Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Matthew Deslauriers   **15 April 2014**

NEGOTIATION AND TRANSFORMATION:

The Grand Boulevards of Paris as Non-Places and New Types of Social Space

by

Matthew Deslauriers

Dr. Elizabeth Goodstein

Advisor

Interdisciplinary Studies in Society and Culture
Institute of Liberal Arts, Emory University

Dr. Elizabeth Goodstein

Advisor

Dr. Kim Loudermilk

Committee Member

Dr. Judith Rohrer

Committee Member

2014

NEGOTIATION AND TRANSFORMATION:

The Grand Boulevards of Paris as Non-Places and New Types of Social Space

by

Matthew Deslauriers

Dr. Elizabeth Goodstein

Advisor

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Interdisciplinary Studies in Society and Culture
Institute of Liberal Arts, Emory University

2014

NEGOTIATION AND TRANSFORMATION:

The Grand Boulevards of Paris as Non-Places and New Types of Social Space
By Matthew Deslauriers

Considering the relationship between the built environment and social fabric is extremely significant to understanding how spaces are experienced and constructed, how the external world is understood by individuals and, ultimately, how lives are led. This thesis examines this relationship by first considering Marc Augé's construction of non-places in relation to anthropological place, on the basis that place is the manifestation of how individuals organize their external reality. It then looks more specifically at the modernization of Paris in the mid-nineteenth-century orchestrated by Georges Haussmann under the rule of Napoleon III. It examines how changes in the physical structure of the city changed movement patterns, altered the perceived scale of the city, and ultimately produced different types of social spaces. Final consideration is given to the experience of modernity, from which is offered the conclusion that while change is constant, progress is an idea that must be negotiated.

NEGOTIATION AND TRANSFORMATION:

The Grand Boulevards of Paris as Non-Places and New Types of Social Space

by

Matthew Deslauriers

Dr. Elizabeth Goodstein

Advisor

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Interdisciplinary Studies in Society and Culture
Institute of Liberal Arts, Emory University

2014

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my advisors Dr. Goodstein, Dr. Loudermilk, and Dr. Rohrer for their unwavering support, advisement, and encouragement. I am also grateful to the countless professors and mentors who have and will continue to inspire me.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The French language does not have a word for 'meandering.' The French verb 'méandre' allows one to meander, but one can never be meandering. There is an aimlessness to the English idea of meandering that is missing from the French. But this is a positive attribute of the French construction of the concept. In English we would have to say directional meandering to communicate the beneficial objective of the action.

This is all to say that this thesis meanders in the French conception of the act with a definite, if slightly elusive target of better understanding the relationship between the built environment and the social fabric. In a city, these two ideas form the concept of urban fabric which becomes of particular interest in this thesis. The built environment is loosely defied as the collection of physical human interventions within a landscape. While this sets up a structure in which the natural stands in opposition to the man-made, that framework is appropriate for this work in that resistance to this breakdown was not occurring in the nineteenth-century, which is the general time period of focus of this thesis.

Encompassed in the concept of social fabric is the relationships between individuals. These can be analyzed on a number of different levels from a very focused consideration at the level of two individuals, to a more comprehensive consideration of culture which is a higher level of social fabric. There are other more encompassing definitions of social fabric that include such areas as economics and politics, but in this thesis I focus on a more sociological or anthropological understanding of social fabric. This ideally enables a narrowing of the range of possible social types of social interactions to consider in looking at a specified locale. The difficulty of segmenting out different aspects of the built environment is that it limits consideration of the interconnectedness of different types of social interaction.

Limiting this thesis disciplinarily also proves challenging in that assessing social fabric as the totality is near impossible within any one discipline. Much of this work is premised on the notion that there is value to considering the totality even though it can become ungainly. The traditional disciplines can be so fastidiously delineated that they limit consideration of anything deemed to fall outside of their boundaries. Such is the case of sociology and psychology which both would have merit in this analysis, but which do not allow enough flexibility to consider the multiple layers of social fabric.

Instead, I have located this thesis in the realm of critical cultural theory, with frequent nods to the related fields of history, architectural theory, and linguistics, among a few others. In doing this, I hope to enable the formation of a more novel set of observations stemming from the critical textual analysis of numerous works falling within those varied disciplines. This is the most effective way to analyze the changing nature of the social fabric of Paris as it went through a physical modernization in the mid-nineteenth century orchestrated by Georges Haussmann under the rule of Napoleon III.

Marshall Berman's 1982 work *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*, situated this thesis in some larger theoretical context. In the third section of the book, titled "Baudelaire: Modernism in the Streets," Berman looks at the work of Baudelaire and those who have subsequently taken up Baudelaire's work to form a narrative about the experience of modernity in Baudelaire's stomping ground: Paris. Of course Paris is far less important to Berman than the ideas and experience of modernity, but his work among others consulted in the writing of this thesis, strongly influenced the construction and organization of this thesis. This thesis focuses chiefly on the theory and the wide implications of theory; Marshall Berman, along with

other thinkers, offered the possibility of focusing this work on theoretical constructions using examples to support the theory as opposed to weaving the theory into examples.

The first argument made in this thesis relates to the decidedly modern concept of 'non-places' a concept created by the french theorist Marc Augé. Examination of the concept of non-places allows for the possibility of the non-place to exist outside the realm of supermodernity, where Augé initially situates the concept. Instead, I assert that the concept of non-place can be applied to other time periods with different mental constructions, so long as those other constructions align with Augé's fundamental tenants of supermodernity which exists both at the forward line of contemporaneity, but also in centuries past. Non-places are more strongly connected to the industrial revolution than any particular variant of modernity. Using non-places as an analytical structure for understanding changes in the Parisian physical and social landscape focuses attention on questions of mobility, scale, and perception. This, in effect, becomes akin to a "disciplinary" frame for structuring the changes in Paris under the Second Empire and the Third Republic that followed.

The characteristics of non-places provide the framework for understanding the transformations of Paris on both a technical level and a social level. While the technical reasons for rethinking and reconstructing the city are clear and seem to be most fundamental, this clarity gives them more significance than they deserve. In considering social issues as motivations behind certain changes, their more obscure nature affords them less credit than they are due as the social issues underly all other issues.

It is from this point that I argue the significance of the built environment beyond just controlling actions and movements, which it certainly does. In addition to that, however, certain aspects of the built environment can also strongly convey values of societies and, as such, be

used in political as well as economic ways. The final chapter of this thesis aspires to characterize modernity as a process of negotiation and the city as the physical manifestation of that negotiation. I endeavor to explicate the experience of living through modernity which is characterized by individuals being taxed with assimilating changes that happen faster than they may be capable of fully understanding. This notion of assimilating change becomes fundamental to my understanding of the experience of modernity. I suggest that physical and symbolic spaces that compose modernity reinforce social structures which is why changes in the physical landscape become so significant for modern and contemporary individuals. The final point made in this chapter is that progress is rooted in the view that the products of modernity yield improvements in quality of life, however, with cities like Paris serving the differing needs of so many individuals and groups, that quality of life does not always materialize. Change is a constant, but progress must be negotiated.

Chapter I: Non-places

Places and non-places share physical forms in common

In 1992 theorist Marc Augé's created the concept of "non-place," his new designation for a type of space that stands in contrast to anthropological place. The overall argument he sets forth is "if a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place."[1] While the definition of non-place is complicated and conflicting, as I will examine in this thesis, the way I use the term 'non-place' in this text is to signify a space that stands in contrast to anthropological places, which themselves are places that ingrate with history, can be used symbolically by individuals to construct their identity, and more strongly relate to their local context. This negative definition becomes the starting point for working with non-place because a positive definition is more contentious as this paper examines in looking more closely at the tensions exhibited by non-places. Responding to this negative definition is largely the overall goal of Augé's work. The work becomes is a primer to non-place which is first accessed through an understanding of anthropological place which emerges out of more traditional anthropological constructions of place.

His conception of anthropological place demands further unpacking to understand two integral and interrelated points. First, what are the qualities of place, which Augé calls 'anthropological place' which come to characterize spaces that are not non-places in Augé's organization? Second, what specifically about supermodernity in Augé's argument characterizes non-places as a new type of space? The second point is particularly significant to the argument set forth in this thesis; if the boulevards of mid-nineteenth century modern (but not

---

[1] Marc Augé, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, trans. John Howe (London: Verso, 1995), 77.

supermodern) Paris are indeed non-places—or pre-non-places—then challenging supermodernity as the sole period in which non-places can exist becomes necessary in the formation of this argument. A note regarding terminology in this thesis: in using terms to describe to specific time periods and sensibilities I understand and use modernity to signify a period that begins with the start of the industrial revolution in 1760 and ends with the end of the second world war in 1950. With the end of modernity comes postmodernity, which I connect to hypermodernity or supermodernity and the rise of the information age. My use of the word contemporary refers to the last twenty or so years from the early 1990s to today.

The concept of a non-place depends first on Augé's notion of an anthropological place which non-place is set in opposition to. Though the anthropological place precedes the non-place, his discussion of anthropological place necessarily emerges from his supermodern, contemporary context in which non-places already exist for him. Thus, anthropological place is a supermodern distinction that exists in contemporaneity but is still the predecessor of non-place in that it captures the uses of spaces prior to the changes of the industrial revolution. From this, a distinction then emerges between anthropological place and the '[place] of memory,' the former of which are "the antithesis of the 'places of memory.' Of places of memory, Augé notes that Pierre Nora aptly captures that what we see in them is essentially how we have changed, the image of what we are no longer. Conversely, the inhabitant of an anthropological place does not make history: he lives it."[2] A place of memory is an anthropological place, but the reverse will not always be true. Considering the definition of non-place and its relation to anthropological place offered in the preceding paragraph, it becomes more difficult to conceive of an anthropological place as somehow broader than a place of memory. However, Augé's discussion

---

[2] Augé, *Non-Places,* 55.

of the individual in anthropological and ethnographic research and his delineation between the object of research and the method of research speaks to these points, without completely resolving them.

