

Leaving Blacks Behind in Brooklyn

Dr. Jerome Krase

Brooklyn College of The City University of New York

✉ Email: jkrase@brooklyn.cuny.edu

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3738-631X>

Abstract

The Borough of Brooklyn, New York has evolved over the past half-millennium from a sparsely settled, lush woodland, to a bustling super-diverse, post-industrial city of almost three million residents. This essay looks at the experiences of those who, over that long period of time, have made their homes in this territory. The first Brooklynites, of course were Native Americans such as members of the Canarsie tribe, but since them there has been a virtual Roman Fountain of migrants and immigrants from every corner of the nation and the globe. This enormous population movement can easily be characterized as a series of what classical urban ecologists such called “invasions and successions” (Park, et al., 1925). Unfortunately, as a consequence of conflicts and competitions over Brooklyn spaces and resources, there has been an unequal, and inequitable, distribution of public goods to “winners” and “losers.” Here we will address that, periodically troubled, history from a “distributive social justice” perspective, with a special focus on those of African descent (Rawls & Kelly, 2003). that will also be prefaced by the United Nations “17 Sustainable Development Goals” (United Nations, 2022).

Keywords

social justice, sustainable development, urban ecology, race, ethnicity, migration

Introduction

The Inequitable Distribution of Public Goods in New York City

Even though inequality is a global problem, it cannot be understood as such. As with other social problems, it is necessary to look more closely at the more and less contexts in which

it takes place such as Brooklyn, New York. «Global citizens» exist merely as theoretical terms in contrast to the flesh and blood people for whom the term refers. Because of conflicts and competitions over the centuries among and between groups who have come to Brooklyn, there has been an unequal distribution of both public and private goods. "Public goods" are commodities or services provided by government that generally have been paid for through public taxation. They are offered for the benefit all members of that society, and many are often provided for free (Fernando, 2021). Examples of public goods include law enforcement, national defense, public safety, access to clean air and drinking water, and services such as recreation, education, and health. Governments at all levels in the United States - Federal, State, and Municipal—provide a wide variety of such public goods. Brooklynites have been lucky in that both New York State and New York City, having a more progressive political tradition, have offered its residents more in the way of public goods than most other states.

Although we believe that everyone has an equal right to the city, it is clear that there continues to be a need today for a comprehensive urban policy that is balanced and equitable. For example, a citywide critical evaluation of the Bloomberg mayoral administration (2002-2013) was taken by political sociologist John Mollenkopf and Councilman from Brooklyn Brad Lander (Mollenkopf & Lander, 2013). The study showed that the Mayor had little concern for the broad increase in inequality, "... seeing it as the inevitable consequence of the prosperity of the city's top earners, who pay a disproportionate share of local taxes." Despite some success in stimulating economic growth, incomes for the poorest workers rose only slightly (pp. 5-6). They also noted that Bloomberg's centralized, data-driven, approach to governance largely ignored opinions of local residents and activists. "Purported economic benefits were used to justify many land use and economic development decisions (with the important exception of the many downzonings granted to mostly-white outer-borough communities), policing, and education (where community input has been almost entirely tokenized)" (p. 6). It should be noted that, Bloomberg's Mayoral successor, Bill DeBlasio, used the notion of the "Tale of Two Cities" as his campaign platform to criticize the former administration's innovations which focused on homogenizing the city away from diverse races, ethnicities, and social classes (Bagli, 2016). However, despite the well-meaning slogan, the unequal distribution of public goods continued, and in some cases were exacerbated by the Covid 19 pandemic. What follows is a discussion of some of the many ways by which inequities are demonstrated in Brooklyn with a special focus on Black Brooklynites who until the present day have been the least recognized and/or compensated for their contribution. Over the centuries, among migrant groups, Blacks consistently have gained the least and lost the most. They have been in Brooklyn the longest and, cumulatively, have made the greatest contributions to the prosperity of the borough. If we were to ask what it is that is owed them for their contributions, the answer would be a great deal. Why, then have they not received their fair share.

Methods. Distributive Social justice

This article conducts a thorough literature review and utilizes methods involving the analysis of changes in population numbers, encompassing both overall figures and those specific to various racial groups, throughout the 1990s and 2000s. Additionally, the study incorporates observation and field studies conducted in New York neighborhoods spanning five decades and selective review of five centuries of Brooklyn history. The overarching objective is to comprehend the correlation between race, poverty, and gentrification by employing this multifaceted, population-focused approach.

Some view inequality as “natural” and therefore are not stimulated to act. Others reject them as inevitable consequences, are moved to act. As do many other scholar activists and urban social scientists today, I believe these essentially Neoliberal and classic urban ecological responses can be contested as issues of social justice. For me questions such as “Who has a right to the city?”, “What is urban justice?”, and “What is a just city?” require an affirmative response. Although a full discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this chapter, a few comments in reference to the distributive social justice principles of John Rawls and especially those in regard to urban territory of David Harvey (1973) are a necessary foundation for the readers’ understanding of this point of view. For a society to be called “just” it must guarantee its members equal access to the liberties, rights, and opportunities it can offer and simultaneously to care for the least advantaged. This depends however on the acceptance of the idea of a social contract freely entered into by its members to which Rawls believed free rational people would ascribe. The principles of justice in the contract «specify the basic rights and duties to be assigned by the main political and social institutions, and they regulate the division of benefits arising from social cooperation and allot the burdens necessary to sustain it» (Rawls & Kelly, 2003, p. 7).

Harvey (1973) refers to Rawls in his discussion of eight principles of territorial distributive justice to address the uneven distribution of urban resources and rights. From these he chose three in the following order - need, contribution to the common good, and merit – that “are sufficiently comprehensive to subsume many of the issues which could legitimately be raised under the other headings” (pp. 100-101). However, he cautions that the concept of territorial distributive justice is not all-inclusive but a principle for resolving conflicting claims – “a just distribution, justly arrived at” (Harvey, 1973; see also Olander, 2015).

Most germane is Harvey’s most important principle of “Need – Individuals have rights to equal levels of benefit which means that there is an unequal allocation according to need” (Harvey, 1973, p. 100). In this work we have clearly shown that poor and working-class residents in general and Nonwhites of virtually every income level in Brooklyn have been unfairly treated by public and private agencies as to their right to remain in their homes and neighborhoods. This is especially unfair given that in many cases it was their individual and collective efforts that were responsible for the survival of these places during the crises that threatened the health of the entire city.

Furthermore, as to the “Right to the City,” Lars Frers and Lars Meier (2007), argue that the word “right” has many meanings which must be adjusted as local and historical contexts, and must pay attention to the right to practice diversity within it. With specific reference to immigrants, Marcello Balbo (2009) sees the right to the city as “a series of legitimate claims to the necessary conditions of a satisfying, dignified and secure existence in cities by both individual citizens and social groups” or “the right of all citizens to access the benefits the city has to offer, based on the principles of solidarity, freedom, equity, dignity and social justice” (p. 12).

Although they are somewhat utopian, the United Nations 17 Sustainable Development Goals are viewed by many as a blueprint to follow for building a better and more sustainable future for everyone. In brief, among the most relevant goals for this chapter are calls to end Poverty and Reduced Inequalities. The guiding principle for all 17 Goals is “Leaving no one behind.” From the Introduction to the Declaration of the Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development:

As we embark on this great collective journey, we pledge that no one will be left behind. Recognizing that the dignity of the human person is fundamental, we wish to see the Goals and targets met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society. And we will endeavour to reach the furthest behind first. (United Nations, n.d.)

It is easy to see how these principles might apply to second and third world countries, but what about the USA, and especially Brooklyn, where, unfortunately, it is also clear that the benefits of Sustainable Development are not equally shared among all segments of society. Although all cannot be discussed here, the most relevant for this chapter, are the Ten Targets for Sustainable Development Goal 11, building "Sustainable Cities and Communities," such as ensuring access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and enhancing inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management. Of equal importance is Goal 16's promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies and providing access to justice for all to build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels (United Nations, n.d.).

