

Photographic Flâneur, Street Photography, and Imagi(ni)ng the City

ILIJA TOMANIĆ TRIVUNDŽA
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

This article argues in favor of continuous symbolic relevance and analytical power of flâneur to pose significant questions about our present social condition, but proposes this can be achieved not by looking at the flâneur as a specific sociohistorical subject but rather through the notion of flânerie as a specific practice of observation, knowledge accumulation, and production of texts. The article first develops the analytical model of flânerie, which is then applied to the genre of street photography to demonstrate how it can be understood as photographic flânerie. In the subsequent part, the article shows how certain contemporary visual practices that represent contemporary developments of the genre of street photography—such as certain types of Google Street View captures and certain types of photographic documentation of urban exploration—can be understood as photographic flânerie’s adaptive responses to the changing conditions of visibility in contemporary societies, the blurring of the division between the public and private domains, and the destructive inscription of neoliberalism into the physical space of the city.

Keywords: flâneur, street photography, street view, urban exploration, ruin porn

The flâneur, a solitary urban stroller who strives to come to terms with the ever-changing “modern condition” through the observation of everyday life in the city, continues to stir the imagination of Western social scientists and cultural critics, with the normal comings and goings of any fashionable concept, ever since Baudelaire’s enthusiastic and hyperbolic endorsement of the flâneur in his 1863 essay “The Painter of Modern Times.” Nevertheless, it remains a highly contested subject, particularly because the “late modern” rediscovery of the flâneur in the late 1970s and early 1980s is primarily based on Walter Benjamin’s pessimistic notes on its demise under the onslaught of the consumer society. For the most part, these works did not use the flâneur as a source for their reflections about modernity, but rather as a rhetorical figure that enabled their authors to launch social and economic critiques about both the modern and the late modern condition. Thus, rather than producing a shared definition of the flâneur, this resulted in the production of “as many images of the *flâneur* as there are conceptions of the modern” (Gluck, 2003, p. 53).

(Re)Introduction: The Flâneur

There are two major strands in the writings on the flâneur. One is affiliated with the critics of modernity who have, for the most part, treated the flâneur as a specific sociohistorical figure and confined

Ilija Tomanić Trivundža: Ilija.Tomanic@fdv.uni-lj.si

Date submitted: 2017–09–06

Copyright © 2019 (Ilija Tomanić Trivundža). Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd). Available at <http://ijoc.org>.

him¹ to the streets and shopping arcades of 19th-century Paris. The other is affiliated with the critics of late modernity who see the remnants of the flâneur's presence throughout the 20th century and well into the present day, but who tend to flatten the flânerie concept into a one-dimensional plane of consumerism in which the present-day flâneurs and flâneuses are little more than mindless consumers (e.g., Parkhurst Ferguson, 1994) or shopping mall rats (e.g., Bauman, 1994). This reduction of the flâneur to a consumer is often accompanied by the overtly liberal interpretations of the notion of "strolling," which strip both the flâneur and flânerie of their constitutive connection to the physical urban space: reading illustrated magazines at the end of 19th century (Gretton, 2006), movie viewing in the early days of the cinema (Bruno, as cited in Wolff, 2006), zapping through TV channels in the 1980s and 1990s (Bauman, 1996, p. 28), or browsing the Net in 1990s and 2000s (Goldate, as cited in Morozov, 2012).

This article is based on a premise that flânerie, as an analytical concept, still has the potential to comment on or to pose questions about our present social condition—particularly those related to the imagi(ni)ng of the city under conditions of the increased visibility of everyday life, the blurred division between the public and private domains, and the intensified inscription of the neoliberal economy into the physical space of the city. The first part of the article outlines how the analytical "currency" of the concept is derived through defining flânerie as a particular kind of social practice, with a set of core characteristics, whose specific manifestations change with the changing socioeconomic circumstances. In the second part of the article, this analytical model is applied to a specific photographic articulation of flânerie—street photography.

Botanizing Flânerie

To sustain the analytical value of the concept of flânerie, Benjamin's (1999a; 1939/2007) claim of the flâneur's consumeristic decline needs to be rejected both in its historical reduction (the flâneur as a bygone social type of 19th-century Paris) and in its moral/ideological condemnation (the flâneur as mindless consumer). As Jenks and Neves (2000) point out, the mainstream body of writing on the flâneur belongs "more to the realm of the literary essay or social-historical analysis than to theoretical, methodological and ethical considerations about actual social research" which prevents "the recuperation of the *flâneur* by social science, as a metaphor for a way of inquiring into the urban" (p. 2; cf. Jenks, 1995, p. 149). In this section, it is argued that such recuperation cannot be achieved by looking for the flâneur as a particular social subject who "goes botanizing on the asphalt" (Benjamin, 1999a, [J82a.3], but rather by botanizing flânerie through identification of the basic constitutive elements of flânerie as a social practice: (1) the perambulating observation, (2) the critical reflection/knowledge production, and (3) the transformation of observations and reflections into communicable "texts."² Such a discursive approach to the subject does not aim to produce one "proper," ultimate definition of the flâneur, but identifies the three basic constitutive elements around which flânerie as a practice can be articulated. It emphasizes that, within specific sociohistorical contexts, flânerie is necessarily articulated differently and is practiced by different subjects for different goals, depending on the specific limitations of the particular social condition and of the chosen medium of expression.

¹ For discussions on the (non)existence of flâneuse, see D'Souza and McDonough (2006).

² An earlier notion of the basic elements of flânerie, first published in Tomanić Trivundža (2011), has been heavily reconceptualized and fully revised for the purpose of this article.

Flânerie as a Particular Type of Observation

The central, constitutive aspect of flânerie is that of the perambulating observation of the urban. From the early 19th century physiologies to Baudelaire's (1863/1995) exhilarating description of monsieur G., flânerie has been described as the act of passionate observation during aimless strolling across the topos of a modern city—its streets, squares, boulevards, as well as its more liminal spaces, such as public parks and shopping arcades. To flâner is to step into the public domain, to throw oneself into the ebb and flow of the crowd, but also to simultaneously maintain a certain level of distance—to be in the crowd rather than one of the crowd. Flânerie has no predetermined itinerary or goal—to flâner is to allow the act of strolling to impose its own logic, being guided solely by "visual lures" (Shields, 1994, p. 65) and momentary fascinations. This apparent aimlessness and constitutive openness to chance is what distinguishes flânerie from other practices of visual investigation or consumption of the city, such as tourism or shopping. By allowing the act of strolling to impose its own logic, flânerie can be seen as a practice of estrangement from a place for the purpose of achieving a heightened sense of awareness, enhancing the flâneur's perception and susceptibility. The central characteristic of the flâneur's gaze lies in its ability to see the city, as well as the people and commodities that "populate" it, as if for the first time, to be able "to walk out your front door as if you're just arrived from a foreign country" (Benjamin, 1999a, M10a,4]. To flâner is, therefore, not a process of "going native" but precisely its opposite—it relies on the sensibility of a native who becomes a stranger to be able to read the fleeting semiotics of the street (Shields, 1994).

