U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

COMMISSION BRIEFING:

RACIAL CATEGORIZATION IN THE 2010 CENSUS

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 2006

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Room 226, Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Abigail Thernstrom, Vice Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, Commissioner MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY

RACHELLE BRACEY TERESA BROOKS CHRISTOPHER BYRNES, Attorney Advisor to the Office of the Staff Director PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division SOCK FOON MACDOUGALL EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian EILEEN RUDERT AONGHAS ST. HILAIRE AUDREY WRIGHT

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS LISA NEUDER KIMBERLY SCHULD



NEAL R. GROSS

I-N-D-E-X

| AGENDA ITEM PAGE |
|--|
| Introductory Remarks by Chairman 3 |
| Speakers' Presentations 11 Charles Louis Kincannon 11 Sharon M. Lee 26 Kenneth Prewitt 34 Ward Connerly 41 |
| Questions by Commissioners and Staff Director 45 |
| P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S |
| (9:09 a.m.) |
| INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN |
| VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I don't mean to |
| start out sounding as if it's some kind of unserious |
| business around here, a little bit of laughter around |
| the room, and I very, very much welcome you. |
| Mr. Connerly, nobody has been able to get |
| hold of. So I think we just assume he's not coming. |
| And we are notably short of our usual members here, |
| and our staff director is also not here. This is very |
| unusual. |
| And each one of the absent people has a |
| very good excuse for not being here. This is not |
| delinquency or evidence of a lack of interest in this |
| very important topic. I am really personally pleased |
| that we are discussing it. |

And, of course, there will be a full

record. And I assure you that everybody will be 1 reading it and then eventually, of course, a written 2 report on this briefing. 3 So, even though our numbers are a little 4 5 short this morning, the eventual product will not reflect that, nor will 6 we have commissioners 7 uninformed by your statements this morning. So, on behalf of the Commission, I do 8 9 welcome you. And, as you probably know, Commission frequently has briefings on important 10. issues. 11 I want to thank as well the Judiciary 12 13 Committee staff, Judiciary Committee and its staff, for providing us with this venue. 14 This briefing will continue until -- well, 15 as long as it continues but certainly no later than 16 Then I think we are going to try to conduct noon. 17 some of the business meeting since we have some 18 19 commissioners who need to leave early, but we will play that a little bit by ear depending on when the 20 briefing ends. 21 I would also like -- yes? 22 Madam Chair, in our 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: prior discussion, I wanted to just pull one item out 24 25 and table it right away. So if we could do that?

| 1 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTRÖM: Sure. |
|----|---|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would like to make a |
| 3 | motion that we amend the agenda and take the report |
| 4 | from the briefing on the Native Hawaiian Government |
| 5 | Reorganization Act and table that until the main |
| 6 | meeting. |
| 7 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Do I have a |
| 8 | second on that? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I second that, |
| 10 | Chair. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. All in |
| 12 | favor? |
| 13 | (Whereupon, there was a chorus of |
| 14 | "Ayes.") |
| 15 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Anybody |
| 16 | opposed? |
| 17 | (No response.) |
| 18 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It is carried |
| 19 | unanimously. So that item is now postponed. We will |
| 20 | not discuss it at all today. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you, Madam |
| 22 | Chair. |
| 23 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Two other short |
| | |
| 24 | announcements. One, I do want to say to the |

director they have done a magnificent job in his absence. And I very much appreciate the staff members who have made that possible.

Do I understand -- I have got my reading glasses on. So that I can't see. Well, do I understand that Ward Connerly has arrived? He is printing something out. Ward Connerly will join us.

I also want to mention that the Commission recently issued an important set of findings and recommendations on a briefing we held in November. It was a briefing on campus anti-semitism, which we regarded as a serious problem.

And the findings and recommendations which were approved by the Commission on a four-one vote, we believe, those of us who voted for it, we believe, represents an important contribution addressing a major issue on campuses involving higher education that has not received sufficient attention. Copies of the Commission's findings and recommendations are available for anybody who is interested in them.

And I very much welcome Ward Connerly, my old friend. So delighted that you made it. We thought for a minute, for a few minutes that you were not going to do so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So let's get going on this panel of experts before us who will advise the Commission concerning the legal and policy implications of the racial categories that will be used in the 2010 census.

Office of Management and Budget in 1997 established revised standards the classification of racial data. Census Bureau administered the 2000 census based on those standards, which included five racial categories, black, white, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and a separate ethnicity question as well as allowing respondents to check more than one selection to indicate a multiracial identity.

OMB later provided rules for federal agencies using the responses for civil rights compliance and monitoring, general program administrative and grant reporting, and statistical reporting.

The experts testifying at this briefing will address the following issues: one, the usefulness of current racial categories in the census 2010; two, the usefulness of alternative or no racial categories on census 2010; and, three, the legal policies, policy implications, of OMB guidance to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

federal agencies on allocation of multiple race , responses.

We have before us this morning, are very pleased to have before us this morning, four true experts on various aspects of racial categorization. First, we have in a separate presentation the director of the Census Bureau, Charles Louis Kincannon. I understand, though it's written out Charles Kincannon, he calls himself Louis.

Then there will be a panel of three experts on various aspects of the issue: Sharon Lee, Kenneth Prewitt, and Ward Connerly. Again, I welcome all of you on behalf of the Commission. I will introduce everyone, describe your activities, and call on you according to the order you have been given for the record.

Charles Louis Kincannon, Director of the Census Bureau, began his career as a statistician at the U.S. Census Bureau in 1963, after graduating from the University of Texas at Austin, held positions of increasing responsibility in the economic, demographic, and administrative areas of the Census Bureau before leaving in September 1975 during the Ford administration to join the staff of the Office of Management and Budget, where he worked on statistical

and regulatory policy.

He also served as the statistical liaison to Vice President Nelson Rockefeller's office -- I think only I at this panel go back that far remembering that era perfectly well -- and provided administrative leadership that supported the successful implementation of the first Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980.

Mr. Kincannon returned to the Census Bureau in September 1981, appointed Deputy Director and Chief Operating Officer in January '92 by President Reagan's first Director of the Census Bureau, Bruce Chapman; served as Deputy Director to John G. Keane in the Reagan administration and Barbara Everett Bryant in the George H. Bush administration; also served as Acting Director from July 1983 to March 1984 and again from January to December 1989.

During that time, he directed the final preparations for the 1990 census. Throughout his tenure with the federal government, Mr. Kincannon received several awards recognizing his contributions, including the presidential rank award of meritorious service and the Department of Commerce Gold Award.

In October 1992, Mr. Kincannon was appointed as the first chief statistician in the

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, |
|----|--|
| 2 | OECD, in Paris, where he coordinated the |
| 3 | organization's statistical programs and advised the |
| 4 | OECD Secretary General on statistical policy. |
| 5 | He attended the University of Texas at |
| 6 | Austin, did postgraduate work at the George Washington |
| 7 | University, Georgetown University, and the University |
| 8 | of Maryland. |
| 9. | And I am going to break with the materials |
| 10 | I have been given and ask since you are speaking |
| 11 | separately from the other three panelists, ask you to |
| 12 | speak and then introduce the other three because they |
| 13 | then yours is a separate session, as I understand |
| 14 | the organization here. And then the other three |
| 15 | speakers come along. |
| 16 | So, rather than running through all of |
| 17 | these words on everybody else, why don't we have you, |
| 18 | Mr. Kincannon, start? And I will introduce the other |
| 19 | speakers after you. |
| 20 | DR. KINCANNON: Thank you, Madam Chair. |
| 21 | I don't know quite why I am separate, but |
| 22 | I will |
| 23 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I don't know |
| 24 | either. I didn't |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: You have the word |

| 1 | "Director" beside your name. I think that gives you - |
|----|---|
| 2 | - - |
| 3 | DR. KINCANNON: Well, these are also my |
| 4 | colleagues of longstanding in several instances. |
| 5 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: They're not |
| 6 | going to be short-shrifted. |
| 7 | DR. KINCANNON: Okay. Good, good. I want |
| 8 | them to have all of their history. |
| 9 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I promise. I |
| 10 | promise they will. I just wanted to liven it up a |
| 11 | little bit by interrupting these descriptions of |
| 12 | people with some substance on the topic. |
| 13 | DR. KINCANNON: Thank you, Madam Chair. |
| 14 | SPEAKERS' PRESENTATIONS |
| 15 | DR. KINCANNON: Good morning. And thank |
| 16 | you for this opportunity to discuss the racial |
| 17 | categorization in the 2010 census. |
| 18 | Race is a part of the American identity. |
| 19 | It is a part of our ongoing effort to describe |
| 20 | ourselves as a nation and to achieve the promise made |
| 21 | at the beginning when the framers wrote "We, the |
| 22 | people." |
| 23 | The history of race classification is also |
| 24 | an instructive lesson in American history telling how |
| 25 | we became the most uniquely diverse nation in the |

world. Race classification reveals how we became the nation of immigrants that we are. The 2010 census is another chapter in this history, and it is part of our ongoing effort to describe ourselves.

The 2010 census also reveals the evolution of race classification. Beginning in 1790, the census implicitly recognized three race categories: white, black, and Indian. These categories reflected the political realities of slavery and of first inhabitants.

It is worth noting that while this classification was originally used as a means of maintaining the parameters of the three-fifths compromise, by 1850, it revealed the expansion of our frontiers and exposed the truth that slavery had to come to an end.

With the Fourteenth Amendment, the census clause was amended. And the census became a true count of every person. By 1890, several new race classifications emerged, acknowledging the presence of Asian immigrants from China and Japan.

Throughout the Twentieth Century, race classification continued to evolve, to include Filipino, Aleut, Hawaiian, and other categories. In 1970, a separate question for Hispanic origin was

added to the questionnaire as part of the long form sample, the extended questionnaire of population and housing characteristics obtained from approximately one in every six households. This question has been included ever since as part of the census short form, the questions answered by every household.

Also, since 1970, the census has relied on self-identification in its procedures. Now race reflects what individuals have chosen and not enumerator observations, as with earlier censuses.

The present race and Hispanic origin categories options descended from the Department of Management and Budget statistical policy directive number 15 issued in 1978.

These are the federal standards that govern the collection tabulation and presentation of race and ethnic data for government programs. At that time, OMB identified four separate race categories, including white, black, American Indian or Alaska Native, and Asian or Pacific Islander, as well as Hispanic as an ethnicity.

Within each of these categories, the census has traditionally presented examples, check boxes, within each category. For example, the Asian category includes check boxes for Chinese, Japanese,

Korean, and Vietnamese.

In addition, the census also offers the option of some other race as a category. This category does not exist for most federal programs but is increasingly popular, especially among the Latino community who do not identify with any of the traditional race categories.

In 1997, OMB issued substantial revisions to statistical policy directive number 15, as the Chair mentioned. These changes were implemented with the census in 2000, which is the parent of the present-day census questions.

The OMB revisions split the Asian/Pacific Islander category to give us five separate race categories: white, black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Hispanic origin remains a separate category and is asked for a separate question that precedes the race question.

These revisions also allow for the collection of data on people with two or more races, meaning that someone can choose to identify as white and African American or American Indian and Asian or as well as any other combination.

For purposes of civil rights enforcement

and monitoring, nine race groups were identified, including the five basic groups as well as four most frequently reported double race groups, which include white and black or African American, white and American Indian or Alaska native, white and Asian, and black or African American and American Indian or Alaska Native. There are now hundreds of race, Hispanic origin combinations possible.

The Census Bureau implemented these changes in census 2000. And the results of the census indicate that the challenge is of the 2010 census, as previously mentioned, an increasing number of people choose to identify as some other race. Both the number and proposition of people reporting some other race as a single race increased from approximately 7 million in 1980 to over 15 million in 2000.

Some other race is the third largest race group in the United States according to census results. This is a challenge because many federal programs do not include some other race. Neither do many household surveys conducted by the Census Bureau for other federal agencies.

The Census Bureau initially intended to drop the "some other race" category for 2010, but we received congressional guidance as part of the 2005

appropriations that we must include this option for 2010, and we shall.

For 2000, those who identified some other race alone, 97 percent were Hispanic or Latino. In fact, 42 percent of the Hispanic population that identified a race indicated some other race. Forty-six percent indicated that they were white. But many Hispanics did not answer the race question.

In census 2000, the Census Bureau asked Hispanic origin before the race question in an effort to get better data for the Hispanic population. We did get higher reporting for Hispanics than in 1990, but we did not capture the detailed Hispanic origin groups, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban, as well as in the 1990 census.

With these results in mind, the Census Bureau has worked for the past several years to improve the race, Hispanic origin questions for the 2010 census. The 2010 census will be conducted using the 1997 official OMB guidance.

We have conducted a series of tests, starting with comp. tent tests in 2003, in an attempt to improve the questions. We have conducted test censuses in 2004 and are now conducting test censuses in Austin, Texas and the Cheyenne River Reservation in

South Dakota this year. These tests are operationally focused, but they offer important opportunities to observe and evaluate content as well.

