

ARTICLE

"Racial realism II: Are folk races real?"

Quayshawn Spencer 

University of Pennsylvania

Correspondence

Quayshawn Spencer, University of Pennsylvania, Department of Philosophy, 249 South 36th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.

Email: qspencer@upenn.edu

Abstract

This article is Part II in a pair of articles on racial realism. In Part I, I defined "racial realism" and discussed the major attempts in the past twenty years among metaphysicians of race and biologists to defend racial realism from the viewpoint of what biologists mean by "race." In this article, I continue discussing and critiquing how metaphysicians of race have conceived of and defended racial realism, but with a focus on how ordinary people use "race." I focus on two broad groups of racial realisms in this article: biological racial realism and social racial realism. After defining each one, I summarize a representative sample of recent attempts from metaphysicians of race to defend both types of racial realism. I also discuss major criticisms against each attempt. I end by sketching a new, radical pluralist way of being a racial realist, and I provide some empirical motivation for why it's promising.

1 | INTRODUCTION

In Part I, I characterized *racial realism* as the view that race is real, with the understanding that what's real is whatever actually exists. Then, I looked at two broad types of racial realism that have been defended in the metaphysics of race and biology literature in the past twenty years: subspecies realism and ecotype realism. In this article, I will focus on recent attempts to defend racial realism from metaphysicians of race when "race" is defined by ordinary people as opposed to biologists. These attempts fall into two broad groups: biological racial realism and social racial realism. After defining each type of racial realism, I summarize and discuss a representative sample of recent attempts to defend each type of racial realism. Afterward, I sketch a new, radical pluralist approach to defending racial realism and I provide some empirical motivation for why it's promising.

2 | IS RACE REAL IN ANY ORDINARY USE OF "RACE"?

2.1 | Defenses of biological racial realism

With respect to ordinary uses of "race," there have been four major defenses of race as biologically real (a.k.a. *biological racial realism*) among metaphysicians of race in recent years.¹ Below are the views about what race is from these four scholars in the relevant ordinary context and in chronological order:

1. In at least “the United States,” a “race” is “a group of persons who share, more or less, biologically transmitted physical characteristics that, under the influence of endogenous cultural and geographical factors as well as exogenous social and political factors, contribute to the characterization of the group as a distinct, self-reproducing, encultured population” (Outlaw, 1996, 9, 136).
2. According to “folk biological conceptions of race,” “race can be best understood in terms of one’s experience of his or her body, one’s interactions with other individuals, and one’s experiences within particular cultures and societies,” which is an “ecological notion of race” (Kendig, 2013, 192, 195, 212).²
3. Currently, “the US meaning of ‘race’ is just the set of populations at the K = 5 level of human population structure” (Spencer, 2014, 1026).³
4. According to “ordinary uses of the English word ‘race’ and its cognates,” a “race” is a “group of human beings (C1) that, as a group, is distinguished from other groups of human beings by *patterns of [racial] visible physical features*, (C2) whose members are linked by a *common ancestry* peculiar to members of the group, and (C3) that originates from a *distinctive geographic location*.” (Hardimon, 2017, 27, 31).⁴

Just like I did in Part I, I will not discuss each defense of racial realism mentioned above. Instead, I’ll just choose one to discuss as representative of the group. So, in what follows, I’ll discuss Hardimon’s defense of biological racial realism because it’s the newest defense of the view to date and it uses as evidence very recent and hotly debated results from population genetics.

For review, Hardimon’s argument for biological racial realism is akin to Mayr’s argument for subspecies realism. Hardimon clarifies what he means by “race” and then attempts to use empirical evidence to show that races exist (in the relevant sense), and so, race (in the relevant sense) is real. However, unlike Mayr, Hardimon takes special care to show that the races identified are biologically real, and so, that race (in the relevant sense) is biologically real.⁵ Also, unlike Mayr, Hardimon is interested in showing that race is biologically real in an ordinary sense of “race” as opposed to a biological sense of “race.” Let’s start with what Hardimon thinks race is.

As I mentioned in (7), Hardimon’s defense of biological racial realism is aimed at defending the biological reality of race in “ordinary uses of the English word ‘race’ and its cognates” (Hardimon, 2017, 27). So, Hardimon is not just concerned with how “race” is used among English speakers, but he is primarily concerned with that linguistic community.⁶ Since Hardimon is primarily concerned with English speakers and since it’d be cumbersome to say “and its cognates” over and over again, I’ll drop “and its cognates” when discussing Hardimon’s view about what race is.

Using a combination of empirical data, intuition-based thought experiments, and two theoretical virtues, Hardimon (2017, 30) abductively infers (C1)–(C3), as stated in (7), as constituting the “core” of “the ordinary concept of race” among English speakers. For convenience, Hardimon (2017, 31) dubs (C1)–(C3) “the minimalist concept of race.” However, I should pause here to clarify something that’s really important to understand about Hardimon’s view.

Hardimon is a *pluralist* when it comes to what race is for English speakers. In his words, “*race is not one thing...* There is no concept that is the concept of race—no one ‘thing’, no one item, no one reality or unreality that *is* race” (Hardimon, 2017, 173). However, it might be hard to see how Hardimon (2017, 30) is a pluralist about what race is for English speakers when he’s identifying a single concept of race (the minimalist concept of race) as capturing the “core” of the ordinary concept of race. The solution to this puzzle is to understand what Hardimon thinks the ordinary concept of race is.

Even though the following might be misleading, several metaphysicians of race use terms like “the ordinary concept of race,” “the folk concept of race,” and “the US meaning of ‘race’” to pick out the “dominant” meaning of “race” in the linguistic community of interest with full acknowledgement that “race” may have multiple meanings in that community (Haslanger, 2012, 304–305; Spencer, 2014, 1026; Glasgow, forthcoming). In Hardimon’s case, he definitely thinks that the ordinary concept of race is simply the dominant meaning of “race” among English speakers as opposed to the only one used within that group, and he thinks that the minimalist concept of race is, as a matter of fact, identical to the ordinary concept of race.⁷

After Hardimon articulates the minimalist concept of race, he goes on to argue that “minimalist race” (as he calls it) is biologically real because, first, there are “minimalist races” in the human species and, second, the minimalist race itself has “explanatory value in biology,” is “intrinsically interesting” in biology, and the differences that make something a minimalist race exist “at the level of the gene” (Hardimon, 2017, 94). Hardimon (2017, 94) does not say that the above criteria must be satisfied in order for a kind to be biologically real, but rather, that these criteria in “their totality” are sufficient for making a kind biologically real. Now, let’s look at Hardimon’s evidence for his view.

Hardimon’s evidence for why the minimalist concept of race is the ordinary concept of race among English speakers is threefold. First, Hardimon (2017, 30) points out that 17 “archetypical examples” of races in the history of the English language turn out to be minimalist races. These races are Carl Linnaeus’s four varieties of people (African, American, Asiatic, and European),⁸ J. F. Blumenbach’s five races (American, Ethiopian, Caucasian, Malay, and Mongolian), UNESCO’s three major races (Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid), and the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB’s) 1997 races (American Indian, Asian, Black, Pacific Islander, and White).

Second, Hardimon uses an intuition-based thought experiment to provide additional support for (C2).⁹ In a non-actual possible world that Hardimon (2017, 48) calls “the permuted world,” he imagines that a whole generation of “black-looking” parents gives birth to a whole generation of “white-looking” children who (after reaching reproductive age) give birth to a whole generation of “Asian-looking” children who (after reaching reproductive age) give birth to a whole generation of black-looking children, and that this process repeats itself indefinitely. Using only his intuitions, Hardimon (2017, 47–48) declares that, after enough iterations, English speakers would not regard the white-looking people, black-looking people, and Asian-looking people in the permuted world to be “races” because they fail to be “ancestry groups.”¹⁰

Third, Hardimon (2017, 50) provides additional “philological support” for (C3). Hardimon (2017, 50-51) points out that almost all of the names of the 17 archetypical examples of races that he has presented implicate the geographic region that is (or was) thought to be the place of “geographical origin” for the race that the name designates. For example, Hardimon points out that all of Linnaeus’s race terms and all of Blumenbach’s race terms are associated with geographic regions that Linnaeus or Blumenbach surmised to be the geographical origin of the race.

