Fragmentation and solidarity in the artistic milieu of contemporary Paris: A perspective from Emile Durkheim

Christian Morgner

Early 20th century Paris is considered to be one of the first art capitals in the world. However, there is, to date, no research on contemporary Paris that looks into the conditions and structure of its urban art scene. The aims of this paper are twofold: 1) to obtain an understanding of the conditions that prevent or separate the current artistic landscape from its former heydays, and 2) to embed the empirical data into a theoretical framework that can potentially be used to compare this situation with those of other cities. The main concept of Durkheim's that will inform this framework is the term milieu. This term has been tested by the author regarding a number of other cities that have been studied, including New York City, Mexico City, London, Beijing, Zürich, and Tokyo. The main findings of this study will show that the Parisian artistic milieu can be described as in a state of 'social sclerosis', as an anaemic detachment from other artistic micro-segments-the solidarity organs not being sufficiently in contact, which constrains freedom of expression, fosters the lack of independence, and promotes low tolerance, which is a partial explanation why Paris is unable to revamp its status as former capital of bohemia.

1. Introduction

Early 20th century Paris is considered to be one of the first art capitals in the world. The Parisian culture of the time, based in the Quartier Latin and Rive Gauche, the bohemianism surrounding the arts, the flaneur,[^] the growth of an early art market, and the extension of the artistic activities to Montmartre and from there to Montparnasse, have all inspired not only nostalgic visions of the city, but have also informed a number of important urban and so-ciological studies (Casanova, 2004; Franck, 2001; Grana & Grana 1990, White & White 1965). The influential status of Paris has slowly disappeared since the 1970s, and is being replaced by cities such as New York, London, and Berlin (Currid, 2006; Guilbaut, 1983; While, 2003). There is, to date, no research on contemporary Paris that looks into the conditions and structure of its urban art scene. The aims of this paper are twofold: 1) to obtain an understanding of the conditions that prevent or separate the current artistic landscape from its former heydays, and 2) to go beyond a mere description, and to embed the empirical data into a theoretical framework that can potentially be used to compare this situation with those of other cities, and to provide a framework that can clarify the conditions and factors that give rise to an art capital of sorts, or to explain the constraints that prevent this. The main concept of Durkheim's that will inform this framework is the term milieu. Although it is known that Durkheim used this term in his theory, it has not been extensively discussed in the literature. However, this term has been tested by the author regarding a number of other cities that have been studied, including New York City, Mexico City, London, Beijing, Zürich, and Tokyo (Morgner, 2014, 2015). The framework has proven to be useful for making comparisons between these cities, particularly for gauging

artistic innovativeness, which is largely defined as a production and reproduction of artistic diversity, and based on a number of empirical findings: 1) the frequency of artistic encounters as a source of stimulation, motivations, and information, 2) the number of artistic interactions as influences on cooperation opportunities, and as a ground for competition and criticism, and 3) the urban density of interactions as a mode for mutual observation, learning, and identity formation.

In the first part of this paper, the term milieu and its possible application to the study of urban art milieus will be discussed. This is followed by a brief methodological discussion on data collection. The latter part of the paper demonstrates how this frame of reference can be applied to the study of artistic milieus by using empirical data from contemporary 21st century Paris.

The main findings of this study are that the Parisian artistic milieu is in a state of 'social sclerosis,' and that this is the result of the fragmented nature of the artistic community. Symptoms of this state of affairs include a constrained freedom of expression, a lack of independence, and a low tolerance for new ideas among Parisian artists, all of which help to explain why Paris has been unable to re-establish its status as a capital of bohemia.

