View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Rhode Island School of Design

Mobility Justice and Social Capital

In Strawberry Mansion and
Kensington, Philadelphia PA

A Thesis Presented In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements
For The Degree Of Master Of Liberal Arts In Nature-Culture-Sustainability Studies
In the Division of Liberal Arts Of The Rhode Island School Of Design,
Providence Rhode Island

By:
Rebecca Fruehwald
2020

Approved By Master's Examination Committee:

Dr. Alero Akporiaye: Assistant Professor
Department of History, Philosophy, and Social Sciences

X________________________________
Dr. Alero Akporiaye

Dr. Lauren Richter: Assistant Professor
Department of History, Philosophy, and Social Sciences

X________________________________
Dr. Lauren Richter

Due to the Covid-19 crisis, the theses were approved by Program Directors, and are often unsigned.

Date of Award: Fall 12-15-2020
Document Type: Thesis
Degree Name: Master of Arts (MA)
Program: Nature-Culture-Sustainability Studies
First Advisor: Alero Akporiaye: Assistant Professor
Second Advisor: Lauren Richter: Assistant Professor

Abstract:

This thesis explores the theoretical and practical relationship between mobility justice and social capital. A literature review establishes the theoretical relationship through an overview of history and policy. The relationship is then explored through a case study of Strawberry Mansion and Kensington neighborhoods in Philadelphia. These sections are then connected by considering how they are both impacted by the larger system of capitalism. The real-world example of gentrification is given for how all these elements interact and affect each other, and the practical relationship between mobility justice and social capital is established. Finally, policy implementations and paths for possible future research are recommended.

Contents

Abstract 4
Introduction 4
Literature Review 11
- **Introduction** 11
- **Critical Environmental Justice and Mobility Justice** 11
- **Transportation Infrastructure, Race, and History** 15
- **Environmental Effects** 19
- **Transportation Solutions** 21
- **Social Capital** 23
- **Social Capital and Mobility Justice** 27
- **Conclusion** 28

Philadelphia: A Case Study 30
- **Introduction** 30
  - **Philadelphia History** 30
  - **Strawberry Mansion History** 35
  - **Kensington History** 38
- **Strawberry Mansion** 40
  - **Mobility** 40
  - **Social Capital** 41
  - **Control Variables** 44
- **Kensington** 48
  - **Mobility** 48
  - **Social Capital** 49
  - **Control Variables** 54

Theory 58
Conclusion 69
References 74

Abstract

This thesis explores the theoretical and practical relationship between mobility justice and social capital. A literature review establishes the theoretical relationship through an overview of history and policy. The relationship is then explored through a case study of Strawberry Mansion and Kensington neighborhoods in Philadelphia. These sections are then connected by considering how they are both impacted by the larger system of capitalism. The real-world example of gentrification is given for how all these elements interact and affect each other, and the practical relationship between mobility justice and social capital is established. Finally, policy implementations and paths for possible future research are recommended.

Introduction

Movement is part of life on earth at all scales, from humans moving about their days to the movement and flow of natural resources and material products. It is within these scales and movements that we find the patterns of life; movement is necessary to keep cycles and life going whether it be non-human animals hunting for food or humans going to work. However, the straightforward concept of movement becomes significantly more complicated when mapped onto places and lives. Issues such as race, gender, ability, and nationality intersect to influence the way people, animals, and resources travel changing the concept of movement to something more complicated: mobility (Sheller 2014, 8-12).

The way different people experience and live out mobility depends on many variables ranging from an individual's identity to local political and geographical issues. Often these various elements interact with each other in complicated ways. For example, two coworkers are leaving their homes in the morning to go to work. As the crow flies, they both live thirty minutes away from the office, but realistically know that due to the time of day and the rainy weather it

will most likely take longer. The first coworker, who is driving, leaves an hour early. They run into traffic on the highway but make a detour through side streets and arrive at work on time and dry. The second coworker, whose car needs repairing, is taking public transit. They leave an hour and a half early because they know the transit system could run slower due to the rain. After a walk to the subway station, and a longer wait than usual due to crowding they finally make it on the subway. However, because the subway was late, they missed their connection to the bus that would take them to the office. The coworker now faces two choices: wait another 20 minutes for the bus which may not arrive on time or walk the rest of the way to the office. Either way, they arrive to work late and wet.

The problems highlighted in this example may seem exaggerated, but they speak to real issues that people face daily. The challenges a commuter can face getting to work may be more complicated than the example above because people's identities often intersect with their mobility. This means that women or people of color may feel more at risk traveling in certain areas due to the way others view them. This applies to public transit but is also relevant to car-based travel. The Black Lives Matter movement was originally started in 2012 after the shooting death of Trayvon Martin (Pellow 2016, 425-426). Since then, multiple Black motorists such as Sandra Bland and Philando Castile have been killed or unjustly arrested over seemingly minor traffic violations that white drivers often do without consequence.

It is instances such as these that distinguish the idea of transportation geography from mobility justice. Transportation geography as a field looks to improve urban design and structure to increase access to public transportation and the number of people who use it. While this work is important, it does not consider larger social variables that affect people's mobility. Issues such as race, income, and gender shape the way people chose to move as much as access to cars and

public transportation, yet they go largely unexamined in the field. As a result, mobility justice tries to fill the gap by taking intersectionality and scale into consideration. It centers around the movement of people, objects, animals, and resources across space whether it be on a local or global scale (Sheller 2018, chap. 1). The form of movement can range from man-made cars to natural forces such as the flow of oil in pipelines across countries (Sheller 2018, introduction). The inclusion of different types of mobility, life forms, and geographies work to ensure justice is sought for all.

By expanding the definition of mobility beyond just people and cars it allows space for the complexities of how injustice and intersectionality are interrelated. Within the human scope of mobility, these complicated mobility connections often result in a "kinetic elite" and a "kinetic poor" (Sheller 2018, introduction, chap. 1). Coined by Mimi Sheller these terms refer to the few people who have the power and ability to travel as they want or need in any given situation or time, and most others who do not have the privilege of being easily mobile (Sheller 2018, chap. 1). These differences will become more drastic as climate change and other environmental disasters create environmental refugees (Sheller 2018, chap. 1).

Regions of the United States are being impacted by climate change differently, with some areas being more obviously affected than others. For people who are not facing immediate threats from floods, storms, or fires it may be easy to believe that they are under no threat of mobility injustice. For instance, the city of my thesis case study, Philadelphia is in the mid-Atlantic and does not experience the intense hurricanes or wildfires that other parts of the country do. However, Philadelphia is still experiencing mobility injustice in other ways.

Over the last decade, Philadelphia has seen an increase in population, housing development, and commercial business (Pew Charitable Trusts 2020, 1). This growth has been welcomed by many as it represents a marked change from the decrease in population and income the city saw from the 1960s through the mid-2000s (Pew Charitable Trusts 2020, 1). While this revival has helped increase the amount of income the city has to fund services, its larger effects are more complicated. As Philadelphia has grown, it has attracted more individuals, particularly young professionals. Inherently there is nothing wrong with this, but what it signals for many neighborhoods is the beginning of gentrification. Neighborhoods across Philadelphia have seen intense gentrification, which is a phenomenon when areas of a city experience a shift in demographics from individuals with low incomes to individuals with middle and high incomes (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). As these new residents arrive, rent, taxes, and the cost-of-living increases, gradually forcing out former residents and changing the culture and community of the neighborhood (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). As Philadelphia faces these changes, and certain residents' risk of being displaced from their homes, mobility justice remains relevant.

How gentrification impacts the larger scale of the community must also be considered. There are many ways to measure and think about community but the method I have chosen for this thesis is to examine social capital. Social capital is an economic and sociological theory that attempts to quantify the capital we gain from social connections, networks, and communities. Many scholars have studied social capital and created their own definitions and forms of measurement, with Pierre Bourdieu and Robert Putnam's definitions being the most famous. Bourdieu's definition focuses on the economic aspects of social capital, stating that social connections allow for individual economic gain, or the potential for future economic gain (Bourdieu 1986, 447-450). Since this capital relies on the ability to make the right social

connections, and be part of a larger network, not everyone will have the means or opportunity to join these networks and thus gain the capital associated with them (Bourdieu 1986, 447-450). Putnam's definition of social capital focuses on the community aspect of social capital, theorizing that community bonds and trust allow for the gain of capital through higher social trust, bonding, and overall welfare (Putnam 2000, chap. 1).

Since Putnam released his work on social capital in the late 1990s and early 2000s, his definition has gained popularity within the literature causing different fields to examine how this form of social capital can be applied within their area. Transportation is one of these fields, with various papers examining how public transportation use can build bonds and trust within a community (Urry 2002, 259-265; Currie and Stanley 2008, 33-36). While this is important work and adds to the overall knowledge and richness of the field it is lacking in two important aspects. The first is that by only using Putnam's definition of social capital it fails to consider the economic gains and social barriers that are present in Bourdieu's definition. The second aspect is that by only focusing on public transportation, the literature fails to acknowledge how social capital impacts broader mobility beyond cars and public transportation.

My thesis seeks to fill this gap by asking the research question what is the relationship between mobility justice, and social capital? Examining Philadelphia as a case study for how this relationship could realistically take place, I will specifically be researching two neighborhoods within the city, Strawberry Mansion, and Kensington. Each of these neighborhoods has its history and challenges, but they are facing similar problems as the city evolves and changes. Tracking the progress of social capital and mobility in these areas over time could indicate if there is a relationship between the level of mobility justice and the level of social capital in each neighborhood.

Researching the history, mobility, and social capital of Philadelphia will allow for insight into how the city has grown and developed over time. It will reveal trends as to how people, neighborhoods, and policy intersect to form the landscape which mobility and social capital map onto. As Philadelphia enters a new period of growth and development, understanding these trends, how they impact residents, and the system's residents rely on will be important for ensuring an equitable and just future.

Investigating the relationship between social capital and mobility justice will also illustrate how mobility justice and social capital are complex forces with the ability to impact lives. This means showing how the inequalities related to social capital are the same inequalities that contribute to mobility injustice. This is important because it shows that all forms of inequality are interrelated within our capitalist society no matter how unconnected they may first appear to be. Finally, I want the case study within this thesis to help motivate others to examine mobility and social capital in their communities. My thesis focuses on Philadelphia, but Philadelphia does not exist in a bubble. While each place in the United States may have its own cultures and problems, they all feel the impacts of capitalistic and racist systems. As the United States and the world face, a present and future increasingly affected by climate change understanding the ways social forces, systems, and places are connected will be more important than ever.

The literature review below provides an understanding of the main academic theories of this thesis, and the histories and social factors that influence them. This begins with an overview of the critical environmental justice and mobility justice movements, their theories, and how they relate to each other. The connection between infrastructure and race throughout history is discussed from urban layout and mobility before cars to how car dependence and

suburbanization changed the way urban spaces are designed. The section ends by considering how suburbanization damaged urban public transportation in the long-term ways which continue today. The theory of social capital is then discussed beginning with an overview of the different theories and definitions of social capital and then focuses on how social capital connects to mobility justice and its application to my thesis.

Literature Review
Introduction

If mobility describes the complexities and interactions of movement then transportation describes the various methods, we use to achieve this movement. In many ways the two concepts go hand in hand: without the need for mobility, transportation would have no purpose and without transportation, we could not achieve mobility. As the world changes, the forms of transportation we use to achieve mobility also change. For instance, climate change has led to the advent of electric cars and increasing numbers of climate refugees. These large-scale changes are important, but the connection between mobility and transportation also happens on smaller, local scales. People's daily struggles to be mobile may seem petty in comparison to global changes, but they often ripple out and affect big life decisions. This literature review examines how social and historical variables affect mobility and social capital, and how they interrelate within societal systems. This broad history and context will be applied within Philadelphia later in this thesis.

Critical Environmental Justice and Mobility Justice

When examining a map of the United States Memphis, Tennessee, Warren County, North Carolina, and Harlem, New York may not seem connected at first. While Tennessee and North Carolina are located next to each other a glance at a map would not indicate that there is anything to connect these two specific communities. However, an examination of the history of the environmental justice (EJ) movement will show that during the 1980s all three of these communities held events and protests to draw attention to the environmental harms they were suffering (EPA n.d.). With residents in these communities suffering from headaches, respiratory illness, and cancer along with other health concerns, there was an understanding that the landfills, waste, sewage, and sanitation conditions in their communities could be responsible

(Pellow 2004, 511-513; EPA n.d). Despite this knowledge and obvious suffering, the struggle to bring attention and action to the issue of environmental injustice would take time.

Awareness around the health and environmental impacts of factories, landfills, mines, and other industrial sites began to grow in the 1960s around the time of the Civil Rights Movement (EPA n.d). However, it was not until the 1980s that the movement gained national attention through community protests, activist work, scientific research, and scholarly publications (EPA n.d). Today environmental justice is a recognized and important part of the larger environmental movement, with the United States Environmental Protection Agency defining it as the equal treatment and involvement of all people regardless of race, income, or other social factors in the development and implementation of environmental laws and policies (EPA n.d.). Activist and academic work continues to help prevent Black, Brown, and low-income communities from being unfairly impacted by environmental degradation and to rectify the damage that has occurred (Walker and Bulkeley 2006, 655-657).

However, like mobility justice criticisms that focusing on transportation is too narrow, there have been criticisms of EJ that is not broad enough in its scope. (Pellow 2016, 427-429; Sheller 2018, chap. 1). Additionally, there are academic criticisms over how effective EJ truly is at implementing change in the real world (Pellow and Brulle 2005, 3-4). To acknowledge and rectify these criticisms, a new academic branch has emerged within the field: Critical Environmental Justice (CEJ). Critical Environmental Justice seeks to change these shortcomings by bringing intersectionality and scale to the EJ movement (Pellow 2016, 429-431). While race and income-based environmental injustice is still happening, CEJ examines how other identities are affected by environmental injustices. This includes intersections such as sexuality, gender, disability, and indigeneity. An expanded view of the scale includes non-human animals and

natural sources such as water. It means thinking about how environmental injustice impacts bodies from the cellular level to how large populations must move because of environmental damages (Sheller 2018 chap. 2). Along with a larger field of study, CEJ also encourages thinking about the systems which allow and enable these injustices and the ways they can be changed (Pellow 2016, 433-434). This is encouraged through several practices ranging from academia to activist anarchism. The goal of CEJ is to ultimately create an environment that treats all people as valuable, important, and indispensable in the world (Pellow 2016, 434-436). Together intersectionality, scale, anarchism, and indispensability form the four pillars of CEJ (Pellow 2016, 429-436).

When examining these pillars of CEJ in comparison with the goals of mobility justice, parallels can be drawn. Mobility justice studies the mobility or immobility of people, animals, and objects on both small scales of everyday movement and large scales of global movement (Sheller 2018 chap. 1). While most transportation geography focuses on how people reach their destinations, mobility justice focuses more on what people experience while on the journey of reaching a location (Urry 2002, 259-265). It takes into consideration how the history of factors such as race, gender, and disability has influenced the way certain groups of people can or cannot move (Sheller 2014, 8-12). It then examines how these factors as well as environmental threats such as climate change have influenced people's ability to be mobile today (Sheller 2018 chap. 1).