After advancing these three sources of evidence, Hardimon uses two theoretical virtues to abductively infer (C1)–(C3) as the content of the ordinary concept of race for English speakers. First, Hardimon (2017, 30) appeals to the “empirical plausibility” of (C1)–(C3) in terms of its ability to make “the best possible sense” out of all three of the phenomena above. Next, Hardimon (2017, 56-57) appeals to the “coherence” of (C1)–(C3), since they are all “mutually consistent.”

With respect to the biological reality of minimalist race, Hardimon appeals to a single source of evidence that comes from recent work in population genetics on the structure of biological populations in humans. In a groundbreaking *Science* article in 2002, Noah Rosenberg and his colleagues used a new computer program known as *structure* to divide humans into hierarchical levels of “genetic clusters” using a large and diverse sample of non-functional alleles in the human genome and a large and diverse sample of human ethnic groups (Rosenberg, Pritchard, et al., 2002, 2381).

Some of the levels of genetic clusters that Rosenberg et al. (2002) discovered merely reflected a subdivision into genetic clusters, but some of them reflected a subdivision into *biological populations*. One level that reflected biological populations was the level that divided people into five continental clusters (a.k.a. the “K = 5 level”). The K = 5 level is composed of “black Africans, Caucasians, East Asians, Amerindians, and Oceanians” (Hardimon, 2017, 93). However, I will call these groups “Africans,” “Eurasians,” “East Asians,” “Native Americans,” and “Oceanians” from now on. In the population-genetic literature, populations with continental ranges are sometimes called “continental populations” (Bamshad et al., 2003, 586). However, for ease of reference, I will call these and only these populations the *human continental populations*. Finally, as Hardimon (2017, 87) points out, Rosenberg et al.’s K = 5 result has been robust (69% frequency)¹¹ across all human genetic clustering studies that have been in the position to test it. But also, Rosenberg et al.’s K = 5 result has been reproduced in the most comprehensive human genetic clustering study to date, which is from Trevor Pemberton, DeGiorgio, and Rosenberg (2013).¹²

Hardimon uses Rosenberg et al.’s K = 5 result for a buffet of metaphysical results. First, Hardimon (2017, 85, 93) claims that each human continental population is a minimalist race in virtue of satisfying (C1)–(C3). Second, Hardimon

(2017, 93) claims that each human continental population is biologically real in virtue of satisfying his four-part sufficient condition for being biologically real. In particular, each human continental population exists (Hardimon, 2017, 84–87). Second, the human continental populations have “biological significance” in an “explanatory” way because population geneticists regularly use them to reconstruct the history of human migrations (e.g. the peopling of the Americas) as well as the origin of certain human adaptations (e.g. the origin of lightly pigmented skin in Eurasians) (Hardimon, 2017, 80–81).

Third, Hardimon (2017, 93) points out that the human continental populations are distinguishable “at the level of the gene” even though Rosenberg and his colleagues used non-functional alleles (not genes) in their study.¹³ To get around this problem, Hardimon (2017, 91) points out that the sample of alleles used in Rosenberg et al.’s (2002) study was large enough and spread out enough across human chromosomes to reliably infer that Rosenberg et al.’s results hold for human genes. Hardimon (2017, 94–95) also mentions a few “medically relevant genetic differences” among the human continental populations as additional evidence.

Last, but not least, Hardimon (2017, 82–83) claims that all minimalist races—including the human continental populations—are “intrinsically interesting” in biology because it’s intrinsically interesting to biologists to explain any pattern of visible physical features in humans correlating with geographical ancestry.¹⁴ For example, Hardimon (2017, 67) claims it’s intrinsically interesting to biologists to explain why “brown skin,” “kinky hair,” and “full lips” in humans are correlated with “Sub-Saharan African ancestry.” Furthermore, the long history of biological anthropologists studying these correlations is good evidence for Hardimon’s claim.

Since Hardimon’s defense of biological racial realism is brand new, there are no objections to it in the literature. However, here are a few concerns that one could have about Hardimon’s defense of biological racial realism. Remember that Hardimon’s defense of biological racial realism has two parts. First, he claims that the ordinary concept of race is the minimalist concept of race. Second, he claims that minimalist race is biologically real. So, there are two straightforward ways of questioning Hardimon’s biological racial realism. One can question whether the minimalist concept of race is the ordinary concept of race, or one can question whether the minimalist race is biologically real. Let’s start with the first concern.

With respect to Hardimon’s claim that the minimalist concept of race is the ordinary concept of race, the semantic mismatch objection is very appropriate here. For review, the *semantic mismatch objection* states that the groups put forth as races aren’t actually races because what constitutes a race in the proposed view deviates too much from “the folk concept of race” or “our folk taxonomy” of races (Glasgow, 2003, 459–460). Furthermore, there are more than a few semantic mismatches between the actual groups called “races” in ordinary English and the ones that count as minimalist races.

Notice that Hardimon does not march through each of his 17 examples of archetypical races to show that each one counts as a minimalist race. Furthermore, when we do, we will see that few (if any) of them count as minimalist races. With respect to Blumenbach’s races and UNESCO’s three major races, it’s important to highlight that these race terms were defined entirely with easily observable features (Blumenbach, 1795/2000, 28–29; UNESCO, 1965, 243).¹⁵ Thus, it should not be surprising that many of these races do not actually possess a common ancestry that’s peculiar to the members of the group, which is condition (C2).

For instance, Blumenbach (1795/1865, 266) defined “Ethiopian” as picking out the group of people distinguished by “black” skin color, “black and curly” hair, “thick” noses, “very puffy” lips, and so forth. As such, Blumenbach (1795/1865, 275) did not just include Sub-Saharan Africans in the Ethiopian race but also, at least, the Melanesians (esp. the Papuans and Ni-Vanuatu) and Aboriginal Australians.¹⁶ However, due to recent work in phylogenetics, we know that Sub-Saharan Africans, Melanesians, and Aboriginal Australians do not possess a common ancestry that’s peculiar to the members of that group (McEvoy, Lind, et al., 2010, 298). Thus, Blumenbach’s Ethiopian is not a minimalist race. And, for analogous reasons, neither is UNESCO’s Negroid. And there’s more.

Next, let’s take a look at Blumenbach’s Malay race. According to Blumenbach (1795/1865, 266, 275), “Malay” picks out Filipinos, Chamorros, Maluku Islanders, Sunda Islanders, Native Hawaiians, Tongans, Rapa Nui, Malagasy, Tahitians, Peninsular Malaysians, Mergui Islanders, and any other people with “Tawny-coloured” skin, “black” hair,

etc., who "use the Malay idiom" (a.k.a. any Malayo-Polynesian language), such as any other people indigenous to Polynesia or Micronesia.¹⁷ However, one thing that Malays don't have in common is an ancestry that's peculiar to the members of the group! Instead, modern phylogenetics has shown us that Malays do not possess a common ancestor that's not also shared with Melanesians and Aboriginal Australians (who are Ethiopians) (Duda & Zrzavý, 2016, 3).

In fact, modern phylogenetic data show that the following groups also don't satisfy (C2): Blumenbach's Caucasian, Blumenbach's Mongolian, UNESCO's Caucasoid, Linnaeus's African, Linnaeus's European, Linnaeus's Asiatic, the OMB's Asian, the OMB's Black, the OMB's White, and the OMB's Pacific Islander (Duda & Zrzavý, 2016, 3). Unfortunately, the only archetypical races on Hardimon's list that satisfy (C2) are Blumenbach's American, UNESCO's Mongoloid, Linnaeus's American, and the OMB's American Indian.

