

# TRANSCENDING BLACKNESS



*From the New Millennium Mulatta  
to the Exceptional Multiracial*



**RALINA L. JOSEPH**

# TRANSCENDING BLACKNESS



**TRANSCENDING  
BLACKNESS**



*From the New Millennium Mulatta  
to the Exceptional Multiracial*

**RALINA L. JOSEPH**

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
DURHAM AND LONDON 2013

© 2013 Duke University Press

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ☺

Designed by Heather Hensley

Typeset in Whitman by Tseng Information Systems, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data appear  
on the last printed page of this book.

FOR JJ, TJ, AND NV



## CONTENTS



### PREFACE

From Biracial to Multiracial to Mixed-Race  
to Critical Mixed-Race Studies ix

### INTRODUCTION

Reading Mixed-Race African American Representations  
in the New Millennium 1

### PART I: THE NEW MILLENNIUM MULATTA

1. Televising the Bad Race Girl:  
Jennifer Beals on *The L Word*, the Race Card, and  
the Punishment of Mixed-Race Blackness 37
2. The Sad Race Girl:  
Passing and the New Millennium Mulatta in Danzy Senna's *Caucasia* 67

### PART II: THE EXCEPTIONAL MULTIRACIAL

3. Transitioning to the Exceptional Multiracial:  
Escaping Tragedy through Black Transcendence in *Mixing Nia* 95
4. Recursive Racial Transformation:  
Selling the Exceptional Multiracial on *America's Next Top Model* 125

### CONCLUSION

Racist Jokes and the Exceptional Multiracial, or  
Why Transcending Blackness Is a Terrible Proposition 155

NOTES 173

BIBLIOGRAPHY 201

INDEX 219





## PREFACE



### FROM BIRACIAL TO MULTIRACIAL TO MIXED-RACE TO CRITICAL MIXED-RACE STUDIES

In the autumn of 1992, I arrived at the oldest dorm on Brown University's campus, a stately, crumbling edifice complete with ivy-covered walls and cinder-block lined rooms that rebelled against my efforts to tack up my leftie political posters and batik-print tapestry. I was a nervous kid outfitted in meticulously ripped jeans, tan Birkenstocks, and a lingering fear that an admissions officer was going to pop out at any moment and announce that there had been a big mistake: I, the daughter of a secretary and a mechanic, really was not allowed into this hallowed Ivy League institution. Class and race, and my exhausting efforts to avoid talking about both, structured my life. While class remained a more-easily submergible entity in neo-bohemian, grunge-accented Providence of the early 1990s, the changing signs and signals of race glowed and blinked like my own personal fluorescent sign. I worried that my racially ambiguous but clearly nonwhite looks made me hypervisible, and before going to college I bobbed and weaved the ubiquitous "what are you?" questions, to save myself from having to reveal what I shrugged off as my race story.

My efforts to remain race neutral were supported by my utter lack of language to begin to chip away at the race question. Before college I had never uttered "multiracial." "Mixed" was the term we used inside my suburban Virginia house and

“biracial” seemed popular with outsiders referring to me. But even within the confines of my immediate family, those terms were not my own: they were monoracially applied descriptors that did not quite match up with my interior racialized self. At Brown I found myself embraced by the vibrant community of students of color and given the language to understand that my unique racialization was not all that special, a revelation that was a complete and total relief. I soon learned of the term *multiracial* as an “us” term, one applied by mixed-race people in the process of self-identification. To me it quickly meant community; it meant not having to define myself further; it meant having a safe space to collectively articulate my frustration with the outside world’s confusion about my phenotype. As a first-semester first-year confronted with the new-to-me term “multiracial,” I embraced it immediately. At seventeen, I could not have imagined that that word would enter my daily, even hourly, vocabulary over the next four years at college. In the United States during the twenty-first century, racialized labels are just as multiple, contentious, and slippery as they were during the twentieth century, but for me, that new word, “multiracial,” and that alone, felt just perfect. Just as Stuart Hall became black in Jamaica of the 1960s with the advent of Black Nationalism in the United States, I became multiracial in New England of the 1990s with the advent of the multiracial student movement on my liberal college campus.<sup>1</sup> I was privately mixed for the first seventeen years of my life until I publically came out as multiracial.