Mobility justice also challenges traditional ideas of space and environment by considering cities as environments worthy of protection in the same way a "natural" environment would be protected (Sheller 2018 chap. 1, 4). This is increasingly important as people in cities around the world are displaced and disenfranchised due to environmental or economic changes.

Therefore, mobility activists advocate for philosophies that facilitate cities, movement, and justice. One of the most influential concepts is the Right to the City (Lefebvre 1974, 11-67). The Right to the City came into prominence through the philosopher Henri Lefebvre who promoted the idea of space as social (Lefebvre 1974, 68-79). This means people have the power and ability to shape their spaces and environments depending on the people, things, and ideas they allow in the space.

This theory proposes that everyone who inhabits a city in some way should have the right to help decide what happens in it from electing officials to choosing what projects to support (Purcell 2002, 101-103). Practically this idea raises many questions such as what constitutes the city and what does not, or do people who could potentially inhabit the city in the future also get a voice in city decision making (Purcell 2002, 101-105)? These questions may make The Right to the City difficult to achieve practically but, theoretically, it speaks to the way mobility and city activists envision more equitable and just cities.

The scholars in favor of Lefebvre and the Right to the City argue it is a radical form of enfranchisement for people who have been disenfranchised by cities and governments. Who is granted enfranchisement and who is not is a central component of mobility justice. Through the placement of roads, housing, and transportation systems the United States government and those in power have systematically disenfranchised certain groups of people. (Lassiter and Kruse 2009, 691-693). The Right to the City empowers people by introducing the idea of justice through movement and inhabitance (Sheller 2018, chap. 1). By allowing people to participate in civic rights where they inhabit, regardless of residence or citizenship many of the unjust barriers currently facing migrants and refugees could be removed. Mobility becomes easier, more accessible, and more just when people have guaranteed rights upon arriving at their new location.

This scholarship has been continued by mobility justice activists and academics. By discussing ideas of the environment, injustice, race, and place, mobility justice focuses on many of the same areas as CEJ, just through the lens of mobility. The tie between the two fields becomes clear when examining their common goals of scope and intersectionality. This connection is worth making for both fields. Examining mobility as an environmental injustice issue could encourage EJ academics and activists to think about how mobility or immobility impacts and shapes the environment beyond vehicles of transportation. Similarly considering how different environmental injustices can change and affect people's mobility may encourage examining mobility in new fields and through new lenses. The tie of values between CEJ and mobility justice is strong enough that it deserves further investigation.

Transportation Infrastructure, Race, and History

For most of the United States population the car is their primary form of transportation, but even those who do not use cars feel their influence. From advertising and sports to an everyday presence in public spaces, cars are everywhere. In contrast, public transit is often dismissed or misunderstood by those who do not use it (Higashide 2019, introduction). While it may seem as if car dominance was an inevitable event due to the advancement of technology, car dependence exists to this extent because of purposeful policies, plans, and designs (Cervero et al. 2017, 1-3). There has been an inequality in cars since the earliest models were released. Early cars were used by the rich for leisure and spectacle as they were too expensive and impractical for other classes (McShane 1994, 12-13). This reinforced class and racial differences and helped lead to the development of suburbs as a place for the rich to escape polluted and overcrowded cities, a movement which was significantly facilitated by the advent of the car (McShane 1994, 12-13).

Car ownership quickly increased as they advanced and became more affordable for the middle-class. The number of private cars owned in the country doubled between 1920 and 1925 causing increasing traffic in cities (Mallach 2018, chap. 1). As a result, city planners began to widen and expand streets allowing for more cars and contributing to the growing suburbs (Mallach 2018, chap. 1). However, it was not until after WWII that the dominance of cars took hold. After the war middle class, white families started to relocate to the suburbs, and jobs, stores, and houses became more spread out (Warren 2014, X). This meant cars became required for everyday travel. At the same time, these families also began to take more frequent and long-distance vacations. As locations centered around entertainment and leisure began to appear such as national parks and amusement parks, highways, and freeways were built to accommodate for longer, faster travel (Lassiter and Kruse 2009, 695). These policies and developments prioritized cars so that public transportation was not needed. This rapid growth and expansion of suburbs lead to what is today known as suburban sprawl (Litman 2019, 3). Rather than developing densely populated centers, suburbs grew sparsely populated neighborhoods with businesses and shops spread across distances (Warren 2014, 7-8). This reinforced the need for cars and caused serious environmental effects.

The history of car dependence described above has a direct correlation with discriminatory and racist policies and attitudes meant to oppress people of color. Oppression through mobility has a long history dating back to times of enslavement when people who were enslaved did not have the freedom to move or travel as they wished (Sheller 2018 chap. 2). Even after slavery ended, mobility and the types of transportation available to Black people and other people of color remained restricted. One example is Octavius Catto, a Black man and civil rights activist in pre-and post-civil war Philadelphia (The Philadelphia Citizen 2020, a). Catto, in

collaboration with his fiancée Caroline LeCount, successfully protested for the desegregation of horse-drawn stagecoaches, a common form of transportation at the time (The Philadelphia Citizen 2020, a). Catto was killed while protesting for Black voting rights on Election Day, 1871 (The Philadelphia Citizen 2020, b). For years his work, sacrifice, and legacy went unrecognized until 2017 when a statue of Catto and a memorial to him was placed in front of Philadelphia's City Hall (Association for Public Art 2018). This story speaks to a trend in both transportation and racial history. The fight for racial equity within transportation has changed with technology, but the core idea of just access to transportation has not. Furthermore, as many transportation geographers advocate for equity through a return to non-car-based mobility, they forget that the inequity that existed long before cars (Sheller 2018, chap. 2; Highaside 2019, introduction).

As the technology evolved, migration patterns shifted and the world entered and exited wars, policies used to oppress groups of people continued. Following WWII thousands of soldiers of all races were looking for jobs and housing. The Veterans Association and Federal Housing Administration worked together to offer low mortgages with no down payment to soldiers (Rothstein 2017, 9-10). Most often these homes were single-family two-bedroom houses located in newly constructed and developing suburbs outside of major cities. Quickly housing developments in New York, Pennsylvania, and California filled with new veterans and their families (Rothstein 2017, 139-141). However, these developments came with purposeful and carefully enforced segregation. Through the policy of redlining banks were able to systematically deny potential Black homeowners the low mortgages and other benefits offered to white buyers (Rothstein 2017,1-23). This forced many Black people to rent rather than buy homes causing them to not only pay more in the long run but also be unable to build the credit and wealth associated with land ownership (Denton 2014, 119-122). Even when Black buyers had the

chance to buy a house it was often under racist and inequitable conditions. One method of this called blockbusting was used by real estate agents to scare white homeowners that Black people were moving into the neighborhood (Rothstein 2017, 12). This caused them to sell their houses at low prices which the real estate agents then sold to Black buyers at significantly higher prices (Rothstein 2017, 12-13). Despite the obvious unfairness of this practice, it was successful because there were so few options open to Black home buyers. Another factor that contributed to the high demand for housing from the Black population, particularly in the Northern part of the country, was the migration of Black people from the South to the North to escape racist Jim Crow policies and gain better economic opportunities (Frey 1979, 426).

What the example above shows is how events and policies which may not seem connected at first ultimately have a large impact on each other. The mobility of people in the post-WWII era played a crucial role in shaping housing policies which continue to affect people today. These policies were implemented insidiously in ways that were not constitutionally legal but could be upheld in court (Rothstein 2017, VII-XV). As a result, many white people took these policies to be legal and normalized them. The term white flight is the result of this normalization (Rothstein 2017, VII). While there may have been white families that moved due to the arrival of Black families in their neighborhood, their fears and decisions were stoked by policymakers and real estate agents (Rothstein 2017, 12-14).

Since Black, low income and disabled citizens were regulated to cities due to the policies described above, urban areas became primarily inhabited by othered groups while suburbs were inhabited by white, affluent people. This division was enforced by the construction of highways that separated the city and suburbs, and isolated and destroyed city neighborhoods while increasing suburban mobility (Lassiter and Kruse 2009, 695). As the suburbs became wealthier

with more professionals living in them, businesses began to move from cities to suburbs taking high-paying jobs and cultural activities with them.

As cities and suburbs became more segregated, the environment and infrastructure of urban spaces began to deteriorate (Mallach 2018, chap. 1). With centers of capital moving out of urban spaces, cities began to be less profitable giving investors less motivation to invest in them. As a result, public services became underfunded, which caused public transportation to become infrequent and unreliable. This posed a problem for many city residents who could not afford or have reliable access to cars. The expense of cars and their associated costs like fuel and maintenance were made more burdensome by the low-paying jobs available which made it harder to save. The lack of public transportation between cities and suburbs made higher-paying jobs located there inaccessible (Warren 2014, 17-18). This lack of transportation infrastructure helped enforce racist policies by ensuring that people of color or with low incomes, did not have the means to be mobile enough to find a better situation.

Environmental Effects

Today few modes of transport have zero environmental impact other than walking and bicycling. As it is impossible to ask everyone to by mobile-only by foot or bicycle, the environmental impacts of different types of transport must be considered and mitigated if possible. In the United States, the transportation sector is responsible for 29 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, the largest percentage of emissions among all the sectors including electric, industry, and agriculture (EPA 2019, 1). Within the transportation sector cars and light-duty vehicles are responsible for the largest percentage of emissions at 59 percent (EPA 2019, 1).

Given the current knowledge of the multifaceted destruction caused by climate change, it is worth finding a way to lower these percentages for people in the U.S. and around the world.

While buses, trains, and trolleys also emit large amounts of greenhouse gases, they can provide transportation to dozens of people as supposed to cars which are built to carry only one or a few people (Higashide 2019, introduction). This is a key advantage of public transportation. While cars vary in size, most carry up to four people. This means that dozens of cars are required to transport a few hundred people. According to the National Association of City Transportation Officials, a street that allows only cars can transport 600 to 1,600 people per hour, a street with car and bus use can transport 1,000 to 2,800 people per hour and a street with a dedicated bus lane can transport 4,000 to 8,000 people per hour (Higashide 2019 introduction).

For this reason, public transportation is ultimately a more environmentally friendly option, because for each person who uses it one less car is on the street emitting carbon and taking up space. Additionally, having fewer cars on the road means not needing as much space for parking, which increases the ability to use the land for multiple purposes (Warren 2014, 8-9). Mixed land use considers factors of scale, geography, and locality to plan urban areas so that there is a mix of different types of commercial, residential, and leisure activities. In terms of its environmental effects, mixed land use helps to break the cycle of car use by making everyday locations accessible through other forms of transportation like buses or biking (Litman 2019, 1-3). Centralizing locations in one area also reduces suburban sprawl and thus the amount of land that is developed (Litman 2019, 1-7).

Transportation Solutions

Due to the infrastructural and environmental problems caused by the car dependence and suburbanization of the 20th century, urban planners are now working to revive cities through increased access, mobility, and transportation options. This involves changing both physical and cultural structures. As cities and public transportation declined, a stigma grew around using it. This can be seen in the way that popular culture portrays public transportation usage as unreliable, unsanitary, and even depressing (Higashide 2019, introduction). In many ways, this depiction of public transit has grown out of the real issues facing these systems after years of underfunding and cuts. However, today there are more efforts to increase the funding and ridership of public transportation systems in cities around the country. This push is partially due to urban planners and policymakers recognizing the positive effects that reliable public transportation can have for a city, its residents, and the environment.

Despite efforts to increase public transportation accessibility and usage, cars remain the main method of transportation and mobility in the United States. One of the reasons for this goes back to the structure of cities. Even if public transportation systems ran perfectly, wide streets, parking lots, highways, and suburban sprawl would still encourage car usage (Warren 2014, 6-10). To shift the infrastructure of cities so they are better suited for and encourage methods of mobility other than cars, transportation geographers are turning to a method called transit-oriented development or TOD (Cervero et al. 2017, 10). There are many ways to implement TOD, but ultimately its goal is to change the layout of cities so that they are more centrally planned and accessible through walking, biking, or public transit (Warren 2014, 49-50). Much of the inspiration for TOD comes from looking at places that are less car-dependent than the U.S. For instance, cities in Europe that are less car-dependent have narrower streets that allow for

greater walking and bike-based mobility (Newman and Kenworthy 2015, 111-115). Methods such as making bus-only street lanes could increase the number of buses able to run, and the number of people who would be able to use them. Other TOD strategies include ending subsidies that support free parking and ensuring that buses and trains run frequently to and from locations so that they are a reliable source of transportation (Warren 2014, 62-64). This would also allow more space for mixed land use. By repurposing space for businesses, residents, or cultural activities close to each other people do not have as much need or motivation to use cars daily.

Through strategies such as these, there is evidence that TOD can help increase non-car-based mobility by making locations more accessible through walking, biking, and public transportation (Litman 2019, 9). Ideally, this would also mean an increase in equity for the people who rely on these methods of transit. However, while the changes that TOD presents such as increased bus service, have made positive changes in cities such as Huston, these benefits have not been equally distributed to all people (Higashide 2019, chap. 2). Currently, many cities are trying to rejuvenate and change their public image, particularly so they appeal to young people (Moskowitz 2018, chap 4). The changes implemented frequently correlate with TOD so that neighborhoods near city centers are accessible through multiple types of mobility (Dawkins and Moeckel 2016, 3-5). This increased mobility has led to an increase in population and businesses such as restaurants, stores, and apartments (Dawkins and Moeckel 2016, 3). The result of all these changes is that over time the same areas which were regulated as Black or low-income neighborhoods during the second half of the 20th century are now experiencing an influx of new, high-income, mainly white residents (Moskowitz 2018, introduction). As the gentrification of these areas progresses, it becomes more expensive and the lower-income residents who have lived there for a long time are forced out (Moskowitz 2018, introduction). It

is in situations like these that traditional transportation geography finds tension with mobility justice. Increased public transit and decreased car use are positive for the people who can afford to live in these neighborhoods, but if the people who depend the most on public transit are being pushed out, then mobility justice is not being served.

Social Capital

Social capital is a theory which attempts to quantify the economic value of social connections. Like many different theories in academia, social capital has come in and out of popular use as different academics try to define and apply it to various situations. One definition of social capital is that it is the trust, reciprocity, and bonding gained through community activities, clubs, and civic events (Putnam 2000, chap. 1). By participating and making ties within their communities, people feel safe and invested in their neighborhoods and are more likely to invest their own time, money, and resources back into the community, therefore, increasing the total social capital (Putnam 2000, chap. 3).

