



Delft University of Technology

## **Fictional Walls**

### **Dystopian Scenarios of Bordered Lives**

Sioli, Angeliki

#### **Publication date**

2024

#### **Document Version**

Final published version

#### **Published in**

Architectures of Resistance

#### **Citation (APA)**

Sioli, A. (2024). Fictional Walls: Dystopian Scenarios of Bordered Lives. In A. Sioli, N. Awan, & K. Palagi (Eds.), *Architectures of Resistance : Negotiating Borders Through Spatial Practices* (pp. 71-84). Leuven University Press.

#### **Important note**

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).  
Please check the document version above.

#### **Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

#### **Takedown policy**

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.  
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The background of the cover is a dark, textured map of the world. Overlaid on the map are various geometric shapes and symbols: a large white circle, a smaller white circle, and several smaller circles of different shades of gray. Some of these circles contain symbols like stars, triangles, and lightning bolts. The map itself is rendered in a light gray tone, with some areas highlighted in a darker gray. The overall aesthetic is modern and academic.

# Architectures of Resistance

Negotiating Borders  
Through Spatial Practices

Angeliki Sioli, Nishat Awan,  
Kristopher Palagi (eds)

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

Published with the support of the KU Leuven Fund for Fair Open Access, TU Delft, Louisiana State University and the European Research Council.



Published in 2024 by Leuven University Press / Presses Universitaires de Louvain / Universitaire Pers Leuven. Minderbroedersstraat 4, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium).

Selection and editorial matter © 2024, Angeliki Sioli, Nishat Awan, and Kristopher Palagi  
Individual chapters © 2024, The respective authors

This book is published under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Non-Derivative 4.0 Licence. For more information, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/cclicenses/>



Attribution should include the following information:

Angeliki Sioli, Nishat Awan, and Kristopher Palagi, (eds), *Architectures of Resistance: Negotiating Borders through Spatial Practices*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2024. (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

Unless otherwise indicated all images are reproduced with the permission of the rightsholders acknowledged in captions. All images are expressly excluded from the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license covering the rest of this publication. Permission for reuse should be sought from the rights-holders.

ISBN 978 94 6270 405 3 (Paperback)

ISBN 978 94 6166 552 2 (ePDF)

<https://doi.org/10.11116/9789461665522>

D/2024/1869/28

NUR: 648

Layout: Crius Group

Cover design: Daniel Benneworth-Gray

Cover illustration: Political Equator. Pierce Quincuncial Projection, Estudio Teddy Cruz + Fonna Forman, 2020.



# FICTIONAL WALLS

## Dystopian Scenarios of Bordered Lives

*Angeliki Sioli*

### 01. WALL

“Wall” is one of the multiple names that have been used to describe a border. “The fence, the wall, [...] the frontier, the limit, the march, the boundary” are all “distinct phenomena in social history” that delineate a border in space, as Thomas Nail reminds us in the *Theory of the Border*.<sup>1</sup> While these words allude mostly to a dividing line, a static linear structure between two separate territories, today’s border studies argue for something different. Antony Cooper and Søren Tinning, referencing the work of numerous contemporary researchers, talk about “the conceptual shift from borders as territorial lines to bordering as socio-cultural processes, practices, and discourses.”<sup>2</sup> Border studies look at bordering not only in terms of territory but also “in the messy here-and-now micro-politics of everyday life practices and experiences.”<sup>3</sup> Based on this definition, this essay examines walls that create territorial separations while also playing a prominent role in everyday life practices and experiences.

The walls under examination are all fictional. They are imaginary structures of three dystopian worlds: the authoritarian regime of OneState, depicted in the novel *We* (1921) by Yevgeni Zamyatin; the totalitarian rule of Big Brother, captured in *1984* (1949) by George Orwell; and the tyrannical dominion of Heirs, described in *The Not Yet* (2014) by Moira Crone.<sup>4</sup> All three novels are deliberately literal in their depiction of walls as borders, showing in an explicit and straightforward way that borders are “a process of social division” in space.<sup>5</sup> Besides this strong common characteristic, two more reasons determined these novels’ selection and comparative analysis. They all depict a territory under omnipresent government surveillance, in which walls of different scales, materialities, and affordances regulate the everyday life practices and experiences of the respective citizens. The interaction of the characters with the layout and architecture of the fictional urban environments challenges walls and borders, allowing thus for moments of spatial and political resistance.

