

Chapter 1

Neighborhood Globalization

The study of European neighborhoods as “global ethnopolises” or “global chronopolises” can be used to understand the internal organization of the globalization process within the European Union.¹ This “globalization from below” complements the “globalization from above” of international politics and trading practices between states. It is an intrinsic component of European globalization because of its distinctive contributions to the process. In other words, these local places are being transformed into operative global sites that link, in their own different ways, the local to the global, rearticulate the global with the local at the local level, and rearticulate the local with the global at the global level.

The social integration of European neighborhoods has taken place at the same time the countries in which they are located are being integrated into the European Union. This manifests itself in the double adaptation of these neighborhoods, at the country level in terms of the urban policies of city hall and at the level of the European Union in terms of immigration policy, since the European parliament can undermine local practices.² The reengineering of local practices is being carried out at the same time as diasporic residents of these neighborhoods are entertaining transnational relations with their homelands and other diasporic sites where their compatriots have resettled, thereby adding another layer of complexity to the globalization process. Jewish quarters in Paris, London, and Berlin have been singled out for this study because of the light they can shed on neighborhood globalization in the European Union.

Since the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in the year 70 C.E., urban Jewish enclaves have mushroomed in the geographical area that became known as Charlemagne’s Europe, which today roughly coincides with the European Union. Throughout the urban European landscape, these quarters emerged as a result of Jewish immigration and the spatial segregation policies of the states where the diasporans settled. Of course, with further migration into the hinterland, which

occurred for reasons of commerce, family reunification, flight from religious persecution, or simply because of expulsion, some neighborhoods in the major cities of Western and Eastern Europe have served, at one time or another, as places where the Jewish population has been the largest demographic group.³

The word “ghetto,” meaning foundry, first applied to the officially designated Jewish neighborhood in Venice in 1516, was later used to refer to any Jewish enclave in Europe.⁴ Highly visible in Western European cities, these quarters became, during the medieval era, the first ghettos of the Western world, separating Jews from the rest of the urban population. In some cases, additional taxes were imposed on the economic activities of the Jews in these segregated areas.⁵ Over the years, these ethnic enclaves have developed a *modus vivendi* as marginal settlements that allow Jewish residents to prosper and reproduce Jewish culture, thus reflecting the spatial insertion and incorporation of the diasporic community into society. In one way or another, World War II and the Holocaust interrupted the linear progression of the social and economic integration of these Jewish enclaves into Western and Eastern Europe or in some cases completely destroyed them, as happened in Prague and Warsaw.

Much has been written about the history of these Jewish ghettos up to the eve of World War II.⁶ For example, the lengthy historiography of the Holocaust provides rich eyewitness accounts of the destruction of the Jewish quarters in Berlin, Budapest, and Warsaw by the Nazi forces.⁷ The present sociological study of urban neighborhoods does not concentrate on the pre-Nazi period, however, but rather on the post-World War II period (1945 to the present) in an effort to re-problematize these global social formations by unveiling the role of the globalization process in the reconstitution and reconstruction of these diasporic Jewish spaces.

The thesis of this book is that these quarters have emerged as global social formations because of the Jewish immigrants from the diaspora that inhabit them, the links with other diasporic sites and Israel that are maintained for religious, patriotic, commercial, and familial reasons, and the relations they have with the city government that regulates their social actions. It further argues that these global entities are a fundamental component of the globalization of the cities with which they share urban space—a fundamental component of transglobal urbanism. Globalization, far from reducing the role of the ethnic place in the metropolis, tends to consolidate its spatial expression as the niche for the expression, performance, and maintenance of a group’s social identity. These quarters are singular sites in networks of

transnational nodes. This analysis explains the specificity of the logic that engenders their positions in this global web of relationships.

