THE GREAT RIVALRY: THE PLANNING LEGACIES OF LONDON

AND PARIS IN THE MODERN ERA

Aubrae N. Wilson

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2018

APPROVED:

Marie-Christine Koop, Major Professor
Douglas M. Klahr, Committee Member
Marijn S. Kaplan, Committee Member,
      Chair of the Department of World
      Languages, Literatures, and
      Cultures
David Holdeman, Dean of the College of
      Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Victor Prybutok, Dean of the Toulouse
      Graduate School

Wilson, Aubrae N. *The Great Rivalry: The Planning Legacies of London and Paris in the Modern Era*. Master of Arts (French), May 2018, 50 pp., references, 16 titles.

This thesis seeks to examine the respective histories of London and Paris, two of the most influential and iconic cities in the world, in order to better understand how each respectively developed and their impact upon modern urban planning. Comparisons are made between, not only the history, but also the noble classes and gentry, religions, and cultural values which influenced the development of each capital city. Additionally, this thesis also seeks to explore how the development of Paris can still greatly assist modern developers in the twenty-first century.

Copyright 2018

by

Aubrae N. Wilson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Marie-Christine Koop, for her constant support and encouragement, and my committee members Dr. Douglas M. Klahr and Dr. Marijn S. Kaplan for their guidance and support in this venture.

To my parents, Steven and Mary Wilson, who have always encouraged me to pursue my goals; to my grandmother, Freddie, who taught me that life was for living; and to Ishi, whose love gives me the strength to go further than I ever thought possible—this is for you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

They are arguably two of the most famous cities on Earth. Paris and London have been immortalized through various mediums of countless poems, songs, and odes. Indeed, these two European capitals have each had their fair share of admirers. Theirs is a long, mutual and – more often than not – antagonistic history of monarchs, wars and, most notably, rivalry.

When Rome fell in AD 476, it left in its wake an immense void in the fabric of the European continent. Admittedly, in the centuries that would follow, it would seem as if every European nation sought to inherit the title of New Rome. While this is a much-debated subject, two cities most assuredly come to mind when one thinks of Europe: English London and French Paris. As similar as they are different, these European titans have endured for nearly two millennia and bear all the scars that one would expect from such antiquity.

In this study, I attempt to answer the questions of how and why these cities came into being, their changes and development over time, and why Paris remains a model for urban planning and development throughout the world. It is my hope that this study will enlighten the reader to such a degree that one will be able to discern and understand the similarities and differences between Paris and London on cultural, historical, and developmental levels. I submit a theory that the planning and development of these capitals were directly derived from two differing, cultural concepts: Parisian order and discipline and London libertarianism.

In order to explain these concepts, it is necessary to discuss the respective histories of Paris and London, placing particular emphasis upon religion, the noble classes and gentry, and the intrinsic values derived from these subjects. It is also essential to repeat that the fall of Rome created a great sense of loss within the Continent itself. Therein, the ideal place to introduce these two cities is in Antiquity.

CHAPTER 2

A HISTORY OF RIVALRY

Paris, or Lutetia as it was known then, was little more than a small, beloved trading post on the outskirts of Roman Gaul. Conquered by Julius Caesar himself, the village of the Parisii—a small, local tribe of Gauls—was renamed Lutetia. The origins of the name are still hotly debated but many scholars believe it is derived from the Latin word *lutum*, meaning 'mud.' This would certainly be an apt explanation, as the topographical and geological predisposition of Lutetia was that of a regularly flooded marshland. While the local Parisii primarily dwelled upon the Île de la Cité, this island was approximately six meters below its present position.

Upon Roman conquest, the Roman style grid was imposed upon Lutetia. While some residential dwellings certainly existed along the Right Bank, the vast majority of the Roman town was built along the Left Bank. The Seine river, while a boon in many ways, was equally as much of a disadvantage. This was due to the frequent flooding that the region experienced. It was the Romans who engineered a solution to the flooding issue via the construction of a grand aqueduct that stretched from the Rungis area all the way to the southernmost part of the city. This enabled the construction of other Roman buildings, such as a basilica on the Île de la Cité, two theatres, a system of public baths and plumbing, and three burial grounds.

While Lutetia certainly served as a strategic trading post, linking the southern parts of the Empire to Roman-occupied Britain, it was never a city of

great significance to the Empire. Tactically, it played a role as a means of defense against Germanic invasions. However, it possessed neither prestige as a provincial capital (that honor went to Lyon), nor did it possess the economic power of its British cousin across the Channel—Londinium.

Londinium was first founded by the Romans in AD 50. It quickly rose to prominence as a lucrative, commercial trading port. It also held the prestigious rank of capital city for the British provinces. Londinium possessed a formidable military base, ample ramparts, a basilica, a forum, and multiple baths. Its timber-framed buildings were destroyed, first in AD 60 by Boudicca, then in AD 120 by a great fire. The city quickly regained its place, however, as an essential, integral part of the Roman Empire.

As the Empire slowly began its decline, Londinium found itself becoming increasingly more self-sufficient. After a slew of attacks by both the Picts in the north and the Saxons in the east, Rome effectively abandoned Britain in AD 410. The self-sufficiency which Londinium had cultivated aided it much during this period, to such a degree that life continued in a rather undisturbed manner for its citizens.

So thus, the Romans made the foundations for what would eventually become a great and epic rivalry. Both Paris and London grew from the segmented remains of Rome, the greatest of which was the Roman Catholic Church. This body would unite Europe up until the Protestant Reformation (1517-1648). While Lutetia and Londinium may have had limited direct contact with one another, it was their shared Roman history that initially connected

them. It would not be until the eleventh century, however, that the rivalry would begin in earnest.

Some scholars believe that the origins of the Anglo-French rivalry lie in the eleventh century with the arrival of the Normans in England. (Tombs, 24) This group of former Viking raiders, led by William the Bastard (later the Conqueror), would take the crown of England by sheer force. The most decisive victory for the Normans was at the Battle of Hastings in October of 1066. It was here that the Norman-French claimant to the English throne, William, defeated Harold, the heir apparent of Edward the Confessor. William would later go on to be crowned as king of England on Christmas Eve of that same year.

Once installed, the Normans selected Westminster as the centermost position of their governmental administration. This choice was largely due in part to the defensibility of the site at the time. The present day Tower of London served as the central core, or donjon, of William's new castle. It was from here that the Normans would rule London as a whole and, by extension, England. It was the first time in English history that a king had complete and total power over the entirety of the land and its people, as can be witnessed in the Domesday Book. The rule of William also marked an abrupt shift from the previous Anglo-Saxon governmental traditions (wherein election and shifts of power was far more frequent), with a formidable, crushing blow to English culture and language.

The Norman Conquest also marked the beginning of a long and turbulent relationship with the European continent through wars of succession, strategic

marital alliances, as well as land and titular disputes. Intermarriage between prominent French houses and the royal court of England (who were by this time French descendants) certainly added to the turmoil. With the passing of time, the English monarchy ceased to view its French cousins as allies and more along the lines of enemies in what would essentially culminate in the Hundred Years' War—a family rivalry of epic proportions. France and England effectively grew into two distinct nations, with differing agendas and ideologies, regardless of their shared ancestries and histories.

The Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) had its origins in the perilous succession laws of England, which extended onto France via the English monarchs' claims to Aquitaine (which was equally considered by the French to be a fief of the French crown) and the matter of the English monarchs' desire to be independent from the kings of France. Neither Paris nor London experienced a dramatic increase in urban development during this era. Indeed, the Black Death temporarily halted development before creating a boom in industry and economy. The Plague also bolstered the emergence of new classes in England and France, permitting the creation of career specializations that had not been seen since the implementation of agriculture.

A few centuries would pass in the aftermath of the Hundred Years' War before the rivalry would rebound once more under the reign of Louis XIV (1638-1715). Louis was, for all intents and purposes, the king of the Continent. He created an expansive empire, the largest in Christendom at the time, thus his capital city needed to reflect this aim. Louis XIV, his father, Louis XIII (1601-

1643), and his grandfather, Henry IV (1589-1610), had all drastically altered the face of Paris. What was once a mediocre capital, consisting of cramped and crowded dirt streets, deplorable living conditions, and shoddy construction, had been transformed into a city of grand boulevards, pedestrian sidewalks, substantial stone buildings, and sweeping vistas. Henry IV began the Parisian enterprise of transforming Paris into New Rome. This was accomplished primarily through the construction of public monuments, something which Louis XIV mastered during his long reign as king.

London, however, retained much of its medieval roots. The city had been marked, not by impressive monuments and vistas, but rather by its laissez-faire style economy and, at times, repugnant filth. London possessed few buildings of cultural importance, save a few theatres. Indeed, the vast majority of its public buildings were pubs. Nearly all housing and minor administrative buildings were timber-framed.

This was a stark contrast to the grandiose, stone structures of Paris during the same period. Up to this point, England had been a somewhat minor power in Europe, occasionally engaging in the odd battle, but generally not a force to be reckoned with. France, however, had emerged as the military, cultural, and religious power whose strength of population and militaristic might gave it somewhat of a monopoly on the Continent. Catholicism reigned as the religious authority of the time, having efficiently suppressed and removed the majority of the Protestant threat from its midst.

The principality of Orange retained a Protestant majority and it was this fact which ultimately changed the position of England and, by extension, London. It also started the rivalry anew. William of Orange, partnered and allied with the Dutch, invaded England and deposed the Catholic king, holding the titles of both James II and VII Stuart during the Glorious Revolution in 1688. From that moment onwards, England became the officially governed Protestant opponent to Catholic France. What would follow was a series of succession wars throughout the Continent once more.

The Great Fire of London in 1666 had destroyed most of the city and it was at this time that the city had an opportunity to reinvent itself. While some of the prevailing architects and planners of the day aspired to create in London a better, English version of Paris or Rome, the projected result proved far too costly to the Crown. By the time of the Nine Years' War in 1688, England had commenced a type of francophobia. (Tombs, 110) This resulted in a complete rejection of, and retaliation against, all things French including city and urban planning models.

If the French were Catholic then the English were proudly Protestant. This in itself had its origins during the Reformation of the sixteenth century, when Protestantism became associated with patriotism. If the French built grand structures of stone in Paris, then the English countered with buildings of brick and timber in London. If something was to be built from stone, it would hardly have consisted of Caen stone, as was found at the Norman remnants of Westminster. English, and only English, stone would be used.

Paris had been a manufacturer of luxury goods since the times of Henry IV. London, rather than focus on quality, hand-made manufacturing, placed an emphasis upon quantity and profit. London, filled with its many bankers, soon began to operate solely upon credit. While Paris and its reigning monarchy were subject to growth based upon often unfair taxation of the working class, London grew in part thanks to often ludicrous lines of credit. Even the Crown itself was subject to the mercy of bankers within the City of London.

While London's inhabitants may have seen themselves as the antithesis to their Parisian counterparts, and the Parisians shared the same sentiment, similarities between the two capitals during this era still abounded. Perhaps, the most worthy of note being the development of the Left and Right banks in each city. Aside from both capitals having a major river running through them, essentially dividing the city in half, the development and growth of either bank were more like one another than some may have wished to admit.

The Right bank of both the Seine and the Thames were initially home to the elites. At its origins, this was where the bankers, merchants, and all kinds of 'new' money from the emerging middle class chose to build their lavish homes. Historically, the Parisian nobility maintained residences on the Right bank and this certainly did not change during this period. In time, however, these groups eventually migrated westward—transferring residence from Right to Left bank. Likewise, the Left bank developed as an academic and artistic hub, typically housing the working class and those on the outskirts of society. As each city grew and developed, the northeastern parts of the city soon

replaced the west as the home of the lower classes as the upper and middle classes migrated towards the undeveloped west.

One difference that certainly played a major role in the development of the capitals was that of the presence of nobility. While the Parisian nobles could often be found at court in Versailles, they were also frequently found in Paris, enjoying their *grandes maisons*. The landed English gentry, however, spent the vast majority of their time away from the hustle and bustle of London, choosing to remain instead at their country estates. This meant that the people responsible for the development of London were, more often than not, the bankers and merchants who sought to make a profit rather than leaving a lasting, cultural imprint upon the city.

In effect, this emphasis upon profit over aesthetic lent itself to shoddy construction and poor quality of life for the average Londoner. John Stow, a notable historian of London, "saw London as steadily being wrecked by overpopulation, overbuilding, and the greed of developers, City men, and speculators." (Wilson, 41) Indeed, he was quoted at the end of his life as saying, "[swindlers] more regarded their own private gain than the good of the city." (Wilson, 41)

The rivalry continued in a somewhat consistent ebb and flow pattern for another century or so before resuming vigorously once more in the nineteenth century. The nineteenth century was, after all, the peak of the Industrial Revolution and the stakes for world renown and industrial domination had never been higher. Francophobia took over London once more during this

period, as did Anglophobia in Paris. Indeed, accounts from various Parisians

and Londoners concerning the Other were often disparaging. (Tombs, 427)

Théophile Gautier, a French diplomat in London was quoted as saying in

1856, "The English…can forge iron, harness steam, twist matter in every way,

invent frighteningly powerful machines…but real art will always escape

them…despite their stupendous material advances, they are only polished

barbarians." (Tombs, 395) He had also stated, four years earlier in 1852,

"London may become Rome, but it will certainly never be Athens: that destiny is

reserved for Paris. In the former we find gold, power, material progress to the

highest degree…the useful and the comfortable, yes; but the agreeable and the

beautiful, no." (Tombs, 442)

Charles Dickens, English literary legend, was likewise disgusted with

Paris. "Paris…is a wicked and detestable place, though wonderfully attractive."

(Tombs, 442)

Queen Victoria herself was extremely distrustful of the French in general.

"I fear the French are so fickle, corrupt, and ignorant, so conceited and foolish

that it is hopeless to think of their being sensibly governed…I fear they are

incurable as a nation though so charming as individuals." (Tombs, 457)

Part of the reason for this great distrust and dislike stemmed from two

differing industries that fought for dominance during this period. English

cotton was a hot commodity, while French silk was highly desirable. Cotton had

become an invaluable export for England (much like wool in previous eras) and

London, as a principal manufacturing hub, reaped the economic benefits. It was

during this century that the English made a name for themselves as mass producers of cheap goods.

The French, by contrast, had focused on the luxury market, specifically the manufacture and production of silk. It was Francis I who had first brought Italians to Paris, in order to teach the French the silk trade, something which had benefitted Paris ever since. This economic opposition lent itself to a developmental and industrial rivalry between the French and the English, especially concerning their capital cities.

