Complex Interior Spaces in London, 1850-1930: Introduction

Abstract

This introductory essay highlights the key themes that appear in the five essays that

make up the special issue: 'Complex Interior Spaces in London, 1850-1930',

which focuses on street markets, railway stations, winter gardens and people's

palaces, and a hospital. Those themes include complexity and multifunctionality;

nodes and networks; modernity; materiality and spatiality; the public/private

spheres; and user experience. The fact that the essays emanate from

a design historical perspective places a new emphasis on the complex interiors

of the buildings under review, and on the activities than went on in them, rather

than on their architectural facades. While these building types were not unique to

London, this introduction suggests that their size and scale were particular to that

city.

Keywords: complexity; inside spaces; multi-functionality; design history; modernity

The indoor spaces that form the subjects of the four essays in this special issue – those of London's

nineteenth- and early twentieth-century street markets, railways stations, winter gardens and

people's palaces, and hospitals - have not previously been discussed together. Indeed, several of

these buildings have not received much individual attention either.[1] While, in recent decades, they

have been studied by historians of nineteenth-century architecture, who have engaged with their

historicism and monumentality and understood that their revivalist styles would have been

considered 'modern' at the time, they were often omitted from the canon of nineteenth-century

buildings constructed by historians of modernist architecture whose aim was to focus on buildings

which, in their eyes, anticipated the upcoming modern movement.[2] This was undoubtedly because,

unlike the 1851 Crystal Palace, the iron and glass building created in Hyde Park for the Exhibition of

the Works of All Nations of 1851, which openly revealed its innovative iron and glass structural

engineering, and which has been considered, in the words of Douglas Murphy, one of the

'forerunners of nearly all the experiments that would come later in the name of modernism', most of these buildings concealed their innovative use of iron (and sometimes steel) and glass behind historicist facades.[3]

However, this special issue focuses less on these buildings' historicist architecture and progressive engineering than on what is considered here to be their highly innovative inside spaces. Seen from the perspectives of historians of design and interiors, these buildings and their inside spaces are of enormous interest. The history of interiors is a relatively new subject. Its emergence in the 1990s was marked by an initial focus on domestic interiors largely driven by feminist design historians who were critical of architectural and design modernism's marginalisation of the home.[4] Their interest in spaces and in assemblages of objects added to design history's earlier focus on isolated objects. Gradually, pioneered by writings by Charles Rice and Mark Pimlott, among others, the history of interiors also began to embrace the insides of public sphere buildings, although that development is, arguably, still in its infancy.[5] Taking their lead from design history, the questions that historians of the interior ask of their material include: How do interior spaces work materially and spatially? How are identities formed in them? What is the relationship between spaces and their inhabitants/users and how can then experiences of the latter be characterised What roles are played by their designers and producers? And how can the experiences of the latter be characterised? In short, their focus is on the interactions between the spatial, the material and the social. To answer their questions, design historians borrow methods from architectural historians, social historians, anthropologists, cultural geographers and the study of everyday life.[6] This special issue has emerged from the work of a group of researchers who have addressed the above interiors from these directions.

Complexity and multi-functionality

In that they were not private family homes, the multi-functional spaces under scrutiny were all situated in the public, or semi-public, sphere. Many of them (with the exception of the London

Hospital) were sites of consumption and leisure, constructed in the context of a programme of social reform which aimed to keep people off the streets and ensure that the masses were entertained and educated.

The word 'complex' is being used here to describe the combination of their defining features which, taken together, arguably constituted a novel phenomenon. In addition to the fact that these buildings were facilitated by expanding entrepreneurialism and large-scale financial investment, they were built in an era of growing working-class and lower middle-class leisure. For the first time, the people from those classes could engage in leisure under a single roof. It was also a time when new materials – iron, steel and glass - permitted the construction of large-scale buildings which housed many different spaces within them. Their interiors were multi-purpose, facilitating a wide variety of activities and reflecting social complexity both spatially and materially. While this was not a new phenomenon – theatres, coaching inns and public houses in earlier periods, for example, already supported several functions within them – these new buildings operated on a different scale and facilitated a wider range of activities. With the exception of the street markets, which lacked walls and roof, but were nonetheless bounded by light, sound and their constrained spaces (and can, therefore, it is argued here, be understood as 'interiors' or 'atmospheric enclosures'), the buildings under review here housed complex networks of interior spaces of different kinds which were used in different ways. All of them – street markets included – encouraged the performance of multiple activities within them. People who visited street markets could shop, engage in leisure and socialise in them; in railways stations people were not only waiting for trains but they could also buy books, have their hair cut and their shoes cleaned, post letters, and take refreshments; in winter gardens and people's palaces visitors could parade, eat, drink, read newspapers, listen to music, look at artworks and skate on ice. In the most specialised of the buildings under discussion, the London Hospital, patients, medical staff, other staff and visitors undertook a wide range of activities nonetheless, including nursing, preparing and serving food, undertaking administration duties, cleaning, working in the mortuary, sleeping (patients and nurses), eating, learning (the medical

