

The American Ethnic Geographer

A Specialty Group of the Association of American Geographers

Volume 6, Number 2

Autumn 1998

Comments from the A.E.G.S.G. Chair

Greetings. I hope each and every one of you had a safe and productive summer. As usual, at this time of year, we all feel rather inundated with the rapid abstract deadline the AAG uses but from all indications this upcoming Hawaii meeting will be a great success. Much of this success is attributable to the hard work that AEGSG members devote to organizing sessions and the high quality of papers and posters presented. It is evident that the AEGSG is a "well oiled machine," given

its members' high degree of professionalism, and for this I wish to thank all of you.

This year, besides special sponsored sessions and plenary speakers, we are honoring Michael Conzen for his tremendous contributions to geography, specifically ethnic geography. Michael's book, *The Making of the American Landscape* has become a mainstay for many of us in the classroom; and this special honor in Hawaii is but a small token of gratitude. I encourage all of you to attend this special session honoring Dr. Conzen, as I do all of our sessions.

I would like to close with thanks to three very special people, friends and

colleagues all. First, I would like to thank Carlos Teixeira for his special newsletters. Carlos is a perfectionist and the newsletter reflects this high degree of professionalism. I encourage each of you to submit short articles, book reviews and "news" to make Carlos' life a little easier. Second, I want to thank Lawrence Estaville for exposing me to the incredibly rich world of American ethnic geography and for his leadership in the specialty group. Finally, I wish to thank Ines Miyares, who has left large shoes to fill. I hope I can do half as good a job as Ines. So, in closing, keep up the tremendous work that each of you are doing and I look forward to seeing you in Hawaii.

Doug Heffington

In This Issue:

The North American Urban
Kaleidoscope 10

*The Changing Ethnic Demography
of Metropolitan Miami*

by Thomas D. Boswell

A.E.G.S.G. Session Report 11

The Homeland Concept, Part 1
Report by Douglas A. Hunt

Recent Publication Reviews..... 13

*Multiculturalism in North America
and Europe: Comparative Perspectives
on Interethnic Relations and
Social Incorporation.*

Review by Momo Podolsky



A.E.G.S.G. Distinguished Scholar Award

James P. Allen

On 27 March 1998, at the Boston AAG, the AEGSG honored James P. Allen with its Distinguished Scholar Award. Previous recipients of this award were Terry G. Jordan (1994), Wilbur Zelinsky (1995), R. Cole Harris (1996), and Allen G. Noble (1997).

continued on next page...

James P. Allen...*continued from cover*

At the AAG in Hawaii in 1999, Michael P. Conzen will be given the award.

Jim earned his AB degree at Amherst College in 1958, his MAT degree at Harvard University in 1959, and his Ph.D. in Geography at Syracuse University in 1970. He launched his research career with a dissertation on Franco Americans in northern New England written under Donald W. Meinig. Since 1969, Jim has been a key faculty member in Geography at California State University, Northridge. The author of numerous articles and book chapters and three atlases on ethnicity in the United States, Jim is rightly known today as the "Dean" of American Ethnic Geographers.

The three atlases are products of Jim's extremely successful collaborative efforts with his colleague at Northridge, Eugene Turner. Jim sets the research direction and writes much of the text while Gene extracts data from computer files to create innovative computer maps. The first atlas, *We the People, An Atlas of America's Ethnic Diversity* (MacMillan, 1988), analyzes by county 67 American ethnic groups. It won four awards including a special J.B. Jackson Prize given by the AAG and the

R. R. Hawkins Award from the Association of American Publishers. The second and third atlases, published in 1990 and 1997, respectively, by the Center for Geographic Studies at California State University, Northridge, concern Southern California. In the second of these atlases, *The Ethnic Quilt: Population Diversity in Southern California*, Allen and Turner analyze 34 ethnic and racial groups in 1990 in five counties—where 20 percent of the foreign-born population of the U.S. now lives. Harold Meyerson referred to *The Ethnic Quilt* as "the real 'LA Confidential' " in an article in the *LA Weekly Literary Supplement* (1 Fall 1997).