The Prince Regent of England had commanded John Nash, English architect, to make London better than Paris during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—especially with regards to the production and placement of public monuments. When Napoleon III and Baron Haussmann began the reconstruction of Paris, the Emperor instructed Haussmann to use London as his model. This one-upmanship became quite commonplace throughout the century, a means of 'we'll do it again, only better.' As the French and English held different cultural values, 'better' was truly a vague notion. It is also important to note that both cities experienced sudden and staggering population growth during this period.

As a result, both Paris and London had differing approaches to the situation. London began by punctuating hygiene. Paris, instead, created *immeubles*—taller buildings which could house more individuals within a single space. London prioritized expansive growth and aggregation; Paris favored a more structured and disciplined approach. The former consisted of a

gallimaufry of architectural styles and elements; the latter remained congruous and invariant. London emphasized free markets and liberal administration; Paris maintained central authority and decidedly more rigid economics. Neither was philosophically or ideologically superior to the other, rather they expressed two differing approaches to governance and population growth. Given the general antipathy during the period, however, each respective group believed the Other's position to be particularly egregious.

The Great Exhibition of 1851 brought international renown to London and the British Empire by showcasing British industrial might and innovation. So thus, Napoleon III of France began, in the 1850s, the Parisian equivalent—the International Exhibition. This marked France's foray into regaining international attention after a particularly turbulent century following the Revolution of 1789. Colonialism on the part of the French and British empires continued to steadily increase and with it, so did the rivalry.

The British ambassador, Sir Edmund Monson stated in 1858, "France, in general, is off its head…a standing danger and menace to Europe." (Tombs, 515)

Théophile Delcasse echoed this statement concerning the French view of the English in 1900. "England is the most domineering and violent of countries." (Tombs, 515)

By the turn of the century, Anglo-French relations were once more deplorable. The vast majority of the rivalry during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries stemmed from ever-growing empires, industries, and their respective

methods of governance, development, population growth, and social issues. Paris was paradoxically described as fascist and modern while London was viewed through the dichotomous lens of being both traditional and liberal. (Tombs, 516) Once more, as the capital cities of two seemingly, diametrically opposed cultures, Paris and London grew and developed out of a cultural war of values. Each was seen as being the antithesis of the other, thereby reflecting the overarching natures of its peoples and histories.

Paris was the cultural and artistic center of the world—a beautiful city which offered all the great pleasures of life. By contrast, London was perceived as a symbol of English freedom, liberty and innovation. While Londoners often critiqued Paris for being stifling, filthy, and amoral, none could accuse it of being an ugly, aesthetically vile city. Likewise, Parisians frequently mocked London's lack of cultural and artistic venues but none could declare it a city under totalitarian rule.

What should be noted is that London, while more liberal in governance than Paris, also began to create a vast sprawl that would lend itself to many an inconvenience in the future. Furthermore, as profit was a primary focus for English developers, quality was frequently overlooked in favor of quantity and price. Many historically significant buildings were removed in order to make way for rushed building projects. To the present day, many buildings and places of significance from London's past are still being unearthed, thanks to continual redevelopment.

Paris, while certainly changed under Napoleon III and Baron Haussmann, retained a significantly greater amount of its historical and ancient buildings than any other European capital. Traffic flow in the city was considered more thoughtfully and with greater attention than ever before. Public spaces for discussion, debate, and leisurely activities were developed throughout its history. What Paris may have lacked in industrial economic power, it made up for in cultural and historical might. It is at this point that a more thorough evaluation of each city must be made in order to properly discuss the lasting impacts of these two capitals.

CHAPTER 3

LONDON: THE AGGREGATE VILLAGE

London at the dawn of the Middle Ages was a flourishing city, burgeoning with continual influxes of people and capital. As a port city imbued with an exceptional location—one in which access to both sea and Continent was readily available—London became a desirable base of operations for many innovative and industrious merchants who saw the British capital as an opportunity for profit.

This period also witnessed the expansion of the Norman government in Westminster and a steady augmentation of Church control. Each of these led to numerous new governmental and ecclesiastical developments within the City of London, though these did see a temporary halt with the arrival of the Black Plague in 1348. The Plague itself, while certainly a terrible catastrophe with regards to human life, brought with it a steady stream of migrants to the British capital and a more diversified labor force. The Black Death created, in essence, a new kind of social upheaval; one that enabled entirely distinct social classes and the near-elimination of the feudal system in England. This proved to be a boon to the London economy, as the shortage of labor increased working wages and ameliorated the standard of living for those within the City.

The sudden shift in the economy altered the face of London. Prior to the fifteenth century, London's streets followed the pre-existing network of roads from the Romans and Normans. For the most part, Londoners were satisfied with remaining within the remnants of their ancestral, Roman city walls.

Westminster essentially existed as its own entity within the City. It was here that the influence of the Catholic Church was most greatly felt. The settlement that quickly built up around the abbey was directly influenced, and sometimes supported, by the abbey itself. In addition to the abbey, increase in governmental development continued under the reign of Richard II. Richard is credited with having effectively rebuilt the Norman Westminster Hall. Within Westminster at this time, a profitable luxury goods and accommodation industry arose, furthering the independence of this governmental hub within the rest of the City. (Clout, 48)

The Church created a sort of welfare system, wherein healthcare and shelter were brought to British citizens in the form of hospitals. London was filled with religious institutions of various sorts throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, including over one hundred parish churches and a plethora of friaries, monasteries, and nunneries. London itself was the home to a large, influential cathedral—St. Paul's. This cathedral was originally constructed during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Saint Paul had widely been hailed as the patron saint of London until the thirteenth century. It was at this time that the patronage of Saint Thomas Becket, assassinated Archbishop of Canterbury, was added to London though he never received his own cathedral. The wealth and abundance of the parishes dispersed throughout London proper and its surrounding suburbs greatly aided in the economic power and influence of the capital. (Clout, 50-51)

The Catholic Church was not, however, immune to its fair share of detractors. In the fourteenth century, John Wycliffe came under scrutiny for his criticism of traditional Church dogma ultimately culminating in the creation of an early group of dissenters known as the Lollards. These Lollards were never fully eradicated from London and went on in later years to assist in the Reformation under Henry VIII. The vast majority of criticism that the Church received was from Londoners themselves, who believed that the Church had accrued excessive wealth at the expense of the people.

Overall, however, London prospered and owed much of its success in power and wealth to the influence of the Catholic Church. It was one of the most populated and economically strong European capitals of the Middle Ages. The bulk of its development was limited to governmental offices in Westminster and ecclesiastical buildings during this period. With the onset of the sixteenth century and an abrupt shift towards Protestantism, however, London found itself in an urban development boom—the likes of which had never been seen before in British history.