Brooklyn: 500 Years of Growth and Change

The first human Brooklynites were Native Americans who called themselves the Lenape, which means «the People.» The Lenape included the Nayack and the Canarsee tribes who planted corn and tobacco and fished in nearby waters. Brooklyn was the seasonal home of the Canarsie, but their lands and wealth were expropriated by fraud and violence during Dutch and then British colonization. The Dutch first settled in Manhattan in the early 1600s, and began to buy land across the river in Brooklyn 1636. By the 1680s the native people had lost all claims to the rolling, heavily forested landscape. The Dutch founded five villages: Bushwick, Brooklyn, Flatbush, Flatlands, and New Utrecht. Gravesend, a sixth village, was founded in 1643 by Lady Deborah Moody, an Englishwoman who was fleeing religious persecution in England and the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The British captured the Dutch territory in 1674, and gathered the six villages into Kings County, part of the crown colony of New York. A census taken in 1698 counted 2,017 people in Kings County. About half of these early settlers were Dutch. The others came from Germany, England, France, and Scandinavia, and included a large number of black slaves brought from Africa. Slavery flourished in these rich farmlands during the 18th century. Since initial invasions of Europeans in the 16th and 17th Centuries, there has been a trickle, that became a torrent in the 19th and 20th Centuries, of migrants and immigrants from every corner of the nation and the globe. Of especial importance for the making of modern Brooklyn, are African Americans, most of whom first came to Dutch New Amsterdam and British New York as slaves five-hundred years ago. It must be noted that African slavery increased and became harsher under British rule. Although New York State passed a Gradual Emancipation act in 1799 that freed those born after July 4, 1799, but they continued to be indentured until they were young adults. In 1817 a new law passed that freed slaves born before 1799, but not until July 4, 1827 (Courts, 2018). Just before the Revolutionary War, slaves composed nearly one third of the population of Kings County. Even before legal slavery ended in New York, a small number of free Blacks had settled in Brooklyn, and over time their settlements, such as Weeksville, grew and, within the limitations of racial discrimination, even prospered. Schools, associations and businesses were established within the confines of their own small, racially segregated, communities. They also contributed greatly to anti-slavery movements and the Underground Railroad.

The increasingly dense urbanization of Brooklyn began in the northern and western areas that were closest to Manhattan, and moved mostly in southern and easterly directions. This was the major pattern for the growth, decline, and current rejuvenation of the borough, and in almost every period Black Brooklynites gained the least and lost the most. As New York City flourished, so did Brooklyn as commuters, immigrants, and

commerce traveled across the river from Manhattan. Development first took place along the waterfront and gradually spread toward the interior. At the turn of the 19th century, the first large-scale immigration began with Irish immigrants and when the Erie Canal was finished and connected to Brooklyn in 1825, the local economy exploded. By 1860, the City of Brooklyn, with more than 200,00 residents, was America's third-largest city and expanded rapidly southward toward semi-rural areas as Irish and German immigrants poured in. When the Brooklyn Bridge opened in 1883 it brought more people into Brooklyn from Manhattan. By 1880, Brooklyn had become a major national manufacturing center in need of workers. Work, though not always safe or healthy, was widely available in booming maritime businesses, gas refineries, metal works, and all sorts of sweatshops. Later in the decade, came a huge wave of immigrants from Eastern Europe, including Russian Jews, Italians, and Poles, along with a mixture of Scandinavians. The City of Brooklyn annexed the originally independent five towns, and itself was annexed by New York City in 1898. At the turn of the 20th century, Brooklyn's population was 1,166,582, almost a third of which were foreign-born. In 1900, the Black population of 18,367 remained in a small number of settlements in Central Brooklyn.

The early years of the 20th century saw a vast expansion in the population from 1,634,351 in 1910 to 2,018,356 in 1920. During the same period Brooklyn's Black population grew from 22,708 to 31,912 as the urbanization of Brooklyn intensified with new bridges, trolley lines, elevated railroads, and subway lines drawing people and commerce away from the shorelines. By 1930 Brooklyn's population exploded by almost a million souls to 2,560,40, and as part of the «Great Migration,» of Blacks from southern states, the borough's Black population more than doubled to 68,921. And for the first time, more than half were not Brooklyn-born. However, Black's residential confinement to Central Brooklyn continued as they became the majority in downtown Brooklyn, Fort Greene, Clinton Hill, Prospect Heights, Bedford Stuyvesant, and Crown Heights (Connolly, 1977; Woodsworth, 2016). The growth of the borough continued more slowly into 1940 and 1950 with 2,698,285 and 2,738,175 respectively. During the same time, the Black population almost doubled again from 107,263 to 208,478. Unfortunately for them, after World War 2 ended, Brooklyn's economic engines that fostered upward mobility for legions of prior im/migrants stalled. For example, factories move to cheaper, non-union locations and the busy ports became less so as huge container ships off-loaded across New York Harbor in modern New Jersey ports. A major Brooklyn economic icon, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, was shuttered in 1966.

Each historical period resulted in differential gains and losses for newcomers, as well as old-timers, in New York City. As we will read in what follows, the period from 1950 to 1970 was the most crucial for Black Brooklynites. All poor and working-class im/migrants suffered discrimination in housing, employment, as well as electoral politics. Many were forced to live in unhealthy neighborhoods, work in underpaid jobs and in unsafe working conditions. Most were also denied patronage opportunities in public employment. For the Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City, much of this was detailed in Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1963) highly influential, and widely criticized, *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Despite his misplaced optimism that Blacks would achieve, as did the others, in only another decade or two, it was still a good chronicle of wide-spread discrimination. As others, such as Elijah Anderson (2000), would later argue, racism was a much more difficult bias than religion and ethnicity to overcome.

From 1950 to 1980 Brooklyn's total population decreased, primarily due to working and Middle-class White flight. The easy availability of government-sponsored (FHA) housing loans for new construction outside of the central city, and the building of highways to the suburbs helped hundreds of thousands of white middle-class residents to flee deteriorat-

ing Brooklyn neighborhoods, as well as the real and imagined influx of Blacks, for the neighboring boroughs of Queens, Staten Island, or the suburbs of Long Island's Nassau County, and New Jersey. Blacks and other People of Color moved into these abandoned spaces; especially in crumbling northern and central Brooklyn neighborhoods. Residential landlords decreased services, as they and homeowners couldn't get loans for maintenance and improvements. Central and Eastern Brooklyn also suffered from a plague of arson as capital flight and disinvestment increased. de-industrialization resulted in the loss of well-paying jobs and outflow of capital New York City

1950	2,738,175	208,478
1960	2,627,319	371,405
1970	2,606,012	656,194
1980	2,230,936	722,316

TABLE 1. BROOKLYN, NEW YORK. TOTAL AND BLACK POPULATION 1950 - 1980

NOTE. DATA GATHERED FROM THE US CENSUSES OF POPULATION AND HOUSING (N.D.). 1990, 2000, 2010, 2020.

As argued by Themis Chronopoulos (2020), racial discrimination and especially *de facto* residential segregation had, until the 1980s, confined most African Americans primarily to what he calls "Black Brooklyn" in Central and Eastern Brooklyn. He cited Craig Steven Wilder (2000) who showed how and why between 1930 and 1953, "...a vast black ghetto stretched across Brooklyn and was becoming the largest concentration of its kind" (p. 177). According to Wilder, the federal government's New Deal's Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC), created to avoid further foreclosures and bank failures, contributed to this ghettoization. Bending to real estate and financial industry interests, it graded and then drew color-coded maps (Hillier, 2003). Race, played an important role in this coding, and the lowest graded areas in Brooklyn, usually the most-Black, were colored red. On the 1938 map, almost all of Central and Eastern Brooklyn was thus "relined" (Badger, 2017). Redlined neighborhoods were generally excluded from mortgage market and properties within those boundaries were devalued. Redlining, in one form or another, continued until the 1980s.

