

DOWN WITH THE WALLS! THE POLITICS OF PLACE IN SPANISH AND GERMAN URBAN EXTENSION PLANNING, 1848-1914*

By 1914, commercial and other photographers were beginning to produce stunning images of the built environment across Europe, including in Spain and Germany. In Madrid, Jaime Murillo Rubiera and Mario Fernández Albarés had started to photograph aspects of the unfolding extension to the city, which began in 1860 and progressed rapidly after 1875. Away from the capital in Barcelona, Joan Martí and Antoni Esplugas captured the dramatic improvements to the cityscape that began with defortification in 1854 and the adoption of an extension plan in 1860. In particular, Esplugas presented unmistakable images of progress in the form of long boulevards disappearing into the distance (Figure 1).¹ A similar enthusiasm for the changing urban landscape was also evident in Germany. In Berlin, Hermann Rückwardt captured the capital's straight streets and modern buildings laid out according to the extension plan of 1862, and F. Albert Schwartz photographed contrasting historical façades along Berlin's growing street network.² Indeed by the turn of the century, Germans in other cities such as Munich and Cologne were scaling new heights to photograph growing urban landscapes.

The modern cityscapes captured by Spanish and German photographers were the result of ambitious extension plans implemented across Europe between 1848 and 1914. Historians have written at length about these post-1848 extension plans, foregrounding the expressly logistical considerations of planners in shaping space.³ That is, we have produced investigations into the practical considerations of drafting urban plans, designing new apartment blocks, and building municipal facilities.⁴ Such research has yielded valuable insights into the processes of legal and administrative

reform needed to expand cities,⁵ as well as the effects extension planning had on processes and motion, including the separation of social classes in the city, the relative distribution of public amenities, and the emergence of housing reform movements.⁶ But as photographs of the new cityscape often suggest – by the way they invest the built environment with a sense of feeling – extension planning involved more than just a physical transformation of space. As many contemporaries put it, extension planning profoundly affected idioms of place. New streets and architectures altered personal experiences of the city, arousing emotions of great pride in, and at other times concern over the changing character of the urban landscape.

Investing urban areas with new meanings was an essential part of extension planning.⁷ For government officials it was important to manage expectations about the evolving city and guide the interpretation of changing urban areas. Engineers and architects too were instrumental to realizing new understandings of the cityscape. Moreover, it was often residents who talked about extension planning as being less of a technocratic affair and more of a process that endowed the built environment with a new identity. Such reflections and assertions are important as they often reveal what an individual perceived to be the rights of different social groups to the growing city. As Doreen Massey has written, expressions of place are articulations of “social interrelations at all scales.” She continues that, “such attempts at the stabilization of meaning are constantly the site of social contest, battles over the power to label space-time, to impose the meaning to be attributed to a space, for however long or short a span of time.”⁸ Otherwise put, interpretations of the changing built environment could and did become acutely contested within a city. Moreover, they reveal what contemporaries perceived to be the evolving position of a city in regional, national, and global frameworks, and as such, they too were debated.

In exploring extension planning in Spain and Germany from 1848 to 1914, this essay aims to illuminate the shifting interpretations of the urban environment that accompanied this activity. The comparison rests on the fact that during this period, engineers in both Spain and Germany readily sought to “catch up” to models of urban development seen mainly in France. The extensions in Madrid (1860) and Berlin (1862) were, for example, deeply influenced by contemporaneous rationalization projects undertaken by Georges-Eugène Haussmann in Paris. Likewise extensions in second or smaller Spanish cities such as Barcelona (1860), Valencia (1858; 1868; 1884), or Málaga (1878) were developed in comparison to French standards.⁹ It was a similar story in German cities such as Cologne (1880), Düsseldorf (1884), and Munich (1893), where Parisian or Viennese models were often expressly considered or used to critique planning.¹⁰ Hence in this period, building officials not only made comparable interventions in the built environment based on international models, they also used a similar language with which to talk about the changing identity of the city. Professionals and bourgeois residents were aware of such trends, and they too used broadly analogous terms of reference to interpret the changing identity of the city.

“Typical” examples of such talk could be found in the expanding capital cities of Madrid and Berlin, but also in Barcelona.¹¹ In Madrid, the Minister of Development Claudio Moyano y Samaniego charged the engineer Carlos María de Castro with preparing an extension plan during the turmoil of the 1854 revolution.¹² Castro’s plan was adopted in 1860 but the building of an extension was difficult for the relatively poor Spanish state, which had lost most of its great empire and was plagued by a crippling national debt. As a result, speculators came to dictate much of the actual construction of new Madrid. This was slow at first, with interruptions caused by revolution (1868), further upheaval, the brief establishment of a republic

(1873-74). Yet in the years after 1875 – with the restoration of monarchy under Alfonso XII – the development of the *ensanche* (extension) increased apace leading to the framing of particular suburbs according to a new modern symbolism, albeit one full of contradictions.¹³ The introduction of the first tramline in the Spanish capital in 1871 also had a great effect on the creation of new suburbs and a proliferation of literary representations of urban modernity.¹⁴ In a similar manner, the revolution of 1854 ensured Isabella II's approval for defortification in Barcelona and the making of an extension plan.¹⁵ After a heated debate between the municipal and central authorities over who exactly should carry out the task, Madrid finally confirmed the implementation of a plan drafted by the engineer Ildefons Cerdà i Sunyer.¹⁶ The realization of Barcelona's extension, known as the Eixample, was arduous work and the relocation of residents to this new part of the city was slow. Nevertheless, as Jesus Cruz has shown, the project developed in tandem with ideas of the modern "bourgeois city."¹⁷ Moreover towards the end of the century, the modernist imagination of place became ubiquitous in Barcelona's extension and in urban construction more generally.¹⁸

The situation in the German states paralleled that of Spain to a large extent. In response to the 1848 revolutions in Berlin, the Police-President Carl von Hinckeldey sought – with the approval of the Prussian Ministry of State – to implement wide-reaching changes across the city based on a new, scientific culture and updated surveys. This culminated in the engineer James Hobrecht's plan for the environs of Berlin in 1862.¹⁹ Hobrecht's planned expansion of Berlin, known in German under the term *Stadterweiterung*, relied on private investment and as in Madrid, it became increasingly difficult to implement at moments of political change, including that of German Unification in 1871. Nevertheless, it was formative for rapidly changing

urban identities. As Yair Mintzker has shown, the final defortification of the city in 1865 played an instrumental role in illuminating the, “world to which the walls once belonged and the modern world that replaced it.”²⁰ Moreover, the shantytowns and pioneers who lived beyond the city wall helped to generate new concepts of the urban frontier and its radical potential.²¹

This propensity to invest the changing cityscape with new meanings was not strictly a Spanish or German phenomenon and the comparative analysis made here could certainly be extended to other European states. Nevertheless, the purpose of these “typical” case studies is to expose the formation of new ideas about the city, highlighting the junctures at which northern and southern debates diverged from one another. The inclusion of Barcelona in the essay acts, moreover, in many respects as a “deviant” case study.²² Despite the similarities between Barcelona and other cities to undergo extension planning in the mid-nineteenth century, it was not a capital city. It was, however, an important second city. Population growth in Barcelona soon began to outpace Madrid in the second half of the nineteenth century, as did the port city’s growing wealth.²³ It was *barcelonés* that held the textile monopoly in Cuba and it was this city that hosted Spain’s first Universal Exhibition in 1888. As a result, tensions between the central authorities and municipal representatives played a much greater role in shaping expansion debates in Barcelona than they did in Madrid or Berlin. This means that to elucidate second-city extension dynamics, Barcelona should be compared with a German second city such as Munich or Hamburg. However, Barcelona has not been included in this essay to such an end, rather it suggests the ways in which capital-city extensions differed from other extension projects.²⁴ Moreover, it complicates our understanding of capital-city extensions by indicating

how, at the end of the century, a growing Catalanism prompted a number of politicians to imagine making Barcelona into a capital city itself.

This essay makes, therefore, a primary argument about the types of interpretations extension planning fostered and in doing so, it also seeks to highlight the ways in which extension planning became politicized during this period. Talking about urban change was, it argues, a fundamental part of a much larger political negotiation between governments and their publics after the mid-century revolutions of 1848 and 1854. As Christopher Clark has written, this period witnessed a range of ambitious government programs of modernization in response to upheaval. Indeed, he calls it nothing less than a period of revolution in government.²⁵ Likewise in other recent accounts of Spanish and German state building there has been an attempt to broaden not only the chronological parameters of modernization to include the aftermaths of the revolutions of 1848 and 1854, but also to show the ways in which citizens engaged with these policies.²⁶ This article builds on such trends by suggesting that debates about extension planning were an integral part of the conversation between state officials and their citizens about what modernizing cities represented and whose interests they embodied in the years before 1914. It pinpoints what individuals in the post-revolutionary decades designated to be “old” or “redundant” in much broader economic, social, and political processes. And it draws attention to the ways in which residents fostered urban pride in the modern city, showing their support for “new” or “advantageous” changes to political and social life.

