This kind of advocacy has not only come from appointees of elected officials, but also from some groups representing people of color. For example, while fighting for classical liberalism and affirmative-action liberalism, some local civil rights groups have supported integration of police departments with racial realist intents.  

Though it is not clear how often hiring occurs with racial realist motivations, it is clear that the hiring of nonwhite officers rose dramatically following the 1960s' racial violence and the strong advocacy of racial realist hiring and placement. Specifically, in the years between 1967 and 2000, minority employment increased in several police forces, including those in New York City (from 5% to 35%); Chicago (20% to 40%); Philadelphia (20% to 40%); Detroit (5% to 65%); and San Francisco (5% to 40%).

IV. THE PEOPLE AND RACIAL REALISM, PART II: THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND THE RACIAL REALIST STRATEGY

In the private sector, it might be said that The People acted on their own: racial realism appears to be just as entrenched as in government employment. It is a prominent strategy and is often advocated in several fields, including medicine, business (especially marketing), and entertainment. It may be a part of any business that has some interaction with diverse populations, and where employers may perceive that racial abilities help them understand customers or use racial signaling to make customers feel a sense of trust.

Medicine is an especially compelling sector for racial realism because the stakes are so high. Here, there was some vague statutory acknowledgement of
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the value of physicians’ varying racial abilities. The Minority Health and Health Disparities Research and Education Act of 2000 contains provisions to encourage the training and hiring of nonwhite physicians, and Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) argued for the bill to his colleagues with racial realist arguments emphasizing white physicians’ inability to give the same treatment to African American patients that they give to white patients.

There has been considerable action on this outside of government as well. A vice president of a Boston HMO, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, explained very clearly a racial realist hiring rationale when she told Fortune magazine that the company had a “diversity imperative” because “[m]any of these [minority] customers demand health care workers who aren’t judgmental—and we have to make sure we provide them.” Various foundations, commissions, and professional organizations have also promoted racial realism in the employment of physicians and other health workers, including the Commonwealth Fund, the Kellogg Foundation’s Commission on Diversity in the Healthcare Workforce (headed by George H.W. Bush’s Health and Human Services Secretary, Louis W. Sullivan), the American Medical Student Association, the Institute of Medicine’s Committee on Institutional and Policy-Level Strategies for Increasing the Diversity of the U.S. Health Care Work Force, the American Hospital Association, and the American College

of Physicians. In the *Grutter v. Bollinger* Supreme Court case regarding racial preferences in law school admissions, thirty different groups (including the American Medical Association and associations representing dentists, pharmacists, and nurses) signed on to an amicus brief that used racial realist rationales for physician employment. According to a 2006 report of the Department of Health and Human Services,

> [G]reater health professions diversity will likely lead to improved public health by increasing access to care for underserved populations, and by increasing opportunities for minority patients to see practitioners with whom they share a common race, ethnicity or language. Race, ethnicity, and language concordance, which is associated with better patient-practitioner relationships and communication, may increase patients’ likelihood of receiving and accepting appropriate medical care.

Racial realism is also a prominent strategy in marketing. Nonwhite marketing professionals have promoted their own racial abilities to reach racially concordant consumers since the middle years of the twentieth century; in 1953, African American marketers formed their own association, the National Association of Market Developers, to promote the use of blacks to market to blacks. Firms dominated by whites have also seen the hiring of nonwhites to market to nonwhites as smart business strategy. This was becoming common by the 1990s, and so it was unremarkable for *Fortune* magazine to state in 1996, “a company with a diverse work force will have an easier time serving markets that themselves are becoming more
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multicultural.”150 The notion of racial abilities extends beyond marketing strategy to customer relations in general.151

In sociologist William Bielby’s analysis of a major finance firm, the practice of matching African American financial advisors with African American clients was described in a 2005 internal report as something that occurred “always.” It led to frustrations among the clients, who resented the higher turnover among the African American financial advisors. The report stated:

Advisors and managers criticized always trying to fit an African American client with an African American advisor, especially when an advisor leaves the business. Because of the high turnover of African American advisors, this often results in a client being paired with 2 or 3 advisors just because they are African Americans. Ultimately, this “shuffling” results in the client becoming frustrated and requesting a white advisor, because they feel they will provide a more stable relationship.152

Racial realist arguments were made explicit in a legal context in the amicus brief of the Fortune 500 companies in the 2003 Grutter v. Bollinger case.153 That brief argued that firms with many nonwhite employees “are better able to develop products and services that appeal to a variety of consumers and to market offerings in ways that appeal to these consumers” and “a racially diverse group of managers with cross-cultural experience is better able to work with business partners, employees, and clientele in the United States and around the world.”154

Another prominent racial realist strategy in the business sector is to leverage racial abilities for the innovation and dynamism that “diversity” is thought to confer to any phase of the business operation.155 As explained by a personnel executive of the Cummins Engine Company in 1986, “differences
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among people of various racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds generate creativity and innovation as well as energy in our work force.”

Firms made similar arguments in amicus briefs for the *Grutter* case. MTV Networks submitted a brief that stated, “[t]he continual innovation required for success in the industry depends on heterogeneity in MTV’s creative work-teams.” The Fortune 500 companies’ brief stated, “a diverse group of individuals educated in a cross-cultural environment has the ability to facilitate unique and creative approaches to problem-solving arising from the integration of different perspectives.” More recently, Fortune 100 corporations submitted a brief in the *Fisher v. University of Texas* case making a more vague but nevertheless racial realist argument, stating that “[f]or amici to succeed in their businesses, they must be able to hire highly trained employees of all races, religions, cultures and economic backgrounds.”

Perhaps nowhere is racial realism more openly practiced than in the advertising and entertainment sectors. Here, employers seek to cater to customer tastes by deploying racial signaling, typically seeking to appeal to different consumers by using models or actors of concordant racial phenotypes. When I say it is openly practiced, I am referring to the still-common practice of specifying race in casting calls, or “breakdowns,” where race is frequently specified as a way to achieve organizational goals (optimal audience reaction) rather than opportunity or justice goals for models and actors.

It took several decades and much pressure from civil rights groups for advertisers to begin to cast nonwhites with regularity, but by the 1990s it became commonplace. For example, a study of 813 morning and daytime
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children’s television commercials in 1997 found that African Americans appeared in about 51% of all commercials, Asian Americans appeared in 9%, and Latinos in about 9%. Advertisers appear unwilling to risk making whites feel unwelcome, however, as this group appeared in 99% of the ads.

This suggests another feature of racial realism in media and entertainment: it is in this sector that racial realism for whites is most prominent. Movie studios are afraid of casting too many nonwhites in a film, and this leads to the common practice of a black and a white actor sharing lead roles. The Los Angeles Times appeared unaware that it might be discussing a violation of classical liberalism’s ban on catering to customer discrimination when it reported, “[s]tudios are more comfortable casting actors of color, such as Jennifer Lopez and Will Smith, despite their popularity, when they include a white star to ensure ‘mainstream’ appeal.”

In the low-skilled sector—in jobs in construction, manufacturing, food service, and other fields—a racial and often immigrant realist strategy may be admitted in interviews with social scientists or journalists. Employers in these fields state that Latinos and Asians make the best workers, often or especially when they are foreign-born, because they have abilities that other groups lack. Typically, the most prized quality is the ability to work long and hard despite poor working conditions and low pay. Though racial realism in this sector uses the perceived abilities of nonwhites, as in the other sectors, it is the least defensible because it reproduces the same hierarchies in nearly all jobs (Asians and Latinos above whites and especially above blacks, and immigrants above American-born workers), and it might even be said (following
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Ackerman) to humiliate not only the excluded, but also the preferred, who are often exploited, especially when they are migrants. Because of the EEOC’s recent efforts to challenge racial realism in low-skilled employment, there is a growing list of successful cases and settlements against employers using racial realist preferences for Asian and Latino immigrants.171

V. IS RACIAL REALISM THE PEOPLE’S AMENDMENT TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION?

Ackerman argues that the Civil Rights Revolution was a movement of the American people to remake the foundational legal framework of the nation. It resulted in statutes, administrative regulations, and court rulings that worked toward the ends of justice, and it achieved justice by eliminating systematic, race-based humiliation of minority groups, as well as humiliation of persons marked by sex, national origin, and religious differences.

