A Janus-Faced Institution
of Ethnoracial Closure

A Sociological Specification of the Ghetto[1]

Loïc Wacquant

> The scientific mind must form itself by
> continually reforming itself.
> (Gaston Bachelard, Psychoanalyse de l'es-
> prit scientifique, 1938)

It is a paradox that, while the social sciences have made extensive use of the
"ghetto" as a *descriptive term*, they have failed to forge a robust *analytical con-
cept* of the same. In the historiography of the Jewish diaspora in early modern
Europe and under Nazism, the sociology of the black American experience in
the twentieth-century metropolis, and the anthropology of ethnic outcasts in East
Asia and Africa, its three traditional domains of application, the term "ghetto"
variously denotes a bounded urban ward, a web of group-specific institutions,
and a cultural and cognitive constellation (values, mind-set, or mentality) entail-
ing the sociomoral isolation of a stigmatized category as well as the systematic
truncation of the life space and life chances of its members. But none of these
strands of research has taken the trouble to specify what makes a ghetto *qua*
social form, which of its features are constitutive and which are derivative, as
they have, at each epoch, taken for granted and adopted the *folk concept* extant
in the society under examination.

---

1   First published in HAYNES/HUTCHISON, 2012, p. 1-33.

15

   This explains that the notion, appearing self-evident, does not figure in most dictionaries of social science.[2] It is also why, after decades employing the word, sociologists remain vague, inconsistent, and conflicted about its core meaning, perimeter of empirical pertinence, and theoretical import. The recent "Symposium on the Ghetto" organized by *City & Community* in the wake of Mario Small's critique of the central theses of my book *Urban Outcasts* richly documents the myriad observational anomalies and analytic troubles spawned by the unreflective derivation of social-scientific from ordinary constructs.[3] These troubles are not resolved but redoubled when the *composite US imagery* of the (black) ghetto (after its collapse) gets transported to Western Europe and Latin America, and they are trebled when scholars attempt cross-national comparisons of patterns of urban marginality and/or ethnoracial inequality based on the national common sense of their home societies as to the meaning of "the ghetto".[4] This debate vividly demonstrates that the ghetto is not a *contested concept* à la Gallie[5] so much as a *confused conception* that comes short of the level of analytic specificity, coherence, and parsimony minimally required of a scientific notion.

   This chapter clears up this confusion by constructing a rigorous sociological concept of the ghetto as a spatially based implement of ethnoracial closure. After spotlighting the semantic instability and slippage of the notion in American culture and scholarship, I extract the structural and functional similarities presented by three canonical instances of the phenomenon: the Jewish ghetto of Renaissance Europe, the black American ghetto of the Fordist United States, and the reserved districts of the Burakumin in post-Tokugawa Japan. Against thin *gradational* conceptions based on rates (of ethnic dissimilarity, spatial concentration, poverty, etc.), which prove promiscuous and prone to metaphorical bleeding as well as inchoate, I elaborate a thick *relational* conception of the ghetto as a

---

2   Remarkably, "ghetto" receives no entry in the nineteen-volume International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences published in the United States just as the country was being shaken to its core by a wave of ghetto riots, cf. SILLS/ MERTON 1968. Even specialized dictionaries of racial and ethnic studies give the notion short shrift: definitions in them are typically terse, limited to the mention of ethnic segregation in space and to a descriptive denotation of particular ghettos (those of the Jewish and black diasporas).

3   Cf. HAYNES/HUTCHISON, 2008.

4   An extended argument in favor of epistemological rupture as the only viable solution to the 'demarcation problem' in the comparative sociology of urban marginality is WACQUANT, 2008(1), p. 7-12, 135-162, 233-235, 272-276.

5   Cf. GALLIE, 1956.

sociospatial institution geared to the twin mission of isolating and exploiting a dishonored category. So much to say that the ghetto results not from ecological dynamics but from the inscription in space of a material and symbolic *power asymmetry*, as revealed by the recurrent role of collective violence in establishing as well as challenging ethnoracial confinement. Next, I unscramble the connections between ghettoization, segregation, and poverty, and I articulate an ideal-typical opposition between ghetto and ethnic cluster with which to carry out measured comparisons of the fates of various stigmatized populations and places in different cities, societies, and epochs. This points to the role of the ghetto as organizational shield and cultural crucible for the production of a unified but tainted identity that furthers resistance and eventually revolt against seclusion. I conclude by proposing that the ghetto is best analogized not with districts of dereliction (which confuses ethnoracial seclusion with extraneous issues of class, deprivation, and deviance) but with other devices for the forcible containment of tainted categories such as the prison, the reservation, and the camp.

A fuzzy and evolving notion

A brief recapitulation of the strange career of "the ghetto" in American society and social science, which has dominated inquiry into the topic both quantitatively and thematically, suffices to illustrate its semantic instability and dependency on the whims and worries of urban rulers. For the past century, the range and contents of the term have successively expanded and contracted in keeping with how political and intellectual elites have viewed the vexed nexus of ethnicity and poverty in the city.[6]

At first, in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, the ghetto designated residential concentrations of European Jews in the Atlantic seaports and was clearly distinguished from the "slum" as an area of housing blight and social pathology.[7] The notion dilated during the Progressive era to encompass all inner-city districts wherein exotic newcomers gathered, namely, lower-class immigrants from the southeastern regions of Europe and African Americans fleeing the Jim Crow regime of racial terrorism in the US South. Expressing upper-class worries over whether these groups could or should assimilate into the predominant Anglo-Saxon pattern of the country, the notion referred then to the intersection between the ethnic neighborhood and the slum, where segregation was

---

6   Cf. WARD, 1989.

7   Cf. LUBOVE, 1963

believed to combine with physical disrepair and overcrowding to exacerbate urban ills such as criminality, family breakdown, and pauperism, and thwart participation in national life. This conception was given scientific authority by the ecological paradigm of the emerging Chicago school of sociology. In his classic book *The Ghetto*, Louis Wirth assimilates to the Jewish ghetto of medieval Europe the "Little Sicilies, Little Polands, Chinatowns, and Black Belts in our large cities"[8], along with the "vice areas" hosting deviant types such as hobos, bohemians, and prostitutes. All of them are said to be "natural areas" born of the universal desire of different groups to "preserve their peculiar cultural forms" and each fulfills a specialized "function" in the broader urban organism.[9] This is what one may call *Wirth's error*: confounding the mechanisms of sociospatial seclusion visited upon African Americans and upon European immigrants by conflating two urban forms with antinomic architectures and effects, the ghetto and the ethnic cluster. This initial error enabled the ecological paradigm to thrive even as the urbanization of African Americans blatantly contradicted its core propositions.[10] It would be repeated cyclically for decades and persistently obfuscate the specificity of ghettoization as an exclusive type of enclosure.

The notion contracted rapidly after World War II under the press of the Civil Rights movement to signify mainly the compact and congested enclaves to which African Americans were forcibly relegated as they migrated into the industrial centers of the North. The growth of a "Black Metropolis in the womb of the white" wherein Negroes evolved distinct and parallel institutions to compensate for and shield themselves from unflinching exclusion by whites[11] contrasted sharply with the smooth residential dispersal of European Americans of foreign stock. And the mounting political mobilization of blacks against continued caste subordination made their reserved territory a central site and stake of sociopolitical struggles in the city as well as a springboard for collective action against white rule. Writing at the acme of the black uprisings of the 1960s, Kenneth Clark made this relationship of ethnoracial subordination epicentral to his dissection of the *Dark Ghetto* and its woes: "America has contributed to the concept of the ghetto the restriction of persons to a special area and the limiting of their freedom of choice on the basis of skin color. The dark ghetto's invisible walls have been erected by the white

---

8   WIRTH, 1928, p. 6.

9   A useful analytic survey of the works of the Chicago school on this front is HANNERZ, 1980; a cutting critique of the biotic naturalism of Park, Burgess and Wirth is in LOGAN/MOLOTCH, 1987, chap. 1.