TOWARDS EXTENSION PLANNING

Neither the Hohenzollerns nor the Bourbons had been in any rush to expand their royal residences in the late eighteenth century or the first half of the nineteenth century. In Madrid, major alterations to the city walls were rare as the central authorities were able to rely on undeveloped land within the urban fabric to meet their needs for display and the requirements of *madrileños* for housing. Indeed the wall was essentially a fiscal barrier rather than a fortification and as such, it allowed for small clusters of housing beyond Madrid proper when the pressure on land increased. But there were exceptions to this lack of activity too, most notably in what came to be known as the Paseo del Prado. The destruction of Madrid's wall for this promenade opened up the old city to the east and provided space for the creation of the Royal Botanic Garden, the Royal Observatory, and the Academy of Sciences.²⁷ Following this, impetus for change increased after the death of Fernando VII in 1833 and the outbreak of the First Carlist War in Spain. During the upheavals in 1836 and 1837, the *progresista* (Progressive Liberal) Prime Minister Juan Alvarez Mendizábal initiated a disentailment of church property on a previously unseen scale. Mendizábal's laws were designed to raise money for the state and to create "a copious family of property owners" in support of liberal politics.²⁸ Further disentanglements followed in 1841 and 1855, prompting a surge of speculative residential construction in Madrid, and no small amount of talk about planning. As the retired British naval captain Samuel Edward Widdrington recorded during his visit to Madrid in 1843:

The most striking change at Madrid is the great and unceasing activity in the building department: every plaza and plazuela—every part of the wider streets was occupied by piles of old materials or new and covered with the dust made by workmen employed in dressing the grey granite of

Colmenar, which forms the exterior of most of the new buildings. The greater part of these transformations proceed from the convents, nearly the whole of which have been sold and either converted to public uses or those of individuals, many of whom who purchased at the outset have made large fortunes by their speculations.²⁹

Commentators such as Widdrington emerged alongside the building works in Madrid, reflecting on what a possible extension to the cityscape would mean for residents. The writer Ramón de Mesonero Romanos was another notable example. Mesonero spent the summer of 1833 travelling to Paris, Lyon, Marseilles, London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds, and used what he saw abroad as the basis for his reflections on European standards of urban development. Following this in 1835, he assumed the directorship of the *Diario de avisos de Madrid* with the unique intention of fostering discussion between the municipal authorities, private investors, and the public about reforms to the cityscape.³⁰ Mesonero believed that a thoughtful extension would transform Madrid from a fixture of the court to a capital city, full of opportunities for an emerging middle class. As he saw it, improving the cityscape was just one part of a larger mission to see Madrid embody its role as a capital city, which “from the center to the circumference, radiate[s] to the distant provinces as a model for national civilization.”³¹

There is certainly evidence to suggest that Mesonero was not alone in his vision. In the 1840s, the municipal authorities received petitions for the establishment of a ministry of public works from which enterprising *madrileños* could make financial gains. In the 1850s, railroad directors supported an extension of the city wall at Atocha from which they stood to make substantial profits and in a similar manner

in 1857, the engineer Mariano de Albó argued that the city should hasten to carry out defortification and institute a policy aimed at the, “reasonable balancing of assets and wealth, so that those assets would yield triple interest.”³² Building firms too saw potential earnings in an extension and at least one such company – *La Urbana* – drafted an extension plan for official consideration.³³ But it was architects, publicists, and wealthy residents like Mesonero who were particularly insistent on the idea that an expansion had to generate a new level of sophistication in the city, not just financial gain. As he put it, Madrid would need to display certain “thermometers of civility” if it hoped to assume a parallel status to that of other European state centers.³⁴ These included monuments and statues that testified to the greatness of the state’s Austro-Hispanic past and the magnificent cities these rulers founded in the New World. Grandeur or magnificence in this context also referred to the display of successive phases of Catholic heritage in the city and the achievements of monarchs such as Felipe V and Carlos III. In other words, any extension should be a construction project in which Madrid presented itself as having moved from being a seat of the court to a modern capital city, thereby displaying its progression as a “civilization.”³⁵

The municipal authorities undertook a striking number of reform projects as suggested by Mesonero but when financial crisis hit the building industry in 1848, the need for ambitious state intervention became clear. After further shocks and a new wave of political instability in 1854-56, change arrived. On April 8, 1857, the central government – now a *Unión Liberal* (Liberal Union), which gave the *Progresistas* a renewed voice since their collapse in the years between 1843 and 1854 – made a decisive intervention into municipal affairs and issued a royal decree for the expansion of the city.³⁶ In the course of his work, the minister of development spoke

of the “extension of the court” but he also, notably, picked up the place-making language of *madrileños* developed in the years between 1835 and 1856, by suggesting that the expansion would be more than just a material intervention at the hand of the Unión Liberal. It would be, he wrote, an extension of a historically significant “capital city.”³⁷ The minister was diplomatic, suggesting that, “after a few years we shall see the court completely and suitably transformed.”³⁸ The engineer in charge of the extension was less so, toasting the project with the words: “down with the court and long live the capital.”³⁹

Away from Madrid in Spain’s second cities, local authorities and residents also discussed the possibility of extension planning, although these discussions derived from a very different historical experience of fortification. In Barcelona, Philip V had introduced a series of political and cultural retributions on the city after its defeat in the War of the Spanish Succession in 1714, including the construction of an enormous citadel – the *Ciudadella* – and a new wall near the harbor. Philip V also issued a military ordinance preventing extramural construction and thereby limiting the authority of local officials in issues of urban development. The result was that the old city came to end abruptly at its fortifications, and these stone structures – unlike the wall in Madrid – remained a striking physical barrier between the city and its surroundings.⁴⁰ As a result Barcelona’s walls became, “signs of the loss of independence” and the empty space beyond them was associated with notions of subjugation and suppression.⁴¹ Indeed such sentiments were not uncommon in other Spanish cities such as Valencia, where local officials referred to their walls as those “ancient and miserable ramparts that tormented the city.”⁴²

As in Madrid, disentailments spurred talk in Barcelona of freeing the city from its walls, especially in 1840 as local *Progresistas* incited revolution in support of

radical liberalism on the national stage. In this atmosphere, the Barcelona *Ajuntament* (City Hall) announced a public literary competition on the advantages to be gained by defortification, asserting that the city walls were an obstacle to industrial, commercial, and population growth. The winner of the competition, the local doctor of radical-democratic leanings and later seminal figure in the hygiene movement in Spain, Pedro Felipe Monlau, agreed. In his essay *Abajo las murallas!* (Down with the Walls!), Monlau argued that Barcelona had suffered from the “tyranny of its walls” for long enough and that it was indeed time to cultivate greater markers of progress in the city. He continued that an extension would provide the chance to grow Barcelona’s population, so as to rival great population centers like Paris and London. As such, the city would attract foreigners and with them capital, industry, culture, and the pretext for more public services. The result would be, he claimed, a manufacturing city composed of a truly cosmopolitan population.⁴³ Monlau’s vision of the extension was thus in many respects similar to Mesonero’s, detailing both the hygiene and manufacturing benefits to extending the city, as well as sketching, although to a much lesser extent, historical markers of civilization afforded by extension.

Monlau wanted to show, furthermore, that Barcelona’s resulting identity as a modern manufacturing city would not interfere with Madrid’s identity as a political city.⁴⁴ This line of argument became particularly important in the years 1841-43, as Barcelona’s business elites – especially *progresista* textile manufacturers – rallied against the Regent Baldomero Espartero in Madrid. In 1841 and 1843, businessmen and members of the working classes carried out demolitions across the city, which included anti-Madrid attacks on the citadel and city wall. Barcelona suffered for its hostility towards Madrid and was bombarded on 3 December 1842 and again in November 1843, leading other publicists to argue all the more that expansion would

cool political tensions in the city.⁴⁵ As Agustín Vila, a member of the Board of Demolition wrote in 1843: Barcelona needed to transition from an old, fortified city into a new, expanding city because Barcelona's walls actually attracted rather than defrayed warfare and strife. The fundamental task in front of the city was, he concluded, to cut Barcelona's ties to its defensive heritage and embrace a modern manufacturing identity.⁴⁶ For conservative observers such as Antonio Brusi Ferrer, this enthusiasm for demolition was frightening but not misplaced. In a series of articles in the *Diario de Barcelona* from 1854-56, he argued that extension would help to eradicate urban disturbances from the city. Here Brusi was looking to the example of Paris, approving of Napoleon's introduction of wide streets for the uninhibited movement of soldiers.⁴⁷

Barcelona's Ajuntament was responsive to the idea of an expanding manufacturing city and by 1853 it had declared its support for an unlimited extension. In July 1854, it made a plea to the central government to allow the defortification in order to create work for the many unemployed people in the city and for those affected by harvest failures in the countryside. Public works, it was argued, would help to resume growth and allay revolutionary unrest. Isabella II finally approved the destruction of Barcelona's walls on 15 August 1854 and work to dismantle them gained momentum. Moreover, an outbreak of cholera in the city in the summer and autumn of that year only furthered the urgency with which the central government sought to redirect social tensions into "healthy" outlets. On 25 October, Isabella II approved the drafting of a plan to extend the city and in the years that followed the Unión Liberal continued to oversee this work.⁴⁸ With the shift in political climate in Madrid, *barcelonés* thus had the chance to assert a new conception of the city through the extension that downplayed its recent subordination to Madrid and focused on

creating a modern, manufacturing identity able to exist within the confines of the Spanish nation.