This concept is not new; for hundreds of years, people have relied on their neighbors and community for help during difficult times (Putnam 1994, 1-10). Due to this history, part of the interest in social capital is understanding how these tendencies translate to today. Sociologist Robert Putnam (2000) investigates the decline of social capital in the United States by examining participation in group activities such as community clubs, and election turnout over time and space (Putnam 2000, chap. 1). Putnam tracks a decline in community involvement and thus social capital from the 1960s to the 1990s (Putnam 2000, chap. 1). He posits that this decline is due in large part to increasing demands on time and attention such as longer work hours and television (Putnam 2000, chap. 10).

Putnam’s work helped spur a new wave of literature using the social trust and bonding definition of social capital. From housing development to transportation, academics and researchers have tried to discover how greater social ties can benefit society, and its systems (Carpiano 2005, 169; Currie and Stanley 2008, 533-543). Given the benefits, Putnam links to social capital such as better education and safer neighborhoods, the appeals of increasing social capital are understandable (Putnam 1994, 10-19). Unlike other community improvement actions that involve intricate plans, policies, or money this definition of social capital simply requires opportunities and time for social interaction and bonding. However, many economists and sociologists take issue with Putnam’s view of social capital. Critiques of his work include that it focuses too much on the social aspects of social capital and not enough on the capital or economic influence of social interactions (Siisiäinen 2003, 188). Additionally, Putnam largely ignores the potential negative effects of social capital such as social exclusion (DeFilippis 2001, 789-790).

Critics of Putnam’s theory of social capital instead look to previous work and definitions to inform their ideas. While Putnam has the most current and well-known work on social capital, he is not the first to write on the topic. Noteworthy theorists in the field include Glenn Loury, and Samuel J. Coleman who respectively bring issues of social discrimination and functionality into the field (DeFilippis 2001, 782-784). Loury argues that the access an individual has to social capital will be determined not only by personal time and resources but also by the privilege they hold within society. Those that are continually denied access to opportunity due to race, income, or gender will not have the same access to social capital as a result (DeFilippis 2001, 782-784). Coleman brings the issue of individual interactions and functionality into social capital. He argues that the potential outcome of any social interaction is dependent on the individuals and

situation. Thus, the social capital that could potentially be produced by the interaction is neither positive nor negative; rather it is neutral until the conclusion of the interaction (Coleman 1988, 98). These inclusions of social inequities and functionalities create a different definition of social capital and address many of the critiques against Putnam. However, it is the work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu that stands in the starkest contrast to Putnam. To have a full understanding of social capital and its application to this thesis it is necessary to explore Bourdieu's definition and views of social capital.

Before Putnam's work and popularity, Bourdieu's theories constituted the most well-known work on social capital. Although Putnam's theories have been the focus of the field within recent years, many who study social capital and sociology find value in his writings, particularly those who critique Putnam. Part of the reason for this is that the two sociologists define social capital very differently. While Putnam views social capital as something that is gained through group interaction, Bourdieu defines it as something that is primarily an individual choice and gain (Bourdieu 1986, 447-450). From this viewpoint, social capital is sought out and gained by the connection's individuals make with other individuals and groups (Bourdieu 1986, 447-450). This can include social groups, clubs, unions, and families. Similarly, to Loury and Coleman, Bourdieu emphasizes the role of social dynamics and norms within these groups. By choosing who is allowed within this network of people the "dominates" as Bourdieu terms them can exclude people based on factors like race or gender (Siisiäinen 2003, 197-200).

While the inclusion of these social factors is like the work of Loury and Coleman, what differentiates Bourdieu is his focus on the economic factors of social capital. Unlike Putnam whose focus is on the social aspect of social capital, Bourdieu continuously makes connections between social capital and economic capital. One way he does this is by categorizing and

defining different forms of capital into economic, cultural, and social capital (Bourdieu 1986, 442). Economic capital is the traditional form of money that can be exchanged with others for goods and services (Bourdieu 1986, 441-442). Bourdieu measures cultural capital as the economic benefit gained from investing time in cultural knowledge and education (Bourdieu 1986, 443-447). In this instance, Bourdieu uses the example of a parent taking extra time to teach their child outside of school (Bourdieu 1986, 443-447). Finally, there is social capital which Bourdieu defines as the economic benefit an individual can gain from the connections with another individual or group (Bourdieu 1986, 447-450).

There are two main factors that cultural and social capital have in common. The first is that social privilege and exclusion affect the way different people can access them. The second is that they all have some form of connection to economics. In Bourdieu’s cultural capital example of tutoring a child, there is a clear element of privilege because many people do not have the extra time to teach or help their child (Bourdieu 1986, 443). This is a problem because the children whose parents do not have the time to give them extra help are put at an immediate disadvantage over the kids whose parents do have the time. Furthermore, the fact that certain kids have extra help and support is not inherently obvious to schools or teachers. As a result, kids with access to this cultural capital are more likely to be viewed as naturally good students, do well in school and get higher-paying jobs. The somewhat hidden relationship between different types of capital is present in social capital as well.

In Bourdieu’s definition of social capital, individuals seek out connections to ultimately increase their capital whether it be in the form of work, money, or another type of personal gain (Siisiäinen 2003, 191-195). Of course, there is no guarantee that social capital will help make this happen. However, when an individual does gain something through a connection the role of

social capital is not always obvious. For instance, when someone gains a job through networking the individual's skills and qualifications are apparent but the role that social capital plays in making that connection possible is not. What this means is that economic capital is always present in social capital but often goes unnoticed making it easy to underestimate how important it is or how certain people have better access to it than others.

Social Capital and Mobility Justice

It is through these often unnoticed and unequal social phenomena that mobility justice and social capital find a connection. Both fields are greatly impacted by social inequities. Within mobility justice, this is the people who are not the "kinetic elite" (Sheller 2018, introduction). Those who are unable to be mobile in their daily lives due to their location, income, race, gender, or ability live in a society that expects them to be mobile but does not give them the help or tools to do so. Similarly, those born into places of privilege and power will have more access and opportunities to build social capital and with-it economic capital than someone born into a social disadvantage. Both these forces operate in our daily lives yet the capitalist systems they occupy have made it, so they are taken for normal since they allow those in power to continue undisturbed.

While this relationship to social capital relies on Bourdieu's definition of the theory, there is also space for Putnam's viewpoint. To integrate the two theories some academics have classified Putnam's ideas under the term of social cohesion (Carpiano 2005, 167). Putnam's definition of community trust and bonding can still take place within Bourdieu's view of individuals and networks. The more connection and trust between two people or groups, the more likely they are to assist each other and have the interaction end beneficially. Within the

world of mobility, studies have already found that social cohesion is greater when people have more mobility and access to public transportation (Appleyard 1982, 17-26; Urry 2002 263-265). This integration also addresses a critique of Bourdieu that he never discusses trust or the effect it could have on social capital (Siisiainen 2003, 195-196).

Integrating Bourdieu’s and Putnam’s theories allow the important factors of both theories to be considered. Neither Bourdieu nor Putnam may agree with this integrated version of social capital, but it enables there to be space for social power, economic factors, trust, and bonding. This combined theory makes sense when discussing its relationship to mobility. The greater someone’s ability to go out and meet people the more likely they are to form connections and networks. For instance, research suggests that the act of commuting on public transportation helps to form social cohesion among riders (Currie and Stanley 2008, 540-543). It is this definition of social capital that I will be using throughout the rest of this thesis. When I refer to social capital both in my case study and theoretically, I am referring to the potential trust, bonds, and economic gains that can come from social networks and cohesion.

Conclusion

When reviewing the different topics present in this literature review such as mobility, social capital, discrimination, and justice, one theme that is prominent in each of them is disenfranchisement. The act where certain groups of people are purposefully given fewer rights, resources, and ultimately justice is present whether discussing mobility justice and people's ability to move after a storm, transportation, and the infrequency with which the bus runs, or social capital and the benefits people gain from social networks and a tight-knit community. It was present as suburbs were built and is still present today as cities gentrify. As we look to a

future where even the most basic aspects of our lives are affected by climate change, we must confront the ways the systems in the United States proliferate disenfranchisement.

For this reason, it is worth looking at real-life events to see how these themes are embodied in the world. This is important to do because while drawing theoretical connections from literature can be straightforward, doing so in real-world examples can be much harder. The constantly changing variables of the environment, people, events, and things impact life in complex ways. However, if parallels between the literature and the real world can be made it strengthens the academic theory and the need for activist action. The case study site in this thesis will be Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Examining the transportation systems, mobility, and social capital in Philadelphia will indicate if the people there are experiencing justice or disenfranchisement as highlighted in the literature review.

To do this I will research the general history of how Philadelphia developed with a particular focus on the effect of immigration, industrialization, and suburbanization. I realize that my thesis will not be able to capture all the complexities that impact the already complex topics of mobility and social capital. For this reason, I am studying two specific neighborhoods, Strawberry Mansion and Kensington. While this analysis is happening on a microscale, the goal is that through my research these neighborhoods will give context to the larger mobility, equity, and justice issues taking place in Philadelphia.

Philadelphia: A Case Study

Introduction

The case study of this thesis focuses on two specific neighborhoods in the Northern part of Philadelphia: Strawberry Mansion and Kensington. Both neighborhoods have specific histories and current events that have contributed to the way social capital and mobility interact there. They also have their own reputations within the region which they must contend with. However, before these neighborhoods can be explored, a brief history of Philadelphia and its culture must be understood.

In American popular history and culture, Philadelphia is best known for the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the 1976 movie *Rocky*. While these historical events and cultural landmarks have become important in how Philadelphia markets itself to the rest of the country and world, there is much more to the city. Philadelphia has an extensive and layered history. Over its 400-year history, it has been a site of both social progress and liberation and oppression and injustice. This makes examining its history difficult as every angle and approach can reveal new and different stories. In this limited overview, it is impossible to depict a history of Philadelphia that includes all the intricacies of its cultures, people, and places as they are ever-shifting. In this way, the city is as mobile as its people; they may be responsible for building the physical place, but over time the city holds reminders of the generation's past, and people and places that have been forgotten. As time passes the city develops its own life beyond the people that live there or those that pass through it.

Philadelphia History

Geographically Philadelphia is in the Eastern part of Pennsylvania and is the largest city in the state. Philadelphia has long been a site of industry, with factories for manufacturing textiles, tools, and other goods built as the Industrial Revolution boomed. Part of what allowed

for this is the two rivers that run along and through the city offering the water and transportation needed for industrial work and shipping. These two rivers, the Delaware which runs along the Eastern side of the city, and the Schuylkill, which runs from North of the city South and into the Delaware, have been essential to Philadelphia's development and growth.

The land that Philadelphia now occupies was originally lived on by the Lenni Lenape Group, with the Susquehannock, Shawnee, and Iroquois Groups also living in the region (Francis, n.d). The Lenape resided along the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers and used the rivers and surrounding land for fishing and hunting (Francis, n.d). The Lenape and other groups lived on the land for hundreds of years before European colonizers arrived in the mid-1600s. While he was not the first European to settle in the area, William Penn has arguably had the biggest long-term impact on the development of the region. He is credited in history as the founder of Philadelphia, and the name Pennsylvania translates to Penn's Woods in Latin (Francis n.d). Penn was a Quaker from England who came to the area in 1682 with a land claim granted to him by King Charles II (Francis n.d). The land was to be a settlement for fellow Quakers to safely practice religious freedom. In 1682 Penn and the Lenape established the Shackamaxon Treaty (Francis n.d). The agreement gave Penn the land which would become Philadelphia but allowed the Lenape to keep some of their villages (Francis n.d).

Due to this treaty and Penn's decision to make Philadelphia a city of religious freedom, the founding of the city has become entrenched in a narrative of peace and brotherhood. While it is true that Penn was a pacifist, the early colonists' relationship with the Lenape did not remain peaceful. After Penn died in the early 1700s, Penn's sons along with land speculator James Logan falsified the terms of a pre-existing agreement with the Lenape to gain more land (Shurley 2019). The agreement, which they had made with William Penn, specified that the Lenape would

give whatever amount of land could be walked in a day and a half to Penn or his ancestors (Shurley 2019). By using inaccurate map measurements and hiring runners, Logan and Penn's sons were able to claim a million acres of Lenape land in what became known as the Walking Purchase (Francis n.d). While the Lenape realized the claim was illegitimate, they were eventually forced out through various terrorization tactics by colonists, and the land was claimed by Europeans (Shurley 2019).

Today the legacy of James Logan lives on, though many Philadelphians may not realize it. One of the biggest streets running through downtown Philadelphia is the Benjamin Franklin Parkway which hosts two of the city's most famous buildings, City Hall, and the Philadelphia Art Museum at either end of it. In the middle sits Logan Circle, a park with a large fountain that frames the buildings on either end of the parkway in water and mist. A popular spot for tourists and residents alike, few probably realize the deeds of the park's namesake. While history classes teach William Penn's peaceful legacy, very few mention the legacies of his descendants. In recent years, the Lenape people still in the area have tried to correct this through walks and museum collaborations. However, the type of education that can be conducted legally is limited as Pennsylvania does not officially recognize any indigenous groups (Shurley 2019).

This history is worth detailing as it sets several mythologies and legacies into motion that continue today. The first is the idea of Philadelphia as a place of progress and tolerance. This was first established through Penn's religious tolerance and freedom, and fully became part of the city's mythology during the Revolutionary period, since Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence and it was signed in Philadelphia. However, while it is true that great progress was made for the time, the history above shows that this narrative is not so straightforward. The second legacy establishes a hidden mobility and history. While the famous men of Philadelphia

have universities, streets, and museums named in their honor, the contributions of people and groups that have been disenfranchised due to their identities are remembered in smaller ways. In statues overlooking highways, on plaques on pavements, and on house fronts, there are small reminders of the people who used to occupy spaces everywhere. As new people move in and old places are destroyed to make room for them, it is these small remembrances that are put at risk.

While forgotten histories exist everywhere, they are particularly prevalent in Philadelphia because it is one of the oldest cities in the country and has attracted immigrants since it was first established. This is partially due to the Delaware River, which helped make the city accessible, but it is also in part to the city's policies. The popular versions of the founding of the city and The Founding Fathers of the Revolution may be romanticized, but policies enacted over its early history helped to make Philadelphia a comparatively free place to live at the time. William Penn may have failed to pass his Quaker ideals to his sons, but his policy of religious freedom did attract religious refugees. Jefferson owned slaves, but the Pennsylvania Abolition Society was still founded in Philadelphia as the first abolitionist group in the country and helped to pass the Gradual Abolition Act in 1780 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania n.d.). These policies made Philadelphia a somewhat safer place to live for persecuted groups of people at the time than many of the other states and cities in the early U.S.

Of course, these broad policies did not ensure complete safety or acceptance by the people of Philadelphia. The Gradual Slavery Act did not immediately abolish all slavery in the state, and slaveowners still found loopholes to work around the law (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, n.d.). Similarly, religious tolerance did not mean that all religions were accepted, even from residents who practiced the same religion as the immigrants. For instance, in 1727 a group of English Protestants living in Philadelphia called the Memorialists wrote to parliament

asking them to ban the immigration of German and Swedish Protestants who were arriving in the thousands due to religious persecution, harsh winters, and war (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, n.d). Even though these people practiced the same religion and were also of European descent they were still viewed as suspicious and threatening.