It is not difficult to understand how predicting a bleak future for American cities in the 1960s because of the influx of POC contributed to the self-fulfilling prophecy of urban decay. As might be expected, a primary element of this racist formula was the equation of nonwhite habitation with urban deterioration. At the time, it was commonly believed that the people who invaded city neighborhoods tend to be of lower socioeconomic status than those they replace. However, there a large array of data disputed that belief. Some of the most interesting contradictory data concerning the social status of traditional black invaders was provided by Taeuber and Taeuber (1969) in *Negroes in Cities*:

Turning to the characteristics of Negroes living in Invasion Tracts and Negro Areas in the six Northern and border cities, two general observations may be made: (1) Negroes in invasion tracts are of higher educational and occupational status, are more likely to be homeowners, and less likely to be crowded than Negro Areas. Movement into previously all-white areas is clearly led by high-status Negroes. (2) Negroes in invasion tracts are often of higher educational status and more likely to be homeowners than whites in these tracts, both before and after invasion. Not only are high-status Negroes the first to enter all-white neighborhoods but owner-occupancy is apparently a major avenue of entry into the new neighborhood. (p. 163)

Also, major case study of residential succession by Northwood and Barth (1965) found that «Negro Pioneers,» especially in the first wave of invaders, tend to be of higher socio-economic status than their white neighbors. The first blacks into a white neighborhood have higher hurdles placed in their way than for incoming whites. Blacks will pay higher prices for homes, and, in general, be «more selected» and «acceptable» to dominant whites in the area. Despite the turmoil of the 1970s and early 1980s, Blacks continued to developed community institutions that were instrumental in the survival and later revival of Brooklyn. Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, fraternal associations, political clubs, arts, and cultural associations, for example Bedford Stuyvesant Beautification Association - Save Our Magnolia Tree Earth Center, Weeksville other organizations from the making of modern Brooklyn (Manoni, 1973). It must also be noted that in this period Black Brooklyn produced leaders in many fields such as Shirley Chisolm, Spike Lee, Kimberly Denise Jones (Lil' Kim) and Louis Gossett Jr.

Declining Brooklyn

Independent of racial bias and stereotyping, was the fact that crime and arson rates soared in minority neighborhoods in the 1960s and 1970s. An often neglected aspect of these problems, which were universally blamed on the victims, were other culprits. For example, John Barracato who served as a firefighter, fire investigator, and deputy chief fire marshal with the New York City Fire Department from 1960 to 1976 noted that “landlords who saw a bleak future for their investments in Brownsville were hiring torches to burn their buildings for insurance” (Barracato & Michelmor, 1976, p. 18; see also Stevens, 1971).

Similarly, in reference to the rising crime rates in Black Brooklyn. In *The Knapp Commission Report* presented to Mayor John V. Lindsay in 1972, evidence was given of widespread New York City Police Department corruption centered in minority communities such as the south Bronx, Harlem and Brooklyn (Knapp Commission, 1973). In these neighborhoods, police officers were directly and indirectly involved in narcotics trafficking, illegal gambling, prostitution, and illegal bottle clubs as well as protecting contractors who were violating city safety and other construction ordinances. Most germane for crime in Black Brooklyn was The Thirteenth Division in Brooklyn, which was the subject of a major anti-corruption investigation.

In May, 1972, after the Commission's hearings, Kings County District Attorney Eugene Gold announced the indictment of virtually an entire division plainclothes squad in Brooklyn, which collected payments from gamblers without interruption during the Commission's public hearings in precisely the same fashion being described by Commission witnesses. The indictments and related departmental charges involved a total of thirty-six current and former plainclothesmen, twenty-four of whom were indicted. According to Mr. Gold, at one time twenty-four of twenty-five plainclothesmen in the division were on the pad. (Knapp Commission, 1973, p. 76)

Unfortunately, the police corruption problem in Black Brooklyn did not fade away. As reported in *The New York Post* (2015):

Brooklyn's 77th Precinct in Bedford-Stuyvesant was like the Wild West. Cops on the beat were known to steal money from the dead, pocket confiscated cash from drug busts, and pilfer crime scenes for anything left behind by burglars. And when takes off crime scenes

weren't enough, the unit created crime scenes of their own. The radio signal "Buddy Bob" was used to gather all parties interested in going on a "raid," which included anything from breaking into a smoke shop after hours to busting down the doors of drug dealers' dens solely to steal any cash on hand. In May 1986, Internal Affairs caught Officer Henry Winter in a pickup truck with cocaine and strong-armed him into informing on his fellow cops. The resulting tapes and testimony were used to indict 13 officers and have another 90 relocated in an attempt to purge the precinct's toxic culture.

It must also be noted that the Knapp commission's star witness, Frank Serpico began his undercover campaign against vice racketeering in the Brooklyn North's 81st Precinct.

This period was also punctuated by urban riots in many major cities such as New York and Los Angeles (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968). For Brooklynites, it was the sizzling summer of 1977 Blackout that had the greatest impact. The power failure led to widespread rioting, looting, and arson in predominantly black neighborhoods. Several blocks of the main Broadway shopping district in Bushwick were torched and a third of the remaining stores closed immediately. More than 40% of Bushwick's commercial and retail operations went out of business within a year (Malanga, 2008; Curvin & Porter, 1979).

The nadir for the city in 1975 coincided with the Mayoralty of Abraham Beame and the New York City Fiscal Crisis that forced a virtual bankruptcy on the demoralized citizenry. New York State's Municipal Assistance Corporation took over the City's financial affairs until 2008. The financial future of the city looked so bleak that Beame's Housing and Development Administrator, Robert Starr, suggested that rather than cutting city-wide services, a "Planned Shrinkage" policy be implemented. The neighborhoods to be cut off from city services to save money were populated primarily by non-whites in The Bronx and Brooklyn. According to Joseph P. Fried (1976) in many Brooklyn neighborhoods increasing urban blight was correlated with the inflow of minorities, especially African Americans. One source of hostility to these new invaders are more racially militant blacks. Today there are complaints about the displacement of Blacks due to gentrification, but it had a parallel in the 1960s and 1970s. An interesting analysis and description of the "negro removal" process is provided by Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward:

Other federal programs, such as urban renewal, were turned against blacks; renewal projects were undertaken in most big cities to deal with the black invasion through 'slum clearance,' by reclaiming land taken by the expanding ghettos and restoring it to 'higher economic' use (i.e., to uses that would keep whites, and businesses in the central city)....

...seventy percent of the families thus uprooted were black.... But with local blacks becoming more disorderly and more demanding in the early 1960s, local government began to make some concessions. Urban renewal provides one example. By the 1960s, black protests were mounting against 'Negro Removal' in the guise of 'slum clearance.' (Piven & Cloward, 1971, pp. 241-42)

What we currently refer to as 'displacement' was also taking place at the time, although in much more limited way, in the 1970s. According to a report of the National Urban Coalition in 1978, if you are elderly poor, or working class and live in an area undergoing rehabilitation, or in a suddenly fashionable neighborhood, you are a prime candidate for displacement by well-to-do suburbanites longing for the city life they left behind. The Coalition's study of forty-four cities showed that over half of the rehabilitated neighborhoods

had higher minority populations before rehabilitation began (AP 1978). Many of the most respected urbanologists of the time strongly criticized these misnomered urban “renewal,” and related programs (Frieden & Morris, 1968; Gans, 1968; Greer, 1965; Lupo et al., 1971; Norwood, 1974; Piven & Cloward, 1971; Bellush & Hausknecht, 1974).

As early as 1940, more than 90,000 out of almost 110,000 Blacks in Brooklyn lived in a small redlined portion of Black Brooklyn. This geographical concentration of Blacks continued and became more pronounced as large numbers of Southern Blacks moved to Black Brooklyn and whites moved out. It should be noted here, that at the time there was also large influx of Afro-Caribbeans. The segregation of Blacks in Brooklyn increased as Whites moved away from them and relatedly increasingly undesirable neighborhoods to “better” parts of Brooklyn, the suburbs, or suburban fringe neighborhoods in Queens and Staten Island. Whites also engaged various practices of “neighborhood defense” against Blacks and other People of Color (Chronopoulos, 2020; DeSena, 2005; Krase, 1982). These mechanisms of de facto segregation were facilitated by real estate agents and landlords who employed a range of more and less obvious tactics deny apartment rentals or housing sales to nonwhites.

