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I. Introduction

New York is widely known to be a metropolis for racial and ethnic diversity because its residents are from virtually every nation on Earth and speak as many as 800 languages. Its boroughs reflect a mixture of White, Black, Hispanic, Latino, Asian, and Middle-Eastern communities.

The New York ethnic neighborhoods of Little Italy and Chinatown date back to the mid-19th century. Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant became home to African-Americans who migrated from the southern states after 1910. East Harlem, once known as Spanish Harlem, was settled by Hispanics from Latin America during the 1940s, and during the 1980s, immigrants from the Dominican Republic, Asia, Jamaica, Haiti, Russia and Africa substantially increased New York’s population.

A visitor or a resident does not have to travel to one of New York’s neighborhoods or stroll down its 120,000 street blocks to experience its racial or ethnic richness. New York’s beauty and uniqueness derive from a myriad of people of different races and ethnicities that anyone can encounter while walking on its streets. Additionally, in New York, an individual can learn about the world outside of the city, and gain understanding about another race or culture simply by engaging in conversation with the Afro-Cuban mother in the subway, traveling with
the Pakistani taxi driver when one is late for an appointment across town, buying a loaf of bread from the Dominican shopkeeper at the “Spanish” bodega, or purchasing fruit and vegetables from the South Korean merchant. No matter where one lives, eats, drinks, shops, or visits, New York’s “colorful” residents are present to contribute their unique experiences to one’s life.

Unsurprisingly, over the past decade, New York’s population has edged closer to racial equilibrium. In fact, in 2010, New York was comprised of a population that was 33 percent white, 29 percent non-white Hispanic and Latino, 23 percent black, 10 percent Asian, and 5 percent mixed race and ethnicity. Moreover, there has been a wave of white young adults, ranging in age from their late twenties to late thirties, integrating into New York’s predominantly African-American and Latino neighborhoods such as Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Bushwick, and Williamsburgh. Furthermore, Asians are further integrating into a wide range of neighborhoods throughout all five boroughs. Lastly, young immigrant minorities have increased their population in New York over the past decade, which suggests to demographers that the City’s long-term race-ethnic balance will continue to remain diverse.

Despite New York’s recent growth in assimilation, immigration and gentrification, where the total white population is only 33 percent, why does its professional Equity theaters, ranging from world renowned, commercial Broadway to smaller, respected Off-Off Broadway theaters, overwhelmingly consist of white actors? New York theater patrons “live in an increasingly interracial society, and it is not illogical to assume that they will want their world reflected on the stage.” Although theater is shown through the image of an illusion of set designs, costumes and make-up, theater artists have a responsibility to reflect the world in which we live, and theater is a medium of that expression.
Contrary to reflecting the diversity of New York, during five previous theater seasons from 2006 to 2011, 80 percent of the roles cast in New York’s theaters were awarded to Caucasian actors. Of the remaining available roles: 13 percent were awarded to black actors, 4 percent were awarded to Hispanic actors, 2 percent went awarded to Asian-American actors, and 1 percent were awarded to others.

Clearly, there is a vast difference between New York’s 67 percent population of people of color compared to New York theaters’ 20 percent employment rate of people of color. In fact, in the New York theater community, the white and non-white percentages of employed actors are almost the reverse of the white and non-white demographics of New York’s total population.

Furthermore, in 2013, the Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC) presented a study that was more revealing than the four-year study of all Broadway and Off-Broadway theatrical employment statistics. In a study of the sixteen major not-for-profit theaters in New York, AAPAC found that these theaters, which had in the past consistently hired more actors of color than the commercial sector, actually lagged behind the large commercial Broadway theaters which had hired 25 percentage rate of employed actors of color; the highest percentage in history. AAPAC revealed that during the 2011-12 season, the percentage of actors of color employed in not-for-profit theaters actually fell from its high of 27 percent in the 2008-09 season to 23 percent. In AAPAC’s study, African-American actors were cast in 16 percent of all roles; Hispanic and Latino actors in 3 percent; Asian-American actors in 3 percent; and others, including Arab-American, Middle Eastern and Native-American in 1 percent.

However, in the past season, the 25 percent historical record of the roles cast in Broadway commercial theaters to actors of color distorts the reality of whether there is diversity
and inclusion of actors of color in all productions in New York theaters. For example, if one exempted race specific works, and considered more integrated or race neutral works, the percentage of employed actors of color would be considerably less. The increase in the percentage of actors of color was largely due to the continuation of *The Lion King*, and a sudden increase in the number of large all-Black or predominantly Black musicals produced on Broadway such as *Memphis, Porgy and Bess, Fela!, and Motown: The Musical*; and plays such as *A Streetcar Named Desire, Stick Fly, and The Trip to Bountiful*. Also, the closing of large theatrical productions that employed a mixed-cast of Latino, Hispanic, Asian, Arab, Middle Eastern and Native American actors such as *In the Heights, Hair, South Pacific* and *The Little Mermaid* gave the illusion that the percentage of African-American actors had increased.

So, what is the problem? Is there discrimination against actors of color by live-stage theatrical employers in New York? What actions must an actor of color or a theatrical employer take in order to increase the amount of employment opportunities available actors from racial minority groups? Is there a legal remedy or non-legal remedy to his dilemma?

The historical data suggests that there is something amiss in the hiring of actors of color in New York. In 1985, almost three decades ago, the Actors’ Equity Association (Actors’ Equity) which is located in New York and represents live theatrical performers, completed a four-year study and found what it believed to be institutional racism within the professional theater. Over 90 percent of the actors hired in America were Caucasian. Although recent employment statistics have improved to some degree, the low percentages of employment among actors of color are still sufficiently low enough to warrant concern in New York, a city with a 67 percent non-white population.
The problem of discrimination in New York theaters has been recognized by various leading theatrical organizations and unions. In 1995, Actors’ Equity joined The Broadway League; the Casting Society of America, The Dramatists Guild, and the Society of Stage Directors and Choreographers, and signed a Document of Principle which states:

We . . . agree to endorse the goals of diversity, inclusion, and the principles of equal opportunity for all who work in the theater industry and condemn racism, prejudice, discrimination and exclusion in the theater . . . While we recognize that there can be no interference with the artistic integrity or contractual rights of the author, director, or choreographer, we urge all members of the theater to challenge traditional stereotypes.

Although these theatrical trade organizations “endorse the goals of diversity and inclusion,” they are limited in the actual enforcement of these goals due to certain rights afforded theatrical decision-makers when casting and hiring actors for their productions.

New York theater decision-makers: producers, directors, choreographers, and playwrights; remain exclusively Caucasian. There are no assurances that these crucial players will unilaterally challenge, change, or eradicate their discriminatory practices. Without the ability of key theatrical trade organizations to enforce diversity or inclusion in regards to the employment of actors of color, due attention is needed either through legal action, changes in employment law, or individualized or group non-litigious efforts. Without the aforementioned actions, theatrical decision-makers are likely to continue discriminatory practices that result in disproportionately low numbers of employed actors of color.

Discriminatory practices within New York theater are not overt, but takes place in more subtle, less obvious ways that makes it difficult for an actor to prove. One may infer that there is discrimination through employment statistics concerning the actors of color. However, this paper will demonstrate that more than statistical percentages are needed for an actor of color to bring a race discrimination law suit against theatrical employer.
Discriminatory practices have been revealed directly from statements made by New York theater decision-makers. These statements inform and warn us that discrimination exists within the New York theater community. For example, Nancy Piccione, director of casting at Manhattan Theater Club, has stated that when she auditions actors of all ethnicities for roles that might not be the obvious role for them based on their ethnic background, she sometimes receives responses from theatrical producers concerning why she made the choice to audition actors in which the producer had no intention to hire. Similarly, there are instances when non-white casting directors are resistant to the notion of auditioning or casting actors of color in roles typically reserved for white actors even when race is not essential to the portrayal of the characters, geographical setting, or historical period of the production.

In order to equal the playing field, and to increase diversity and inclusion of actors of color in the New York theater, the theatrical community as whole must confront and challenge casting practices that are prevalent among theatrical employers. By its very subjective nature, the casting process is inherently filled with the risk of inadvertently excluding racial groups from opportunities to audition and seriously contend for the vast majority of the roles offered in the theater. Thus, a compelling problem arises when theatrical decision-makers’ subjective view, based on preconceived notions; not reality, talent, or theatrical training, permeates throughout the New York theater industry, adversely reducing employment opportunities for actors of color.

The focus of this paper is on the legal protections that Congress and the courts provide to New York theatrical employers concerning their hiring practices, and the challenges these protections present to actors of color in obtaining employment. In Section II, this paper will explain current federal employment legislation, Title VII, and how this Act, in its current form,
may present insurmountable barriers to actors of color if they were to challenge the casting and hiring practices of New York theatrical employers.

In Section III, this paper will demonstrate how the First Amendment further protects theatrical employers; however, why it is important to advocate for the right of artistic expression despite its often disparate effects on actors of color.

In Section IV, this paper will reveal past and present efforts to increase the number of actors of color that are employed in the New York theaters. Further, Section IV will explore the aims and goals of theatrical trade unions that advocate for diversity and inclusion of actors of color, and whether their efforts have been successful. Moreover, Section IV will interpret how directors and producers use different casting methods not only to increase diversity and inclusion of actors of color, but to achieve their artistic goals. Lastly, Section IV will address past and current controversies concerning various the casting methods used to increase diversity and inclusion of actors of color.

In Section V, this paper will recommend legal and non-legal solutions other than the different casting methods that could increase the amount of actors of color in the New York theater despite the challenges presented by Title VII and the First Amendment. Finally, Section VI will conclude with a summarization concerning why efforts to increase diversity and inclusion of actors of color in the New York theater must yield to the First Amendment right of freedom of speech to preserve an individual’s artistic expression.

At this point, in Section II, this paper will focus on the statutory language, precedential cases, and congressional history that underlie Title VII. Additionally, as a framework, Section II will hypothesize an African-American actor’s pursuit in being cast by a casting director in a role as an “engineer” within a theatrical production. Furthermore, Section II will analyze how a
discrimination law suit under Title VII would apply to this African-American actor as well as any actor of color who seeks legal relief from the court due to a theatrical employer’s direct or indirect discrimination based on race.

II. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

A. Purpose and Intent of Title VII

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 governs discrimination in the workplace.\(^59\) Congress’ intent was to provide formal procedures to eliminate employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.\(^60\) In *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, the Supreme Court stated: “Congress did not intend by Title VII . . . to guarantee employment opportunities to every person regardless of qualifications.”\(^61\) Title VII “does not command that any person be hired simply because he was formerly the subject of discrimination, or because he is a member of a minority group.”\(^62\) However, Congress requires “the removal of artificial, arbitrary and unnecessary barriers to employment when the barriers operate invidiously to discriminate on the basis of racial or other impermissible classification.”\(^63\)

B. Unlawful Employment Practices

Section 2000e-2(a) provides that it shall be unlawful for an employer:

1. to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such an individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; or
2. to limit, segregate, or classify his employees or applicants for employment in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or other otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.\(^64\)

Section 2000e-3(b) prohibits the publication of “any notice or advertisement relating to employment . . . indicating any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based on race or color.”\(^65\)
Under Title VII, an actor could bring an action against an employer under two racial discriminatory theories: 1) disparate treatment and 2) disparate impact.\(^\text{66}\) Disparate treatment occurs when an employer commits a discriminatory act against an employee or applicant.\(^\text{67}\) Disparate impact occurs when an employer’s practices or policies cause systematic discrimination against a specific class of employees or applicants.\(^\text{68}\)

### C. Disparate Treatment Action

The United States Supreme Court established the basic framework for a disparate treatment action in *McDonnell Douglass Corp. v. Green*.\(^\text{69}\) In order to establish a prima facie case of racial discrimination due to disparate treatment, a plaintiff must show:

1. that he belongs to a racial minority group;
2. that he applied and was qualified for the job for which the employer seeks applicants;
3. that, despite his qualifications, he was rejected; and
4. that, after his rejection, the position remained open and the employer continued to seek applicants from persons of complainant’s qualifications.\(^\text{70}\)

A disparate treatment action focuses on the intent of the employer.\(^\text{71}\) A plaintiff must prove discrimination through either direct or sufficient circumstantial evidence to imply discriminatory intent beyond a preponderance of the evidence.\(^\text{72}\) Once the plaintiff establishes a prima facie case, there is a rebuttable presumption that a discriminatory act occurred.\(^\text{73}\) An employer must rebut this presumption by providing a reason for the plaintiff’s rejection so that the employer may avoid a direct verdict in favor of the plaintiff.\(^\text{74}\) The employer must only offer nondiscriminatory reasons why the plaintiff was rejected.\(^\text{75}\) The employer does not need to persuade the court that it was motivated by its proffered reasons.\(^\text{76}\) Depending on the jurisdiction,\(^\text{77}\) the employer may also have to produce a reason that was available to it at the time the employer made its decision not to hire an applicant or promote an employee.\(^\text{78}\) Once the employer successfully rebuts the presumption of discrimination with a nondiscriminatory reason for rejecting the plaintiff, the burden shifts once more to the plaintiff to show by a preponderance
of the evidence that the employer’s asserted reason is actually a pretext to an intentional discriminatory act. 79 In all, under a disparate treatment action, the burden of persuasion always remains with the plaintiff. 80

In seeking employment as an actor, an individual has a small chance of prevailing in a discriminate treatment discrimination law suit. 81 For example; suppose a qualified African-American actor’s agent submits his headshot 82 to a casting director for the role as the “engineer” in a drama. 83 However, the casting director does not audition the actor because she perceives “engineer” as being Caucasian. Thus, due to casting director’s subjective thought of the “engineer” as a Caucasian, she only auditions Caucasian actors for the “engineer” role, and inadvertently blocks all non-Caucasian from having an opportunity to audition for the producer. According to the disparate treatment theory, there was no discriminatory act under these circumstances because the casting director choice to not audition the African-American was not due to dislike or thoughts of inferiority against African-Americans. 84

Additionally, the African-American actor alleging discrimination, would have difficulty showing that he both applied for and was rejected for the job. 85 First, the actor would have to show that the casting director actually reviewed his headshot. 86 Second; if the actor proves that the casting director reviewed his headshot, he would then have to show that the casting director did not audition him solely due to invidiousness towards his race or thoughts that African-Americans would be inferior in the “engineer’ role. 87 However, in this hypothetical, the casting director did not intentionally discriminate against the actor. 88 The casting director either did not audition actor because her subjective mind did not “see” or “read” an African-American as the “engineer” in the drama. 89 Third, the actor would have to show that the casting director possessed the authority to hire him, and in most cases, the casting director has no hiring
authority. Finally, in a disparate treatment race discrimination suit, the actor would have to overcome the casting director’s assertion of a bona fide occupational qualification defense.

D. Bona Fide Occupational Qualification (BFOQ) Exception

Under Section 2000e-2(a) of Title VII, once a plaintiff has established a prima facie case based on racial discrimination due to disparate treatment, the employer may assert a bona fide occupational qualification (BFOQ) defense under the exception of Section 2000e-2(e)(1). The exception allows employers to discriminate on the bases of sex, religion, and national origin as long as the discrimination is based on a “bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation” of the employer. The exception does not apply race. In fact, Congress expressly rejected race as a BFOQ.

The Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (EEOC) and Congress narrowly construe the BFOQ to apply only to sex, religion, and national origin. “Occupational qualification” refers to a requirement that affects an employee’s ability to perform his job. The term “reasonably necessary” is subject to an objective standard. When an employer uses the BFOQ exception to defend itself against a discrimination suit, the court applies a business necessity test. The business necessity test requires the employer demonstrate that a particular employment practice of hiring an applicant on the basis his “sex, religion, and national origin,” is related to the applicant’s ability to do a particular job, and it relates to the “essence” or “central mission” of the employer.

Under Title VII, the Fifth Circuit has stated that the “business necessity test, is not a business convenience test based on customer preferences.” For example, in Diaz v. Pan American World Airways, the airline argued that being female was a BFOQ for its flight attendants because women were better at “providing reassurance to anxious passengers, giving
courteous personalized service, and . . . making flights as pleasurable as possible.” The Fifth Circuit rejected the airline’s argument as being related to the essence or central mission of its business. In applying the “business necessity” test, the court held that “customer preference may be taken into account when it is based on the company’s inability to perform the primary function or service it offers.” The court explained that the essence of the airline’s business was to mechanically and safely transport passengers, and women flight attendants were not “reasonably necessary to the normal operation” of the airline’s business to mechanically and safely transport passengers. Thus, the airline’s employment practice of discrimination against men in favor of women for its flight attendant positions was not a BFOQ on the basis that “most men may not perform” in a manner that the airline perceived that its customers would prefer.

In the context of casting an actor in a theatrical production, a casting director may use the BFOQ exception to defend a disparate treatment action against an actor only when it concerns the actor’s religion, sex, or national origin. Therefore, in the aforementioned hypothetical, the BFOQ defense would not be available to the casting director if an African-American actor brought a discrimination law suit against her for not auditioning him for a role as the “engineer” in the drama because a BFOQ is not based on racial discrimination.

However, if the actor was an African-American female claiming discrimination on the basis of sex, the casting director may assert a BFOQ defense. “The EEOC has interpreted Title VII as allowing sex as a BFOQ in hiring actors if necessary for the purpose of authenticity.” Still, under the disparate treatment theory, the African-American actress would have to demonstrate that the casting director possessed invidious intent to discriminate or successfully challenge the validity of whether the casting director’s rejection was pretext to a discriminatory act. Further, the actress would have to show that the “engineer” role remained opened, and that
the casting director or producer was still seeking an actress with the same qualifications.\textsuperscript{114} If the actress is unable to establish a prima facie case based on disparate treatment, an alternative option would be a racial discrimination action based on a disparate impact theory.\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{E. Disparate Impact Action}

Under Title VII, a prima facie case of racial discrimination due to disparate impact is established when:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a [plaintiff] demonstrates that a[n] employer uses a particular employment practice that causes a disparate impact on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and the [employer] fails to demonstrate that the challenged practice is job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity; or
  \item the [plaintiff] makes the demonstration described in subparagraph (C) with respect to an alternative employment practice.\textsuperscript{116}
\end{enumerate}

However, under the disparate impact theory, if the employer first demonstrates that its employment practice does not cause a disparate impact, then the employer is not required to demonstrate that such a practice is a business necessity.\textsuperscript{117}

Under subparagraph (C), if the employee meets its burden of demonstrating that the employer’s practices causes a disparate impact, the employer must demonstrate that the challenged employment practice is a business necessity.\textsuperscript{118} If the employer meets its burden of demonstrating that its employment practice relates to a business necessity, the plaintiff may still prevail if he demonstrates that an alternative practice could achieve the employer’s legitimate business interest, and the employer fails to adopt this alternative practice.\textsuperscript{119}

The employer may not use a business necessity defense against a plaintiff’s claim of intentional discrimination.\textsuperscript{120} Thus, according to the Act, unlike a discrimination law suit based on disparate treatment, a disparate impact action does not depend on the employer’s intent.\textsuperscript{121} In \textit{Griggs v. Duke Power Co.}, the Supreme Court stated that “. . . Congress directed the thrust of [Title VII] to the consequences of employment practices, not simply motivation.”\textsuperscript{122} “Good
intent or the absence of discriminatory intent does not [allow] employment procedures or testing mechanisms that operate [to impede minority groups from employment opportunities] and are unrelated to measuring [their ability to perform in a certain job].” 

Thus, Title VII allows an action when the employer’s practices are facially neutral but discriminatory in effect.

In *Griggs*, Duke Power Company (Duke Power) had abandoned an overt policy of limiting African-Americans to working within its Labor Department. However, Duke Power’s new policy required a high school diploma and successful performance on two tests: a general intelligence test and a comprehension test; for initial consideration for a position, or transfer, or promotion to any of its other departments which paid higher wages. Duke Power stated that the reason for instituting these new requirements was to “improve the overall quality of [its] work force.”

In a class action lawsuit against Duke Power, African-American employees alleged that the performance test requirements were not related to the jobs within the other departments. Further, the African-American employees claimed that the performance test requirements operated, in fact, to render them, as a group, ineligible for transfer to the higher paying positions within Duke Power’s other departments. However, Duke Power maintained that Title VII allowed “‘any professionally developed ability test’ that is not ‘designed, intended or used to discriminate because of race . . .’” Duke Power further argued that it lacked discriminatory intent because it had provided financing to employees to cover two-thirds of the costs of obtaining a high school diploma.

The Supreme Court rejected Duke Power’s arguments and referenced the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) guidelines concerning job-related tests. The EEOC interpretation explains: “[t]he fact that a test was prepared by an individual or
organization claiming expertise in test preparation does not, without more, justify its meaning of Title VII.” Since EEOC’s guidelines must be supported by Congress’ goal in the enactment of Title VII . . . to remove barriers that have operated in the past to favor an identifiable group of white employees over other employees. Thus, under Title VII, “practices, procedures, tests neutral on their face, and neutral in the terms of intent, cannot be maintained if they operate to ‘freeze’ the status quo of prior discriminatory employment practices.”

