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To a casual observer it might appear that metropolitan Miami is a typical Sun Belt urban complex. Historically, its mild winter climate has generated a tourist-dominated economy. As a post-automobile-era metropolis, Miami's central business district is relatively small and its suburbs have undergone massive expansion. And Miami's ethnic mix is similar to that of many southwestern cities, its population being comprised of large percentages of non-Latin whites, Jews, blacks, and Hispanics.

However, closer analysis reveals that Miami is significantly different from other Sun Belt cities. The Hispanic component dominates its population more than is the case with most other cities in the United States. In 1980, 56.0 percent of the City of Miami's population was classified as being of Spanish descent, while 35.7 percent of Dade County's population was Hispanic. Only four other Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) had higher percentages of their populations being Hispanic. To emphasize this point, metropolitan Los Angeles, the city in the United States with the largest number of Hispanics, had a comparable figure of only 27.5 percent. The SMSAs of New York and Chicago were the only large urban areas outside the Sun Belt to have a significant proportion of their populations being Hispanic, with their respective values being 16.4 and 8.1 percent.

Of further relevance is the fact that the Hispanic domination of Dade County's population is relatively recent in origin. For instance, in 1950 only 1.8 percent of the City of Miami's population was born in Latin America; for all of Dade County the comparable figure was 1.3 percent. In 1950 about 6,200 Latin American-born persons lived in metropolitan Miami; by 1984
the Hispanic population had risen to approximately 723,000, an increase of more than 116 times. Thus, there has been a massive change in the ethnic composition of Miami's population, especially since Cubans began immigrating on a large scale to South Florida in 1959 when Fidel Castro seized power in their island homeland.

The relative magnitude of the Hispanic influx to Dade County can be illustrated by comparing the growth rates of its major population components between 1970 and 1980. During this decade the county's total population increased by 28.3 percent. The growth of Hispanics was 94.2 percent, whereas for blacks and whites it was 47.8 and 17.8 percent. In fact, if only non-Hispanic whites are considered, this segment of the population declined by some 50,000 (about 7 percent).

The Hispanicization of the population during the past twenty-five years has produced major changes in the landscape, economy, and politics of Dade County. The best example of landscape change has occurred in Miami's Little Havana, located two miles southwest of the city's central business district. During most of the fifties this was an area in decline, with relatively old housing and businesses that were barely making ends meet. Today it is one of the two main concentrations of Cuban residences and Cuban-owned businesses in the county. Its economy thrives and it is here that some of South Florida's finest restaurants and most prosperous enterprises are found.

In 1950 Miami's economy was dominated by tourism, with about 35 percent of Dade County's workers earning a living in this industry; by 1979 this sector accounted for only 10 percent of Dade's total employment. Miami now looks towards Latin America and the Caribbean for a far larger share of its business than it did before the Hispanics arrived. The bilingual abilities, business experience, and cultural attributes of the city's Spanish-origin
population have played a major role in the development of the county's tourism, international trade, finance, and banking industries. Today Miami ranks second only to New York City as an international banking center in the United States.  

Until the sixties, Dade County had the political reputation of being a liberal stronghold belonging to the Democratic Party. Today, primarily because of its large Cuban population, it is just the opposite. Now that many Cubans have achieved U.S. citizenship, the county tends to support Republican Party candidates and votes in favor of conservative positions in national politics. In local politics there is considerable ethnic bloc voting, with Hispanics, blacks, Jews, and non-Latin whites often supporting different sides of the issues. 

The purpose of this paper is twofold. The first is to describe some of the details of the racial and ethnic composition of both Dade County's total population and, more specifically, its Hispanic population component. The second goal is to describe the residential segregation patterns that prevail among the various racial and ethnic components of metropolitan Miami's population. Emphasis will be placed on the Hispanic racial and ethnic classes. The findings of this study will be compared to those of other published studies dealing with segregation patterns of persons of Spanish origin living in other cities in the United States. 

RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF DADE COUNTY

The racial and ethnic composition of metropolitan Miami's population in 1980 is displayed in Table 1. It is important to note that these figures repre-
sent the situation prior to the arrival of the Mariel Cubans. This is because the census enumeration was undertaken on April 1, 1980 and the Mariel refugees did not begin arriving until April 21, 1980. During the five-month period between April and September, approximately 125,000 new Cubans arrived in the United States and perhaps 90,000 eventually settled in Dade County. Recent estimates by the Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department indicate that the county's total population was 1,750,000 in 1984. Taking into consideration total net migration (including the arrival of the Mariel refugees) and natural increase since the 1980 census enumeration, it is estimated that 41 percent of metropolitan Miami's population is Hispanic. The non-Latin white and the black populations are estimated at 40 percent and 19 percent. Thus, by 1984 Hispanics clearly had become the largest component of Dade County's population.

