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Printed & Bound in China
It is an honor to have my work noted and engaged by scholars in architecture, and a pleasure to be invited to give this lecture. Indeed, it is a double pleasure since I was raised in a European intellectual tradition with a very low disciplinary threshold, so I consider myself not so much a sociologist as a generic social scientist who happens to be employed in a sociology department. And I deem it a core component of my occupational duty to engage issues across disciplinary boundaries, as well as across the divide between scholarly and professional endeavors. Moreover, the topic of urban seclusion is one that lends itself well to these kinds of exchanges, from which both researchers and practitioners can benefit.

I propose to provide you with some intellectual stimulation by circling about an issue to which I have devoted over a decade of work, namely, changing forms of urban marginality in advanced societies – what I call urban polarization from below. I will do so by drawing on two of my recent books. The first, Urban Outcasts, dissects the devolution of the black American ghetto after the riots of the 1960s and compares it to the decline of the periphery of Western European cities in order to puzzle out the dynamics and experience of relegation in advanced society. The second book, Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity, tracks the punitive policy, wedding restrictive “workfare” and expansive “prisonfare,” deployed by the state to impose insecure work and curb the disorders generated by the sudden implosion of the black ghetto on the U.S. side and the gradual decomposition of working-class territories on the European side and their supersession by a new regime of urban poverty I call “advanced marginality.”

These two books are closely linked, first, chronologically and topically (they form a sequel) and, second, conceptually: they both probe spatial confinement or containment as technique for managing problem categories and territories, the topic of my lecture. I will approach it by first sketching a rudimentary framework for parsing out the use of space as a medium for social closure and control in the city. I will then apply this schema to present a compressed analysis of the divergent trajectories of the black American ghetto and the European working-class borough in the post-Fordist age anchored by the three spatially inflected concepts of ghetto, hyperghetto, and antighetto.
Rudiments of Sociospatial Seclusion

reasoning. We can treat this hierarchy as a continuum or, for clarity’s sake here, dichotomize it into seclusion at the top and seclusion at the bottom of society. The second dimension is whether seclusion is elective, resulting from choice and a desire to participate in or to limit one’s presence and activity within a particular zone, or imposed, produced to constrain one’s activities, curtail their movement, or restrict one’s residence to a given location. In the first case sociospatial seclusion is driven and solidified by affinity from within, in the second case by hostility from without. We can then distribute the ideal-typical forms of sociospatial seclusion in the twodimensional space defined by these two axes (see Figure 1): elective versus forced, at the top or at the bottom looking at the top right-hand side quadrant, on the choice side and high in social and physical space, you find those people who choose isolation and seek privacy, who wish to be among the likes of themselves or their activities, curtail their movement, or restrict their residence to a given location. In the first case sociospatial seclusion is represented by elite enclaves or traditional upper-class districts in the city (such as those erected and fiercely defended by the Parisian higher bourgeoisie, as described by Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot) or gated communities that have mushroomed at the apex of the social and spatial hierarchy over the past two decades (where symbolic capital is exercised by powerful persons, endowes the material and symbolic capital to exclude others and to self-seclude). In the second case, seclusion at the foot of the urban hierarchy are bunched up ignoble activities. This is represented by the prison, a physical boundary, a space with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.

The two major ethnoracial forms deployed to effect sociospatial seclusion along two basic dimensions. The first dimension is based on class (market capacity), ethnicity (honor), or religion and its germane forms on the analytic grid that it anchors. Sociospatial seclusion operates in the countryside while sociospatial seclusion occurs in and around the city—a milieu that I would characterize as having a willful isolation is concretized by a physical boundary, a fence with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.

Sociospatial seclusion is the process whereby particular social categories and activities are corralled, hemmed in, and isolated in a reserved and restricted quadrant of physical and social space. The verb “to seclude,” originating in 1451, comes from the Latin secludere, which means to shut off, to isolate, to confine. Sociospatial seclusion can concern populations (e.g., bourgeois, migrants, religious sects), institutions (e.g., medical facilities, schools, religious centers), or activities (e.g., schooling, narcotic trafficking, or trash incineration), and it can be specified according to setting, rural sociospatial seclusion operates according to setting, rural sociospatial seclusion operates at the countryside, and urban sociospatial seclusion operates at the city. Following Robert Park’s study of the “Fear of Touching” in sixteenth-century Venice, we can specify forms of sociospatial seclusion along two basic dimensions. The first dimension is based on class (market capacity), ethnicity (honor), or religious affiliation and its germane forms on the analytic grid that it anchors. Sociospatial seclusion operates in the countryside while sociospatial seclusion occurs in and around the city—a milieu that I would characterize as having a willful isolation is concretized by a physical boundary, a fence with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.