As already noted as to redlining, financial institutions denied business and housing loans to minorities seeking opportunities in white areas. Those who managed entrée to white neighborhoods residents were often verbally and physically harassed. In some cases, they were attacked in schools or public spaces, and were harassed by police because they were frequenting white neighborhoods. According to Chronopoulos (2020):

In a general sense, neighborhood defense was an effort to maintain the racial exclusivity of white neighborhoods during a period of political mobilizations by African Americans demanding equality. It resulted in the hoarding of benefits and resources by white populations through the denunciation of Black advancement and the embrace of political entrepreneurs from the right. (p. 560)

Citing Joel Schwartz (1993), Chronopoulos (2020) also argued that public policies, such as slum clearance and the building of public housing projects also contributed to the racial segregation of neighborhoods. According to Schwartz (1993), under Moses, subsidized housing projects had racial overtones as they accepted only White or Black tenants, depending on where they were built. Almost totally Black, Brownsville became one of many minority neighborhoods in New York to be neglected and suffer from the maldistribution of municipal services (Chronopoulos, 2020).

There were also some unanticipated consequences of liberal policies in the 1960s which was framed by civil rights movements, during which «restrictive» covenants and «neighborhood preservation» groups were stigmatized by liberal-minded publics and political authorities. The effect was the elimination of both real and imagined racial discrimination. Subsequently many city neighborhoods, previously defended by social class hurdles, were quickly integrated, and white middle class flight from the city accelerated. According to Thabit, East New York turned from White to Black in only six years because about 200 real estate firms resorted to blockbusting: “‘Ripe’ blocks were flooded with scare literature; brokers and speculators paraded black families up and down the streets to frighten whites into selling (Thabit, 2003; see also Krase, 1982). However, Williamsburg and Greenpoint in North Brooklyn, remained white because of neighborhood defense (DeSena, 2005; Chronopoulos, 2020).

It appears that only after a variable «Tipping Point» is reached does an area seem to take a general socioeconomic downturn. To most scientists the tipping point is a simple

proportion of non-whites to total population in the area, after which the area slowly or rapidly becomes essentially all non-white (Wolf, 1967; Deutsch & Collins, 1951). There are other aspects of residential change in the inner city that require more intensive study. For example, a slow rate of home sales in an area can still coincide with a high rate of ethnic change. Often non-white invaders are the only prospective buyers, and whites the only sellers, of neighborhood property. Many residential Brooklyn blocks had rather «normal» turnover rates in the 1960s; approximately four percent per year, but due to racial steering by white and black real estate agents during a ten-year period they shifted from being predominately white to being predominately black.

During the two-term Mayoralty of John Lindsay (1966–1973), the NYC Planning Commission several different experiments in Decentralized Government followed: Little City Halls, Urban Action Task Forces, the Neighborhood Action Program, and the Office of Neighborhood Government. These efforts stimulated the growth, perhaps even the proliferation of local community and neighborhood associations in Brooklyn. However, since in the eyes of the general public most of these government programs were associated with neighborhood deterioration there was considerable opposition to being included in such designated “poverty” areas organizations. In the 1970s minority and changing neighborhoods were the focus of much attention by government agencies as evidenced in Central Brooklyn Model Cities, the Office of Neighborhood Government in Crown Heights, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Community School District. In the 1970s and 1980s local groups in central Brooklyn aggressively competed for the limited number of various Federal «Poverty Area» designations in order to be eligible for increased funding opportunities and programs.

In 1977, the NYC Human Rights Commission heard testimony concerning attempts to organize local residents specifically around the issue of redlining. The New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG) released the results of a study detailing the lending practices of seven Brooklyn banks charging that “the entire borough of Brooklyn is red-lined.”

Like BRIC, NYPIRG believes that the issue must be addressed on the community level as well as in the broader arena of government agencies and legislatures, and in the fall of 1976 they began organizing around the redlining issue in East Flatbush and Prospect-Lefferts-Gardens. Borrowing techniques used successfully in Chicago, community residents have been meeting with bank presidents and presenting their demands for mortgage loans in their community. Some successes have already been noted and efforts are now underway to enlist the cooperation of local residents in a movement to withdraw deposits from non-cooperating banks. This effort, which is now being publicized as the “Bank on Brooklyn” campaign, is receiving considerable attention in the press and will undoubtedly be watched closely by bankers and other community groups.” (Paul & Baker, 1977, pp. 86-87)

In 1968, the Federal Civil rights Act was passed and Title VIII of the Act was the first comprehensive federal open housing law. It banned discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, lease, and financing of housing, and in the furnishing of real estate brokerage services. It resulted in numerous public and voluntary organizations seeking to enforce its mandate. Fair housing was a major concern of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) of New York City’s Commission on Human Rights. The goal of their housing unit was providing minorities with housing option in areas from which they were excluded as well as preventing brokers from steering whites

away from integrated neighborhoods. Organizations and Activists acted as fair housing “checkers” or “testers.”

In the 1970s however a broad spectrum of civic, business and political forces were working with increased vigor to reverse the decline. They joined together in a number of coalitions and succeeded in reversing the borough’s fortunes. By the power of their own will and inspired leadership they mobilized resources and a stream of public and private investment began to flow to Brooklyn. They set in motion an economic, cultural, and civic flowering of modern Brooklyn that accelerated in the 1990s and continues to this day. For example, local activists joined in the fight against the related real estate practices such as “block-busting” and “racial steering.” “Blockbusting and panic peddling are real estate practices in which brokers encourage owners to list their homes for sale by exploiting fears of racial change within their neighborhood” (Heiman, 1986, p. 1145) As a result Black Brooklyn neighborhood associations became a party to a 1977 “anti-solicitation” order by the then New York State Secretary of State Mario M. Cuomo. It should be noted that under the leadership of Eleanor Holmes Norton, The New York City Commission on Human Rights had also ordered non-solicitation orders in aggrieved neighborhoods. Although there were several successful challenges to specific provisions of the New York State order, the order did bring needed close attention to these damaging practices, as well as restrictive legislation resulting from it, and for a time they lessened.

The order stated in part:

...that all licensed real estate brokers and salespersons are hereby restricted and shall cease and desist from soliciting listings of properties for sale and for purchase in any manner including but not limited to solicitation by means of letters, postcards, telephone calls, door-to-door canvassing, window signs, billboards, advertisement by hand-bills or news publications in the counties of Kings and Queens, except that brokers and salespersons may solicit listings of properties for sale and for purchase in newspapers of general circulation. That all solicitation be and is hereby prohibited until further notice (Heiman, 1986; Mehlhorn, 1998).

New York City’s Second Fiscal Crisis

Commenting on a Center for an Urban Future study, *New York in the World*, by Glenn von Nostitz (2011), Patrick McGeehan (2011) wrote:

Arguably, New York has benefited more and suffered more from globalization than any other state in the nation,’ Garrick Utley, the president of the institute and a former television journalist, said. ‘New York is sort of a macro-microcosm of the nation, facing the challenges of the global economy. The state has lost more manufacturing jobs in the last 40 years than any other big state, including Michigan, though Michigan has suffered more since 2000, the report found. Within New York State, manufacturing has disappeared fastest in New York City, leaving few options for the rising tide of immigrants needing to support their families.