Across the other side of Europe, the move towards extension planning in Berlin resembled much of what had taken place in Madrid. The area within Berlin's customs wall – a relatively ordered and spacious structure – underscored Berlin's status a *Residenzstadt*, that is a seat and source of royal display. Beyond the wall, however, a second city grew up in the first half of the nineteenth century. From 1841-46, extramural suburbs grew rapidly with over 2,000 new dwellings built each year. The scale of this construction was much larger than that in Madrid and many of these apartments were hastily erected around major areas of employment such as the Oranienburger and Rosenthaler suburbs.⁴⁹ Here, unlike the center, the urban landscape was devoid of monumentality and municipal facilities. Indeed, persons living beyond the Berlin wall were not considered residents of the city, leading these Berliners to register their dissatisfaction at this state of affairs in the 1840s and 1850s. During this period the authorities received letters calling for defortification and new opportunities to build.⁵⁰ Moreover, residents within the old city also wrote to the authorities arguing that, as one group did in July 1864, the need to get rid of the customs wall had long been recognized.⁵¹

Resistance to the divided nature of the city grew during the pre-March era but only in the revolution of 1848 did deadly clashes between revolutionaries and troops, including physical attacks on the wall, make clear that the state could no longer ignore the interests of urban populations to the extent it had been.⁵² On the urgings of the conservative, albeit innovative Interior Minister Otto von Manteuffel, the executive agreed that Prussia needed to foster stronger municipalities under state oversight, loyal and able to oversee their own affairs beyond the limits of a city wall. The task as

he saw it was for the state to better foster the interests of the middle classes, rather than having them undermine it by cultivating insurgent municipal identities.⁵³ To achieve this end, Manteuffel drafted a municipal ordinance and a police administration law.⁵⁴ The first piece of legislation sought to remove barriers to urban change by increasing franchise to include wealthy residents, but with the expectation that municipal governments would undertake more ambitious projects in their remit. And the second piece of legislation placed the police in a position to realize such aims.

The promulgation of the Police Administration Law (1850) prompted a rapid response from Carl von Hinckeldey, the conservative Police-President in Berlin who possessed strong convictions about the need to incorporate the suburbs into a unified city and for the state to oversee their improvement.⁵⁵ Hinckeldey believed that the way to sideline democratic politics in Berlin was for the state to take over the material improvements sought by residents. He therefore undertook the completion of long-running surveying works, on the basis of which up-to-date extension plans for the city could be made.⁵⁶ Following this in 1855, he ordered the creation of a plan to further order Berlin's surroundings. Due to personnel problems, it was delayed until after Hinckeldey's death in 1856 but by 1858, James Hobrecht was commissioned with the task of drawing up a plan to regulate future growth and on June 20, 1865, Wilhelm I finally moved to defortify the city.

Of course Hinckeldey's vision for extension placed a premium on improving public health in Berlin but for many architects, writers, and upper-middle class residents, the new direction of the state also fostered exciting opportunities akin to the desire in Madrid for both commercial and historical progressions in civility. Upon discussing the extension one newspaper reported that: "The existing plain houses will

obtain a metropolitan dress with surprising speed.” This included furnishing, “ground floors...as shops to meet the needs of the elegant,” and the building of, “modern houses...in that area in which, at present, there are empty spaces.”⁵⁷ In other words, the act of extension would produce a metropolis based around increased display and consumption. The newspaper continued that the new market between Karlstrasse and Schiffbauerdamm would be unique in this respect. The writer of the *Berliner Beobachter* agreed with this assessment in an article of September 3, 1865. He argued that the building of the extension in commercial terms was “work for the magnificence of our city.”⁵⁸

Moreover, debates about dismantling or renovating the gates in the city wall emphasized the need to foster Berlin’s historical identity. For example, *Die Wochenblatt des Architekten-Vereins zu Berlin* claimed that it made sense for the authorities to tear down many of the old city gates or at the very least repurpose them for the housing of telegraph stations as they inhibited the circulation of goods and people, and they were not considered to be particularly attractive. But gates such as the Brandenburg Gate were more complex cases. Most Berliners were agreed on the historical importance of this section of the wall, the *Wochenblatt* claimed, and in 1867 it argued that with a few simple demolitions of the surrounding buildings, “the ideal meaning” of the structure as a “Prussian victory gate” could be realized.⁵⁹ The authorities wavered in renovating the gate but in general, they were supportive of such measures.⁶⁰ Indeed, they had sought to meld Prussian insignia to ancient Greek designs in much of their building to affirm a growing sense of Berlin as a modern Prussian capital in the order of the ancient world.⁶¹ Of course this Prussian emphasis in Berlin was at odds with the national histories being called for in many other capital cities but it made sense in the German political environment of the 1850s and 1860s,

and it was certainly not incompatible with German nationalism.⁶² Nevertheless Berlin was not like Madrid, which developed as the heart of a centralized state and could display corresponding phases in which the nation had developed.

CREATING EVER EXTENDING CITIES

After 1848/54, ideas of the extension as a general civilizing space in which a historically-rooted capital city or second city could be made, became shaper and more defined. In Madrid, the minister for development commissioned the engineer Carlos María de Castro with the task of drawing up an extension plan to organize the rural land surrounding the city but to limit his work to fixing, “the lines of roads and streets, parks, avenues, and plazas, the sites or floor plans of principal public buildings, blocks of houses, their general distribution, and finally the city limits” so as to minimize tricky property acquisitions.⁶³ Castro’s plan divided Madrid into eight zones, of which three were purely residential areas. In the northern part of the extension next to an industrial zone, he designed a residential area for the aristocracy. Moving eastwards, he included districts for the middle class, artisans, and working class. South of the city, he created zones for commercial and agricultural use, and there was a zone in the extension for the housing of military barracks, although these were also scattered throughout the city (Figure 2).⁶⁴ The laying out of such streets and speculative building progressed only slowly in the years between the approval of Castro’s plan in 1860 and the restoration of monarchy in 1875, but by 1880, there were 23,593 residents living in the northern part of the extension.⁶⁵ Likewise by 1878, there were 15,362 inhabitants living in the eastern part of the extension. Here Salamanca was the most populated neighborhood, with 8,213 residents, followed by

Plaza de Toros (3,032), Almirante (1,222), Delicias (1,064), Alcalá (982), Retiro (686), and Belén (163). Moreover, the growth of a tram network in the 1880s ushered in even more rapid rates of urban expansion and monumental construction. In particular, Castro planned the relocation of a number of state institutions, including museums, a national library, and several government ministries to the eastern part of the extension.⁶⁶

During the period 1860 to 1888, architects propagated monumental building in the extension as indicators of historical progress in the city, such as the construction of the Biblioteca Nacional on the Recoletos in the eastern part of Castro's plan. Commenced in 1866 and completed in 1892, the massive, neo-classical building was adorned with statues of Alfonso X (known as Alfonso the Wise), Saint Isidoro, and Alonso Berruguete. This cluster represented a coming together of learned, cosmopolitan thinkers in the Spanish pantheon – a point that was further emphasized when Agustí Querol i Subirats later crafted a statue of Hispania above the group. Indeed, this line of design confirmed the national rather than courtly histories that Castro envisaged such buildings would evoke. As he put it, the new buildings would write the history of “our generation,” in terms of a nation rather than an estate.⁶⁷ Other institutions took on a similar appearance and anchoring in national history such as the *Ateneo* (1884), Banco de España (1891), Stock Exchange (1893), and Ministry of Agriculture (1897).⁶⁸ As such, the concern for civility in the extension as expressed before 1854 became refined in increasingly popular, monumental construction projects specifically designed to celebrate a historically grounded nation.

