Forthcoming in *Heterosexual Histories*, ed. Rebecca Davis and Michele Mitchell (New York University Press, 2020), through peer review and copyediting, in final production

Chapter 2

The Strange Career of Interracial Heterosexuality

Renee Romano

In 1603, long before there was any category we now know as heterosexuality, William Shakespeare penned *Othello*, which famously features a love affair and marriage between the beautiful white Desdemona and the "Moorish" Venetian general, Othello. That love affair ends badly, as interracial relationships often do in cultural representations, when a jealous Othello kills his wife after being misled by the duplicitous Iago into believing that she is having an affair. In Shakespeare's tale, Othello's passionate love and desire for his wife does not make him manly. It does not make him "normal." Instead, as literary critic Rebecca Ann Bach has shown, at the time when the play was written, a man's unbridled desire for a woman made him weak, even effeminate. Othello's excessive desire for his wife marked him as racially other in the seventeenth century, a degraded Moor who did not exhibit the kind of self-control suitable for a proper man.[1]

Heterosexuality, Hanne Blank writes in *Straight: The Surprisingly Short History of Heterosexuality*, is "like air, all around us and yet invisible."[2] It is the task of this volume to make visible what has been elusively invisible, to make historically specific a category, identity, and norm that have remained stubbornly ahistorical. The changing reception to the character of Othello offers one small clue to the early emergence of what Bach calls the "heterosexual imaginary" over the course of the eighteenth century. If in Shakespeare's day, Othello's excessive desire for his wife marked him as a racially inferior man, by the eighteenth century, commentators on the play had begun to laud Othello for his passion as an emerging heterosexual

order recoded male sexual desire for women as a key marker of masculinity. Over the course of the eighteenth century, Bach argues, "what was originally part of Othello's racial stigma became part of the dominant male identity."[3]

That transition of course did not reach completion in the eighteenth century. Even in the early twentieth century, a medical dictionary still defined heterosexuality as "abnormal or perverted appetite toward the opposite sex."[4] And while this new category might have helped Othello's reputation with theater critics, did it really, as Bach's analysis seems to imply, somehow help legitimize the idea of interracial love? Shakespeare's problematic characterization of his overly jealous Moor reflected what scholars have recognized as an extraordinarily powerful aspect of the emergence of race: the ways in which ideologies about racial difference and especially the supposed inferiority of nonwhites drew on portrayals of sexual difference and deviance. As race cohered as an ideology for categorizing the people of the world in a hierarchy (especially in slave societies like that which developed in the United States), hypersexuality—or supposedly illicit and excessive uncontrollable sexual desire—became a key marker of racial inferiority. The changing reception of a character like Othello makes one wonder: might the acceptance of sexual desire signaled by the emergence of heterosexuality somehow diminish the stigma of sexual racism and undercut the opposition to cross-race relationships that served as a foundation of America's racial/sexual system?

Or would history show that as the sexual system evolved in the United States, middle-class whites could legitimate their own more passionate sexual desires as respectable and properly heterosexual by defining them against a stigmatized other, an other that would include not only the new category of "homosexuals" who engaged in same-sex acts, but also interracial couples, who too engaged in sexual acts with what most saw as an improper object choice? As

heterosexuality became decisively normative, shifting from its turn-of-the century definition of a "perverse" desire for the opposite sex to its 1934 dictionary definition of "normal sexuality,"[5] was it in part because same-race couples could go to a "black and tan" club, watch interracial mixing, and craft their own more respectable heterosexual identity in opposition to a deviant margin? Othello's story did not end in the eighteenth century; instead, black men like him who desired and married white women would again end up as outsiders, heterosexuals perhaps but certainly not heteronormative, at least not in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, and arguably, still not today.

This essay asks what interraciality, or the experience of interracial couples, can tell us about the history of heterosexuality. And it explores what a focus on heterosexuality might reveal about the history of interracial sexuality, too. My analysis takes seriously historian Kevin Mumford's call that we consider interraciality as a category of analysis. In his book, *Interzones: Black/White Sex Districts in Chicago and New York in the Early Twentieth Century*, Mumford contends that "interracial relations on the margins" are "central to understanding the character of modern American culture."[6] What does heterosexuality look like when we move interraciality from the margins to the center? What do we learn about the power and limits of heterosexuality, as well as how it became and has served as a normative category that structures politics, society, and culture, when we focus on the history and experience of interracial couples?

Drawing on both my own work on black-white interracial marriage and a wide scholarship on interracial sexual and marital relationships throughout US [RD1]history, I argue that interraciality and heterosexuality have a complicated and ambivalent relationship, one that ensures that the experiences of heterosexual interracial couples differ not only from white heterosexual couples, but also from same-race nonwhite ones. Interraciality magnifies and

overdetermines heterosexual interpretations of male-female interactions. As a result of the intense sexualization of the color line, all kinds of cross-racial male-female interactions are presumed to be sexual. Heterosexual interracial couples are thus hypervisible, while same-sex desire across racial lines is frequently invisible and culturally illegible. Yet even as cross-race male-female relationships are incessantly read as heterosexual, they are not heteronormative and have not been accorded the full privileges of heterosexuality.

While we know, thanks to the work of Siobhan Somerville, that race played an important role in shaping cultural conceptions of the emerging category of homosexuality, scholars have paid less attention to how race has worked to construct the boundaries of what constituted "proper" heterosexuality.[7] Yet for much of US history, cross-race different-sex relationships have been as "queer" in their challenge to heterosexuality as homosexuality has. Heterosexual interracial relationships have historically threatened notions of white racial purity. They have challenged a social and national order constructed to maintain white supremacy and white male patriarchal privilege. Stigmatized as illicit and deviant, they served as an "other" against which the heterosexual norm could define itself. In many ways, different-sex interracial couples, especially those involving a white woman, have proved as much of, or even more of, a threat to the heteronormative social order, than same-sex couples have.