Upon Henry VIII's ascension in 1509, England as a whole and London in particular began a dramatic transformation into being a new kind of European power. In 1536, Henry ordered the official Dissolution of the Monasteries. While this dissolution may have been marketed to the common person as the removal of ineffective and archaic religious tradition in favor of the new "patriotic" Protestantism, in reality this change was an effort to solidify the king's authority as head of state and church as well as bring more money and land

into the Crown's coffers. This was accomplished through the acquirement and sale of monastic lands, holdings, and wealth. (Clout, 54-55)

This dissolution in turn launched a new means of acquiring wealth for the gentry and emerging merchant classes. The Catholic welfare systems, as well as the Church's power and influence as a political entity, simultaneously diminished. The novel Protestant religion brought with it a greater emphasis on the rights of the individual and early capitalism. Land speculation began in earnest during the 1540s as a means of quick and easy profit for the vast array of financiers, clothiers, and entrepreneurs of the era. This brought about London's rapid rise in economic might and spurred a population boom, as more wealth was often synonymous with better quality of life. It was during this time that London emerged as the leading economic power of Europe. (Clout, 57)

Along with these economic, religious, and political changes came a cultural and architectural revolution that would have lasting effects: the theatre. The theatre emerged as the sole entertainment and cultural venue of London—a place to be thoroughly enjoyed by all manner of citizens. Theatres of the time were frequently large, having the capacity to hold upwards of three thousand people per building. As these structures grew in popularity, so did the quality and influence of English literature and culture. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw an upsurge of writing and authorship like never before, with authors such as William Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe. (Clout, 58-59)

It is important to note that though the theatres offered entertainment to the masses, they also provided an irresistible means of profit for their investors

and developers. As with much of the developments from the period, emphasis upon money often led to shoddy construction that resulted in poorly finished structures that would need to be replaced in the following centuries. This rush towards profit and disregard for quality lent itself to the Great Fire of 1666. Fireplaces, a recent addition to the London home, were assembled so carelessly that they rapidly transformed from a means of warmth and protection to a dangerous source of risk—likely to catch fire spontaneously and without much warning. The sheer proximity in which houses were built meant that the fire could easily spread to the destruction of entire blocks within a short period. (Clout, 59)

As London grew and expanded, it began absorbing smaller suburbs and villages. These former offshoots of London, once small Church communities, found themselves sold from parish hands into those of City developers. Ultimately, London commenced its journey to becoming an aggregate village. The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries also saw a redefinition of what it was to be English. This was expressed through the aggrandizement of public buildings and using new materials. English architecture until this point had primarily consisted of a combination of timber and stone, though stone was, admittedly, more rare in its application than timber. Brick progressively became more and more the material of choice for new urban developments.

Seventeenth-century London built upon the cultural and religious evolution from the previous two centuries and saw the construction of numerous new public monuments, gardens, churches, and housing

developments. London's population swelled to over half a million by 1700. (Clout, 74) In general, the wealthier elite began to gravitate towards the westernmost parts of the City. Shortly after the fire of 1666, London experienced a widening of its streets and its first regulated building code, requiring street fronts to be uniform in 1667. (Clout, 69)

This followed in conjunction with a rise in francophobia. England, newly "freed" from the power of Rome, became a bastion for Protestants in Europe. France, by contrast, remained mostly and devotedly Catholic. Thus, London had need of monuments and religious structures to reflect this newfound identity and separation from the remaining Continental powers. Here, at this intersection of identities, emerged Sir Christopher Wren to help shape the future of English architecture towards a form based on Classicism—realizing English identity via the modus of architecture in the seventeenth century.

Wren sought to bring about the British equivalent of Rome and Paris in London. After the destruction of the first St. Paul's during the Great Fire, Wren was tasked with its rebuilding. It was in this cathedral that he gave London its own masterful dome, adding prestige and notoriety to the skyline. To this day, building codes within the city prohibit any construction from blocking the view of St. Paul's cathedral. (Clout, 57)

It was also during the seventeenth century that London's trichotomic arrangement became more readily recognizable; that is to say that its ancient core undulated out into the commercial and industrial institutions. The gentry and elite continued their westward movement, developing new suburbs along

the Strand River ever nearer Westminster. This new development would eventually come to be known as the West End. By contrast, the northernmost parts of the city transformed into the base for semi-skilled workers and artisans. (Clout, 67) The beginnings of London's future as a sprawling, mega metropolis also emerged during this era.

The East End transformed during the seventeenth century into a burgeoning, industrial sector due to lower rent and minimal legislative interference. The economic epicenter remained at the core of the City itself. Large, newly constructed squares and gardens began to spring up in various sectors of the capital, allowing for increased rates of fresh air and greater public spaces. Indeed, by the end of the seventeenth century London hardly resembled its ancestral origins. It had nearly doubled in size, no longer a cramped and crowded capital. (Clout, 67) Rather, after the Great Fire, London had commenced a metamorphosis into a red-bricked, broadened capital city. Building codes had officially been put into place, ensuring uniformity of design. Parks and open-air gardens contributed to this redesign.

At the start of the eighteenth century, hygiene and sanitation began to play a paramount role in the development of London. The outlying suburbs and villages, such as Islington and Twickenham, were quickly incorporated into London proper. Economic power continued to swell within the British capital, ensuring the continued growth and development of the city as a whole. Coffee houses emerged at this time, yet another addition to a growing public sector. These coffeehouses continued their westward expansion, serving as places of

meeting, gossip and political intrigue. While better police protection and streetlights had been added by the end of the seventeenth century, crime remained appallingly high in the capital. The crime rate seemed to increase in conjunction with the ever-expanding gap between rich and poor in the urban center. While new, beautiful houses and public spaces sprung up along the West End, the lower classes were forced to make due in squalid living conditions, many in decrepit and dilapidated tenements that needed to be either repaired or rebuilt. The Lighting Act, first introduced in 1738, certainly ameliorated the crime a fair amount but it did not halt all crime across the city. (Clout, 73)

At the beginning of the century many of the surrounding pasturelands and fields were still visible and discernible. By the end of the eighteenth century, however, London had continued its growth sprawl to such a degree that these were rendered nearly invisible, either by the sheer area of urban growth or by the increasing smoke pollution throughout the city. The eighteenth century also saw the steady emergence and development of purely residential districts. More and more of the middle class flocked to these areas, evacuating much of the East End and the City, in favor of the West End. (Clout, 72-73)

This departure increased the ever-growing social divide within the city. As a greater number of immigrants from around England and the rest of Europe swarmed to London, the city slowly but surely divided into east and west. The west, by this time, was filled with elite and middle class merchants, traders, etc.

Residential sectors had nearly overtaken the West End. The northeast, an industrial hub for well over a century, became the sector for the lower class and poor.

Schools and hospitals were also heavily developed during the eighteenth-century. It was King George IV who desired to make London a grand, monumental capital. City improvements and a slew of public works began in earnest under his reign. The government increased its spending in the effort to create building initiatives and stipends. John Nash, illustrious English architect, played a significant role in this. (Clout, 74)

As London continued its rapid expansion, it needed more effective transportation. Prior to the eighteenth century, local parishes were responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of city roads. During the new century, however, the government was forced to take this responsibility upon itself. Street widening only helped to a small degree, the eventual solution being that of the construction of new roads. These roads deviated from the ancient Roman and Norman grid system. Eventually, the development and construction of six new bridges was needed to fully accommodate the increased traffic flow. However much these improvements helped traffic flow during the eighteenth century, the city was entirely ill-equipped for what would come in the following century. (Clout, 80-81)

The nineteenth century brought with it an unprecedented increase in population. London, at the turn of the eighteenth century, had a little more than a million people within its environs. By the end of the nineteenth century, this

number had grown to nearly seven million. As the population grew, so did the need for better and more efficient means of transportation. The Underground officially arrived near the end of the century, during the 1890s. While this was certainly of benefit to the upper-middle class, the working poor were unable to afford public transportation fares. This meant that the majority of the lower classes were forced to live near their place of employment. (Clout, 84)

It was during the Victorian era that London also witnessed the development of the lower-middle class, a group consisting of the likes of clerks and bookkeepers. This new social milieu effectively altered the state of consumption within the City. Cheaply produced, manufactured goods replaced the artisanal workshops and luxury goods as demand for the mass-market increased. Essentially, factories began to force out smaller producers, thereby contributing to urban sprawl and the agglomeration of smaller villages and suburbs into London proper.

