

# RRR

## ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 1991

VOLUME II, NUMBER 9

### Undercounting Hispanics

by Murray N.  
Rothbard

If the rationale for eternally cossetting and privileging blacks is the ever-receding "legacy of slavery" (now a century-and-a-half long gone), then what is the excuse for doing the same for Hispanics? Hispanics were never enslaved, at least not within the borders of the United States. It is true that they have not been doing very well in our upwardly mobile society, but does mere failure entitle one to permanent privilege at the expense of the able? Is it the difficulty of transferring from the Spanish language to English? But all immigrants, except those from Britain, have had to adopt a new language, and most have done very well. Is there something about the Spanish language that makes the transition difficult? But actual immigrants from Spain seem to do well, as do immigrants from Cuba or Argentina. Indeed, there seem to be two particular sets of Hispanic immigrants who do badly and are therefore the recipients of quotas and affirmative action: Mexicans (usually in the West), and Puerto Ricans (in the East).

**Does  
mere  
failure  
entitle  
one to  
perma-  
nent  
privilege?**

One strange Hispanic problem has recently appeared in New York City. Now that elections have been brutally shifted from the state and local to federal jurisdiction, the U.S. government has decided, in its wisdom, that New York City governance, featuring a Board of Estimate with a fixed number from each borough, was "discriminatory," since the people from less populous boroughs are over-represented, and from more populous boroughs, under-represented. Indeed, the fanatical federal courts are determined to stamp out all areas where proportional representation does not exist; only the explicit clauses of the U.S. Constitution prevent them from overturning the clearly disproportionate system of having two senators from each state.

Under the command of the federal government, New York has expanded the number of city councilmen that now constitute its governing body, and has been desperately trying to gerrymander the district lines to create as many black, Hispanic, and even gay districts as possible. In New York, the big push is on to correct the allegedly grievous "under-representation" of Hispanics. Now even though

(Cont. page 2, col. 1)



### THE EAR

by Sarah Barton  
America's Only Libertarian  
Gossip Columnist

Hardworking Norm McConnell has been virtually expelled from the Massachusetts LP for being too normal. Norm, who did heroic ballot access work for the Ron Paul campaign, denounced the anti-Paul cabal of social misfits who run that historically bizarre (even for the LP) state party. Norm was in turn attacked for not being a lifestyle libertarian, and told to make himself scarce.

\*\*\*\*\*

Randians all over America are pressuring Justin Raimondo *not* to publish his blockbuster article on the "ominous parallels" between a 1922 Old Right novel and *Atlas Shrugged*. Justin's title: "Who Is Henry Galt?"

\*\*\*\*\*

Dave Boaz, executive veep of the left-libertarian Cato Institute, defines "bigotry" in a letter to the editor of the *Washington Blade*, D.C.'s gay newspaper, as being "firmly committed to the 'heterosexual ethic.'"

\*\*\*\*\*

A subscriber calls to say that *Reason* magazine rented his name to the "Society for the Right To Die." Nothing wrong with that, says our man, but isn't it interesting that a suicide group sees *Reasonettes* as customers? "They wouldn't rent the *RRR* list!" ●

leftist ideology proclaims blacks and Hispanics to be in permanent solidarity against the hated white oppressors, in actual fact blacks and Hispanics tend to live cheek-by-jowl with one another in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens, and so an increase in the number of Hispanics in the City Council or Congress is likely to mean a drop in the number of blacks.

Oddly enough, the Department of Justice, even though commending the New York redistricters for doing a heroic job of racial and ethnic gerrymandering, has disallowed the redistricting plan for not guaranteeing more Hispanic victories. What seems to be the problem with the Hispanics? In several districts, for example, the District Commission created districts with a clear Hispanic majority, not just of the population but also of people of voting age. So if there are several districts where 51 or 53 percent of the voting age population is Hispanic, what's the fuss all about? Why does the result still "discriminate" against the Hispanics?

The answer: it seems that Hispanics, in large numbers, don't vote. In the proposed District 8, for example, which includes East Harlem and part of the South Bronx, over 50 percent of voting age population is Hispanic, but Hispanics constitute only 40 percent of registered voters. Therefore, the chances of an Hispanic being elected from the district are minimal. But if Hispanics are too lazy or whatever to vote, why should *other* ethnic groups, who vote more heavily, be penalized? Shouldn't

representation be based on voting age population, thereby rewarding voters instead of penalizing them? And *why* don't Hispanics vote, anyway? Who knows? Difficulties with English? But surely this is an English-speaking country, and public business should be conducted in English, as it has been for all previous immigrant groups. Why should Hispanics receive special privileges if they are too indifferent to learn English? Perhaps because more illegal immigrants are Hispanic? But surely illegal immigrants can hardly be expected to demand proportional representation. Illegal immigrants should count themselves lucky that they are not rounded up and sent home, much less demand that they be represented in the legislature.

