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Introduction

The prolific student of two giants of social science, Pierre Bourdieu and William Julius Wilson, Loïc Wacquant is an interdisciplinary sociologist who has made varied and original contributions to urban studies, although his influence extends well beyond cities. His foundational writings on incarnation, the penal state, ethnoracial domination, and social theory have been translated in two dozen languages and have triggered debates in multiple disciplines. He is best known among urbanists for his comparative analyses of ‘advanced marginality’ and ‘territorial stigmatization’, his thesis about the penalization of poverty, and his rethinking of the vexed question of the ghetto. His work is rooted in his insistence upon (and practice of) intensive fieldwork as instrument of epistemological rupture and theoretical construction. Wacquant’s emphasis on the role of the state as producer of marginality, the weight of symbolic structures in the production of dispossession in cities, and the need to fuse theory, ethnography and comparison, has proved especially instructive and provocative.

Wacquant is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley and a Researcher at the Centre de européen de sociologie et de science politique in Paris.

Academic biography and research focus

Wacquant was born and raised in the south of France, and moved to Paris in 1979 to study at France’s top management school, the École des Hautes Études Commerciales. In January of 1981, his intellectual trajectory was altered by one event: an exhilarating public lecture by Pierre Bourdieu, who soon became Wacquant’s mentor and intellectual inspiration as he
switched from economics to sociology at the University of Paris in Nanterre, and then at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. In 1985, Wacquant received a fellowship to pursue a doctorate in sociology at the University of Chicago, working with the celebrated sociologist William Julius Wilson, author of *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987) a seminal study of racial segregation in American cities (see Wacquant and Wilson, 1989). Wacquant was troubled by lack of reflexivity and the ‘gaze from afar’ that dominated scholarship on the ghetto, and especially by the presumption of ‘social disorganization’ and what he characterizes as the ‘scholarly myth’ of the ‘urban underclass’. Departing from Wilson’s approach, Wacquant brought Bourdieu’s theory into the American ghetto and turned to ethnography. He joined a boxing gym to interpret the post-1960s transformation of the historic ‘Black Metropolis’ depicted by Drake and Cayton (1945). He expanded his focus to a transatlantic comparison in response to the moral panic that swept through France and much of Western Europe in the 1990s about the alleged ‘ghettoisation’ of peripheral urban districts undermined by deindustrialisation.

The comparison between Chicago and Paris, mixing fieldwork, survey data and institutional comparison, yielded two urban monographs, a ‘carnal ethnography’ of boxing *in* the ghetto seen from inside and below, *Body and Soul* (Wacquant, 2004) and a macroanalytic dissection *of* the ghetto seen from above, *Urban Outcasts* (Wacquant, 2008). Wacquant also produced a raft of influential articles that shed light on the revamping of symbolic, social, and physical space in the city and entailed conceptual innovation regarding the ghetto, territorial stigmatization, the precariat, ethnographic methodology, the tangled nexus of social and penal policy in the city, and neoliberal statecraft (see Wacquant, 2014).