Table 1 shows that less than half of metropolitan Miami's population was comprised of non-Latin whites. While almost 80 percent of the county's population was classified racially as white, 31 percent were classified as Latin whites. Close to 90 percent of the county's Latins classified themselves as white, with less than 2 percent claiming to be black and about 11 percent claiming to be of some other race. Among Hispanics the distinction between black and white is an important one. This has been found to be the case among Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. Because American blacks are characterized by low socioeconomic status in the United States, dark-skinned Hispanics tend not to want to be labeled as black. They feel that they have little in common with blacks culturally, although they often are as poor economically. This has been the attitude of most dark-skinned Hispanics living in Miami; they do not consider themselves to be the same as American blacks but they realize that they are of a different color than
TABLE 1. RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF METROPOLITAN MIAMI IN 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial and Nationality Classes</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage for Dade County</th>
<th>Percentage for Subpopulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latin White</td>
<td>754,443</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Races</td>
<td>1,625,781</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,262,275</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>280,434</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races</td>
<td>69,081</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Origin Nationalities</td>
<td>580,994</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>13,238</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>44,656</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>407,253</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spanish Nationalities</td>
<td>115,847</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Origin Races</td>
<td>580,994</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (1)</td>
<td>507,832</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (2)</td>
<td>10,764</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races (3)</td>
<td>62,398</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These figures do not include approximately 90,000 Mariel refugees, since they began arriving after the enumeration of the 1980 Census.

(1) Percent of all Dade County's whites that are Spanish white = 40.2%.
(2) Percent of all Dade County's blacks that are Spanish black = 3.8%.
(3) Percent of all Dade County's other races that are Spanish other races = 90.3%.

white Hispanics. For this reason, about 69,000 Dade County residents classify themselves as being of "Other Races" (see Table 1). Almost 90 percent of these residents were of Spanish origin. It is probable that the remaining 10 percent are primarily blacks who have immigrated from the Caribbean and distinguish themselves from American blacks. Mohl estimates that 50,000 to 60,000 Haitians and 25,000 to 30,000 Jamaicans currently live in Dade County. 15

Racially, most of metropolitan Miami's population is classified as either black or white. Less than 5 percent are in the "Other Races" class. Even fewer are either American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleuts or Asian and Pacific Islanders. 16

Among persons of Spanish origin living in Miami it is clear that most (70 percent) are Cubans. When compared to Sun Belt cities outside of Florida, metropolitan Miami is the only urban area in which the majority of Hispanics are of Cuban descent. This is important because of the nature of the selection process that operated during the migration flow from Cuba. Since a sizeable percentage of the Cubans traveling to South Florida came from Cuba's middle and upper classes, they have experienced greater success in climbing the socioeconomic ladder than have most Mexicans and Puerto Ricans living in the United States. 17 As a result, being Hispanic is not associated with being poor in Miami to the same degree as in the cities of the Southwest and in New York and Chicago.

Although Cubans represent the largest component of Miami's Spanish-origin population, it is important to note that in 1980 about 30 percent of Dade County's Hispanics were not Cubans. The Cuban population numbered 400,000; in addition, 45,000 Puerto Ricans, 13,000 Mexican-Americans, and 116,000 "Other Spanish Nationalities" were living in metropolitan Miami.
Included in the residual latter category are thousands of Nicaraguans, El Salvadorians, Colombians, Guatemalans, Venezuelans, and Dominicans. 18

PATTERNS OF Racial AND ETHNIC SEGREGATION IN METROPOLITAN MIAMI

This section contains two parts. The first is a summary of the literature on racial and ethnic segregation in Miami. The second is an empirical analysis of the levels of segregation in Dade County, on a census tract scale, using 1980 census data. Segregation is important because it plays a major role in shaping an ethnic group's opportunities for housing, education, shopping, and employment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Virtually all the literature on segregation in metropolitan Miami has compared the residential patterns of blacks and Hispanics with those of whites or non-Latin whites. For instance, the literature shows that at first sight it may appear that blacks are well-dispersed throughout Dade County because they are not concentrated in a single core area, as they are in many northern and southwestern cities. Instead, they are concentrated in ten well-defined communities (see Figure 1). These ten areas contain close to 70 percent of Dade's black population. 19 In fact, not only are there relatively few blacks living outside these areas but there are few whites or Hispanics living in these communities. Dudas and Longbrake find that in 1970 85.6 percent of Dade County's black population would have had to be redistributed in order for it to have exhibited the same distribution as that of the
county's white population. This level of segregation has remained stable over the past several decades, since the comparable 1950 and 1960 figures were 83.6 and 88.2 percent. The authors claim that, in addition to overt discrimination and white-flight succession, two factors were responsible for the continued high level of segregation for blacks. First, public housing projects designed to aid the poor were only found in black areas; locating some housing projects in white areas would have hastened residential integration. Second, the development of suburban communities specifically designed for blacks, such as Richmond Heights, deterred integration by absorbing a large number of middle-income blacks who otherwise might have settled in white or Hispanic neighborhoods. 20 As in black ghettos of other cities, Miami's areas of black concentration tend to expand by a contagious diffusion process, whereby the territory closest to them is exposed to black invasion, followed by either white or Hispanic succession. 21