The flâneur should, consequently, not be understood as a "perambulating panopticon" (Mazlish, 1994, p. 51), for flânerie does not produce a totalizing vision and accompanying web of power-knowledge. Quite the opposite, the type of gaze cultivated by flânerie is mobile, fragmented, momentary, and open to chance. It cultivates a detached gaze of an outside observer who is, like a barefoot semiotician, attempting to read the city, its inhabitants, and omnipresent commodities as a series of signs and signifying surfaces. The gaze of the flâneur is, thus, akin to that of a detective (Benjamin, 1999a) looking for visual cues that need to be deciphered, for details that would yield a deeper meaning on careful inspection.

Baudelaire famously describes the flâneur's task as that of transcending the chaos of appearances to "distil the eternal from the transitory" and find the "element of beauty it contains, however slight or minimal that element is" (Baudelaire, 1863/1995, pp. 11–12). This is achieved through a series of small and momentary everyday life epiphanies, for which Gleber (1999) borrows the notion of *augenblick* (p. 14). The hunt for such chance momentary insights is often described as intoxicating, as both the sensory and sensual experiences encroach onto the domain of the nonrational (Baudelaire, 1863/1995; Benjamin, 1999a; Gleber, 1999, p. 24).

Flânerie as a Particular Kind of Knowledge Production

As a particular social practice and a method of urban inquiry, flânerie differs from mere strolling. Flânerie represents a type of observation that combines "the aimlessness of strolling, and the reflectiveness of the gaze" (Wolff, 2006, p. 21). Although traversing physical space is constitutive of flânerie, the strolling is not an end goal in itself, but primarily a strategy for the accumulation of information. Flânerie is, thus, not simply an act of passive visual consumption, and as such differs from gawping or voyeurism, because

its observation serves as the basis for critical reflection rather than mere sensual arousal (Frisby, 1994, p. 93; cf. Featherstone, 1998, p. 913). Although the gaze of the flâneur is directed at the surface, at appearances, its aim is to penetrate the surface, to go beyond the appearances so that they would reveal “the secret treasure of which they were themselves no more than the outer coverings” (Proust, 1922; cf. Gluck, 2003, p. 70). As Shields (1994) puts it, “back-dropping the flâneur is a mythology of scopic penetration and understanding which could only be supported on the basis of rationalizing empiricism” (p. 78). To flâneur is more than an act of observation, it is, as Benjamin (1999a) famously described it, to go “botanizing on the asphalt” (Benjamin, 1999a, [J82a,3])—not merely to observe but also to collect, describe, and catalogue the observations. However, it is important to note that such botanizing is not a positivist, but a reflexive, constructivist project. The epistemology of flânerie explicitly acknowledges the subjective dimension of knowledge formation and its construction in the process of sense making, and it consequently requires an active subject. Benjamin (1999a) vividly describes this process in a fragment from *The Arcades Project*:

With the aid of a word I overhear in passing, I reconstruct an entire conversation, an entire existence. The inflection of a voice suffices for me to attach the name of a deadly sin to the man whom I have just jostled and whose profile I glimpsed. (Benjamin, 1999a, [M7,8])

Gluck (2003, p. 77) points out that there are essentially two strands of flânerie-based knowledge production—one that addresses the social aspect of the urban experience and another that focuses on the aesthetic dimension of modernity.³ From the former perspective, modernity is a social labyrinth that awaits to be deciphered; from the latter, it is an aesthetic text (or its raw material) that needs to be conveyed through the creative potential of the artist. In both cases, however, the fragments of real life are to be carefully (re)assembled into an interpretative text that supposedly reveals the true essence of the social phenomenon or person (Baudelaire, 1863/1995).

The knowledge produced through flânerie is not objective knowledge but one deeply marked by the tension between authenticity and speculation. On the one hand, accounts of flânerie bear the aura of authenticity because they are based on eyewitnessing. On the other, conclusions formed through these accounts are highly speculative because they are based on the flâneur’s imagination and on the domain of memory rather than facts. The authority of these claims to truth (or beauty) rests on the flâneur’s or flâneuse’s ability to make a contemporary social condition visible and explainable, even if it is based on such problematic assumptions as judging a person’s moral character from their facial features or hand gestures. The flâneur’s knowledge is, therefore, often that of a connoisseur rather than of a (social) scientist. Even if driven by the same impetus to make the world more knowable, predictable, and manageable, it is based on different imaginative empiricism.

³ Contrary to Gluck (2003), we treat the two as general rather than historically specific types.

Flânerie as a Production of "Texts"