**Key ideas**

Whilst often read as a strictly Bourdieusian sociologist, numerous influences melt in Wacquant’s writings on cities. To be sure, Bourdieu’s teachings do provide the epistemological underpinnings and analytic frame, but in order to map and diagnose the fate of the urban ‘precariat’ (the precarious fractions of the postindustrial working class destabilized by the fragmentation of wage labour and the spread of a dishonour of place) Wacquant draws on Engels, Durkheim, Weber, Mauss, Wittgenstein, Elias, and Goffman. Frustrated by the depoliticised portraits of poverty and place crafted by scholars from the Chicago Schools (human ecology and symbolic interaction) and by the economic determinism of research spawned by Marxist or Weberian variants of political economy approaches, Wacquant’s approach is characterised by (1) an insistence on the role of *state structure and policy* in determining the forms, distribution, and intensity of urban marginality; (2) the importance of *symbolic systems* - of which cities are major centres of production and diffusion - which do not simply mirror social relations but help constitute them; (3) the effort to track down the mutual conversion and mapping of symbolic, social, and physical space at multiple scales and to spotlight the role of space in social domination. This triple focus is nourished by a combination of abstract theory and concrete ethnography that has spawned conceptual formulations and advances around the nexus of marginality, ethnicity and penalty (Wacquant 2014), but two in particular stand out for the further inquiries they have spawned across national and disciplinary boundaries.
First, Wacquant’s comparative investigations reconceptualise the *ghetto as an ‘instrument of ethnoracial closure’* based on the ‘double reciprocal assignation’ of a stigmatized category and a reserved territory (Wacquant, 2015a). Based on a comparison of three canonical cases (the sociospatial seclusion of Jews in Renaissance Europe, black Americans in the Fordist industrial metropolis, and Burakumin in Tokugawa-era Japan), Wacquant argues that the ghetto is an *institutional form*, a social-organisational device that employs space to fulfil two conflictive functions: economic extraction and social ostracization. He shows that the ghetto was created by city rulers to maximise the material value extracted out of a disparaged ethnic category, while minimizing intimate contact with its members. As a consequence, a ghetto exhibits distinctive sociological properties, chief among them the development of a set of parallel institutions (places of worship, press, schools, medical clinics, businesses, civic associations) that duplicate those of the city from which its residents are banished. Those institutions act as at once a *sword*, effecting closure to the benefit of the dominant, and a *shield*, offering a protected space wherein the dominated can experience reciprocity and dignity, hence Wacquant’s characterization of the ghetto as ‘Janus-faced’. *Contra* portrayals of the ghetto as a space of material destitution and social disintegration (hegemonic in journalism, politics, and large segments of urban research), Wacquant shows that ghettoization typically translates into the economic improvement, social strengthening and symbolic unification of the target population (entailing ‘paradoxical profits’ for the subordinate category). Wacquant (2015a) uses this articulation of the ‘second face’ of the ghetto to advocate for what he calls ‘a diagonal sociology’ capable of capturing the dynamic meshing of verticality (exploitation and inequality) and horizontality (reciprocity and equality) in urban life and in institutions more generally. It was the elaboration of the historical meaning and sociological contents of the ghetto that allowed Wacquant to account for the collapse of the ‘communal ghetto’ in the United States and its mutation into a ‘hyperghetto’ (devoid of economic function due to macroeconomic transformation and state retrenchment). It anchored his critique of the loose or opportunistic use of the term ‘ghetto’ to describe working-class territories or immigrant districts in the European urban periphery, which in fact sport considerable ethnic diversity, fail to produce a shared identity, and are deeply penetrated by the state (leading Wacquant to call these zones ‘anti-ghettos’ as they move away from the pattern of the ghetto as conceptualised above).

Second, Wacquant developed the concept of *territorial stigmatization* after analysing the crystallisation of what he termed a ‘blemish of place’ (2007, p.67): the profound sense of neighbourhood taint emerging on both sides of the Atlantic. Having heard French urban policy officials speak of lower-class districts with disgust in their voices, and then hearing residents of La Courneuve outside of Paris (and Woodlawn inside of Chicago) internalising and/or reassigning onto their neighbours those degraded images, Wacquant set about conceptualising spatial disgrace and its effects by drawing on the theories of Goffman and Bourdieu. He combines Goffman’s (1963) relational view of stigma at the micro level, whereby an individual is assigned ‘an undesired differentness’ from ‘normals’, with Bourdieu’s (1991) more macro theory of *symbolic power*: the performative capacity to make reality (by making representations of reality stick and come true). Bourdieu was centrally interested in symbolic struggles between different classes, and particularly the ways in which authoritative agents and institutions strive to impose a definition of the social world best suited to their interests. Wacquant extends this insight to struggles over and in space
as marker of identity. This blend of theory helps him diagnose territorial stigma as ‘arguably the single most protrusive feature of the lived experience of those trapped in these sulphurous zones’ (Wacquant 2008, p.169) and a distinctive feature of ‘advanced marginality’ in the 21st century due the autonomization of spatial taint from other bases of defamation. Wacquant spotlights how certain areas of disrepute in advanced societies become nationally renowned across class levels, racialized, and portrayed as emblems and vectors of disintegration (unlike the disreputable wards of the metropolis in the industrial era which were perceived as an organized ‘counter-society’). He maps out how spatial stigma impacts social strategy and identity at multiple scales in ways that entrench marginality (Wacquant, 2014). He also warns that scholars who deploy the trope of the ‘ghetto’ for rhetorical dramatization in hopes of inciting progressive policy intervention actually contribute to the further symbolic degradation of dispossessed districts and thus to the very phenomenon they should be dissecting.