In this essay, I look into the different wall conditions captured by the three novels, unpacking the meanings they erect, the political and social power they imprint in space, and the kind of surveillance they impose. Quotes from the

novels related to walls and surveillance are used to communicate how the characters perceive and experience them.<sup>6</sup> Elements of the plot necessary for understanding the meaning and qualities of the examined walls are also introduced (I have attempted to restrict summaries to details pertinent to the analysis). I then examine the way these walls “leak”<sup>7</sup>—as all borders do—pointing out moments and acts of resistance. I conclude with a look at contemporary real-world wall conditions, discussing the importance of history and fiction in understanding and working with borders and walls from an architectural perspective.

## 02. WALL CONDITIONS

**Glass of a Beloved Panopticon.** “O, mighty, divinely delimited wisdom of walls” (91) exclaims the protagonist of *We*, who lives happily in the totalitarian city of OneState, a place where walls are perceived as the “most magnificent of all inventions” (91) and “the basis of everything human” (40). All walls in OneState are made of glass, creating physical yet transparent boundaries of different scales, forms, and affordances.

The biggest one is the Green Wall, which derives its name from the cloudy green glass it is made of. It both encircles and confines OneState. It carries no openings, passages, entrances, or exits, prohibiting any citizen from leaving OneState and any outsider from entering. The division between the society within and the world outside is “extensive,” introducing “an absolute break—producing two quantitatively separate and discontinuous entities.”<sup>8</sup> The Green Wall is meant to protect the rational, mechanized, and perfectly ordered OneState from Nature, the “irrational, ugly world of trees, birds, and animals” (91), as well as from the wild people of Mephi. Its very existence “differentiates, categorizes and hierarchizes” civilization.<sup>9</sup> As a boundary it is exactly what Caterina Resta describes in her article “Walled Borders”: “an ontological and political character, which concerns not only territory but also the discriminating definition of human and non-human.”<sup>10</sup> The protagonist of the story is assured that “man ceased to be a wild animal only when he built the first wall” (91).

The Green Wall is also a stark manifestation of how a society is “a product of the borders that define it” and how “certain dominant social formations” emerge because of the border, as Thomas Nail argues.<sup>11</sup> Life in OneState is as transparent as glass, frighteningly exposed to the public eye, and totally deprived of notions like privacy and isolation. The architecture of the city’s homogenous private apartments attests to this reality. Their walls, floors, and ceilings are made of clear glass. Every aspect of the citizens’ life takes place in open view. As Zamyatin’s protagonist puts it, “We live in broad daylight inside

these walls that seem to have been fashioned out of bright air, always on view. We have nothing to hide from one another" (19).

The glass city of OneState is an urban scale manifestation of Bentham's panopticon. It imposes "a certain self-discipline under the threat of external observation."<sup>12</sup> Control of the population in OneState is achieved "by a simple idea of Architecture," as Bentham would argue.<sup>13</sup> The society of OneState, totally visible, "is not one of spectacle but of surveillance," as Foucault might add.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the novel portrays a glass city in which life is perfectly controlled, scheduled, prearranged, and constantly surveilled. The "experienced eye of the Guardians" (15) is always there to "protect [...] from making the slightest mistake, the slightest misstep" (65). Zamyatin's cynical and satirical writing—a strong critique against the repressive regime of his native Soviet Russia<sup>15</sup>—presents creepy conditions of surveillance, borders, and control. The world he portrays is an ironic "beloved" panopticon, as the story's main protagonist professes to love living in it.

**Posters and Telescreens of a Dreaded Synopticon.** George Orwell's dystopian world, published almost thirty years after *We*, features no glass walls or external fortifications. The center of London, where the plot unfolds, is under the command of a Party led by Big Brother. Its citizens, the Party members, live "from birth to death" a totally controlled and surveilled life "under the eye of the Thought Police" (200). Unlike the impressive Green Wall of OneState, in Orwell's narrative there is no physical border between the city center and the dilapidated decaying suburbs that surround it, inhabited by the proles. The Party's rules, prohibiting interaction between Party members and the proles, seem to be more than enough to raise a figurative wall around the city center.

