Jeffrey Schwartz
Professor Davis
11.469: Urban Sociology
3 June 2007

Sociology of the (Parisian) Street

## I. Introduction

The reconstruction of Paris undertaken by Haussmann during the Second Empire was an attempt to respond to the rapid industrialization and urbanization of the middle nineteenth century by remaking the city over in the image of its ascendant bourgeoisie. Haussmannization, as Haussmann's urban renewal program came to be called by his contemporaries, was unprecedented largely because of its attempt to conceive of an existing metropolis as a unitary whole. Haussmann's program created a vast new system of boulevards, sewers, parks, and gaslights through a peculiar combination of authoritarian planning, Saint-Simonian deficit spending, and *laissez-faire* capitalism, and in so doing achieved many of its overt purposes. As far as it was just a program of urban renewal projects, Haussmannization should be considered a success.

But Haussmann's project was also an implicit redefinition of how cities should be conceived, and in this the meaning of Haussmannization is far more contested. By looking at the city as a network of spaces organized around mobility and conspicuous consumption, Haussmann's dramatic simplification, rationalization, and stratification of urban space constituted one part of a discussion about the meaning of urbanism and the modern city. The changing role of the flâneur in the city, partly in response to Haussmannization, offers a unique perspective on the urban design politics of Haussmann's changes as they *mean* from the street that can be traced out in the imaginative art from the period. Flânerie as it came to be formulated under Baudelaire constituted a challenge to Haussmann's conception of the city as rationalized space, and it was not until flânerie reverted to its dawdling, banal nature under the Impressionists was Haussmann's perspective on the city also validated.

The relationship of Baudelaire's flâneur to Haussmann's *embourgeoisement* of Paris is lastly a statement about the possibility of the street as a place of solidarity.

Haussmann's Paris is one of inherent contradiction, at once dedicated to increasing bourgeois hegemony, security, and legibility while paradoxically remaining polyvalent and open to interpretation. Baudelaire's flânerie was a radical reinterpretation of the possibilities and meanings of the new boulevards Second Empire Paris, the first articulation of the 'expansive' and 'inclusive' possibilities of the street as a place of social hope. As such, the Parisian street of Second Empire is the direct or indirect progenitor of the ideas of such varied sociologists and theorists of the city as Simmels, Benjamin, Lefebvre, Berman, Bakhtin, and Castells.

**II. Haussmannization's Aims**

Louis Napoleon came to power following the Revolution of 1848, when he became President of the Second Republic at the behest of Paris' urban upper middle class. In 1852 he successfully orchestrated a *coup d'etat*, thereby creating the Second Empire and proclaiming himself Napoleon III, Emperor of France. That same year, Napoleon III is supposed to have arrived in Paris with a map of the city under his arm already marked with the location of his new boulevards. In 1853, Napoleon III and his new prefect of the Seine Georges-Eugene Haussmann, undertook a program of urban reconstruction in Paris that was to make the city over in the image of its ascendant bourgeoisie.

Insofar as Haussmannization was an attempt to address the problems of rapid industrialization and urbanization in mid-nineteenth century Paris, it began before Haussmann became the Seine's prefect. Under Louis-Philippe's July Monarchy, which lasted from 1830 until 1848, new railroad terminals were built at the outer limits of the medieval city, and the Rue de Rambuteau was constructed, which linked the eastern quarters of the city with Les Halles, the public markets. In constructing that street, Rambuteau, who was Haussmann's predecessor as the prefect of the Seine, pioneered the use of boulevard-creation as a tool for urban renewal. In Rambuteau's own words, it was "easier to cut through a pie's inside than the break into the crust" (Jones 352). Under Rambuteau's prefecture, in 1852, the Conseil Municipal approved the decree

providing for the expropriation of properties adjacent to the path of public works, thereby enabling the grand public works projects of the ensuing two decades.

Thus few of Haussmann's interventions under Napoleon III were entirely novel in their own right. What was unique at the time of his appointment as prefect of the Seine in 1853 was Haussmann's willingness to undertake the *plan d'ensemble*—a plan characterized by enormity and a unity of vision–and apply it to an existing city. Haussmann's program was exceptional in part because of how well it represented its particular historical moment: his plan imaged the city as the sum of its functionalities, a unity formed from its constituent networks for moving increasing amounts of people and materials through an urban space. "For [Haussmann] the modern city was an organism which needed to be analyzed according to a strictly utilitarian examination of urban functions. [He] saw [himself] as a physician-urbanist," tasked with functionally providing for Paris' nourishment through the circulation of the roads that were its arteries, the parks that were its lungs, and the sewers that provided for the disposal of its waste (Jones 348). Though some of Haussmann's interventions were prefigured in Christopher Wren's 1666 plan for London, Saalman notes that "Napoleon III's idea of restructuring the city by cutting streets through it represented a fundamental change of approach"; "[e]arlier transformations of Paris had always consisted of additions to the already existing urban fabric" (14). What perhaps most distinguishes Haussmannization as a mode of urban development "…was the unitary, holistic vision which underpinned it" (Jones 345).

The renovations of Paris undertaken under Haussmann, during his tenure as prefect from 1853 to 1869, were an unprecedented attempt to image the city as a unified whole, a response to rapid industrialization and urbanization through a set of interventions characterized by often divergent strains of rationalism, state interventionism, capitalism, and Saint-Simonian social and economic theories. When Haussmann's reconstruction projects were in full swing, one-in-five Parisian workers were employed in constructing such *grand travaux*, and one-fifth of Paris' streets were rebuilt. By the end of Haussmann's tenure at the prefecture, he "had carried out some 2.5 billion francs worth of public works through innovative debt financing equivalent to

approximately forty four times the total city expenditure on all services in 1851" (Jones 344). The number of miles of sewers increased four-fold, to three hundred and forty-eight; the surface area was more than doubled, from 13.5 square miles prior to Haussmann's arrival in 1853 to 30.8 square miles by the 1860s; and the population of one million in 1851 doubled to 1.9 million in 1872 (Gandy 28, Jones 344).

Yet, for all its achievements in rationalizing space, Haussmannization should not be considered synonymous with the process of modernization. Instead, it is an oftentimes contradictory response to the particular tensions present in urbanism and in Paris in the middle of the nineteenth century. In the words of Gandy, paraphrasing Saalman:

> …the reconstruction of Second Empire Paris was the most influential nineteenth century solution to the problem of rapid urbanization. The transformation of Paris gave the bourgeois revolution (1848 and beyond) its most radical architectural expression of any European city. The reconstruction reflected the needs of an urban mercantile class who faced the consequences of modernity not by an escape into romantic anti-urbanism, but through a celebration of the possibilities for the technological mastery of urban space and the search for progressively greater degrees of social and spatial order…[T]hese new discourses of order and control both reflected and constituted emerging tensions and inequalities, driven by the processes of capitalist urbanization" (Gandy 29).