A study using the 1973-74 Social Register for Cubans compares the distributions of upper- and middle-class Cubans living in Miami, San Juan (Puerto Rico), and New York City. The purpose is to determine the degree to which Milton Gordon's concept of "ethclass" applied to Cubans living in these three cities. This concept suggests that people choose residential locations on the basis of both ethnic affiliation (peoplehood) and socioeconomic (behavioral similarity) conditions. The study therefore hypothesizes that upper- and middle-class Cubans tend to locate in upper-middle-income neighborhoods dominated by Cubans. For San Juan this was the case, as 70.4 percent of the Social Register Cubans resided in such areas. However, this was not the situation in Miami and New York City. For Miami only 17.0 percent lived in upper-middle-class Cuban neighborhoods. On the other hand, 34.3 percent resided in non-upper-class Cuban areas. Hence, 51.3 percent
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Figure 1
chose to live in some type of Cuban neighborhood, while 48.6 elected to live in non-Cuban areas. Most of the latter lived in upper-class non-Cuban communities. In New York City 78.9 percent of the Social Register Cubans resided outside Cuban neighborhoods, with most being found in upper-middle-class areas. Thus, in San Juan the ethclass dimension appeared to prevail. In Miami ethnicity appeared to be more important than ethclass; in New York City socioeconomic class seemed to be most important. The study explains these differences as follows. In San Juan the Cuban population is more homogeneous, with a disproportionately large share being from the upper and middle classes. In Miami there is a large Cuban population, but most Cubans are middle-income persons who prefer to live in Cuban-dominated neighborhoods, regardless of class status. New York City does not have any neighborhoods that are strongly dominated by Cubans. As a result, it is difficult for wealthy Cubans to find a place to live that is both wealthy and Cuban. Consequently, many choose to live in well-to-do neighborhoods where other middle- or high-income non-Cuban Latins reside.  

A recent study of Dade County uses 1970 census data to compare Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans with other racial and ethnic groups. It finds that Cubans were the most heavily concentrated group in the City of Miami (central city of the SMSA), with blacks and Puerto Ricans ranking second and third. When comparing each group's segregation from the rest of the population, it finds that blacks were the most segregated, Hispanics were moderately segregated, and persons of European stock were the least segregated. Among the Hispanics, Cubans were the most segregated, followed closely by Mexicans; Puerto Ricans were the least segregated. Another finding was that socioeconomic status explains only part of the variability in segregation patterns. Furthermore, the study notes a high correlation
between segregation patterns in the central city and the metropolitan fringe; that is, those classes most segregated in the city tend also to be the ones most segregated in the suburbs. Puerto Ricans were more highly segregated within the central city from the non-Latin ethnic classes than were either Cubans or Mexicans. In the suburbs, however, the Mexicans were the most segregated. The authors conclude that, despite elements of enforced constraint in housing choice, a greater influence in metropolitan Miami's segregation patterns appears to be ethnic self-selectivity, especially among Cubans. In this regard, the authors draw a parallel between Cubans and the Europeans who immigrated to the United States earlier in this century.23

