

# Multicultural Intelligence

**Eight Make-or-Break Rules  
for Marketing to Race, Ethnicity,  
and Sexual Orientation**

**DAVID R. MORSE**



Paramount Market Publishing, Inc.

Paramount Market Publishing, Inc.

950 Danby Road, Suite 136

Ithaca, NY 14850

www.paramountbooks.com

Telephone: 607-275-8100; 888-787-8100 Facsimile: 607-275-8101

Publisher: James Madden

Editorial Director: Doris Walsh

Copyright © 2009 David R. Morse

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. Further information may be obtained from Paramount Market Publishing, Inc., 950 Danby Road, Suite 136, Ithaca, NY 14850.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

All trademarks are the property of their respective companies.

Cataloging in Publication Data available

ISBN 978-0-9801745-6-4 *hardcover*

ISBN 978-0-9801745-9-5 *paperback*

# one

---

## Melting Pots, Multiculturalism, and Marketing to the New America

In 2004, Comedy Central's irreverent *South Park* series aired an episode titled, "Goobacks," a play on the anti-Mexican slur "wetbacks." Instead of a wave of immigration from a country to the south, the cartoon town of South Park must contend with an "invasion" by a time-traveler from the year 3040. We learn that his world (actually Earth) is overpopulated, and the one-way time travel portal will allow him to earn money his family will need more than a thousand years in the future. When he achieves success in shoveling snow for very low pay, more immigrants from the future arrive. A CNN newscast describes them as a "hairless, uniform mix of all races" with the same skin color—a light tan—and their language is also mixed from "all world languages." Working men in the town begin to react with rage. "THEY TOOK OUR JOBS!!" becomes a mantra of the working-class town's men throughout the episode, eventually morphing into a mangled and unintelligible chant of "Dey tuuk ur jerbs!" and devolving to, simply, "Derka DURRRR!" As more immigrants arrive, town residents begin to call them "goobacks," a pejorative term referring to the goo on their bodies, (a side effect of time-traveling, we're told).

Reluctantly, the town accommodates the immigrants, to a point where a future version of "English" is taught in school. Angered that the immigrants are taking their jobs, or "derka durrrr," the working class men hatch a plan to "become gay" in order to stop procreation,

and therefore ensure that goobacks, and all future generations, will never exist.

Given the rapidity at which the demographics are changing, the imaginations of *South Park* writers may provide about as much help as the projections of demographers and sociologists when it comes to the future makeup of the United States. Maybe in a thousand years, or a hundred years, we really will be a severely overcrowded nation of barely employed tan-skin ethnic hybrids who speak guttural “world languages.”

Peter Salins, an immigration scholar who is provost of the State Universities of New York, expressed a common frustration among those trying to figure out what we are to become: “I do not think that most Americans really understand the historic changes happening before their very eyes. What are we going to become? Who are we? How do the newcomers fit in—and how do the natives handle it—this is the great unknown.”

As the scholars and writers weigh in on the question of what is to become of us, we marketers must, at minimum, try to understand the new America of today, and what each new wrinkle in the fabric of society means for products, our brands, our companies. If we get it right, if we are able to crack the code on complex issues like assimilation and ethnic identity, we stand to make a lot of money. If we miss it, we risk becoming as meaningless as the buggy manufacturers of yesteryear who failed to see the emergence of the internal combustion engine.

### **Melting Pot or Salad Bowl?**

Writing of the Germans in 1751 Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin asked why should the “boors be suffered to swarm into our settlements and by herding together establish their language and manners to the exclusion of ours? Why should Pennsylvania, founded by the English, become a colony of aliens, who will shortly be so

numerous as to Germanize us instead of our Anglifying them?" In the 1850s, patrician Henry James wrote of the Boston Common: "No sound of English, in a single instance escaped their lips; the greater number spoke a rude form of Italian, the others some out-land dialect unknown to me." Sound familiar?

In order to better grasp how to market to today's new immigrants in America, it's important to predict how they might integrate with the mainstream. In the early twentieth century, cities like New York and Chicago swelled with immigrant populations from Poland, Italy, and Germany. In 1910 Chicago, 70 percent of the people were either immigrants or children of immigrants. Woodrow Wilson described the new immigrants as "men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor initiative of any quick intelligence" and "sordid and hapless elements." Yet they integrated.

