: The Politics of Interracial Intimacy, 1945–1954*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2005.
- Luna, James. *Half Indian/Half Mexican*. Three Black and White Photographs. Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego, CA. 1991.
- Lund, Joshua. *The Impure Imagination: Toward a Critical Hybridity in Latin American Writing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- Mansbridge, Jane. "The Making of Oppositional Consciousness." In *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*, edited by Jane Mansbridge and Aldon Morris, 1–19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Martinez-Alier, Verena. *Marriage, Class and Colour in Nineteenth-Century Cuba: A Study of Racial Attitudes and Sexual Values in a Slave Society*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Marx, Anthony W. "Contested Citizenship: The Dynamics of Racial Identity and Social Movements." *International Review of Social History* 40, supplement 3 (1995): 159–60.
- Mass, Amy Iwasaki. "Interracial Japanese Americans: The Best of Both Worlds or the End of the Japanese American Community?" In *Root, Racially Mixed People*, 265–79.

-
- McKee, James B. *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- McNeil, Daniel. *Sex and Race in the Black Atlantic: Mulatto Devils and Multiracial Messiahs*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Meletis, J. and V. Goratsa. "Derivatives of the Hellenic Word 'Hema' (Haema, Blood) in the English Language." *Archives of Hellenic Medicine* 29, Suppl. 1 (2012): 8–36.
- Mencke, John G. *Mulattoes and Race Mixture: American Attitudes and Images, 1865–1918*. Ann Arbor MI: UMI Research Press, 1979.
- Miller, Marilyn Grace. *Rise and Fall of the Cosmic Race: The Cult of Mestizaje in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.
- Montgomery, Michelle R. "Identity Politics: The Mixed-race American Indian Experience." *Journal of Critical Race Inquiry* 2, no. 1 (2012): 1–25.
- Moran, Rachel F. *Interracial Intimacy: The Regulation of Race and Romance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- _____. "Love with a Proper Stranger: What Anti-Miscegenation Laws Can Tell Us About the Meaning of Race, Sex, and Marriage." *Hofstra Law Review* 32, no. 4 (2004): 1663–79.
- _____. "Loving and the Legacy of Unintended Consequences." *Wisconsin Law Review* 2 (2007): 239–82.
- Mörner, Magnus. *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America*. Boston: Little Brown, 1967.
- Morris, Aldon, and Naomi Braine. "Social Movements and Oppositional Consciousness." In *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*, edited by Jane Mansbridge and Aldon Morris, 20–37. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Murphy-Shigematsu, Stephen. "The Voices of Amerasians: Ethnicity, Identity, and Empowerment in Interracial Japanese Americans." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1987. ProQuest 8711675.
- Nadal, Kevin L., Yinglee Wong, Katie Griffin, Julie Sriken, Vivian Vargas, Michelle Wideman, and Ajayi Kolawole. "Microaggressions and the Multiracial Experience." Special Issue, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 1, no. 7 (2011): 36–44.
- Nakashima, Cynthia L. "An Invisible Monster: The Creation and Denial of Mixed-Race People in America." In *Root, Racially Mixed People*, 162–180.
- _____. "Voices from the Movement: Approaches to Multiraciality." In *Root, The Multiracial Experience*, 79–100.
- Nascimento, Abdias do. *Brazil: Mixture or Massacre? Essays in the Genocide of a Black People*. Translated by Elisa Larkin Nascimento. Buffalo, NY: Afrodiaspora, 1979.
- Nash, Gary B. *Forbidden Love: The Secret History of Mixed-Race America*. New York: Henry Holt, 1999.
- _____. "The Hidden History of Mestizo America." *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 3 (1995): 941–64.
- _____. *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.
- Newman, Alyssa. "Colorblindness and the Formation of Collective Identity: Perspectives and Experiences of Multiracial Black High School Students in Northern California." MA thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2011.
- Niemonen, Jack. "The Race Relations Problematic in American Sociology: A Case Study and Critique." *The American Sociologist* 28, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 15–54.