The effect on the relative affluence of residents of Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx was stark: The report stated that the median income for individuals in each borough, as a percentage of the nation’s median income, fell significantly from 1970 to 2008 (Von Nostitz 2011). Public discourse about the crisis proliferated in American public discourse. For

example, since 2008, the *New York Times* published more than 1,000 articles about foreclosures and the mortgage crisis. Veteran city journalist Sam Roberts (2010) summarized data from the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS showed that, adjusting for inflation, New Yorkers' median household income declined between 2006 and 2009 from \$48,631 to \$48,355. City home values registered the sharpest declines, to \$517,000 in 2009 from \$557,300 in 2007. In the same period, the population dependent on food stamps rose to 17.2 percent from 13.3 percent in 2007 although the poverty rate remained unchanged (18.7 percent). In 2008, the City's own more sophisticated measure of poverty classified 22 percent of New Yorkers as poor. Since 2007, the income gap in the city appeared to have widened somewhat as the proportion of people who were making \$200,000 or more and those earning less than \$10,000, adjusting for inflation, rose from 5.9 percent to 6.5 percent and from 11.1 percent to 11.5 percent respectively (Roberts, 2010).

Subprime Mortgages and Foreclosures

Sassen (2009) argued that the securitizing of mortgages created a new channel for extracting household income, bundling it up with other types of debt and selling it off to financial investors. Extending this concept to modest-income households opens up a global potential market comprising billions of households. These mortgages were often marketed to households that lacked the capacity to meet the monthly mortgage payments without full disclosure as to the risks and possible changes in interest rates. In this way, household savings could be extracted. This was evident in the local-level data showing that African-Americans and low-income neighborhoods had a disproportionately higher incidence of subprime mortgages in all mortgages from 2000 to 2007. She cited extreme differences between Manhattan and other New York City boroughs: In 2006 less than 1 percent of mortgages sold to Manhattan home-buyers were subprime compared to 27.4 percent in the Bronx.

During the same period, there was also a sharp rate of growth of subprime mortgages in all boroughs except Manhattan. A further breakdown by neighborhoods (Community Districts [CDs]) showed that the 10 worst-hit neighborhoods were poor, and in them between 34 percent and 47 percent of mortgages were subprime. Controlling for race a similar pattern was evident, as whites, with far higher average income than all the other groups in New York City, were far less likely to have subprime mortgages than all other groups, reaching 9.1 percent in 2006 compared with 13.6 percent of Asians, 28.6 percent of Hispanics and 40.7 percent of blacks (Sassen, 2009). All of the top 10 CDs with the highest rates of subprime lending in 2006 were well-known nonwhite minority areas; five were in Brooklyn.

One of the most striking effects of the current crisis was manifest in home loan foreclosures. According to Michael Powell and Jane Roberts, mortgage foreclosure rates in the region were highest in areas with high minority populations (Powell & Roberts, 2009; see also Bloch & Roberts, 2010). As expected, the distribution of foreclosures is not random, but covaries with poverty and race. In Brooklyn, for example, the CDs hit hardest were 3 Bedford-Stuyvesant (12 percent White), 4 Bushwick (24 percent White), and 5 East New York (18 percent White). Median Household Income in these CDs for 2005–07 fell between \$28,000 and \$32,000. (In comparison, the median household income for New York City as a whole was \$47,581.) The proportion of the population receiving income support (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Supplemental Security Income, Medicaid) in these Brooklyn areas varied between 44 percent and one-half. In the areas least affected,

such as CD 2 Brooklyn Heights, Fort Greene (50 percent White), CD 6 Park Slope, Carroll Gardens (68 percent White), CD 10 Bay Ridge, Dyker Heights (74 percent White), 15 Sheepshead Bay (77 percent White) and CD 18 Canarsie, Flatlands (32 percent White) the median household income is substantially higher, ranging from around \$46,000 to more than \$77,000, with income assistance between 15 percent and one-third (ACS Population by Race, 5-Year Average 2005–09 Census). The foreclosure data for Bedford Stuyvesant and Bushwick in Brooklyn was startling, especially in the area north of Broadway in Bushwick (CD 4) and between Atlantic and Gates Avenues in Bedford Stuyvesant (CD 3).

The New York City Department of Housing Preservation (HPD) and Development invited developers and local organizations to submit applications for the funding of proposals to acquire and redevelop foreclosed, abandoned, or vacant properties in Census tracts most affected by foreclosures. The program uses stimulus funds from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to prevent further declines in neighborhoods most severely impacted by foreclosures. Of the 20 neighborhoods Targeted by the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP1) 3 were in the remains of Black Brooklyn and most of the others were where Black Brooklyn residents had moved such as Flatlands/Canarsie, and East Flatbush.

During the crisis, New York City Consumer Affairs Commissioner, Jonathan Mintz, announced an expansion of the City's Financial Empowerment Centers (Sarlin & Lootens, 2010). The centers provide free homeownership and foreclosure prevention counseling. There are 20 Financial Empowerment Center locations, including three new ones in the Garment District and Lower East Side, in Manhattan, and Melrose, in the Bronx. As might be expected, given the uneven effects of the recession in New York City, these three as well as those in the complete list of Help Centers, are all located in the previously identified problem areas for New York City's Neighborhood Stabilization Program. Distressed neighborhoods such as these tend to have clusters of anti-poverty services and businesses catering to basic needs at low cost.

Political Disempowerment

Economic prosperity and housing, although significant, were not the only public goods Black Brooklynites were systematically deprived of. Black institutions and organizations, especially those with electoral political potential suffered greatly during the 20th century from discrimination in the form of gerrymandering as well access to registration and voting. So much so that The Federal Voting Rights Act, usually associated with racial discrimination in the Deep South, applied to Brooklyn's Congressional Districts. According to Doug Muzzio (2021):

The law was a culmination of the black civil rights movement and a cornerstone of Lyndon Johnson's great society. With it, the federal government would finally fulfill the promise of the Fifteenth Amendment, enabling blacks to exercise the franchise unhindered by exclusionary devices such as literacy tests, white primaries, poll taxes and grandfather clauses. The law prevented states from enforcing discriminatory tactics aimed at preventing blacks' fair opportunities to participate in the voting process.

Currently, the law covers Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas and Virginia; of California, Florida, Michigan, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Dakota— and Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx.

As a result of a suit brought under the Voting Rights Act in 1967, Black Brooklyn, which was cut up among several, mostly white Congressional Districts, was rearranged to create one that enabled Afro-Caribbean New York State Assemblywomen Shirley Chisholm to win in 1968. The act was amended in 1970 to include jurisdictions that had literacy tests, and in which less than 50 percent of the voting age population was registered or voted in the 1968 presidential election. In July 1970, the Attorney General found that New York State maintained a test or a device that adversely affected minority voting participation. In March 1971, U.S. Bureau of the Census found that fewer than 50 percent of voting age residents were registered in Bronx, Kings, and New York counties. Together these determinations required the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan to become "covered" jurisdictions subject to pre-clearance (Doug Muzzio, 2021; see also Brooks, 2013). For a closer look at ethnic and racial politics in Brooklyn see Howell (2018), Krase and LaCerra (1992).

Immobility: Race, Poverty

According to Sheller and Urry (2006), although the significance of mobility in analyses of spatiality and spatial restructuring has been recognized by many social scientists, they continue not to fully '... recognize how the spatialities of social life presuppose, and frequently involve conflict over, both the actual and the imagined movement of people from place to place, event to event' (p. 6). Ethnic population maps of Brooklyn since the 1920s show the remarkable immobility of Black, Jewish, and Italian enclaves. Today most of New York's Ultra-Orthodox, Jews ironically, reside in Wirth's 'voluntary' ghettos of various degrees, whereas most Blacks occupy rather "involuntary" ones (Wirth, 1928). The immobility of Orthodox Jews is primarily due to regulations that tie them to local religious leaders and institutions. For Blacks limited residential mobility is due in large part to discrimination. Brooklyn's dwindling Italian American population remains tied to historically important immigrant enclaves, and is therefore voluntary. Beyond race and ethnicity, poverty increases the immobility of these already immobile racial and ethnic groups (Krase 2016).