This construction of a civic, national trajectory in the extension and a general propensity towards magnificent construction drew comment in the 1880s from onlookers and expression in realist culture. Noticeably, many *madrileños* considered

the creation of monuments and monumental buildings to be too slow. For example, the architect Joaquín de la Concha criticized the authorities in 1882 for not constructing monuments in the extension at the same rate as could be seen in other European capitals. This lack of energy, he made clear, was not based on a lack of illustrious persons of religion, science, and the arts in need of veneration.⁶⁹ Indeed others praised such works but also critiqued the pace of change. For example, upon returning to Madrid in 1880 the former wine-maker José María voiced in Benito Pérez Galdós' novel, *Lo prohibido* (1885), that he was, "astonished at the beauty and spaciousness of the new neighborhoods, the rapid modes of communication, the palpable improvement in the appearance of the buildings, streets, and even the people." He continued that, "the charming gardens laid out in the once dusty squares, the gallant edifices of the well-to-do, the assorted shops" were "in no way inferior, as far as can be judged from the street, than those in Paris or London," even if Madrid's many "advances since '68," were "more akin to whimsical leaps than to the steady, assured pace of those who know whither they are going."⁷⁰ According to Galdós and certainly many others, this mixture of monumentality and commerce played an important role in echoing what was seen to be particularly "European" about exemplary cities such as Paris, but Madrid seemed to fall behind in pace of construction. Indeed, Mesonero had made this point years earlier when he encouraged the municipal authorities to alter the avenues of Alcalá and Atocha and line them with trees, so that residents could comfortably stroll along these boulevards and admire the luxury products for sale there. This would, he argued, help Madrid to come closer to the beauty of Paris and London.⁷¹

Back in Barcelona, a tussle broke out between the Spanish central government and the municipal authorities concerning who would oversee the new extension plan.

The now *moderado* (Conservative Liberal) majority in the Ajuntament enthusiastically supported an extension plan drafted by the city architect Antonio Rovira i Trias as this plan foregrounded radial boulevards and grand squares – like those drafted by Haussmann in Paris, especially for the place de l'Étoile.⁷² Such a plan aesthetically evoked aspects of Barcelona's proud heritage, which the Municipal Architect Miquel Garriga i Roca traced back to the Romans.⁷³ But the authority and preferences of the Ajuntament were overruled by Madrid. In contrast to its wishes, the central authorities placed the *progresista* engineer Ildefons Cerdà i Sunyer in charge of the Barcelona extension. Cerdà – whose conception of expansion was deeply influenced by early French socialist thought – focused on the Eixample as Barcelona's new heart, organizing the city anew according to notions of circulation, especially with respect to traffic, rather than expressions of urban beauty that characterized the plans preferred by the Ajuntament.⁷⁴ Like Castro, Cerdà was unable to rely on adequate state legislation for large-scale expropriations but he still managed to produce a plan of breathtaking scale to order the vacant, private property stretching from the old city to Barcelona's surrounding mountains and villages, and in it he detailed a repetition of equally-sized square blocks separated by streets of uniform width rather than a zoned plan as Castro did (Figure 3).⁷⁵

Although not the favored option of the Ajuntament and indeed lampooned in the press as a Madrid interfering in Catalan affairs, Cerdà's plan nonetheless provided architects with opportunities to emphasize a historical progression in civility. There was substantial enthusiasm for the construction of monumental, civic institutions on the land previously occupied by Barcelona's wall, such as the new building for the University of Barcelona and the Palace of Justice. In many such instances, as Maiken Umbach has shown with respect to the Palace of Justice, monumental structures were

covered with motifs referencing a historical trajectory of Spanish and Catalan achievements.⁷⁶ Such amalgams resonated with Barcelona's business classes in the early years of the Restoration, who supported the new political order in Madrid and the stability it promoted, at least until the loss of Spain's last overseas colonies in 1898.⁷⁷

The aristocratic and bourgeois residents who bought up much of the Eixample also increasingly celebrated the erection of monuments to famous Catalan personalities, which in the period 1860 to 1888 spread further into the heart of the extension than institutions did. Monuments to Joan Güell i Ferrer and Josep Anselm Clavé i Camps – residents who made important political, industrial, and cultural contributions to the city – became extremely popular (Figure 4). Indeed, not only monuments to residents but their private workplaces and houses drew comment. For example, *La vanguardia* waxed lyrical in 1884 as the Masrera workshop opened in the Calle de Bailén and *Ilustración artística* reproduced magnificent images of the new building. This striking construction contained, “representations of every age, civilization, and artistic style” – itself acting as a historical record of civilization.⁷⁸ Likewise W'r Lodia wrote in *The Decorator and Furnisher* in 1892, that he had, “seldom noticed a city possessing so many entirely modern and large edifices of noteworthy design,” many of which were photographed and proudly displayed in the first exhibition of the Sociedad Fotográfica Española. Catalan photographers also photographed the interiors of such buildings, many of which were located in streets named by the Catalan poet Victor Balaguer i Cirera.⁷⁹ Balaguer deployed the names of persons, places, and events integral to the Catalan past, particularly its civic flowering in the Middle Ages, throughout the city's extension, thereby conflating urban progress within a narrative of Catalan revival.⁸⁰

By 1888, the extension was becoming the focus of a historical Catalan cultural revival but there were indications of tension in Barcelona too. For example, an article entitled “La Barceloneta” appeared in March 1865 in *El comercio de Barcelona: Periodico democratico*, describing the proposed demolition of Barceloneta. Here the author wrote at length about the renovation of the quayside area, which meant that a neighborhood of about “5,000 families” was to be lost to satisfy the interests of those men who aligned themselves with the politics of the Unión Liberal and of course, for profit. He continued that with such demolitions Barcelona would also lose its long connection to its local, maritime identity.⁸¹ This attention to non-manufacturing identities verged on the port, where fortifications around the royal dockyards were only demolished in the late 1880s. Images of these walls indicated a certain resilience of the pre-modern city and drew comment from periodicals such as the *Diario de Barcelona* on Barcelona’s status as former maritime empire (Figure 5).⁸²

Over in Berlin, ideas of place also became more refined in the period between the approval of the extension plan in 1862 and its implementation up to 1888. The Prussian authorities instructed the engineer James Hobrecht to focus on laying out streets in privately-owned but undeveloped areas surrounding the city, meaning that the Berlin police, who were in charge of the plan’s implementation until 1875, could avoid difficult land acquisitions.⁸³ Planned extension was particularly pronounced in the north and east, where Hobrecht imagined a proliferation of working-class neighborhoods would form. Indeed, the growth of Berlin’s extension was rapid, especially after 1871: in 1850, the city consisted of 419,000 residents but by 1880, it had grown to 1,122,000 residents.⁸⁴ Hobrecht’s blocks varied in size and form, and yet Hobrecht believed that the resulting apartments would foster a hygienic city and harmonious interactions between social classes, much like Cerdà envisioned in

Barcelona.⁸⁵ There was also a monumental aspect to this agenda, with Hobrecht drafting a series of grand squares on the southern side of the city, which he intended to be complemented by impressive buildings (Figure 6).⁸⁶

The German authorities supplemented Hobrecht's plan with increasingly bombastic structures, overseeing the construction of such buildings as the Reichstag, the Cathedral, and Natural History Museum. Most of these buildings were situated, however, in the center of the city rather than in the extension. This prompted architects and residents to call for a wider range of monuments in the new suburbs of the capital and the completion of Hobrecht's proposed monumental squares. As one writer in the *Wochenblatt* put it: "In particular, these new quarters lack monuments that are distinguished and characteristic enough to dominate their surroundings and break through the monotony, which inevitably adheres to town houses."⁸⁷ The architect Ernst Bruch, in his now infamous attack on the extension, derided the uniformity of the city as a fundamental obstacle to Berlin's ascension to the most powerful and cultured city of the future.⁸⁸ Indeed, Bruch's critique spanned far more than the historical grounding of the city, but it highlighted the same concern for the realization of a modern capital city identity according to European standards of progress.

Nevertheless, the Berlin police regulated, like in Barcelona, the naming of streets and this served to tie the extension more actively to a national story. After 1871, the Berlin police frequently deployed names related to German Unification or the Napoleonic Wars in the extension. Apart from these rousing events, street names also took on collective identities based on German cultural icons such as composers, poets, and native flowers.⁸⁹ But here too problems emerged as the state of sidewalks failed to match up to their heady namesakes. For example, along the Prenzlauer

Chaussee, a growing working-class area, residents complained about the, “masses of debris and all sorts of filth” piled up as a result of defortification and extension planning.⁹⁰ Such problems were relatively localized but they could become widespread, as the residents in the vicinity of the Hamburg Gate recognized. These residents argued that a modern city required safe and sensible solutions to pedestrian traffic rather than forcing individuals to navigate sidewalks that were congested with building refuse or were simply too narrow.⁹¹ To be sure, writers in the *Deutsche Bauzeitung* – the successor of the *Wochenblatt* – often developed this point by highlighting that broad sidewalks and well-planned streets were no mere question of pragmatics but instead a defining feature of a modern metropolis.