10   Cf. WACQUANT, 1998.

11   Cf. DRAKE/CAYTON, (1945) 1993.

society, by those who have power."[12] This diagnosis was confirmed by the Kerner Commission, a bipartisan task force appointed by President Johnson whose official report on the "civil disorders" that rocked the American metropolis famously warned that, because of white racial intransigence, America was "moving toward two societies, one black, one white – separate and unequal."[13]

But over the ensuing two decades the dark ghetto collapsed and devolved into a barren territory of dread and dissolution due to deindustrialization and state policies of welfare reduction and urban retrenchment. As racial domination grew more diffuse and diffracted through a class prism, the category was displaced by the duet formed by the geographic euphemism of "inner city" and the neologism of "underclass," defined as the substratum of ghetto residents plagued by acute joblessness, social isolation, and antisocial behaviors.[14] By the 1990s, the neutralization of the "ghetto" in policy-oriented research culminated in the outright expurgation of any mention of race and power to redefine it as any tract of extreme poverty ("containing over 40 % of residents living under the federal poverty line"), irrespective of population and institutional makeup, in effect dissolving the ghetto back into the slum and rehabilitating the folk conception of the early twentieth century.[15] This paradoxical "deracialization"

---

12 CLARK, 1956, p. 11.

13 KERNER COMMISSION, 1968, p. 2. This formula was intended as an inverted echo of the Supreme Court decision Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) which proclaimed racial segregation congruent with the country's Constitution, provided that the dual institutional tracks thus spawned be "separate but equal" (which they never were, not surprisingly since the same court studiously omitted to specify any criteria of equality or the means to bring it about). This ruling provided the juridical basis for the establishment of six decades of legal segregation in the United States, until the 1954 decision Brown v. Board of Education found that racial separation by itself implies an inegality that violates constitutional principles. It points to the pivotal role of the state in the (un)making of the black ghetto and of ethnoracial domination more generally.

14 CF. WILSON, 1987.

15 Cf. JARGOVSKY, 1997. At the same time, the ostensibly deracialized conception of 'the ghetto' as a district of widespread destitution kept the focus squarely on the African-American (sub)proletariat by adopting as its operational cut-off point the bureaucratic category of a census tract with a 40-percent poverty rate, which coincidentally ensured its empirical overlap with the remnants of the historic Black Belt. Like the discovery of the 'underclass' a decade earlier, this conceptual move validated the special worries of state elites about the management of

of a notion initially fashioned, and until then deployed, to capture ethnoracial partition in the city resulted from the combination of the crumbling of the historic dark ghetto of the industrial era and the correlative political censorship of race in policy-oriented research after the ebbing of the Civil Rights movement. This "gutting of the ghetto"[16] was then taken one step further by the rash proposal to abandon the notion altogether, instead of clarifying it, on grounds that it cannot capture the complexity, heterogeneity, and fluidity of "poor black neighborhoods" in the United States[17] – as if ghettoization were a flat and static synonym for impoverishment, occurred only in the United States, and could not encompass, or partake of, a fluid and differentiated urban formation.

Meanwhile the term was extended to the study of the distinctive sociocultural patterns elaborated by homosexuals in the cities of advanced societies "in response to both stigma and gay liberation"[18] after the Stonewall riots. It has also made a spectacular return across western Europe in heated scholarly and policy debates over the links between postcolonial immigration, postindustrial economic restructuring, and spatial dualization as the fear of the "Americanization" of the metropolis swept the continent.[19] That European social scientists took to invoking "the ghetto" to stress the growing potency and specificity of ethnoracial division in their countries just when their American colleagues were busy extirpating race from the same notion is an irony that seems only to further muddle its meaning. Yet one can extract out of these varied literatures common threads and recurrent properties to *construct a relational concept* of the ghetto as an *instrument of closure and control* that clears up most of the confusion surrounding it and turns it into a powerful tool for the social analysis of ethnoracial domination and urban inequality. For this it suffices to return to the historical inception of the word and of the phenomenon it depicted in Renaissance Venice.

A janus-faced institution of ethnic closure and control

Coined by derivation from the Italian *giudecca*, *borghetto* or *gietto* (or from the German *gitter* or the Talmudic Hebrew *get*: the etymology is disputed), the

---

black marginality in the inner city while eliding the latter's roots in ethnoracial domination and regressive state policies.

16   WACQUANT, 2002.

17   Cf. SMALL, 2009.

18   LEVINE, 1979, p. 31.

19   Cf. MUSTERD et al., 2006; SCHIERUP et al., 2006.

20

word "ghetto" initially referred to the forced consignment of Jews to special districts by the city's political and religious authorities. In medieval Europe, Jews were commonly allotted quarters wherein they resided, administered their own affairs, and followed their customs. Such quarters were granted or sold as a privilege to attract them into the towns and principalities for which they fulfilled key roles as money-lenders, tax collectors, and long-distance tradesmen. But, between the 13th and the 16th century, in the wake of the upheavals caused by the Crusades, favor gradually turned into compulsion.[20] In 1516 the Senate of Venice ordered all Jews rounded up into the *ghetto nuovo*, an abandoned foundry on an isolated island enclosed by two high walls whose outer windows and doors were sealed while watchmen stood guard on its two bridges and patrolled the adjacent canals by boat.[21] Jews were henceforth allowed to come out to pursue their occupations by day, but they had to wear a distinctive garb that made them readily recognizable and return inside the gates before sunset on pain of severe punishment. These measures were designed as an alternative to expulsion to enable the city-state to reap the economic benefits brought by the presence of Jews (including rents, special taxes, and forced levies) while protecting its Christian residents from contaminating contact with bodies perceived as unclean and dangerously sensual, carriers of syphilis and vectors of heresy, in addition to bearing the taint of money-making through usury, which the Catholic Church equated with prostitution.[22]

As this Venetian model spread in cities throughout Europe and around the Mediterranean rim,[23] territorial fixation and seclusion led, on the one hand, to overcrowding, housing deterioration, and impoverishment as well as excess morbidity and mortality, and, on the other, to institutional flowering and cultural consolidation as urban Jews responded to multiplying civic and occupational restrictions by knitting a dense web of group-specific organizations that served as so many instruments of collective succor and solidarity, from markets and business associations, to charity and mutual aid societies, to places of religious worship and scholarship. The *Judenstadt* of Prague, Europe's largest ghetto in

---

20 Cf. Stow, 1992.

21 Cf. Curiel/Cooperman, 1990.

22 Cf. Sennet, 1994, p. 224.

23 Cf. Johnson, 1987, p. 235-245. A functional variant arose with the ghetto of Rome, which was founded in 1555 on the banks of the Tiber and abolished in 1870. It purported to foster the religious conversion and cultural dissolution of Jews, but it ended up having the opposite effects and it did not diffuse geographically. Cf. Stow, 2001.

21

the eighteenth century, even had its own city hall, the *Rathaus*, emblem of the relative autonomy and communal strength of its residents, and its synagogues were entrusted not only with the spiritual stewardship but also with the administrative and judicial oversight of its population. Social life in the Jewish ghetto was turned inward and verged "on overorganization"[24], so that it reinforced both integration within and isolation from without.

One can detect in this inaugural moment the four constituent elements of the ghetto, viz., (i) *stigma*, (ii) *constraint*, (iii) *spatial confinement*, and (iv) *institutional parallelism*. The ghetto is a social-organizational device that employs space to reconcile two antinomic functions: (1) to maximize the material profits extracted out of a category deemed defiled and defiling; and to (2) minimize intimate contact with its members so as to avert the threat of symbolic corrosion and contagion they are believed to carry. If the target population did not serve an essential economic function, it could be kept out of the city or expelled from it – as Jews had been periodically in medieval history. If that same group was not irremediably tainted, it would simply be exploited and allowed to mingle in the city in accordance with its position in the division of labor. It is the conflictive combination of economic value and symbolic danger that made handling Jews problematic and spurred the invention of the ghetto.

These same four building blocks and the same dual rationale of *economic extraction cum social ostracization* governed the genesis, structure, and functioning of the African-American ghetto in the Fordist metropolis during the half-century after World War I. Blacks were actively recruited into northern cities of the United States cities at the outbreak of World War I because their unskilled labor was indispensable to the industries that formed the backbone of a factory economy fed by booming military production but starved of hands by the interruption of European migration.[25] Yet there was no question of them mixing and consorting with whites, who regarded them as inherently vile, congenitally inferior, and shorn of ethnic honor owing to the stain of slavery.[26] As blacks moved in from the South in the millions, white hostility increased and

---

24 WIRTH, 1928.

25 Cf. MARKS, 1989.

26 The following disquisition on the 'Negro character' published in the journal of the Hyde Park Property Owners' Association (cited in SPEAR, 1968, p. 220) captures the tenor of the view of African Americans held by white Chicagoans at the close of the Great War: "There is nothing in the make-up of a Negro, physically or mentally, which should induce anyone to welcome him as a neighbor. The best of them are insanitary. [...] Ruin alone follows their path. They are proud as peacocks, but

patterns of discrimination and segregation that had hitherto been informal and inconsistent hardened in housing, schooling, and public accommodations and were extended to the economy and polity.[27] African Americans were forcibly funneled into reserved districts that quickly turned homogeneously black as they expanded and consolidated. They had no choice but to seek refuge inside the bounded perimeter of the Black Belt and to endeavor to develop in it a network of separate institutions to procure the basic needs of the castaway community. Thus arose a duplicate city anchored by black churches and newspapers, black block clubs and lodges, black schools and businesses, and black political and civic associations, nested at the core of the white metropolis yet sealed from it by an impassable fence built of custom, legal suasion, economic discrimination (by realtors, banks, and the state), and violence, as manifested in the beatings, fire-bombings, and riots that checked those who dared to stray across the color line.