Reproduction

Without the regulation of different-sex interracial relationships, it would have been nearly impossible to build a race-based society where privileges and opportunities were granted based on a racial hierarchy. Colonial and later state prohibitions against different-sex interracial relationships helped construct and define racial boundaries and categories and in particular allowed for the imagining of whiteness as a space of racial "purity," uncontaminated by the taint

of "blood" of racial groups that were rapidly being defined in opposition to whiteness. If European settlers to the Americas had freely mixed with both the indigenous people and the Africans imported as laborers, race as we know it today may not have ever developed. But the colonies and later states chose a different course, passing laws that had two major functions: to create a sharp division, especially between those considered white and those of African descent; and to ensure that race would correspond, first with slave status and later with privilege.[8]

The web of anti-miscegenation laws that marked the American landscape in some form or another for over 300 years (from the passage of the first law targeting interracial sex in Maryland in 1661 to the 1967 Supreme Court ruling in *Loving v. Virginia* that declared all remaining state anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional) sought to create and protect a mythic "pure" whiteness from the contamination of interracial mixing.[9] Virginia's 1662 law decreed that "any Christian" who fornicated with a Negro man or woman would have to pay double the fines typically incurred for such an act. That law also announced a profound break with English common law because it ruled that a child's legal status would follow from that of its mother rather than its father. The law laid out the reasons for the change quite clearly. "Whereas some doubts have arrisen whether children got by any Englishman upon a negro woman should be slave or ffree, Be it therefore enacted and declared by this present grand assembly, that all children borne in this country shall be held bond or free only according to the condition of the mother."[10] White men, in other words, could have sex with enslaved women, and any resulting children would inherit their mother's slave status. But mixed-race children of white women would be born free. Thus all interracial relationships between white women and black men potentially threatened the system of racial slavery, as well as the authority of white men.

These regulations and social customs helped create the astounding racial fiction that mixed-race children born to white women would "pollute" the white race, while those born to women of color would not affect whiteness, as long as the white father did not try to legitimate them through marriage or some other legal means. The greater policing of white women's reproductive capacities reflected a patriarchal perspective on heterosexual sex: men were the active partners, who through the sex act transferred their semen—and metaphorically their blood—to women. But the passive female partners did not have the same potential to pollute men. Thus a white man "injected" his white blood into nonwhite races when he had sex with a woman of color. But a white woman was polluted and tainted by nonwhite blood if she had sex with a man of color. Segregationist Mississippi senator Theodore Bilbo starkly acknowledged this gendered construction of interracial sex in a 1947 screed against integration. "We deplore the conditions which have poured a broad stream of white blood into black veins," Bilbo wrote, "but we deny that any appreciable amount of black blood has entered white veins. As disgraceful as the sins of some white men may have been, they have not in any way impaired the purity of the Southern Caucasian blood."[11]

Bilbo reassured his readers that southern white women had "preserved the integrity of their race" so that no one could "point the finger of suspicion in any manner whatsoever at the blood which flows in the veins of white sons and daughters of the South."[12] Yet, his seeming need to defend white female purity reflects the fundamental insecurity that heterosexuality causes for whiteness: even as whiteness must be reproduced to ensure a secure future for the white race, the very process of reproduction carries within it the seeds of the destruction of whiteness itself. Concepts of race are inherently linked to the body; race offers a mechanism to categorize bodies in a way that reproduces itself. Heterosexual reproduction thus operates as both

the mechanism to ensure the maintenance of racial difference and the site that endangers the production of race.[13]

Cross-racial sex, especially that between white women and nonwhite men, had to be policed in order to construct racial categories and then later to maintain them. The late nineteenth century emergence of heterosexuality as a sexual system only intensified fears about the dangers that different-sex interracial relationships could pose to white racial purity. Heterosexuality both placed erotic satisfaction at the core of modern sexual identity and revalued women's sexuality in a positive way.[14] As literary scholar Mason Stokes explores, this shift to a pleasure-driven sexuality increased anxiety about racial mixing. Heterosexuality "located desire outside family, race, and nation," Stokes argues, thus bringing with it a heightened possibility for perversion and corruption.[15]

Regulating interracial sex was especially crucial since the same racialized sexual stereotypes that developed as a way to differentiate nonwhites from whites could also serve to generate cross-racial desire. Even as white men insisted that black men posed a threat to white women because of their ostensibly heightened sexual appetite, their alleged lack of self-control, and their supposedly enormous penises, they worried that white women freed to explore their own sexual satisfaction might find such men appealing. Sexual racism—or ideas of racial difference articulated through constructions of sexual difference—had perhaps the unintended consequences of turning many racial "others" into attractive sexual partners; stereotypes about black men particularly threatened whiteness since they portrayed them in ways that emphasized their sexual prowess and that could, theoretically, make them attractive to white women, the guardians of white racial purity.[16] The emergence of heterosexuality, Stokes thus argues, led

white men to focus obsessively on the dangers of racial mixing, to engage in a "compulsive imagining of interracial sex" between black men and white women.[17]

Given the threat that heterosexuality posed to whiteness it seems perhaps inevitable that Stokes finds that American literature from the nineteenth and early twentieth century demonstrates the importance of white male homosociality to the project of white supremacy. It was relationships *between* white men—who took on the project of controlling white womanhood—that served to protect whiteness, Stokes suggests. Homosocial kinship between white men was far safer for whiteness than the heterosexual desire of men for women—or even worse, of women for men of their choice. Even relationships between white men that blurred the line between the social and the sexual were thus less of a threat to the existing racial and social order than differently-sexed interracial relationships were. As Stokes writes, in turn-of-the century American literature, "homoeroticism becomes, paradoxically, the only structure of desire that can keep whiteness white." Robert Young in his 1995 work, *Colonial Desire,* makes the same point more explicitly. Same-sex sex, he writes, "posed no threat because it produced no children; its advantage was that it remained silent, covert, unmarked…In fact, in historical terms, concern about racial amalgamation tended if anything to encourage same-sex play…".[18] Heterosexual interraciality, given its ability to blur racial lines through the birth of mixed-race children, proved more threatening than homosexuality to a racial system predicated on notions of white purity.

Reproducing the Nation

But it was not just white racial purity that heterosexuality threatened; its new "pleasure-centered dispersal of sexual energy" had within it the seeds "of the fall of the white state," Stokes concludes, a possibility brought to the screen in the famous 1915 silent film, *Birth of a Nation,*

directed by D.W. Griffith.[19] *Birth of Nation* dramatized Griffith's version of the history of Reconstruction, as the South sought to rebuild after the Civil War. In Griffith's version, based loosely on Thomas Dixon's novels, *The Klansman* and *The Leopard's Spots*, the threat to white southerners was both the mentally and socially inferior freed blacks who no longer accepted their rightful place as subordinate to whites and the northern whites who falsely believed that blacks could ever be equal to whites. The political drama focuses on the birth of the Ku Klux Klan and its efforts to restore white supremacy in the South, but its romantic drama focuses on two heterosexual couples, each involving one child of the pro-Union white northern Stoneman family and one child of the pro-Confederacy white southern Cameron family. For the Stoneman-Cameron couples to achieve their happy ending, the white northern partners must both come to recognize the threat that blacks present to the social order and to realize the danger posed by interracial relationships. Here the most conniving blacks are those who are racially mixed themselves, and what black men really want as the symbol of their newfound freedom is a white wife. In *Birth of a Nation*, interracial sex threatens not only white racial purity—indeed, the character presented as the paragon of white female purity, a teenager known only as "Little Sister," jumps to her death rather than face defilement at the hands of a black man—but also the fledging post-Civil War national order. The white northerners can only be happily united in matrimony with their white southern lovers when they realize how threatening black political, social, and sexual equality really is. As one of the intertitle cards in a climactic scene near the end of the silent film reads, "The former enemies of North and South are united again in defense of their Aryan birthright."[20] Birthing a nation, the film makes quite clear, required promoting certain kinds of relationships while prohibiting others.