Questions of research methodology are necessary in Augé's creation of anthropological place, as this concept emerges from a period within anthropologic and ethnologic research during which the object of study has been changing as a result of changes in the construction of otherness which are directly related to the spaces those others inhabit. There are three temptations Augé details that ethnologists experience in researching indigenous populations, 'the other.' First, there is the temptation "to identify the people he studies with the landscape in which he finds them, the spaces they have shaped," and second there is the temptation[3] "to look back from the upheavals of the present towards an illusory past stability."[4] Though apparently less significant than the final temptation he highlights, these first two are not insignificant. As they relate to research and our understanding of the relationship between human beings and their environments, they reflect a propensity to establish connections and stability in situations where both of those qualities might not exist. In the construction of anthropological place, these temptations also hinder the ability to individualize the experience of spaces by contributing strongly to the third temptation Augé identifies: "the 'totality temptation'."[5] He cites Marcel Mauss's explanation of the totality of social fact as "the sum of different institutions that go into [a social fact's] make-up, but also the whole range of different dimensions that serve to define the individuality of all those who live in [the social fact] and take part in it."[6] Augé then points to

---

[3] This temptation is exhibited not just by ethnologists but also by the so-called 'indigenous population.'

[4] Augé, *Non-Places,* 47.

[5] Augé, *Non-Places,* 48.

[6] Augé, *Non-Places,* 48.

Levi-Strauss's summary of Mauss's explanation which is "the total social fact is primarily the

social fact perceived totally."[7] This summary becomes particularly important in that it allows for

the consideration of a multiplicity of perspectives in analyzing a social fact. This reflects a tension

inherent in the singular form of social fact in that even though it is created by a collection of

individuals, it can never be completely reduced to an individual and still be entirely captured—

thus, there is an irreducible complexity to the singular form of a social fact. In Augé's social fact

of focus, 'anthropological place,' he relies heavily on this notion of multiple understandings of

anthropological place to account for the variation that occurs in collective constructions of a

place.

This multiplicity of perspectives that produce anthropological place make it different from

overly broad construction of place more generally. Augé's anthropological places "want to be —

[and] people want them to be — places of identity, of relations and of history,"[8] which concurs

with Michel de Certeau's perception of place, as Augé draws upon de Certeau's ideas in his own

formulation. Place is a construct rooted in the individual, but not necessarily reducible to the

individual. Instead, place can both surround individuals and exist as something separate from

them, while always offering the possibility of individuals connecting more strongly to one

another. Place influences those connections and the individuals that make them by offering a

shared identifier, as Augé notes. Considering place as a shared identifier suggests that place

exists as an unchanging context for social interaction. This is too static of a view, however, which

forces Augé to include the historical nature of place to account for the instability of places. The

instability in anthropological place results from both the changing identities within the place, but

---

[7] Augé, *Non-Places,* 48.

[8] Augé, *Non-Places,* 52.

also the changing physicality of places as time progresses forward. In his work, de Certeau

acutely relates place to space in his idea of "*space [as] a practiced place.*"[9] De Certeau's

formulation of space as an embodied place seems counterintuitive considering usual

constructions of place as a specific space. Although this section is chiefly concerned with the

distinction between anthropological place and non-place, the relationship between this

formulation of space and non-place becomes important as the origin of non-place is called into

question.

Most relevant to the relationship between the built environment and social fabric in

Augé's construction of anthropological place is the geometric form it takes:

> It can be mapped in terms of three simple spatial forms, which apply to
> different institutional arrangements and in a sense are the elementary
> forms of social space. In geometric terms these are the line, the intersection
> of lines, and the point of intersection. Concretely, in everyday geography
> more familiar to us, they correspond to routes, axes or paths that lead from
> one place to another and have been traced by people; to crossroads and
> open spaces where people pass, meet and gather, and which sometimes (in
> the case of marketplaces, for example) are made very large to satisfy the
> needs of economic exchange; and lastly, to centers of more or less
> monumental type, religious or political, constructed by certain men and
> therefore defining a space and frontiers beyond which other men are
> defined as others, in relation with other centers and other spaces.[10]

Succinct in its summation of the physical forms of social space, this passage captures virtually all

of human social spaces in the three forms of line, intersection and point of intersection. As he

notes, these forms manifest themselves in our environments as specific types of places, from

roads to marketplaces. His description in many ways mirrors the places of modern and

contemporary Paris. It is a city largely shaped by Haussmann in the middle of the nineteenth-

century, in a baroque layout, in which roads (lines) cross one another in neighborhoods,

---

[9] Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 117.

[10] Augé, *Non-Places*, 56–57.

marketplaces, and parks (intersection of lines) and connect at various monuments (point of

intersection). It would seem that as an anthropologist and ethnologist Augé could be reading the

physical spaces of contemporary Paris as the foundation of anthropological place.[11] While this

geometric perspective nicely maps on to the physicality of the city, there is nothing inherently

humanistic about the geometric physicality that underpins his concept of anthropological place.

Certainly, a human scale exists in his construction, but there is something almost quaint about

the structure that fails to account for changes in scale. The A6 autoroute from Paris to Lyon,

which would be characterized as a non-place, exists on a vastly different scale than the market

street of the Rue Mouffetard. While the geometries might be the same, but the scales and thus

uses of these spaces make them vastly different sorts of social space. For this reason, organizing

or characterizing places by their physical form does not adequately capture anthropological place

and non-place as Augé argues. He subsequently remarks that "notions of itinerary, intersection,

centre and monument are useful not only for the description of traditional anthropological

places… [but also] contemporary French space, urban space in particular."[12] This further

reinforces his belief that this geometric physicality is somehow specifically inherent to

anthropological place, although it is a structure that can be applied elsewhere. The foundation

for this geometric physicality as originating from anthropological place is weakly argued and

while he may not be entirely incorrect, his notions of this physicality rely on modern,

postindustrial spacial relationships. The physical distance between Paris and Lyon is always going

to be longer than the distance between two points within either city, but as the speeds of travel

increased in both of those situations the distance in time, or 'itinerary,' would change the scale of

---

[11] Augé's discussion of the geometry of anthropological place exists in his section on anthropological place which suggests that this is where he conceives of these physical forms as existing—as the physical organization of the social fact of anthropological place.

[12] Augé, *Non-Places,* 64.

the physical space which would affect the mental construction of each place through the change in scale and thus result in a changed perception of the relationships.

The differences between places and non-places become extremely relevant in relation to the physicality of these two types of places. Under Augé's construction, although he does not articulate as much, the physical similarities are not the points of differentiation—rather, the differentiation lies in the whether or not spaces can "be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity."[13] Non-places are the ones that cannot be defined as such. His hypothesis "is that supermodernity produces non-places, meaning spaces which are not themselves anthropological places and which, unlike Baudelairean modernity, do not integrate the earlier places: instead, these are listed, classified, and promoted to the status of 'places of memory', and assigned to a circumscribed and specific position." This idea of integration, or lack thereof, into earlier places deserves further consideration. An example of a contemporary non-place is the Charles de Gaulle Airport, which is itself an example of the built form of the airport. These are spaces that did not exist prior to the advent of jetliner travel; they are new places, or non-places as the case may be, but architecturally, both in layout and appearance, they were unequivocally inspired by the transit hubs (railroad stations) which preceded them. Such is the nature of architecture—it is iterative and the form of these physical spaces follows the functions those spaces are tasked with performing. In Augé's construction, non-places do not concern themselves with the physical forms the spaces take. Their non-placeness apparently originates in the way humans use the space which is substantially impacted by the way the space is physically designed and constructed. Augé downplays the significance of the built form as being important in the overall establishment of a particular space as a place. A contemporary airport might be a

_____

[13] Augé, *Non-Places*, 78.

space one transits *through* and thus spends less time in, but its status as a non-place does not

necessarily make the space of less significance or import.

It follows that physicality is not the differentiator—places and non-places share physical

forms in common. Instead, "'non-place' designates two complementary but distinct realities:

spaces formed in relation to certain ends (transport, transit, commerce, leisure), and the

relations that individuals have with these spaces."[14] The form of the airport is a non-space

because it exists in service to transport and the users of the airport relate to it in a transitory way.

This is the crucial differentiator of non-places: their function and how people relate to that

function. Beyond their specific function, "… non-places mediate a whole mass of relations, with

the self and with others, which are only indirectly connected with their purposes. As

anthropological places create the organically social, so non-places create solitary

contractuality."[15] From this statement two issues needing resolution emerge. First, what is the

relationship between the decidedly complex notion of place (or non-place) and the physical

world that embodies that place as delineated by language. Second, if non-places are indeed not

defined by their physicality, than what becomes the significance of that physicality. Questions of

the role supermodernity plays in the formation of non-places still remain.

Turning to the linguistic construction of place and non-place Augé looks at de Certeau's

formulation of place and space as being particularly salient in revealing the role of language in

the formation of these two social facts. De Certeau, in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, argues that

place is the foundation on which space is linguistically produced through the practices of

inhabiting a volume. In this way de Certeau upends traditional understandings of place as being

---

[14] Augé, *Non-Places*, 94.