Those of us who know Jim personally find that his curiosity knows no limits, that he radiates youthful exuberance, and that he loves adventure and travel. Jim gained much first-hand knowledge of the American West by hopping freight trains and back packing. The profile that we have of Jim is that of a very complete person, and for his creative scholarship in ethnic geography he well deserves the AEGSG's Distinguished Scholar Award.

Richard L. Nostrand
University of Oklahoma

The North American Urban Kaleidoscope: The Changing Ethnic Demography of Metropolitan Miami¹

Thomas D. Boswell

Department of Geography, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida 33124-2060

Metropolitan Miami is not unusual because of the number (about 1 million) of Hispanics who live there nor because of the percentage (about 58 percent) of its population that is comprised of Hispanics. Both the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles (with almost 6 million Hispanics) and New York (with close to 4 million Hispanics) contain far larger Latino² populations, and several metropolitan areas in both Texas and New Mexico have larger percentages of their populations being Hispanic. Still, there are two characteristics that particularly distinguish the ethnic demography of Miami from other major metropolitan areas in the United States. One is the rapidity with which greater Miami's ethnic composition has changed, from being a predominantly Anglo city to one that now has a Latino majority. The second is the success that Miami's Hispanics have enjoyed when compared to the economically and socially disadvantaged positions of Hispanics living in most other American cities. Each of these two distinctions will be elaborated upon below.

In January 1959 the communist revolution led by Fidel Castro overthrew the former Cuban government, an event that was to have a tremendous impact on Miami, located only 226 miles

north of Havana. As the Castro government initiated its major social and economic transformations in Cuba, many Cubans began emigrating to the United States, and particularly to metropolitan Miami. In 1960, only 5 percent of Miami-Dade county's population was Hispanic and 80 percent was Anglo,³ with the remaining 15 percent being Blacks. By 1998, however, the Hispanic proportion had increased to approximately 58 percent. The Black percentage grown to about 21 percent, and Anglos had dropped dramatically to about the same percentage as Blacks. Thus, in less than four decades Miami had changed from being a predominantly Anglo city to one clearly dominated numerically by Hispanics. No other large metropolitan area in the United States has ever had its ethnic demography so radically transformed in such a short period of time.

Throughout the 1960's and into the early 1970's immigration to Miami was dominated by Cubans. In 1970, 91 percent of all Latinos living in Miami-Dade county were persons of Cuban origin.⁴ However, things began to change during the middle 1970's, as immigrants from other Latin American countries began to discover Miami. By 1990, the percentage of Hispanics who were of Cuban descent had declined to 59 percent. Today,

there are probably about 650,000 Cubans living in Miami, but there are also many thousands of Nicaraguans (100,000), Puerto Ricans (90,000), Colombians (75,000), Dominicans (40,000), Mexicans (30,000), Peruvians (25,000), Hondurans (20,000), as well as other Hispanic nationality groups living in this metropolitan area.⁵

The majority of Miami's Hispanics are solidly members of the American middle class, more so than is the case for most Hispanics living in other American cities. In 1997, almost 30 percent of all Hispanic Americans lived in families with incomes below the poverty level. For Miami the comparable percentage was about 15 percent. There are at least four reasons why Hispanics in Miami have been more successful economically than most Latinos living elsewhere in the United States. First, because of the nature of Cuba's revolution, the Cubans who arrived in Miami during the early 1960s were selected disproportionately from the upper and middle classes of Cuban society. Although most of these Cubans were not allowed to bring money with them, they did bring their "human capital" (e.g. their skills, experience, education, and entrepreneurial skills). Because of the skills they brought with them, they were able to lay the economic foundation for future waves of other Latin American immigrants. Second, the early-arriving Cubans received financial and educational assistance from the U.S. government because they were classified as political refugees, assistance that was not available to most other Hispanics. Third, as the Hispanic population of Miami increased, an ethnic economic enclave was established that provided assistance to newly-arriving Latinos. Fourth, Cuban families living in the United States more frequently (than other Latino families) included wives who worked in addition to

their husbands. Thus, it was common for Cubans to have more than one person contributing to the family income.