However, as Thomas Nail reminds us, "the border is not only in between the inside and outside of two territories, states, and so on, it is also in between the inside and the inside itself: it is a division within society."<sup>16</sup> Indeed in *1984*, walls divide the members of the Party itself. The members of the Inner Party live in luxurious apartments behind walls that the members of the Outer Party cannot cross without a special invitation. The members of the Outer Party live in dilapidated buildings the members of the Inner Party never visit. Most importantly though, everyone lives under the constant surveillance of everybody else; the Party's brainwashing is so harsh and effective that most children inform on their own parents. In short, the many obedient Party members observe the few disobedient ones, creating societal conditions similar to a synopticon.

Synopticon, introduced by Thomas Mathiesen in 1997 as a counternotion to Foucault's panopticon, is "used to represent the situation where a large number focuses on something in common which is condensed," basically "the opposite of the situation where the few see the many."<sup>17</sup> Mathiesen explains



that historically “panopticism and synopticism have developed in intimate interaction, even fusion, with each other.”<sup>18</sup> He even mentions *1984* in his article, arguing that “Orwell described panopticism and synopticism in their ultimate form as completely merged: through a screen in your living room you saw Big Brother, just as Big Brother saw you.”<sup>19</sup> Though this last observation is not actually accurate—the screens in the living rooms do not provide a live broadcast of Big Brother’s life—the fact that the many loyalists of the Party would observe the few disobedient ones is still a clear element of a synoptic spatial condition, one that is clearly dreaded by the protagonist of the story.

Party members caught disobeying the rules are imprisoned and excruciatingly tortured behind the frightening walls of the Ministry of Love. These humongous walls are completely opaque, carrying no windows at all. In the urban scale the walls of all the Ministries create the towering spatial division between the inside and the inside itself. They are made “of glittering white concrete, soaring up, terrace after terrace, three hundred meters into the air” (4). They are so enormous in scale that they are visible from anywhere in the city. As Gerald Bemstein in his article “The Architecture of Repression” observes, these walls create a “hermetically sealed interior, as repressive and degrading as any of the techniques of brainwashing” used by the Party.<sup>20</sup>

Within the city center the walls of all other buildings carry constant reminders of the Party’s totalitarian regime. They are flooded with enormous posters of Big Brother’s face with the caption: BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU. Posters abound within all interior spaces as well, but even worse, the walls of the private apartments carry telescreens, devices that simultaneously receive and transmit information (as Mathiesen also points out). This ubiquitous technology guarantees the most literal and frightening live, nonstop surveillance. Imagine a personal apparatus that can pick “any sound [...] above the level of a very low whisper” (3) and record any action within a wide field of vision. The Outer Party members cannot shut them down (unlike the Inner Party members) and while they can lower the volume, they cannot completely mute them. They are constantly exposed to the Party’s propaganda, even when they are asleep.

**Walled Urbs and Enclaves of a Cruel Banopticon.** While Zamyatin’s *We* and Orwell’s *1984* portray aspects of the panopticon and synopticon respectively, I argue that Moira Crone’s more contemporary dystopian novel, *The Not Yet*, borrows strongly from the principles of the banopticon. As Didier Bigo, who put forward the term, argues, the banopticon “excludes certain groups” of people “in the name of their future potential behavior.”<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the societal conditions “normalize the non-excluded through the production of normative imperatives, the most important of which is free movement.”<sup>22</sup> Indeed, the world portrayed in the *The Not Yet* thrives on exclusions of certain groups whose behavior

may threaten the societal status quo. It is also built on strict rules regarding the movement of the different societal groups. The walls, literal and figurative, that appear in the novel control the capacity of these groups to move freely or not.