The Supreme Court noted that Congress had placed on the employer the burden of showing that any given requirement is related to performing the job in question. In this case, the evidence demonstrated that employees who had not completed high school or taken the intelligent tests in the past, performed satisfactorily and made progress in the departments where Duke Power had implemented the test requirements. Moreover, the promotion records of employees that had not met the new testing criteria suggested that the requirements were not needed to support Duke Power’s purported policy of advancement within the company. Thus, the Court found that neither the intelligence tests nor the high school diploma requirement were related to a successful performance of the jobs within Duke Power’s higher paying departments. Overall, the Court concluded that Duke Power had failed to show that the high school diploma and test requirements supported its genuine business need of improving “overall quality of [its] work force.”

By analogy, a group of qualified African-American actors who was not auditioned by the casting director nor submitted to a producer of the drama because the casting director did not subjectively envision someone other than a Caucasian actor in the role as the “engineer,” could have a race discrimination claim based on the disparate impact of the casting process. Here, the casting director does need to have intentionally discriminating against the actor based on his
race. The casting director’s process of reviewing agents’ submissions of headshots of African-American actors automatically denies this identifiable group of actors of employment opportunities despite their qualifications. If the actors were to file a class action disparate effect discrimination law suit against the casting director, the issues would be: 1) whether the casting director’s process disproportionately rendered qualified African-American actors as group ineligible for the “engineer” role based on their race; 2) whether being Caucasian is a requirement for the “engineer” role; and 3) whether the casting director’s actions prohibited the African-Americans, as an identifiable group, ability to be considered for an opportunity to audition for the producer, the actual theatrical employer.

In this example, although the casting director did not intend for her casting process to automatically impede all qualified African-American for consideration of the “engineer” role, her good faith intention would not be a valid defense under the disparate impact theory. Furthermore, since race is not a BFOQ, the casting director would be precluded from attempting to justify that being Caucasian is a requirement to successfully portray the “engineer” role. Thus, the casting director would have to justify some other reason for maintaining a casting process which adversely excludes African-American actors as a group. Nonetheless, the very nature of the entertainment industry and the auditioning process insulates the casting director from being sued under the disparate impact theory as well.

First, as noted in Griggs, a disparate impact discrimination law suit is generally brought as a class action. In the hypothetical of the casting director auditioning actors for the “engineer” role, an African-American actor would have to search for other African-Americans actors who were discriminated against in the same manner, then convince them to join him in a class action law suit against the casting director. Second, the actors must collectively consider
their available time, the amount of financial resources needed to hire an attorney, and whether filing a law suit against a casting director who would probably have the support of a producer backed by wealthy investors, would be worth their efforts. Here, the actors would most likely fear retaliation by their agents who may refuse to submit the actors’ headshots for projects in the future, and more harmful, actors may fear that other casting directors will refuse to audition them with or without an agent’s submission of the actors’ headshots, thus effectively terminating their career in the New York theater industry. Third; if the casting director is not the employer, the the producer, as the employer, is not required to guarantee a job on the basis of the actors’ qualifications. Lastly, the actors would have to overcome the casting director’s or producer’s assertion of a business necessity defense which protects employers from liability when a class action law suit is brought against them claiming disparate effect due to race discrimination.

**F. Business Necessity Defense**

Unlike disparate treatment discrimination cases, after the plaintiff has established a prima facie case under disparate impact theory, the employer must show that its practice which is discriminatory in effect is justified by a business necessity that relates to the performance of the job that the plaintiff seeks. Congress has recognized the need for employers within the entertainment industry to cast actors with certain appearances where race is considered essential to the character and script of a project. The congressional note states:

Although there is no exemption in Title VII for the occupations in which race might be deemed a bona fide job qualification, a director of a play or movie who wished to cast an actor in the role of a Negro, could specify that he wished to hire someone with the physical appearance of a Negro. Thus, where race is necessary for the credibility of a role in a movie or television project, casting directors can select actors based on the way they look, not their race, without violating Title VII.
G. The Entertainment Industry’s Authenticity Requirement as a Business Necessity Defense

The legislative history of Title VII indicates that Congress may not have intended for the Act to pertain to casting actors in the entertainment business. In 1964, Senators Clark and Case explained that although race was not a BFOQ which could possibly exempt an employer for casting based on race, a director of a play could specify the desire to cast someone with “the appearance of a Negro in the role of a Negro so that the play would be authentic as possible.”

In Miller v. Tex. State Bd. of Barber Exam’rs, in dicta, the Fifth Circuit indicated that in the parameters of a facially neutral discriminatory practice, there could exist circumstances that permit an employer to hire based on an applicant’s race as a business necessity. For example, in the context of law enforcement, a state could assign black officers to infiltrate an all-black criminal organization where a white man would not pass without notice as long as the black officers were allowed to work on other law enforcement assignments where their race was not a factor in their placement.

In Miller, using the aforementioned example as a framework, in dicta, the Fifth Circuit stated, that it could be possible for a police department to assign a black man to work as an undercover investigator at all-black barber shops because it would be difficult to successfully disguise a Caucasian man as a “shoeshine boy in or as a patron of an all-black barber shop.” Further, the court stated that the assignment of a black man as undercover investigator would not be discriminatory providing that the assignment was given to the officer in a racially neutral manner as an officer who could successfully disguise himself. Similarly, in the context of employment in the entertainment industry, the court explained, in dicta, that it is possible for an entertainment employer to use the business necessity defense when casting an actor to play a certain role based on race. The court stated: “that it is likely that a black actor could not
appropriately portray George Wallace, and a white actor could not appropriately portray Martin Luther King, Jr.”

Applying the preceding analogy to the hypothetical of the African-American actors that were not considered by the casting director for an audition for the “engineer” role; if the actors were to demonstrate through in a class action law suit that casting process had an adverse effect concerning employment opportunities available to them and other similarly situated African-American actors, then the casting director could invoke the business necessity defense. In this example, the casting director would either have to show that her process did not present barriers to African-American actors as a group for being considered for the “engineer” role; or the casting director could demonstrate that being Caucasian was essential to the functioning of the “engineer” role to add authenticity to the drama. For example, a Caucasian man as the “engineer” would add authenticity to a play that is set in Antebellum South Carolina during 1820. If the casting director succeeds in either of the aforementioned tasks, the actors still have another opportunity to prevail under the disparate impact theory by demonstrating that there was an alternative method available to the casting director to maintain the authenticity of the drama without a Caucasian in the “engineer” role. However, the casting director may ultimately have a First Amendment defense that she or the producer has chosen a Caucasian actor as the “engineer” based on their freedom of artistic expression.

III. The First Amendment Right: Freedom of Artistic Expression

A. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution provides that “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.” Further, the Constitution requires the government to remain “neutral in the marketplace of ideas.” However, the
Supreme Court has held that not all speech is entitled to the protections of the First Amendment.\textsuperscript{177}

Since the casting of actors may be considered as a medium of expression, a casting director or theatrical producer may assert a First Amendment defense concerning their casting preferences.\textsuperscript{178} Furthermore, an actor’s performance may be “considered a statement in which the actors are the ‘words’ cast by the director [or producer] to express that statement, [thus] the casting decision should be protected as other words and types of expressive conduct . . . .”\textsuperscript{179}

Although no court has ever decided the issue of “freedom in casting” in the context of a Title VII discrimination law suit,\textsuperscript{180} the United States Supreme Court has held that “specific applications of antidiscrimination laws violated the First Amendment.”\textsuperscript{181} For example, in Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston (GLIB), a unanimous Court “resolved that parades are protected speech.”\textsuperscript{182} In this case, a veteran’s council that organized an annual St. Patrick’s Day parade claimed that their right of expression granted by the First Amendment allowed their organization to exclude GLIB from participating in the parade.\textsuperscript{183} On the other hand, GLIB wanted to march in the parade “to celebrate its members’ identity as openly gay, lesbian, and bisexual descendants of Irish immigrants to show that there [were] such individuals in the community.”\textsuperscript{184} Further, GLIB wanted to march in the parade with its members carrying a “shamrock-strewn banner with the simple inscription” of their organization’s name.\textsuperscript{185} A Massachusetts state antidiscrimination law required the council to allow GLIB to participate in the parade.\textsuperscript{186} In holding that the application of the commonwealth’s antidiscrimination law violated the First Amendment, the Court stating that in this instance, the exclusion of a group based on their sexual orientation was permitted in order for the council express their own message separate from GLIB’s intended message.\textsuperscript{187}
Furthermore; since the legislative history of Title VII may not have intended the Act to apply to casting actors in the theater industry, one may defer to the United States Constitution since it supersedes a statute. The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution states:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made Pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Thus, a theatrical employer may invoke its First Amendment right when an actor of color files a law suit claiming racial discrimination due to the casting practices used by casting directors and producers even though the practices have a disparate effect concerning the employment opportunities available to minority groups. “In essence, no matter how offensive the casting process may be to the audience or other actors,” a First Amendment defense is “an important legal weapon” that protects the theatrical employer when it inadvertently excludes and discriminates against actors of color.

B. The Miss Saigon Freedom of Speech Dilemma

Theater producer, Cameron Mackintosh, incited the most publicized controversy concerning the exercise his First Amendment right to freedom of speech in the casting of the musical, Miss Saigon, for the Broadway stage. In London, British actor, Jonathan Pryce played the role of “the Engineer,” a character described as a half-French and half-Vietnamese “Eurasian.” Mackintosh had planned to allow Pryce to portray “the Engineer” role in “yellow-face” during the New York production of the musical. Asian theater, David Henry Hwang and B.D. Wong, brought Mackintosh’s intended plan to the attention Actors’ Equity due to their concern that the theater community lacked available roles for Asian actors. Subsequently, Actors’ Equity rejected Mackintosh’s application requesting its assistance in obtaining approval for Pryce to work as an actor in the United States. Actors’ Equity stated that it “could not
condone or be a part of a casting decision that it strongly [viewed] as an affront to the Asian community and [was] insensitive to [the] efforts being made by the entire theater community to accurately reflect the multi-racial society in which we live.”