- Nogueira, Oracy. "Preconceito racial de marca e preconceito racial de origem: Sugestão de um quadro de referência para a interpretação do material sobre relações raciais no Brasil." In *Tanto preto quanta branco: Estudo de relações raciais*, edited by Oracy Nogueira, 78–79. São Paulo: T. A. Queiroz, 1954/1985.

-
- Nobles, Melissa. "‘Responding with Good Sense’: The Politics of Race and Censuses in Contemporary Brazil." PhD diss. Yale University, 1995. ProQuest (9540604).
- . *Shades of Citizenship: Race and the Census in Modern Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Obama, Barack. *Dreams from My Father: A Story of Race and Inheritance*. New York: Random House, 1995.
- Olson, Steve. *Mapping Human History: Discovering the Past Through Our Genes*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Ortiz, Fernando. *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. Translated by Harriett de Onís. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.
- Owens, Louis. *Mixedblood Messages: Literature, Film, Family, Place*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.
- Paolini, Albert J. *Navigating Modernity: Postcolonialism, Identity, and International Relations*. Edited by Anthony Elliot and Anthony Moran. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999.
- Park, Robert E. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33, no. 6 (1928): 881–93.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., Wendy Wang, and Paul Taylor, et al. *Marrying Out: One-in-Seven New U.S. Marriages is Interracial or Interethnic*. Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends Report. June 4, 2010; revised June 15, 2010. Executive summary page: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/06/04/marrying-out/>. Complete 41 page report: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/755-marrying-out.pdf>.
- Pérez Cabral, Pedro Andrés. *La comunidad mulata: El caso socio-político de la República Dominicana*. Caracas: Gráficas Americana, 1967.
- Pérez-Torres, Rafael. *Mestizaje: Critical Uses of Race in Chicano Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- Perlmann, Joel, and Mary C. Waters, eds. *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002.
- Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends Report. *Marrying Out: One-in-Seven New U.S. Marriages is Interracial or Interethnic*. Paul Taylor, Jeffrey S. Passel, Wendy Wang, et al. June 4, 2010; revised June 15, 2010. Executive summary page: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/06/04/marrying-out/>. Complete 41 page report: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/755-marrying-out.pdf>.
- . *The Rise of Asian Americans*. Paul Taylor, et al. June 19, 2012, updated April 4, 2013. Overview page: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans/>. Complete 285 page report: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2013/04/Asian-Americans-new-full-report-04-2013.pdf>.
- . *The Rise of Intermarriage: Rates, Characteristics Vary by Race and Gender*. Paul Taylor, Wendy Wang, Kim Parker, et al. February 16, 2012. Executive summary page: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/02/16/the-rise-of-intermarriage/>. Complete 56 page report: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2012/02/SDT-Intermarriage-II.pdf>.
- Pierson, Donald. *Negroes in Brazil: A Study of Race Contact at Bahia*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.
- Pinto, Luís Aguilar da Costa. *O negro no Rio de Janeiro: Relações de raças numa sociedade em mudança*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1953.

-
- Piper, Adrian, artist. *Cornered*. Art Exhibition and video 1988.
- . “Passing for White, Passing for Black.” In *Out of Order, Out of Sight, Volume I: Selected Essays in Meta-Art 1968–1992*, 275–307. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996. Originally commissioned by *Harper’s Magazine*. First published in *Transition* no. 58 (1992): 4–32.
- Pollock, David C., and Ruth E. Van Reken. *Third Culture Kids: The Experience of Growing Up Among Worlds*. Revised edition. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2002.
- Poston, W. S. Carlos. “The Biracial Identity Development Model: A Needed Addition.” *Journal of Counseling and Development* 69, no. 2 (1990): 152–55.
- powell, john a. “The Colorblind Multiracial Dilemma: Racial Categories Reconsidered.” *University of San Francisco Law Review* 31 (1997): 789–806.