Crone imagines a de-annexed and flooded New Orleans in the year 2112, populated by three strictly separated and harshly disconnected categories of people: the Heirs, the Not Yets, and the Nats. The Heirs—the wealthy, elite ruling class who lives “forever with mindless intensity”<sup>23</sup>—have access anywhere they wish. Heirs enclose themselves willingly in cities called Walled Urbs, surrounded by walls “fifteen stories high” (97). The most affluent Walled Urbs are even covered by balloon domes, on which a sky is projected, displaying a simulacra of climate and weather conditions. These domes allow for control of every single aspect of the environment of the city, even the air and the atmosphere, creating spheres of absolute exclusion. As Peter Sloterdijk would argue in his theory of spheres, these domes create a “fundamentally changed relation to the atmospheric envelope” that surrounds us all and makes us *humas*.<sup>24</sup> Air is the treasure that allows human beings to realize that they are always immersed in something that is imperceptible, impossible to control and yet very real.<sup>25</sup> Air is something we share with all other human beings, brings everything together, and makes everything possible.<sup>26</sup> The control over the air that the Heirs have achieved disconnects them even further from the other two social groups. Moreover, it extends from the urban scale to that of the human scale. The Heirs undergo regular medical procedures, adding ever so often new *prodermis* on their existing skin. This *prodermis*, which guarantees “longevity” (near immortality), is a kind of wall between them and the surrounding environment, sealing them even further from the air. Impervious to the air, the Heirs lack basic human qualities like the sense of time, of which they have none. They exist in a temporal limbo, having no sense of ethical urgency.<sup>27</sup>

The Not Yets and the Nats constitute the middle and lower rungs of the society respectively and must demonstrate complete subordination to those on the top.<sup>28</sup> The Not Yets, who are sponsored (owned) by the Heirs, live a life strictly defined by their benefactors and “cannot move freely in most districts” (92). They spend their early life working under excruciating conditions to accumulate a trust that will allow them to undergo the medical procedure to transform them into Heirs. The Nats consist of mixed races and have no access to a trust. They are considered third-class citizens who live a mortal life with no access whatsoever to the Heirs. Nats live in various Enclaves. The Enclaves are not separated by walls, since in the flooded New Orleans area, water acts as the physical borders. Moreover, Custom Controls between Enclaves authorize permissions of entrance and exit, and it is expected that their inhabitants carry enclave cards as their official identity documents. Nats also live in outlier camps surrounded “by high fences and guarded by dogs” (30). As



Robert Azzarello observes in *The Three Hundred Years of Decadence*, “the result is a world of haves and have-nots, those with access to medical science and technology that allow them to approach immortality and those without such access.”<sup>29</sup> Crone forewarns of these imposing walls built by society.

### 03. WALL LEAKS

The ability of walls to create conditions of absolute separation and exclusion has been effectively critiqued by many thinkers in the field of border studies. Thomas Nail is quick to remind us, through numerous examples of historic walls, that “borders, both internal and external, have never even succeeded in keeping everyone in or out.”<sup>30</sup> This incapacity “is not just a contemporary waning sovereignty of postnational states; borders have always leaked.”<sup>31</sup> Mezzadra and Neilson in *Border as Method* affirm that “many walls are far less rigid than they pretend to be.”<sup>32</sup> And Nick Vaughan-Williams in *Border Politics: The Limits of Sovereign Power* adds that borders are not “in any sense given but (re)produced through modes of affirmation and contestation” being “above all, lived.”<sup>33</sup> They are “dynamic phenomena that first and foremost involve people and their everyday lives.”<sup>34</sup> Indeed, the walls of the novels under examination leak.

**Dark Red Walls and Wall Blinds.** In Zamyatin’s *We*, some of OneState’s citizens and some of the wild people outside OneState cross the Green Wall. In both cases this is a forbidden act and, as many such acts, it shakes existing structures, enabling new ones to emerge. Indeed, the mechanized predetermined life inside OneState is overturned outside and new structures seem to be forming as the novel comes to an end. A small group of citizens crosses toward the wilderness and a small group of the Mephi crosses into OneState.

The crossing between the two worlds takes place through the portal of the Ancient House, which sits at the very edge of OneState, adjacent to the Green Wall. This is a remnant of the old ages, a historic house with “dark red walls” (91) and a garden, functioning more like a museum of how life and architecture used to be before the Two-Hundred-Years War. The Ancient House serves as a secret meeting place and as the gate to the world beyond the Green Wall. A hidden exit, through an old wardrobe, leads to a dark corridor that looks like “the tubes of the subways” (94) and exits outside of the Green Wall. Under conditions of panopticism, the only possible crossing is behind walls that are no longer glass but opaque; retrograde walls and corridors that block the eyes of the Guardians and sabotage the power of the panopticon’s surveillance.