➤ *In order to better grasp how to market to today's new immigrants in America, it's important to predict how they might **integrate** with the mainstream.*

In his 1916 bestseller *The Passing of the Great Race*, Madison Grant blames "the agitation over slavery" for distracting Americans from forging a "national opposition to the intrusion of hordes of immigrants of inferior racial value." Sociologist Herbert J. Gans wrote that the mass migration of "swarthy Jews, 'black' Irish, and Italian 'guineas'" terrified the lighter-skinned native-born Americans, most of whom were of English and German stock.

It took a while for groups like the Irish, Italians, and Jews to find their way into the mainstream. In the 1930s, a generation after the largest wave of immigration in the country's history until now, the children of immigrants were still being vilified as foreigners. During the 1935 World Series, Cubs players and fans went out of control hurling anti-Semitic taunts at Hank Greenberg of the Detroit Tigers, causing umpire George Moriarty to stop the game. (An interesting side note, the baseball commissioner later fined Moriarty \$250 for using profanity in demanding that Cubs players stop their bigoted remarks, but did not fine any Cubs players.)

The biggest immigrant group at the start of the 21st century is

Hispanics, (a term I will use interchangeably with Latinos). Millions of today's Hispanic immigrants cross the perilous Mexican-U.S. border with the intention of making money and one day returning home, a hope that is usually shattered when their U.S.-born children don't want to leave the country of their birth. One factor that many argue might preclude the assimilation of Latinos is the sheer magnitude of their immigration in the last 35 years. In the early twentieth century, about 85 percent of immigrants came from one continent, Europe, but they spoke a plethora of languages: Yiddish, Italian, Russian, Polish, German, Hungarian, and English. Over

➤ *Over half of today's immigrants come from a single region, Latin America, and speak one language, Spanish*

half of today's immigrants come from a single region, Latin America, and speak one language, Spanish. Of those immigrating from around the world between 2000 and 2006, over one-third came from a single country, Mexico.

In the early twentieth century, ethnic media helped maintain a sense of community, and hundreds of newspapers sprung up in urban areas throughout the Northeast and Midwest. In today's U.S. Hispanic market, one TV network, Univision, has reached behemoth status, on occasion trumping all other networks in English or Spanish. Univision's primetime *telenovelas* reach between 20 and 30 percent of Hispanic households, and into the 40th percentile for those households with their television sets on. Rather than fragmenting ethnic groups like the ethnic press of old, Univision has been a tremendous unifying force. And it has allowed advertisers unprecedented reach to sell products to Latinos around the country.

An important difference between then and now is the current atmosphere of tolerance for diversity in the United States, what some have called the "culture of multiculturalism." San Diego's city council stopped using the term "minority" and other pejorative connotations in official documents in 2001 in favor of more respectful ethnic labels. Today's young Hispanics hear Reggaetón music on mainstream radio stations with DJs who sprinkle their speech with

Spanglish. They are proud of their language and their culture. They are proud of the fact that non-Hispanics are eating their food and listening to their music. Like the immigrants of old, they are making an indelible mark on the mainstream.

Multiculturalism is a double-edged sword, however. On the one hand, it makes it okay for ethnic groups to maintain an identity that is distinct from the mainstream. At the same time, it makes it easier for those immigrants who choose to assimilate to do so.

Clearly there are differences between today's immigrants and those of earlier generations. However, many sociologists have concluded that the differences have been over-hyped and that the melting pot is as real today as it was in the past. In their book *Remaking the American Mainstream*, Richard Alba and Victor Nee argue that the process of assimilation works in much the same way as it always has. What is needed is a reformulation of assimilation; one that accounts not only for the fact that immigrants are changed by the mainstream, but also the reality that the mainstream is, and always has "evolved through incremental inclusion of ethnic and racial groups that formerly were excluded."

➡ Many sociologists have concluded that the differences have been **over-hyped** and that the melting pot is as real today as it was in the past.