- Price, Darby Li Po. “Humorous Hapas, Performing Identities.” *Amerasia Journal* 23, no. 1 (1997): 99–111. ProQuest. *Sociological Abstracts*. Bethesda, MD: Cambridge Scientific Abstracts. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Puckett, Anita. “The Melungeon Identity Movement and the Construction of Appalachian Whiteness.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11, no. 1 (2001): 131–46.
- Qian, Zhenchao, and Daniel T. Lichter. “Changing Patterns of Interracial Marriage in a Multiracial Society.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73, no. 5 (2011): 1065–84.
- Quan, Robert Seto. *Lotus Among the Magnolias: The Mississippi Chinese*. In collaboration with Julian B. Roebuck. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1982.
- Ramos, Artur. *O negro na civilização brasileira: Etnografia religiosa e psicanálise*. Rio de Janeiro: *Civilização Brasileira*, 1934.
- Renn, Kristin A. *Mixed Race Students in College: The Ecology of Race, Identity, and Community on Campus*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.
- Renn, Kristin A., and Paul Shang. “Editors’ Notes.” *New Directions for Student Services* 2008, no. 123 (2008), 1–4, doi:10.1002/ss.280.
- Reuter, Edward Byron. *The Mulatto in the United States, Including a Study of the Role of Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World*. Boston: Richard G. Badger, The Gorham Press, 1918.
- . *Race Mixture: Studies in Inter-marriage and Miscegenation*. New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill, 1931.
- Ribeiro, René. *Religião and relações raciais*. Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Educação e Cultura, Serviço de Documentação, 1956.
- Riley, Steven F. “Don’t Pass on Context: The Importance of Academic Discourses in Contemporary Discussions on the Multiracial Experience.” (Opening remarks presented at the Mixed Roots Film & Literary Festival, Japanese American National Museum, June 11, 2011), Los Angeles, CA. <http://www.mixedracestudies.org/wordpress/?p=14196>.
- Roberts, Dorothy. *Fatal Invention: How Science, Politics, and Big Business Re-create Race in the Twenty-first Century*. New York: New Press, 2012.
- Robinson, Reginald Leamon. “The Shifting Race-Consciousness Matrix and the Multiracial Category Movement: A Critical Reply to Professor Hernandez.” *Boston College Third World Law Journal* 20, no. 2 (2000): 231–89.
- Rockquemore, Kerry Ann, and David L. Brunnsma. *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.
- Rockquemore, Kerry Ann, and Tracey Laszloffy. *Raising Biracial Children*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, 2005.
- Rodriguez, Clara E. *Puerto Ricans: Born in the U.S.A.* Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Rogers, J. A. *The Five Negro Presidents: According to What White People Said They Were*. New York: J. A. Rogers, 1965.

-
- _____. *Nature Knows No Color Line: Research into the Negro Ancestry in the White Race*. New York: J. A. Rogers, 1952.
- _____. *Sex and Race: A History of White, Negro, and Indian Miscegenation in the Two Americas, Volume II: The New World*. New York: Helga M. Rogers, 1942.
- _____. *Sex and Race: Negro-Caucasian Mixing in All Ages and All Lands, Volume I: The Old World*. New York: Helga M. Rogers, 1941.
- _____. *Sex and Race, Volume III: Why White and Black Mix in Spite of Opposition*. New York: Helga M. Rogers, 1944.
- _____. *World's Great Men of Color, Volume I: Asia and Africa, and Historical Figures Before Christ, Including Aesop, Hannibal, Cleopatra, Zenobia, Askia the Great, and Many Others*. New York: J. A. Rogers, 1946.
- _____. *World's Great Men of Color, Volume II: Europe, South and Central America, the West Indies, and the United States, Including Alessandro de' Medici, Alexandre Dumas, Dom Pedro II, Marcus Garvey, and Many Others*. New York: J. A. Rogers, 1947.
- Romo, Rebecca. "Between Black and Brown: Blaxican Identity and Experience in the United States." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 2011. ProQuest (3495702).
- _____. "Between Black and Brown: Blaxican (Black-Mexican) Multiracial Identity in California." *Journal of Black Studies* 42, no. 3 (2011): 402–26. doi: 10.1177/0021934710376172.