Along with the dark walls of the Ancient House, there is one more architectural element “used in a disruptive manner towards the totalitarian system

of the One State, since the privacy that” it also affords “allows for insurgence” against the ever-visible everyday living, as Jana Culek suggests.<sup>35</sup> The glass walls of OneState’s apartments are equipped with blinds which the citizens “get to use [...] only on Sex Day” (10). Lowering the blinds allows them to create some privacy for the act of sexual intercourse, an act that takes place only with a predetermined partner for one hour on specific and prescheduled days of the week. Some citizens use the time and protected space behind the blinds to plot a revolution against OneState. These are also the citizens who venture outside the Green Wall. When the group of Mephi crosses into OneState, the glass walls of the city become yet again an architectural element of resistance. The Mephi use them to pin up posters announcing their presence in the city and threatening its citizens. Similar posters appear on the glass walls of the subway, on the benches, and on car mirrors.

**Wall Alcoves and the Antique Store.** *1984* begins with an act of resistance. The protagonist decides to start a diary recording thoughts and ideas, something not allowed by the Party. The architecture of his apartment seems to have pointed him toward this small rebellion, as the protagonist is convinced that it is partly “the unusual geography of the room that had suggested to him” (6) the idea to write a diary in hiding. In his living room, the telescreen is not placed in the “end wall, where it could command the whole room,” (5) but instead in the “longer wall, opposite the window” (5). Next to the telescreen there is “a shallow alcove” (5) probably to “hold bookshelves” (5) when the apartment was first built. By sitting there, he remains “outside the range of the telescreen, so far as sight” (6) goes.

The other part of his decision has to do with the diary itself, which the protagonist buys in an antique shop in the suburbs. This is where the second opportunity for defying the rules and crossing borders appears. While the Party members are not supposed to visit the proles, the rule is relatively loose, allowing for some movement between the city center and the suburbs. As there are “various things such as shoelaces and razor blades [...] impossible to get hold of in any other way,” (6) the Party members venture from time to time into the dilapidated suburbs of London looking for them in “ordinary shops” (6). The protagonist finds in this excuse the opportunity to roam around the proles, in search of unobserved solitude and some kind of connection to the past that the Party has so carefully erased. As the reader finds out:

One could not learn history from architecture any more than one could learn it from books. Statues, inscriptions, memorial stones, the names of streets—anything that might throw light upon the past had been systematically altered. (98–99)

Marcin Tereszewski, in his article “The Confines of Subjectivity: Spaces of Resistance in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*,” points out that this is probably “why the protagonist is drawn to older inhabitants, asking them questions about pre-revolutionary England.”<sup>36</sup> The protagonist tries to reconnect with a past he no longer remembers as a way of rooting himself in his environment.<sup>37</sup>

It is in the proles that he will also secretly rent an apartment—just above the antique shop—to meet a lover in hiding. In the conditions of synopticon put forward by Orwell, it is when the characters are outside the strict confines of the Party, and among people that the Party separates itself from, that members can momentarily escape. Crossing the boundary between the city center and the suburbs, under the excuse of necessary purchases, allows for a limited and temporal freedom.

**Alteredds and the Wooden Palace.** The acts of resistance in *The Not Yet* are subtler and less heroic in comparison with the ones described in the other two novels; alternatively, these acts are actually encouraged by members of the ruling class. The main character of the story, a Not Yet, secretly crosses some of the strict borders of the Walled Urbs, per an Heir’s request. The only way for this crossing to take place is for him to transform into a fake Alteredd. Not Yetts and Nats can be “resculptured by doctors” into Alteredds, creatures with animal elements, like “claws instead of hands,” or “wings coming out of their backs” (31). Alteredds are human pets owned by Heirs and for this reason they have some relative freedom of movement. As a fake Alteredd, the protagonist hides behind a metaphorical wall protecting him while visiting the wealthier Urbs of the West and the North. Unlike the Walled Urb of the New Orleans area, where the plot unfolds, the rules in these wards are very strict and the protagonist could never enter their high excluding walls as a Not Yet. In his trips, which are described very briefly in the novel, he needs to make sure nobody understands he is a fake Alteredd or he will be arrested.

