Gwen Ifill: We turn now to a look at the broader debate under way in the wake of the Greek referendum.

For that, we're joined by New York Times columnist Paul Krugman, who is also professor of economics at the Graduate Center at the City University of New York, and Stephan Richter. He is publisher and editor in chief of The Globalist.

Stephan Richter, you just heard that statement of optimism coming from the Greek ambassador. What do you think the fallout is going to be from the vote this weekend?

Stephan Richter: The Globalist: It's going to be severe, because there have been lots of attempts, from Angela Merkel, from the SPD in Germany, from certainly the leader of Italy, France, and so on, to build a bridge for Mr. Tsipras.

Angela Merkel herself took him basically under his — wing, a neophyte, a young politician. She wanted to build a bridge. She risked a lot. But the Greeks, basically, this government has thrown away the belief of others that, even if we had a deal tomorrow, something magical happened, that it has either the will or the capacity to implement the agreement.

As we know from many of these agreements over time throughout the world — this is not just a Greece
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For that, we're joined by New York Times columnist Paul Krugman, who is also professor of economics at the Graduate Center at the City University of New York, and Stephan Richter. He is publisher and editor in chief of The Globalist.

Stephan Richter, you just heard that statement of optimism coming from the Greek ambassador. What do you think the fallout is going to be from the vote this weekend?

STEPHAN RICHTER, The Globalist: It's going to be severe, because there have been lots of attempts, from Angela Merkel, from the SPD in Germany, from certainly the leader of Italy, France, and so on, to build a bridge for Mr. Tsipras.

Angela Merkel herself took him basically under his — wing, a neophyte, a young politician. She wanted to build a bridge. She risked a lot. But the Greeks, basically, this government has thrown away the belief of others that, even if we had a deal tomorrow, something magical happened, that it has either the will or the capacity to implement the agreement.

As we know from many of these agreements over time throughout the world — this is not just a Greece situation. Washington, with the IMF, has dealt a lot of conditionality and other things over the years. Countries must be willing to change in order to get to a brighter future. And it's not about just opening banks and throwing some money their way. That would be nice if it were that.

But the situation really is, if you think all the euro crisis away, Greece had problems before it got ever started in the euro. Those problems are still with us. And that's what it needs to rectify. And money can't change that. It takes far deeper change in Greece.

GWEN IFILL: Paul Krugman?

PAUL KRUGMAN, The New York Times: Well, I think one thing that is really important to understand just how much effort Greece has put in. Greece has achieved an incredible budget adjustment. It has raised taxes and slashed spending to the tune of what would be more than $2 trillion a year if it was happening in the United States.

So, we're talking about a Greek government that has under successive leaders made enormous sacrifices.
It’s bizarre to have people talking as if they haven’t done anything. They have done a lot of these structural reforms as well.

The problem is that what the euro leaders, the Troika, had been trying to do is essentially impossible. When a country is fairly deep in debt, as Greece was, even at the beginning of this, though it’s worse now, to try to, through austerity, bring that debt under control, is an impossible task.

What you’re doing is, you’re bashing the economy so badly that the economy shrinks faster than anything you can do on the budget side. So, no, essentially, Europe has been completely living in a fantasy world on all of this. I don’t know what the answer — I mean, I suspect that the answer is going to be Greek exit from the euro. But the notion that Greeks have somehow failed to deliver, after all the incredible suffering they have gone through, is just — part of the problem is that belief.

**GWEN IFILL:** Stephan Richter, we have seen today the IMF and the European Central Bank and the Netherlands and Germany all pretty much hold the line. Do you think they hear what it is that Mr. Krugman is talking about?

**STEPHAN RICHTER:** No, because the point he’s making about debt relief, and which he made in the New York Times today, is really not what is at issue.

I don’t think there are many German politicians or even German citizens who are expecting any money back out of Greece. I think there was a big mess. The German banks were in part faulty. Investment banks, Goldman Sachs helped the Greek government fake its statistics and so on. There’s plenty of blame to go around.

Nobody expects money comes back from Greece. But Greece has a tradition of taking the concession and then not delivering. When they got into the euro, basically, the benefit was that Greece got much lower interest rates, which helps an economy, helps entrepreneurs to do business. But instead of using it to improve their economy, they basically used it to hire more people in government.

Every party packed the payrolls of the government, and then they were unelected, and the next team came in, the old guys stayed. And this is not a way to make Greece productive. There are very many Greek productive people. Unfortunately, many of them live abroad, especially in the United States. There is entrepreneurship in Greece, theoretically, but it’s basically voted with their feet to move abroad.

**GWEN IFILL:** Paul Krugman, are these other nations in the Eurozone, especially Germany, are they trying to make Greece an example, for fear of the same sort of instability spreading?

**PAUL KRUGMAN:** Well, there is some. That’s speculation. We don’t really know that.

It’s hard not to suspect that. The main point right now is you have to ask, is there — if your notion is, well, Greek society has always been corrupt, well, you knew that. And it’s not — this is an impossible — talk about mission creep, trying to turn this from, let’s deal with this financial problem, let’s deal with this macroeconomic problem to let’s remake Greek society, that’s saying that you want Greece out.

And then, if that actually happens, Europe is going to be very sorry, because the consequences for the whole European system, the consequences for the European project will be terrible. In the end, if Greece leaves the euro, the consequences for the Greeks will be a few months of chaos, but possibly a big gain in competitiveness and recovery.

Remember, Greece functioned as an economy before there was a euro. The notion that they cannot survive without is wrong. And the folly — I mean, I have no brief for the current government of Greece. They are immature, inexperienced. But compared with the monstrous folly that’s been repeated year after year on the part of Europe’s leaders, it’s nothing. This is an incredible failure of judgment.

**GWEN IFILL:** So, should the Eurozone, Stephan Richter, go? Should Greece go from the Eurozone or should the Eurozone just cut Greece loose?

**STEPHAN RICHTER:** The tragedy is that the Greek case has shown that in order to for the Eurozone to survive, there needs to be a minimum agreement on fiscal policies, on lots of policies, and the Greek government under any stripe — that is not just a Syriza problem — is outside of that consensus.

That’s the tragedy. In order to preserve the Eurozone, we will see, in all likelihood, a Grexit, unless Mr. Tsipras pulls one more rabbit out of his hat, which is that he comes up with a unity government and can say, this is no longer about politics, we’re all in this together. But that’s a very low probability. But that’s his last card.