- Rondilla, Joanne L., and Paul Spickard, eds. *Is Lighter Better? Skin-Tone Discrimination Among Asian Americans*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007.
- Root, Maria P. P. "Experiences and Processes Affecting Racial Identity Development: Preliminary Results from the Biracial Sibling Project." *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health* 4, no. 3 (1998): 237–47.
- _____. "Five Mixed-Race Identities: From Relic to Revolution." In *New Faces in a Changing America: Multiracial Identity in the 21st Century*, edited by Loretta I. Winters and Herman L. DeBose, 3–20. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003.
- _____. *Love's Revolution: Interracial Marriage*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.
- _____, ed. *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.
- _____, ed. *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992.
- _____. "Resolving 'Other' Status: Identity Development of Biracial Individuals." In *Complexity and Diversity in Feminist Therapy*, edited by Laura S. Brown and Maria P. P. Root, 185–206. New York: Hayworth, 1990.
- _____. "Within, Between, and Beyond Race." In Root, *Racially Mixed People*, 3–11.
- Rosaldo, Renato. "Forward." In *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*, by Nestor Garcia Canclini, xi–xvii. Translated by Christopher L. Chiappari and Silvia L. López. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Rosenblatt, Paul C., Terri A. Karis, and Richard D. Powell. *Multiracial Couples: Black and White Voices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.
- Rout, Leslie B. Jr. *The African Experience in Spanish America, 1502 to the Present Day*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Russell, Kathy, Midge Wilson, and Ronald Hall. *The Color Complex: The Politics of Skin Color Among African Americans*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.
- Salgado de Snyder, Nelly, Cynthia M. Lopez, and Amado M. Padilla. "Ethnic Identity and Cultural Awareness among the Offspring of Mexican Interethnic Marriages." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 2, no. 3 (1982): 277–82.

-
- Sandoval, Chela. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Scales-Trent, Judy. *Notes of a White Black Woman: Race, Color, Community*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- Seidman, Steven. "Introduction." In *The Postmodern Turn: New Perspectives on Social Theory*, edited by Steven Seidman, 1–23. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Senna, Danzy. *Caucasia*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1999.
- Sexton, Jared. *Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Simon, Rita J., and Howard Altstein. *Transracial Adoptees and Their Families: A Study of Identity and Commitment*. New York: Praeger, 1987.
- . *Transracial Adoption: A Follow-Up*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1981.
- Simon, Rita J., Howard Altstein, and Marygold S. Melli. *The Case for Transracial Adoption*. Washington, DC: The American University Press, 1994.
- Simon, Rita J., and Rhonda M. Roorda. *In Their Own Voices: Transracial Adoptees Tell Their Stories*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- . *In Their Parents' Voices: Reflections on Raising Transracial Adoptees*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- . *In Their Siblings' Voices: White Non-Adopted Siblings Talk About Their Experiences Being Raised with Black and Biracial Brothers and Sisters*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Skidmore, Thomas E. *Black into White: Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Smedley, Audrey. *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.
- Smith, Zadie. *White Teeth*. New York: Vintage, 2001.
- Snow, Charles Percy. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution: The Rede Lecture, 1959*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- . *The Two Cultures: and a Second Look: An Expanded Version of "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution."* New York: New English Library, 1963.
- Soe, Valerie, producer. *Mixed Blood*. Interactive Video Performance. Ephemeral Films. 1992.
- Solaún, Mauricio, and Sidney Kronus. *Discrimination Without Violence: Miscegenation and Racial Conflict in Latin America*. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Sorokin, Pitirim. *Social and Cultural Dynamics: A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, Law, and Social Relationships*. Revised and abridged. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1957.
- Spencer, Jon Michael. *The New Colored People: The Mixed-Race Movement in America*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Spencer, Rainier. *Reproducing Race: The Paradox of Generation Mix*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2011.
- . *Spurious Issues: Race and Multiracial Identity Politics in the United States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999.
- Spencer, Stephen. *Race and Ethnicity: Culture, Identity, and Representation*. Abingdon Oxon., UK: Routledge, 2006.