Although typically conceived as an act of solitary, anonymous, and detached observation, flânerie is, in fact, not complete until the insights gained are communicated to the public. The final step of flânerie is the transformation from the role of observer/analyst into that of a producer—a creator of various literary (poetry, prose, plays, as well as physiologies, feuilletons, and cultural criticism) or visual "texts" (illustrations and paintings, as well as photography and film). In his role as a creator of texts, the flâneur shares much common ground with other practitioners of expert communication of observable urban everyday life, such as social theorists, urban ethnographers, and journalists (Benjamin, 1999a; Frisby, 1994; Jenks & Neves 2000; Wolff, 2006). The production of communicable accounts of flânerie is spanned between desire and (economic) necessity. If the former relates to the creative aspects of the practice (the intoxication of observation, of being one with the world, and the desire for outside recognition of the connoisseur status), the latter is linked to the "affordability" of flânerie as a time-intensive practice. As noted already by Benjamin, to maintain the freedom necessary to practice flânerie, the flâneur might end up being forced to go on the market to "sell his images of metropolis, to sell his socially necessary labour time spent on the boulevards, traversing the signifiers of modernity" (Frisby, 1994, p. 95). To practice flânerie is to occupy (at least temporarily) a position that is slightly anachronistic (Donald, 1999, p. 46), and "out of the step with the rapid circulation of the modern metropolis" (Tester, 1994, p. 15) and with the rationally organized flow of capitalist (late) modernity. Hence, its most attentive observer is someone who walks with a different, slower pace than that of the surrounding crowd because he or she stands outside of the "productive time" of (post)industrial capitalism. Such idleness can, under certain circumstances, be seen as a sort of "demonstration against the division of labor" (Benjamin, 1999a, [M5,7]); however, the mere fact that the time spent flânering is first and foremost time that is spent outside "the increasing ordinance of public life . . . in terms of labour and productivity" (Shields, 1994, p. 73) does not make it unproductive or independent of productive relations. The idleness of flânerie is a "productive idleness," one that is necessary for the accumulation of the observations and the subsequent production of "texts." Consequently, the freedom to flâner is not an absolute freedom, but a currency that is exchanged for highly precarious or bohemian ways of making a living, frequently accompanied by stigma of suspicion.

In the next section, the three basic constitutive elements of flânerie, outlined above, are used to demonstrate how street photography represents one of the more enduring, if often overlooked, forms of flânerie.

Street Photography as Flânerie

Photography as such has, for the most part, been absent from the mainstream debates on the flâneur concept, and connecting the two has never gained much credit outside of the more recent, specialized literature on photography (e.g., Scott, 2009; Tormey, 2013; Westerbeck & Meyerowitz, 1994/2001). Curiously enough, this "missing link" goes back to Benjamin, who failed to articulate the connection between photography and flânerie, even though he was a, insightful observer of the medium of photography. Benjamin not only lived in and walked about the same Parisian neighborhoods as many of now famed photographic flâneurs (Kertész, Brassai, Atget), but he was also very much aware of the work of the contemporary Paris-based photographers. Benjamin (1931/1999b), for example, writes extensively about one of now most cherished photographic flâneurs, Eugène Atget, in his 1931 essay "Little History of Photography." He also writes about the potential of photography and cinema to help the "modern man"

absorb the threatening shocks of urban modernity, which he sketches out in the 1935 essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (Benjamin, 1939/2007). Thus, it is not without historical irony that one notes that, while Benjamin was busily compiling his notes in *Bibliothèque Nationale* and lamenting the death of the 19th-century flâneur, a new form of 20th-century flânerie—practiced by both male flâneurs, such as Kertész or Brassai, and female flâneuses, such as Germaine Krull, Gisèle Freund, or Lisette Model—found its way onto the pages of the interwar press, filling the increasingly popular illustrated magazines with visual accounts of everyday city life.

Susan Sontag's *On Photography* (1977/2005) is often credited as the first work to explicitly connect (street) photography and flânerie. In the book, Sontag claims that "photography first comes into its own as an extension of the eye of the middle-class flâneur" (p. 43), but simultaneously condemns the result as fake bourgeois sentiment that is based on sympathy rather than social engagement:

The photographer is an armed version of the solitary walker reconnoitering, stalking, cruising the urban inferno, the voyeuristic stroller who discovers the city as a landscape of voluptuous extremes and who, "adept of the joys of watching[,] . . . finds the world 'picturesque.'" (p. 43)

However, these comments are more informative about Sontag's general quarrel with documentarist photography and bourgeois political (un)sensitivity, rather than useful as a starting point for inquiry into photographic flânerie or illustrative about street photography as a specific photographic practice. For this purpose, an earlier observation made by Henri Cartier-Bresson that articulates a distinction between the voyeuristic gaze linked to sensual pleasure and the scopophilic desire linked to experiencing and knowing might be more useful. Rather than accusing the urban photographic observation of voyeurism, Cartier-Bresson (1955/1999) emphasizes its pensive qualities by describing photographic flânerie as the union of the instantaneity of catching life with a camera with the "methodological mind" (p. 51) of the photographer.

Street photography was born at the end of the 19th century out of a merger among the technical affordances (such as smaller cameras and shorter recording times), the lifted legal restrictions on taking (candid) photographs in public spaces, and the recognition of the street as a stage—a privileged site in which social encounters become performances casted by modernity and directed by chance. As a medium of expression, photography has several characteristics that are attuned to the gaze of flânerie. Most notably, the photographic camera has the capacity to capture a fleeting moment. It captures an instant of time and gives that instant both form and duration by transforming it into an image, which extend beyond the moment the image is recorded (e.g., Berger & Mohr, 1982/1995, pp. 119–124). Photography is a medium that in itself privileges surface—it reduces all social phenomena and action to their physical manifestations, to their outward appearances. It is also a medium that champions chance. The photographic camera is an ideal prosthetic device for the flâneur, not only because it enables the instantaneous recording of chance findings but also because, as a medium, it is inherently open to chance (interpretation) at the moment of viewing. The camera records objects in front of the lens indiscriminately, recording not only what the photographer sees but also a wealth of "unnoticed" details and information that provide the potential for subsequent "chance discoveries" in the process of looking at photographs.

Although street photography was never a fully coherent photographic genre or style, its many currents always bear a strong imprint of *flânerie*. From the perspective of the three constitutive elements of *flânerie* as a social practice, the most evident connection is with the gaze of *flânerie*—its mobility, instantaneity, transitivity, fragmentation, and openness to chance. For a street photographer, the city is experienced as an immense reservoir of self-generating images that need to be snatched and captured within a fraction of a second. This instantaneity of the photographic gaze and its connection to the *flâneur's* prized *augenblick* is most famously summed up by Henri Cartier-Bresson (1995/1999) as the ability of "simultaneous recognition, in a fraction of a second, of the significance of an event as well as of a precise organisation of forms which give that event its proper expression" (p. 42). Being able to capture such rare moments (p. 23) requires observation with an ever-attentive eye, a state of mind filled with intoxication (being able "learn how to anticipate that that thing is going to unfold in front of you in 1/1000 of a second" and "then you get back what a 1/1000 of a second reveals, which is unbelievable"; Meyerowitz, as cited in Westerbeck documentary, 1982, minutes 3–5), and a simultaneous anxiety about missing out or failing to capture moments that cannot be recreated ("one must seize the moment before it passes, the fleeting gesture, the evanescent smile. . . . That's why I'm so nervous"; Cartier-Bresson, as cited in Westerbeck & Meyerowitz, 1994/2001, p. 157). The gaze of street photography as a form of *flânerie* is an affirmation and a glorification of chance; it promotes the "aesthetics of constant unexpectedness" (Milosz, as cited in Westerbeck & Meyerowitz, 1994/2001, p. 42), most often in the form of surprising confluences and humorous, enigmatic, or even uncanny juxtapositions (Tormey, 2013, p. 96). The object of street photography's gaze is both life on and life of the streets, and the genre remains stretched between the depictions of the people and activities on the street and the depictions of the urban space and semiotics of objects. Although these positions are not mutually exclusive, most photographers recognize either the "face" or the "trace" to be the signifying surface of the present social condition.