**GWEN IFILL:** Grexit means Greek exit. I love that.

But, Paul Krugman, what do you think about that? Is there a rabbit to be pulled out of the hat?

**PAUL KRUGMAN:** Well, if we’re talking about unity government, Greece has had a series of those, right?
It has had a consensus. By and large, it has done 90 percent, 95 percent of what the Troika told it to. And the results have been catastrophic. If that's the demand now, that once again Greece sacrifice — the current Greek government sacrifice its own principles, go back on what it promised the electorate, this time it's really going to work, well, I don't think you're going to blame Greece for the consequences, if that what happens.

GWEN IFILL: Paul Krugman of The New York Times and Stephan Richter of The Globalist, thank you both very much.

STEPHAN RICHTER: Thank you.

PAUL KRUGMAN: Thank you.

The post What are Greece's options after 'no' vote? appeared first on PBS NewsHour.
"Democracy Cannot Be Blackmailed": Greek Voters Overwhelmingly Reject Creditors’ Austerity Demand

Greeks have overwhelmingly turned down the terms of an international bailout in a historic rejection of austerity. With a margin of 61 to 39 percent, Greeks voted no to further budget cuts and tax hikes in exchange for a rescue package from European creditors. Polls had indicated a narrow vote, but the "no" side swept districts across the country. Thousands of people flocked to Athens’ Syntagma Square Sunday night in celebration. In voting against austerity, Greeks have rejected measures that helped cripple the economy, but also turned down a financial lifeline for its struggling banks. The banks will remain closed today as the European Central Bank meets to consider new emergency loans. Greek Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras says he will seek a new round of talks with creditors in which restructuring Greece’s $267 billion debt is on the table. In a surprise move, Greek Finance Minister Yanis Varoufakis announced his resignation today, saying Greece’s creditors no longer want him involved in the talks. Varoufakis said, "I shall wear the creditors’ loathing with pride." We are joined by Costas Panayotakis, author of "Remaking Scarcity: From Capitalist Inefficiency to Economic Democracy" and professor of sociology at NYC College of Technology at CUNY.

Transcript
This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form.

AMY GOODMAN: We begin today’s show in Greece, where more than 60 percent of voters Sunday rejected a bailout deal proposed by international creditors that demanded harsh austerity measures, like pension cuts and tax increases, but included no debt relief. This is voter Christina Vlachaki, who joined thousands to celebrate in the streets of Athens.

CHRISTINA VLACHAKI: [translated] This is our first step to our next battle. Now it truly starts. I do not think that everything will suddenly be perfect, but it is a first step in making fear go away. Up until now, they were scaring us. Now we overcome this and move to the next stage. Slowly, we will get to the place that we deserve to be.

AMY GOODMAN: Greek Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras responded to Sunday’s resounding “no” vote saying Greeks had proved that, quote, “democracy won’t be blackmailed.”

PRIME MINISTER ALEXIS TSIPRAS: [translated] Today, considering last week’s very difficult circumstances, you made a very brave choice. However, I am fully aware that the mandate here is not a mandate to break with Europe, but a mandate to strengthen our negotiation position to seek a viable solution. This time, the issue of debt will also be on the negotiating table.

AMY GOODMAN: Tsipras says debt talks will resume immediately with a new negotiating team. This follows a surprise resignation by Greece’s finance minister, Yanis Varoufakis, who had urged a "no" vote on the referendum and over the weekend had accused Greece’s European creditors of terrorism. Today, he wrote on his blog he had been, quote, "made aware of a certain preference by some Eurogroup participants, and assorted ‘partners’, for my
... 'absence' from its meetings; an idea that the Prime Minister judged to be potentially helpful to him in reaching an agreement," Varoufakis wrote. He added, quote, "I consider it my duty to help Alexis Tsipras exploit, as he sees fit, the capital that the Greek people granted us through yesterday's referendum. And I shall wear the creditors' loathing with pride." Meanwhile, German Chancellor Angela Merkel is meeting today with French President François Hollande to assess the situation, and an emergency European Union summit meeting is set for Tuesday.

For more, we're joined by Costas Panayotakis. He is author of Remaking Scarcity: From Capitalist Inefficiency to Economic Democracy, professor of sociology at New York City's College of Technology at CUNY. He's just returned from Greece.

Welcome back to Democracy Now! We spoke to you last week just before the vote. The resounding "no" vote, did it surprise you?

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS: Yeah, I think it surprised everybody, including the government. All the polls before the vote suggested that it was very close. So, I think that was a great victory for democracy in Greece. People were under immense psychological pressure from the media, that were threatening them with nightmare scenarios; from workplaces, where many business owners were threatening their workers that if a "no" prevailed, they would lose their jobs; and from the European partners, who basically were saying that a "no" vote would mean exit from the eurozone. So, it's a very important result. It's a hopeful development. It will not end the austerity, even if there is an agreement, but it creates a better environment for anti-austerity forces to keep fighting.

AMY GOODMAN: Well, what does it mean today?

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS: Well, the situation in Greece is still very difficult. It is urgent, because the banks are closed, so the normality in the banking system has to be restored. As long as it is not restored, it basically will have a bad effect on the economy. And this creates lots of pressure, of course, on the Greek government, and it is consistent with a strategy of economic strangulation of—that the Europeans have used ever since the election of this new anti-austerity government.

AMY GOODMAN: Greece's finance minister, Yanis Varoufakis, resigned today. He said his country's resounding "no" vote means it can now ask for a fair deal from its international partners.

YANIS VAROUFAKIS: [translated] We will invite them one by one to find common ground. For example, we will see positively the fact that the International Monetary Fund a few days ago, in its honor, published a report which confirms that our debt needs restructuring.

AMY GOODMAN: So that is the—well, was the finance minister, Yanis Varoufakis. He surprised many by resigning. He posted on his blog that he was resigning because he had been "made aware of a certain preference by some Eurogroup participants, and assorted 'partners', for my .... 'absence' from its meetings," he said, "idea that the Prime Minister judged to be potentially helpful." What about this?
COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS: Well, there had been some talk about Varoufakis. I mean, he used to be the head of the negotiating team with the Europeans as finance minister, and he had been replaced from that role a few months ago because he was insistent on a deal that is viable. He's not a sort of long-term politician. So he doesn't want to just—he didn't want to just achieve an agreement that would last a few months and would continue this kind of pattern of agreements that are made and have to be reconsidered and revisited a few months later. So that made him very, very unpopular with his partners, who are the more traditional politicians. Perhaps it was partly a stylistic issue, as well. You know, he wasn't—you know, finance ministers in the eurozone are usually very sort of gray, sort of technocratic figures, so perhaps his style was commented on. But I think there was substantial differences, and he basically held for his position, which was substantially right.