In response, to Actors’ Equity rejection of a Pryce being cast in the principle role as “the Engineer,” Mackintosh stated that “the debate [was] no longer about the casting of Miss Saigon, but about the art of acting itself.”199 In addition, Mackintosh claimed that there was no legal basis for the rejection of the Pryce, therefore he cancelled the Broadway production despite record advance ticket sales of $25 million.200 Mackintosh refused to continue production of the musical unless given artistic control.201 Moreover, Mackintosh’s Equity production contract stated: “there can be no interference with the contractual rights or artistic discretion of the Playwright, Director, or Choreographer . . . .”202 This “no interference” clause provided evidence that Actors’ Equity recognized the ultimate importance of artistic expression in casting actors.203

C. A Practical Application of Casting as Freedom of Speech in the New York Theater

Proponents of the idea that casting actors is a form of artistic expression, advocate that a director’s or producer’s choice of an actor is protected by the right to freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment.204 Alisa Solomon, a dramatist and theater critic, states that the goal of the theater director is to tell the truth based on his or her perception of reality.205 A director may choose to cast a particular role solely based on his or her discretion.206 In addition, a director should have the artistic freedom to “read” race as a fact in the story.207 For example, Solomon states that the casting based on race in the Broadway drama, The Trip to Bountiful, did not “make the play about race or about being black, but neither [did] it pretend that the characters and the audience [were] not aware of who [the characters were] historically.”208 However, in respect to casting black actors in roles traditionally played by white actors, the director of The
Trip to Bountiful had the opportunity to exercise his freedom of speech. In the context of intentionally casting black actors in lead roles, the director could bring “new insights,” to the theater’s audiences by way of his “reinterpretation” of a well-established play through a particular cultural lens of an African-American.

IV. Non-Traditional Casting

A. The Challenges

The benefit of the business necessity defense for theatrical employers is that it gives instruction to the theatrical employer concerning how it can cast actors without violating Title VII. The defense protects the theatrical employer by allowing it to enhance the authenticity of the characters portrayed in staged theatrical productions, and simultaneously discourages actors of color from challenging the disparate effects of the employer’s casting process. Furthermore; if a theatrical employer were to fail in asserting the business necessity defense while litigating a disparate impact class action suit, the First Amendment offers additional protection as to the employer’s preference concerning the employer’s preference of one actor over another. Arguably, the business necessity and First Amendment defenses provide an environment that cultivate exclusion. Given these limitations, alternative solutions to the current law are needed to “equal the playing field” so that more employment opportunities are available to actors of color in the New York theater. One of the earliest efforts to increase diversity and inclusion of actors of color in the theater is the practice of “non-traditional casting.”

B. “Non-Traditional Casting:” Definition and Purpose

In response to Actors’ Equity’s four-year study completed in 1986 which indicated that 90% of the actors employed in professional theater were Caucasian, Actors’ Equity conceived of “non-traditional casting” to increase employment of actors of color in the theater.
year, Actors’ Equity along with the Casting Society of America, the Dramatists Guild, The League of American Theater and Producers, and The Society of Stage Directors and Choreographers, formed the Non-Traditional Casting Project to end “neglect” by theater employers, and to encourage them to consider and hire actors on the basis of their talent and merit, not the color of their skin.\textsuperscript{218}

The Non-Traditional Casting Project’s intention was to diversify a “Eurocentric, Western repertoire” of theater productions by including actors who, for decades, had been for systematically excluded and discriminated against due to their race or ethnicity.\textsuperscript{219} However, the Project advocated that when an actor of a particular race or ethnicity was essential to promote the authenticity of a character or play, as protected by the business necessity rule, employers were to remain sensitive to that need, and not cast actors as tokens to fulfill a racial or ethnic quotas.\textsuperscript{220}

\textbf{C. Types of “Non-Traditional Casting”}

In 1967, Broadway’s earliest practice of “non-traditional casting” occurred when producer David Merrick recast a successful all-star, all-White cast of \textit{Hello, Dolly!} with an all-Black cast co-starring Pearl Bailey and Cab Calloway.\textsuperscript{221} In 1976, \textit{The Wizard of Oz} was retold and re-cast with black actors in the Tony Award winning production of the \textit{The Wiz}.\textsuperscript{222}

Today, “non-traditional casting” has several definitions and purposes.\textsuperscript{223} This paper distinguishes six types of ‘non-traditional casting:’ 1) “non-traditional casting” of veteran theater artists;\textsuperscript{224} 2) “non-traditional casting” of notable entertainers;\textsuperscript{225} 3) “non-traditional recasting” of a revival;\textsuperscript{226} 4) “colorblind casting;”\textsuperscript{227} 5) “multi-racial casting” or “multi-cultural casting;”\textsuperscript{228} and 6) “reverse colorblind casting.”\textsuperscript{229} In addition, some “non-traditional casting” methods are intended to add new interpretive insight to a playwright’s work instead of demonstrating the universality of the play.\textsuperscript{230}
(1) “Non-Traditional Casting” of Veteran Theater Artists

The most recognized method of “non-traditional casting” is to purposely cast an actor in a role where the race, ethnicity or sex of the character has previously been established in the consciousness of the public. This method of casting is consistent with the former Non-Traditional Casting Project’s goal to increase employment of actors of color in theater roles where the character’s race, ethnicity, or sex was not essential to the portrayal of the character. However, this type of casting is usually reserved for the most acclaimed Broadway veteran actors such as: James Earl Jones; Morgan Freeman; Audra McDonald; Lillias White; Vanessa Williams; Daphne Rubin-Vega; Melba Moore; and Laurence Fishburne, after they have achieved substantial success portraying racial specific roles such

(2) “Non-Traditional Casting” of Notable Entertainers

Another “non-traditional casting” method employs notable entertainers in roles traditionally known to be portrayed by Caucasian actors. Theatrical employers typically use this type of casting when they seek to hire notable television and film actors or famous recording artists for large production musicals. Beginning in the 1990s, patrons of Broadway theaters began to see African-American recording artists portray iconic characters in long-running, award-winning Broadway musicals such as Les Miserables, Beauty and the Beast, Chicago, and Jekyll & Hyde. This form of “non-traditional casting” is inapposite to the goals stated by the Non-Traditional Casting Project because the casting of commercially successful recording artists, who do not typically pursue nor rely on being cast in staged musicals on Broadway, continually allows theatrical employers to deny opportunities to qualified, unemployed actors.

(3) “Non-Traditional Recasting” of a Revival
After a long absence, in the early 2000s, the revival of re-casting a play traditionally consisting of Caucasian actors with an all-Black, Latino, or Asian cast has once more become a successful trend among theater producers. In 2008, Stephen Byrd produced a Broadway revival of Tennessee Williams’ *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* featuring an all-Black cast which starred James Earl Jones and Phylicia Rashad as “Big Daddy” and “Big Mama,” respectively. The drama had previously been performed on Broadway during four separate seasons between 1955 and 2003. Byrd’s production of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* was the first time that the drama was staged with an all-Black cast.

During the 2012-2013 theater season, a non-traditional recasting variation appeared where the principal characters are recast with non-white actors and the supporting characters are portrayed by white actors. Most recently, in April 2013, Horton Foote’s *The Trip to the Bountiful* was revived on Broadway at the Stephen Sondheim Theatre, and was cast with renowned African-American television and film actors in the lead roles which were traditionally portrayed by white actors.

However, some individuals oppose recasting traditional all-white theatrical productions with casts comprised of actors of color. In 1996, renowned playwright, August Wilson, stated that an actor of color who played role conceived for a white person denied something in himself – “everything from his culture to the way he [talks] and [thinks].” In particular, Wilson stated:

To mount an all-black production of *Death of a Salesman* or any other play conceived for white actors as an investigation of the human condition through the specifics of white culture, is to deny [people of color of their] own humanity, [their] own history, and the need to make [their own investigations from the cultural ground on which [they] stand as [people of color].

You got all the actors working over there, celebrating European culture instead of here celebrating black culture.

(4) “Colorblind Casting”
Another name for “non-traditional casting” is “color-blind casting.”246 Contrary to “non-traditional casting,” the goal of “colorblind casting” is either to minimize, erase or ignore an actor’s race, and allow the actor to play the role without skin color being a factor in his or her interpretation of the character.247 The concept of colorblind casting appears to work effectively in British, Russian, and American classic plays by William Shakespeare, Henrik Ibsen, and Tennessee Williams, where the audience tends to know the play and the characters well, and accepts that the actor “just happens to be” portrayed by actors of color.248

However, in a recent colorblind casting of updated-modernized versions of classical plays, a director subsequently allowed the actors to “play” on the differences in their race without letting race overshadow the plot or theme.249 In director David Leveaux’s contemporary update of Romeo and Juliet, Caucasian Hollywood actor Orlando Bloom plays a motorcycle-driving “Romeo” and African-American Condola Rashad plays Broadway’s first black “Juliet.”250 The actors have commented that they were not looking to make the play about race but chose not to ignore it.251 The central conflict of the play is that the “ancient grudge” brings the families apart, “not the color of the lover’s skin.”252

In the contemporary Broadway theater, the producer can cast based on sheer talent where one of the goals of the production is to display an actor’s unmistakable acting ability or vocal power.253 For example, Filipino actress Lea Salonga254 was successfully cast in her first Broadway role as the French orphan “Eponine” in Les Miserable,254 and African-American actress Audra McDonald was successfully cast as an opera student in the play Master Class.255

Opponents of “colorblind casting” argue that this method of casting is not sensible and should not exist.256 In support of August Wilson’s aforesaid arguments, opponents state that “the characters’ races affect their history, their place in society, and their effect on the audience.”257
Furthermore, opponents argue that casting actors of color has an impact on Caucasian individuals’ social views of people of color therefore the actor’s racial characteristics should be explored and not ignored when an actor portrays a role traditionally reserved for a Caucasian actor.258

(5) Multi-Racial or Multi-Cultural Casting

“Multi-racial” or “multi-racial casting” generally occurs when the script of a theatrical production specifically requires that the actors are of different, and many times, specific ethnic or racial backgrounds.259 Usually, the theme or social commentary of the production depends upon overt ethnic and racial conflicts or inter-racial romantic relationships.260 For example, Broadway’s Memphis tells the story of an African-American female singer who falls in love with her manager-promoter, a white young man who loves “black music,” and becomes the city’s popular disc jockey in a segregated southern city.261 Here, it may have been the playwright’s unspoken intention to create a multi-racial cast by way of writing a musical that explores how “black” music and dance became popular among America’s white youth during the Rock-and-Roll era, and affected the collective consciousness of the nation.262 In Memphis, similar to the popular Broadway musical Hairspray,263 the casting director and producer were forced to hire a multi-racial cast specifically comprising of blacks and whites in order to convey the theme of the musical and the reality of its plot.264

In contrast to the “multi-racial casting” that was observed in the production of Memphis where the struggle between the races was a central aspect of the plot, there are musicals and plays that imply very little about the characters’ race.265 In Rent, writer, director, and producer Jonathan Larson chose a multi-racial cast to subtly inject racial undertones and subplots into the
production rather than depend on the overt expression of animosity or tension between the
characters due to race as displayed in *Memphis*.²⁶⁶