As a form of knowledge production, street photography conceptualizes "the street" both as the location of and metaphor for the everyday, arguing that the everyday deserves to be recorded because it can be taken as an indicator of the present social condition (Eskildsen, 2008, p. 10) or because it is a terrain of the unperceived and overlooked (Blanchot, as cited in Wigoder, 2015, p. 370). Street photography's claim to knowledge is grounded in its stake of catching life unaware, unmediated, or in other words—authentic. One strand of street photography, drawing on the taxonomic affinities of the medium (Scott, 2009, p. 64), focuses on presenting an inventory of authentic urban characters, much akin to early physiologies, creating in time "an imaginary ensemble of characters without which it would be impossible to visualise the urban spectacle" (Ebner, 2008, p. 193). Another one of the strands uses the street "as a site of unmasking" to test the bourgeois performance for its authenticity (Eskildsen, 2008, p. 10). The latter, in particular, is attuned to the idea that the gaze of the *flâneur* can penetrate the surface, punctuate the appearance of a person or object, and reveal their "true" character or expose a social phenomenon. Either documentary or lyrical, these momentary visual epiphanies provide the grounds for speculative knowledge, which is heavily reliant on the viewer's knowledge and imagination in the stage of interpretation and on his or her ability to complete the story or answer the questions posed. The particular characteristics of the photographic medium—and sometimes the photographer's conscious stylistic decisions—make photographic *flânerie* essentially a two-stage process. Photographs are always "incomplete utterances" (Sekula, 1982, p. 85), unable to univocally articulate a definite claim, statement, or evaluation, and are therefore reliant on the viewer's participation much more than the written accounts of *flânerie*. The reading of street photography is thus, in itself, an act of *flânerie*, a "chance

encounter, designed to trigger an unselfconscious spontaneity of response, free, shifting, made of insight, amusement, sentiment, but unisistent, and of uncertain duration" (Scott, 2009, p. 66).

Transformed into "texts"—either as single images or series of photographs that are published, most notably, in the form of photographic books, as well as in exhibitions and in the press—street photography either celebrates the aesthetic dimension of everyday life in cities (the poetics of the street, the overlooked) or poses a social commentary. However, as Scott (2009) notes, the social commentary of street photography appears to be less binding than that of documentary photography because it "registers and affirms the random, the uncontrolled, the unknown (and perhaps unknowable)" (p. 85). Although street photography often lacks explicit, predetermined, sociopolitical agenda, its openness to randomness is better understood through the notion of serendipity than through that of plain chance. Street photographers like to emphasize that their images are not the result of a stroke of luck but that these chance findings are earned; they are the "gifts" received in exchange for the continuous laborious work of perambulating observation and anticipation, deriving from their connoisseurship of the street (e.g., Meyerowitz, as cited in Westerbeck, 1981). Because it trades in serendipity as a kind of "earned chance" (see Kelsey, 2008), street photography is often attuned to surrealist aesthetics, to notions of found objects and ready-mades (Westerbeck & Meyerowitz, 1994/2001, p. 158), and frequently functions either through the estrangement of the familiar or by elevating "the commonplace and familiar into something mythical and even heroic" (Howarth & McLaren, 2010, p. 9). From the perspective of text production, street photography makes the city legible through a series of questions rather than readable in the form of definite answers. Its visual "texts" often remain mysterious and unresolvable.

Having applied the analytical model of flânerie to street photography, the following section is used to present what—to paraphrase Habermas—the contemporary structural transformations of flânerie in the form of street photography can reveal about our ability to imag(in)e our present social condition through photographic urban observation.

Contemporary Challenges to Photographic Flânerie

Since the turn of the millennium, photographic flânerie is gradually undergoing a series of transformations that can be seen as an adaptive response to three trajectories of the broader and interlaced sociotechnological changes: the growing ubiquity of photography, the increasing publicness of everyday life through Internet-based (algorithmically mediated and mass surveyed) communication, and the commodification of urban public space. Admittedly, these general trends inscribe themselves differently in specific urban, local, and national contexts and any in-depth analysis of specific photographic flânerie projects should also account for such specificities. This section, however, aims to delineate the general trends on the level of genre and it, for that reason, remains on a more abstract level of the central tendencies of the "present socioeconomic condition" that are, admittedly, far more visible in the Western/Northern centers than in the non-Western/Northern ones or in the multiple peripheries of the globalized world.

The growing ubiquity of photography in and the ever greater communicative publicness of everyday life both reinvigorate and challenge the photographic flânerie and the genre of street photography. On the one hand, there have never been so many professional and amateur photographers consciously practicing

street photography and communicating their visual “finds” publicly as there are today. They do so most often through image-sharing sites (e.g., Flickr), blogs, social networks (e.g., Instagram), as well as through more institutionalized channels such as photographic exhibitions, festivals, and the genre’s most cherished form—photographic books. On the other hand, the recent changes in imaging and communication practices also significantly challenge the street photography’s claim of exclusivity and legitimacy in “taking candid pictures in the stream of everyday life” (Howarth & McLaren, 2010, p. 9). Street photography’s claim of supplying meaningful expert societal narration through images of the everyday is challenged from “below” by the burgeoning flow of vernacular images of everyday life on social media, where they are an instrumental part of the networked sociability and identity-performing practices. At the same time, the genre’s claim of legitimacy is also challenged from “above” by the corporations, state institutions, or surveillance agencies that, in the name of increased security or enhanced commercial services, engage in an automated and clandestine collection of images or the creation of visualizations of urban life. These two developments destabilize the genre of street photography in two very different ways. The vernacular challenge of the genre’s exclusivity challenges the aesthetic dimension of the genre—the proliferation, repetition, and imitation gradually transform certain types of images into visual clichés, resulting in a symbolic contestation between the amateurs and professionals that pushes the latter into a search for stylistic and thematic innovations. The proliferation of nonhuman imaging and visual surveillance, on the other hand, work to undermine the street photographer’s legitimacy to produce images of everyday urbanity—as the professional and serious amateur photographers taking photographs in public spaces are increasingly becoming subject to suspicion, harassment, and legal prosecution (Howarth & McLaren, 2010; Marsh, Miles, & Palmer, 2015).