This attitude of suspicion towards immigrants remained over the decades and centuries even as the people, the city, and the world changed. As the city's population grew in the mid-19th and early 20th century, blocks of row homes were built to accommodate them, with the row house becoming a symbolic structure of working-class neighborhoods (Casper 2013). International and national events caused influxes of immigrants from certain areas. In the 1800s it was the Irish (Kenny 2019, 17). In the early 1900s, it was the Italians, Puerto Ricans, and Polish (Hernandez n.d). However, people moving to the city were not limited to international groups. In the early 1900s around WWI, Philadelphia saw a massive increase of African Americans because of the Great Migration, a period where Black people moved in masse to the North due to racism, increased employment opportunities, and better personal safety (The Great Migration n.d.). This occurred in many Northern states, but Philadelphia was particularly affected as they actively sought out Black migrants to come and take the industrial jobs that had been left open because of the decrease in workers during WWI (The Great Migration n.d.). This strategy worked and by 1930 the city's Black population had more than doubled (The Great Migration n.d.).

All these groups faced various degrees of xenophobia and racism, with tides of backlash and acceptance shifting as new groups arrived. Still, many were able to carve out space for themselves, their families, and their culture within the city if only for a few blocks. As the population of a group of immigrants grew in the city, they would attempt to establish themselves in a neighborhood and would either successfully integrate or find a new area. If the immigrants

stayed in the neighborhood, more people of the same race or ethnicity would move there. Over time this caused the demographics of a neighborhood to shift, with the former group moving elsewhere while cultural landmarks of the more recent group were put into place. An example is the Bella Vista neighborhood of South Philadelphia which is well known as an Italian neighborhood and is home to the famous Italian Market. What is not as well-remembered is that before the Italians arrived, the neighborhood was known as the Jewish Quarter (Historical Society of Pennsylvania 2019).

This tendency for immigrants to move where people of the same racial or ethnic background were already established caused sections of neighborhoods to become segregated. However, this trend became more pronounced as the Black population in the city grew in the 1930s (Finkel 2016). With thousands of Black migrants coming into the city, particularly North and West Philadelphia, white families moved out and the city became hyper-segregated (Finkel 2016). As a result, the culture and atmosphere from neighborhood to neighborhood could vary greatly even if they were geographically next to each other. This caused neighborhoods to become insular, with people commonly living within the same few blocks their entire lives.

This history of migration and the acceptance, backlash, and changes that come with it remain relevant in Philadelphia today. As the city experiences gentrification and neighborhoods change, the question of mobility, and who stays in what areas continues. These changes are affecting Strawberry Mansion and Kensington in individual ways that deserve a deeper examination.

Strawberry Mansion History

The history of Strawberry Mansion (SM) can be traced back to the late 1700s when North Philadelphia was still considered the country. Sitting on the Eastern bank of the Schuylkill River, it was accessible to the center of town but only consisted of a few main roads, and Laurel Hill

Cemetery which is still in use today (Ludlum 1931, 2-4). It was in this quiet location that Pennsylvania Supreme Court Judge William Lewis built a manor home in the Georgian style which he named Summerton (Ludlum 1931, 2-4). Over the years several other large homes were built, and the surrounding area was developed as the city grew. After Lewis's death, his house was bought and then sold again with the land surrounding the house eventually being used to run a dairy farm and grow produce (Ludlum 1931, 7-9). During this period, the house grew a reputation for its strawberries and cream and started to be referred to locally as the Strawberry Mansion. By 1867 this had become the official name of the house with the neighborhood, which had been previously named Somerton, also adopting the name (Ludlum 1931, 7-9).

It was also in 1867 that the city established a new park on the land which Strawberry Mansion and the other manor homes resided on (Lewis 2006, 283). The creation of what would become Fairmount Park was spurred by the construction of the municipal waterworks on the Schuylkill River in the early 1800s which allowed the city to draw large amounts of drinking water from the river (American Planning Association n.d.) However, the quality of the water had already been degraded through years of industrial use. Motivated by a desire to upkeep public health and safety, the city began to buy additional land around the Schuylkill and the waterworks (American Planning Association n.d.). After years of planning and various designs and architects Fairmount Park was established, making it second in age and size only to Central Park (Lewis 2006, 285-286). Today Fairmount Park spans over two thousand acres with the neighborhood of Strawberry Mansion sitting on the eastern side (American Planning Association n.d.).

The history of Fairmount Park is important to the neighborhood because it influenced the way it developed and continues to develop today. Building the park motivated new construction, and as the 19th century came to an end the area saw the addition of the Philadelphia Zoo,

Woodside Amusement Park, and the Strawberry Mansion Bridge (SM CDC n.d.). In turn, this attracted residents, and the neighborhood became a working-class, mostly Jewish area (SM CDC n.d.). As the Great Migration in the first half of the 20th century progressed more African Americans moved into North Philadelphia and the neighborhoods around Strawberry Mansion (The Great Migration n.d.). However, the demographics of Strawberry Mansion itself did not change until the 1960s as nearby suburbs developed and many of the Jewish residents in the neighborhood moved out (SM CDC n.d.). As space became available, Black residents began to move in, causing Strawberry Mansion to become a majority Black neighborhood.

The switch from a Jewish neighborhood to a Black neighborhood in the 1960s did not happen by coincidence. As detailed in the literature review it occurred around the time suburbs were being developed both nationally and locally. For the Philadelphia region, this included the development of suburban neighborhoods such as Levittown in the nearby Bucks County. Built by William Levitt, Levittown was one of the first suburban developments in the state and strictly segregated as Levitt could only receive funding from the Federal Housing Administration if he refused to sell to Black homebuyers (Rothstein 2017, 140-143). During this time Philadelphia also experienced drastic deindustrialization of its manufacturing industries. This occurred through a variety of events including increased manufacturing space in the suburbs, competition from foreign manufactures, and the advent of synthetic materials that competed with the more expensive materials produced in the city's textile mills (Elesh n.d.). This process particularly hurt Philadelphia's Black residents who were drawn to the city for its industrial jobs. Over the next decades as harmful urban renewal policies set on removing "blight" were put into place, Strawberry Mansion suffered (Howard and Vitiello n.d.). Decreasing population and incomes made it hard to attract investors to the neighborhood, and soon it had a reputation for being poor

and violent. However, tracking mobility and social capital illustrate that the history and culture of the neighborhood go far beyond its reputation.

Kensington History

Kensington was first founded in 1730 by Anthony Palmer who bought the land in hopes of creating a quiet neighborhood away from the center of town (Remer 2002, 9-10). Due to its rural surroundings and a nearby creek, the area was a good spot for shipbuilding and soon attracted shipbuilders and large numbers of German immigrants. Over the following decades, Kensington would continue to attract industry as technology progressed and the Industrial Revolution began. This included iron, chemical, carriage, tool, and most significantly textile manufacturing (Remner 2002, 12-13).

By the 1830s Kensington was recognized as a center of industry and drew in migrants and immigrants to settle there (Remer 2002, 12-13). The neighborhood became divided along ethnic lines with Front Street acting as a barrier between the two. In the west lived the descendants of the first German and Protestant immigrants and in the east the newer immigrants, who were mainly Irish and Catholic (Remner 2002, 13). These ethnic and religious divides lead to tensions, most notably the Bible Riots of 1844 in which Protestant and Catholic groups clashed over which version of the bible should be allowed in public schools (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, n.d.). A Catholic church was burnt down during the riots, and the state troops had to be called in to bring them to an end (Remer 2002, 15-16). These events eventually lead to Kensington becoming an official part of the city of Philadelphia in 1854 (Remer 2002, 15).

As the 20th century began Kensington faced many of the same hardships as the rest of the city. While industry continued to supply jobs, the Depression and technological change shifted the profitability of manufacturing and hard times ensued. By the 1950s the golden age of

manufacturing in Kensington had ended, and many of the factories closed (Lubrano 2018). With the economy of the neighborhood now crippled, and an influx of new Black and Puerto Rician residents, many of the German and Irish residents moved leaving blocks of row homes empty (Lubrano 2018). Racial tensions between residents of color and white residents grew, with acts of violence targeted against the Black and Latino newcomers. In 1974 the Santiago Family experienced a string of racist attacks which cumulated in their house being firebombed and five of the family members dying (Errico n.d.). This attack caused a wave of protests by the Latino community and anti-racism groups. The pain of this event was worsened by a corrupt investigation on the part of the police, depriving the Santiago's of justice (Errico n.d.). This attack illustrates the volatility of both Kensington and Philadelphia at the time.

It was also around the 1970s that drugs began to be commonly sold in Kensington ((Lubrano 2018). While the neighbor was, and still is, majority Black and Latino, white gangs returned to sell drugs in the now-abandoned factories (Lubrano 2018). Over the years the types of drugs available changed, as did U.S policies on drugs. Famously the war on drugs in the 1980s, disproportionately targeted Black people and communities even though they were not more likely to be caught with or use drugs than white people (Alexander 2018, chap. 5). This was true in the 80s and remains true today as Kensington has become the epicenter of the opioid epidemic in Philadelphia. The goal of including this history is not to portray Kensington as a place where only bad things happen. The reality of the neighborhood, both in the past and present is much more complicated. As the following sections will show just by following two variables in the neighborhood, mobility, and social capital, a picture of struggle, perseverance, and change is made clear.

Strawberry Mansion
Mobility

People with low incomes and people of color have traditionally had the hardest time accessing mobility due to physical and societal barriers. Given that most Strawberry Mansion residents fall into one of these categories it is worth examining the different types of mobility and transportation operations in the neighborhood. Using data from the American 5-year Community Survey (ACS), I was able to collect information on the amount and type of transportation SM residents accessed when commuting to work. Employed residents over the age of 16 were counted in the survey. The total number of workers in SM decreased between 2011 and 2018 from 9,927 people to 9,895 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). During this time, the total number of workers who had zero access to a car dropped slightly from 34.2% to 32.8% (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The total number of people who used public transportation to reach work remained relatively stable at 43.8% of workers in 2011 and 43.1% in 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

Considering that so many people within the neighborhood rely on public transportation it is important to understand how it operates in the area. Strawberry Mansion is served by the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, or Septa, which provides public transportation to the entire Philadelphia region. Using Septa's website, I was able to determine the type and frequency of public transportation offered in the neighborhood. In terms of buses, eight routes run through the neighborhood: the 3, 7, 32, 39, 48, 49, 54, and 61 buses (Septa n.d.). The 7, 39, and 54 buses run every 60 minutes, while the 61, 49, 32 buses run every 30 minutes (Septa n.d.). The 3 and 48 bus run every 15 minutes (Septa n.d.).

At first, glance having eight different bus routes may appear to be excellent public transportation access. While having multiple bus routes to choose from is a benefit, the level of

accessibility becomes more complicated when looking at the route frequency. Out of the eight buses, only two operate at a high-frequency rate of 15 minutes (Septa n.d.). All the other buses require a wait of 30 to 60 minutes (Septa n.d.). This gives riders low flexibility in terms of timing. It becomes even more difficult if using one of these buses as a connection to other public transit. Schedules, the frequency of the other routes, and the possibility of early or late arrivals must all be considered. For instance, the Subway which runs to Center City, and South Philadelphia is a commonly used method of high frequency, rapid transportation. However, the only way to reach the station from Strawberry Mansion is to take the 39 bus, a bus that only runs once an hour (Septa n.d.).

Another important aspect of mobility and its effect on SM to consider is how public transportation influences the economy and development of the city. In Philadelphia, a third of population growth in the city between 2010 and 2019 was along the Elevated Train and Subway lines (Septa n.d.). According to Septa's estimates, proximity to high-quality public transportation increases the value of a house by an average of $870 (Septa n.d). Between 2010 and 2019 an estimated 1,501 to 23,285 residential and commercial building permits were requested per square mile in areas located near the Elevated Train and the Subway. For Strawberry Mansion, the number of permits ranged between 501 and 23,285 per square mile in this time (Septa n.d.).

Social Capital

Despite its reputation for poverty, Strawberry Mansion has a rich history of culture and art. In the 1950s a house in the neighborhood was purchased by jazz artist John Coltrane, who lived in the house through the 50s and then had several family members live there until the 1990s (Kaier 2013). The house represented an important time in Coltrane's life as it was where he recovered from a substance abuse disorder and composed one of his most important albums,

Giant Steps (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d; Goodin-Smith 2020). Long term residents remember or have heard stories of the sounds of saxophone coming from the house as Coltrane practiced (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d).

In 1985 the house was placed in the registry of Philadelphia's Historic Places and in 1999 it became a National Historic Landmark (Goodin-Smith 2020). However, these designations have not saved the house from falling into disrepair. As a result, neighborhood residents and jazz artists and lovers have founded the John Coltrane House National Historic Landmark, a non-profit working to fix, historically restore and preserve the house. For years they have worked to raise money and awareness around the house with events like jazz walks and concerts. This has also helped bring the community together and celebrate the history and current work of jazz and Black music (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d.; Kaier 2013). Unfortunately, the house remains in danger and was placed on Preservation Pennsylvania's list of historical sites at risk in 2020 (Goodin-Smith 2020). This means that without additional funding from the state and other larger donors the house could be demolished.

This tradition of art, history, and culture continues today through organizations like Blackberry Arts Group, which was founded by artist Trish Sealy (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d). In her practice, Sealy incorporates traditional African folklore and has transformed her house into a space to create and showcase art (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d). Through the Blackberry Arts group, she brings artists from the Caribbean to Strawberry Mansion to create and share their art (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d). Fairmount Park has also begun to open the historical houses in the park as spaces for community events often centering around arts and culture (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d). During these events, Sealy and other artists in the neighborhood are invited to share their art with the rest of the community. This marks a change

from the last several decades where the historic houses in the park were not open for residents to explore. These events have not only given people a chance to learn and build connections but appreciate the history of their neighborhood on a deeper level. These artistic movements and organizations have given neighborhood residents a chance to learn, participate, and have a role in the culture of their community. This helps to build social capital through the creation of connections and community engagement and pride.

Another important organization that helps ensure the wellbeing of residents and builds long term social capital is the Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation. In the 1960s and 70s Community Development Corporations, or CDCs, were created to increase the amount of capital and housing in underserved areas (Gillette and Vitiello n.d.). The Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation was formed in 2004 and is working to empower the community and ensure that it is revitalized in a sustainable way that benefits its residents (SM CDC n.d). One method of this is through the work of the Neighborhood Action Center which helps residents buy and rent houses, build budgets, search for jobs, and provide food vouchers (SM CDC n.d). Over the years it has partnered with other community groups such as Community Ventures to construct properties for low-income homeownership (SM CDC n.d).