Haussmann's Paris was unique precisely because of the extent to which it attempted to simplify and order the city into its constituent functions

While much of the justification for Haussmann's urban renewal program is often attributed to securing Paris from future revolution, the reasons for his program of urban renewal were more subtle and multifaceted. Overtly, Haussmann explained his changes as many urban renewal programs would in the ensuing century and a half, on the grounds of (in his words) "security, circulation, and salubrity" (Jones 348). In very concrete ways, Haussmannization was an attempt to make Paris over for the bourgeoisie, to instantiate the financial institutions and social mores, desires for leisure, and tastes of the urban upper middle classes. "[T]here was a groundswell of desire from within the urban community for a more livable city. This does not mean to say that

if Haussmann had not existed, the Parisians would have invented him. But it does signify that Haussmanism was in the air" (Jones 350).

Because the Commune of 1871 destroyed most of the records at the Hotel de Ville, it is impossible to distinguish those projects undertaken during the Second Empire at the behest of Haussmann from those directly mandated by Napoleon III. Regardless, it is clear that Haussmann's mandate for his public works came from "the politico-aesthetic tastes of Napoleon III himself" (Scott 62). There is also little doubt that Napoleon III's aims for Paris drew heavily from the deficit-financed political-economics of the Saint Simonists (through their journal *Le Globe*), and that he desired for Paris to be "…a lasting symbol of French international power" as a "…'city of marble' worthy of comparison with Augustan Rome" (Scott 62). Napoleon III triangulated these impulses with "a driving faith in scientific progress, industrial progress, and commercial expansion." As such, Haussmannization was comprised of a particular combination of state interventionism, *laissez-faire* economic liberalism, and bourgeois visions for the city of Paris (Gandy 28, 36).

Thus Haussmann's Paris was an attempt to image the city, to remake it as a legible place on behalf of the urban upper middle class. No longer conceiving of the city as an accumulation of heterogeneous *quartiers* and neighborhoods (pace Berman), Haussmann helped to articulate what modernity means for nineteenth century urbanism—an interconnected network of streets, sewer lines, lights, and parks that permitted one to view Paris as a whole, as a unity. Haussmannization "opened up the whole of the city, for the first time in its history, to all its inhabitants. Now, at last it was possible to move not only within neighborhoods, but also through them. Now after centuries of life as a cluster of isolated cells, Paris was becoming a unified physical and human space" (Berman 151). Haussmann's Paris strove for conceptual and visual simplification. In doing so, Mumford places Haussmann in the tradition of the Baroque Planner, who,

> in the interest of mechanical efficiency and outward aesthetic conformity,…ignored the social structure of the city, and in his effort to accelerate traffic, he impeded the meeting and co-operation of those whom the traffic supposedly served…sacrificing to straight

> lines, broad avenues, and unimpeded vehicular movement the specific historic character of the [city] and all the complex human needs and purposes it served (387).

Haussmann was an engineer, he was a physician-urbanist, and he was a regulator, but he was also a creator. Calling himself the *artiste-demolissuer* (the "demolition artist"), Haussmann took Paris as his canvas. But it was not his canvas alone. The following explores the urban design politics of Haussmann's specific interventions, followed by an exploration of some of the works of imaginative art of the period in order to trace the meanings of Haussmann-era Paris.

## III. Haussmann's Interventions

*Militarization & Roads*

While Haussmannization cannot be reduced merely to a process of militarily securing the city, insulating the city from future revolution was certainly a paramount consideration in Baron Haussmann's plans. The urban renewal program carried out by Haussmann and Napoleon III was an attempt to order a city that had experienced nine barricades in the quarter-century preceding III's reign (Scott 61). Road-building, especially the broad boulevards for which Paris is renowned, were they primary means to achieve this security. Haussmann's roads provided "multiple, direct rail and road links" between the military depots and the potential insurrectionary spaces in Paris. As Haussmann wrote, "the order of this Queen-city is one of the main pre-conditions of general [public security]" (Scott 60). While Haussmann surely means far more than security when he speaks of 'ordering' Paris, framing his operations in terms of defense, safety, and surveillance had its advantages: there is "no disputing that part of Haussmann's modernity was his wish to put an end to insurrection" which, incidentally, made it much easier to get funds appropriated from the Conseil Municipal (Clark 39). The French politician Leon Faucher explained the need for Haussmann's first 50 million franc appropriation as "the interests of public order, no less than those of salubrity, demand that a wide swath be cut as soon as possible across this district of barricades" (Scott 61).

As with all of Haussmann's interventions, development occurred unevenly, and his urban renewal program disproportionately affected different areas of the city. The Second Empire located "…innovation at the very core of the city, in the heartlands of the radical districts which had opposed Louis Bonaparte's rise to power" (Jones 344). The centers of revolution and resistance in Paris were concentrated in certain *quartiers* with complex, medieval street plans, and the annexation of the "inner suburbs" in 1860 was "explicitly designed to gain mastery over a *ceinter sauvage* ['savage' or 'wild center']. 

> Haussmann described these areas as a 'dense belt of suburbs, given over to twenty different administrations, built at random, covered by an inextricable network of narrow and tortuous public ways, alleys, and dead-ends, where a nomadic population without any real ties to the land and without any effective surveillance grows at prodigious speed (Scott 61).

It was precisely the antithesis to Haussmannization, the foil to and one of the reasons for Haussmann's urban renewal program. Mumford asks, "were not the ancient medieval streets of Paris one of the last refuges of urban liberties?" and identifies the creation of the boulevards and the razing of whole quarters as "the best possible protection from within. To rule merely by coercion, without affectionate consent, one must have the appropriate urban background" (369).

Paris' new avenues were of course not just for military spectacles, but were polyvalent places that served many new purposes aimed at ordering, stratifying, and aestheticizing the street. Prefiguring the isolomente of Mussolini's Rome, Haussmann carved out monuments "…in geometrically ordered open spaces," such as the Tour Saint-Jacques (Saalman 17). As the only surviving portion of the Saint-Jacques church razed for the Rue de Rivoli, the tower was intended as a part of the Haussmannization's monumentalism and formalism but came to symbolize, partly through Le Secq's photograph from 1853, the alienation felt by Baudelaire and others (see figure 1). The broad axial ways linked not just military depots to the city, they connected salient cultural centers and civic monuments, as well as provided the forum for the emergent commercial culture. Again, Mumford: "[i]n the new city…the buildings form a setting for the avenue, and the avenue is essentially a parade ground…In the medieval town the

upper classes and the lower classes had jostled together in the street…Now, with the development of the wide avenue, the dissociation of the upper and lower classes achieves form in the city itself…The daily parade of the powerful becomes one of the principal dramas of the Baroque City…" (370).

*Sewers*

Haussmann's reforms of the Paris underground shared his rationalized aims aboveground. Just as the new boulevards aimed at visual congruity and order, the renovations to the sewers rehabilitated the underground according to changing tastes about the sense of smell. There were 37 thousand horses (presumably making manure) in the city before Haussmannization, and Cholera epidemics occurred regularly and as recently as that which coincided with the Revolution of 1848. As early as 1827, an official report on Paris' health had noted "'the sense of smell gives notice that you are approaching the first city in the world, before your eyes could see the tips of its monuments'" (Gandy 26). When sewer reconstruction began under the auspices of Haussmann's assistant Belgrand, the sewers were still those from the medieval city. By 1870, Haussmann extended Paris' sewer system to 348 miles of modern sewer lines, which represented a fourfold increase from the previous two decades, though this, too reflected uneven development—the whole of Paris was not fully incorporated into the sewer system until 1930 (Gandy 29-30, 37) (see Figure 2).