college), worshipping (in the chapel) and performing operations. Described by Amy Smith as 'a sprawling medical complex' the London Hospital contained wards, operating theatres, nurses' homes, kitchens, and a mortuary, among many other discrete spaces.[7] While, by not being primarily commercially driven, it differed from the other interiors described here, in terms of its spatial multi-functionality, it had much in common with them.

All those activities required the presence of both multi- and single-purpose, and of open and closed, spaces within the complex structures in question. Multi-functionality, which was both represented and enabled by spatial and material complexity, distinguished the spaces under review from many of their neighbouring single-offer urban buildings, such as skating rinks, concert halls, swimming pools, music halls, cafes, restaurants, theatres, exhibition halls, churches and museums, among many others. (Although they frequently also contained additional inside spaces to facilitate secondary activities, such as eating and drinking). Multi-functionality required special attention on the part of the architects and designers whose task was to fit many different spaces into the sites at their disposal.

Visitors were required to redefine themselves in response to these indoor spaces, which they had not encountered before. However, there was agency on both sides. While the interiors in question influenced the ways in which inhabitants negotated them, the latter also played an important role in defining the former. Arguably, new social behaviours and class and gender roles developed, and the spaces themselves were redefined as a result of the negotiations that occurred within them. Richard Dennis has observed that, 'A recurring theme in cultural analyses of modern cities is the creative tension between increasingly structured and segregated spaces and the opportunities among socially and geographically mobile populations to transgress the boundaries betweeen them.'[8] The same tension existed within these multi-functional inside spaces, where multiple agencies were at work.

Nodes and networks

From around 1850, transformations in urban transport, sanitation, communication and energy supply gave rise to London becoming what we now understand as a 'networked city'.[9] The relationships of these multi-functional environments under discussion with each other also created a set of networks. They occupied both the centre and various peripheral areas of London. Given their internal complexity they can be understood as microcosms of the city. Access to them was made possible by the development of the railway lines which brought visitors from outside London, and from suburban London and beyond, to the metropolis. Visitors might have visited several complex interiors in a single day: Arriving in one of the large railway stations they probably completed their journeys on the underground railway, by cab or by omnibus, and gone on to visit a winter garden and/or a department store. As Victoria Kelley explains, 'the street markets also linked the countryside with the city, acting as 'nodes that connected [them], transmitting provisions and supplies into the hands of London's hungry population'.[10]

Modernity

The core period under discussion in this special issue – roughly 1850 – 1930 - is often associated with the advent of modernity in Britain. Although, in order to blend with the existing fabric of the city, the buildings under review expressed themselves outwardly in historicist styles – neo-classicism was especially popular – in the sense that that they were new building types, they were understood as modern at the time.

Travelling by train was a modern experience as was, for many people, engaging in leisure in public, especially in an enclosed multi-purpose space. The idea of leaving one's home and reaching one's destination without having to go outside at any point, and thereby avoiding inclement weather, represented the realisation of a modern urban dream for large sections of the population in the second half of the nineteenth century. The concept of joined-up enclosure, and the protection from the weather that came with that, had been mooted before these constructions took that dream forward in the forms, notably, of Joseph Paxton's Great Victorian Way of 1855 and Owen Jones's

proposed Palace of the People of 1858.[11] Above all, the new buildings discussed here all offered

their inhabitants shelter from the elements. Even street market stalls had canvas covers slung over

them in wet weather and, at the London Hospital, the enclosed bridges that led from the main

hospital to the nurses' quarter protected the nurses from bad weather and, as Amy Smith explains,

prevented them from having to 'venture out into the streets.' They also contributed to the speed

and efficiency of work being undertaken at the hospital. At Marylebone station, as Fiona Fisher

explains, a wide glazed veranda provided cover for passengers moving from the station to the

hotel.[12]

Patients in the London Hospital were treated by modern methods in a complex inside space that

depended on new forms of efficiency, sanitation and ventilation, which, in turn, affected the layouts

and material contents of the internal spaces. While new items of medical equipment were also being

used in the hospital, the other buildings being discussed here also embraced technological

modernity. A room dedicated to telegraphy was included in the Royal Aquarium, for example, while

electric lighting was also eventually introduced into railway stations, dispelling the earlier gloom that

had previously characterised them.

