



Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Programme

**ARCHITECTURAL PSYCHOLOGY IN UTOPIAS/DYSTOPIAS:  
WILLIAM MORRIS'S *NEWS FROM NOWHERE*, GEORGE  
ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* AND J.G. BALLARD'S  
*HIGH-RISE***

Adem BALCI

Ph.D. Dissertation

Ankara, 2022



ARCHITECTURAL PSYCHOLOGY IN UTOPIAS/DYSTOPIAS: WILLIAM MORRIS'S  
*NEWS FROM NOWHERE*, GEORGE ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* AND J.G.  
BALLARD'S *HIGH-RISE*

Adem BALCI

Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Programme

Ph.D. Dissertation

Ankara, 2022

## KABUL VE ONAY

Adem Balcı tarafından hazırlanan “Architectural Psychology in Utopias/Dystopias: William Morris’s *News from Nowhere*, George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and J.G. Ballard’s *High-Rise*” başlıklı bu çalışma, 24.06.2022 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Doktora Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

---

Prof. Dr. Hande Seber (Başkan)

---

Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol (Danışman)

---

Prof. Dr. Mine Özyurt Kılıç (Üye)

---

Doç. Dr. Zeynep Z. Atayurt Fenge (Üye)

---

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aslı Değirmenci Altın (Üye)

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylım.

Prof. Dr. Uğur Ömürganülşen

Enstitü Müdürü

## YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kağıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım hakları bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinleri yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan “**Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge**” kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. <sup>(1)</sup>
- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren ..... ay ertelenmiştir. <sup>(2)</sup>
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. <sup>(3)</sup>

27/07/2022

Adem Balcı

### I “Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge”

- (1) Madde 6. 1. Lisansüstü teze ilgili patent başvurusu yapılması veya patent alma sürecinin devam etmesi durumunda, tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu iki yıl süre ile tezin erişime açılmasının ertelenmesine karar verebilir.
- (2) Madde 6. 2. Yeni teknik, materyal ve metotların kullanıldığı, henüz makaleye dönüşmemiş veya patent gibi yöntemlerle korunmamış ve internette paylaşılması durumunda 3. şahıslara veya kurumlara haksız kazanç imkanı oluşturabilecek bilgi ve bulguları içeren tezler hakkında tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile altı ayı aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılması engellenebilir.
- (3) Madde 7. 1. Ulusal çıkarları veya güvenliği ilgilendiren, emniyet, istihbarat, savunma ve güvenlik, sağlık vb. konulara ilişkin lisansüstü tezlerle ilgili gizlilik kararı, tezin yapıldığı kurum tarafından verilir \*. Kurum ve kuruluşlarla yapılan işbirliği protokolü çerçevesinde hazırlanan lisansüstü tezlere ilişkin gizlilik kararı ise, ilgili kurum ve kuruluşun önerisi ile enstitü veya fakültenin uygun görüşü üzerine üniversite yönetim kurulu tarafından verilir. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler Yükseköğretim Kuruluna bildirilir.  
Madde 7.2. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler gizlilik süresince enstitü veya fakülte tarafından gizlilik kuralları çerçevesinde muhafaza edilir, gizlilik kararının kaldırılması halinde Tez Otomasyon Sistemine yüklenir.

\* Tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu tarafından karar verilir.

## ETİK BEYAN

Bu çalışmadaki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, kullandığım verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı, yararlandığım kaynaklara bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu, tezimin kaynak gösterilen durumlar dışında özgün olduğunu, **Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol** danışmanlığında tarafımdan üretildiğini ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Yönergesine göre yazıldığımı beyan ederim.

**Adem Balcı**

*Annem için...*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout my Ph.D. odyssey, I have had the good fortune to benefit from the knowledge, experience, and expertise of many invaluable people, and likewise, I have been overwhelmed by the genuine kindness and outpouring support of many others. Although the list is a long one, it is with great pleasure that I would like to acknowledge them by name. Without their presence in my life, writing this dissertation would have been a more solitary journey and certainly much harder.

First and foremost, I would like to express my heart-felt thanks to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol, who has always been an inspirational role model for me since my undergraduate years at Hacettepe University with her unending energy, enthusiasm, work-discipline, and expertise. Working with her for my doctoral work has been a real pleasure for me, and I have incurred debts of gratitude to her for her rigorous readings of the numerous drafts of each chapter, conscientious attention to details, constructive feedback, helpful comments, constant support, patience, and most importantly, unwavering belief in me. It goes without saying that it was a relief to be in such good hands, and my appreciation is beyond words.

I would also like to extend my thanks to Prof. Dr. Hande Seber and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Z. Atayurt Fenge for their invaluable insights, expert feedback, and incisive criticism, which have enriched my argument. I have especially benefited from Dr. Atayurt Fenge's expertise in the novel and the theories of spatialities. Special thanks go to her. I owe also debts of gratitude to the other jury members, Prof. Dr. Mine Özyurt Kılıç and Assist. Prof. Dr. Aslı Değirmenci Altın, for the time and effort they took to read my dissertation, and for their sound feedback and invaluable suggestions.

I owe special thanks to Prof. Dr. Serpil Oppermann for being unstintingly supportive of me since my undergraduate years. Besides being an invaluable mentor, who has always supported my studies and encouraged me, she has always been there to uplift me whenever I lost hope. My sincere appreciation also goes to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sinan Akıllı, from whose expertise as my supervisor I benefited a lot while writing my MA thesis, for his unending support, encouragement, and friendship. I would also like to



extend my deepest thanks to Prof. Dr. Meldan Tanrısal for cheering me up during our daily chitchats with her sharp sense of humour, and for being supportive of me when I needed her help. I also owe debts of gratitude to Prof. Dr. Asalet Erten, whose unfailing support and blessings have motivated me further. I feel myself very lucky for having met with Prof. Dr. Ünal Aytür, who is for me the most significant and exemplary scholar of English studies in Turkey. His support and encouragement are much appreciated. I must also acknowledge the unyielding support and generous advice of Prof. Dr. A. Deniz Bozer, Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Sibel Dinçel.

I feel very fortunate to have excellent friends in my life, whose camaraderie has made this Ph.D. journey less lonely, more enjoyable, and certainly much more endurable. First of all, I must acknowledge my heat-felt thanks and incalculable debt to Arzu Çevirgen, long time friend, colleague, and office-mate, who has helped me in constant and considerate ways throughout my Ph.D. studies, and proved a valuable friend in times of needs. I cannot thank her enough for going through all steps of this process with me, and at times getting more stressed than me. Many thanks to Özden Dere, another invaluable friend in the quest, whose support and stimulation have been unyielding despite the miles between us. As well as a good friend, Özden has also proven to be an excellent fellow traveller in conference trips.

Special mention is due to Assist Prof. Dr. Fazile Eren Kaya for being a true friend, who has managed to relax and cheer me up at the end of long office days with her unending energy and deep sense of humour. I am especially thankful to her for taking me out to try new desserts and dishes, and most importantly, providing me with all kinds of memes, which mostly made my day in the rush of every day routine.

Nilay Cevher deserves a special mention for years of friendship and support. On the first day of school at Hacettepe University in 2007, we met accidentally in the labyrinth-like corridors of the Faculty of Letters. For the past fifteen years or so, she has been one of my best friends, and we have saved many excellent memories at home and abroad. I remember our lunch breaks at school with a smile on face. Another friend that deserves special mention is Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selda Taşdemir Afşar, who frequently participated in these lunch breaks, during which we had candid conversations and discussions. I am indebted to her for offering her time and help whenever I needed.

I also owe debts of gratitude to Dr. Tuba Ağkaş Özcan for her unflagging support and constant stimulation. She has proven to be a good friend by being there whenever I needed her help, and encouraging me much more when my energy waned. My best wishes go to Assist. Prof. Dr. Seçil Erkoç for her genuine companionship and unconditional support. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. İmren Yelmiş, who has been a source of encouragement and support since my first day in the department, for our stimulating conversations from which I have benefited a lot. Thanks are due to Dr. Kübra Vural Özbey and Dr. Cemre Mimoza Bartu for their warm conversations and collegial help, and to Dr. Hatice Çelikdoğan and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kübra Baysal for their constant support and encouragement.

I am much indebted to Ömer Cengiz, whose friendship I have been enjoying for almost two decades now. Despite the miles between us for some time, he has tirelessly supported me with long phone calls, and encountered all the difficulties of doing a Ph.D. with me.

My last thanks are reserved for my dear family. I am indebted to my parents, Safiye and Ahmet Balcı, and my sisters, Semiye Yıldız, Zeynep Öztürk, and Yüksel Ekiz, for their unfailing support and unconditional love, which have been immense stimuli in bringing this dissertation to fruition. Semiye deserves special thanks for taking me to the airport indefatigably for my educational trips for over the past fifteen years. My warmest gratitude is to my two-year-old nephew, Doruk, who has recently begun poaching on my computer with the claim that he is writing “our” dissertation. In these trying times, his *joie de vivre* has thankfully enlivened us, and writing my dissertation in his company has been much more fun. Last but not least, I must express my special thanks to my mother for encouraging me to further my studies, for standing by me, and for raising me curious. This dissertation, which is dedicated to her, is hers as much as mine.

## ABSTRACT

Balci, Adem. *Architectural Psychology in Utopias/Dystopias: William Morris's News from Nowhere, George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four and J.G. Ballard's High-Rise*, Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara, 2022.

Perusing three utopian/dystopian novels set in London, namely, William Morris's *News from Nowhere* (1891), George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), and J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise* (1975), this dissertation scrutinises the functional use of architecture in utopias/dystopias as a primary element rather than a mere backdrop to manipulate the psychology of the characters in line with the domineering ideology the writers explore either to praise or attack. Morris's utopian novel *News from Nowhere* delineates a socialist society in a future agrarian land called Nowhere to criticise the mechanic and dehumanising environment of the Victorian Era. By reading the work side by side with the essays of Morris on socialism and Arts and Crafts movement, as well as the park movement in the nineteenth century, it is observed that in the depiction of the pleasing land of utopia, Morris incorporates his socialist and artistic ethos to reflect the positive role of utopian architecture. On the contrary, in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* architecture is used as a means of oppression to serve the Party's corrupt ideology. Drawing on Michel Foucault's Panopticism and Michel de Certeau's concepts of "strategy" and "tactic," it is seen that the totalitarian government of Oceania attains its power through the manipulation and control of architecture, which affects the psychology of the characters in a negative way. In much the same way but in a totally different context, Ballard's *High-Rise* is also about the negative impact of architecture on the thoughts and behaviour of the tenants of a high-rise building. In the light of Freud's discussion of civilisation, Henri Lefebvre's socio-spatial diagram of the production of social space, and Michel de Certeau's concepts of "strategy" and "tactic," it can be said that in *High-Rise* it is the eponymous high-rise building, which brings about violence due to the negative effects of modernist architecture on the psychology of the characters. Consequently, in these three utopian/dystopian works, the functional use of architecture, is especially crucial, for the ideologically loaded architecture in each one of them is at the centre of the major events the writers explore.

**Keywords:** William Morris, George Orwell, J.G. Ballard, *News from Nowhere*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, *High-Rise*, Utopia, Dystopia, Architecture, Architectural Psychology.

## ÖZET

Balcı, Adem. *Ütopya/Distopyalarda Mimari Psikolojisi: William Morris'in Hiçbir Yerden Haberler'i, George Orwell'in Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört'ü ve J.G. Ballard'ın Gökdelen'i*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2022.

Londra'da geçmekte olan William Morris'in *Hiçbir Yerden Haberler'i* (1891), George Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört'ü* (1949) ve J.G. Ballard'ın *Gökdelen'ine* (1975) odaklanan bu tezin temel amacı ütopya/distopya yazınında mimarinin sadece olay örgüsünün geçtiği bir ortamdaki ziyade, ütopya yazarlarının övmek, distopya yazarlarının ise yermek amacıyla ele aldığı ideolojileri yansıtarak karakterlerin psikolojilerini etkilemede kullandıkları temel araç olduğunu savunmaktadır. Morris'in ütopyası *Hiçbir Yerden Haberler*, Viktorya Döneminin mekanik ve insanlıktan çıkarıcı ortamını eleştirmek için Hiçbir Yer isimli sosyalist ve tarıma dayalı bir toplumu resmetmektedir. Eser, Morris'in sosyalizm ve Sanat ve El Sanatları akımı üzerine yazdığı denemeleri, ve on-dokuzuncu yüzyılda umumi parkların açılmasına vesile olan park hareketleriyle birlikte okunduğunda görülmektedir ki, bu mutluluk verici yeri tasvir ederken, ütöpik mimarinin olumlu yönünü yansıtmak için Morris kendi sosyalist ve sanatsal görüşlerini de işin içine dahil etmektedir. Ütopyanın tam aksine, Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* isimli distopyasında ise mimari, karakterler üzerinde tahakküm kuran baskıcı iktidar sahiplerinin kendi ideolojileri doğrultusunda kullanılmaktadır. Michel Foucault'nun "Panoptisizm" ve Michel de Certeau'nun "strateji" ve "taktik" kavramları ışığında bakıldığında, Oceania'nın totaliter hükümetinin, mimarinin çeşitli unsurlarını kullanarak karakterleri manipüle ettiği, onlar üzerinde baskı kurduğu ve onları böylece kontrol altında tuttuğu görülmektedir. Benzer bir şekilde ama tamamen farklı bir bağlamda, Ballard'ın *Gökdelen* romanı da mimarinin karakterlerin düşünceleri ve davranışları üzerindeki olumsuz etkisi hakkındadır. Freud'un uygarlık kavramı üzerindeki düşünceleri ve Henri Lefebvre'in "mekanın üretimi" ve Michel de Certeau'nun "strateji" ve "taktik" kavramları ışığında bakıldığında, Ballard'ın *Gökdelen* romanındaki bina, modernist mimarinin insan psikolojisi üzerindeki olumsuz etkisinden ötürü şiddete yol açmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, her ne kadar mimari tüm ütopya/distopyalarda önemli bir yere sahip olsa da, özellikle bu çalışmada adı geçen üç eserin her birinde, yazarların irdeledikleri temel konuların merkezinde olması sebebiyle ayrıca önem arz etmektedir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** William Morris, George Orwell, J.G. Ballard, *Hiçbir Yerden Haberler*, *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört*, *Gökdelen*, Ütopya, Distopya, Mimari, Mimari Psikolojisi.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>KABUL VE ONAY.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ETİK BEYAN.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>ÖZET .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER I: THE ARCHITECTURE OF PLEASURE: WILLIAM MORRIS'S <i>NEWS FROM NOWHERE</i>.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>CHAPTER II: THE ARCHITECTURE OF OPPRESSION: GEORGE ORWELL'S <i>NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR</i>.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>CHAPTER III: THE ARCHITECTURE OF VIOLENCE: J.G. BALLARD'S <i>HIGH-RISE</i> .....</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>WORKS CITED.....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1: ORIGINALITY REPORT .....</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: ETHICS BOARDS WAIVER FORM .....</b>	<b>184</b>