My initiation into the world of multiraciality came about at the Third World Center (TWC) whose moniker bore its 1960s activist roots. There I learned of the Brown Organization of Multiracial and Biracial Students (BOMBS), a group that some student leaders had started two years earlier. When Brown’s paradigm-shifting minority student orientation, the Third World Transition Program (TWTP), asked participants to break out into racial affinity group sessions, a number of multiracial first-years had felt split about where to go. So they created their own multiracial affinity group, which eventually became BOMBS. When I was first introduced to the group I remember immediately loving the implied destruction in the group’s name, which was so counter to the other blandly multicultural student group names I would come to be familiar with, such as, “prism” or “mosaic.” As my coming into a multiracial consciousness did nothing less than explode my earlier attempts at racial neutrality, BOMBS resonated with my mixed-racial epistemology.

We modeled our organization after the university's existing racial support and advocacy student groups, such as the Organization of United African Peoples (OUAP), the Asian American Students Association (AASA), and the Latin-American Students Organization (LASO), which modeled themselves after traditional civil rights groups. BOMBS meetings took place in the warm embrace of the TWC, in community with other students-of-color groups. In order to populate our meetings in those early pre-email days, BOMBS members rounded up recruits by official means, including posting fliers for the group around the campus cafeterias and unofficially by slyly approaching the racially ambiguous dormmate down the hall. In September of 1991, a year before I arrived at Brown, BOMBS put out its first flier:<sup>2</sup>

### **BOMBS!**

#### Brown Organization of Multi- and Biracial Students

This is an organization especially designed for any and all persons who have ever felt left out or marginalized by members of groups to which they partly or wholly belong. Our organization is intended as a support group for bi/multiracial or multicultural people who have in the past been forced to "choose" between the different races and cultures that are parts of their identities.

In the past, we have been ignored and treated as though we were invisible, solely because we have always been defined in terms of OTHER people. NO MORE. The reason why our people have been ignored throughout history is because there has never been any sort of political base or forum from which to make our voices heard and to raise society's awareness of our existence. Presently, organizations like ours have been springing up at college campuses NATIONWIDE. Why? Because our numbers are growing. With the absence of anti-miscegenation laws since 1967, and the consequences thereof, THERE ARE MORE OF US THAN EVER BEFORE. Even the U.S. government has been forced to sit up and take notice of us, as they are being pressured to include us as a separate category on the year 2000 census forms.

Why do we say "our people"? Because, like members of other recognized racial groups in this country, our people DO have a common experience from which to draw unity and solidarity. Not only do we feel the same racism from the white majority as do our other Third World brothers and sisters, but we get it from them as well. We refuse to sit by

and be ignored any longer. We are the invisible minority within a minority, but this is about to CHANGE.

WE EXIST. WE ARE HERE AMONG YOU.

WE ARE A POLITICAL PRESSURE COOKER ABOUT TO EXPLODE.

join us.

1ST ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING:

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 7:00 PM

1ST FLOOR OF THE TWC.

SEE YOU THERE.

The “we,” the “us,” the “our,” the all caps were intoxicating to me, and to my cohort, a newly formed group of multiracial subjects. Both idealism and budding militancy were apparent. When I showed the flier from September 1991 to BOMBS members in 2009, they told me that its dramatic “old-school” style sounded markedly different from their own less politicized rhetoric. We were a first-generation movement and, as such, we were emphatic about defining ourselves with each other and against “whole” race, or monoracially identified people. We used what was even then old-fashioned language of oppositionality to stake a claim of victim status. We believed our multiracial identification was new, radical, and incendiary. Later I learned that various multiracial peoples had indeed collaborated, and colluded, in other places and times. For example, elite mixed-race people, deemed variously “black,” “mulatto,” or “colored” by white society, helped cement African American color and class distinctions by creating a “beige-ocracy,” to use the word of the founding multiracial studies historian Paul Spickard.<sup>3</sup>