STAGNATION IN THE CITY

In all three cities, architects, publicists, and mainly bourgeois residents celebrated the many strides towards becoming a historically grounded capital city or regional center, but as was suggested in the section above, there were concerns too. This was certainly true in Madrid, where parts of the old city and some of the poorer suburbs along the banks of the Manzanares seemed to remain untouched by the “progress” of planning. In these areas, a lack of order began to be associated with nascent associations with socialism.⁹² Indeed, Pablo Iglesias founded the Socialist Workers’ Party in the Calle Hernán Cortés in the old city in 1879. By 1881, the party acted from his house in a public and official capacity, and disseminated their newspaper, *El Socialista*. This paper, plus others, appealed directly to literate and semiliterate working-class audiences in order to rouse hostility against Restoration politics.⁹³

For those bourgeois residents who did not simply avoid or ignore the underdeveloped and potentially radicalizing parts of the city, there were two main responses. The first was to support large-scale demolitions – such as those for the creation of the Gran Vía – to rationalize the old city center. Of course affected property owners of all types were opposed to this long-discussed project, which was first suggested in the 1850s and finally started in 1910 (Figure 7). They wrote to the authorities framing expropriations as, “a most serious legal question.”⁹⁴ But for those aristocratic and bourgeois residents not affected by demolitions, the project became a focus of celebration. Newspapers such as the *ABC* and weeklies like *Actualidades* enthusiastically printed photographs of the first works of demolition in the old city. These included shots of the official festivities as well as views of the old, twisted lanes that would soon be destroyed in service of new stores trading in luxury products.⁹⁵ In particular, the latter photographs helped to draw in such formerly “undeveloped” places into larger narratives of “progress” in the making of the Spanish capital and its residents. As the novelist Pío Baroja observed in his work *La busca*, “The Gran Vía has greatly changed Madrid’s urban character. The great avenue has taken away some of the population’s liveliest and most picturesque features, thereby modifying its inhabitants’ customs and manners.”⁹⁶

Of course not everyone celebrated such developments, or at the very least cautioned restraint. Indeed, Baroja was part of a generation of writers – the generation of ‘98 – who, along with a small number of architects and bourgeois residents, were less interested in seeing the old city demolished. Like Baroja, the writer José Gutiérrez Solana was another to voice such opinions, lamenting the loss of the old town’s alleys and the almost preindustrial life they seemed to sustain. As he wrote, trying to find some degree of solace in the situation, “the one thing that compensated

for the sight of such barbarous demolition was the very beauty of destruction, the romantic hours around a wreckage that transported us from the metropolitan capital to a sort of Castilian village ravished by the winds of ruin and destruction.”⁹⁷ Residents with similar sympathies patronized the many theatres that sprung up in Madrid, showing the “common people” of the old town as a primary source of folklore rather than fear.⁹⁸ These plays endowed Madrid’s civilized status with a new, preindustrial and “authentic” element, diffusing concerns about social uprisings.

In Berlin, much of the inner city, especially the area around the Wilhelmstrasse, was transformed by monumental building projects in the 1870s and 1880s, but as in Madrid, some streets remained undeveloped. Hans Kurella – the psychiatrist and famous translator of many of Cesare Lombroso’s works on criminal anthropology – noted in an article in *Die neue deutsche Rundschau* in 1899, that the “common people” remained behind in these derelict areas.⁹⁹ He continued: “sometimes it is habit that holds them there, sometimes it is the inability to find an apartment on the periphery, mostly however, it is the nature of their work that inhibits them moving away from the center. The out-worker wants to stay close to the clothing store; wage earners, coachmen, cleaners, ironing and washing women, landladies, servants, domestic tailors, midwives, copyists, and dance and piano teachers must not leave ‘their’ area if they do not want to lose their clients.”¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the many workers that moved into centrally located suburbs like Rixdorf only intensified this impression of underdevelopment as their suburbs took on a “wholly working-class” composition.¹⁰¹

The municipal government in Berlin undertook a small number of reforms in the old city on the grounds of a need to improve these areas, including taking over a reform of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Strasse in the mid-1870s (Figure 8). By 1910, plans to

reform the city center multiplied as part of the Greater Berlin Competition and observers readily praised such efforts. As Walter Lewitz wrote in *Die Berliner Architekturwelt* in 1911, these “architectural delights” strove in different ways to give “the right artistic expression to the modern metropolis, the capital of the new German Reich.”¹⁰²

Like Madrid, however, a challenge to historically grounded ideas of progress in the city also developed in Berlin in the years directly after 1888. It too came from residents and architects who were keen to heighten an awareness of destruction in the city and frame the disappearing cityscape as a new source of folklore. As the author Friedrich Fuchs wrote in 1901, everyday one could read of “Berlin’s oldest buildings falling victim to the pickax.” He continued, “with that, one of the last remnants of the good old days disappears.” In Fuchs’ opinion, it was not just the form of preindustrial Berlin that was being lost to the construction of tenement or office buildings, it was also the spirit of the builders and inhabitants of these houses that was being lost to Berlin’s modern identity.¹⁰³ Fuchs’ sense of nostalgia could also be seen in plays, which like their counterparts in Madrid, increasingly made jokes out of the streets and persons of the old city. Here the characteristic streets and dense living quarters of what was once essentially a fishing village provided the backdrop for discussions about the ways in which Berlin was transitioning into a cosmopolitan city comparable to Paris.¹⁰⁴ The frequent conclusion was that Berlin was failing at this task but the new styling of authentic Berliners sought to deprive this anxiety of its revolutionary potential.

In Barcelona, concerns about shifting urban identities also took on a heightened form in the latter nineteenth century and all the more so than in Madrid and Berlin. From the 1880s on, bourgeois families increasingly moved out of the old

city to take up residence in the Eixample. The new occupants – mostly migrants – lived in subdivided apartments with much higher densities than before and within a short time, parts of the old town became stamped with a singular, working-class character. Certainly by the start of the twentieth century, contemporaries identified several districts as being proletarian places at the center and on the edge of the city, including: the Raval; Barceloneta; Poblenou; Poble Sec; and Sants.¹⁰⁵ The increasing occurrences of anarchist outbursts in Barcelona inflected this situation with a sense of potential radicalization and resulted in arguments for the need to transform the city according to a “civilized” form of destruction, so as to eliminate a socialist or potential anarchist revolution.¹⁰⁶ As Javier Tort y Martorell – doctor of civil law and public works official – remarked in a speech about reforming the city center on January 26, 1880 in the Barcelona Athenaeum:

In all the most important European cities one can bear witness to a thoroughly modern phenomenon: all, or most, of the remnants of their former existence are falling into ruins, giving way to wide thoroughfares, magnificent squares, beautiful and imposing gardens, notable monuments, which take their place improving the sanitary conditions, public highways, and aspect of the cities; everywhere the destructive pick works ceaselessly; but it is not the pick of the socialist revolution, which tries to chip away, one after another, at the foundations of the social edifice, so that in a given moment it may come crashing down; rather it is the pick of civilization, which opens up the chest of these remains to bring forth new cities, just as the plough furrows the earth, not to sterilize it, but rather to reveal the source of its prodigious fertility.¹⁰⁷

The municipal authorities attempted time and again to reform the old town to help align it with the extension. Cerdà originally included changes to the city's medieval core in his extension plan, in which three thoroughfares would carve up the old city and thereby harmonize communications with the new. The municipal architect Roca surveyed the areas under question and considered how such reforms could be implemented, but he too later abandoned the project. In 1872 and in 1879, the municipal government established a special commission for the reform of Barcelona, resulting in a new plan by Àngel José Baixeras. But again things stagnated. Only in 1889 did the central government approve Baixeras's plan and in the 1890s, introduce new powers of expropriation for municipal governments rendering the project possible but only after much opposition from property owners.¹⁰⁸

This phase of planning showed that by the 1880s, both the central authorities of the Restoration and Barcelona's municipal government were concerned to order the old urban fabric to prevent any image of old Barcelona as a place of the proletariat, as in Madrid and Berlin. But uniquely in Barcelona, working-class residents became increasingly willing to contest the intentions of the municipal authorities, especially as reforms began to take place in the early twentieth century. In 1902 and again in 1909, working-class residents erected barricades in the chaotic streets of Barcelona's core and much of this activity played off the threat of reforms in the old town. Violence in the *Setmana Tràgica* (Tragic Week) of 1909 was a case in point, as workers incorporated resistance to the first of the old town reforms in their protest activity: the creation of the Via Laietana (Figure 9). During this uprising, workers repurposed 7,000 m² of paving stones to build barricades and thereby isolate the old town from the rest of the city.¹⁰⁹ The events of the Tragic Week in Barcelona were

dramatic and showed how radicalized ideas of place could become in the old fabric of the city and how they could be molded beyond bourgeois circles.