## INTRODUCTION

Informed by the spatial turn in the humanities and social sciences, and deeply entrenched in the phenomenon of utopianism, this dissertation aims to scrutinise the functional use of architecture in utopian/dystopian narratives by exploring the complex web of interlinks between ideology, power, knowledge, and resistance as reflected in the selected British utopias/dystopias. Similar to real life, in literary works too there is no way of escape from architecture, for there might be no setting without the delineation of an architectural landscape. The architecture surrounding us and our everyday lives both in real life and in the fictional works is by no means neutral, but replete with diverse ideologies and competing power relations. What is more however, such ideologically loaded architectural realms have a direct influence on the psychology, moods, thoughts, emotions, and hence behaviour of their occupants. Literary works, ranging from the Gothic novel, and horror, mystery, fantasy and science fiction genres to travel literature and drawing-room comedy, among many others, make much use of this aspect of architecture to set the tone for the unfolding of the events. Yet still, among all literary genres, utopia/dystopia emerges as the most significant one that benefits from such function of architecture, as it attains its critical mode from the apt use of architectural spaces. While the utopia writer uses architecture for good ends to construct a better society for the wellbeing of its occupants so as to juxtapose it with a malfunctioning contemporaneous society, the dystopia writer uses it as the embodiment of the corruptive and dehumanising features of the domineering minority to manipulate and control the thoughts, emotions, and behaviour of the subordinate groups to prevent even a tiny possibility of rebellion. At this juncture, the basic premise of this dissertation is that ideologically loaded architecture is used in utopias to set the peaceful utopian atmosphere, while it is used as the primary means of oppression and manipulation that opens the door to the hell of dystopia. Consequently, through the analysis of a work of utopia and two works of dystopia, namely, William Morris's (1834-1896) *News from Nowhere* (1891), George Orwell's (1903-1950) *Nineteen*

*Eighty-Four* (1949), and J.G. Ballard's (1930-2009) *High-Rise* (1975), with respect to the exploration of the impact of architecture on the thoughts, moods, and behaviour of the characters at the intersection of power and ideology embedded into architecture, this dissertation claims that in these works the psychology and behaviour of the characters are also manipulated and controlled in line with the dominant ideology through the functional use of architecture.

Before discussion, it will be much helpful to give some insights regarding the methodology to be followed both in the Introduction and in the chapters. For the sake of unity among all these works, what will be explored will not be restricted to architecture *per se*, but will include all built environments, including other human-made constructs ranging from woods, parks, and public places to squares and streets. As well as these built environments, the presence and absence of the natural environment in utopias and dystopias respectively will also be explored in detail to shed light on how human nature is overpoweringly enmeshed, and influenced by its own environment. In the first place, the arrangement of the novels for the chapters, beginning in the Victorian Era with utopia, and then switching to the tumultuous age of the twentieth century, follows a chronological order to demonstrate both the development of the utopian/dystopian narration, and also different approaches to and manifestations of architecture within the larger socio-cultural, economic, and political developments in the world. Although totally unlike, all the works are set in different utopian and dystopian manifestations of the city of London, which is specifically chosen as the spatial denominator. What is specific to these works is that they are all centred around the functional use of architecture, and make much use of it. Following the true nature of utopia as a literary genre, the discussion begins with the rural and pre-lapsarian London of the first chapter, continues with a war-torn dystopian one in the second chapter, and finally ends with a modern manifestation that is adorned with nothing but bare concrete. Despite such stark differences among them however, all three books are entangled in diverse ways through complex power relations. In this respect, the analysis of the competing power relations as reflected in architecture which influences the characters will be conducted by drawing from the theories of three French critics, namely, Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991), Michel Foucault (1926-1984), and Michel de Certeau (1925-1986), whose appreciation

of space overlaps and speaks back to the significance of the architectural spaces in utopias/dystopias.

Such exploration of the architectural realms in utopias/dystopias might be categorised as a technique that is part of what the literary critic Robert T. Tally terms “spatial literary studies,” which might be accepted as the extension of the spatial turn in the humanities and social sciences. The French philosopher Michel Foucault, one of the most significant of the spatial theorists, claiming that “[t]he great obsession of the nineteenth century was [...] history;” declared the second half of twentieth century to be “the epoch of space” (“Of Other Spaces” 22). Such privilege of time over space is rather problematic, because, in this kind of approach while the former is associated with “narrative development and change,” the latter is reduced to a “mere background or an empty container in which the unfolding of events over some *durée* could take place” (Tally, “Introduction: The Reassertion” 2). However, space is as worthy as time. Therefore, Foucault’s suggestion might be accepted as a paradigm change, as he wanted to shift the focus from “time” to “space,” and most probably unknowingly, elicited the so-called spatial turn, the origins of which might be traced back roughly to the 1960s. For Tally, although it is very difficult to pinpoint the exact date of the spatial turn, it has been more than fifty years now. Spatial literary studies, which draw on the studies of the spatial critics ranging from geography, sociology, urban studies, gender studies, postcolonial studies and philosophy, is a comparatively recent field of study that emerged in the past few decades (“Spatial Literary Studies” 317, “Introduction: Spaces of the Text” 1). Along with Foucault, a number of other philosophers, geographers, urbanists, sociologists, and literary and cultural critics such as Henri Lefebvre, David Harvey (1935- ), Edward W. Soja (1940-2015), Yi-Fu Tuan (1930-), Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995), Edward W. Said (1935-2003), Derek Gregory (1951- ), Nigel Thrift (1949- ), Michel de Certeau, Homi K. Bhabha (1949- ), Manuel Castells (1942- ), Anthony Giddens (1938- ), Tim Ingold (1948- ), Bruno Latour (1947- ), Doreen Massey (1944-2016), Gillian Rose (1947-1995), Fredric Jameson (1934- ), and Robert T. Tally Jr. (1969- ), among many others, have explored different aspects of space from cultural, topographical, postcolonial, sociological, and gender perspectives, and set the stage for a critical re-appreciation of space, – which was initially rendered static, inactive and



insignificant, – not as a mere backdrop for the events to unfold, but as an active and dynamic agent, shaping and shaped by everyday practices. Due to manifold studies carried out by these spatial critics, we have become, in the words of Edward Soja, “increasingly aware that we are, and always have been, intrinsically spatial as well as temporal beings, active participants in the production and reproduction of the encompassing human geographies in which we live, as much and with similarly given constraints as we make our histories” (12).

As James Kneale also puts it, “it is not easy to say what ‘space’ is;” and what is more, “[i]t is often taken for granted as a category of existence or experience, and has received much less attention than time in philosophy, social theory, and textual criticism – although not in the discipline of geography” (423). The definition of the term in *The Oxford English Dictionary* seems to support his argument, for it is defined as “[t]he dimensions of height, depth and width within which all things exist and move” (“Space”). Such a definition of the term is actually a very reductionist one, for it both treats space as an empty container to be filled, and reduces it just to its mathematical dimensions as a measurable thing. Such partial and limited definition of the term might be rather misleading, because space is dynamic and agentic, and is continually produced and re-produced as part of our everyday practices. In this respect, as Foucault also argues, space is not something to be treated as “the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile” (“Questions on Geography” 70).<sup>1</sup> What is more, as Kneale also puts it, “space is not natural, or abstract, or literally ‘there,’ but is relational, lived, and lively”

---

<sup>1</sup> Foucault actually blames the philosophers for the disregard of space, and argues: “Among all the reasons which led to spaces suffering for so long a certain neglect, I will mention just one, which has to do with the discourse of philosophers. At the moment when a considered politics of spaces was starting to develop, at the end of the eighteenth century, the new achievements in theoretical and experimental physics dislodged philosophy from its ancient right to speak of the world, the cosmos, finite or infinite space. This double investment of space by political technology and scientific practice reduced philosophy to the field of a problematic of time. Since Kant, what is to be thought by the philosopher is time. Hegel, Bergson, Heidegger. Along with this goes a correlative devaluation of space, which stands on the side of the understanding, the analytical, the conceptual, the dead, the fixed, the inert. I remember ten years or so ago discussing these problems of the politics of space, and being told that it was reactionary to go on so much about space, and that time and the ‘project’ were what life and progress are about. I should say that this reproach came from a psychologist – psychology, the truth and the shame of nineteenth-century philosophy” (“The Eye of Power” 149-150).

(423), and hence, “space and society produce each other” (423). Kneale elaborates on his explanation as follows:

space is *relational* – it is not anything in itself but derives its apparently natural characteristics from its relations with other places, people, and things. [...] Second, space is *multiple and heterogeneous*. There are many different narratives within one place and many experiences of it; the cultural politics of identity and difference become spatial metaphors of “position.” [...] Finally, space is *in process*, becoming rather than fixed. The agonistic relations between and within places ensure that their futures are always open, allowing us to resist teleological arguments and to derail apparently singular narratives (like globalization). There are always alternatives. (424-25, emphasis original)

Kneale’s argument actually is very much in tune with what Foucault states above, and communicates well with the comments of other critics as given below. To sum up his view in a nutshell, there is a reciprocal relationship between space and society, both influencing one another in diverse ways. The interrelationship between space and society is perhaps the best manifestation of the fact that space is not “merely a backdrop or setting for events, an empty container to be filled with actions or movements; [...] [r]ather, [...] both a product and productive” (Tally, *Spatiality* 119-120). Just on the contrary, as James Kneale and Rob Kitchin also posit, space is “charged with meaning through discourse and practice” (2). With all the studies conducted in the humanities and social sciences on space with the spatial turn, “space could no longer be seen simply as a backdrop against which life unfolds sequentially, but rather, intimately tied to lived experience” (Warf and Arias 4). Since space is no longer seen as an empty container for the events to unfold, for Barney Warf and Santa Arias, “‘space matters,’ not for the trivial and self-evident reason that everything occurs in space, but because *where* events unfold is integral to *how* they take shape” (10, emphasis original). That is to say, “[s]pace is not simply a passive reflection of social and cultural trends, but an active participant, i.e., geography is constitutive as well as representative” (Warf and Arias 10). Consequently, it is possible to deduce that space is “a means by which we organise the world” (Garcia 2).

In literary studies, as in cultural studies and critical theory in general, the appreciation and re-assertion of space have made a breakthrough, for in literary studies the focus up until recently has been on time and temporality, while the exploration of space was

reduced mostly to “the areas in which things took place, the mere setting, a backdrop or container in which the events unfolded but which itself had little direct consequence.” Furthermore, “[s]pace or place in this rendering remained rather static and inconsequential, whereas time and temporality appeared to gain significance, whether they are considered in terms of grand historical developments over centuries or an individual’s experiences of the passage of the hours in a day” (Tally, “Space of the Novel” 153). Despite such privilege of temporality, space is actually “nothing new to literature,” because, “[s]etting is a key feature of almost all stories, as events take place in a given place, after all. [...] Whole genres may be defined by such spatial or geographical characteristics, such as the pastoral poem, the travel narrative, utopia, or the urban exposé” (Tally, “Introduction: The Reassertion” 1).

Although setting is important in all genres of literature, for the novel, it is specifically significant, for as Tally also posits, it is “often a crucial aspect of the novel, since the history and geography directly affect the way that characters, events, and plots are understood” (Tally, “Space of the Novel” 154). Space tells us a lot more than time with respect to the characters, event itself, and the unfolding of the events. The novel is generally known as a temporal form. However, it is also a spatial form. To put it in other words, it is a spatio-temporal form. As Tally further argues, “[g]enerally speaking, space and spatiality, like time and temporality, have always been part of literature and literary studies” (Tally, “Introduction: The Reassertion” 1). Space and spatiality actually reveal much more than one can imagine, and hence perhaps it can be argued that spatiality is more significant than temporality. For Tally, when one talks about space in a literary work, it does not necessarily just refer to “geography,” but also to all “[o]ther spatial arrangements, such as architecture, interior design, and types of spaces, invariably have their own effects on a narrative” (“Space of the Novel” 155). In this respect, it can be argued that while exploring Charles Dickens’s (1812-1870) novels, London is generally the referential point. However, the spatiality of his novels cannot be limited to the city of London as a geographical referent, but to all kinds of spatial arrangements such as houses, factories, mansions, orphanages, graveyards, and the cityscape, among many others, and their bond and/or interaction with each other. Likewise, James Joyce’s (1882-1941) Dublin as manifested in his novels *Ulysses* (1920)

and *A Portrait of the Artist* (1916), and the short stories in the story collection *Dubliners* (1914) is not about Dublin *per se* as a geographical element, but about its colonial past, the spectre of which manifests itself in the extant imperial architecture that the characters encounter, or about the sense of entrapment and paralysis, which pursues each one of them wherever they go. In much the same way, in Victor Hugo's (1802-1885) novels, spatiality cannot just be reduced to the city of Paris, but also includes the Cathedral of Notre-Dame, the Seine, and the poverty-stricken quarters of the poor, just to give a few examples.