As Alba and Nee point out, assimilation is a two-way street. Immigrants are transformed by America but America is also transformed, even redefined, by immigrants. Let us be reminded that it was not that long ago that pizza, bagels, and apple *strudel*—er, I mean *pie*—were considered foreign foods. And words like graffiti, ballerina, confetti, schmuck, and tuchus were non-comprehensible to most Americans.

Even if the term melting pot applied 100 years ago, it doesn't fit today. Demographers and social historians have adopted a new phrase, the "salad bowl," to describe a united nation of peoples who bump into each other and share the same space (and laws), but retain what makes them "special," and prefer not to blend in, at least not too much.

Now we have our first multicultural President, with a father from Kenya and a mother from Kansas, raised in Hawaii and in Indonesia, with an Asian sister, and who is astoundingly comfortable in his own skin. In his first press conference as President-elect, Barack Obama referred to himself as a “mutt,” a self-effacing way of saying that he, like an increasing number of Americans, is the sum of many identities. Putting politics and party and ideology aside, Barack Obama is, at least demographically, much more like the future of the United States than its past.

Is it possible that the nation will fracture into many disconnected communities with no shared commonality or purpose—a salad bar, to extend the food metaphor to ridiculousness? Or will it become something between a salad bar and a salad bowl, a pluralistic society with some core values about capitalism and citizenship, but with minimal interaction among groups? No one can say for sure what our nation will be like fifty years down the road.

### **The new multicultural marketing**

Multicultural marketing is based on the idea that there are discrete cultures in America, ethnic or otherwise, that have distinct identities that separate them from the mainstream. It assumes that they have unique needs when it comes to the types of brands or products they buy and that they need to be communicated with differently in order to be persuaded to become customers. It is based on the premise that they do not respond to advertising the way the mainstream does, either because they do not speak English or because their culture and history are so different. The chapters in this book will examine what makes the major multicultural groups different from the mainstream and from each other, as well some ideas on how to avoid the most common pitfalls, like stereotyping or assuming that things don't change.

My company, New American Dimensions, conducts market

research for companies or organizations that want to target multicultural people. We call them the new Americans because our country is going through a demographic and cultural overhaul and more and more, they represent the people that we are most likely to live next door to, interact with at the supermarket, or marry. Or be.

If the words of the 19th-century philosopher Auguste Comte, “demography is destiny,” still ring true, then it is the destiny of America to be a country of predominately brown people. The convergence of two forces, an aging white population and explosive immigration from Latin America and Asia, is leading to what many have called the “browning of America.”

The statistics are impressive. The three biggest hyphenated segments, Hispanic-, Asian-, and African-Americans, make up over 30 percent of the U.S. population—40 percent if you look at just those under 18. Since younger Americans tend to be brown, it is expected that by about the year 2042, white non-Hispanics will drop to less than half the population. Barring any remarkable reversal of current trends, Hispanics will outnumber Anglos sometime in the early 22nd century.

☞ *It is expected that by about the year 2042, white non-Hispanics will drop to **less than half** the population.*

In economic terms, these demographic shifts reflect big changes in terms of who has and spends dollars. Multicultural consumers mean big money. In 2007, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and African Americans made up \$2.2 trillion in purchasing power. Add openly gay and lesbian adults to the equation (and allowing for some double counting) and the total goes up to \$2.9 trillion. That’s larger than the gross domestic product (GDP) of every country in the world except China, Japan, India, and of course, the United States.

It’s no wonder that both large and small organizations are hiring companies like mine to figure out what all this demographic upheaval means. The economic need to understand and ultimately reach multicultural consumers has spawned an industry of advertisers, strategists, media planners, newspapers, radio stations, tele-

vision networks, and market researchers. Add to that the many multicultural marketing and diversity departments and the people who work in them and you've got a mega-infrastructure of business-people poised to capitalize on the New America. Welcome to the world of multicultural marketing.

The pioneers of multicultural marketing were the African-American advertising agencies that were created in the 1960s and 1970s, though it has been the immigration explosion since the 1970s that has led to multicultural marketing's precipitous rise. Many clients now feel that because they speak English, African Americans can be reached with mainstream advertising, despite cultural differences. It's a logical conclusion, though I believe, an erroneous one. For the last 25 years, the mantra of Hispanic and Asian American advertising agencies has been "in-language and in-culture messaging." For many of these consumers, in-language has come to mean English.