- Spickard, Paul R. *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

-
- Spickard, Paul R., and Rowena Fong. "Pacific Islander Americans and Multiethnicity: A Vision of America's Future?" *Social Forces* 73, no. 4 (1995): 1365–83.
- Spiro, Lisa. "'This Is Why We Fight': Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 16–35. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.
- Squires, Catherine R. *Dispatches from the Color Line: The Press and Multiracial America*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2007.
- Stabb, Martin S. "Indigenism and Racism in Mexican Thought: 1857–1911." *Journal of Inter-American Studies* 1, no. 4 (1959): 405–23.
- Stearns, Jeff Chiba, producer and director. *One Big Hapa Family*. Meditating Bunny Studio, 2011.
- Steinhorn, Leonard, and Barbara Diggs-Brown. *By the Color of Our Skin: The Illusion of Integration and the Reality of Race*. New York: Dutton, 1999.
- Stepan, Nancy Leys. *"The Hour of Eugenics": Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Stephan, Cookie White. "Ethnic Identity Among Mixed-Heritage People in Hawaii." *Symbolic Interaction* 14, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 261–77.
- . "Mixed-Heritage Individuals: Ethnic Identity and Trait Characteristics." In *Root Racially Mixed People in America*, 50–63.
- Stephan, Cookie White and Walter G. Stephan. "After Intermarriage: Ethnic Identity Among Mixed-Heritage Japanese-Americans and Hispanics." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51, no. 2 (1989): 507–19.
- Stonequist, Everett V. *The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1937.
- Tannenbaum, Frank. *Slave and Citizen*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1946.
- Taylor, Verta. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review* 54, no. 5 (1989): 761–75.
- Taylor, Verta, and Alison Dahl Crossley. "Abeyance Cycles in Social Movements." In *Movements in Times of Democratic Transition*, edited by Bert Klandermans and Cornelius van Stralen. Philadelphia: Temple University Press (forthcoming in 2014).
- Taylor, Verta, and Nancy E. Whittier. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller, 104–30. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Telles, Edward E. *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Telles, Edward E., and Stanley Bailey. "Understanding Latin American Beliefs About Racial Inequality." *American Journal of Sociology* 118, no. 6 (2013): 1559–95.
- Telles, Edward E., and Edward Murguía. "Phenotypic Discrimination and Income Differences Among Mexican Americans." *Social Science Quarterly* 71, no. 4 (1990): 682–96.
- Telles, Edward E., and Christina A. Sue. "Race Mixture: Boundary Crossing in Comparative Perspective." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35 (2009): 129–46.
- Thornton, Michael C. "Is Multiracial Status Unique? The Personal and Social Experience." In *Root, Racially Mixed People*, 321–25.
- . "Policing the Borderlands: White- and Black-American Newspaper Perceptions of Multiracial Heritage and the Idea of Race, 1996–2006." *Journal of Social Issues* 65, no. 1 (2009): 105–27.
- . "A Social History of a Multiethnic Identity: The Case of Black Japanese Americans." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1983. ProQuest (8402386).

-
- Tiffin, Helen. "Introduction." In *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*, edited by Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin, vii-xvi. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990.
- Tilly, Charles. *Social Movements, 1768–2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm, 2004.
- Tizard, Barbara, and Ann Phoenix. *Black, White, or Mixed Race?: Race and Racism in the Lives of Young People of Mixed Parentage*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Trigo, Abril. "General Introduction." In *The Latin American Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Ana del Sarto, Alicia Rios, and Abril Trigo, 1–14. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- . "Shifting Paradigms: From Transculturation to Hybridity: A Theoretical Critique." In *Unforeseeable Americas: Questioning Cultural Hybridity in the Americas*, edited by Rita de Grandis and Zilá Bernd, 85–111. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., 2000.
- Tucker, M. Belinda, and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan. "New Trends in Black American Interracial Marriage: The Social Structural Context." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52, no. 1 (1990): 209–18.
- Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Twine, France Winddance. "Brown-Skinned White Girls: Class, Culture, and the Construction of White Identity in Suburban Communities." In *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, edited by Ruth Frankenberg, 214–43. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- . "Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Cultural Politics of Everyday Racism in Rural Brazil." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994. ProQuest (9529535).
- . *Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Maintenance of White Supremacy in Brazil*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
- Twine, France Winddance, Jonathan F. Warren, and Francisco Ferrandiz, producers. *Just Black? Multiracial Identity in the U.S.* New York: Filmmakers Library, 1990.
- US Census Bureau. *Married-Couple and Unmarried-Partner Households: 2000*. By Tavia Simmons and Martin O'Connell. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-5. Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Issued February, 2003. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/censr-5.pdf>.
- US Census Bureau. *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010*. By Karen R. Humes, Nicholas A. Jones, and Roberto R. Ramirez. 2010 Census Brief, C2010BR-02. Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Issued March, 2011. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>.
- US Census Bureau. "Table 3. Annual Estimates of the Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin for the United States: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2007." *Population Estimates: Vintage 2007 National Tables: "National Characteristics: National Race, Sex, and Hispanic Origin (Link to Excel spreadsheet)"*, NC-EST2007-03. Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Release date May 1, 2008. http://www.census.gov/popest/data/historical/2000s/vintage_2007/index.html.
- US Census Bureau. *The Two or More Races Population: 2000*. By Nicholas A. Jones and Arny Symens Smith. Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR/01-6. Issued November 2001. Washington DC: US Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/C2kbr01-6.pdf>.
- US Census Bureau. "We the People of More Than One Race in the United States." By Nicholas A. Jones. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-22. Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Issued April 2005. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs/censr-22.pdf>.
- US Census Bureau. *2000 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File: 2000 Census of Population and Housing. Technical Documentation*. PL/00-1 (RV). Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Issued March 2001. <https://www.census.gov/rdo/pdf/pl94-171.pdf>.
- US Census Bureau. *2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File: 2010 Census of Population and Housing. Technical Documentation*. PL/10-2 (RV). Washington DC: US Census Bureau. Issued January 2011. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/pl94-171.pdf>.

-
- US Department of Health and Human Services. National Institutes of Health. National Human Genome Research Institute. "An Overview of the Human Genome Project." <http://www.genome.gov/12011238>. Updated November 8, 2012.
- US Department of Health and Human Services. National Institutes of Health. National Human Genome Research Institute and US Department of Energy. Office of Science. "Human Genome Project Goals." <http://www.genome.gov/11006945>. Updated October 11, 2007.
- Useem, John, Ruth Useem, and Donoghue, John. "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture: The Roles of American and Non-Western People in Cross-Cultural Administration." *Human Organization* 22, no. 3 (1963): 169–79.
- Van der Ross, Richard Ernest. *The Rise and Decline of Apartheid. A Study of Political Movements among the Coloured People of South Africa, 1880–1985*. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1986.
- Vasconcelos, José. *La raza cósmica: Misión de la raza iberoamericana: Notas de viajes a la América del Sur*. Madrid: Agencia Mundial de Librería, 1925.
- Vesna, Victoria. "Towards a Third Culture of Working in Between." *Leonardo* 34, no. 2 (2001): 121–25. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1577014>.
- Wade, Peter. *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America*. London: Pluto Press, 1997.
- Wade, T. Joel, Melanie Judkins Romano, and Leslie Blue. "The Effect of African American Skin Color on Hiring Practices." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 34, no. 12 (2004): 2550–58.
- Wagley, Charles, ed. *Race and Class in Rural Brazil: A UNESCO Study*. New York: UNESCO International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Wailoo, Keith, Alondra Nelson, and Catherine Lee. "Introduction: Genetic Claims and the Unsettled Past." In *Genetics and the Unsettled Past: The Collision of DNA, Race, and History*, edited by Keith Wailoo, Alondra Nelson, and Catherine Lee, 1–12. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012.
- Walker, Rebecca. *Black, White, and Jewish: Autobiography of a Shifting Self*. New York: Riverhead Trade, 2002.