To turn to the spatial traits of familiar literary texts is worthy of note, for such an analysis provides fresh insights for the interpretation of known texts, by shifting "the focus away from the author and the context, onto the text itself" (Brosseau 10). As a matter of fact, the primary objective of this dissertation is therefore to venture into the realm of the spatial literary studies within the concept of an architectural analysis of traditional utopian/dystopian narratives to provide fresh insights for future studies with respect to the exploration of the hitherto unnoticed and/or disregarded aspects of familiar and much investigated texts. Because, by emphasising the spatial nature of classical texts, this study will redefine how they are better shaped by the spatial arrangements of designs and architectural surroundings. In this respect, as Tally also argues, "[i]n examining spatial representation in literary works, spatially oriented criticism has also invoked interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary practices, frequently making productive connections to architecture, geography, history, politics, social theory, and urban studies, among other fields" ("Introduction: Spaces of the Text" 2). Hence, the focus on the representation of architecture in utopian/dystopian narratives will be explored from a spatial perspective. To this end, it is helpful to explore the ideas of some spatial critics, namely, Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and Michel de Certeau. Although they focus on space from different angles, their theories seem to complement each other. Consequently, evaluating these critics side by side will be much helpful to shed light on how space is a kind of battleground of different and competing power relations, which shape it while at the same time being shaped by it due to its dynamic nature.

The eminent French critic, sociologist, and urbanist Henri Lefebvre focuses on the role of space as “a means of control, and hence of domination, of power” (30). As opposed to previous mathematical and philosophical appreciations of space, which attributing “a strictly geometrical meaning” regarded it as “an empty space” (1), Lefebvre evaluates it as “social space” that is produced and reproduced by means of the social relations of the users. That is why, he “inveighs against any treatment of space as mere container or milieu, as a kind of neutral setting in which life transpires” (Molotoch 888). For Lefebvre, therefore, “*(Social) space is a (social) product*” (Lefebvre 26; 27, emphasis original). What is more, “[s]ocial space *per se* is at once *work* and *product* – a materialization, of ‘social being’” (Lefebvre 101-102, emphasis original). The production of space is not a simple one as “in the sense that a kilogram of sugar or yard of cloth is produced” (Lefebvre 85). In a similar way, as he further argues, the production of space is not “an aggregate of the places or locations of such products as sugar, wheat or cloth” (85). It is a much more complex phenomenon, to express which Lefebvre proposes a socio-spatial formulation that is made up of a triadic division of space into three processes/components: physical space (perceived), mental space (conceived), and social space (lived). Lefebvre uses this spatial triad to scrutinise the intersection of power and space, and expresses each one of them respectively with the terms *spatial practice*, *representations of space*, and *representational spaces*.

In Lefebvre’s triadic formulation, *spatial practice* is the first component, and stands for the perceived space, which refers to the physical space that is imbued with the everyday activities of the users. What is significant with respect to *spatial practice* is that “[i]t is lived directly before it is conceptualized; but the speculative primacy of the conceived over the lived causes practice to disappear along with life, and so does very little justice to the ‘unconscious’ level of lived experience *per se*” (Lefebvre 34). It is the primary producer of space, and hence “embraces production and reproduction” (Lefebvre 33). Therefore, in *spatial practice*, “the reproduction of social relations is predominant” (Lefebvre 50). In the words of Lefebvre, “[t]he spatial practice of a society secretes that society’s space; it propounds and presupposes it, in a dialectical interaction; it produces it slowly and surely as it masters and appropriates it” (Lefebvre 38). Therefore, to understand the *spatial practice* of a society one needs to decipher its space, and the

everyday practices it offers (Lefebvre 38). Intervention into “the daily life of a tenant in a government-subsidized high-rise housing project,” or just “motorways,” or “the politics of air transport” will unravel the *spatial practices* of people in capitalist societies (Lefebvre 38).

*Representations of space*, the second component of the triad, are the conceived space, which stands for the “conceptualized space” of “scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers” (Lefebvre 38). As a matter of fact, it is the realm of the producers. As conceptualised, *representations of space* are tied “to knowledge, to signs, to codes, and to ‘frontal’ relations” (Lefebvre 33). As the dominant space “in any society (or mode of production),” *representations of space* are abstract, yet still play a significant role in “social and political practice” (Lefebvre 41), for they combine “ideology and knowledge within a (social-spatial) practice” (Lefebvre 45). In *representations of space*, it is very difficult to distinguish ideology from knowledge. If the producers cannot realise their ideologies in concrete form by applying them, it does not mean anything at all.

Also referred to as *spaces of representation*, *representational spaces* are the third component of the triad, and embody “complex symbolisms, sometimes coded, sometimes not, linked to the clandestine or underground side of social life, as also to art (which may come eventually to be defined less as a code of space than as a code of representational spaces” (Lefebvre 33), and hence refer directly to the experience of lived space that manifests itself with these images or symbols. It is primarily the space of the “inhabitants” or the “users,” but also, the space of some artists and writers and even philosophers, who just “describe” (Lefebvre 39, emphasis original). What is specific to *representational spaces* is that while on the one hand the users or the inhabitants just experience what is imposed on them by the domineering powers, nevertheless the former simultaneously seek ways of altering and appropriating what is forced on them. That is to say, the users are in search of specific tactics to react against mastery over them. *Representational spaces* overlay “physical space, making symbolic use of its objects” (Lefebvre 39). Hence, unlike abstract *representations of space*, it is

“alive” and “speaks” (Lefebvre 42). What is more, “it may be directional, situational or relational, because it is essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic” (Lefebvre 42).

In the production of space, there is a “dialectical relationship” of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived spaces of the triad (Lefebvre 39). The complex relationship among the moments of space “are never either simple or stable, nor are they ‘positive’ in the sense in which this term might be opposed to ‘negative’, to the indecipherable, the unsaid, the prohibited, or the unconscious” (Lefebvre 46). Each one of the components of the spatial triad contributes in diverse ways to the production of space “according to their qualities and attributes, according to the society or mode of production in question, and according to the historical period” (Lefebvre 46).

Following a trajectory similar to that of Lefebvre, Michel Foucault also associates space with power, and explores how it turns into a battleground for competing ideologies. In the majority of his whole corpus, if not all, Foucault is profoundly preoccupied with power relations and diverse manifestations of power, as sovereign power, disciplinary power, and bio-power. He accepts his preoccupation with power with the statement: “It is true that I became quite involved with the question of power” (“The Subject and Power” 778). With respect to his exploration of the nexus of space, power and knowledge as a means of social control, this study will focus on his conceptualisation of the disciplinary power in a disciplinary society with respect to the concept of Panopticism, a term he adopted from the English philosopher Jeremy Bentham’s (1748-1832) architectural plan for a model penitentiary to shed light upon the controlling nature of modern society. To this end, just before a critical discussion of Foucault’s concept of Panopticism, it will be much helpful to explore Bentham’s Panopticon. Investigating Bentham’s model penitentiary and its function requires unearthing the etymological roots of the word Panopticon, which will throw much light on the functioning of this concept, for Bentham “named this prison Panopticon to reflect the Greek roots meaning ‘all seeing’” (Strub 40) to emphasise the primary objective of his model penitentiary, which was to sustain perpetual surveillance. Etymologically, the word Panopticon is derived from the Greek word, *panoptes*, meaning “all-seeing,” the roots of which go back to the name of an entity in Greek mythology. This mythological

figure, who is usually known as a “herdsman” (Roman and Roman 80) or a “giant” (81) with “a hundred eyes” (Hamilton 98), is Hera’s watchman Argus Panoptes, “the All-Seeing” (Hard 228), who is also known as Argos Panoptes.<sup>2</sup> Here the emphasis is on Panoptes’s a hundred eyes, some of which never fall asleep to keep watch even while sleeping. Drawing heavily from the myth of Argus Panoptes with respect to his all-seeing nature, Bentham proposes a model penitentiary based on the principle of constant inspection, which is actually provided through the functional use of a specific architectural edifice designed in the form of an annular building with individual cells of the prisoners in the periphery and a central tower of inspection at the centre, where only a guard is situated to observe the inmates of the cells to keep them under strict control.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As Edith Hamilton posits, as Argus Panoptes “could sleep with some of the eyes and keep on guard with the rest” (98), Hera sets him as a watchman to protect the nymph Io from Zeus. However, Hermes, the mischievous messenger God, “[d]isguised as a shepherd,” lulls him “to close all his eyes in sleep with the aid of his reed pipe and the story of its invention by Pan” (Roman and Roman 81), which actually explores the sad story of the nymph Syrinx. When finally all the eyes of Argus Panoptes go to sleep, Hermes beheads him (Roman and Roman 81). After this event, Hera takes Panoptes’s eyes, and “set them in the tail of the peacock, her favorite bird” (Hamilton 99).

<sup>3</sup> In his Panopticon writings, Letter II, which is entitled “Plan for a Penitentiary Inspection-House,” Bentham describes his Panopticon plan layout as follows:

The building is circular.

The apartments of the prisoners occupy the circumference. You may call them, if you please, the *cells*.

These *cells* are divided from one another, and the prisoners by that means secluded from all communication with each other, by *partitions* in the form of *radii* issuing from the circumference towards the centre, and extending as many feet as shall be thought necessary to form the largest dimension of the cell.

The apartment of the inspector occupies the centre; you may call it if you please the *inspector’s lodge*.

It will be convenient in most, if not in all cases, to have a vacant space or area all round, between such centre and such circumference. You may call it if your please the *intermediate* or *annular* area.

[...]

Each cell has in the outward circumference, a window, large enough, not only to light the cell, but, through the cell, to afford light enough to the correspondent part of the lodge.

The inner circumference of the cell is formed by an iron *grating*, so light as not to screen any part of the cell from the inspector’s view.

Of this grating, a part sufficiently large opens, in form of a *door*, to admit the prisoner at his first entrance; and to give admission at any time to the inspector or any of his attendants. (35, emphasis original)



As the primary principle of this specific architectural structure is to sustain surveillance of the subordinate groups to keep them under total control, the Panopticon, while allowing the guard in the inspection tower to observe and speak to the inmates in the cells with the help of a specific mechanism, prevents the latter seeing the former except the tower itself. In this respect, as Foucault also puts it, what is most significant in this architectural model is that the individual inside the cell, “is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication” (*Discipline* 200). With such a manipulation of the inmates of the individual cells, the principal effect of the Panopticon, for Foucault, is,

to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. To achieve this, it is at once too much and too little that the prisoner should be constantly observed by an inspector: too little, for what matters is that he knows himself to be observed; too much, because he has no need in fact of being so. In view of this, Bentham laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable. *Visible*: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. *Unverifiable*: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so. (*Discipline* 201, emphasis added)<sup>4</sup>

As the ones observed in the cells cannot see the observer in the inspection tower, the prisoners cannot know when they are being watched exactly; and thereby they, in a way, become their own inspectors, and internalise this feeling of continuous surveillance, which makes them regulate their behaviour and self-censor themselves so as not to get punished for their misbehaviour. The prisoners are thus disciplined. With the Panopticon, Bentham actually “invented a technology of power designed to solve the problems of surveillance” (“The Eye of Power,” 148), for, as Foucault claims by quoting from Bentham, such a model is vital for “effective exercise of power” (“The Eye of Power” 148).

Indeed, inspection was not a new thing, but the uncertainty of being watched was

---

<sup>4</sup> Also see his “The Eye of Power,” p. 147.

somehow new, and brought forth subordination: “Bentham’s innovation, then, was not just to inspect, or even to ensure that the gaze is asymmetrical, but to use uncertainty as a means of subordination. The asymmetrical gaze created uncertainty which in turn produced surrender” (Lyon 65). Even though such a penitentiary was never built in his lifetime or later, Bentham, as a philosopher of utilitarianism, — which is simply built upon the principle of the greatest good of something for a high number of people, — believed his model to be a very functional one, for with only one guard in the inspection tower, a high number of prisoners are kept under control, and they are disciplined. For Foucault, in this respect, “[w]henver one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a particular form of behaviour must be imposed, the panoptic schema may be used” (*Discipline* 205). Unlike Bentham’s description of the Panopticon as an architectural model however, Foucault uses Panopticism as a metaphor of social control in disciplinary societies, where individuals are exposed to constant surveillance and manifold means of control by numerous apparatuses of the state. As he uses Panopticism to shed light on the functioning of power relations, Foucault believes the Panopticon to be “an important mechanism” which not only “automatizes and disindividualizes power” (*Discipline* 202), but also “produces homogenous effects of power” (*Discipline* 202). In this respect, it can be asserted that Foucault adopts the term to shed light on the functioning of power relations on the nexus of seeing and being seen at the intersection of power, knowledge, and space. Consequently, as Foucault posits, “[t]he Panopticon functions as a kind of laboratory of power. Thanks to its mechanisms of observation, it gains in efficiency and in the ability to penetrate into men’s behaviour; knowledge follows the advances of power, discovering new objects of knowledge over all the surfaces on which power is exercised” (*Discipline* 204). Therefore, as opposed to Bentham’s plan, the Panopticon is not a dream building, but “the diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form [...]; in fact, a figure of political technology that may and must be detached from any specific use” (*Discipline* 205). Foucault’s explanations of the functioning of the Panopticon thus cast light on the functioning of power relations in such disciplinary societies, where the primary requirement of disciplining is the control of the subordinate groups by means of self-regulation born due to fear with respect to the uncertainty of surveillance or scrutiny.