Viewed through Wacquant’s urban sociological lenses, the state is not a bureaucratic monolith delivering uniform goods, nor an ambulance that comes to the rescue in response to ‘market failure’, but rather a potent ‘stratifying and classifying agency’ (2014, p. 1699) that continually moulds social and physical space, and particularly the shape, recruitment, structure, and texture of lower class districts. The marginal spaces of the metropolis are construed as a precipitate of the material and symbolic powers of the state as they percolate down through the class and spatial structure. ‘Advanced marginality’ is characterized by Wacquant (2008) as an ascendant poverty regime in postindustrial cities typified by the fragmentation of wage labour, the recoiling of the social state, and the buckling of the social economy of reciprocity based on kinship and place that was a feature of working-class districts in the Fordist-Keynesian era.

**Contributions to urban studies**

Wacquant lectures regularly around the world, and his work circulates widely beyond academic to inform and influence public debate in Europe and Latin America in particular. His writings have proved especially useful to scholars studying the impact of neoliberal restructuring at the bottom of the urban order, and his (2012) characterisation of neoliberalism as ‘market-conforming state-crafting’ (via the organisational triad of economic deregulation, ‘restrictive workfare’, and ‘expansive prisonfare’) has influenced urban studies across several disciplines (from sociology and anthropology to criminology and planning, to geography, law and social work). By emphasising the value of ethnography as an ‘instrument of rupture’ to pierce the screen of common sense and policy categories, Wacquant’s work has stimulated scholars conducting fieldwork to uncover views of the fractured neoliberal city ‘from below’. His resolute insistence upon theoretically-guided ethnography (as opposed to an inductive ‘get-your-ideas-in-the-field’ approach favoured by practitioners of the Chicago School) has sparked vigorous debate. In ‘Scrutinizing the Street’, Wacquant (2002) anatomizes three canonical ethnographies of race and poverty in the contemporary U.S. as exemplars of ‘a certain epistemological posture of unreflective surrender to folk apperceptions, to ordinary moralism, to the seductions of official thought and to the rules of academic decorum’ (2009, p.122). For Wacquant, this posture causes scientific errors and policy misdiagnoses of urban problems, and fosters the subordination of scholarship to the
categories and concerns of state elites smitten with neoliberal nostrums. Unsurprisingly, this epistemic critique was not welcomed by broad factions of the American sociological establishment which dismissed it as a political broadside. Another recurrent criticism of Wacquant’s work has been his insistence that class, not ethnicity or religion, is the primary principle of division of urban space and determinant of life chances in the lower-class districts of the French (and European) metropolis. Thus Schneider (2014) argues that he does not pay sufficient attention to the concentration of black/Arab youth in these districts, and asks what leads them to set their neighbourhoods aflame if they live in a society devoid of racial discrimination, racial profiling and police violence. Wacquant’s (2015b) response is that the primacy of class, despite the growing potency of ethnicity, is an empirical fact shown by the rise of a small but spatially mobile postcolonial petty-bourgeoisie and by the growing similarity in the demographic profile of foreign and national populations everywhere.

Wacquant’s signal contribution to urban studies is his demonstration that the failure to heed the role of symbolic structures in the production of inequality and marginality in the city means that neighbourhoods are made into the cause of poverty rather than the expression of underlying problems to be addressed. For example, the vast literature on ‘neighbourhood effects’, sustained by the postulate that ‘where you live affects your life chances’, ignores the mechanisms and ramifying consequences of the stigmatization of place, and in many instances contributes to that very stigmatization via a disparaging gaze trained upon the neighbourhood. Wacquant’s work demonstrates that social science has a role to play in casting free of that gaze and can help to ‘break through the screen of often absurd, sometimes odious projections, that mask the malaise or suffering as much as they express it’ (Bourdieu, 1999: 629).
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