The two major ethnoracial forms deployed to effect sociospatial seclusion along two basic dimensions. The first dimension is based on class (market capacity), ethnicity (honor), or religious affiliation and its germane forms on the analytic grid that it anchors. Sociospatial seclusion operates in the countryside while sociospatial seclusion occurs in and around the city—a milieu that I would characterize as having a willful isolation is concretized by a physical boundary, a fence with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.

In both cases, segregation is backed up by economic and cultural capital, the two major ethnoracial forms deployed to effect sociospatial seclusion along the urban hierarchy are the ghetto and the ethnic cluster, which must not be confused with the ghetto and the ethnic cluster, which must not be confused with the segregation that is based on class (market capacity), ethnicity (honor), or religious affiliation and its germane forms on the analytic grid that it anchors. Sociospatial seclusion operates in the countryside while sociospatial seclusion occurs in and around the city—a milieu that I would characterize as having a willful isolation is concretized by a physical boundary, a fence with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.

In both cases, segregation is backed up by economic and cultural capital, the two major ethnoracial forms deployed to effect sociospatial seclusion along the urban hierarchy are the ghetto and the ethnic cluster, which must not be confused with the ghetto and the ethnic cluster, which must not be confused with the segregation that is based on class (market capacity), ethnicity (honor), or religious affiliation and its germane forms on the analytic grid that it anchors. Sociospatial seclusion operates in the countryside while sociospatial seclusion occurs in and around the city—a milieu that I would characterize as having a willful isolation is concretized by a physical boundary, a fence with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.

In both cases, segregation is backed up by economic and cultural capital, the two major ethnoracial forms deployed to effect sociospatial seclusion along the urban hierarchy are the ghetto and the ethnic cluster, which must not be confused with the ghetto and the ethnic cluster, which must not be confused with the segregation that is based on class (market capacity), ethnicity (honor), or religious affiliation and its germane forms on the analytic grid that it anchors. Sociospatial seclusion operates in the countryside while sociospatial seclusion occurs in and around the city—a milieu that I would characterize as having a willful isolation is concretized by a physical boundary, a fence with a gate and guards providing surveillance and protection, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community, and the comforts of membership in a privileged community.
which retraces the invention of the first ghetto in history, Richard Sennett coins a beautiful expression that captures its purpose. He calls the ghetto an urban condom, because its design allowed for the penetration of the Christian city by Jews (they were needed to supply a gamut of financial, trade, and cultural services pivotal to the success of the court) while isolating them to curtail intimate contact with them (the Jewish body was believed to be corrupt and corrupting, a vector of disease and sacrilege). The ghetto emerged as the sociospatial device permitting the joint economic exploitation and social ostracization of this outcast category: Jews fanned into the city to carry out their essential economic duties during the day, but returned at nightfall behind the locked gates of their reserved quarter under pain of severe punishment. When circulating outside the walls of their ghetto, they were required to wear a special garment (such as a yellow hat or a pointed cap) so that Christians could identify and avoid them. The same spatial device was reinvented and deployed four centuries later in the Northeast and Midwest of the United States when Southern blacks migrated into the expanding industrial cities that wanted their labor but did not wish them to mix with white residents, lest this bring about “social equality” between the so-called races and the odium of “miscegenation.” In this case, skin color advertised membership in an inferior ethnoracial category to be shunned, and the sharply bounded Bronzeville served as both labor pool and prophylactic container of contaminating bodies.

During the interwar years, the Chicago school, which launched the sociological study of the city in the United States, made the cardinal mistake of lumping the residential and institutional clumps formed by recent waves of Irish, Italian, Polish, and German immigrants under an ill-defined notion of “ghetto” covering Jewish districts and the Black Belt. This is what I call Wirth’s error, after Louis Wirth, one of the founders of urban ecology, for two reasons. First, as Wirth himself unwittingly demonstrates in his classic book The Ghetto, there never existed a Jewish ghetto in the United States, other than as a “state of mind,” that is, a subjective “we-feeling” and cultural orientation— which is very different from a concretized sociospatial contraption. Second and more crucially, contrary to the Black Belt, the
all-black enclave in which all African Americans regardless of class were forced to reside through a combination of legal suasion, street intimidation, and collective violence, these white ethnic clusters were mixed in composition, mobile in location, and contained only a minority of their respective migrant populations, who resided there mainly due to class constraint and cultural attraction.