2. The term 'milieu' in the writings of Emile Durkheim and the idea of the 'artistic milieu'

Large agglomerations¹ of artists can be found in many cities, such as Bushwick in New York City, East London (Shoreditch, Victoria Park), or District 798 in Beijing. Several studies have been conducted on the clusters of artists living and working in large urban centres (Currid, 2006; Florida, 2002; Heilbrun, 1989). These studies focused mainly on demographics, and overlooked the importance of analysing the actual connections between the artists living in a given city. Quantitative comparisons and rankings do not take into account the qualitative arrangement of the urban setting (Menger, 2006). The artists are not dispersed throughout the city; the majority gather in a specific area, and it is here that quantity seems to matter because a large number are brought together, in the spatial sense of the word. Although a smaller city might have the same proportion of artists as New York City, the actual number would be only a few hundred (if that many), in contrast to several thousand clustered together in the art districts of large urban centres. Ethnographic studies are often inspired by the methodological orientation of the Chicago School (see Bain, 2003; Currid & Williams, 2010; Grazian, 2004; Ley, 2003; Lloyd, 2002), and although they focus on the question of social integration and interaction, they remain, in terms of their conceptual orientation, quite narrow because the models that they develop are abstract enough so that they can account for the conditions of art districts in other cities, or because they have not tried to address art scenes that are constrained by social disintegration, and a lack of diversity and innovativeness.

The following conceptual formulation of a city's artistic milieu was inspired by Durkheim's version of milieu. The term is often translated as 'environment' (Durkheim, 1965, 1982, p. 113, p. 116). Durkheim did not use *l'environnement*, and while the translation might appear to be a minor issue, the notion of milieu is much closer to Durkheim's concept and to the semantic tradition (Spitzer, 1942). The term 'milieu' also refers to 'in the middle' (*au milieu*

in French), which implies that one element is related to two others and that is both defined through this position and receives direction from it. This notion of milieu shares similarities with the network theory of Harrison C. White (1992, p. 65): 'Identities come to perceive the likelihood of impacts to other identities in some string of ties and stories. The social result is called a network.' A network or milieu is in this sense not simply defined through linkages or interconnections, but as originating from 'interacting control struggles' (2008, p. 150) or a 'triggering of identities' (2008, p. 6). In other words, in contrast to classical notions of networks, this is not just a form of observing or being linked to other parts of a network, but rather of co-production. The idea is that the formation of identities (an identity is like a stabilised profile, configuration, or role) activates control searches by other identities, which have their own impetus towards controlling other parts. The linking is then not like the linking of pearls on a chain, but occurs because '[e]ach control effort presupposes and works in terms of other identities'

1 The word agglomeration is used deliberately because the word reflects a loose coupling of elements.

An artistic milieu is therefore not simply to be seen as artists who know each other or have common linkages, because these forms of an association can also be described as an agglomeration. Instead, the linkages between the artists define each other, and thereby shape social order. The term 'milieu' or 'network' reflects this notion of a reflexive co-production. The word 'environment' refers to what is outside, perhaps the outside of a system or how something is located in a specific setting and influenced by the setting, which is a one-way relationship. Because this study considers art districts, it is concerned with how they are shaped internally, and how the artists relate to and thus define each other. Therefore, Durkheim's term *milieu* is more appropriate.

The milieu is therefore marked by an interactive approach in which its nature is characterized by the construction and interpretation of meaning.² Furthermore, these interactions have a spatial dimension, as they require a space in which these interactions can occur. When many artists live and work together or near each other, frequent interactions are inevitable. In these settings, running into other artists becomes a daily occurrence, and interactions can evolve easily. These encounters become so normal that the mere perception of other artists triggers them. Referring to the countryside, one artist noted that 'there aren't any artists around ... you have to call people up ... in New York, you just step out on the street' (Rosenberg & Fliegel, 1979, p. 18). As a consequence of this intensity, the interactions become orientated towards each other, occurring in the middle of or with reference to other interactions with artists.

This mutual interconnectedness of an artistic milieu is an important aspect that requires further differentiation. Two additional criteria (Durkheim, 1912, p. 139) are helpful: 1) the number of social units; and 2) the degree of concentration (or dynamic density). The second of these is not just a spatial setting; the proximity might be a given, but separation through social distance is also implied (Durkheim uses the word 'moral' instead of 'social'). Proximity thus refers to actual social (moral) relations that not only compete with each other but also share a common way of life (Wirth, 1938). A simple physical agglomeration is therefore insufficient because density does not refer to the number of inhabitants, but to