This forced institutional parallelism predicated on enveloping and inflexible spatial seclusion – not extreme poverty, housing blight, cultural difference, or mere residential separation – is what has distinguished African Americans from every other group in US history, as noted by leading students of the black urban experience from W.E.B. Du Bois and E. Franklin Frazier to Drake and Cayton to Kenneth Clark and Oliver Cox.[28] It also characterizes the trajectory of the Burakumin in the Japanese city after the close of the Tokugawa era.[29] As the lineal descendants of the *eta* and *hinin*, two categories locked out of the fourfold estate order of feudal Japan (composed of warriors, peasants, artisans, and merchants), the Burakumin were untouchables in the eyes of the Buddhist and Shinto religions.[30] As a result, they suffered centuries of virulent prejudice, discrimination,

---

have nothing of the peacock's beauty. [...] Niggers are undesirable neighbors and entirely irresponsible and vicious."

27 Cf. SPEAR, 1968; OSOFSKY, 1971.

28 Cf. WACQUANT, 1998.

29 Cf. HANE, 1982.

30 The eta ("filth eternal") were permanent and hereditary pariahs descended from the occupational guilds tainted by the handling of death, blood, leather, and armor. The hinin ("nonhuman") were temporary and nonhereditary pariahs tainted by criminal punishment (typically banishment for ten to twenty years). The exact origins, composition, and evolving status of the Burakumin are the objects of fierce debates in Japanese historiography in relation with contemporary political battles and policy alternatives (cf. NEARY, 2003), and the topic continues to be as sulfurous as the category.

segregation, and violence that kept them cloistered in social and physical space. By the nineteenth century, they were legally confined from sundown to sunup in out-of-the-way hamlets (*buraku*) that were omitted from official maps; they were obliged to wear a yellow collar and to walk barefoot; they were expected to drop on their hands and knees when addressing commoners; and they could be killed virtually without sanction. Crucially, the Burakumin were barred from entering shrines and temples and they were restricted to wedding solely among themselves, based on the belief that the filth of their ancestors was indelible and communicated by blood. Although they are phenotypically indistinguishable from other Japanese, they can be identified through the marriage registries established and diffused during the Meiji era (1868-1912), as well as by their patronym and place of provenance or residence.

The Burakumin were officially emancipated in 1871, but as they moved into cities they were funneled against their will into notorious neighborhoods near garbage dumps, crematoria, jails, and slaughterhouses, that were widely viewed as nests of criminality and immorality. There, they were barred from industrial employment and locked in low-paying and dirty jobs, sent to separate schools, and compelled to remain largely endogamous,[31] effectively leading constricted lives encased by a network of parallel and inferior institutions. By the late 1970s, according to the Burakumin Defense League, they were estimated to number 3 million, trapped in 6000 *buraku* districts in some thousand cities across the main island, with strong concentrations in the Kyoto region. After a full decade of vigorous programs of affirmative action launched in 1969, one-fifth of the Burakumin were still employed as butchers, shoemakers and in the leather trades, and over one-half worked as street sweepers, trash collectors, and public works employees. As a result, their rates of poverty, welfare receipt, and mortality stood far above the national average.[32]

Spread over three continents and five centuries, the Jewish, African-American, and Burakumin cases demonstrate that the ghetto is not, *pace* Wirth, a "natural area" arising via environmental adaptation governed by a biotic logic "akin to the competitive cooperation that underlies the plant community"[33] The mistake of the early Chicago school here consisted in falsely "converting history into natural history" and passing ghettoization off as "a manifestation of human nature" virtually coterminous with "the history of migration"[34], when it is a

---

31   Cf. DeVos/Wagatsuma, 1966.

32   Cf. Sabouret, 1983.

33   Wirth, 1928, p. 284f.

34   Ibid., p. 285.

highly peculiar form of urbanization warped by asymmetric relations of power between ethnoracial groupings: a special form of *collective violence concretized in urban space*. That ghettoization is *not* an "uncontrolled and undesigned"[35] process, as Robert E. Park asserted in his preface to *The Ghetto*, became especially visible after World War II in the United States when the black American ghetto was reconstructed from the top down, and its shelf-life extended by another quarter-century, through state policies of public housing, urban renewal, and suburban economic development intended to bolster the rigid rigid spatial and social separation of blacks from whites.[36] It is even more glaring in the instance of the "caste cities" built by colonial powers to inscribe in space the hierarchical ethnic organization of their overseas possessions, such as Rabat under French rule over Morocco and Cape Town after the passage of the Group Areas Acts under the apartheid regime of South Africa.[37]

Recognizing that it is a product and instrument of group power makes it possible to appreciate that, in its full-fledged form, the ghetto is a *Janus-faced institution* as it plays opposite roles for the two collectives it binds in a relation of asymmetric dependency. For the dominant category, its rationale is to *confine and control*, which translates into what Max Weber calls the "exclusionary closure" of the subordinate category.[38] For the latter, however, it is a *protective and integrative device* insofar as it relieves its members from constant contact with the dominant and fosters consociation and community-building within the constricted sphere of intercourse it creates. Enforced isolation from the outside leads to the intensification of social exchange and cultural sharing inside. Ghettos are the product of a mobile and tensionful dialectic of external hostility and internal affinity that expresses itself as ambivalence at the level of collective consciousness. Thus, although European Jews consistently protested relegation

---

35   IBID., p. viii.

36   Cf. HIRSCH, 1983.

37   Cf. ABU-LUGHOD, 1980; WESTERN, 1981. Colonial societies form a vast yet largely uncharted domain for the comparative study of the dynamics and forms of ghettoization for three reasons. First, in their settler variant, they were 'geographic' social formations, predicated on land spoliation, close control of the circulation of goods and people, and the rigid regimentation of space. Second, they were founded on sharp, stiff, and salient ethnoracial divisions that were projected onto the spatial organization of the city. Lastly, urban forms were major vehicles for social engineering and identity crafting in the colony. Cf. for illustrations the complementary studies of French dominions by WRIGHT, 1991, and ÇELIK, 1997.

38   Cf. WEBER, 1922/1978.

within their outcast districts, they were nonetheless deeply attached to them and appreciative of the relative security they afforded and the special forms of collective life they supported: Francfort's ghetto in the eighteenth century was "not just the scene of confinement and persecution but a place where Jews were entirely, supremely, at home"[39] Similarly black Americans took pride in having "erected a community in their own image," even as they resented the fact that they had done so under duress, as a result of unyielding white exclusion aimed at warding off the specter of "social equality," that is, sexual mixing.[40]

"I love Harlem because it belongs to me"

The sentiment of being "home" inside the ghetto, in a protected and protecting space, is expressed with verve in the narrative of the daily foibles of Jesse B. Semple or Simple, the character created by the poet Langston Hughes to give voice to the aspirations of urban black Americans at the mid-century point. Thus when he exclaims about Harlem :

> "'It's so full of Negroes, I feel like I got protection.' – 'From what?' – 'From white folks', said Simple. I like Harlem because it belongs to me. […] You say the houses ain't mine. Well, the sidewalk is – and don't you push me off. The cops don't even say, 'Move on,' hardly no more. They learned something from them Harlem riots[41]. […] Here I ain't scared to vote – that's another thing I like about Harlem. […] Folks is friendly in Harlem. I feel like I got the world in a jug and the stopper in my hand! So drink a toast to Harlem!"[42]

Acknowledging the double-sidedness of the ghetto spotlights its role as organizational matrix and symbolic incubator for the production of a "spoiled identity" in Erving Goffman's sense of the term.[43] For the ghetto is not only the concrete means and materialization of ethnoracial domination through the spatial segmentation of the city; it is also a site of intense cultural production and a potent *collective identity machine* in its own right. It helps to incrustate and

---

39   GAY, 1992, p. 67.

40   Cf. DRAKE/CAYTON, (1945) 1993, p. 115

41   In 1935 and 1943, the residents of Harlem rose up against racial exclusion made unbearable by the economic collapse of the Great Crisis, cf. GREENBERT, 1991.

42   HUGHES, 1957, p. 20f.

43   Cf. GOFFMANN, 1963.

elaborate the very division of which it is the expression in two complementary and mutually reinforcing ways. First, the ghetto sharpens the boundary between the outcast category and the surrounding population by deepening the sociocultural chasm between them: it renders its residents objectively and subjectively more dissimilar from other urban dwellers by submitting them to unique conditionings, so that the patterns of cognition and conduct they fashion have every chance of being perceived by outsiders as singular, exotic, even "aberrant",[44] which feeds prejudicial beliefs about them.

