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CHAPTER 7

Places of Stigma:
Ghettos, Barrios, and Banlieues

Ernesto Castañeda

While concentrating on the Parisian periphery, this chapter implicitly compares different spaces of social stigma and exclusion: ghettos, barrios, and banlieues. The ghetto was initially a state-designated space for a stigmatized group. It first appeared in Europe; the term was later applied in the United States to urban neighborhoods, especially the areas where African Americans lived after migrating from the South (Haynes and Hutchison 2008). The view of the ghetto as a place of insecurity needing strong policing became a top urban policy concern in the United States and later in Europe (Wacquant 2008). Immigrant enclaves on both sides of the Atlantic have also evoked this preoccupation with “dangerous” peoples and spaces.

I concur with Talja Blokland (2008, 377) that “the question is not ‘which area is a ghetto’ but instead ‘how do mechanisms of border creation and maintaining create areas where residents consider themselves involuntarily segregated and what processes and mechanisms contribute to this understanding of social reality?’” The boundaries of concrete ghettos, banlieues, and immigrant enclaves shift over time. Studying their historical formation and dissolution as well as the actual views and practices of their inhabitants sheds light on the social processes and mechanisms that constitute them.
This chapter begins by briefly discussing the theoretical concept of the social boundary, which can be used to schematize the parallel processes that stigmatize space. Proceeding chronologically, it then looks briefly at the history of the ghetto and the banlieue to show how the current stigma of the Parisian banlieue draws on a long history of power relations inscribed in social space. The chapter turns next to ethno-surveys, participant observation, interviews, and secondary sources to describe how contemporary practices in and around the banlieue are in conflict with the political, journalistic, and sometimes sociological approaches used to frame them. It ends by making some general comparisons with the ideas of “the ghetto” and “el barrio.” The processes that produce the mental maps of the ghetto, the banlieue, and the barrio are similar, even when their objective conditions differ.

Relational boundary-making mechanisms are the middle-range theory implied in the chapter. The argument and methodological approach is that from an analytical perspective it is impossible to understand banlieues, ghettos, and other stigmatized spaces without studying their relationship with what lies outside of them. One should not talk about the Parisian banlieue without talking about Paris, and one cannot talk seriously about Paris without taking into account its banlieue. Understanding the history and contemporary antagonistic relationship between places of stigma and their surroundings allows one to see that the same processes of framing and boundary-making are in place. Yet differences in the way these boundaries are produced and policed result in different social outcomes. Historical and ethnographical contextualization illuminates similarities and differences between the ghetto, the barrio, and the banlieue.

BOUNDARY-MAKING
Michèle Lamont and Virag Molnar (2002, 168) define symbolic boundaries as “conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space.” Categorization is a basic mental way of organizing the many stimuli that our brain is confronted with every day (Massey 2007; Simmel 1971; Zelizer and Tilly 2006). Social categories arise when there seems to be implicit agreement on how to categorize other people and determine their symbolic worth (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006). Group boundaries result from a process of relational identifications and feedback
loops, since how group X defines itself in relation to group Y is likely to cause a response from group Y, and group Y’s response, in turn, could affect group X’s self-conception; the process repeats itself ad infinitum (Tilly 2005). Different mechanisms and boundary-work keep X different from Y (Massey 2007; Roy 1994; Thorne 1993; Tilly 1998, 2004). We see social boundaries when “a boundary displays both a categorical and a social or behavioral dimension . . . —how to relate to individuals classified as ‘us’ and ‘them’ under given circumstances” (Wimmer 2008, 975). Thus, the existence of social boundaries often affects life chances; for example, workers with an address in a stigmatized banlieue are less likely to be employed than those living in central Paris. Yet moral rationales are often provided to deny or justify unequal outcomes (Lamont 2000). “The act of giving credit or (especially) assigning blame draws us-them boundaries: We are the worthy people, they the unworthy” (Tilly 2008, 7). Once these beliefs are internalized, it is difficult to humanize “the other,” and stigmatization appears “natural” (Bourdieu 1991, 1998).

As I show here in the case of Paris, when political and spatial configurations stress and underline differences, almost mirror-image moral and symbolic boundaries between groups form under what Georg Simmel (1964) called concentric social circles. The mental social circles and boundaries for natives in the ideal-typical nation-state would look something like this:

**FIGURE 7.1. Imagined Concentric Circles of Identification**
This is the picture assumed in liberal political theory. But in multicultural global cities, such as Paris and New York, different concentric circles overlap (especially at the neighborhood level) with those of immigrants or minorities with different religions, languages, or national origins (Sennett 2008). The challenge of a multicultural society is to go beyond these “primordial” groupings by minimizing spatial segregation and forming a civic community among cultural others—a long the spirit of the motto \textit{e pluribus unum} (of many, one)—resulting in an equal citizenship for all the residents of a city (Castañeda 2010).

THE GHETTO AND THE MYTH OF THE URBAN COMMUNITY

The word \textit{ghetto} may come from the Venetian (local proto-Italian) word \textit{gettare}, “to pour,” used to name a foundry off of a Venetian island. In 1382, Jewish people were allowed to act as merchants in the medieval principality of Venice, but by 1516 they had to sleep within the confines of the island of the former foundry (Haynes and Hutchison 2008). In this fashion, the meaning of \textit{ghetto} as a housing area concentrating a segregated and stigmatized group was born. Ironically, this coincides with the other meanings of \textit{gettare}: to throw, to cast away.

Stigma was ascribed to space and marked in the body. When Jewish people went into Venice, the men had to wear a yellow circle and the women a yellow scarf, and they could not wear jewelry (Haynes and Hutchison 2008). This practice was adopted many years later throughout Europe. Nazism further reinforced the connection between ascribed characteristics and special treatment: Jews were marked physically (with yellow stars) and officially (with notes on identity cards and passports) and concentrated in living quarters and camps with known dire consequences. Ethnic spatial segregation does not always play the same role: The ultimate role of a concentration camp is extermination; a reservation’s role is to keep social and spatial distance; and a ghetto can function as a prophylactic to maintain social boundaries while allowing for capital investment and labor exploitation (Sennett 1994; Wacquant 2010b).

At the birth of sociology in the United States, the Chicago School of Sociology assigned itself the task of conducting community studies that would map and designate “natural areas” within Chicago. These originally descriptive studies had a performative effect, since by partly describing the city of Chicago, these
scholars also created neighborhood names and characteristics and went on to convince politicians, schoolteachers, social workers, and others to use these neighborhood labels and boundaries, even if many city residents would not have recognized them as characterizing “their neighborhood” (Venkatesh 2001).