(6) “Reverse Colorblind Casting:” Caucasian Actors in Non-White Roles
The *Miss Saigon* Dilemma Revisited

Audiences usually show strong objection when a Caucasian actor is cast in role written or
traditionally reserved for an actor of color.²⁶⁷ Most notably, in 1990, New York’s Asian-
American community became outraged over a white actor’s performance in *Miss Saigon* while
his face was painted yellow.²⁶⁸ Supporters of the various forms of non-traditional casting of
actors of color, argue that non-traditional casting was never intended to provide employment
opportunities in the theater to Caucasian actors.²⁶⁹ When actors of color are not given the
opportunity to portray characters of their race, the existing problem of exclusion becomes
magnified, and there is a reversal of gains in the numbers of employed non-Caucasian actors in
the theater.²⁷⁰

Sharon Jensen, President of the Alliance for Inclusion in the Arts, formerly the Non-
Traditional Casting Project, states that “until there is genuine equality throughout our society,
[“non-traditional casting” is] not a two-way street.”²⁷¹ For instance, in the context of equality; if
an Asian, Hispanic, or American Indian actresses do not have the opportunity to portray
characters specifically written for them, then they are mostly unemployable in the theater
industry where no greater than 4 percent, 3 percent, and 1 percent of the roles are written for
them, respectively.²⁷²

What’s more, an Asian, Hispanic, or American Indian’s actress’s ability to grow
professionally as an actor by portraying roles that are not specific to her race or ethnicity is
limited.²⁷³ Ann Nestor Serrano, a Puerto Rican actress has stated that she is not embarrassed to
play a “Hispanic” but she does not want her career to be limited to playing Hispanics.²⁷⁴ Yet, the
business necessity doctrine and First Amendment right that is presumably afforded to theatrical employers reinforce this limitation on this Puerto Rican actress’s career.\textsuperscript{275} Thus, these defenses that are meant to protect individuals, actually allows Serrano to be harm by excluding her from portraying characters written for her in an employment market where less than 4 percent of the roles are available to her.\textsuperscript{276}

On the other hand, referring to the career limitations that challenge actors of color, Tisa Chang, the former artistic director of the Pan-Asian Repertory Theater in Manhattan, said that she “would not wish to include a Caucasian actor with a group of Asian actors to represent a Japanese-American family.”\textsuperscript{276} Chang further stated that she “[did] not see Japanese-American families being portrayed with an integrated cast.”\textsuperscript{277} In the same manner, under the business necessity doctrine and the First Amendment, a different artistic director would have the liberty to follow the same view as Chang, and cast roles that excludes the Japanese-American or Puerto-Rican actresses simply because the artistic director does not “see” these actresses as being a part of a Caucasian family or community.\textsuperscript{278} However, in an industry that has an average 20 percent employment rate for all actors of color, the unchanging casting and hiring practices of theatrical employers underscore why “minority” communities react negatively to “reverse colorblind casting” of Caucasian actors in roles traditionally reserved for actors of color.\textsuperscript{279}

\textbf{(7) The Success of Non-Traditional Casting}

Although there have been some successes in “non-traditional casting” in New York theaters, opportunities for actors of color are still not proportionate to the city’s minority population.\textsuperscript{280} The proliferation of available roles for actors of color during the late nineties was welcomed, but not considered a breakthrough when currently only 20 to 25 percent of the roles cast in New York are awarded to minorities; a city where there is 67 percent minority
population. Further, the vast majority of plays and musicals produced in New York continue to have racially segregated casts. Since the force of “non-traditional casting” of actors of color is limited by the law, and the practice of “non-traditional casting” arguably frustrates the director or producer’s freedom of expression, other actions are needed to increase the amount of actors of color that are employed in New York theaters and hired for non-race specific roles.

V. Alternative Solutions

A. Challenging the “Low Sales” Assumption

Neil Pepe, artistic director of the Off-Broadway Atlantic Theater Company, established by writer David Mamet and actor William H. Macy, has stated that, “[they] certainly believe that racial and ethnic diversity among [their] artists only adds depth and complexity to the work.” Asian-American and Tony Award winning playwright of *M. Butterfly*, David Henry Hwang has stated that limits placed upon casting actors not only hurt the people being discriminated against, but it hurts the institutions doing the discrimination as well. However, many New York theatrical productions that employ the largest amount of actors, produce plays and musicals that were written during a period when people of color were not included in the story. More importantly, Broadway producers thrive financially by staging revivals of these older theatrical works and operate under the assumption that the cannot include actors of color in order to remain profitable.

Furthermore, many casting directors, the producers “front-men,” are still resistant to the idea of mixed-race biological families in a theater productions. Casting directors hold strong to the notion that all-white family dramas are a staple of American theater; therefore rarely cast actors of color. In addition, producers demand that their plays are cast with
Caucasian actors to sustain marketability and to attract a white audience who are the majority of theater-goers.\textsuperscript{290}

Before producing a play, producers consider factors such as audience appeal and economic prospects of a play.\textsuperscript{291} When money is on the line, theater producers tend to err on the side of caution and go with the safest choice.\textsuperscript{292} When producers think to cast a role with an actor of color, particularly in the case of a high profile role on Broadway, they tend to cast a well-known “name.”\textsuperscript{293} This practice not only reduces opportunities for recently “trained” actors of color seeking employment, but virtually eliminates Asians, American Indians, Middle-Easterners, among others, from being considered for roles because there are not these “name” actors to consider.\textsuperscript{294}

However, theater producers may have been casting their plays and musicals based on the faulty assumptions that only white theater patrons will buy tickets.\textsuperscript{295} Their assumptions could be challenged because it is illogical to assume that audience members who live in an increasingly interracial city will consistently prefer to see theater productions that reflect realities uncommon to their environment.\textsuperscript{296} Moreover, the League of American Theater Producers production contract with the Actors’ Equity Association, in fact, demonstrates that it is the organizations’ joint intention that employment opportunities be improved to reflect not only its multi-racial actor community, but the multi-racial community where a play is staged.\textsuperscript{297} Douglas Aibel, artistic director of the Vineyard Theater, an Off-Broadway theater, has stated that, “[he] thinks audiences become more diverse when there’s more diversity onstage.”\textsuperscript{298}

The “non-traditional casting” concept for theater employment has proven to be financially viable, as well as artistically well-received by theater patrons.\textsuperscript{299} Broadway’s 2013 revival of Edward Horton’s \textit{The Trip to Bountiful} attracted sizeable black audiences throughout
its run on Broadway. In addition, the drama’s total audience rivaled the production of Tennessee Williams’s *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* which featured an all-Caucasian, Hollywood cast. Furthermore, the preceding revival of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, featuring an all-African-American cast was more successful than its successor. Similarly, Tennessee William’s *A Streetcar Named Desire*, featuring a mixed cast of African-American and Hispanic actors, also had successful and extended runs on Broadway.

Furthermore, Marcia Pendleton, a marketing and advertising consultant for the arts, has noted that a production with a notable cast and special marketing efforts will prevent mixed reviews by Caucasian theater critics from diminishing sale tickets to plays or musicals that features actors of color. Pendleton further notes that patrons from targeted ethnic communities are likely to buy tickets for theatrical productions when the actors on the stage look like them regardless of theater critics’ opinions. Although *The Trip to Bountiful* received mixed reviews, Cicely Tyson’s performance steadily attracted African-American audiences, and the success portraying a role traditionally portrayed by a white woman, was evidenced by the African-American audience singings having impromptu sing-a-longs with Ms. Tyson during her performances.

**B. Actor and Audience Activism**

Actors and theater patrons may have to make stronger efforts to increase public awareness about the under-representation of actors of color in the New York theater. Oskar Eustis, artistic director at the Public Theater, has urged Asian-American actors to “make noise” and consider protesting or picketing theaters to urge producers and casting directors to think in a more counter-intuitive manner when casting roles. Ms. Piccione, director of casting at the Manhattan Theater Club, has noted that as a result of black actor protests for more “non-
traditional casting” over several decades, jobs eventually came in greater numbers.  

Stephen C. Byrd, the Broadway producer who cast a mixed-raced revival of Streetcar Named Desire has advocated for an “Occupy Broadway” movement to push for more racial diversity in the theater.  

However; actor and audience activism pose a potential problem of exacerbating the problems concerning low employment, diversity, and inclusion of actors of color in New York theaters. Efforts to bring public awareness concerning casting and hiring practices in the theater could anger producers and provoke them to cancel theatrical productions that include actors of color in an effort to assert their First Amendment rights of freedom of artistic expression in the selection of actors.  

As an alternative to street protests, actors and audience members could create more effective dialogue with theatrical employers without placing blame. Instead of being “upset, fed-up, frustrated, irritated, indignant, and disillusioned” about the lack of diversity in New York theater, further efforts could be made to educate, inform, and challenge leaders of the theater community concerning the effects of their casting practices. Slogans and sit-ins may have assisted black performers over time in increasing the amount of roles available to them, but it may be time to take the emotion out of the issue of “non-traditional casting,” and present cold numbers, pie charts and bar graphs to theater producers.  

There is evidence that theater producers are willing to listen and make changes to their casting practices when they are more informed about how they are perceived by the public. For example, Neil Pepe, artistic director of the Off Broadway Atlantic Theater Company, has stated that statistical results of a survey scoring the theater company lowest in terms of the diversity of their casts, was a welcome reminder that there are many groups of artists in New
York that are underrepresented on their stages. Furthermore, Oskar Eutist, the artistic director of the famed Public Theater that was once targeted publicly for hiring white actors to play Asian characters, attended a meeting of the Asian American Performers Action Coalition at Fordham University at Lincoln Center. Eutist acknowledged that the group’s thoughts about “non-traditional casting” and its impact upon their careers would force him to make it a higher priority at his institution. “This is what pressure is supposed to do to institutions.”

C. Private Right of Action

Actors and theatrical trade associations which advocate for greater diversity and inclusion in the theater could lobby the United States Congress and the New York State Legislature to create a private right of action statute for performing artists. The proposed statute could be similar in form to the various State Unfair and Deceptive Acts and Practices statutes (UDAPs), and could provide for attorney’s fees and costs, statutory, and treble damages. With a private right of action, actors could be encouraged to file discrimination law suits when they believe that they were victims of race discrimination, and attorneys could be more willing to represent actors.