Haussmann's sewer program betrayed a complicated relationship with modernism. The reconstruction of the sewers was initially concerned with storm water drainage, but the increase in personal water consumption placed far more human feces in the sewer system than Haussmann had intended. The prefect of the Seine was reticent to permit human feces into the sewer system; "…the desire to separate 'clean' storm water from the 'dirty' human waste was integral to Haussmann's conception of an orderly flow of water through urban space (Gandy 30).

The Baron's reticence reflects larger shifts in bourgeois attitudes towards water in the middle of nineteenth century Europe. The resulting increase in demand for private space and the integration of buildings into the "comprehensive water supply and

sewage systems in order to accommodate the increasing demand for personal use of water" had profound implications for the shape of Paris (Gandy 32). Gandy concludes that "[t]he Haussmannization of Paris…[inscribed] new patterns of social and spatial order within which nature was increasingly to be a focus of leisure and convenience rather than of material necessity" (32). Mumford arrives at a similar assessment: "Haussmann…robbed urban life at its lower levels of some of its worst terrors and physical debasements. If the creative aspects of city life were diminished by industrialism, the evil effects of its waste-products and excrement were also in time reduced" (477-478). For those who could afford to remain in the city, Paris was a far healthier place.

*Lighting*

Haussmannized Paris literally and figuratively became the "city of light." In the 1830s, gas lighting was considered a novelty, but by the end of the 1850s, over three thousand gas lamps had been installed along Paris' new boulevards. Lighting promised excitement and the reassurance of public safety, and played an important role in the new consumerism and the changing roles of the street. "[T]he project of the illuminated city was connected with, and even captured the older idea of the enlightened city" (Prendergast 32). Lighting therefore was a symbolic connection from the project of Haussmann and Napoleon III that arched from the middle of the nineteenth century back to the origins of rationalist planning in the previous century's Enlightenment.

Lighting, too, was enjoyed unevenly by Parisians. All-night lighting in central and western Paris—the wealthiest areas of Haussmann's city—enabled flânerie. The "new and fast-growing leisure and pleasure culture" was linked to lighting; "Paris as illuminated 'spectacle' is Paris offered for consumption, and nowhere, of course, did gas and electric lighting more directly contribute to the function of the city…than in the glitter it conferred on the commodity". The increasingly stratified and ordered patterns of habitation and mobility also entailed that lighting "would mean different things to different people… Many of the urban poor saw very little of it, especially the natural sort" (Prendergast 33-34).

*Manipulation of the Past*

One of Haussmann's first acts as prefect of the Seine was to change the seal of Paris. In reconnecting to older imperial iconographic traditions, Haussmann and Napoleon III were hoping to draw on the authority of the past, even if it was not Paris' own history that was emphasized. The "return of a Bonaparte in 1848 instigated a reprise of imperial themes and grandiose scale of operations" (Jones, 344). Urban renewal began by linking to the old (Ferguson 115, 117). However, while Napoleon III emphasized the Second Empire's ties to Roman and Napoleonic empires, "Paris' own history played very little part in [Napoleon III]'s vision for the city." Similarly, Haussmann admitted that "he thought essentially in terms of Paris' 'security, circulation, and salubrity'…Neither man displayed much nostalgic or aesthetic appreciation of the lived environments of the old city" (Jones 348).

Compared to twentieth century absolutist regimes, Paris' distant past was largely left untouched by both Haussmannization and its discontents. However, both made symbolic use of Paris on the eve of Haussmann's program. Perhaps prefiguring a very (post?)modern trope, it was not the ancient past that was most useful to both parties, but the very recent history that came to have the most salience. Haussmann employed Charles Marville and others "…to make before-and-after pictures of areas being transformed by his works—but the emphasis was less on nostalgia for a world that was being lost than relief at its being consigned to history" (see Figure 3). History was absent from core features of Haussmann's programs because both he and Napoleon III were looking for Paris to become "the shining light of the modern age" (Jones 349).

Those discontent with Haussmann's changes also manipulated the past to their purposes. Almost immediately after the commencement of Haussmannization, the concept of a lost "old Paris," *le vieux Paris*, emerged. It was "…for the most part little more than a reactionary demand for a return to the more secure and hierarchical

taxonomies of the past (the city as 'readable' by virtue of everyone being in, and perceivable as being in their 'proper' place)" (Prendergast 15).[1]

*Who Benefits?*

The intended and actual beneficiaries of Haussmannization were clear. While some of the interventions in Haussmann's *grand travaux* benefited all of those who could afford to remain within the twenty *arrondissements*, Haussmannization was for the bourgeoisie. As Saalman summarizes:

> The fact remains that the urban bourgeoisie in general and the upper middle class in particular approved, participated in, and profited by the Haussmannization of Paris. The new class of daring financiers, large-scale building contractors, big department store owners, hotel operators, and the rest of the nouveau riche commercial breed had every reason to support and promote all aspects of the Second Empire program (Saalman 113).

Haussmann's public works was almost Keynesian, and he appeared to have invented a "a virtuous circle which conjoined private and public energies" that resulted in new homes, mass employment (at the peak of his public works Haussmann employed one-fifth of Paris' workforce), public health, city beautification, supplied financial bourgeoisie. "Haussmann financed 90% of this with loans; only 10% of the public works were financed by public money" (Jones 353). "[R]econstruction required not only financial innovation but also a radical reorganization in the balance of political and economic forces in the city." (Gandy 28)

All told, Haussmannization displaced 350 thousand Parisians. In 1860, Haussmann annexed all of the land extending out to the Thiers Wall, creating the twenty *arrondissements*, doubling the land area of the city, and increasing its population half-again. The populations of the Ie and IIe *arrondissements* at the center of the city were

---

[1] On a personal note, this is a very prominent strain in post-Katrina public discourse—no matter how bad New Orleans was before the storm, they just want it to return to the way it used to be. It brings to the forefront issues of legitimacy and authenticity, and whether the city can be conceived of as a unity—something which I think began here in Paris under Haussmann.

halved, while the populations in the XIIIe and XVIIe at the periphery of Paris doubled (Clark 37, Jones 365). "There was only one desirable station in this despotism; it was that of the rich. It was for them that the avenue was made and the pavement smoothed out…it was to protect them that the soldiers marched…" (Mumford 371). Far from the inexorable march of progress or modernity, Haussmannization was a set of deliberately chosen interventions selected to respond to the pressures facing Paris in the middle of the nineteenth century. It should come as no surprise that such massive upheavals disproportionately benefited the politically and economically dominant urban upper middle classes, nor that such a process had many discontents, some of whom were not confined to the working-class shantytowns outside the XXe *arrondissement*.

*Whose Perspective Matters?*

Insofar as a perspective represents a particular constituency, the perspective of the bourgeois *nouveau riche* most nearly approximates that favored by Haussmann's urban renewal program. While it was not an uncomplicated or unilateral process, Haussmannization wrote the bourgeoisie and their political, social, and economic mores into the built environment of Paris.