- Wallace, Kendra R. *Relative/Outsider: The Art and Politics of Identity Among Mixed Heritage Students*. Westport, CT: Greenwood/Ablex, 2001.
- Wardle, Francis. "Are You Sensitive to Interracial Children's Special Identity Needs?" *Young Children* 42, no.2 (1987): 53–59.
- Warnock-Graham, Octavio, producer, director, and writer. *Silences*. New Day Films, 2006.
- Warren, Jonathan F., and France Winddance Twine. "White Americans, the New Minority?: Non-Blacks and the Ever-Expanding Boundaries of Whiteness." *Journal of Black Studies* 28, no. 2 (1997): 200–18.
- Waters, Mary C. "Multiple Ethnicities and Identity in the United States." In *We Are a People: Narrative and Multiplicity in Constructing Ethnic Identity*, edited by W. Jeffrey Burroughs and Paul Spickard, 23–40. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Watson, David, and Kristin Naragon. "Positive Affectivity: The Disposition to Experience Positive Emotional States." In *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology*, 2nd ed., edited by C. R. Snyder and Shane J. Lopez, 207–215. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- West, Candace, and Sarah Fenstermaker. "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society* 9, no. 1 (1995): 8–37.
- Wilber, Ken. *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston: Shambhala, 1996.
- _____. *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Boston: Shambhala, 2000.
- _____. "An Integral Theory of Consciousness." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 4, no. 1 (1997): 71–92.
- _____. *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*. New York: Random House, 1998.

-
- Williams, Gregory Howard. *Life on the Color Line: The True Story of a White Boy Who Discovered He Was Black*. New York: Plume, 1996.
- Williams, Kim M. "Boxed In: The United States Multiracial Movement." PhD diss., Cornell University, 2001. ProQuest (3011238).
- _____. "Defying the Civil Rights Lobby: The American Multiracial Movement." Paper presented at Benjamin L. Hooks Institute for Social Change, Memphis, Tennessee, April 2007, 1–35.
- _____. *Mark One or More: Civil Rights in Multiracial America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008.
- _____. "Multiracialism and the Civil Rights Future." *Daedalus* (Special Issue on Race) 134, no. 1 (Winter 2005), 53–60.
- Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, eds. "Introduction." In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, 1–19. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Williams, Teresa Kay. "Prism Lives: Identity of Binational Amerasians." In *Root, Racially Mixed People*, 280–303.
- _____. "Race as Process: Reassessing the 'What Are You?' Encounters of Biracial Individuals." In *Root, The Multiracial Experience*, 191–210.
- Williams, Teresa Kay, Cynthia L. Nakashima, George Kitahara Kich, and G. Reginald Daniel. "Being Different Together in the University Classroom: Multiracial identity as Transgressive Education." In *Root, The Multiracial Experience*, 359–79.
- Williams-León, Teresa, and Cynthia L. Nakashima. "Reconfiguring Race, Rearticulating Ethnicity." In Williams-León and Nakashima, *The Sum of Our Parts*, 3–10.
- _____, eds. *The Sum of Our Parts: Mixed-Heritage Asian Americans*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.
- Williamson, Joel. *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States*. New York: Free Press, 1980.
- Wilson, Anne. *Mixed Race Children: A Study of Identity*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1987.
- Wilson, Carter A. *Racism: From Slavery to Advanced Capitalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.
- Wimmer, Andreas. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113, no. 4 (2008): 970–1022.
- Woods, Sister Frances Jerome. *Marginality and Identity: A Colored Creole Family Through Ten Generations*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972.
- Wright, Roy Dean, and Susan N. Wright. "A Plea for a Further Refinement of the Marginal Man Theory." *Phylon* 33, no. 4 (1972): 361–68.
- Wright, Winthrop R. *Café con Leche: Race, Class, and National Image in Venezuela*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993.
- Young, Robert J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Zack, Naomi, ed. *American Mixed Race: The Culture of Microdiversity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1995.
- _____. *Race and Mixed Race*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.