[15] Augé, *Non-Places*, 94.

demarcated space. It is an odd construction to work with in that it runs counter to widely

accepted cultural understandings of space as the field in which places exist. For the purpose of

this inquiry, this disconnect may not be relevant. What is of value is the understanding that

physicality, that is some physical environment, precedes a humanistic, linguistic organization of

that environment. De Certeau's notions of place and space become important for Augé because

"the distinction between places and non-places derives from the opposition between place and

space."[16] Though Augé's anthropological place is different from de Certeau's notion of place, the

process of linguistic signification in de Certeau's argument allows Augé to argue beyond the

"existing negative definition of non-place."[17] The more positive definition that ultimately

emerges is one in which a non-place does not lack meaning. Rather, that meaning comes largely

from references to other anthropological places connected or related to the non-place. Indeed,

places exist in an interconnected way even if we demarcate places. What this overlooks is the fact

that supermodern non-places of the type Augé is exploring including spaces for transit and

commerce belong to specific classes of architectural forms. While anthropology or ethnology does

not necessarily concern itself with the built environment as directly as an architectural theorist

might, consideration of the architectural form non-places take seems necessary to successfully

understand non-places and how they function in society.

  Augé makes a contrast between modernity and supermodernity; 'Baudelairean modernity'

integrates old and new, supermodernity cleaves off the old and makes spectacle out of it. The

origins of this differentiation are harder to deduce. Allegedly a product of the advent of non-

places which themselves stem largely from developments in transportation and increases in the

---

[16] Augé, *Non-Places*, 79.

[17] Augé, *Non-Places*, 82.

movement of people, this seems a somewhat arbitrary distinction as, at least in Paris, the

monuments that have largely become historical spectacles were featured in the baroque

organization of the city Haussmann imposed upon the city in the name of modernization.

Perhaps, modern and supermodern uses of these monuments have rendered them even more

spectacular than they once were, but this process is not inherently supermodern. This is to say

that the integration within Baudelairean modernity that Augé observes does not stand in contrast

to the compartmentalization of 'places of memory' apparent in supermodernity. Instead, the

process of making spectacle the historical and the hyper-local is a mental integration of spaces

that do not readily fit into the supermodern context overrun with non-places.

Non-places exist outside supermodernity

The meaning of places comes not just from the linguistic way we organize the spaces

around us, but also from the visual physicality of the spaces we inhabit and frequent. It is this

idea that that allows non-places to exist outside the strict confines of supermodernity.

Furthermore, increasing the role of non-places's visual constructions does not necessarily stray

entirely from Augé's definition of non-place. If the definition of non-places is reduced to the

simple assertion that they are places not concerned with history, relativity, or identity then even

in light of the abundant emphasis Augé places on supermodernity as yielding non-places or vice

versa, the correlation between the two should not imply causation.

In describing the effects of the relationship between supermodernity and non-places,

Augé asserts that "since non-places are the space of supermodernity, supermodernity cannot

aspire to the same ambitions as modernity."[18] Issues of aspiration evidently set these two periods

---

[18] Augé, *Non-Places*, 111.

apart, but to see these periods as having different ambitions overlooks the stronger similarities within them. Supermodernity[19] is to be understood as something of a hypermodernity where the processes of modernization happen at an increased rate. The underlying driver that is progress continues largely unchanged from modernity to supermodernity. Although Augé and countless others have agreed with a challenging of the notion of progress as a result of the multidimensionality of progress, technological and scientific progress has been at the heart of global changes since the industrial revolution. This is a point strongly emphasized by the Third Republic in France. The advent of non-places seems to fall much more in line with technological changes of industrialization which perhaps are the foundations of modernity and supermodernity, but seem to not completely define those periods as technological change is constant between the two. As such, other factors must differentiate supermodernity from modernity.

The natures of the technological changes that have occurred certainly look different when comparing the loosely defined modernity and the even looser supermodernity. But Augé, writing in 1992, would not have experienced the digital consumer world in the way it presents today that captures some more fundamental shift in the way cultures communicate and relate to one another. For Augé, supermodernity "stems simultaneously from the three figures of excess: overabundance of events, spatial overabundance and the individualization of references."[20] What is curious about these excesses is they seem to relate not to the physical environment, but instead with our relationship to the external. They are an overstimulation of the individual by the external world and they align with an overstimulation that is not dissimilar from the

---

[19] As stated earlier in this thesis, supermodernity is referenced and discussed by other theorists under the identifier postmodernity or hypermodernity.

[20] Augé, *Non-Places*, 109.

overstimulation Gerog Simmel examines in *The Metropolis and Mental Life*. Simmel opens his

essay with the assertion that "the deepest problems of modern life flow from the attempt of the

individual to maintain the independence and individuality of his existence against the sovereign

powers of society, against the weight of the historical heritage and the external culture and

technique of life."[21] This is not dissimilar from Augé's excesses. Although expressed differently,

the times and pressures both of these theorists are confronting and working with are not

dissimilar from one another. The idea of place fundamentally captures the human relationship to

the external environment. It is the primary process by which one organizes his environment. It is

fundamental to our functioning even if types of environments that compose those places are

different. In these theorists work with place, the focus is not on the physicality of those spaces,

but rather the effect of those spaces and the way experience of spaces affects the individual and

social construction of places. Baudelaire is oft cited for his poetic descriptions of modern life in

Paris and his writings merit further consideration in the context of the question of how Parisian

boulevards function as non-places. Augé cites Baudelaire as the chief communicator of a specific

type of modernity and yet Baudelaire's modernity is a visual modernity translated into language

that the reader then translates into a subsequent visual and emotional image. The visuality of the

city is important to his experience of the city. This is obvious—there is great force in the

appearance of a space. There are two possibly unanswerable, but no less important, questions

that emerge from this obvious statement. First, what role does the visual presentation play in the

experience of a space, be that space a building or something more open. The second more

narrow issue is how does our perception of a space change with changes in the visuality of the

space. The scope of these issues makes them particularly challenging to address. They are

---

[21] Georg Simmel, "The Metropolis and Mental Life," in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. Neil Leach (London: Routledge, 1997), 69.

relevant to consider, however, because they allude to possible issues of subjectivity in the process of creating generalized experiences of modernity and supermodernity. In his discussion of the study of ethnology, Augé comments "never before have individual histories been so explicitly affected by collective history, but never before, either, have the reference points for collective identification been so unstable."[22] Thus, for Augé there is something about contemporary life that strengthens the value of the individual but also changes the nature of meaning in contemporary society.

Augé would, in a slightly cyclic fashion, point to the proliferation of non-places and the somewhat illusive processes that create those non-places as the explanation behind a heightened sense of individualization and the dissolution of strong feelings of collective identity. The accepted notion Augé sets forth is "when individuals come together, they engender the social and organize places," however, "the space of supermodernity is inhabited by this contradiction: it deals only with individuals…, but they are identified… only on entering or leaving. Since non-places are the space of supermodernity, this paradox has to be explained: it seems that the social game is being played elsewhere than in the forward posts of contemporaneity."[23] The non-places of supermodernity are certainly linked to the monumental spectacles—they would not exist without non-places, lacking in meaning, to instill in individuals a deep desire for meaning which can be derived from the anthropological places of contemporaneity. Looking once again to some of the contemporary world's undisputedly monumental international airports (spaces that Augé would most certainly characterize as non-places) we are offered two distinct possibilities. Either, the continued proliferation of non-places has shifted the spectrum of non-places resulting in a

---

[22] Augé, *Non-Places,* 37.

[23] Augé, *Non-*Places, 111.

gradation of non-places with some being weaker in their non-placeness and others being stronger, or non-places simply are not entirely devoid of their power to shape identity as many architectural theorists would cite as being the power of architectural forms. A third less plausible alternative would be that non-places can be moved closer to the status of anthropological place when their built forms sufficiently differentiate them from others of the same type. The question that then arises is how should one understand Paris, or any city, when considered as a whole, unified place.

Augé adopts something of a fatalistic account of supermodernity—an almost placeless world dominated by an out-of-control proliferation of non-places in line with the rise of capitalism and global networks of communication and movement. His work reads as subtly nostalgic for a time in which there were more places of collective reference, and yet early on in his commentary on methodology he argues that stability is only perceived retrospectively. This is not to say there is a problem with the concept of non-places entirely. They do capture some quality of modern life that seems not dissimilar from Simmel's and others's accounts of modern, generally urban life. Instead, the delineation between place and non-place is not as strong as Augé suggests and as such they are not simply contained in supermodernity. There are outstanding questions, to be sure, including the issues of how places function in the context of globalization and thus universalizability. Expanding the concept of non-places outside of the contemporary may assist in revealing changes in the way people have come to interact with their physical environments after the start of the industrial revolution. The industrial revolution as a marker of a change in era is more appropriate than loose concepts like modernity and supermodernity as it references the significant changes in transportation and industry that have produced a dramatically different world than the one before it.

Chapter II: Parisian Transformations

The contemporary city of Paris with its wide, gracious boulevards and iconic monuments is in many ways a product of a remarkable modernization of the city from 1852 to 1870.[24] The scale of the overall modernization project was massive, encompassing everything from streets to public parks to administrative buildings to subterranean sanitation infrastructure. One of the most significant of the changes to be implemented by the then prefect of Paris, Georges Haussmann under the rule of Napoleon III, are the sweeping boulevards which cut right through the heart of the city. These new boulevards become the foundation of all subsequent projects and were enormously controversial both for the way they were constructed and the city they produced.

There is one main difficulty in understanding the impact of this massive reconfiguration of the built environment of Paris on the social fabric: consensus is generally nonexistent with regards to the multiple objectives of the projects as well as the effects of the projects. The disagreement is largely a product of the density inherent in urban lives. Public urban projects become contentious because they are trying to serve the diverse needs of a variety of individuals in different socio-economic strata. This is certainly the case in mid-nineteenth-century Paris where a variety of opinions have been expressed by contemporary scholars who reach divergent conclusions. A further challenge is that these projects (it is difficult to say just boulevards as the various interventions in the built environment of Paris are interconnected) touched multiple facets of human life from physical health to mental states. One can see that sewers benefit physical health, public parks offer mental pleasure (though Haussmann disagreed with Napoleon III on this point), and boulevards make it easier to travel but also dramatically alter the

---

[24] Howard Saalman, *Haussmann: Paris Transformed* (New York: George Braziller, 1971).

experience of being in the space of the city. There are inherent tensions within Haussmann's boulevards—they impact the urban fabric in truly unprecedented and undeniably varied ways. This variety makes them somewhat ungainly to contend with; however, considering the ways the boulevards changed physical movement among people, altered visual and experiential scale, and shifted notions of social space offers the best opportunity to understand how these at once precedented and unprecedented forms both changed and preserved different parts of the social fabric of mid to late nineteenth-century Paris and beyond.