The sociological literature on urban enclaves distinguishes the “rich enclaves” (such as Boston’s Beacon Hill or Chestnut Hill), in which people choose to live to enhance their status, from the “poor enclaves” (such as the black ghetto or the Chicano barrio) that are segregated on the basis of the race, religion, or sexual orientation of the residents.⁸ It also discusses immigrant enclaves formed by ethnicity, as seen in Chinatown, Little Italy, Germantown, Little Havana, and Little Haiti.⁹ The emphasis in most of this literature on urban enclaves is placed on assimilation, showing the slow pace of the integration of these groups into mainstream society. The issues of immigration, urban poverty, housing segregation, social mobility, racial discrimination, crime, and the marginal location of places of residence usually are discussed from this sociological perspective.¹⁰ The majority of researchers frame the question of ethnic enclaves inside the geographical constraints of the nation-state precisely because they are interested in assimilation issues.

This book shifts the emphasis from assimilation theory to globalization theory as the proper frame of reference for the study of locality. It also departs from earlier community studies by not assuming that the globalization of the neighborhood comes about mainly or exclusively as a result of the globalization of the metropolis. In contrast, it theorizes the local neighborhood as a global social formation that generates its own global flows, a formation that disciplines, influences, and pollinates metropolitan globalization.

Paris, Berlin, and London have been selected for this study because of the role of these metropolitan centers in European Jewish life. Berlin’s Jewish quarter, Scheunenviertel, provides the most dramatic setting because remnants of the Holocaust and the devastation of Jewish life are the most visible there. It is also in Berlin that forms of reparation (including citizenship for displaced Jews, the financing of visits to their former homeland, the rehabilitation of certain locations, the construction of museums, and permanent police protection of some Jewish sites) have been most visible because of governmental intervention and publicity. Paris’s Jewish quarter, Pletzl in Le Marais, is also important because of the large numbers of North African Jews who came as refugees to the enclave to live alongside the Yiddish-speaking Eastern European Jews. London’s Stamford Hill and Golders Green are also interesting and meaningful diasporic sites because many of their residents came from the historic Whitechapel Jewish quarter, which the Nazi forces bombed, but, of course, never occupied, keeping the

Jewish residential population somewhat protected and therefore spared from the ravages of the “final solution.”¹¹

As we will see, while the globalization of the neighborhood does not occur solely as a result of the globalization of the metropolis, the ethnic enclave also cannot be understood by focusing only on its local aspects, nor can it be understood by focusing exclusively on its global components. To understand its transglobal integration and organization, we must pay attention to the ways it relates to the hostland, the homeland, and other diasporic sites.

Yet the diasporic neighborhood also must be seen in light of its particular history within the processes of globalization. Neighborhood history reveals and unveils different forms of global connection, pertaining to individual, community, and generational practices. For example, the extraterritorial relations maintained by the first generation of immigrants are not likely to be the same as those maintained by later generations. These relations also might be more symbolic than real. Generational history reshapes relations with the mainstream system as well because later generations might be more interested in what is going on in their own places of residence rather than in the ancestral homeland, which they may never have visited. In addition, the identity of an ethnic enclave implies the coexistence of claims made by the homeland, which projects the diasporic place as an extension of itself; the hostland, which sees the neighborhood as an administrative unit of its territory and its residents as citizens who have rights (voting rights, etc.) and duties (paying taxes, etc.); and the community, which sees itself as having obligations toward its residents, loyalty toward the hostland, and responsibility toward the homeland.

The global neighborhood thus is an urban community that shares a place that the residents shape out of their experiences, needs, and cultural practices, which result from their triple interaction with the mainstream urban system, diasporic sites, and the homeland with which they maintain commercial, religious, and social relations. Global neighborhoods appear in various distinguishable shapes depending on whether they are an *asylopolis*, in which the majority of residents are refugees fleeing political turmoil, religious persecution, or a natural disaster in their previous place of settlement, an *ethnopolis*, in which ethnicity constitutes the logic of its operation, a *chronopolis*, in which a calendar system different from the mainstream provides the logical itinerary of its deployment, a *technopolis*, in which high-tech work is the magnet of its constitution, a *panethnopolis*, in which its demography is made up of diverse immigrant groups, or a *creolopolis*, in which its residents are the offspring of previous generations of immigrants.¹²

Urban Quarters

Naming the European Jewish enclave or residential neighborhood a “quarter” deserves a sociological explanation if we are to understand its particularity in relation to other urban units of comparable size. To do so, we must explain the process of quarter formation. Quartering means the spatial incorporation, segregation, differentiation, and administration of a group by race, national origin, class, religion, profession, or sexual orientation in a specific area of the city.¹³ The formation and existence of urban quarters are based on different premises of social organization.