AMY GOODMAN: The older people tended to vote yes, the younger people overwhelmingly voted no—older people, pensioners, afraid for their economic stability.

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS: Yes. I mean, this is in line with electoral results, including the electoral result back in January. There was a lot of—a terror campaign in the media, the media that never sort of looked very closely in the past about the sufferings of ordinary people. They were focusing relentlessly on the queues of pensioners trying to collect their pensions from the banks, and they created a kind of climate of fear. But for many young people, for most Greeks, they have lost so much already that they fear they have nothing more to lose.

AMY GOODMAN: Last week, economist Thomas Piketty, author of *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, was interviewed in the German newspaper *Die Zeit*, saying, quote, "When I hear the Germans say [that] they maintain a very moral stance about debt and strongly believe that debts must be repaid, then I think: what a huge joke! Germany is the country that has never repaid its debts. It has no standing to lecture other nations." In your last thoughts, your response? Thirty seconds.

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS: I think there is a lot of hypocrisy in many—on the part of many European officials. The head of the European Commission was prime minister of Luxembourg, that thrived as a tax haven, that undercut the tax receipts of other European countries. And other countries, like the Netherlands, have also served as a tax haven. And these are countries that are oftentimes hardliners, and they point the finger to Greece. And they forget that, yes, there may be issues in Greece—there is corruption, but oftentimes the corruptors are European companies, notably German ones.

AMY GOODMAN: Professor Costas Panayotakis, thanks so much for being with us, author of *Remaking Scarcity: From Capitalist Inefficiency to Economic Democracy*. He's a professor of CUNY, City University of New York, here in the city. This is Democracy Now!, democracynow.org, The War and Peace Report.
Greek Voters Reject Creditor’s Demands
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“Democracy Cannot Be Blackmailed”

Democracy Now [1]

HAVANA TIMES – Greek voters have overwhelmingly turned down the terms of an international bailout in a historic rejection of austerity. With a margin of 61 to 39 percent, Greeks voted no to further budget cuts and tax hikes in exchange for a rescue package from European creditors. Polls had indicated a narrow vote, but the “no” side swept districts across the country. Thousands of people flocked to Athens’ Syntagma Square Sunday night in celebration.

In voting against austerity, Greek voters have rejected measures that helped cripple the economy, but also turned down a financial lifeline for its struggling banks. The banks will remain closed today as the European Central Bank meets to consider new emergency loans. Tsipras says he will seek a new round of talks with creditors in which restructuring Greece’s $267 billion debt is on the table.

In a surprise move, Greek Finance Minister Yanis Varoufakis announced his resignation today, saying Greece’s creditors no longer want him involved in the talks. Varoufakis said, “I shall wear the creditors’ loathing with pride.” We are joined by Costas Panayotakis, author of “Remaking Scarcity: From Capitalist Inefficiency to Economic Democracy” and professor of sociology at NYC College of Technology at CUNY.

Celebration for the No vote victory in Athens. Photo: wikipedia.org
Divorce may be the best way to remove the 'condition' from a spouse's conditional permanent residence status

Q. My girlfriend is a conditional permanent resident, with a two-year card. She left her husband and we want to start a relationship but don't want to hurt her chances. My friend married for love, but she and her husband soon realized that the marriage wouldn't work. They have joint bank and credit card accounts as proof that their marriage was real. What are my friend's options?

M., California

A. One possibility is for your friend to ask her husband to sign the petition removing the condition. Despite their separation, if he is willing to help her she can file a "joint petition" to remove the condition from her residence. If the husband won't help, she can self-petition for her permanent card (valid for 10 years and renewable).

Your friend received a two-year conditional permanent resident card because she became a permanent resident within two years of her marriage. She can apply to remove the condition without her husband's help if 1) she married in good faith, and the marriage was bona fide or "real" and was terminated by divorce or annulment, or 2) she is the victim of spousal abuse or her child has
Bride and groom figurines standing on two separated slices of wedding cake, symbolizing divorce. If a husband won’t sign a spouse’s petition to remove the “condition” from her conditional permanent resident status, divorce may be the best option

suffered abuse from her husband or, 3) that leaving the United States will result in her suffering extreme hardship.

If her husband won’t sign the petition, divorce may be the best option. No matter which route she chooses, she will benefit from help from an immigration law expert.

When a conditional permanent resident self-petitions based on a good faith marriage, the USCIS wants to see a divorce or annulment decree before approving the petition. If the divorce becomes final before the two-year card expires, the ex-wife can file form I-751, Petition to Remove the Conditions of Residence immediately. If a divorce is not final when the card expiration date is near, the conditional resident should nevertheless file the form. USCIS will give her a limited amount of time to get divorced. If she can’t get divorced in time, USCIS will refer her case to an immigration judge. The judge will typically give her additional time to get a divorce decree.
De Blasio planning process skips many community boards

De Blasio at the press conference announcing OneNYC. (AP Photo/Seth Wenig)

By David Giambusso 5:21 a.m. Jul. 7, 2015

In the run-up to the release of his OneNYC plan, Mayor Bill de Blasio's office promised an "unprecedented" outreach effort, seeking input from every corner of the city on the plan that would set a course for New York's next decade of growth.

Roughly two months after its release, many community board leaders—the on-the-ground interlocutors between neighborhoods and City Hall—said they were not briefed or consulted on the plan prior to its release. Many also say they've yet to hear anything about the report from the administration.

"No one called here," said the Rev. Richard Gorman, chairman of Bronx Community Board 12. "There has yet to be a meeting of all the community boards and anyone from City Hall. Anybody who seeks to do a plan like this is going to have to do a little more outreach and cast a little bit of a wider net if they expect any kind of support."

The plan is de Blasio's answer to former mayor Michael Bloomberg's PlaNYC, an exhaustive document that charts the administration's approach to population growth and environmental threats. In the legally mandated, four-year update, de Blasio changed the name to OneNYC and opened up the plan to include affordable housing and a significant hike in the minimum wage—part of de Blasio's continued emphasis on income inequality in the five boroughs.