But this type of a privileged legacy was not apparent to us, those born in the early 1970s to race-traitor parents just a handful of years after the *Loving v. Virginia* decision decriminalized interracial marriage in 1967. BOMBS’s first newsletter bears evidence of this particular history and our sense that we were pioneers:

If a multiracial organization gets off the ground, it has the potential to be very powerful. We know that there are a lot of us out there, but the problem has always been that we have never identified ourselves as a separate group. We have always been either in limbo or forced to choose sides. Hasn’t it always been hard for you, multiracial friend, to define your own identity because others felt obligated to choose it for

you? No more. This organization is important because it will allow us to have a separate space for multiracials, where we can define ourselves in terms of ourselves, and not in terms of other groups. What we need are committed people willing to stick together and carve a niche for ourselves at this university so that our voices can be heard. Previous attempts at starting and maintaining similar organizations in the past have failed, but only because of lack of support or commitment. But we know that you're all out there (we've seen you). Don't just wish us luck. Come join, bond—unite!

Reading these words so many years later, I can see how this racially provocative organization spoke so eloquently to kids like me, the multiracially awkward soul wading through late adolescence in the early 1990s. One phrase that particularly jumps out to me is “we’ve seen you.” I wonder now: Is it an observation? A lure? A threat? A wink from one insider to another? The writers assumed that we racial outsiders shared multiracial pain and exclusion and the concomitant desire to become visible, a desire to become racially legible, named, and claimed. To exchange status as “them” for “us.” Their rhetoric asserted that group identity alone would create a space for our support and resistance.

These two documents from the 1991–92 school year represent the very beginning of BOMBS. They were the founding documents that I pored over as a first-year. I joined and began attending weekly meetings, later planning those meetings and leading the organization forward. As multiracial student activists, we were struck by the sense that we were doing something new and different in the very old world of race. In BOMBS I found a community of fellow self-described racial outsiders. Regulars tended to be people like my late-teenage self, whose self-identity was bound up in those three little words, not a romantic “I love you,” but an incredulous “what are you?” Through conversations at BOMBS I understood that I didn’t have to answer that question the way the asker intended. That I could turn the question around on my interrogator: why do you want to know? That I could identify in an unsatisfyingly nebulous way. Although I never personally described myself as “human” or “American” as some of my fellow BOMBS members defiantly did, I gave annoyingly nebulous answers such as “woman of color” that allowed me to provide a politicized response and yet avoid laying bare my personal history. I relished being able to resist “what are you?,” which to me was akin to avoiding opening a vein to the

genealogy that might logically explain my oddly racialized looks. Nestled within the protective cocoon of the TWC, BOMBS allowed me the space to resist racialization by performing a multiracial identity.

Resist and perform I did! Multiracialism simply obsessed me at Brown. I read, discussed, wrote about, and challenged everything and anything having to do with mixed-raciality. In my sophomore year, I became one of the second sets of co-chairs of BOMBS. I hosted forums such as “Hair Issues,” a deliberation for women of color on the relationship between gender, racial authenticity, and hair. Not to be outdone by traditional student race groups, we began Multiracial Heritage Week. We brought mixed-race speakers, professionally multiracial folks, such as the journalist Lisa Jones, the author and the daughter of the African American writer and activist Amiri Barks (Leroi Jones), and the white, Jewish writer Hettie Jones; academics, such as the philosopher Naomi Zack; and comedians, such as Amy Hill. Intrigued by the vast number of mixed-race women at Brown who did not necessarily identify with the term *multiracial* or even each other, I worked with Sachi Cunningham, my friend and one of the founders of BOMBS, to create *Mixed Girls*, a documentary that examined mixed-race women’s perceptions of and reactions to their own multiraciality.<sup>4</sup> I became the undergraduate teaching assistant for an anthropology course called “Growing Up Ethnic and Multicultural” and co-designed the curriculum for a Group Independent Study Project, “Multiraciality in the United States,” where we examined the “multiracial movement’s” founding texts from the late 1980s to early 1990s.