Some urban sites have evolved as ethnic quarters because of policies of segregation or anti-Semitism entertained and enforced by the central or city government.¹⁴ The medieval Jewish quarters in Europe were constructed because Jews were not allowed, before emancipation, to live anywhere else in the European city. Social engineering from the top down produced the quarter as a segregated place. For example, the Jewish quarters in Paris and Berlin were created in the context of these customs and state policies.

Other quarters have come about because of income and industrial work.¹⁵ Poor immigrants establish themselves in the areas of town where they can find the most employment and where they can afford housing. Here it is the ability to earn a living that influences the choice of residence, including the possibility of living among compatriots who speak the same language and practice the same culture. Upper-class individuals who do not want to live near the poor establish their own quarters, which appear sometimes as *gated communities*. Here, again, income is the driving force. The existence of poor quarters such as Jewish Scheunenviertel in nineteenth-century Berlin and rich quarters such as Beacon Hill in Boston can be explained by the income or social class that is at the root of their formation.

Certain quarters develop based not on income or restrictive laws, but on self-imposed religious clustering.¹⁶ Stamford Hill in London is increasingly becoming such a quarter because of the continuing immigration of Hasidic Jews. They congregate in this neighborhood, buying homes, welcoming members of the faith, and enlarging the community for the purpose of carving a congenial social context in which they can practice their religion.

Other quarters develop from totally different principles, such as sexual orientation.¹⁷ The Castro district in San Francisco is such a quarter. It primarily attracts people who are engaged in same sex relationships. In the process of forming a homosexual quarter, residents

have developed a supportive community of their own, facilitated by living among like-minded neighbors.

Some quarters are based on profession, as is the case of neighborhoods with artists' communities. Artists congregate in these areas because of affordable rents, the existence of space for their studios, and an environment propitious for their artistic creativity.¹⁸ The bohemian context of these quarters serves as a place of work, a residence, a spur to intellectual and artistic creativity, and a marketplace where they can attract people to buy their output (paintings, sculpture, etc.). The Latin quarter in medieval Paris served as such a place. It accommodated both artists and Latin-speaking students who attended the Sorbonne.

In the sociological literature, a quarter is invested with two meanings: It is seen as either a community or an administrative unit.¹⁹ It is seen as a community when the emphasis is placed on the people who live in the area, their lifestyles, the local history, and the quarter's relations with the rest of the city. For example, one could speak of one quarter as being different in its population composition from another quarter. This community focus corresponds to the bottom-up approach to the study of the neighborhood. In contrast, the top-down approach sees the quarter as an administrative unit. It is a category used by city hall and mainstream society to explain the geographical partitioning of the urban landscape, the free-market reality that leads to such an outcome, and the management of such a unit to ensure that it is in harmony with the zoning policies of the city. These two meanings of a quarter refer to its local performance. In this book, the Jewish quarter is invested with a third meaning—in addition to the two previously mentioned—that captures both its local and global orientation. It is viewed as a *global chronopolis*. This view emphasizes its local incorporation into an European city, its interaction with city hall for its survival and reproduction, the ongoing relations of its residents with their homeland or foreign place of origin, and the different calendar (lunar-solar) that religious Jews use, which sets the enclave apart from the rest of society. The quarter is a transnational pole of a global continuum with the homeland and other diasporic sites serving as the dispersed nodes of this circuit.