In 1979 Morton Winsberg examined the residential patterns associated with Cuban immigration into Dade County. He found that, contrary to common belief, a small Cuban population resided primarily in Little Havana as early as 1950--prior to the Castro Revolution. In fact, 70 percent of the county's Cubans lived within a three-mile radius of Miami's central business district. By 1970 this percentage had declined to only 28 percent, indicative of a widespread diffusion of Hispanics into suburban locations. Compared to the ethnic expansion that typified U.S. cities between 1880 and 1914, Miami's Latin expansion between 1960 and 1970 occurred more rapidly and diffused more widely. The economic success of Miami's Hispanics, as well as their rapid growth, promoted this dispersal. Their residential expansion has been much less tied to the contagious diffusion process described earlier in this paper for blacks. Latin growth has frequently occurred in areas far removed from those areas in which Hispanics are already heavily concentrated. In 1950 Dade's Latins were well integrated with other populations, such as non-Latin whites and Jews. By 1970, however, it was clear that Hispanics were taking over former non-Latin white and Jewish
neighborhoods through a process of invasion and succession. Between 1960 and 1970 non-Latin whites in the areas of Hispanic concentration declined by over 111,000. As a result, the level of segregation between Latins and non-Latin whites increased significantly during this period. In 1950 31 percent of the Hispanics would have had to be redistributed to exhibit the same residential patterns as the Anglos; this figure rose to 44 percent in 1960 and to 52 percent in 1970. Winsberg concludes that, because of the large growth of metropolitan Miami's Latin population, its various racial and ethnic groups appear to be extremely polarized. As evidence, he presents indices of segregation for Latins, Jews, and Anglos that have steadily increased between 1950 and 1970.$^{24}$

Winsberg later updated his study by using 1980 census data. He found a slight decrease in the degree of segregation between blacks and Hispanics during the seventies. In 1970 86 percent of the blacks would have needed to be redistributed to exhibit the same residential patterns as Latins, whereas in 1980 the proportion declined to 81 percent. The segregation index between non-Hispanic whites and blacks dropped from 87 to 80 percent. When non-Latin whites were compared to Hispanics there was almost no change, the indices for 1970 and 1980 being 52 and 53 percent. His conclusions are: (1) the large growth of both blacks and Hispanics during the seventies continued to fuel segregation through the processes of invasion and succession discussed in his 1979 paper; (2) Hispanics have competed more successfully than blacks for housing space because of the Hispanics' ability to rapidly improve their economic status; and (3) Dade County will remain highly segregated in the future, particularly if large-scale Latin immigration continues to South Florida.$^{25}$
EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SEGREGATION PATTERNS

This section updates some of the findings of Aguirre, Schwirian, and La Greca's study and extends the two investigations by Winsberg. This will be accomplished through analysis of the racial and Hispanic ethnic segregation patterns in metropolitan Miami, using 1980 census data at the census tract scale. The following six questions are addressed:

1. To what degree are the various population components of Dade County concentrated in its central city, the City of Miami?

2. What are the patterns of segregation when the residential distributions of the individual Hispanic nationality components are compared to those of metropolitan Miami's various racial classes?

3. Are the Hispanic nationality components segregated from each other? If so, which are most highly segregated?

4. To what degree are the three Hispanic racial components segregated from the various racial classes of metropolitan Miami?

5. To what extent are the three Hispanic racial components segregated from each other?

6. Are there significant levels of segregation between the Hispanic racial classes and the Spanish nationality groups?

Concentration in the Central City

Most studies of segregation find that the poorest people and newest immigrants of a metropolitan area are more concentrated in the central city than are the middle and upper classes. The majority of investigations dealing with both Sun Belt and Snow Belt cities report that blacks are most concentrated in central cities, followed by Hispanics and non-Latin whites. The studies by Winsberg and by Aguirre et al. suggest that the central city of Miami has served as a receiving area for newly arriving immigrants from Latin America. As the arrivals enter this area they displace more affluent Hispanic and non-Latin white older residents, who either
leave Dade County or move into the county's middle- and upper-class suburbs. Boswell and Curtis note that there are two reception centers, rather than one, for Cuban arrivals (see Figure 2). One is the Little Havana area of the City of Miami and the other is Hialeah.

The figures in Table 2 indicate the percentages of Dade County's sub-populations that are concentrated in the cities of Miami and Hialeah. A little over one-fifth of the county's total population is found in the City of Miami. Only 9 percent of non-Latin whites live in the central city, whereas 31 percent of all blacks and 33 percent of all Hispanics live there. In fact, blacks and Hispanics together accounted for 81 percent of the City of Miami's total population in 1980. Blacks are largely found in Overtown and the Liberty City-Brownsville complex; most Hispanics reside in Little Havana and areas further west. Among the Hispanics, Cubans are most concentrated in the Central City, followed by "Other Spanish," Puerto Ricans, and, more distantly, by Mexicans. The fact that Cubans and the "Other Spanish" are the most recent arrivals accounts for the fact that the total Hispanic population is somewhat more concentrated in the central city than is the black population, a finding that contradicts most other studies of blacks and Hispanics. In addition, some of the growth of Liberty City has extended northward outside the city limits of Miami.