But there is another way to interpret the word 'perspective.' Haussmannization was also an explicit and highly original statement about how best to understand the city in the mid- to late-nineteenth century. And while he never completely brought his own vision to fruition, Haussmann's changes to Paris clearly imply that urbanism was henceforth to be best understood by maps and by technological systems of roads, sewers, communication, and popular culture and mobility, from the vantage of increasing physical and social order and a faith in rationalist methods. It is no coincidence that Haussmann provided the first accurate map of Paris in preparing his public works. Such a view of the city has profound urban design politics considerations (alienation, Baudelaire dealing with same issue of dislocated sense of dread and enthrallment, new forms of capital, etc.) Above all else

> The new Paris was intensely visualized…Part of Haussmann's purpose was to give modernity a shape, and he seemed at the time to have a measure of success in doing

> so; he built a set of forms in which the city appeared to be visible, even intelligible: Paris, to repeat the formula, was becoming a spectacle (Clark 66).

Because of his "heroic simplifications" that achieved legibility at the expense of imposing "a much more pronounced segregation of the population by class and function," Haussmann's Paris was a "more easily managed and administered city" (Scott 62-63). Haussmannization thus recapitulated the very problem it was trying to solve, what Prendergast calls the "unfolding paradox of the modern city throughout the nineteenth century." That is, "Haussmann's objective was to produce a coherent and stratified identity for modern Paris, a clearly readable system of boundaries and demarcations" but instead presided in many ways over a city that was becoming increasingly illegible, one that paradoxically became socially more opaque as its physical environment became "clearer, cleaner, and more uniform" (Prendergast 10-11).

Haussmann was by no means alone in attempting to stand from a perspective that could make sense of the seemingly incomprehensible modern city. As a group of painters whose star was rising as the Second Empire fell, the Impressionists articulated a view of 'modernity' that expands on the vision of the city as a place of increasing illegibility. Prendergast, following Clark, keenly observes that "if the work of the Impressionists caught an important truth in registering the disappearance from the surfaces of everyday life in the city of a fully coherent sense of 'form,' then this is not the same as saying…that the city 'lacks order'" (Prendergast 15). He continues:

> …if the city appears to resist intelligible representation and 'workable forms of visualization,' it may be that appearances are to some extent deceptive; that what truly controls the city (for example, increasingly powerful, mobile capital) seeks to remain hidden, unlocatable, at once fluid and disoriginated. It is one of the myths of the modern city that it 'belongs' to no one in particular, that everything in it is permanently up for grabs to everyone. No belief could have been more convenient to those with an interest in disguising the fact that they actually owned most of it (Prendergast 15-16).

Haussmannization does nothing if not confirm that increasing illegibility of cities serves to coherently benefit a particular group of people and disenfranchise another.

As was true for all of Haussmann's interventions, decisions to rationalize space with a select area implicitly entailed a decision *not* to do so outside of a certain area.

The very decision of Haussmannization's boundaries were a part of the calculus of that order: "improvements in the city necessitated a choice, and there was an attendant segregation outside the XXe arrondissement" for every improvement within the city proper (Jones 364). The creation of Haussmann's capital city necessitated the removal of those who could no longer afford to live in the city center to its periphery. Belleville, which was a small outpost before 1853, became a town of 60 thousand people by 1856. "By the 1860s, it had become a suburban equivalent of what the Faubourg Saint-Antoine had been earlier—an illegible, insurrectionary *foyer*" (Scott 63). Haussmannization did not end revolution in Paris; it relocated it to a space that was legible, relatively homogeneous, and segregated from the center of the city.[2]

Thus one possible ending to the story of Haussmannization is the Paris Commune of 1871. When France lost to Prussia in the Franco-Prussian war in 1870, the victors staged a crippling siege of Paris through the end of that year which resulted in the declaration of the Paris Commune in March of 1871. "If…the Commune…was partly an attempt to reconquer the city by those exiled to the periphery by Haussmann, Haussmannization can at least in part be considered successful for securing the city for the bourgeoisie (Scott 63). Though the war with Prussia cemented the end of Napoleon III's reign, Haussmann's strategic design of the city of Paris proved effective. The Parisian government army (the *versailais*) brutally ended the Commune in Belleville within two months, and the Sacre Coeur was built in expiation in the heart of Montmartre (Luxenberg 113).

## IV. Responses to Haussmannization

*How Do Haussmann's Changes Mean?*

Reading the many possible narratives of Haussmann's urban renewal program is also an exploration of the design politics of 19th century urbanism. Haussmannization was intended to secure Paris largely on behalf of an urban, upper middle class bourgeoisie, but determining its meaning—and its effectiveness—is a process that is

[2] The riots and civil unrest in the suburbs of Paris in the fall seems to be a contemporary parallel.

always mediated by the goal of inquiry. For instance, Haussmann's boulevards played a large part in quelling the Communards, and Haussmannization was successful in securing the city for its bourgeoisie. However, potential authoritarian planners in the audience should take note that Haussmannization did not prevent Haussmann from losing his prefecture in 1870; though he went on to success in his private life, as a narrative of personal achievement, Haussmannization might be considered only a mild success. There is no single 'true' or 'correct' story of Haussmannization.

George Haussmann's perspective of Haussmannization, then, is not the only one that matters, and Haussmannization's meaning is not solely determined by the intentions of Napoleon III and Haussmann. When Marshall Berman poses the question "what did the boulevards do to the people who came to fill them?" he is insisting on new perspectives of Haussmann-era Paris; one such perspective is that of the uniquely nineteenth century figure of the flâneur (Berman 152).

The narrative arc of the flâneur offers particularly keen insights into Haussmann-era Paris. The story of the nineteenth century Parisian flâneur is one of declension: the flâneur begins his tenure as an 1820s bourgeois dawdler, idly strolling the streets and arcades of Paris, and ends the 1870s virtually same (Ferguson 150). But in the interim, roughly coinciding with Haussmann's time as prefect of the Seine, the flâneur is a different figure altogether, whose actions constitute a response to the urban design politics of Haussmannization and in whom we can trace particular meanings of modernity and urbanism in Haussmann-era Paris. The flâneur during Haussmann's Paris is, above all else, the flâneur of Baudelaire's poetry, and his perspective is a direct affront to the bourgeois transformation of Paris. Insofar as making Paris in the image of the urban upper middle class is concerned, the banalization of Baudelaire's flâneur is at least as resounding of a political victory as the defeat of the Communards. Thus, another ending to the narrative of Haussmannization is the incorporation of the flânerie not of Baudelaire but of the more amenable Impressionists, whose flânerie no longer enjoyed a "special relationship with the city" (Ferguson 150).

*Flânerie*

For the nineteenth century from the 1820s onwards, the flâneur figure could be seen prowling the streets of Paris as an idle observer. From the earliest the flâneur was a man with the means to explore Paris as a detached observer of the street or arcade.

> "The role of flâneur, the sentient ambler around the streets of the post-Revolutionary, modern city, continued to play a significant role in perceptions of Paris. The flâneur was the individual immersed in the crowd, but not of it. 'For the perfect flâneur, for the passionate spectator, it is an immense joy to set up home in the heart of the multitude, amid the ebb and flow of movement, in the midst of the fugitive.' The flâneur's anonymity allowed him to witness the pulsating street life of the expanding city, and he diffused his perceptions and sensations in novels, newspaper articles, literary guidebooks, and urban physiologies—which in their diverse ways assisted the literary myths of Paris…" (Jones 360).