The East End remained a deplorable site for poverty throughout the nineteenth century. The disparity between the West End and that of its eastern counterpart was so great that the term "environmental segregation" seems most apt to describe the situation. The Cross Act of 1875 authorized the destruction of slums but banned the new construction of tenements and housing. Due to congestion issues, greater numbers of developers sought to expand the city outwards, creating new crops of villages and suburbs along the way. (Clout, 86) Flat dwelling had finally taken off in the nineteenth century, an architectural mode of living borrowed from their Parisian counterparts.

The Victorian age also saw an increased segregation in all manner of construction, from housing to the use of public transportation and public institutions (such as hospitals, theatres, and pubs.) Naturally, the most prestigious of these institutions were housed along the West End. Land zoning was formally introduced at this time, ensuring the sanctity of the residences for the uppermost echelons of society. London sprawled to ever-increasing distances and as it did, so did the classification of social statuses via the suburb of residence. (Clout, 88)

Under the reign of Queen Victoria, London transformed from a commercial trade port to the height of economic power—a city of industry and massively produced mercantilism. London had rapidly become the economic powerhouse of all Europe thanks to the implementation of industrial production. In this newfound status, the development of corporate, financial, and industrial headquarters found a place in the City like never before.

By the twentieth century, London changed once more: the once individualistic tendencies gave way to a more welfare-based system during the 1950s. The London County Council (LCC) formed after the First World War and had as its goal the provision of newer, safer housing for much of the lower income communities dispersed throughout northeastern London. Indeed, post-war London developed a severe housing crisis due to the augmentation of population during the nineteenth century. While certainly of noble intent, public housing development projects fell by the wayside rather quickly, coming to a near halt by 1920. (Clout, 112)

A greater proportion of Londoners increasingly ventured into the suburbs, with the hopes of obtaining improved places of residence. As these people evacuated the city ever outwards, so did the commercial and industrial developments. Thus, London continued to expand and overtake more and more of its surrounding villages and suburbs. Additionally, the twentieth century brought a shift in construction—from multi-level flats to single, semi-detached homes with individual gardens. (Clout, 112) This idea of the "Garden City", first suggested by Ebenezer Howard during the 1890s, became a popular one.

The City still suffered from the effects of Victorian class segregation, resulting in the upper- and middle-class exodus out of the City center towards newly designated residential suburbs, still west of the city. Due to this issue, governance sought to stifle the ever-increasing sprawl outwards by purchasing the surrounding lands and forbidding their development during the 1930s. Planning was thoroughly regulated and laid the framework for post-war construction during the 1940s. (Clout,115)

Upon the destruction of the City during World War II, the planners of London switched their emphasis from one of suburban development to that of a centralized city. The City changed from being a commercial trade port to one of international financial markets and tourism. The arts also saw a renaissance of sorts, starting in the 1960s, something which brought about the construction of renovation of many theatres and concert halls. Privatization of building increased once again, seeing the intensification of more numerous but inferior construction. Additionally, the twentieth century witnessed a return to more

traditional architectural styles in the 1980s, as architectural legacy received greater public attention as a whole. (Clout, 125)

Transportation congestion was, and continues to be, an issue to this day. City and urban planning often took the backseat to the needs and desires of individuals and private developers. Thus, much of London's growth was poorly accompanied by governmental planning. The emphasis on private capital over public welfare has remained a trend in London since the Reformation era. Arguably, the dissolution of abbeys and parish authorities brought with it a kind of egocentrism the city had not known before, due to a change in culture and identity. Furthermore, this seems to be a contributing factor in the suburbanization of London, a desire to escape the "have-nots" of society in favor of one's own benefit.

CHAPTER 4

PARIS: THE ENLIGHTENED CITY

Contrary to its British equivalent across the Channel, Paris saw a greater variation of urban development during the Middle Ages. While ecclesiastical buildings were certainly constructed, a great deal of which commenced under Philip II, also known as Philip Augustus, they were not the sole category of urban structures created. As heir to the Capetian throne, Philip sought to make Paris a fitting capital city for his kingdom in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This began with an impressive rampart which encircled the entire city and was quickly followed by the constructions of the Louvre and Les Halles. In addition to these, Philip also ordered the streets of the city to be paved, as he was rumored to have been disgusted with the scent of dung that so often permeated Parisian air (Horne, 31). Philip himself supervised the new constructions in Paris and it was under his reign that the Notre Dame cathedral was successfully built.

Indeed, it was under this king that both the University of Paris and French trade flourished, as his defensive ramparts enabled the French capital to grow and develop without threat of invasion—a first in the city's history. Paris grew to become a commercial trade center on the Continent, due to its possession of formidable defenses and Les Halles. Additionally, university students and faculty received virtual immunity from royal authority as Philip had declared concerning the matter, "Neither to arrest clerics accused of crimes nor to seize the chattels without serious cause. If arrest was deemed necessary, the cleric

was to be delivered immediately to an ecclesiastical court, which would attempt to satisfy the king and the injured party." (Horne, 35)

Thus, scholars were free to influence the city as they desired, with many from their ranks becoming judicial officers within Paris itself thanks to Philip's formation and implementation of bailiffs. It was not just scholars who profited from this piece of legislation, members of the gentry class were also beneficiaries of this new system. These individuals from the bourgeoisie were responsible for the dispensation of justice and authority, thereby requiring permanent residence in the capital. This residency meant, therefore, that all development of Paris was tightly regulated through those in power, i.e. the nobility. (Horne, 35)

Having the bourgeoisie in power, however, was not always of benefit to the citizens of Paris. One example of this was the legislation and enforcement of places of what Alistair Horne calls "social hygiene"—the designation of areas for sin, vice, and generally distasteful practices. These areas were not located within the vicinities of the nobility but were instead placed along the peripheries or lowest income communities. In modern terms, this act would be considered one of urban segregation which, "sorts population groups into various neighborhood contexts and shapes the living environment at the neighborhood level." (Kawachi, 265) This kind of segregation often results in environmental injustice, wherein a marginalized community is subject to disproportionate amounts of pollutants and a lack of access to ecological benefits.

Still, Philip's contributions to Paris rendered it a burgeoning capital within Europe—a city which had undertaken the task of formulating culture and economic success. His ramparts around the city ensured a degree of peace in the following centuries, even in spite of the Hundred Years' War, and paved the way for the next great developer of the French capital: Henry IV.

Henry IV, first Bourbon king of France, was a man determined to strengthen his reign through policy, administration, and a remodeling of Paris. In 1598, Henry passed the Edict of Nantes, an act which brought peace to the nation from warring religious factions—those of Protestantism and Catholicism. Indeed, the king himself was raised Protestant and later converted to Catholicism, something which spurred Henry's quest for strengthening the validity of his reign.