An important content test was conducted in 2005 as part of the national census test, a test that included multiple panels. This test examined the need for examples for the Hispanic origin and race question. We are currently evaluating these results. And evaluations will be available later this year.

Throughout these tests, we have been mindful of several emerging challenges, including the increasing concerns about privacy and confidentiality of the data as well as the production of small area data for certain population groups. These concerns must be balanced with the increasing interest to obtain detailed information about the diversity of our country.

The 2010 census will also be the short form-only census -- well, if you don't count 1790 -- that it will be conducted in connection with the American community survey, which will provide the information of greater detail on the population's characteristics.

We will have a limited amount of space on the actual 2010 form. We must carefully choose and

1.

б

test any wording or additional examples used on the form.

To that end, we have tested whether we can reduce the number of check boxes for the major race categories on the forms and provide simple "Yes"/"No" responses for the Hispanic origin question.

We are also testing whether to include a separate tribal enrollment question for the American Indian and Alaska Native group.

Finally, we are testing whether we should include a modified ancestry question to elicit specific race and Hispanic origin groups as well as other ancestries, such as German, French, or Scotch Irish.

The results of the 2005 national census test will be available later this years. And this will be an opportunity for the Census Bureau and stakeholders to discus the implications of question wording on the data. This opportunity is an important feature of the 2010 census planning effort, a much more systematic and expanded effort than in the past.

We have been fortunate throughout this decade to receive the necessary support from the administration and from Congress to conduct these tests as well as other research and planning

٠ 6

activities. We have been given the opportunity to truly test different options.

And this is not limited to Hispanic origin and race questions. We're also testing other content issuance as well as improvements in the processes of the Census Bureau for the census, including the use of bilingual questionnaires in targeted areas, the use of mobile computing devices for field data collection, and other long-sought coverage improvement efforts.

This testing is crucial to the test of the census because it will allow us to learn what can be accomplished successfully and what is operationally feasible; in short, what will work.

Another equally important part of the testing program is to learn what will not work. In fact, in many ways, this may be more important. Knowing what not to do means we can focus our efforts at what we can do well. Accurate data is the ultimate goal of the census to not only help tell the story of our people, but they ensure that the promises of nations can be kept.

Thank you for your patience. I will be pleased to answer your questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I think we will hold all questions until the end because I think

commissioners probably will have questions that will be directed at several of you at once. And we can get 2 a robust discussion going at that time. 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want to make 4 one comment, though, --5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- which is that you 7 8 can tell this man is a pro. He ended at exactly one second left on the timer. 9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Commissioner 10 11 Yaki, I made the same observation myself. add he set a standard for the other speakers? 12 Sharon M. Lee is professor and Director of 13 Graduate Studies at the Department of Sociology, 14 Portland State University. Her research focuses on 15 social demography, immigration, immigrant experiences, 16 race and ethnicity, particularly measurement issues, 17 Asian Americans, and intermarriage, and language and 18 cultural diversity, and health care. 19 She recently completed a study of the 20 effects of interpreter services on limited English 21 proficient patients, health care use, and is currently 22 studying how cultural differences influence foreignborn, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, women's health 24 attitudes, police behaviors and experiences. 25

She represents the Population Association of America on the Census Advisory Committee of Professional Associations and is a member of the American Sociological Association's task force on race statement, the steering committee of the scholars' network of -- I'm going to get this wrong because my Spanish is nonexistent -- Hablamos Juntos, a Robert 7 8 Wood Johnson Foundation funded initiative to improve patient-provider communication among Spanish-speaking patients and the Office of Minority Health Advisory 10 11 Committee for its pilot project on culturally and linguistically appropriate service, CLAS in health 12 care. 13

> Kenneth Prewitt, Carnegie professor of public affairs at Columbia University. Mr. Prewitt's research includes the of ethnoracial use classification in national statistics and the recent changes the classification has undergone.

> He serves on many professional advisory committees and is currently most active on the Committee on National Statistics of the National Research Council.

> His publications include Politics and Science and Census Taking, 2003, Introduction to American Government, Sixth Edition, in 1991; and The

2

3

4

5

6

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

long

U.S. Decennial Census: Political Questions, Scientific Answers, Population and Development Review. He has authored or co-authored a dozen books, more than 100 articles and book chapters. Mr. Prewitt also has had professional career outside the classroom. I should say Professor Prewitt also had a long professional career outside the classroom as Director of the U.S. Census Bureau from 1998 to 2001, Director of the National Opinion Research Center, President of the Social Science Research Council, and Senior Vice President of the Rockefeller Foundation. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Center for the Advance Study in the Behavioral Science. Other awards include honorary degrees from Carnegie-Mellon University and Southern Methodist University. In 1990, he was awarded the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit from the Federal Republic of Germany. He earned his B.A. from Southern Methodist He received an M.A. from University in 1958.

Washington University in 1959, attended the Harvard

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Divinity School in 1960 as a Danforth fellow.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In 1963, he earned his Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University. From 1965 to 1982, he taught at the University of Chicago as an assistant, associate, and then full professor.

His other academic appointments include the Dean of the Graduate Faculty at the New York New School University and faculty positions at Stanford University, Washington University, the University of Nairobi, and Makerere University in Uganda. Thank you for being with us, Mr. Prewitt.

And Ward Connerly, Chairman of the American Civil Rights Institute, which is a national not-for-profit organization aimed at educating the public about the need to, as ICR describes it, move beyond racial and gender preferences.

Mr. Connerly has gained national attention as an outspoken advocate of equal opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, sex, or ethnic background. As a member of the University of California Board of Regents, Mr. Connerly focused the attention of the nation on the university's race-based system of preferences in its admissions policy.

On July 20th, 1995, following Mr.

end the university's use of race as a means for admissions.

He was appointed to a 12-years term as US regent in 1993. In 1995, Mr. Connerly accepted the chairmanship of the California Civil Rights Initiative, which was prop. 209 campaign.

Under his leadership, the campaign successfully obtained more than a million signatures qualified for the November '96 ballot. And California voters passed prop. 209 by a 55 percent to 45 percent margin.

Mr. Connerly's efforts have led to several honors and awards from supporters around the nation; including the Patrick Henry Award in 1995 from the Center for the Study of Popular Culture and Individual Rights; the National Columbia Award in 1996 from the Washington Institute for Public Policy Studies; the Lincoln Award for Leadership in 1997 from the Independent Women's Forum; the Courage in Leadership Award, 1997 from Black America's Political Action Committee; Lieutenant General Edward J. Bronars Defender of Freedom Award in 1997 from the Freedom Alliance; the Spirit of Lincoln Award in 1998 from the Log Cabin Republicans; State Achievement Award from the Conservative Political Action Conference that same

year; the Thomas Jefferson Award that same year from the Council for National Policy; also in '98 the Ronald Reagan Award from the California Republican Party; the Racial Harmony Hall of Fame Award in 2000 from A Place for Us; the Black Students Association Award from the University of Tennessee in Chattanooga in 2001; and the Individual Freedom Award from the Sovereign Fund that same year.

Mr. Connerly has been profiled on Sixty Minutes, the cover of Parade Magazine, the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Newsweek Magazine, virtually every other news magazine in America.

He's also appeared on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer, Crossfire, Firing Line, Hannity and Colmes, the Crier Report, Meet the Press, Rivera Live, Dateline, Politically Incorrect, NBC Nightly News, CNN, and C-SPAN.

He is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Connerly and Associates, a Sacramento-based association, management, and land development consulting firm founded in 1973 by Mr. Connerly and his wife, Ilene.

He is regarded as one of the housing industry's top experts, possessing a comprehensive knowledge of housing and development issues. He has

been inducted as a lifetime member into the California
Building Industry Hall of Fame. Mr. Connerly is
currently a member of the Rotary Club of Sacramento.

I thank you as well as, again, everyone else for being here. And I believe, Ms Lee, you have got the floor for ten minutes.

DR. LEE: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to offer a presentation for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' briefing on racial categorization in the 2010 census.

I have a longstanding interest in racial categories of the U.S. census having worked and published on this topic for over 15 years. My comments this morning reflect my perspective as a social demographer and sociologist who has used census-based data extensively to study racial and ethnic issues in the United States and my experience for the last six years as an adviser under the U.S. Census Bureau's Advisory Committee of Professional Associations.

Here is an outline of my presentation. I am going to begin with a brief history of racial statistics in the census. The U.S. has a long history of collecting racial statistics. In this history, the

U.S. census plays a key role as both collector and disseminator of racial statistics for the nation.

For much of this history, racial

statistics functioned to maintain a social order and policies that excluded non-white groups from civil and political rights. Anti-miscegenation even extended race-based policies into the private personal sphere of marriage.

The era of civil rights dramatically changed the role of racial statistics. Racial statistics were used to document racial discrimination, leading to new laws and policies to address systemic racial inequalities.

In their contrasting roles as maintained or redress of racial inequality, racial statistics shed a similar fundamental premise. That is, the population can be categorized into distinct, separate, mutually exclusive groups.

The number and labels of these racial categories in a census may and do change from census to census, as I and others have noted. But the statistical protocol was constant. Each resident of the U.S. was assigned to one race in the census; that is, until the 2000 census.

Now turning to the 2000 census, the U.S.

population has grown and changed dramatically since the first census of 1790. How the census categorizes and counts the U.S. population by race has also changed.

Almost every census for the past 200 years has collected racial data differently than the one before it. This is a key point to bear in mind because the argument of consistent racial categories across censuses is not a valid argument against future changes in census racial categories.

There were two significant features of the 2000 census that I believe are instructive for today's briefing. The first was the change to allow Americans to report more than one race in response to the growing population of multiracial Americans.

Second was the inclusion of a sixth racial category, "some other race," on the census form with OMB's approval. This was intended to reduce non-response to the race question by Hispanics, particularly Hispanics of Mexican origin, who are among the largest groups of immigrants in recent years and who do not identify with existing racial categories.

Interracial unions and immigration have continued into the Twenty-First Century, with

В

important consequences for the future racial composition of the U.S. population.

In addition, despite civil rights legislation and substantial progress in reducing racial inequalities in the U.S., evidence of racial disparities in many areas, including health and health care, education, employment, and poverty persist.

The growth of the Hispanic population has also highlighted gaps between some Hispanic groups and the non-Hispanic white majority on many indicators of social well-being.

Therefore, there are compelling reasons for the federal government to continue to collect racial statistics and for the census to continue with this key role in this process.

Now, looking ahead to the 2010 census, in the remainder of my comments, I focus on two specific aspects of this issue: first, a possible redesigning of the race question for the 2010 census; and, second, potential impacts of how the 2010 census is conducted on the quality of racial statistics.

A number of researchers, including myself, believe that a single redesigned census question on race and Hispanic origin has several advantages over the current two-question format used in the 2000

census.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You can see from exhibit A the four main features of exhibit A. First, the race and Hispanic questions have been combined. Second, the lead-in question does not specify race or ethnicity. Third, it allows reporting of multiple responses. And, fourth, it includes the category "some other race." I will briefly expand on each of these four features.

Researchers commonly make Hispanic a coequal category with racial categories such as white,
black, or Asian. Merging the race and Hispanic
questions and making Hispanic a co-equal category with
the other categories has additional advantages.

It more accurately reflects how some Hispanics view themselves, particularly the largest Hispanic group, Mexican Hispanics, who do not identify with OMB's five official racial categories.

Merging the two questions may lower nonresponse rates. And data from the single question will be just as, if not more, effective for civil rights compliance and monitoring.

Second, given the option of Hispanic as a co-equal category, the lead-in question need not refer to either race or Hispanic ethnicity.

This question format is not new. For

example, the 1980 census, the lead-in to the question on race did not refer to race and read "Is this person?"

This question format has the additional advantage of eliminating the current distinction between race and ethnicity where ethnicity is limited to Hispanic or non-Hispanic.

The third feature, the change to allow reporting more than one race in the 2000 census was the right change in response to demographic and social reality. The 2010 census should continue to allow more than one race and instruct responders to select all that apply.

Finally, the inclusion of some other race complies with legislation passed by Congress last November and will offer an additional choice for many groups, such as Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, North Africans, Brazilians, and others, who do not identify with the current five official OMB races.

I will now turn to the third part, actually, the last part of my presentation, which is the impact of data collection methods. The census has been conducted in many ways. Prior to the 1970 census, census enumerators visited each household and determined a person's race in the personal interview

and based on observation.

I

The 1970 census form was designed to be completed by respondents, rather than an enumerator. So respondents chose their race from the categories listed on the form. Beginning with the 1980 census, responses to the race question were based primarily on self-identification.

In step with new technologies, I believe that the Census Bureau had initially planned to use the internet in its data collection for the 2010 census. Households may be answering the census form via the internet or other media. But I understand that these plans are now temporarily put on hold because of financial constraints.

It is well-known that the mode of administrating surveys can affect both response rate and content of responses. Many researchers have reported the responses to questions about race and ethnicity are particularly susceptible to such situational and contextual effects.