MORE ON CAPITAL

De Blasio administration officials said the planning process would include an
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"unprecedented" outreach effort, in contrast to the Bloomberg plan. The city launched an online survey, conducted meetings with community leaders in all five boroughs and convened an advisory board of key stakeholders in real estate, environmental advocacy and business.

They also said they would hold listening sessions with all 59 of the city's community boards.

Capital called all 59 to gauge their level of input and received responses from 31. Of those, 22 board leaders said they had no input on the OneNYC plan, many adding that, even months after its release, they still have not been contacted. Only nine of the community boards that Capital reached reported having had any prior knowledge of the plan before its April 22 release.

"I must have missed that because I don't recall being invited to that meeting," said Xavier Rodriguez, district manager for Bronx Community Board 5. "They sent out a press release. Now if you want to call that a briefing, that's a briefing. To me a briefing is where someone makes a presentation and you get to answer questions. We've not had that kind of interaction."

When asked about the discrepancy, Amy Spitalnick, a City Hall spokeswoman, said it was never the administration's intention to meet with every community board. When shown an email in which city officials said they planned to meet with all 59 community boards, Spitalnick said the assertion was "a typo."

What the administration meant to say, she asserted, was that it would conduct listening sessions in all 59 community districts—the geographical areas for which the boards are responsible.

City Hall officials said that community board district managers would have been briefed at borough service cabinet meetings and provided letters sent to some community leaders asking to meet. Spitalnick pointed to a phone and web survey with thousands of respondents and dozens of meetings throughout the five boroughs as part of the "most extensive community outreach process ever," in preparation for the plan.

"This included meetings with leaders from every community district and at borough service cabinet and/or borough board meetings in every borough -- in addition to meetings with hundreds of civic organizations, community leaders, and elected officials," Spitalnick said in an email.

City Hall provided a list of 54 meetings that took place in all five boroughs. More than 30 of the meetings are listed as "roundtable discussions with community leaders" in a given community board.

Brooklyn's Community Board 2 was among those listed.

"We had a very strange experience," said Robert Perris, the board's district manager.

"They said, 'Given how quickly we need to write it we can only have an executive meeting,'
and then they were a no-show."

Perris said the meeting was scheduled to take place on March 23, roughly a month before the plan’s release. A City Hall official later told Perris that he, the official, had "put in the wrong date in his calendar" and so missed the meeting, Perris said.

De Blasio administration officials also said they had a listening session with leaders in Bronx Community Board 12. Gorman has been chairman for more than 20 years, but apparently didn’t make the cut.

"As far as this plan, no one has called the community board," he said.

The city did meet with some community boards, Capital found, though some meeting attendees were uncertain of the level of impact they had on the plan.

"We did a small joint roundtable with people from [Community Board] 7," said Susan Seinfeld, District Manager of Queens Community Board 11. "I don’t know really how much impact it had. ... I asked for a hard copy [of the plan] and they said they were out. We did not get a hard copy."

Some said they were satisfied with their level of input.

"They gave us a bunch of questionnaires, They did give us a call," said Frank Guscio, district manager of Queens Community Board 6. "They spoke at my meeting."

On Monday, as they were fielding questions for this story, city officials suggested Capital reach out to George Fernandez Jr., chair of Manhattan Community Board 12.

"Community Board 12 was part of a roundtable discussion," Fernandez said in an interview. "It was a very interesting conversation around economic growth. I really appreciate the fact that the mayor reached out to the community."

Prior to Monday, the community board had not returned two phone calls seeking information.

Others seemed insulted that community boards did not have more of a voice in the OneNYC process.

"We were offered an opportunity to put together a community conversation with the public relations end of the plan," said Craig Hammerman, District Manager of Brooklyn’s Community Board 6. "At no point were we invited to have real meaningful conversation with the people who were making decisions on what policies should be in place."

Hammerman’s ire may be of particular concern to de Blasio, given that both of the mayor’s Park Slope homes are in Community Board 6.

"PlanNYC was a glossy plan developed primarily in-house by the Bloomberg Administration with select paid consultants which looked great on paper to the uninitiated," Hammerman said in a follow-up. But, he added, "it was lacking in feedback mechanisms and a process which could have institutionalized it moving forward. It looks like we’ve lost an opportunity to correct past mistakes with OneNYC since we didn’t have an opportunity to contribute during the early development phases."

In May, Capital reported that de Blasio used the same consultants as Bloomberg to prepare the plan.
Being sidelined is nothing new to many of the city's community boards, said Eve Baron, academic program manager of urban and community studies at the CUNY School of Professional Studies.

"They're supposed to be New York City's neighborhood level of self-government," she said. "Historically they exist because New York City is far too big for any agency or administration to know what's going in any neighborhood."

The original function of the boards was to weigh in on city planning. Baron said that the effectiveness of the boards varies from district to district, but in general they suffer from a lack of funding.

"They're supposed to be involved in decisions about growth and development but they've never been properly resourced to perform that role," she said.

Still, even when boards go through the lengthy process of submitting formal plans, called a 197-a, to City Hall, they are often given short shrift.

"There are probably no boards that would say that their 197-a plans have been adopted or implemented," Baron said.

City officials say the OneNYC plan is an evolving document and despite its rollout more than two months ago, the outreach process is still underway.

"The engagement didn't end with OneNYC's release," Spitalnick said. "It is continuing through an extensive second phase that will ensure communities continue to shape the planning and implementation of these major initiatives."
US faculty unions under threat

Supreme Court to consider whether educators are obliged to pay union fees

JULY 6 2015

The US Supreme Court has agreed to consider a case that could in effect make union membership dues optional for public employees.

Currently, the norm for faculty unions in the US is that if they win a vote to represent a bargaining unit, all members of that unit must pay for the costs of collective bargaining in the form of dues.

The vast majority of faculty members who are represented by unions are in public higher education, and such a shift could be devastating to the financing of their unions, Inside Higher Ed (http://www.insidehighered.com/) reported.

Members of a unit who object to political stances of a union may get a refund for those expenses, but they are still required to pay what is known as a “fair share” of union costs that are related to
bargaining and representation. That requirement could go away, depending on how the Supreme Court rules.

"If the Supreme Court rules that 'fair share' violates the First Amendment rights of public employees, they would transform the entire public sector into right to work, more appropriately named 'right to freeload'," said Rudy Fichtenbaum, a professor of economics at Wright State University and national president of the American Association of University Professors, which acts as a union on some of the campuses where it has chapters.