The climatic resistance comes unexpectedly, and unlike *We* or *1984*, from an Heir. Dr. Greenmore decides to spend some time in her Wooden Palace, in the countryside outside the Walled Urb of Re-New Orleans where she normally resides. She wishes to study precedents related to an Heir’s disease. Her land is secluded “surrounded by oaks and even some field of cane” (110), which acts as a planted wall. In the privacy of her house, Dr. Greenmore discovers information about peoples’ old ways of living, their beliefs about religion, family, and love, all of which have been erased ever since eternal life was achieved. She, an Heir, slowly falls in love with the Not Yet protagonist and engages in sexual intercourse with him, something completely unthinkable in the world they both live in. The shedding of the most intimate wall, that of the *prodermis*

that covers all Heirs gifting them eternal life, is an act of border crossing. In the conditions of a banopticon, where certain groups of people are excluded and freedom of movement is limited, crossing the walls of the cities under disguise, searching for your human past, and quenching desires of the flesh with a member of another societal group are acts of resistance that question the existing borders and norms.

#### 04. BORDERED LIVES: A CONCLUSION

In his essay “Bindings against Boundaries: Entanglements of Life in an Open World,” Tim Ingold differentiates between an understanding of life as either occupying the world or a life as inhabiting it. When “life is lived into boundaries within which life is contained,” he argues it “is reduced to an internal property of things that occupy the world but do not properly inhabit it.”<sup>38</sup> Ingold develops the difference, arguing that an occupied world “is furnished with already-existing things, while one that is inhabited is woven from the strands of their continual coming-into-being.”<sup>39</sup> He prompts us to attempt “to recover the sense of what it means to inhabit the world,” and he reminds us that “the creeping entanglements of life will always and inevitably triumph over our attempts to box them in.”<sup>40</sup> Indeed, the life entanglements of the characters in the novels triumph, as Ingold puts it, over their worlds’ various walls.

The extreme and clear-cut nature of these novels’ walls makes it easy to understand the nature of the boundaries they create, the method of control and exclusion they impose, the surveillance they force. In our contemporary world, many gray zones make these conditions more difficult to detect, understand, and attempt to cross, a condition that people in power thrive off. We still have borders of all the above-described conditions: hermetically closed walls in social and physical terms, semi-penetrable boundaries, invisible or nonexistent physical borders segregating communities and cities. The Green Wall of OneState and Walled Urbs of the Heirs resemble in their function, the tall barbed wire fences installed on the geographical borders between countries like Mexico and the USA or Greece and its Balkan neighbors. The glass walls of OneState’s apartments and the telescreens resemble webcams and television shows in which people live in total exposure, or social media feeds through which people willingly reveal intimate and personal moments of their lives. The telescreens function similarly to cell phones and devices that can track our location at any given moment, with our own voluntary permission. The Walled Urbs resemble countries that one can only visit with a special permission or invitation, and of course, the countless gated communities around the globe where people—not necessarily the privileged few—willingly separate

themselves from their surroundings, avoiding (or controlling the degree of) contact with other social strata under the excuse of safety.<sup>41</sup> The Enclaves remind us of divisions of race and difference (especially in their limited access to healthcare). The Not Yets' indentured servitude speak volumes of the illegal labor (including child labor) in so many developing countries that sustain the production of goods consumed knowingly by the developed world. The people who produce these goods do not have the financial means to acquire them, which is yet another very harsh wall, albeit invisible. These novels help reveal society's walls and divisions of very different natures, from spatial and physical ones to political and societal ones. The acts of resistance the three novels describe are all subtle, small-scale, and probably incapable of causing a systemic change in the larger authoritarian regimes in which they occur. Nonetheless, they are still acts of resistance—and not necessarily revolution—that create fissures in walls.