I, therefore, urge that if the Census
Bureau should be using the internet or other modes of
media to collect data for the 2010 census, that the
Census Bureau should conduct testing across modes of
data collection to evaluate the potential effects on

response rates and quality of data. The introduction 1 of internet census operations will be something new 2 and needs careful testing and monitoring if it does 3 happen. 4 5 To conclude, I am mindful that recommendation for redesigning the race question and 6 racial categories in the census is likely to be 7 controversial. However, as I noted earlier, such 8 change has commonly occurred in the past. And there 9 is no good reason for such change not to happen in the 10 11 future. 12 It is a challenge to meet scientific and statistical standards of data quality and coverage; 13 fulfill legislative, programmatic, and administrative 14 requirements of the federal government; and satisfy 15 other advocacy and interest groups all at the same 16 17 time. So it is a very difficult balancing act. 18 However, as long as there are compelling 19 reasons to continue to collect racial data, there 20 should be continuing efforts to improve how the census does this. 21 Thank you for listening. And I will be 22 23 very happy to answer questions later on. 24 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Professor

Prewitt?

DR. PREWITT: Thank you for this opportunity.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And thank you for your economy as well. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

DR. PREWITT: I believe that the racial categorization used in the 2000 census has deficiencies that make it poorly matched to the public policy challenges it should be helping our society to address.

Modifications in question format for the 2010 census that offer a better match are feasible and should be introduced and in my judgment are not precluded by the standards issued by OMB in '97.

The current system is unstable: the blurring of racial boundaries through intermarriage; the introduction of the multiple-race option in official statistics; multiculturalism as a way to describe the society and ever prescribe its proper feature; increased use of census categories in the quest to assert group identities; the rhetorical and even legal references to diversity as a goal in education and employment, largely displacing the vocabulary of social justice; the very real increase in demographic diversity resulting from a million or more new immigrants each year coming from every region

in the world; the growth of the Latino population, which in federal statistics has now been emphasized as counted as an ethnic group, though in many other venues as a race group; the human genome project, which, at least in health statistics, reintroduces the issue of whether race is biologically real in ways that might have policy consequences; using DNA testing as a fashionable way to uncover individual ancestry; and, of course, as we will hear in a moment, political effort to eliminate race and ethnicity from the statistical system altogether. It is a chaotic situation. The government should provide a clear answer to a simple question.

What purposes should guide official race and ethnic statistics? Many of the problems with the present categories emerge from a failure to address this prior question.

My answer, the primary purpose is to inform the government and the society if there are population groups that continue to suffer from past discrimination or are today being discriminated against in ways that fall within the scope of anti-discrimination policies.

The secondary purpose is to provide a portrait of the society in order to learn whether the

nation is achieving its announced goal of moving beyond the dismal legacy of racism.

To sharpen my point, it is not the task of

To sharpen my point, it is not the task of the federal government to collect statistics so that one population group can assert that it is larger than or growing more rapidly than another population group.

It is not the task of the federal government to collect statistics so that population groups can embrace their identity. It is not the task of the federal government to collect statistics that measure diversity unless that term is subjected to an analytic rigor that is thus far absent in public discourse and in Supreme Court rulings.

With this in mind, the 2010 question that is with these purposes in mind, the primary purpose is to inform the government whether there is and continues to be discrimination.

I recommend a two-question format for the 2010 census that differs in significant ways from the format used in 2000. The first step is to discard the distinction between race and ethnicity and in the process move away from the term "race" altogether.

I recommend the following question, "What is this person's population group? Mark one or more of the groups to indicate what this person considers

ı

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

himself or herself to be." I then would list "American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; black, African American; Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander; Spanish, Hispanic, Latino; and white"; that is, the five primary race categories plus including Hispanic, Spanish, Latino as a category in a merged question.

This merged question format jettisons the conceptually and methodologically flawed distinction between race and ethnicity. It also gets rid of the word "race," a term that reaches back to a thoroughly discredited Eighteenth Century science that took physiological markers as indicative of moral worth and intellectual ability.

The government does not have to use the term "race" -- it did not appear in the 1980 question, but it is used six times in the 2000 question -- any more than it has to use the term "ethnicity" to count Hispanics. That term does not appear on the 2000 census form.

If this wording is thought by some, as it is, as too radical, then I would urge that the stem of the question simply read, "What is this person's race or ethnic group?" and again repeating all five plus Hispanic as one list.

Each of these versions would minimally disrupt statistical series. "Mark one or more" is retained. The government can still enforce the Voting Rights Act and the civil rights laws that center on the 1977 classification.

Data quality would be improved, especially for millions of Hispanic residents, respondents who now select the merely meaningless "some other race" category. The merged format eliminates the awkward "non-Hispanic white" category that now appears in the statistical record, government reports, the media, academic research. And it would deny the nonsense that there are only two ethnic groups in America: Hispanic and non-Hispanic. It would reduce, I believe, non-response to the race question.

This question format would no doubt result in marginally different counts than with the 2000 question format, though in which direction is difficult to anticipate. But there is no statistical or scientific reason to assert that the 2000 format produces a more accurate enumeration of the nation's population groups than one produced by the format I propose for 2010.

This merged question should be paired with a second open-ended question designed to allow

respondents to describe themselves outside the forced choice of the six-category question.

What is this person's ancestry, nationality, ethnic origin, or tribal affiliation? Details of the sort provided by the open-ended question permit tracking discrimination in ways not now possible and permit more focused anti-discrimination policy when specific groups, some recent immigrant groups, for example, experienced discriminatory barriers to job, schooling, or home ownership, barriers that a nation committed to a policy of inclusiveness is obliged to remove.

There remain strong reasons for official statistics that can detect patterns of discrimination and our classification scheme needs to catch up with the ways in which discrimination occurs across a very diverse population.

Categories as broad as Asian do not capture the different life chances of, for example, Japanese Americans or Southeast Asians and with respect to the Hispanic category, the different life chances of Cuban Americans and Mexican Americans.

I would urge that this question -- it's now, of course, being pretested, as the director has just said, by the Census Bureau -- I would urge that

it be on the American community survey only and not on the short form for reasons unrelated to the agenda of this particular Commission. But, nevertheless, I feel very strongly that the Commission might consider such a question and where its proper location would be.

Many thoughtful Americans, certainly including myself, wish that anti-discrimination law were not necessary. We wish that we lived in a society that is truly colorblind. But if we are to create that society, we need to know what is happening to various population groups across the country.

America endorses the goal of eliminating discrimination and will, I believe, continue to support statistics robust enough to determine whether groups historically excluded are overcoming the legacy of slavery and racist government policies and to indicate whether more recently arrived groups are being unfairly held back or penalized by virtue of their country of origin or related arbitrary group characteristics.

More than two centuries after the Constitution started the nation down the road of racial classification, there remain compelling reasons to continue such measurement. It follows that the government should state clearly what those reasons are

B

and then design the most policy-relevant classification feasible. On moral and methodological grounds, the categories used in census 2000 should be improved for the 2010 census.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Thank you very much.

Last, but not least, Ward Connerly.

DR. CONNERLY: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Commission. I appreciate the opportunity of sharing the views of the American Civil Rights Institute with regard to the topic that you are considering.

The perspective I share is also informed by a 12-year sentence as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, an experience that happily and mercifully ended roughly a year ago.

Classifying and subdividing the American people into what amounts to five food groups, Asian, black, Hispanic, Native American, and white, is a process that I find to be highly objectionable. Unless these racial categories within our existing classification system have scientific validity, something that is very much in dispute, I find them to be repugnant; inhuman, to use the characterization of

Nelson Mandela; and socially regressive for a nation that proclaims as its creed "One nation indivisible."

Where I am powered to do so, I would purge immediately from the public arena all classification of Americans based on skin color, texture of hair, nose width, lip size, and slanted eyes, all attributes that serve to define race.

I recognize, however, that my view is an idea that is not yet ready, if ever, for implementation in a society in which race seems to seep out of every pore of the public domain. Therefore, it would be an act of utter futility for me to propose that there be no racial categories on the census 2010. Instead, I will accept that which is and offer a proposal that would at least improve the existing system.

While I see no compelling need for classifying individuals on the basis of their race, if we must have a system of government classification, it is obvious, for a variety of reasons, that the system must be based on self-identification. I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans and interest groups involved with issues of race accept this premise without much disagreement.

However, this generally universal view

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

crumbles when government agencies deny individuals their right to identify themselves as multiracial.

As you know, OMB guidance to federal agencies and, indeed, all agencies that seek to be in conformance with federal guidelines allows agencies to permit individuals to select any or as many race boxes as they wish.

That system essentially forbids agencies, however, from allowing the category of multiracial.

Instead, those who select one or more boxes are collapsed into a category that comports with so-called government civil rights enforcement objectives.

The centerpiece of this approach is the odious one-drop rule that has guided America's struggle throughout our nation's history. It is the root of all evil, it seems to me, in our country with regard to the realm of race.

To provide freedom of choice and then to limit what one might choose is not freedom of choice at all. When the government refuses to acknowledge the existence of multiracial identity. It is affecting, I would suggest, the civil rights of those who choose this identity for themselves.

The presumption is that only pure race individuals are confronted with issues of

discrimination in the workplace by those from other races; white against black, for example. In reality, those who identify as multiracial may be subject to discrimination from those of all races, especially from those most visibly linked to a multiracial individual.

For example, Tiger Woods has been battered throughout his public life by those who see him as black and nothing more than that. He has borne the brunt of cruel and tasteless jokes on BET comedy shows by those who refuse to acknowledge the fullness of his identity. These attitudes reveal themselves in the course of everyday transactions for multiracial individuals.

Some say that it is impractical to acknowledge multiracial identity until a greater critical mass of individuals embrace this identity. In truth, that critical mass has already been reached.

At the University of California, in a study conducted about two years ago, those who would select multiracial as their identity greatly exceeded the combined total of those who identify as black or Native American. This phenomenon is in evidence at many universities throughout the nation.

Multiracial identity is a matter of choice

for many families and individuals that want to blend their respective races into an identity that all members of the family can share. It is cruel for parents to have to contend with the agonies of separate racial identities for siblings who may not look related in families in which the families are interracial.

For this and other reasons, I believe the time has come for the census to acknowledge the obvious reality of multiracial identity and to offer this as a choice on census 2010. Your Commission could provide critical leadership if it were to so recommend.

Thank you for allowing me to share my views with you.

WICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Thank you very much. This has clearly been clearly a wonderful panel. And, once again, I am so grateful to all of you for coming.

QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF DIRECTOR

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It is now open to questions from commissioners. Why don't I start with one. I was very pleased to hear the degree of consensus on the fact that there is something very wrong with the current structure of the questions.

В

I mean, we just start with this notion that there are only two ethnic groups in America. Are you Hispanic, "Yes" or "No"? So we've got two ethnic groups: Hispanic, non-Hispanic. Then these racial groups, as has been readily admitted, are categories that come from a long and ugly past in America.

So I'm very pleased by the suggestions for alternatives. And, by the way, I think, you know, one of the things that has always puzzled me -- and I understand that there is a history here, but one of the things that has always puzzled me if we are really trying to draw a portrait of important groups in America, we have no question on religion on the census. And I do know that history, but I do think, again, if we're collecting data trying to talk about the fabric of American society, that religion is obviously an important component.

But I wondered, Professor Prewitt, you suggest, really, a -- but anybody else can chime in here -- two-tiered solution. You have the first question. You know, I am trying to get, certainly as I think we should try and get, rid of the distinction between race and ethnicity in what is a person's population group.

And then, second, you allow more fine-

grained answers to the categorization so that the umbrella terms "Hispanic" and "Asian," for instance, are broken down. Those are intellectually indefensible categories, it seems to me, as is the category white.

But I wonder whether there isn't a way that you see of not having a two-tiered approach. That is, it seems to me as long as you keep that initial group of categories, you are reinforcing their existence in a world in which they are, the edges are, not only blurring, but we would like to promote that process further.

And I just wondered why one question -and here I am moving closer to what Ward Connerly is
saying or as his roll-back position -- that didn't
reinforce those categories and did allow for one
ancestry question.

And one of the ancestry questions, obviously, in order to capture African Americans could be African American/black but wouldn't solve a problem without the down sides that seem to be apparent anyway.

DR. PREWITT: Yes. If the title of this hearing were "Racial Categorization in Future Censuses as Against the 2010 Census," I would offer a quite

different argument.

В

In fact, in my longer written testimony, I say, "Were it not for the schedule and statutory constraints faced by the 2010 planning, I would recommend a more radical transformation for the nation's racial categorization, which indeed will get rid of the five primary categories altogether, would turn to simply an ancestry origin, ethnicity, openended question. And we aggregate up into whatever combinations either a government agency wants to aggregate up into our analytic purposes or what have you.

I am bound by my responsibility as a past director not to make a recommendation.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I see. Okay.

DR. PREWITT: But I think that is absolutely inconceivable for 2010.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Right.