The Community Service Society mapped poverty in New York City and found that poverty and low incomes, unemployment, subsidized housing, emergency rent assistance, Housing Court actions, emergency feeding sites, disconnected youth, and low educational attainment, were all highly concentrated in Upper Manhattan, the South Bronx, and Central Brooklyn. They concluded, 'New Yorkers are living with the effects of poverty in every part of New York City, but the experience of poverty remains closely tied to place. Half of the city's 1.4 million poor people live in neighborhoods where the poverty rate is at least 24.8 percent (compared to a citywide rate of 19.2 percent), and one-quarter live in neighborhoods where the rate is at least 34.1 percent' (Community Service Society & United Way, 2008). Not unsurprisingly, Bloch and Roberts (2010) reported mortgage foreclosure rates were highest in areas with high minority populations. In Brooklyn, the Community Districts (CDs) hit hardest were Bedford-Stuyvesant (12% White), Bushwick (24% White), and East New York (18% White). Mortgage foreclosures add to neighborhood stress because abandoned and boarded up buildings become signifiers of poverty, which stigmatizes the surrounding area.

Immobility: Stop and frisk

According to Tesfahuney «Differential mobility empowerments reflect structures and hierarchies of power and position by race, gender, age and class, ranging from the local to

the global» (Teschahoney, 1998, p. 501; see also Massey, 1994). Places and technologies that enhance the mobility of some can do so while at the same time they decrease the mobility of others, especially as they try to cross borders (Timothy, 2001). Therefore, it is not surprising to discover that race and poverty-induced immobility produce other patterns and concentrations such as for crime and arrests. If authorities wish to make arrests, the geography of race and class is metaphorically like shooting fish in barrel. Gelman et al. (2007), Fagan and Kiss looked at claims of racial bias against the New York City Police Department's 'Stop-and-Frisk' Policy. Blacks and Hispanics represented 51% and 33% of the stops but were only 26% and 24% of the New York City population. Most important for mobility issues, they found evidence of stops:

... that are best explained as 'racial incongruity' stops: high rates of minority stops in predominantly white precincts. Indeed, being 'out of place' is often a trigger for suspicion ... Racial incongruity stops are most prominent in racially homogeneous areas. For example, we observed high stop rates of African-Americans in the predominantly white 19th Precinct, a sign of race-based selection of citizens for police interdiction. We also observed high stop rates for whites in several precincts in the Bronx, especially for drug crimes, most likely evidence that white drug buyers were entering predominantly minority neighborhoods where street drug markets are common. (Gelman et al., 2007, p. 816)

A map created by the Center on Race, Crime and Justice, John Jay College of Criminal Justice showed of the Precincts with more than 55,000 stops 2003-2008, 4 of the 8 were in the remains of Black Brooklyn, 73 Ocean Hill Brownsville, East New York 75, Crown Heights 77, Bedford Stuyvesant 79 (Jones-Brown, 2010). Unfortunately, a more recent study showed that discrimination in stops and frisks has continued (Bekiempis, 2017).

Stopped here Education Redlining

According to *A Rotting Apple: Education Redlining in New York City* (Holzman, 2012), the long-term and continuing problems of meeting the needs of poor nonwhite students in Community School District 17 are the result of a New York City-wide pattern of "Educational Redlining" (Schott Foundation for Public Education, 2012). The main conclusion of this Schott Foundation for Public Education report is that New York City's public schools' student's educational outcomes and opportunity to learn are more a product of where they live than their own abilities.

Primarily because of New York City policies and practices that result in an inequitable distribution of educational resources and intensify the impact of poverty, children who are poor, Black and Hispanic have far less of an opportunity to learn the skills needed to succeed on state and federal assessments. They are also much less likely to have an opportunity to be identified for Gifted and Talented programs, to attend selective high schools or to obtain diplomas qualifying them for college or a good job. High-performing schools, on the other hand, tend to be located in economically advantaged areas. (Schott Foundation for Public Education, 2012)

New York's school system is considered among the most racially and socioeconomically segregated in America. The most recent iteration of educational racial inequity was raised in reference to public Specialized High Schools and educational enrichment programs. A lawsuit by civil rights attorneys and student plaintiffs in State Supreme Court in Manhattan

was filed to fundamental change how New York City's public school students are admitted into selective schools. It argues that the city's school system has replicated and worsened racial inequality by sorting children into different academic tracks as early as kindergarten, and has therefore denied many of its roughly one million students of their right to a sound, basic education. Defendants include the New York State Governor, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio, and the incoming school's chancellor Meisha Porter (Shapiro, 2021).

The Gentrification of Black Brooklyn

Adding the latest insult to injury has been the displacement of Black residents and businesses by the Gentrification of what was left of Black Brooklyn, parts of which had been gentrified by Blacks themselves. According to Chronopoulos Black gentrification was apparent in the 1970s with the growth of the middle class. Due to limited choices Middle-class Blacks Facing moved to low-income, mostly minority areas in Northwest Black Brooklyn and eventually southward and eastward in the borough. The final decade of the 20th century witnessed a revival in Brooklyn's fortunes. Crime ebbed during the 1990s, and neighborhoods in Black Brooklyn, like Bedford Stuyvesant, Bushwick, Fort Greene, and Clinton Hill began to spring back to life as the outflow of capital in the city reversed. The displacement and gentrification in North Brooklyn was also pioneered by a new generation of artists, fleeing from the high rents in Manhattan in northern Williamsburg, and Greenpoint (Zukin, 1987; Lees, 2003).

A seemingly benign form of gentrification in the 1970s was "The Brownstone Revival Movement" that was part of the national «Back to City» movement. The movement aimed to recreate and preserve traditional urban middle-class residential values in the face of urban decline noted earlier in this chapter. Since a much smaller proportion of Blacks were in the higher classes, and gentrification is primarily an upper middle class invasion process, Blacks became the losers in the competition for these increasingly desirable spaces. It should be noted that Black Brooklyn always had many positive qualities such as historically valuable housing stock and ease of transportation to Manhattan, but, like Harlem, was stigmatized by its Black occupation. It is obvious, therefore, that their "ethnic cleansing" would become an important part of the process of "upscaling" (Chronopoulos, 2020; Krase, 1977).

Two of the most influential were the Brooklyn Brownstone Conference (BBC) and the city-wide New York Brownstone Revival Committee (BRC) in their "Back-to-the-City" movement activities. Founded in 1968, ironically, the organization had campaigned against mortgage red-lining and got some banks to offer mortgages for brownstones in Black Brooklyn. From 1973 to 1986, BRC co-sponsored with the Brooklyn Brownstone Conference the annual Brooklyn Brownstone Fair that resulted in the gentrification of many Black Brooklyn neighborhoods and the displacement of Black residents.

Unfortunately, this activism against urban deterioration changed to the celebration of what Neil Smith (1998) would call urban neighborhood "revanchism" which "blends revenge with reaction" (p. 1). In general urban revanchism has been viewed as: "reaction against the successes of social democracy, the welfare state and socially responsible urban policy during the middle half of the twentieth century, and revenge against the malefactors held responsible for urban decay and the supposed 'theft' of the city" (Jou et al., 2016, p. 563).

In Northwest Black Brooklyn, Whites became the numerical majority after 2013 (Chronopoulos, 2020) Just as the increases in housing costs in Manhattan brought white gentrifiers to North Brooklyn in the 1980s, as they subsequently increased in super-gen-

trifying Williamsburg in the 1990s, first-wave gentrifiers and newcomers ventured further south into Central Brooklyn and Crown Heights. A 2019 study by Kristen Lewis and Sarah Burd-Sharps found:

The five neighborhoods with the largest increase in White residents accompanied by a decrease in residents of another racial or ethnic group were all found in Brooklyn—Bedford-Stuyvesant, Williamsburg, Clinton Hill, Park Slope and Gowanus, and Crown Heights North. Between 2000 and 2010, these neighborhoods all saw an increase of between 6,700 and 15,600 White residents, paired with a simultaneous decrease in Black residents (Bedford-Stuyvesant, Crown Heights North), Latino residents (Williamsburg), or both (Clinton Hill, Park Slope and Gowanus). (Lewis & Burd-Sharps 2019; see also Vo, 2020; Richardson et al., 2020)

It must be also noted that between 1990 and 2020 as the total population of Brooklyn increased by 347,788, the Black population decreased by 38,622.