Next, the ghetto is a cultural combustion engine that melts divisions amongst the confined population and fuels its collective pride even as it entrenches the stigma that hovers over it. Spatial and institutional entrapment deflects class differences and corrodes cultural distinctions within the relegated ethnoracial category. Thus Christian ostracism welded Ashkenazic and Sephardic Jews under an overarching Jewish identity such that they evolved a common "social type" and "state of mind" across the ghettos of Europe.[45] Similarly, America's dark ghetto accelerated the sociosymbolic amalgamation of mulattos and Negroes into a single unified "race" and turned racial consciousness into a mass phenomenon fueling community mobilization against continued caste exclusion.[46]

Yet this unified identity cannot but be stamped with ambivalence as it remains tainted by the very fact that ghettoization proclaims what Weber calls the "negative evaluation of honor"[47] assigned to the group confined. It is therefore wont to foster among its members sentiments of self-doubt and self-hatred, dissimulation of one's origin through "passing," the pernicious derogation of one's kind, and even fantastical identification with the dominant.[48] The ghetto is home, but it remains an inferior home, built under duress, that exists at the order and sufferance of the dominant. Its residents know that, as it were, in their bones.

---

44 Cf. SENNETT, 1994, p. 244; WILSON, 1987, p. 7f.

45 Cf. WIRTH, 1928, p. 71-88; IBID., 1956/1964

46 Cf. DRAKE/CAYTON, (1945) 1993, p. 390.

47 WEBER, 1922/1978.

48 Cf. CLARK, 1965, p. 63-67. The phenomenon of "passing" among the Burakumin is an explosive question in the historical sociology and politics of Japan's "invisible race", cf. NEARY, 2003. An abiding sense of disgrace born of the internalization of stigma is a prevalent theme in the autobiographies of Burakumin activists (e.g., HANE, 1982, p- 163-171).

Disentangling poverty, segregation, and ethnic clustering

Articulating the concept of ghetto as sociospatial mechanism of ethnoracial closure makes it possible to disentangle the relationship between ghettoization, urban poverty, and segregation, and thence to clarify the structural and functional differences between ghettos and ethnic neighborhoods. I tackle each of these questions in turn.

1. *Poverty is a derivative and variable characteristic of ghettos*: The fact that many ghettos have historically been places of endemic and often acute misery owing to the paucity of space, the density of settlement, and the economic restrictions and statutory maltreatment of their residents does not imply that a ghetto is necessarily a place of destitution, nor that it is uniformly deprived. Indeed the very opposite is true: ghettos have more often than not been vectors of economic amelioration, even as they imposed multifarious restrictions on their residents. The *Judengasse* of Frankfurt, instituted in 1490 and abolished in 1811, went through periods of prosperity no less than penury, and it contained sectors of extraordinary opulence as court Jews helped the city become a vibrant center of trade and finance – part of its glamour to this day comes from it being the ancestral home of the Rothschild dynasty.[49] Being forced to dwell within the walled compound of the *mellah* did not prevent the Jews of Marrakech from thriving economically: many of its business leaders were renowned throughout Morocco for their wealth.[50] Turning to the United States, James Weldon Johnson insisted that the Harlem of the 1930s was "not a slum or a fringe" but the "cultural capital"[51] of black America, a place where "the Negro's advantages and opportunities are greater than in any other place in the country." Similarly, Chicago's "Bronzeville" at the mid-twentieth-century point was not only far more prosperous than the Southern black communities from which its residents had migrated; it harbored the largest and most affluent African-American bourgeoisie of its era.[52]

The ghetto arises through the *double assignation of category to territory and territory to category*, and therefore purports to contain the gamut of classes evolved by the confined group. It follows that, to the degree that this group

---

49   Cf. Wirth, 1928, chapter 4.

50   Cf. Gottreich, 2006, p. 102-105.

51   Johnson, 1930, p. 4.

52   Cf. Drake/Clayton, (1945) 1993.

experiences socioeconomic dispersion, its reserved district offers extensive avenues for economic betterment and upward mobility in its internal social order. Indeed, in the case of African Americans, ghettoization, class differentiation, and collective enrichment proceeded apace: in addition to allowing the conversion of peasants into industrial workers, the rise and consolidation of the ghetto fostered the growth of a black middle class of business owners, professionals, politicians, teachers, and preachers servicing a captive clientele of lower-class coethnics that the dispersed rural communities of the South could have never sustained.[53] Whether a ghetto is poor or not, and to what degree, depends on the overall economic standing of the category it cloisters, its distribution in the division of labor, and on extraneous factors such as demography, ecology, state policies, and the shape of the surrounding economy.

Conversely, not all dispossessed and dilapidated urban districts are ghettos – and if they are such, it is not by dint of their level of deprivation. Declining white neighborhoods in the deindustrializing cities of the US Midwest and the British Midlands, depressed rural towns of the former East Germany and southern Italy, and the disreputable *villas miserias* of greater Buenos Aires at the close of the twentieth century are territories of working-class demotion and decomposition, not ethnic containers dedicated to maintaining an outcast group in a relationship of seclusive subordination.[54] They are not ghettos other than in a purely metaphorical sense, no matter how impoverished and how isolated their residents may be. If extreme rates of concentrated poverty breeding social isolation sufficed to make a ghetto, as argued by William Wilson,[55] then the backcountry of Alabama, Native American reservations, large chunks of the former Soviet Union and most Third-World cities would be gargantuan ghettos. More curiously still, by that definition neither Venice's *ghetto nuovo* nor Chicago's Bronzeville at the peak of their historical development would be ghettos![56]

---

53   The ghetto of Chicago thus produced the country's first black national newspaper, "The Chicago Defender", whose owner, Robert S. Abbott, was also the city's first black millionaire, cf. SPEAR, 1968, p. 165-167.

54   Cf. the case of Buenos Aires dissected by AUYERO, 2000.

55   Cf. WILSON, 1996.

56   Another anomaly generated by the income-based (re)definition of the ghetto is the following: the same neighborhood, harboring the same population and institutions, and fulfilling the same functions in the metropolitan system, would alternately become a ghetto and cease being one with wide variations of its poverty rate caused by cyclical fluctuations of the economy. This conception not only leaves out the canonical cases of the ghetto: by making ghettoization a derivative property of

The *favelas* of the Brazilian metropolis are often portrayed as segregated dens of dereliction and disorganization, overrun by drugs and violence, but upon close observation they turn out to be variegated working-class wards with finely stratified webs of ties to industry and to the wealthy districts for which they supply household service labor. They display considerable variety in levels of segregation and situations of collective "socioeconomic vulnerability".[57] As in the *ranchos* of Venezuela and the *poblaciones* of Chile, families that dwell in these squatter settlements span the color continuum and have extensive genealogical bonds to higher-income households; they are "not socially and culturally marginal, but stigmatized and excluded from a closed class system"[58]. In any case, neither their poverty rate nor the mix of functions they fulfill in the metropolis, from viable reservoir of labor power to warehouse for the rejects of "regressive deindustrialization," qualifies them as ghettos. The same demonstration applies to the *ciudad perdida* in Mexico, the *cantagril* in Uruguay, and the *pueblo jóven* in Peru.[59]

Given that not all ghettos are poor and not all poor areas are (inside) ghettos, one cannot collapse the analysis of ghettoization into the study of slums, impoverished estates, and assorted districts of dispossession in the city. This conflation is precisely the mistake committed by those European observers who, smitten with a vague and emotive vision of the black American ghetto as a territory of urban dissolution and social dread – that is, with the barren *vestiges* of the dark ghetto *after its implosion* at the close of the 1960s – conclude that "ghettoiza-

---

economic inequality and income distribution, it fails utterly to identify a distinctive sociospatial form.

57   Cf. MARQUES/TORRES, 2005; KOWARICK, 2009.

58   PERLMA, 1976, p. 195. Cf. also ZALUAR/ALVITO, 1998.

59   Cf. WACQUANT, 2008(1), p. 7-12. There are at least three major interlinked reasons why ghettos did not emerge in Latin American cities – a fact attested by Gilbert, cf. GILBERT, 1998; IBID., 2011. First, the countries with significant dishonored populations (descendants of African slaves and native peasants) have evolved gradational systems of ethnoracial classification based on phenotype and a host of sociocultural variables, as opposed to categorical systems based on descent (as define Jews in Europe and blacks in the United States), resulting in fuzzy and porous ethnic boundaries. Second, and correlatively, they sport low and inconsistent patterns of residential segregation, and solid segregation is a necessary stepping stone to ghettoization. Third, Latin American states have spawned sharply asymmetric conceptions of citizenship, but they have typically not given legal imprimatur to ethnoracial classification and discrimination.

tion" has struck the lower-class zones of the urban periphery of Europe due to rising unemployment, immigrant segregation, and festering delinquency, or, worse, because they adopt the fleeting impressions of their residents who think of themselves as "ghetto" since this is how depressed and defamed neighborhoods are now publicly labelled in public debate.