As case law develops, and more concrete legal guidance comes from the federal or state courts, the possible threat of expensive and time-consuming law suits might induce theatrical employers to change their hiring practices to avoid on-going litigation. Still, attorneys would probably have a financial disincentive to litigate for actors in a private right of action due to the insurmountable hurdle of overcoming the business necessity and First Amendment defenses most likely to be asserted by theatrical employers. Moreover, actors of color may fear retaliatory action of being “shut out” of auditions by casting directors and producers, or their agents who must maintain cordial relationships with theatrical employers.
Overall, Congress may have little political will or cohesion to either pass legislation concerning employment in the performing arts or consider a private right of action as a viable solution to creating more employment opportunities for actors of color.\textsuperscript{327} On the other hand, New York State would probably have an interest in increasing employment opportunities for actors of color given that the population of New York City comprises of 67 percent of people of color.\textsuperscript{328} Still, without a Congressional amendment to Title VII, the business necessity defense would probably shield employers from liability in a discrimination lawsuit regardless of any state statute that attempts to provide greater legal protection to entertainers through a private right of action.\textsuperscript{329}

\textbf{D. Initiatives for Formal Theater Training for Actors of Color}

Many “starry-eyed,” talented actors of color are simply not adequately trained in order to successfully thrive in the extremely competitive New York theater industry.\textsuperscript{330} In addition to the lack of available dramatic roles, actors of color are further hindered in their employment endeavors because they are not formally trained in singing and dancing; areas where more opportunities exist as ensemble players in a musical.\textsuperscript{331} During the \textit{Miss Saigon} controversy, Actors’ Equity hinted that there was an issue concerning the supply of actors of color who were properly trained for the rigors of the New York theatrical stage.\textsuperscript{332} Subsequently, Actors’ Equity mandated that Cameron Mackintosh, producer of \textit{Miss Saigon}, offer vocal training to Asian actors so that they could be qualified to at least audition for roles in the musical.\textsuperscript{333}

Only the talented and the well-trained actor of color can survive in an industry where its practices restrict their employment opportunities in an ultra-competitive environment.\textsuperscript{334} Veteran New York acting instructor and educator, William Esper has stated that “never has the American
actor been subjected to so much intense competition and needed so many skills in order to survive."

Furthermore, most opportunities in the New York theater are reserved exclusively for actors who have completed undergraduate and graduate theater programs at universities awarding them a Bachelor of Fine Arts or a Master of Fine Arts degree, or completed two years at a New York acting conservatory. Generally, each year these institutions privately showcase the talents of its graduating students by allowing them to produce their own professionally staged shows to be viewed exclusively by New York theater agents, personal managers, casting directors, and producers. Thus, due to having more familiarity of the talent and potential of students from these institutions of higher learning, theatrical decision-makers need only look to them during the initial phases of casting principal and ensemble roles for the theater.

Given that proper training is a key element gaining employment as an actor, the theatrical trade unions, in particular Actors’ Equity, could further their outreach efforts to ensure that middle and high school students are aware of the necessity of university or conservatory training if they wish to pursue a career in the theater. Moreover, as New York State has instituted a minimum pro bono requirement for licensed attorneys who wish to practice law in the state, Actors’ Equity could require that its members dedicate time informing interested middle and high school students about the importance of formal theater training. Through outreach programs, students of color could be made aware of the public and private universities, affordable and expensive, that are available to provide them with the necessary training in movement, voice, speech, stage combat, dialects, script analysis, and acting. In addition, there are acting conservatories with intensive theater training programs for students who do not wish
to spend four to seven years in a university setting. In all, these institutions have the necessary faculty and facilities to properly train actors of color for the demands of a career in the theater.

**E. Playwright and Lyricist Initiatives**

Similar to the previous recommendation that Actors’ Equity require its members to mentor students of color, The Dramatists Guild could increase its outreach efforts in New York City’s middle and high schools where there are large populations of students of color as well. Providing instruction to New York’s middle and high school students of color in the art of playwriting and songwriting could probably result in more young people of color considering and pursuing careers in these aforementioned fields. Naturally, efforts that aim to increase familiarity with the playwriting and songwriting process could provide students with the necessary foundation and confidence to attempt publication and production of their work.

Moreover, as aspiring dramatists these students will mostly create artistic works that express the uniqueness of their race and culture, thus, inevitably create employment opportunities for actors of color to portray the characters and interpret the songs on the stage with enhanced authenticity. For instance, *Miss Saigon* served as a source of employment for Asian-Americans; however, actors were not satisfied with the playwright’s portrayal of Asian culture on the stage. Tom Kouo, who played the lead role of “Thuy” in Miss Saigon, stated:

> I am grateful for *Miss Saigon* . . . [b]ut in the end, it’s still written by two French guys who don’t really understand who they are writing about, no matter how hard they might want to. Being in the show, you realize that you’re not represented here. You’re out there performing, speaking words written by people who don’t know what you really say, how you really say it.”

**F. Producing**

In the past, actors of color and producers have shown their ability to be self-determined in the production of theater projects which created employment opportunities for them in New
York theater. In 1916, African-Americans of the Drama Committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) were the first non-white individuals to produce a play in New York. Additionally, despite the harshness of the Great Depression, new African-American theater groups formed and provided employment opportunities for actors of color. In fact, Langston Hughes’s *Mulatto* played continuously for over two years during the Great Depression.

Lack of diversity in the talent pool that produces New York theaters may be a reason why there is a disproportionate number of Caucasian actors compared to actors of color employed in the theater. Today, more African-American, Latino, and Asian-American Hollywood entertainers in the industry should join the small number of producers that are providing employment opportunities on Broadway. While Hollywood does not seem to provide the desired opportunities to showcase actors of color in principal roles, artistic growth and enthusiastic audiences await superstar television and film actors to make a contribution to the “Great White Way.” Overall, Hollywood actors and performers of color could and should use their prestige, influence, and financial resources to produce shows that will continue to diversity New York theaters.

There are many stories to be told and many that are yet to be written for the New York stage. There are many talented New York actors that can breathe life into these stories. The limits and challenges that Title VII and the First Amendment present, does not have to be an ultimate barrier to actors of color. The law protects all; not only Caucasian producers of theatrical works. Thus, the law can protect the works and casting choices of producers of color. So; until there is equality in casting and hiring actors of color by all theatrical decision-makers, why not embrace the artistic protections that the nation’s laws provide, and start to produce the
racially integrated works and race specific work that actors of color desire? Why not use the law to some advantage? Not only does the law provide for greater artistic freedom in the theater, New York theater patrons anxiously await it!

VI. Conclusion

This paper has examined how Title VII, in its current form which potentially allows theatrical employers to persist in discriminatory casting and hiring practices without being challenged within the legal system. “Non-traditional casting” efforts has made some strides in the attempt to provide more opportunity to actors of color in the New York theater, but “non-traditional casting” appears to be limited in its scope and its reach. Ultimately, “non-traditional casting” must yield to the theatrical producer’s right to artistic expression.

Theater is about telling a story based on the truth as an individual perceives it. If a theatrical producer’s perception of the truth is to cast all characters in a play with Caucasian actors, then that is that producer’s artistic choice. Theater patrons are free to support this producer in his artistic endeavor or to reject his expression by not going to see his production. In the same vein, patrons are free to support directors and producers who produce theatrical shows in a manner that is a reflection of their life and experiences. Thus, ultimately, a theatrical producer should have the final word concerning whether to cast a play with or without consideration of race. This right is guaranteed by the First Amendment and his artistic preference as expressed through the actors he chooses to cast should not be constrained by other laws. Artistic expression is a vital right and should be respected in the theater.
The name “New York” refers to the City of New York that encompasses the boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and the Bronx.
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See Solomon, supra note 194, at ¶ 3-8. 13. Regional theater director, Timothy Douglas, originally had the idea to stage a production of The Trip to Bountiful with African-American actors as the principle characters. In 2011, Douglas premiered the drama at the Cleveland Play House. In 2013, Broadway director, Michael Wilson premiered the drama at the Stephen Soundheim Theater in New York City. The original cast consisted of: Cicely Tyson; Cuba Gooding, Jr.; Vanessa Williams; and Condola Rashad. Ms. Rashad was nominated for a Tony Award in the category of “Featured Actress in a Play” for her portrayal of “Thelma” in the production. The Trip to Bountiful was written by Horton Foote and, originally premiered on Broadway in 1953 with an all-white cast. See PLAYBILLVAULT.COM, supra note 23 (last visited Dec. 3, 2013).

Solomon, supra note 194, at ¶ 13.

See supra § II(G): The Entertainment Industry’s Authenticity Requirement as a Business Necessity Defense.

Id.


Id.

See infra § IV(B): Non-Traditional Casting: Definition and Purpose.

Id.

Ng, supra note 21, at 460.
C. Types of Non-Traditional Casting


See Krieger, supra note 187, at 845. Krieger distinguishes four different types of non-traditional casting: 1) “societal casting,” in which minorities are cast in roles they perform every day in society, but from which they are usually excluded due to discriminatory hiring practices; 2) “cross-cultural casting,” in which a play is set in an entirely different cultural world from that which the author intended; 3) “conceptual casting,” in which the actor is cast in a role specifically in order to have his race or ethnicity add an extra dimension to the performance; and 4) “blind casting,” in which actors are cast according to their talents and qualifications, not their physical characteristics.

See infra § IV(C)(1): “Non-Traditional Casting” of Veteran Theater Artists.

See infra § IV(C)(2): “Non-Traditional Casting” of Notable Entertainers.

See infra § IV(C)(3): “Non-Traditional Recasting” of a Revival.

See infra § IV(C)(4): “Colorblind Casting.”

See infra § IV(C)(5): “Multi-Racial Casting” or “Multi-Cultural Casting.”

See Solomon, supra note 205, ¶ 12. Solomon comments on Halle Foote’s statement about how the universal the meaning of The Trip to Bountiful remained despite the revival of the play with African-American actors cast in the principle roles.

See Ng, supra 21, at 460 (referring to “casting of ethnic minority . . . [a]ctors in roles in which race, ethnicity, or sex is not germane”).

Id.