In architectural terms, the (white) ethnic cluster can be represented by a bridge, whereas the (black) ghetto would be figured by a wall. One is a mechanism of flexible and temporary seclusion inside a porous perimeter that operates as an acclimation chamber and a way-station toward cultural assimilation and sociospatial integration into the broader society. The other is a means of inflexible and permanent seclusion inside an impermeable poke that works to isolate and dissipilate the population it harbors in perpetuity (that is, until it breaks down). In sum, the ethnic cluster and the ghetto have divergent structures and serve opposite functions; therefore it is a fundamental sociological error to lump them together. This is an error that continues to be routinely made by social scientists — peruse, for illustration, Zeitz's historical account of “ethnic New York” after World War II. A germane mistake is that which, substituting income deprivation for ethnoracial closure, assimilates the ghetto to “a neighborhood with a high concentration of poor people, regardless of their ethnic makeup.” By this twisted definition, which became popular in policy-oriented research on urban poverty in the United States in the 1990s, poor rural counties and Native American reservations are gigantic ghettos, as would be the poorer districts of an all-white city; but the Venetian ghetto novo and Chicago's Bronzeville at its historic peak were not ghettos! This suffices to show the incoherence and incongruence of this definitional legerdemain.

To better understand the difference between ghetto and ethnic cluster, it is useful to plot into the diagram of forms of sociospatial seclusion at the bottom a third institution of forced confinement: the prison. The prison uses the physical restraint of walls and the force of guards to segregate convicts, that is, a discredited category whose rights and contacts with outsiders are amputated as sanction for violating societal standards of conduct. It is a kind of judicial ghetto within which inmates develop a parallel society and culture of their own in response to forcible isolation and the deprivations it entails. Conversely, we may think of the ghetto as an ethnoracial prison that confines a dishonored population into a special perimeter in which the latter is constrained to develop its separate life-sphere in reaction to spatial confinement and social banishment. As soon as we grasp the structural and functional kinship between ghetto and prison (indicated by their proximity on my analytic map of forms of sociospatial seclusion), we understand why the collapse of the former after the riots of the 1960s led to the growth of the latter as a substitute for corraling a population deemed dishonored, destitute, and dangerous.

The ghetto is, by definition, an urban animal which emerges in the context of a dense settlement that thirsts for the economic value provided by the stigmatized category — otherwise the latter would simply be excluded or expelled, as Jews were periodically before the rise of urban principalities and black Americans were before the onset of Fordism. If the Roth-Symonds Lecture were a lecture series rather than a single address, I would spend a couple of sessions laying out forms of sociospatial seclusion in the rural environment, because there is much to learn also from that comparison. In the countryside, the major factor differentiating modalities of spatial enclosure is whether the subordinate population...
must move to supply labor or be removed to release land they occupy. In cases where the dominant group does not wish to, or cannot, extract labor out of subalterns, but seeks to appropri- ate their territory, as in colonial encounters aimed at securing or neutralizing the threats they presented, we find a range of intermediate constellations that arise to secure the labor power of subordinate populations while preventing them from coming into competition with the primary clientele of carceral institutions, while also suspending the labor supply of the latter as a major cause behind the booming expansion of the former, thus becoming coupled by a boomerang expansion of functional racialization. In such scenarios, you get a variety of racial seclusion into as single analytical framework and to theorize them together, instead of treating them separately, as if they belonged to different domains (rural studies, urban sociology, criminology, and the anthropology of class and ethnicity) and obeyed distinct logics. Much is lost by the conventional compartmentalization of research on racial activities. The normal urban sociologist pays no attention to the countryside communities from which city migrants come and loses the analytical mileage one gets by tracking similar sociospatial processes of concentration, separation, and assignment operating in different environments. Similarly, students of upper-class districts and gated communities are oblivious to ghettos and prisons; they construe the formation of enclaves of the privileged as a process unto itself disconnected from the fate of dispossessed and dis- enfranchised citizens, who in reality they are directly linked to.

Designing Urban Seclusion: The 2009 Roth-Symonds Lecture
coincide with the emergence of a social space in which the black American urban proletariat, previously dispersed among the nation’s cities, was systematically confined to what came to be known as the black ghetto. The ghetto was not just a physical location but a product of a complex process of social, cultural, and institutional changes that transformed the urban environment in the United States. The rise of the ghetto was a result of the intersection of various factors, including the legacy of slavery, the rise of industrialization, and the development of urban planning and housing policies.

