Architecture of Power and Exclusion: Monte Carlo as a Territory of Symbolic Ordering

Xavier Reinaldo-Virgili 0000-0002-9039-6779

Abstract

This article examines Monte Carlo as a paradigmatic case of architecture of power and exclusion, where urban space functions as a device that organizes social hierarchies, regulates access, and produces forms of differentiated belonging. Based on an interdisciplinary theoretical framework —Lefebvre, Foucault, Harvey, Bourdieu, Sennett, Goffman, Kapferer, Urry, and Pine & Gilmore— it analyzes how the materiality of luxury, urban aesthetics, and spatial planning converge to generate a landscape of soft exclusion, in which distinction is materialized both in the verticality of the territory and in the symbolic codes that govern its use. The study shows that in Monte Carlo, architecture not only represents contemporary power, but also makes it operable through the distribution of circulations, the production of selective visibility, and the daily ritualization of semi-public spaces. Thus, the Principality constitutes a global laboratory where luxury functions as spatial technology, consolidating social inequalities through the aesthetic integration of exclusion into the urban landscape. The research proposes that Monte Carlo exemplifies in an exceptional way how the space, aesthetics, and performativity of luxury are articulated to reproduce a highly sophisticated, albeit discreetly coded, regime of social hierarchy.

Key words: Power architecture, spatial exclusion, urban luxury, social hierarchy, Monte Carlo

1. INTRODUCTION

Talking about architecture of power and exclusion means observing how built space orders and sometimes limits it. Cities are not neutral, every street and every façade articulates a particular way of distributing bodies or gazes. In certain places, this dimension of space becomes more evident. Monte Carlo is one of those settings where power is not hidden behind architecture, it is embodied in it and is displayed by it. The Principality is both a tiny territory and a unique urban laboratory. Here, architecture

functions as a system of filters. It defines who has access, where they can observe from, which areas are accessible to everyone, and which, although formally public, end up becoming spaces with restricted access.

This mixture of openness and closure, glamour and control, makes up what we might call “an aesthetic of soft exclusion”: nothing seems forbidden at first glance, but everything—from the choice of materials to the layout of the stairs or the elevation of the terraces—silently delimits social positions. Monte Carlo is not built solely to be inhabited. It is built to be looked at, and also to look. This visual reciprocity, so characteristic of luxury contexts, implies that architecture acts as a mediator between those who circulate through the space and those who symbolically dominate it. It is not just a matter of ostentatious buildings or monumental infrastructures; the logic of power also appears in minute details: a railing that marks a boundary, an elevated access that demands a particular type of presence, a shadow that signals a reserved space.

This research note seeks to analyze, from a sociological and spatial perspective, how this architecture of power operates in Monte Carlo and why it can be considered a paradigmatic example of contemporary spatial exclusion. Through a theoretical overview and an analysis of the territory, we will attempt to show how luxury, far from being a simple aesthetic attribute, becomes a tool of order—and, at times, of segregation—deeply embedded in the materiality of the place. The aim is not to offer a comprehensive, exhaustive view (which would be impossible in a few pages), but rather to open a path to understanding how the space of luxury is used to gently legitimize social differences that are rarely stated, even though they are there, visible, if one knows where to look.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Analyzing Montecarlo as a case of architecture of power and exclusion implies assuming that space is a social product deeply charged with meanings and hierarchies and not an inert medium. Architecture not only organizes urban life, but also produces inequalities and, on occasion, legitimizes them. To support this reading, the present theoretical framework draws on various authors who, from different perspectives, enable us to understand the complexity of the phenomenon. Some speak explicitly about space; others about power, ritual, or the gaze. All, however, shed light on a different aspect of how the Monegasque territory articulates luxury, social difference, and control.

2.1 Architecture, power, and spatial order

The theoretical reflection must begin with Henri Lefebvre, who argues that space does not "exist" naturally, but is produced. In The Production of Space, Lefebvre explains that each society manufactures its own spaces according to its needs, interests, and, above all, power relations. Urban space is representation of power in action and not merely a physical arrangement. The city is traversed by three dimensions: conceived space (planned by institutions, architects, technicians), perceived space (experienced in everyday practice), and symbolically conceived space (laden with images and imaginaries). Monte Carlo, in this sense, embodies a very particular balance: it combines an extremely regulated conceived space—visual, economic, legal—with a lived space that seems fluid, almost natural, even though it is in fact meticulously controlled.