1990	2,300,664	872,305
2000	2,465,326	898,350
2010	2,552,911	860,083
2020	2,648,452	833,683 estimate 2019

TABLE 2. BROOKLYN, NEW YORK. TOTAL AND BLACK POPULATION 1990 - 2010
NOTE. DATA GATHERED FROM THE US CENSUSES OF POPULATION AND HOUSING (N.D.) 1990, 2000, 2010, 2020.

Conclusion

It would take several volumes to discuss the many other examples of racial inequities in Brooklyn previously discussed in this chapter, such as housing evictions (Chen, 2021), environmental racism (Gould & Lewis, 2017), food deserts (Ky, 2014), and access to COVID-19 testing and treatment. (Pereira et al., 2021; Krase & DeSena, in press) Employing a distributive social justice perspective, prefaced by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2022), this essay has focused on the most salient outcomes of the conflicts and competitions over Brooklyn spaces and resources as they have impacted Brooklynites of African descent. To conclude this chapter, I restate the guiding principle for all 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals - “Leaving no one behind,” and ask whether Black Brooklynites have received their fair share of public goods over their half-millennium of involuntary and voluntary residence in the borough. Considering even the limited evidence presented here, the answer is clearly «No.» In the 1970s «Critical Race Theory» was developed by lawyers, legal scholars, and activists who saw that the progress and momentum made during the Civil Rights Era (1950s and 60s) had either slowed and in some cases ended (Omi & Winant, 1994). The theory provides an understanding of how race is not only socially constructed but how those constructions are institutionalized and negatively impact different minority groups at different times (Delgado, 2001). As demonstrated in this essay about Black Brooklyn, the negative impacts are numerous and obvious. As all my work is pragmatic in orientation, I hope this essay will motivate positive changes. In conclusion, I look forward to seeing in the future what would a socially just Brooklyn, or any other city around the globe, would look like.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

References

- Anderson, E. (2000). Beyond the Melting Pot Reconsidered. *The International Migration Review* 34 (1): 262-270.
- Badger, E. (2017, August 24). How Redlining's Racist Effects Lasted for Decades. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/24/upshot/how-redlinings-racist-effects-lasting-for-decades.html>
- Bagli, C. V. (2016, January 13). Looming end of Tax-Break program could harm mayor's housing plan. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/14/nyregion/death-of-tax-break-program-could-hamper-mayor-de-blasios-housing-push.html>
- Balbo, M. (2009). Social and spatial inclusion of international migrants: Local responses to a global process.» SSIIM Paper Series.
- Barracato, J., & Michelmore, P. (1976). *Arson!* W.W. Norton and Company.
- Bekiempis, V. (2017, June 7). NYPD stop-and-frisk report downplays racial disparities, court papers say. *New York Daily News*. <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/nyc-crime/nypd-stop-and-frisk-report-downplays-racial-bias-court-papers-article-1.3228852>
- Bloch, M. & Roberts, J. (2010, May 30). Mapping Foreclosures in the New York Region. *New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2009/05/15/nyregion/0515-fore-close.html>
- Brook, D. (2013, February 21). New York should hate the Voting Rights Act—Why is the city defending it? *Slate Magazine*. <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2013/02/voting-rights-supreme-court-case-why-is-new-york-defending-the-voting-rights-act.html>
- Bellush, J. & M. Hausknecht. (1971). *Urban Renewal: People, Politics and Planning*. Doubleday-Anchor.
- Chen, S. (2021, March 17). New York Renters in Covid Hot Spots Are Four Times More Likely to Face Eviction. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/17/realestate/new-york-city-renters-evictions.html>
- Chronopoulos, T. (2020). What's Happened to the People? Gentrification and Racial Segregation in Brooklyn. *Journal of African American Studies* 24, 549–572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-020-09499-y>
- Community Service Society & United Way. (2008). *Mapping Poverty in New York*. Community Service Society. https://smhttp-ssl-58547.nexcesscdn.net/nycss/images/uploads/pubs/Mapping_booklet.pdf
- Connolly, H. X. (1977). *A Ghetto Grows in Brooklyn*. New York University Press.
- Courts, H. S. O. T. N. Y. (2018, October 24). *When did slavery end in New York?* Historical Society of the New York Courts. <https://history.nycourts.gov/when-did-slavery-end-in-new-york/>

- Curvin, R. & Porter, B. (1979). *Blackout Looting! New York City, July 13, 1977*. Gardner Press.
- Delgado, R. (2001). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York University Press.
- DeSena, J. N. (2005). *Protecting One's Turf: Social Strategies for Maintaining Urban Neighborhoods*. University Press of America.
- Deutsch, M. & Collins, M.E. (1951) *Interracial Housing*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Fernando, J. (2022, March 20). *What are public goods? Definition, how they work, and example*. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/public-good.asp>
- Frers, L., & Meier, L. 2007. *Encountering urban places: Visual and material performances in the city*. Ashgate.
- Fried, J.P. (1976, February 3). City's Housing Administrator Proposes 'Planned Shrinkage' of Some Slums. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/1976/02/03/archives/citys-housing-administrator-proposes-planned-shrinkage-of-some.html>
- Frieden, B. & Morris, R. (1968). *Urban Planning and Social Policy*. Basic Books.
- Gans, H. (1968). *People and Plans*. Basic Books.
- Gelman, A., Fagan, J. & Kiss, A. (2007). An analysis of the New York City Police Department's 'Stop-and-Frisk' Policy in the context of claims of racial bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 813-823. <http://www.stat.columbia.edu/~gelman/research/published/frisk9.pdf>
- Gould, K. A. & Lewis, T. L. (2017). *Green Gentrification: Urban sustainability and the Struggle for Environmental Justice*. Routledge Equity.
- Greer, S. (1965). *Urban Renewal and American Cities*. Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Harvey, D. (1973). *Social Justice and the City*. Blackwell.
- Heiman, A. (1986). Nonsolicitation and Cease and Desist Orders Against Real Estate Brokers in New York. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*. 15, (3). <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1533&context=ulj>
- Hillier, A. E. (2003). Redlining and the home owners' loan corporation. *Journal of Urban History*. 29(4), 394-420.
- Holzman, M. H. (2012). *A Rotting Apple: Education Redlining in New York City*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform
- Howell, R. (2018). *Boss of Black Brooklyn: The Life and Times of Bertram L. Baker*. Fordham University Press.
- Jones-Brown, D. (2010, March). *Stop, Question & Frisk Policing Practices in New York City: A Primer*. https://static.prisonpolicy.org/scans/PRIMER_electronic_version.pdf
- Jou, S-C., Clark, E. & Chen, H-W. (2016). Gentrification and Revanchist Urbanism in Taipei?. *Urban Studies* 53 (3), 560-576.
- Knapp Commission. (1973). *The Knapp Commission Report on Police 1973*. George Braziller
- Krase, J. (1977). Reactions to the Stigmata of Inner City Living. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*. 4 (7), 997-1011.
- Krase, J. (1982). *Self and Community in the City*. University Press of America.
- Krase, J. & LaCerra, C. (1992). *Ethnicity and Machine Politics: The Madison Club of Brooklyn*. University Press of America.
- Krase, J. & DeSena, J. N. (in press). *COVID-19 in Brooklyn: Everyday life during a pandemic*. Routledge.
- Krase, J. & DeSena, J. N. (2016). *Race, Class, and Gentrification in Brooklyn: A View from the Street*. Lexington Books.
- Krase, J. & Shortell, T. (2013). Seeing New York City's Financial Crisis in the Vernacular Landscape. In K. Fujita (Ed.), *Crisis and Cities: New Critical Urban Theory* (pp. 188-217). Sage.
- Krase, J. (2016). Seeing residential (im)mobilities in New York City. *Cultural Studies*, 30(3), 376-400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2015.1113631>