Cloistering the Quarter

The making of a quarter cannot be completed until a cloistering process sets the boundaries that separate it spatially from the rest of the city. Cloistering means "enclosure" and can be done from the inside,

by the resident group itself, or from the outside, by society. A quarter comes into being when it is physically cloistered, a geographical demarcation that has social implications. Separation stemming from the inside is done either consciously or unconsciously for the purpose of preservation and protection of the community's cultural traditions. This process develops out of everyday practices, which create the self-imposed need to separate the community from the rest of society. This is seen in the case of the Hasidim who, in the absence of any legal prescription, carve a social niche compatible with their religious aspirations. From the outside, separation is imposed by society for the purpose of segregation (racial or religious) or administration.

Cloistering the quarter requires a willingness to participate in the social construction of an area or to recognize it as a distinct site of society. It sets a group of people living in a specific site apart from the rest of society, geographically speaking, separates the site from others, and in some cases even provides it with a name, such as "the Jewish quarter." Such a name specifies the national or religious identity of the group and its separateness as an administrative district. In other words, an ethnic quarter becomes such only when it is cloistered, meaning that the group holds the site as its turf or territory, that city hall recognizes it and provides public services tailored to the specific needs of the community, and that society recognizes it because of its exoticness, its role in city affairs, and its reputation as an enclave different from other neighborhoods.

Cloistering implies a series of mechanisms. These include the legal justification that emanates from the policies of the city and the working of market forces that allow such a social transaction to occur, which in turn involves such factors as the fluctuation, displacement, construction, and ghettoization of housing stocks. Cloistering is a geographical isolation from society that necessarily leads to the reinforcement and strengthening of community ties, social solidarity in the face of perceived adversity, socialization in the ways of the enclave, preservation of customary practices, and the development of a new hyphenated identity.

Cloistering also implies that the lack of integration reinforced the "otherization" of the other. It creates borders inside of which state practices can be implemented as well as a new site for law enforcement to patrol. Borders are zones of transgression for community expansion and are sites of conflict because the mainstream wants to incarcerate the group inside these limits and the group wants to reach beyond its enclave to meet housing demands. Borders, whether symbolic or real, are distinct features that one must cross to join either side of the

divide. In short, cloistering is a procedure to incarcerate the global in the local, that is, it is the local disciplining of the global. It does so by prioritizing and amplifying the local aspects of the neighborhood over its global features. When such a trend is reversed, one witnesses the process of decloistering.

Decloistering a quarter is the process by which the local enclave becomes fully able to perform its global identity in a gentrified environment, resulting in the shift from the globalization of homogeneity to the globalization of heterogeneity. It comes about as a result of the repeal of housing segregation laws and restrictive covenants, the will of city hall to modernize the locale, and the availability of efficient communication and transportation systems. Whether the process is driven by the diaspora, market forces, or by city hall, decloistering provides new opportunities for the rearticulation of the global with the local, the disincarceration of the global in the local, and the structured performance of the local in the global.

The Articulation of the Local with the Global

The ethnic neighborhood is not an isolated phenomenon, but is connected to an elsewhere. Heretofore, the lack of attention to the intertwining of its global and local dimensions has been due to the need to attend to more tangible practices that can be used by the city or state government to resolve immediate problems. In this vein, problems of segregation, housing, crime, the integration of ethnic enclaves, racial discrimination, and the functioning of ethnic economies have taken precedence over developing paradigms that include the global production of urban everyday life at the neighborhood level.

By replacing a local approach to the study of the ethnic enclave with a more balanced framework that emphasizes both its local and global parameters, I wish to correct the fallacious belief that neighborhood problems are caused and generated locally. Most are not, because they are a result of encounters between external and internal factors. Therefore, the trajectory of a local place is shaped by the global relations, which it maintains with external entities. In this light, enduring solutions for the eradication of neighborhood problems must also be sought in the interface of the community with outside actors. Here we are referring to identifying the institutions, ideologies, and transnational practices that produce such problems. The focus on the tail end of the process may not always be sufficient unless the parameters of the globalization of the local neighborhood are understood and its fundamental aspects addressed.