Movement

The need for an improved ability to move throughout the growing, modernizing city of Paris was the primary impetus for Napoleon III's and Haussmann's dramatic plan to cut roads straight through the heart of old Paris. The July Monarchy that preceded Napoleon III's Second Empire had begun to modernize the streets of Paris with work on the extension of the Rue de Rivoli.[25] This project, which Napoleon III and Haussmann inherited, paled in comparison to the plans they had throughout the city to create long and broad boulevards that would connect the inner core of the city to the railway stations that had been built on the periphery of the city in something of an organic gesture. This was the dominant way the city had been constructed until Haussmann began to draft his own plans. Haussmann's approach to urban planning "started from the demands of an industrial age. The first result of approaching the planning of a city street as a large-scale transportation problem is the endless street, the street that stretches beyond the range of the eye."[26] Haussmann recognized the significance and growing importance

---

[25] Saalman, *Haussmann,* 14.

[26] Sigfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*, Fifth ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 771.

of vehicular mobility. While the pedestrian was meticulously considered in the physical design of the boulevards, Haussmann's chief concern was improving mobility for the carriage services (and later the automobile) which would enable individuals, particularly wealthy ones, to move more efficiently throughout the city.

Another type of movement that the boulevards enabled also proved to be an important consideration for both Haussmann and, more significantly, Napoleon III. From "[his] point of view, the city was quite unstable socially, having been the site of several city riots already which threatened not only city, but also national, authorities, given its role as the capital city of France."[27] As such, the boulevards allowed police and military forces to rapidly deploy around the city and into specific neighborhoods. Furthermore, the width of the new boulevards made it impossible for dissidents to erect the iconic barricades Victor Hugo describes in *Les Misérables* that were made possible by the narrow medieval streets that characterized old Paris. The barricades were viewed as both representing and enabling revolution. By preventing their easy construction, Napoleon III believed he would be able to better control the city and prevent public expressions of dissent. These two factors exemplify better control of possible social unrest, as it had become clear in the first half of the nineteenth century "that the non-elite city populations, now overwhelmingly in the majority and ever growing in numbers, could not be controlled simply by forced segregation or the awesomeness of memorial monuments scattered around the city."[28]

Though the design of the boulevards met technical needs of transportation and troop mobility, they were also concerned with appealing to the middle class lifestyle through providing

---

[27] Kevin Archer, *The City: The Basics* (London: Routledge, 2013), 170.

[28] Archer, *The City*, 171.

the built environment to support that lifestyle and its associated sensibilities. The boulevards

with wide roadways and, importantly, sidewalks reflected "the continuation of an urban tradition

of creating streets as places were people could promenade."[29] From generous sidewalks along

key routes throughout the city to the inclusion of refined street furniture, "this attention to

streets as more than places for the circulation of vehicles… played an immense role in giving

Paris the overall character that distinguishes it."[30] This account by Stephane Kirkland, while

perhaps true from a contemporary viewpoint, stands in sharp contrast to the criticism leveled

against Haussmann and his boulevards by the theorist and critic Walter Benjamin. To Benjamin,

the long, wide boulevards are consistent with "the inclination, noticeable again and again in the

nineteenth century, to ennoble technical necessities by artistic aims."[31] This statement seems to

express a great fear of modernity—that the technical will, almost inevitably, subsume all else.

Indeed, this idea is not limited to Benjamin, but expressed by Simmel and, later, Augé. In

offering this idea, Benjamin forces us to consider that the built form of the boulevards captures

something about the ruthlessly technical nature of modernism. This ruthless technicality and

definite rationality support the notion of the boulevards Haussmann and Napoleon built as non-

places or at least early non-places. Although they have humanistic implications, their chief

objectives are responding to the most pressing, high-level technical issues facing the city. The

humanistic impact of the boulevards were not ignored, of course, and ultimately "these streets

had a twofold character: They existed both for their own sakes, as places to live and shop

according to new standards of upper middle class affluence, as a kind of stage for elegant living,

[29] Stephane Kirkland, *Paris Reborn: Napoléon III, Baron Haussmann, and the Quest to Build a Modern City* (New York: St. Martin's, 2013), 133.

[30] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 133.

[31]Walter Benjamin, "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century," ed. Neil Leach, in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997), 38.

promenading, and socializing in outdoor cafés and restaurants." Ye, on a different scale, "as connecting corridors between what an up-to-date mid-nineteenth-century man such as Napoleon III considered key points of the city."[32] While this observation highlights the two general ends of the boulevards, it also captures the changing scale of the city in which new connections change conceptions of the near while new larger physical spaces redefine the experience of being in the city.

Scale

The single most evident and significant impact the construction of Paris's boulevards had on the city was dramatically changing the physical scale of the city, both in temporal and spatial terms. Temporally, the size of Paris dramatically decreased with the improvements in vehicular transportation that the boulevards brought about. Although this most directly benefited the upper classes, the changes to the built environment from construction of the boulevards touched all levels of society. Of the projects orchestrated by Haussmann, the boulevards were the most significant for "the streets themselves, not squares or single buildings, dominate the scene."[33] Their significance cannot be overstated. Though there certainly were many individual architectural works both in Paris and around the world that exceeded the Parisian boulevards in monumental significance. The boulevards, with their uniform style and extraordinary length, stand in sharp contrast to the narrow, winding organic medieval streets of old Paris. The boulevard as a form was not a new idea as they "developed out of the baroque avenue. The baroque idea was to have long avenues of trees unrelated to houses. In the nineteenth century this idea was taken up and transmuted. It reappeared in the form of endless tree-lined streets

---

[32] Saalman, *Haussmann*, 14.

[33] Giedon, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 770.

bordered by uniform apartment houses."[34] The irrelevance of the trees to the buildings, the

endless nature of the boulevards, and the regulated uniformity of the buildings lining the streets

reflect a depersonalized landscape. While this is not to suggest that somehow the boulevards

bear all responsibility for the depersonalized nature of the city, their form only served to

reinforce this aspect of modern city life.

Changes to the visual scale of the city become particularly prevent in considering place

Charles-de-Gualle, site of L'Arc de Triomphe and formerly called place de l'Etoile.[35] As Kirkland

describes, the place is significant for the twelve streets that meet in remarkable symmetry to

circle the monument. Haussmann's vision produced "a striking urban form, especially if one goes

up to admire it from the top of the Arc de Triomphe, as Haussmann always recommended one

do."[36] Standing atop the Arc de Triomphe one gains a totalizing view of the space below: streets

are reduced to their technical functions, forms become simplified, and individual acts and

interactions in the city below are virtually erased. De Certeau explores issues of scale in modern

metropolises in "Walking in the City" within his notable work *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Of the

individual surveying the city below, he remarks, "his elevation transforms him into a voyeur. It

puts him at a distance. It transforms the bewitching world by which one was 'possessed' into a

text that lies before one's eyes. It allows one to read it, to be a solar Eye, looking down like a

god. The exaltation of a scopic and gnostic drive: the fiction of knowledge is related to this lust

to be a viewpoint and nothing more."[37] The city and its landscape, when surveyed from above,

becomes accessible and approachable. Of course, as de Certeau goes on to argue, the city cannot

---

[34] Giedon, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 770.

[35] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 161.

[36] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 162.

[37] De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 92.

be properly understood from above as this totalizes and effectively removes from view the individual acts that, whether ultimately positive or negative, define the city and its functioning. The built environment of Paris defines Paris in two ways. First, it establishes a visual identity under which less tangible elements of the city can be organized. Second, the built environment captures the specific types of interactions that define a culture and define a city. The act of promenading is an originally French act, captured in the French origin of the English word, and is reflected in the built environment that motivated the installation of such grand sidewalks. Establishing a hierarchy between social acts and the built environment is rather impossible, as they simultaneously produce and reinforce one another. Though it would appear that the social act universally proceeds the built space in which to preform that act, built spaces reinforce certain types of behavior while simultaneously discouraging others, representing the way external environments can shape and modify our behavior. It is for this reason that a city must be experienced and understood on the level of the human at street level. For de Certeau, "the panorama-city is a 'theoretical' (that is, visual) simulacrum, in short a picture, whose condition of possibility is an oblivion and a misunderstanding of practices." The totalized perspective of the city prevents understanding of the nuanced practices that reflect the urban experience. The challenge, not unique to Paris, is that planning has increasingly and overwhelmingly been focused on the totalized form as the means by which to both understand and thus design for the city. In this regard, Haussmann's boulevards, although designed with improved mobility as the chief objective, do an at least adequate to above adequate job of functionally responding to the desires of walking humans. This is not to suggest that they represent the most humanistic approach to responding to the needs of a modernizing Paris, just that, overall, they seem to have afforded the space for the individual to exist in the context of modern technical needs. Thus, it

can be said that the streets of paris "had a twofold character: They existed both for their own sakes, as places to live and shop according to new standards of upper middle class affluence, as a kind of stage for elegant living, promenading, and socializing in outdoor cafés and restaurants, and also as connecting corridors between what an up-to-date mid-nineteenth-century man such as Napoleon III considered key points of the city."[38] Reconsidering Augé's notion of non-place as a way to understand the relationship between individuals and their external landscapes, this twofold character captures a key tension of the boulevards. They hold the anthropological places that lives regularly interact with, they become something akin to an anthropological place in that they adopt a strong identity and become intimately identified as being uniquely Parisian and thus uniquely connected to the identity of the city of Paris. Simultaneously, or perhaps more strongly in the roadway versus the sidewalk, they also exhibit elements that would lead to their characterization as non-places. In enabling more direct, rapid movement between places, they become passages, an experience that is only heightened as movement in vehicles to cover longer distances disconnects individuals from the external spaces through which they are moving. Such is why de Certeau grounds the city in the practice of walking—as Augé notes "when individuals come together, they engender the social and organize places."[39] Augé seems to be implying, with a twinge of nostalgia, that places are always engendered with character by the actors interacting in a personal, familiar fashion. Though possible in an urban context today as in the nineteenth century, this notion of places only existing through more intimate exchanges is somewhat unlikely in any context as patterns of movement change and economies grow in scale. The number of actors through both increases in population but also increases in movement increases

---

[38] Saalman, *Haussmann*, 14.