In the early 20th century, the American urban landscape was shaped by a combination of economic, social, and political forces. The Great Migration of African Americans from the rural South to the northern cities was facilitated by the growth of the industrial economy, which created a demand for labor in the factories. However, these migrants faced significant barriers to entry and faced discrimination in housing, employment, and education. The result was a concentration of black populations in specific areas, often in neighborhoods that were perceived as undesirable or unsafe. This process was facilitated by a series of policies, including redlining, which restricted access to credit and housing in certain areas.

The structure of the black ghetto was characterized by the persistence of stigma and constraint. Stigma refers to the negative stereotypes and myths that attached to black communities, which reinforced the perception of them as pathological or dangerous. Constraint refers to the ways in which black communities were forced to live in specific neighborhoods, often as a result of discriminatory policies or the inability to afford better housing. The combination of these factors created a cycle of isolation and exclusion that was reinforced by the development of institutional parallelism, which refers to the creation of independent social and cultural institutions that served the needs of black communities.

The existence of the black ghetto was not just a reflection of black suffering, but also a source of resistance and creativity. Black communities developed their own cultural and political institutions, which provided a sense of community and identity. This process of self-sufficiency and cultural production was an important aspect of the black experience in the black ghetto.

Let us now consider the process of segregation as a model of sociospatial seclusion. When we talk about segregation, we are referring to the process by which populations are isolated and excluded from certain areas based on their race, ethnicity, or other characteristics. The black ghetto is a clear example of this process, as black communities were systematically confined to specific neighborhoods, often through policies such as redlining and restrictive covenants. The result was a separation of black and white communities, which had significant consequences for the social, economic, and cultural lives of black Americans.

In conclusion, the black ghetto is a complex phenomenon that reflects the intersection of various social, political, and economic forces. The process of segregation is not just a historical event, but a contemporary issue that continues to shape the lives of black Americans. Understanding the history of the black ghetto is essential for understanding the ongoing struggles of black communities to achieve equality and justice.
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This clues us to the two antinomic roles played by the ghetto at the two ends of the relationship of ethnoracial domination it materializes, which historians of the Jewish diaspora in Europe, anthropologists of caste regimes in Asia and Africa, and sociologists of the black experience in industrial America have documented but, paradoxically, failed to realize and thematize. One readily discerns that, from the standpoint of the ruling category, a ghetto is an instrument for domination since it sharply curtails the life space and life chances of the secluded category. But, and this is just as important, grasped from below and within, the ghetto creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghettoized, the ghetto serves as a protective buffer that creates a distinctive Lebenswelt within which the subordinate can breathe away direct contact with the dominant, and this is just as important. Thus, from the standpoint of African Americans in the Fordist metropolis who have been ghett...
What happened to the black American ghetto after the upheavals of the 1960s? If you understand that a ghetto is not just a segregated place, a district of dilapidated housing and social dereliction, among them vice and violence, but also a peculiar sociospatial contraption geared to effecting economic exploitation and social ostracization, then you can track the causes of the brutal implosion of America’s “Bronzeville” after the peaking of the Civil Rights Movement. The ghetto came apart and crumbled onto itself, as it were, under the press of three converging forces. The first is economic: it is the shift away from a Fordist industrial economy, anchored by factory production located inside the city and requiring large pools of unskilled labor, to a decentralized service-based economy in which automation made the labor power it contained already marginal. The second factor is demographic and political: it is what I call the Great white migration. Historians have produced excellent books on the Great black migration from the South to the northern city between the two World Wars, but we are still waiting for a comprehensive account of the massive white exodus to the suburbs in reaction to black entry and its reverberating impact on American society, culture, and politics. In the 1960s and 1970s, whites fled by the millions to recreate in the suburbs the social and spatial distance with southern blacks streaming into the metropolis. This huge population transfer towards the suburbs, coupled with the fiscal crisis of cities of the 1970s that was used by political elites as pretext to shrink programs for the poor and to reorient urban policy toward the provision of corporate and middle-class amenities, reduced the political pull of an inner-city population already marginalized in the economic realm. It also caused the fiscal crisis of cities of the 1970s that was used by political elites as pretext to shrink programs for the poor and to reorient urban policy toward the provision of corporate and middle-class amenities. The third force that broke the ghetto apart is successful block mobilization.
we mean by the term, the question would be either meaningless or irresolvable. Relatedly, if you cling to the inchoate folk notion current in everyday life, the media, and large sectors of research, the woolly and constantly shifting ordinary perception of the ghetto as just a “bad neighborhood,” or a segregated, poor, violent, or decrepit district you would rather not enter and dwell in, then you can find ghettos almost anywhere. And ghettos disappear as quickly as they appear depending on a host of conjunctural factors like crime trends and the unemployment rate! But then, under any of these definitions, the two canonical cases of the ghetto, the ghettos of sixteenth-century Venice, Florence, or Rome, and the Bronzevilles blossoming in mid-twentieth-century Chicago, Detroit, or New York, were not ghettos. So has the working-class periphery of Western European cities drifted in the direction of the ghetto? My answer to this query is: so that we may say that they are turning into on-ghettoes—ghettoes almost anywhere. And ghettos disappear as quickly as they appear depending on a host of conjunctural factors like crime trends and the unemployment rate! But then, under any of these definitions, the two canonical cases of the ghetto, the ghettos of sixteenth-century Venice, Florence, or Rome, and the Bronzevilles blossoming in mid-twentieth-century Chicago, Detroit, or New York, were not ghettos. So has the working-class periphery of Western European cities drifted in the direction of the ghetto? My answer to this query is:

First, ghettoization means that members of a bounded category are being forced to live in a separately identifiable reserved enclave, whether the site or useful. But the derelict districts of the public sector and migrate into individual houses. This “creaming” of the materially stable households has left behind in the projects only working-class families just when these were being undermined by a dramatic rise in unemployment and the relentless spread of insecure informal and formal organizations. But working-class territories with preserved enclaves will face difficulties if the gradual and increased differentiation of the economic landscape and the maturation of the residential market, the end of the Reserve and development of competitive housing markets, the end of the Reserve and development of competitive housing markets, will lead to the dissolution of what is left behind. The question then arises: are these impoverished and isolated ghettos or ghetto-like? Having forged a rigorous characterization of what a ghetto is, we can provide a rigorous answer. If we had not specified conceptually what
Loïc Wacquant

Thirdly, I pointed out earlier that the ghetto is a cultural fusion machine that fosters the emergence of a shared idiom of identification and claims-making that encompasses the various components of the stigmatized population. Thus ghettoization eroded the distinction between Ashkenazi and Sephardic in the case of Jews, and it similarly melted the differences between Negroes and mulattos who had arrived in France en masse in the 1920s, as part of the massive migration of African Americans to the United States, leading to the segregation of the French urban landscape. The language of ghettoization turns out to be fundamentally inadequate to describe urban seclusion in Western Europe at the dawn of the twenty-first century.

Let me now, by way of conclusion, come to the final element in the equation of urban seclusion. To understand the logic of race and ethnicity in the European metropolis, we need to confront the idea that the boundaries of the targeted category, irrespective of their income and social standing, are the same across the globe. The Jewish ghettos of pre-revolutionary Europe, such as those of Prague and Frankfurt, and the black ghettos of Chicago and Paris, are strikingly similar in their structure and function. The ghetto is not simply a place of concentration, but a zone of control, a state within the state, where the power of the authorities is exerted through a system of surveillance and surveillance. The residents of the ghetto are not mere inhabitants, but active participants in a process of social engineering, where the state shapes and reshapes the boundaries of the targeted group, fragmenting their community and isolating them from the rest of society. This is why I call them anti-ghettos, by way of provocation directed at the advocates of the fashionable thesis of the "Americanization" of the European city. Upon close examination, the language of ghettoization turns out to be fundamentally inadequate to describe urban seclusion in Western Europe at the dawn of the twenty-first century.
of relegation in the American and the European metropolis, we must specify the criteria whereby populations are sorted out and thrust down to the bottom of the stratified system of places that compose the city. In the United States, relegation to the ghetto is determined by ethnicity—that is, by that peculiar variant of denegated ethnicity commonly called “race”—later modulated by class (with the emergence of the duet formed by the hyperghetto and the segregated black middle-class satellite), and distinctively intensified by the state through its economic, welfare, education, housing and health policies, all of which work to deepen urban disparities and entrench poverty. We can sum up this dynamic by the algebraic formula: \((E > C) \times S\) which reads “sociospatial seclusion is determined by a combination wherein ethnicity trumps class and is amplified by the state.” By contrast, in Western Europe, class precedes ethnicity in determining relegation, and marginalization is strongly cushioned and partly mitigated by the state, through a combination of universalist social protection and targeted interventions aimed at checking urban devolution, giving us the algebraic formula: \((C > E) + S\).