- Li, K., Cromley, E. K., Fox, A. M., & Horowitz, C. R. (2014). Evaluation of the placement of mobile fruit and vegetable vendors to alleviate food deserts in New York City. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd11.140086>
- ALees, L. (2003). Super-gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights. *Urban Studies*, 40(12), 2487–2509.
- Lewis, K. & Burd-Sharps, S. (2019, March 13). The Pace, and Face, of Gentrification: Population Change in Five Brooklyn Neighborhoods. *The Center for New York City Affairs, The New School*. <http://www.centernyc.org/the-pace-and-face-of-gentrification> Accessed June 16, 2021.
- Lupo, A., Colcord, F., & P. Fowler, E. P. (1971). *Rites of Way*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Malanga, S. (2008). The Death and Life of Bushwick. *City Journal*, Spring 2008 https://www.city-journal.org/html/death-and-life-bushwick-13083.html?wallit_nosession=1
- Manoni, M. (1973). *Bedford-Stuyvesant: The Anatomy of a Central City Community*. Quadrangle Books.
- Massey, D. S. (1994). *Space, Place, and Gender*. University of Minnesota Press.
- McGeehan, P. (2011, October 25). Report Lays Out State's Great Gains and Losses from Globalization. *New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/26/nyregion/report-details-globalization-effects-in-new-york.html?ref=todayspaper>
- Mehlhorn, D. (1998). A Requiem for Blockbusting: Law, Economics, and Race-Based Real Estate Speculation. 67 *Fordham L. Review*. 1145. <http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol67/iss3/4>
- Mollenkopf, J. & B. Lander. (2013). *Toward a 21st Century for All: Progressive Policies for New York City in 2013*. Center for Urban Research at the CUNY Graduate Center. <http://www.21cforall.org/>
- Moynihan, D. P. (1963). *Beyond the Melting Pot*. MIT and Harvard University Press.
- Muzzio, D. (2021). Voting Rights Act. *Gotham Gazette* <https://www.gothamgazette.com/index.php/about/1856-voting-rights-act>
- Northwood, L.K., & A.T. Barth. (1965). *Urban Desegregation: Negro Pioneers and their White Neighbors*. University of Washington Press.
- Norwood, C. (1974). *About Paterson*. Harper and Row.
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. (1968). *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. Bantam Books.
- New York Post. (2015, December 28). Police Corruption Scandals that Rocked New York City. *The New York Post*. <https://nypost.com/dispatch/5-police-corruption-scandals-that-rocked-new-york-city/>
- Olander, C. (2015). Unjust Urbanities: Spatially Reinforcing Patterns of Segregation. *Proceedings of the 10th International Space Syntax Symposium*, 112. http://www.sss10.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2015/07/SSS10_Proceedings_112.pdf
- Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. Routledge
- Park, R.E., Burgess, E.W. & McKensie, R.D. (1925). *The City*. University of Chicago Press.
- Paul, A. & K. Baker. (1977). *Economic investment and the Future of Neighborhoods*. NYC Commission on Human Rights.
- Pereira, S., Dobkin, J., & Akpan, N. (2021, January 31). City Reveals White New Yorkers Have Received Lion's Share Of COVID-19 Vaccine Doses," *The Gothamist*, <https://gothamist.com/news/white-new-yorkers-triple-nyc-covid-19-vaccine-doses>
- Piven, F. F. & Cloward, R. A. (1971). *Regulating the Poor*. Pantheon Books.
- Powell, M. & Roberts, J. (2009, May 15). Minorities Affected Most as New York Foreclosures Rise. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/16/nyregion/16foreclose.html>
- Rawls, J., & E. Kelly. (2003). *Justice as Fairness: A Reinstatement*. Harvard University Press.

- Richardson, J., Mitchell, B., & Franco, J. (2020). *Shifting Neighborhoods: Gentrification and Cultural Displacement in American Cities*. NCRC RESEARCH. <https://ncrc.org/gentrification/>
- Roberts, S. (2010). Recession Takes Toll on City, Census Survey Shows. *New York Times*. <http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/28/recession-takes-toll-on-city-census-survey-shows/>
- Sarlin, K, & Lootens, A. (2010, June 8). Consumer Affairs Commissioner Jonathan Mintz Announces Expansion of the City’s Financial Empowerment Centers to Include Counseling in Chinese, Homeownership and Foreclosure Prevention Counseling and Counseling for Homebound New Yorkers. *NYC Government*. http://www.nyc.gov/html/dca/html/pr2010/pr_060810.shtml
- Sassen, S. (2009). When Local Housing becomes an Electronic Instrument: The Global Circulation of Mortgages—A Research Note.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33 (2), 441-526.
- Schott Foundation for Public Education. (2012). *A Rotting Apple: Education Redlining in New York City*. Schott Foundation for Public Education. <https://schottfoundation.org/resource/a-rotting-apple-education-redlining-in-new-york-city/>
- Schwartz, J. (1993). *The New York Approach: Robert Moses, Urban Liberals, and Redevelopment of the Inner City*. Ohio State University Press.
- Shapiro, E. (2021, March 10). Lawsuit Challenging N.Y.C. School Segregation Targets Gifted Programs. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/09/nyregion/nyc-schools-segregation-lawsuit.html>
- Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). The New Mobilities Paradigm. *Environment and Planning*, 38 (2), 207–226.
- Smith, N. (1998). Giuliani Time: The Revanchist 1990s. *Social Text*. 57, 1–20.
- Stevens, S. (1971). Instant Urban Renewal. *New York Times*, June 19. <https://www.nytimes.com/1971/06/19/archives/instant-urban-renewal.html>
- Study finds suburbanites displacing poor in cities. (1978, August 2). *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/1978/08/02/archives/study-finds-suburbanites-displacing-poor-in-cities-findings-of.html>
- Taeuber, C. E., & A. F. Taeuber. (1969). *Negroes in Cities*. Atheneum.
- Tesfahuney, M. (1998). Mobility, Racism and Geopolitics. *Political Geography*, 17(5), 499–515.
- Timothy, D. J. (2001). *Tourism and political boundaries*. Routledge.
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- United Nations. (2022, May 31). *Take action for the sustainable development goals*. United Nations Sustainable Development. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>
- US Censuses of Population and Housing. (n.d.). Census. <https://www.census.gov/decennial-census>
- Vo, L. T. (2020, February 27). These 11 Maps Show How Black People Have Been Driven Out Of Neighborhoods In Five Of The Most Gentrified US Cities. *BuzzFeedNews* https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/lamvo/gentrification-maps-white-black-people-neighborhoods?fbclid=IwAR2m-oM7F8cKDEgKKwAJdSbmZFWKIzfxupIK-IvC_mW1FFdXkRxR1qqGqFl4
- Von Nostitz, G. (2011). *New York in the World*. Center for an Urban Future and SUNY Levin Institute.
- Wilder, C. S. (2000). *A Covenant with color: race and social power in Brooklyn*. Columbia University Press.
- Wirth, L., (1928). *The Ghetto*. University of Chicago Press.

- Wolf, E. P., & C. Lebeaux. (1967). Class and Race in the Changing City: Searching for New Approaches to Old Problems. In L.F. Schnore (ed). *Social Science and the City*. Praeger.
- Woodsworth, M. (2016). *Battle for Bed-Stuy: The Long War on Poverty in New York City*. Harvard University Press.
- Zukin, S. (1987). Gentrification: Culture and Capital in the Urban Core. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13, 129–147.

Author Biography

Jerome Krase is a Murray Koppelman Professor, and Professor Emeritus, at Brooklyn College of The City University of New York. President of European Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. After graduating from the elite Brooklyn Technical High School in 1960, he went on to study at Indiana University's Bloomington Campus. There, after a three-year enlistment in the U.S. Army, he earned a BA in Sociology, with minors in History and Philosophy, in 1967. In 1973, he received a Ph.D. in Sociology at New York University in 1973. His Doctoral Dissertation, "The Presentation of Community in Urban Society," dealt with the undeserved stigmatization of a Black neighborhood in Brooklyn, thereby questioning unwarranted negative racial stereotypes in general.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC4.0) which allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.