Apart from the London Hospital, the interiors being discussed here were all spaces of modern

capitalism. In addition, Kevin Hetherington has maintained that what he described as a 'emerging

form of modern subjectivity' could be found in them.[13] He suggested that that concept was first

manifested in the Crystal Palace, which he noted was a 'hybrid social space composed of elements

from the theater, fair, winter garden, greenhouse, warehouse, museum, gallery, fantasy place,

bazaar'.[14] Because production was still prioritised over consumption on that site, however (i.e.,

visitors were unable to purchase items), Hetherington explained that the Crystal Palace was 'a

paradoxical space of emergence between two moments of subject formation.'[15] Arguably by 1870

the culture of consumption was fully in place and the modern subjectivity that Hetherington

describes was fully formed in several of the interiors under discussion here.

The street markets were not part of the same strand of modernity as the materially and

technologically enabled spaces of the winter gardens and railways stations. However, they represent

an important, overlooked site of the ephemeral experientiality that constituted an important

characteristic of the modern city. The markets used a bare minimum of physical means, borrowing

their spaces and their boundaries from the streets, and transforming them with sound and light as

much as with hard infrastructure.

Materiality and spatiality

The large open spaces that were present inside many of the buildings under review – the great halls

in the Royal Aquarium, the People's Palace and the Alexandra Palace, for example, in addition to the

train sheds of London's railway termini, among others - were made possible by the use of iron and

glass. These shared material features helped define a new building typology, one that catered for

large numbers of people engaged in a variety of activities under a single roof. It embraced railway

stations, winter gardens, department stores and exhibition buildings, among others. Materially

speaking, their precedents included the horticultural conservatories that had been constructed on

the estates of the wealthy and in botanical gardens in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth

centuries. Although the iron and glass structures of the buildings under discussion here were often

hidden from the street views, their presence recalled the 'Crystal Palace', which, in turn, reached

back to the horticultural greenhouse. That aspect of the buildings linked them more closely with the

past than with the uncompromised modernity of the contemporary era. Mark Pimlott has

elaborated this idea in his books, *Without and Within: Essays on Territory and the Interior* and *The*

Public Interior as Idea and Project.[16]

This aspect of the story of these materially innovative structures suggests the addition of the

'natural' to the' spatial' and the 'material'. As Penny Sparke explains, plants and flowers are

important features of London's winter gardens and people's palaces, serving both to introduce into

them a level of private domesticity and to link them to the world outside.[17] In the London Hospital

the presence of plants and flowers, Amy Smith maintains, created a feeling of 'homeliness' – plants and flowers were important components of the domesticity of middle- and working-class homes - and they were seen as being 'conductive to the welfare and comfort of those for whom home is the ward for the time while they are living in it.' Flowers also had a role to play in the street markets where they were on sale. They were present, also, in railway termini, whether at their entrances to welcome travellers or to provide a level of decoration when civic occasions were hosted within them.

The forward-looking materiality of the spaces in question was also influenced by the modernising processes that went on in them. In the London Hospital, for example opalite was used to create sanitary impermeable surfaces, while the floors were covered with linoleum.

Public/private

The spaces in question were privately-owned for the most part, although the street markets claimed informal occupation of the public circulation spaces of the city. Behind-the-scenes spaces also existed, however, supporting many of the buildings' functions. They were not meant to be seen or experienced by visitors/customers.