the development of the lines of communication and transmission between them (Durkheim, 1912, p. 140).³ The latter phenomenon is further differentiated by network theory in the form of weak and strong ties (Granovetter, 1973). Furthermore, the role of these ties as a form of social capital needs to be considered (Bourdieu, 1983). Access or exclusion from networks is an important resource that can have serious effects upon the position of an artist in developing a career (Guiffre, 1999). Thus, while the first element (the number of social units) simply denotes the number or the frequency of artistic interactions, the second (density) refers to the awareness of the frequency of related communications in the presence of other artists (i.e., interactions evolve into milieu). A cross-tabling of these criteria suggests that different urban artistic settings are possible. Research by the author (Morgner, 2014, 2015) demonstrates that Williamsburg, New York and East London are marked by a high frequency of artistic interactions with dense spatial interlinks. These milieus are marked by strong mutual support, but also high competitiveness. The diverse and vibrant pool of artistic interactions reinforces the milieu and attracts further artists to move to the area. However, in this paper, a setting will be considered that is marked by the high number of artists living and working in Paris, but that is marked by a sparse spatial mutuality of artistic interactions. The results and consequences this setting of the Parisian artistic milieu can be described as 'social sclerosis'. This setting describes an anaemic detachment from other artistic micro-segments the solidarity organs not being sufficiently in contact (Durkheim, 1933, p. 368). As a consequence, the freedom of expression is severely constrained, there is a lack of interdependence, but also of cooperation, and competition.

3. Empirical methodology

The strategy used to collect qualitative and quantitative data on Paris was similar to previous research by the author in a number of other cities, for instance, New York, London, Zurich, Beijing, and Tokyo. In addition to the collection of statistical data and the interpretation of secondary data, ethnographic observation and in-depth interviews were the main empirical methods used in the data collection. The ethnographic data were collected over a period of six months in 2012. The process included walks throughout the city and observations of the population and architecture in different districts, while shadowing artists in their daily work and interactions. Furthermore, regular visits were paid to art museums, art galleries (including openings), off-spaces, music venues, bars, and cafes. Further data were collected through studio visits or by 'hanging out' with the artists and living in the relevant neighbourhoods. The author was himself based in Montreuil, which houses many artists, but he also relied on previous contacts with access to the Parisian art world.

In conducting the research for this study, it was of course not possible to talk to every artist or professional in the Parisian art world. The two main approaches used as points of entry into this unknown universe involved two strategies: referrals and contacts made in common meeting places (Salganik & Heckathorn, 2004). Both strategies have the disadvantage of possibly involving only one specific perspective or selection; that is, the referral might include only like-minded people, and the meeting places might be frequented only by certain artists or professionals. Certainly, only a limited sample of the population can be researched in this way. However, because this study focuses on descriptions of the Parisian

art world in general, and not on individual artists or spaces, a certain validation could be gained if several distinct perspectives were to reveal common features. The strategy employed, therefore, was to combine the referral system with that of the meeting place or entry point. This methodology of maximal versus minimal contrast originated in the well-established method known as grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

In the present case, the technique of multiplying the referral and meeting/entry combinations was introduced with a focus on contrasting cases. Contrasting data were gathered not only from the interviews, but also from ethnographic and statistical information and other secondary sources. The entry points were reflected in the range of differing dimensions, social settings, and mediums that specifically provided contrasting perspectives, namely the emerging and established, a variety of municipal and private venues/institutions (museums, galleries, music and performance spaces, off-spaces, studios, and art schools), and artists working with different media (including dance, painting, sculpture, graffiti, video, photography, writing, and composing). About 30 in-depth interviews were conducted, which included artists (painters, musicians, writers, dancers) and art professionals (artist-in-residence managers, gallery owners, theatre directors, and live-music venue managers) at different stages of their career. The interviewees were not only French nationals, but came from a variety of countries (the United States, Italy, Belgium, Ukraine, Argentina, Poland, and South Korea). The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analysed using ATLAS.ti software. The empirical analysis of the data showed a number of negative tendencies reflected in the statements of artists and art professionals that participated in this study. A considerable number therefore requested to be quoted only anonymously. All translations from French into English are by the author, unless otherwise noted.

4. The artistic milieu of Paris

The empirical research on Paris revealed that this artistic milieu is characterized by many artistic interactions that are sparsely spatially interlinked, and that therefore influence the dynamics, output, and status of Paris as a city of the arts.