Although the Chicago School left a legacy of great ethnographies and made many methodological and theoretical contributions, it also created a myth of transplanted rural villages in urban spaces. This myth led policymakers and social scientists to try to impose a certain order—grouping social groups into particular neighborhoods as if they were plants in a thick botanical garden. Through this process we see the romantic ideal of traditional rural communities being reproduced in the concepts of the ghetto, barrio, banlieue, and immigrant enclave alongside the desire to circumvent, round up, and fence in unknown “others,” the poor, and the dangerous classes.

Major theorists of large social change, including modernization, industrialization, urbanization, and globalization (de Tocqueville, Durkheim, Simmel, Weber, Wirth, Thomas, Park, and so on), invariably contrast city urban life with the ideal-typical rural community. These theories posit city-dwellers as atomized, seemingly autonomous, and able to remake their identity without the social norms and integration provided by small communities. But this is not necessarily the case for rural and international migrants who arrive in their cities of destiny with customs and identities formed in a different cultural context (Castañeda 2010). Chain migration, social networks, homophily, cheap housing, and exclusion by others often combine to concentrate newcomers into ethnic enclaves (Tilly and Brown 1967; Wilson and Portes 1980), yet this does not signify that these newcomers lack a desire to assimilate structurally.

DEFINING THE BANLIEUE

The word banlieue refers to the areas surrounding a city; it is an update of the word faubourg, which used to mean “lying outside the city” but now commonly refers to areas in central Paris that were incorporated into the city centuries ago (Castañeda 2009a). There is a temptation to compare the French banlieues with the American “suburbs,” but there are important differences. In the United States the word suburb usually carries a positive connotation and is associated with private property, middle-class ease, low-density population, and an overall
high quality of life, even though suburbs originally emerged to provide affordable housing for lower-middle-class white ethnics (Gans 1982; Katznelson 2005). Furthermore, the American suburbs have grown increasingly diverse in recent years (Fry 2009).

In contrast to the idyllic image of the homogeneous, peaceful, and affluent American suburbs, the contemporary immediate connotation of the banlieue and its inhabitants, the banlieusards, is one of overcrowded public housing, people of color, new immigrants (mainly from French former colonies), and crime (Wacquant 2010b). The banlieue is something closer to the stereotype of “the ghetto” in America, and although there are important differences, what both share today is the aggregate experience of exclusion from the labor market, categorical inequality, social boundaries, and housing policies and practices that result in residential segregation (Massey and Denton 1993).

Lately the word banlieue carries a negative connotation somewhat at odds with its complex history and social reality. The modern-day Parisian banlieues include some of the wealthiest areas of France, including La Defense, Neuilly, and even Versailles and Fontainebleau. All of these places are, in the strict sense, banlieues, yet they are anything but shabby or humble; still, they are places of racial, class, and cultural homogeneity, featuring gated communities and wealthy enclaves (Frank 2004; Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot 2007). Thus, it is important to keep in mind that not all French banlieues are the same (Wacquant 2008), given the differences between the western banlieues, which include areas like La Defense, Bois Colombes, and Neuilly (where French president Nicolas Sarkozy was mayor for many years), and the stigmatized and heavily populated cités (public housing projects), such as La Courneuve and Sarcelles. In this author’s opinion, the latter are over-stigmatized in that they lack the objective poverty or lack of infrastructure that can be observed in American über-ghettos, Mexican ciudades perdidas, Brazilian favelas, and Argentinean villas miseria, not to mention the poverty in Haiti, rural Morocco, and sub-Saharan Africa, where some of their inhabitants come from. Most people in the banlieues and the cités have a roof over their heads, food, health care, and provision of other basic necessities. Yet it is relative deprivation that matters, and some of the inhabitants of the banlieue—especially those living in the projects—feel a strong sense of physical and symbolic marginalization.
THE HISTORY OF THE BANLIEUE

The importance of the banlieue can be fully understood only in historical perspective and in relation to the city it surrounds. Like many medieval cities, Paris was a walled city for defensive purposes. As the city grew, new walls were constructed, eventually totaling six. A new wall was built in the years preceding the French Revolution, but this time mainly for taxation purposes. The wall demarcated Paris proper. Its doors included customs posts, and everyone entering or leaving with commercial goods had to pay a fee or tax called the octroi. These murs d’octroi were spatial and legal barriers to free trade and mobility for tax purposes, but they also created a real social boundary between those living inside (intra-muros) and those living outside (extra-muros), with economic consequences for trade and production (Fourcaut, Bellanger, and Flonneau 2007). Consequently, the cost of living was lower outside Paris than inside, resulting in an early division between the large percentage of the labor force that had settled in the banlieue and the consumers, visitors, financiers, and administrators who lived inside the city walls (Castañeda 2009a).²

During the Ancien Régime, the Parisian banlieue contained vast open areas where the nobility of Paris and Versailles went to spend time surrounded by nature. Later this taste was emulated by the arrivistes of the growing French bourgeoisie and by the petite bourgeoisie, who would go to the green banlieue on weekends as a sign of distinction, as depicted in the short stories of Guy de Maupassant and by Jean Renoir in his celebrated film Une Partie de cam- pagne (1936). But as more people built houses in these idyllic lands, the banlieue was quickly transformed from forest into urban and suburban space. The remaining forests of Vincennes and the Bois de Boulogne are legally protected: Although technically located outside of the city limits, they are annexed to the city and under its jurisdiction.

After the French Revolution of 1789, the Constitutional Assembly decreed the limits of Paris to be a circle with a circumference determined by a radius of three leagues (lieues) around the center set at the Notre Dame Cathedral. In 1841 the politician Adolphe Thiers ordered the construction of a new set of walls and customs towers to be surrounded by a zone where it was forbidden to build. In 1860 the city was expanded by the Baron Haussmann, and crossing taxes continued to be levied. In this expansion, Paris officially engulfed
l’ancienne banlieue, which included the communes of Batignolles, Belleville, Bercy, Passy, la Villette, and other neighboring areas. When the Paris octroi was instituted in these communes, many industries were forced to move out of the new city borders for fiscal reasons, and many workers followed (Harvey 2008). Some of the most developed and industrialized external communes decided to also charge octroi to raise funds for local infrastructure and public spending, while poorer banlieues, hoping tax incentives would attract industry and population, did not. The octroi of Paris and its surrounding metropolitan area was not abolished until 1943, during the German occupation, when it was replaced with a general sales tax (Fourcaut et al. 2007).