Heterosexuality is not simply the sexual desires and practices that are socially defined as "normal." Rather, as Stevi Jackson writes, "[T]he coercive power of compulsory heterosexuality derives from its institutionalization as more than merely a sexual relation."[21] Heterosexuality is institutionalized through laws and public policy that privilege certain kinds of relationships and familial arrangements over others. Government policies that promote marriage, that encourage male-headed households, that link government benefits to one's marital status, and that view marriage and family creation as a solution to poverty or juvenile delinquency have all worked to portray the ideal citizen as heterosexual. As Joane Nagel explains in her work on the intersections of race, sexuality, and ethnicity, "Implicit in the idea of the nation…are certain prescriptions and proscriptions for sexual crossings—what good citizens should and should not do sexually, and whom they should and should not have sex with."[22] Gender plays a vital role in this nation-building, with women given responsibility for reproducing the nation and men for running and defending it. As a result, nationalist politics goes "hand-in-hand" with forms of "hegemonic masculinity" that promote and affirm a patriarchal, heteronormative social order that justifies monitoring and controlling women's sexuality. Nationalist discourse across the globe, Nagel concludes, defines "proper places for men and women," "valorize[s] the heterosexual family as the bedrock of the nation," and condemns "those considered outside the sexual boundaries of the nation."[23]

Peggy Pascoe's sweeping history of America's anti-miscegenation regime highlights just how much energy has been expended to place heterosexual cross-race relationships outside of the "sexual boundaries of the nation." Legislation regulating interracial relationships were among the first racial laws passed in the colonies and they were the last segregation laws to fall in the civil rights era. Anti-miscegenation laws, which existed in some form from 1661 to 1967, proved

the most pervasive and enduring forms of legal racial discrimination. The anti-miscegenation regime, Pascoe reminds us, was a national one, not just a southern one. Laws prohibiting interracial marriage existed in all but nine of the fifty states at one time or another. They targeted not only relationships between blacks and whites, but also between whites and Asians, Malays, and, in some cases, Native Americans. Anti-miscegenation laws thus grouped together all nonwhites as a threat to white purity and made clear that preventing interracial marriage was a vital part of constructing a system of white supremacy and building a stable nation.[24]

Sexuality scholar Steven Seidman insists that critical sexuality studies must focus more attention on "Analyzing the way in which regimes of normative heterosexuality create hegemonic and subordinate forms of heterosexuality." .[25] If so, then exploring the anti-miscegenation regime needs to be at the top of the priority list. The widespread and intense regulation of interracial relationships suggests that different-sex cross-race relationships were among the most deviant forms of heterosexuality, viewed by authorities as highly threatening to the state. Institutionalized heterosexuality typically promotes monogamous, marital relationships, with marriage being so important to the state that long-term cohabiting different-sex couples are presumed to be part of a "common-law marriage" even when they have made no legal contract with each other. But in the case of interracial pairings, marriage actually made a relationship more threatening to the state, not less. Interracial marriages had to be regulated in order to prevent the transfer of wealth and assets from whites to nonwhites. They needed to be prohibited to ensure that any children born of interracial sex would be considered illegitimate. And they needed to be stigmatized as a way to promote a construction of a stable national order where whites held a privileged place.

Indeed, the regulation of interracial marriage was so important to states that even white men would find their rights limited. While the regulation of interracial sex sought to control the actions of white women while allowing white men to freely engage in sex with nonwhite women, the prohibition of interracial marriage affected both men and women alike. While Peggy Pascoe notes that this impingement on the rights of white men was among the "hardest won—and most unstable—achievement" of the anti-miscegenation regime, the fact that patriarchal privilege did not extend to white men's rights to legitimize their mixed-race children or to leave their assets to their nonwhite partners demonstrates that interraciality could, to put it crudely, trump heterosexuality.[26] Courts regularly denied nonwhite long-term partners of white men the status of common-law wives, which would have granted them the right to their partner's estates and legitimacy for their children. Many of the miscegenation cases that reached the courts concerned the disposition of property or estates after the death of a white spouse. Some states designed laws specifically to prevent this kind of wealth transmission. Mississippi law awarded inheritances to any white descendant, regardless of legitimacy and no matter how remote, over any mixed-race descendent.[27]

Yet while the anti-miscegenation regime placed some limits on white men's freedom for the sake of the nation, it was white women who had the power to truly disrupt the national order through engaging in interracial relationships. Women, perceived as the guardians of the purity of their communities, have been charged with reproducing and upholding the identity of racial nations. As legal scholar Leti Volpp argues, "Nationalism entwines with race so that women are subjected to control in order to achieve the aim of a national racial purity."[28] White women who explicitly chose nonwhite men challenged not only the white men in their own lives, but also the entire edifice of a racial system justified by the need to defend white women's racial purity.

White men defended segregation, the denial of political equality, and the practice of lynching on the grounds that they needed to protect precious white womanhood from nonwhites, and especially black men, who might come to see themselves as equal to whites if not confined to a subordinate racial status.[29] No wonder that white women who became involved in interracial relationships were frequently portrayed as mentally ill and even institutionalized by their parents.[30] "But would you want your daughter to marry one?," the famous "final" question, invoked as late as the 1960s as a way to silence critiques of segregation, made clear the ways in which interracial relationship between white and nonwhite men directly threatened white male patriarchal authority. "A Negro having relations with a white man's daughter, his own precious virgin, is in effect a storming of the castle, the penultimate act of castration," a 1966 magazine article colorfully explained.[31]

And what is castration but the ultimate denial of patriarchal power? While feminist scholarship tells us that heterosexuality has served as an institution of male control over women, interracial heterosexuality instead threatened white male patriarchal control over white women. In a seminal 1980 essay, Adrienne Rich argued that women's emotional, economic, and physical bonds with each other represented the most powerful threat to compulsory heterosexuality and male control over women. But white men's response to the possibility of relationships between white women and nonwhite men suggests that heterosexual interraciality could be as threatening to patriarchal power as lesbianism was.[32] Interraciality, like same-sex relationships, challenged the stability of a heterosexual national order.