The statistical data indicated that there is an agglomeration of artists in Paris (Gouyon, 2011a, 2011b; Pinçon & Pinçon-Charlot, 2004), with some concentrations in the eastern sections of the city (near the Place d'Italie, such as the Rue Ricaut, Rue du Chateau des Rentiers, and adjacent streets), near the Rue Oberkampf, Belle-ville, along the Quai de la Seine, among others, as well as parts of the Ile-de-France (e.g., Montreuil and Bagnolet). However, these artistic interactions were only loosely connected.⁴ The artists were often not aware of other artists, even if they lived in close proximity; if they were aware, the interlinking of their activities was rare or fragmented. The artistic milieu of Paris with regard to the location of its artists can be described as many small spots in different districts, but without congregation or merger into a larger artistic community or similar setting. This was clearly observed in the interviews, with references to 'pockets' (the term most used here), 'spots,' 'points,' and 'flickering lights.' There is no coherent art district in contemporary Paris or a district with a great density of artists and a high level of interaction. Using Durkheim's word, one could speak of a segmented 'milieu.' Typical statements were as follows: 'It is

really spread out, not very dense. . . . It is more like different places' or 'It is a very fragmented scene, there is not much of a crossover.'

5. Anaemic tendencies of the artistic milieu

This section will consider the development of artistic activities within this segmented milieu, paying particular attention to creativity, exchange, and social climate. The atomised communities in Paris and Greater Paris have significant effects on the social grounding of the artistic activities both within and outside them. The interactions within such micro-clusters occur among groups of people who are familiar with each other, and the input from the outside remains weak. The artists in these micro-pockets, or micro-segments, are often friends who have known each other for a long time; they are familiar with each other's projects. In some cases, they have established links with galleries, art centres, theatres, dance spaces, and music venues. Because the artists tend to move along these lines of the network, they interact with the same people (as one artists stated: 'the team is already built') and produce works within established settings. The social relationships have a repetitive quality, and social relations are closed and insular. Consequently, the artists develop 'social sclerosis', that is, an anaemic detachment from other micro-segments the solidarity organs not being sufficiently in contact (Durkheim, 1933, p. 368). The micro-segments are thus difficult to identify from the outside, making it difficult to follow their trends, use their infrastructure, exchange information, and so on. Additionally, and perhaps even more importantly, simply being with like-minded artists does not extend to a wider collective sentiment and to a communal sharing (Durkheim, 1933, p. 102). As one mid-career artist stated, 'It's never about community, it's always being by yourself, you try to find a space and survive on your own, you're never related to other people.' The isolation and insular quality does not foster social capital. As Bourdieu (1983, p. 24) explains: social capital is 'the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition' (Bourdieu, 1983, p. 249). The mutual acquaintance cannot be extended, so that a wider network that has a more durable quality can be formed. The individual artist remains confined to their own small world apart from a wider artistic community.

The sparse connections contribute to a rather atomistic access to spaces, and places with artistic activities somehow exist but remain unknown. This lack of knowledge is not simply to be seen as a problem of emerging artists who do not yet know the art world, rather, it can be seen as lack of brokerage that inhibits the access to these places, and locations remain fragmented. For instance, the Parisian art scene, unlike Berlin, New York, or London, has no dedicated art forum in the form of a website, app, art journal, or similar tool that provides information about these artistic pockets. This lack of brokerage was also observed by one interviewee who stated, 'you have many little communities, you have many little lights and ... access is very limited. ... You don't have the key to open the door.' Following Burt (2005), Bourdieu's conception of social capital can be extended in this context of this lack of brokers, because social capital is scarce. The structural holes between the mini-clusters are not overcome, which means that variations within these clusters are not shared and challenging ideas are hard to come by. 'People with connections across structural holes have early access to diverse, often contradictory, information and interpretations, which gives them a competitive advantage in seeing and developing good ideas' (Burt 2005, p. 63).

The lack of brokerage means that ideas that might be mundane in one mini-cluster cannot spawn creativity in another, where this idea would be new and valued. Furthermore, good ideas are unlikely to be carried much further, and are likely to remain undiscovered by the art professionals.