Although they were all located in the public arena rather than private homes, signs of domestic privacy and interiority could be found in most of these spaces. The very fact that interiors, rather than the external manifestations of architecture, are under discussion here, might suggest that a level of 'cosiness' or 'interiority' was inevitably present in them. Hetherington has argued that the very idea of the interior implies privacy.[18] Does the very experience of being inside, one could ask, instantly evoke a level of comfort, safety and security? Kelley asks whether the women who inhabited the street markets, which, she claims, contained a level of interiority, felt as safe in them as they did in department stores. Within the interiors in question, spaces such as the reading rooms in the Royal Aquarium and the Peoples' Palace, the winter gardens in the last two, in addition to those in the Alexandra Palace, offered yet another level of private domesticity and the comfort that

were traditionally associated with that sphere. Rest rooms, for example, became essential for a comfortable experience, particularly for women. Fisher quotes a visitor to a London railway terminus who spoke about, 'the comfort of the station'. 'We are snugly under cover', they explained. She also suggests that 'an associated interiority' accompanied that feeling of snugness.

The presence of domesticity in many of these indoor spaces facilitated new opportunities for women to enter the public sphere. The gendered waiting rooms of the railway termini offered spaces of protection to travelling women, while the operation of chaperons within them attested to wider concerns over unaccompanied women's use of public space in the late nineteenth century. Even in the street markets, which lacked the security that middle-class women enjoyed in various of the other spaces under discussion here, there was a sense of domestic intimacy in the opportunity offered to working-class women for meeting with neighbours, for gossiping, and for friendly social interaction, alongside the fulfilment of the provisioning tasks that were so important to life in the home.

The London Hospital is more accurately described as a 'home from home' than as a public space. The fact that both patients (in the wards) and nurses (in the nurses' home) slept in the building complex at night aligns it to hotels, sanatoria, workhouses and lunatic asylums, which were all home substitutes, whether entered willingly or otherwise. Staying in them could be temporary or permanent. The nurses' homes also contained personal items that confirmed individual identities. A complex interior, the hospital embraced a spectrum of spaces, including private ones (the nurses' bedrooms for instance) to unequivocally public examples (including the outpatients' department).

Where the street markets were concerned it was especially at night that a sense of interiority was created by the invisibility of everything that, 'fell outside the pool of illumination' made by the naphtha flares that surrounded the stalls. Kelley describes the markets as 'places' in this context thereby evoking the ideas of Marc Augé, in his 1992 book, 'Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity', in which the author claimed that the legacies of the nineteenth-

century complex interiors under review – airports, shopping malls and leisure complexes among them – had become 'non-places'.[19] The vestiges of domesticity and examples of interiority that could be found in these earlier complex interiors would suggest that a degree of 'placeness' was still present, however, and that, as a result, both individual and collective identities could be formed in them.

User experiences

Hetherington has argued that 'modernity alters the character of experience fundamentally'.[20] A more fractured and fragmentary set of experiences comes into being and a loss of community takes place as a result, he maintained. In the words of Guy Debord, 'everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation'.[21] Arguably, that process was taking place during the lifetimes of the spaces under review. They all catered for large numbers of people and the greatest challenge to their managers was the efficient handling of crowds. That was especially difficult as both large open spaces for mass use and smaller spaces for individual activities were both present under one roof and there was often a high level of porousness between them. Attention was given to the ways in which circulation was organised, although that varied according to the nature of the activities that were being engaged in.

As Richard Dennis has indicated, in connection with the public space of the street, while processes of urban modernisation often sought to ease the movement of traffic and pedestrians, new technological innovations created the potential for urban obstructions in the form of objects such as drinking fountains, phone boxes and public toilets.[22] Similar forms of clutter, and the tensions that ensued between free-flowing movement and public amenity could also be found in the space of the railway station. As the London Hospital was a site of necessary work, rather than one of pleasure or leisure, activities and circulation had to be managed as tightly and as efficiently as possible. The same was the case, to a significant degree, in railway stations where crowd management had to be enforced for the efficient running of the train service. Where shopping/consuming was the main

activity (except in the case of the street markets where much of the purchasing that went on could be considered a form of work), a more relaxed, less managed atmosphere prevailed in which browsing was often combined with socialising.

Where leisure and pleasure constituted the main agenda, the crowd was largely left to promenade as it wished, although in the Royal Aquarium there was some suggestion that visitors were strongly encouraged to engage with certain entertainments. It is also interesting to consider the time element in visitors' experiences. How long did visitors spend in these spaces? Were they in a hurry or were they killing time? That had a huge influence on the effectiveness or otherwise of the commercialisation of the spaces under review as people were much more likely to engage in consumption if they had time on their hands. The provision of opportunities for rest and recuperation within the spaces undoubtedly encouraged people to spend more time (and money) in them than they might have otherwise done.