Consequently, disciplinary power depends on the continual surveillance of the subordinate subjects, which provides a source of knowledge for the rulers, and Foucault's concept of Panopticism sheds light on the inextricable link between discipline, power, and knowledge. However, the subordinate groups, while policing themselves so as not to be punished, simultaneously seek ways of escape from the domineering impact of the disciplinary power. Hence, in such disciplinary societies of domination and control, "no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remain the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groups" (Foucault, "Space, Knowledge, and Power" 245). In much the same way, as he puts it in other words in another work, "[w]here there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (*The History* 95). Interestingly enough, though Foucault is aware of the possibility of resistance from the subordinate groups, he does not explore it, but focuses on the dynamics of discipline established by the rulers or the authorities. As opposed to Foucault however, Michel de Certeau delves into "antidisciplines," and sheds light on how the subordinate ones resist against the dictates of the manipulators by way of different techniques while remaining within the framework established by the latter.

Michel de Certeau, who is deeply influenced by Lefebvre with respect to his discussion of everyday life, and by Foucault with respect to his explorations of the intricate relationship between space, power, and knowledge, also engages with the power relations in space. Before discussing his distinction from Foucault, it will be beneficial to begin with de Certeau's spatial theory with respect to his critique of everyday practices as he discussed in his seminal book *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984) especially by focusing on his distinction between space and place, and tactic and strategy as significant spatial practices within the urban context. de Certeau begins his discussion of everyday practices with the criticism of modern society, which is both capitalist and consumerist. While conceptualising consumerism, he claims that culture consists of products and system, and production is a way of exercising power and a way of disciplining the subordinate groups. Hence, society is divided into two groups: the producers and users. The users, who constitute the majority of society, are the ordinary people, and they are the focus of de Certeau in his discussion. Generally, it is believed

that in the operation of their daily lives, ordinary people are actually subordinate to the rulers or authorities, who turn out to be the producers. For de Certeau, the users, who are “commonly assumed to be passive and guided by established rules” (xi) of the producers, are not, as opposed to the common belief, passive consumers that use up what is proffered to them, but are active agents, who re-produce what is presented them to appropriate their needs and ways. They re-produce by means of spatial everyday practices. de Certeau expresses this process as follows:

To a rationalized, expansionist and at the same time centralized, clamorous, and spectacular production corresponds *another* production, called ‘consumption.’ The latter is devious, it is dispersed, but it insinuates itself everywhere silently and almost invisibly, because it does not manifest itself through its own products, but rather through its *ways of using* the products imposed by a dominant economic order (xii-xiii, emphasis original).

What de Certeau alleges is that consumption itself is indeed another way of production, for the users do not consume what is proffered to them in the exact way the producers wish. That is why, each consumption is a re-production. This process of the re-production of production shows that the users react in an invisible way against what is imposed on them by means of their practices. What is significant at this juncture is that while resisting, they actually remain within the framework established by the producers by keeping a low profile, and thereby do not get reactions from the producers. Although de Certeau does not give an exhaustive and particular definition of the concept, he refers to everyday practices as “‘ways of operating’ or doing things” (xi), and claims that everyday practices are not “obscure background of social activity” (xi). To better explain the power relations between the users and producers, and to express the practices of these two groups, de Certeau adopts two terms, “strategy” and “tactic” from the military lexicon.

de Certeau makes a distinction between strategy and tactic for the operation of everyday practices. To begin with the first of the binary concepts, a strategy for de Certeau, is “the calculation (or manipulation) of power relationships that becomes possible as soon as a subject with will and power (a business, an army, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated” (35-6). What is more, a strategy, “postulates a *place* that can be delimited as its *own* and serve as the base from which relations with an *exteriority* composed of targets or threats (customers or competitors, enemies, the country surrounding the city,

objectives and objects of research, etc.) can be managed” (de Certeau 36, emphasis original). That is to say, strategies are related with power, and require a planning.

A tactic, just on the other hand, is “a calculated action determined by the absence of a proper locus” (de Certeau 37). The realm of a tactic is “the space of the other” (de Certeau 37); that is to say, the space of the marginalised users, and hence tactic is the “art of the weak” (de Certeau 37). That is why, “it must play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power” (de Certeau 37). It must be on watch for opportunities to prepare a space for itself. If there is no such space, it must prepare it by manipulating events. This foreign power is the strategy of the producer. It must be able to catch each opportunity “on the wing” (de Certeau xix), but still, “[w]hatever it wins, it does not keep” (de Certeau xix). Because it must manipulate these events and opportunities. As a tactic plays on within the framework of the strategy, it can also be evaluated as “a maneuver [...] within enemy territory” (de Certeau 37). Due to this mandatory confinement into the realm of the strategy, tactic cannot have the choice of “planning general strategy,” but “operates in isolated actions, blow by blow” (de Certeau 37). The only option for a tactic is “to make the most of the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary power” and “poach in them” (de Certeau 37). Therefore, a tactic must always be on the alert for “opportunities” (de Certeau xix; 37), and even manipulate events to create opportunities for itself, for “[i]t is a guileful ruse” (de Certeau 37).

For de Certeau, all everyday practices, ranging from talking, walking, reading, swimming, cooking to shopping and singing, among many others, are all “tactical in character” (xix), and we need these tactics to cope with the difficulties of life. What is significant with respect to tactics, and hence everyday practices is that they have a political nature. In this respect, as de Certeau puts it with respect to the tactics of consumption, “the ingenious ways in which the weak make use of the strong, thus lend a political dimension to everyday practices” (xvii). While some of the users are aware of what they are doing, that is, they resist against what is imposed on them consciously, the others are mostly unaware of what they are doing, and carry out diverse tactics unwittingly.

de Certeau's above-mentioned disagreement with Foucault manifests itself with respect to their explorations of everyday power relations from two different angles. Although de Certeau is indebted to Foucault and his notion of power relations in society, he nevertheless is critical of his approach, because especially in his *Discipline*, de Certeau believes Foucault to analyse "the mechanisms (dispositifs) that have sapped the strength of these institutions and surreptitiously reorganized the functioning of power: 'miniscule' technical procedures acting on and with details, redistributing a discursive space in order to make it the means of a generalized 'discipline' (surveillance)" rather than exploring "the apparatus exercising power (i.e., the localizable, expansionist, repressive, and legal institutions" (xiv). While Foucault is in the belief that disciplinary societies produce subjects that internalise power, and police themselves, for de Certeau, the ones in the subject position are not so passive, but react against what is imposed on them in diverse ways. Hence, whereas Foucault unearths the "microphysics of power," de Certeau explores resistance and agency. de Certeau criticises Foucault for exploring the disciplinary society from the perspective of the rulers or producers and disregarding the subordinate groups, who actually constitute the majority. While Foucault is after establishing "a genealogy of disciplines," de Certeau wants to understand 'anti-disciplines', the silent and unacknowledged forms of resistance" (Gardiner 168). Different from Foucault, who is concerned with the production of power relations, de Certeau prefers to venture into the dynamics of consumption, which in effect turns out to be a re-production, for

[i]f it is true that the grid of "discipline" is everywhere becoming clearer and more extensive, it is all the more urgent to discover how an entire society resists being reduced to it, what popular procedures (also "miniscule" and quotidian) manipulate the mechanisms of discipline and conform to them only in order to evade them, and finally, what 'ways of operating' from the counterpart, on the consumer's (or "dominee's"?) side, of the mute processes that organize the establishment of socioeconomic order (xiv).

It is by means of their everyday practices that "users reappropriate the space organized by techniques of sociocultural production" (de Certeau xiv).

Of all the parts and chapters of *The Practice of Everyday Life*, the part entitled "Walking in the City" is the most frequently analysed and quoted part of the book, and its significance lies in that it "offers a persuasive theoretical framework for

understanding the temporal and spatial operations of popular culture” (Morris, “What We Talk About” 676). As Morris further argues, “Certeau’s central argument in terms of the enunciative nature of praxis is that space and place are not merely inert or neutral features of the built environment; instead, they must be activated by the ‘rhetorical’ practices of users and passers-by” (“What We Talk About” 677). As a result, de Certeau’s distinction between space and place with respect to everyday practices is worthy of note: “A place (*lieu*) is the order (of whatever kind) in accord with which elements are distributed in relationships coexistence. It thus excludes the possibility of two things being in the same location (*place*). [...] A place is [...] an instantaneous configuration of positions. It implies an indication of stability” (117, emphasis original). A space, just on the other hand, “exists when one takes into consideration vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables” (de Certeau 117). That is why, it is “composed of intersections of mobile elements” (117). It might hence be claimed to be “actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it” (117). Consequently, “[s]pace occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities” (de Certeau 117). In a nutshell, de Certeau deduces that “*space is a practiced place*” (117, emphasis original). As a matter of fact, while a street that is geometrically determined by urban planning is a mere place, it transforms into a space by the help of its users, that is, the walkers. In a similar vein, “an act of reading is the space produced by the practice of a particular place: a written text, i.e., a place constituted by a system of signs” (117). Consequently, “[s]tories thus carry out a labor that constantly transforms places into spaces or spaces into places. They also organize the play of changing relationships between places and spaces” (118).

Harkening back to the opening lines of the chapter, in which de Certeau describes a viewer looking at the streets of Manhattan from the top of the World Trade Centre, from its 110<sup>th</sup> floor, the viewer has a sort of “voluptuous pleasure” due to the panoptic observation of the whole land (de Certeau 92). The viewer is away from the chaos of New York. His/her position gives him/her the chance of being “a solar Eye, looking down like a god” (de Certeau 92). However, the ones who walk the streets as opposed to those looking down the street from their high places are actually the ones who

experience these spaces. One's elevation to a high place actually "puts him at a distance," and what is more, as written on a poster on the 110<sup>th</sup> floor of the Trade Centre, "[i]t's hard to be down when you're up" (de Certeau 92, emphasis original). For the sphinx-like viewer on top of the edifice, it is hard to be down on the streets. As opposed to their detached position however, the walkers of the city are actually its practitioners:

The ordinary practitioners of the city live "down below," below the thresholds at which visibility begins. They walk – an elementary form of this experience of the city; they are walkers, *Wandersmanner*, whose bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban "text" they write without being able to read it. The practitioners make use of spaces that cannot be seen; their knowledge of them is as blind as that of lovers in each other's arms. The paths that correspond in this intertwining, unrecognized poems in which each body is an element signed by many others, elude legibility. [...] The networks of these moving, intersecting writings compose a manifold story that has neither author nor spectator, shaped out of fragments of trajectories and alterations of spaces: in relation to representations, it remains daily and indefinitely other. (de Certeau 93, emphasis original)

As the practitioners of the city, the walkers create their own stories, although they cannot read them. While the city planners, architects, and rulers, that is to say, the producers implement and impose their authority by means of the use of geographical and geometrical tools, the everyday practices of the walkers, that is the users, have nothing to do with geography or geometry. They impose their own tactics while walking in the strategic framework of the producers. "Their swarming mass is an innumerable collection of singularities. Their intertwined paths give their shape to spaces they weave places together. In that respect, pedestrian movements form one of these 'real systems whose existence in fact makes up the city'" (de Certeau 97).

As Denis Hollier aptly puts it in his *Against Architecture*, "[t]here is [...] no way to describe a system without resorting to the vocabulary of architecture" (33). Especially as this dissertation is primarily concerned with architecture and its effects on humans, it will be helpful to begin with the definition of the word architecture, its roots and connection with space. Derived from the Latin word *architectura*, architecture is basically defined as "[t]he art or practice of designing and constructing buildings" in *The Oxford English Dictionary* ("Architecture"). As a matter of fact, such a complicated



phenomenon called architecture, which stands for both art and engineering of building, cannot just be reduced to such a limited and reductionist viewpoint. Surrounding us with its physical dimension as well as ideological function, architecture is an indispensable part of our everyday lives. Yet still, it might make sense when the primary function of architecture is at stake: the need for shelter. Humans need shelter to protect themselves from external and natural forces such as rain, snow, and storm, to give a few examples. In the first place, architecture emerged as a means of shelter but then evolved in time with new demands and new meanings attached to it. However, reducing architecture just to shelter would be an insult to architecture, for it generally “goes beyond protecting us from the elements,” and only then “it begins to say something about the world” (Goldberger ix).

The concept of home is perhaps the most significant aspect of how architecture goes beyond being a shelter. Home, for Edward Allen, is “a place for certain kinds of work carried out by various members of the family: pursuing hobbies, studying, writing letters, cleaning and repairing things, managing financial affairs [...], for play and for entertaining friends” (20). It is the place where “you hang your hat—along with your coat, your shoes, your wardrobe, your dishes, your books, and all the rest of your belongings” (Allen 20). To put it in a humorous way, albeit out of context, home is the place, as the postcolonial writer Grace Nichols (1950- ) puts it in her poem “Wherever I Hang,” “[w]herever [...] [she] hang[s] [...] [her] knickers” (*Lazy Thoughts* 10). In addition to Allen’s explanation, Nichols’s ironic example demonstrates that home is a place, where the occupants feel themselves relaxed and safe, or to delineate it with the very expression, where they feel themselves at home. However, besides home, humans need gathering places, workplaces, markets, theatres, cinemas, religious places so on *ad infinitum*. Such close relationship of humans with architectural realms shows that there is no way of escape from architecture, for we are all surrounded by it, “[a]lmost every moment of our lives, awake or asleep, we are in buildings, around buildings, in spaces defined by buildings, or in landscapes shaped by human artifice” (Roth and Roth Clark 1).