Within the genre of street photography, at least two adaptive responses to the contemporary challenges of flânerie’s basic constitutive elements can be discerned that have, as indicated above, challenged the status of photographic flânerie as a discrete and monetizable practice of mediating the accounts of everyday urban life, and have undermined the very legitimacy of knowledge production through perambulating urban observation by “unauthorized” individuals. Admittedly, virtual flânerie and UrbEx flânerie are two very different extensions of the genre of street photography. The former replaces the physical flânerie with a virtual one and has photographers “stroll” through existing online visualizations of urban environment, such as Google Street View, and the latter preserves the physical aspect of flânerie but radically changes its location, moving it from publicly accessible urban spaces, formerly epitomized by “the street,” to those pockets of urban space that are fenced off from public access.

“Virtual flânerie” refers to the photographic projects⁴ that use Google Street View as a visual interface for accessing the urban life in its rough rather than raw form. The most notable projects of this kind are Michael Wolf’s *Paris Street View* (2006) and his subsequent projects *Manhattan Street View* (2010) or *Street View/Interface* (2010), Jon Rafman’s *Nine Eyes of Google Street View* (2008–ongoing), Doug Rickard’s *A New American Picture* (Campany, O’Toole, & Rickard, 2012), and Mishka Henner’s *No Man’s Land* (2012). For Michael Wolf, strolling through Google’s visualization of Paris rather than physically exploring the city is a way of avoiding a cliché representation of an overrepresented, “mausoleumized” city. By applying the typical chance-driven gaze of the photographic flâneur to the automated visualizations of

⁴ Not every appropriation of Street View imagery can be counted as virtual flânerie; practices such as Street View or Google Earth “spotting” are generally motivated by different drives (e.g., see Wolthers, 2016).

the Google Street View, Wolf captures a number of street photography's typical motifs, even images that are reminiscent of some of street photography's most celebrated photographs (e.g., Doisneau's "Kiss"). Rafman's ongoing project, *Nine Eyes of Google Street View*, is similarly inspired by the ability of the Street View to provide the visual imaginary akin of earlier street photography, leading one critic to claim that the project produces "a parallel history of the medium, in which repeat images from Lartigue, Doisneau, Winogrand . . . and other masters mingle indiscriminately with freakishly fascinating snapshots" (Dyer, 2012, para. 7). For Rickard, virtual flânerie is a way of overcoming the inability to travel physically, resulting in a visual portrayal of economically devastated areas of the contemporary United States. In *A New American Picture*, the Street View automated visualization of places in which the American dream has broken down is appropriated through the flâneur's pensive gaze by extracting the images that, in terms of content and aesthetics, belong to the street photography and social documentary tradition. In Henner's *No Man's Land*, Google's automated recording of the physical environment is subjected to a critical perambulating gaze to reveal incidental portrayals of social inequality through a series of environmental portraits of prostitutes on the outskirts of cities in southern Europe.

This abandoning of the physical city space and the replacement of "legwork" with "mousework" should not be seen as an end of flânerie, but rather as its radical transformation. Geared toward the critique of the dominant regime of visibility, virtual flânerie represents an attempt to reinstate the human agency into the contemporary milieu of new visibility and publicness through automated, computerized surveillance of the urban environment. These projects acknowledge that the totalizing and impassionate robotic gaze of the Street View can record meaningful images of social life by chance. At the same time, they also claim that such visualizations do not constitute the "readability" of the city in themselves (de Certeau, 1984, pp. 92–93) but are merely an extension of what de Certeau (1984) called the "voyeur-god's totalising view" onto the street level. To achieve social readability, the images need to be "redeemed" from the flow of visual data by a reflexive human gaze of a contemporary photographic flâneur. As an act of meaning making and knowledge creation, virtual flânerie's narration is still dependent on chance, but, unlike the statistical probability that structures the images caught by the robotic gaze, the findings of virtual flânerie depend on serendipitous (earned) chance, one that is granted to the flâneur as a social connoisseur. Although it could be argued that Street View aims to disenchant the world, to make it knowable and predictable, virtual flânerie aims to either reenchant it with poetry and the surreal or sublime aesthetic appreciation (Rafman, Wolf), or to bring social consciousness and commentary to the impassionate robotic gaze (Henner, Rickard). In the process, these projects disenchant the supposed transparency of the robotic gaze they appropriate: the pixelated images, the elements of application interface, and the blurred faces of individuals are constant reminders to the viewer that he or she is interpellated into witnessing through a system of representation in which public visibility is conditioned by private liability and corporate interest.

The second "structural transformation" of photographic flânerie is the visual narration of contemporary urbanity through urban exploration. If virtual flânerie is an adaptive response to the changing regime of publicness, then urban exploration can be seen as an adaptive response to the material manifestations of the inscription of neoliberal economic relations into the urban space. Generally speaking, urban exploration is practiced either as an exploration of abandoned buildings and structures or as an exploration of urban infrastructure and buildings that are off limits to the general public (sometimes referred to as "place hacking"). The present style of urban exploration, also known as UrbEx or simply UE, was

codified in the early 2000s (see Garrett, 2013, pp. 34–35; cf. Edensor, 2005) and combines exploration of physical space with an imperative for visual documentation. Mediation and documentation through images is central to the practice: UrbEx is visual (photography/video as mode of exploration) and visualized (images are published online), but the taking of images also has a normative role of policing the boundary of ethical behavior (“take nothing but pictures”).