While in the early days of BOMBS we took our political cues from civil rights and racial nationalist groups, we took our naming and identity cues from authors in the emerging multiracial movement, many of whom identified as mixed-race, and all of whom distanced themselves from past work pathologizing interracial relationships and multiracial people. In the early 1990s, we read the historians Paul Spickard’s *Mixed Blood* (1989) and F. James Davis’s *Who Is Black?* (1991), the psychologist Maria Root’s anthology *Racially Mixed People in America* (1992), and the philosopher Naomi Zack’s *Race and Mixed Race* (1994). The most influential of these scholars to the multiracial movement was Root, who has argued vehemently that mixed-race people have a nearly constitutional right to self-identify and even deserve their own bill of rights.<sup>5</sup> With a new body of work in multiracial studies came the choice of terminology not frequently in circulation before: “multiracial,” and then, following a similar move-

ment of scholarship in the United Kingdom, “mixed-race.” As a first- and second-year college student, I found these books thrilling because they defended, named, and historicized my own existence.

Mixed-race was the object of my personal, political, and academic study—a full-blown preoccupation. I learned as much as I could about the history, literature, and racialization of mixed-race folks. Through *BOMBS*, my haven of the TWC, TWTP, all of the various programs supporting students of color, and my coursework in American civilization, then Afro American (now Africana) studies, semiotics, literature history, and sociology. I also learned about larger questions of race, class, gender, sexuality, and, most importantly, power. I learned that racialized choice, a key value of the multiracial movement, was not an option for most, while racialized conscription, which we special mixies fought against, was. I learned about structural racism and how to explore the lived realities of race, from differential rates of homeownership, healthcare, and high school graduation rates, among other measures. Consequently, I soon found that questions of power were largely absent from early multiracial movement literature. I found myself questioning: what happened after we created our own terms? Outside of fulfilling one’s own self-identity desires or sating the curiosities of onlookers, what does a term that provides an “accurate” account of “what mixes?” or “what percentages?” reveal? What happens after the missing story is told, or the incorrect story is righted? What happens after we join the table? And most importantly, were we reinforcing the racial order rather than blowing it up?

These budding questions converged in my senior year at Brown when I wrote a thesis on the representations of a cross-section of mixed-race women in magazine advertisements, a study that drew on the multiracial, interdisciplinary track I had been pursuing. I identified two dialectics of representation, “crossover/spice” and “beauty/beast” and argued that these advertisements overwhelmingly sought to categorize and exoticize mixed-race women, demonstrating discomfort with miscegenation and multiracials themselves. Even though my study, in retrospect, was overly ambitious, methodologically questionable, and incoherently written in places (in my attempt to sound similar to the theory I fought to comprehend), researching and writing in a new scholarly area was so exciting that I realized that I wanted to make a career out of my questioning. I wanted to be an academic who studied multiraciality.

Over the course of my four years at Brown I learned that the “what



are you?” question that so plagued me and that I initially identified as solely the lot of multiracial folks like me, was actually the lot of all people who did not appear to belong, whether through race, gender, sexuality, or ability status. This idea has percolated more over the years, as has the notion of cross-identity, or perhaps more specifically to use the words of Stuart Hall, “cross-identification connections.”<sup>6</sup> I’ve been traveling from the questions “who is mixed-race?” to “what does mixed-race mean?” to “how do people use mixed-race?” to “why is it important to name, understand, and unpack mixed race?” These questions led to the topic that became a central concern of this book: the attempted silencing and demeaning of the blackness in mixed-race blackness, a pernicious dynamic that did not appear to pollute all representations of the nonwhite aspects of multiracial Asian Americans, Latinos, and American Indians.