For the low-income individuals in need of housing, jobs, or food the SM CDC offers a chance for connection and ease of difficulties. It gives an individual a better chance of joining mainstream networks and building their social capital networks through increased income or homeownership. The Strawberry Mansion CDC has become an organization with its own social capital by working with other organizations in Philadelphia. This is especially important now as Strawberry Mansion faces increased rates of gentrification. The two neighborhoods surrounding it, East Falls and Brewerytown, have faced increasing rates of gentrification over the years. The

same process is now facing Strawberry Mansion as it attracts people due to its proximity to Center City and Fairmount Park. Residents who have seen what has happened in other neighborhoods are aware that they cannot afford the increase in property rates, rent, and cost of living. Organizations like SM CDC and the social capital it provides could give residents a better chance of remaining in the neighborhood as it changes.

Control Variables

Mobility justice and social capital in Strawberry Mansion are also influenced by and intersect with other social factors. Understanding what these variables are and how they affect the neighborhood is important as it gives a general sense of the landscape upon which mobility and social capital exist. The data below shows that together the control variables, mobility, and social capital form a complex network of relationships that ultimately all influence each other.

Using statistics from the 2011 to 2018 ACS, I gathered and analyzed data on the racial, economic, and gender makeup of the Strawberry Mansion population. I chose these variables as they had the most available data, and almost everyone in the neighborhood would be affected by at least one of the categories.

As previously established, SM became primarily a neighborhood of color in the 1960s, a change due to the policies and financial benefits offered to white people. The data from the ACS reveals that Strawberry Mansion is still a relatively small, majority-black neighborhood, but over recent years it has seen changes in both race and size (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). While the rest of Philadelphia has seen growth over the last 10 years, SM has seen slight decreases since 2016. Before then it had some years of slight increases but the highest the population has been at since 2010 was in 2015 at 36,876. As of 2018, the population was at 32,196 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The Black community still makes up most of the population but has decreased since 2016 to its lowest percentage of 92.4% of the neighborhood (U.S. Census

Bureau 2011-2018). Meanwhile, the white, Asian, Latino, and Native American groups have all seen increases, but they have not been consistent, with increases and decreases in each group from year to year. One consistency in the data is the ratio of females to males, with females always having a larger percentage (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

In terms of mobility, the racial group with the highest use of cars and public transportation was the Black community. However, since the Black community makes up most of the neighborhood, it would not appear that their use of public transportation is disproportionate. The same is true of the other racial groups in the neighborhood. In terms of social capital since most of the population is Black, the people who stand to benefit the most are also Black. This makes sense when considering that organizations like the Community Development Corporation are designed to serve the community. In addition, the leaders within the CDC who serve on the board are all Black (SM CDC n.d).

Other groups like the John Coltrane National Landmark and the Blackberry Arts Group are specifically centered around Black history, music, art, and culture. Given the historical exclusion of Black people from planning and community spaces, it is meaningful that so many organizations in Strawberry Mansion are dedicated to building Black wellbeing, culture, and connections. It has yet to be discovered if the demographics and focus of these organizations will change as more racial and ethnic groups move into the neighborhood.

The next variable and intersection point for mobility and social capital is income. Strawberry Mansion saw an increase in median income and a decrease in the percentage of people living under the poverty line between 2011 and 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). According to the Pew Charitable Trusts, in 2017 the median income for the entire city of Philadelphia was $39,759 (Pew Charitable Trusts, 2019, 11). In 2017 the median income in Strawberry Mansion

was $15,733 and in 2018 it was $16,118 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). Overall, the neighborhood saw a $2,735 increase between 2011 and 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). In 2011 Strawberry Mansion saw its highest percentage of individuals living below the poverty line during the 2011-2018 time at 41.5% (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). By 2018 this number had dropped to 39.40%, but it was a slight increase from the 2016 percentage of 37.7% (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). These numbers alone do not account for why the number of individuals living in poverty increased between 2016 and 2018.

The economic differences between car users and public transportation users were stark. In 2011 the median income of someone who drove to work was $31,46l (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The median income for a public transit user was $24,435 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). By 2018 this difference had grown with the income of the car users rising to $31,662 and the public transit users falling to $21,773 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). This means that in 2018 there was an almost $10,000 yearly income difference between people who drove to work and people who relied on public transportation. These statistics are further supported by analyzing the means of transportation for people above and below the poverty line. In 2018 23.5% of people living 100 percent below the poverty line used public transportation, while only 12.5% of people living at 100 to 149 percent of the poverty line used public transit (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

Social capital connects with income in SM because since it is a low-income neighborhood, the social capital mainly benefits those with low incomes. In Strawberry Mansion this relationship is shown through the financial help the Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation offers to residents, whether it be food vouchers, assistance building a budget, or employment resources. These services not only help those who have the most

financial need but can also have long term positive effects on a person's future. Receiving help saving, finding a job, or easing economic stress, can help build future capital both financially and socially.

The last control variable I am connecting with mobility and social capital is gender. According to ACS data, females consistently made up a bigger percentage of the workforce than males, even during decreases in the total workforce. The type of vehicles males and females used to commute varied with female workers having higher percentages of both car and public transportation use. However male workers almost always had higher levels of car access than females. Between 2011 and 2018 male workers had higher levels of access to a car 6 of those years (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). Female workers also consistently had higher levels of no car access than male workers, with the biggest difference being in 2018 when 25.1% of male workers had no access to a car compared to 38.4% of female workers (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). Given that in 2018 female workers accounted for 57.7% of the workforce while male workers only accounted for 42.3% these numbers indicate that there is a disparity between the way males and females access cars (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

While this indication is frustrating in terms of gender equality, the relationship between gender and social capital in SM is more positive. In Strawberry Mansion four of the five people who serve on the board of the Community Development Corporation are women (SM CDC n.d.). The Blackberry Arts Group and the John Coltrane National Landmark were also founded and led by women. While men still play an important role within the community, these organizations show that women are leaders in building social capital for the good of the neighborhood.

Kensington

Mobility

It is not an exaggeration to say that mobility and transportation overshadow Kensington. The Elevated Train, or El, was completed in 1922 and extended rapid transportation from Northeast Philadelphia to Center City (Philadelphia History Museum n.d.). The track runs over Kensington Avenue, one of the main streets of the neighborhood, and creates a shadow over the street below. In addition to the change in light, the noise and vibration from the train can be heard and felt almost constantly.

However, the El's presence does not ensure that all people have access to transportation or mobility. Using the same ACS data of workers 16 years or older commuting to work between 2011 and 2018 I examined the state of overall mobility. Between 2011 and 2018 the total number of workers increased slightly from 24,505 to 25,185 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The percentage of those who used cars to reach work decreased slightly from 43.1% in 2011 to 42.5% in 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The percentage of workers using public transportation to commute to work remained relatively stable from 43% in 2011 to 42.5% in 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

In Kensington, the El serves as the primary source of public transportation, running trains every 5 to 10 minutes (Septa n.d). El stations are located several blocks apart, with the Allegheny Station at Kensington Ave and Allegheny Ave located in the heart of the neighborhood (Septa n.d). However, 4 bus routes also serve the neighborhood. They are routes 3, 5, 60, and 89 (Septa n.d). The 3 and 60 buses run every 15 minutes, while the 5 bus runs every 30 minutes, and the 89 bus runs every 60 minutes (Septa n.d). Between the El and these buses, riders have greater flexibility in terms of the times they can leave and catch public transportation. Additionally, the El already runs through heavily commuted to spots such as Center City which lessens the need

for riders to make a connection (Septa n.d). As with Strawberry Mansion Kensington has seen increased development due to its proximity to public transit, particularly the El. In Kensington between 501 and 3,500 residential and commercial building permits per square mile were requested from 2010 to 2019 (Septa n.d).

Social Capital

While data from official organizations, such as the ACS captures a snapshot of the lives of people in Kensington, it can only do so much. It fails to record the circumstances of those experiencing homelessness or who have precarious living conditions, as well as the feelings of the residents who see it daily. Since drugs and the opioid epidemic have affected Kensington so greatly, I wanted to make sure the voices of these individuals were accounted for in my thesis. I was interested in what, if any, social capital existed among these groups and how that affected the social capital of the neighborhood.

To do this I analyzed the stories told on the blog *Kensington Blues* run by photographer Jeffery Stockbridge (Stockbridge 2008-2018). Starting in 2008 Stockbridge began to go to Kensington to meet the people who live and come there and get to know their stories (Stockbridge 2008-2018). These include residents of the neighborhood, people with substance abuse disorder, and occasionally people who have recovered from substance abuse. The blog posts consist of three different types of stories: photos, conversations Stockbridge has with an individual, and written journal entries that are then photographed. A post can be any combination of these elements but there is always a photograph. I analyzed and coded approximately fifty posts from the blog looking for common themes. Posts I included in this count were individual's stories, journal entries, and pictures that featured the El. I included these pictures because it illustrates how the El, mobility, and transportation is always constant in the neighborhood.

The Kensington residents Stockbridge speaks to feel frustrated by the high rates of drug use, homelessness, and ongoing issues they can lead to in the neighborhood (Stockbridge 2008-2018). They are worried about their safety and unsure of how to explain the events and environment of the neighborhood to their children (Stockbridge 2008-2018). This frustration has also affected businesses and stores in the area. In July of 2020 business owner Hector Fuentes announced his plan to move his business, 4 Sons Pizza, off Kensington Avenue to another location (Lineman 2020). Fuentes cited moving the pizza shop, which had been located on the avenue for 50 years, over safety concerns (Lineman 2020). At a rally in July of 2020 Fuentes and other business owners and community members discussed their frustration at what they perceive as a lack of action by government officials to address the opioid epidemic in the neighborhood (Lineman 2020).

Even when potential solutions to the epidemic are proposed they often face opposition. In 2018 a huge debate began over whether a supervised safe injection site should be opened in the neighborhood (Allyn and Winberg 2020). The goal of the site is to limit the number of overdoses and the spread of disease, as well as to offer help and resources to the individuals who go there. This proposal received backlash from many Kensington residents who viewed it as an encouragement of substance abuse that would draw more people with substance abuse disorder into the neighborhood. This debate exposes underlying tensions in the neighborhood over how the opioid crisis is being handled. The frustration is understandable as the residents of Kensington must live with the effects of the epidemic every day. Their concerns are valid and deserve to be addressed. However, it ultimately furthers the division between people in the neighborhood, limiting the social capital and cohesion that can be created.

Among those who actively struggling with substance abuse, *Kensington Blues* shows that although everyone has a different story, many face the same issues. Sobriety, going to rehab, and struggling with relapses were a common theme, with fifteen posts detailing experiences with sobriety and then relapses (Stockbridge 2008-2018). However, many also spoke of wanting to go to rehab or not enjoying the lifestyle with thirteen posts detailing previous experiences with rehab (Stockbridge 2008-2018). Barriers to making this happen were the physical dependence of the body on the substance, and the power and hold that both the substance and associated lifestyle had on the person (Stockbridge 2008-2018). The posts sharing these experiences ranged across years, from as early as 2008 to 2018. This indicates that the issues people with substance abuse disorder experience remains constant over time.

It would be inaccurate and an oversimplification to say that increased social capital would be the solution to these problems as the causes of substance abuse and its related issues are complicated, and different for everyone. However, a lack of social capital can make the goal of sobriety harder to achieve. Because of the stigma of substance abuse, very few people who are struggling have access to social networks. In eight posts, people discussed feeling "trapped" "stuck" or "lost" and in nine posts people expressed thoughts of suicide or feeling dead (Stockbridge 2008-2018). The healthiest way to combat these feelings is to seek help, and for many people, the first step to achieving this is by making a personal connection in the recovery community. However, once people have achieved sobriety, they can still have trouble accessing mainstream social capital. In five posts, people discussed having trouble getting or keeping a job (Stockbridge 2008-2018). Part of this issue is because many of the people who are trying to get jobs have previous criminal records which limit the types of jobs, they can have. This increases

the barriers for people who are trying to maintain their sobriety and get work through means that are considered legitimate by mainstream society.

Fortunately, multiple recovery houses in Kensington offer guidance and help to those struggling. The two that are the most widely known are Last Stop Recovery House and First Stop Recovery House (Stockbridge 2008-2018). Both houses are operated by people who are in recovery from substance abuse disorders themselves and can offer the knowledge and experience that comes with long term sobriety. These sites provide an opportunity to build the community and social connections helpful to recovery. The importance of this is illustrated in nine posts in which people discuss how having a sense of community was helpful in recovery (Stockbridge 2008-2018). Frequently people come back to work or volunteer at the houses even after their stay has ended, thus helping to provide further employment and structure.

Unfortunately, both First Stop and Last Stop are currently struggling to find the funding they need to stay open. First Stop Recovery which was formed as an outgrowth of Last Stop, is a relatively new organization and relies on rent from residents and donations to keep operating (Bond Harris, 2018). It does not receive any government funding as it does not distribute any rehabilitation-based substances such as methadone or suboxone (Bond Harris, 2018). The use of these drugs in recovery is debated, but by choosing not to use them First Stop must forego that source of funding. Instead, The First Stop follows a more traditional method of the 12 steps, encouraging individuals to find jobs, and helping them take care of any legal troubles they may face (Bond Harris 2018). They believe that this approach will foster long term sobriety and help individuals reenter mainstream society.

While Last Stop was established almost twenty years ago, has seen hundreds of individuals through recovery, and is well known within recovery circles, it is also facing financial difficulties

(Winberg 2019, a). Like First Stop, Last Stop does not use methadone or suboxone as part of its treatment and thus does not receive government funding. However, unlike First Stop, Last Stop does not charge residents rent and relies entirely on donations and grants for funding (The Why 2019). Part of the reason for this is that Last Stop is not legally zoned to house residents. Officially Last Stop functions as a clubhouse for recovery meetings, community building, and a place to get a hot meal. Unofficially it does offer people a place to stay if needed especially for those early in their recovery. This bending of the rules recently caused trouble as the recovery house received almost two million dollars in fines from the city in January of 2019 over zoning laws (Winberg 2019, a). The city cited overcrowding and unlawful residential use as the reason for the fines (Winberg 2019, a). These charges pushed Last Stop to officially register as a non-profit with a board of trustees something that had been overlooked until that point. Despite this new registration, The Last Stop still faces the challenge of paying the fees which places the organization at risk (Winberg 2019, b). These legal issues illustrate the larger challenges organizations face to be considered official and gain access to social capital.

In addition to these individual issues, First Stop and Last Stop also must contend with changes in the neighborhood. It may seem counterintuitive that an area that is facing poverty, homelessness, and addiction on the level that Kensington is, would be gentrifying at the same time. However, the southern part of the neighborhood experiencing the new construction, housing, restaurants, and shops indicative of gentrification (Hoffman 2019). This has caused an increase in property taxes making living and staying in the neighborhood more expensive for residents and operations like First Stop and Last Stop. In 2018 Last Stop had to move from the location they had been at for seventeen years to a new building farther north in the neighborhood (Winberg 2018). The old building was sold for $200,000 to a developer who remodeled it into an

apartment building (Winberg 2018). While the move will ensure that Last Stop can continue operation, leaving the old building came with a sense of loss for the many who found recovery and community there. The most prominent physical example of this was a brick wall on which every person who reached a year of sobriety signed their name (Winberg 2018). Considered a rite of passage it was a reminder to each person of the progress they had made and the bigger community they were part of through Last Stop. The wall was painted over when Last Stop moved locations (Winberg 2018).