"The ghetto" comes to France: How "everyday usage" drowns out sociology

Didier Lapeyronnie's thick book on the alleged coalescence of the "urban ghetto" in France announces a study of "segregation, violence and poverty" in that country but contains not a shred of data and no analysis on these trends and their overlap.[60] Instead, it uses the word ghetto as a loose synonym for declining lower-class estates branded as such by journalists and by some of their residents (who themselves have learned the label from the media). The notion then inexplicably devolves into a subjective concept pertaining to lifestyle, self-conception, and "the shared feeling of having been betrayed" by dominant institutions:

> "The term ghetto belongs to the everyday vocabulary of the *banlieue* [lower-class periphery]. It is used to designate a difficult social or personal situation, even a psychological situation stamped by disorder, poverty, and sometimes violence. It is not necessarily associated with urban segregation and confinement in a territorial sense […]. Many residents can be of the ghetto without living in the ghetto. They can live it partially, as a function of moments and interactions.… By following this everyday usage, we understand the ghetto to be a dimension of individual and collective behaviors […]. The ghetto is not a situation, it is a category of action in an array of social relations […]. We shall seek to evaluate and to define the ghetto as a function of its effects on the self-construction effected by its residents, as a function of the capacity of individuals to name themselves and to assert an 'I', to establish or not a positive relationship to self […]. We shall seek the truth, or rather the truths, of the ghetto, in the words and in the reflections of its residents"[61]

Characterizing the ghetto as a matter of subjective orientation, "a psychological situation stamped by disorder, poverty, and sometimes violence," is both

---

60 Cf. LAPEYRONNIE, 2007.

61 IBID., 2010, p. 22-24, 26.

incoherent and inconsistent with the established conceptual usage of the term. By that definition, neither the Jewish ghetto of Venice nor the black ghetto of Chicago in their full bloom would be ghettos; any population invoking the idiom of the ghetto is *eo ipso* ghettoized; and consequently the simple remedy to ghettoization is for the residents of lower-class districts to change their representations of themselves. Not to mention that French citizens residing outside the country's "sensitive neighborhoods" who feel "betrayed" by leading institutions would be surprised to discover that, unbeknownst to them, they "live the ghetto."

Echoing Lapeyronnie (on whose views he relies), the sensationalist book by *Le Monde* journalist Luc Bronner entitled *The Law of the Ghetto* provides a selective account of street delinquency and a long litany of clashes between unemployed youths and the police in a few *banlieues* brashly labelled "ghettos" because of the shock value of the term to describe territories of "social, political, and economic violence": "We must dare this term which so frightens the Republic" to describe "our Gomorra."[62] When the so-called law of the ghetto denotes the imprint of low-grade criminality, the flourishing of an informal economy, and assorted urban disorders, we know we have reached the point where the word has been emptied of any sociological meaning to serve as an ordinary *categoreme*, a term of accusation and alarm, pertaining not to social science but public polemic, that serves only to sell books and to fuel the spiral of stigmatization enmeshing the unpoverished districts of the urban periphery.

2. *All ghettos are segregated but not all segregated areas are ghettos*: The select boroughs of the West of Paris, the exclusive upper-class suburbs of Boston, Berne or Berlin, and the "gated communities" that have mushroomed in global cities such as Milan, Miami, São Paulo, and Cape Town are monotonous in terms of wealth, income, occupation, and very often ethnicity, but they are not for all that ghettos. Segregation in them is entirely voluntary and elective, and for that very reason it is neither all-inclusive nor perpetual. Fortified enclaves of luxury package "security, seclusion, social homogeneity, amenities, and services" to enable bourgeois families to escape what they perceive as "the chaos, dirt, and danger of the city"[63]. These islands of privilege serve to enhance, not curtail, the life chances and protect the lifestyles of their residents, and they radiate a positive aura of distinction,[64] not a sense of infamy and dread. In terms

---

62 Bronner, 2010, p. 249, 23.
63 Caldeira, 2000, p. 264f.
64 Cf. Low, 2004.

of their causal dynamics, structure and function, they are the very antithesis of the ghetto. To call them such, as with variations on the expression "gilded ghetto," invites confusion and stretches the semantics of the term to the point of meaninglessness.[65]

This indicates that residential segregation is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for ghettoization. For a ghetto to emerge spatial confinement must first be *imposed and all-encompassing*; then it must be overlayed with a distinct and *duplicative set of institutions* enabling the population thus cloistered to reproduce itself within its assigned perimeter. If blacks are the only ethnic category to be "hypersegregated" in American society,[66] it is because they are the only community in that country for which involuntary segregation, assignment to a reserved territory, and organizational parallelism have combined to entrap them in a separate and inferior social cosmos of their own, which in turn bolstered their residential isolation, as well as enforced their extreme marital isolation, virtually unique in the world among major ethnic groups.[67]

That even forcible segregation at the bottom of the urban order does not mechanically produce ghettos is demonstrated by the fate of the declining lower-class *banlieues* of France after the mid-1970s. Although they have been widely described and disparaged as "ghettos" in public discourse and their inhabitants share a vivid feeling of being cast out in a "penalized space" suffused with boredom, anguish, and despair,[68] relegation in these depressed concentrations of public housing laid fallow at the urban periphery is based first on class, and only secondarily on ethnicity, and it is remarkably impermanent. Proof is that the residents who move up the class structure typically move out of the neighborhood – so much so the rate of geographic mobility among the households of "sensitive neighborhoods" surpasses the national average.[69] As a result these degraded districts are culturally heterogeneous, typically harboring a mix of native French families with immigrants from three to six dozen nationalities. And their inhabitants suffer not from institutional duplication and enclosure but, on

---

65 Pinçon-Charlot/Pinçon's, 2007, dissection of the dense web of associations, clubs, and councils through which the upper crust of the French bourgeoisie bulwarks its secluded spaces (exclusive urban enclaves, parks and castles, beaches and gardens) shows that the "ghettos of the gotha" are no ghettos. This catchy coinage makes for good marketing copy but muddies the sociological waters.

66 Cf. Massey/Denton, 1993

67 Cf. Patterson, 1998.

68 Cf. Pétonnet, 1982.

69 Cf. Observatoire des Zones Urbaines Sensibles, 2005.

the contrary, from the lack of an ingrown organizational structure capable of sustaining them in the absence of gainful employment and adequate public services. Like the German *Problemquartier*, the Dutch "*krottenwijk*", and the British "sink estates," France's deteriorating *banlieues* are, sociologically speaking, *anti-ghettos*.[70]

The anti-ghettos of Western Europe and the Roma exception

If and when an urban district turns into a ghetto, it should display five mutually reinforcing properties resulting from the reciprocal asssignation of category and territory: (1) growing ethnic homogeneity; (2) increased encompassment of the target population; (3) rising organizational density; (4) the production and adoption of a collective identity; (5) and impermeable boundaries. On all five dimensions, the formerly industrial *banlieues* of France harboring rising shares of immigrants have been *moving steadily away from the pattern of the ghetto*.[71]

Over the past 30 years, these defamed districts have become more diverse in their ethnic composition; the proportion of all foreigners living in them has stagnated or decreased (depending on geographic location and national provenance); and they have lost most of the dense web of organizations that they harbored at the bloom of the age of the industrial "Red Belt." Most strikingly, notwithstanding political campaigns periodically denouncing "multiculturalism" and the media obsession with "Islamicization," these districts have failed to spawn a collective idiom and vision that would unify their residents on grounds of ethnicity, nationality, religion or postcolonial status.[72] Lastly, families experiencing upward mobility, whether through education, employment, or entrepreneurship, have crossed the boundaries of these districts in droves to move up the ladder of neighborhoods and diffuse in metropolitan space. With national variations and regional twists, this French pattern of a multilevel drift

---

70   Cf. WACQUANT, 2008(1).

71   Cf. IBID., 2008(2).

72   Identification based on territory, often cited as a ground for ethnogenesis among lower-class immigrant youths, turns out to be weak: it is defensive, situational and labile; it is closely linked to lifecycle and evaporates upon entry into the labor market or migration out of the neighborhood, cf. LEPOUTRE, 1997.

antithetical to ghettoization fits the trajectories of most immigrant "minorities" throughout Western Europe.[73]