There are other ways in which Miami's Latino population is different from Hispanics living elsewhere in the United States. For example, because of their economic success and growing numbers they are more politically empowered and they play an important role in Miami's politics. Because of the communist takeover in Cuba, Miami's Hispanics are strongly anticommunist and tend to vote more conservatively and more often for Republican Party candidates than Latinos elsewhere in the United States. Also, because they are unable or unwilling to return to Cuba, Cubans living in the United States have elevated Miami to a special order of importance, as it has become a homeland in absentia for Cuban Americans.

Footnotes

¹ Metropolitan Miami is defined to here include all of Miami-Dade County. In 1997, the name of Dade County (the county containing the City of Miami and 26 other municipalities) was changed to Miami-Dade County.

² In this article I use the terms Hispanic and Latino as synonyms.

³ I am using the word Anglo to include all non-Hispanic Whites (including Jews).

⁴ Persons of Cuban origin include all individuals who considered themselves in the census to be of Cuban descent regardless of whether they were born in the U.S. or Cuba.

⁵ The figures for 1998 in parentheses are only estimates based on anecdotal evidence because the last census was taken more than eight years earlier.

A.A.G. Session Report

Boston A.A.G., 28 March 1998; A.E.G. Specialty Group Session #6503 The Homeland Concept Revisited (Part 1)

Organizer and Chair: Lawrence E. Estaville, Southwest Texas State University

Panelists: Charles S. Aiken, Daniel D. Arreola, Martyn J. Bowden, Stephen C. Jett, Richard L. Nostrand.

The discussion focused on several of the 12 questions developed and deliberated at the 1994 San Francisco A.A.G. (A transcript of that session was published in Fall 1997 by *The American Ethnic Geographer*.) These questions remain as the seminal issues surrounding debate of the homeland concept, nearly a decade after its genesis in geography. This report was condensed and edited in April 1998 by Douglas A. Hurt from a tape-recording made at the session.

Homeland concept overview:

Nostrand: In the late 1980s, while finishing his book *The Hispano Homeland*, Nostrand felt compelled to define the term homeland. No literature in geography existed on homelands, so he developed three qualities: people, place, and bonding with place (seemingly the key). The ideas of control of place and time were later brought out at AAG sessions organized by Nostrand and Estaville.

At the 1991 Miami A.A.G., homeland papers were read by **Brock Brown, Estaville, Douglas Heffington, Dean Louder, Nostrand, and Walter Schroeder**. At the 1992 San Diego A.A.G. two sessions were organized and papers were read by **Thomas Boswell, Michael Conzen, Estaville, Steven Hoelscher and Robert Ostergren, Douglas McDonald and Ary Lamme, Michael Roark, and Ira Sheskin**. These 13 papers became the essence of a 1993 special issue of the *Journal of Cultural Geography*, edited by **Estaville and Nostrand**. Five homeland ingredients were outlined: people, place, bonding with place, control of place, and time. The editors believe that issue is the first published dialogue in geography on the homeland concept.

In 1994, Syracuse University Press requested an extension of the dialogue on the homeland concept by transforming the journal issue into a book. Meanwhile, at the 1993 Atlanta A.A.G. **Estaville** organized another panel discussion. **Michael Roark** chaired the panel that included **James Allen, Boswell, Estaville, Lamme, Nostrand, and Sheskin**. Another homeland session was organized at the 1994 San Francisco A.A.G. by **Estaville**. Panelists included **Conzen, Estaville, Terry Jordan, Lamme, Nostrand, and Sheskin**.

This 1998 panel, the sixth A.A.G. homeland session, provides a chance to reflect upon the many geographers that have contributed thoughts about the concept of the homeland. Many of these scholars will be featured in the present book effort, *Homelands in the United States*. The volume will include 15 chapters. Editors **Nostrand** and **Estaville** plan to submit the volume in May 1998 to Syracuse University Press for publication.

Homeland concept questions:

1. What are the basic parameters that define a homeland?

Jett: A sense of community (or family) that involves people and place. For the Navajo, the Navajo earth is their Mother.