Control Variables

As with Strawberry Mansion, Kensington also experiences a network of relationships between mobility, social capital, and control variables. Using the same ACS data and timeframe of 2011-2018 I looked at the racial, economic, and gender makeup of Kensington.

The total population for Kensington decreased from its peak of 67,104 in 2011 to 65,247 in 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The population is majority Black, but the Black population has fallen slightly over the last several years from 85.5% in 2011 to 79.8% in 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The white, Latino, Asian and Indigenous communities all saw increases with the biggest increases among the white population which grew by 2.7% between 2011 and 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). Additionally, Kensington has a small but growing population of people who identify as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander with 0 individuals counted in 2011 to 46 individuals in 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). As with Strawberry Mansion, the percentage of females was consistently higher than males.

It is worth examining how these racial demographics intersect with mobility and social capital. The public transit use of the different racial groups correlated with their percentage of the population indicating that no racial group is disproportionately dependent on public transit. The relationship between race and social capital is more complicated. While the neighborhood is

majority Black and Latino, many people struggling with substance abuse are white. The people who run and attend the recovery houses in the neighborhood are also mostly white. While drug addiction can affect anyone, the way people are treated, and the access they have to resources can vary based on race. Data on the racial demographics of the people that First Stop and Last Stop serve is not available, so it is unknown if any racial discrimination is taking place. However, the fact that mainly Black and Brown people live in a neighborhood struggling with the opioid epidemic is telling as to what conditions certain groups must contend with.

Next, there is the relationship between income, mobility, and social capital. The median income of residents increased every year between 2011 and 2018 except for 2015. For reasons unknown, income, and the number of jobs decreased in 2015 while the level of poverty increased. This was the only year where all three of these economic indicators grew worse. I have not been able to find causes for why this is. However, by 2018 the median income was at $22,345 and had increased a total of $3,345 from 2011 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). Despite this increase, the total percentage of individuals living under the poverty line increased between 2011 and 2018 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). The lowest percentage was in 2014 at 28.90% while the highest was in 2015 at 31.50% (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). By 2018 the percentage was at 30.6% (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

The economic difference between car users and public transportation users was not as dramatic as it was in SM, but still present. In 2011 the median income of people who drove to work was $34,336 while the income for those who used public transit was $24,759 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). By 2018 this difference had decreased with the income of car users falling to $31,889 and the income of public transit users rising to $28,054 (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). In 2018 15.9% of people living below 100 percent of the poverty line used public transit

to reach work, and 7.6% of people living between 100 and 149 percent of the poverty line used public transit (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

Economically the role of social capital provided through recovery houses plays a crucial role in the process of sobriety. Often the people who are going to these locations for recovery are homeless or in precarious living situations, with little to no income. Depending on how long they have been in this situation, they frequently do not have the most basic forms of registration that allow a person to build capital such as bank accounts or identification. By helping people through recovery and working out legal and financial matters, these organizations allow building capital in a way that is official and legally recognized.

Finally, there are connections between gender, mobility, and social capital. Female workers always made up a greater percentage of the workforce, but male workers consistently used cars to reach work at higher percentages than female workers. The largest difference was in 2013 when 44.1% of male workers used cars to get to work compared with only 38.1% of female workers (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018). This data is further supported by the fact that between 2011 and 2018 female workers had higher levels of no car access than male workers (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2018).

Social capital and recovery houses are also important when it comes to gender. First Stop and Last Stop were both founded by men, but women work as volunteers and employees within the houses to help run the day-to-day operations and assist residents. However, there are other gender aspects beyond leadership. In Kensington women experiencing homelessness or substance abuse disorder face choices and challenges specific to their gender. In the fifty posts I coded from *Kensington Blues*, twenty-one discussed sex work, all of which was conducted by women (Stockbridge 2008-2018). While it was these women’s choice to partake in sex work,

many of them discussed the inherent danger and uncertainty of the work. This is supported by eight posts in which women discussed physical or sexual violence they had experienced while homeless or engaged in sex work (Stockbridge 2008-2018). The physical, emotional, and psychological effects of this abuse cannot be fixed by social capital alone. However, by providing safety, shelter, and community these organizations can help give the stability needed for healing.

Theory

This chapter examines the relationship between mobility justice, social capital, and the case study in greater depth to answer my research question. I will examine how various economic, policy, geographical, and social forces work together to form the relationship between mobility and social capital and ensure they work together as part of the larger capitalist system. I will use examples from the case study of Strawberry Mansion and Kensington as further support of how this theory is intertwined with and impacts the real world.

To understand how mobility justice and social capital are affected by the different economic, policy, geographical, and social forces it must first be understood what larger system they all exist and work in. The United States functions within a capitalist economic system. Many scholars have tried to define and explain how capitalism works, and the larger effects it has on the world around it. These definitions can vary greatly depending on the background, experience, and outlook of the writer. In keeping with the use of Lefebvre's theoretical ideas, I am using his definition of capitalism. While a philosopher like Lefebvre may give a different definition than an economist, it will maintain the theoretical foundation of this thesis as well as consider mobility and space.

Lefebvre defines capitalism as an economic system that allows for the creation of capital, or money, through the manufacturing, buying, and selling of material products, land, labor, and commodities. (Lefebvre 1974, 8-11). One reason capitalism is difficult to define is that capital can come from many different sources and the people who decide how these sources are used to make capital are varied as well from banks, government agencies, individuals, and multinational corporations (Lefebvre 1974, 10). Together these elements of capital sources and actors create

the system of capitalism (Lefebvre 1974, 10). As Lefebvre posits the system of capitalism works to create a dominance or hegemony in the way it rules over the middle and working-class through culture, knowledge, policies, and political leaders (Lefebvre 1974, 10-11). While many theorists view this dominance as complete and unchangeable, Lefebvre views capitalism as a vulnerable system and it is due to this vulnerability that it must rely on violence to stay in power (Lefebvre 1974, 11).

At first, it may be difficult to understand how this conceptual definition of capitalism relates to mobility and social capital. However, examining the categories of economics, policy, geography, and society will show how they work individually and together to further capitalism. Using examples and drawing inferences from the Strawberry Mansion and Kensington case study will also help establish how these theoretical issues translate to real life.

In many ways, money and economic wealth are the entry point for mobility. With wealth comes the ability to purchase the technology that powers mobility ranging from cars to private planes. While private planes are only an option for the wealthiest of people, having a reliable form of transportation through a car is less common than it may seem. Although many Americans have a car, car ownership does not ensure reliable mobility. Cars are expensive to buy or lease, and have recurring costs for insurance, gas, and maintenance. Many people can afford a car but cannot afford to repair it, making their mobility insecure. In 2018 car debt was at its highest point ever in the United States at 1.26 trillion dollars, marking a 75 percent increase between 2009 and 2018 (Higashide 2019, introduction). Due to the problems with public transportation systems in the United States, people who are without a functioning car cannot necessarily rely on public transportation to regain their mobility security.

Economics and money also serve as an entry point for social capital. Many organizations, like unions or clubs, have mandatory fees that must be paid upon admittance and then each subsequent year. For people with low incomes, the fees may make these groups and the potential social capital they offer, inaccessible. Furthermore, the amount of time people with low incomes have to devote to organizations outside of work is often limited compared to people with higher incomes who have more leisure time. People with low incomes also have fewer opportunities to establish connections with people and groups that offer the amount and type of social capital as the wealthy (Portes and Vickstorm 2015, 47-50). In SM and Kensington income shapes the way residents are mobile, as evidenced by the average income gap between people who commute to work by car versus public transportation. It also shapes social capital by determining the needs of residents.

Policy has a large impact on mobility and social capital, and the way different people can access it. This ranges from infrastructure that limits mobility to unspoken rules about who can join certain organizations. It is important to note that just because certain groups have been excluded from white networks and spaces, does not mean they are without important places and social capital. Even in the face of discrimination, people have always managed to form meaningful networks that provide their own benefits and power. The debate around whether it is better for these groups to build their own capital rather than to be included in white forms of capital is continuous, and it is not my intention to reduce the importance of these networks and gathering places. However, mainstream economic and power benefits that can be gained from social capital are still frequently produced by white groups meaning that minority groups may not have access to that social capital and its benefits.

The legacies of policy and how they affect mobility and social capital can be seen in Strawberry Mansion and Kensington. As discussed in previous sections it was the result of specific government housing policies that caused white populations in the 1950s and 60s to move to the suburbs. Once this occurred it was further government policies that chose not to fund and invest in urban areas, causing many of the financial and mobility issues these neighborhoods are still struggling with.

Why urban areas were not invested in after suburbanization and deindustrialization in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s is worth deeper consideration (Mallach 2018, chap. 1). Deindustrialization happened because companies found they could maximize profit and capital by moving factories and manufacturing out of cities and into rural areas and overseas (Elesh, n.d.). This is what caused previously industrial neighborhoods like Kensington to fall into poverty, which has led to long-term mobility, social capital, and public health issues. In the name of making a profit these companies caused cities to lose a large percentage of productivity. Factory workers may have lost their income, but they also stopped making money for the city through the production of goods. In a capitalist system that values spaces by the amount of capital they can produce, part of the motivation to not fund cities anymore may have been their decrease in the ability to make money.

The implications geography has on mobility may seem obvious. The geography of a city and where someone is in it can determine how far they must travel for work, or leisure, and thus how much time and money they spend on a commute. However, the impacts it has on social capital are equally important. Geographical separations between high- and low-income neighborhoods or the city and the suburbs also lead to separations in social capital. By making it geographically difficult to access certain areas it becomes difficult to access the social capital

they contain. This is illustrated in a story of two women who were on a bus and discussing possible improvements to the bus system with the driver (Higashide 2019, introduction). When the driver suggested they attend an evening meeting at city hall to discuss these ideas with city leaders, the women said they could not because it ended after the buses stopped running and they would have no way of getting home (Higashide 2019, introduction).

Additionally, geography comes with a certain sense of territory and familiarity. People who have grown up in the same neighborhood have similar experiences and references, a built-in connection. This becomes a problem when considering neighborhood segregation both racially and economically. If a person of color or someone who grew up with a low income is trying to form a connection with someone who is white or wealthy, they are put at a disadvantage by not having that commonality. A lack of mobility worsens this by making an area geographically isolated. This can be seen in Kensington where people with substance abuse disorder are mentally and geographically isolated within the neighborhood causing them to feel trapped.

This idea of commonality continues to be important as it relates to the social aspects of mobility and social capital. The issues described above like racism, are inherently social. White people reacting with fear and violence to a person of color is a reaction that is socially conditioned. This is taught socially through depictions of people of color, particularly Black men as violent and scary. This affects the mobility of people of color by limiting their options of safe ways to move without being viewed as a threat. In terms of social capital, it is difficult for people to make a connection if they do not feel wanted or do not see anyone that looks like them or shares their experiences. In these situations, many individuals do not feel that a potential connection is worth the effort or the continual ostracization of being the only person of color. Because of this social isolation and judgment, any potential capital that could be created is lost.

The role of racism as a social concept also has a role in capitalism. During the time policy decisions were being made to defund urban areas, the racial makeup of cities was changing. Philadelphia and other Northern cities saw an increase in Black populations during The Great Migration of the 1920s and 30s. However, the effects of suburbanization and white flight in the 1950s caused the Black population and other racial minorities to make up a larger percentage of cities. It was with this new urban demographic that policy funding, and thus capitalism chose not to support cities, a decision which impacts continue today. A discussion on whether capitalism is an inherently white supremacist system is beyond the scope of this thesis, but the definitions, and examples of capitalism in this chapter illustrate that it is a system that supports what it views as valuable. Not supporting Black and Brown spaces, and the systems they rely on such as public transportation would suggest that capitalism does not find them valuable.

Together these four categories act as a system to deny minority groups access to both mobility and social capital. For someone who is not able to afford a car because they do not have the money, the best option for them is to get a higher paying job. But they cannot reach that job because it is in the suburbs and not accessible by public transportation. And even if they do finally get access to a car, they may not feel safe driving it if they are Black. Whenever there is a way to work around one barrier, another barrier is in place. This is no accident; it is put into place officially and unofficially by a capitalist system. Social capital could potentially offer an alternative by gaining capital through social connections, but the same barriers that prevent mobility are in place for social capital only they take the form of fees, unspoken rules, and privileged connections. Thus, the theoretical relationship between mobility and social capital is formed. Understanding this theoretical relationship gives meaning to how the connection between mobility, social capital, and the control variables in the case study form a network of

relationships. Race, income, and gender do not exist in isolation; they are all affected by capitalism and its forces, and thus also affect each other.

There is a real-world example that illustrates the relationship between mobility and social capital as well as connecting it to larger issues of policy, economy, society, geography, and capitalism. This occurrence is gentrification. Gentrification has been briefly defined and mentioned as an issue within transit-oriented development, Strawberry Mansion, and Kensington. Given the ties, it has to the literature, case study, and theory, I am discussing it in greater depth now so that the full complexities of its connections may be understood.

The term gentrification was first coined in 1964 by British sociologist Ruth Glass (Moskowitz 2018, chap. 2). Glass called it gentrification as she observed it was a phenomenon of the upper class or gentry moving into traditionally middle class and lower-class neighborhoods (Moskowitz 2018, chap. 2). Gentrification has been experienced in many other parts of the world since Glass first defined it, but the definition has remained largely the same: it is the event of upper-middle or upper-class people moving into areas that are middle or lower class (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2).

Since its identification in the 1960s, the understanding that gentrification is a process with specific steps has grown. The beginning of this process involves a few “pioneer” individuals who move to a neighborhood and buy and renovate houses (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). As the process continues, development companies and corporations become involved. They invest money into the neighborhood through the demolition and construction of buildings to attract new residents and make a profit on their ventures (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). This is a key component to gentrification called the rent gap (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). It is when

developers consider the amount of money, they must invest in land versus the amount of rent they can eventually charge when the area gentrifies (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2).

This calculation is important because the cheaper the land is, the more motivation developers have to buy it and eventually make a profit from it (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). This means that the worse the condition of a neighborhood, the more likely it is that developers will buy the land. When a few groups of middle-class individuals move in they will already own land to develop, and thus ensure that gentrification continues. Eventually, rent, taxes, and overall cost of living will rise, forcing out the residents who lived there and changing the culture of the neighborhood to market it to the new, wealthier residents (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2). Frequently individuals are blamed for gentrification, but this process shows that the real gentrification is due to developers, as they have the power and money needed to change a neighborhood (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 2).

Being forced to leave a home, neighborhood, and community due to gentrification is mobility injustice. This is the reality that Strawberry Mansion and Kensington residents are facing. Residents of these neighborhoods already know they cannot afford the increased costs associated with gentrification (Fairmount Park Conservancy n.d.). Rather than leaving by choice people are being forced out and disenfranchised due to capitalism. This is what differentiates gentrification from the neighborhood changes described in the history of Philadelphia. In those cases, neighborhood pushback and cultural changes happened because of individual decisions, not corporate developers.