Within the cacophony of urban exploration practices and their mediations, the notion of photographic flânerie can be extended to those projects that are typically based on the exploration of derelict and ruined places (rather than of functioning man-made structures), those that focus on building the narrative around the site (rather than around the explorer), and those that use photographic mediation to contemplate the socioeconomic change (rather than using it to seek peer approval or social media praise). Such projects extend beyond basic documentation work available through popular UrbEx resource pages such as Urban Exploration Resource (<https://www.uer.ca/>) or 28 Days Later (<https://www.28dayslater.co.uk/>), or exploits of individual researchers. Typical projects that would fall under category of UrbEx flânerie would be *Detroiturbex* (<http://detroiturbex.com/>), which charts and historicizes urban decline of Detroit through combination of UrbEx images, historic photographs and documents, long-term documentary photographic projects on ruination such as David McMillan’s work on *Chernobyl Exclusion Zone* (2019), or art projects imag(in)ing specific locations, such as Yves Marchand and Romain Meffre’s *The Ruins of Detroit* (2010) and Andrew Moore’s *Detroit Disassembled* (2010), to name but two of the most acclaimed and contested projects of this type.

From the perspective of flânerie’s three constitutive elements, this type of urban exploration can be understood as a specific claim to the city that is fueled by the search for the authenticity of experience. Garrett’s (2013) ethnographic study shows urban explorers as the individuals who wish to establish a different and more personal relation to the city, one that goes against the “imperatives of late capitalism which encourage spectatorship rather than participation” (p. 18). As a form of knowledge production, publicized on a sprawling number of specialized blogs, websites, self-published photo books, art photography books, and exhibitions, UrbEx flânerie projects constitute attempts to partake in the narration of the city—either by constructing the narrations of sites and places left out by the official cultural intermediaries or through narratives that challenge the established expert-produced narratives (*Detroiturbex*), or those which challenge modes of their perception (*Chernobyl Exclusion Zone*) and visual display (*The Ruins of Detroit*, *Detroit Disassembled*).

UrbEx flânerie does not abandon the physical space of the city in the search of chance insights, but it changes both the notion of chance and the location of the flânerie as contemporary flâneurs and flâneuses end up strolling off the increasingly commercialized, regulated, and surveyed streets of contemporary cities into the spaces that are “left behind” by the flow of economic activities. UrbEx flânerie’s quest and celebration of chance is thus realized through an embodied reclaiming of access to the ruins—factories, mills, or mines, as well as abandoned houses, residential housing units, and public buildings such as closed-down schools, hospitals, asylums, or abandoned military installations. Edensor (2005) notes that against the regulated backdrop of the monetized and securitized spaces, the urban ruins stand out as rare spaces that still “contain the promise of unexpected” (p. 4)—not only as the physical manifestations of the breakdown of the expected

order or through their haphazard juxtapositions or decontextualized “display” of objects, but also because they are in the constant process of unpredictable change due to their physical decay.

This is in sharp contrast to the virtual flânerie’s aesthetics and conception of chance: If virtual flânerie attempts to reinstate human agency and history into the seemingly timeless mode of representation, then the photographic activity of UrbEx flânerie essentially functions to simultaneously immobilize history through an image and to “capture the experience of being present in the flow of time” (Garrett, 2013, p. 52). Thus, the typical photographic motives and visual tropes of UrbEx flânerie focus on the physical manifestations of the passing of time, such as physical deterioration (e.g., flaking paint), recognizable objects or signs of a bygone era (e.g., advertisements, inscriptions), and on nature reclaiming man-made structures (e.g., trees and other vegetation, fauna). Through this, UrbEx flânerie imagery challenges the viewers not only to evaluate the present in relation to the past, or contemplate on the “possible futures that never came to be,” but also to acknowledge “the disharmony and the ambivalent relationship between human, historical, and natural temporalities” (Boym, 2011, para. 10).

Peripatetic Conclusion on Contemporary Photographic Flânerie

This article argues in favor of continuous symbolic relevance and analytical power of the flâneur to inform about or comment on a set of changes that characterize the present social condition, such as the changing conditions of visibility in contemporary societies, the blurring of the division between the public and private domains, and the destructive inscription of neoliberal capitalism into the physical space of the city. The article also argues that such recognition of relevance should not be achieved by looking for the flâneur as a specific sociohistorical subject, but rather through the notion of flânerie as a specific practice of observation, knowledge accumulation, and production of texts.

The analytical potential of the flâneur, *pace* Benjamin, does not reside in its ability to serve as a central metaphor for explaining specific sociohistorical epoch, but in its ability to offer insights into the processes of social change via flânerie’s adaptive responses to the changing conditions of visibility, production, spatial mobility, and social communication. Put differently, the particular currency of flânerie has always been its testament to the ability to make sense of the changing social condition by means of perambulating urban nonexpert observation—either directly through the mediated observations or indirectly through public debates triggered by flânerie as a specific form of societal observation. As expressions and articulations of cultural anxieties, the latter can be at least as informative as the former about the processes of social change, as the author has for example argued elsewhere in connection to selfies (Tomanić Trivundža, 2015). From this perspective, questioning of contemporary (ir)relevance of the flâneur cannot stop with analysis of flânerie’s adaptive responses to the processes of social change, but should also include the analysis of cultural anxieties triggered by these adaptive responses.

Admittedly, a detailed and systematic analysis of cultural anxieties present in public discourse about the transformations of the genre of street photography is beyond the aim and scope of this article. This concluding section has a far more modest aim—of merely sketching the contours of such an evaluation through the public debates and critique triggered by virtual flânerie and UrbEx flânerie. It was argued above that virtual flânerie and UrbEx flânerie are two different adaptive responses of the genre of street photography—the former

being a response to the changing regime of publicness and the latter to the material manifestations of the inscription of neoliberal economic relations into the urban space. Virtual flânerie responds to monetizable structuring of visibilities and invisibilities, conditioned by algorithmic power and corporate liability. It insists on readability of social relations and inequalities even within the constraints of the impersonal gaze of corporate visualizing and surveillance apparatuses. If virtual flânerie is after the "invisible eye," UrbEx flânerie counters different invisibility—that of the "invisible hand"—by exposing the destructive spatial inscription of the neoliberal capitalism and insists on readability of its undermining of social contract in late modernity through imag(in)ing urban and industrial ruination.