CONCLUSION

Extension planning in the eighteenth century was primarily the domain of princes looking to aggrandize their cities of residence, but by the mid-nineteenth century, it took place in a range of capital and second cities, under the auspices of increasingly active central and municipal authorities.¹¹⁰ In such cases, this essay has argued, extension planning continued to involve more than just changes to space and the technocratic languages it became couched in. Expanding the urban fabric in the mid-nineteenth century encouraged an outpouring of ideas about what an extension would mean for a city's identity.

In both Spain and Germany, the making of new capital city identities derived from architects, publicists, and bourgeois residents who inflected extension debates with demands for historically framed markers of national identity and national political potential. That is, urban expansion was about creating a visual record of the progress of a city from its former status as a seat of court to its modern identity as a national capital, even if both Madrid and Berlin seemed to constantly struggle with such a task. Of course the emphasis on grounding capital cities within a larger historical trajectory could be confused for an outdated preference for aesthetics over rational engineering in city building in both Spain and Germany. Indeed, Cerdà was a proponent of such a view, writing that: "Hitherto when it has been a case of founding, altering or extending a town or city, nobody has concerned himself with anything other than the artistic or monumental aspects...To beauty and to the grandiosity of

certain details have been sacrificed the political and social economy of the city.”¹¹¹ But enthusiasm for markers of a historical progression in civility in the city after 1848 seemed to be more about bolstering narratives of progress and national power rather than any resistance to change. Moreover, post-revolutionary governments were willing to facilitate demands for such interventions in the built environment – especially monumental buildings, statues, plans to disencumber, and street naming – and for good reason. The virtue of such interventions were that they could continue to accommodate conservative aspirations for modernization as well as a whole range of liberal concerns that were at times in harmony with the aims of the state and at other times in conflict due to their emphasis on more rapid democratic and technocratic advances.¹¹² This echoed the general trends in politics after 1848 and 1854, as governments looked to integrate middle-class populations into political life through modernization policies.

Markers of historically-grounded progress could also work in the construction of second-city identities but here there was greater potential for conflict with the state. In Barcelona, architects and members of the middle classes criticized the implementation of extension plans that ignored indigenous histories and particularities. The local was, they argued, essential to the creation of a modern, second-city identity composed of both Catalan and Spanish elements. Indeed, Catalan and Spanish identities sat next to each other in Barcelona in a delicate balance over the period 1848 to 1888, but this would soon change with a boom of building works stimulated by the Universal Exhibition in 1888, and especially with the beginnings of a new urban policy promoted by the bourgeois nationalist *Lliga Regionalista* (Regionalist League) after their entry into municipal government in 1901. The new policy sought to shift Barcelona’s identity to an unprecedented level. As the League

wrote in their press organ *La veu de Catalunya*: “Barcelona is, for us, an extraordinary city, the unrivalled city, the city *par excellence*, the capital, the complete city, the point of radiation for all the trends in national life, whether economic or political, [the] fundamental organ of the people...heart and basis of the race.” Barcelona should, it posited, become “a great European city” or “the Paris of the south.”¹¹³ As a result, Barcelona turned to consider extension planning in a similar manner to Madrid and Berlin in the early years of the twentieth century, that is, as the making of a capital city.

Extension planning over the period 1848 to 1914 provided, therefore, a new phase for interrogating city identities. The extension visualized growing bourgeois interests in the city, but as the case of Barcelona showed, it also began to generate more radical, proletarian critiques of urban identities in the late 1880s and beyond. In other words, the expanding city would not just be a bourgeois city but a proletarian one too. This became clearer at the end of the nineteenth century as the planning of further urban works provoked a new round of intense discussions about the reordering of social life and no lack of assertions about modern nationalism in Spain and Germany. In the 1920s and 1930s, these early debates broadened and even more so, planning in the post-WWII era provided some of the most intense reflections on the intersections between society, political ideology, and world order seen in modern Europe.¹¹⁴ Indeed, the unparalleled and widely destructive attempts by planners to re-urbanize city centers in the 1960s and 1970s provoked intense discussions about the meaning of community and heritage in many European states, especially in the Federal Republic of Germany.¹¹⁵ The discussions of the post-48 period were, therefore, just the beginning of a long engagement with government policies of

expansion in the modern era and they provide an important point of departure for understanding how residents invest urban change with new meanings.

* I am grateful to Sukriti Issar, Yair Mintzker, Mila Roode, and this journal's three anonymous reviewers for their comments on earlier drafts of this essay. Invaluable feedback also came from participants of the conferences: "Negotiating Urban Change from the Middle Ages to the Present" and "Documenting Spanish Modernity: The Politics of Cities and Cityscapes" (University of Oxford, 2015); the German History Society's annual conference in 2015; and the annual conference of the European Association for Urban History (EAUH) in 2016.

¹ On Martí see Rafel Torrella and David Iglésias, *Joan Martí, fotògraf: Belleses del XIX* (Barcelona, 2008). On Esplugas see Núria F. Rius, "Las exclusivas fotográficas

de Pau Audouard y Antoni Esplugas en la Exposición Universal de 1888: Carrera profesional y mediación política,” *Goya* 352 (2015): 244-57. On the relationship between the built environment and photography see Lucila Mallart, “Illustrated Media, the Built Environment and Identity Politics in Fin-de-siècle Catalonia: Printing Images, Making the Nation,” *Cultural History* 4 (2015): 113-135.

² On Schwartz see: Katja Zelljadt, “Capturing a City’s Past,” *Journal of Visual Culture* 9 (2010): 425-38; Katja Zelljadt, *Camera Berolinensis: Das Berliner Album des Fotografen F. Albert Schwartz (1836–1906)* (Berlin, 2006); and L. Demps, *Berlin: Photographien von F. Albert Schwartz* (Berlin, 1991). On Rückwardt see Michael Neumann, *Berlin zwischen Residenz und Metropole: Photographien von Hermann Rückwardt 1871-1916* (Berlin, 1994).

³ On space see David Harvey, “Spacetime and the World,” in *The People, Place, and Space Reader*, ed. Jen Jack Giesecking and William Mangold (New York, 2014), 12-15.

⁴ The literature that focuses on absolute space is far too large to list here but for a classic example and excellent text see Thomas Hall, *Planning Europe’s Capital Cities: Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Urban Development* (Oxford, 1997).

⁵ See for example Anthony Sutcliffe, *Towards the Planned City: Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780-1914* (Oxford, 1981).

⁶ See for example Nicholas Bullock and James Read, *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840-1914* (Cambridge, 1985).

⁷ Tim Cresswell, *Place: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Hoboken, 2014), 12. On place see also Jen Jack Giesecking and William Mangold, eds., *The People, Place, and Space Reader* (New York, 2014).

⁸ Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge, 1994), 5.

⁹ Joan Busquets, *Treballs sobre Cerdà i el seu Eixample a Barcelona* (Barcelona, 1992), 306; Jesus Cruz, *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture in Nineteenth-Century Spain* (Louisiana, 2011), 164-68.

¹⁰ Christian Engeli, “Stadterweiterungen in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert,” in *Die Städte Mitteleuropas im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Wilhelm Rausch (Linz, 1983), 53-54 and 62.

¹¹ Jason Seawright and John Gerring, “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options,” *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2008): 294-308, 297.

¹² On property damage in Madrid see María Zozaya, “‘Moral Revenge of the Crowd’ in the 1854 Revolution in Madrid,” *Bulletin for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies* 37 (2012): 18-46.

¹³ Rubén Pallol Trigueros, *Una ciudad sin límites: Transformación urbana, cambio social y despertar político en Madrid, 1860-1875* (Madrid, 2013); Rubén Pallol Trigueros, “El Madrid moderno: Chamberí (el Ensanche Norte), símbolo del nacimiento de una nueva capital, 1860-1931” (Ph.D. diss., Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2011); Rubén Pallol Trigueros, “Chamberí, ¿un nuevo Madrid? El primer desarrollo del Ensanche Norte madrileño, 1860-1880,” *Cuadernos de historia contemporánea* 24 (2004): 77-98.

¹⁴ Deborah L. Parsons, *A Cultural History of Madrid. Modernism and the Urban Spectacle* (Oxford, 2003), 66-7.

¹⁵ Barcelona was the first city in Spain to ignite in popular revolution in 1854 and it served as a touchstone for provincial centers such as Valencia and Malaga. See V.G. Kiernan, *The Revolution of 1854 in Spanish History* (Oxford, 1966), 54, 56, and 74.

¹⁶ For the larger planning history into which the extension falls see Manuel Torres, Josep Llobet, and Jaume Puig, *Inicis de la urbanística municipal de Barcelona: Mostra dels fons municipals de plans i projectes d'urbanisme 1750-1930* (Barcelona, 1985).

¹⁷ Cruz, *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture*, 131-68. See also Eduardo Aibar and Wiebe E. Bijker, "Constructing a City: The Cerdà Plan for the Extension of Barcelona," *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 22 (1997): 3-30.