In my final year as an undergraduate I became disillusioned with the utopian promises of multiracial studies and activism. They seemed so focused solely on naming and claiming a multiracial identity, and that was no longer enough for me. Things just seemed more complicated than that. One moment of revelation came to me while chatting with a white woman who attended a BOMBS public event: I was alarmed to hear that she came to learn how to obtain a nonblack identity for her mixed-race African American preschool-aged daughter. I was even more alarmed later to learn that she was not alone; the political scientist Kim Williams investigated mothers just like this on the nationwide scale. Williams found that the leaders and participants of multiracial advocacy groups were overwhelmingly white women married to black men. The most famous of these women is Susan Graham, founder of Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally), who led the fight for the multiracial category on the census, and even had her young son testify before Congress, so that he did not have to identify as black.<sup>7</sup>

Graham and other well-known spokespeople in the multiracial moment identified multiracialness as the only possible form of racial identification, which simultaneously pathologized blackness, apparently unrepentantly. From this type of multiracial activism, and not from the type of minority-based community articulated by BOMBS, sprang the so-called 1990s-era multiracial agenda, with the first item being the establishment of a new census category. Arguments for color blindness and against race-based measures such as affirmative action, which began to be dismantled across the country immediately after I graduated from college, accompa-

nied this embrace of “the multiracial cause.”<sup>8</sup> For example, in the mid-to-late 1990s, Newt Gingrich, the former Republican Speaker of the House, aligned himself with a so-called multiracial cause, and supported such measures as the addition of a “multiracial” category on the 2000 U.S. Census, which was, much to the chagrin of multiracial activists, defeated in lieu of a “mark one or more” option. Because of these strange collaborations I began questioning the politicians’, the media’s, and even my own embrace of multiracialism. Was love of mixed-race people really love, or was it a disguised hatred of monoracial African Americans, a form of coded antiblack racism?

The antiblack racism in the multiracial movement from the 1990s did not fit with my multiracial college activism, and yet it stuck with me. It unsettled me to understand how politicians and the media manipulated multiracialism into an alignment of “my people” with the politics of the Far Right. Understanding the split dividing national multiracial advocacy groups from college-based activists helped me see why some of my closest friends around the country, who were mixed black and white and who grew up with close ties to African American communities, didn’t want anything to do with this multiracial thing. Why weren’t their stories a part of the burgeoning narrative of mixed-race? Other questions loomed for me: In our celebrations of mixed-race, were we excluding or dismissing the experiences, histories, and racializations of other minoritized communities? How could multiracialism work to dismantle and not fortify the privileges of whiteness? How could we articulate our agenda in a way that might forge cross-racial coalitions, instead of separations?

After I left college I began to answer many of my questions on the utility of mixed-race through the writings of the essayist Lisa Jones in her book *Bulletproof Diva* (1994). I had read Jones’s essays initially in her column in the *Village Voice*, and I thought about them time and again as I developed my own multiracial research agenda. Jones captured the “what are you?” question—the variety of ways in which mixed-race people are often questioned because of their “racially ambiguous looks”—better than anyone had managed to do:

Who are you, what are you, where are you from, no, where are you really from, where are your parents from, are your grandparents Americans? Are you from here, what’s your background, what’s your nationality, where do you live? Are you black, are you white, do you speak

Spanish? Are you really white, are you really black? Are you Puerto Rican, are you half and half, are you biracial, multiracial, interracial, transracial, racially unknown, race neutral, colorless, colorblind, down with the rat race and the human race? Who are you? Where are you coming from? Who are your people?

She helped me understand that the “what are you?” question and all its permutations mark mixed-race people as either pathological or extraordinary, the object-like “what” or exotic and desirous “who.”

At another level, I would encounter popular representations of multi-racial people in memoirs, novels, television shows, and films that were equally dim about who and what multiracial people might be. Like most people, I instinctively read texts against lived experiences, and in the case of multiracial African Americans, the representations do not reflect the true complexity of lives. For years, from teaching high school English in Miami to studying ethnic studies in graduate school in San Diego to teaching difference and communication courses in Seattle, I have struggled to accept the limitations of representations of multiracial African Americans. I have wanted to find resistant counternarratives that echoed the rich diversity of experiences and racialized identifications that multi-racial people have, from identifying with one monoracial identity, to two or more monoracial identities, to a race not in his or her own background, to “multiracial” as a category, to all of the above. But what I’ve come back to over and over for the case of mixed-race blackness is the failure of the representative landscape to meet the experiential one.