It is worth noting that in all three novels the attempts of the protagonists to cross the borders, physical or metaphorical (and go against the inhumane laws of the totalitarian and authoritative regimes) take place, primarily, in spaces steeped in history and memories of the era before the radical social and political changes described in the stories. In *We*, the Ancient House is a reminder of the hectic and chaotic life before the order of mathematics and the transparency of glass walls. It is a place to meet a sexual partner in secrecy, to discover what passion really is, and to live a nonmechanized moment of existence. It is also the gateway to the other side of the Green Wall. In *1984* the antique shop and the apartment above it, once again steeped in the history of a life before the rule of the Party, become the context that allows the characters to think about what the Party really is and how they can work against it. "Being a place of memory and memorabilia," Tereszewski argues, the antique shop—and the room above it I would add—represent "an antithesis to the ahistorical social reality of" *1984*'s London.<sup>42</sup> In *The Not Yet*, it is behind the walls of the Wooden Palace that Dr. Greenmore decides to shed her *prodermis* and study the life of people before the scientific revolution that brought about near eternal life. The novels touch on the capacity of people to orient themselves through the preservation of memories, rituals, and meanings that history (personal and collective) carries with it. This is not an understanding of history for the sake of the past and a blind obedience to it, but an understanding of history as a force guiding us critically and creatively toward the future, as Nietzsche beautifully suggests in his essay "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life." We need history "for the sake of life and action, and not so as to turn comfortably away from life and action."<sup>43</sup> And we need literature, in the form of science fiction, and not only, to keep reminding us where ahistorical conditions can lead if taken to their extreme.

These dystopian novels remind architects, urban planners, and policy-makers who deal with boundaries in their multiple forms that any spatial decision has the potential to ignore or overrule people's history, culture, customs, rituals, and ways of living. Designers should also not overlook that history is a construct and that the histories of adjacent communities and people may be filled with conflict and disagreement. To negotiate such boundaries is difficult, challenging, but also paramount. As Anthony Cooper and Søren Tinning remind us, "in recent years we have witnessed an intensification of the debate surrounding such issues as 'freedom of movement,' 'open borders,' and even 'no borders,' [...] in the search for effective ways to tackle, negotiate, and possibly abolish the violence of borders"<sup>44</sup> What these three novel show us is that the answer is not a strict wall that deletes every historical trace of its territory. The novels remind us that any such harsh and ahistorical boundary will be crossed, will be challenged, and will ultimately topple, even if only by the accumulation of many small fissures over time. The "creeping entanglements of life" against its imposed borders, as Ingold puts it, will ultimately triumph.

## NOTES

1. Thomas Nail, *Theory of the Border* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 2.
2. Anthony Cooper and Søren Tinning, eds., *Debating and Defining Border: Philosophical and Theoretical Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2020), 28.
3. Ibid.
4. Yevgeny Zamyatin, *We*, trans. Clarence Brown (New York: Penguin Books, 1993); George Orwell, *1984* (New York: Signet Classic, 1950); Moira Crone, *The Not Yet* (New Orleans: University of New Orleans Press, 2012). Please note that *We* was first published in 1924 by E. P. Dutton. in English translation by Gregory Zilboorg. Ever since there have been various other English translations. For this reason, slight differences in names (like OneState) and terms may appear from translation to translation.
5. Nail, *Theory of the Border*, 2.
6. I have employed in-text citation here in order to avoid an unnecessarily long list of endnotes. If a sentence contains multiple quotes from the same page, the page number is added only once at the end.
7. All borders leak precisely because all borders are constituted by and through a process of leakage, which is only temporarily stabilized into border regimes. Nail, *Theory of the Border*, 13.
8. Ibid, 12. Nail differentiates between an extensive and intensive division.
9. Christian Wille et al., eds., *Border Complexities and Logics of Dis/Order* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2023), 17.



10. Caterina Resta, "Walled Borders: Beyond the Barriers of Immunity of the Nation-States," in Cooper and Tinning, *Debating and Defining Borders*, 262.
11. Nail, *Theory of the Border*, 4.
12. As quoted in Simone Browne, *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 34.
13. Ibid.
14. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 217.
15. Jana Culek, "Forms of Utopia: The Social and Spatial Forms of *We* and *Metropolisarchitecture*," in *Writingplace Journal 4: Choices and Strategies of Architectural Imagination*, ed. Klaske Havik, Rajesh Heynickx, and Angeliki Sioli (Rotterdam: nai010, 2020), 54.
16. Nail, *Theory of the Border*, 5.
17. Thomas Mathiesen, "The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' Revisited," *Theoretical Criminology* 1, no. 2 (1997): 219.
18. Ibid., 223.
19. Ibid.
20. Gerald S. Bemstein, "The Architecture of Repression: The Built Environment of George Orwell's *1984*," *Journal of Architectural Education* 38, no. 2 (1985): 28.
21. As quoted in Browne, *Dark Matters*, 39.
22. Ibid.
23. "Bill Lavender Interviews Moira Crone about Her Book *The Not Yet*," Bill Lavender, *Southern Literary Review: A Magazine for Literature of the American South*, April 26, 2012, <https://southernlitreview.com/authors/bill-lavender-interviews-moira-crone-about-her-book-the-not-yet.htm>.
24. Peter Sloterdijk, "Foreword to the Theory of Spheres," in *Cosmograms*, ed. Melik Ohanian and Jean-Christophe Royoux (London: Lukas & Sternberg, 2005), 225.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Robert Azzarello, *Three Hundred Years of Decadence: New Orleans Literature and the Transatlantic World* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2019), 173.
28. Ibid., 174.
29. Ibid., 173.
30. Nail, *Theory of the Border*, 8.
31. Ibid.
32. Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, *Border as Method, Or The Multiplication of Labor* (Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2013), viii.
33. Nick Vaughan-Williams, *Border Politics: The Limits of Sovereign Power* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 7.
34. Ibid.
35. Culek, "Forms of Utopia," 58.