Therefore, unlike defining architecture as the construction of buildings, to delineate it as

“the assemblage of elements” (3), which are not limited to some concrete materials such as brick, carbonette, and steel, among many others, but more importantly, incorporating “the assembling of people, places, things, anticipations, time, sensation, seasons, weather, memory and meaning, which is always in some sense temporary and clouded” (Bille and Sørensen 3) will be helpful. With all these diverse assemblages, architecture is indeed a field of art, but “the unavoidable art [...] the art form we inhabit” (Roth and Clark 4). Since we are all surrounded by architecture, unlike other arts, “architecture has the power to affect and condition human behavior” (Roth and Roth Clark 4). Such effect of architecture on human thoughts and feelings, if not abused by manipulative powers, is actually an important aspect of architecture, for “[a]rchitecture begins to matter when it brings delight and sadness and perplexity and awe along with a roof over our heads. It matters when it creates serenity or exhilaration, and it matters just as much [...] when it inspires anxiety, hostility, or fear” (Goldberger x).

Such effect of architecture on us is directly related with its symbolic function, for besides its volume and mass with respect to its physicality, architecture has a symbolic dimension, as well. This symbolic dimension of architecture is embedded with ideologies. This aspect of architecture is directly related with the message of the architects or the ones who commission them. As they convey specific messages, it can be claimed that “architecture ‘speaks’ in moving ‘language’ about human values” (Shoemaker 181). Therefore, architecture tells us about politics, economy, religion, business, and culture, to give a few examples. In the words of Paul Goldberger, in this respect, “[a]rchitecture is the ultimate physical representation of a culture, more so than even its flag” (16). Collesium, the Parthenon, the Leaning Tower of Pisa, Taj Mahal, Casa Mila, Empire State Building, La Sagrada Familia, Eiffel Tower, Buckingham Palace, London Tower Bridge, St. Paul’s Cathedral, Notre-Dame de Paris, Westminster Abbey, the Sistine Chapel, the Hagia Sophia Mosque, Château de Chenonceau, Acropolis, St. Basil’s Cathedral, Sacré Cour, Sydney Opera House, Potala Palace, and the Galata Tower, among many others, are only some of the most well-known architectural structures unravelling a lot about the socio-economic, cultural, and political backgrounds of their countries. Yet still, it is not only such famous ones, but also every single architectural structure that tells us much about that society.

The symbolic function of architecture is more manifest “in religious and public buildings, where the principal intent is to make a broad and emphatic proclamation of communal values and beliefs” (Roth and Roth Clark 5). Monumental architecture is used as the symbol of power and authority. For Lawrence J. Vale, in this respect,

[p]olitical power takes many forms. In addition to the power evinced by a charismatic leader, an indomitable military presence, an entrenched bureaucracy, or an imposing network of laws and statutes, many political regimes make especially powerful symbolic use of the physical environment. Throughout history and across the globe, architecture and urban design have been manipulated in the service of politics. Government buildings are [...] an attempt to build governments and to support specific regimes. More than mere homes for government leaders, they serve as symbols of the state. (3)

Because, architecture is “power in action” (Wallenstein xiv). Especially in totalitarian regimes such as Stalin’s Communist Russia, Hitler’s Nazi Germany, and Mussolini’s Fascist Italy, these monumental structures were used as a sign of power and grandeur of the ruler to overwhelm the citizens, and to keep them under the strict rule of the authority.

Besides the manifestation of power, architecture has another significant aspect, as well, which is its mnemonic function. This aspect of architecture is described by Goldberger as follows: “Buildings also stand as evidence of the power of memory”(xi). By quoting from Vincent Scully, Goldberger claims it to be “a conversation between the generations, carried out across time” (xi). Although “[w]e may not all participate in the conversation, [...] we all have to listen to it. For that reason alone, architecture matters: because it is all around us, and what is all around us has to have an effect on us” (Goldberger xi).

As the symbolic and mnemonic aspects of architecture also show, “architecture is not about itself [...] [but] about everything else” (Goldberger 37). Indeed architecture is “never a neutral envelope” (Goldberger 37), but a very efficient in affecting the psychology and the behaviour of the occupants “in powerful but often imperceptible ways” (Spurr, Foreword xvii). In this respect, as Leland M. Roth and Amanda C. Roth Clark argue, “[a]rchitectural space [...] is a powerful determinant of behaviour” (11). At

this juncture, to discuss the role of architecture in shaping human thoughts and feelings, and hence behaviour, it will be helpful to explore the role of environment on human psychology within the context of architectural psychology. Before exploring architectural psychology, it will be much helpful to make the slight distinction between environmental psychology and architectural psychology, which are sometimes used interchangeably. Environmental psychology, as Enric Pol posits, is the “most comprehensive name” (20) of the field, and the term environment does not necessarily refer only to the natural environment, but to “all other environments [...] [such as] built environments, learning environments and informational environment” (De Young 223). In this respect, as David V. Canter and Kenneth H. Craik argue, environmental psychology is “the *area of psychology which brings into conjunction and analyzes the transactions and interrelationships of human experiences and actions with pertinent aspects of the socio-physical surroundings*”(2, emphasis original). To put it more clearly in the words of Steg, van den Berg, and de Groot, it is “the discipline that studies the interplay between individuals and their built and natural environment” (2). Unlike environmental psychology’s wide range of interest in all kinds of environments, architectural psychology just focuses on the interrelationship between the built environment and human psychology and behaviour. Evaluating architectural psychology as the third stage of environmental psychology, Pol traces its emergence back to “the late-1950s and early-1960s,” and claims it to have “ended in the late-1980s” (2). In much the same way, for Mirilla Bonnes and Gianfranco Secchiaroli, architectural psychology emerged in the late 1950s in the United States and some other countries as a result of the studies of the research groups “based on the collaboration between psychologists and architects”(4) to explore “the relationship between architectural design and the behaviour of patients in psychiatric hospitals” (3).

By scrutinising the interrelationship between human behaviour and their built environments, architectural psychology sheds light on the profound effects of the built environment in influencing the psychology and behaviour of human beings. For Alexander Abel, “[t]hrough the examination of the mutual relation between human experience and behavior, and the dimension of space, created or influenced by man, its intention is to support human well-being on one hand, and the continued existence and

conservation of the entire ecosystem on the other” (203). Especially in today’s world, when people are spending “more than 90% of their lives indoors” (Evans 536), such exploration of the reciprocal relationships between architecture and human psychological health is of great significance. However, unlike studies and experiments conducted in the fields of architecture and psychology, this dissertation adopts the term “architectural psychology” as a *trope* to explore how architectural structures teeming with competing power relations are used effectively as a means by utopia/dystopia writers for their own ends to formulate their utopian or dystopian worlds of imagination.

Due to the profound impact of architecture on the thoughts and feelings of human beings, the writers of utopias/dystopias have laid great emphasis on the architectural designs of their fictive worlds, and thus have made great use of architectural psychology in their works. However, it is not only utopias and dystopias, but also all literary works in general that make much use of the psychology of architecture either for the characters, or for the readers to set the tone for what will happen. In this respect, as Robert Louis Stevenson also argues in his “A Gossip on Romance,” “[s]ome places speak distinctly. Certain dank gardens cry aloud for a murder; certain old houses demand to be haunted; certain coasts are set apart for shipwreck. Other spots again seem to abide their destiny, suggestive and impenetrable, ‘miching mallecho’” (141). However, sometimes architectural structures or places become so dominant that they actually become the principle characters. The haunted houses in Edgar Allan Poe’s (1809-1849) “The Fall of the House of Usher” (1839), and Elizabeth Bowen’s (1899-1973) “The Demon Lover” (1945), the eponymous mansion, house, and castle respectively in Emily Bronte’s (1818-1848) *Wuthering Heights* (1847),<sup>5</sup> Shirley Jackson’s (1916-1965) *The Haunting of Hill House* (1959), and Horace Walpole’s (1717-1797) *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), the castle in Bram Stoker’s (1847-1912) *Dracula* (1897), the house in Charles Dickens’s (1812-1870) *Bleak House* (1853), the hobbit houses in J.R.R. Tolkien’s (1892-1973) *The Hobbit* (1937), Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry in J.K. Rowling’s (1965- ) *Harry Potter* series (1997-2007), the

---

<sup>5</sup> Albeit less significant, the mansion called Thrushcross Grange is another architecture contributing to the atmosphere and unfolding of the events in *Wuthering Heights*.

six churches designed by the architect Nicholas Hawksmoor in Peter Ackroyd's (1949-) novel of the same name, the opera house in Gaston Leroux's (1868-1927) *The Phantom of the Opera* (1909-1910), and the cathedral Notre-Dame de Paris in Victor Hugo's (1802-1885) *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* (1833) are only very few of the literary architectural structures that emerge as the principle "figures," either setting the tone for what will happen, or triggering the events, but always the memorable ones while the events or the stories are mostly forgotten. They are still with us, and it is very difficult for one to forget these mnemonic structures. Stevenson also sheds light on this fact as follows:

[E]ach has been printed on the mind's eye forever. Other things we may forget; we may forget the words, although they are beautiful; we may forget the author's comment, although perhaps it was ingenious and true; but these epoch-making scenes, which put the last mark of truth upon a story and fill up, at one blow, our capacity for sympathetic pleasure, we so adopt into the very bosom of our mind that neither time nor tide can efface or weaken the impression. (142)

This is why architecture is important in literature. One might forget the plot, events, or the characters of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but not the enormous ministry buildings of the Party. In much the same way, the glass architecture of Yevgeny Zamyatin's (1884-1937) *We* (1924) occurs to one's mind even if one forgets everything else regarding the book. As all of these examples demonstrate, architecture is more than a backdrop or setting in numerous literary works, and remains as a memorable construction. However, in utopias/dystopias, its significance is much more in the foreground. It is never used a backdrop for the unfolding of the events, and it has its own life and stories interconnected with the stories of its human counterparts, and hence acts as the primary character of these novels.

Such functional use of architecture in literature is the sign of the fact that they are indeed two different façades of the same pattern. Hence, to shed light on this close relationship between literature and architecture, David Spurr claims that "literature is the art of writing and that architecture is the art of building" (Foreword xv). There is a reciprocal relationship between architecture and literature. Undoubtedly, one can "talk about the construction and representation of architecture in literary narratives" (Charley 2). Likewise, "[a]ll buildings, whether a garden shed or a cathedral have functional and

programmatic stories that are inscribed in plan, form and spatial organisation” (Charley 2). It is possible to see the entanglement of literature and architecture in diverse ways. Consequently, while one can explore the architectural realms in the literary works, s/he can also read architecture like a literary text.

Before exploring the architectural realms in literary utopias/dystopias, it will be illuminating to scrutinise the long history of utopianism, and its use of architecture and space as a complex phenomenon within the Western context. Although there is not a single and unified definition of the term utopianism – because each society and/or culture has its own way of social dreaming, and they do not “all look alike” (“What is Utopia” 155) – Lyman Tower Sargent defines it as “social dreaming” (“What is a Utopia?” 155; “In Defense of Utopia” 15; “Three Faces” 9; Claey's and Sargent 2) at its simplest, and this concept engages with “thinking about different ways of living” (Sargent, “What is a Utopia” 154). As a broad system of thought, utopianism encompasses “the dreams and nightmares that concern the ways in which groups of people arrange their lives and which usually envision a radically different society than the one in which the dreamers live” (Sargent, “Three Faces” 3). Although not called as utopianism *per se*, there was the utopian thought/impulse since “the dawn of humankind” (Sargent, “Utopia” 2403), manifesting itself in numerous forms in myths, oral tradition, and religious festivals, “golden age,” and “earthly paradise” (Claey's and Sargent 6). The Golden Age is, for example, “at the root of utopianism” (Sargent, “More's Utopia” 199). Myths mostly known with such labels as “golden ages, arcadias, earthly paradises, fortunate isles, isles of the blest” are “the foundation of utopianism” (Sargent, “Three Faces” 10). What is more, Christianity (Claey's and Sargent 6), some festivals like Saturnalia and the Feast of the Fools, and “the myth of Cockayne (a land of plenty)” (Vieira 5-6), also known as Cockaigne, are actually the important influences giving birth to the phenomenon utopianism. Although it is mistakenly believed to be an exclusively Christian and Western tradition, the manifestations of such belief in better and ideals societies can also be observed in some other civilisations, cultures and belief systems such as ancient Sumer, Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, and Daoism, among many others (Sargent, “Utopia” 2405, 2407).

The multi-dimensional phenomenon called utopianism manifests itself in three different ways or forms that Sargent calls “faces.” These three faces of utopianism are the “utopian literature,” “utopian practice, including intentional communities,” or “communitarianism” and “utopian social theory” (“Three Faces” 4; “Theorizing Utopia” 13). Although the names given to them might differ among the critics of utopian studies, there is a consensus among most utopian scholars that utopia has three manifestations or components. For example, Gregory Claeys argues that “[n]o single definition can satisfy the demands of every angle of scholarly enquiry, though there is broad agreement that there are three main components or ‘faces’ (as Lyman Tower Sargent terms them) of the tradition: the literary, the communal, and the ideological” (“Five Languages” 26). In much the same way, in another article, Claeys refers to the three ‘faces’ as its “three facets: a literary tradition, an ideology or ideologies, and a tradition of communal living and organisation” (“Three Variants” 14). Such a multi-faceted phenomenon cannot be reduced to only one of its three faces, i.e., the literary utopia,<sup>6</sup> but within the general framework of this dissertation, only its first face will be explored.