The experiential landscape is what has inspired *Transcending Blackness*. My readings in this book wouldn’t be possible without all of the experiences I have enjoyed with a vibrant community of organic and trained intellectuals and activists. Because this project began with BOMBS, I must begin by thanking the people who powered BOMBS, especially Sachi Cunningham, Mike Hurt, Dean Karen McLaurin, and Jason Sperber, and who powered me through BOMBS, including Praveen Fernandes, Jeffery Mingo, Heather Reid, and Jim Wallace. My BOMBS critique was crying out for a frame, and at the University of California, San Diego, my professors Jane Rhodes, Daphne Brooks, Yen Espiritu, Nicole King, Ross Frank, and George Lipsitz opened up new worlds of ethnic and cultural studies to frame my ideas. Cherise Smith, Sarita Cannon and Lisa Ze Winters—members of the East Bay dissertation-writing group—beautifully mod-

eled ethical, positive scholarship and provided the support necessary for me to finish my dissertation—and they along with Allison, Mike, Alonzo, and Ava Marie Smith keep me longing for Oakland. At the University of Washington, WIRED (Women Investigating Race, Ethnicity, and Difference) has bolstered me through many a long, gray day, and I want to thank all the members of our collective for making Seattle an intellectually and personally productive space; my WIRED writing group, LeiLani Nishime, Habiba Ibrahim, and Tyina Steptoe for validating and pushing my work; and Luis Fraga for his support of WIRED. My students, including Manoucheka Celeste, Madhavi Murty, Elizabeth Cortez, Anjali Vats, Kate Bell, Kris Mroczek, Jennifer McClearn, Tabitha Bronsma, Jamie Moshin, Vanessa Au, Monique Lacoste, Camille Elmore-Trummer, Desireé Boyd, Michelé Prince, Juana Reid, and the Barbados crew, helped this work to come alive in the classroom. My colleagues Crispin Thurlow, Christine Harold, Leah Ceccarelli, Valerie Manusov, Jerry Baldasty, David Domke, Michelle Habell-Pallan, Sonnet Retman, Angela Ginorio, Judy Howard, Andrea Griggs, and Lea Vaughn warmly welcomed me into the uw fold. A special thanks for the pedis and pep talks with my Seattle sisters, Janine Jones, Alexes Harris, and Joy Williamson-Lott; raucous laughter with Wadiya Udell; coffee shop work dates with Jen Neighbors; and family fun with the Kalbach-Udells, LaBordes, Fabers, Joneses, Bonney-Retmans, Espanias, and Wu-Floyds. A variety of fellowships provided me with the time and space to think, including the American Association of University Women, the University of California President's Fellowship, the Ford Foundation, and the Woodrow Wilson Career Enhancement Fellowship. When my faith in this project waned, the advice, support, and critique of Daphne Brooks, Matt Jacobson, Laura Helper-Ferris, Ken Wissoker, and my two anonymous reviewers rocketed me through my revisions. Thank you to Shosanna Weinberger for allowing her incredible image to grace the cover of the book. I will be forever grateful to the University of Washington's Whiteley Center for providing me with the most beautiful space in the world to think and write. Much love to my families the Landwehrs, Captains, D'Souzas, Whites, and Scanlans. My utmost appreciation to the people who encouraged me to ask too many questions: my parents, Richard and Irene Landwehr, and Grandpi, Jesse Meeks.