[39] Augé, *Non-Places*, 111.

the number of social interactions and thus leads to the blasé mental attitude Simmel identifies in his essay *The Metropolis and Mental Life*.

Social Spaces

Thus far, the discussion of this thesis has focused largely on the physicality of spaces without a full consideration of the social interactions that are contained within those physical spaces. Space in relation to the social functions in two ways. First, it can offer an account of the identity of a society as it is manipulated to fit the ideals of that society or group of people. This is the notion Augé is pursuing when he observes:

> "Collectives (or those who direct them), like their individual members, need to think simultaneously about identity and relations; and to this end, they need to symbolize the components of shared identity (shared by the whole of a group), particular identity (of a given group or individual in relation to others) and singular identity (what makes the individual or group of individuals different from any other). The handing of space is one of the means to this end, and it is hardly astonishing that the ethnologist should be tempted to follow in reverse the route from space to social, as if the latter had produced the former once and for all. This route is essentially 'cultural' since, when it passes through the most visible, the most institutionalized signs, those most recognized by the social order, it simultaneously designates the place of the social order, defined by the same stroke as a common place."[40]

Of importance to consider in his observation is his language regarding the ethnologist's temptation or propensity to view space as a complete derivative of sociality. He offers the suggestion of an expanded notion of the relationship between sociality and space. This expanded notion offers the acknowledgement of the reverse process by which the multiple levels of identity Augé observes are shaped by the spaces in which those identities become salient and are reinforced. Thus, there is a certain accounting for the diversity inherent within identity that makes generalizations problematic even though they might be particularly useful in

---

[40] Augé, *Non-Places*, 51.

understanding overall trends. There is a subjective, political nature to identity formation that directly interplays with questions of space which are always on some level political questions in the urban context where spaces serve a multitude of individual identities and even collective identities are nuanced and typically unresolved. Such is the situation in Paris in the nineteenth-century where multiple identity groups exist within the same spaces and thus negotiations must be made (often within the political arena).

Paris in the nineteenth-century had "become the byword for everything that was enchanting and intoxicating about the urban scene. The centralized nature of French life encouraged this especially rich and varied culture. Everything was drawn to Paris, which became the overheated source of all social, intellectual and artistic expression."[41] Accordingly, there was a diversity of social classes and, importantly, the population of Paris continued to grow. There is an organicism to the Parisian culture Elizabeth Wilson describes in her work. This organic and vibrant culture mirrors the 'organic arrangement' of "the city's public works infrastructure, street, and building patterns" that had become "quite overwhelmed by an ever-growing population."[42] Such is a loose capture of the physical and social environment of Paris that both Napoleon III and Haussmann found when examining Paris in the middle of the nineteenth-century. Compressing more and more people into the organic physical arrangement of Paris produced the overarching technical problems of mobility and sanitation that Haussmann was seeking to address in his renovation of the city. These technical problems were indicative of social problems that Napoleon III and Haussmann also believed a reconsideration and reconstruction of the city could resolve. On this point there is some disagreement in the literature with varying degrees of sympathy

---

[41] Elizabeth Wilson, "The City of the Floating World: Paris," in *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women* (London: Virago, 1991), 47.

[42] Archer, *The City*, 170.

accorded to Napoleon III. This becomes extremely apparent in considering the, perhaps undue, emphasis placed on the boulevards as mitigators of social strife. The boulevards have been overwhelmingly viewed as an exertion of social control by preventing revolution through their built form. This is generally the view professed by less technical, cultural analyses of improvements to the boulevards. Texts more concerned with the overall urban planning take a more balanced approach arguing that "[Napoleon III] had more in mind than his personal security. He was preoccupied with the social problems and eager to adjust his capital to a revolution whose significance and consequences he had become aware of during his exile in England."[43] The suggestion here is that as much as the boulevards enabled the forceful control of power, true power came from the people, in this case the French bourgeoise, who wielded strong political influence. Reconstructing Paris to address their needs became the overwhelming goal of Napoleon III and Haussmann.

In this way, "it apparently never occurred to either Napoleon or Haussmann, in their most extravagant dreams of demolition, to pull down all of old Paris in order to rebuild it anew," a view commonly expressed in cursory understandings of the rebuilding. Instead, "they wanted to improve the city, not destroy it. What lies behind the new boulevards was neither 'appalling disorder' nor unspeakable slums, but the tightly knit, highly organic, and lively fabric of the old town which was just as essential to the everyday life of all Parisians as were the new boulevards."[44] This is, to be fair, a particularly positive account of the organic and often unsanitary neighborhoods of old Paris. The infrastructure simply was not in place to support the vast number of people and their various kinds of waste. Furthermore, exponential population

---

[43] Françoise Choay, *The Modern City: Planning in the 19th Century* (New York: George Braziller, 1969), 15.

[44] Saalman, *Haussmann*, 114.

growth put pressures on existing spaces forcing outward expansion in the organic way the city

had grown thus far. Miriam Levin offers a particularly good characterization of the emperor's

urban planning philosophy in saying:

> "Napoleon III and his *équipe* were men of what I call 'salutary urban communications,'
> intent on putting human beings and a modern built environment into a smoothly
> functional, healthful, and aesthetically attractive interactive network. 'Communications'
> refers not simply to the material networks of telegraph, boulevards, transport, and gas
> and electric illumination that improved the circulation of people, goods, and capital, but
> to a means of institutionally creating and rationally managing dynamic economic and
> social relationships within the city, connected nationally and internationally through an
> urban environment built out of the most advanced technologies available."[45]

This novel characterization offers a more complex understanding of the motivations behind the

renovation of Paris. Though the technical innovations of mid-nineteenth century Paris receive

considerable attention as these are the physical manifestations of changes within the structure of

the city, the motivations behind the ideas that changed Paris and the impact of these innovations

are less discussed. Though certainly more illusive, the social impacts are of chief importance

because, as Augé reinforces, the physical spaces of urban environments are considerable

reflections of the social conditions and ruling ideas of a society. Paris of the nineteenth-century

becomes an interesting location in which to examine this—at the heart of the changes in the

physical organization of the city were considerable tensions as "the rapidly changing landscape

posed the problem of people's orientation in their own city."[46] Not simply a result of the rapid

pace of change, the top-down approach to the renovation was also largely responsible for the

difficulties of many Parisians to locate themselves within the city as both the spaces changed but

also the social interactions that took place in those spaces were altered. Top-down rationality was

---

[45] Miriam R. Levin, "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914," in *Urban Modernity: Cultural Innovation in the Second Industrial Revolution* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010), 17–20.

[46] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 134.

replacing the organic growth that had made previous changes to the urban environment more easily adapted to. The small scale organic changes within Paris yielded far different results that better reflected the current social fabric. Of course, the downside of this process is that it ignores the totality and thus was not capable of properly handling the issues facing the growing city of Paris.

As Françoise Choay argues of the urbanite in *The Modern City: Planning in the 19th Century*, "he was unable to assimilate this urban revolution in terms of any previous process in which one urban order was blotted out by another. The situation had become dramatic, for he was now confronted with a spatial order devoid of its traditional richness of meaning."[47] In an organic growth model there is an obvious progression from one built form to another as spaces experience slow transformation. In this new paradigm the meaning that comes from what came before is lost, though the new spacial order is not entirely devoid of meaning as Choay suggests. Instead, technological and scientific ideas, rationality, and importantly, capitalism, come to imbue the new spaces with meaning. The meaning becomes disconnected from any historical meaning and here we see the first example of the spaces (sweeping boulevards, standardized middle class apartment buildings) as being something of non-places in their historical irrelevance and relational independence. For the first time Parisians were confronting an urban landscape that was designed irrespective to the organic societal factors that had previously been the driving force in urban design.

Changes to the urban landscape under Haussmann were not the first rapid changes the city had experienced. During the French Revolution the city underwent massive spatial change as buildings and spaces were destroyed as well as the history that went with them. Different in this

---

[47] Choay, *The Modern City*, 8.

case was that the physical destruction and spatial alterations were far more in line with the social

upheaval that characterized the French revolution. As a result of the French Revolution and the

destruction of countless historically significant structures including the Bastille, "the

archeological vision had been born, and it forced the Prefect [Haussmann] to spare monuments

of the past."[48] This is reflected in the plan he implemented with monuments anchoring the

connecting boulevards. Not all was preserved and a shortcoming of the renovation emerged; "in

the 1850's and 1860's, the idea of preserving an urban texture had not yet matured:

Haussmann's most serious error was to destroy irrevocably the tightly woven and diversified

fabric of the Île de la Cité, whose new blocks of giant buildings condemned it to death."[49] This

destruction is a particularly salient example of the social impact of the sweeping changes

Haussmann imposed thought the city. The 'tightly woven and diverse fabric' was both physical

and social, replaced instead with large administrative offices that could not, and indeed were not

designed to recreate the dense, lively spaces they replaced. This tends to be the overwhelming

critique of Hausssmann—that he destroyed the spaces that had come to define urban life in Paris

in the mid-nineteenth century. Cities are not static however, and the irony is that contemporary

Paris and much of the character that defines contemporary Paris for outsiders are products of

Haussmann's plans. The experience of Parisians, of course, is somewhat different, however with

regard to the collective identity the city seems to have adopted, the projects Haussmann

implemented with their spectacular nature, continue to carry much of the identity of Paris.