36. Marcin Tereszewski, "The Confines of Subjectivity: Spaces of Resistance in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four," *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 18, no. 1 (2019): 62.
37. Ibid.
38. Tim Ingold, "Bindings against Boundaries: Entanglements of Life in an Open World," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 40, no. 8 (2008): 1797.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., 1797, 1809.
41. For more see: Edward J. Blakely and Mary Gail Snyder, "Fortress Communities: The Walling and Gating of American Suburbs," Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, accessed December 9, 2023, <https://www.lincolninst.edu/publications/articles/fortress-communities>.
42. Tereszewski, "Confines of Subjectivity," 62.
43. Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life," in *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 59.
44. Cooper, *Debating and Defining Borders*, 18.

## REFERENCES

- Azzarello, Robert. *Three Hundred Years of Decadence: New Orleans Literature and the Transatlantic World*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2019.
- Bemstein, S. Gerald S. "The Architecture of Repression: The Built Environment of George Orwell's *1984*." *Journal of Architectural Education* 38, no. 2 (1985): 26–28.
- Browne, Simone. *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Cooper, Anthony, and Søren Tinning, eds. *Debating and Defining Border: Philosophical and Theoretical Perspectives*. Oxon: Routledge, 2020.
- Crone, Moira. *The Not Yet*. New Orleans: University of New Orleans Press, 2012.
- Culek, Jana. "Forms of Utopia: The Social and Spatial Forms of *We* and *Metropolisarchitecture*." In *Writingplace Journal*, 4 Choices and Strategies of Architectural Imagination, edited by Klaske Havik, Rajesh Heynickx, Angeliki Sioli, 50–69. Rotterdam: nai010, 2020.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Ingold, Tim. "Bindings against Boundaries: Entanglements of Life in an Open World," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 40, no. 8 (2008): 1796–1810.

- Lavender, Bill. "Bill Lavender Interviews Moira Crone about Her Book *The Not Yet*." *Southern Literary Review: A Magazine for Literature of the American South*, April 26, 2012. <https://southernlitreview.com/authors/bill-lavender-interviews-moira-crone-about-her-book-the-not-yet.htm>.
- Mathiesens, Thomas. "The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' Revisited." *Theoretical Criminology* 1, no. 2 (1997): 215–34.
- Mezzadra, Sandro and Brett Neilson. *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2013.
- Nail, Thomas. *Theory of the Border*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "The Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life." In *Untimely Mediations*, edited by Daniel Breazeale, translated by R. J. Hollingdale. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. New York: Signet Classic, 1950.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. "Foreword to the Theory of Spheres." In *Cosmograms*, edited by Melik Ohanian and Jean-Christophe Royoux. London: Lukas & Sternberg, 2005.
- Tereszewski, Marcin. "The Confines of Subjectivity: Spaces of Resistance in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 18, no.1 (2019): 54–71.
- Vaughan-Williams, Nick. *Border Politics: The Limits of Sovereign Power*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.
- Wille, Christian, Carolin Leutloff-Grandits, Sylvie Grimm-Hamen, Falk Bretschneider, and Hedwig Wagner, eds. *Border Complexities and Logics of Dis/Order*. Border Studies: Baden-Baden, 2023.
- Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We*. Translated by Clarence Brown. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.