Surveillance was widespread in most of the inside spaces described here. It was present in the London Hospital and in the railway stations where it was undertaken both by railway company workers and the police. Hawkers and drunken persons were efficiently ejected from the sites in question. In the Royal Aquarium prostitutes presented a problem and steps (albeit unsuccessful ones) were taken to prevent them entering the space. Gender and class separation occurred in several of the spaces, including the wards in the hospital and railway waiting rooms. Although they were informal sites that were not officially organised or managed, the street markets were frequently depicted with a police constable surveying them from the periphery.

Was London unusual?

Finally, it is worth giving some thought as to whether the development of these kind of buildings containing complex, multi-functional interiors was unique to London in the years between 1850 and 1930. For the most part it was not as many similar structures were created elsewhere. Much has been written about Paris's arcades, department stores and exhibition halls, for example, building

types which were also visible elsewhere in Europe, from Vienna to Berlin to Milan. Botanical gardens - the repositories of plants and flowers from world-wide colonies - complete with winter gardens which served a social as well as a horticultural function, were also present in most of Europe's large cities, although buildings like the Royal Aquarium and the Alexandra Palace, which were entertainment spaces first and foremost, were less in evidence outside the UK.[23] New forms of transportation also characterised the streets of most of Europe's cities.

However, London's street markets were deemed unique. The American, J.W. Sullivan, visited Europe several times in the decade before the First World War, with the purpose of observing different systems of retail markets to learn lessons to take back to New York. He produced a detailed comparison of Paris, Berlin and London, and concluded that London's informal street markets, which contrasted strongly with the market halls provided by city authorities elsewhere, provided the cheapest food supply for the mass urban population.

If the general situation in London was unique in any way it centres around the question of size and scale. London was a major centre of global trade, finance and insurance and, although its position as the world's busiest port was challenged in the final two decades of the nineteenth century, it still handled a third of imported goods (by value) to the United Kingdom in 1910.[24] It was also a city of strong juxtapositions of wealth and social and economic inequality as Charles Booth's late-nineteenth-century mapping of the distribution of urban poverty revealed.

There is no doubt that London was growing at a faster pace than several of its European counterparts. The city had around 5 million inhabitants in 1883, which compares with around 2.3 million for Paris and around 1.2 million each for Vienna and Berlin.[25] It had a large migrant population, with just over a third of those returned in the 1881 census having been born elsewhere in the United Kingdom.[26] Until 1880 the city's built-up area was largely contained within four miles of Charing Cross and separated from the outlying population centres that had begun to grow with the expansion of the railway.[27] From the 1880s onwards, however, London was transformed by the

development of new forms of transport: the underground railway, bicycles, motor cars and buses and electric trams.[28] The result was a sudden rush to the suburbs.

This rapid growth suggests that, while the centres of many cities were also witnessing the construction of buildings with large complex interiors at that time, the need in London to control the movements and activities of the large numbers of newly emergent and newly mobile members of the working-class- and lower-middle-class-populations was particularly pressing. While the number of street markets grew to meet their consuming needs, the railways stations constituted an important component of the new transport systems that brought many of them into the urban setting, while the winter gardens and people's palaces (especially the Alexandra Palace and the People's Palace in the Mile End Road) catered for their educational and entertainment requirements, which were judged to be considerable.

The need to expand the opportunities for mass leisure was also evident in the expansion of many other forms of single-purpose sites of entertainment. At the end of the 1870s, for example, London was estimated to have had fifty-seven central and suburban theatres, with seats for around 126,000 people and by 1910 about 141,000. [29] Cinema grew rapidly in the early years of the twentieth century, with ninety-four licensed by the London County Council in November 1911. [30] The London Hospital also increased in size and efficiency to cater for expanding needs.[31]

Another possible difference between London and other European centres relates to the level of planning that was in evidence in the period under review. Paris experienced 'Haussmannisation' and the creation of its wide boulevards, while a similarly planned structure was put in place in Vienna. In many cities large-scale urban growth was managed with grid planning, as in Barcelona and New York. However, in this period in London, development was more piece-meal, and large-scale planning projects - such as the clearing of older streets to create Aldwych and Kingsway - were rarer. This was in part a result of the fact that, while the London County Council (LCC) replaced the

Metropolitan Board of Works in 1888, the City Corporation continued to have control of their square-mile enclave in the heart of the city.