➤ *The state of multicultural marketing is in flux and possible jeopardy.*

The state of multicultural marketing is in flux and possible jeopardy. At the same time that African-American agencies are losing multicultural corporate budgets to Hispanic agencies, the Hispanic agencies face an even more formidable challenge: assimilation, or its more politically correct cousin, acculturation.

Since 1970, the growth of the Hispanic and Asian-American populations has been driven by immigration. But since then, there has been plenty of time for an entire U.S.-born generation to reach adulthood. In 2007, 85 percent of Hispanics and 76 percent of Asian Americans under the age of nineteen were born in the United States. There is one constant amidst all this change—U.S.-born children speak English. If not by the time they enter school, then certainly by the time they finish the first or second grade. And that means trouble for the zealots who staked their fortunes on equating multicultural marketing with marketing in a language other than English.

That is not good news, for example, to the Spanish-language

television networks and Hispanic advertising agencies that have had a lock on this business for the last 25 years. The reaction of each has fluctuated between denial, defensiveness, and dread at the suggestion that today's younger generation, the source of the Hispanic market's exponential growth, prefers English. Their reaction, however delusional, is not irrational. Should corporate America decide, as many did with African Americans, that they can reach English-speaking Hispanics with their mainstream advertising, the result would be devastating to the agencies—as long as they limit themselves to being “Spanish-language agencies” as many do.

The politics play out on multiple levels. A large swathe of advertising agencies—Hispanic, African American, Asian, general market or otherwise—are owned by large marketing conglomerates like Interpublic Group, WPP Group, or Omnicom Group. If a client switches Hispanic dollars to English, the conglomerate's Hispanic agency might lose that chunk of the business to its general market counterpart. And though it's all in the family, each agency is still responsible for delivering its own return on investment. I've seen the politics rage just as fiercely within the client's own organization. A company's multicultural-marketing department might control the budget for Hispanic marketing dollars in Spanish. Change to English, though, and the dollars move to the general marketing budget. Or they simply disappear. If Hispanics speak English, then they will be reached with a mainstream campaign. At least that's the argument.

The idea of marketing to Hispanics began only a few decades ago when a group of primarily Cuban immigrant pre-revolution advertising executives from Havana found an opportunity for non-English speakers who were not being reached by mainstream advertising. In those days, Hispanic immigration was relatively new, and there were thousands of Hispanics starving for Spanish-language advertising. So when this charismatic group started knocking on the doors of corporate America to sell them on Spanish-language advertising,

television networks and Hispanic advertising agencies that have had a lock on this business for the last 25 years. The reaction of each has fluctuated between denial, defensiveness, and dread at the suggestion that today's younger generation, the source of the Hispanic market's exponential growth, prefers English. Their reaction, however delusional, is not irrational. Should corporate America decide, as many did with African Americans, that they can reach English-speaking Hispanics with their mainstream advertising, the result would be devastating to the agencies—as long as they limit themselves to being “Spanish-language agencies” as many do.

The politics play out on multiple levels. A large swathe of advertising agencies—Hispanic, African American, Asian, general market or otherwise—are owned by large marketing conglomerates like Interpublic Group, WPP Group, or Omnicom Group. If a client switches Hispanic dollars to English, the conglomerate's Hispanic agency might lose that chunk of the business to its general market counterpart. And though it's all in the family, each agency is still responsible for delivering its own return on investment. I've seen the politics rage just as fiercely within the client's own organization. A company's multicultural-marketing department might control the budget for Hispanic marketing dollars in Spanish. Change to English, though, and the dollars move to the general marketing budget. Or they simply disappear. If Hispanics speak English, then they will be reached with a mainstream campaign. At least that's the argument.

The idea of marketing to Hispanics began only a few decades ago when a group of primarily Cuban immigrant pre-revolution advertising executives from Havana found an opportunity for non-English speakers who were not being reached by mainstream advertising. In those days, Hispanic immigration was relatively new, and there were thousands of Hispanics starving for Spanish-language advertising. So when this charismatic group started knocking on the doors of corporate America to sell them on Spanish-language advertising,

it was an easy sale. And it's easy to see how the equating of Spanish-language advertising with marketing to Hispanics took hold and exploded with the exploding population.