When the Hispanic population is subdivided into its racial components, it is clear that the black Hispanics are most concentrated in the City of Miami, followed closely by the "Other Hispanic Races" class. The factors of race and ethnicity make both of these classes more likely to settle in the central city.

Figures for Hialeah have also been displayed in Table 2 because, after Miami (346,865), Hialeah (145,254) is Dade County's second largest city and
DISTRIBUTION OF THE CUBAN-AMERICAN POPULATION IN DADE COUNTY 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial or Nationality Classes</th>
<th>Percent Living in Miami</th>
<th>Percent Living in Hialeah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latin White</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Spanish Origin</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spanish Nationalities</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish White</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Black</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spanish Races</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has become the county's other major node of Hispanic settlement. In most respects living in Hialeah is very similar to living in Little Havana. Compared to the total population of Dade County, only Hispanics are overrepresented in Hialeah. Nine percent of all the county's population live in Hialeah, but only 5 percent of non-Latin whites and 1 percent of all blacks live there. On the other hand, 19 percent of all persons of Spanish origin live in Hialeah, with Cubans having the highest representation at 22 percent. In 1980 74.3 percent of Hialeah's population was Hispanic, with 60.3 percent being of Cuban descent.

When the figures in Table 2 for the percentage concentrations in the City of Miami are compared to those calculated by Aguirre et al. for 1970, it is obvious that the percentage of all the subpopulations living in the central city has substantially declined. For instance, in 1970 26.4 percent of the county's total population was living in the City of Miami. For all whites, blacks, Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans, the figures were 23.4, 40.2, 21.7, 56.4, and 38.2 percent, respectively. This decline in central city concentration is exactly what one would expect in a county whose population has been rapidly suburbanizing.

**Segregation of Hispanic Nationalities**

This section compares the residential patterns of four Spanish-origin nationalities, first to the racial classes of Dade County and second to each other. The four nationalities are those for which the 1980 census has published separate figures for the Miami Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Spanish nationalities). The index of segregation that will be used is the index of dissimilarity. This index expresses the percentage of either of two populations, whose
percentage distributions are being compared on a census tract scale, that
must be redistributed for both of the populations to have identical residential distributions in Dade County. Its possible values range from 0.0 to 100 percent. Following the suggestion of Kantrowitz, indices of 70.0 or above will be considered to be high and those below 30.0 will be considered to be low; moderate levels will be between 30.0 and 70.0. Differences between indices that are less than 5 percentage points will be regarded as being insignificant. While there is some debate on the pros and cons of using this measure, it is employed here to facilitate comparison with previous studies of ethnic and racial segregation.

The figures in the upper half of Table 3 are the indices of dissimilarity for comparing the Spanish nationality classes with Dade County’s major racial components. The index for comparing all blacks with all whites is 80.9, and the index for comparing all blacks with non-Latin whites is 83.9 percent. A recent study of the twenty-nine largest cities in the United States found that, based on data for 1970, the average index of dissimilarity comparing whites to blacks was 83.1. Based on data for 1980, then, Miami’s degree of segregation between blacks and whites is almost identical to this average.

Two generalizations can be made about the figures in the upper half of Table 3. First, the degree of segregation of each of the four Spanish nationalities is highest relative to blacks in Dade County; the levels of the indices for Cubans and the Other Spanish are high, while the levels for Mexicans and Puerto Ricans are in the moderately high range. Miami is not atypical when compared to most other cities in the United States. For instance, a study of ten cities in the United States reports that average indices for comparing blacks with Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans were
TABLE 3. INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY COMPARING SPANISH NATIONALITIES WITH DADE COUNTY RACIAL GROUPS AND WITH EACH OTHER IN METROPOLITAN MIAMI IN 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Races and Spanish Origin Nationalities</th>
<th>Mexican</th>
<th>Puerto Rican</th>
<th>Cuban</th>
<th>Other Spanish Nationalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latin White</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages for County Races</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spanish Nationalities</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages for Spanish Nationalities</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.A. = Not Applicable
The levels of segregation of the four Spanish nationalities from non-Latin whites are all in the moderate range. The same study of ten cities found average indices for comparing non-Latin whites to Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans to be 63.6, 71.3, and 69.1. Thus, the Miami levels of segregation for non-Latin whites were significantly below these levels. It is clear that, in Miami, Hispanics are much less segregated from whites than from blacks. They also are less segregated from whites than are blacks. For example, one study determined that the census tracts in 1980 that contained 90 percent of Dade County's black population comprised only about 11 percent of the area's non-Latin whites. In contrast, the tracts that contained 90 percent of the county's Hispanics comprised about 47 percent of the non-Latin white population. Massey's studies (see earlier references) document the same finding for other U.S. cities.