However, irrespective of these differences, the critique of both of these forms of flânerie—voiced in mainstream media as well as various specialized forums, photography blogs, and social media posts—articulates similar objections that evolve around the inappropriateness of flâneristic gazing via notions of voyeurism and inauthenticity of experience/observer. While the critique of virtual flânerie tends to focus on individual projects, UrbEx flânerie is generally reproached under a common frame of "ruin porn." It is typically dismissed by critics as constituting an abusive and exploitative gaze of outsiders, whose tendency to aestheticize and decontextualize the ruins results in their fetishization (Leary, 2011), trivialization (Clements, as cited in Strangleman, 2013), and pleasurable visual arousal with glaring omission of social reality and human suffering (Arnold, 2015). In debates on ruin porn, UrbEx flânerie emerges not only as exploitative, pornographic visualization of the social blight, but also one which is done by an inappropriate observer, an outsider (either out-of-towner⁵ or artist photographer rather than documentary photographer or photojournalist), which renders the resulting narration and representation not only exploitative but inauthentic (e.g., Leary, 2011). Issues of inauthenticity and voyeuristic exploitation of subjects also feature prominently in objections voiced against individual virtual flânerie projects. Thus for example *Nine Eyes of Google Street View* and *A New American Picture* were repeatedly labeled as inauthentic, with Rafman reproached for lack of authentic creativity in curation of existing imagery and Rickard disapproved for inauthenticity of virtual eyewitnessing. Similarly, Wolf's winning an Honorable Mention in the Contemporary Issues section at the 2012 World Press Photo competition was disapproved on the grounds of not constituting authentic photojournalistic eyewitnessing. Wolf's, Rickard's, and particularly Henner's project *No Man's Land*, have also been labeled as extremely voyeuristic and exploitative in relation to their subjects, with expert critics openly favoring more traditional and institutionalized documentary and photojournalistic approaches, and vernacular critiques objecting their alleged monetization of "the pain of others" in the sphere of art.

These critiques are in many ways reminiscent of earlier critiques of photography as a failing system of representation (e.g., Sontag, 1977/2005) and replicate their dominant themes, such as fear of the corrupting power of images⁶ and individualization of blame and responsibility in relation to photography as a system of

⁵ To a significant extent, the debate on ruin porn is waged over the pictorial representation of Detroit and, by extension, of the reasons for its economic decline, challenging its global symbolic resonance as the former birthplace and a current scrapyard of the Fordist dream.

⁶ For example in debates on ruin porn, the simultaneous fear and contempt of images tend to be based on a highly simplified conceptualization of the cognitive and emotional effects of images. An illustrative example of this position is Arnold (2015), whose understanding of the power of images is merely a variation of the hypodermic needle model of media effects.

representation. From the perspective of flânerie's adaptive responses, it is not the replication of earlier discursive struggles that is particularly informative, but their specific articulation of the distinction between "good" and "bad" looking in relation to the changing conditions of visibility in contemporary societies, the blurring of the division between the public and private domains, and the destructive inscription of neoliberalism into the physical space of the city. The critique of virtual and UrbEx flânerie is essentially a denouncement of flânerie's claim to possibility of generating valid social knowledge via visual observation guided by connoisseurship (rather than institutionalized professionalism), structured by serendipity (rather than algorithmically-managed chance), and narrated through aesthetic(ized) (rather than direct, rational) form.

The relegation of flânerie to the domain of indecent looking of a flawed observer via failure (or unwillingness) to acknowledge the difference between voyeurism and scopophilia can be seen as a very troubling argument against the ability of citizens—who are neither part of the political class nor its auxiliary forces of experts and institutionalized professionals—to grasp the political dimension of or pose significant questions about the ongoing processes of social change. It is also a promotion of a dubious argument that exposure of the failing socioeconomic contract in the late modernity, the misplacement of trust in the ideas of progress and rationalism, the biases of algorithmic "social computability," or the misguidedness of social utopia that is based on an exploitative and unsustainable system of continuous economic growth can only be grasped in a rational manner.

This is not to claim that virtual and UrbEx flânerie projects are inherently political, but merely that they poses the potential to be understood politically. Rather than being considered a decadent and self-indulgent form of voyeurism, they can be seen as a way of coming to terms with the dystopic present (virtual flânerie) and future (UrbEx flânerie) based on sublime rather than rational experience. As Apel (2015) rightly emphasizes in relation to images of industrial ruination, it is "the beauty of ruins [that] helps us to cope with the terror of apocalyptic decline" (p. 18). If we accept the premise that we live in an age in which it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism, the particular currency of contemporary photographic flânerie is that its imag(in)ing of the city has the potential to interpolate us into contemplation of the latter rather than the former.

References

- Apel, D. (2015). *Beautiful terrible ruins: Detroit and the anxiety of decline*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Arnold, S. (2015). Urban decay photography and film: Fetishism and the apocalyptic imagination. *Journal of Urban History*, 41(2), 326–339.
- Baudelaire, C. (1995). *The painter of modern life and other essays*. London, UK: Phaidon. (Original work published 1863)
- Bauman, Z. (1994). Desert spectacular. In K. Tester (Ed.), *The flâneur* (pp. 138–157). London, UK: Routledge.

- Bauman, Z. (1996). From pilgrim to tourist—Or a short history of identity. In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 18–36). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Benjamin, W. (1999a). *The arcades project*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Benjamin, W. (1999b). *Selected writings* (Vol. 2). Cambridge, MA: Belknap. (Original work published 1931)
- Benjamin, W. (2007). *Illuminations*. New York, NY: Schochen Books. (Original work published 1939)
- Berger, J., & Mohr, J. (1995). *Another way of telling*. New York, NY: Vintage. (Original work published 1982)
- Boym, S. (2011). *Ruinophilia: Appreciation of ruins*. Retrieved from <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/r/ruinophilia/ruinophilia-appreciation-of-ruins-svetlana-boym.html>
- Campany, D., O'Toole, E. & Rickard, D. (2012). *Doug Rickard: A new American picture*. New York, NY: Aperture.
- Cartier-Bresson, H. (1999). *The mind's eye: Writings on photography and photographers*. New York, NY: Aperture. (Original work published 1955)
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Donald, J. (1999). *Imagining the modern city*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dyer, G. (2012, July 14). How Google Street View is inspiring new photography. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2012/jul/14/google-street-view-new-photography>
- Ebner, F. (2008). Urban characters, imaginary cities. In U. Eskildsen, F. Ebner, & B. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Street and studio: An urban history of photography* (pp. 186–194). London, UK: Tate.
- Edensor, T. (2005). *Industrial ruins: Spaces, aesthetics and materiality*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Eskildsen, U. (2008). Introduction. In U. Eskildsen, F. Ebner, & B. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Street and studio: An urban history of photography* (pp. 8–15). London, UK: Tate.
- Featherstone, M. (1998). The flâneur, the city and virtual public life. *Urban Studies*, 35(5/6), 909–925.
- Frisby, D. (1994). The flâneur in social theory. In K. Tester (Ed.), *The flâneur* (pp. 81–110). London, UK: Routledge.
- Garrett, B. (2013). *Explore everything: Place-hacking the city*. London, UK: Verso.