Haussmann's changes in Paris elicited attendant changes in flânerie. The flâneur of Second Empire Paris responded not only to the dramatic physical alterations of Paris—especially the new boulevards—but more importantly, he was attuned to the tectonic shifts in Paris' social topography as the city became reconstituted in the image of its upper middle class residents. Thus, the flânerie of mid-century Paris was categorically different from both the flânerie that preceded and followed it. "The new landscape of power and the new practices of Paris at the mid-century required another kind of character…constructing modern representations of Paris required coming to terms with the new spaces and the new society signaled by those spaces. A whole new literature of articulation was a necessity" (Ferguson 114, 117). That literature was the new flânerie, articulated in the imaginative arts of the period, including poetry, naturalist literature, photography, and painting. Zola paraphrases: "Haussmann launched Paris into the whirlwind of great expenses. Cities imitated Paris, individuals imitated Paris" (quoted in Ferguson 118).

This new flâneur, who reached its greatest expression in the poetry and criticism of Charles Baudelaire, became a figure of intense emotion rather than remaining a detached observer. The flâneur of Second Empire Paris possessed a keen sense "…of

displacement and alienation…" heightened by Haussmannization. "Unlike those who preferred to luxuriate in the spectacular and consumerist excess of Paris," Baudelaire's flâneur first stepped off the "…route of boulevards, department stores, [and] public gardens… [Baudelaire's flâneur] was thus aware of the degree to which Haussmann's modernity was a myth, superimposed over repression and destruction (Jones 390).

Baudelaire's flâneur was a liminal figure that mediated the meanings of urbanism in the nineteenth century. As one who was able to articulate an adequate response to Haussmannization through poetry, literature, photography, and other imaginative arts, "the Haussmannian boulevard was not all-conquering." The "dispute over the meanings of the city had become a debate over the nature of modernity," and Baudelaire's flâneur was a key arbitrator in that discourse (Jones 391). He was simultaneously enthralled and appalled by the sea changes rapidly washing over the city during the 1850s and 1860s, and the new flâneur often described feeling like a stranger, exile, or traveler in his own city for that very reason. In Baudelaire's own words, the changes in Second Empire Paris "make me feel, in this country so dear to my heart, like a traveler. I am a stranger to what is coming, to what is, as I am to these new boulevards" (Rice 146).

*Baudelaire*

Baudelaire's flânerie is a radical critique of Haussmannization. His flâneur's rejection of the prefect's rationalism, reductivism, and simplification recalls what Whitehead has called the "Romantic Reaction" (Whitehead). Baudelaire's flâneur takes the typical tropes of the flâneur literature—such as the theme of chance and randomness ("*au hasard*") pleasantly surprising the flâneur—and, in the context of Haussmannization, imbues them with angst, alienation, and nostalgia.

> If, for Baudelaire, the random electrifies the mind, the experience is more commonly painful than pleasurable…The 'shock' of the contingent and the aleatory is, as Benjamin suggests, more appropriately thought of on the model of 'traumatic' event…Chance appears here rather as…a violence done to the mind rather than a release from routine into exhilarating perceptual freedom. The promised moment of epiphany becomes its

> opposite, the moment not of heightened awareness but of a fall into the meaninglessness of discontinuous, fragmented life (Prendergast 145).

Baudelaire's flâneur was published in newspapers and serialized magazines, and at the height of the Second Empire, he represents a rejection of many of the benedictions of modernity ostensibly achieved with the building of Paris. Though Baudelaire had given up politics on the barricades of 1848, his sensitivity to the possibility that randomly walking around the new city would expose him to an "encounter with the unbearable" constituted a political statement in and of itself (Prendergast 150).

*"The Swan" ("Le Cygne")* (see Appendix A)

The Swan is a poem about exiles, mobility, and memory. Haussmannian Paris can be read everywhere into the literal geography as well as the symbolic topography of the poem. Standing in the Tuileries in front of the Louvre (see Figure 4), Baudelaire's flâneur-narrator is confronted with the sudden shock of Haussmannian reconstruction that has created the Arc du Carrousel and is immediately launched on a wave of imagery and emotion in which he identifies with exiles. His narrator's mind flies first to Andromache, the wife of Hector who, after being forced to flee from Troy, is found in her grief and exile in Virgil's *Aeneid* to have recreated her lost city of Troy on the Italian peninsula. Baudelaire imagines her sorrow to have cried a river of tears which returns him to the Carrousel and his sense of his own lost city: "Old Paris is no more (the form of a city/Changes more quickly, alas, than a human heart)." Baudelaire's narrator then remembers where there was once a glass menagerie, and identifies with the image of a swan with clipped wings, which had escaped from its cage only to find that he, like Baudelaire in Paris, was in a "stream without water".

The flâneur-narrator continues: "Paris changes! But nothing in my sadness/Has moved! New Palaces, scaffoldings, blocks,/Old suburbs, everything has become allegory for me,/And my dear memories are heavier than rocks." He then returns to standing in front of the Louvre and thinks of a "great swan," Andromache, and of a "Negress," whom he imagines is physically ill as a result of her deep longing for her home in Africa. The narrator then comes to identify, at least in part, his emotion: he

thinks “Of whoever has lost what can never/Be found again,” immediately conveying for the reader his longing for pre-Haussmannization Paris.

*“The Eyes of the Poor”* (see Appendix B)

Baudelaire invented the prose poem as a new poetic form in response to what he felt to be his inability to adequately articulate in any other manner his experience with Paris undergoing Haussmannization. “The heterogeneity of the city demands a new mode of poetic representation. Baudelaire explicitly linked the ideal prose poem to the experience of the ‘enormous, heterogeneous’ city” (Prendergast 131).

“The Eyes of the Poor” begins at a window on one of the “new cafes” on the corner of “the new boulevard, still covered in rubble but already showing gloriously its unfinished splendors.” The window “is a key staging-post in the itinerary of the Baudelarian flâneur,” and here the audience is explicitly placed in Haussmann’s Paris. Two bourgeois lovers sit outside, bathed in the café’s “sparkling” lights and “dazzling” mirrors after a long day, the entire scene an illusion of bourgeois indulgence and “gluttony.” And yet not until the narrator perceives a poor father and his two children admiring the café does the narrator consider his surroundings. The flâneur-narrator returns his gaze from the poor family to his lover, expectation her to reciprocate his upwelling of emotional recognition, only to find that she is repulsed by the ogling of the poor, and wishes for “the maitre d’ to send them away from here”.