The French analysts who, caught in the political mood and fed by swirling media rumor, bemoan the morphing of the declining working-class districts of the urban periphery into fearsome "immigrant ghettos" wed conceptual confusion and historical amnesia.[74] First, they conflate territories of dereliction (marked by increased unemployment, the deterioration of the housing stock, and the devalorization of their public image) with ethnic segmentation, and they mistake mere segregation, produced by the conjoint press of class and ethnonational origin, for territorial assignation and institutional parallelism – whose absence is then obfuscated by the hazy and sulfurous category of "communautarianism," or by the invocation of the loose journalistic category of "Muslim communities" that exists only in the worried minds of outsiders. Next, they conveniently forget that ethnically marked populations issued from the former colonies were notably *more* segregated spatially and *more* isolated socially (in terms of social ties, marital unions, and institutional participation) in the 1960s and 1970s than they are today. A half-century ago, these immigrants lived separated lives tightly encased in the peripheral sectors of the secondary labor market and in the parallel institutions of the shanty-towns (*bidonvilles*) and reserved housing compounds of the SONACOTRA, the state agency entrusted with housing workers migrating from the Maghrib.[75] Indeed, in sharp contraposition to the black American hyperghetto, it is the growing mixing of native and immigrant populations at the bottom of the structure of classes and places, and the correlative *closing* of social distance and disparities between them in the context of the decomposition of traditional "working-class territories" that are the source of the xenophobic tensions and conflicts that stamp these urban zones.[76]

If there is one category whose experience deviates sharply from this pattern to veer toward ghettoization, it is the Roma of Eastern Europe. This population of 3 to 5 million, dispersed mostly across Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czekoslovakia, and the Balkans has long been marginalized in both monoethnic rural villages and urban districts combining the four structural components of stigma, constraint, spatial enclosure and institutional parallelism. After the collapse of the Soviet empire, the destruction of the safety net and the abrupt social polarization wrought by the market economy have reactivated anti-Roma prej-

---

73 Cf. MUSTERD/KEMPEN, 2009; PEACH, 2009; HARTOG/ZORLU, 2009
74 E.g. MUCCHIELLI/LE GOAZIOU, 2007; LAPEYRONNIE, 2007.
75 Cf. SAYAD/DUPUY, 1995; BERNADOT, 1999
76 Cf. WACQUANT, 2008(1).

udice (as a "criminal race"), animosity, and discrimination and territorial fixation has flared anew as Gypsies sank into unemployment and destitution.[77] But there are also counter-tendencies: many Romas have passed undetected among the non-Gypsy population while others have experienced upward class mobility against the backdrop of a fuzzy ethnic hierarchy enforced with variable stringency in the different nations. Overall, class and country prove to be stronger determinants of the trajectory of Gypsies than race and space.[78] Nonetheless, the controversial policy of the Berlusconi government to reinstitute state-run camps to corral Gypsies on the outskirts of Italian cities and the heinous campaign of destruction of "illegal Rom encampments" launched by President Nicolas Sarkozy in France in the summer of 2010 to curry favor with electors of the far right are there to remind us that the Roma remain prime candidates for the (re) activation of sociospatial enclosure even in western Europe.[79]

3. *Ghettos and ethnic neighborhoods sport divergent structures and serve opposite functions*: Moving beyond a gradational perspective to scrutinize the peculiar patterning of social relations within the ghetto as well as between it and the surrounding city throws into sharp relief the differences between the ghetto and the ethnic clusters or immigrant neighborhoods such as newcomers to the metropolis have formed in countless countries. The foreign "colonies" of interwar Chicago that Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, and Louis Wirth – and after them the liberal tradition of assimilationist sociology and historiography[80] – mistook for so many white "ghettos" were scattered and mobile constellations born of cultural affinity and occupational concentration, more so than prejudice and discrimination. Segregation in them was partial and porous, a product of immigrant solidarity and ethnic attraction instead of being rigidly imposed by sustained outgroup hostility. Consequently residential separation was neither uniformly nor rigidly visited upon these groups: in 1930, when the all-black Bronzeville harbored 92 % of the city's African-American population, Chicago's Little Ire-

---

77   Cf. GHEORGE, 1991.

78   Cf. LADÁNYI/SZELÉNYI, 2006.

79   The prototype Rom "village" of Castel Romano outside of Rome, home to some 800 Gypsies, with its prefabricated huts laid out in a grid and surrounded by a high metal fence patrolled round the clock by a special police force, and the subjection of its residents to a special census and fingerprinting are strongly redolent of the early modern Italian ghetto. Cf. CLOUGH MARINARO, 2009; CALAME, 2010: http://places.designobserver.com, 07.05.2013.

80   Cf. MILLER, 1992.

land was "an ethnic hodge-podge" of 25 nationalities composed of only one-third Irish persons and containing a paltry 3 % of the city's denizens of Irish ancestry. The eleven dispersed districts making up Little Italy were 46 % Italian and contained just under one-half of Chicagoans of Italian origin. Thus both of these clusters were ethnically plural and monolithically white, and both contained a minority of the population supposedly ghettoized in them.[81]

This pattern was not unique to Chicago but repeated itself in every major industrial center of the Midwest and Northeast of the United States. For instance, the typical Italian immigrant to Philadelphia in 1930 resided amongst "14 percent other Italian immigrants, 38 percent Italian stock, 23 percent all foreign born persons and 57 percent all foreign stock"[82]. Except for marginal and local peculiarities, there were no white "ethnic" neighborhoods in the American metropolis wherein members of one European community were thoroughly isolated from native whites and monopolized space and local institutions to the exclusion of urbanites of other national origins.[83] What is more, the distinctive institutions of European immigrant enclaves were turned outward: they operated to facilitate adjustment to the novel environment of the US metropolis. They neither replicated the organizations of the country of origin nor perpetuated social isolation and cultural distinctiveness. And so they typically waned within two generations as their users gained access to their American counterparts and climbed up the class order and the corresponding ladder of places.[84] All of which is in sharp contrast with the immutable racial exclusivity and enduring institutional alterity of the Black Belt. This Chicago illustration dramatizes the fact that the immigrant neighborhood and the ghetto serve diametrically opposed functions: the one is a springboard for *assimilation* via cultural learning and social-cum-spatial mobility, the other a material and symbolic isolation ward geared toward *dissimilation*. The former is best figured by a bridge, the latter by a wall.[85]

---

81 Cf. PHILPOT, 1978, p. 141-145.

82 HERSCHBERG et al., 1981, p. 200.

83 Cf. WARNER/BURKE, 1969.

84 Cf. NELLI, 1970.

85 Cf. for full documentation of the sharp divergence between the black ghetto and the 'colonies' formed by European immigrant (Jews from Eastern countries, Poles, Italians, and the Irish) in the first half of the twentieth century in the United States LIEBERSON, 1980; BODNAR et al., 1982; ZUNZ, 1986, and GERSTLE, 2001, esp. chap. 5. Workers of Belgian, Italian, Polish, and Iberian provenance underwent a very similar process of spatial diffusion via class incorporation in the French industrial

From shield to sword

It is fruitful, then, to think of *ghetto and ethnic cluster as two ideal-typical configurations situated at opposite ends* of the homological continua of constraint and choice, entrapment and self-protection, exclusivity and heterogeneity, encompassment and dispersal, inward and outward orientations, rigidity and fluidity, along which various populations (themselves differently marked) can be pegged or travel over time depending on the intensity with which the forces of stigma, constraint, spatial confinement, and institutional parallelism impinge upon them and coalesce with one another. We can then shift the analysis from the ghetto as a topographic object, a static state, to *ghettoization* as a sociospatial dynamic, a *multilevel process* liable to empirical specification and measurement. A population that formed mobile clusters out of cultural affinity and inconsistent hostility can find itself subjected to stringent ostracization and territorial fixation such that it evolves permanent sites for comprehensive seclusion: such was the experience of Jews in early modern Europe and of African Americans in the northern metropolis of the United States at the dawn of the Fordist era as they shifted from segregation to ghettoization.

Conversely, ghettoization can be attenuated to the point where, through gradual erosion of, and disjunction between, its spatial, social, and mental boundaries, the ghetto devolves into an elective ethnic concentration operating as a springboard for structural integration and/or cultural assimilation into the broader social formation. This describes well the trajectory of the Chinatowns of the United States from the early to the late twentieth century[86] and the status of the Cuban immigrant enclave of Miami which fostered integration through biculturalism after the Mariel exodus of 1980.[87] It also characterizes the "Kimchee Towns" in which Koreans converged in the metropolitan areas of Japan, which sport a blend of features making them a hybrid of ghetto and ethnic cluster:[88] they are places of infamy that first arose through enmity and constraint, but over

---

city of the first half of the twentieth century in spite of being subjected to virulent xenophobia and widespread collective violence during phases of economic turmoil, cf. NOIRIEL, 1988. Over the past quarter-century, postcolonial migrants have been following a germane trajectory in cities throughout Europe, characterized by low to moderate segregation from nationals and stagnant to decreasing spatial concentration, cf. MUSTERD, 2005.

86   Cf. ZHOU, 1994.

87   Cf. PORTES/STEPICK, 1993.

88   Cf. DEVOS/CHUNG, 1981.

the years their population has become ethnically mixed; residential mingling has in turn enabled Koreans to socialize and intermarry with Japanese neighbors as well as obtain Japanese citizenship through naturalization.