Utopia as a literary genre, like the wider and much complex phenomenon of utopianism, is named after the Renaissance thinker Sir Thomas More’s (1478-1535) famed work *Utopia*<sup>7</sup> (1516), which was written in Latin and translated into English only “in 1551 by Ralph Robynson” (Rogan 309). Although the long utopian literary tradition as a genre

---

<sup>6</sup> Sargent claims literary utopia to have two variants, known as “body utopias or utopias of sensual gratification” and “city utopias or utopias of human contrivance” (“Three Faces” 4). Utopias of sensual gratification are “social dreaming at its simplest” and require no “human effort,” but are regarded “as a gift of nature or the gods” (Claeys and Sargent 2). As a matter of fact, these utopias are the myths known with diverse labels such as “golden ages, Arcadias, earthly paradises, fortunate isles, isles of the blest,” and share some common traits as “simplicity, security, immortality or an easy death, unity among the people; unity between the people and God or the gods, abundance without labor, and no enmity between human beings and the other animals” (Claeys and Sargent 2). Quite the contrary, in city utopias, which are set in imaginary cities, human contrivance of social order is very much in the foreground and hence, they are also known as utopias of human contrivance. Plato’s *Republic* is a well-known example of this tradition (Claeys and Sargent 3), but Sargent believes his *Laws* to fit better (“Three Faces” 11).

<sup>7</sup> The original title of the book is *Libellus vere aureus nec minus salutaris quam festivius de optimo reip[ublicae] statu, deq[ue] nova Insula Vtopia*.



goes back to the ancient Greeks, to Plato's *Republic* (c.375 BC), More's eponymous work is significant for denominating a long history of a literary genre, and setting the stage for the future utopias by establishing its generic conventions. In effect, it was not More's intention to name a literary tradition; he just called the fictional island of his imaginary society that was accidentally discovered by the Portuguese sailor Raphael Hythloday Utopia, by combining two Greek words, "ouk" or "ou/u" and "topos," which respectively mean "no" or "not" and "place," with the suffix "ia" to refer to a "place" that is essentially a "no/non place"(Vieira 4; Claeys and Sargent 1; Sargent, "Three Faces" 5). Although More's imaginary island is called Utopia all throughout the book, and the title of the work is named after this island, More coined another term, i.e., "eutopia," to refer to the island in the poem called "A Short metre of Utopia,"<sup>8</sup> published at the end of the book. Derived from and pronounced in the same way as utopia, eutopia stands for "the good place" (Vieira 5; Sargent, "More's Utopia" 200). When the initial name of the island Utopia, that is, Nusquama – a Latin word standing for "nowhere" (Vieira 4), is taken into consideration, More's aim in further complicating matters by means of the use of a very witty pun on the homonyms, utopia and eutopia, is obviously in communication with his critical intention in depicting an ideal and good place that is simultaneously a non-place. The underlying reason for the ambivalent nature of the meaning of the word utopia,<sup>9</sup> which became the name of the literary genre – concerned with the depiction of "an imaginary society in some detail" (Claeys and Sargent 1) – that had precursors such as Plato's *Republic* but was invented by More himself, is the satirical nature of the genre, for the utopian writer offers a socio-economic, judiciary, political, and cultural commentary on a contemporaneous society with respect to its defects by juxtaposing it with an ideal one that literally exists nowhere. In this respect, as Northrop Frye also posits, "[t]he utopian writer looks at his

---

<sup>8</sup> Written by the poet laureate Anemolius, the last two lines of the poem reads as follows: "Wherefore not Utopie, but rather rightly /My name is Eutopie: a place of felicity" (*Three Early Modern Utopias* 128). In the Penguin edition of *Utopia* that is used in this dissertation, this poem is not included, therefore it is quoted from Oxford World's Classics' *Three Early Modern Utopias: Utopia, New Atlantis, The Isle of Pines* (1999).

<sup>9</sup> As a matter of fact, More named a literary tradition that had existed long before he wrote his *Utopia*; he just coined the name of the genre, and "[t]he word utopia has itself often been used as the root for the formation of new words [...] such as eutopia, dystopia, anti-utopia, alotopia, euchronia, heterotopia, ecotopia and hyperutopia" (Vieira 3), as utopia as a genre adapted itself to the requirements of each age, and hence acquired new meanings.

own society first and tries to see what, for his purposes, its significant elements are. The utopia itself shows what society would be like if those elements were fully developed” (“Varieties of Literary Utopias” 324). In much the same but in a more symbolic way, Sargent resembles utopia to “a carnival/funfair mirror in reverse,” which “shows us a better possibility” of a “distorted contemporary society” that is held up to it (“In Defense of Utopia” 12). From a productive different angle, as Gordin, Tilley, and Prakash argue, utopias are “histories of the present” (1). That is to say, they are more concerned with the problems of the present albeit set in different topographies or times, past or future alike. Hence, it can be argued that “the primary characteristic of the utopian place is its non-existence combined with a *topos* – a location in time and space – to give verisimilitude” (Sargent, “Three Faces” 5; Claeys and Sargent 1). While all works of fiction depict “a no-place,” what utopian fiction mostly depicts is “good or bad no-places” (Sargent, “Three Faces” 5; Claeys and Sargent 1).

As is well known, there are many neologisms derived from the word utopia, which stand for slightly different things within the general framework of utopia as an umbrella term. And, the sub-genre depicting a non-existing good place is eutopia rather than utopia. To make the basic distinction between these variants of utopia, be it eutopia, euchronia, or dystopia, among many others, it will be much helpful to give the basic definitions of only some of these major terms to clarify the slight differences between them. Utopia, as Sargent puts it, is “a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space” (“Three Faces” 9; “In Defense of Utopia” 15; also in Claeys and Sargent 1). Similarly eutopia, which is also known as positive utopia, is “a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as considerably better than the society in which that reader lived” (“Three Faces” 9; “In Defense of Utopia” 15). Despite the slight difference between utopia and eutopia, as Sargent aptly, puts it, “[i]n standard usage utopia is used both as defined here and as an equivalent for eutopia” (“In Defense of Utopia” 15; “Three Faces” 9). Following the standard usage, in this dissertation, the term utopia will be used as an equivalent of eutopia. In a similar fashion, utopia as an umbrella term is oftentimes used as an equivalent of euchronia, “the good place in the future” (Vieira 9), which depicts a

familiar society located in a future time in an ideal way, emerging especially in the eighteenth century and becoming much more common in the nineteenth century with some famous examples such as Edward Bellamy's (1850-1898) *Looking Backward: 2000-1887* (1888) and William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, in both of which the primary characters fall asleep and awake in the future to find everything enhanced for the good of the citizens. Consequently, utopia will also be used in this study as an equivalent of euchronia.

When it comes to the common features of utopia, Sargent states two main aspects that a utopia must have: "the society described must not exist" and "the author must in some way evaluate that society" ("What is a Utopia?" 157). Besides these main aspects, some other characteristics of the majority of utopias are that these are the places, "in which everyone has adequate food, shelter, and clothing gained without debilitating labor [...]. But these basic elements are expressed in different ways in different times and places and also reflect individual concerns; as a result, the range of utopias present throughout history is immense" (Sargent, "Utopia" 2405). Some other features of most of the utopias are enumerated by Frye as follows: "the states predominate over the individual: property is usually held in common and the characteristic features of individual life, leisure, privacy, and freedom of movement, are as a rule minimized" ("Varieties of Literary Utopias" 335). As More invented the genre, utopias written after him follow a similar trajectory established by his seminal book. The conventions of utopia hence might be enumerated as the journey motif, an accidentally discovered unknown land, the visitor's guided tour in the utopian land, and the visitor's return to his homeland to delineate a better and ideal alternative to the people back at home.

Consequently, what is depicted is "the alternative ways of organizing the imagined societies" (Vieira 7). Although these imagined societies are better than the actual societies that the utopian writers criticise, one significant point that needs to be emphasised is that the societies or citizens depicted in utopias are by no means perfect ones or perfect people. Although some utopian scholars depict utopian societies as perfect ones, Sargent is critical of the use of the words "perfect" and "perfection," because according to his line of argument, "[i]n English the words mean finished,

completed, without future change. Thomas More did not pretend that the society in his *Utopia* was perfect” (“In Defense of Utopia” 13). And for Sargent, maybe the only utopias that might be perfect are “some myths of an earthly paradise and some of the depictions of heaven that were popular in the late 19th century” (“In Defense of Utopia” 13). Perhaps more significant than this reason is the fact that “there are in fact very few utopias that present societies that the author believes to be perfect” (Sargent, “Three Faces” 9). This is an important issue in that although utopias are claimed to be ideal societies, in effect they are not so ideal for each one of the citizens. Examples might be traced in Thomas More’s *Utopia* and Tommaso Campanella’s (1568-1639) *The City of the Sun* (1602). *Utopia* is certainly not an ideal society for the slaves and women. Women are subordinate to males and to their husbands, and they are mostly allocated the household jobs. Even free citizens cannot travel freely among the cities in the same country without special permission. It is an “authoritarian, hierarchical and patriarchal” society, but still “economically equal and more egalitarian in some other social institutions than the society in which he [More] lived” (“More’s Utopia” 202). In much the same way, Campanella’s *The City of the Sun* is also a very hierarchical society, and hence, younger ones and women are pushed to the periphery. Another defect of these so-called ideal societies is that there is no glimmer of individuality, as the basic aim of the system is to support collective identity, not the individual one. What is more, “[m]any utopias are, from the perspective of individual freedom, dystopias” (Sargent “Authority” 573). This actually proves how one’s utopia might be somebody else’s dystopia. Hence, as Claeys also puts it, “just as one person’s terrorist is another’s freedom-fighter, so is one person’s utopia another’s dystopia. Indisputably, thus, whether a given text can be described as a dystopia or utopia will depend on one’s perspective of the narrative outcome” (“The Origins” 108). Taking all these into consideration, it is better to not call utopias as perfect places, where everything is in peace and order. However, as Sargent suggests, it might be better to say that “[t]he overwhelming majority of utopias are about *better* not perfect” places (“Theorizing Utopia” 20) when compared to the writers’ present society, which is the target of their critique. The utopian society is hence, for Sargent, “a good or significantly better society that provides a generally satisfactory and fulfilling life for most of its inhabitants” (“Flawed Utopia” 226), that is to say, there are flaws in every utopia at

least from the perspective of someone.

Despite the increase in the number of utopias in the nineteenth century, with the turn of the twentieth century, dystopian pessimism replaces the optimism of the previous century. Like other neologisms, dystopia is also derived from the umbrella term, utopia, and is used to depict both bad conditions and also as the name of a literary genre that emerged in the late nineteenth century and became a widespread genre in the twentieth century, and continues to be so in the twenty-first century. Although it later became the name of this genre, “[t]he first recorded use of dystopia [...] dates back to 1868, and is to be found in a parliamentary speech in which John Stuart Mill tried to find a name for a perspective which was opposite to that of utopia” (Vieira 16). Mill, as Fátima Vieira posits, used the word “synonymous with cacotopia, a neologism that had been invented by Jeremy Bentham; and the two words have in fact a similar etymology and intention: *dys* comes from the Greek *dus*, and means bad, abnormal, diseased; *caco* comes from the Greek *kako*, which is used to refer to something which is unpleasant or incorrect” (16). After Mill’s usage, the word came to be used to refer to “a non-existent bad place” (Sargent, “Utopia” 2405).

Also known as negative utopia, dystopia as a literary genre refers to “a non-existent society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as considerably worse than the society in which that reader lived” (Sargent, “In Defense of Utopia” 15). Aptly depicted by Gordin, Tilley, and Prakash as “utopia’s twentieth century doppelgänger” (1), dystopia depicts the stark opposite of the peaceful and orderly non-existent utopias by means of the portrayal of the suppression of individuality under the domineering and manipulative control of totalitarian governments, capitalist systems, or through the misuse of science and technology. Since only a particular but small group who holds power in their hands are the ones that benefit from this victimisation, dystopia might also be defined as “a utopia that has gone wrong, or a utopia that functions only for a particular segment of society” (Gordin, Tilley, and Prakash 1).

Even though dystopia as a term is derived from utopia, and they both depict non-

existent places, the former good and the latter bad ones, they do not follow similar patterns with respect to narration, as the conventions of dystopia are different from those of utopia. First of all, as opposed to the common journey motif to the unknown utopian land, the visitor's guided tour in there and the comparison with a contemporaneous society, as Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan put it, "the dystopian text usually begins directly in the terrible new world; and yet, even without a dislocating move to an elsewhere, the element of textual estrangement remains in effect since the focus is frequently on a character who questions the dystopian society" (5). The characters are already a part of this system. There is no trip to this land, and it is an everyday reality of their lives. What is interesting however, this new order, which is terrible and unbearable for the readers, is rather ordinary for almost the whole society including a few rebels, who come to realise the malfunctioning of events after a while. For example in *Nineteen Eight-Four*, the principle character, Winston Smith is aware of the overwhelming power of the Party and its manipulations just from the very beginning, while D-503, the protagonist of a similar text from numerous different angles, namely, *We*, is a faithful number<sup>10</sup> of the One State, believing whole-heartedly in the awesomeness of glass architecture that is specifically designed by the manipulative rulers to keep the numbers of the State under control. Albeit set in unfamiliar places and distant times, either past or future, the non-existing places, or the events, though far-fetched, are oftentimes very familiar, because "the real referents of dystopian fictions are generally quite concrete and near-at-hand" (Booker 19). Hence, the target reader will easily notice that these imaginary places and events are the exaggerated versions of what they experience in their daily lives.

Utopias were also written in the twentieth century, and are being written in the twenty-first century. Yet still, dystopia was the predominant genre of the twentieth century,<sup>11</sup> and "continues to show its health in the new millennium" (Murphy 477). The

---

<sup>10</sup> The world of *We* is a very mathematical one, even feelings are sometimes expressed by means of the use of mathematical signs such as X. In this dehumanising world, as individuality is totally annihilated, even people are just nothing but mere numbers of the One State.