As the population density of Paris increased, the city looked to the banlieue to locate new cemeteries and public parks. In 1887 a large building went up in the exterior commune of Nanterre as a dépôt de mendicité—to house Parisian mental patients, the homeless, vagabonds, and aged people and to imprison “deviant” women. In 1897 this building was also turned into a hospital. To this day L’Hôpital de Nanterre offers shelter to the very poor of the region and to newly arrived immigrants who have neither a place to stay nor a supportive social network.

THE CONTINUOUS NEED FOR HOUSING

As elsewhere, French industrialization created a large rural-to-urban migration. The Paris region has always been a popular destination for both internal and international migrants. Female workers from the French provinces, Spain, Portugal, Yugoslavia, and Africa would live in servant apartments (chambres de bonnes) atop bourgeois buildings in western Paris, while the high cost of living and high occupancy rate in Paris forced the working class to move to the eastern part of the city and to the banlieues.

In 1914, following a public scandal about the mal-lotis—the people who, owing to overcrowded conditions, had built on open lots in the banlieue that lacked public services such as water, roads, electricity, and gas—the socialist politician Henri Sellier (1883–1943) pushed for the creation of habitations à bon marché (HBM)  s, or affordable housing. A number of HBM s were built around the city in the area where the Thiers wall had been laid. Between 1921 and 1939, the HBM administration built garden-cities (cités-jardin) inspired
by the British urbanist Ebenezer Howard. In 1935 the architect and urbanist Maurice Rotival was the first person to use the term *grandes ensembles*—which corresponds to "the projects" in the United States—to refer to a set of large public housing buildings with shared common areas designed to house multiple families. Among the most infamous affordable housing projects was La Cité de la Muette in Drancy, built between 1931 and 1935, which was used as a Jewish internment camp during the German occupation, leading to the death of over 67,000 deportees.

The painter, architect, and urbanist Charles-Edouard Jeanneret, also called Le Corbusier (1887–1965), published influential books in which he presented detailed proposals for planned, rational, and utopian residential complexes formed by many large housing buildings (Le Corbusier 1923/1927, 1935/1967). His work influenced the construction of public housing and large public works in places like Brasilia, Brazil, Co-op City in New York, the Robert Taylor Homes in Chicago (Venkatesh 2002), and the cités built in banlieues throughout France that would house many thousands in areas that offered little employment.

At the end of World War II, the *îlots insalubres*—the slums in the construction-free zone around the Thiers walls—were replaced with modernist housing projects. After Algeria’s independence in 1962 and the migration to France of *pied noirs* (white colonists), Jewish people formerly living in Algeria, and *harkis* (Muslims who had fought on the French side), the French state decided to house the new arrivals in projects in remote banlieues of Paris, Marseille, and Lyon, partly in the hope of hiding them from the public view of regular citizens.

To provide more formal housing for the new workers from Algeria, the Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travailleurs (SONACOTRA) was created in 1956. Yet, in 1964 there was a public scandal surrounding the conditions at the *bidonville* (shantytown on the outskirts of a city) of Champigny, a slum that housed more than 10,000 Portuguese immigrants in conditions of extreme poverty an hour away from the luxuries of Paris. Many Algerians lived in similar conditions in other *bidonvilles*. To appease public opinion the so-called Debré law was passed to improve the conditions of the migrant workers: It explicitly looked to prevent them from leaving France and thus hinder the successful reconstruction and growth of France from 1945 to 1973 during what came to be known as Les Trente
Glorieuses (“The Glorious Thirty”). Along with the Marshall Plan, foreign labor helped reconstruct France and make its economy grow after the war.

The rise of the welfare state, along with the increasing cost of living in Paris, led to the construction of habitations à loyer modéré (HLMs, subsidized public housing). Originally, the heavy concentration of French working-class families, many of them hailing from other regions of France and Europe, led to the appearance in certain banlieues of the “red banlieues,” which often elected communist or socialist mayors and had a dense associational and cultural life (Stovall 1990; Wacquant 2010b). According to some hypotheses, this hegemony changed after the Communist Party failed to incorporate the large arrival of new immigrants into its local agenda and thus lacked their complete support (Fassin and Fassin 2006). French workers from Paris and the provinces lived there first, but eventually the population changed from working-class residents to relative majorities of immigrants from former colonies, even in the face of laws against the concentration of more than 15 percent of a given group in a given area; these laws were explicitly aimed at preventing the creation of ghettos, something disdained and deeply feared by the French. What many failed to see was that group concentration arose not only from processes of self-segregation but also from social networks, unemployment support, and solidarity acts that brought underrepresented groups together in order to survive strong labor market discrimination, spatial segregation, and social exclusion. Furthermore, discrimination and segregation did not necessarily result in concentration (Dangschat 2009); indeed, North African immigrants and their descendants (with the exception of a certain concentration in Barbès) are now dispersed throughout the Parisian metropolitan area. This trend does not mean, however, that they are structurally integrated into French mainstream society, and in fact it has only further discouraged collective identification and action.

Although the French government has opposed the creation of “ghettos,” the political opposition from the richest quarters inside and outside Paris has pushed immigrants and workers out into certain distant and poor banlieues. This has resulted in an enduring inequality for many of the inhabitants of these areas, owing to lack of access to quality education and good jobs, and is the reason why many banlieue inhabitants live off of unemployment and other social benefits. To address these inequities, special education zones (zones
d’éducation prioritaire [ZEP]) were created in 1981 to dedicate more educational funds to certain “sensitive areas.” In this way the French government has been able to direct some resources to certain underprivileged groups by the territorialization of public policy (Doytcheva 2007).

BOUNDARIES OF DISTINCTION AND EXCLUSION

In 1954 the boulevard périphérique, an expressway around the city, was launched and built along HBM’s in the zone formerly reserved for the Thiers wall. It further reinforced the boundary between Paris and the growing banlieue.

Many French banlieues still give testimony to their past as old provincial villages that have been engulfed by the growing metropolitan area and share many a common element, such as train stations, public squares, churches, city halls, stores, restaurants, and private houses and cités on their own peripheries, with regular buses that travel farther inside the banlieue and out to rural areas.