While nonwhites have not had an equal place to whites in the nation, they have at least had the possibility of inclusion if they adhered to heteronormative conventions through same-race marriages and nuclear family formation. Indeed, understanding how "regimes of normative

heterosexuality create hegemonic and subordinate forms of heterosexuality" requires that we also explore how blacks, Asians, and other racialized communities viewed cross-racial relationships. Communities of color participated in the construction of a heteronormative order that stigmatized interracial relationships even if their full inclusion in that order remained elusive. That has been the case whether they have sought to further themselves on the basis of their similarity to white Americans or whether seeking power and purchase in the nation on the basis of their differences from whites.

For racialized groups stigmatized as sexually deviant and licentious, embracing the respectability politics associated with heteronormativity—monogamy, marriage, and middle-class cultural practices—has long served as one path towards racial equality. Both blacks and Asian Americans, for example, promoted images of their own family life as "normal" in order to further their claims for cultural and political inclusion. As Judy Wu has argued, the experience of being defined as sexually deviant as a result of racial discrimination "reinforces the value of heteronormativity" for nonwhite groups.[33] Of course, since the entire anti-miscegenation regime marked nonwhites as inferior to whites, people of color did not necessarily support or advocate bars on intermarriage themselves. Indeed, they feared that such bans would only serve to make it easier for white men to sexually exploit women of color. But, like whites, many associated interracial relationships with exploitative and illicit sex, characterized those who would engage in such relationships as degraded, and feared that open involvement in or support for such relationships would tarnish the entire community as lacking in respectability. In 1868, all eight of the black delegates to the Arkansas Constitutional Convention joined white delegates in voting to condemn "all amalgamation….legitimate or illegitimate."[34] Black clubwomen in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century promoted "ladylike" behavior and sexual self-control as a

way for black women to challenge the "myth of black promiscuity," a myth fueled by even consensual interracial relationships.[35] The impulse to associate interracial relationships with immorality and to condemn them as detrimental to the race continued well into the twentieth century. "All decent colored people disapprove of mixed marriages," a self-described "Loyal American Negro Mother" wrote in 1949, while black sociologists St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, Jr. found in their 1945 study of black Chicago that having a white spouse could hurt blacks' social position with other blacks.[36] Blacks or other racial groups who sought to normalize their racial difference by publicly performing heteronormativity tended to be wary of cross-racial relationships.[37]

This common ground between whites and nonwhites again highlights the deviant nature of heterosexual interracial relationships. Such relationships have long been sexualized in such a way that respectability politics has proven a limited avenue for advancement for interracial couples. The anti-miscegenation legal regime had the effect of stigmatizing all kinds of interracial relationships as immoral and licentious even if the relationship was stable, long-term, monogamous, or resulted in a marriage.[38] Marriage, in other words, did not normalize heterosexual interraciality; it did not confer respectability upon an interracial couple as long as there were laws barring intermarriage. Even in states where intermarriage was legal, white women with black men and black women with white men were presumed to be prostitutes, not wives. Elaine Neil, a white woman, had to threaten to sue the state of New York in the early 1950s to stop a police campaign against her and her black husband. Police arrested Elaine on prostitution charges, called her a "whore," and questioned the legitimacy of her marriage to her black husband. Nor did marriage protect couples from speculation that their relationships were motivated by sexual curiosity, mental instability, or economic gain.[39]

That is not to say that heterosexual interracial couples have not engaged in a politics of respectability. Indeed, cross-race couples have sought to distance themselves from negative stereotypes of illicit interracial sex by stressing exactly the kinds of behaviors that heteronormativity requires: that they married for love, that they are no different from same-race heterosexual couples, that they are stable and monogamous, and that they have children and form nuclear families. But this project has been, at best, incomplete. The 1951 intermarried couple who insisted to *Ebony* magazine that they were ordinary people, "nothing spectacular nor side show freaks," differed little in perspective from couples in the 1980s who railed against the negative portrayal of interracial relationships on television talk shows, to current couples who feel they must constantly work to deflect negative stereotypes and to position themselves as normal, legitimate, and "in love."[40] Normalizing heterosexual interracial love through a politics of respectability remains an elusive strategy for full acceptance because it is not the status of an interracial relationship—commercial or not, married or not, stable or not—that makes it deviant. It is the fact of their relationship at all. As with queer couples, heterosexual interracial couples have had to fight to be considered respectable because their object choice automatically renders their relationship non-normative.

It is not only respectability that has eluded interracial couples, but also the possibility of participating in a politics of nation building. Interracial relationships have threatened not only the construction of a white heteronormative state, but also have been viewed with disgust by other racial groups who envisioned constructing a sense of nationhood based on their ethnic or racial heritage. Preeminent black nationalist leader Marcus Garvey, the head of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, went so far as to praise the white supremacist Ku Klux Klan in 1922 because that organization, like his, believed in racial purity. Garvey and the Klan shared similar

anti-miscegenation views. “Whilst the Ku Klux Klan desires to make America absolutely a white man’s country, the Universal Negro Improvement Association wants to make Africa absolutely a black man’s country,” Garvey explained. Interraciality threatened both of these nation-building projects.[41] In the 1960s and 1970s, black nationalists attacked blacks who intermarried for betraying the race and “sleeping with the enemy.” Malcolm X echoed Marcus Garvey in his opposition to intermarriage. “Let the white man keep his women and let us keep ours,” he instructed blacks. Black nationalists described interracial relationships, in the words of Eldridge Cleaver, as a “revolutionary sickness,” a sign of one’s desire to be white. Building a strong black nation required, as one black woman explained, that blacks eschew interracial relationships and “want to see the blood of our heritage running in and through the veins of our children.”[42] There is no space for interraciality in racial nationalism, whether espoused by whites or other racialized groups.

Although there have always been a handful of Americans who have praised racial mixing as a way to fulfill America’s destiny, it has proven difficult for interracial couples to imagine themselves as engaged in their own political project. Historian Greg Carter, who writes about the understudied intellectual American tradition of viewing racial mixing a positive good rather than a threat or sign of degradation, shows how advocating racial mixing could be part of a vision of full equality for all races in a transformed country. Thus radical abolitionist Wendell Phillips urged people of all races to mix freely in the United States, while more recently, groups created by and for mixed-race couples and families have sometimes described interracial love as one avenue towards reducing racial tensions. As one magazine for interracial couples insisted in 1977, “Love is the answer, not legislation.”[43] But whatever nation-building project interracial couples and their families might be involved in has always been viewed as utopian, as even the

title of Carter's book—*The United States of the United Races: A Utopian History of Race Mixing*—suggests.