The second generalization that can be made is that Cubans are more segregated from Dade's racial components than are the other three Spanish nationalities. Mexicans rank second, with Puerto Ricans and the Other Spanish exhibiting the lowest average indices. These are reasonable findings because it is easier for Cubans to live in their own enclaves, due to their large numbers and recency of arrival. In addition, it is logical that Mexicans would be more highly segregated than either Puerto Ricans or the Other Spanish, since a large percentage of the Mexicans live in the southern part of Dade County (in the vicinity of Homestead and Florida City), where many are employed in agricultural enterprises. Some studies of other cities have found that Puerto Ricans are more segregated than Mexicans from non-Latin whites and less segregated than both Cubans and Mexicans from blacks. This finding is related to the fact that Puerto
Ricans in these other cities are generally poor and many are dark-skinned. On the other hand, Puerto Ricans who live in Florida are very similar to the state's Cuban population in terms of socioeconomic achievement, though, for the United States as a whole, Puerto Ricans are much poorer than Cubans. Therefore, in Florida Puerto Ricans are more successful in competing for residential space than they are in, say, New York City. In the latter city they are more similar in socioeconomic terms to blacks than to whites.

The figures in the lower half of Table 3 indicate the levels of segregation among the four Spanish nationality groups. Given their common language, religion, and Spanish cultural roots, it might seem reasonable to expect that the levels of segregation among the four nationality classes would be low. The figures in Table 3 and the patterns shown in Figure 3 clearly indicate that this is not the case. All of the indices fall in the moderate range. The highest value is 66.9, indicating that close to two-thirds of the Mexicans or Cubans would need to be redistributed for their residential distributions to be identical. The lowest index, 30.6, compares the distributions of Puerto Ricans and the class of Other Spanish. In terms of averages, Mexicans are the most segregated from the others, with a mean index value approaching 60 percent. Cubans occupy an in-between position, with a mean index of almost 50 percent. Puerto Ricans and Other Spanish Nationalities are characterized by the least amount of segregation, with indices of close to 40 percent. Massey's research on ten American cities found that the average index of segregation between Mexicans and Cubans was 74, which is similar to the value of 67 for Miami shown in Table 3. When he compared Mexicans and Puerto Ricans the average index was 66, which is considerably higher than the value of 51 for Miami. Finally, when Massey investigated Cubans and Puerto Ricans he determined an index of 72, which is
much higher than the figure of 47 in Table 3. A study by Conway, Bigby, and Swann based on 1980 data for New York City reports an index of 54.8 when the residential patterns of Cuban and Puerto Ricans were compared. It may be concluded that, although there is a moderate degree of segregation among the Spanish Nationalities in metropolitan Miami, the levels of this segregation are generally lower than in most other U.S. cities. Furthermore, the levels of dissimilarity are always lower than when each nationality is contrasted to blacks. When compared to non-Latin whites, however, the results vary: Sometimes the Spanish Nationality classes are more segregated from each other than they are from Anglos, and sometimes the reverse is true.

Segregation of Hispanic Racial Classes

The figures in Table 4 will be used to answer the fourth and fifth questions of this analysis. To the best of my knowledge, no other published studies have compared the segregation patterns of all Hispanics according to their racial characteristics, although several have investigated the residential patterns of black Puerto Ricans.

The figures in the upper half of Table 4, which compare the Spanish racial classes with the racial categories for all Dade County, answer the fourth question. A priori reasoning suggests that black Hispanics would be the most segregated from non-Latin whites and the least segregated from blacks; conversely, Hispanic whites would be the least segregated from non-Latin whites and the most segregated from the county's blacks. It would also be expected that the Other Spanish Races class would occupy intermediate levels of segregation from both blacks and whites. The results displayed in Table 4 corroborate these expected results so closely that the
TABLE 4. INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY COMPARING SPANISH RACIAL CLASSES WITH OTHER DADE COUNTY RACIAL GROUPS AND WITH EACH OTHER IN METROPOLITAN MIAMI IN 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Races and Spanish Origin Racial Classes</th>
<th>Spanish Racial Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latin White</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages for County Races</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish White</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Black</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spanish Races</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages for Spanish Nationalities</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.A. = Not Applicable
averages of the indices of dissimilarity for each racial class are very close to each other. It appears that the Hispanic reaction to Dade County's racial differences is very similar to that of non-Latin blacks and whites.