But I do think that's an important part of your

message as to what we should be striving for here.

DR. PREWITT: Yes. I would hope that by 2020, we could have erased the racist pentagon with its hierarchical assumptions, but that partly depends on civil rights laws, of course.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.

| 1 | DR. PREWITT: And our job I think as a |
|--------|---|
| 2 | statistical agency, the director's job, is to provide |
| 3 | the statistics that allow the country to administer |
| 4 | its policies. |
| 5 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sure. I |
| 6 | understand that. Yes. |
| 7 | Does anybody else have anything they want |
| 8 | to add to that? |
| 9 | (No response.) |
| , 10 . | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Other |
| 11 | questions? Yes, Commissioner Kirsanow? |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. Thanks |
| 13 | very much for coming. And thanks to staff for putting |
| 14 | together such a splendid panel. |
| 15 | I have a number of questions. I am sure |
| 16 | others do, too. But I'll just ask one discrete one of |
| 17 . | Professor Prewitt, I think you indicated that the |
| 18 | primary purpose for gathering racial statistics or |
| 19 | ethnic statistics in the census is for civil rights |
| 20 | purposes. And that necessarily raises the question. |
| 21 | It seems to me that there is a different |
| 22 | assessment of race/ethnicity when it comes to how the |
| 23 | law views such terms, how anthropologists view such |
| 24 | terms, how sociologists view such terms. And, in |

fact, because I have no life, yesterday I tried to

determine how many ethnicities there were determined by various anthropological departments; the CIA, for example. And there are over 3,000.

So it necessarily also raises the question, isn't a breakdown of, say, 6 categories or in the current case 63 or I think we have almost 126 options necessarily inherently arbitrary. And how reliable are such categorizations if, in fact, there is this multiplicity of potential ethnicities in racial groups?

DR. PREWITT: All taxonomies are inherently arbitrary and necessarily create sharp divisions where they don't exist. That's true whether you're dividing the country between urban, rural, and suburban, for example, or in the industrial classification system.

So all category systems in statistical decision-making have to have some arbitrary characteristics. But to go more directly to your question about the race, ethnicity categories, the argument I am prepared to make is that -- and it starts with an answer to the question of why the nation is asking its population to sort itself into racial and ethnic categories.

I do not think -- and here I really

strongly differ with my colleague, Mr. Connerly that identity, expression of identity, is the proper function of a statistical system.

And I think that the debate about the multi-race option in the 1990s introduced for the first time officially the argument that we need to put into our category system something to allow people to express their identity. That is not the purpose of the statistical system as it has been designed. It could become. But then the government has to say that is its purpose.

And then, as I was saying to my colleagues earlier this morning, I asked a group of students what categories would they have. And this nice little Indian student put her hand up and said, "Well, I would like a category for the Patels. There are, after all, more Patels in the area where I live than any other category," perfectly reasonable response if the purpose is identity expression. Why not a category for the Patels?

I think that we are in this chaotic, messy situation because the government doesn't say clearly why we are doing it. My answer is discrimination, civil rights. Somebody could have a different answer: identity. Somebody could have an altogether different

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

answer: sociological research. I don't think the government can have multiple answers to that question and come up with a coherent system.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just one quick follow-up. And I have got a lot of others, but I'll defer to others. The follow-up to that is under Title VII, we have got areas of protective classifications: race, sex, age, national origin. There's nothing in there about ethnicity. National origin might implicate ethnicities.

So the question is, if the premise for doing this kind of categorization is for civil rights enforcement purposes, we have got some type of a database by which to gauge whether or not certain types of policies or practices are discriminatory. Then it seems to me that if you arbitrarily truncate the number of ethnicities to 63, 126, 6, whatever it may be, that you're not adequately or precisely informing the issue of Title VII enforcement, for example. Would you agree with that?

DR. PREWITT: Yes, that's right. Just to go back to the second question that I recommend, which is certainly the wording that the Census Bureau is now considering and has used a version of this in the past, what is this person's ancestry, nationality,

ethnic origin, or tribal affiliation. It's a catch-1 all. It's how do you want to define yourself? 2 That would then give us a very, very 3 complicated matrix across the country where we could 4 track discriminatory action toward very particular 5 groups. 6 As I say, Mexican Americans could be 7 discriminated against but not Cuban Americans, 8 Haitians but not Argentineans, although they're both 9 lumped into the Hispanic category. 10 So this more refined system would allow us 11 still to track discrimination and act upon it 12 13 according to civil rights laws. And it would be a more realistic picture of what is going on in society 14 than these old racial pentagon, which we inherited 15 from Linnaeus, five colors. 16 And I worry that we may reinscribe that 17 system with some of the human genome project. 18 19 that's a very dangerous place for the society to be. So I would like to get away from that racial pentagon 20 that we got from a flawed, flawed science in the 21 Seventeenth Century. 22 CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Other 23 questions? 24

MELENDEZ:

COMMISSIONER

25

Commissioner

Melendez. I would like to just ask a question to Mr.

Connerly. If, you know, the statistics for the census are used basically to identify discrimination, is your position that if we got rid of all the categories, there would be some other way to measure discrimination?

Otherwise you would have to say that at some point discrimination is nonexistent. But it

Otherwise you would have to say that at some point discrimination is nonexistent. But it seems to me that the categories would always have to be present in some form because we always have discrimination.

DR. CONNERLY: Commissioner, I think that the issue of discrimination, measuring discrimination is pretty low on the totem pole of why most people check these boxes.

The census frames the structure of how Americans see themselves and how all the different government agencies throughout the land gather and tabulate this data. Discrimination is pretty low down there.

And it seems to me that people are expressing identity. That's why they check the box, "What are you? Who are you?" That's the only reason that we check the boxes generally.

And so if we're going to provide a

б

framework for people to designate how they see themselves, I think that we have to evolve to a place where we capture how people generally see themselves. They don't see themselves as Asian. They might see themselves as Chinese, but we don't provide that option. It is collapsed into, as I say, one of the five food groups.

So I think we have to start from the whole question of identity, not civil rights enforcement.

So I think we have to start from the whole question of identity, not civil rights enforcement.

And I think that is where this thing goes wrong because we're measuring something that really is not the real world.

The University of California gathers this data, not because of discrimination but because it's trying to construct some amorphous goal of diversity.

And different agencies have different reasons, but civil rights enforcement is pretty low down the list.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have difficulties with that statement that you just made.

DR. CONNERLY: That is your --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I certainly -- and let me just say that I come from this from the position of someone who when he was in California vehemently opposed proposition 209 --

DR. CONNERLY: I know you did.

1.3

| - 1 | • |
|-----|--|
| 1 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: and spoke out |
| 2 | against it on many occasions. And I would say |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Michael, would |
| 4 | you just identify yourself for the record here? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Are we on tape? |
| 6 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. That's |
| 7 | the point. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm Commissioner |
| 9 | Michael Yaki. |
| 10 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I would just note |
| 12 | for the record that the two West Coasters made it here |
| 13 | to the hearing today. |
| 14 | I would sincerely disagree with the idea |
| 15 | that it's very low on the priority list. And I think |
| 16 | that certainly the I don't know how you would |
| 17 | categorize discrimination, but I would certainly say |
| 18 | that for a number of the federal agencies that we deal |
| 19 | with on a regular basis, that it is not something that |
| 20 | is seen as very low priority or toss away or just |
| 21 | something that is a bonus in terms of how we gather |
| 22 | the data. |
| 23 | And I would like to ask the other three |
| 24 | panelists, who have been part of this and seen the |
| 25 | data being used, how you would respond to that |

statement by Mr. Connerly.

11.

DR. CONNERLY: Well, before you do that, with all due respect, let me make sure that you are accurately portraying what I said. And that is that when people check these boxes, civil rights enforcement is not upper most in their mind. It's pretty low down the list.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I know, but that goes to the question of why are they checking the boxes. And it goes to the question that Mr. Prewitt put forth, which is that these boxes are used by the government for various purposes.

It is not, I think, a place where someone is there to say, "This is kind of how I feel about it," whatever. They know this data is being used, how it is being used. Perhaps we can enunciate better why it is being used. But certainly there are advocacy groups out there who have worked on the census over the years.

I was part of the group in the '80s that started going, asking for the sub-check-off under the Asian category for Chinese, for Japanese. I have my own personal reasons for doing that. I am half Chinese, three-eighths Japanese, one-eighth Hawaiian. To this day, I still don't know how to check those

boxes. I probably ruined one of your forms in 1990 or 2000.

But I also understand that there are very significant public policy reasons for doing it. My convenience or my sort of whim as to, well, today I kind of feel Japanese or today I kind of feel today or today I want to stir fry my sushi, so I'm both, you know, it just doesn't matter. What it is is what the form is asking for. What the form asks and what we do with the form is a wholly different matter than how I approach the form as I see it as a civic duty.

Part of what we did in San Francisco and other communities was working with the census on outreach teams to say, "It is a civic duty to answer this." This is not sort of a convenience. This is not sort of a way for you to express who you are. It is to get accurate data that is going to help the government make policy decisions down in the future.

I think that messages goes out there pretty loud clear.

DR. CONNERLY: And my position, as you know, has been it's your civic duty to tell them, "No, thanks. I won't answer." So do we just happen to disagree in that regard?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: As we disagree on the

prop. 209.

В

DR. CONNERLY: Right.

DR. LEE: Madam Chair, may I add to that?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sure. I'm

delighted to have you add something.

DR. LEE: This is Sharon Lee.

I think census data are used by many people for many reasons. And one of them is -- and in this case I do agree with Mr. Connerly that people do see those boxes as a form of self-identification, but I also respectfully disagree with your earlier point about wanting a multiracial box for people to express their multiracial identity because, as we know from looking at the 2000 census data, where people were allowed for the first time to check more than one racial box, that this more than one race population is extremely heterogeneous.

And this heterogeneity is not just in terms of what the combinations are but also in terms of other important characteristics, such as education, employment, and so forth. So I respectfully disagree with you on that.

I also want to reaffirm Commissioner
Yaki's point, which is that there are many groups
involved in how the census gets done and what choice

is offered to people on the race question because many community advocacy groups are very involved as we move towards the census and lots and lots of outreach programs and education efforts to try to first get people to answer the form and send it back; and, secondly, to answer it in a particular way because of concerns about civil rights and apportionment and voting and things like that.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. Professor Prewitt?

DR. PREWITT: For the record, I am sure that the director will agree to this statement. The

DR. PREWITT: For the record, I am sure that the director will agree to this statement. The long form in the 2000 census had some 54 questions. Roughly that many will now be produced, reproduced in American communities survey.

There is no single question on any census form which is not put there for a programmatic purpose, as announced by the United States government. The Census Bureau does not write the questionnaire. The United States Congress writes the questionnaire, in effect, doesn't write it but confirms all questions.

Every question on the census is tracked back to some statutory or programmatic purpose. Whatever the people think of when they're answering

1.1

it, that is why they are there.

So the question has to be asked of Mr. Connerly whether if he wants to undo some programmatic or statutory purpose. Then we can take a question off the form.

But as long as that exists on the books -- and the civil rights laws do exist on the books, fortunately. The Voting Rights Act still is on the books.

As long as those statutes are on the books, the census is obligated to ask a question which will allow the government to administer that law.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. I mean, I was about to say and ask a question very much in keeping with that, which is in response to Mr. Connerly. I'm not sure why we care what is in people's heads, what the priorities of the respondents are.

I mean, the central question, it seems to me, is what sort of information does the government need for what sort of programmatic or statutory purposes. And if we don't like those programmatic or statutory purposes, that should be the discussion, it seems to me, the use that is made of these categories and what we have got on the books and whether, you

know, with respect to -- Dr. Prewitt just mentioned the Voting Rights Act, whether, you know, it makes sense to be racially and ethnically gerrymandering all of those districts.

But that is the question, it seems to me, rather than what the census form should have on it, given the fact that the Voting Rights Act, as he said, is sitting there.

DR. CONNERLY: I appreciate that, but I would submit to you that allowing the people the additional option of multiracial does not impair all of these other programmatic reasons that you may have. To wipe out the race categories altogether would probably do that.

But to say, "We acknowledge that there is now a group of Americans who identify themselves as multiracial. They are a multiracial family. They see themselves as multiracial, to allow them that option does not diminish in any way the ability to enforce all of these different programs. It's just adding one more group to the equation.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But with all due respect, Mr. Connerly, that is almost indulgent in a way that you characterize it because let's take, for example, fair housing programs that the government is

NEAL R. GROSS

trying to enforce.

.19

Say that you are of mixed parentage. Your one parent is white, your one parent is African American or black. And the siblings may take one or more characteristics or the other. One of those siblings goes out and tries to get housing in a different community.

And they look at that person. This other person looks at them, makes their own subjective interpretation that this person likes they're black or African American to me and I really don't want them in my neighborhood. So I am going to say "No."

Now, the indulgency may be on the part of the parents or the kids or whoever to check that multirace category, but when that person goes and says, "I got discriminated against because they think I am African American" or whatever, that is a whole different ball game.