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed analysis, see Krishan Kumar, "Utopia's Shadow" p. 19; Sargent, "Do Dystopias Matter?" p. 10; Sargent, "Authority&Utopia" p. 573.

atmosphere of the past century paved the way for the flourishing of the genre, and the new one accelerates it, for the twentieth century, as Vieira argues, was “predominantly characterized by man’s disappointment” (18) with “the pressure of two world wars and the rise of Soviet communism” (Sargent, “Authority” 565), “the grisly excesses of totalitarian regimes in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, and the specter of global nuclear holocaust” (Booker 17), “eugenics” (Claeys, “The Origins of Dystopia” 111), as well as the misuse of the developments in science and technology. The failure of socialism in the face of its communist practice leading eventually to totalitarianism, and hence the loss of individuality in the hands of totalitarian leaders emerge as the subject matter of most of the famous dystopias written in the first half of the twentieth century. For Abbott Gleason, “[f]rom small beginnings, in the ‘twenties, ‘totalitarianism’ (as a category to describe the most brutal, highly mobilized and technologically intrusive states the world has yet known) grew up to dominate the consciousness of Europe and America during the Cold War” (145). When it came to the “mid-30s, there were clearly three important ones: the Soviet Union, Germany, and Italy” (Gleason 150). Orwell’s own observations of the domineering impact of totalitarianism with respect to his experiences of “the Spanish Civil War, Stalin’s Soviet Union and Mussolini’s Italy” (Lyon 61) gave better shape to the accumulation of his knowledge about the true colour of totalitarianism, and its negative impact on individuals. Claeys summarises the common theme of the early dystopias of the twentieth century as follows: “Their common theme is the quasi-omnipotence of a monolithic, totalitarian state demanding and normally exacting complete obedience from its citizens, challenged occasionally but usually ineffectually by vestigial individualism or systemic flaws, and relying upon scientific and technological advances to ensure social control” (“The Origins” 109). These common features observed in such dystopian works are used deliberately to criticise the manipulative influence of such domineering totalitarian governments with respect to the citizens’ loss of individuality, and shed light on the “excessive centralization of power as the primary cause of the troubles of society” (Sargent, “Authority” 565).

Despite their bleak atmosphere, readers are still attracted to dystopias. This is maybe because by means of the use of such negative events in such bad conditions and places,

dystopias warn the readers of the potential dangers. Hence, as Sargisson also argues, dystopias are “often the jeremiads of utopianism,” and hence “tell us what’s wrong with the now, and they imagine how things could (easily) become much worse” (40). These narratives are daunting, because they are intended “to frighten the reader and to make him realize that things may go either right or wrong, depending on the moral, social and civic responsibility of the citizens” (Vieira 17).

When it comes to the functional use of architecture in utopias/dystopias, it can be stated that they follow different techniques to impose their ideologies. Since they are written to describe ideal societies in hyper-idealised good/non-places, like other aspects, there are detailed descriptions of architecture and city plans in utopias. Especially the seminal utopian fictions such as More’s *Utopia*, Campanella’s *The City of the Sun*, and Francis Bacon’s (1561-1626) *New Atlantis* (1627) include exhaustive information about the city plans and architecture of their utopian societies. That is why, as Nathaniel Coleman also propounds, “[t]here is no Utopia without architecture” (1). As stressed above, since human thoughts and feelings are overpoweringly influenced by the constructed environment, the architectural designs and city plans of the utopian societies in these utopian fictions are arranged in such an ideal and user-friendly way that they contribute to the happy condition of their communities. Besides, due to these features, these utopian fictions have long been a source of inspiration for architects to follow in constructing architecture and city plans. Therefore, as Coleman further argues in the following part of his above given quotation, “can there also be no architecture without Utopia” (1).

Unlike utopias, where people lead a happy life in harmony with one another and with their surroundings, dystopias delineate a darker world, where “ruin, death, destruction, [...] cataclysm, war, lawlessness, disorder, pain, and suffering” as well as the oppression of totalitarian regimes, and the misuse of technological developments pervade. That is why, in dystopian works, “derelict buildings, submerged monuments, decaying cities, wastelands, [and] the rubble of collapsed civilizations” (Claeys, *Dystopia* 3) replace the utopian architecture and setting of the peaceful utopias. As dystopias deal with the unfavourable conditions, the architectural designs and city plans



in dystopian landscapes also contribute to their deteriorating or unfavourable circumstances. Especially through the help of the spatial arrangements, dystopia writers show how corruptive and domineering governmental powers and/or misleading technological developments oppress people. In the early dystopias such as Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which are aptly referred to as the "totalitarian nightmares" (13) by Coverley, totalitarian governments manipulate the spaces where people work and live as a means to impose their ideologies on individuals to oppress them easily. Therefore, through the manipulation of the constructed environment, that is, architecture, these totalitarian authorities succeed in influencing the psychology of the individuals overwhelmingly, and thereby, oppress them easily. Eventually, it can be inferred that architecture and architectural designs reflect the ideologies of those who construct them, and this ideology differs in utopias and dystopias.

A brief perusal of some key utopian/dystopian narratives might be of great help to cast some light upon the functional use of architecture in utopias/dystopias. As Thomas More's much celebrated eponymous work sets the stage with respect to the conventions of the genre for future utopias, it is apt to begin with his *Utopia*. The island of Utopia, which is accidentally discovered by a Portuguese sailor called Raphael Hythloday, who stays in its capital city Aircastle for five years and learns about their administrative, judiciary, financial, religious, educational, architectural, and socio-cultural systems thoroughly, returns to England only to inform them about this ideal and better society as an example to be adopted. Utopia is a crescent-shaped island that is situated in an unknown part of the world, and is mostly not known by the majority of the world citizens except soupçon sailors, who serendipitously discovered it.

In this primarily agricultural society, where men and women are fundamentally involved in farming, the state regulates each step of everyday lives such as work hours, meal times, houses, and dress, among many others, so that everything might function systematically. Perhaps the most significant things that the state organises and controls are the well designed and preserved town planning, landscape structure, and the whole architectural layout. Transformed into a separate island from a peninsula by means of a

channel cut from the mainland, Utopia as a land is designed meticulously by King Utopus, the conqueror, and is divided into fifty-four identical towns that are “built on the same plan,” and hence “all look exactly alike” (*Utopia* 70), and “[e]very town is divided into four districts of equal size, each with its own shopping centre in the middle of it” (*Utopia* 80). To be more precise, there is a mathematical distribution of the land and its organisation, and hence it is claimed that “[t]he distribution of land is so arranged that the territory of each town stretches for at least twenty miles in every direction, and in one direction much farther – that is, where the distance between towns reaches its maximum. No town has the slightest wish to extend its boundaries, for they don’t regard their land as property but as soil that they’ve got to cultivate” (*Utopia* 70). Aircastle as the capital is situated in the middle of the island, and Hythloday depicts it in detail, and this depiction gives information about the rest of the island, because as mentioned before, all the towns are arranged and designed in much the same way. Aircastle is “surrounded by a thick, high wall, with towers and blockhouses at frequent intervals” (*Utopia* 72) so as to protect it from the devastating effects of natural forces such as storms. Similar to the towns, the streets are also “well designed, both for traffic and for protection against the wind” (*Utopia* 73). Besides, it is not only the town and streets, but also the buildings themselves that are well organised, which are far from each other for the sake of functionality and organisation. The houses in the countryside are supplied with agricultural equipment, and are provided with gardens at the back, which are kept very well, and where they grow fruit, grass, and flowers. The well design and order of the houses, and the whole landscape are specifically contrasted with the previous houses, which are claimed to be “small huts or cottages” built with timber and plastered with mud just before the conquest of King Utopus 1760 years ago. The houses in the present Utopia are three-storey structures, which are carefully structured against the damage that might be caused by bad weather (73-74). Since these houses are carefully preserved, and repairs are immediately carried out by the state, they have “maximum durability with the minimum of labour,” and hence new “houses are very seldom built on entirely new sites” (*Utopia* 78).

The flawless construction and organisation of the whole island are done on purpose, and given in detail in the largest part of the narrative, since it is the utopist’s aim to

demonstrate how such a well-designed, well-organised, well-preserved, and user-friendly landscape provides a peaceful and pleasant atmosphere for its citizens to live. In effect, it is not only in *Utopia*, but also in most of the early modern utopias that there are detailed depictions of town planning, landscape, and architectural constructions. Hence, these utopias are also labelled as city utopias or blueprint utopias. In the first edition of *Utopia*, for example, More includes a wood-cut map of the fictional island of Utopia.

Although such organisation of the island is carried out meticulously for the good of the citizens, it is a very controlling society, and there is no glimmer of hope for individuality even at home, because households consist of at least forty adults and two slaves, and interestingly enough, similar to most of the dystopias, monitoring is the central aspect of these societies, as “[e]veryone has an eye on you” (*Utopia* 84). Even though there is no division of sex with respect to job allocations, women in this so-called ideal society are still pushed to the domestic sphere when necessary. They are mostly concerned with the household tasks, and moreover, they are made to confess their sins once a month to their husbands. For instance, menus for lunch and dinner are planned and prepared by women. Likewise, two slaves of each household are responsible for all the rough and dirty work. In this regard, it can be deduced that while the island of Utopia is organised in such a functional way in line with the ideologies of the writer to offer every opportunity for its citizens, as it is organised from a free and able male perspective for a male dominant society, especially from the twenty-first-century perspective, it is more like a dystopia for women and slaves rather than a utopia. The underlying reason for such inequality between sexes and races is Utopia’s hierarchic and authoritarian structure.

The Italian writer and priest Tommaso Campanella’s *The City of the Sun*, written in a dialogue form similar to the pattern established by Plato’s *Republic*, is perhaps the best of city utopias that puts much emphasis on town planning and architecture. Although it is directly based on a monastic system, and ruled by the chief priest Hoh, Campanella’s utopia shares most of the features of More’s utopia with respect to equal distribution of work, common property, communal gatherings for food, the use of the same the

garments for all citizens only with slight changes for different sexes, and agriculture as the primary occupation but with no slaves on the island. With respect to town planning and architecture, *The City of the Sun* is the most significant one, as the narrative space allocated to the depiction of architectural construction of the island is evidently much more than that of *Utopia*. The citizens of the City of the Sun value agriculture very much, and hence, “there is not a span of earth without cultivation” (*The City* 23). Besides agriculture, however, they are also good at observing “the winds and propitious stars” (*The City* 23), and “have a correct knowledge of the stars, and the ebb and flow of the tide” (*The City* 24). Their skill in the observation of the movements of the stars are especially important, for they regulate their everyday lives by following an astrological pattern; and such an approach is reflected on the architectural design of the whole island, which is actually surrounded by “seven rings or huge circles named from the seven planets” (*The City* 1), the internal and external, higher and lower walls of which are used both as a means of protection from the natural and external forces, and as a means of open museum and source of education for children, because they are adorned with the minute depictions of all sorts of arts and sciences, ranging from astrology, theology, mathematics to physics, history, and geography.

Most obviously, Campanella designs the whole island in a perfect way, the citizens of this utopian island live in large palaces that are joined to the walls of the circuits, and seem to be “all one palace” (*The City* 2). On top of the hill, there is a huge temple that is “built in the form of a circle; [...] not girt with wall, but stands upon thick columns, beautifully grouped” (*The City* 3) “on a space of more than 350 paces” (*The City* 3). The temple as the biggest and most magnificent edifice is the most beautifully decorated architecture. However, every single palace is also well organised, and separated from one another by well-decorated walls. Architecturally speaking, unlike More’s *Utopia*, the city walls in *The City of the Sun* are used much more functionally, for each and every custom of the island is narrated by means of the depictions of their education system, religious beliefs, trades, agricultural activities, and etc. on the city walls. Thus, it can be deduced that Campanella actually benefits from such functional use of architecture as an ideological tool to formulate his utopia, and therefore the backbone of

the whole book and narration is architecture itself. That is why, if architecture is taken out of *The City of the Sun*, almost nothing remains.

As opposed to Utopia, in the City of the Sun, there are no servants or slaves, but what is problematic is that children are held in common. As a matter of fact, the whole social system is established on a kind of brotherhood and every male citizen over the age of twenty-two is called father by the young, and in much the same way, the ones under the age of twenty-two are called son by the elderly. Although there is no information with respect to a similar practice among women, what is clear is that there is a kind of division of labour according to sex, and hence “all sedentary and stationary pursuits are practised by the women, such as weaving, spinning, sewing, cutting the hair, shaving, dispensing medicines, and making all kinds of garments” (*The City* 12). Therefore, despite such pleasant and orderly architectural structure of the island, Campanella’s utopia is not so much a “non-existent good place” as the term suggests, for women.

Sir Francis Bacon’s posthumously published and incomplete utopia *New Atlantis*, which is also labelled as a scientific utopia by some, is another classical utopia following some of the conventions set by More’s *Utopia* with respect to the journey motif and exploration of an unknown island. The island that is found by some fifty-one sailors lost in the Pacific on their way from Peru to China and Japan is the mythological island, Bensalem. Unlike the citizens of Utopia and the City of the Sun, the Bensalamites do not accept foreigners into the island. Hence, it is not known by other people except a few strangers like these sailors, who are given only a license of six weeks to sojourn, and are allowed to stay only in the Guest House. The Bensalamites, very fond of science and technology, “know well most part of the habitable world, [...] [but keep themselves] unknown” (16). As common with utopias, this is a very peaceful society, and hence, “[h]appy are the people of Bensalem” (35). Although we are not given details about their education, eating habits, occupations, and daily lives, it seems certain that the source of this happiness and peace is Salomon’s House, a scientific institution referred to as “the very eye of this kingdom” (18), in which scientific experiments are carried out especially through the “study of the works and creatures of God” (29).