To conclude, the discussions of interiors in this special issue highlight many of the ways in which the material and the spatial interacted with the social in late-nineteenth century and early twentieth-century London. The coming together of several factors – new patterns of urban consumption, transportation and leisure; the availability of new materials with which to construct large-scale buildings; and new forms of investment among them – resulted in new forms of complex spaces which both drove, and were driven by, new behaviours. Although responding to a range of different needs – from shopping to promenading to being operated on - the new indoor environments in question made it possible for large numbers of people to become part of the everyday fabric of the city within structures that contained and sheltered them while also helping them construct new identities in an urban setting.

[1] It is worth noting that the one complex and technologically innovative building that has already received considerable attention is the department store – both European and American - which has been the focus of work by historians of retailing and consumption. Studies include: G. Crossick and Serge Jaumain (eds.) *Cathedrals of Consumption: European Department Stores 1850-1939* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999); A. Lasc, P. Lara-Betancourt and Margaret Male Petty (eds.) *Architectures of Display: Department Stores and Modern Retailing* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017); E. M. Orr *Designing the Department Store: Display and Retail at the Turn of the Century* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2019); and J. Whitaker *The Department Store: History, Design, Display* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2011).

[2] Along with several other European iron and glass buildings, the Crystal Palace was mentioned in N. Pevsner *Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to the Bauhaus* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Book Ltd., 1960).

[3] D. Murphy *The Architecture of Failure* (Winchester, UK, Washington, USA: Zero Books, 2012), 2.

[4] See, for example, P. Sparke *As Long as it's Pink: The Sexual Politics of Taste* (London: Pandora, 1995).

[5] See C. Rice *The Emergence of the Interior* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006) and M. Pimlott *Without and Within: Essays on Territory and the Interior'* (The Netherlands: Jap Sam Books, 2007) and *The Public Interior as Idea and Project* (The Netherlands: Jap Sam Books, 2017).

[6] See, for example, M. de Certeau *The Practice of Everyday Life* (California, USA: University of California Press: [3rd edition] 2011) and H. Lefevre *The Production of Space* (Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 1991).

[7] A. Smith 'The Expansion and Remodelling of the London Hospital by Rowland Plumbe, 1884–1919', *The London Journal* (issue/DOI needed)

[8] R. Dennis *Cities in Modernity: Representations and Productions of Metropolitan Space, 1840–1930*, (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 2.

[9] J. A. Tarr and G. Dupuy, eds., *Technology and the Rise of the Networked City in Europe and America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988)

[10] V. Kelley 'London's Street Markets: the shifting interiors of informal architecture' *London Journal* (issue/DOI needed)

[11] Joseph Paxton's Great Victorian Way of 1855, which was never actually built, would have consisted of a ten-mile covered loop around much of central and west London, integrating a glass-roofed street, railways, shops and houses.

[12] F. Fisher 'Inside London's Railway Termini, c.1870-1939' *London Journal* (issue and DOI needed)

[13] K. Hetherington *Capitalism's Eye: Cultural Spaces of the Commodity* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 10.

[14] Hetherington, *Capitalism's Eye,* 22.

[15] Hetherington, *Capitalism's Eye,* 20.

[16] Op. cit., 4.

[17] P. Sparke '"Covered Promenades for Wet Weather": London's Winter Gardens and People's Palaces' *London Journal* (issue and DOI needed)

[18] Hetherington, *Capitalism's Eye,* 122

[19] M. Augé *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (New York: Verso Books, 2009)

[20] Hetherington, *Capitalism's Eye,* 20.

[21] Hetherington, *Capitalism's Eye,* 29.

[22] Dennis, *Cities in Modernity,* 136.

[23] See J. Hix *The Glasshouse* (London: Phaidon, 2005)

[24] S. Inwood *City of Cities: The Birth of Modern London* (London: Macmillan, 2005), 23.

[25] Inwood, *City of Cities,* 9.

[26] Inwood, *City of Cities,* 9.

[27] Inwood, *City of Cities,* 10.

[28] Inwood, *City of Cities,* 225.

[29] Inwood, *City of Cities,* 420.

[30] Inwood, *City of Cities,* 448.

[31] See E. Rappaport *Shopping for Pleasure: Women in the Making of London's West End* (Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 2000).