And I think that if you are losing track of those kind of statistics by allowing the sort of globular amorphous and, I would say, highly unscientific taxonomic category called "multirace," you are depriving the government of the means of tracking and identifying and responding to issues that are out there.

. 25

I mean, why not -- I mean, you know, should someone be barred from raising that claim if 2 they chose on the form to claim multirace without any 3 other specification? 4 5 DR. CONNERLY: Commissioner, you are once again, it seems to me, with respect, imposing your 6 will on those individuals who say, "I am multiracial." 7 You think that the government's reasons are far more 8 important than the right of that individual to express 9 themselves as they see themselves. 10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't see how this -11 12 DR. CONNERLY: Let me finish, please. 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. Seriously, Mr. 14 Connerly, with all due respect, I am not imposing my 15 will upon anybody. No one is going to deny you or Mr. 16 17 Prewitt or Ms. Lee or Mr. Kincannon the right to go 18 out there and say, "I am Chinese," "I am Irish," "I am" whatever. That is who you think you are. 19 20 But the census is a totally different animal. 21 The census is a form designed by the 22 government to measure data for the purposes of the federal government programs that we all are a part of 23 one way or another. . 24 25 So I don't see. It just seems to me

rather self-indulgent.

Ż

DR. CONNERLY: As I was saying before you cut me off there, this whole thing is a balancing act.

There is nothing pure about this. There is nothing scientific about this. It's a balancing act. And I am saying balance it by allowing individuals who have accepted for themselves multiracial as their identity.

This is not a multiple choice question for them. They see themselves as multiracial. Allow them that option. Your desire to say, "Well, we want to put you in this box because it's cleaner for us to be able to enforce it," that, it seems to me, should be subordinate to the question of how people see themselves. It's a system of self-identification.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: It may be a system of self-identification, but I still believe that what you are talking about is a very self-indulgent idea of self-identification that does not comport with what the true goals and what the priorities of the census are.

Again, no one is restraining you or anyone else from going out and say, "I am a multiracial person." Myself, to this day, I still am not sure exactly how I characterize myself.

When I'm in Chinatown, people go "Are you

Chinese or Japanese?"

I go, "Well, I'm both." When I am in Japantown, they say the same thing. It doesn't matter how I characterize or what I say. But the question is, -- and I think this is perhaps the most important part of why we have the civil rights laws to begin with -- not everyone looks at you the same way.

You may proclaim yourself to be "I am multiracial," but someone else may decide to look at you as they have looked at Tiger Woods and said, "You know what? The kid is black. He's not golfing in my club. The kid doesn't match my characteristics. I'm not going to let him tee off, you know, with my friends."

The purpose is not simply to say who I am.

The purpose is to track data because other parts of this great society that we live in are not perfect, are not pure, battles continue, Voting Rights Acts still are on the books, the Civil Rights Act of '64 still on the books, fair housing laws still on the books.

The reason why is because as much as we would like to be -- and I join you, Mr. Connerly, in wanting that utopian society, where people aren't judged by what they look like, their skin color, the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

texture of your skin, whatever, however you called it, but we're not there.

And the census is a way to ensure how we can remedy how other people act in response to how you are perceived. That's why I think it is important.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Real quick question. Actually, two questions, one a follow-up to what Commissioner Yaki is saying. It's just simply a logical question. That is, because if the purpose of gathering this data is, for example, to enforce civil rights laws and to accurately gauge it and if, then, Mr. Connerly's premise that a multiracial category or counter to Mr. Connerly's premise that a multiracial category then would somehow disrupt our ability to enforce civil rights laws, it seems to me that the census is, in large part, self-reporting.

So if enforcement is contingent upon how others perceive you, wouldn't the data suffer as a result? If you report yourself, for example, as being Chinese but someone discriminates against you because they view you as something other than Chinese, then we have got a disconnect in the data.

And so the very premise that is self-

reporting is to report something that is based on what somebody else sees you as seems to be a huge disconnect. In other words, to properly enforce the civil rights laws, we should have an enumerator identify who you are because that is how a discriminator would identify who you are.

DR. CONNERLY: Precisely.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second, if the purpose of gathering this data is to inform a programmatic activity, can someone cite for me what specific lawful governmental function has been demonstrably improved by the proliferation of racial categories in the census?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, is the question improved or simply the mandate of the law met? I mean, isn't that --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, even that one. I'll even derogate or degrade the question to, is the mandate of the law met? And I think the first question I asked raises the question of whether or not it is.

For this reason, let's talk about Title VII, for example. For almost 30 years, I have been involved in Title VII litigation. And I would be hard-pressed to find one occasion in which census data

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

was ever introduced into the equation.

In the discovery process, what happens is usually you have got data that is introduced related to how many blacks, Hispanics, Asians, what have you are in a given subset of a class but no reference in my 30 years -- I have been doing this a little bit -- is ever made to what the general population is out there.

Now, I know that the EEOC, for example, just about two days ago issued a guidance indicating that they were going to pursue systemic instances of discrimination on a greater basis.

But even when the EEOC tries to introduce demographic data -- and I am not the greatest litigator in the world -- we can blow that out of the water so simply it's amazing. They try to introduce it, and we blow it out of the water, saying it's not applicable or relative to this particular case because it's just too big and hand-handed.

I don't mean to be making observations. I mean to be asking questions. But let me ask this one more discrete question. This is of Mr. Kincannon.

I think it's 42 USC 1973 is the provision that permits the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to make an inquiry to the Census Department so that the

Census Department will conduct surveys to gather . 1 evidence statistical with respect 2 registration and race for given political subdivisions 3 or states. . Do you know if there is any existant 5 inquiry in that regard, existing right now? 6 just don't know. Have we done that? Are there any 7 states that the Civil Rights Commission has identified B as subject to a statistical gathering mandate by the 9 Department of Census? 10 DR. KINCANNON: I'm not aware of that, 11 I'm not particularly aware of the details of the 12 provision of law you cite. We do collect statistics 13 on race and ethnicity and other factors state by 14 state; in fact, block by block, for purposes of the 15 Voting Rights Act and related court decisions and work 16 directly with the Justice Department. 17 All of those statistics are publicly 18 available when they are produced. And so that would 19 20 seem to answer most questions of that sort. have to see what the law says, but --21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, it is very 22 simple. 23 DR. KINCANNON: Yes. 24

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW:

25

It simply says

that either Congress or the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights can ask the director of the census to conduct a survey as to voting patterns and the registration for political subdivisions or states that are subject to, for example, the pre-clearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act. And I was just ignorant of whether or not we had done so.

DR. KINCANNON: I am not aware of whether you have done so or not. We do a regular survey following national elections, every two years, to ask people about registration and participation in voting. We don't ask them how they voted, of course, but just whether they registered and participated.

These data are certainly available at the national level. They may be available at the state level, at least for some states. We don't ask that on the American community survey or on the census.

And requests for authority to ask the data have to be accompanied with resources in some fashion or another. So that would be the next step to be taken in a request for data.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.

One other question. In terms of programs that are informed by the gathering of racial or ethnic data, aside from the purported attempt to enforce

| 1 | Title VII, are there any other programs that are |
|----|--|
| 2 | informed by the gathering of racial and ethnic data, |
| 3 | programs or policies of the government? |
| 4 | And I appreciate that you are probably not |
| 5 | the right panel to ask that. We should get Congress |
| 6 | up here. Is anyone aware of what programs are |
| 7 | specifically informed by that data? |
| 8 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, voting |
| 9 | right, the enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, of |
| LO | course. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Other than |
| 12 | enforcement of civil rights laws. |
| 13 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I see. |
| 14 | DR. KINCANNON: Red lining of loans and |
| 15 | things like that. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Absolutely. |
| 17 | DR. KINCANNON: Discrimination in |
| 18 | education, schooling. There are a lot of things where |
| 19 | specifically statistics are used in the measurement of |
| 20 | what is going on and enforcement of both laws. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: We used statistics |
| 22 | from the Census Bureau in our Adarand report on the |
| 23 | growth of minority small businesses in this country in |
| 24 | terms of ownership, whether they are simply owner- |
| 25 | owned or had employees that break down in terms of |

size.

That was very much a part of the Adarand stats. They came out, as a matter of fact, the day before we considered the report and it had to be incorporated into the final report that came out.

I mean, I can name a ton of different things over the time, but, as the commissioner said, the Community Reinvestment Act relies a lot on information gathered from the census. The issues regarding, I think, the Indian housing program depend on the census.

In terms of estimating shares, state shares, under the Medicaid program, census becomes very much a large factor in determining how many, what percentage of people are under poverty and in what areas, et cetera.

So I think there is a fair amount of data. It is amazing how much does come out of the census. It's amazing how many different groups and organizations rely on that in helping form judgments and policies and whether programs are succeeding or failing over time.

DR. CONNERLY: Community Development Block Grant Program, of course, relies on this. But frequently the data is just pure garbage.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, it's interesting. Again, going back to data quality, regardless of the merits of gathering racial information or ethnic information, it goes to data quality again because race isn't necessarily or ethnicity isn't necessarily a proxy for better metrics, such as poverty, income, health status, geography, a whole variety of matters that may better implicate the programmatic activity that we're talking about.

I note that in some of the materials that were distributed to us in terms of data quality again, when the Office of Management and Budget examined the races as identified by birth certificates versus death certificates, the races changed for a given individual between that time, from the time they were born to the time they died.

For Mexicans, I think it was 47 percent of Mexicans changed their race or ethnicity from the time they were born to the time they die. For Cubans, it's 67 percent.

So to what extent is data actually -- I'm not trying to be facetious about this, but there seems to me to be an inherent problem in the reliability of this data when people's races seem to change over the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8'

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

24

course of their lifetime.

And I also note one other thing in terms of the data that was submitted. There was an inquiry as to whether or not in the policy number 15 the ethnicity of -- I think it's Cape Verdeans -- should be included in the census.

And so that intrigued me as to why we would want to break it down because I was not aware of a great amount of discrimination against Cape Verdeans. At least I hadn't heard about that or what programs we have for Cape Verdeans.

And I found out that three-quarters of the states do not even have any Cape Verdeans in the population and Cape Verdeans is not even an ethnicity. Cape Verdeans are 80 percent Creole, 6 percent black, and 3 percent French, 4 percent something else. So there are ethnicities within that ethnicity.

So, again, it goes to data quality. I wonder what we're actually measuring.

DR. PREWITT: Could I just add a word or two on this important exchange about data quality? Vital statistics, of course, emerge for administrative records, not census records; that is, birth rates and birth certificates and death rates. And they are recorded by medical authorities or coroners or what

have you.

So that would account for some of these shifts. It has nothing to do with what the Census Bureau collects. This is real collection.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And as they are dying, they are not changing their race is what you're basically saying.

DR. PREWITT: The Census Bureau collects a statistical portrait of the society at a given point in time if people actually change their judgment about how they want to be recorded for the next census, that would be irrelevant to the census purposes. The census purpose is to collect a statistical portrait at a given time.

But a more complicated answer to your earlier question, if I may, many people mistake -they say, "Well, we spend \$200 billion each year in federal funding based upon government statistics, especially census data, and presume that a lot of that is given to particular racial groups. And that is simply not true.

There is not a single federal dollar that is categorized for a particular racial group, maybe categorized for an income group or a housing group or geographic group but not for a racial group.

You may not appreciate but the federal government in its statutory language has never described race. It has never defined it or identified any races.

All of the race categories that we use emerged from a bureaucratic process, if you will, initially from EEOC, then standardized in 1977 under OMB leadership, and then reconsidered in the 1997 change to directive 15.

There is no congressional legislation that mentions any race group. It mentions groups historically discriminated against, but no particular race group is ever identified.

The only identified group in federal legislation is Hispanic. There is a law which the government -- I think it's 1977. I think it's 93. 174-93 is the law, which says if you collect statistics, you also have to collect statistics on Hispanics. And the word "Hispanic" or "Latino" -- I'm not sure which in that time -- is identified in the legislation.

So it is left, if you will, to the agencies to sort of come up with these categories.

The U.S. government; that is, the United States

Congress, doesn't want to have a conversation about

.1

race, quite honestly. And it's left to things like the Commission to have to hold these hearings and struggle with the consequences.

Finally, if I may add one more footnote to the earlier conversation? I just have to point out to Mr. Connerly that the Census Bureau was constantly under pressure to ask a question of sexual orientation so people can express their identity on that dimension. There's even been urging that the Census Bureau ask in its gender question, offer the option of transgender. And there are people who say, "That is who I am, and I want to find myself on the Census Bureau."

The Census Bureau says, "There are no programmatic government reasons for asking that question, and we won't ask it." Unless the government says, "We want to have a programmatic reason for knowing about sexual orientation or knowing how many transgender people there are in the United States," unless the government says that, the Census Bureau doesn't ask the question.

So I just have to ask you if you want to turn the Census Bureau into an expression of who I am and who I want to be, should we put on the census questionnaire a question on sexual orientation and

transgender?