The case accepted by the Supreme Court is *Friedrichs v California Teachers Association*, which was brought by high school teachers who believe that they should not have to pay the "agency fee" for being represented by a union.

They argue that unions engage in activities that inherently are forms of speech, and that employees should not be required to pay the unions anything. Such requirements compel the teachers to support activities with which they disagree and thus violate their constitutional rights, the teachers say.

The legal theory they have put forward has been one that many conservative legal groups have embraced, hoping for a case like this. Since 1977, when the Supreme Court found that there was a right for unions to charge an agency fee, the legal right to do so has been clear. The new case explicitly asks the Supreme Court to reverse the 1977 ruling.

While union leaders believe that they provide valuable services for their members and win them better contracts, many predict that some unknown but potentially significant number of union members would simply opt not to pay any membership dues.

Federal labour law requires the unions to represent the interests of all employees in a bargaining unit, so a union would remain bound to, for example, handle a grievance of, or provide advice to, a faculty member who paid nothing.

Dues vary from campus to campus and union to union. Fichtenbaum said that most AAUP collective bargaining dues are from 0.7 to 1.2 per cent of salary.

Frederick E. Kowal, president of United University Professions, the faculty union at the State University of New York, said that dues there are about 1 per cent of salary. His union is affiliated with both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association.

He said the lawsuit was "an insidious way to bankrupt unions".

Union supporters note that the organisations are elected to represent employees, and that employees have the right in elections to vote out the leaders if they don't like the way the union is being run and can even vote to end collective bargaining. So they argue that there are many options for those who may disagree with a union's position or strategy.

William A. Herbert, executive director of the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions at Hunter College of the City University of New York, said he saw the case as extremely significant for faculty unions.

But he stressed that many unions have strong ties to members and with additional outreach could encourage many members to continue to pay dues. This shift "could rekindle internal organising", he said.

A ruling is expected next year.
It's Official: The U.S. is Becoming a Minority-Majority Nation

Census data shows there are more minority children under age 5 than whites.

The number of minority children in the U.S. is expected to continue rising, according to the Census Bureau.

They may not know it, but for kids under the age of 5, the day the United States became a minority-majority nation has already arrived.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2014 there were more than 20 million children under 5 years old living in the U.S., and 50.2 percent of them were minorities.

Parents who identified their child as white with Hispanic origin were the largest minority, making up 22 percent of the 19.9 million children under age 5, followed by African American children, who make up 15 percent.

Currently, the Census considers Hispanic not a race but an ethnic background. Hispanics can be of any race, and Hispanic origin is asked on Census forms in a question separate from the one about race.

But some say that the way the census counts who belongs to which racial group is flawed.
"The census suffers from binary thinking," Professor Richard Alba of City University of New York said in a phone interview. "Some people are both, majority and minority."

This is because the Census Bureau, not the respondent, decides into which racial category a person falls. If a child has a white parent and a black parent, or if the child's parents identify themselves as white but do not check the box for "not Hispanic or Latino," the child is categorized as a minority.

Still, the number of minority and mixed-race children in the U.S are only expected to rise. "More than half of the nation's children are expected to be part of a minority race or ethnic group," by 2020, the U.S. Census Bureau reports, referring to all kids under the age of 18.

The minority population is expected to rise to 56 percent of the total population in 2060, compared with 38 percent last year. When that happens, "no group will have a majority share of the total and the United States will become a 'plurality' [nation] of racial and ethnic groups," the U.S. Census states. The minority-majority trend reflected among 5-year-olds is the beginning of that shift.

"We are a much more diverse country than we were," said Professor Andrew Cherlin, a sociologist at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. "Groups in America are mixing more than we think."

"Current rates of immigration are high and intermarriage is increasing," Cherlin added in a phone interview.

A record 14.6 percent of all new marriages in the U.S. in 2008 were between people of two different races or ethnicities, according to a social and demographics trends report by the Pew Research Center, and the children of these couples reflected America's changing demographics. Multiracial children of black-and-white descent were the largest group in 2014, according to Census data, making up 36 percent of the multiracial population under 18.

The "two or more races" population is projected to be the fastest-growing group over the next 46 years, with its population expected to triple in size. The Census breaks down the "two or more races" category as while combining with any other race, i.e. American Indian, Alaska native, Asian and black.
Some Puerto Ricans, discouraged by financial crisis, plan to move off island

By TINA SUSMAN

JULY 6, 2015, 11:15 AM | REPORTING FROM SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO

In historic Old San Juan, in the soft light of an early morning, a group of university students gathered to take photographs.

There was no shortage of subjects. A young man stood with large iguanas crawling up his arms and across his shoulders, waiting for tourists to snap his picture and pay him a dollar or two. An elderly man, his worn shoes held together with fraying velcro strips, swept leaves into a dust pan as more swirled to the ground in the salty sea breeze.

But the students, all of them American citizens by virtue of their birth in this U.S. territory, did not reach for their cameras. Instead, they were absorbed in a spirited debate about the future, and their vision did not bode well for Puerto Rico. Each of them planned to leave the island, discouraged by an economic situation whose grim state was illuminated with the governor’s warning last week that Puerto Rico was running out of money to pay its $72-billion debt.

“The economy is just on the floor,” said Alejandro Cardona, 19, part of the photography class from the University of Puerto Rico in Bayamon, near San Juan. “There is going to be less money and fewer jobs. I want to start my own company, but here, I don’t think I can do it.”

Classmate Juan Hernandez, 27, who already has a degree in graphic arts, said his part-time job at a call center did not pay enough to cover his rent, car payments, student loans and food each month.

“I have to get out of here,” Hernandez said. “I love Puerto Rico, but we are a little island, and I have big dreams.”

Many Puerto Ricans will tell you that it is hard to dream big on the island, especially in light of Gov. Alejandro Garcia Padilla’s televised announcement about the financial crisis. It came after the release of a government-commissioned report by an independent team of financial experts, who used words like “dire” and “unsustainable” to describe Puerto Rico’s economic footing.

“Crisis looms,” they said, despite recent local government measures such as higher taxes – the sales
and use tax increased from 7% to 11.5% as of July 1 -- pension reforms and spending cuts.