6. Anaemic tendencies: cooperation and competition

Within the micro-clusters, strong ties emerge between artists who are friends. These strong ties are important, because they hold the potential to motivate others to continue with their projects, especially those departing from accepted or common standards. However, deviation as a challenging of thresholds (Granovetter, 1978) does not only require supportive networks, but also those who critique and question this position. Brandenburger and Nalebuff (1996) call this combination of cooperation and critical competition: Co-Opetition. Such a critical competition can evolve much more easily if, as Simmel (1969) has argued, high levels of indifference or even anonymity exist. The mutual strangeness grants higher levels of individual freedom, because one is not bound by personal, tribal networks of kinship (Durkheim, 1933, p. 297). The anaemic structure of Paris and the formation of mini-clusters creates a village-like structure within these artistic pockets. People know each other well and thresholds for critical competition remain low. One has to avoid conflict, as this could easily lead to social exclusion. Attempts to critique and open competition are discouraged, and engaging or even talking about topics that could lead to such conflicts are avoided.

Thus, art is not a current topic, if it is discussed at all. One interviewee offered, 'We meet in Paris during openings, not really in Montreuil, and if we see each in a cafe we just talk as friends, but we don't talk about projects.' The lack of opportunities to discuss and analyse has two effects. First, the standards of the production, distribution, and consumption of art are not challenged, and second, no competitive challenge among the 'members' of this micro-cluster is likely to develop (Duncan, 1957, p. 490). They do not push each other, and they do not constantly question projects and ideas. Consequently, critical discussion cannot thrive. Another interviewee said, 'There are always people doing stuff, but it is very limited in contrast to L.A. or London.' There is little gain in cooperation if the other projects are known or if there is only a friendly exchange without a push-and-pull quality: 'It is very friendly, cool, not very competitive. . . . [T]hey are disconnected from the art market. . . . [T]hey are more or less friends.' In fact, in some segments or mini-clusters, the infrastructure for such discussions does not even exist; there are no sympathetic cafes or local art spaces that serve as meeting places. One artist living in the 13th arrondissement said, 'To meet other artists I go to the Cafe Beaubourg.'⁵ The lack of stimulation also leads to a tendency not to talk about ideas, because they might be stolen by others: '[W]hen competition places isolated and estranged individuals in opposition, it can only separate them more' (Durkheim, 1933, p. 275). Hence, the city is turned into a 'battlespace' (Graham, 2009). Some interviewees reported that they shut down their website⁶ to avoid theft of their ideas or that they refuse to discuss their projects. Predictably, even less information about possible innovation circulates, and the creative environment is further flattened.

7. Anaemic tendencies and professional solidarity (exhibitions, theatre, and music venues)

The most common way for artists to find jobs is through the referral of other artists, particularly another artist who is already involved in one of these social arenas (Bhandari & Melber, 2009; Janssen, 2001, p. 341). Using Durkheim's (1933, p. 66) terminology, one could speak of professional or occupational solidarity. Through that system, a surprisingly stable career path can develop (Hendricks, 1972; Oh, 2004; Verdassdonk, 1994). To find such work, as studies by Granovetter (2000) have demonstrated, so-called weak ties are a crucial structure. People living within your own habitat, such as your close friends, often share the same social situation and setting; consequently, they are unable to provide additional information. However, weak ties provide a link to other networks, enabling the diffusion of information and facilitating opportunities to make oneself known, be talked about, and be observed by others (Shields, 1991). These networks are at the heart of what Becker (1982) calls art worlds. The anaemic tendencies in Paris have resulted in referral systems that remain extremely local and closely related to the artistic pockets. Hence, the referral structure has an insular quality because the same people recommend each other. This insular referral structure has two consequences: 1) innovation can only develop among small networks of art dealers, curators, or directors and their artists, as well as among the artists to which these artists refer; 2) the art market remains overtly conservative and is largely detached from the local scene.