Interracial couples, moreover, have found that their relationships are stigmatized and discredited if there is even the slightest hint that their actions are politically motivated. While same-race heterosexual couples can be part of a nation-building project—even an explicit one—and not have the status and legitimacy of their relationship called into question, interracial relationships have been much more easily charged with being together for reasons that heterosexuality deems illegitimate, such as marrying to promote a political agenda. Not surprisingly, different-sex interracial couples have historically taken great pains to insist that their marriages are respectable, traditional, and loving.[44] The earliest clubs for interracial couples, the Manasseh Society, which was founded in Milwaukee and Chicago in the late nineteenth century, and the Penguin Club, founded in New York in 1936, explicitly required that all members be legally married and even demanded proof of character. The Manasseh Society required that members attend church regularly; the Penguin Society forbid childless couples on the ground that the presence of children indicated a more stable marriage.[45] Being seen as "crusaders" for interracial love served to reinforce negative stereotypes about these relationships in ways that placed them even further outside heteronormativity. For same-race couples, building stable nuclear families has been considered a key aspect of nation-building, but cross-race couples have found little place for themselves in that project.

Deviant or Other? The Visibility of Hetero Interraciality

Scholars of normative heterosexuality tell us that there are many ways to be a "bad" heterosexual. While the invention and institutionalization of heterosexuality served most powerfully to regulate and stigmatize same-sex acts, it also created hierarchies which privileged

heterosexuals who were involved in monogamous, gender-conventional long-term (preferably married) relationships based on love over those who engaged in casual sex, commercial sex, had multiple partners, or who in some ways challenged gender norms. As Steven Seidman argues, "normative heterosexuality not only establishes hierarchy with homosexuals, but creates hierarchy among heterosexualities" as well.[46] Interracial couples might be considered the poster children for deviant heterosexuality; adhering to heteronormative conventions has done little to normalize them historically.

The exclusions of different-sex interracial couples from the most basic aspects of heterosexual privilege raise the question of whether they are really lesser heterosexuals, ranked lower on a hierarchy than normative heterosexuals, or are perhaps instead defined as outside the norm entirely. One of the most powerful aspects of heterosexual privilege, Hanne Blank writes, is the right to go through the world without your relationship attracting much notice. "Having your sexuality and your relationships be perceived as 'normal' provides unearned privilege," Blank argues. "It accrues automatically and invisibly to everyone *who is perceived as being heterosexual* for as long as they continue to be perceived that way" [emphasis added].[47]

Are different-sex interracial couples "perceived as being heterosexual" under this definition? If being heterosexual means one has the right to go through the world without your relationship attracting much attention, they certainly have not had that right. Different-sex interracial couples in the United States have historically encountered disapproval and even violent opposition. Historically and currently, different-sex couples complain about the stares, comments, and scrutiny they experience when they are in public. Whether those comments are hostile or affirming, they make clear that interracial relationships are not normative.[48]

As a sexual regime, heterosexuality stigmatizes same-sex relationships as the ultimate boundary against which normative practices are judged, making homosexuality suspect and highly visible, while making heterosexuality the invisible norm. But the color line has been sexualized in a way that makes different-sex interracial pairings far more visible than same-sex interracial relationships. It is heterosexual interracial pairings that raise the specter of the loss of white racial purity and the threat to the project of constructing a racial nation. Cross-racial interactions between a man and woman—particularly the most taboo of those crossings between black and whites but also sometimes those between white men and Asian women—serve as visible triggers of a history of sexual racism and illicit desire, and that history is so powerful that even men and women of different races who are only acquaintances are often construed as sexually involved. Sociologist Amy Steinbugler argues that "racial difference may actually heighten presumptions of heterosexual intimacy." Some pairings are so associated with racial and sexual deviance that "others may read this historic symbol onto two individuals who are simply occupying the same physical space."[49]

While heterosexual interracial couples experience a heightened sense of public visibility, queer interracial couples often feel profoundly invisible. In her interviews with contemporary queer interracial couples, Amy Steinbugler found that most felt that their interraciality lacked any public identity and indeed made them culturally illegible. All of the cultural scripts about interraciality relate to different-sex pairings, a category that carries with it longstanding "historical, social, and political meanings."[50] In fact, crossing the color line has been so deeply linked to deviant heterosexual desire that at times even same-sex interracial racial pairings have been understood as fundamentally heterosexual. In 1913, psychologist Margaret Otis explained the relationships between young black and white women at a reform school as an example of

white women's heterosexual attraction to men, with race difference standing in for gender difference. "The difference in color, in this case," Otis argued, "takes the place of difference in sex."[51] Other twentieth century reformers also attributed interracial lesbian relationships in prison to black women taking on masculine roles and temporarily substituting for male partners for their supposedly straight white female lovers.[52] This understanding of interracial lesbian relationships demonstrates the power of the "heterosexualization" of the color line.

This relative invisibility of same-sex interracial relationships is particularly noteworthy because demographic evidence suggests that today—and perhaps historically—queer couples are in fact more likely to be interracial than straight ones. In 2010, the US Census found that same-sex couples were more likely to be interracial or interethnic than any other kind of couples; 20.6 percent of all same-sex couples were interracial or interethnic as compared to 18.3 percent of different-sex unmarried couples and 9.5 percent of different-sex married couples.[53] Nevertheless, queer interraciality often remains invisible in public. Black law professor I. Bennett Capers explains the different treatment that he encounters when he is out with his white husband than when his black brother visits with his white wife. His brother and sister-in-law "are still suspect, subject to the look, an 'interracial tax,'" while he felt he was actually made safer and less threatening by having a white male partner.[54]

Rather than different-sex interraciality being a form of "bad" heterosexuality, it might perhaps be more aptly considered as akin to same-sex relationships: one of the "others" that heterosexuality as a new sexual regime defined itself against. The reorganization of the systems of gender and sexuality that took place in the late nineteenth century and resulted in the "invention" of the categories of heterosexuality and homosexuality drew on and developed from ideas already in circulation about race and racialized bodies. In *Queering the Color Line*,

Siobhan Somerville argues that scientific discourses about race shaped the ways in which sexologists articulated emerging models of homosexuality. Sexologists scrutinized bodies of so-called "inverts" for biological markers of difference just as scientists had scrutinized black bodies for markers of racial inferiority. They described gender ambiguity—or what seemed to be a mixed gendered body—as akin to a mixed-race body. And they developed a new focus on sexual object choice that linked homosexual and interracial desire as both unnatural and deviant.[55] The emerging system of heterosexuality defined homosexuality as deviant, in other words, by associating it with interracial sex, which was already understood as illicit and overly sexualized.