Experts offer various reasons for Puerto Rico’s downward slide. They include decades of poor fiscal management, failure to build up the tourism industry to its full potential, an oil-dependent energy sector, and the phasing out in 2006 of an IRS tax code that offered incentives to U.S. firms operating on the island. That led to job losses when firms moved elsewhere.

Through it all, successive administrations piled on debt by selling more bonds to pay the bills.

The 26-page government-commissioned document, whose chief author, Anne Krueger, is a former World Bank chief economist, recommended a variety of fixes, including reducing the dependence on imported oil; cutting wages to reduce labor costs; and revamping labor laws to encourage hiring, thereby reducing the 12.2% unemployment rate and alleviating the 41% poverty rate.

It also called for debt restructuring, which would require cooperation from hedge funds that turned to Puerto Rico expecting big gains, and for a change to the U.S. law that bars Puerto Rico from filing for Chapter 9 bankruptcy. Because it is not a U.S. state, Puerto Rico cannot access the federal bankruptcy law that Detroit turned to when it hit rock bottom. It also has no access to emergency funding from the IMF or other institutions who step in to save flailing countries, because it is not an independent nation.

“In this way, Puerto Rico is stuck between a rock and a hard place,” said Eric LeCompte, an advisor to the United Nations on global development and debt relief and the executive director of the Jubilee USA Network. The faith-based organization lobbies for debt relief for developing countries.

“From our perspective, because we represent religious organizations, it’s imperative to end the poverty,” LeCompte said, but he added that all Americans should be concerned about Puerto Rico. That’s because of the amount that U.S. bond funds have invested in Puerto Rican bonds, which were sold by Puerto Rican administrations as they sought cash.

Americans eagerly bought up the tax-exempt bonds, which offered higher returns than U.S. Treasury notes. The mutual fund research firm Morningstar said that as of the end of June, U.S. bond funds had $11.3 billion in Puerto Rican debt, so the island’s inability to make payments on its bonds would hit American investors in the pocketbook. Hedge funds and individual American investors held billions more in Puerto Rican debt, the firm said.

On Wednesday, the government avoided default by making payments, including $416 million owed to creditors by the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority and about $600 million in other general obligation bonds.
Garcia Padilla said he had appointed a working group to negotiate with creditors in hopes of postponing payments on Puerto Rico’s overall debt. He gave the group until the end of August to propose economic reforms.

Whatever changes are made, though, would take years to generate a substantial recovery. In the meantime, more Puerto Ricans will leave, reducing the island’s tax base and the labor force needed to fuel the economy.

“It’s a vicious cycle,” said Edwin Melendez, director of the Center for Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College in New York. “The more stagnant the economy, the more people leave the island. The more people leave the island, the lower the economy, and it’s a cycle that doesn’t seem to have an end.”

Melendez, whose family went to the mainland from Puerto Rico in 1978, said the number of Puerto Ricans living stateside is more than 5.1 million, compared with 3.5 million on the island. In 2003, the numbers were about equal, a reflection of the growing pace of migration.

Across Puerto Rico, populations dropped in 68 of the 78 municipalities, including the capital, San Juan, between July 2010 and July 2013, the U.S. Census Bureau said last year. San Juan’s population dropped 5% in that period.

Many observers say it is time for Washington, which has been providing technical assistance and advice during the financial crisis, to do more to help Puerto Rico. Spain ceded the island to the United States at the end of the Spanish-American War in 1898. Congress made Puerto Ricans U.S. citizens in 1917, and commonwealth status, which provides some autonomy, began in 1952.

But Puerto Ricans living on the island are not eligible to vote in U.S. presidential elections, and Kenneth McClintock, a longtime Puerto Rican lawmaker, said that is one reason Washington is not more inclined to step into its economic fray now. “In a democracy, if you don’t vote, you don’t count,” said McClintock, who was Puerto Rico’s secretary of state from 2009-13.

McClintock said that when the administration he served took office on Jan. 2, 2009, officials found that the government didn’t have enough money to meet the Jan. 15 payroll. “That’s how bad the situation was,” McClintock said in an interview at his lobbying firm, Politank, near the Capitol. The only option was to sell yet more bonds to raise cash, he said.

He said his administration cut more than 30,000 jobs and that the current one could also take harsh austerity measures. But McClintock also said the Obama administration could do more to help, including steering government contracts to the island and directing federal agencies to renegotiate repayment terms on debts.
Pedro Pierluisi, Puerto Rico’s non-voting representative in the U.S. Congress, has sponsored a bill that would allow large public corporations on the island to declare bankruptcy. White House spokesman Josh Earnest has said that while no bailout of Puerto Rico was under consideration, the Obama administration supports Congress considering the bankruptcy bill.

The signs of population flight and its economic effect are clear. In the touristy area of Old San Juan, whose narrow streets are lined with colonial-era buildings painted in a rainbow of colors, it is not unusual to see shuttered shops and restaurants. A short drive away from the cruise ship terminal, apartment blocks stand empty, their doors and window panes gone and their crumbling walls splashed with graffiti.

The contrast between down-and-out locals and the tourists who come to lounge on white-sand beaches, roam the Spanish-built forts and dine in the shade of fig trees is striking.

As visitors snapped pictures from a spot overlooking the harbor, the smell of unwashed bodies wafted through the park from homeless men sleeping on benches nearby. A homeless woman sought shade on the steps of a vacant building down the hill. In the beachside Condado district, destitute men dug through trash cans, looking for leftovers tossed away by visitors to the area's hotels, casinos and seafood restaurants.

One woman in a commercial building, who would not give her name because she did not want to anger her boss, grew teary-eyed as she spoke of her plan to leave.

“I have two master's degrees and I'm working as a receptionist,” said the woman, who is taking a teaching job in Milwaukee next year. It is the first step in launching a new life on the mainland. “I know it's freezing there,” she said, “but it's only for a year.”
Behavior Brief

A round-up of recent discoveries in behavior research
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Fish fathers' oxygen supplies

Male pipefish are known for their unique role in carrying and nurturing developing eggs, which are unusually large for the size of the adult fish. It has long been thought that pipefish dads also somehow supply extra oxygen to their eggs, encouraging their growth. However, according to a study published last month (June 3) in the *The Journal of Experiential Biology*, the oxygen saturation within the male's
embryo-incubating pouch is much lower than expected.

Researchers at the University of Zurich, the University of Gothenburg, and Uppsala University in Sweden investigated the oxygen question using wild-caught male pipefish mated with females in captivity.