By anyone's standards, a mismatch of 13 out of 17 shows that Hardimon's minimalist concept of race is not the meaning of "race" used to pick out these four sets of races and probably also not the ordinary concept of race for English speakers. The problem is that Hardimon's (C2) requires the members of minimalist races to share an ancestry that's "peculiar" to members of that group. But the addition of the word "peculiar"—and sometimes Hardimon (2017, 75) says "distinctive"—elevates the kind of ancestry group that minimalist races must be to what some philosophers of biology have called *exclusive groups*—which are groups whose members share an ancestor in common that's unique to the group.¹⁸ However, the race terms that have littered the English language rarely pick out exclusive groups.

Now, I don't doubt that Hardimon will be able to provide a clever reply to this objection, and that reply very well may save Hardimon's claim that the minimalist concept of race is the ordinary concept of race. However, suppose the semantic mismatch objection I've presented above is fatal to Hardimon's claim that the minimalist concept of race is the ordinary concept of race. Does this imply that Hardimon has failed to defend biological racial realism? No. It's sufficient that the minimalist concept of race is *an* ordinary concept of race and that there exists some biologically real minimalist races for Hardimon to have successfully defended biological racial realism. While I await Hardimon's evidence that the minimalist concept of race is an ordinary concept of race, I will grant that it is for now.

This brings us to Hardimon's (2017, 93) claim that the human continental populations are biologically real minimalist races, which is a crucial claim in Hardimon's defense of biological racial realism. But is it true that the human continental populations are both biologically real and minimalist races? I'll just focus on the last claim. However, it should be noted that there are philosophers and biologists who disagree that the human continental populations are biologically real.¹⁹

Remember that the human continental populations are the five biological populations in humans that, according to contemporary population genetics, constitute a unique human population subdivision. They're Africans, East Asians, Eurasians, Native Americans, and Oceanians. Now, right away, given the people who currently belong to the African and Oceanian populations, we know that these two populations are not minimalist races.

According to how population geneticists use the terms "African" and "Oceanian," "African" picks out Sub-Saharan Africans and every population from the Sub-Saharan African diaspora (e.g. African Americans, Afro-Brazilians, Cape Verdeans, Dominicans, Jamaicans, Siddi Indians, etc.), and "Oceanian" picks out Aboriginal Australians, Melanesians, Micronesians, and Polynesians (Pemberton et al., 2013, 902). But here's the problem. It's widely known among biological anthropologists that Melanesians, on average, are statistically indistinguishable from Sub-Saharan Africans in terms of skin color, facial features, and hair texture, which are the "racial" visible physical features according to Hardimon (2017, 35). In other words, Melanesians tend to have darkly pigmented skin, black hair, the ability to grow afros, wide noses, full lips, and so forth.

For instance, the average skin reflectance of visible light for human populations indigenous to New Guinea has been shown to vary between 31.2 and 41.0, while the average skin reflectance of visible light for human populations indigenous to Sub-Saharan Africa has been shown to vary between 19.45 (among the Chopi of Mozambique) and 50.96 (among the Coloureds of Cape South Africa), thus making the Papuans statistically indistinguishable from Sub-Saharan Africans in terms of skin color (Jablonski & Chaplin, 2000, 74–75, 90–91).²⁰ But what's also interesting

is that the overwhelming majority of Oceanians in the world are Melanesian (~75%)²¹ Thus, the most prevalent pattern of racial visible physical features among Oceanians is the same pattern found among Africans. In that case, Africans and Oceanians clearly don't satisfy (C1). But there's more.

Neither Eurasians nor East Asians possess a common ancestry that's peculiar to the members of these groups. For one, there's no ancestor that Eurasians share that's not also shared by East Asians, Oceanians, and Native Americans (Duda & Zrzavý, 2016, 3). Also, there's no ancestor that East Asians share that's not also shared by Oceanians and Native Americans (Duda & Zrzavý, 2016, 3). That leaves us with the Native Americans. Native Americans do satisfy (C1)–(C3). However, Native Americans don't satisfy (C1)–(C3) *essentially*, and since (C1)–(C3) tell us what minimalist races are *essentially*, it's not enough that Native Americans happen to satisfy (C1)–(C3) at this point in time or in our possible world.

For instance, since population geneticists define human continental population terms using common genomic ancestry and geographic origin criteria alone, it's metaphysically possible for human continental populations to not satisfy (C1). In fact, it's widely accepted among biological anthropologists that Native Americans did not visibly diverge from East Asians until well after they evolved from East Asians (Jablonski, 2012, 53). Actually, some Native Americans still haven't visibly diverged from East Asians! The natives of Alaska, Canada, and Greenland are statistically indistinguishable from East Asians in terms of racial visible physical features. They tend to have Asian eyelids, light to moderately pigmented skin, hair that's black and straight, etc.²² In fact, due to the strong similarity in racial features, Blumenbach (1795/1865, 266) classified North American "Esquimaux" with Mongolians instead of Americans. In any case, the point is that there was a time period in Native Americans' past when they violated (C1). Given these facts, it turns out that none of the human continental populations are minimalist races. And thus, Hardimon's defense of biological racial realism does not succeed.

2.2 | Defenses of social racial realism

In addition to biological racial realism, there have been many attempts among metaphysicians of race to defend racial realism by defending *social racial realism*, which is any attempt to defend race as socially real. In the literature, this view is often called "racial constructivism" or "Race Constructionism" because many who argue that race is socially real do so by arguing that race is real as a social construct (Mills, 1998, 48; Haslanger, 2012, 308). Social racial realism is a widely defended view among metaphysicians of race. Usually, defenders of social racial realism defend the view that race, as understood in some ordinary language or dialect, is socially real and not biologically real. Some examples of such defenses can be found in Alcoff (2006); Haslanger (2012); Sundstrom (2002); and Taylor (2013). However, some social racial realists defend both the biological and social reality of race. Some examples of this type of defense can be found in Outlaw (1996), Kendig (2013), and Spencer (2014). However, below is a representative sample of the many ways that metaphysicians of race have identified what race is in a non-biological social racial realism in the past few decades:

"A group is racialized (in context C) if and only if (by definition) its members are (or would be) socially positioned as subordinate or privileged along some dimension (economic, political, legal, social, etc.) (in C), and the group is "marked" as a target for this treatment by observed or imagined bodily features presumed to be evidence of ancestral links to a certain geographical region" (Haslanger, 2012, 308).

"Our Western races are social constructs. They are things that we humans create in the transactions that define social life. Specifically, they are the probabilistically defined populations that result from the white supremacist determination to link appearance and ancestry to social location and life chances" (Taylor, 2013, 89–90).

"... we have good reason to think that any thoughtful version of social constructionism must recognize both political and cultural aspects of the existence and significance of race. There is no doubt that part of why race has such a major impact on our lives, especially the lives of people of color, is because, historically and

in the present, it has functioned by slotting people into positions of relative privilege and disadvantage. The political theory of race captures this well. And yet, in speaking of the impact of race on our lives, we necessarily speak of the shaping of our lives by our socialization into particular ways of life where being this or that race is among the modes of identification that influence how we think and act. Race must therefore also be understood as a cultural phenomenon" (Jeffers, 2013, 420).

"Social constructivism about races holds that races are socially real, that is, they are identical with socially constructed properties, or social kinds. One particular version of social constructivism, namely, historical constructivism, claims that the properties that make a group of people a race are certain historical properties of the individuals that belong to that group (e.g., the life histories of the members of the group, or their ancestors)" (Díaz-León, 2015, 547).