(1) The first aspect refers to a selection structure, where the referral and peer-review system creates a path-dependency that results in a very circular structure. Those artists who manage to showcase their work in a gallery, performance, or music venue build their reputation within this limited network. The build-up of their reputation leads to their further selection and thereby limit the opportunities for other artists to exhibit or perform their work:

...a show with heavy funding, at a regional art centre, and the same region buys the artwork, I mean it is this closed circle that leads to sort of intellectual laziness. ... There is no instinct of survival, no instinct of necessity, no urgency.

I didn't think it was a very active art scene, very, very provincial, very closed circles and I think it still is in many, many ways. ... You have to be in that circle to survive.

The anaemic tendencies of such a repetitive setting has led to a lack of social challenges and a reduced number of artistic inventions, and contributes to an artistic agenda in which only particular standards are accepted, which are described in Paris as 'official art.' One interviewee put it: The 'official art' rests on a creation of a system of friends. The label has a negative connotation, because it refers to former academies that produced works under a political or religious regime, and that thereby represented the taste of the artistic orientation of the state. This image of the official art is further reinforced by the history of Paris and its former status of a global art city. A considerable number of galleries and performance venues represent the glamorous history of Modern Art in France, which limits the scope and visibility of new ideas. One of the gallery owners stated:

... [A]nd in France with such a rich cultural history, it tends to be, for me, I feel, it tends to be more of a baggage than an asset, more of a, not so much a liability but just something,

having a lot to bear and it's hard to make, I guess, aesthetic propositions that are radical in nature ... It is, therefore, very hard to make aesthetic proposition outside of [them].

(2) The second aspect refers to the consequences of such an official art and the reliance on historically-established subjects. Music, performance venues, and galleries are places of value generation. They define the value of a work or piece not simply by adding a price but through a complex process of networked co-evaluation (Velthuis, 2005). However, this applies mostly to art-works that are contemporary, new, and by not-yet-fully-established artists, as their outstanding value has not been proven. As one dealer said: 'To sell a Picasso you don't have to be in a network ... Contemporary art has to be in network, which creates an entity that enhances the importance of the work.' As a consequence of this reliance on traditional and established works, the gatekeepers that could potentially unite the dispersed art milieu are disconnected from their locality and are recruited outside of Paris:

I discovered them [two artists] when they were in their first exhibition at the Tate Modern ... three months later they had their first solo show at the gallery and that's the way it works. You can see that for almost all the artists, that they were discovered either at exhibitions abroad, in biennials, Documenta or museum exhibitions.

Thus, the possibilities that exist to overcome anaemic tendencies in Paris are limited both by the artistic milieu, and the disconnection of exhibition spaces and other venues from their locality. Artists who want to overcome these challenges have in principle only one solution, namely, to succeed outside of France: 'If we move, we wanna move abroad, because in France there is nothing outside of Paris.'

8. Summary

The art scene of Paris in the early 20th century is commonly seen as an exemplary confluence of spatial materiality, where symbolism and artistic interactions were mutually influential in a positive way (Hewitt, 1996). This socio-urban milieu put Paris on the world art map. However, this perception of the Parisian artistic milieu does not consider the full picture. The milieu is not only a source of cosmopolitan thinking, but also a potential means of removing a great city from global trends and innovation in the art world.⁷ The empirical data revealed that the Parisian art milieu is marked by high levels of co-presence and mutual perception, but only within a number of disconnected multi-clusters.

It seems that there are a number of unique features that have contributed to this particular decline in Paris: the city's monu-mental architectonic structure (lack of atmospheric space); the city's spatial density (lack of new spaces); the city's centrality within France (lack of a competing national city); and the city's cultural and social homogeneity (lack of niche space).

It is notable that the majority of buildings in Paris (more than 60 percent) were constructed before 1950. From 1950 to 1975, about 21 percent was added, and another 12 percent was

built in the late 1970s and 1980s. In the last 20 years, only 6.5 percent of new buildings have been constructed (INSEE, 2011).

Furthermore, the spatial configuration between Paris, London and Berlin varies greatly. When comparing Paris with the spatial density of London and Berlin, the differences are striking. Paris has a population density of 21.319 people/km², in contrast to 3.924 people/km² in Berlin and 4.978/km² in London. Paris is therefore much more crowded, and free space, particularly residential space, is in high. The overcrowding of Paris is quite a unique feature, at least when compared to its surrounding neighbours, namely Berlin and London. Although the housing market reaches higher prices in London, the size of the city, and thereby possible diversification within it, makes it possible to cope with these prices and still offer a sufficient number of niche spaces.