On the other hand, Michel Foucault introduces key conceptual tools for thinking about space as "political technology". His notion of device helps us understand how architecture can function as a mechanism of social order that regulates behavior without the need for direct coercion. For Foucault, visibility is a condition of power: being seen, being classifiable, being locatable. Monte Carlo—with its elevated terraces or strategically hidden areas—embodies this Foucauldian logic with precision. Space determines what is seen and from where, but also who can occupy certain places without being questioned.

David Harvey's perspective adds that urban planning is a tool for capital accumulation and management. Cities become territories designed to maximize value: financial, tourist, symbolic. In this framework, luxury is not an adornment, but an urban engine. The concentration of wealth in Monte Carlo—which is not accidental, but political—translates into a highly unequal spatial distribution, in which certain resources (views, access, premium services) are organized to favor a very small social group. Harvey calls this phenomenon "urbanism as business," something that in Monte Carlo takes on an almost absolute character: the entire territory is optimized to reproduce privileges.

Manuel Delgado reminds us that public space is not always as public as it seems. Although Delgado does not specifically refer to luxury, his ideas on social control and behavior regulation allow us to understand how certain territories—such as Monte Carlo—produce spaces that are perceived as open but whose appropriation is implicitly stratified. Circulation is allowed, yes, but not necessarily "belonging."

2.2 Exclusion, aesthetic boundaries, and spatial capital

Pierre Bourdieu´s notion of symbolic capital explains how certain places acquire prestige because of the social relationships and narratives they embody. Monte Carlo is not just a collection of luxurious buildings, it is a territory laden with meaning, a kind of "spatial brand."

The concept of spatial habitus is equally relevant: it refers to the behaviors and sensibilities that determine how an individual moves and observes a space. In areas such as Monte Carlo, habitus becomes visible in minimal gestures.

Richard Sennett offers a complementary perspective by highlighting how the city reveals social differences. Architecture can encourage mixing or reinforce segregation. Monte Carlo seems to lean toward the latter: although there are no explicit prohibitions, the aesthetics of luxury—its materials, its design, its visual composition—function as a symbolic boundary. The "public intimacy" Sennett speaks of is selective here: the space demands discretion, composure, a particular type of physical presence that not everyone possesses or can simulate.

In turn, Erving Goffman allows us to read these spaces as social stages. Monte Carlo thus becomes a theater where individuals play roles: the resident, the wealthy tourist, the investor or the aspirational visitor, and where architecture acts as a backdrop that guides and conditions those performances. What seems spontaneous is a learned social choreography.

Finally, Zukin reveals how aesthetic capital becomes a form of control. Homogeneous urban landscapes can be exclusionary because they generate normative expectations about who belongs in them. Monte Carlo exemplifies this mechanism: architectural beauty does not soften exclusion; it disguises it.

2.3 Luxury as the architecture of prestige

To conclude the theoretical framework, it is essential to introduce the specific dimension of luxury as a tool for spatial planning.

Kapferer explains that luxury is a system. It is based on scarcity and narrative. Its main function is not to offer comfort but to create meaning: to differentiate. In spatial terms, this implies that certain territories become scenarios designed to materialize that distinction. Monte Carlo fits perfectly into this logic because everything is a sign of belonging to a global elite.

John Urry, for his part, contributes the notion of the tourist gaze. Tourists look according to a set of cultural expectations. And in the case of luxury, this gaze becomes more demanding, more comparative, more symbolic. Monte Carlo not only meets these expectations; it helps to produce them. It is a destination created to be seen from certain angles: elevated, expansive, luminous, impeccable.

3. MONTE CARLO AS AN ARCHITECTURE OF POWER AND EXCLUSION

Analyzing Monte Carlo from the perspective of the architecture of power and exclusion involves observing how the territory represents the luxury. The city functions as a space designed to produce a specific type of social experience. Monte Carlo operates as a complex spatial device, an aesthetic and political machinery that configures hierarchies, behaviors, and forms of selective belonging.

This interpretation is developed below based on the six key dimensions proposed.

3.1 Monte Carlo as a spatial device

The idea of Monte Carlo as a spatial device is manifested in its urban structure. The territory is organized according to an almost surgical logic: everything obeys a design that combines functionality with an aesthetic of control. Visitors may feel that they are moving freely—there are no explicit restrictions, no visible walls—but mobility is carefully directed by the forms of the space.

The access points function as soft filters. Anyone can walk through Port Hercule, yes, but certain strategic points—the inner docks, the boarding walkways, the private terraces—delimit areas where only some can enter, without the need for signage.