 Even with missteps in his treatment of the Île de la Cité, Haussmann recognized that all

should not be destroyed in service of his new urban plan. In contemporary as in Haussmann's

---

[48] Choay, *The Modern City*, 19.

[49] Choay, *The Modern City*, 19.

times, "the inner quarters of the city—with their integrated mixture of large regular new streets and narrow irregular old streets, with their complex intermingling of variously scaled commercial and residential functions—are still the most successful and agreeable parts of the city from every point of view."[50] There are of course several factors behind this notion of success and agreeability. Firstly, the dual commercial and residential functions of these areas almost certainly made them somewhat less transient in that daily public life was brought closer to private lives. Movement and activity not related to an exodus changes the nature of spaces by making them lived in as opposed to moved through. Unlike the first factor which is concerned with present experience, the second factor relates more to perceived and past experience. As Wilson explains, "Baudelaire and his contemporaries experienced the sensations of the new metropolis as 'modern', yet the changes already taking place in Paris generated the beginnings of a sensibility of nostalgia. As Paris was transformed architecturally, the surviving districts of 'Old Paris' became picturesque. This nostalgia became the 'charm' of Paris."[51] The idea of nostalgia is interesting because it captures a longing for the past and an implied dissatisfaction with the present. Modernity itself is situated as the opposition to nostalgia with the modern architectural projects as being reflective of and furthering this experience. Thus the question is raised as to whether these modern spacial changes can be said to be responsible for the nostalgia or if the nostalgia is somehow in response to a reluctance to change irregardless of the very qualities of the changes. In Paris, it seems that both of these processes contribute to the nostalgia for the charming older areas of Paris. There is more complexity to this idea, however, in that the surviving older districts continue to be accessible with the only apparent modernization being the newfound contrast

---

[50] Saalman, *Haussmann*, 114.

[51] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 60.

between them and the truly modern boulevards, ubiquitous bourgeois urban housing and newly spectacular monuments. The bigger concern then seems to be the fate of the older, organic spaces in the context, and perhaps under the threat of, ruthlessly rational modernism which is at odds with the organic, and thus irrational, building that led to the social and spacial problems Napoleon III and Haussmann were seeking to address.

To call any of their interventions modern, however, might be a gross misstatement. On some level they were modern in that their objectives were to respond to the then problems of the capital. What made them not modern, however, is the fact that they were expressly rooted in baroque notions of planning and organization of cities and towns. It was the implementation of the baroque style of urban planning that produced the city of Paris as it exists today. Especially true in the case of Paris, "the role given in Baroque planning to the satisfaction of the eye destroys the former sense of intimacy and the city is transformed into a spectacle."[52] It is repeated ad nauseam in analyses of Haussmann's urban interventions that questions of aesthetics were always tertiary to resolving the first the technical and then the social problems facing Paris. However the boulevards adopted the style of the treelined baroque avenue because the style added aesthetic value to what was primarily a technical solution. More significantly, however, the baroque style of pronounced visual perspectives is attributed to the loss of intimacy within the city and a transformation of what is left into spectacle. In becoming a spectacle there is the implication that the city also became less organic not only in organization and appearance, but also in social organization and interaction. This inorganic nature of interactions under the new spatial organization led to "a further paradox of the 'modern' city; even as its inhabitants experienced it as more fragmented and disorientating, the regulation of the new mass society

---

[52] Choay, *The Modern City*, 8.

tightened."[53] This is hardly surprising, considering the overall power of all architecture to control and wield influence over those who interact with it. In Paris, the boulevards and ubiquitous middle class housing in addition to the prominence of the monuments in the urban landscape produced a fabric that not only reflected bourgeois tastes and desires, but also reinforced the values of the Second Empire and, later, the Third Republic. Their influence as social signifiers and reinforcers of cultural values continues to this day.

This social control was also exerted in more direct ways through the overall organization of spaces that came as a result from changes to the urban fabric of Paris that resulted from, what effectively amounts to, government-financed gentrification of certain areas of the city. Prior to Haussmann's reconstruction "Paris had been composed of many small, extremely dense neighborhoods, often with an identity defined by some dominant economic activity. Although there were rich and poor areas, many of Paris's *quartiers* had quite a bit of heterogeneity, and were, in any case, in close proximity to one another."[54] Ideas that Simmel sets forth in *Metropolis and Mental Life* seem especially relevant to understanding the value of this heterogeneity. Though there is acknowledgment of the role economic activity plays in characterizing certain areas, the mingling of economic classes would seem to challenge reduction of the individual to purely economic ends through the lessening of abstraction that would result from increased spacial segregation on the basis of class. This challenging of both abstraction and reduction of individual value can be said to provide the 'charm' of these neighborhoods, which certainly suggests that charm is directly related to the strength of individual interpersonal connections. There is a genuineness to these connections that seems to dissolve as the qualities of Augé's non-places

---

[53] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 53.

[54] Kirkland, *Paris* Reborn, 170.

become more and more prevalent with the changing of physical spaces that led to the changes in

the nature of interaction where 'solidarity contractility' replaces the 'organically social.'[55]

These changes are what lead to the city becoming a spectacle as meaning is slowly lost in

the process of creating 'solidarity contractility.' Individuals and spaces are reduced to their

elementary composition with identification being verified on an individual level with what

aspects of the object become most relevant to the individual. Of course, this does not negate the

presence of collectively agreed upon identities, it just reflects the codifying of these values

through other means. As Wilson explains of the power of the city as a spectacle, "in the right

costume a woman—or a man—could escape into a new identity. Such, at any rate was a widely

held belief about the great nineteenth-century city. To what extent individuals were really able to

escape their origins is less certain, but undoubtedly many reformers believed that anonymity not

only made it possible, but also presented an insidious challenge to law and order."[56] This is

certainly why issues of the public security were so highly considered in the renovation, however,

her assertion also reveals something more fundamental about the nature of changes in the city.

The idea of costuming to become something else suggests a particular importance of

visuality in the city. Visual structures become representative of the meaning of the object. While

it is unlikely that the visual capturing the totalized meaning is a new phenomena of the city, the

sheer number of objects within the city seems to have imbued the visual with more importance

as the number of interactions increased through increased urban mobility. Wilson argues that

"the charm of Paris combined overpowering melancholy at the loss of the past with the loneliness

of the 'atom in the crowd'. It was the charm of the alleyways and courtyards lapped in shadow,

---

[55] Augé, *Non-Places*, 94.

[56] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 51.

the bridges and quays of Paris, which were beautiful especially *because* they seemed doomed to crumble before the developer's demolition squad. Shabby, forgotten corners of the city inhabited by the marginals became precious and magical."[57] This charm Wilson describes ties nicely to Augé's notion of anthropological place as the situation of meaning within a society. It suggests the reasons behind our gravitation towards these places because they capture emotional life more than the anonymity people assume in non-places can provide. Furthermore, Wilson captures the idea of control as being particularly important to people living in a landscape where the developers sculpt the landscape in a top-down approach that seems uncontrollable on an individual level. The magic and preciousness she identifies in the street corners occupied by the marginals captures the intimacy of life that totalized considerations of the city loose.

These qualities are captured in the images by Eugène Atget of the deserted city spaces that sharply contrasts to the life we know exists in them. The photographer does absolutely capture lives and the impressions of lives in many of his photographs, but overall he seems to provide the distinct commentary that in many ways the city is being overtaken by its cityness, by modernity, by the planning—lives are somehow something smaller in relation to the totality of spaces. As the curator of prints for the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1952, A. Hyatt Mayor tells of his work, Atget was something of a visual poet creating haunting narratives by forcing reconsideration of the spaces of familiarity.[58] Though he is operating in something of a poetic tradition in his capturing of the spaces of Paris, he also seems to aptly capture the limitations of totalized thinking of a space through the very fact that he can carve artistic meaning out of a built environment that serves numerous other less aesthetic functions. This could be said of any

---

[57] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*,60.

[58] A. Hyatt Mayor, "The World of Atget," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 10, no. 6 (February 01, 1952), jstor.org/stable/3258011.

work of art, but it seems to be particularly relevant in his work where the spaces he capture

reflect more intimate spaces in the city, but their emptiness communicates a haunting nostalgia

for life. It is as though he would like us to yearn for the life we know ought be present. Another

famous photographer of the city, Charles Marville was hired by the city of Paris to directly

capture the changes in Parisian life as a result of the proliferation of the wide boulevards and

destruction of intimate spaces to make room for the changes Haussmann sought.[59] Marville

captures not only the product, but also the process which offers us glimpses into the nature of

changes in the urban landscape. The dearth of peoples in the photographs almost certainly does

not represent the actual lived experience of the city, but they do offer a narrative of change in

that the individual was becoming smaller and smaller within the city.