This analytic schema allows one to assess the degree to which a given urban configuration approximates one or the other pure type and on what dimension(s). Thus the so-called gay ghetto is more aptly characterized as a "quasi-ethnic community," since "most gay persons can 'pass' and need not be confined to interacting with their 'own kind'"[89] and none are forced to reside in the areas of visible concentration of gay institutions based on their sexual orientation. Indeed, the vast majority of gays do not live in, or even patronize, these districts, which are local clusters of commercial establishments and public spaces catering to the preferences of gays in matters of consumption and sociability. Their degree of closure, mutual orientation, and collective organization are highly variable and often contested, both without and within the gay district, as illustrated by the case of Le Marais in Paris.[90]

The double-sidedness of the ghetto as *sword* (for the dominant) and *shield* (for the subordinate) implies that, to the degree that its institutional completeness and autonomy are abridged, its protective role is diminished and risks being swamped by its exclusionary modality. In situations where its residents cease to be of economic value to the controlling group, extraction evaporates and no longer balances out ostracization. Ethnoracial encapsulation can then escalate to the point where the ghetto morphs into an apparatus merely to warehouse the spoiled and supernumerary population, as a staging ground for its expulsion, or as a springboard for the ultimate form of ostracization, namely, physical annihilation.

The first scenario fits the evolution of America's "Black Metropolis" after the peaking of the Civil Rights movement in the mid-1960s. Having lost its role as a reservoir of unskilled labor power, the dark ghetto crashed and broke down into a dual sociospatial structure composed of (i) the *hyperghetto*, entrapping the marginal fractions of the black working class in the barren perimeter of the historic ghetto; (ii) and the *black middle-class satellites* that burgeoned at the latter's periphery, in the areas left vacant by white outmigration, where the growing African-American bourgeoisie achieved spatial and social distance from its lower-class brethren.[91] The hyperghetto is a novel sociospatial configuration, doubly segregated by race and class, devoid of economic function, and

---

89   Murray, 1979, p. 169.

90   Cf. Sibalis, 2004.

91   Cf. Wacquant, 2008(1), p. 11, 51f., 117f.

thus stripped of the communal institutions that used to provide succor to its inhabitants. These institutions have been replaced by the social control institutions of the state (increasingly staffed by the black middle class), and in particular by the booming prison and its disciplinary tentacles. As the authorities turned from the social welfare to the penal regulation of racialized marginality in the city, the hyperghetto became deeply penetrated by and symbiotically linked to the hypertrophied carceral system of the United States by a triple relationship of structural homology, functional surrogacy, and cultural fusion.[92] The second and third scenarios, wherein the ghetto devolves into a means of radical ostracization, were those implemented by Nazi Germany when it revived the *Judenghetto* between 1939 and 1944, first, to impoverish and concentrate Jews with a view toward relocation and later, after mass deportation turned out to be impractical, to funnel them toward extermination camps as part of the "final solution".[93]

The unchecked intensification of its exclusionary thrust attendant upon the loss of its shielding capacity suggests that the ghetto might be most profitably studied not by analogy with urban slums, lower-class districts, and immigrant enclaves but alongside the reservation, the camp, and the prison, as belonging to a broader genus of institutions for the *forced confinement of dispossessed and dishonored groups*.[94] It is not by happenstance that the Bridewell of London (1555), the Zuchthaus of Amsterdam (1654), and the Hospital général of Paris (1656), designed to instill the discipline of wage work in vagrants, beggars, and criminals via incarceration, were invented around the same time as the Jewish ghetto. It is not by coincidence that today's sprawling refugee camps in Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, and the occupied territories of Palestine and the Gaza Strip look ever more like a cross between the ghettos of early modern Europe and gigantic gulags.[95] And that retention camps for unlawful immigrants have mushroomed throughout Europe as the European Union moved to treating transnational peregrination from the global South as a matter of material security and ethnonational status.[96]

---

92   Cf. WACQUANT, 2001.

93   Cf. FRIEDMAN, 1980; BROWNING, 1986.

94   WACQUANT, 2010, sketches an analytic framework that brings together into a single model forms of sociospatial seclusion at the top (gated communities, upper-class districts) and at the bottom (slum, ethnic cluster, ghetto, prison), as well as urban and rural forms (among which figure preserves, reservations, and camps).

95   Cf. AGIER, 2008; ROZELIER, 2007.

96   Cf. LE COUR GRANDMAISON et al., 2007.

A robust analytic concept of the ghetto as an organizational device for the spatial enclosure and control of a stigmatized group offers a way out of the semantic morass and empirical confusion created by the unreflective adoption of the shifting folk notions of the same among political and intellectual elites. It allows us, not only to describe, differentiate, and explain the diverse urban forms developed by tainted populations as they come into the city without falling into the many traps set by the metaphorical and rhetorical usages of "the ghetto." By spotlighting the tangled nexus of space, power and dishonor, it also gives us the means to grasp the structural and functional kinship between the ghetto, the prison, and the camp just as the state managers of the advanced societies are increasingly resorting to borders, walls, and bounded districts as the means to define, confine, and control problem categories.

Literature

ABU-LUGHOD, JANET L., Rabat, Urban Apartheid in Morocco, Princeton, NJ 1980.

AGIER, MICHEL, Gérer les indésirables. Des camps de réfugiés au gouvernement humanitaire, Paris 2008 (Engl. transl.: Managing the Undesirables: Refugee Camps and Humanitarian Government, Polity, 2011).

AUYERO, JAVIER, Poor People's Politics: Peronist Survival Networks and the Legacy of Evita, Durham, NC 2000.

BERNARDOT, MARC, Chronique d'une institution: la 'Sonacotra' (1956-1976), in: Sociétés contemporaines 33-34 (1999), p. 39-58.

BODNAR, JOHN et al., Lives of Their Own: Blacks, Italians, and Poles in Pittsburgh, Urbana, IL 1986.

BRONNER, LUC, La Loi du ghetto. Enquête dans les banlieues françaises, Paris 2010.

BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER R., Nazi Ghettoization Policy in Poland, 1939-1941., in: Central European History 19, 4 (1986), p. 343-368.

CALAME, JON, The Roma of Rome: Heirs to the Ghetto System, in: The Design Observer, December 2010: http://places.designobserver.com, 07.05.2013.

CALDEIRA, TERESA, City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sâo Paulo, Berkeley 2000.

ÇELIK, ZEYNEP, Urban Forms and Colonial Confrontations: Algiers Under French Rule, Berkeley 1997.

CLARK, KENNETH B., Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power, New York 1956.

CLOUGH MARINARO, ISABELLA, Between Surveillance and Exile: Biopolitics and the Roma in Italy, in: Bulletin of Italian Politics 1, 2 (2009), p. 265-87.

CURIEL, ROBERTA/COOPERMAN, BERNARD DOV, The Ghetto of Venice, New York 1990.

DEVOS, GEORGE/CHUNG, DEAKYUN, Community Life in a Korean Ghetto, in: Koreans in Japan: Ethnic Conflict and Accomodation, ed. by CHANGSOO LEE and GEORGE DEVOS, Berkeley, CA 1981, p. 225-251.

DEVOS, GEORGE/WAGATSUMA, HIROSHI (eds.), Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality, Berkeley, CA 1966.

DRAKE, ST. CLAIR/CAYTON, HORACE R., Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City (1945), Chicago, IL 1993.

FRIEDMAN, PHILIP, The Jewish Ghettos of the Nazi Era., in: Id./Fridman, Ada June (eds.), Roads to Extinction: Essays on the Holocaust, New York 1980, p. 59-87.

GALLIE, W.B., Essentially Contested Concepts, in: Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society 56 (1956), p. 167-198.

GAY, RUTH, The Jews of Germany: A Historical Portrait, New Haven, CT 1992.

GERSTLE, GARY, American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century, Princeton, NJ 2001.

GILBERT, ALAN, The Latin American City, New York 1998.

ID., On the Absence of Ghettos in Latin America, in: HAYNES, BRUCE D./HUTCHISON RAY (eds.), The Ghetto: Contemporary Global Issues and Controversies, Boulder, Colorado 2012, p. 191-225.

GHEORGHE, NICOLAE, Roma-Gypsy Ethnicity in Eastern Europe, in: Social Research 58, 4 (1991), p. 829-844.

GOFFMAN, ERVING, Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity, New York 1963.

GOTTREICH, EMILY, The Mellah of Marrakesh: Jewish and Muslim Space in Morocco's Red City, Bloomington 2006.

GREENBERT, CHERYL LYNN, Or Does it Explode? Black Harlem in the Great Depression, New York, Oxford 1991.

HANE, MIKISO, Peasants, Rebels, and Outcastes: The Underside of Modern Japan, New York 1982.

HANNERZ, ULF, Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community. New York 1969.

HARTOG, JOOP/ZORLU ASLAN, Ethnic Segregation in the Netherlands: An Analysis at Neighbourhood Level, in: International Journal of Manpower 30,1/2(2009), p. 15-25.