Heterosexuality as a new sexual regime associated with different practices and behaviors became socially acceptable in part through contrasting it to both interracial heterosexuality and to homosexuality, which in fact were often geographically linked. What Kevin Mumford calls "interzones," or sites that allowed interracial mixing that developed in northern cities in the early twentieth century, also became sites associated with same-sex relationships. Interracial sex became the marker of vice; these deviant spaces, Mumford suggests, provided space for the emergence of new gay subcultures. Both different-sex cross-racial mixing and same-sex relationships became the stigmatized other that a new more sexually permissive heterosexual center could redefine itself against. A dance hall could be respectable as long as it did not allow racial mixing, Mumford argues in his study of New York and Chicago. In California, fears of mixing between white women and Filipino men led to city bans on mixed-race dancing, not to mention bans on all dance halls in the 1920s.[56]

Historian Chad Heap similarly demonstrates that the new heterosexual system based on the acceptance of female sexual desire and of the erotic as central to one's identity legitimated

itself and became respectable through the practice of middle-class whites defining themselves against an "other" that included both same-sex and different-sex interracial relations. Heap focuses on the practice known as slumming, where middle-class whites (and new immigrants seeking whiteness) visited neighborhoods and clubs associated with primitivism, illicit desire, and commercial sex, and in so doing shifted the boundaries of what was considered respectable sexual behavior (dating and oral sex, Heap argues, were two practices that slumming helped validate). Whites could maintain their own respectability, even while embracing new sexual practices, by positioning themselves against a degraded, exotic other. "Slumming provided the mechanism through which its participants could use both race and sexual encounters to mediate their transition from one system of sexual classification to another," Heap writes.[57] Both black and tan slumming and the subsequent "pansy" craze, where middle-class whites visited first spaces in black neighborhoods and then spaces associated with same-sex coupling, helped reshape middle-class sexual boundaries and legitimate the idea of sexual pleasure and desire linked to the emergence of heterosexuality. Interraciality, in short, helped establish the boundaries of what constituted proper and normative heterosexuality and became one of the markers that served to stigmatize same-sex relationships as deviant.

Heterosexuality Post-*Loving*?

In 1967, the US Supreme Court declared the entire anti-miscegenation legal regime unconstitutional after Richard and Mildred Loving challenged the state of Virginia's ban on interracial marriage. Richard, a white man, and Mildred, a woman of African and indigenous ancestry[MM2], had been childhood sweethearts in Caroline County, Virginia.[58] But after they married in 1958, they were charged with violating Virginia law and forced to leave the state to avoid a jail sentence. Seeking to return home, they eventually began a court challenge that would

result in the invalidation of all the remaining miscegenation laws nationwide. Marriage, the Supreme Court ruled in the *Loving* case, was a fundamental right that states could not abridge or deny on the basis of race.[59]

Since that ruling, the number of heterosexual interracial couples in the United States has increased dramatically, especially those involving Asians and Latinos. In 1967, only three percent of all newlyweds married across race lines. Today, seventeen percent of different-sex new marriages are interracial or interethnic (meaning Latino/non-Latino). The number of black-white married couples has increased from 51,000 in 1960 to 422,250 in 2010. Public opposition to interracial relationships has also declined dramatically since the *Loving* decision. In 1958, 94 percent of Americans disapproved of black-white marriages; today, only 11 percent do. Americans of all racial groups are more open to intermarriages involving members of their own families. In 2000, 31 percent of Americans indicated that they would disapprove of a family member marrying someone of another race; in 2015, that number stood at only 10 percent. And 39 percent of Americans in a 2017 Pew Research Study said that more people marrying across race lines would be good for society; only 9 percent claimed that more intermarriages would harm society.[60]

But if cross-race different-sex relationships have been as challenging to heterosexuality as same-sex relationships and both interraciality and homosexuality served as the "other" against which heterosexuality was defined, what does the lessening of the taboo against interraciality suggest about the stability and future of the sexual regime of heterosexuality?

To be fair, not everyone agrees that there really has been any meaningful decrease in opposition to interracial relationships since *Loving*. Pointing to the still small number of interracial couples and to other indicators, many scholars and social commentators argue that

interracial pairings remain rare and socially deviant. Fifty years after *Loving,* whites remain four times more likely than random to marry another white person, and a recent study attributes most of the increase in the number of interracial marriages to demographic change, especially the growth in the US population of Asians and Hispanics and decline in the white population, rather than to more tolerant attitudes towards interracial relationships among whites.[61] Ethnographic studies of heterosexual interracial couples find that they still report feeling hypervisible in public, while studies that seek to probe people's private racial feelings find that many whites still find interracial relationships off-putting and even something that inspires disgust.[62] A recent edited collection of essays by law professors about the 1967 *Loving* decision almost uniformly takes the glass half-empty approach, emphasizing all the ways that heterosexual privilege remains outside the reach of different-sex interracial couples. As one writer explains, "mixed race remains a threat to political stability and social respectability," while another stresses that black-white relationships remain "sexualized spectacles" that observers see as deviant and perverse. Interracial couples, a third essay points out, rarely see relationships like theirs represented in the media or affirmed as normal for their children.[63]

But given the changes in the last thirty years and the fact that today, one in six newlyweds is married to a partner of a different race or ethnicity and the rate of interracial pairings is even higher among cohabiting but unmarried couples, it seems useful to conclude with at least some questions about what a greater openness to interraciality might suggest about the future of heterosexuality.

Siobhan Somerville lays out one possible answer in her 2005 essay "Queer Loving," where she argues that heterosexual interracial relationships became normative—at least in the legal arena—through the increased demonization and stigmatization of same-sex relationships.

Normative citizenship, Somerville argues, had been articulated both through discourses of race and discourses of sexuality, as reflected in laws that prohibited interracial marriage and criminalized homosexuality. But just weeks before the Supreme Court handed down the *Loving* decision, they upheld a 1952 law that made homosexuals and adulterers ineligible to naturalize. For Somerville, this timing is evidence that "the interracial couple was imagined as having a legitimate claim on the state at the same time that the nation was defensively constituted as heterosexual, incapable of incorporating the sexually suspect body." *Loving* thus expanded marriage rights by consolidating heterosexuality as a prerequisite for recognition by the state, Somerville insists. Interracial marriage became legitimized in law "in relation to its thorough heterosexualization."[64] In this reading, different-sex interracial relationships became normative—at least in the eyes of the law—because they could be defined against same-sex relationships. Thus one possibility is that interraciality and homosexuality no longer operate in tandem as others against which heterosexuality defines itself.