The indices in the lower half of Table 4 and the patterns in Figure 4 portray the degrees of segregation between the three Hispanic racial classes and can be used to answer this investigation's fifth question. Regarding these figures, four important points can be made. First, all the indices are in the moderate range, meaning that there is a significant amount of segregation within the Spanish racial categories. These segregation patterns are logical. For instance, black Hispanics are more segregated from white Hispanics than they are from the Other Spanish Races; and white Hispanics are less segregated from the Other Spanish Races than they are from the black Hispanics.

The second point is that, although there are significant differences among the Hispanic racial classes, these differences are considerably less than when the Hispanic racial classes are compared to the racial classes for all of Dade County's racial populations. For example, when Hispanic whites are compared to Dade's black population, the segregation index is 79.2. However, when Hispanic whites are compared to Hispanic blacks, the index is 58.8. While this latter figure is significant, it is more than 20 points lower than 79.2. When Hispanic whites are compared to Other Spanish Races, the index is 37.8. Yet, when non-Latin whites for the county are compared to the Other Hispanic Races, the value is 60.7, almost 23 points higher. The conclusion is that nationality affiliation among Hispanics partially, but not totally, compensates for racial differences in residential patterns in metropolitan Miami.
CENSUS TRACTS CONTAINING ONE PERCENT OR MORE OF EACH OF THE THREE SPANISH RACES IN DADE COUNTY IN 1980

FIGURE 4
The third point is that the patterns displayed in Figure 4 indicate a moderate tendency for the Other Spanish Races to be located in areas between the main concentrations of black and white Hispanics. In other words, the Other Spanish Races appear to exhibit a tendency to occupy transitional areas between the other two Hispanic racial classes.

The fourth point is that Spanish blacks are less segregated from Dade's total black population (I.D. = 39.5) than they are from its Spanish white residents (I.D. = 58.8). The patterns displayed in Figure 4 clearly show that Spanish blacks tend to be most concentrated in the north central sector of Dade County, corresponding with local black neighborhoods such as Liberty City, Brownsville, and Opa Locka. They are also found in transitional areas between white Hispanic and black neighborhoods, such as the eastern side of Hialeah and in Allapatha. Jackson, in his study of Puerto Ricans living in New York City, has reported similar findings. He suggests that "Puerto Ricans are being 'pulled apart' spatially, with their darker skinned members residing more with blacks than with other Puerto Ricans or with non-Hispanic whites." Dade's black Hispanics appear to be exhibiting similar residential behavior.

Segregation of Spanish Racial and Nationality Classes

The indices in Table 5 provide answers for the sixth question in this analysis, regarding the degree of segregation between the residential patterns of Hispanic races when compared to Hispanic nationalities. The averages at the bottom of the table reveal that the white Hispanics have the lowest mean segregation. Black Hispanics and Other Hispanic Races exhibit averages that are very similar to each other and that are about 20 points higher than that of the Hispanic whites. These averages, however, mask
important detailed differences; the individual indices vary greatly, with examples being in all three categories (low, medium, and high). Mexicans are the most highly segregated from the Hispanic whites, and Cubans are the least segregated from this class. On the other hand, Cubans are the most segregated from black Hispanics and Puerto Ricans are least segregated from this group. Puerto Ricans are the most segregated from the Other Hispanic Races. It is reasonable to hypothesize that these differences are at least partly related to the racial composition of each nationality group. Unfortunately, data to test this notion are not available in the published census material for Miami.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper has described the racial and ethnic composition of metropolitan Miami and has explained the great change that has taken place in these characteristics during the past twenty-five years. Miami has evolved from a fairly typical southern Sun Belt city into a major center of international trade focusing on Latin America, but this change has promoted competition among the county's ethnic groups for residential space.

This study has also described the segregation patterns that have resulted from this competition. It found that Cubans are most concentrated in the central city of Miami due to their recency of arrival in the United States. Mexican-Americans are concentrated in the southern part of Dade County, where they can more easily find agricultural jobs. When the residential patterns of the Hispanic nationality components were compared to metropolitan Miami's racial classes, the study noted that the Spanish
TABLE 5. INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY COMPARING SPANISH RACIAL CLASSES WITH SPANISH NATIONALITIES IN METROPOLITAN MIAMI IN 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Origin Nationalities</th>
<th>Spanish Racial Classes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish White</td>
<td>Spanish Black</td>
<td>Other Spanish Races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spanish Nationalities</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages for Spanish</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nationalities were much more highly segregated from blacks than they were from non-Latin whites. Despite certain cultural similarities, it also found that the four Hispanic nationalities were moderately segregated from each other. Mexicans were the most segregated, followed by Cubans. The Spanish racial components were segregated from Dade County's racial subpopulations as expected. For example, black Hispanics were most segregated from non-Latin whites and least segregated from the county's total black population. There was a moderate amount of segregation between the three Hispanic racial classes, but this was less than when the residential patterns of Spanish racial groups were compared to those of metropolitan Miami's racial classes. This finding's significance lies in its suggestion that ethnic affiliation only partly compensates for racial differences. It was observed that there is a moderate tendency for the Other Spanish Races to be located in transitional zones between black and white Hispanics and for black Hispanics to be less segregated from Dade County's black population than from its white Hispanics. Finally, the study reported moderate degrees of segregation between the Spanish racial classes and the Spanish nationalities. The black Hispanics exhibited the most segregation and white Hispanics the least. The study suggested that the differences between the nationality groups is most likely related to each group's racial composition. Clearly, historian Raymond Mohl is correct when he states that "...ethnicity is alive and well in Miami." On a more general level, sociologist Nathan Kantrowitz has argued that ethnic segregation (as a manifestation of slow assimilation) does not quickly disappear in most American cities.