Most of the cultural, intellectual, economic, and political attention within France and a possible outlook beyond its borders are concentrated in the city (about 20 percent of the French population live in the metropolitan region). It makes it highly attractive to live there, and possibly no other French city can rival it (Lyon or Marseille offer virtually no artistic infrastructure).

Finally, the city is marked by an increasing cultural and social homogeneity, which is perhaps much more important and can be seen in an urban dynamic, known as gentrification, which is not in favour of the artists; it keeps artists from settling in a specific area for a certain time and hinders an unfolding of an urban dynamic, thus transforming districts into art districts. In contrast to London and Berlin, the gentrification has nearly affected all parts of Berlin and is also spread greatly into greater Paris (Preteceille, 2006). Clearly, these findings advance our understanding of how the urban milieu fuels artistic activities and vice versa, by providing the conceptual means through which further empirical studies can be directed.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by a 'Research in Paris' (161) grant. I am thankful to Pierre-Michel Menger, who served as my host at the Ecole des hautes etudes en sciences sociales.

References

- Bain, A. L. (2003). Constructing contemporary artistic identities in Toronto neighbourhoods. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Geographe canadien*, 47(3), 303-317.
- Becker, H. S. (1982). *Art worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bhandari, H. D., & Melber, J. (2009). *Art/Work: Everything you need to know (and do) as you pursue your art career*. New York: Free Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). Forms of capital. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Burt, Ronald S. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brandenburger, A., & Nalebuff, B. (1996). *Co-Opetition: A revolution mindset that combines competition and cooperation*. New York: DoubleDay Business.

Casanova, P. (2004). *The world republic of letters*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Currid, E. (2006). New York as global creative hub: a competitive analysis of four theories on world cities. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 20(4), 330e350.

Currid, E., & Williams, S. (2010). The geography of buzz: art, culture and the social milieu in Los Angeles and New York. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 10(3), 423e451.

Duncan, H. D. (1957). Sociology of art, literature and music: social contexts of symbolic experience. In H. Becker, & A. Boskoff (Eds.), *Modern sociological theory: In continuity and change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Durkheim, E. (1912). *Les regles de la methode sociologique*. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan.

Durkheim, E.. [1893] (1933). *The division of labor in society*. G. Simpson (Trans.). New York: The MacMillan Company.

Durkheim, E.. [1895] (1965). *The rules of sociological method*. G. E. G. Catlin (ed.), (S. A. Solovay & J. H. Mueller, Trans.). New York: The Free Press.

Durkheim, E.. (1982) *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method*. S. Lucas (ed.), (W. D. Halls Trans.). London: Macmillan Press.

Fischer, C. S. (1975). Toward a subcultural theory of urbanism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 80(6), 1319e1341.

Florida, R. (2002). Bohemia and economic geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 2, 55e71.

Franck, D. (2001). *Bohemian Paris: Picasso, modigliani, matisse, and the birth of modern art*. New York: Grove Press.

Friedrichs, J. (1995). Cologne d a creative city. *European Planning Studies*, 3(4), 441e463.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gouyon, M. (2011a). *Peintres, graphistes, sculpteurs...les artistes auteurs affilies a la Maison des artistes en 2009*. Paris: Ministere de la Culture et de la Communication, DEPS, coll. 'Culture Chiffres'.

Gouyon, M. (2011b). *Ecrivains, photographes, compositeurs...les artistes auteurs affiliés à l'Agessa en 2008*. Paris: Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, DEPS, coll. 'Culture Chiffres'.

Graham, S. (2009). The urban "battlespace". *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7e8), 278e288.

Grana, C., & Grana, S. (Eds.). (1990). *On Bohemia: Models of the self-exiled*. NJ: New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360e1380.

Granovetter, M. (1978). Threshold models of collective behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(6), 1420e1443.