¹⁸ See above all Maiken Umbach, "The Modernist Imagination of Place and the Politics of Regionalism: Puig I Cadafalch and Early Twentieth-Century Barcelona," in *The Re-Enchantment of the World: Secular Magic in a Rational Age*, ed. Joshua Landy and Michael Saler (Stanford, CA, 2009).

¹⁹ For an overview of the historiography on the Berlin extension see Claus Bernet, "The 'Hobrecht Plan' (1862) and Berlin's Urban Structure," *Urban History* 31 (2004): 400-19, 409-19. For the larger planning history into which Hobrecht's extension falls see Gerhard Fehl and Juan Rodriguez-Lores, eds., *Stadterweiterungen 1800-1875: Von den Anfängen des modernen Städtebaues in Deutschland* (Hamburg, 1983).

²⁰ Yair Mintzker, *The Defortification of the German City, 1689-1866* (Cambridge, 2012), 5.

²¹ Kristin Poling, "Shantytowns and Pioneers beyond the City Wall: Berlin's Urban Frontier in the Nineteenth Century," *Central European History* 47 (2014): 245-74.

²² Seawright and Gerring, "Case Selection Techniques," 297.

²³ Joan Ramon Resina, *Barcelona's Vocation of Modernity: Rise and Decline of an Urban Image* (Stanford, CA, 2008), 28.

²⁴ See for instance Maiken Umbach, “A Tale of Second Cities: Autonomy, Culture, and the Law in Hamburg and Barcelona in the Late Nineteenth Century,” *The American Historical Review* 110 (2005): 659-92.

²⁵ Christopher M. Clark, “After 1848: The European Revolution in Government,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22 (2012): 171-97.

²⁶ Abigail Green, *Fatherlands: State-Building and Nationhood in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge, 2001); N. Durán de la Rúa, *La Unión Liberal y la modernization de la España Isabelina: Una convivencia frustrada, 1854-1868* (Madrid, 1979); Anna Ross, “Post-Revolutionary Politics: The Case of the Prussian Ministry of State,” in *1848 as a Turning Point in Political Thought*, ed. Gareth Stedman Jones and Douglas Moggach (Cambridge, 2016); Guy Thomson, *The Birth of Modern Politics in Spain: Democracy, Association and Revolution, 1854-75* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 3-5.

²⁷ Antonio Lafuente and Tiago Saraiva, “The Urban Scale of Science and the Enlargement of Madrid (1851-1936),” *Social Studies of Science* 34 (2004): 531-69, 533.

²⁸ Mendizábal quoted in Mary Vincent, *Spain, 1833-2002: People and State* (Oxford, 2007), 17-18.

²⁹ S. E. Widdrington, *Spain and the Spaniards in 1843*, 2 vols. (London, 1844), 1:17.

³⁰ “Boletín,” *Diario de avisos de Madrid* April 1, 1835, in Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, *Trabajos no coleccionados*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1903), 1:3-6; “Policía Urbana,” *Diario de avisos de Madrid* April 20, 1835, in *ibid.*, 15-16. Mesonero also published a substantial body of works about Madrid’s population and proposals for extension in individual treatises and articles for *La ilustración* and the *Seminario*

pintoresco Español. For the full collection of Mesonero's articles see *Trabajos no coleccionados*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1903).

³¹ Daniel Frost, *Cultivating Madrid: Public Space and Middle-Class Culture in the Spanish Capital, 1833-1890* (Lewisburg, 2008), 56.

³² Cruz, *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture*, 160.

³³ Antonio Bonet Correa, *Plan Castro* (Madrid, 1978), XXII.

³⁴ Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, *Rápida ojeada sobre el estado de capital* (Madrid, 1989), 7.

³⁵ "Mejoras de Madrid: Estatuas y monumentos públicos," *La ilustración*, March 8, 1851, in Mesonero, *Trabajos no coleccionados*, 1:129-37. See also Rebecca Haidt, "Visibly Modern Madrid: Mesonero, Visual Culture, and the Apparatus of Urban Reform," in *Visualizing Spanish Modernity*, ed. Susan Larson and Eva Woods (Oxford, 2005), 32-34.

³⁶ On the *Unión Liberal* see Raymond Carr, *Spain, 1808-1975*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1982), 255-64.

³⁷ "Real decreto," April 8, 1857, in D. Carlos Maria de Castro, *Memoria descriptiva del ante-proyecto de ensanche de Madrid* (Madrid, 1860), 6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

³⁹ Lafuente and Saraiva, "The Urban Scale of Science," 549.

⁴⁰ Aibar and Bijker, "Constructing a City," 4-5.

⁴¹ Malcolm Miles, "Drawn and Quartered: El Raval and the Haussmannization of Barcelona," in *City of Quarters: Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*, ed. David Bell and Mark Jayne (Aldershot, 2004), 45.

⁴² Cruz, *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture*, 166.

⁴³ Pedro Felipe Monlau, *Abajo las murallas!!! Memoria sobre las ventajas que reportaría Barcelona, y especialmente su industria, de la demolición de las murallas que circueyen la ciudad* (Barcelona, 1841), 3-5.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 11-20.

⁴⁵ Raymond Carr, *Spain, 1808-1975* (Oxford, 1982), 223-27.

⁴⁶ Agustín Vila, *Abajo las murallas!!! Resumen histórico de los males que ha causado á España, y á Barcelona en particular, el haberse mantenido plaza fuerte esta ciudad despues de la dominación sarracena* (Barcelona, 1843).

⁴⁷ Sara Anna Mangiagalli, "Barcelona 1854-1856: Crónicas del ensanche, reflexiones de Antonio Brusi Ferrer," *Arquitectura, Ciudad y Entorno* 1 (2006): 29-45, 33-34.

⁴⁸ For a timeline of events see the publication of the Barcelona Museu d'Història de la Ciutat, *Abajo las murallas!!! 150 anys de l'enderroc de les muralles de Barcelona* (Barcelona, 2004), 183-84.

⁴⁹ Bullock and Read, *The Movement for Housing Reform*, 20-22.

⁵⁰ Poling, "Shantytowns and Pioneers beyond the City Wall," 247.

⁵¹ Petition to the *Stadtverordnetenversammlung*, July 23, 1864, in Landesarchiv Berlin (LAB) A Rep. 000-02-01 Nr. 1579, unpaginated.

⁵² On physical attacks on the city walls see Mintzker, *The Defortification of the German City*, 232.

⁵³ See Manteuffel to Leopold von Gerlach on August 21, 1852, in Heinrich von Poschinger, ed., *Unter Friedrich Wilhelm IV: Denkwürdigkeiten des Ministers Otto Freiherrn von Manteuffel*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1901), 2: 241.

⁵⁴ On the *Gemeinde-Ordnung* see Heinrich Heffter, *Die deutsche Selbstverwaltung im 19. Jahrhundert: Geschichte der Ideen und Institutionen* (Stuttgart, 1950), 315-17, and 327-37.

⁵⁵ Hinckeldey to Manteuffel, June 26, 1854, in Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStA PK), VI. HA NI Otto von Manteuffel, Tit. III, Nr. 48, 8.

⁵⁶ *Berliner Intelligenz-Blatt* November 24, 1850, in LAB A Pr.Br.Rep. 030 Nr. 585, 166.

⁵⁷ “Nach dem Fall der Berliner Stadtmauer,” in LAB A Rep. 000-02-01 Nr. 1579, unpaginated.

⁵⁸ “Die Niederlegung der Stadtmauer,” *Berliner Beobachter* September 3, 1865, in *ibid.*

⁵⁹ Untitled, *Wochenblatt des Architekten-Vereins zu Berlin*, May 18, 1867, 195; “Die Stadthore Berlins,” *Wochenblatt des Architekten-Vereins zu Berlin* May 25, 1867, 202-3.

⁶⁰ “Bauausführungen und Projekte. Die Neugestaltung des Brandenburger Thores in Berlin,” *Deutsche Bauzeitung* May 22, 1868, 209-10.

⁶¹ Walter Erhart, “Written Capitals and Capital Topography: Berlin and Washington in Travel Literature,” in *Berlin – Washington, 1800-2000: Capital Cities, Cultural Representation, and National Identities*, ed. Andreas W. Daum and Christof Mauch (Cambridge, 2005), 59.

⁶² During the revolutions of 1848-49 and into the 1850s, Berlin did not assume a leading role in German affairs, Frankfurt did. Only with the Unification of Germany in 1871 did the Prussian leadership elevate Berlin to a place of unquestionable political importance. See Gerhard Brunn, “Die deutsche Einigungsbewegung und der Aufstieg Berlins zur deutschen Hauptstadt” in *Hauptstädte in europäischen Nationalstaaten*, ed. Theodor Schieder und Gerhard Brunn (Munich, 1983), 17-24.

⁶³ “Real decreto,” April 8, 1857, in Castro, *Memoria Descriptiva*, 10.