The team split the males into two environments with either 100 percent or 40 percent oxygen-saturated water and allowed pregnancy to continue for 24 days. During that time, the researchers measured average oxygen concentrations in the fish's brood pouches, which reached just 51 percent among the fathers housed in 100 percent oxygen saturation and 32 percent among those living in the lower-oxygen environment. The results suggest that pipefish fathers don't supply extra oxygen to their young, the researchers noted in a press release.

**Chicks learn to click**

Java sparrow (*Lonchura oryzivora*) fathers teach their male offspring to make clicking noises, according to a study published this spring (May 20) in *PLoS One*. *L. oryzivora* is one of a handful of bird species whose communication repertoires include mechanical sounds; the birds intersperse beak clicks into their songs. By listening to recordings of such songs sung by domesticated Java sparrows, researchers at Hokkaido University in Japan determined that male sparrows pass on clicking patterns to their natural or adopted sons, *Science* reported.

The researchers analyzed recorded songs from 30 individuals for the frequencies of clicks and where in their songs the birds added these sounds. They found that clicks more often appeared in certain sequences of notes and that those arrangements of click-notes were shared between father-son pairs. In their paper, however, the researchers noted that “whether clicking patterns themselves were learned or whether they were simply linked to learning-based vocalizations is still debatable.”

Although the researchers noted that the Java sparrows tended to click more often as they aged, it's not clear whether the birds use clicking for mating or other functions. “The question of why Java sparrows use non-vocal sound communication in addition to singing remains a puzzle,” they wrote.

**Anti-predation posture**

To escape the notice of their sharp-sighted predators, many caterpillars masquerade as non-prey, such as other animals or objects. According to a study published May 22 in *Animal Behavior*, the moth larvae *Apochima juglandisaria* and *Macrauzuza maxima*, which both masquerade as bird droppings, incorporate posture into their anti-predation disguises.

“For caterpillars, avoiding birds is a major occupation,” Daniel Rubinoff, an entomologist at the University of Hawaii who was not involved with the study to *National Geographic*. “The less you look like a caterpillar, the less likely you are to be attacked.”

Researchers at the Graduate University for Advanced Studies in Hayama and Rikkyo University, both in Japan, demonstrated the importance of posture in masquerading as bird feces by creating more than 400 caterpillar models from dough and placing them on tree branches in stretched out or curled up orientations. Black and white striped models meant to resemble poop were three times less likely to be attacked by birds if they were bent or curled, supporting the team's hypothesis that curling boosts the
impression of an inedible pile of droppings.

According to Science, the study is the first to show that posture matters for caterpillars pretending to be something they’re not.

High-tech faux eggs

Researchers often use artificial eggs to study how birds decide to accept or reject parasitic eggs placed in their nests by other freeloading birds. Making these fake eggs by hand or finding wooden eggs with the right combination of desired qualities can be a challenge. To find out whether the egg-making process could be somewhat automated, researchers in the U.S. and Argentina employed 3-D printing. They reported the results of their efforts May 26 in PeerJ.

“Instead of using natural eggs, it’s best to use fake eggs, because you can control the size, and shape and the color much more accurately,” Mark Hauber, who studies neurobiology and behavior at Hunter College in New York City told NPR’s All Tech Considered.

With 3-D printing, the researchers were able to standardize egg design, allowing them to test just one variable at a time. They found that parent robins promptly ejected 80 percent of the eggs printed and painted to resemble those of brown-headed cowbirds, the natural parasite of the American robin nest. When the eggs were painted robin’s egg blue, the birds were less likely to toss them, confirming that color was a major factor in the robin’s decision to keep or reject a foreign egg.

“You can imagine, it would be really labor-intensive and time-intensive to individually handcraft eggs that exploit that whole range of variation,” biologist Christina Riehl of Princeton University who was not involved in the study told All Tech Considered. “With 3-D printing, it’s the possibility of being able to make exactly what you want. And not only that, but you can share those designs with other researchers so they can replicate your results with exactly the same methods.”

Birds of a feather yawn together

Although it’s still not exactly clear why yawning is contagious, the list of creatures that can “catch” yawning from one another is growing. According to a study published May 27 in Animal Cognition, the latest species added to the list is the budgerigar (Melopsittacus undulatus).

“Thus far, yawning has been demonstrated to be contagious in a few highly social species,” coauthor Andrew Gallup, a biopsychologist at the State University of New York College at Oneonta told New Scientist. “To date, this is the first experimental evidence of contagious yawning in a non-mammalian species.”

Humans aside, other animals that have shown contagious yawning include chimpanzees, domestic dogs, and one type of rat.

Gallup and his colleagues found that budgerigars were about three times more likely to yawn within five minutes of a neighbor if the birds could see each other. The finding may hint that the birds express a form of empathy.

“Contagious yawning by itself is not exactly empathy, but it hints at the tendency to mimic and
synchronize with the bodies of others,” Frans de Waal, who studies animal behavior at Emory University and was not involved in the study, told *New Scientist*. “This process is probably the basis of mammalian empathy.”

**Accessorizing crabs**

To better understand how self-decoration is used in the wild, a pair of researchers at the University of St Andrews and the University of Exeter reviewed the scientific literature for studies describing the behavior among several species. They outlined in detail the behaviors of the crab family *Majaidea,* which contains more than 900 species, most of which attach foreign materials to their shells to hide themselves from predators. Their report was published last month (June 3) in *Biology Letters.*

“*The most common reason to decorate is to avoid predators,*” coauthor Martin Stevens, an ecologist at Exeter, told *National Geographic.*

*National Geographic* reported that Velcro-like hairs on the crabs’ shells enable them to attach materials and even other animals, such as anemones, to their bodies. When the crabs molt, they often save and reuse the materials, which also include pieces of coral and seaweed. Some decorator crabs attach poisonous plant material to their backs to keep predators at bay.