One of the fundamental aspects of the globalization process is the role played by information technology in its deployment. Information technology provides an extra means for the connections of a diasporic neighborhood to the outside world. A wired office or home, used for linkages with outside agents, is fundamentally a node in a global network and therefore a global site.²⁰ Connectivity not only globalizes the ethnic enclave, but also provides more permanence to the process.

If we accept the idea that globalization seen in this way affects every aspect of society, it makes sense to study these ramifications not only in the macrostructural realm, but also in the microstructural forms of engagement, where agency practices can be decoded. Jewish neighborhoods in the European Union offer sites where this analysis can proceed.

These diasporic neighborhoods provide a window on the unfolding of the globalization process because they serve as incubators in which internal and external factors interface. Thus, a theory of globalization that pays equal attention to macrostructure, microstructure, and agency will be useful to develop in order to understand both the local and global parameters of daily life in these neighborhoods. This analytical distinction will be followed in this study by focusing on the local place as the embodied site where global practices are choreographed and performed and by identifying multiple neighborhood aspects that are entangled in global practices. To begin to achieve this end, various behaviors of global neighborhood practices will be analyzed: the local site as a niche that individuates the processes of globalization, as a node in a transnational network, as reglobalization because of deglobalization, and as a transitory or permanent state.

Local Niches and the Globalization Process

Globalization is often studied in terms of flows, mobility, and cross-border relations, but not always in terms of the behaviors of local neighborhoods. If local sites are nodes in global networks, however, they deserve to be studied as global phenomena so that the social shape of the local place and its import to the network can be deciphered. How does globalization get anchored locally? Once the local site is inscribed in or produced by globality, how does it behave?

As a niche for the individuation of the global, in the local, different flows mix, interact, and crisscross. The grammatical rules that produce the outcome are shaped by the global as well. Of course, this larger process does not have one trajectory, but rather is made up of a bundle of crisscrossing circuits with contradictory outcomes that

constitute the infrastructure of these neighborhoods of globalization. What are these processes and how can they be studied?

Seeing a local site as a niche where the processes of globalization are individuated means that globalization manifests itself in different fashions, which explains the dissimilarities in outcomes among different places. In other words, a niche localizes global processes, and the encounter of global flows in local places produces different local outcomes. The role of the local place as a node that gives its own imprint on global processes cannot be underestimated. Consequently, one may argue that a local site provides clues on how aspects of the globalization process unfold. The rule of thumb here is that the previous history of a neighborhood and social conditions on the ground structure the content and variability of the local outcome of transnational practices. In other words, the local history of the place shapes the local outcome of the global process. Different places with different histories have different global outcomes as well.

In turn, the global process as it lands in, traverses, or is produced by local realities can reinforce, transform, or have minimal effect on the local site. This process plays a reinforcement role when the linkage sustains local institutions and maintains their existence, as shown in the case of diasporic religions, which need a connection to the homeland as justification for the faith of the brethren. However, it plays a transformative role when the linkage changes the parameters of relations on the ground. For example, diasporic relations with the homeland sometimes work to strengthen the position of opposition parties and undermine the popularity of the national government.

Here the word “niche” conveys the idea that a locality, because of its internal dynamics, may be more attuned to some global processes than others. This difference in local outcomes may be due to the kinds of agents involved in such a process. For example, some global interactions involve individuals, while others involve groups; some are outward looking, and others inward. The concept of a niche emphasizes once again the ways in which the social context puts constraints on what can be achieved by global linkages and in which communities reposition themselves to fit in the evolution of the global network.

The Local Viewed as a Node in Global Networks

Through various types of connections or relationships, a local site becomes a node linked to other nodes, a new type of locality. As a node, it provides an infrastructure for the deployment of globalization, and it is also influenced by what happens within the network.

Because locality is a node, it can generate output to activate a global undertaking. It does so as the initiating mechanism that influences the behavior of or even gives birth to the network. The local is the place at which various networks interconnect, and they provide the context that influences this interconnection. Since every community is involved in different types of activities, there are multiple linkages that are molded locally. This means that the local's internal structure also is constantly being remolded by external influences because its own functioning depends on the central, peripheral, or incidental types of these relationships in the network.