Geographer Morton Winsberg has painstakingly analyzed the changing ethnic patterns in Dade County since 1950. He emphasizes the residential segregation characteristics of blacks, Jews, Hispanics, and non-Latin
whites. His most recent study predicts that segregation among these groups will not only persist but will probably increase.\(^4\)

Jaffe, Cullen, and Boswell have found that Cuban-Americans, who account for approximately 70 percent of metropolitan Miami's Hispanic population, appear to be as rapidly acculturating demographically to American characteristics as any other non-English speaking immigrant group in U.S. history. They base this claim on the fact that certain characteristics of the Cubans are rapidly evolving towards American norms. These characteristics include occupation, education, female labor-force participation, income, reproductive behavior, and the relatively high out-marriage rates of their American born progeny.\(^4\)

It must be recognized that acculturation and assimilation are not the same concepts. Assimilation implies that the melting pot thesis will prevail, whereby Hispanics would become indistinguishable from the rest of American society. Acculturation suggests that one culture borrows certain attributes from another but does not necessarily lose its distinctiveness. The latter concept allows for the possibility of cultural pluralism. Certainly, Miami today is more a pluralistic society than a melting pot. Whether or not Dade's Cubans and other Latin components will melt soon depends on several factors. Perhaps the most important of these factors is whether or not large-scale immigration from Latin America continues. If it does, such immigration will provide an infusion of new arrivals that would begin the assimilation process all over again. A second factor is whether or not the Cuban-American population continues to concentrate in South Florida. Obviously, such geographic concentration will slow the rate of assimilation, but the tradeoff is that it will ease the adjustment processes for the more recently arrived migrants and many of the elderly who never
assimilate. A third factor is the Cuban government's ability to continue to play a prominent role in the news. Each time Fidel Castro makes a pronouncement it is played up by the news media, reminding Cuban-Americans about their homeland and their hatred for the Castro government. 48

The above three conditions are not likely to change much in the near future. It is therefore unlikely that Dade County's current ethnic and racial flavor will soon change dramatically. Hispanics will continue to play a major role (perhaps the dominant one) in Dade County's future, at least for the next several decades. It may take an additional two or three generations for the Hispanic population component to melt to the point that it is no longer recognizable. Still, it is likely that the Hispanic population will eventually assimilate; indeed, Walter Kamphoefner suggests that Miami's Cubans are following the same pattern of assimilation as did the Western and Northern Europeans who arrived in the United States during the nineteenth century. 49

The first large-scale wave of Cubans did not begin arriving until twenty-six years ago, and most of these arrivals thought their stay in the United States would be temporary. Not until the middle-to-late sixties did the majority realize that they were in the United States for good. Hence, for all practical purposes, the assimilation processes for the earliest arriving Cubans did not begin until sometime between 1965 and 1970. Of course, for many other Hispanics it started after that time. In fact, the 90,000 Mariel refugees who settled in Dade County, and most of the Nicaraguans, have only been in the United States for six or seven years. It should not be surprising, then, that ethnicity is "alive and well in Miami." This fact, however, does not mean that the Hispanics will never become assimilated; much evidence suggests otherwise. Kamphoefner is correct in
hypothesizing that Dade County's Hispanics can be expected to follow closely the acculturation and assimilation patterns experienced by most earlier waves of European immigrants to the United States, although it should be emphasized that this process took place over several generations. What is more, these European groups have not completely disappeared as distinct ethnic populations. For instance, Italian-speaking neighborhoods remain in several northeastern cities, and German-speaking communities still exist in parts of the Midwest and northern Great Plains states. Thus, a small minority of Italians and Germans has yet to assimilate.
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