Most of all, I thank James, TJ, and Naima Joseph for endlessly embracing their spacey partner and mama. We live this book every day. Questions, comments, compliments, complaints, and jokes about multiraciality are

an integral part of our everyday lives. I am a multiracial woman, partnered with a multiracial man, and together we have two multigenerationally mixed-race children. Our children are racialized quite differently from each other: our caramel-complexioned son is read as “minority” (although racially ambiguous to many), while our ringleted, olive-skinned daughter is read, for the most part, as white. When I registered my son for kindergarten in the Seattle public school system, the older African American woman who took my registration forms (none of which, surprisingly, asked for race) looked at me and at the required picture of him that I presented along with his birth certificate and entered “black” for our boy. Our girl has been racialized by the system as well: after she became ill at her preschool, a paramedic filling out his routine paperwork noted her as “white.” But what would have happened if either of these events had occurred after a beach-heavy July in San Diego instead of a house-heavy February in Seattle? Our “race” switches with the seasons and with geography. We, as a family, work to normalize and concretize our discussions of race and mixed-race that have made their way into every page here. This book is dedicated to them, my own race-conscious, race-shifting, racially plural family, who are my inspiration, support, and favorite distraction.

## INTRODUCTION



### READING MIXED-RACE AFRICAN AMERICAN REPRESENTATIONS IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

I have never been at home in my body. Not in its color, not in its size or shape. Not in its strange, unique conglomeration of organic forms and wavy lines. . . . There's an awkwardness to my body, a lack of grace, as if the racial mix, the two sides coming together in my body have yet to reconcile.

—Rebecca Walker, *Black, White, and Jewish*

For a young man of mixed race, without firm anchor in any community, without even a father's steadying hand, the essential American ideal—that our destinies are not written before we are born, that in America we can travel as far as our energy and talents will take us—has defined my life. With a mother from Kansas and a father from Kenya, I know that stories like mine can happen only in the United States of America.

—Barack Obama, "What Is Patriotism?"

Representations of multiracial Americans, especially those with a black parent and a white parent, appear everywhere in the twenty-first-century United States, from the memoirs of celebrity children to the reality shows of supermodels to the speeches of presidential candidates. Some representations equate mixed-race with pain: the multiracial individual is mired in the confusion and problems imagined to be inherent in the racial mixture of black and white. These images, such

as the ones Rebecca Walker conjures in her memoir, feature a twenty-first-century twist on the old stereotype of the “tragic mulatto,” a phrase coined by the poet and literary scholar Sterling Brown in 1933 to connote the character who represents the problem of race mixing, and who is inevitably ruined because she or he is a person “without a race.”<sup>1</sup> Other representations equate multiraciality with progress: the mixed-race person functions as a bridge between estranged communities, a healing facilitator of an imagined racial utopia, even the embodiment of that utopia. These images, such as the one Barack Obama’s team cultivated during his first presidential election campaign, feature a special, sometimes messianic mixed-race character who has moved beyond the assumed confines of his or her African American heritage, and whose very existence portends racial liberation. In both positive and negative modes, despite their many differences, blackness operates as metaphoric tether. Further, blackness is presented as an internal, secret attribute of the multiracial individual, something to be struggled with or repressed in private.

This book examines the legacy of the problem-special dichotomy. Blackness remains pathological in both typological iterations. In the former it is the root cause for the multiracial African American woman’s emotionally and sexually unbalanced behavior; in the latter the multiracial African American subject’s metaphorical sloughing off of blackness is the root cause of her success. Multiracial nationalist advocacy for a “multiracial” category on the 2000 U.S. Census used this dual trope: multiracials need self-identification because they are troubled by confusing choices and are a special people. The texts I examine in *Transcending Blackness* largely advance the idea that mixed-race identity formation, characteristically marked by struggle, takes place in isolation; such individual and personal experiences are thought to be antithetical to a larger group or community sentiment.<sup>2</sup> In general, monoracial characters in the texts that I analyze do not question the permeability of racial borders.

Without question, racist laws are at the root of the mandate that multiracial African Americans identify as black: the one-drop rule, more technically called hypodescent, dictated that anyone with any degree of black “blood” was considered black, and biologically based chattel slavery and Jim Crow racism in the United States helped confirm that blackness was inferior. Nevertheless, one unintentional result of racist law and action has been the growth and strength of multiracial African Americans through membership in black communities; in the words of Valerie Smith, “these

'rules' were internalized by African Americans who converted them from mere signifiers of shame to markers of pride."<sup>3</sup> Representations of blackness as something to be transcended fly in the face of the historic embrace of multiracial African Americans in African American communities. Such flat representations of mixed-race African Americans belie the complexity of real-life experiences of such subjects, who live simultaneously as black and mixed-race, in a messy multiplicity that is rarely contained in any racialized nomenclature.