. 12

DR. CONNERLY: No, I wouldn't put it. I would wipe out race, as you know. But I'm saying that what you have in mind, not you but what the government has in mind when it asks these questions, which is programmatic reasons, when I am filling out those forms, I and others, that's not going through our head. What is going through our head is "Well, what am I?"

And so individuals are filling out, they're expressing their entities, regardless of what the government has in mind. And so I am saying that since the Congress has not ordained what these races are and individuals are self-identifying and we're going to keep this ridiculous system that we have that is largely useless in my view, then we may as well allow individuals who are growing in numbers who would see themselves a multiracial that right to express what they see as their identity.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The question, again, goes back to if the primary purpose of gathering racial and ethnic statistics is to inform a programmatic function, aside from the civil rights enforcement component of it, then, how do we inform it if none of those programs have a racial component?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

In other words, if those programs don't identify on the basis of race, then why are we gathering information on the basis of race, especially when a race is a very poor proxy for other legitimate reasons for a program to exist, such as poverty, income, medical reasons, and so on and so forth?

DR. LEE: If I may, Commissioner Kirsanow, that is a very, very good question. From my perspective as a demographer and sociologist and also being familiar with the kinds of research that many of my colleagues in the profession engage in, we make extensive use of the census and other Census Bureau data to study different population groups in terms of opportunity, achievements, and so forth.

And I think that is because we are as social scientists very committed to understanding whether there are inequalities and disparities in this country. And I agree with everyone who has spoken so far that we all wish, I definitely sincerely wish that we no longer have to have data on race in order to document disparities and inequalities.

One area of research that I am familiar with is in the health care and access to health care and health status. Many of the research that I have seen and I am familiar with, we try our best using our

methods and data that we have to try to control for many, many, many variables that we think might explain why there are disparities in health status and health care.

For example, we know that certain population groups in this country continue to have extremely poor outcomes in terms of medical and health status. And after you have controlled for other things that we often think of race as a proxy for, socioeconomic status, income, so forth, there is still disparity.

And it's true. It's very hard to say that this disparity is evidence for actual discrimination by a particular health provider or particular institution. It is very, very hard. And I think that's why a lot of cases, court cases, find it very hard to succeed.

But after you have tried to take care of all the factors that one can theoretically think of, if there is still a disparity, then without the data on race, we cannot say that it was because these groups differed on race.

Now, I am not saying that I then feel very confident to say that this means that there is racial discrimination in this area. As a researcher, one is

| 1 | obviously very cautious in coming to conclusions. |
|------|---|
| 2 | But I just offer this as a comment to your |
| . з | comment · |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. |
| 5 | DR. LEE: and a very good question. |
| 6 | And then, you know, I just really want to affirm, |
| 7 | along with everyone else, that the current system of |
| 8 | race and ethnic data gathering is horrible, is |
| 9 | cumbersome. It makes no sense. We really need to |
| 10 | change it, but, again, for the 2010 census, there is |
| 11 | no time. But this is something that hopefully there |
| 12 | will be future efforts by OMB and others. |
| 13 | · VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Did you want to |
| 14 | say something? I'm sorry. You looked as if you |
| 15 | wanted to say something. Am I correct or incorrect? |
| 16 | DR. KINCANNON: Yes. I wouldn't mind |
| 17 | saying just a few things |
| 18 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sure. |
| 19 | DR. KINCANNON: to sort of go back over |
| 20 | some of the points raised here. |
| 21 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sure. |
| 22 . | DR. KINCANNON: One is that because race, |
| 23 | ancestry, ethnicity are not really scientific |
| 24 | concepts, we can't really verify that they're true or |
| 25 | not. We can measure consistency of reporting. But |
| | II |

people evolve in the way that they regard themselves. We can tell whether the correct age is given and so forth.

A second thing to say is that people do not know why they answer any of these. Well, they would understand age, and they understand gender. They understand relationship to other people in the household. They don't understand very well why we ask race, although you don't have to live so long in this society to understand that it is an important factor in what is going to happen to you.

They certainly don't understand why we ask about things like journey to work. They just think there is a committee of sociologists or somebody up here meddling with a lot of curious questions. And, yet, that is one of the most important and useful questions on the census or on the ACS.

The second thing to say is, as was observed, the census is a product of government. It doesn't have any independent life itself. It originated in the Constitution and in repeated acts of law or legal decisions that result in what we have. That's true of the statistical system generally.

We are guided by the law. In fact, the Constitution says the census will be taken in such

manner as the Congress shall by law direct. It 1 2 doesn't say that in every part of it, but even though it's always true, I think, in other parts of it. 3 We are not going to make any untested changes in the questionnaire. I mean, this is why we 5 are really almost out of time for 2010 because of the 6 lead time in testing, evaluating, getting comment, and 7 incorporating. 8 And I would say that unless there is some 9 10 decision by a high court or an act of Congress, that we're not going to do anything that hasn't been tested 11 about the race question because if we haven't tested 12 it, then we don't know what is going to happen. And I 13 know where that blame will fall: on my successor. 14 But that's all right. 15 (Laughter.) 16 DR. KINCANNON: I still am concerned. 17 COMMISSIONER 18 YAKI: Or predecessor, whatever way you want to --19 That's right. 20 DR. KINCANNON: That's I am not sure that "race" is a useful word, 21 although a lot of Americans understand it. . 22 personally convinced, although without any scientific 23 evidence, that ethnicity and ancestry are not very 24

useful labels on a questionnaire except to the

questionnaire together. It helps us keep our records 2 tidily. 3 Finally, I lived for eight years And it's against the law in France to ask a 5 question about race, national origin, ancestry, or 6 7 religion. In French society, discrimination exists. It's just that they can't measure the effects of that. 8 So there are many differences of how our government 9 has evolved, but erasing the measurement does not 10 erase the problems that a society faces. 11. French problems are no worse than our 12 problems. And they deal with them as well as we deal 13 14 with them, maybe better in some instances. But this to suppress the measure of it is not the answer. 15 That's all I have to say. 16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Kincannon, in 17 terms of --18 DR. KINCANNON: Yes? 19 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is there or do you perceive of there being a possible problem, going back 21 to data quality, longitudinally given that you have 22 got a proliferation of categories and you also have an 23 increasing tendency on the part of the populous to 24

scholars and bureaucrats that are putting the

identify themselves, as Mr. Connerly indicated, as

25

multiracial?

At least the materials that we got, the sizeable number of percentage of the population is increasingly viewing themselves as multiracial. So do you see there being a problem in terms of the integrity of the results longitudinally; in other words, being able to measure apples to apples going down the road?

DR. KINCANNON: To some extent, that is true of every census. Ten years is a long time in between. And it's difficult without looking at measures in between to decide whether something is a real change, a change in perception, or an aberrancy of some kind.

Certainly for race, it is important. If nothing else, we have seen how the American Indian population has increased far beyond the possibility of natural increase. And it is because of changed perceptions that something that people may have hidden 30 years ago or 20 years ago, that their mother may have hidden when they were born is now something in which they take interest and pride. And so we see more people identified that way.

So they are not, strictly speaking, necessarily comparable over time, although for blacks

and whites, blacks and others, those figures remain, you know, reasonably useful over a long period of time.

The vital statistic system does not consistently measure all races. And certainly all states are not asking about Hispanic ethnicity at birth. That means that the only way we can really do evaluation of the census quality on the basis of demographic analysis is between blacks and all others. So that's a great limitation in our mind, but because of the decentralized nation of vital statistics, we simply lack that tool.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Let me ask a couple of things. Professor Prewitt, you said, look, there is no federal law that specifically -- you gave one exception -- mentions group by name. In the 1975 Voting Rights Act, of course, it does identify four groups specifically by name. In 1965, of course, it did not name blacks as a group, but it does in the '75 amendments.

Your larger point that -- and it seems to me it highlights the complexity of all of this -- none of this federal legislation is going specifically after any one or more groups, but the fact is that a lot of it is framed in such a way that language is a

proxy for race or ethnicity.

I mean, everybody knows that Title I by now is now -- it wasn't originally, but Title I by now is basically about African American kids. And the "No Child Left Behind," the latest revision of Title I, right up in its preamble says, "This is about the racial gap in achievement." Well, that includes, of course, Latinos as well as African Americans, but, nevertheless, it's basically about the gap, how far behind in terms of levels of educational achievement black students are on average. So, you know, we use proxies for race in an awful lot of this legislation.

And in terms of the Voting Rights Act and the use of census data, well, two things. One, of course, the census counts Hispanics without regard to citizenship, but, then, the Voting Rights Act, of course, since non-citizens can't vote, the Voting Rights Act, we've got Hispanic districts drawn, where an awful lot of the residents of the district can't vote. And so they're not really Hispanic or we don't know the degree to which there are Hispanic districts.

So, you know, it's just a mess, it seems to me.

You know, you stress the programmatic purposes of the census. And, of course, those are very real and very important. But from my point of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

view as a social scientist, the portrait of America purpose is as is important.

And I have been very torn, as Mr. Connerly knows, on the question of getting rid of the boxes simply because I am a social scientist and I do want the best data we can gather in to draw a portrait of America.

I mean, I think that is important, particularly because if we have an ill-informed portrait of America, then all sorts of political use is made of erroneous numbers of bad guesses at what America looks like. And numbers are inflated or minimized or whatever but driven by various agendas that I think are very unfortunate.

I don't think, Mr. Connerly, that self-identification is ever going away. That is here to stay. As long as we are collecting data, it is going to be on self-identification. We're not going back on that.

And the last comment, I mean, it does seem to me -- and this is directed also to Mr. Connerly -- that your unstated goal here -- and I am very sympathetic to it, as you know. I mean, I have been very torn on this whole issue because, again, I am a social scientist. Your unstated goal is really to

make these government statutes unenforceable.

And the reason I am very sympathetic to it is there have been a couple of mentions, for instance, of the Voting Rights Act. And I think it is Mr. Kincannon who said or maybe it was Professor Prewitt who said, "Well, we have now got block-by-block census data." And, of course, as everybody on this panel knows, we have got very sophisticated software now used.

So that these insane, in my view, districts are drawn and a family, an African American family, moves out of the central core of Dallas, is moving up the economic ladder and is moving to a suburb and guess what. The districting lines chase that family because, you know, there the census has identified a black family.

So you get these district lines that come out like a tentacle grabbing that family and/or a cluster of families so that they are lumped together in a way that really violates their sense of self-identification as now having had some social mobility and moving into the middle class. It lumps them together with their old neighbors in inner city Dallas or wherever.

And so, you know, I do think, Mr.

Connerly, that is your unstated goal: let us make these statutes --

DR. CONNERLY: I plead guilty.

And it's just a comment on my part. I'm very sympathetic to that, although, although I as a social scientist, you know, want data. And I don't know how to reconcile the down sides, which I think everybody here might in one way or another agree on with the important of having a portrait of America, just putting aside the question of the legitimacy of the federal and state statutes that depend on racial and ethnic statistics and so forth.

DR. CONNERLY: Commissioner, I would say that the data is so unreliable it is collapsed into such silly categories that it is rendered essentially useless at best.

In many cases, it leads in different directions because when you start with "I am Vietnamese" and you end up with "Well, I am Asian," there is nothing there, I think, that institutions can use.

Yes, I would like to see us get rid of that. Yes, those who fear that the use of multiracial will lead in that direction are probably right.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Is that my objective? Sure. But I think that is where we are right now. The reality happens to comport with my hidden agenda, which isn't hidden very well, I guess.

But that is the reality. People now see themselves as multiracial. And we are essentially denying that. And we are denying that because we fear that what they want is going to come to pass. And it will.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What percentage
-- I'm going to ask a statistician here. What
percentage of people do you estimate think of
themselves as multiracial?

DR. LEE: In the 2000 census, 2.4 percent of the population checked more than one race. Proportions were much larger among people 18 and younger, which is an indication of several things, including the fact that intermarriage has been increasing over the last several decades and it is the children of the interracial unions who are using the opportunity now to check more than one race or that their parents report them as more than one race.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But whatever the percentage of the under 18 category, the fact is that we're talking still, Mr. Connerly, about small

numbers here.

1

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

. 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. CONNERLY: Commissioner, I'm not so sure. When we did this study at UC, the fact that we did not allow that as an option, the fact that the government guides the choices that you can make contributes to that, I believe, depressed number, unrealistic number.

When you say, "You can choose anything you want as long as you choose within these groups," then I think you limit those choices. If "multiracial" were there, I firmly believe that more people would check it. And that is the fear that a lot of those who don't like this, that is the fear that they have.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Do you think the box if it contained the disclaimer "If you check this box, we will not be able to track any data relating to discrimination, allocation, poverty, other kinds of important factors that might be of relevance to you and your family"?

DR. CONNERLY: But that's not a true statement, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure, it is.

DR. CONNERLY: No, it isn't.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Absolutely, it is.