This clarifies the first word in the title of my lecture: “Designing Urban Seclusion in the Twenty-First Century.” On both sides of the Atlantic, it turns out that the grand designer of urban marginality, by omission or commission, is the state. The state is the agency that sets the parameters according to which the distribution of people, resources, and activities is effected across the two-by-two space described by the diagram of sociospatial seclusion. Through its various programs, from urban planning, economic regulation, fiscal policy, and infrastructural investment to the spatially differentiated provision of core public goods such as housing, education, health, welfare, and policing, the state determines the extent of the distance between the top and the bottom of the urban order; the vehicles, pathways, and ease with which that distance may be travelled; and what forms of sociospatial seclusion take root and grow (whether deprived and defamed categories are hemmed in a ghetto, an ethnic cluster, or a slum; how big the prison etc.). Through its structure and policies, patterned actions and inactions, the Leviathan determines the scope, spread, and intensity of marginality in the city. This implies that, insofar as they collaborate in shaping the built environment, urban planners and architects partake in the production of the space of sociospatial relegation. And they will grow more implicated in the design of urban seclusion as advanced societies increasingly rely on spatial “solutions” to festering social problems in the dualizing metropolis.36

1 This is an abridged and revised version of the sixth Roth-Symonds Lecture and keynote address to the Symposium on Spatial Illiteracies, delivered at the Yale School of Architecture on March 27, 2009. I have cut out many illustrative examples and analytic digressions, but preserved the oral cast of the talk I would like to thank Iben Falconer and Olga Pantelidou for kindly serving as my sherpas during my brief trek in the land of Yale architecture. Jack Brough for his patient assistance in the preparation of this text, and Megan Comfort and Zach Levenson for their astute comments that helped to clarify it.


4 For a discussion of the practical backdrops and theoretical aims of these two books, see the recapitulation of their analytic linkages in Loïc Wacquant, “The Body, the Ghetto and the Penal State,” Qualitative Sociology 32, no. 1 (March 2009): 101-29.

5 The Oxford English Dictionary (second edition, 1898) attributes six meanings to the verb “to seclude.” The first two fit my purpose well: “To shut apart, to enclose or confine so as to prevent access or influence from without. Also, to enclose or confine (a material thing) in a separate place”; “In wider sense: To remove or guard from public view; to withdraw from opportunities of social intercourse.”


15 The analogy rises to the level of homologization one recalls that the prison was invented at the end of the sixteenth century not as a device for fighting crime but as a tool to curb urban marginal- ity and to instill the work ethic to the "study beggars" threatening public order and work relations in the emerg- ing capitalist city. See Pieter Spieren- burg, The Prison Experience: Disciplinary Institutions and their Inmates in Early Modern Europe (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991).


17 Stephen Cornell, The Return of the Native: American Indian Political Resurgence (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). This is the case also of the Kanak natives in New Caledonia, a French colony island in the South Pacific where I carried out my first sociological investi- gations in the 1980s, which is unique in the former French empire in that it developed a dual system of law and property materialized by reservations that exist to this day. See Claude Liauzu, ed., Dictionnaire de la colonisation française (Paris: Larousse, 2007).

18 There is much to learn on this front from the provocative inquiries of anthropolo- gist Michel Agier who has pursued the dynamics of marginalization by studying the "undoing" of the city in situations ranging from declining lower-class dis- tricts to ghettos to camps of global refugees and internally displaced people on three continents. See Michel Agier, L'invention de la ville: Banlieues, townships, invasions et favelas (Paris: Archives Contemporaines, 1999) and Gérer les indésirables: Des camps de réfugiés au gouvernement humanitaire (Paris: Flammarion, 2008).

19 In addition, most studies of gated communi- ties have been undertaken by urban planners and anthropologists, two disci- plines whose methodological proclivities cause them to isolate their objects from macrostructures of power.


21 Wacquant, "Deadly Symbiosis."


31 Key constituents of conservative politics after the 1970s in both suburb and city, such as the revolt against taxation, the thrust to privatize public services, and the demand for school vouchers, were fashioned in the crucible of "white Right" as a powerful sociospatial move- ment intent to counter and even reverse the gains of the Civil Rights Movement. See Kevin M. Kruse, White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conserva- tion (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

32 Wacquant, Punishing the Poor.


35 Catherine Wilmot de Wenden and Rémy Leveau, La Bourgeoisie (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2007). Derived from the in- version of the previous form in street language, the term bour is often used in everyday life and in public debate to designate French people of Maghrebine origins (although many say persons find it offensive and reject it).