The way in which Henry IV shaped Paris is manifold. His funding of royal architects and developers, personal purchase of lands, and centralization of government would leave a legacy for his successors to follow—the most notable of which being Louis XIII and Louis XIV. Indeed, Joan DeJean states concerning Henry IV, "The list of accomplishments that both the king and his contemporary admirers proudly enumerated as the architectural highlights of his reign always began with the urban works referred to as the 'two wonders of France': the Pont Neuf, a bridge that would revolutionize the way European cities related to their rivers, and the Place Royale, today's Place des Vosges, a square that would transform urban public space." (DeJean, 7)

Additionally, the king had a revolutionary mindset concerning his capital city, one that was quite forward-thinking for the time. Under his reign, Paris began a radical undertaking towards becoming a city of sweeping vistas and public spaces, the likes of which would not be seen again until Baron Haussmann during the nineteenth century. The Pont Neuf is a defining characteristic of the king's vision, as it was intended as a major public work. The very idea that a bridge could be a public gathering place, and not a cathedral or the courts of a palace, was incredibly avant-garde for the sixteenth century, especially in France. (DeJean, 21)

Not only was the bridge a new construction that would enable passage from one bank to the other in a unique span, it was made of stone. Most bridges prior to the Pont Neuf throughout Europe had been narrow and timber-framed, London Bridge included. What makes the Pont Neuf so singular amongst the bridges of Europe, in addition to its stone construction, is its width—an entire seventy-five feet across. This width was unheard of during the sixteenth century, not to mention the fact that Henry IV outlawed the construction of tenements lining the bridge's span. The space where these houses traditionally would have existed was replaced with the first pedestrian sidewalks seen since the Romans. The end result was an unusually broad bridge which possessed unobstructed views of the river and city at large, offering Parisians from every walk of life the ability to enjoy an urban space per gratis. For France, a country that was heavily socially stratified, this mingling of classes bordered on subversion. (DeJean, 43)

The bridge brought with it the union of both Right and Left Banks, a notable feat as the Right Bank continued its development into a cultural and residential hub, and served as the ideal location to gossip or display one's wealth. The Pont Neuf's great width also enabled personal carriages to cross from one side of the city to the other with relative ease, an impressive display of the king's foresight into vehicular transportation and infrastructure. Admittedly as the bridge grew in popularity, attracting locals and tourists alike, it still suffered from traffic jams due to its uptake in visitors. The Pont Neuf was not merely a bridge but an information, technological and cultural highway where a vast array of activities, performances, and notices took place. (DeJean, 38)

The public works that Henry IV began also included broader streets, such as the rue Dauphine, as means of properly integrating and organizing bridge traffic. These broader streets would certainly be of great benefit later, especially during Haussmann's renewal of the city during the 1800s. As the Pont Neuf was inclusive, so also was the Place des Vosges.

The Place Royale, now known as the Place des Vosges, was the French capital's first planned public space and the first modern city square in Europe. (De Jean, 46) Francis I had first brought Italian artisans to France, including those in the silk trade, to teach French citizens the art of fabrication. Henry IV believed that the silk trade would prove vital to the French economy and thus assembled a conglomerate of leaders to make France the leading producer of high quality silk in the world. (DeJean, 46) The Place Royale, entirely funded by

the private investment of wealthy city officials and tradesmen, would be the site to realize this goal. While the Place Royale served as a workshop for silk manufacture, it also served the public, by royal decree, in a threefold manner. The first of which was that it was to act as an adornment for Paris. Secondly, the Place Royale would be the designated public space in the urban fabric for public ceremonies. Its third purpose, and potentially the most radical of the three, was to give Parisians a recreational space. (DeJean, 53)

It is interesting to note that Henry IV created two public, secular urban places which were available to all Parisians—regardless of class or social standing. As France was considered to be the international defender of the Catholic Church, the fact that its ruler had constructed secular sites for the citizens' enjoyment is somewhat astonishing. After all, the Church had always encouraged charity as a prized virtue—most rulers had constructed various hospitals and cathedrals as a means of following this religious command. Prestige for towns, for many a century, was gained through the display of ever-towering cathedrals. Indeed, throughout the Middle Ages cathedrals, monasteries, and other ecclesiastical buildings were often the only sites open to the general public. The alterations to the Parisian cityscape during the reign of Henry IV forged the way for Louis XIV in the years to follow and changed the very definition of 'public space.'

Louis XIV, France's most famous ruler and virtual king of the Continent, lavished much of his affection and purse upon Versailles. Though the Sun King certainly preferred his residence at Versailles, he nonetheless created in Paris

an urban marvel that would dominate the cities of today: the boulevard. Louis was less concerned with public meeting places than his grandfather, though his vision for the French capital was equally, if not greater than, Henry IV's.

With his great love for conquest and formidable military power, Louis XIV had no need for the medieval ramparts that had so long protected Paris from invaders. Thus, he commissioned two men, Francis Blondel and Pierre Bullet, to formulate a new urban plan for his capital—a means to display his power and influence to the rest of the world. Paris, he decided, was to be richly adorned and serve as jewel in his crown. (DeJean, 99)

While not all of Louis's designs manifested, the greatest and most significant of them assuredly did. The open-city concept, that is to say a city free from ramparts, had never before been explored in urban history. (DeJean, 97) With the majority of European civilizations having a rather strong penchant for attacking and invading one another, a city without walls was foolish indeed. Still, Louis's vision was steadfast. Starting in 1670, the former fortification and ramparts surrounding Paris were demolished in order to make way for green walkways of elms—all to aid in community leisure. Through the demolition of these walls, the city opened itself to the surrounding green vistas. (DeJean, 100)

Blondel's task extended, not only to the transformation of fortifications into broad walkways but to the reconstruction of Paris as a whole. Thus main thoroughfares throughout the capital were lengthened and broadened, accomplished in order to make Paris a 'walking city'. This change in streets contributed to a greater ease and flow of traffic within the city. Not only was the

reconstruction of Paris to be utilitarian, it was to be aesthetically pleasing as well—something which brought about the preservation of one of the historic Saint-Antoine gates, essentially creating a hybrid of traditional and contemporary urban development. (DeJean, 101)

Paving during the seventeenth century also became regulated and fully implemented throughout the capital. The paving stones used throughout the process added to the city's grandeur. Paris was, after all, not a city of timber but of stone. The sidewalk, once novel two centuries prior, became an integral aspect of the walking city. Of prime importance to his goal was the availability of consistent panorama for the average pedestrian within the city. Unobstructed views adjacent to the sidewalks were crucial to making Paris walkable.