Exclusion is materialized in the layout of the territory, in the height of a step or the orientation of a guardrail. The same is true in the Casino environment: the main entrances appear open, but the flow of bodies is organized so that “incorrect” visitors never penetrate too far into the higher spaces (literally and symbolically).

This hierarchical distribution of circulation makes Monte Carlo a space where visibility is power. From any elevated point—and there are many—one dominates the landscape and, with it, the position of others. Those who occupy a balcony at the Hôtel de Paris do not just look: they become visible as part of the legitimate social fabric of luxury. Those who remain below observe the scene from outside, aware that the upper access points operate as unspoken boundaries.

The visible and invisible barriers are probably the most sophisticated element of the system. The visible ones are subtle: planters that separate areas, ornamental railings, private elevators. The invisible ones are more powerful: social codes that indicate who belongs and who does not. Monte Carlo does not exclude through prohibitions; it excludes through expectations.

3.2 Aesthetics of power: light, lines, and materials

One of the most interesting point of Monte Carlo is the way it uses aesthetics to consolidate order. The architecture is designed to express power. Polished marble, visible in the Casino area or at the entrances to the Hôtel Hermitage, functions as a symbolic material of legitimization.

Glass creates an aesthetic of controlled transparency because you can observe the interior, but you cannot enter. Light plays a fundamental role: it creates a landscape where visuality determines the hierarchy of space. It is no coincidence that many buildings in Monte Carlo feature symmetrical compositions that guide the eye towards prominent areas: entrances, display windows, logos.

The urban scenery is perfected with carefully designed vanishing lines. Everything seems designed to frame views that act as visual signs of power. Each itinerary offers a privileged angle, a gigantic theatrical set where the visitor plays a role (consciously or not) in the narrative of luxury.

3.3 Topography of privilege

Monte Carlo is, literally, a vertical luxury. The topography functions as a system of spatial hierarchy. The difference in height between areas generates a symbolic stratification: the elevated—panoramic views, terraces, penthouses, balconies—belongs to the world of the privileged; the low—streets at sea level, passageways, general access stairs—is associated with transit, the public, that which cannot be fully controlled.

The terraces of palace hotels, for example, not only offer better views: they offer better social positions. From them, the city appears orderly, small, almost within reach. Height becomes an unmistakable sign of status. In contrast, those who circulate at port level move in a more exposed, more regulated, more shared space. Verticality is a form of elegant exclusion.

The port itself is a paradigmatic case. Port Hercule acts as a hierarchical infrastructure: super yachts occupy the most visible spaces, the easiest accesses, the most celebrated docks. Small boats are relegated to more peripheral areas. The sea, supposedly democratic, becomes a social map where economic power can be read as clearly as a skyscraper in Manhattan.

Topography does not only distribute bodies: it distributes experiences. Those who look at Monte Carlo from above experience a sense of control and harmony; those who do so from below perceive grandeur, but also limits. The geometry of privilege is inscribed in every slope.

3.4 Social landscape and soft exclusion

Exclusion in Monte Carlo rarely takes on confrontational forms. It is a “soft,” almost polite, but deeply effective exclusion. The social landscape is shaped by semi-public spaces that, although accessible, restrict their actual use through implicit codes.

The lobbies of palace hotels, for example, are open to anyone, but only a very specific type of person can inhabit them without feeling observed. The price of a coffee, the arrangement of the furniture, the controlled silence—everything contributes to defining who belongs there. There are no signs saying “no entry” because they are not necessary. The terraces of the Carré d'Or, the corridors of the Metropole, the entrances to the Casino function as stages of aesthetic exclusion: anyone who does not fit into the

visual narrative of the space—whether due to their clothing, attitude, or simple body language—feels out of place without any intervention being necessary. The exclusion becomes emotional, not physical.

Added to this are the implicit codes of behavior. In luxury environments, it is necessary to know how to move, how to look, when to stop, how to speak. These codes are learned socially, not explicitly taught. In Monte Carlo, they operate as invisible filters that differentiate aspirational tourists from residents, occasional visitors from the established elite.

3.5 The performativity of luxury in Monte Carlo

Luxury in Monte Carlo is not an attribute: it is a social performance. Palace hotels play a central role in this staging. The Hôtel de Paris offers a way of appearing in the world and the Monte Carlo Casino, with its Belle Époque grandeur, acts as the symbolic heart of the Principality. It is not just a place to gamble; it is a ritual of presence, a performative declaration of temporary belonging to a universe where money flows, but also status, gaze, comparison.