While Somerville argues that interraciality became normative by the intensified exclusion of the homosexual, developments since she made that argument in 2005 raise the very different possibility that different-race and same-sex relationships have both become less oppositional to heterosexuality in the last forty years as long as they adhere to certain heteronormative (or homonormative) conventions. It is telling that the last fifty years have witnessed not only the legalization of interracial marriage and an increased acceptance for interracial relationships, but also the legalization of same-sex marriage and a lessening of the taboo against homosexuality. Indeed, the popularity of the *Loving* analogy—or the argument by proponents of gay marriage that since the court upheld individuals' freedom to marry across racial lines in 1967, it should uphold the right of individuals to marry someone of the same sex—indicates that the increased

acceptance of interraciality has helped spur the acceptance of homosexuality too. It seems that both kinds of relationships that heterosexuality defined itself against have become more socially acceptable as long as they do not challenge gender conventions, they link sex to love and marriage, they uphold family values, and they limit their public displays of affection. The history of interraciality may tell us, in short, that heteronormative heterosexuality is today "constituted as much by the 'other' being incorporated in a subordinate position within the dominant category as by the 'other' being excluded."[65] Even though the division may no longer be solely between same-race/interracial or hetero/homo, heteronormativity in this reading still creates a hierarchy between "good sexual citizens" and those "bad" sexual citizens who engage in erotic behaviors unmoored from intimacy and monogamy.[66]

Or—and this final possibility seems as likely to me as the others—the legalization of interracial marriage and at least a lessening of the taboo against interracial relationships may signal we are near the end of the sexual regime known as heterosexuality. Jonathan Ned Katz ends his book about the invention of heterosexuality with evidence that the sexual regime was already becoming less stable beginning in the 1970s and 1980s. Katz points to increasing divorce rates, falling marriage rates, less distinction between "gay" and "straight" sex acts, and a general convergence of gay and straight lifestyles.[67] While Katz doesn't include anything about race on his list, the growing number of interracial couples might be yet another indicator that the era of heterosexual supremacy is coming to an end.

Whatever the future holds for heterosexuality, it's clear that its past is inextricably linked to interraciality. Yet these links remain woefully unexplored. Scholars of sexuality still rarely identify monoraciality as a key prerequisite to heterosexual privilege, while scholars of interracial relationships have failed to recognize heterosexuality and heteronormativity as

important influences on heterosexual interracial intimacy. In other words, heterosexuality remains an area where monoraciality is assumed, while interraciality is an area of intellectual inquiry where heterosexuality is assumed.[68] But as this essay has attempted to demonstrate, neither interraciality nor heterosexuality can be fully understood without reference to the other.

[1] Rebecca Ann Bach, "17th and 18th century Othello and Desdemona: Race and Emerging Heterosexuality," in *Feminisms and Early Modern Texts: Essays for Phyllis Rackin*, eds. Bach and Gwynne Kennedy (Selinsgrove, Pa.: Susquehanna University Press, 2010), 81-98.

[2] Hanne Blank, *Straight: The Surprisingly Short History of Heterosexuality* (Boston: Beacon Books, 2012), xvi.

[3] Bach, "17th and 18th century Othello and Desdemona," 81.

[4] Quoted in Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 92.

[5] Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.

[6] Kevin Mumford, *Interzones: Black-White Sex Districts in Chicago and New York in the Early Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), xi, xii.

[7] See Siobhan B. Somerville's seminal work, *Queering the Color Line: Race and the Invention of Homosexuality in American Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000). Her argument about the ways in which race served as a key reference point for understanding homosexuality is discussed in more detail later in the essay.

[8] For more on the process of constructing whiteness as a space of "purity," see Kirsten Fischer, *Suspect Relations: Sex, Race, and Resistance in Colonial North Carolina* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002); Joanne Nagel, *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality: Intimate Interactions, Forbidden Frontiers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 37-62.

[9] The 1661 Maryland law mandated that "free-born" English women who married Negro slaves serve the same master during the life of her husband and that any children of the couple would be slaves as well. There is a large literature on the history of anti-miscegenation laws in the United States and the role such laws played in shaping racial and gender hierarchies. See, for example, Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009). A good introduction is Peter Bardaglio, "'Shamefull Matches': The Regulation of Interracial Sex and Marriage in the South Before 1900," in *Sex, Love, and Race: Crossing Racial Boundaries in North America*, ed. Martha Hodes (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 112-140.

[10] Ania Loomba and Jonathan Burton, eds., *Race in Early Modern England: A Documentary Companion* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 229.

[11] Theodore Bilbo, *Take Your Choice: Separation or Mongrelization* (Poplarville Miss: Dream House Publishing Co, 1947), 57-58.

[12] Bilbo, *Take Your Choice*.

[13] Richard Dyer, *White* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 20; Mason Stokes, *The Color of Sex: Whiteness, Heterosexuality, and the Fictions of White Supremacy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 16.

[14] For more on this, see Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, 88.

[15] Mason Stokes, "White Heterosexuality: A Romance of the Straight Man's Burden," in *Thinking Straight: The Power, Promise, and Paradox of Heterosexuality*, ed. Chrys Ingraham (New York: Routledge, 2005), 133.

[16] For a good overview of racial sexual stereotypes and their social implications, see Nagel, *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality*.

[17] Stokes, *The Color of Sex*, 17.

[18] Stokes, *The Color of Sex,* 18; Robert C. Young, *Colonial Desire*, quoted in Stokes, "White Heterosexuality," 146.

[19] Stokes, "White Heterosexuality," 146.

[20] D.W. Griffith and Thomas Dixon, *Birth of a Nation* (Los Angeles, CA: Triangle Film Corp., 1915).

[21] Stevi Jackson, "Sexuality, Heterosexuality, and Gender Hierarchy: Getting our Priorities Straight," in *Thinking Straight*, 18.

[22] Nagel, *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality*, 141. See also Diane Richardson, *Rethinking Sexuality* (London: Sage Publications, 2000), 80.

[23] Nagel, *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality*, 159, 166.

[24] See Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*.

[25] Steven Seidman, "From the Polluted Homosexual to the Normal Gay: Changing Patterns of Sexual Regulation in America," in *Thinking Straight*, 40.

[26] Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*, 11.

[27] Stetson Kennedy, *Jim Crow Guide: The Way it Was* (Baton Rouge: Florida Atlantic University Press, 1990) [originally published as *Jim Crow Guide to the U.S.A.*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1959], p. 67. Pascoe's *What Comes Naturally* explores this issue of wills, estates and miscegenation law in great depth.

[28] Leti Volpp, "American Mestizo: Filipinos and Antimiscegenation Laws in California," in *Loving v. Virginia in a Post-Racial World: Rethinking Race, Sex, and Marriage*, eds. Kevin Noble Maillard and Rose Cuison Villazor (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 71.