Local nodes do not all have the same weight in a network. Some are more influential in the global network than others. Sometimes they attain this status because of events that occurred in their midst. This is what happened when the Goldenberg Restaurant in the Jewish quarter in Paris was bombed in 1982. Jewish communities throughout the world waited for news from Le Marais to find out if their loved ones had been injured.

Not all global relations are initiated from elsewhere, either. Some have evolved from the local. This explains the two-way process of the globalization mechanism. As a site that converts incoming processes to meet local needs, the local finds itself as a destination in the process. Furthermore, the global operates on the basis of a stratified system, which contributes to the diversity of local outcomes. This stratification is not permanent, but is constantly being unmade and remade.

Locality Viewed as Reglobalization Because of Deglobalization

The globalization process does not always maintain a linear progression. Deglobalization also can occur. Neighborhoods can become deglobalized because of the deportation, internment, or elimination of groups of residents. When this happens, previous global linkages may no longer exist, leading to a transformation or relocalization of the site. This creates a locality that has been, to a great extent, deglobalized.

At the end of the nightmares of war or persecution, however, the neighborhood may return to a new form of stability. This occurs with the return of some residents while others have left for good, having been killed by their persecutors, emigrated to other sites, or placed in state institutions because of incapacitation. In the absence of old residents, new migrants may move in with new extraterritorial ties, remaking the place once again a node in a transnational network.

Reglobalization marks the end of one global process and the beginning of another. We see here that globalization at the local level has a history: It can be made, unmade, and remade and may not proceed in an unbroken continuum. For the neighborhood, reglobalization brings different actors, different external connections, and the pursuit of different goals because of different activities, even if the physical infrastructure remains the same. Here we have physical continuity without social continuity.

The trajectory of the globalization process at the local level is thus sometimes made up of interruptions, reconnections, new connections, and the elimination of old connections. Reglobalization presents a new face for the neighborhood. It becomes globalized with a new local system of practices.

Globalized Locality as a Transitory or Permanent State

Temporality in the globalized locality appears in different modes. Some practices are transitory or incidental and only globalize the enclave for a distinct period of time. Other relations are routine and more permanent and have up and down periods. Some relations are cyclical and are activated on a regular basis. The global relations or connections of the diasporic enclave thus have a tempo that can be studied at the neighborhood level. This temporal structure allows us to distinguish between times when relations are dense and times when they are not. Neighborhood life tends to follow the ebb and flow of these global practices, which can cause a neighborhood to maintain a rhythmic cadence not totally in sync with that of the mainstream chronotype surrounding it. The cadence of the Jewish week, for example, with its peak day on Saturday, provides a global rhythm different from the rest of the metropolitan community in Berlin, Paris, and London.

When a neighborhood is permanently linked to an elsewhere, the form these extraterritorial relations take also may vary. Some relations do not survive the purpose for which they were created. Some are accidental or not preplanned, and others are suppressed. Two forms of neighborhood links to the global must be singled out: infrastructural and relational. Infrastructural links are the myriad ways that the local is wired with the interests of other localities: money invested in banks that travel from site to site, insurance paid to out-of-state institutions, neighborhood institutions that are the subsidiaries of their headquarters located elsewhere, and neighborhood businesses that are dependent on homeland institutions for their goods in order to survive. This kind of

“infrastructural globalization” has existed, in one form or another, for many years. Relational links, by contrast, focus on human interaction and proceed from a different logic. “Relational globalization” thus links family members located in diverse overseas sites, grassroots organizations that operate transnationally, and individuals who entertain cross-border relationships. These two types of extraterritorial relations are constitutive of the local scene and cannot be divorced from one another.