Blondel's apprentice, Pierre Bullet, worked alongside Blondel in order to create what is now known as the Bullet-Blondel map. This map, a layout for all of Paris created by the two chief architects of the king's vision, would shape the city's future. In their own words, Paris would become, through the map: "A Map of Paris, That Shows All the Public Works Already Completed to Beautify the City and to Make It More Convenient—As Well As Those His Majesty Wishes to See Carried Out in the Future." (DeJean, 103)

Indeed, three months after Louis's death in 1715, the successors to his reign looked to the Bullet-Blondel map for guidance concerning the city's future development. Rather than merely widening the streets, as Henry IV and his team of experts had done, Bullet and Blondel created boulevards and avenues within the French capital. The distinction between the two was evident:

boulevard came from 'bulwark', eventually replacing the stretches of the former ramparts around Paris; the avenues were tree-lined walkways that enabled swift passage throughout the city. The grandest of these avenues is the present-day Champs-Elysées, originally constructed to coincide with the expansion of the Tuileries gardens in 1709. (DeJean, 109)

The boulevards and avenues were unique to Paris, even more unique to Parisian urbanism, as they provided both routes of travel and public displays in one setting. Benches were commissioned, first for the Tuileries and later for some of the avenues, so that visitors could rest and enjoy the scenic vistas that Paris had to offer. Indeed, Balzac himself stated, "The boulevard," caused other European cities to appear, "like a middle-class woman in her Sunday best." He also concluded that, "Every capital has a poem in which it expresses itself, sums itself up, and is most fully itself. No other city has anything comparable to the Boulevards of Paris." (DeJean, 121)

The boulevards were not the only first that Paris accomplished; in addition to its utilization of sidewalks, the French capital also pioneered the postal system, public street lighting, and public transportation. While the latter of which was a fleeting experiment in public carriage services and would not be considered again until the Métro, the others quickly found footing at home and abroad. (DeJean, 123-127)

During the eighteenth century, Paris spread westwards, with a large portion of the aristocracy fleeing the then unpopular Marais in favor of the Saint-Germain district. Their contributions to this district include a vast array of

hotels, of which many are still in existence. Louis XV continued his great-grandfather's habit of living at Versailles but did leave his own imprint upon the capital through the construction of various monuments, such as an equestrian statue of himself placed within a freshly constructed square—the Place Louis XV (which is now the Place de la Concorde.) He also began construction on a new church which would later come to be known as the Panthéon.

Louis XVI progressed the Sun King's plans for Paris, following the map created by Bullet and Blondel. A new bridge, the Pont Royal, was constructed in the Faubourg Saint-Germain to join the two banks once more, though this bridge never reached the same height of fame as the Pont Neuf; this bridge did, however, help to ameliorate traffic congestion to a further degree. Another contribution by Louis XVI was that of the Théâtre Français, which eventually came to be known as the Théâtre Odéon in the wake of the Revolution. Cafés and salons continued their growth in popularity, greatly advancing the intellectual and philosophical pursuits of the epoch.

With the French Revolution in 1789, however, Parisian development came to a standstill. The Bastille was destroyed, historical monuments defaced or torn down entirely, and churches and cathedrals were pillaged and stripped of adornments. Indeed, Paris would not see further development until the reign of Napoleon I. It was he who was responsible for creating a series of hygienic measures within the city, finally allowing water to pass into the city from the long-blocked Canal de l'Ourcq. This enabled the construction of more public fountains, thereby ensuring public access to water. The Rue de la Paix was

developed under his reign, something which ensured France's status as a luxury goods manufacturer. Like his predecessors of the Ancien Régime, Napoleon constructed a slew of public monuments bearing his effigy. The most famous of these monuments is that of the Arc de Triomphe, completed in 1806. Still, for all his pomp, Napoleon did not truly restructure or develop in any significant fashion. (Chadych, 68) That responsibility would fall to Napoleon III and his trusted administrator, Georges-Eugène Haussmann.

The Emperor was determined to regain France's position of pre-eminence that had been lost during the Revolution. England had, London more specifically, overtaken France as the leading European power. Paris, once the cultural and economic epicenter of the Continent, had been economically toppled by the British capital across the Channel. For Napoleon III's objective to succeed, he would need to remodel Paris to an extent unseen since Henry IV and Louis XIV.

Baron Haussmann was responsible for this great undertaking. Efficient and ruthless in this assignment, he carried out the French Emperor's command to the nth degree. Haussmann's model was London, inspired by the Bullet-Blondel map from the seventeenth century. Paris was restructured through the demolition of slum districts and their gentrification, annexation of suburbs, redesigned sanitation networks, addition of new public squares on the Île de la Cité, addition of roundabouts and expansive boulevards which linked to monuments for efficient transportation, and the formation of green spaces and avenues. Each new street was directly linked to a monument (such as the Arc de

Triomphe or Notre Dame), thereby forming a series of straight axes and rendering traffic much-improved. The greatest of these monuments was the newly designed and constructed the Opera—which today bears the namesake of its architect, Charles Garnier. Because of his emphasis on the city-center, the *banlieues* were unfortunately neglected. This in itself caused a housing crisis during the baby boom after World War II.

Shops became tantamount to Parisian life, as equally abundant as cafés and restaurants. Museums grew in popularity in nineteenth-century Paris and remain an important cultural aspect of the city to this day. Even after the defeat of Napoleon III in 1870 at Sedan, Paris continued to draw the attentions and affections of designers, merchants, artists, and authors. Cultural productions such as ballets, operas, and novels added to the city's prestige. It seemed that the city had, once again, found its footing as the cultural epicenter of the world at large. (Chadych, 88)

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries brought with them a new architectural style, Art Nouveau, which was to be of significant importance to one new public work in particular: the Metro. As previously mentioned, Paris was the first city to have experimented with public transportation during the reign of Louis XIV. Due to its egalitarian nature, however, it proved too much for the nobility and aristocracy of the time, who had no desire to ride with the common folk. Its fate was sealed and done with entirely by the end of the seventeenth century. By 1900, however, as Paris expanded and grew ever-larger in popularity and population, the question of mass transit arose once more.

The London Underground had already successfully laid the framework for mass public transit in 1863. Paris implemented its own version of this mass transit in the form of the Metro. Architecturally speaking, the entrance to the Metro stations was part and parcel to the Art Nouveau movement, the most famous of which being Hector Guimard's iteration at Abesses Station. While London's Underground was often complex, even convoluted at times, in its design, the Paris Metro was more efficient in its routing of passengers throughout the city and into the suburbs. Metro stations and a greater number of train stations quickly cropped up around Paris, making travel faster and more efficient than ever before.

Just as the capital seemed to find its place in world affairs once again, it was quickly caught up in a series of wars, the two greatest of which being World War I, quickly followed by World War II. Each of these left its own marks on Paris, with the city witnessing destruction from bombs and other acts of war. Still, Paris did see less destruction than some other European cities—German Berlin was practically destroyed. In the years following the Second World War, Paris was home once again to various protests and revolutions—a long-held tradition in the capital. Presidents from the Fourth and Fifth Republics left their own marks on the cityscape through various means.

Georges Pompidou commissioned two architects, Renzo Piano and Richard Rogers, to design and build a multi-purpose center in 1969. The resulting Pompidou Center is an iconic modern example of Parisian architecture. Giscard d'Estaing commissioned, in 1976 and 1977 respectively,

the construction of the Cité des Sciences and the conversion of the Gare D'Orsay into what is now the Musée d'Orsay. (Chadych, 112)

François Mitterrand declared the transformation of the Louvre into an art museum, ordered a new opera house at Place de la Bastille, as well as commissioned the Grande Arche, the Institut du Monde Arabe and the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. Jacques Chirac established the Musée du Quai Branly and a refurbishing of industrial sectors into green areas. (Chadych, 112)

In keeping with tradition, the Paris of today is strictly regulated and controlled by government entities. Zoning is taken seriously and uniformity of design remains enforced. New constructions are required to complement existing structures. Even when inspiration was taken from British London, Paris maintained its authoritative orderly and disciplined approach to urbanism. Preservation of monuments and history remain of utmost importance. Indeed, Paris has the greatest quantity of preserved, historical architecture in Europe. (DeJean, 13)

CHAPTER 5

HEIRS APPARENT

Today, each capital has left an enduring legacy upon urbanism and development. The liberty of free development within London resulted in a wide array of architectural styles and buildings over the years. Most importantly, however, is the utilization and implementation of public green spaces. The 'garden city', first popularized at the end of the nineteenth century, went on to heavily influence not only future London developments but other metropolises as well—New York and Chicago being two such examples.