Is the movement toward racial realism similarly a movement of The People? And how are we to assess its fit with the Civil Rights Revolution?

First, as stated above, federal, state, and local governments have through their actions and/or words shown at least some support for racial realism. They have done so in their use of appointments to executive, judicial, and party leadership posts, and in the hiring of law enforcement officers and teachers. Government use of racial realist strategies, especially by elected officials, at least implies the support of The People.

In other ways, racial realism appears to be a movement of The People. Specifically, employers are part of The People, as are advocates, activists, members of professional organizations, and others affiliated with medicine, business, and media and entertainment, and they have in various ways shown their support for racial realism.

When the government and private organizations and employers have used racial realist strategies—or advocated for their usage—objection, criticism, and controversy is typically limited to specific instances of hiring and placement, at least since the 1980s. Supporters of racial realism in skilled and professional

jobs typically are proud of what they are doing, and appear to expect to be praised rather than criticized. Yet there are reasons to question the constitutional equivalence of racial realism and the Civil Rights Revolution. First, there are no government spokespeople clearly articulating why the nation should be moving toward racial realism. Presidents or members of Congress may mention it in passing, but there are no speeches comparable to those of Martin Luther King, Jr., Lyndon Johnson, or Hubert Humphrey that show how racial realism fits with American traditions and why it is the right thing for employers to be doing. It has happened slowly, in a piecemeal fashion, mostly in the background, until it has become commonplace while rarely being acknowledged.

Second, and relatedly, racial realism lacks an authorizing statute. Racial realism has come up in Congress, such as when Senator Kennedy argued for the Minority Health and Health Disparities Research and Education Act of 2000, but no senator recognized its distinctiveness from classical liberalism or affirmative-action liberalism at that time. The wisdom or justice of racial realism has never really been debated in Congress or any public venue that I am aware of, nor has its fit with the Civil Rights Revolution.

Moreover, in addition to the lack of an official, acknowledged “green light” for racial realism, there appear to be red lights ordering it to stop, or warning lights suggesting this strategy of management is not a good idea. There are court decisions denying its legality or constitutionality, including at the Supreme Court level. The EEOC guidelines at best suggest “caution” when using racial realism— and at some points appear to deny the legality of racial realism altogether.

There is a third way that racial realism is distinct from the Civil Rights Revolution. If Ackerman is correct that a goal of that revolution was to end institutionalized humiliation of minority groups, then it is very much a problem that some nonwhites have resisted some racial realist strategies. While I have thus far emphasized the humiliation that comes about from the practice of racial realism in the low-skilled employment sector, the humiliation of people of color is also apparent in some studies of business and professional employees. Some complain poignantly of being “dead ended” in jobs that are intended to leverage racial abilities or signaling but have little direct connection
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to profit generation and thus lack promotion possibilities. Racial realism can also be used in strategic ways that nevertheless do not lead to hiring of nonwhites beyond token levels. Most importantly, some nonwhites have challenged their racial realist work assignments in court—a dynamic that is apparently quite rare (or nonexistent) when employers use classical liberal or affirmative-action liberal strategies to hire and place workers.

Finally, while private employers are themselves members of The People, it is difficult to argue that they are acting with the same kind of authorization and spokesperson status that the leaders of the Civil Rights Revolution had. These employers and various civil society advocates are unelected, and they are accountable to shareholders, funders, or to no one. When employers and other elites are creating their own version of employment law, it at least suggests that we have moved beyond the Civil Rights Revolution, but it also suggests that perhaps we should not have made this move. At the very least, the phenomenon needs to be acknowledged, and brought in line with the justice and opportunity goals that are still widely embraced.
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