Notice that the quotes above are useful in seeing how social racial realists have separated themselves. Some, like Sally Haslanger (2012) and Paul Taylor (2013), have argued that race is real as a political construct only.²³ Others, like Chike Jeffers (2013), have argued that race is real as a political and cultural construct. While others, like Esa Díaz-León (2015), have argued that race is real as a socio-historical construct. Due to space constraints, I will just discuss Haslanger's defense of social racial realism. I'm focusing on Haslanger's defense because it's clear, well-argued, and the book it's from has won a prestigious prize in philosophy.²⁴

Before I start discussing Haslanger's defense of social racial realism, it's important to distinguish between two different projects that Haslanger has in the metaphysics of race. One of her projects is *descriptive* insofar as the task is to identify the nature and reality of race given the "single or dominant public meaning (or folk concept) of 'race'" among "competent users of English" (Haslanger, 2012, 305). However, a different project of hers is *revisionary* insofar as the task is "to develop accounts of gender and race that will be effective tools in the fight against injustice" (Haslanger, 2012, 227). My focus will be Haslanger's descriptive project.

Haslanger (2012, 304–305) starts by adopting referentialism as the semantic framework that she will use to define "race" in its "single or dominant" use in ordinary English. Roughly, *referentialism* is the semantic theory that identifies the meaning of a word as just the object it designates. For comparison, note that Hardimon does not adopt a referentialist approach in his defense of racial realism because the minimalist concept of race is a *concept* as opposed to a referent. In any case, Haslanger (2012, 305) justifies her referentialist assumption from her observation that "race" is a name in ordinary English and from the work of Hilary Putnam (1973) and Saul Kripke (1980) who have argued that almost all English names have referential meanings.

Next, much like Hardimon, Haslanger compiles a list of paradigm races among English speakers. However, unlike Hardimon, Haslanger (2012, 227) focuses on paradigm races among American English speakers. Haslanger (2012, 306) lists "Black," "White," "Asians," and "Latino/as" as "groups usually considered races" in current American English. Furthermore, for Blacks and Whites, she provides paradigm members of each race. For Blacks, she lists a few famous African Americans (e.g. Malcolm X and Oprah Winfrey) and a few famous Sub-Saharan Africans (e.g. Nelson Mandela and Kofi Annan) (Haslanger, 2012, 306). For Whites, she lists a few famous Europeans (e.g. Margaret Thatcher and Vincent Van Gogh), some famous European Americans (e.g. George Bush and Arnold Schwarzenegger), and one famous Russian Jew (Golda Meir) (Haslanger, 2012, 306).

After presenting her list of paradigm races and paradigm Black and White people, Haslanger (2012, 306) *abduces* what she considers to be the best theory for what the term "race" refers to (and thus means) in American English and for why "we can all confidently identify members of different races" and list "groups usually considered races." Haslanger's (2012, 306) theory for why American English speakers overwhelmingly agree on paradigm races and members of those races is because "race" and race terms in American English refer to real things in the world. So, in Haslanger's view, the fact that American English speakers overwhelmingly agree on both paradigm races and paradigm members of those races is strong evidence for *some* type of racial realism being true. But which type?

Haslanger (2012, 306–307) entertains the possibility that "race," in its dominant American English meaning, refers to a real biological thing. However, Haslanger is ultimately convinced by two papers from biologists that "race," in its

dominant use in American English, does not pick out a real biological thing. One of these papers is from the population geneticists Marcus Feldman and Richard Lewontin (Feldman & Lewontin, 2008), and the other is from the biological anthropologist Deborah Bolnick (2008).

After doing away with the biological option, Haslanger (2012, 308–309) posits the hypothesis that “race” picks out “a social type,” and, in particular, a social type she calls *the racialized group*. The racialized group is, of course, a group whose members are, essentially, socially positioned as subordinate or privileged along some social dimension (economic, political, legal, etc.), and the group is marked as a target for this treatment by observed or imagined bodily features presumed to be evidence of ancestral links to a certain geographical region.

So, at its base, Haslanger’s defense of social racial realism is abductive. She observes the ease with which American English speakers are able to list paradigm races and paradigm members of those races, and she observes the particular paradigm races and race members that American English speakers list. She considers racial anti-realism, biological racial realism, and social racial realism, and concludes that a social racial realism that identifies race as the racialized group provides the best explanation for the observed phenomena.

There’s a lot to like about Haslanger’s defense of social racial realism. Haslanger’s defense steers clear of intuition-based thought experiments, which are controversial in contemporary metaphysics and the metaphysics of race in particular.²⁵ Also, Haslanger’s defense presupposes that almost all English names have referential meanings, which is widely accepted among specialists in the philosophy of language. Also, much like Hardimon’s defense of biological racial realism, Haslanger’s defense of social racial realism engages with relevant findings from contemporary population genetics, and it’s always a good thing to engage with relevant, high-quality science when doing metaphysics. With that said, there have been a few objections raised to Haslanger-style defenses of social racial realism in the literature. Also, I have some concerns about Haslanger’s particular defense as well.

First, some philosophers would not be pleased with Haslanger’s default assumption that “race” has a referential meaning in American English. In particular, Ron Mallon (2006, 527) calls any defense of racial realism (or anti-realism) that presupposes “a particular theory of reference” a “semantic strategy” for getting its metaphysical result. Furthermore, Mallon (2006, 528, 548) argues that the semantic strategy “ought to be abandoned in race theory” because it makes debates about the correct account of race “hostage” to debates about the correct account of meaning and reference-fixing for names in the philosophy of language, of which there is “little agreement” and little hope of resolving anytime soon. Hence, Mallon’s concern about any defense of racial realism that adopts a semantic strategy, such as Haslanger’s, is that the defense is automatically question-begging due to its controversial background assumptions about meaning or reference-fixing that have little hope of being resolved anytime soon by the relevant experts.

To strengthen Mallon’s worry, it’s worth pointing out that referentialism for English names is not as widely accepted among specialists in the philosophy of language as Haslanger thinks. For instance, in a recent worldwide survey on what English-speaking philosophers believe, it was discovered that, among specialists in the philosophy of language, 42.8% “accept or lean toward” a “Millian” (a.k.a. referentialist) position on name meanings, 34.2% “accept or lean toward” a “Fregean” position on name meanings, and 23.0% held other positions, such as “Reject both” or “undecided.”²⁶ So, Haslanger is certainly taking on a controversial background assumption by assuming that almost all English names have referential meanings in her defense of social racial realism. Furthermore, one reason why some philosophers of language are skeptical of using referentialism as a general framework for understanding English name meanings is that recent empirical studies suggest that the intuition-based thought experiments typically used to support referentialism for English names are not as strong as many philosophers once thought (Machery, Mallon, Nichols, & Stich, 2004; Machery, Mallon, Nichols, & Stich, 2013; Mallon, Machery, Nichols, & Stich, 2009).

While I’m sympathetic to Mallon’s worry and I do think Haslanger is taking on a controversial background assumption when she assumes that almost all English names have a referential meaning, Haslanger can easily fix this problem by simply not adopting that background assumption. She doesn’t need it anyway. All Haslanger needs to assume about meaning is that “race” and race terms have referential meanings in American English, at least in their dominant uses. Furthermore, adequate justification for adopting that semantic assumption would be that it’s presupposed by the theory that *best explains* the relevant phenomena.

Now, Mallon could respond with the deeper worry that it's not clear that Haslanger's theory can explain anything because it's not clear that referents are *real* meanings. After all, this is largely what the debate about what English names mean is *about* among experts on that topic in the philosophy of language. However, this concern is inappropriate because it's not a problem that's unique to the metaphysics of race.

In any philosophical debate, there's going to be philosophical background assumptions made that are controversial among the relevant philosophical experts. However, we adopt those assumptions anyway in that philosophical debate because taking a stand on the controversial issue is *constitutive* of engaging in that debate. For instance, there is a robust debate among philosophers of science about the best way to articulate the nature of a natural kind for the purposes of explaining the "epistemic reliability" (e.g. explanatory success, inductive success, etc.) of certain kinds in the natural and social sciences (Boyd, 1999, 146). This debate is known as *the natural kind debate* in the philosophy of science.²⁷

In the natural kind debate, one background assumption that all interlocutors in that debate make but that is extremely controversial among metaphysicians who investigate the reality of universals is that properties—and thus, universals—exist. Nevertheless, the interlocutors in the natural kind debate assume that properties exist because a stance on that issue is required to take a stance on what makes a kind natural in the sciences. In short, kinds don't exist if properties don't exist, and there aren't any natural kinds if there aren't any kinds.