If this registered voting problem is ever solved, however, others will quickly appear. Many registered Hispanics don't bother to vote, especially in primaries, where New York politics is generally decided. So what is supposed to be done then? The logical conclusion to this nonsense is that the federal government will eliminate elections altogether, and then the federal courts will directly appoint all state and local officials, making sure of the proper ethnic blend.

In the meanwhile, in a parallel problem, every state and locality is bellyaching about an "undercount" in the census, and de-

manding that the missing people be added on to their numbers. It is a curious spectacle to see mayors and governors, many of them committed to Zero Population Growth, hysterically insisting that there are millions of missing who must be rounded up and added to the list. No one ever complains of "overcounting." "Undercounting" is of course a modern phenomenon. In the old days, the only point of the census was to count people so that electoral votes and total representation could be allocated to the states. Now, of course, states and localities get lots of federal

taxpayer handouts per person, and hence the scramble to count as many as possible, including bums, pigeons, and falcons. Dollars provide a far greater lure than mere representation.

Secretary of Commerce Mosbacher has wisely decided not to "adjust" the

original census count, but not before giving the case away by having the Census Bureau estimate, with absurd precision, the number and percentage of people it missed in each state and locality. But if the count itself, the actual count of numbers, erred and missed people, how in the world can the Census Bureau state, for example, that it undercounted the population of Baltimore by 4.7 percent? How it can possibly know what it failed to count, especially with such precision? The answer is that it

**Why should Hispanics receive special privileges if they are too indifferent to learn English?**

can't, and the seeming precision is totally spurious. The estimates of missing are arrived at by mere statistical manipulation and massage of the data. But the whole point of the census is that, for once, an agency *doesn't* rely on faulty sampling theory (based on an unsupported, arbitrary, and wrong assumption that samples are always distributed around the "population" figure via a bell-shaped "normal" curve). The unique thing about the census is that, every ten years, it doesn't sample; it goes out and tries to count. To "adjust" such figures is to undercut the whole point of a census.

According to the theorists, most of the "undercounted" are Hispanics, who deliberately make themselves scarce at census time. Why do they do so? First, they have an innate distrust of the government, and don't want to be counted. Surely a healthy instinct, even though much of the reason for the distrust may be that the said "missing" generally have something to hide. Many of them, once again, are illegals, who obviously don't want to call themselves to the attention of government. All well and good, but then, as we said above, why should illegals be represented in Congress or in the handout line? And again—and this applies to both blacks and Hispanics—many of the male residents of the inner city don't want to be counted lest their female consorts and progeny be deprived of welfare payments or public housing. OK, but then again, surely they shouldn't be represented in government. ●

## THE SHORT LIBERTARIAN QUIZ

### PALEO or NIHILO/MODAL?

Some readers have been puzzled over the meaning of such terms as "paleo-libertarian" and "modal libertarian." We hereby provide a handy 10-question quiz, based on events or issues in the recent news, to clarify the issue and help you answer the question: *Are you a Paleo, or a Modal?*

1. Do cops have the right to require law-breakers (e.g. drugged-out speeders) to stand still and be frisked? (The Rodney King case.)

**Paleos:** Yes. **Modals:** No.

2. Do bums have the right to stink up public libraries and to expose themselves to children there?

**Paleos:** No. **Modals:** Yes. (Mary Gingell and the LP).

3. Do bums have the right to clog up, beg, and harass people on the public streets?

**Paleos:** No. **Modals:** Yes.

4. Was the U.S. right to go to war against, and massively bomb, Iraq?

**Paleos:** No. **Modals:** Either: Who cares? or No answer.

5. Is the U.S. government right to outlaw racial or religious discrimination in employment or housing?

**Paleos:** No. **Modals:** (Apparently) Yes.

6. Should all residents of the United States, including aliens, have the right to vote in U.S. elections?

**Paleos:** No. **Modals:** Yes.

7. Do parents have the right to stop their young children from engaging in "consensual" sex and pornography?

**Paleos:** Yes. **Modals:** No.

8. Do parents have the right to instruct their young children in their religion?

**Paleos:** Yes. **Modals:** No.

9. Does one nationality have the right to become independent of the domination of another (e.g. Croats or Slovenes from the Serbs in Yugoslavia)?

**Paleos:** Yes. **Modals:** Either: Who Cares? or No (because "nations" are a "collective" and "only individuals have rights.")

10. Should all public matters in the United States be conducted in English?

**Paleos:** Yes. **Modals:** No (Because all languages should have "equal access").