DR. CONNERLY: No, it isn't. People who

NEAL R. GROSS

are checking off --COMMISSIONER YAKI: Absolutely. . 2 3 DR. CONNERLY: No, it is not. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Connerly, you 5 know, I sit here. And I have listened to this for --I don't know -- ten years coming from you. 6 just boggles my mind that I think there is one 7 fundamental thing we agree on. 8 And that is we both want a society that is truly colorblind, where race is not an issue. 10 we can agree on that, wouldn't you? 11 DR. CONNERLY: I would hope so. 12 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: The problem is we don't live in that society. We don't live in that 14 kind of place. I know, you know, for myself in my 15 lifetime, I have encountered discrimination. Other people I know have encountered discrimination. 17 I'm not talking just "Oh, I didn't get the 18 19 job because" whatever. I'm talking about people who called me J words and C words and every other kind of 20 word. 21 22 And in the case of what Mr. Kirsanow said about this disconnect if you're this, but they hit you 23 because of that, well, you know, I don't think that 24 when Vincent Chin got his head stoved in by people in 25

1980 because they thought he was Japanese he really cared whether they thought he was Chinese or not. They just saw him as someone who they were going to pound on because they wanted to take out their frustrations of the American automobile industry against someone they thought was from Japan.

You know, we don't live in that kind of world. And to the extent that we don't live in that kind of world and we have programs in the civil rights department, we have programs in housing and urban development, we are better designed to address and deal with these, we need the data to make sure we know how best to do it.

And, again, I just think it's nice but it's self-indulgent to say, "Well, I'd like to kind of be this multiracial thing." Well, okay. Put on there a big giant disclaimer, "If you do that, this is what will happen. These are the kind of stats that will not occur."

In the voting rights arena, it would be a complete mess because then you're saying they're thinking, "Well, how do we know whether there is vote dilution or not?" There is this amorphous group of people. We don't know what they are, who they are, what group they are.

ı

For all practical purposes for what we as 1 a society want to do to get to that better place, to 2 get to the place that you want this country to be and 3 I want this country to be, it just doesn't make any sense. 5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I think, in 6 fairness to Mr. Connerly, he should be able to finish 7 his thought, but I want to just interject. Since we 8 don't have a good definition of vote dilution, we 9 still don't know. I mean, that whole concept -- it's 10 a bad example to use. 11 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't think so at 12 all. I think this is where you and I disagree on the 13 Voting Rights Act report, which we will be talking 14 about later today. 15 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. 16 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I think there is a very good definition of vote dilution. I think there . 18 are excellent examples of where communities have 19 attempted to 20 impose vote dilution of minority communities. 21 22 And if we want to disagree and debate about that, we can. 23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We can do that 24 25 later. But, in any case, I think Mr. Connerly had the

floor. And I think he would like to finish what he 1 2 had to say. DR. CONNERLY: Thank you, Commissioner. 3 I don't want this to become a replay of our disagreements over the past ten years. And I 5 6 think there are larger questions here, one of which is the consistency. 7 If we say that our system is one of self-8 identification and we have a group of people that 9 identify themselves in a certain way, it seems to me 10 that it's inconsistent for us to deny them that 11 12 option. Some say it's only 2, whatever percent. 13 That is certainly larger than the number of those who identify as Native American. And, yet, we allow that. 15 So if we're trying to not get into the 16 realm of where this is going to end up -- and clearly 17 18 in my view, 100 years from now, we will think this is all silly. 19 But for right now, if the census is going 20 to be an accurate reflection of our population based 21 on how people identify themselves, the logic of 22 allowing multiracial in my view apart from the 23 political considerations that some have, the logic is 24

overwhelming that we allow them that option, not to

1 say "You can check multiple choice," then after you do, "We will take that freedom away because we will 2 then assign you to the box that we think you belong 3 in." It's inconsistent. 4 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Commissioner 5 Kirsanow? 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 7 Another very discrete question. And this goes to Mr. Kincannon, 8 who is more engaged in his wiper, as most of us 9 usually are. 10 There are after every census concerns, 11 allegations, representations that the census has 12 under-counted certain population groups. 13 several wonderful years in statistics 101. And I have 14 never been able to figure out what we don't know. 15 I mean, you can do multiple regression 16 analysis to come to some type of general idea of what 17 you may not have taken into consideration, but do we 18 know, first of all, whether or not there have been 19 20 under-counts of different population groups? And if 21 we have, to what extent? DR. KINCANNON: Well, there's quite a lot 22 of research and evaluation information that is 23 publicly available on this. I won't go back. I 24 certainly can't go back and recall all of it. 25

There are certainly consistent measures of under-coverage of the black community if the self-identification is correct. And we know that going back to the 1940 census, I believe I am correct in saying, based on demographic analysis.

As I said before, we don't have good vital statistics that permit us to look at other than that split between blacks and all others. We have done follow-up evaluations measuring coverage using sampling surveys after the census. And that also indicates under-coverage of American Indians, for example, particularly those that live on reservations.

So there are also figures along the lines that you were speaking that correlate under-coverage in the census with very young people, with people of low educational attainment, with people who have low incomes, people who live in central city areas and in very rural areas, all of which are things that correlate also sometimes with various race and ethnicity groups.

So there is well-documented evidence that we miss people in the census. The measurements we did in 2000 seemed to show that we had improved coverage over the 1990 census and for the first time had reversed a many decades-long trend in declining total

1.5

coverage of the population.

.22

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Do you think -- and this is to any member of the panel. You don't need to be an expert on the Voting Rights Act, but it really goes, I guess, to the statistics and the gathering of information.

Is there a concern in the testing that was done prior to implementation of the 2000 census? That is a greater number of potential categories of self-identification.

In that testing, was there -- and I think, Professor Prewitt, you may have been involved in this also. In that testing, was there any kind of metric or was there any kind of indication that perhaps this proliferation of categories might inadvertently result in a dilution of numbers in different political subdivisions for purposes of section 2 of the Voting Rights Act?

To extrapolate a little bit, let's say that you have a number of categories and prior to 2000, though, you only had 5-6 categories. If, say, blacks had identified themselves as black and not as Cuban or Jamaican or something else, then you may have a subset of the population that is 13 percent black. And in different political subdivisions, that would

vary.

But now if you have given different choices, that might dilute to a point of, let's say, seven percent might identify themselves as black. Was that per the testing process? Was that a concern?

DR. KINCANNON: I wasn't here during the testing process. And I don't recall discussion of that element. We did produce if they had formally reported as black and later reported -- well, they're not supposed to stop reporting as black if they also report they're Cuban because ethnicity and race are separate questions on the census. And I think that is part of the rationale, holding them as separate questions, but who knows what that rationale is in everybody's mind.

The adding making it possible to report more than one race does not reduce the mention of every race involved. And the way we present the statistics, it is possible for the Justice Department or for this Commission or anybody else to tell the total number of people who have indicated they are -
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: By aggregating

DR. KINCANNON: -- black and so forth.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

them.

DR. KINCANNON: And, of course, the sum 1 total of all of those things exceeds 100 percent. But 2 still you have no loss of the total identity of 3 persons of any racial group. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 5 In the Census Bureau -- I'm sorry. Go ahead, Professor Prewitt. 6 7 DR. PREWITT: You finish whatever you want to make. 8 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I take it --9 10 correct me if I am wrong -- that the Census Bureau . 11 obviously is not involved in policy. directives from Congress as to what you are supposed 12 to measure and you measure. 13 So, in other words, considerations of 14 whether or not having these categories -- Mr. 15 Connelly's concern, for example, is kind of like the 16 17 more elegant, I think, rendition of the Morgan Freeman 18 example of they asked Morgan Freeman a few weeks ago, "Well, you know, what about race? What do we need to 19 do about this matter of race and racial discrimination 20 and all the racial problems we have?" 21 And he goes, "Well, stop talking about 22 And I think his point was happily we have gotten .23 to the point in this society where there is still 24

pervasive and invidious discrimination out there and

we shouldn't discount it, ignore it, and we need to 1 seize it and root it out where we can. It's no longer 2 1964 either. 3 And I think -- I'm not speaking for Mr. 4 Freeman, but I think I know Mr. Connerly -- that the 5 extent to which we keep talk about it, it seems as if 6 we exacerbate the racial divide. 7 And, as I tell my kids, the amount of 8 encounter discrimination you are going to 9 is infinitesimal compared to what was encountered 40 10 years ago, but we seem to be in a hyper-racialized 11 society, where we're talking about it even more and 12 more. Less discrimination, the more we talk about it. 13 That's maybe a good thing. 14 15 I hope there is less discrimination. there is a question as to whether or not we're 16 perpetuating things by just being so hyper-sensitive 17 also. 18 Are there policy considerations related to 19 the number of boxes you have as to if we have these 20 many boxes or these few boxes, somehow we may be 21 contributing to some racial problems down the road? I 22 guess that is something for Congress to consider. 23 DR. KINCANNON: Yes. We don't have any 24

25

policy problems with that.

We have operational

| 1 | problems. |
|----|--|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Testing problems? |
| 3 | DR. KINCANNON: Well, the more options you |
| 4 | give, the more space it takes, but that's an |
| 5 | operational concern and not a policy concern. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. Because the |
| 7 | short form, for example, about one-third of the entire |
| 8 | short form consists of matters of race, which would |
| 9 | suggest to somebody who sees it, you come down from |
| 10 | Mars, and you get this form. You think the government |
| 11 | is only concerned about race. |
| 12 | DR. KINCANNON: You don't have to come |
| 13 | down from Mars. That's true. |
| 14 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I |
| 15 | think Commissioner Yaki had something to say. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. I'm just going |
| 17 | to |
| 18 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I have a |
| 19 | question. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: go into a totally |
| 21 | different let's talk prospectively about 2010. And |
| 22 | it's a question that some friends of mine wanted me to |
| 23 | bring up. And that has to do with the treatment of |
| 24 | Latino, Hispanic identification on the form for 2010. |
| | |

I guess you are running some tests right

now on how to do the sampling and how to get the 1 response rates. Could you elaborate a little bit 2 about what the efforts are right now? 3 DR. KINCANNON: Well, last year we had a 4 national content test, the second one in this decade. 5 And we tested five different versions of the way to 6 ask the race and ethnicity question. included in the slides and in the record that I 8 submitted. 9 Some of them wrote very slight variations. 10 And we're now in the mode of analyzing the results, 11 evaluating them, and seeing which of those methods 12 seem to produce the best result, the least confusion, 13 and so on. 14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: And do you think that 15 will be available, then, for the 2010 short form? 16 that the goal? 17 DR. KINCANNON: Yes, yes. 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. 19 DR. KINCANNON: We will complete that 20 And it will go into the analysis this year. 21 22 questionnaire that we proposed to Congress for -- and that we will use in the dress rehearsal in the 2008 23 and then in the ACS from 2008 through 2013, whatever 24 it is, and in the short form for the 2010 census. 25

| 1 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Now, according to your |
|----|--|
| 2 | data, 97 percent of the "some other race" category |
| 3 | check-offs turned out to be Latino or Hispanic. What |
| 4 | was the rationale for Congress keeping that category, |
| 5 | even though you were going to be adding Hispanic, |
| 6 | Latino, whatever it is that you're going to do to |
| 7 | elucidate that in the 2010 census? |
| 8 | DR. KINCANNON: Well, the rationale of |
| 9 | Congress was that Hispanic groups wish to have that |
| 10 | question continue. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. |
| 12 | DR. KINCANNON: I don't know whether 97 |
| 13 | percent of Hispanics cared one way or the other, but |
| 14 | representative groups wanted to retain that. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. |
| 16 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Did you have |
| 17 | something to say on that? |
| 18 | DR. PREWITT: Yes. It goes back to the |
| 19 | earlier conversation about multiracialism. So it's |
| 20 | important to know when you're looking at statistics on |
| 21 | multirace option, which is different than the |
| 22 | multiracial category that Mr. Connerly recommends, |
| 23 | that a very high percentage of the 2.4 percent in the |
| 24 | 2000 census who are recorded as having chosen more |

than one race, is a combination of one of the primary

races and some other race, which, of course, Some other race is not a race. 2 nonsense. 3 So our statistics on the choice multiracialness incorporates that deep flaw, it seems 4 to me, in the question, which is the "some other 5 race." 6 The Census Bureau -- and I can speak, I 7 think, probably more forcefully than the director can В on this issue. The Census Bureau would wish that the 9 "some other race" were not on the 2010 census. 10 And it's been put on by legislation to 11 indeed comport, if you will, with Mr. Connerly's kinds 12 of logic, which is that Hispanics want to be able to 13 use it, even though it is useless data for any kind of 14 programmatic purpose whatsoever because "some other 15 race" is not a race by definition. 16 So it is there to allow 15 million or 17 perhaps even more Hispanic Latinos to go ahead and 18 write that down on that line, even though it is 19 confusing the multirace conversation that we are 20 having and they are going to get imputed anyway in 21 many instances. So it is a bad item. It's bad, bad 22 statistics and bad public policy. 23 Just another second. If I could, I want 24

sure that I associate myself with the

chairman. I would like for this country to imagine that the census data and other major federal surveys are a public good that allow us to understand ourselves.