Similarly, metaphysicians of race engaged in the debate about the nature and reality of race given how "race" is dominantly used among American English speakers must take a stand on what "race" means in the relevant context, and thus must take a stand on what a name's meaning is, at least for "race."

Given that adopting some controversial philosophical background assumptions will be unavoidable, a more appropriate approach to take in the metaphysics of race is to respect both the expertise of other philosophers and the disagreement among them about topics in which they specialize and use as background assumptions in race theory only those philosophical assumptions that are serious candidates for truths among the relevant philosophical experts (Spencer, 2014, 1026). Furthermore, as evidenced by the statistics I presented earlier, referentialism about English names is a serious candidate for being a true description of what constitutes an English name's meaning, at least in most cases, and at least according to the expertise of specialists in the philosophy of language. As such, Haslanger is within the bounds of good judgment to use a referent as a meaning of "race" or a race term if doing so allows her to best explain the relevant phenomena. With that said, another worry one could have about Haslanger's defense of social racial realism is that her theory doesn't "best explain" the relevant phenomena.

In fact, one concern that I have about Haslanger's defense of social racial realism is that she has not provided enough evidence that the racialized group is a better candidate than any biological entity that's a serious contender for the referent of "race" in the dominant use of "race" among American English speakers. In particular, Haslanger only cites Feldman and Lewontin (2008) and Bolnick (2008) as evidence that "race" does not pick out a real biological thing in its dominant use in American English. However, neither of these papers are sufficient for drawing that inference.

For one, Feldman and Lewontin only argue for two claims that are relevant for Haslanger's purposes. First, they argue that the recent human population structure results of Rosenberg et al. (2002) and the like do not vindicate "taxonomic" notions of race, such as Theodosius Dobzhansky's "geographical race" (Feldman & Lewontin, 2008, 95–96). Second, they argue that these same population-genetic results do not vindicate "the classical division of human races" that presupposes "large differences in genes influencing cognitive and most physiological traits" (Feldman & Lewontin, 2008, 96). Of course, Feldman and Lewontin are correct about both of these claims, but the fact that "race," as it's predominantly used in American English, doesn't pick out a "taxonomic" race or a "classical" race isn't adequate evidence that the term doesn't pick out a biological thing at all. This is because there's more serious candidates for the referent of "race" in American English that Haslanger completely ignores.

In particular, since 2002, several geneticists have claimed that Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results or population-genetic results very similar to them vindicate our dominant, ordinary way of defining "race" in American English. For example, Neil Risch et al. (2002, 3) have said that "these population genetics studies have recapitulated the classical definition of races based on continental ancestry..."²⁸ So, for Haslanger not to have explored Risch et al.'s (2002)

biological candidate or any 21st century biological candidate for the referent of "race" in American English is a problem. Furthermore, that problem has only worsened over time since more and more biological candidates have been proposed, such as Spencer's (2014) proposal that "race" (in its dominant use in American English) picks out the set of human continental populations, and Hardimon's (2017) proposal, which I've already discussed.

However, with all of that said, Bolnick's (2008) paper alone could be sufficient for Haslanger to achieve her goal. Bolnick (2008) advances a multi-faceted critique of Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results on methodological grounds. So, if Bolnick's critique is successful, any biological candidate for "race" in the dominant American English usage whose evidence for reality stems from Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results, or any population-genetic results that presuppose the same methods that Bolnick attacks, is immediately suspect. So, understanding and assessing Bolnick's concerns about Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results will be worthwhile.

First, Bolnick (2008, 78) worries that the ethnic groups in Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) sample are too few and far between to make for a representative sample. Bolnick also expresses a few concerns about Rosenberg et al.'s use of *structure*, which, of course, is the computer program that Rosenberg et al. (2002) used for human genetic clustering and, ultimately, to sort out human population structure. With respect to the *structure* use, Bolnick's (2008, 80) first worry is that "*structure* will identify as many groups as the program user tells it to identify," which makes its results "not surprising—or significant."

Bolnick's (2008, 76) second worry with respect to Rosenberg et al.'s *structure* use is related to her claim that the program will identify as many clusters as the user tells it to identify. Given that the latter is true, Bolnick (2008, 76–77) believes that the only way to identify a level of clusters as "biologically significant" is to find the level that is "*most likely represented*" by the data set, which, according to the model assumptions of *structure*, corresponds to the level with the highest likelihood value.²⁹ However, Rosenberg et al. (2002) could not find a single level of human genetic clustering with the highest likelihood value, and so, according to Bolnick (2008, 77), the appropriate interpretation of Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results is that there aren't any "biologically significant" levels of human genetic clusters. So, if Bolnick is right, it would be inappropriate to use Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results to infer any biologically significant populations in the human species.

While Bolnick's concerns are thoughtful and relevant, they don't undermine using Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results to infer biologically significant populations in the human species. For one, Bolnick is wrong that *structure*'s results are neither surprising nor significant because the computer program will identify as many clusters as the user tells it to identify. For one, it's false that *structure* will identify as many clusters as the user tells it to identify. While this is usually true, it's possible for *structure* to not identify any clusters at all, such as when the sample of organisms consists entirely of clones or entirely of a group of organisms that have been randomly mating for a long period of time. However, I fully acknowledge that, usually, *structure* will identify as many genetic clusters as the user tells it to identify. Nevertheless, even in these cases, the clusters that *structure* finds may still be surprising and significant.

In a nutshell, what *structure* does is uses Bayesian inference to find a single set of clusters at a pre-specified K level that is most likely the one that's represented by the genomic data. Also, since graded cluster membership is allowed by *structure*, there are literally infinitely many ways that *structure* can assign membership grades to organisms across clusters, and so there are literally infinitely many sets of clusters that *structure* could identify at any given K level. Given this fact, if *structure* does find a single set of clusters at a K level that has the highest probability of being represented by the genomic data, that fact all by itself is surprising and significant.

The significance of a set of genetic clusters is further supported by the fact that it is not uncommon for *structure* to fail to find a single best set of clusters at a K level. In fact, Bolnick (2008, 76) mentions that Rosenberg et al. (2002) didn't report any human genetic cluster results at $K > 6$ because *structure* couldn't find a single best set of clusters at any K level above 6 in their analyses.

Of course, Bolnick (2008, 77) could reply that statistically significant genetic clusters need not be "biologically significant" genetic clusters, and that's right. However, we already know that the statistically significant genetic clusters at, at least, $K = 5$ are biologically significant because we have a causal explanation for how they arose. First, humans migrated to different major geographic regions (e.g. East Asia, Oceania, the Americas, etc.). Next, major geographic

barriers to human interbreeding (e.g. the Himalayas, the Pacific Ocean, etc.) prevented random or even frequent interbreeding among people after these new lands were occupied. Finally, genomic diversity arose and spread among people in the same continental regions (e.g. from mutation and interbreeding) after enough time passed (Rosenberg, 2011, 681).

So, while it may be okay to be skeptical of the biological significance of some human genetic clusters identified by *structure*, it's inappropriate to be skeptical of the biological significance of *all* human genetic clusters identified by *structure*. Given this fact, Haslanger hasn't ruled out the serious rival that, perhaps, what "race" means in its dominant American English usage is a biological thing that is evidenced as biologically real, at least partly, by Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results.³⁰ After all, human geneticists are able to predict US adults' self-reported folk races (esp. Asian, Black, and White) with a stunning 98.8–99.9% accuracy using only human continental population membership as background knowledge (Tang, Quertermous, et al., 2005, 271; Guo et al., 2014, 153). That's a rival worth taking seriously.