In Paris et le désert français (“Paris and the French Desert”), Jean-François Gravier (1947) blames Paris for devouring all the resources, talent, and wealth of the entire country and, one could add, the French colonies. According to Gravier, this centralization of power, influence, and resources will end in the symbolic desertification of the whole of France unless something is done to build industry in the provinces and decentralize public functions and priorities. Even Haussmann was concerned about a luxurious center surrounded by a proletariat ring of workers (Fourcaut et al. 2007). Thus, it is not only the poverty of the banlieue that is at issue, but the overconcentration of wealth in the western part of Paris and the continuous gentrification of the city. As many French thinkers have warned, twenty-first-century Paris risks becoming a city museum for the millions of tourists who visit every year, oblivious to the backstage that is the banlieue, which they “see” primarily through the train windows as they pass through it from the airport to their hotels. With the heavy gentrification of recent years, Paris, like New York, risks becoming the exclusive property of its richest inhabitants, plus the young, the artists, and the immigrants who know how to share apartments and live frugally. This concentration of the very rich and poor in the city is a common characteristic of neoliberal global cities (Sassen 2001).
To this day there is a critical need in Paris for housing for students, single parents, artists, and the poor who cannot afford the city’s rents but may not qualify for public housing. The housing crisis is especially acute for foreigners, who are categorically distrusted, and the sans-papiers (undocumented migrants), who cannot demand social welfare. Today many new citizens and people living in bad housing conditions (les mal loges) engage in social movements to demand what in modern France has come to be recognized as a basic human right: access to decent housing (Castañeda 2009b).

The residential concentration of the cités in the banlieues contrasts with the area of La Defense, a banlieue west of Paris, which in 2008 provided 150,000 jobs but housed only 20,000 residents (Price 2008). The project of La Defense was launched in 1958 with the goal of making Paris the financial capital of Europe and attracting multinational corporations. The plan succeeded in attracting transnational and French financial firms, but it failed to reproduce the busy and around-the-clock mixed-use public areas to be found in downtown Paris.

GHETTO DISCOURSE AND THE CASE AGAINST (SINGLE) COMMUNITY STUDIES

Can a relevant distinction be made between voluntary and involuntary processes of spatial isolation and segregation? Right-wing politicians such as Le Pen and Sarkozy as well as pundits and many academics denounce the ghettoization of France and claim that poverty concentration and “neighborhood effects” have an impact on the integration of the youth living in the banlieues and especially in the cités or projects. Academics and politicians go there sporadically to point fingers—Fadela Amara, for instance, recently led a tour of the banlieues before presenting her anticipated but uneventful “Plan Banlieue”—but as demonstrated in the previous section through a review of the historical record, my claim is that the causation arrow goes the other way around: People live in ghettos because of initial discrimination and purposeful segregation by nonmigrants (Gans 2008) and because of compounded social network effects as information spreads about the availability of housing (Mahler 1995; Menjívar 2000), not because they refuse to “integrate.”

Segregation in the Parisian metropolitan area may be due as much to the rich, who through the decades have gone to great lengths to make sure that
they themselves are concentrated—for example, in the Parisian west—and spatially separated from immigrants and, even more, from the working-class French (Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot 2004; Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot 2007). In light of this possibility, the way to study the integration of immigrants and their descendants is not by looking closely at life in any one banlieue as a de facto segregated community but by looking at the larger unit of which it is a part: France.

Despite a long history of spatial boundary-making, the lived space and experiences of the franciliens (Parisians and the banlieusards who inhabit the Île-de-France, or Parisian metropolitan area) go beyond obsolete political and administrative boundaries. The banlieues are an integral part of Paris because much of the city’s business, work, and daily life are conducted there, behind the scenes—without the backstage of the banlieue, the Parisian stage up front could not hold up. Thus, we cannot talk about the Parisian banlieue without talking about Paris, just as we cannot talk fully about Paris without taking its banlieue into account, and the same holds for other major francophone cities. That is why, against the common assumptions, I set out not just to study a French banlieue but also to study immigrants across the ecological system of the Parisian urban region, including Paris itself. My many visits to Paris and different banlieues have provided me with some opportunities to observe how united or divided the inhabitants of these areas are, and how they work as a social and urban system.

ETHNOGRAPHY OF THE CHAMPS-ÉLYSÉES

“The most beautiful street in the world!” gush many tourist-guides (Taylor 2005). The legendary Champs-Élysées arguably has some of the best marketing in the world, and with one of the world’s most expensive rents for a shopping strip (Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot 2009). Everyone knows about the Champs-Élysées. To foreigners the Champs-Élysées physically represents Paris, along with the Eiffel Tower, Notre Dame, and the Louvre. The thoroughfare goes from the Place de la Concorde to the Arc de Triomphe. Tourists, expats, and visitors have to pay homage to this street at least once; for the same reason, any self-respecting French Parisian avoids going to the Champs-Élysées (or at least denies it). Parisians shopping for luxury goods go to L’Avenue Montaigne, which is a few blocks south and much more expensive and exclusive stores (Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot 2009). Although the Champs-Élysées does
not equal Paris for most native Parisians, because of how trite and commercialized it has become, for most visitors and immigrants alike it does. A visitor with a few days to spend in Paris will stroll through the Place de la Concorde to the Arc de Triomphe and be amazed by its grandiosity. Interestingly, as Gordon Price rightly remarks, this public space is not very long, but given the contrast between its design-empty areas and the monumental constructions, as well as the area of La Defense further down, it makes Paris appear much bigger than it is: “Paris is an illusion!” (Price 2008, 13). Nevertheless, beautiful illusions are what attract not only tourists and romantics but also second-generation immigrants—or, as they would prefer to be called, first-generation French. Their parents rarely spent leisure time in the Champs-Élysées. They may have been too self-conscious, feeling out of place amid such luxury and modernity. But their children are legally French, and they want to belong. So, on the weekends and in the evenings, they get on the RER and Metro, undergo a routine security check for drugs (mostly for males) when they transfer trains at the Châtelet–Les Halles central hub Metro station (Goris, Jobard, and Lévy 2009), then get off at the Franklin D. Roosevelt stop and join their friends strolling the Champs-Élysées. This expedition into the center of the city shows the desire of the youth to integrate and connect with Parisian society, or at least their fantasized image of it. On the cover to one of his albums, French banlieue rapper Rohff appears as a giant dressed in a tracksuit using the Arc de Triomphe as a chair (see Figure 7.2). This may represent the desire of French citizens of color to be visible and respected in the French mainstream just as they are. Unfortunately, when groups of young men from North and sub-Saharan Africa walk in groups of ten, even if they are dressed up, freshly showered, and perfumed, the police, many locals, and tourists may take them to be potential criminals. Policemen always keep them under surveillance.