Baudelaire here employs his special brand of poetic “shock,” that brings not the promised epiphany but rather meaninglessness and disorientation. Haussmann’s boulevard becomes completely opaque. The audience sees Baudelaire’s most overt statement of his politics. As Prendergast elaborates, “what the eyes of the poor see, and what they say, is that the poor are excluded, that spectacle and the pleasures it promises are a matter of class” (39). The woman’s unwillingness to return Baudelaire’s narrator’s sympathy and his gaze

> undoes one of the great fictions of Second Empire Paris: that the culture of the boulevard has been fully democratized, and that the city of pleasure is available to all. In her heartless way, the woman sys it how it is, that the poor have no place where the lovers

> are…This is here, then, a politics of urban pleasure and pain, traced out in the fractured intimacy of a personal exchange…Baudelaire is the great artist of the intermeshing of the public and the private, those moments at which the most delicate kinds of personal feeling…are deeply affected and mediated by the social history of the city as a whole (Prendergast 40).

Baudelaire's flâneur represents a perspective that "directly implicates the figure of the poet himself and the very act of writing poetry about, or against, the city" (Prendergast 37). Baudelaire here offers us an description to Berman's question about the relationship of the new boulevards with its new inhabitants, and thus offers an alternative perspective from that of Haussmann. Baudelaire and Haussmann do not simply demarcate a nascent modernism, they limn the first contest over what modernism in the city means.

*Nadar*

In 1858, Nadar filed a patent for the first aerial photography of urban panoramas taken from a hot air balloon, and in 1861 he took the first electrically-lit photographs in the Parisian underground. In many ways, Nadar was searching for comprehensibility in the city. He never took a photograph of a Parisian boulevard, and instead opted for the high and low angles that might have emulated how Haussmann himself would have imaged the city. While he shares little of Baudelaire's sense of existential alienation, and even shares a political optimism and a faith in scientific progress that was amenable to that of the Second Empire, Nadar's perspectives suggest that despite better legibility, Paris is even more inscrutable than before.

In 1858, Nadar went up in his hot-air balloon to take the first birds-eye photographs. Figure 5 is one of his photographs of the Arc de Triomph with only four of its axial roads and a number of vacant parcels outnumbering extant structures. The horizon is compressed and the broad boulevards radiate out from the focus of the image, which is the Arc. This photograph documents Paris in transition, in stark contrast to the tortuous streets and dense, irregular buildings of the medieval city. Nadar is exploring how one might best understand the city. However, when he comes

down from his balloon, he concludes in his journal that what he saw "…is no longer Paris, my Paris that I knew, where I was born…I no longer know how to find myself in that which surrounds me (Rice 177-178).

Similarly, beginning in 1861 Nadar traveled to the Parisian underground at the invitiation of Belgrand in order to take the world's first underground photographs illuminated electrically. While "his primary purpose appears to be technical…whatever their deliberate or unintended ironies, Nadar's photographs must have been largely congenial to the official view (Prendergast 81). Nadar's images of the catacombs (see Figure 6) shows piles of bones that are clean, coherent, and efficient. Many of the bones came from those disinterred by Haussmann's construction, prompting Nadar to comment, "even death does not guarantee us protection against expropriation by Haussmann" (Rice 165). And as with the images from the hot air balloon, "the extension of photography into the underground city…reinforced the ambiguous role of modern technologies in providing the illusion of complete control and comprehension of complex urban societies (Gandy 26).

There is very little in Nadar's sewers to disturb an audience. When first shown, [Nadar's] images shocked and fascinated the French public. Contrary to the popular conceptions of the underground as the mysterious place of a Victor Hugo story, "there is very little here to disturb an audience;…Nadar's sewers come to us 'laundered,' in the imagery of organized dynamic space geared to ceaseless and energetic circulation" (Prendergast 82) (see Figure 7). Nadar's photographs fostered the popularity of sewers and catacombs with the urban middle classes, and the city offered tours of the underground beginning in the 1867 Universal Exposition. However, "most visitors to the Paris sewers…have probably been disappointed to find 'not the dark and dangerous caverns through which Jean Valjean made his perilous escape in 1832 but the spacious, clean, and well-lighted galleries of the Second Empire'" (Gandy 26). Despite the orderly surfaces, even tourists had great difficulty in finding a narrative more worth telling than *Les Miserables*.

*Impressionists*

Unlike Baudelaire and Nadar, whose flâneur perspectives continued to frustrate simplistic stories about legibility, rationalized space, and modernity, by the mid-1870s the Impressionists' portrayal of flânerie was fully amenable to Haussmannization. In that, the Impressionists' flânerie is symptomatic of their accommodation with Haussmann's changes. Whereas flânerie was a means to resist Haussmannization for Baudelaire and Nadar, the Impressionists had, by and large, no such reservations.

> The Impressionists' taste for the festive here and now had an element of political escapism about it…[a]s time went on, many flâneurs became more sanguine and reflective and subordinated their sensations to a more astringent and critical intelligence. They fully accepted that a new, spectacular [in the sense of the word 'spectacle'] seemed to be emerging (Jones 389).

By the dawn of the Third Republic, the flâneur had again become the idle, bourgeois gentleman. The rise of the department store, too, had diminished the storefronts in Paris—Bon Marche opened its new store in 1876—further diminishing the role of the flâneur in mediating the meaning of Paris' urbanism.

*Boulevard des Capucines* (1873) by Monet and *Bathers at Asnieres* (1884) by Seurat each are emblematic of the banalized flâneur. Monet's painting, likely framed from Nadar's studio on the Boulevard des Capucines, epitomizes the Impressionist "blur" that here highlights the manner in which the masses on the streets have been reconciled with the building, boulevard, and park of Haussmannization (see Figure 9). There is no sense of anxiety, just the teeming, orderly-yet-formless crowds. Similarly, Seurat's flâneur mediates to a place utterly reconcilable with Haussmann's changes from fifteen years previous. Seurat

> …successfully captures a new kind of mediation between society and nature in post-Haussmann Paris: we are presented with a regularized, stylized, and commodified imagery based around leisure, spectacle, and the semblance of salubrity…In Seurat's *Bathers*, we find a unique representation of urban nature in transition, where the established pleasures of bathing in the outskirts of Paris were simultaneously being dispelled by both declining water quality and the development of new transport links which provided greater accessibility to more salubrious places further afield from the metropolis…" (Gandy 33).

The Impressionists retain much of the imagery but none of the angst or alienation of the flânerie of Second Empire Paris.

*Marville*

Lastly, this narrative arrives again with Marville, this time in 1877, standing in the middle of the Rue de Rivoli two decades after he photographed the medieval streets of Paris as Haussmann's official street photographer (see Figure 10). Seven years after the fall of the Second Empire and the ending of Haussmann's reign as the prefect of the Seine, Marville is still looking at the crowd with a sense of alienation. Few perhaps knew more of the former city that was lost than Marville. Here he deliberately chose a photographic process that, by virtue of its long exposure time, has the crowd erase themselves through their movement. He stands in a crowd, yet finds a way to be a flâneur still.

**V. The Sociology of the Parisian Street**

As an expression of modernity and urbanism, Baudelaire's flânerie has far-reaching connections in sociological accounts of the city since the mid-nineteenth century. The flâneur of the Second Empire is engaged in a conversation with Haussmannization—the former constitutes a radical critique of authoritarian planning while paradoxically retaining the latter's possibilities for creating spaces of social hope. Simply put, Baudelaire's poetry and other writings insist on the possibility of the new boulevard as a place of interaction and heterogeneity that is not subject to a single, hegemonic narrative—Haussmann's or otherwise. While flânerie has a particular association to time and space (what Mikhail Bakhtin calls a "chronotope"), it also articulates the larger possibilities for streets as places of public solidarity beyond the boulevards of Second Empire Paris. Baudelaire's flânerie orders value in a modern, urban landscape: his flâneur prefigures leftist theories of urbanism for the next century-and-a-half by interpreting the changes in the physical and social spaces of the city; explicating the relationship between the individual and community; and ultimately exploring the street as a space for social hope.