Now, perhaps Haslanger would respond to the last concern by pointing to the fact that Hispanics (or Latinos) are a paradigm race for American English speakers, and one fact that's well-confirmed in genetics and evolutionary biology is that the Hispanic race is not a biological group. They're not a monophyletic group. They're not a paraphyletic group. They're not an exclusive group. They're not a breeding population. They're not a continental population or any other genealogical population. And the list continues. So, if Hispanic is a paradigm race for American English speakers, as Haslanger claims, but it's not a biological group, then that should be enough to do away with any plausible biological candidate for the referent of "race" in the dominant American English use of the term. This is a good reply to the last objection. However, Haslanger's evidence that Hispanic is a paradigm race for American English speakers is problematic, and there's more reliable evidence that points to the opposite being true.

With respect to why I think Haslanger's evidence is problematic, notice that Haslanger exclusively relies on her intuitions to generate her list of paradigm races and the paradigm members of these races. To be specific, Haslanger (2012, 307) doesn't cite any scientific source to support her claim that Blacks, Whites, Asians, and Latinos/as are "usually considered" races for American English speakers, and she doesn't cite any scientific source to support her claim that "we can all confidently identify members of different races" in the American English-speaking community. So, it's possible that Haslanger has imagined a high level of agreement among American English speakers about what the paradigm races are and who's in them, and then used that imaginary agreement to abductively infer social racial realism!

Furthermore, the possibility above is especially problematic because, if the Hispanic race is not a paradigm race for American English speakers, then it's far from clear that American English speakers are not referring to a biological thing with "race" in its dominant meaning. This brings me to my second reason for why I think Haslanger's evidence for Hispanic being a paradigm race for American English speakers is problematic: There's survey evidence that strongly suggests that Hispanic (or Latino) is not a paradigm race for American English speakers.

In a recent and nationally representative survey of Hispanic American adults, Paul Taylor et al. (2012, 61) gave their Hispanic subjects the opportunity to racially self-report "Hispanic/Latino" in addition to the five OMB races and "some other race." So, since all of these subjects said they were "Hispanic/Latino" when queried about whether they were "Hispanic/Latino," if most Hispanic American adults view Hispanic as a race, most of these subjects should self-report "Hispanic/Latino" as their race if they think "Hispanic/Latino" is a race at all. Unfortunately, the result was that only 25% of subjects reported "Hispanic/Latino" as their race. Furthermore, the most popular answer was "White" (at 36%). So, it appears that "Hispanic/Latino" isn't even considered a race among the majority of Hispanic American adults! Data like these strongly suggest that Hispanic is not a paradigm race among American English speakers, even though it's true that some American English speakers consider Hispanic to be a race.³¹

3 | A PLEA FOR RADICAL PLURALISM

Notice how messy Taylor et al.'s (2012) results were. According to their results, 36% of Hispanic American adults reported their race as "White" alone, 26% reported only a demonym for their "country of origin" as their race (e.g.

"Mexican," "Puerto Rican," etc.), 25% reported "Hispanic/Latino" alone, 3% reported "Black" alone, and 13% reported something else (e.g. "don't know") or nothing at all (Taylor et al., 2012, 61). Taylor et al.'s (2012) results are not unusual. In fact, they're extremely normal. Out of all of the large-scale empirical studies aimed at discovering which properties American English speakers use to assign racial membership or how American English speakers sort themselves or others into races, none of these studies have found a single or dominant way that American English speakers use "race" and race terms.

For example, in a nationally representative survey of US adults, Jack Citrin et al. (2014, 6) found that, across all test conditions, 13.3–21.4% of subjects said that Barack Obama should have reported "black only" as his race on the 2010 US census questionnaire, 53.9–64.8% of subjects said that Obama should have self-reported "both black and white," and 21.1–25.1% of subjects said they were "not sure." These are extremely messy results, and they are representative of how American English speakers use "race" and race terms.³²

Given the pattern of messiness in the empirical data on how American English speakers use "race" and race terms, one plausible interpretation of the data is that there is no single or dominant meaning of "race" among American English speakers. Furthermore, if the latter is true, then the correct position to take about the reality of race, at least with respect to how American English speakers use "race," is *radical racial pluralism*. I'll say that *racial pluralism* is the view that there's no single correct answer to the question of what race is and whether race is real in a particular context. For instance, Hardimon (2017) is a racial pluralist with respect to how "race" is used to classify people in ordinary English.

However, radical racial pluralism goes farther than racial pluralism by accepting racial pluralism and adding that there isn't even a dominant answer to this question. For instance, Appiah (1992); Glasgow (2009); Hardimon (2017); Haslanger (2012); Taylor (2013); Zack (2002), and almost all other metaphysicians of race will agree that there is at least a dominant way that American English speakers use "race," and so, will agree that there is at least a dominant answer to the question of what race is and whether it's real in this particular context. However, I'm skeptical that the empirical data support this popular view.

For clarity, radical racial pluralism does not imply that racial realism is false for the American English context or any other ordinary linguistic context. It's just to say that our claims about race being real must be both extremely contextualized and deflated in their metaphysical importance. However, I fully admit that a careful and well-supported argument is needed to secure radical racial pluralism as the correct metaphysical position about race in the American English context. Only time will tell who is right.³³

Endnotes

¹ This definition of "biological racial realism" as "race is biologically real" is from Joshua Glasgow (2009, 80).

² However, I should note that Kendig (2013, 195) invents her theory not just to explain folk racial discourse but also "natural scientific race conceptions" and "social scientific race conceptions."

³ Also, by "the US meaning of 'race,'" Spencer means the "widest-used" meaning of "race" in the United States (Spencer, 2012, 1026).

⁴ I've added "racial" to the quote because Hardimon doesn't think that just any visible physical feature is relevant for minimalist racial classification, and he cites Adam's apples and skin color due to sun exposure as examples of irrelevant visible physical features (Hardimon, 2017, 35). Instead, the "racial" visible physical features are inherited and have to do with skin color, facial features, and hair type (Hardimon, 2017, 35).

⁵ Actually, this is not entirely correct. Hardimon advances racial realism about minimalist race in Chapter 3 of *Rethinking Race* without defending the biological reality of the kind but advances a version of biological racial realism in Chapter 4 of that same book. I'll be discussing Hardimon's defense of biological racial realism because it's much more nuanced and creative than his first defense of racial realism.

⁶ In fact, Hardimon (2017, 56) explicitly claims that the concept of race he's identified originated in Europe and is used to some extent by Brazilian Portuguese speakers.

⁷ This interpretation of Hardimon's view was verified by personal correspondence.

⁸ Actually, Linnaeus classified people into six varieties. The other two were "Wild Man" and "Monstrosus" (Linné, 1800, 9).