Furthermore, some first-generation immigrant Berbers may walk on Les Champs in traditional clothing as if in Marrakesh. Young women wearing veils are also seen as threatening: They pose a symbolic threat to the cult of secularité that the French elites hold dear (Bowen 2007). Topping it off are the Roma people (“Gypsies”) and women from eastern Europe who may not necessarily be Muslim but who wear headscarves and kneel in silence, sometimes even in a form that could be misunderstood as praying to Mecca, and who often have signs in English about their suffering children that they use to ask money of tourists. So there may be some confusion for foreign and provincial French
tourists, since what was supposedly a characteristically “French” area is full of “oriental” characters along with American, Latino, and European middle-class tourists. Casual outside observers like Christopher Caldwell (2009) may take mental pictures and draw a conclusion about Islam overtaking Europe.3

If members of the French elite are there, they are to be found indoors, protected by high prices, in restaurants like the Fouquet’s and Maxim’s, along with the middle class, who may be buying a couple of last-minute gifts in Sephora or Fnac. McDonald’s or Starbucks outlets along the Champs-Élysées are de facto reserved for foreigners, immigrants, and the occasional French student on a budget looking for a place to study. Those who occupy this physical space may have shared a subway ride and a couple of feet of pavement, but their mental maps and worldviews place them in completely different symbolic universes. Thus, “symbolic segregation” exists at the symbolic heart of Paris. In this way, the Champs-Élysées is a microcosm of what happens in more extreme ways across the entire Parisian metropolitan area.

The immigrant youth and children of African parents may go to the Champs to show off their success, parking their brand-new luxury cars and motorcycles in the street while risking a ticket and police harassment for blocking traffic. Younger kids may come on Rollerblades or rented velibs (short for vélo libre, a public bicycle rental program). But it is forbidden (interdit) to ride bicycles on the sidewalks of the Champs, and by doing so they also risk police harassment. Thus, what in the eyes of these young people starts as an evening of fun in Paris, an opportunity to mix in, can easily turn into a game of cat-and-mouse with the police.

This game may turn out badly when these youths are denied entry into the exclusive nightclubs on the street, which happens even when, ironically, the doormen are of the same social origin (Dendoune 2007). I observed a verbal dispute between youth of immigrant origin and young tourists outside one such nightclub. In the blink of an eye, there were over twenty policemen on the scene, some wearing anti-riot gear. Minutes later, one “Arab” kid was brought to the ground and clubbed by a number of policemen. In a few seconds, blood started marking the pavement of the Champs-Élysées.4

Months later, immigrant youth and foreigners gathered in the cafés and restaurants around the Champs-Élysées to watch the end of the Eurocup soccer tournament. Spain won for the first time; many immigrants, especially Moroccans, wore their Spanish jerseys and celebrated as if their home team had
won. Thousands of members of the Spanish community in Paris celebrated with big parties in the streets and were joined by Maghrebins and Latin Americans. That night I was out watching the game with a large group of Spanish and Latin American expats who worked for a transnational pharmaceutical company. As celebrations started, the police started to disperse the Spanish fans with a tone implying that a victory for Spain was not an event worth celebrating in Paris. This is the Paris known to the local, marginalized youth but unknown to many tourists.

PARIS ETHNOSURVEYS

While living in Paris as a visiting scholar at two prestigious universities (Sorbonne and Sciences Po) during the academic year 2007–2008, I conducted ethnosurveys of a purposive sample across the Parisian metropolitan area. Sixty-five respondents were Muslim, and to keep a control group I also conducted ethnosurveys among twenty-four immigrants who were not Muslim, but space limitations prevent me from discussing this other group in this chapter. From the Muslim North African sample, 75 percent were men and 25 percent women, with an average age of thirty-two and a median age of twenty-nine. (For more on the methodology and the other cases studied, see Castañeda [2010] and Castañeda [forthcoming].)

FIGURE 7.2. Map of Interviewees Residence in the Parisian Metropolitan Region
The people I interviewed included first-generation immigrants as well as citizens whose origins were in North Africa (Arabic or Berber) and most of whom were nominally Muslim. The results from my sample show medium levels of residential segregation (Wacquant 2008) but strikingly high levels of social distance from “mainstream” French society, especially among first- and second-generation males. A structural reason for their social invisibility and lack of sense of belonging was discrimination and the accompanying unemployment. Unemployment rates for people of Maghrebi origin, especially those who are phenotypically “Arab,” are much higher than for other groups (Silberman, Alba, and Fournier 2007).

While in Paris, I spent a great deal of time with unemployed men who rarely left their apartments and who suffered high levels of depression, persecution anxiety, and reactive xenophobia. Although they spoke French, had residency papers, and had lived in France for a while, including some with high levels of education and skill, they were systematically denied long-term work contracts. For a few of these migrants the stress of their situation had made them vulnerable to mental illness (Grinberg and Grinberg 1989).

Many of my informants identified themselves as North African or Maghrebi, even when they had French papers. In one marginal but still representative case, a French citizen whose grandparents came from Algeria, but who had been to Algeria himself only once and whose Arab was very limited, told me that he identified as Algerian. When I asked him why this was so, he said, “Look at me, look at my camel face. Do I look French? When I am in the street, in the subway, people do not see a Frenchman but an Arab.” He thus reported a racial description of the French as white. He was verbalizing a social boundary that existed inside and outside of the banlieue.

This individual no longer had formal employment by the time I met and interviewed him. He had worked in a factory until a job accident forced him to stop. He spent his evenings and nights hanging out in a bar next to some projects in a banlieue south of Paris.

When I asked him if he had friends different from himself, he first answered yes, saying that he had clients from all over Paris, but when I pushed him about the people he trusted and felt close to, he said that he preferred to stay by himself or with other Algerians. “About blacks,” he said. “I respect them, but I prefer to keep my distance. I do not want any problems with them.” He distrusted “whites” too, and he was worried about people he did not know who
would suddenly appear, walk around, and ask questions. If they were not sociologists like myself (I was accompanied that day by an Algerian man), they must be policemen trying to pass as civilians. He said that his father, who worked in construction and as a janitor in a public school, “worked so hard when he came to France, and he sacrificed so much for me and my siblings.” To supplement his disability income and help his parents, this interviewee sold drugs and engaged in other self-described “illegal activities.”