But the population changed. The immigrants learned English. And more significantly, their children grew up in the United States. Some of them became advertising executives. In the 1990s, a new generation of Hispanics, young, increasingly affluent and comfortable with English, began to emerge (or at least become recognized). They realized that the party line that blindly defended Spanish-language advertising was short sighted. Clearly Hispanics speak both languages and to refuse to acknowledge this would be the kiss of death. Early in the new millennium, the battle lines were drawn between the old guard of Hispanic agencies together with Univision, and the new.

➡ *In Hispanic marketing circles, it has been **heresy** to say that Latinos prefer English.*

It's no surprise that in Hispanic marketing circles, it has been heresy to say that Latinos, U.S.-born or otherwise, prefer English. But things are changing.

One organization, the New Generation Latino Consortium (NGLC), was founded with the stated purpose of "raising the marketing profile of a burgeoning yet underserved segment of the U.S. Hispanic population, known as New Generation Latinos." New Generation Latinos are the ones who prefer English; they are underserved because for too long, corporate America was under the spell of the no-English party line, so until very recently, all marketing directed at U.S. Hispanics was done in Spanish.

In the world of Hispanic marketing, many have ceased to demonize the seven-letter word "English." They realize that America lives up to its reputation for being the graveyard of all other languages. There is an even more sinister word, however, called "assimilation," defined by Alba and Nee as "the attenuation of distinctions based on ethnic origin." If assimilation does occur with today's ethnics, if ethnic distinctions go away, then multicultural marketing becomes extinct.

We should keep in mind when we are talking about assimilation that it is a phenomenon that applies to immigrant populations, and also to Native Americans, but only those that have emerged from reservations after generations of forced isolation. It does not apply to African Americans, who have lived nearly 400 years in what is now the United States, yet who were first enslaved, later segregated, nearly always oppressed. Because of the unnatural separation that occurred between blacks and whites, very distinct cultures emerged that continue to the present day.

Assimilation is an irrelevant term when it comes to African Americans, since it is doubtful given American history that African Americans will lose their racial or cultural distinctiveness any time soon, especially when taking into consideration that blacks have always been exposed to white culture. Rather, the contrary is occurring; more whites than ever are exposed to black culture.

In the case of African Americans, a more relevant term is integration, meaning the bringing together of two discrete cultures. Integration was the goal in the early days of the civil rights movement, and although legal barriers that kept whites and blacks apart have been removed, African Americans and whites continue to inhabit very separate worlds. It is for the future to decide how the immigration and assimilation of largely non-white populations will impact the historic American dichotomy of black and white.

### **The long road to visibility**

In their book, *Minorities and Media: Diversity and the End of Mass Communication*, (Sage Publications, 1985) Clint C. Wilson II and Felix Gutierrez wrote that advertisers in the U.S. had reflected minorities by “either ignoring them or, when they have been included in advertisements for the mass media audience, by processing and presenting them so as to make them palatable salespersons for the products being advertised.” If people of color or gays appeared at

all in commercials, they had to be presented in a way that would make people in the mainstream feel good about themselves, not threatened. But because an appearance was so rare, minorities were glad just to see themselves.

The earliest attempts by advertisers to show people of color in mainstream ads were, when seen through the eyes of the 21st century, shocking, consisting of exaggerated images of black slaves to sell products to white consumers. Marilyn Kern-Foxworth describes the portrayal of blacks in the 1940s and beyond in her amazing book, *Aunt Jemima, Uncle Ben and Rastus: Blacks in Advertising, Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (Greenwood Press, 1994): “The mouth was opened unusually wide and filled with large and/or carnivorous white teeth encased by exceptionally large, thick, ruby-red protruding lips. The eyes in these advertisements were most often seen bulging uncontrollably with ecstatic fright.”

Ads featuring distorted images of blacks were popular through the 1940s, showing up in all the advertising vehicles of the times. It was common to find products bearing the brand name “nigger.” There were “Nigger Head” brand canned fruits and vegetables, stove polish, tobacco, and oysters. Black children were often labeled as “pickaninnies” as in Pickaninny brand peanut butter. A typical portrayal of blacks was as African cannibals with a bone through the nose. Soap companies loved to use images of African Americans, claiming that their product was so powerful that it “had the power to cleanse the black skin of Negroes and miraculously change it to white.”