See generally PLAYBILLVAULT.COM, supra note 23 (last visited Dec.3, 2013). African-American actor James Earl Jones was awarded the Tony Award for “Best Actor in a Play” for his portrayal of “Jack Jefferson” in The Great White Hope before being cast as “Lennie” in Of Mice and Men and “Othello” in Othello. African-American actor Morgan Freeman received an Academy Award nomination for his portrayal of “Hoke Colburn” in the film version of Driving Miss Daisy before being cast as “Frank Elgin” in The Country Girl. African-American actress Audra McDonald was awarded the Tony Awarded for “Featured Actress in a Musical” for her portrayal of “Carrie Pepperide” in Carousel before being cast in non-race specific role of “Sharon” in Master Class where McDonald was awarded her second Tony Award for “Featured Actress in a Play.” Lillias White successfully portrayed “Effie White” in the original version and revival of Dreamgirls before being cast as “Miss Jones” in How to Succeed in Business Without Really Trying. White subsequently was awarded the Tony Award for “Best Featured Actress in a Musical” for the role of “Sonja,” a prostitute in The Life. Vanessa Williams was awarded the Theatre World Award for the portrayal of “Aurora/Spider Woman” in Kiss of the Spider Woman before being cast the “Witch” in Into the Woods. Laurence Fishburne was awarded the Tony Award for “Best Featured Actor in a Play” for the portrayal of “Sterling” in Two Trains Running before being cast as “Henry II” in The Lion in the Winter. See also Ben Brantley, Theater Review, ‘Les Miserables:’Didn’t We Just See This Revolution?, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 10, 2006, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/10/theater/reviews/10mise.html?pagewanted=all (noting that Hispanic-American Broadway actress, Daphne Ruben-Vega, who originated the role of “Mimi” in Rent, cast to play “Fantine” in the Broadway revival of Les Miserables; the longest-running Broadway musical that originally opened in 1987) Rubin-Vega was nominated for a Tony Award and was awarded a Theatre World Award for “Best Actress in a Musical” for her portrayal of “Mimi Marquez” in Rent, and received a Tony Award nomination for “Featured Actress in a Play” her portrayal of “Conchita” in Anna in the Tropics before being cast as French character “Fantine” in the Broadway revival of Les Miserables. See also Harry Haun, An Affinity for Fantine: Tony-Winner Steps into “Les Miz”, PLAYBILL.COM, Dec. 12, 1995, http://www.playbill.com/features/article/64173-An-Affinity-for-Fantine. After twenty five years, Melba Moore, of the original production of Hair and, Purlie, for which she was awarded a Tony, Drama Desk, Theater World Award for her portrayal of “Lutiebelle,” returned to Broadway in the role of “Fantine” in Les Miserable. Cf. NPR Staff, ‘Pippin Star’ Star Patina Miller Soars On Broadway, NPR, Aug. 26, 2013,
http://www.npr.org/2013/08/26/214893476/pippin-star-patina-miller-soars-on-broadway
(noting that a black actress revived the role as “Lead Actor” in Pippin, originated by
Broadway legend Ben Vereen forty years ago). Miller was awarded the Tony Award for
“Actress in a Musical” for her portrayal of “Lead Actor” in the 2013 revival of Pippin.
The role of “Lead Actor” had originally been cast with African-American male actors.

Non-Traditional Casting of Notable Names

See generally PLAYBILLVAULT.COM, supra note 23 (last visited Dec. 3, 2013).
African-American Recording Artist Toni Braxton portrayed “Belle” in Beauty in the
Beast and “Aida” in Aida. African-American Recording Artist Michelle Williams of
Destiny’s Child portrayed “Aida” in Aida and “Roxie Hart” in Chicago. African-
American Recording Artist Shanice portrayed “Eponine” in Les Misérables. African-
American Recording Artist Jody Watley portrayed “Betty Rizzo” in Grease. African-
American Recording Artist Usher Raymond portrayed “Billy Flynn” in Chicago.
African-American Television Personality Wayne Brady portrayed “Billy Flynn” in
Chicago. African-American Radio and Television Host Wendy Williams portrayed
“Matron ‘Mama’ Morton” in Chicago. African-American Recording Artist Jordin Sparks
portrayed “Nina” In the Heights. Hispanic-American Recording Artist Ricky Martin
portrayed “Marius” in Les Misérables and “Che” in Evita. Television Actor Corbin Bleu
portrayed “Usnavi” in In the Heights and “Jesus” in Godspell. African-American
Recording Artist Deborah Cox portrayed “Aida” in Aida and “Lucy Harris” in Jekyll &
Hyde. African-American Recording Artist Heather Headley portrayed “Aida” in Aida in
which she was awarded the Tony Award “Actress in a Musical” and the Drama Desk
Award for “Outstanding Actress in a Musical.”

Id.

Id.

See Jensen, supra note 218 and accompanying text. One of the goals of the Non-
Traditional Casting Project was to end neglect of actors of color seeking employment in
the theater.

(3) “Non-Traditional Re-Casting” of a Revival

See Tambay A. Obenson, Kenny Leon Planning ‘Fatal Attraction’ Broadway Adaptation
(With An All-Black Cast?), INDIEWIRE (Jul. 9, 2012 12:49 PM),
http://blogs.indiewire.com/shadowandact/kenny-leon-planning-fatal-attraction-broadway-
adaptation. Obenson blogs about the success of bringing an “all-black cast version of a
popular work” to the theater while discussing Kenny Leon’s next project. See also
Michael Musto Thu, Baayork Lee is Presenting An All-Asian Version of Hello, Dolly!,
VILLAGE VOICE (Apr. 11, 2013 11:15 AM),
http://blogs.villagevoice.com/dailymusto/2013/04/baayork_lee_is.php. Musto Thu blogs
about the announcement to cast and produce an all-Asian adaptation of Hello Dolly!
Baayork Lee is an Asian-American actress that was a member of the original A Chorus
Line cast on Broadway.


Ben Brantley, Theater Review, Home is Where the Years Disappear, The Trip to Bountiful at the Soundheim Theater, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 23, 2013, available at http://theater.nytimes.com/2013/04/24/theater/reviews/the-trip-to-bountiful-at-the-stephen-sondheim-theater.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0. African-American actor, Cicely Tyson, was cast as the matriarch Mrs. Carrie Watts, and was supported by African-American actors, Cuba Gooding, Jr., Vanessa L. Williams, Condola Rashad, and white actor Tom Wopat who portrayed the “Sheriff” who is sent to search for Mrs. Watts in the Deep South during 1953.

See Janet I-Chin Tu, A Story To Tell -- Playwright August Wilson, Now Settled In Seattle's Misty Nest, Writes About The The Black Experience Like No Other Storyteller, SEATTLE TIMES, Jan. 18, 1998, available at http://community.seattletimes.nwsource.com/archive/?date=19980118&slug=2729219. August Wilson was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Fences and The Piano Lesson, the Tony Award for The Piano Lesson. His other plays include: Joe Turner’s Come and Gone, Radio Golf, Gem of the Ocean, Ma Rainey’s Black Bottom, King Hedley II, Seven Guitars, and Two Trains Running.

“In the summer of 1996, Wilson stunned the 500 people attending a conference of the Theater Communications Group, a national network of nonprofit drama institutions. Wilson presented a speech about the role of race in cultural identity, the underfunding of black theaters in America and, most controversially, his denunciation of color-blind casting, the practice of casting African-Americans and other non-Caucasians in roles originally created for white performers.” Tu states that “[t]o understand Wilson's opposition to color-blind casting, you have to appreciate that much of his life's work has been about [investigating], articulating and even helping to forge an African-American culture and identity (emphasis on the African heritage) that doesn't take second place to the dominant European culture in America.”
Ng, supra note 21, at 460.

See Solomon, supra note 205, at ¶ 12.

Id.


ABC News, supra note 249.

Id.; but see Brantley, supra note 250 (commenting on the fact that the principle actors are white and black “may underscore the division between the families,” however “it registers as irrelevant when they’re together).

See Jensen, supra note 218 and accompanying text.

See PLAYBILLVAULT.COM, supra note 23 (last visited on Dec. 1, 2013). After portraying the role of “Eponine” in Les Miserables, the show’s producers cast Lea Salonga in Miss Saigon in which she was awarded the Tony Award for “Actress in a Musical.” In the 2014 Broadway revival of Les Miserable, the producers cast African-American actress Nikki M. James in the role of “Eponine.” Cameron Mackintosh, the producer who challenged Actors’ Equity for the right to have total artistic control in the casting of the original production Miss Saigon cast both Salonga and James in the role of the French orphan girl in Les Miserables.

See Michael Kilian, Equal Opportunity Escapes Actors, CHI. TRIB., Aug. 13, 1998, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1998-08-13/features/9808130242_1_lynn-thigpen-roles-minorities (commenting on Audra McDonald’s acclaim on Broadway that has allowed her to play a servant in Ragtime and other non-race specific roles such as “Sharon,” an opera student Master Class”). Audra McDonald was awarded the Tony Award for “Featured Actress in a Play” for her portrayal of “Sharon” in Master Class.


Id.

Id. The blogger stated: “Gene Roddenberry [creator, screenwriter and producer of the original Star Trek television series] understood [the effects on society when casting an
[Roddenberry] purposely cast diverse actors in *Star Trek* because he envisioned a peaceful, diverse future for Earth. His series takes place in a fictional, science fiction environment, but he understood the power his portrayal of race had. He cast Nichelle Nichols as “Lieutenant Uhura,” a character that could probably have been played by an actress of any race. Casting a black actress in such an important role was rare for the 1960s, and having the character take part in television's first interracial kiss was enormously controversial. But Roddenberry wanted to make a statement, and the civil rights movement supported him. When [Nichols] seriously considered leaving the show, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. told her [that] she had to stay on because she was providing an important role model for young African-Americans [and others]. Race in casting makes a huge social impact.”


Id. Blank comments that the plot of *Memphis* may be simple, but the significance of the civil rights movement, time period in which the musical is set, “wasn’t just a political movement, . . . a cultural one.”

Id.


See Isherwood, supra note 262 (comparing *Memphis* to *Hairspray*’s popular music and racial divide in Baltimore during the 1960s).

See Blank, supra note 259. A black and white cast was necessary to demonstrate the racial tension between the races during the 1950s.

See SporkGoddess, Do You Think It’s Important for Rent to Have a Multiracial Cast?, BROADWAYWORLD.COM (Apr. 19, 2010 6:56 PM), http://www.broadwayworld.com/board/printthread.php?thread=1014665&boardid=1 (posting “The show’s book mentions absolutely nothing about their races in reference to their daily struggle. But I do believe the racial thing brings different aspect of thought to the audience and to the actor’s performance. And professional casting companies would most likely not cast a white Colins”).

Id. at Apr. 4, 2019 3:36 AM (posting that “this story has a lot to do with acceptance. We just accept the roles as is and the diversity not because the book or someone says, but rather we accept it because [it’s] in front of us, living”).
See Kilian, supra note 255.


See Jensen, supra note 33. Jensen responded to a guest post on the Mister Producer blog criticizing “colour-blind” casting.

Id. Jensen comments that the theater is almost exclusively controlled by Caucasian individuals, and that there is a need for the “creative team to be sensitive to accurately representing the cultural needs of a [play] and casting. . . .”

Id.