Transglobal Diasporic Urbanism

What emerges from the connections of these sites to each other is a new type of urbanism that is transglobal in its mode of operation and the form of city life it produces. Saskia Sassen speaks of “a systemic dynamic bidding these cities . . . an economic system that rests on distinct types of locations and specializations each city represents . . . the formation, at least an incipient one, of a transnational urban system.”²¹ She concludes her observations and analyses based on economic and financial linkages between global cities such as London, Tokyo, and New York by saying that “whether this has contributed to the formation of transnational global urban systems is a question that requires more research.”²²

In the debate over the global city, various types of transnational commercial, financial, familial, religious, and social linkages have been documented and analyzed, and this literature has unveiled the multiplicity of factors and the plurality of niches that constitute the makeup of such global urban systems of practices. Michael Peter Smith has ventured to make sense of this literature and has extracted from it what he thinks might contribute to our understanding of this new form of urban restructuring, which he refers to as “transnational urbanism.” He uses this concept as “a cultural rather than geographic metaphor.”²³ Furthermore, he sees transnational urbanism as a “marker of the criss-crossing transnational circuits of communication and cross-cutting local, translocal, and transnational social practices that ‘come together’ in particular places at particular times and enter into the contested politics of place-making, the social construction of power differentials, and the making of individual, group, national, and transnational identities, and their corresponding fields of difference.”²⁴ He further argues that we should shift our emphasis in the study of cities “from globalization to transnational urbanism” and calls for a reconfiguration of urban research to refocus on “transnational urban studies.”²⁵

This book seeks to further this shift in emphasis. The forms of a transglobal urban system depend on the shape of each of its transnational

components, as we have noted. Until we understand the modes of operation of these diverse units and their connectedness, we may not be able to understand the global integration of global neighborhoods. Hence, our option is to focus on these components—diasporic enclaves and their extraterritorial relations—to understand how cross-border urbanism and global neighborhoods are mutually feeding and sustaining the existence and shape of each other. It is my view that such a bottom-up approach unveils processes that otherwise might not be made explicit or might be cluttered by the top-down approach used by global city analysts. In this context, I conceive of transglobal diasporic urbanism as the process by which global neighborhoods become embedded in the social organization of networks of transnational sites that mutually influence and sustain each other. This transnational interaction is achieved through the expansion of the local place because of the translocal life in which the residents are engaged, the linkages to transnational networks that blur the boundaries of its geographical parameters, the connections to different sites for diverse reasons that globalize the local structure, the mobility of people and things that is intrinsic to the social reproduction of both the unit and the network, and the structural position that the local site occupies as a function of its location in the transnational hierarchy of sites.

The Plan of the Book

This introduction has set the stage for the examination of globalization in three neighborhoods. Chapter 1 examines the unmaking and remaking of Jewish space in Paris, documents the social history of the Marais quarter, shows how each historical juncture in the evolution of the community was globally produced, explains the strength of the Sephardic community that has succeeded the Ashkenazi community, and provides an interpretation of the trajectory of the quarter.

Chapter 2 delineates the history of the Berlin Jewish quarter, its destruction during World War II, and its symbolic reappearance after the reunification of Germany. It follows the plight of the Jews who returned to East Berlin after the war and analyzes the everyday life of the community by taking three critical moments into consideration: the first decade of the socialist regime, the era of the Berlin Wall and its aftermath, and the postreunification period. This reconstruction of local history has been done with the help of members of the local community, who provided their interpretation of events.

Chapter 3 studies two Jewish enclaves in London: Stamford Hill and Golders Green, whose population initially came mostly from the

historic Jewish ghetto of London's East End, Whitechapel. The various streams of Jewish migration from Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa are also documented to show the global composition of these neighborhoods. These sites are studied from the perspectives of various actors, both Jews and Gentiles, who have all witnessed the arrival of Jewish immigrant cohorts to these neighborhoods.

Chapter 4 examines the relations of Paris's city hall with the Jewish quarter. The city administration has been studying the best way to intervene and renovate the Jewish quarter. It has argued that this area needs to integrate with the larger modernization plan for the city being implemented by the mayor's office. This controversy has created a messy situation in the neighborhood due to the merchants' association's protests against such urban renovation; they believe it will lead to the extinction of many shops and the eventual disappearance of the Jewish quarter itself. This chapter analyzes the controversy and explains what is at stake for both sides.