The Opera House is another clear example. Climbing its stairs is not a functional gesture, but a ceremonial one. One enters as if crossing an aesthetic and social threshold. The architecture invites, almost compels, one to modify the way one walks, looks, occupies space.

The Metropole Shopping Center adds another layer to performativity: its almost palatial aesthetics turns the everyday act of consuming into a theatrical experience. The crystal chandeliers suspended above the entrance, the marble walkways, the indirect lighting... all make consumption a gesture of social self-affirmation.

Luxury retail also acts as a symbolic frontier. The boutiques of Louis Vuitton, Cartier, and Hermès mark territories where only certain groups feel comfortable. The illuminated windows, impeccable floors, and silent interiors function as markers of aesthetic exclusion: luxury becomes a filter for bodies.

3.6 Monte Carlo as a global laboratory of luxury

Finally, Monte Carlo is not just a case study: it is a global laboratory of contemporary luxury. Here, forms of exclusive sociability are tested, premium architectural models are experimented with, and practices are consolidated that are then reproduced in Dubai, Singapore, or Doha.

The circulation of capital—financial, symbolic, tourist—permeates every part of the territory. The principality is a hub of global elite networks, a place where residents are not just neighbors, but investors, collectors, and owners of multiple residences. This condition produces a selective sociability where encounters are not fortuitous: they are articulated by spaces that favor interaction among equals.

Elite residences—towers, villas, penthouses—are not just homes; they are spatial markers of global status. Their architecture does not respond to traditional domestic functions, but to the need to consolidate a symbolic presence in one of the most exclusive territories in the world.

Events—Formula 1 Grand Prix, charity galas, art festivals—serve a similar function. They are rituals where the global elite recognize, observe, and validate each other. Monte Carlo provides the setting, but the power is produced by the participants.

Together, this network of practices, spaces, and actors turns Monte Carlo into a territory where the architecture of luxury becomes an architecture of power, and where exclusion operates in an elegant, silent manner, impeccably integrated into the landscape.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Analyzing Monte Carlo from the perspective of the architecture of power and exclusion allows us to understand how an apparently homogeneous, clean, “perfect” territory can function as an extraordinarily complex social machine. Nothing in Monte Carlo is completely spontaneous and nothing seems explicitly imposed. The relation between aesthetic transparency and social opacity is perhaps one of the most significant features of the Principality. Here, space not only organizes activities: it organizes differences.

The production of space—following Lefebvre, Harvey or Foucault is materialized in Monte Carlo with unusual clarity. All the elements make up a spatial order that legitimizes and reproduces a very precise social hierarchy. Exclusion does not take the harsh, visible form of other cities; it takes an elegant, polite, almost ethereal form. It is perceived rather than imposed.

Monegasque architecture constructs social dispositions. Those who belong know it; those who do not, feel it. The shop windows, the palace hotels, the ceremonial staircases act as silent tests, as continuous examinations of social legitimacy.

And finally, theories of luxury—Kapferer, Urry, Pine & Gilmore—allow us to understand that the architecture of power in Monte Carlo is not merely material: it is experience. It is seen, lived, interpreted. Luxury acts as a spatial grammar that orders mobility, emotions, and even gazes.

Taken together, Monte Carlo reveals itself as a contemporary laboratory where architecture, luxury, and power come together in a sophisticated system of soft exclusion. A territory where beauty does not hide hierarchy, but illuminates it. And where sociological analysis finds an almost ideal case study of how space can become—discreetly, but firmly—a silent technology of social differentiation.

References

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Delgado, M. (1999). *Ciudad líquida, ciudad interrumpida*. Editorial Universidad de Antioquia.

Delgado, M. (2011). *El espacio público como ideología*. Los Libros de la Catarata.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings*. Pantheon Books.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Vintage.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Northeastern University Press.

Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review, 53*, 23–40.

Harvey, D. (2013). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.

Kapferer, J.-N., & Bastien, V. (2012). *The luxury strategy: Break the rules of marketing to build luxury brands* (2nd ed.). Kogan Page.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell.

Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theater and every business a stage*. Harvard Business School Press.

Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (2019). *The experience economy* (Updated ed.). Harvard Business Review Press.

Sennett, R. (1977). *The fall of public man*. Knopf.

Sennett, R. (1990). *The conscience of the eye: The design and social life of cities*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The tourist gaze 3.0*. Sage.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The cultures of cities*. Blackwell.

Zukin, S. (2010). *Naked City: The death and life of authentic urban places*. Oxford University Press.