Both of these photographers seem to loosely capture a new sensibility emerging in

modernizing Paris: the flâneur. The Flâneur is not exclusive to modernity, however, as he is

something of the next iteration of the bohemian from the era of the French Revolution with "the

difference between the bohemian and the *flâneur* [being] that while the bohemian had been

passionately emotional, the *flâneur* was a detached observer. He caught the fleeting, fragmentary

quality of modern urban life, and, as a rootless outsider, he also identified with all the marginals

that urban society produced."[60] This character becomes particularly important in analyses of the

city because he is a tangible representation of the modern life he observes. He captures a duality,

a tension of modern Parisian life. He uses the city in a new way as he "lived on the boulevards,

and made the streets and cafés of Paris his drawing room."[61] This was a new figure reflecting the

---

[59] The Metropolitan Museum of Art, "Charles Marville: Photographer of Paris," The Metropolitan Museum of Art, accessed March 18, 2014, metmuseum.org/exhibitions/listings/2014/charles-marville.

[60] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 54.

[61] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 54.

more public nature of life and reinforcing the visuality and spectacular nature of the city. The

advent of this character and the very public nature of his identity also suggest a rise in role of

public spaces in individuals' lives. On this point the writers Edmond and Jules Goncourt offered

the following assessment: "'social life is beginning to undergo a great change… One can see

women, children, husbands and wives, whole families in the café. The home is dying. Life is

threatening to become public.'"[62] Life may have been threatening to become public, but it seems

to largely have already adopted this public stance as normal. What is of particular interest in

both the concepts of the flâneur and of the increasingly public nature of modern life is that both

are still on some level concerned with private interaction. Certainly, new public modes of

decorum arose with changes in the level of public participation, but ultimately the nature of the

relations of chief importance do not seem to be undergoing significant change. Certainly there

were more interactions with strangers, but both the flâneur and the family in a public space are

not dramatically altering their interactions within those units; the flâneur remains alone, the

family remains as a unit. The public nature of their interactions becomes the new, becomes the

modern.

      This public spaces that become ever more prevalent in lives are further altered by the

changes that came as a result of class separation through changes in housing costs brought about

by the improvements Haussmann implemented in Paris. Unlike the heterogeneous

neighborhoods, "the rebuilding of Paris [put] the rich with the rich and the poor with the poor.

Some considered that this created a 'dangerous separation of society's classes . . . , imprudently

breaking the old equilibrium.'"[63] This separation changed the lives of Parisians at all levels of

---

[62] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 52.

[63] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 170.

society as social activities outside of working lives became increasingly intraclass affairs. Thus, the effects of the metropolis on an individual's mental construction of the social and the spacial aspects of the city as articulated by Simmel become abundantly present in the changing fabric of Paris. It was a time of displacement as neighborhoods were torn down and families were moved and the changes marked the advent of an increasing separation of social classes that would have an impact on the city up to the present day, when the lower classes still find themselves on the far less expensive outskirts of the city in dramatically different environments from the more intimate ones preserved in central Paris. In Haussmann's time "painful human consequences, [especially for the working class, were] the concrete reality of the old Paris giving way to the new dream of urban grandeur and modernity."[64] Tension is at the heart of the modernization of Paris, as tension is at the heart of most urban projects by the virtue of these projects touching all levels of society. Though there was undeniably rapid change and social upheaval as a result of the spacial reconfiguration, the benefits were incontestable. Aside from the boulevards, "the Second Empire presided over a large-scale drive to build a whole infrastructure of urban facilities: town halls for each arrondissement, barracks for the imperial guard, churches, hospitals, hospices, universities, high schools, middle schools, and primary schools," but "despite these efforts, many contemporaries saw the transformation of Paris as a social regression."[65] Although this notion of social regression is not unjustified, especially considering the spaces and experiential factors that many Parisians feel were lost with the expansion of the boulevards of Paris, the genuine impetus behind this viewpoint is better characterized as a reaction to the ideals of modernity and the subsequent impact those ideals have on the built spaces.

---

[64] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 136.

[65] Kirkland, *Paris Reborn*, 170.

Chapter III: Negotiating Modernity

The changes to the urban landscape of Paris and the Parisian social dynamics discussed in this work serve to illustrate two fundamental experiences that have arisen in lives to various, but generally increasing degrees, since the industrial revolution. First, the somewhat complex experience of living through history as the pace of change accelerates is more frequently, albeit indirectly, discussed. Second, and related to the idea of living through history, is the also broad and complicated notion of the experience of modernity. By this I mean, the experience of assimilating change as the oft referenced pace of life increases. This seems to be the most salient factor in changes in lived experience across cities and lives as industrialization and informatisation has progressed. There are many associated values that become intimately tied with notions of progress and forward movement.

Fundamental to belief in the power of modernity as progress is the view that the products of modernity yield improvements in quality of living. In Paris, though the Second Empire and the Third Republic, modernization assumed this role as "Paris-based elites wished to master the forces of industrialization by constructing a set of science- and technology-based institutions, values, organizations, and spaces. The urban environment of the [French] capital became the site where economic uncertainties and social strife would give way to a future seemingly insured against such difficulties."[66] Science and technology became the cornerstones of secular, governmental progress. If the processes and effects of industrialization can be captured and explained as socially beneficial values, the negative effects of industrialization can be lessened. More importantly, industrialization can be controlled and understood; variability becomes a

---

[66] Levin, "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914," 14.

codified value of the processes of industrialization.[67] The desire to manipulate and master the

inevitable future changes that progress brings is particularly well captured in Walter Benjamin's

writings in which his "interest in Parisian 'passages' and, more generally, in iron and glass

architecture, stems partly from the fact that he sees these things as embodying a wish to

prefigure the architecture of the next century, as a dream or anticipation."[68] Architectural control

becomes a form of spatial control which becomes a way of attempting to control the future.

Though the 'iron and glass' that captures Benjamin's interest is acknowledged as being

noteworthy on one level for its newness, its novelty, it is more significant to Benjamin as the

representation of an attempt to define the parameters of the future spacial environment. In

defining the architectural parameters of the future, the conceivers of these new forms hope to

wield some control over larger cultural ideas that are expressed through built forms.

Paris, the necessary locale of Benjamin's *Passagenwerk*, is revealed in the same work as

the location in which this 'desire to prefigure' is both first observed and continues to be most

strongly reflected in the built environment. In Paris, the conceivers of both "the Second Empire

and the Third Republic combine urban rebuilding (including the erection of laboratories and

schools), universal expositions, and museums to restructure Parisian's reality. The appeal of these

activities lay in their ability to simultaneously symbolize and materially advance an industrial

capitalistic system."[69] A convergence of elements yields both the industrial landscape, but also

the experience of that landscape. In producing the experience, iconic elements of the landscape,

like the Eiffel Tower, become symbolic of both the context in which that object stands and the

factors which produce that context. This ability of certain structures and building types to

---

[67] Informatisation follows this same pattern.

[68] Augé, *Non-Places*, 93-94.

[69] Levin, "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914," 14.

symbolize and thus concretize values of the upper classes[70] through cultural associations makes

them particularly attractive as projects through which ideas can be more widely disseminated.

The Third Republic became the longest lasting government of France since the Ancien

Régime and although it was a democratic republic, it was highly politicized which extended to its

continuation of Haussmann's plans for renovating Paris. With the boulevards having been largely

constructed during the Second Empire, the Third Republic continued the modernization and

symbolization of Paris in other ways; "under the Third Republic, the loose associations between

development of the city, expositions, and museums would be tightened, rationalized and

reformulated into an open-ended narrative of progress, along with conceptions of the present,

past and future based on science and technology."[71] Thus changes in the built environment not

only affected the physicality of spaces and the experience of being in those places, but also very

fundamental understandings of culture. The emphasis on science and technology conditioned the

society for industrial changes by positioning science and technology as the new, the modern, and

the explainer. This shift in values undoubtedly played a role in forming spectacle of the historical

and anthropological places that stood in contrast to new forms and institutions that captured the

essence of modernity. As new structures replace earlier ones, the old spaces and structures that

are preserved become increasingly still in the context of change.

Of course, the changes involved in modernization build on what came before. The

iterative nature of modernization is captured by Benjamin in his analysis of Haussmann's

transformation of Paris. As evidenced by the boulevards, "Haussmann's urban ideal was of long

perspectives of streets and thoroughfares. This corresponds to the inclination, noticeable again

---

[70] The generalized values of society at large are the ideas and values of the ruling class, even if those ideas do not capture the experience of all within the society.

[71] Levin, "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914," 20.

and again in the nineteenth century, to ennoble technical necessities by artistic aims. The

institutions of the secular and clerical dominance of the bourgeoisie were to find their apotheosis

in a framework of streets."[72] Though the political critique of this is overwhelming, his idea of

'ennobling technical necessities by artistic aims' is of particular interest. In this idea he conveys

both the iterative nature of progress, but also the way by which technological progress[73] is

tempered for a great majority of people who are resistant to change. This is at the very least a

significant function of architecture and this passage enables a slightly more complicated reading

of Benjamin's notion of prefiguring architecture. In wishing to prefigure future architecture, a

conceiver also wishes to both prefigure the future but also make it more accessible. It is

impossible to disconnect this idea from the political commentary of Benjamin's text. Architecture

serves ideas and the holders of those ideas. In late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Paris

the ruling class used architecture and urban forms to create an urban landscape in service to

specific ideals and objectives that differed from the needs of other levels of society. The idea of

accessibility should be complicated as accessibility implies choice in access. The wish to prefigure

architecture carries the goal of controlling the trajectory of the urban landscape and thus the

society at large. In this context, accessibility should be understood as the process by which the

industrial future is made palatable to the masses. Progress must be understood as an iterative

process performed by the ruling class and ultimately expressed in the architecture of their time.

 As modernity is expressed in the built forms of a society, the professed values can be

altered, which in turn alters the relationship individuals have to modernity. This is predicated on

the understanding that within modernity the possibility of multiple fundamental values exists. In

---

[72] Benjamin, "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century," 38.

[73] Benjamin seems to view this progress negatively.