- ⁹ I am emphasizing that Hardimon's thought experiment is "intuition-based" because some thought experiments use natural observations as opposed to personal intuitions to obtain the experiment's result. An example is Isaac Newton's moon test. See Appendix A in Spencer (2004) for a thorough discussion of Newton's moon test.
- ¹⁰ For context, Hardimon develops this thought experiment to respond to Glasgow's (2009, 33–34) objection that (C1) in a slightly adjusted form is sufficient to capture the ordinary concept of race in at least American English.
- ¹¹ See Spencer (2015, 48) for this estimate and its calculation.
- ¹² See Spencer (2014, 1034) for a discussion of Pemberton et al.'s sample of human ethnic groups.
- ¹³ Today, geneticists usually consider a gene to be a functional part of an organism's genome (Dupré, 2004, 329).
- ¹⁴ Hardimon (2017, 67) calls the totality of these correlations "the minimalist biological phenomenon of race."
- ¹⁵ Most of these features were morphological, but some were behavioral, mental, or linguistic.
- ¹⁶ Other groups of people with high frequencies of the "Ethiopian" traits are Filipino Negritos, Malaysian Negritos, Thai Negritos, and Andaman Islanders.
- ¹⁷ Given Blumenbach's tawny skin color constraint, Malayo-Polynesian-speaking Melanesians (e.g. Admiralty Islanders, iTaukei, Ni-Vanuatu, etc.) do not count as Malay. Instead, due to their Sub-Saharan African morphological features, Blumenbach (1795/1865, 275) classified these people with Ethiopians.
- ¹⁸ See Velasco (2009) for a thorough discussion of exclusive groups. Also, what's interesting here is that Hardimon's first attempt to characterize an ancestry criterion in the ordinary concept of race only required members of the same race to be "linked by a common ancestry," which is a much weaker criterion (Hardimon, 2003, 445). However, Hardimon added "peculiar" to his ancestry criterion in his 2012 essay in the *Journal of Philosophical Research* and he's kept it ever since. See Hardimon (2012, 259; Hardimon, 2013, 11; 2017, 31).
- ¹⁹ For example, some biologists and philosophers of biology, like Weiss and Long (2009) and Rasmus Winther, Giordano, Edge, and Nielsen (2015) worry that the model assumptions of the computer programs used to detect human continental populations are so unrealistic that it's inappropriate to say that the human continental populations actually exist. Also, some metaphysicians of race—such as Naomi Zack (2002), Koffi Maglo (2011), and Adam Hochman (2013)—worry that an appropriate standard for what counts as biologically real in the context of human biodiversity rules out the human continental populations as biologically real. For a response to the latter worry—but not the former—see Spencer (2014, 1035–1036).
- ²⁰ The wavelength of visible light used for this analysis was 685 nanometers, which is red light.
- ²¹ This estimate is from Spencer (2015, 50).
- ²² The term "Asian eyelid" is shorthand among ophthalmologists for eyelids that possess at least one of the following traits: epicanthal folds, low or missing supratarsal creases, and extra fat pads in the upper eyelids (Kiranantawat, Suhk, & Nguyen, 2015). The more of these traits a person possesses, the more "Asian" her eyelids are. Interestingly, the reason why ophthalmologists have pinpointed the distinctive features of the Asian eyelid is because of the high demand among East Asians and Asian Americans for plastic surgery to make Asian eyelids more "Caucasian-like" (Kiranantawat et al., 2015, 158).
- ²³ Besides Haslanger (2012) and Taylor (2013), Root (2000), Sundstrom (2002), and Alcoff (2006), among others, have defended this version of social racial realism.
- ²⁴ The book I'm referring to is Haslanger's *Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique*, which won the American Philosophical Association's Joseph B. Gittler Award in 2014. The Gittler Award is an annual award given out for publishing the best book in the philosophy of social science out of the nominated and eligible books in that year.
- ²⁵ For a general criticism of using intuition-based thought experiments in metaphysics, see Machery (2011). For criticisms of using intuition-based thought experiments in the metaphysics of race, see Haslanger and Saul (2006) and Spencer (2015, 52).
- ²⁶ The survey was conducted in 2009 by David Bourget and David Chalmers, and the results are available at <https://philpapers.org/surveys/>. The definition of "specialist" I used to obtain these statistics was "Philosophy faculty or PhD." Also, the statistics presented reflect the "coarse" view of the survey results. For a thorough discussion of the sample and method used to conduct the survey, see Bourget and Chalmers (2014).
- ²⁷ For some contributions to the natural kind debate besides Boyd (1999), see Devitt (2011); Dupré (1981); Ereshefsky and Reydon (2015); Hacking (1991); Häggqvist (2005); Griffiths (2004); LaPorte (2004); Machery (2005); Magnus (2012); Millikan (1999); Slater (2015); Spencer (2016); and Wilkerson (1988).
- ²⁸ For another set of geneticists who defend a different, but related, view, see Burchard et al. (2003).
- ²⁹ The relevant background here is that *structure* uses Bayesian inference to identify the genetic clusters at any particular level. Furthermore, Bayesian inference presupposes Bayes' theorem and a Bayesian interpretation of the probability of

an event. As for the likelihood value, it's a term in Bayes' theorem when probabilities are interpreted in a Bayesian way. See Easwaran (2011) for a good introductory discussion of Bayesian inference.

³⁰ In addition to Hardimon (2017), it's worth pointing out that Spencer (2014) also uses Rosenberg et al.'s (2002) results to defend biological racial realism for what "race" picks out in its dominant American English usage.

³¹ See Hardimon (2017, 38–39) for another argument as to why Hispanic is not a paradigm race for American English speakers using entirely different empirical evidence.

³² For other examples, see Compton, Bentley, Ennis, and Rastogi (2013); Glasgow, Shulman, and Covarrubias (2009); Morning (2011); and Rios, Romero, and Ramírez (2014).

³³ For other metaphysicians of race who have embraced radical racial pluralism, see Ludwig (2015) and McPherson (2016).

ORCID

Quayshawn Spencer  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6896-164X>

WORKS CITED

- Alcoff, L. M. (2006). *Visible identities: Race, gender, and the self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Appiah, K. A. (1992). *In my father's house*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bamshad, M., Wooding, S., Watkins, W., Ostler, C., Batzer, M., & Jorde, L. (2003). Human population genetic structure and inference of group membership. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 72, 578–589.
- Blumenbach, J. (1795/1865). On the natural variety of mankind, Third Edition, 1795. In T. Bendyshe (Ed.), *The anthropological treatises of Blumenbach and Hunter* (pp. 145–276). London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green.
- Bolnick, D. (2008). Individual ancestry inference and the reification of race as a biological phenomenon. In B. Koenig, S. Lee, & S. Richardson (Eds.), *Revisiting race in a genomic age* (pp. 70–85). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Bourget, D., & Chalmers, D. (2014). What do philosophers believe? *Philosophical Studies*, 170(3), 465–500.
- Boyd, R. (1999). Homeostasis, species, and higher taxa. In R. Wilson (Ed.), *Species: New interdisciplinary essays* (pp. 141–186). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Burchard, E., Ziv, E., Coyle, N., Gomez, S., Tang, H., Karter, A., ... Risch, N. (2003). The importance of race and ethnic background in biomedical research and clinical practice. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 348(12), 1170–1175.
- Citrin, J., Levy, M., & Van Houweling, R. (2014). Americans fill out President Obama's census form: What is his race? *Social Science Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12105>
- Compton, E., Bentley, M., Ennis, S., & Rastogi, S. (2013). 2010 Census race and hispanic origin alternative questionnaire experiment. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.
- Devitt, M. (2011). Natural kinds and biological realisms. In J. Campbell, M. O'Rourke, & M. Slater (Eds.), *Carving nature at its joints: Natural kinds in metaphysics and science* (pp. 155–174). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Díaz-Leon, E. (2015). In defense of historical constructivism about races. *Ergo: An Open Access Journal of Philosophy*, 2(21), 547–562.
- Duda, P., & Zrzavý, J. (2016). Human population history revealed by a supertree approach. *Scientific Reports*, 6(29890), 1–10.
- Dupré, J. (1981). Natural kinds and biological taxa. *The Philosophical Review*, 90(1), 66–90.
- Dupré, J. (2004). Understanding contemporary genomics. *Perspectives on Science*, 12(3), 320–338.
- Easwaran, K. (2011). Bayesianism I: Introduction and arguments in favor. *Philosophy Compass*, 6, 312–320.
- Ereshefsky, M., & Reydon, T. (2015). Scientific kinds. *Philosophical Studies*, 172(4), 969–986.
- Feldman, M., & Lewontin, R. (2008). Race, ancestry, and medicine. In B. Koenig, S. Lee, & S. Richardson (Eds.), *Revisiting race in a genomic age* (pp. 89–101). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Glasgow, J. (2003). On the new biology of race. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 100(9), 456–474.
- Glasgow, J. (2009). *A theory of race*. New York: Routledge.
- Glasgow, J. (forthcoming). What kind of thing is race? In J. Glasgow, S. Haslanger, C. Jeffers, & Q. Spencer (Eds.), *Four views on race*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glasgow, J., Shulman, J., & Covarrubias, E. (2009). The ordinary conception of race in the United States and its relation to racial attitudes: A new approach. *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 9, 15–38.
- Griffiths, P. (2004). Emotions and natural and normative kinds. *Philosophy of Science*, 71, 901–911.