While these economic forces are the main driver behind gentrification, it is worth considering the role of geographic factors. As discussed in the mobility section of the case study

chapter, both SM and Kensington are centrally located near Septa public transportation routes and have experienced an increase in residential and commercial building permits in the hundreds and thousands over the last 10 years (Septa n.d.). While Septa proudly displays this information as an indicator of economic development, these numbers hide the darker truth of gentrification. Transit-related gentrification is easy to propose theoretically, but it is harder to practically prove. Although Septa is not the only cause for gentrification in these neighborhoods it could be a contributing factor. It is important to note that resistance to gentrification does not mean that the residents of SM and Kensington do not deserve the increased safety or other social benefits that can come with gentrification. Everyone deserves to live in a neighborhood that is safe, clean, and accessible. The problem with gentrification is that improvements are happening for the new, mainly white, higher-income residents and not the mostly low-income residents that have lived there for decades.

Philadelphia is far from alone in experiencing gentrification. Cities around the country such as New Orleans, Detroit, and New York are all undergoing the same process (Moskowitz 2019, preface). With this comes the formation of groups and efforts by residents to stay in their neighborhoods (Moskowitz 2019, preface). So, what can Strawberry Mansion and Kensington do to fight the gentrification happening in their neighborhood?

The good news is that in SM it is already happening through social capital. While none of the community groups studied specifically work against gentrification, the work they are doing will help residents and the community be more resilient to it. For instance, the Strawberry Mansion CDC helps people buy homes, and strengthen their financial wellbeing through budgeting and saving. This means that residents will be more likely to weather increasing costs as they own their home and do not have to worry about rent. For those who still rent, the CDC

can provide them with the skills and resources to deal with increasing costs. Even the community organizations that are not financially based like Blackberry Arts Group and the John Coltrane National Landmark play a role in fighting gentrification. These groups help bring people together and strengthen community bonds, pride, and social cohesion. Because of this, residents may see the value of living in SM and be more invested and motivated to fight gentrification.

While these organizations alone cannot stop gentrification or ensure that residents will be able to stay in the long term, their services offer hope and a method of resistance. It is through the social capital they create that residents have a better chance of remaining in their neighborhoods, and thus gain mobility justice by not being forced out. It is within this context that the real-world relationship between social capital and mobility justice is established.

This relationship between social capital and mobility justice through gentrification also applies to Kensington. While Strawberry Mansion is experiencing social cohesion through community organizations, Kensington is suffering from a lack of social cohesion due to tensions over the opioid epidemic. This is understandable. When tackling such a complicated and sensitive issue, tensions are naturally going to arise. However, the disagreement is preventing the community from moving forward and working towards solutions that will ultimately help everyone. It also means that the residents there do not have the sense of community or investment needed to work against gentrification.

This lack of community social capital and action could also cause a loss of social capital within the recovery community. Last Stop has already had to move locations due to the increasing costs associated with gentrification. If these organizations, which are struggling financially, are forced to move the social capital they create in the neighborhood will be lost.

This means that people with substance abuse disorder who could find mobility, both personally and within society, through First Stop and Last Stop, will not have it as a resource. This is the form the social capital and mobility justice relationship takes in Kensington: the lack of social cohesion leads to enforced mobility, which then causes the further loss of social capital and mobility within the sub-community. The irony of this is that with the potential loss of recovery organizations in the neighborhood, the opioid epidemic will only grow worse, leading to more community tension than before.

It is reasonable to ask: if gentrification stands to strip cities of so much why do the local governments allow it to happen? Why do they not pass a policy that would limit the amount of land or number of buildings real estate corporations can develop? The answer is that in many cities, Philadelphia included, local governments have become dependent on the income from real estate corporations, other businesses, and development they bring with them through gentrification (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 1). As federal funding for social services has decreased the reliance on money from other sources like corporations has increased (Moskowitz 2019, chap. 1). This makes it difficult to motivate policy changes that may slow or stop gentrification.

Conclusion

The literature review, case study, and theory of this thesis work together to show how historical policies and infrastructure decisions have driven the income, demographics, and mobility, and social capital of urban areas. The complicated relationships between mobility, social capital, and variables like race, income, and gender are illustrated in the case study of Strawberry Mansion and Kensington. In considering how these conditions and variables exist within a larger capitalist system the link between history, policy, and the real-world case study becomes clear.

It is was in the name of profit, that suburbanization and deindustrialization occurred leaving cities and their residents to struggle for access to services, transportation, and capital. Now it is those same neighborhoods that are being disenfranchised again due to gentrification. Given this history and current challenges, it is a testament to the resilience of communities like Strawberry Mansion that they can create the social capital needed to resist gentrification. Even in Kensington where social capital is more complicated, residents have found ways to build community and capital while recovering from substance abuse disorder.

Despite social capital helping to improve mobility justice, it is not going to stop gentrification. Larger community and national actions are needed to stop the forced mobility of gentrification. There must be a shift in urban funding and the dependence of cities on the income from gentrification. This is what is called for in movements like Critical Environmental Justice's pillar of activist anarchism. It calls for a recognition of how capitalism makes a system that devalues people and the environment over profit, and for purposeful action that works to dismantle this system. As Lefebvre posited capitalism is dominant not because it is immortal but because it is vulnerable (Lefebvre 1974, 10-11).

This process of system-wide change will take time, effort, and organized activism. Activists have been fighting against the forces of capitalism for decades and will most likely continue to fight for decades more. However, this systematic shift can happen on a micro-scale by working to fight against the displacement of gentrification. Starting a conversation about how capitalism has influenced mobility and promoting the relationship between mobility justice and social capital could help make these ideas more accessible to the public. Non-academics may not have use for the theoretical relationship, but gentrification is a reality affecting thousands of people. Understanding how social capital could realistically be used as a method for combating gentrification could help motivate others to make a change. What follows below are policy recommendations that Philadelphia could take to promote mobility justice and social capital and challenges faced in implementing them.

Promoting policy and action that increases mobility and social capital in Strawberry Mansion, Kensington, and the whole of Philadelphia is going to take time, a variety of methods, and resources. In 2020 this is particularly difficult because in addition to ongoing safety and financial concerns there are new challenges caused by the 2019-2020 COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic is still ongoing at the time of writing this, but its effects on people, mobility, and social capital are undeniable. Residents of Pennsylvania have been urged to stay at home and avoid public spaces, decreasing the opportunity to form and build social capital. In terms of mobility, Septa ridership and income have dropped drastically. Between March and June alone Septa saw a 92% decrease in bus, trolley, and subway ridership and a 98% drop in regional rail ridership (Madej 2020). This has resulted in a $124 million loss in revenue between March and June of 2020 (Madej 2020). These losses along with a potential loss in state funding could result in a permanent decrease in transportation and mobility in the city.

At first, it may seem that these cuts could help slow the process of gentrification that has taken place in some neighborhoods. However, now that the gentrification process has started it is unlikely to stop, regardless of what happens with Septa. Budget cuts would just reduce the transportation options and mobility of people who depend on it. Instead, Septa needs to address its culpability and role in the gentrification of the city. Next, they need to work to ensure that neighborhoods like SM and Kensington will continue to be served by public transportation, while also helping to combat gentrification. By working with organizations such as the Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation that assist low-income residents, Septa could help give them a better chance of being able to stay in their communities and together potentially find methods to increase mobility.

Another big policy action needs to address the state of the community and social capital in Kensington. Currently, the community is lacking cohesion due to disagreement over how to best handle the opioid crisis. One method for how to build empathy and commonality could be to host events that can bring together residents and people who have experienced substance abuse disorder. This would be a good opportunity for Last Stop or First Stop to step in and build social capital. It would give people in recovery a chance to listen to the concerns of residents, and residents to build empathy for people in recovery. Given the severity of these differences, and the amount of time they have existed, one session between groups is not going to heal the tensions. It will take a long time and be a slow process. However, it is in the best interest of everyone to work on building social capital and cohesion.

Finally, some type of policy must be put in place will protect land and control the amount of rent that developers can charge (Moskowitz 2019, conclusion). This will practically limit the amount of land they can buy and the amount of profit they can make from it. Furthermore, by

investing in social services and programs which help individuals and low-income communities, neighborhoods would never get to the point where the land is profitable enough to buy (Moskowitz 2019, conclusion). While policy suggestions such as this may seem idealistic, they are possible with enough time and effort. This is work well invested if it means bringing justice to those who have been denied it for so long.

As with all projects, this thesis was challenged with certain limitations. The biggest two I experienced were time and the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to these factors, I was not able to conduct individual interviews or visit the neighborhoods of my case study. The pandemic also limited the way I was able to conduct my historical research as libraries and historical societies were closed as I was doing research. It is because of these limitations that my historical and case study research is based on publicly accessible sources and not personal interviews.

The benefit of these limitations is that it provides numerous opportunities and methods for future research. In the future researching individual's mobility and social capital could shine new light on how they function and their relationship with other variables. It could also strengthen the evidence of the relationship between mobility justice and social capital. Other possible paths for future research include using additional or different control variables, and research into mobility and social capital's relationship in other locations. Strawberry Mansion and Kensington have similar demographics, but would the mobility and social capital relationship be in two neighborhoods with different demographics? This thesis is researched and presented as a case study to encourage others to study the relationship between mobility and social capital in their cities or areas. If more research can be conducted into the field of mobility and social capital, then it can help provide insight as to how these variables are connected and

part of a larger system that spans across physical space. Additional research could also help provide local and national solutions on how to improve mobility and social capital access.

This future research would help advance the knowledge of the mobility justice and social capital relationship. This is important because as the United States and the world experience the effects of climate change, creative solutions and ideas will be needed. The mobility justice and social capital relationship represent one of these possible solutions. However, it is far from the only one. By supporting academic and activist communities, more solutions and opportunities can be created. This could help ensure a more just future for those who have long been denied justice.

References

American Planning Association. N.d. “Fairmount Park: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.” Accessed December 2, 2020. https://www.planning.org/greatplaces/spaces/2016/fairmountpark/

Amsterdam, Daniel, and Domenic Vitiello. N.d. “Immigration (1930-Present).” The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia. Accessed December 1, 2020. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/immigration-1930-present/

Alexander, Michelle. 2018. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press. Amazon E-Book.

Allyn, Bobby, and Michaela Winberg. “Philadelphia Nonprofit Opening Nation's 1st Supervised Injection Site Next Week.” NPR, February 26, 2020. https://www.npr.org/2020/02/26/809608489/philadelphia-nonprofit-opening-nations-first-supervised-injection-site-next-week

Appleyard, Donald, M. Sue Gerson, and Mark Lintell. 1981. *Livable Streets*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Association for Public Art. n.d. “A Quest for Parity: The Octavius V. Catto Memorial” Accessed November 20, 2020. https://www.associationforpublicart.org/artwork/catto-memorial.html

Bauman, John F. 2014. “ Row Housing as Public Housing: The Philadelphia Story, 1957-2013.” The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 138, no. 4 (October): 425-456. JSTOR.

Bond Harris, Courtenay. Photographs by Jeffery Stockbridge. 2018. “ Finding a Way into Recovery at The First Stop.” *Kensington Blues* (blog), January 5, 2018. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/the-first-stop/

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by John Richardson, 241-58. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. PDF.

Bowen-Gaddy, Evan. 2018. "3 maps that explain gentrification in Philadelphia." *WHYY*, March 14, 2018. https://whyy.org/articles/3-maps-explain-gentrification-philadelphia/.

Britton, McKenna. N.d. "1970: Census Reports on Puerto Rican Demographics in Philly." Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Accessed December 2, 2020. https://omeka.hsp.org/s/puertoricanphillyexperience/page/1970-census

Carpiano, Richard M. 2005. "Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health: Can Bourdieu and sociology help?" *Social Science and Medicine* 62, no. 1 (January): 165-175. https://doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.05.020

Casper, Amanda. 2013. "Row Houses." The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/row-houses/

Cervero, Robert, Erick Guerra, and Stefan Al. 2017. *Beyond Mobility: Planning Cities for People and Places*. Washington, DC: Island Press. EBSCOhost.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94, no. 1 (January): 95-120. JSTOR.

Currie, Graham and Janet Stanley. 2008. "Investigating Links between Social Capital and Public Transport." *Transport Reviews* 28, no. 4 (July): 529–547. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/01441640701817197.

Dawkins, Casey and Rolf Moeckel. 2014. "Transit-Induced Gentrification: Who Will Stay, and Who Will Go?" Paper Presented at Transit, Transit Oriented Development, and Urban Form: A Bi-National Symposium, Featuring Paris, France, and Washington, DC, October 18, 2014. https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/21508/tod_gentrification_v3.pdf?sequence=1

DeFilippis, James. 2001. "The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development." *Housing Policy Debate* 12, no. 4 (March): 781-806. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2001.9521429

Denton, Stacy. 2014. "The Rural Past-in-Present and Postwar Sub/urban Progress." *American Studies* 53, no. 2: 119-140. https://doi.org/10.1353/ams.2014.0090

Elesh, David. N.d. "Deindustrialization." The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia. Accessed December 1, 2020. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/deindustrialization/

Elliott, Joseph E.B., Nathaniel Popkin and Peter Woodall. 2017. *Philadelphia: Finding the Hidden City*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Errico, Olivia. N.d. "1975: White Neighbors Firebomb the Santiago Family Home." Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Accessed December 2, 2020. https://omeka.hsp.org/s/puertoricanphillyexperience/page/santiago-firebombing

Fairmount Park Conservancy. N.d. "Strawberry Mansion Short Films" Accessed December 2, 2020. https://myphillypark.org/what-we-do/arts-culture/strawberry-mansion/

Finkel, Ken. 2016. "Roots of Hypersegregation in Philadelphia, 1920-1930." The Philly History Blog (blog). February 22, 2016. https://blog.phillyhistory.org/index.php/2016/02/roots-of-hypersegregation-in-philadelphia-1920-1930/

Francis, Lee. N.d. "Indigenous Peoples of Philadelphia." American Library Association. Accessed December 3, 2020. http://www.ala.org/aboutala/offices/diversity/philadelphia-indigenous

Frey, William H. 1979. "Central City White Flight: Racial and Nonracial Causes" *American Sociological Review* 44, no. 3 (June): 425-448. JSTOR.