Paris, the modernity of the Second Empire was different from the modernity of the Third

Republic. Not only were the constitutions and governmental structures different, but these

differences produced different understandings of the values that needed to be conveyed in the

physical spaces of Paris, as the capital of France. To this end, "… the Third Republic would not

throw out the achievements of the Second Empire in Paris, but would alter the character of

modernity in the city to make it serve the middle class. Its leaders would introduce their own

political agenda for science and technology, one that would liberalize and democratize the

culture of change."[74] Although, Napoleon III and Haussmann were endeavoring to serve the

upper bourgeois, which they did to varying degrees, the Third Republic, as a republic, was far

more concerned with serving a broader swath of society. The idea of solidifying a 'culture of

change,' supported by the agenda of science and technology[75] acts as a stabilizer of rampant

industrialization which would allow the city to continue to modernize by strengthening the

resilience of the public to the new. Thus it was both economically and politically advantageous

for the Third Republic to invest in the institutionalization of modernity.

Through this institutionalization of modernity, the experience of modernity became a set

of values that was now culturally reinforced. In the same way "Haussmann, by means of the

physical changes he wrought, enhanced the 'modern' quality of the nineteenth-century capital,

with its constant flux and movement,"[76] the Third Republic used the concretizing nature of the

built environment to shape the modernity and thus shape the experience of the people living

within in the processes of forward progress. This is significant because it helps to explain the way

---

[74] Levin, "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914," 23.

[75] Although not expressly professed as values by the Second Empire, these values were almost certainly entertained as rationalism and engineering were both highly valued.

[76] Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City*, 53.

that modernization and industrialization can be, in a certain way, controlled and manipulated to reflect the interested of the ruling class. The tension inherent within the urban experience is often reduced to questions of politics or economics as the city often becomes a location in which negotiations of control play out.

Miriam Levin's analysis of urban modernity and specifically the large role of expositions and museums play in shaping culture, suggest that in many ways the urban experience is characterized by a whole multitude of different forms of negotiation. While Haussmann revealed the process of physical negotiation, the Third Republic was more focused on negotiating the best values to profess to see their vision of urban life move forward. As such, "between 1852 and 1914, Paris developed into a modern center of industrial society through the efforts of elites, who combined institution building with a belief in the power of science and technology to organize positive change."[77] Not only could could science and technology yield positive progress, but Paris, like other modernizing cities, could use the built environment to meet more than just basic human needs for shelter and protection. The built environment of Paris could be used to make tangible intangible ideas to the masses. This certainly is not just the case with Paris in the mid- to late-nineteenth-century and the early twentieth-century, but fundamental to our understanding of the role architecture plays in our lives and our interactions. The ideals of the Third Republic could not stand to stronger negotiators in the form of the Nazis, but the structures that compose Paris reflect the multitude of values that have shaped the city and present a strong and salient example of the significance of the built environment in our lives.

---

[77] Levin, "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914," 56.

Conclusion

Augé's non-places share physical forms in common with his construction of anthropological place. This is to say that the common differentiator between places and non-places are not their outward appearance, but their function in relation to human needs. It is for this reason that non-places can exist outside supermodernity as there is nothing particular about non-places that confine them to supermodernity. Instead, as the differentiator between places and non-places is their humanistic function, all that is required of a non-place is that is is not concerned with the historical, relational, or with identity. This makes the boulevards of Paris a particularly compelling example of a non-place.

The Haussmannian boulevards are intriguing as non-places because they capture a moment at which a radical transformation within one city is bringing forth both the fundamental type of space of modernity and supermodernity but also having to tie those spaces directly into the old anthropological places of yore. This proves to be an interesting case study in that the negotiations that play out in the transformation have dramatic shifts on how individuals perceive themselves and their identity within the city. There are also important class dynamics at play, as the ideas that were implemented were those of the upper middle class. The nature of these changes reveals the tension of modern urban life in that within a given city many different needs exist which are oftentimes in conflict with one another.

Improving the ease of movement is the first and most obvious concern Haussmann was seeking to address in the construction of the boulevards which were designed to significantly improve rates of travel throughout the city. The boulevards were also designed to improve the mobility of troops around the city, although this point is overemphasized in analyses of Haussmann's projects. Changes in the speed of transport also resulted in changes in the scale of

the city and how it is perceived. Although the scale of the city had always been explored through consideration of other perspectives that sought to totalize the city from an elevated viewpoint, the boulevards of Paris resulted in very direct and perceivable changes in scale in relation to distance and time. The city became both smaller, but also more abstract as improved transit allowed people to move from point to point ignoring the in-between instead of moving through more accessible spaces to get from one place to another. Finally, the boulevards changed the social spaces of the city by separating classes and depersonalizing interactions within the city.

In the changing city of Paris, modernity became an experience that had to be negotiated on two fronts. First, it was necessary to contend with the changes in the built environment and the effects those changes had on one's relation to their surrounding environment. The second negotiation within modernity occurred at a higher level in the relation of values to the structures that communicated those values.

Paris, but more broadly any city, becomes a location of tension and negotiation. This negotiation happens on multiple levels as I have shown in this thesis. The idea of negotiation is particularly apt way of understanding relationships in the city between individuals, groups and the built environment. Though there are certainly inequalities in those negotiations, structuring the city as a site of negotiation improves our ability to conceive of different parties having different needs but also having different capital with which they negotiate. This paradigm offers the possibility of being extended to other cities and ultimately which will yield further insight into the nature of the relationship between the built environment and the urban social fabric.

Bibliography

Archer, Kevin. *The City: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2013.

"The Architecture of Happiness." Alain De Botton. 2013. Accessed October 15, 2013. http://alaindebotton.com/architecture/.

Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Translated by John Howe. London: Verso, 1995.

Augé, Marc. *A Sense of the Other: The Timeliness and Relevance of Anthropology*. Translated by Amy Jacobs. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Bataille, Georges. "Part I Modernism: Georges Bataille." In *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, edited by Neil Leach, 20-23. London: Routledge, 1997.

Benjamin, Walter. "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century." Edited by Neil Leach. In *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, 33-40. London: Routledge, 1997.

Benko, Georges, and Ulf Strohmayer, eds. *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.

Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Bridge, Gary, and Sophie Watson, eds. *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Carmona, Michel. *Haussmann: His Life and Times, and the Making of Modern Paris*. Translated by Patrick Camiller. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2002.

Certeau, Michel De. *L'invention Du Quotidien: I. Arts De Faire*. Gallimard, 1990.

Certeau, Michel De. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Choay, Françoise. *The Modern City: Planning in the 19th Century*. New York: George Braziller, 1969.

Conley, Verena A. *Spatial Ecologies: Urban Sites, State and World-Space in French Cultural Theory*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012.

Cresswell, Tim. *Place: A Short Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

De Botton, Alain. *The Architecture of Happiness*. New York: Vintage, 2008.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

De Certeau, Michel. "Walking in the City." In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, translated by Steven Rendall, 91-110. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Proust and Signs*. New York: G. Braziller, 1972.

Derrida, Jacques. *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*. Translated by Pascal-Anne Brault and Michael Nass. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy: With Selections from the Objections and Replies*. Translated by John Cottingham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." Translated by Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics* 16 (Spring 1986): 22-27.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. First ed. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Giedion, Sigfried. *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*. Fifth ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Glaeser, Edward L. *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*. New York: Penguin Press, 2011.

Glazer, Nathan, and Mark Lilla, eds. *The Public Face of Architecture: Civic Culture and Public Spaces*. New York: Free Press, 1987.

Guattari, Felix. "The Three Ecologies." Translated by Chris Turner. *New Formations*, no. 8 (Summer 1989): 131-47.

Harbison, Robert. *Thirteen Ways: Theoretical Investigations in Architecture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995.

Kirkland, Stephane. *Paris Reborn: Napoléon III, Baron Haussmann, and the Quest to Build a Modern City*. New York: St. Martin's, 2013.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Levin, Miriam R. "Bringing the Future to Earth in Paris, 1851–1914." In *Urban Modernity: Cultural Innovation in the Second Industrial Revolution*, 13-73. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.

Lorde, Audre. "Poetry Is Not a Luxury." 1977. In *Sister Outsider*, 36-39. Trumansburg: Crossing Press, 1984.

Malpas, J. E. *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Massey, Doreen B. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Mayor, A. Hyatt. "The World of Atget." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 10, no. 6 (February 01, 1952): 169-71. jstor.org/stable/3258011.

McDonough, William. *Something Lived, Something Dreamed*. Illus. Christopher Stern. Salt Lake City: Red Butte, 2004. Print.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art. "Charles Marville: Photographer of Paris." The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Accessed March 18, 2014. metmuseum.org/exhibitions/listings/2014/charles-marville.

Moran, Joe. *Reading the Everyday*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Mostafavi, Mohsen, ed. *In the Life of Cities*. Zürich: Lars Müller, 2012.

Mumford, Lewis. *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.

Panerai, Philippe, Jean Castex, Jean-Charles Depaule, and Ivor Samuels. *Urban Forms: The Death and Life of the Urban Block*. Oxford: Architectural Press, 2004.

Patt, Doug. *How to Architect*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.

Potter, Jonathan. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric, and Social Construction*. London: SAGE, 1996.

Project for Public Spaces. "9 Great Streets Around the World." Project for Public Spaces. March 5, 2010. pps.org/blog/9-great-streets-around-the-world/.

Reader, John. *Cities*. London: William Heinemann, 2004.

Saalman, Howard. *Haussmann: Paris Transformed*. New York: George Braziller, 1971.

Simmel, Georg. "The Metropolis and Mental Life." In *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, edited by Neil Leach, 69-79. London: Routledge, 1997.

Stevenson, Deborah. *The City*. Cambridge: Polity, 2013.

Wilson, Elizabeth. "The City of the Floating World: Paris." In *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women*, 47-64. London: Virago, 1991.