Baudelaire's concern with the changing role of the street in the modern city is not his alone. Benjamin first found in Naples the interaction of public and private spaces that he came to find so enthralling in Baudelaire's Paris. He writes that in Naples, "the stamp of the definitive is avoided," by which he means that there is no meaning of the city that is not open to redescription (Merrifield 58). There, the material and the social freely interpenetrate one and other, as described by Merrifield:

> the two spill over into each other in courtyards, back alleys, squares, and stairways. Everything here became a "theater" of the contingent,[3] a "popular stage," and nowhere is it "thus and not otherwise." …Public and private lives get commingled: every private attitude or act "is permeated by streams of communal life."…Porosity of the private and public realms is a wonderful subversion of Benjamin's own bourgeois upbringing, with its obsession with the interior private sphere, dignified and quiet, enclosed and proper (58-59).

Benjamin comes to see Paris and urbanism largely through the eyes of Baudelaire, and he arrives at the same reconciliation that he saw in Naples and that the poet saw in Second Empire Paris. He deplores the *embourgeoisement* of the city while acknowledging "…its ambiguity, its sensual pleasure, …'the inestimable value of novelty'" (Merrifield 65). As with Haussmann and Baudelaire alike, Benjamin finds the modern city to be simultaneously both legible and inscrutable, inducing ennui in some instances while in others holding its observers in thrall (see Appendix A and B). "Whereas Engels saw little [in Haussmannization] apart from capitalist modernization, Benjamin was stirred by the whole experience of capitalist modernity" (Merrifield 65). The new boulevard's capacity to intermix and accommodate private self-creation with public ends is what imparts its stature in the modern city as a space for solidarity.

Berman brings this reconciliation to a contemporary, post-Moses urbanism by locating Baudelaire in the Bronx. When he asks the question (repeated from above) "what did the boulevards do to the people who came to fill them?" he looks back to Second Empire flânerie in order to articulate a parallel response to Moses' changes to New York City. Moses, like Haussmann, "…conceived of cities principally as

---

[3] Anticipating Mumford's characterization of the city street-as-theater.

obstructions to the flow of traffic" (Merrifield 164). Berman too rejects high modern, authoritarian planning by finding an alternative in the street, a method employed fruitfully by Jane Jacobs.

Lefebvre arrives at a similar assessment of the street by contrasting the medieval streets of Navarrenx with the modernist, new town boulevards of Mourenx. Lefebvre upholds both of these as the polar ends of a spectrum between which he wanted to mediate. Mourenx is the "totally legible" street, that, paraphrased by Merrifield, "expresses an ordered, enclosed, and *finished* world" that Lefebvre purposely juxtaposes to the world that he takes Navarrenx to represent (81). The medieval city has an "organic intimacy" that parallels what Benjamin loved about Naples. Navarrenx's streets are "places 'to stroll, to chinwag, to be alive in…the street is something integrated'" (Merrifield 82). Navarrenx for Lefebvre is what le Vieux Paris came to be in reaction to Haussmannization, held in juxtaposition to the modernizing city not as a wholly adequate alternative, but as an alternative set of values for urbanism. Like Baudelaire's flânerie, Benjamin, Lefebvre, and Berman seek to navigate between these two urbanisms by creating a novel urbanism that privileges the street. Baudelaire made his modern urbanism in the streets—he reconciled the organic with the modern—by reproducing what was once created spontaneously: he "botaniz[ed] on the street."

Fundamental shifts in the relationship between individuals and their communities attended the changing physical and social geographies of the modern city. Anticipating Castells' later writings, Second Empire flânerie represents a different relationship between the individual and his community, one that sets aside the sociological categories of *gesellschaft* and *gemeinschaft* in favor of more fluid connections between individual and community. Baudelaire's individual flâneur shares much with the writings of the Russian literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin, Lefebvre, and Berman. For these thinkers the individual is in constant redefinition with the community. Bakhtin, drawing on Rabelais (like Baudelaire and Lefebvre) and Dostoevsky, theorizes about the "unfinalizability" of the self. Simmel's concern with sociotechnical oppressiveness is sidestepped: Bakhtin's individuals and communities mutually redefine one and other. As in Baudelaire, individual identity is always susceptible to redefinition amidst the street

crowd (see the poem "A Une Passante"/"To a Passerby" for the best example of susceptible identity in Baudelaire's flânerie). Bakhtin's concept of *carnival* encapsulates the way in which many distinct voices ("polyphony") influence one and other. And like Bakhtin, Lefebvre's celebration of the festival, his desire for "non-finality" and for the "unfinished" city, is an implicit recognition of the changing boundaries between the public and the private. Lefebvre's "right to the city" is a hope—shared by Berman—for commonplace solidarity in everyday spaces. The street is integral to novel conceptualizations of the relationship between the individual and community.

In modern urbanism, the street is thus the space in which social hope is localized. Baudelaire, Benjamin, Lefebvre, and Berman see in street life an antidote to individualism and reductionism, and the place in which to mediate between individual and community. Walter Benjamin took Baudelaire's flâneur to be the ideal mediator of value, meaning, and possibility in modern urbanism. Berman, too, looks to the streets:

> A society of split men and women…badly needs a terrain on which people can come together to heal the inner wounds—or at least to treat them…Implicit in our basic democratic rights, then, is the right to public space (quoted in Merrifield 169).[4]

The street ensures us the shock of recognition that so fascinated Baudelaire. As with Baudelaire's poem "The Eyes of the Poor" (Appendix B), Berman insists that the recognition that the poor [or the many 'others' of Lefebvre and Bakhtin] are "part of the same city and the same society as ourselves, linked with us in a thousand ways" (quoted in Merrifield 169). Baudelaire wrote, "there is an epic quality to modern life…we only have to open our eyes to see and know the heroism of our day" (Merrifield 167). Berman, too, wants to locate his "modernist vocabulary of opposition" in the street (Merrifield 165). And finally, quoting Merrifield:

> Benjamin's city is a city of hope…In his streets, exteriors become interiors, private individuals become public citizens…In this way, Benjamin sings a paean to an expansive and inclusive urban public space (67).[5]

---

[4] Rorty, too, recognizes just such a difference between public and private vocabularies, and though he considers them irreconcilable, I believe that locating such public and private needs in the street will provide for navigating between

## VI. Coda

Part of my initial inspiration for writing this paper was the degree to which Haussmann's interventions seemed, at first glance, to be so much more beloved when his 20th century baroque counterpart Moses was so utterly vilified. And it seems to me now that the reason, at least in part, is that our world has been so thoroughly accommodated to Haussmann-like interventions that they seem hardly anything but beautiful. It is not the passage of time that has made Haussmann more or less loved or vilified than Moses, but the degree to which our world is common-sensically described in Haussmannized terms. I think it is safe to say, also, that Moses is not so fortunate precisely because his interventions—interstates and urban renewal come immediately to mind—are not nearly so well accommodated, or so uncontroversial. That reconciliation does not come with time, it comes through the mediation of cultural politics.