⁶⁴ Hall, *Planning Europe’s Capital Cities*, 149-50.

-
- ⁶⁵ Borja Carballo, Rubén Pallol, and Fernando Vicente, *El Ensanche de Madrid: Historia de una capital* (Madrid, 2008), 130 and 180.
- ⁶⁶ Castro, *Memoria descriptiva*, 119.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Parsons, *A Cultural History of Madrid*, 57.
- ⁶⁹ Joaquin de la Concha, “Reformas Municipales,” *Revista de la sociedad central de arquitectos*, November 26, 1882, 202-203.
- ⁷⁰ Benito Pérez Galdós, *Lo prohibido* (Madrid, 1885), 6.
- ⁷¹ Daniel Frost, “Mesonero’s Modern Landscapes,” *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 6 (2005): 319-34, 329.
- ⁷² Hughes, *Barcelona*, 281.
- ⁷³ Miquel Garriga i Roca, “Importancia y movimiento de esta ciudad,” in *Arxiu Històric de la Ciutat de Barcelona*, 5D. 33.3/14, unpaginated.
- ⁷⁴ On Cerdà’s theory of urbanization see Arturo Soria y Puig, “Ildefonso Cerdà’s General Theory of ‘Urbanización,’” *Town Planning Review* 66 (1995): 15-39.
- ⁷⁵ Hall, *Planning Europe’s Capital Cities*, 133-34. Cerdà’s vision for the extension was popular amongst engineers – especially in terms of the order it promoted. See “Ensanche de Barcelona,” *Revista de obras públicas* 11 (1859): 133-35.
- ⁷⁶ Maiken Umbach, “A Tale of Second Cities,” 685-90.
- ⁷⁷ Chris Ealham, *Anarchism and the City: Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Barcelona, 1898-1937* (Edinburgh, 2010), 2.
- ⁷⁸ “El taller de los señores Masriera,” *La vanguardia*, April 30, 1884, 7; *Ilustración artística*, July 7, 1884, 1.
- ⁷⁹ W’r Lodia, “Interior Views from the House of Senor Guell, Barcelona,” *The Decorator and Furnisher* 19 (1892): 145-46.

⁸⁰ Cruz, *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture*, 147.

⁸¹ “La Barceloneta,” *El comericio de Barcelona: Periódico democratico*, March 22, 1865, 1-2.

⁸² Juan Mañe y Flaquer, “Marsella y Barcelona,” *Diario de Barcelona*, October 21, 1857, 8688-90.

⁸³ Only in 1874 and 1875 did Prussian municipalities acquire a firm basis by which to expropriate land in order to build streets and expanded powers to set street lines. See: Brian Ladd, *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany* (Cambridge, MA, 1990), 91; Sutcliffe, *Towards the planned City*, 16-19.

⁸⁴ In comparison Madrid stood at 398,000 residents in 1880 and Barcelona at 346,000 residents. See Andrew Lees and Lynn Hollen Lees, *Cities and the Making of Modern Europe, 1750-1914* (Cambridge, 2007), 287.

⁸⁵ For an overview of the Hobrecht Plan see Jutta Lubowitzki, “Der ‘Hobrechtplan’ . Probleme der Berliner Stadtentwicklung um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts,” in *Berlin Forschung V. Einzelveröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin Band 71*, ed. Wolfgang Ribbe (Berlin, 1990).

⁸⁶ Hall, *Planning Europe’s Capital Cities*, 195-96.

⁸⁷ “Berlin in seiner gegenwärtigen Bauthätigkeit,” *Wochenblatt des Architekten-Vereins zu Berlin*, January 19, 1867, 19-20.

⁸⁸ Bruch, “Berlin’s bauliche Zukunft und der Bebauungsplan,” *Deutsche Bauzeitung*, March 24, 1870, 95 and June 23, 1870, 201.

⁸⁹ Dirk Verheyen, “What’s in a Name? Street Name Politics and Urban Identity in Berlin,” *German Politics and Society* 15 (1997): 44-72, 46.

⁹⁰ “Extract aus dem Sitzungs-Protocolle der Stadtverordneten-Versammlung,” September 17, 1868, in LAB A Rep 000-02-01 Nr. 1579, unpaginated.

-
- ⁹¹ Copy of a letter to the Berlin Magistrat in LAB A Pr.Br.Rep. 030 Nr. 611, 2-3.
- ⁹² Frost, *Cultivating Madrid*, 129-33.
- ⁹³ Carr, *Spain*, 447; David Ortiz, *Paper Liberals: Press and Politics in Restoration Spain* (Westport, 2000), 58.
- ⁹⁴ See, for example, the letters written between January 29 and August 22, 1912 in Archivo General de la Villa de Madrid, 15-303-12.
- ⁹⁵ *ABC*, April, 5, 1910; *Actualidades*, April, 7, 1910.
- ⁹⁶ Luis Fernández Cifuentes, "The City as Stage: Rebuilding Metropolis after the Colonial Wars," *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 3 (1999): 105-27, 121.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁸ Parsons, *A Cultural History of Madrid*, 67-71.
- ⁹⁹ On Kurella and especially his role in the diffusion of criminal anthropology in Germany see Mariacarla Gadebusch Bondio, "From the 'Atavistic' to the 'Inferior' Criminal Type: The Impact of the Lombrosian Theory of the Born Criminal on German Psychiatry," in *Criminals and their Scientists: The History of Criminology in International Perspective*, ed. Peter Becker and Richard F. Wetzell (Cambridge, 2006).
- ¹⁰⁰ Hans Kurella, "Wohnung und Häuslichkeit," *Neue Deutsche Rundschau* 10 (1899): 816-19, reprinted in Gerhard A. Ritter and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Deutsche Sozialgeschichte, 1870-1914. Dokumente und Skizzen* (Munich, 1982), 58.
- ¹⁰¹ Theodor Goecke, "Das Berliner Arbeiter-Mietshaus," *Deutsche Bauzeitung* 24 (1890): 501.
- ¹⁰² Walter Lewitz, "Architektonisches von der allgemeinen Städtebau-Ausstellung zu Berlin," *Berliner Architekturwelt* 13 (1911): 123-25, reprinted in Iain Boyd Whyte and David Frisby, eds., *Metropolis Berlin, 1880-1940* (Berkeley, 2012), 68-69.

-
- ¹⁰³ Friedrich Fuchs, “Neu-Berlin,” *Berliner Leben: Zeitschrift für Schönheit und Kunst* 4 (1901): 135-36, 135.
- ¹⁰⁴ Tobias Becker, *Inszenierte Moderne: Populäres Theater in Berlin und London, 1880-1930* (Munich, 2014), 165-76.
- ¹⁰⁵ Chris Ealham, *Class, Culture and Conflict in Barcelona, 1898-1937* (London, 2005), 23.
- ¹⁰⁶ Carr, *Spain*, 440-41.
- ¹⁰⁷ Javier Tort y Martorell, *La reforma de Barcelona: Discurso pronunciado en el Ateneo Barcelonés en la sesión del día 26 de Enero de 1880* (Barcelona, 1880), 7.
- ¹⁰⁸ Joan-Anton Sánchez de Juan, “‘Lo mejor es enemigo de lo bueno’: Las ambigüedades del discurso municipal sobre la reforma urbana del interior de Barcelona (1872-1896),” in *Barcelona-Montréal: Desarrollo urbano comparado*, ed. Horacio Capel and Paul-André Linteau (Barcelona, 1998), 399-411, 402-405; Hall, *Planning Europe’s Capital Cities*, 140.
- ¹⁰⁹ Aibar and Bijker, “Constructing a City,” 19.
- ¹¹⁰ Ladd, *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany*, 79.
- ¹¹¹ Cerdà in 1859 quoted in Aibar and Bijker, “Constructing a City,” 16.
- ¹¹² Matthew Jefferies, “Wilhelminischer Monumentalismus: Zur politischen und kulturellen Rolle der Architektur im Deutschen Kaiserreich,” in *Das Deutsche Kaiserreich in der Kontroverse*, ed. Sven Oliver Müller and Cornelius Torp (Göttingen, 2009), 237-38.
- ¹¹³ Ealham, *Anarchism and the City*, 3. See also Francisco Javier Monclús, “Barcelona’s planning strategies: From ‘Paris of the South’ to the ‘Capital of West Mediterranean,’” *GeoJournal* 51 (2000): 57-63, 58.

¹¹⁴ On urban reconstruction in Germany see J. M. Diefendorf, *In the Wake of War: The Reconstruction of German Cities after World War II* (New York, 1993).

¹¹⁵ Anna Ross, “Photographing Reurbanization in West Berlin, 1979-84,” in *The Ethics of Seeing: 20th Century German Documentary Photography Reconsidered*, ed. Paul Betts, Jennifer Evans, and Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann (Oxford, 2017).