Aiken: Notes that there are problems with these questions because the criteria do not fit some studies, such as the Blacks in the South.

Arreola: States that the homeland concept has been self-defined by the book editors with the parameters of people and place.

Bowden: Treats New England, the Yankee Homeland, as a French style *pays*. The problem for his chapter was one of culture formation: people who have a distinct English culture move through a process of adjustment to an American culture. **Bowden** lists a series of cultural characteristics that distinguish the Yankee homeland.

2. What makes a homeland different from a culture region?

Arreola: Homeland residents have a sense that they have a

distinct identity. Sometimes the word homeland does not get a response with South Texas residents. However, they have a distinct feeling about their place, but do not necessarily define it with geographic boundaries. Sub-areas, or nodes, of identity exist within the Tejano homeland. Not all residents identify the Tejano homeland in the same way.

Bowden: Direct migration of people from a source area and diffusion of their ideas is the defining quality of homelands. Culture regions include homeland and periphery and do not include the migration of people, just the migration of ideas. A New England culture region exists in addition to a Yankee homeland.

Jeff Smith: Is there a difference between core and homeland?

Bowden: Homeland is the core. It is another area of cultural formation. Bowden notes the problem of labels and definitions.

Nostrand: Defines homeland as "a place that a people love to the degree that they call it home." Culture regions do not express a peoples' relation to place.

Michael Conzen: Would you disallow the Mormon culture region?

Nostrand: No. A culture region and homeland can exist at the same time. Homelands exist under the label of cultural ecology – a peoples' relationship to place. Culture regions and homelands are not mutually exclusive. Culture regions can be homelands.

Bowden: The relationship between culture and place is culture region and the relationship between culture and nature is cultural ecology. Do not kill the homeland concept with tightly bounded parameters.

Aiken: Discusses the problem of what population percentage is necessary for a group to be included as a homeland.

Jett: Homeland implies a degree of exclusivity – control of place. Homeland suggests home in the sense of living and originating in a place, or hearth. A culture region may share the same culture, but has no unity or "home quality".

Arreola: Geographers such as **Meinig** have defined a South Texas culture region. This culture region includes more people than just Tejanos – people with Texas-Mexican ancestry.

3. Does a homeland have to be ethnic?

Susan Hardwick: Are ethnic and cultural homelands different entities?

Bowden: Argues that ethnicity is a main component of homelands. Yankee culture emerges from one of 13 Yankee beachheads in New England. The ethnic component of the one beachhead (East Anglian) is important since the other beachheads did not form a homeland.

Conzen: When did the settlers stop feeling English? What does

it mean to "stop feeling English"? A process of ethnogenesis existed for Yankees to emerge and recognize that Britain is not the source for cultural ideas.

Bowden: By 1690, Yankees stop using English place names, develop animosity towards British patricians, use the term Yankee as a synonym for an anti-British person, and have a deep resentment of forced toleration of religious freedom and British courts.

Conzen: Notes that some Tejanos who don't consider South Texas as a homeland also can have a close identity with Mexico.

Arreola: Yes and no.

Conzen: The debate about homelands and culture regions forces us to think of boundaries and meanings. Ethnogenesis is the key. Groups must break attachments to old areas outside America.

Arreola: Cites the problem of close proximity to Mexico for Tejanos in South Texas and the development of new identities.

Conzen: References Serbia and Greater Serbia. Asks if, in addition to Mexico, a Greater Mexico exists in Texas?

Arreola: Notes the idea of "Middle Mexico" among the younger Tejano generation. "Middle Mexico" is a transition zone between Mexico and America.

Jett: The Navajo provide a different example. Navajos are recent arrivals in the Southwest (1400's), yet they have no

migration legends. They have a sense of a created template, or plan, involving land and people. The Navajo maintained an ethnic identity and bond with place. A sense of ethnicity remains today.

Bowden: Both the Navajo and New Englanders set up false mythologies of self, space, and environment that they use to identify a homeland.

Jett: The Navajo adopted mythology from the Pueblos and incorporated those ideas as theirs.

Smith: Asks if the distinct Navajo homeland boundary markers are important for the homeland concept.