- Guo, G., Fu, Y., Lee, H., Cai, T., Harris, K., & Li, Y. (2014). Genetic bio-ancestry and social construction of racial classification in social surveys in the contemporary United States. *Demography*, 51(1), 141–172.
- Hacking, I. (1991). A tradition of natural kinds. *Philosophical Studies*, 61, 109–126.
- Häggqvist, S. (2005). Kinds, projectibility and explanation. *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*, 5(13), 71–87.
- Hardimon, M. (2003). The ordinary concept of race. *The Journal of Philosophy*, C, 100(9), 437–455.
- Hardimon, M. (2012). The idea of a scientific concept of race. *Journal of Philosophical Research*, 37, 249–282.
- Hardimon, M. (2013). Race concepts in medicine. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 38, 6–31.
- Hardimon, M. (2017). *Rethinking race: The case for deflationary realism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Haslanger, S. (2012). *Resisting reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haslanger, S., & Saul, J. (2006). Philosophical analysis and social kinds. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 106(1), 89–118.
- Hochman, A. (2013). Against the new racial naturalism. *The Journal of Philosophy*, CX(6), 331–351.
- Jablonski, N. (2012). *Living color: The biological and social meaning of skin color*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jablonski, N., & Chaplin, G. (2000). The evolution of human skin coloration. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 39, 57–106.
- Jeffers, C. (2013). The cultural theory of race: Yet another look at Du Bois's "The Conservation of Races". *Ethics*, 123(3), 403–426.
- Kendig, C. (2013). Race as a physiosocial phenomenon. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 33(2), 191–221.
- Kiranantawat, K., Suhk, J., & Nguyen, A. (2015). Asian eyelid: Relevant anatomy. *Seminars in Plastic Surgery*, 29(3), 158–164.
- Kripke, S. A. (1980). *Naming and necessity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- LaPorte, J. (2004). *Natural kinds and conceptual change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linné, C. V. (1800). *A general system of nature through the three grand kingdoms of animals, vegetables and minerals: Systematically divided into their several classes, orders, genera, species, & varieties, with their habitations, manners, economy, structure, & peculiarities* (Vol. I). (W. Turton, Trans.). Swansea, Wales: Voss and Morris.
- Ludwig, D. (2015). Against the new metaphysics of race. *Philosophy of Science*, 82(2), 244–265.
- Machery, E. (2005). Concepts are not a natural kind. *Philosophy of Science*, 72, 444–467.
- Machery, E. (2011). Thought experiments and philosophical knowledge. *Metaphilosophy*, 42(3), 191–214.
- Machery, E., Mallon, R., Nichols, S., & Stich, S. (2004). Semantics, cross-cultural style. *Cognition*, 92(3), B1–B12.
- Machery, E., Mallon, R., Nichols, S., & Stich, S. (2013). If folk intuitions vary, then what? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 86(3), 618–635.
- Maglo, K. (2011). The case against biological realism about race: From Darwin to the Post-Genomic Era. *Perspectives on Science*, 19(4), 361–390.
- Magnus, P. (2012). *Scientific enquiry and natural kinds, from planets to mallards*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mallon, R. (2006). 'Race': Normative, not metaphysical or semantic. *Ethics*, 116, 525–551.
- Mallon, R., Machery, E., Nichols, S., & Stich, S. (2009). Against arguments from reference. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 79(2), 332–356.
- McEvoy, B., Lind, J., Wang, E. T., Moyzis, R. K., Visscher, P. M., van Holst Pellekaan, S. M., & Wilton, A. N. (2010). Whole-genome genetic diversity in a sample of Australians with deep aboriginal ancestry. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 87, 297–305.
- McPherson, L. K. (2016). Deflating 'race'. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 1(4), 674–693.
- Millikan, R. (1999). Historical kinds and the "special sciences". *Philosophical Studies*, 95, 45–65.
- Mills, C. (1998). *Blackness visible: Essays on philosophy and race*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Morning, A. (2011). *The nature of race: How scientists think and teach about human difference*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.
- Outlaw, L. (1996). *On race and philosophy*. London: Routledge.
- Pemberton, T., DeGiorgio, M., & Rosenberg, N. (2013). Population structure in a comprehensive genomic data set on human microsatellite variation. *G3: Genes, genomes, Genetics*, 3(5), 891–907.
- Putnam, H. (1973). Meaning and reference. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 70(19), 699–711.
- Ríos, M., Romero, F., & Ramírez, R. (2014). *Race reporting among Hispanics: 2010*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.
- Risch, N., Burchard, E., Ziv, E., & Tang, H. (2002). Categorization of humans in biomedical research: Genes, race and disease. *Genome Biology*, 1–12.
- Root, M. (2000). How we divide the world. *Philosophy of Science*, 67(3), S628–S639.

- Rosenberg, N. (2011). A population-genetic perspective on the similarities and differences among worldwide human populations. *Human Biology*, 83(6), 659–684.
- Rosenberg, N., Pritchard, J., Weber, J. L., Cann, H. M., Kidd, K. K., Zhivotovsky, L. A., & Feldman, M. W. (2002). Genetic structure of human populations. *Science*, 298(5602), 2381–2385.
- Slater, M. (2015). Natural kindness. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 66(2), 375–411.
- Spencer, Q. (2004). Do Newton's rules of reasoning guarantee truth... must they? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 35(4), 759–782.
- Spencer, Q. (2012). What 'biological racial realism' should mean. *Philosophical Studies*, 159(2), 181–204.
- Spencer, Q. (2014). A radical solution to the race problem. *Philosophy of Science*, 81(5), 1025–1038.
- Spencer, Q. (2015). Philosophy of race meets population genetics. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 52, 46–55.
- Spencer, Q. (2016). Genuine kinds and scientific reality. In C. Kendig (Ed.), *Natural kinds and classification in scientific practice* (pp. 157–172). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sundstrom, R. (2002). Race as a human kind. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 91–115.
- Tang, H., Quertermous, T., Rodriguez, B., Kardia, S. L. R., Xiaofeng, Z., Brown, A., ... Risch, N. (2005). Genetic structure, self-identified race/ethnicity, and confounding in case-control association studies. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 76(2), 268–275.
- Taylor, P. (2013). *Race: A philosophical introduction* (Second ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Taylor, P., Lopez, M., Martinez, J., & Velasco, G. (2012). *When labels don't fit: Hispanics and their views of identity*. Washington, DC: The Pew Hispanic Center.
- UNESCO (1965). Proposals on the biological aspects of race. *Race and Class*, 6(3), 243–247.
- Velasco, J. (2009). When monophly is not enough: Exclusivity as the key to defining a phylogenetic species concept. *Biology and Philosophy*, 24, 473–486.
- Weiss, K., & Long, J. (2009). Non-Darwinian estimation: My ancestors, my genes' ancestors. *Genome Research*, 19, 703–710.
- Wilkerson, T. (1988). Natural kinds. *Philosophy*, 63(243), 29–42.
- Winther, R., Giordano, R., Edge, M., & Nielsen, R. (2015). The mind, the lab, and the field: Three kinds of populations in scientific practice. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 52, 12–21.
- Zack, N. (2002). *Philosophy of science and race*. New York: Routledge.

Quayshawn Spencer received his PhD in philosophy and an MS in biology from Stanford University in 2009 and 2008, respectively. His dissertation questioned whether the cladistic race was biologically real using a novel way of identifying scientifically real kinds. His masters project in biology was to investigate whether certain *Eurema* butterfly species have been misclassified by systematic entomologists using mitochondrial DNA and newer phylogenetic tree reconstruction algorithms. Spencer is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. His research in the philosophy of race, philosophy of biology, and philosophy of science has primarily appeared in *Philosophy of Science*, *Philosophical Studies*, and *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*. Spencer also has two books under contract with Oxford University Press that engage with topics in the metaphysics of race.

How to cite this article: Spencer Q. "Racial realism II: Are folk races real?". *Philosophy Compass*. 2018;13:e12467. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12467>