➔ *Despite the prevalence of African-American images in mainstream advertising, advertisers mostly **ignored** them as consumers until the 1960s.*

Despite the prevalence of African-American images in mainstream advertising, albeit distorted, African Americans were mostly ignored as consumers by advertisers until the 1960s, an astounding fact given that as early as 1920 there were over 11 million African Americans in the United States.

A breakthrough came in 1963, when the *New York Herald Tribune*

and other mainstream newspapers ran an ad for the New York Telephone Company featuring a well-dressed, non-stereotypical African-American man. It showed him walking to a phone booth with the caption “A man of action knows—you get action when you telephone.” The portrayal was so extraordinary that it made news. The lead from one newspaper read: “What might well be the first use of a Negro model in general circulation publications was published in this and other metropolitan area newspapers yesterday by the New York Telephone Company.” Four years later, one of the earliest examples of a multicultural marketing campaign came about. A series of posters in New York showed photographs of a smiling Asian American, African American, and Native American holding a sandwich with the tagline, “You don’t have to be Jewish to love Levy’s real Jewish Rye.”

A *Time* magazine article from 1969, “The Black Man in the Grey Flannel Suit,” about the rise of the black middle class and a burgeoning African American market would help precipitate a paradigm shift in the mind of corporate America. Large companies were not just seeing advertising to African Americans as a way to avoid censure from black activists and the government. They were finally beginning to see viable consumers with disposable income to spend on their products. Multicultural marketing was starting to take on wings.

As with early depictions of blacks, Hispanics were portrayed as cartoon-ish, if they were shown at all. Probably the best-known depiction of a Hispanic in an ad campaign was at times human and at times plantain—Chiquita Banana. Developed by the United Fruit Company, later renamed Chiquita, she first hit the radio waves in 1944, singing the now famous jingle, designed to teach Americans how to ripen bananas. She was at first depicted as a banana, but was soon brought to life by actresses and elevated to celebrity status, becoming a ubiquitous presence on commercials, television programs, and the movies. Her form has evolved over the years,

➤ *As with early depictions of blacks, Hispanics were portrayed as cartoon-ish, if they were shown at all.*

but a constant has been her fruit-laden hat, ruffled skirt, heels, thick Spanish accent, and rumba dancing. She was never the subject of any serious controversy, but the Carmen Miranda knock-off burned the image of the Latina spitfire firmly into the American consciousness.

An early use of a Latin character in advertising was on a 1940's avocado crate label for "Lazy Peon" brand California avocados. It depicts a man sleeping under a giant sombrero with a cactus and a small village in the background. A large foot and prominent big toe in sandals pokes out from under the sombrero. The whole picture equates the afternoon siesta with laziness.

Frito-Lay debuted the "Frito Bandito" in 1967, an animated sombrero-sporting, mustachioed Mexican who steals Fritos and sings "I am the Frito Bandito" to the tune of the Mexican classic "Cielito Lindo." Voiced with a thick, stereotypical Mexican accent by Mel Blanc, the ad contained the warning "Caution: He loves cronchy Frito corn chips so much he'll stop at nothing to get yours. What's more, he's cunning, clever—and sneaky!" The chip bandit was met with immediate protests by the Mexican Anti-Defamation Committee, which accused Frito-Lay of spreading the image of Mexicans as gun-toting thieves. The company responded by toning down the accent, erasing his gold tooth, and making the character less leering and more cheerful. That wasn't sufficient. Under the threat of a Hispanic boycott, a \$610 million lawsuit (\$100 for each Mexican American), and pressure from Congress, local television stations, and the press, Frito-Lay reluctantly retired the character in 1971.

The first representations of Asian Americans in the mid-1800s were depictions of Chinese men used to sell rat poison and laundry products to whites. Trade cards (a postcard-like precursor to the in-store sales flyer) for a "Rough On Rats Vermin Exterminator" service depict a "Chinaman" about to place a rat in his mouth, evoking the logic that since Asians eat rats, they make good exterminators. Laundry ads, like Lavine Soap, sported Chinese mascots because

an endorsement from a Chinese laundry-man suggested the soap must be effective.