- Gleber, A. (1999). *The art of taking a walk: Flânerie, literature, and film in Weimar culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gluck M. (2003). The flâneur and the aesthetic: Appropriation of urban culture in mid-19th-century Paris. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(5), 53–80.
- Gretton, T. (2006). Not the flâneur again: Reading magazines and living the metropolis around 1880. In A. D'Suozza & T. McDonough (Eds.), *The invisible flâneuse? Gender, public space, and visual culture in nineteenth-century Paris* (pp. 94–112). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Henner, M. (2012). *No man's land* [Photographic series]. Retrieved from <https://mishkahenner.com/No-Man-s-Land>
- Howarth, S., & McLaren, S. (2010). *Street photography now*. London, UK: Thames & Hudson.
- Jenks, C. (1995). Watching your step: The history and practice of the flâneur. In C. Jenks (Ed.), *Visual culture* (pp. 142–160). London, UK: Routledge.
- Jenks, C., & Neves, T. (2000). A walk on the wild side: Urban ethnography meets the flâneur. *Cultural Values*, 4(1), 1–17.
- Kelsey, R. (2008). Photography, chance and the pencil of nature. In R. Kelsey & B. Stimson (Eds.), *The meaning of photography* (pp. 15–33). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Leary, J. P. (2011, January 15). Detroitism: What does "ruin porn" tell us about the Motor City? *Guernica*. Retrieved from https://www.guernicamag.com/leary_1_15_11/
- McMillan, D. (2019). *Chernobyl exclusion zone* [Photographic series]. In D. Baillargeon & D. McMillan, *David McMillan: Growth and decay: Pripyat and the Chernobyl exclusion zone*. Göttingen, Germany: Steidl. (Original work 1994–2011).
- Marsh, A., Miles, M., & Palmer, D. (Eds.). (2015). *The culture of photography in public space*. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Mazlish, B. (1994). The flâneur: From spectator to representation. In K. Tester (Ed.), *The flâneur* (pp. 138–157). London, UK: Routledge.
- Marchand Y., & Meffre, R. (2010). *Yves Marchand & Romain Meffre: The ruins of Detroit*. Göttingen, Germany: Steidl.
- Moore, A. (2010). *Andrew Moore: Detroit disassembled*. Bologna, Italy: Damiani.

- Morozov, E. (2012, February 4). The death of the cyberflâneur. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/opinion/sunday/the-death-of-the-cyberflaneur.html>
- Parkhurst Ferguson, P. (1994). The flâneur on and off the streets of Paris. In K. Tester (Ed.), *The flâneur* (pp. 22–42). London, UK: Routledge.
- Proust, M. (1922). *Swann's way: Remembrance of things past*. New York, NY: Henry Holt. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7178/7178-h/7178-h.htm>
- Rafman, J. (2008–ongoing). *Nine eyes of Google street view* [Photographic series]. Retrieved from <https://9-eyes.com/>
- Scott, C. (2009). *Street photography from Atget to Cartier-Bresson*. London, UK: I. B. Tauris.
- Sekula, A. (1982). On the invention of photographic meaning. In V. Burgin (Ed.), *Thinking photography: Communications and culture* (pp. 84–109). London, UK: Palgrave.
- Shields, R. 1994. Fancy footwork: Walter Benjamin's notes of "flânerie." In K. Tester (Ed.), *The flâneur* (pp. 61–80). London, UK: Routledge.
- Sontag, S. (2005). *On photography*. New York, NY: Rosetta Books. (Original work published 1977)
- Strangleman, T. (2013). "Smokestack nostalgia," "ruin porn" or working-class obituary: The role and meaning of deindustrial representation. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 84, 23–37.
- Tester, K. (1994). Introduction. In K. Tester (Ed.), *The flâneur* (pp. 1–21). London, UK: Routledge.
- Tomanić Trivundža, I. (2011). Dragons and arcades: Towards a discursive construction of the flâneur. In I. Tomanić Trivundža, N. Carpentier, H. Nieminen, P. Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, R. Kilborn, T. Olsson, & E. Sundin (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on European mediasphere* (pp. 71–81). Ljubljana, Slovenia: Faculty of Social Sciences Press.
- Tomanić Trivundža, I. (2015). Are a thousand pictures worth a single word? The struggle between condemnatory and affirmative discourses on photographic change in Slovene and UK mainstream media news reports on selfies. *Javnost/The Public*, 22(1), 93–109.
- Tormey, J. (2013). *Cities and photography*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Westerbeck, C. (director), & Gilberg, R. (producer). (1982). *Jowl Meyerowitz: Street photography*. New York, NY: Nimble Thimble Productions Inc.
- Westerbeck, C., & Meyerowitz, J. (2001). *Bystander: A history of street photography*. Boston, MA: Little,

- Brown. (Original work published 1994)
- Wigoder, M. (2015). Some thoughts about street photography and the everyday. *History of Photography*, 25(4), 368–378.
- Wolff, J. (2006). Gender and the haunting of cities (or, the retirement of the flâneur). In A. D'Suozza & T. McDonough (Eds.), *The invisible flâneuse? Gender, public space, and visual culture in nineteenth-century Paris* (pp. 18–31). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Wolf, M. (2006). *Paris street view* [Photographic series]. Retrieved from <http://photomichaelwolf.com/#paris-street-view/1>
- Wolf, M. (2010). *Manhattan street view* [Photographic series]. Retrieved from <http://photomichaelwolf.com/#manhattan-street-view/1>
- Wolf, M. (2010). *Street view/interface* [Photographic series]. Retrieved from <http://photomichaelwolf.com/#interface/1>
- Wolthers, L. (2016). Monitoring the margins: Street views of sex workers. *Photography and Culture*, 9(3), 239–254.