Granovetter, M. (2000). *Getting a job: A study of contacts and careers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Grazian, D. (2004). The symbolic economy of authenticity in the Chicago Blues scene. In R. Peterson, & A. Bennett (Eds.), *Music scenes: Local, translocal, and virtual* (pp. 31e47). Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Guiffre, K. (1999). Sandpiles of opportunity: success in the art world. *Social Forces*, 7(3), 815e832.

Guilbaut, S. (1983). *How New York stole the idea of modern art*. Illinois. The University of Chicago Press.

Heilbrun, J. (1989). The distribution of arts activity among U.S. Metropolitan areas.

In D. V. Shaw, & et al (Eds.), *Cultural economics 88: An american perspective*.

Ottawa: Association for Cultural Economics.

Hendricks, J. A. (1972). *Artistic career development as an interactive process: Case studies of abstract expressionists* (PhD Dissertation). Pennsylvania State University.

Hewitt, N. (1996). Shifting cultural centres in twentieth-century Paris. In M. Sheringham (Ed.), *Parisian fields*. London: Reaktion Books.

INSEE. (2011). *Evolution et structure de la population*. Paris: coll. 'Chiffres Cle, Paris'.

Janssen, S. (2001). The empirical study of careers in literature and the arts. In D. Schram, & G. Steen (Eds.), *The psychology and sociology of literature: In honour of Elrud Ibsch*. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ley, D. (2003). Artists, aestheticisation and the field of gentrification. *Urban Studies*, 40(12), 2527e2544.

Lloyd, R. (2002). Neo-bohemia: art and neighborhood redevelopment in Chicago.

Journal of Urban Affairs, 24(5), 517e532.

Menger, P. (2006). Artistic labor markets: contingent work, excess, supply and occupational risk management. In V. A. Ginsburg, & D. Throsby (Eds.), *Handbook on the economics of art and culture* (vol. 1). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Morgner, C. (2014). World art cities: theoretical considerations, Paper presented at World Congress in Sociology. Yokohama.

Morgner, Christian (2015). The evolution of cultural districts: A case study on Williamsburg: New York City and 798, Beijing, [special issue on 'Creativity and Space']. *Belgeo - Belgian Journal of Geography*, 3, 1e21.

Oh, S. (2004). Network of relationships as a transitional mechanism in professionalization: a descriptive case study of five young artists (PhD Dissertation). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Pinçon, M., & Pinçon-Charlot, M. (2004). *Sociologie de Paris*. Paris: Editions La

Decouverte.

Preteceille, E. (2006). La segregation sociale a-t-elle augmente ? La metropole parisienne entre polarisation et mixite'. *Societes Contemporaines*, 62, 69e93.

Rosenberg, B., & Fliegel, N. (1979). *The vanguard artist*. New York: Arno Press. Salganik, M.

K., & Heckathorn, D. D. (2004). New application methods for network

analysis. In R. M. Stolzenberg (Ed.), *Sociological methodology*. Washington:

American Sociological Association.

Shields, R. (1991). *Places on the margin: Alternative geographies of modernity*. New

York: Routledge.

Simmel, G. (1969). The metropolis and metal life. In R. Sennett (Ed.), *Classic essays on the culture of cities*. NJ. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Spitzer, L. (1942). Milieu and ambiance: an essay in historical semantics. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 3(1), 1e42.

Velthuis, O. (2005). *Talking prices: Symbolic meanings of prices on the market for*

contemporary art. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Verdassdonk, D. (1994). Marginality a characteristic of artistic product. The need of personal networks to sustain an artistic career. In K. Beekman (Ed.), *Institution*

& *innovation*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

White, Harrison C. (1992). *Identity and control: A structural theory of social action*.

Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

White, Harrison C. (2008). *Identity and control: How social formations emerge* (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

While, A. (2003). Locating art worlds: London and the making of Young British art.

Area, 35(3), 251e263.

White, H. C., & White, C. A. (1965). *Canvases and careers: Institutional change in the French painting world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wirth, L. (1938). Urbanism as a way of life. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 44(1), 1e24.

Zukin, S. (2012). The social production of urban cultural heritage: identity and ecosystem on an Amsterdam shopping street. *City, Culture and Society*, 3(4), 281e291.