My informants often responded that they preferred to stick to themselves or be with close family members. They mistrusted strangers, including fellow countrymen and coreligionists, who, they said, often used the socially expected solidarity and charity between fellow Muslims to take advantage of them, so they preferred not to make many friends. Their relative poverty and social marginality prevented them from being able to satisfy those expectations of generosity, aid, and reciprocity. This common lack of resources combined with the wide mistrust that French society has of ethnic communal life (Fassin and Fassin 2006; Lacorne 2003) results in high fragmentation among young immigrant Arab men in the Parisian metropolitan area, even among themselves. In other words, many men are in the same structural position, undergoing the same feelings of exclusion, disempowerment, and desperation, but they rarely talk about this with each other, even if they share the same spaces, such as a coffee shop or a neighborhood.

As a whole, immigrant Arabs from North Africa lack representative organizations, legitimate spokespeople, and political representation within political parties and the government. The second and subsequent generations are not much better off, but being more cognizant of their rights as French citizens, they are more prone to anger and disorganized, semispontaneous demonstrations, as in the riots of 2005 in reaction to the death of two young French citizens of Maghrebi origin running away from the police (Schneider 2008). These riots were carried out mainly by disenfranchised second-generation French citizens. Indeed, most of my interviewees spoke against them, since their neighborhoods and their possessions, cars, and businesses were the targets of these riots, second only to buildings that represent the state: schools, libraries, police stations, bus stops.

The riots showed a generalized discontent among youth in the banlieues, who live in objectively positive conditions with all the basic services and are
not oversegregated in terms of ethnicity, race, or religion, but who are continuously harassed by police and thwarted by their limited prospects in the labor market.

**SPATIAL SEGREGATION IN FRANCE**

When people talk about immigration in France, the idea of the banlieue is often conjured. Scholars sometimes assume that studying immigration in France entails studying the banlieue. Many French citizens themselves like to compartmentalize the “problem of immigration” and relegate it to the banlieues. Since the riots of 2005, one often hears about “the crises of the banlieues.” Deeper sociological analyses have demonstrated that the issue is more complex, that immigrant integration is not the exclusive problem of the banlieues, and that there is a lot of diversity within and among banlieues (Wacquant 2008, 2010b).

A common question in academic comparisons between urban exclusion in the United States and France is whether the concept of the ghetto can be applied in France. To answer this question, one should also listen to the voices of second-generation Africans who were born and raised in Paris or on its outskirts. In his memoir about growing up in France as a child of Algerian immigrants, journalist Nadir Dendoune (2007, 19) writes: “The projects are a glass cage. The frontiers are there; so inscribed in the asphalt, that you have the sense of an implicit message saying, ‘you are not part of society.’ Civilization stops here.” This quote reveals two components of his stigmatization: geography and a lack of the proper cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991).

In reaction to what many young French minorities see as blatant discrimination, some banlieues have produced a self-declared ghetto subculture with their own French rap deeply inspired by the popular countercultures originally created in the American black ghettos and then spread across social classes and countries by media and marketing (Daniels 2007; Pattillo 1999), yet expressing local concerns in *français*. Another related example of a growing counterculture is the *verlan*, or banlieue youth slang. For example, French people often use the word *Arab* in a derogatory sense and as a cultural put-down. They often fail to distinguish between citizens and noncitizens and between generations. Thus, in an example of reactionary identity (Portes and
Rumbaut 2001), second- and third-generation French Arabs in the 1980s called themselves *beurs*, a play on words based on inverting the syllables of *Arab*. This term is not that different from how the term *Chicano* is used in the United States. Words like *beur* mark, and reproduce, the symbolic boundaries between French of European descent and those of Arab descent, as well as the boundaries between Arabs, blacks, and Jews.

Thus it is that one can speak of *French ghettos*—in the original sense of the term combining ethnic stigma, spatial segregation, entrapment, and counterculture (see Chapter one, this volume). Loïc Wacquant (2008) argues that banlieues are structurally very different from black ghettos, partly because they lack their own subculture and informal cultural and political institutions. Yet the growing French rap industry, the banlieue-inspired movies and theater, and the particular language and clothing style of banlieue youth—as well as the growth of associations, movements like *Conseil Representatif des Associations Noirs* (CRAN) and the *Indigènes de la République*, and the car-burnings across banlieues—may contradict Wacquant’s hypothesis. Furthermore, the relative lack of ethnic organizations and coordinated actions may have more to do with French republican laws and values than with a lack of discrimination against visible minorities (Castañeda, forthcoming). Whether or not the banlieues are ghettos, they surely are places of stigma.

Although there are differences in objective material conditions (Wacquant 2008) and the French government would argue against the existence of “real ghettos” in France, many French banlieue inhabitants embrace the term with its implication of segregation and lack of social integration and equality. This is most clearly seen in music: As in the United States, a certain ghetto pride and culture have emerged from the banlieue. This counterculture reflects a long history of differentiation between Paris proper and the “wild” and “uncivilized” rural areas outside of it that have always been economically and symbolically subordinated to it.

The daily experiences of the banlieusards sharply contrast with the stereotypes held by many Parisians. For example, the movie *La Haine* (1995), directed by Mathieu Kassovitz, presents a powerful metaphor, but also an exaggerated representation of life in the banlieues. It draws much-needed attention to the issue of police violence and broad discrimination, but it perpetuates the negative stereotype of the banlieue and underplays intergroup conflict. *L’Esquivel*
(2003), directed by Abdellatif Kechiche, does a much better job of portraying the everyday reality of young banlieusards, whose lives are very different from those of their schoolteachers who try to teach them proper French and from those of the policemen who scare them away from public areas.

Although many of the young people living in the cités are unemployed and, because of many social and economic restraints, do not leave their neighborhoods every day, their main frame of reference is still the larger hegemonic concept of “French culture.” They watch the same television channels as other French; they watch many American television series and movies and listen to music in English; and like their compatriots, they filter these non-French cultural experiences through a French lens, sometimes even by means of dubbing that tries to adapt the original content to the local context. In this way a very interesting and fecund French rap cultural scene has emerged, one obviously inspired by African American rappers but still distinctly French. As just one example, the banlieue rappers Rohff and Kéry James equate their situation in France to being unloved in their 2004 song *Mal aimé* (*Unloved*).8 The lyrics, seemingly about a love affair gone sour, refer to the feeling of minorities in the banlieue: loneliness, mistrust, and a sense of betrayal of what school taught them France was all about.