Racialized expression, including nomenclature, is not a foregone conclusion but a form of representation, which Stuart Hall describes as "an essential part of the process by which meaning is produced and exchanged between members of a culture."<sup>4</sup> Representations are vehicles that drive controlling and alternative images of race, gender, class, and sexuality, the social forces that govern our society. Popular cultural representations are fertile areas of study because they allow us to analyze the myths of our culture, or as Hall puts it, "popular culture . . . is where we discover and play with the identifications of ourselves, where we are imagined, where we are represented."<sup>5</sup> In other words, popular representations, where identity is imagined as both a site of social domination and agency, transform seeming fictions of racialization and sexualization into something close to reality. Evelyn Hammonds argues that visual representation, in particular, is a fundamental scholarly site because "in the U.S. race has always been dependent upon the visual."<sup>6</sup>

But such representations do not simply create meaning in a one-way process. As Hall and the Open University scholars illustrate in their famous circuit of culture, because of the interplay of audiences and texts, culture reflects, critiques, and creates changing ideologies.<sup>7</sup> Just as culture is perpetually mutating, so are racial meanings. Michael Omi and Howard Winant explain that race is not an essence, but "an unstable and 'decentered' complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle," a process that works to apply racial meanings, which they deem racialization.<sup>8</sup> Because both culture in general and racial representations more specifically are dynamic, it might seem that shifts in culture keep up with quick transformations in racialization. Racialization works by means of cultural representations, and representations actualize racialization; put another way, lived experiences of race inform representational ones, and representational race informs experience.<sup>9</sup> Changes in culture and racialization do not, however, immediately trans-



late to changes in material life in such areas as state and public policies.<sup>10</sup> And most representations of mixed-race African Americans do not reveal the reciprocal complexity produced through this exchange. The script of multiracial blackness is stuck in a circuit of controlling, anti-black images.

In this “mulatto millennium,”<sup>11</sup> to use the author Danzy Senna’s phrase, images of multiracial blackness largely do not illuminate the benefits of identifying as black. Instead of showing Americans embracing blackness in messy, hybridized, multiracial forms, the unspoken dictate in contemporary representations of multiracial Americans is that blackness must be risen above, surpassed, or truly transcended. In order to avoid being the “new millennium mulatta” who is always divided, alone, and uncomfortable, as exemplified in the first epigraph, popular images suggest that one must become the “exceptional multiracial” who is the unifying, post-racial, U.S. ideal, as exemplified in the second epigraph. To be more specific about the terms of this binary, on the one hand, multiracial blackness is *disdained* for its imagined primordially raced nature, with its tragic-mulatta lineage. On the other hand, multiracial blackness is *desired* for its imagined transcendent quality, where it is ahistorically divorced from racism and sexism in the United States with its troubling history of chattel slavery, Jim Crow racism, and entrenched misogyny. Because the popular conception that race means black, the end of race must mean the end of blackness. Whiteness, imaged as pure, invisible, and promise-laden, remains prized as the savior for multiracial African American figures from blackness, presented as sullied, hypervisible, and tragedy filled.

The new millennium-mulatta image is not supplanting the exceptional multiracial but is functioning in tandem with it, with both modes operating simultaneously in a dialectic. As dialectical stereotypes, the two images are, in the words of Yuko Kawai, “ambivalent as they contain contradictory messages simultaneously.”<sup>12</sup> The condemnation of blackness is either implicit, where blackness is stigmatized through the presentation of tragic-mulatta inevitability, or explicit, where throwing off the yoke of blackness means arriving at a safely post-racial state. The struggle with black transcendence occurs through not only racialized but gendered and sexualized performances. Gender is not a floating additive characteristic in the representations I examine; it is an essential intersectional category that structures and restructures race, as well as other imbricated categories, such as class and sexuality.<sup>13</sup> In the representations I examine, gendered identity helps racialized identity become operative,