Part of what the imaginative arts—here Baudelaire, Nadar, and Marville, amongst others—do so well is to show us the meaning of Haussmann's urban design politics, and how those meanings are subject to redescription. Haussmannization draws to a close not with the end of Haussmann's prefecture, nor with the fall of the Second Empire or the crushing of the Commune, but with the rise of the street as a place of conspicuous consumption—the street of the Impressionists. Haussmann's interventions secured Paris for the bourgeoisie more soundly with the passing of Baudelaire's flâneur in favor of the Impressionists than they did when the Communards were put down at Belleville.

---

[5] If I can arrogate to such a claim, I believe New Orleans is another instance of what Berman finds in the Bronx, and Benjamin in Baudelaire's Paris: a city in which the streets are a space expansive and inclusive enough to mediate between public and private, between individuals and their community.

**APPENDIX A**
**"The Swan" ("Le Cygne") (published 1857)**

I.
Andromache, I think of you! This small river,
Poor sad mirror where once shone
The immense majesty of your widow's grief,
This deceptive Simois which grows with your tears,

Suddenly enriched my fertile memory,
As I crossed the newly built Carrousel.
Old Paris is no more (the form of a city
Changes more quickly, alas, than a human heart);

I see only in my mind that camp of booths,
The piles of rough-hewn capitals and shafts,
The grass, the heavy blocks turned green by the water of pools,
And, shining on the tiles, the crowded bric-a-brac.

There once a menagerie spread out;
There I saw, one morning, at the time when under a cold
Clear sky Labor awakens, when the road
Pushes a dark storm through the silent air,

A swan which had escaped from its cage,
And, with its webby feet rubbing the dry pavement,
Was dragging its white plumage over the level ground.
Near a stream without water the bird opening its beak

Nervously bathed its wings in the dust,
And said, its heart full of its beautiful native lake:
"Water, when will you rain down? When will you thunder, O lightning?"
I see that wretched bird, a strange and fatal myth,

Toward the sky at times, like the man of Ovid,
Toward the ironic and cruelly beautiful sky,
Stretching its avid head over its convulsed neck,
As if it were addressing reproaches to God!

II.
Paris changes! But nothing in my sadness
Has moved! New palaces, scaffoldings, blocks,
Old suburbs, everything has become allegory for me,
And my dear memories are heavier than rocks.

In front of the Louvre, an image vexes me:
I think of my great swan, with its mad gestures,
Like exiles, ridiculous and sublime,
And devoured by an unrelenting desire!  And then of you,

Andromache, fallen from the arms of a great husband,
A degraded animal, in the hands of proud Pyrrhus,
Near an empty tomb bent over in ecstasy;
Widow of Hector, alas, and wife of Helenus!

I think of the Negress, thin and phthisical,
Walking in mud, and looking, with haggard eyes,
For the absent palm tree of proud Africa
Behind the huge wall of fog;

Of whoever has lost what can never
Be found again!  Of those who collapse in tears
And suckle Grief as if she were a kind of wolf!
Of sickly orphans drying like flowers!

As if in a forest where my mind is exiled
An old memory sounds as in a blast from a horn!
I think of sailors forgotten on an island,
Of prisoners, of conquered men!
...And of many others!

**APPENDIX B**
**"The Eyes of the Poor" (1869)**

"Ah! you would like to know why I hate you today. It will no doubt be harder for you to understand than for me to explain it to you; as you are, I believe, the most perfect example of feminine impermeability that one could encounter.

We had just passed a long day together that appeared short to me. We had each sworn that all our thoughts would be common to the both of us, and that our two souls would nevermore do anything, but as one;—a dream that has nothing original in it, after all, except that, dreamt by all men, it has been realized by none.

That evening, a bit tired, you wanted to sit outside in front of the new café on the corner of the new boulevard, still covered in rubble but already showing gloriously its unfinished splendors. The café sparkled with light. The gas lamps themselves radiated all the warmth of a new day, and with all their strength brightened the blinding white walls, the dazzling faces of the mirrors, the gilded mouldings and cornices, the errand-boys with chubby cheeks trailing behind their leashed dogs, the ladies laughing at the falcons perched on their fists, the nymphs and goddesses carrying on their heads fruits, pâtés and game meats, the Hebes and Ganymedes presenting with outstretched arms a little amphora of Bavarian cream or a two-toned obelisk of a selection of ices; all history and all mythology put into service of gluttony.

Just in front of us, on the roadway, was planted a brave man of some forty years, with a weary face, a grizzled beard, holding the hand of a little boy and carrying in his other arm a small child too weak to walk. He was playing the nanny and taking his children out for some evening air. All in rags. These three faces were extraordinarily serious, and these six eyes fixedly contemplated the new café with equal admiration, though varying in expression according to age.

The eyes of the father were saying: "How beautiful it is! how beautiful it is! one might say that all the gold of our poor world is painted on these walls."—The eyes of the little boy: "How beautiful it is! how beautiful it is! but this is a house that only grants entry to people who are not like us."—As for the eyes of the smallest, they were too fascinated to express anything but a mindless and profound joy.

The balladiers say that pleasure lifts the spirit and softens the heart. The ballad was right that evening, concerning me. Not only was I touched by that family of eyes, but I felt a little ashamed of our glasses and our carafes, much larger than our thirst. I turned my gaze toward yours, dear love, to read my thoughts there; I was plunging into your eyes, so beautiful and so oddly gentle, into your green eyes, inhabited by Caprice and inspired by the Moon, when you said to me: "Those people there are insufferable with their eyes open like carriage gates! Could you not ask the maître d' to send them away from here?"

How difficult it is to understand each other, my dear angel, and how much thought is incommunicable, even between people who love each other!”

Works Cited

Benjamin, Walter. *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York, N.Y., U.S.A: Viking Penguin, 1988.

Clark, T. J. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers*. Rev. ed, Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Gandy, Matthew. "The Paris Sewers and the Rationalization of Urban Space." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, Vol. 24: 1, 1999, pp. 23-44.

English, Donald E. *Political Uses of Photography in the Third French Republic, 1871-1914*. Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI Research Press, 1984.

Ferguson, Priscilla Parkhurst. *Paris As Revolution: Writing the Nineteenth-century City*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1994.

Jones, Colin. *Paris: Biography of a City*. London: Allen Lane, 2004.

Jordan, David P. *Transforming Paris: The Life and Labors of Baron Haussmann*. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Marville, Charles. *Paris*. Paris: Hazan, 1994.

McCauley, Elizabeth Anne. *Industrial Madness: Commercial Photography in Paris, 1848-1871*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Pinkney, David H. *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Prendergast, Christopher. *Paris and the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1992.

Rice, Shelley. *Parisian Views*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1997.

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

*Visions of the Modern City: Essays in History, Art, and Literature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *Science and the Modern World. Lowell Lectures, 1925*. New York: New American Library, 1964.