In open-ended questions about how they would define their neighborhoods and neighbors, many interviewees used the word “ghetto” to describe the places they live in. Others used the equivalent of “immigrant enclave.” As can be seen in Figure 7.3, many others pointed to the French or mixed character of the neighborhood. These findings point to both the diversity of Parisian and banlieue neighborhoods and the adoption of the term *ghetto* by some franciliens.

**COMPARING FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES**

Wacquant coined the term *hyperghetto* to designate the ghetto after the neoliberal policymaking ideology and the accompanying de-industrialization of urban areas. He notes that compared with immigrant labor and cheap labor overseas, black labor has become unnecessary and relatively expensive. I would add that the rise of neoliberal thinking and its accompanying crisis has normalized certain levels of unemployment that are suffered mainly by North
Africans in France and, in the United States, first by blacks, then by Latinos, and then by whites living in the Midwest and rural areas (Carr and Kefalas 2009). The economic crisis that started in 2007 further spread unemployment across different demographics, but these groups were especially affected.

Like socially mobile migrants in the barrios and banlieues, portions of the black middle classes have left the ghettos, and thus the poor and unemployed are overrepresented in these areas. Many have to rely on an underground off-the-books economy and drug-selling to make ends meet (Venkatesh 2006). The criminalization of these activities lands many people of color from poor neighborhoods in prison (Wacquant 2010a).

Unfortunately, fears, discourses, and remedies regarding ghettos have spread throughout the world. For example, French policymakers, terrified about the possible development of ghettos and immigrant enclaves, are quick to deny any similarity with places in French territory and quick to attack any ethnic mobilizations in the banlieues. France has reacted by emulating the policies of police departments in New York and Los Angeles. While they reject any structural similarity, they have acquired some of the same techniques to produce "law and order" through punitive action, as espoused by Sarkozy, first as a minister of the interior and later as president of France.
NORTH AMERICAN GHETTOS AND BARRIOS

In the United States, the practice of social segregation was historically related to the different social and legal rights of slaves and free individuals. Although there were both black and white slaves and indentured servants in the colonial years, after some decades a racial system had come into use as a way to categorize and reproduce inequality (Massey 2007; Tilly 1998). Despite the legality of slavery, in the South black and white quarters were often next to each other, showing the close interdependence and interaction between masters and slaves. As black Americans became emancipated from their slave condition, many migrated north in search of supposedly greater tolerance and work opportunities in industrializing urban areas. There they became concentrated in certain neighborhoods, not only because of social networks and affinity but also because of employer and public policies and the racism and exclusionary practices of northern whites who moved out of neighborhoods after a certain racial tipping point was reached (Massey and Denton 1993). Yet the ghettos of Harlem and the Bronx (areas where this author lived for years) are far more heterogeneous than the stereotype of them, as well as more heterogeneous than Chicago, a city that, with a large African American population, has often and wrongly stood as a representative city for all of the United States (Small 2008).

Puerto Rican migrants followed a pattern similar to blacks moving north. As citizens from a U.S. territory, they moved into the continental U.S. landmass in search of opportunities and often ended up in areas that bordered African American enclaves in cities like Chicago and New York.

The work of anthropologist Oscar Lewis (1966) on the poor vecindades of El Barrio de Tepito in Mexico City, extended later to working-class neighborhoods in Puerto Rico and New York, was important in documenting the daily lives of poor people in these neighborhoods. A misreading of what he termed “the culture of poverty” would contribute to a stereotype that blames the victim and questions the morality of the so-called “underserving poor” (Katz 1996). The realities on which Lewis’s “culture of poverty” was based only got worse following the large migration into central cities of blacks and Puerto Ricans and the loss of many jobs in urban areas due to offshoring and de-industrialization (Marwell 2007; Wilson 1997). The state provided subsides to
white ethnics to build and inhabit suburban areas, but blacks and Latinos were left behind (Gans 1982; Katznelson 2005).

This resulted in ethnic and class concentrations in certain neighborhoods. Poverty became spatially concentrated in these neighborhoods, at first because of the struggles associated with first-generation migration and subsequent poverty, and then because of unemployment and lack of opportunities for social mobility. To this argument must be added the rise of neoliberal moral discourses and the socio-scientific literature and simplistic policies that criminalized and pathologized poverty and created symbolic boundaries between whites and blacks and between poor and successful blacks and Latinos (La-mont 2000). In the imaginations of the American public and policymakers, “the ghetto” became black and “el barrio” brown. In this view of these areas as dangerous, immoral, and undeserving places in need of drastic policy (and police) intervention, the effects of poverty were misunderstood as causes and justified what Wacquant (2008) calls a “malign neglect” that allowed these areas to fall into increasing disrepair. This response was answered by an increase in the language and action of “law and order,” following the “broken windows” theories, and by an increase in the penalization of poverty, drug-dealing, and incarceration, mainly of minorities living in these neighborhoods.

New York has witnessed the arrival of many groups from Latin America and the Caribbean (Aranda 2008; Bourgois 2003; Dávila 2004; Fuentes 2007; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Jones-Correa 1998; Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, and Waters 2004; Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, Waters, and Holdaway 2008; Loveman and Muniz 2007; Marwell 2007). If we take a close look at the realities of Latino neighborhoods in the New York City metropolitan area, a more complex image of changing composition emerges—one that is relevant here because in many ways Latinos in New York City offer a closer comparison than African Americans to North Africans in Paris (Castañeda 2010; Wacquant 2008).

A neighborhood just north of the Upper East Side of Manhattan is known as Spanish Harlem, or El Barrio. This area has served as an arrival gate for multiple waves of significant numbers of immigrants (Bourgois 2003; Orsi 2002); the last such waves were Puerto Ricans in the 1940s and Mexicans in the last couple of decades (Smith 2006). Lexington and East 116th Streets may feel to a visitor like a small version of Chicago’s Little Mexico, yet research by the author has shown that, despite the storefronts, the neighborhood is very heterogeneous and most Mexicans in New York have never lived in this area.
Furthermore, although this place has offered a home and a sense of community to many ethnic groups, many socially mobile immigrants and their children have left the stigmatized East Harlem, even if they now remember it with nostalgia (Dávila 2004).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has shown that boundary-making processes and historical legacies are at play in the formation of banlieues, barrios, immigrant enclaves, and Jewish and African American ghettos. Most of these spatial boundaries disappear or dissipate over time. Place of residency matters because of its differential effect on life chances, yet scholarship and folk understandings tend to overstate spatial concentration—to a point of assuming that all members of a certain social group live in a particular neighborhood.