I am on record as saying that it is too bad that the census has been pulled back so that the only questions you can ask are ones which have a very concrete programmatic or statutory purpose.

I would hope that we would be liberated to have a conversation in settings like this about what should the country understand about itself, what is in our public interest, what is in the interest of our democracy to understand about ourselves and allow the census to be the primary vehicle for collecting that information. Whether that becomes a multirace option or a multiracial question or so forth, then it's a legitimate conversation.

Finally, I guess I would add to Mr. Connerly's important observations about this we simply do not know statistically. If you have asked a multiracial option as against multirace, checking more than one box, and simply said "multiracial," we simply don't know what the numbers would have been.

That's easy to find out. All you have to do is do a big survey but sample. Ask one but sample

NEAL R. GROSS

people the census question as it now exists, the other people the question which simply adds multiraciality as a category, and we would have some statistical guess as to where the population would like to be. And I would be happy to see that survey conducted. would be very important information. We simply do not know. The other thing Ι would just add

statistically, much to my own surprise, I am on record saying the multirace population will grow rapidly in this period. But, nevertheless, over the first five years, I guess now five years including test data, the American community survey since the 2000 census, that number has not gone up very much at all. It has been quite flat, much to our surprise, much to my surprise.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Professor Prewitt? · I'm sorry. Go ahead.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, .just going to pick up from your point that the collection of this data allows us to understand ourselves and return to a question that I raised at the very start.

As I said, I understand what the history is here, but I wonder if there hasn't been any consideration given in recent years of reviving the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | issue of asking questions about a person's religion. |
|----|--|
| 2 | I mean, how we understand ourselves in this country in |
| 3 | terms of self-identification, religion is a very |
| 4 | important factor. |
| 5 | DR. PREWITT: Again, I could speak as an |
| 6 | ex-director. The director would probably have to |
| 7 | hesitate giving an answer to this. But I would like |
| 8 | to see in the nature of the public good, |
| 9 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. |
| 10 | DR. PREWITT: I would like to see a |
| 11 | question on religion. We know why it is not there. |
| 12 | It goes all the way back to 1790. |
| 13 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. |
| 14 | DR. PREWITT: And the times that we tried, |
| 15 | Hindu and so forth, were failed efforts |
| 16 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. |
| 17 | DR. PREWITT: for all kinds of reasons. |
| 16 | But from the point of view of information as a public |
| 19 | good, it is such an important part of our |
| 20 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Exactly. |
| 21 | DR. PREWITT: existence as a society. |
| 22 | there was a time, of course, when the census did do a |
| 23 | survey on religion. And that was truncated very |
| 24 | quickly, as we well know. |
| | |

But, anyway, I am happy to be on record

| 1 | saying that I would like for this society to |
|----|---|
| 2 | understand itself religiously the way it understands |
| 3 | itself other ways and would hope that Congress would |
| 4 | allow the United States Census Bureau to be a vehicle |
| 5 | for providing that information. |
| 6 | . COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Professor? I'm |
| 7 | sorry. Go ahead. |
| 8 | DR. LEE: Can I just add to that, |
| 9 | Commissioner? |
| 10 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. |
| 11 | DR. LEE: The Canadian census routinely |
| 12 | includes a question on religion. And just also |
| 13 | something that bears on this discussion so far, they |
| 14 | do not use the word "race" in that collection of the |
| 15 | statistical property of the country. And the census |
| 16 | is done every five years. And they ask a question on |
| 17 | ethnicity. That's it. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Arlan? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Arlan, yes? |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. I think just |
| 21 | a comment. Commissioner Melendez. |
| 22 | I know that speaking of Native American |
| 23 | reservations, we were really under-counted, I think, |
| 24 | in the 1990 census. And I think it's improved some |
| 25 | but not only as far as identifying who we are. |

You know, I think many people have in their mindset that the census data is used in some type of formula for distributing resources or allocating resources to the general community, whether or not it's identifying economic conditions in a certain sector of the United States, so that hopefully by identifying who you are, that resources actually can come your way.

I think that is part of the reason people fill out the census forms, not necessarily totally to identify that we're Native American or some nationality. I think in the back of our minds, we're hoping that this data is used to allocate resources by Congress, who looks at it for empowerment zones and all kinds of different things to send resources our way.

Does anybody want to comment on that?

Because I know that we talked about it just being used solely for many identifying discrimination, but, again, disparity, like Ms. Lee mentioned, doesn't really necessarily say there is discrimination.

You're just looking at disparities in resources to a certain extent. Does anybody want to comment on that?

DR. CONNERLY: Well, I think you are

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

absolutely right, at least in terms of the perception.

| 1 | Congresswoman Waters in Los Angeles ran ads during |
|-----|---|
| 2 | the 2000 census, saying, "Make sure you check the box |
| 3 | because this will facilitate the delivery of services |
| 4 | to your community." So I think that that view has |
| 5 | been fostered. |
| . 6 | And I think that those ads were paid for |
| . 7 | by the Census Bureau, as I recall. |
| 8 . | DR. KINCANNON: I don't think Ms. Waters' |
| 9 | ads were paid for by the Census Bureau. |
| 10 | DR. PREWITT: I'm certain they weren't. |
| 11 | DR. CONNERLY: There were some that were, |
| 12 | I guess. |
| 13 | DR. PREWITT: Well, there were many ads, |
| 14 | \$187 million worth of advertising for the census. |
| 15 | DR. CONNERLY: Yes. |
| 16 | DR. PREWITT: But that had nothing to do |
| 17 | with what Senator Boxer might have |
| 18 | DR. CONNERLY: Waters. |
| 19 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Waters, |
| 20 | Congressman Waters. |
| 21 | DR. CONNERLY: Congressman Waters, not |
| 22 | senator. |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: A couple of |
| 24 | questions, and it's not necessarily directed at |
| 25 | anybody but anyone who wants to answer. |

Title

And I don't want to beat a dead horse, but I'm going to. In terms of data quality again and in terms of informing governmental programs or policies, going to the issue of religion, discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, or color, national origin, religion, we're gathering data on some of them but not all of them. We're leaving out color, for example, and we're leaving out religion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it seems to me that this data is illserving the programmatic or policy purpose of civil rights enforcement under Title VII. So then the question naturally begs, "Well, why then are we just doing it selectively?"

And then the question is, if we are leaving out religion and color because of certain sensitivity concerns and maybe even First Amendment concerns, I'm wondering whether that, then, also implicates the question of whether the census itself because it's something done by the government has Latinos being inherently coercive. In other words, when you get something from the government, you're more likely to fill it out than if you get it from, say, a private agency.

This goes to what Commissioner Chairman

| | • |
|------|--|
| 1 | Thernstrom was saying. And that is it gives us a |
| 2 | portrait of ourselves. But I'm wondering, would it be |
| 3 | better if that portrait were put together not by the |
| 4 | government but by, say, private entities, who could |
| 5 | maybe even perhaps even better target the gathering of |
| 6 | the information. |
| 7 | For example, how much does the census |
| 8 | cost, 200-something million dollars, to do? |
| 9 | DR. KINCANNON: You are a few decades off |
| 10 | in that cost. |
| 11 | (Laughter.) |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. It's like a |
| 13 | billion dollars? |
| 14 | DR. KINCANNON: Eleven billion dollars is |
| 15 : | the |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: How much? |
| 17 | DR. KINCANNON: Eleven billion |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Eleven billion? |
| 19 | Okay. |
| 20 | DR. KINCANNON: life cycle cost. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Maybe that is a |
| 22 | little too expensive for private entities, although I |
| 23 | would note that Harvard, Yale, and all of these others |
| 24 | have got endowments in the billions. And a consortium |
| 25 | of all of the academics in the country or all of the |

·1 2

> . 3

5

б

7 8 9

11 12

10

. 14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

scholars in the country and their institutions could maybe if they think it is so important pool their resources and do it. And it wouldn't be inherently coercive.

The government, for example, is very careful about sending out surveys and information because they believe something from the government is inherently coercive and compels people. Whether it does by, you know, penalty of law or not, people are more likely to fill out something that comes from the government.

In my day job, I'm with the National Labor Relations Board. And we are very scrupulous about not giving employees the belief that something is being affirmed or endorsed by the National Labor Relations Board because it's more likely they will vote the way the union or the way the board thinks they should vote.

I didn't mean to ramble on like this, but the two discrete questions are, is there a problem with not eliciting data or inducing data related to religion and color in informing Title VII?

And two is, is it possible that a consortium of private entitles might do as good a job if a different job than, say, the census would in

But, anyway,

gathering information without the possibly inherently coercive component that might be associated with the government or --VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And let me just add a sentence to that. Of course, we, private entities and nonprofits, et cetera, do collect a lot of information. That is where all our religious data comes from, nongovernmental sources. And I assume that those data are fairly accurate. let's have you --COMMISSIONER YAKI: I do hear that Halliburton has a lot of cash on hand right now. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Which is horrible. Well, I suppose that DR. KINCANNON: question is to me, really. I don't think that there is a private organization that is capable of producing the same coverage or response that the Census Bureau produces by spending quote a lot of energy and having a very talented staff to do that. 19 20 don't think any private research organization regularly receives response rates in the 90 percent rate. And on the American community 22 survey, we are getting reports, response at the level 23

> **NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of 95 or 96 percent month in and month out. I just

don't believe anybody else can deliver that.

1

2

3

5

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

Of course, that is using, at least technically, coercive power of government. It's a mandatory survey. The census is mandatory. Your response is mandatory under the law. We don't prosecute people very often at all for that, but it does make a difference in peoples willing to respond.

We measured that difference at the request of the House Government Affairs Committee to see what difference it made to have the American community survey mandatory or voluntary. And if we were going to get the same response rates without mandatory authority, it would have increased the cost by more than a third.

So it does make a difference to tell the people that the Congress is saying something is so important that they oblige them to reply, even if enforcement is minimal.

I do not have any desire whatsoever to have the Census Bureau involved in collecting religion, period. The law forbids us to do it on a mandatory basis; that is, with the census.

In my view, there is no utility for us to get involved in measuring that except in very narrow circumstances where a survey relates to some behavior or health condition very closely associated with

1 .

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | religious practice. We almost never do that, even |
|------|--|
| 2 | though the law permits that. |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And you're so |
| 4 | opposed because? |
| 5 | DR. KINCANNON: It's just another |
| 6 | controversial hassle that the Census Bureau does not |
| 7 | need to get into. |
| . 8 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, wait a |
| 9 | minute. Religion is a more controversial category |
| 10 | than race? |
| .11 | DR. KINCANNON: Yes, yes. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would say, Madam |
| 13 | Chair, that I would bet that the non-response rate |
| 14 | would shoot up significantly. I think that religion, |
| 15 | religious beliefs are so intrinsically personal to |
| 16 | people that if they were forced to comply |
| 17 | VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's a testable |
| 18 | proposition, and they could omit that one question, |
| 19 | that answer to that one question. |
| 20 | Anyway, I have been told by the staff that |
| 21 | it would be a very good idea to wrap up. And unless |
| 22 | any member of the panel has something further he or |
| 23 · | she would like to say |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, one |
| 25 | question? I'm sorry. |

Comparative data. Do any of you have any opinions as to whether there are better census systems elsewhere? Professor Lee touched upon Canada, and I thought that was really interesting. Are there any other census systems throughout the world that we should emulate or avoid, are better than ours, worse than ours? Any thoughts with respect to racial categorization?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I assume Mr. Connerly would say, "Look, France doesn't collect

Connerly would say, "Look, France doesn't collect racial data."

DR. LEE: Perhaps I can try to respond,
Commissioner Kirsanow, having used census data from
other countries, including Australia, Singapore,
Malaysia, the U.K., and Canada, and also research and
looked at data that researchers, demographers have
used, data from the Brazilian census.

Now, I don't think there is a perfect census system anywhere in the world. And I think that many of the issues that the U.S. census and the U.S. Census Bureau have to try to grapple with, other countries have their own challenges.

Just coming back to the issue about religion, the Canadian census, as I mentioned earlier on, has routinely had a question on religion. And

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
. 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

they don't have the kind of legislative injunction 1 2 against adding a question on religion. 3 And, as far as I know, -- Statistics Canada is the Census Bureau counterpart in Canada -it has never been a controversial question, believe it 5 But I don't think it's the case in this 6 7 country. 8 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: If nobody else has anything they want to say, no other commissioner 9 has an urgent question, I would like to once again 10 thank all of you for coming. 12 It's a topic that interests me enormously and I think this has been a wonderful panel. And 13 those who were not able to be here have missed an 14 enormously informative morning. 15 16 Thank you so much. would like. actually, to take a five-minute break. 17 Good. 18 Thank you, Commissioner Yaki. Five minutes. 19 trying to get out of here on a plane, but five minutes 20 we can do. 21 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter 22 concluded at 11:40 a.m.) 23

24