HAYNES, BRUCE D./HUTCHISON RAY (eds.), The Ghetto: Origins, History, Discourse, in: City & Community 7, 4 (2008), p. 347-398.

ID. (eds.), The Ghetto: Contemporary Global Issues and Controversies, Boulder, Colorado 2012.

HERSCHBERG, THEODORE et al., Philadelphia: Work, Space, Family, and Group Experience in the 19th Century, Oxford, New York 1981.

HIRSCH, ARNOLD, Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago 1940-1970. Cambridge 1983.

HUGHES, LANGSTON, Simple Stakes a Claim, New York et al. 1957.

JARGOWSKY, PAUL A., Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City, New York 1997.

JOHNSON, JAMES WELDON, Black Manhattan (1930), New York 1981.

JOHNSON, PAUL, A History of the Jews, New York 1987.

KERNER COMMISSION, The Kerner Report. The 1968 Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968), New York 1989.

KOWARICK, LÚCIO, Viver em risco. Sobre a vulnerabilidade socioeconômica e civil, Sâo Paulo 2009.

LADÁNYI, JANOS/ SZELÉNYI, IVAN, Patterns of Exclusion: Constructing Gypsy Ethnicity and the Making of an Underclass in Transitional Societies of Europe, New York 2006.

LAPEYRONNIE, DIDIER, Ghetto urbain. Ségrégation, violence, pauvreté en France aujourd'hui. Paris 2007.

LE COUR GRANDMAISON et al. (eds.), Le Retour des camps. Sangatte, Lampedusa, Gantánamo, Paris 2007.

LEPOUTRE, DAVID, Cœur de banlieue. Codes, rites et langages, Paris, 1997.

LEVINE, MARTIN P., Gay Ghetto, in: Journal of Homosexuality 4, 4 (1979). Reprinted in expanded form as: 'YMCA': The Social Organization of Gay Male Life, in: Gay Macho: The Life and Death of the Homosexual Clone, New York 1998, p. 30-54.

LOGAN, JOHN R./MOLOTCH, HARVEY L., Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place, Berkeley, CA 1987.

LOW, SETHA M., Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America, New York 2004.

LIEBERSON, STANLEY, A Piece of the Pie : Blacks and White Immigrants since 1880, Berkeley 1980.

LUBOVE, ROY, The Progressives and the Slums: Tenement House Reform in New York City, 1890-1917, Pittsburgh, PA 1963.

MARKS, CAROL, Farewell – We're Good and Gone: The Great Black Migration. Bloomington, IN 1989.

MARQUES, EDUARDO AND HAROLDO TORRES, São Paulo: segregação, pobreza e desigualdades sociais, São Paulo 2005.

MASSEY, DOUGLAS/DENTON, NANCY, American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass, Cambridge, MA 1993.

MILLER, Z. L., Pluralism, Chicago School Style: Louis Wirth, the Ghetto, the City, and Integration., in: Journal of Urban History 18, 3 (1992), p. 251-279.

MUCCHIELLI, LAURENT/LE GOAZIOU, VÉRONIQUE, Quand les banlieues brûlent. Retour sur les émeutes de novembre 2005, Paris 2007.

MURRAY, STEPHEN O., The Institutional Elaboration of a Quasi-Ethnic Community, in: International Review of Modern Sociology 9 (1979), p. 165-177.

MUSTERD, SAKO, Social and Ethnic Segregation in Europe: Levels, Causes, and Effects, in: Journal of Urban Affairs 27, 3 (2005), p. 331-348.

ID./VAN KEMPEN, RONALD, Segregation and Housing of Minority Ethnic Groups in Western European Cities, in: Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie 100, 4 (2009), p. 559-566.

ID. et al. (eds.), Neighbourhoods of Poverty: Urban Social Exclusion and Integration in Europe, London 2006.

NEARY, IAN, Burakumin at the End of History, in: Social Research 70, 1 (2003), p. 269-294.

NELLI, HUMBERT S., Italians in Chicago: A Study in Ethnic Mobility, New York, Oxford 1970.

NOIRIEL, GÉRARD, Le Creuset français, Paris 1998 (English tr. The French Melting Pot, Ithaca 1996).

OBSERVATOIRE DES ZONES URBAINES SENSIBLES, Rapport 2005, Paris 2005.

OSOFSKY, GILBERT, Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto – Negro New York, 1890-1930, 2nd ed., New York 1971.

PATTERSON, ORLANDO, Broken Bloodlines, in: ID., Rituals of Blood: Consequences of Slavery in Two American Centuries, New York 1998, p. 1-167.

PEACH, CERI, Slippery Segregation: Discovering or Manufacturing Ghettos?, in: Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 35 (2009), p. 1381-1395.

PERLMAN, JANICE, The Myth of Marginality: Urban Poverty and Politics in Rio de Janeiro, Berkeley, CA 1976.

PÉTONNET, COLETTE, Espaces habités. Ethnologie des banlieues, Paris 1982.

PHILPOTT, THOMAS LEE, The Slum and the Ghetto: Neighborhood Deterioration and Middle-Class Reform, Chicago 1880-1930, New York, Oxford 1978.

PINÇON-CHARLOT, MONIQUE/PINÇON, MICHEL, Les Ghettos du gotha. Comment la bourgeoisie défend ses espaces, Paris 2007.

PORTES, ALEJANDRO/STEPICK, ALEX, City on the Edge: The Transformation of Miami, Berkeley, CA 1993.

ROZELIER, MURIEL, Naplouse Palestine. Chroniques du ghetto, Paris 2007.

SABOURET, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, L'autre Japon: les Burakumin, Paris 1983.

SAYAD, ABDELMALEK/DUPUY, ÉLIANE, Un Nanterre algérien, terre de bidon-villes, Paris 1995.

SCHIERUP, CARL-ULRIK et al., Migration, Citizenship and the European Welfare State: A European Dilemma, Oxford 2006.

SENNETT, RICHARD, Fear of Touching, in: ID., Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization, New York 1994, p. 212-251.

SIBALIS, MICHAEL, Urban Space and Homosexuality: The Example of the Marais, Paris' 'Gay Ghetto', in: Urban Studies 41, 9 (2004), p. 1739-1758.

SILLS, DAVID/MERTON, ROBERT (eds.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York 1986.

SMALL, MARIO, Four Reasons to Abandon the Idea of 'the Ghetto', in: City & Community 7, 4 (2009), p. 389-398.

SPEAR, ALLAN H., Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920, Chicago, IL 1968.

STOW, KENNETH R., Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe, Cambridge, MA 1992.

STOW, KENNETH, Theater of Acculturation: The Roman Ghetto in the Sixteenth Century, Seattle 2001.

WACQUANT, LOÏC, A Black City Within the White': Revisiting America's Dark Ghetto, in: Black Renaissance 2, 1 (1998), p. 141-151.

ID., Gutting the Ghetto: Political Censorship and Conceptual Retrenchment in the American Debate on Urban Destitution, in : Globalisation and the New City: Migrants, Minorities and Urban Transformations in Comparative Perspective, ed. by MALCOLM CROSS and ROBERT MOORE, Basingstoke 2002, p. 32-49.

ID., Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality. Cambridge 2008(1).

ID., Ghettos and Anti-Ghettos: An Anatomy of the New Urban Poverty, in: Thesis Eleven 94 (2008)(2), p. 113-118.

ID., Designing Urban Seclusion in the 21st Century, in: Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal 43 (2010), p. 165-178.

ID., Deadly Symbiosis: Race and the Rise of the Penal State, Cambridge 2011.

WARNER, SAM BASS, JR./BURKE, COLIN B., Cultural Change and the Ghetto, in: Journal of Contemporary History 4 (1969), p. 173-187.

WARD, DAVID, Poverty, Ethnicity, and the American City, 1840-1925, Cambridge 1989.

WEBER, MAX, Economy and Society (1922), 2 vols., ed. by GUENTER ROTH and CLAUS WITTICH, Berkeley, CA 1978.

WESTERN, JOHN, Outcast Cape Town, Minneapolis, MN 1981.

WILSON, WILLIAM JULIUS, The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy, Chicago, IL 1987.

ID., When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor. New York 1996.

WIRTH, LOUIS, The Ghetto, Chicago, IL 1928.

ID., The Ghetto (1956), in: On Cities and Social Life, ed. by ALBERT J. REISS, JR., Chicago, IL 1964, p. 84-98.

WRIGHT, GWENDOLYN, The Politics of Design in French Urban Colonialism. Chicago 1991.

ZALUAR, ALBA/ALVITO, MARCOS (eds.), Um século de favela, Rio de Janeiro 1998.

ZHOU, MIN, Chinatown: The Socioeonomic Potential of an Urban Enclave, Philadelphia, PA 1992.

ZUNZ, OLIVIER, The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Urban Development, and Immigrants in Detroit, 1880-1920, Chicago 1986.