“The nice thing about being a decorator is that wherever you go, you can pull off the old decoration and stick on something new and quickly adapt yourself to whatever environment surrounds you,” John Stachowicz, an ecologist at the University of California, Davis, who was not involved in the study, told *New Scientist.* “If you’re a slow-moving, roving animal, being able to quickly adopt the coloration or background of wherever you are is likely very adaptive.”
NYC Doesn't Fly Confederate Flags, But It's Still A Shrine To Slaveowners & Slave Profiteers

by Nathan Tempey in News on Jul 6, 2015 12:32 pm

A view of New Amsterdam's first slave auction in 1655. (Public domain)

In the two weeks since white supremacist Dylann Roof allegedly murdered nine people in a South Carolina church, activists, politicians, and everyday anti-racists have taken up the cause of removing Confederate flags and monuments from the public landscape. The campaign is a noble one—the flag was, after all, created explicitly for Southern white people to start a war to preserve slavery, and Roof posed with it in photos before reportedly trying to incite his own race war—but for some liberal New Yorkers, it has served as a self-congratulatory reminder that the South is a uniquely racist place with a disgusting past that has nothing to do with them.

Of course, the problem with this line of thinking is that the whole country was built on slavery, not just the South, and we have yet to deal with its horrors on anything approaching the way, for instance, South Africa has reckoned with apartheid, or Germany has atoned for the Holocaust. Today, Americans can visit a national Holocaust museum in their own country, but not a national slavery museum.

An 1895 Harper's New Monthly article described slavery as "part and parcel of [colonial New York's] economic organization," and at one time New York was home to the most slaves of any city except...
Charleston. Yet, it wasn't until last month that Wall Street got a marker memorializing the municipal slave market where, from 1711 to 1762 prospective buyers made enslaved men flex to assess their fortitude, and grabbed women's genitals when considering a purchase. The African Burial Ground near City Hall didn't get a memorial until 2010, and it almost didn't get one at all because the developer building a tower on top of it tried to breeze through the regulatory process without acknowledging the site's historical significance. Few other reminders of this past exist in New York.

Monuments to prominent slaveowners from New York's history, on the other hand, are plentiful, though they're seldom presented as such. For example:

*Delancey Street (Joanna Pan/Flickr)*

**James De Lancey** (1703-1760), lieutenant Governor of New York and provincial Supreme Court judge. Delancey Street is named after him.

He presided over the 1741 trials of dozens accused in a supposed slave revolt plot. One hundred fifty-two enslaved and free people of African ancestry, plus a handful of Europeans, were arrested, of whom 13 black men were burned at the stake, 21 people hanged, 84 sold into slavery, and seven exiled from New York. De Lancey's slave Othello was among those hanged. Historians now doubt that a plot existed in the first place.

De Lancey is not to be confused with Westchester County Sheriff James De Lancey (1746-1804), owner of at least six slaves, who famously sued a man in Nova Scotia, where slavery wasn't allowed, *to be reimbursed for wages earned by his former slave, Jack, who had escaped north.*
The Chambers Street subway station (Daniel Krieger/Flickr)

John Chambers (1710-1764), New York alderman and provincial Supreme Court judge. Chambers Street is named after him.

He also presided over the 1741 slave revolt trials, including that of his slave Robin. Robin was burned at the stake.
Cadwallader Colden (1688-1776), colonial governor. PS 214 the Cadwallader Colden School in Flushing is named after him.

He sold his slave Gabriel to keep him apart from the enslaved woman Gabriel was in love with. He also sold a 33-year-old woman and one of her children to someone in Barbados, because to allow her to be near the rest of her enslaved children would "spoil them."
The Van Cortlandts. Van Cortlandt Park is named after Stephanus Van Cortlandt, and the Westchester towns of Cortlandt and Cortland Manor are named after the family.

Olof Van Cortlandt came to the city in 1637 as an employee of the Dutch West India Company, a leading African slave trader that brought the first enslaved Africans to New Amsterdam, as the city was then called. His son Stephanus was New Amsterdam's first locally born mayor. Stephanus's grandson Pierre brought slaves to staff the family manor in what's now Croton-on-Hudson. The family owned vast tracts of land in
what is now Westchester County, and operated sugar refineries that processed slave-picked sugarcane.

New York state abolished slavery in 1827, but trade in slave-made goods remained a staple of the local economy and wealthy and powerful city leaders continued to reap huge profits from the institution. They included:

*Moses Taylor*, founder of the bank that is now Citibank, who traded in slave sugar.
William Havemeyer owned what came to be called the Domino Sugar factory, which refined slave sugar cane and molasses. Havemeyer Street in Brooklyn is named after him. (Last year, artist Kara Walker created a critically lauded installation, *A Subtlety*, inside the old factory that commented on the sugar trade and slavery.)
John Jacob Astor made his fortune trading fur, slave cotton, and for a time, opium. The Waldorf-Astoria hotel chain, Astor Place, Astoria, Queens, and a host of other New York places are named after his family.

Emmanuel Lehman (Public domain)
The Lehman brothers Henry, Mayer, and Emanuel founded Lehman Brothers in 1850 as a slave-cotton brokerage in Alabama, then moved it to New York in 1870, post-emancipation.

Their investment firm famously folded during the 2008 financial collapse, but Lehman College, named for Mayer's son Herbert, a New York governor and U.S. senator, remains in the Bronx.
Charles L. Tiffany founded Tiffany & Co. in 1837 with cash from his father, owner of a Connecticut cotton mill.

The bank J.P. Morgan Chase, founded in 1799 by Aaron Burr as the Bank of Manhattan Co. (PDF), seized 1,250 slaves from plantation owners over debts, and between 1831 and 1865, did deals in which 13,000 slaves were used as collateral.

Still don't see it? How about this: as a commenter notes, New York itself is named after England's James II, Duke of York, who headed the Royal African Company, formed specifically to supply Virginia planters with captive labor. We could keep going. And as The Root wrote in an article on the subject:

The very name "Wall Street" is born of slavery, with enslaved Africans building a wall in 1653 to protect Dutch settlers from Indian raids. This walkway and wooden fence, made up of pointed logs and running river to river, later was known as Wall Street, the home of world finance. Enslaved and free Africans were largely responsible for the construction of the early city, first by clearing land, then by building a fort, mills, bridges, stone houses, the first city hall, the docks, the city prison, Dutch and English churches, the city hospital and Fraunces Tavern. At the corner of Wall Street and Broadway, they helped erect Trinity Church.

We should of course acknowledge that New York came to be a hotbed of abolitionism even as conservative slaveowners and profiteers continued to hold sway. Names of abolitionists of European descent like Robert Murray and Lewis and Arthur Tappan live on in the New York landscape. Enslaved and free people of African descent struggled for liberation in New York, too, as they did throughout the South and the Americas. The Weeksville Heritage Center in Brooklyn, preserving part of the 19th-century free African American community of Weeksville, serves as a potent acknowledgment of that.