While London has certainly influenced contemporary cities in the realms of sanitation, public green spaces, and variety of architecture, the British capital has never succeeded in achieving the one thing its French counterpart, Paris, has: the translation from urban reality into near-mythical idea. Paris is more than the capital of France and its worth extends beyond tourism and governance because it resonates within human consciousness as a state of being. 'City of Light' and 'City of Love' are just two of the epithets given to Paris. Indeed, these are excellent examples of what often springs to mind when one thinks of Paris. Regardless of whether these fantasies have any basis in reality, the fact remains that Paris evokes something within the individual. Paris remains one of only a few cities to have this kind of power upon the human psyche; others which come to mind are New York, Jerusalem, and possibly Venice.

Thus the question becomes: what was Rome? Was it an economic and military powerhouse? It most certainly was. More than anything, however, Rome was an idea—a very successful one at that. It was the greatest empire known to man and it remains so influential on Western thought that we are still discussing it today. Rome birthed the Republic, a form of governance implemented around the world, the arch, concrete, and built so well upon Greek thought that it is often credited for having perfected them (such as the theatre.)

If we seek to answer the question of which city has successfully become Rome's heir in light of this definition, an obvious victor emerges: Paris. There is no question as to London's importance and influence in the world but the fact remains that it has not, and for the foreseeable future will not, achieve the near-mythical status of Paris—thus rendering the British capital inadequate in inheriting the title of New Rome.

For all its flaws, Paris has attained the notoriety that few metropolises have and that status is what has rendered it so famous in urbanism. It is for that reason that urban anthropologists analyze the city's successes and failures concerning center-periphery relations. Paris is unique, after all, in that it does not follow the trend of most cities: wherein the suburbs are safer than the city center; rather, the direct inverse is the case of Paris. Much of this can be attributed to Haussmann's neglect of suburban Paris, its implications continuing to have greater magnitude than some may think concerning *les banlieues.*

I believe the greatest reason for the success of Paris is due to its cultural values of discipline and order. It is certainly true that French governance has always had a decidedly more authoritarian aspect than the libertarianism of Britain, something which could be attributed to the historical influence of Roman Catholicism in France. While this ultimate assumption of power has often been detrimental to the people of France, it has been instrumental in creating and preserving the idea of Paris.

Human beings are free agents and human agency cannot be ignored by any government. A city, however, can be more rigidly governed so as to protect its human residents. Cities do grow, ebb and flow, but having strictly enforced guidelines can help to ensure that the growth remains manageable, even beneficial, for all residents.

By contrast, when a city is given too much liberty, what often results is the greatly problematic issue of 'urban sprawl'—that is to say a city which devours its environs and makes the lives of its inhabitants significantly more difficult, due to the amount of congestion, distance, and time wasted in the aforementioned situations. Moreover, urban sprawl has been linked to higher health risks (Vallianatos, 420).

Given Paris's more organized and orderly approach to development, it is no surprise, therefore, that much of its public transportation is more easily navigated. Indeed, Paris remains a 'walkable city'. There is always something to see, some panoramic vista which entertains the eye of the flaneur. The city owes much to its aristocratic governors of old, who sought for selfish purposes

to make it a jewel of Europe, in this regard. The involvement of the French monarchy and other elite classes demanded the uniformity of design which contributes to Paris's aesthetic integrity today.

In the wake of post-colonialism and the baby boom following the Second World War, many current cities examined how to adapt to ever-increasing populations (Gilles-Corti, 2912). Some followed the path of London, agglomerating their neighboring suburbs until they reach a massive sprawl. With the realization that sprawl has more negative consequences than benefits, others are returning to models, such as Paris, in order to examine the practicality of building upwards rather than outwards.

In addition to the issue of population growth, environmental impacts are also being re-evaluated. Paris is included in this search, as pollution and global warming continue to pose serious threats to human health. Modernist ideologies from the 1930s-1960s placed a rather heavy emphasis upon vehicular transportation over walkability in urban environments. Given the ever-present environmental crises the world at large is facing, attitudes are once again shifting towards sustainable, efficient city planning and development. (Gilles-Corti, 2913) Once again, it is in the arena of 'walkability' that Paris can be referenced, in order to better understand the relationship between pedestrian and city.

This idea of 'Parisian walkability' is present in the city's future plans. *Le Grand Paris* is an urban development project that the city of Paris began in 2016. In this new plan are several new subway lines that connect the city to

"airports, business centers, research centers and universities, as well as metropolitan areas that are currently difficult to access." This project will also see greater urban density, thereby limiting future sprawl. ("Le Grand Paris Express En Résumé." *Société Du Grand Paris*, 14 Sept. 2017)

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

As we meet the challenges of life in the twenty-first century, we can look to the past for inspiration to creative solutions to our own problems. Paris stands apart as a unique city in Europe because of its historical significance but also because of its visionary planners who approached the challenges of city organization and development with aplomb.

The city of Paris easily offers a multitude of public spaces and venues, historic preservation, public transportation, and aesthetics in an orderly fashion. Its enforcement of uniformity of design manages to blend a wide array of architectural variation (such as medieval, stone structures with modern steel and glass structures) while never compromising aesthetic flow. An excellent example of this meeting of styles is present at the Louvre, where I.M. Pei's glass pyramid floats in the center courtyard of its Renaissance neighbors. While initially scandalous, today the pyramid is as much a part of the Louvre as the Mona Lisa.

While both London and Paris are famous throughout the world, each serving as vital capital cities to their respective countries, Paris emerges as more than a capital, even more than a city. Paris is an expression of French identity in architectural form. It is associated with grace, intellectualism, fashion, and the epitome of high culture. These are not all Paris entails, however, as its citizens have always been resilient, spirited, and revolutionary. These qualities, when married with the order and discipline so readily found

within the city's design, produce a place that is instantly recognizable,

decidedly French, and most of all, enduring.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chadych, Danielle and Dominique Leborgne. *L'Histoire de Paris pour les Nuls*. Paris: First, 2013.

Clout, Hugh D. *The Times History of London*. London: Times Books, 2008.

DeJean, Joan. *How Paris Became Paris: The Invention of the Modern City*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Duby, Georges. *Histoire de la France: Des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Larousse, 2011.

Duffy, Eamon. *Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition: Religion and Conflict in the Tudor Reformations*. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.

Gilles-Corti, Billie. "City Planning and Population Health: A Global Challenge." *The Lancet* 388.10062 (2016): 2912-2924.

Hall, Peter. *Cities in Civilization*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1998.

Horne , Alistair. *Seven Ages of Paris*. London: Macmillan, 2002.

Jones, Colin. *Paris: the Biography of a City*. London: 2004, Penguin.

Julaud, Jean-Joseph. *L'Histoire de France des Origines à 1789*. Paris: First, 2006.

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

Klein, Peter J. *The Catholic Source Book*. Chicago: ACTA Publications, 2000.

Tombs, Robert and Isabelle Tombs. *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present*. London: Knopf, 2006.

Tombs, Robert. *The English and Their History*. London: Knopf, 2016.

Vallianatos, Mark. "Farm-to-School." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23.04 (2004): 414-423.

Wilson, A. N. *London: A Short History*. London: Phoenix, 2006.