Gillette, Howard Jr. and Domenic Vitiello. N.d. "Community Development." The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia. Accessed December 1, 2020. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/community-development/

Gillette, Howard Jr. and Domenic Vitiello. N.d. "Community Development Corporations (CDCs)." The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia. Accessed December 1, 2020. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/community-development-corporations-cdcs/

Goodin-Smith, Oona. 2020. "Philadelphia jazz great John Coltrane's house 'at risk,' preservationists say." Philadelphia Inquirer (Philadelphia), February 8, 2020. https://fusion.inquirer.com/news/coltrane-john-historic-house-preservation-philadelphia-jazz-20200208.html

Gutierrez, Flor Jazmin. N.d. "2000: Philadelphia Has 3rd Largest Puerto Rican Population on U.S. Mainland." Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Accessed December 2, 2020. https://omeka.hsp.org/s/puertoricanphillyexperience/page/3rd-largest-population

Higashide, Stephen. 2019. *Better Buses, Better Cities: How to Plan, Run, and Win the Fight for Effective Transit*. Washington, D.C: Island Press. Amazon E-Book

Historic Strawberry Mansion. "Timeline." Accessed December 2, 2020. http://www.historicstrawberrymansion.org/timeline/

Historical Society of Pennsylvania. N.d. " Contradictions of Freedom in a New Nation." Accessed December 2, 2020. http://digitalhistory.hsp.org/pafrm/doc/constitution-pennsylvania-society-promoting-abolition-slaveryacts-general-assembly

Historical Society of Pennsylvania. N.d. "Memorial Against Non-English Immigration, December 1727." Accessed December 2, 2020. https://hsp.org/memorial-against-non-english-immigration-december-1727

Historical Society of Pennsylvania. N.d. "Pennsylvania Pluralism? Citizenship, Immigrations, and Ethnicity in the Keystone State." Accessed December 2, 2020. https://hsp.org/history-online/exhibits/pennsylvania-pluralism-citizenship-immigrations-and-ethnicity-keystone-state

Historical Society of Pennsylvania. N.d. “Riot in Philadelphia.” Accessed December 2, 2020. https://hsp.org/riot-philadelphia

Historical Society of Pennsylvania. 2019. “Vitality Of Immigration Lives On In The Italian Market.” Hidden City, January 22, 2019. https://hiddencityphila.org/2019/01/vitality-of-immigration-lives-on-in-the-italian-market/

Hoffman, Zuri. 2019. “Kensington: One Neighborhood, Two Worlds.” Philadelphia Neighborhoods, January 21, 2019. https://philadelphianeighborhoods.com/2019/01/21/kensington-one-neighborhood-two-worlds/

Kaier, Charlie. 2013. “The John Coltrane House.” Whyy. July 19, 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=POMqFL9f1z0

Lassiter, Matthew D. and Kevin M. Kruse. 2009. "The Bulldozer Revolution: Suburbs and Southern History since World War II." *The Journal of Southern History* 75, no. 3 (2009): 691-706.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1974. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.

Lewis, Michael T. 2006 “The First Design for Fairmount Park.” The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 130, no. 3 (July): 283-297. JSTOR.

Lineman, Tom. 2020. “Four Sons Pizzeria is Moving from Kensington Avenue; Cites Dangerous Environment.” Juniata News, July 31, 2020. https://juniatanewsphilly.com/2020/07/31/four-sons-pizzeria-is-moving-from-kensington-avenue-cites-dangerous-environment/

Litman, Todd. 2019. *Evaluating Transportation Land Use Impacts: Considering the Impacts, Benefits and Costs of Different Land Use Development Patterns*. Victoria: Victoria Transport Policy Institute. https://www.vtpi.org/landuse.pdf

Lubrano, Alfred. 2018. “How Kensington Got To Be The Center Of Philly’s Opioid Crisis.” Philadelphia Inquirer (Philadelphia), January 23, 2018. https://www.inquirer.com/philly/news/kensington-opioid-crisis-history-philly-heroin-20180123.html

Ludlum Steward, Mabel. 1931. “The Story of Strawberry Mansion.” Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Museum 26, no. 142 (May): 2-14. JSTOR

Madej, Patricia. 2020. "Septa Shows Dire Map of Reductions." *Philadelphia Inquirer* [Philadelphia], 19 Aug. 2020.

Mallach, Alan. 2018. *The Divided City: Poverty and Prosperity in Urban America*. Washington, D.C: Island Press. Amazon E-Book.

McShane, Clay. 1994. *Down the Asphalt Path*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Moskowitz, P.E. 2018. *How to Kill a City: Gentrification, Inequality, and the Fight for the Neighborhood*. New York: Bold Type Books. Amazon E-Book.

Newman, Peter and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy. 2015. *The End of Automobile Dependence: How Cities are Moving Beyond Car-Based Planning*. Washington, DC: Island Press. EBSCOhost.

Newman, Andrew. n.d. "Treaty of Shackamaxon." *The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia*. Accessed November 21, 2020. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/treaty-of-shackamaxon-2/juuj

The Philadelphia Citizen. n.d. "Caroline LeCount." Accessed November 20, 2020. https://thephiladelphiacitizen.org/caroline-lecount-biography/.

The Philadelphia Citizen. n.d. "Octavius Catto." Accessed November 22, 2020. thephiladelphiacitizen.org/octavius-catto/.

Pellow, David N. 2004. "The Politics of Illegal Dumping: An Environmental Justice Framework." *Qualitative Sociology* 27 no. 4, (Winter): 511-525. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:QUAS.0000049245.55208.4b

Pellow, David Naguib, and Robert J. Brulle. 2005. "Power, Justice, and the Environment: Toward Critical Environmental Justice Studies." In *Power, Justice, and the Environment: A Critical Appraisal of the Environmental Justice Movement*, edited by Pellow and Brulle, 1-19. Cambridge, MA: MIT

Pellow, David N. 2016. "Toward a Critical Environmental Justice Studies: Black Lives Matter as an Environmental Justice Challenge." *DuBois Review* 13, no. 2 (August): 425-441 https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X1600014X

Pew Charitable Trusts. 2020. "Philadelphia 2020." Pew Charitable Trusts, April 7, 2020. www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/reports/2020/04/philadelphia-2020-state-of-the-city.

Pew Charitable Trusts. 2019. "The State of 10 Cities." Pew Charitable Trusts, December 3, 2019. www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2019/the-state-of-10-cities.

Philadelphia History Museum. N.d. "Under the Frankford El." Accessed December 3, 2020. http://www.philadelphiahistory.org/objects/under-the-frankford-el/?c=2420

Portes, Alejandro and Erik R. Vickstorm. 2011. "Diversity, Social Capital, and Cohesion." *Review of Sociology* 37, (August): 461-479. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-SOC-081309-150022

Purcell, Mark. 2002. "Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant." *GeoJournal* 58, no. 2 (October):99-108. https://doi.org./ 10.1023/B:GEJO.0000010829.62237.8f

Putman, Robert D. 1994. "Social Capital, and Public Affairs." *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 47, no. 8, (May): 5-19. *JSTOR*.

Putman, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster. Amazon E-Book

Regalado, Pedro A. N.d. "Fair Housing." The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia. Accessed December 1, 2020. https://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/fair-housing/

Remner, Rich. 2002. "Old Kensington." Pennsylvania Legacies 2, no. 2 (November): 8-16. JSTOR.

Rothstein, Richard. 2017. *The Color of Law*. New York: W.W Norton.

Septa. N.d. "Broad Street Line." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.septa.org/maps/transit/pdf/bsl.pdf

Septa. N.d. "Market Frankford Line." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.septa.org/maps/transit/pdf/mfl.pdf

Septa. 2020. More Than The Ride: 2020 Impact Report. http://www.septa.org/strategic-plan/pdf/More-Than-The-Ride-2020-web.pdf

Septa. N.d. "Rebuilding the System." Accessed December 1, 2020

Septa. N.d. "Route 3." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.septa.org/maps/bus/pdf/003.pdf

Septa. N.d. "Route 39." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.septa.org/maps/bus/pdf/039.pdf

Septa. N.d. "Route 60." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.septa.org/maps/bus/pdf/060.pdf

Septa. 2018. 2018 Septa Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report. http://septa.org/strategic-plan/reports/2018-survey-results.pdf

Septa. N.d. "Septa Impact- the City of Philadelphia" Accessed November 30, 2020. http://septa.org/strategic-plan/philadelphia.html

Sheller, Mimi. 2014. "The new mobilities paradigm for a live sociology." *Current Sociology Review* 62, no. 6 (May): 789-811. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114533211.

Sheller, Mimi. 2018. *Mobility Justice The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*. New York: Verso. E-book.

Shurley, Daniel. 2019. "Philadelphia's Forgotten Forebears: How Pennsylvania Erased The Lenape From Local History." Hidden City. August 23, 2019. https://hiddencityphila.org/2019/08/philadelphias-forgotten-forebears-how-pennsylvania-erased-the-lenape-from-local-history/

Siisiäinen, Martti. 2003. "Two Concepts of Social Capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam." *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 40, no. 2: 183-204.

Sobel, Joel. 2002. "Can We Trust Social Capital?" *Journal of Economic Literature* 40, no. 1 (March): 139-154. *JSTOR*.

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2008. "Stephanie." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 13, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/stephanie/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2008. "Teri." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 30, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/teri/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2008. "The Beginning, Melissa." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 26, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/melissa/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. " Darlene." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted January 13, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/darlene/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. "Dolly." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted March 30, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/dolly/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. "Flo." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 25, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/flo/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. "Jenna." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 31, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/jenna/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Jennette” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 20, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/jennette/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Kensington and Tioga.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted March 19, 2015. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/kensington-and-tioga/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Krista.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted May 18, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/krista/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Lauren.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted November 30, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/lauren/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009 “Maria’s Block.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted June 15, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/marias-block/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Mary.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted March 2, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/mary/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Nicole.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 27, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/nicole/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Sam.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 15, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/sam/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Sarah.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted October 31, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/sarah/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Teri.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted October 17, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/teri/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “The Tracks.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted January 20, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/the-tracks/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2009. “Tic Tac and Tootsie.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 1, 2011. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/tic-tac-and-tootsie/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Donna." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted January 24, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/donna/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Jamie." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 13, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/jamie/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Jessica." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted October 25, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/jessica/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Kensington and Somerset." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted January 17, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/kensington-and-somerset/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Kevin and Tom." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 3, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/tom/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Tanya." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 8, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/tanya/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2010. "Wilfredo." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 26, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/wilfredo/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. "Edward and Robert." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 12, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/edward-and-robert/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. "Journal Entry by Shannon." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted October 24, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/shannon/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. "Journal Entry by Sherry & Kevin." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 10, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/journal-entries/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. "Kevin." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 4, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/kevin/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. "Marelyn." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 10, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/marelyn/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. “Matt and Carissa.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 30, 2015. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/matt-and-carissa/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. “Melissa 2009/20011” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted May 10, 2012. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/melissa/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. “ Mike Sweat.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted February 7, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/mike-sweat/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. “Sarah.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted May 16, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/sarah/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. “Sherry.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 19, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/sherry/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2011. “Vinny.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 19, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/vinny/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2012. “El Train from McPherson Square.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 7, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/el-train-from-mcpherson-square/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2012. “Eric Kyle no. 2.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 25, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/eric-kyle/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2012. “Journal Entry by Mike, AKA Dense.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 14, 2016. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/journal-entries/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2012. “Marion.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 13, 2013. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/marion/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2012. “Pat and Rachel.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 13, 2016. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/pat-rachel/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2012. “Tom.” Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 9, 2015. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/tom/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Diana." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 11, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/diana/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Jess." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted September 30, 2016. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/jess/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Kensington and Clearfield." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted October 9, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/kensington-and-clearfield/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Me Scared? By Melynda Wilson." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted February 5, 2015. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/mindy/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. " Paul and Anthony." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted December 17, 2015. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/paul-and-anthony/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Scott." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted August 28, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/scott/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Star." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted May 15, 2015. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/star/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2013. "Valerie." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted December 18, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/valerie/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2014. "Krista Got Clean." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted October 2, 2014. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/krista/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2017. "Follow Up: Matt Neal." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted July 24, 2017. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/stories-of-recovery/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2018. "My name is Hope Daniels. That's not really my name." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted November 27, 2018. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/your-story/

Stockbridge, Jeffery. 2018. "Your Story: Family Matters." Kensington Blues (blog). Posted April 3, 2018. https://kensingtonblues.com/category/your-story/

Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation. N.d. "Board Members." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.strawberrymansioncdc.org/board-members/

Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation. N.d. "History." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.strawberrymansioncdc.org/history/

Strawberry Mansion Community Development Corporation. N.d. "Strawberry Mansion Neighborhood Action Center." Accessed November 30, 2020. http://www.strawberrymansioncdc.org/s-m-n-a-c/

The Great Migration: A City Transformed. N.d. "Historical Overview." Accessed December 1, 2020. https://greatmigrationphl.org/node/24

The Why. 2019. "The Last Stop's last stand? Why a Philly addiction recovery house is fighting to stay open." NPR, March 11, 2019. https://whyy.org/episodes/the-last-stops-last-stand/

United States Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2011- 2018. *Commuting Characteristics by Sex.* https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=8600000US19132,19143&tid=ACSST5Y2018.S0801&hidePreview=false

United States Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2011- 2018. *Means of Transportation to Work By Selected Characteristics.* https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=8600000US19132,19143&tid=ACSST5Y2018.S0802&hidePreview=false

United States Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2011- 2018. *Selected Characteristics Of The Total And Native Populations In The United States.* https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=8600000US19132,19143&tid=ACSST5Y2018.S0601&hidePreview=false

United States Environmental Protection Agency. N.d. "Environmental Justice." Accessed December 11, 2020. https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality and Transportation. June 2019. *Fast Facts: U.S. Transportation Sector Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2017*. EPA-420-F-19-047. https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P100WUHR.pdf

Urry, John. 2002. "Mobility and Proximity." *Sociology* 36, no. 2 (May): 255-274. *JSTOR*.

Vazquez-Hernandez, Victor. N.d. "Earliest Puerto Rican Settlements in Philadelphia: Southwark, Spring Garden and Northern Liberties." Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Accessed December 2, 2020. https://omeka.hsp.org/s/puertoricanphillyexperience/page/geography-geograph-a

Walker, Gordon P., and Harriet Bulkeley. 2006. "Geographies of Environmental Justice." *Geoforum* 37, no. 5 (March): 655-659.

Warren, Roxanne. 2014. *Rail and the City: Shrinking our Carbon Footprint while Reimagining Urban Space.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. EBSCOhost.

Winberg, Michaela. 2019. "After $2 million scare, Kensington's Last Stop recovery center is going legit." Billy Penn, March 13, 2019. https://billypenn.com/2019/03/13/after-2-million-scare-kensingtons-last-stop-recovery-center-is-going-legit/

Winberg, Michaela. 2019. "City levels $2 million lawsuit against well-known Kensington recovery center." Billy Penn, February 12, 2019. https://billypenn.com/2019/02/12/city-levels-2-million-lawsuit-against-well-known-kensington-recovery-center/

Winberg, Michaela. 2018. "Kensington's famous Last Stop addiction recovery center prepares for move." Billy Penn, March 26, 2018. https://billypenn.com/2018/03/26/kensingtons-famous-last-stop-addiction-recovery-center-prepares-for-move/