[29] While relationships between white women and black men were deemed particularly threatening, other kinds of interracial relationships also challenged the social and patriarchal order. As Mary Ting Yi Liu has shown, the murder of a white woman, allegedly by her Chinese lover in early twentieth century New York City, generated efforts by authorities to "restore moral and spatial order" with intensified surveillance of the Chinatown, intensified spatial segregation, and efforts to police the behavior of white women. See Mary Ting Yi Liu, *The Chinatown Trunk Mystery: Murder, Miscegenation, and Other Dangerous Encounters in Turn-of-the-Century New York City* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

[30] Renee Romano, *Race Mixing: Black-White Marriage in Postwar America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 66-69.

[31] Romano, *Race Mixing*, 197-198.

[32] Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," *Signs* 5:4 (Summer 1980): *Journal of Women's History* 15:3 (Summer 1980): 631-660.

[33] Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, "Asian American History and Racialized Compulsory Deviance," *Journal of Women's History (*Autumn 2003): 60.

[34] Hannah Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom: Citizenship, Sexual Violence and the Meaning of Race in the Postemancipation South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 164.

[35] For more on black clubwomen's adherence to and promotion of "respectable" middle-class sexual norms, see Stephanie J. Shaw, *What a Woman Ought to Be and to Do: Black Professional Women Workers during the Jim Crow Era* (University of Chicago Press, 1996), 13-25.

[36] Both quoted in Romano, *Race Mixing*, 85.

[37] Mason Stokes, "Father of the Bride: Du Bois and the Making of Black Heterosexuality," in *Next to the Color Line: Gender, Sexuality, and W.E.B. DuBois*, ed. Susan Gillman and Alys Eve Weinbaum (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 289-316.

[38] Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally,* 59-62.

[39] For more, see Romano, *Race Mixing,* 48-49, 127-132.

[40] Romano, *Race Mixing,* x; 277-279; Amy C. Steinbugler, *Beyond Loving: Intimate Racework in Lesbian, Gay, and Straight Interracial Relationships* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), see Chapter 5.

[41] Bob Blaisdell, ed., *Selected Writings and Speeches of Marcus Garvey* (Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 2004), viii.

[42] Romano, *Race Mixing,* chapter 7, pp. 216-247. Quotes from pp. 221, 222, 243

[43] *Interracial*, March 1977, p. 17.

[44] *Race Mixing*, 139-140.

[45] Will Kuby, *Conjugal Misconduct: Defying Marriage Law in the Twentieth-Century United States* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), 226-227.

[46] Seidman, "From the Polluted Homosexual to the Normal Gay: Changing Patterns of Sexual Regulation in America," 40.

[47] Blank, *Straight*, 164.

[48] For more on the visibility of heterosexual interracial couples, see Romano, *Race Mixing*; Steinbugler, *Beyond Loving*, 55.

[49] Amy Steinbugler, "Hiding in Plain Sight: Why Queer Interraciality is Unrecognizable to Strangers and Sociologists" in *Interracial Relationships in the 21st Century*, 2nd ed., eds. Earl Smith and Angela Hatterly (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2013), 97.

[50] Steinbugler, "Hiding in Plain Sight," 99.

[51] For more on this, see Somerville, *Queering the Color Line*, quote from p. 34.

[52] See Cheryl D. Hicks, *Talk With You Like a Woman: African American Women, Justice, and Reform in New York, 1890-1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 204-236.

[53] Daphne Lofquist, et al., "Households and Families, 2010," 2010 Census Briefs, U.S. Census Bureau, April 2012, p. 18, https://www.census.gov. Note these numbers refer to both interracial relationships and to same-race Hispanic/non-Hispanic relationships, or what the U.S. Census Bureau considers as interethnic marriages. If only *interracial relationships* are considered, the corresponding numbers are 6.9 percent of all heterosexual married couples, 14.2 percent of unmarried different sex couples, and 14.5 percent of same-sex couples were interracial.

[54] I. Bennett Capers, "The Crime of Loving: *Loving*, *Lawrence*, and Beyond" in *Loving v. Virginia in a Post-Racial World*, 106.

[55] Somerville, *Queering the Color Line*, 39.

[56] Mumford, *Interzones*, 56; Rick Baldoz, *The Third Asiatic Invasion: Migration and Empire in Filipino America, 1898-1946* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), 130-134.

[57] Chad Heap, *Slumming: Sexual and Racial Encounters in American Nightlife, 1885-1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 10.

[58] Mildred Loving, who was from the triracial community of Hunter's Point, Virginia, was of mixed Native American and African ancestry and recent scholarship has revealed that she defined herself as Indian rather than black. Indeed, Arica Coleman argues that from their own perspective, the Loving's marriage adhered to Virginia law, which allowed marriages between whites and some Native Americans. Outsiders, however, including the media and the courts, defined Mildred Loving as black and the 1967 case of *Loving v. Virginia* was viewed at the time as affirming the rights of blacks and whites to marry. For more on this issue, see Arica Coleman, *That the Blood Stay Pure: African Americans, Native Americans, and the Predicament of Race and Identity in Virginia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

[59] Romano, *Race Mixing*, 188-191.

[60] Frank Newport, "In U.S. 87 percent Approve of Black-White Marriage, vs. 4 percent in 1958," Politics, Gallup.com, July 25, 2013, www.gallup.com; Gretchen Livingston and Anna Brown, "Intermarriage in the U.S. 50 Years After Loving v. Virginia," Pew Research Center, May 18, 2017, www.pewsocialtrends.org.

[61] Dan Kopf, "Why is Interracial Marriage on the Rise,"*Priceonomics,* September 1, 2016, https://priceonomics.com.

[62] Allison L. Skinner and Caitlin M. Hudac, "'Yuck, you disgust me!' Affective Bias against Interracial Couples," *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 68 (January 2017): 68-77.

[63] Kevin Noble Maillard, "The Multiracial Epiphany, or How to Erase an Interracial Past," in *Loving v. Virginia in a Post-Racial World*, 95; Camille A. Nelson, "Love at the Margins: The Racialization of Sex and the Sexualization of Race," in *Loving in a Post-Racial World*, 103, 104; Angela Onwauchi-Willig and Jacob Willig-Onwuachi, "Finding a *Loving* Home," in *Loving v. Virginia in a Post-Racial World,"* 184.

[64] Siobhan B. Somerville, "Queer Loving," *Gay and Lesbian Quarterly*, 11:3 (2005): 357, 358.

[65] Carol Johnson, "Heteronormative Citizenship and the Politics of Passing," *Sexualities* 5:3 (2002): 330.

[66] Seidman, "From the Polluted Homosexual to the Normal Gay," 58.

[67] Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.

[68] Steinbugler, *Beyond Loving*, xix, xx.