Jett: Yes. The four sacred peaks are models from the underworld specifically brought by holy people and placed in specific positions to demarcate the Navajo homeland. Only within the four sacred peaks are ceremonials effective. A sense of reciprocity exists between Navajo behavior and the land and its behavior. Neither exists well without the other.

Estaville: Argues that homelands are special culture regions. Homelands involve a bonding with place, and are possibly ethnic entities. Many parallels exist between the groups under discussion.

To be continued in next issue (Vol. 7, No. 1)...

Douglas A. Hurt

*University of Oklahoma, Department of Geography,
100 E. Boyd St., #684, Norman, OK 73019*

Recent Publication Reviews

Multiculturalism in North America and Europe: Comparative Perspectives on Interethnic Relations and Social Incorporation

Edited by Wsevolod W. Isajiw, Canadian Scholars' Press, 1997

Reviewed by Momo Podolsky (Ph.D., University of Toronto)

This voluminous book (over 600 pages) was compiled as a result of a 1994 conference at the University of Toronto, in which scholars from North America and Europe were invited to participate in the current debates surrounding multiculturalism as a policy and as a demographic makeup of a society. The organizer of the conference and editor of the present volume, Wsevolod W. Isajiw, urged the participants to adopt "social incorporation" as a central concept, so as to allow for meaningful comparisons between essays grounded in different contexts. Social incorporation, Isajiw argues in his thorough theoretical exposition (pp. 79-102), can be used as a "roof-concept" and is defined as the "process through which a

social unit is included in a larger social unit as an integral part of it" (p.82). When applied to the study of ethnicity, social incorporation can thus subsume under it seemingly paradoxical phenomena such as assimilation and identity retention without contradiction.

It is always a difficult task to fit each and every participant's essay to form a cohesive book, but the editor manages to divide the twenty four essays into six parts, reflecting their specific contributions: 1) multiculturalism from a global (comparative) perspective, 2) theoretical frameworks of social incorporation, 3) multiculturalism at the community (minority or mainstream) level, 4) economic factors of social incorporation, 5)

studies on Germany, and 6) studies on Canada and the United States. The highlights of the book, for this reviewer, were provided by two well-known names in the field of ethnic studies, John Rex ("Multiculturalism in Europe and North America") and Danielle Juteau ("Ethnic Communalizations in the World System: Theorizing from the Margins"). Rex's essay is based on the keynote address he gave at the conference: it is a concise yet insightful exposition of the characteristics of multiculturalism in Europe, the United States and Canada. Juteau's essay, on the other hand, discusses forms of nationness and the construction of ethnic boundaries in reference to Quebec, and her remarkable theoretical elegance brings freshness to the old debate of the "essential" versus "constructed" nature of ethnicity. Also noteworthy are the solid empirical studies by Bernhard Nauck ("Migration and Intergenerational Relations: Turkish Families at Home and Abroad") and James Friederes ("Edging into the Mainstream: A Comparison of Values and Attitudes of Recent Immigrants, their Children and Canadian-Born Adults"), which both deal with the intergenerational relationships among immigrant families and provide comparisons with non-immigrant subjects.

The biggest merit of this book is that, in spite of the number of contributors, it manages to maintain a theoretical focus throughout, and thus provides the reader with a sense that all the essays were indeed meant for an exchange of knowledge around the same theme. Too often, scholars are content to present their work at a conference without being concerned as to how it may enhance the knowledge of their colleagues or other attendants. It is evident that all the authors featured in this book did respect the conference motto of striving towards "comparative perspectives".

**The next issue (Vol. 7, No. 1) of
The American Ethnic Geographer
will be published in February 1999.**

And don't forget to check out the AEGSG web site at:
[HTTP://EVEREST.HUNTER.CUNY.EDU/AEGSG](http://EVEREST.HUNTER.CUNY.EDU/AEGSG)

Carlos Teixeira, Editor,

The American Ethnic Geographer

Scarborough Campus,
University of Toronto,
Department of Geography,
1265 Military Trail,
Scarborough, Ontario, Canada,
M1C 1A4.