Chapter 5 studies the Jewish quarter comparatively, both as a place of residence and as a business district. As a residential neighborhood, it has developed social institutions for its people as well as for outsiders. The bookstores where residents can acquire religious books and cultic objects, the synagogue and oratories where the faithful attend Sabbath prayers, and the kosher shops and grocery stores where they can purchase their weekly food intake are local institutions central in the reproduction of the neighborhood as a diasporic Jewish place. Businesses that cater to this diasporic clientele are an important component that gives the neighborhood much financial stability, feeds competition among local entrepreneurs, and attracts tourists to the enclave.

Chapter 6 explains how the rhythm of life in the Jewish quarter is in disharmony with the rest of the city on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. There, the Jewish calendar takes precedence over the Gregorian calendar used by the rest of the urban community. On the "day of preparation," the shops close early on Friday afternoon in comparison to Gentiles' stores; on Saturday, the shops are closed for the Sabbath, while nearby non-Jewish stores are open; on Sunday, the neighborhood is alive with tourists patronizing the shops. Throughout the year, religious Jewish celebrations such as Yom Kippur provide a different rhythm of life in the neighborhood. These ethnic festivities affect the flow of activities and produce a distinct temporal characteristic of the enclave.

Chapter 7 shows that the renovation of these quarters as "sites of memory" by city hall was often done with the motivation of luring tourists and their money to these locations to fatten the city coffers. Here, the idea is to remake these areas as exotically Jewish as possible to ensure a tourist trade, instead of the intent to modernize the built

structures. As long as these quarters remain Jewish-like, both Jews and non-Jews will visit them. This aspect of heritage tourism is also fashioned to appeal to Jews in search of their roots, who may visit the enclave for that purpose. Entrepreneurs organize formal group visits, films, festivals, and lectures to attract Jewish and non-Jewish visitors as well as students to the locale or site of memory. The city thus adds the ethnic enclave in its map of exotic neighborhoods as another place to visit. In the end, this move generates publicity and thinly veils the fact that the neighborhood has moved on to another level of its incorporation in the city's administrative structure. It has become a theme park.

Chapter 8 examines the Jewish quarter as a global entity or social formation. It emphasizes global features of the Jewish quarter, its global logic, its relations with Israel and other Jewish quarters that sustain its religious life, its transnational economic activities, and its political engagement on behalf of the security of the state of Israel. It explains why fundraising to support humanitarian Jewish efforts in the fields of social services, education, and religious activities is periodically undertaken for the survival of the group and why security has become an important element that ties these communities together by providing trained guards, collaborating on security measures, or sharing intelligence so that the communities may protect themselves.

Chapter 9 focuses on the patterns of Internet and cell-phone use in these Jewish neighborhoods. It looks at how these communication tools have contributed to a multimedia environment in each neighborhood; how they are used to communicate with overseas parents, to read foreign Jewish newspapers, to participate in cyberforums about Israeli politics; and how some use the Internet to engage in online commercial transactions. It explains how the Internet has provided an infrastructure for transnational family socialization and how it has become a major component of digital diasporic globalization.

The penultimate chapter shifts the focus of the analysis from agency to structure in an attempt to study the larger context of the impact of formal Jewish organizations on everyday practices in the Jewish neighborhoods in Paris, Berlin, and London. It posits that what goes on in these neighborhoods cannot be explained simply in reference to the exclusive realm of local players, but also is affected by the interference of other individuals and associations located outside these enclaves. It shows that the influence of these "external" entities—formal institutions, political and trade relations of the country with Israel, the movement of Jewish high-tech workers from one site to another—is multivocal, and affects the neighborhoods in myriad ways, sometimes minimally and at other times maximally depending on what is at stake

or the mitigating circumstances. In the process, it explains the translocal embeddedness of these *neighborhoods of globalization*.

The conclusion explains how these neighborhoods operate, how they are linked to each other, how individuals and goods circulate through these nodes, how they provide protected niches for those persecuted and in search of asylum, and how they form a complex global urban system. It identifies the elements that constitute the logic of such a global urban system.