See William H. Honan, Casting for Change; Meeting Airs Frustrations of Minority and Disabled Actors, CHI.TRIB., Feb. 1, 1990, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1990-02-01/features/9001100027_1_able-bodied-actress-ethnic-minorities-actors-equity-association (using the example given by Donna Couteau Brooks of the Sac and Fox nation in Stroud, Oklahoma, of an American Indian actress seeking work as an actor portraying an Indian); see also Healy, supra 20, notes 24-27 and accompanying text.

Honan, supra note 272; see also Healy, supra 20, notes 24-27 and accompanying text.

Honan, supra note 272.


Honan, supra note 272.

Id.


Healy, supra 20, notes 24-27 and accompanying text.

See generally Healy, supra 20, notes 24-27 and accompanying text.

Id.

See supra text accompanying text note 33; and see supra notes 33-36 and accompanying text.

See Ng, supra note 21, at 456-57 (describing how non-traditional casting does not rectify the non-inclusion of Asian-Americans in the theater because it prevents considerations of race to remedy the situation).
Gener, supra note 268.

Id.

Witherspoon, supra note 35.

Id.

Healy, supra note 20.

Id.

Id.


Gener, supra note 268.

Id.

Id. “Trained” actors are generally those that have completed a two-year acting conservatory training, a Bachelor of Fine Arts, or a Master of Fine Arts in drama.

Healy, supra note 20.

See Ng, supra note 21, at 473.

Id. at 455. Actors’ Equity formally rejected Broadway producer, Cameron Mackintosh’s application for a white actor to be cast in a principal role as a Eurasian pimp in the Broadway production of Miss Saigon. In addition, Jonathan Pryce is not a United States citizen.

Healy, supra note 20.

Solomon, supra note 205, at ¶ 15.

Id. During the opening week of The Trip to Bountiful, the Sondheim Theatre sold 77 percent of its approximately 1,000 seats each night. Solomon states that there were a sizeable number of black patrons. See also PLAYBILLVAULT.COM, supra note 23 (last visited Dec. 1, 2013). According to Playbillvault.com, during the 2012-2013 season, the play sold 69.53% of its available seats throughout its official run on Broadway from April 23, 2013 to October 9, 2013. The play began previews on March 30, 2013, and was extended into the 2013-2014 season.

See PLAYBILLVAULT.COM, supra note 23 (last visited Dec. 1, 2013). Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, featuring an all-Caucasian cast, and sold 73.51% of its available seats during the 2012-2013 season. This play had a run from January 17, 2013 to March 30, 2013. Its previewed date was December 18, 2012.
Id. During the 2007-2008 season, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, featuring an all-African American cast, sold 91% of its available seats. This revival of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* previewed on February 12, 2008. The play opened on March 6, 2008 and closed June 22, 2008. Also see LONDONBROADWAY.COM, http://london.broadway.com/shows/cat-hot-tin-roof-london/photos/cat-on-a-hot-tin-roof-london-show-photos/ (last visited Dec. 1, 2013). Due to the play’s Broadway success, the producers revived the play on the West End in London, England.


Solomon, supra, Id. at para. 15. Marcia Pendleton is the president and founder of Walk Tall Girl Productions, a boutique marketing, audience development and group sales agency for the arts.

Id.

Id. Solomon noted that the black audience members willingly joined Ms. Tyson as she sang a “rousing” hymn during her performance as “Mrs. Carrie Watts.”

Healy, supra note 20.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

See Kim, supra note 66, at 417.

See Ng, supra note 21, at 456. Cameron Mackintosh cancelled the production of *Les Miserables* and, defended his right to have artistic control over the selection of actors cast in the musical.

Gener, supra note 268.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.
See N.Y. GEN. BUS. §§ 349-50, Ch. 20, Art. 22-A. In 2013, New York has proposed the Consumer Protection from Deceptive Acts and Procedures that provides private “right of action to an injured person” from violations of the statute to recover his “actual damages or fifty dollars, whichever is greater, or both such actions. The court may also, in its discretion, increase the award of damages to an amount not to exceed three times the actual damages up to one thousand dollars, if the court finds the defendant willfully or knowingly violated this section. The court may award reasonable attorney's fees to a prevailing plaintiff.”

See Id.; see also 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 13 and 45. Statutory and treble damages could be an alternative method of calculating damages for actors where actual monetary damages based on Actors Equity scale wages would not deter racial discrimination by producers or would not be worth the time and expense of filing a law suit.

See Onwuachi-Willing, supra 81, at 342 (stating that “[c]ases that challenge the use of race . . . in casting in general could move writers to include an explicit call for a diverse group of actors in their scripts, spur agents to send more actors of color to try out for roles in which the race of the character is not specified, or result in the hiring of a more racially diverse group of writers, directors, and producers).


See Onwuachi-Willing, supra note, at 343.


See generally Center for Urban Research, supra note 3; see also Roberts, supra notes 12-13 and accompanying text.

See generally supra § II(G): The Entertainment Industry’s Authenticity Requirement as a Business Necessity Defense.

See Ng, supra note 21, at 457. In reversing its position concerning the denial of Cameron Mackintosh’s application for a white actor to portray the Eurasian pimp in Miss Saigon, Actors’ Equity Association took into consideration Mackintosh’s willingness to provide vocal training for Asian actors to qualify them for consideration for roles in his Broadway musical.
See Armstrong, supra note 239. Dreamgirls and Tony Award-winning actress, Anika Noni Rose, stated that she relished the opportunity to be on Broadway in a purely dramatic production, for which she is better trained than musicals. See also NYTIMES.COM, Biography, Anika Noni Rose, http://www.nytimes.com/movies/person/355460/Anika-Noni-Rose/biography (last visited Dec. 1, 2013). Rose trained as an actor at the American Conservatory Theater in San Francisco, CA.

See supra accompanying text to note 330.

Id.

See generally William Esper, To MFA or Not to MFA? That is the Question, ESPERSTUDIO.COM., http://esperstudio.com/?page_id=38, (last visited Dec. 1, 2013). William Esper is an internationally recognized authority on the work of Sanford Meisner. He is the co-author (with Damon DiMarco) of The Actor’s Art and Craft: William Esper Teaches the Meisner Technique, published by Anchor/Random House in 2008. He is a graduate of Western Reserve University as well as the Neighborhood Playhouse School of the Theater where he was trained as an actor by Sanford Meisner. In 1962, he undertook training as a teacher and director with Meisner and proceeded to work closely with him as a teacher and director for the next 15 years. Mr. Esper was on the staff of the Neighborhood Playhouse from 1965 to 1977 and was Associate Director of the Playhouse Acting Department from 1974 to 1977. In 1977, he founded the Bachelor of Fine Arts and the Master of Fine Arts Professional Actor Training Programs at Rutgers University’s Mason Gross School of the Arts. He led the department until 2004. In 1965, Mr. Esper founded the New York studio where he has taught concurrently with his work at the Neighborhood Playhouse and Mason Gross School of the Arts. He continues to teach at his studio today.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Esper, supra note 334; see also ACTORSEQUITY.ORG, Education and Outreach, http://www.actorsequity.org/EducationOutreach/edoutreachhome.asp (last visited Dec. 3, 2013). The Actors’ Equity Association offers has a “Schedule An Equity Outreach Seminar” where a representative from Actors’ Equity could bring an “Outreach Seminar” to a school or student group could visit Actors’ Equity at its New York City Office.

Esper, supra note 334

Id.

Id.

See Ng, supra note 21, at 472-73. Ng suggests “increasing ethnic minority representation on the board of trustees of theater, arts, and education programs targeted at public high school students, theater productions specifically directed toward ethnic minority audiences, comprehensive internship programs for college and university students considering careers in professional theater . . . .” See also DRAMATISTSGUILD.COM, http://www.dramatistsguild.com/eventseducation/, (last visited Dec. 1, 2013). The Guild offers varied outreach events to members across the country to writers, no matter their age or level of experience. Some programs include the Dramatists Guild Fellows Program, seminars, Director/Dramatist Exchanges, Songwriter/Bookwriter Exchanges, and town hall member meetings across the country.

Cf. Jensen, supra note 33. Jensen comments that the theater is almost exclusively controlled by Caucasian individuals, and that there is a need for the “creative team to be sensitive to accurately representing the cultural needs of a [play] and casting. . . .”

Chen, supra note 58, at 539.

Id.


Id. at 79. In 1916, Angela Grimke’ wrote Rachel for the Drama Committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The play was the first play written, produced and performed by African-Americans in the New York theater. The play was produced at the Neighborhood Theater in New York City. In 1912, Lester Walton, an African American theater critic, formed the Lafayette Theater Stock Players in Harlem. The Lafayette Theater Stock company influenced the formation of the Lincoln Theatre Troupe at the Lincoln Theatre in New York, where in 1915 Scott Joplin presented a folk opera about real African American life, Treemonisha.

Id.

Id.
See Witherspoon, supra note 30. Witherspoon writing about an established African-American actor’s view that Broadway “lack of diversity in shows largely lies in the absence of black talent behind the scenes producing and directing shows.” See also VICTORLIRIO.COM, http://www.victorlirio.com/1/post/2012/06/interview-on-underrepresentation.html (last visited Dec. 3, 2013). Asian actor and Artistic Director of Diverse City Theater Co. in New York stated in his blog: “We, obviously, want to see ourselves represented on . . . Broadway. Stories about us, about people like us. In my opinion, if we want more content about Asians on Broadway, then we need to produce it ourselves. I cannot hold the commercial establishment responsible for the lack of content about Asians. For example, Hispanic-Americans represent a larger part of the national population than African Americans. But, there is more commercial theater about the African-American experience because there are African-Americans who rise up to leadership roles as producers producing theater about them. They are important members of the commercial theater establishment. Asians with wealth, on the other hand, do not take risks in the theater. Generally speaking, they are too fiscally responsible and probably do not view commercial theater as a sound financial investment because of the uncertainty of the return.”

See Id.; see also Keli Goff, Black Producers Still Rare on Broadway, THE ROOT, Apr. 30, 2013, http://www.theroot.com/articles/culture/2013/04/black_broadway_producers.How_comm on_are_they.html. “When it comes to those producers who are responsible for conceptualizing a project and bringing it to the stage, it may come down to just two. [Stephen Byrd and Alia Jones are] probably the only African-Americans on Broadway who . . . produce, choose the project, director, etc. . . . Alia Jones has been called the only woman of color . . . working as a lead producer on Broadway today. Their company, Front Row Productions, is responsible for such Broadway successes as . . . Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, [A Streetcar Named Desire, The Trip to Bountiful, and Romeo and Juliet.].

See Armstrong, supra note 239 (quoting Lou Myers stating: “[What is] great about [The Trip to Bountiful revision of an American classical drama featuring African-American actors in the principal roles] is . . . at times Broadway has been able to set the tone that other places in the industry follow.”).

See Id.

Id.