The Chinese laundry stereotype would prove to have remarkable longevity. In 1972, an ad for Calgon water softener featured a Caucasian woman picking up her sparkingly clean clothes at a Chinese laundry. When she asks the proprietor, Mr. Lee, how he does it, he sagely responds with a heavy accent that it is an “ancient Chinese secret.” At that point his wife barges out of the backroom to announce, “We need more Calgon!” in unaccented American English. Though many criticized this ad for its stereotyping, others defended it as satirizing the stereotype.

Gays and lesbians, until fairly recently, were the least visible of all groups. The few times they were shown, it was in a way that only wise and aware gays would get it. According to Mike Wilke, founder of the

➤ *Gays and lesbians, until fairly recently, were the **least** visible of all groups.*

Commercial Closet, gay reference in the early 1900s was a coded affair, with red ties symbolizing homosexuality in New York’s gay underworld. A 1917 ad for Ivory soap, illustrated by gay artist J.C. Leyendecker, shows a group of handsome, naked young men in the shower, exchanging admiring glances. In a 1923 ad for Standard Plumbing fixtures, a man in a red bathrobe with the bathtub behind him gets a light for his cigarette from another man, apparently his “roommate.” A print ad for Smirnoff vodka in a 1958 edition of *Esquire* magazine features two men in business suits with drinks in their hands. The tag line reads “Mixed or straight—it leaves you breathless!” It features two dandyish men, one with his arm behind the other, staring at him daintily.

In the last few years, there has been a growing interest in gays and lesbians. Their politically correct designation is the LGBT community, standing for lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender people, though the “B” and the “T” are often ignored in real-world marketing.

Programs like *Will and Grace* and *Queer as Folk* have helped make

mainstream America comfortable with having gays in their homes, at least on television. The result is gay and lesbian multicultural marketing, and increasingly companies are looking at gays as another multicultural segment that deserves attention. Still, there are many pitfalls in targeting or not targeting LGBT consumers. Gays and radical religious right organizations have been in a constant and acrimonious tug of war: gays, on one hand, saying they deserve honest representation, and groups like the Mississippi-based American Family Association (AFA), threatening to punish companies for vocal support of such “degenerates.” Groups like AFA are on the wrong side of history, however, and later I will explain how dancing with bigots is an increasingly losing battle for corporate America.

### Hitting the bull’s eye

Multicultural marketing is a fluid thing. Those of us trying to hit the multicultural bull’s eye are constantly confronted with a moving target. There are emerging multicultural markets that are getting more attention today—Eastern Europeans, Middle Easterners, and Africans, for example, and there will be more in the future. Today’s multicultural groups may assimilate into the mainstream or change it so profoundly that they will no longer be considered part of multicultural marketing’s sphere of interest. Just where that bull’s eye is today, and where it will be in the future, are the two fundamental questions that the following chapters will endeavor to answer.

☞ *Scores of marketers don’t understand what makes the new Americans tick.*

The problem is that there are scores of marketers who don’t understand what makes the new Americans tick. Some are daunted by the prospect of marketing to an unfamiliar consumer group; others make stupid mistakes.

In my experience, some of the world’s best marketers, the large global corporations, are whizzes at marketing around the planet. They source materials around the world, have plants and labor

forces in multiple countries, sell their products via sophisticated distribution networks, and seamlessly adapt their marketing campaigns to the idiosyncrasies of local markets while remaining faithful to a core marketing strategy. Yet when it comes to marketing to gays, or African Americans, Hispanics, or Asian Americans, they go glassy-eyed. It is my sincere hope that after reading these pages, you will have a deeper, richer understanding of today's newest consumers, and what it means for your business. I'll look at what motivates multicultural consumers to faithfully buy certain products or brands and boycott others. I'll also give some insight into what makes the multicultural marketing industry tick and how big multicultural dollars mean that those in charge of spending don't always act in their own best interest or that of their clients. Ultimately, my goal is that you will be sufficiently armed with the rules of the new American to not fear it, but to support and nurture it. If you can make an honest buck in the process, even better.