The built environment matters as well, because it displays social characteristics and embodies a particular cultural presence. The existence of a number of storefronts with foreign goods and symbols immediately marks a place as other, exotic, communal, ghettoized, premodern, or gentrified. The conclusions drawn from a superficial reading of streets and buildings are then applied to the inhabitants of that area. When this happens, spatial, symbolic, and social boundaries coincide and become anchored in place and reinforced in the public imagination.

Black Harlem, Spanish Harlem, and the Parisian banlieues are empirically more diverse in terms of social class and ethnicity than their popular representations would have us believe. Yet the mental maps, framing, and stereotypes—the idées reçus (“received ideas”)—create social boundaries that pair stigmatized people with stigmatized places. In this sense, the ideal-type coming from the historical European Jewish ghetto is useful in describing contemporary inequalities, social boundaries, and limited mobility of labor across space. Unauthorized immigrants sell their labor, but they cannot move freely through space because of fear of deportation (Núñez and Heyman 2007); they may be as entrapped as Jews were in Venice. Banlieusards can legally move throughout France, yet some of them rarely do so.

For educated members of the second and later generations, the boundaries of “el barrio” and the banlieue may have been more permeable than for the inhabitants of the black ghetto after the great migration from the American
South, since, as with white ethnics, many middle-class Latinos and banlieue-dwellers who experienced social mobility moved out. Sometimes success means leaving the neighborhood where one was born. Yet in the American case, race trumped class mobility and blacks had a harder time moving far from the poor ghettos—Chicago’s Hyde Park being the most common example (Pattillo 1999). Today, even as some blacks are better able to choose their neighborhood based only on income, urban ghettos, just like the barrio and some parts of the banlieue, continue to house the poorest members of a stigmatized group (poor in terms of economic, social, political, and symbolic capital). The residents of these areas suffer the scorn not only of the majority group but also of the members of their own group who have moved out, succeeded, assimilated, or “passed.” They remain behind what is not only a symbolic boundary but a social boundary, since an undesirable address on a résumé often results in fewer employment opportunities—and thus fewer opportunities for social mobility.

As social scientists, we reify and “ghettoize” neighborhoods if we study them in isolation. World systems theory reminds us that we cannot fully understand the periphery without including its unequal relations with the core. The same applies to wealthy urban centers and stigmatized neighborhoods—they have to be understood relationally. The chic neighborhoods are so only in relation to stigmatized neighborhoods.

To conclude, despite somewhat enviable objective conditions for some of the “poor” population in the banlieue and in some public housing in New York City, relative deprivation is what matters the most for those who live in these areas. In the media and the popular mind, the banlieues now play an equivalent role to the U.S. ghetto. As in the United States, the French state has a very direct role in producing and limiting ethnic concentrations in public space—for example, through its colonial policies and the subsequent building of housing for migrant workers in particular areas of métropole. Long-lasting ethnic segregation is not voluntary but imposed from the outside. Objectively, material conditions in the American barrio and immigrant enclave tend to be very low (historical slums and present-day colonias in the Southwest being the most extreme examples), yet confinement to these areas tends to decrease over time, and with access to citizenship and work. Immigrant enclaves, including Chinatowns, tend to experience ethnic succession when their inhabitants are replaced by people from another country or region. In contrast, present-day banlieues
have become problematic because, in the popular imagination, they house and contain immigrants and minorities. If the concept of the ghetto cannot be applied to France, it is only because France lacks the historical equivalent of an African American population. This does not mean, however, that contemporary social boundaries against stigmatized groups are not also inscribed in space, in minds, and in speech in the word _banlieue_. The term _ghetto_ is a concept that classically represents stigmatization and spatial and social boundaries. But because of its long history and changing composition, it can sometimes create more polemic misunderstandings rather than provide clarity. Thus this chapter proposes the term _places of stigma_ to designate the different spaces that result from the same categorical processes of creation and reproduction of social inequality (stigmatization, constraint, confinement, marginalization, underemployment) that become inscribed in flesh and stone.

Notes

1. Kevin Beck, Lesley Buck, and Natalie Schwarz helped in the preparation of the text. The NYLON research network, Gil Eyal, Emmanuelle Saada, Robert Smith, Craig Calhoun, Richard Sennett, Ray Hutchison, and Bruce Haynes provided feedback on earlier versions of this chapter. All errors remain my own.

2. To a large extent, this class segregation continues to this day and indeed has only been exacerbated by de-industrialization and the declining support for the welfare state.

3. These observations may be further biased when one observes the women covered head to toe who accompany oil millionaires from Saudi Arabia and the Emirates during the day but who stay home at night while the men, dressed in conservative religious clothing, go to bars, discos, and strip clubs and enjoy what they could not be seen consuming at home. This reality has little to do with the conclusions that a casual observer could draw from strolling down les Champs a couple of times.

4. I started filming this incident of unprovoked and unwarranted police brutality with my digital camera, until another bystander informed me that it was illegal to do so; I stopped filming before the police realized what I was doing and seized the camera. The footage of part of this incident is available on YouTube at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mh8VXMpokAU. Minutes later, ambulances arrived to take away the bleeding person, and everyone dispersed. I went next door to get a crêpe, and when I came back, the scene on the street was back to normal, as if nothing had happened, but I could still see the young man’s blood on the pavement.

5. This is similar to the situation that Cecilia Menjívar (2000) documents among Salvadorans in San Francisco.

6. The second immigrant generation and subsequent generations tend to be more integrated into diverse social networks and to have more capital, depending on the social segment to which they have assimilated.
7. “La cité est une cage de verre. Les frontières sont là. Tellement inscrites sur le bitume que tu as l'impression que c'est un message implicite: vous ne faites pas partie de la société. Ici, s'arrête la civilisation.”

8. Rohff was born on the African island of Comoros, a country that is 98 percent Muslim. Kéry James was born in the West Indies to Haitian parents. Both were former members of the influential Mafia K’1 Fry, a group of rappers from the banlieue of Val-de-Marne.
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