As the focus is on Salomon's House, the reader gets the architectural details with respect to the depiction of this institution as well as with a short portrayal of the Strangers' House, which is claimed to be "a fair and spacious house, built of brick, [...] and with handsome windows, some of glass, some of a kind of cambric oil" (10-11). Besides its spaciousness, the chambers in the house are claimed to be "handsome and cheerful" and "furnished civilly" (11). Even the Strangers' House is designed in such a functional and ornate way that most probably the narrator does not need to give any information regarding the dwellings of the citizens. Yet still, "great and spacious houses," in which they "imitate and demonstrate meteors; as snow, hail, rain, some artificial rains of bodies and not of water, thunders, lightnings; also generations of bodies in air; as frogs, flies, and divers others" (48), "chambers of health," where they categorise air "good and proper" to treat several illnesses and to preserve health (48); "fair and large baths" to cure illnesses (48); "large and various orchards and gardens," which are not designed for their beauty but to grow diverse plants and trees for different ends with unnatural techniques that ripen them before their natural course, and give them much sweeter taste, better colour and better smell than usual (48); "perspective houses," in which they "make demonstrations of all lights and radiations" (52-3); "sound-houses" to practice all sounds" (54); "perfume-houses" to multiply and imitate various smells (54), "engine-houses" to produce instruments and engines of motions; "a mathematical house" to deal with geometry and astronomy (55); and finally, "houses of deceits of the senses" (55), all situated in Salomon's House, give the reader enough clues about the effective use of architecture to establish such an ideal utopian land. As Bacon finishes the book abruptly with the claim that "[t]he rest was not perfected" (83, emphasis original), there is no mention of women and children, and hence we do not know anything about the condition of women in general, or the gendered division of architectural spaces in particular.

Unlike such efficient use of architecture and town planning in utopias, architecture in dystopias is used for very different ends to prepare the oppressive atmosphere for the bad events to unfold. Such ideological misuse of architecture by the domineering authority figures can easily be traced in classical dystopias such as Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, Aldous Huxley's (1894-1963) *Brave New World* (1932), and Orwell's *Nineteen*

*Eighty-Four*, to mention just a few. Although architecture is used successfully in these dystopian narratives to reverberate the dehumanising dystopian world, another text perhaps much more significant than these novels with respect to the portrayal of dystopian architecture is a short story titled “The Machine Stops” (1909) written by E.M. Forster (1879-1970). As Forster’s only work of dystopia, the short story, in Graham J. Murphy’s words, “has the strongest claim to being dystopia’s originary text” (473). Hence, it is worth analysing here in detail to shed light on the use of architecture in dystopian narratives.

Set in the future, in this dystopian story, all civilisations have vanished, and the remaining ones are living under ground in their small room, which is “hexagonal in shape, like the cell of a bee” (Forster 13), and there is a total dependence on the Machine, which controls each and every minute of their lives. The Machine actually controls their lives so much that the ones who want to visit the surface of the earth for some specific reasons are made to get “an Egression-permit” (Forster 41). If they do not take this permission, they are threatened with “Homelessness,” that is, “death” as in the example of Kuno, the dystopian rebel of the story, who questions and then challenges the oppressive power of the Machine by violating its rules with his secret visit to the surface of the earth.

As a matter of fact, the overwhelming impact of the Machine is explained by means of the specific architecture allocated to every single individual. Although Kuno’s mother Vashti is pleased with the opportunities offered by the Machine in her cell, her first depiction just at the beginning of the story reveals much about the suffocating atmosphere inside these cells, which are situated under ground:

Imagine, if you can, a small room, hexagonal in shape, like the cell of a bee. It is lighted neither by window nor by lamp, yet it is filled with a soft radiance. There are no apertures for ventilation, yet the air is fresh. There are no musical instruments, and yet, at the moment that my meditation opens, this room is throbbing with melodious sounds. An armchair is in the centre, by its side a reading-desk — that is all the furniture. And in the armchair there sits a swaddled lump of flesh — a woman, about five feet high, with a face as white as a fungus. It is to her that the little room belongs. (Forster 13)

In such a suffocating realm, Vashti is portrayed as “a swaddled lump of flesh” that spends her whole life there with no physical interaction with other people and the physical environment – because there is nothing natural any more. While she is content with her life despite the perpetual humming of the Machine, Vashti is wholly dependent on the Machine, and cannot even take her book without its help. Although they come to the realisation that they have been oppressed by the Machine and the Central Committee that is in charge of it when finally the Machine stops, it is initially only Kuno, who criticises the domineering impact of the Machine on them:

Cannot you see, cannot all you lecturers see, that it is we that are dying, and that down here the only thing that really lives is the Machine? We created the Machine, to do our will, but we cannot make it do our will now. It has robbed us of the sense of space and of the sense of touch, it has blurred every human relation and narrowed down love to a carnal act, it has paralysed our bodies and our wills, and now it compels us to worship it. The Machine develops — but not on our lines. The Machine proceeds — but not to our goal. (Forster 56)

Eventually, while depicting the dehumanising impact of the Machine on its users, Forster makes functional use of architecture, by confining the characters into cell-like rooms which actually prepares the dystopian nature for the events to unfold. These cells like everything else are designed and strictly controlled by the Central Committee, and hence by delineating such a dehumanising place, the writer draws attention to the fact that in dystopias the places where people live are used as a means to the ends of powerful controllers.

Set in the future, very much like “The Machine Stops,” the Russian novelist Yevgeny Zamyatin’s *We* is another classical dystopia that demonstrates how totalitarian power of the One State under the rule of the Benefactor manifests itself by means of the use of glass architecture and glass landscape that is separated from nature and the people living there by the Green Wall, which surrounds their so-called civilised society, and totally transparent and sterile environment. Like More’s *Utopia* and Campanella’s *The City of the Sun*, everything in *We*, be it meal times, work hours, free hours, sleeping hours, or even sexual life, which is allowed by means of the use of pink coupons, are designated by the Table, and strictly controlled by the Guardians. Seemingly the primary reason for such control of the numbers of the One State is the wish to become We instead of I,



because “‘We’ is from God, and ‘I’ from the devil” (*We* 128). However, in effect, the state attains its power from ceaseless control of the numbers by means of continuous surveillance, manifesting itself in their glass architecture.

The Green Wall is perhaps the best example of how architecture is used functionally in that after the Two Hundred Years’ War, which is fought between “the city and the village” (*We* 21), “only 0.2 of the earth’s population” survive and “two tenths of the survivors have the chance of tasting “the heights of bliss in the shining palace of the One State” (*We* 21), they totally separate themselves from the physical environment, and confine themselves willingly to the oppressive realm of the One State. Therefore, interestingly, it is stated in the book: “Man ceased to be a wild animal only when he built the first wall” (*We* 93). Like the Green Wall, the houses of the numbers are all made of glass so that everybody can see what others are doing either at home or work. Besides, it is not only the houses or the workplaces but also the whole landscape including the pavements that is made of glass. Except for sexual hours, because only then they are allowed “to lower the shades” (*We* 18), they live behind their “transparent walls that seem woven of gleaming air,” which make them “always visible, always washed in light” (*We* 18). The protagonist D-503, a mathematician and chief engineer of the airship called the *Integral* is very happy with this transparency like everybody else except a few individuals like I-330, a female number, and her friends, who meet in an opaque house called the Ancient House, which is a remnant of the past and used as a museum. Perhaps more functional than the Guardians, who ceaselessly chase numbers to control their behaviour, is the use of such transparent architecture, which in Foucauldian terms, makes each number its own inspector so as not to be punished for their misbehaviour.

Another key dystopia is Huxley’s *Brave New World*, which delineates the loss of individuality within a capitalist and consumer society, where people are controlled through technological and scientific developments. In the dehumanising world of pleasure, there is no pain and suffering but also there is no meaning of life. Their only truth is a ceaseless yearning for consumption – “ending is better than mending” (*New World* 49) – and sexual promiscuity for which they are conditioned while still embryos

in tubes. Society is divided into five castes of Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon, and the members of each caste are predestined for their roles in the tubes.

Although there is no monitoring or surveillance as in *We* or *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the citizens are strictly controlled by the authorities. The means of control in this specific case is the use of a drug called *soma*, which has “[a]ll the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects” (*Brave New World* 54), and unlimited sexual promiscuity, for “every one belongs to every one else” (*Brave New World* 40). In this hierarchic society, there is a sharp distinction between castes, and it is reflected in the use of architectural spaces. There is no longer a concept called home, and the most significant architectural structures are the high-rises. Perhaps due to its phallic message, the ones on top of the social structure live on their own in the high-rises, and use helicopters for transportation, while the lower groups dwell in groups in low-rise houses, and use the rail system for transportation.

The spaces allocated to the upper classes of the caste are equipped with the best of everything, which might be observed clearly in the depiction of the hotel at Santa Fé in New Mexico, where Bernard and Lenina, respectively Alpha and Beta Plus characters, stay during their visit to the Savage Reservation. The conveniences that the hotel provides its visitors can be enumerated as “[l]iquid air, television, vibro-vacuum massage, radio, boiling caffeine solution, hot contraceptives, and eight different kinds of scent were laid on in every bedroom” as well as “synthetic music plant,” and “sixty Escalator-Squash Racket Courts,” among many others (*Brave New World* 100).

As these examples also show, in dystopias, as in utopias, there is a functional use of architectural spaces as an ideological means to control the characters in numerous ways. While such control might be crystal clear in some works as in the example of *We* or *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, they might be totally implicit in some others as in *Brave New World*. Although the lower castes are controlled easily as they are fertilised by means of the use of Bokanovsky technique, which produces ninety-seven identical citizens, the higher castes are controlled in a way by means of the over satisfaction of their needs and desires.

Drawing upon these critical insights into utopia/dystopia with respect to the functional use of architecture, this study claims that architecture in utopias/dystopias is less than a shelter but more of an ideological tool, and hence used as a means for different ends in each one of the works analysed. In the first chapter, the Victorian artist and writer William Morris's utopian fiction, *News from Nowhere*, which "offers a vision of a socialist future" (Coverley 103) in a pastoral England that is freed from the horrors of the Industrial Age, is analysed. Critical of the Victorian Era with respect to its mechanic and dehumanising atmosphere, Morris sets his utopia in a rural London, where the "malign influence of the industrial revolution was finally erased" (Coverley 105) due to an upheaval in 1952. Exploring Morris's interest in Gothic architecture as well as the handicrafts of the Middle Ages especially through the profound influence of John Ruskin with respect to his critique of the mechanisation and capitalism of the Victorian Era, manifesting itself in the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, and his attachment to the socialist cause, this chapter evaluates *News from Nowhere* as the perfect embodiment of the author's dreams of an ideal society. Since the work borrows from Morris's artistic and political worldviews extensively, the utopia is read side by side by the writer's essays. Since Morris pays special attention to the depiction of the gardens, forests, and woods of Nowhere, which actually makes the landscape a paradisaical one, the park movement in the Victorian Age is also incorporated in to the framework of the chapter. Hence, it is argued that by preparing the landscape and architecture of Nowhere with borrowings from such diverse backgrounds, Morris actually distances the architecture of his time from the mechanical and industrialised world of the late Victorian Era. Not surprisingly however, the architectural background of utopia, of course along with some others, is actually one of the most significant reasons of the happiness of the citizens. Based on this viewpoint, it is finally deduced that similar to other utopian narratives explored before, Morris's *News from Nowhere* also owes the source of happiness to the well organised landscape and peaceful of architecture of the utopia.

In the second chapter, however, Orwell's seminal novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which criticises the ills of the totalitarian regimes, is analysed. This chapter proposes that while delineating a dystopian world, in which individuals and society are oppressed

through a series of well-known techniques such as revising and rewriting the historical truths to support its ideology, inventing a new language called *Newspeak* to support its discourse, and with the posters of Big Brother, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* also deploys the oppression of the psyche through the manipulation of architecture. Drawing on Foucault's concept of Panopticism, Oceania is evaluated as a disciplinary society, where the gigantic ministry buildings are used to demonstrate the Party's power and to give the citizens the impression that they are under continual surveillance. It is also claimed that while inflicting a sense of helplessness in the citizens with the power of the Party manifesting itself with its huge edifices, crumbling architecture in the derelict and war-torn landscape populated by the Outer Party members and proles is specifically left in ruins to further reinforce the sense of helplessness to have more power and domination over the citizens. In the second part of the chapter however, borrowing de Certeau's terms, tactic and strategy, it is proposed that by walking in the city, which is a tactical practice as opposed to the Party's strategy, Winston and Julia resist against its impositions. This everyday practice helps them remember the function of some ruined churches, which connects them with their forgotten past, and hence reinforces the weak sense of individuality endeavouring to resist against the Party. When compared to Morris's utopia, where architecture and architectural designs are used to influence the characters in a positive way to contribute to their happiness, the architectural psychology in Orwell's dystopia is used to criticise the Party's control of the citizens through the manipulation of architecture to oppress and manipulate the individuals. Consequently, similar to the architecture of Nowhere that is imbued with Morris's ideology, which reflects his prioritisation of Arts and Crafts over mass production, Orwell's dystopia also proves that architecture in the novel reflects the ideology of the manipulative Party members. Since their governmental organisation is based on the oppression of the individuals through various means, they use architecture ideologically to demonstrate their power, and to oppress and control the minds and moods of the individuals. Consequently, it is deduced that more than numerous other techniques such as the use of posters, *telescreens*, and hidden mikes, among many others, the manipulation of the landscape and architecture is a much more functional technique in oppressing and controlling the citizens.

In the third chapter, J.G. Ballard's dystopian science-fiction, *High-Rise* is scrutinised to explore the negative impact of modernist architecture on the psychology of the characters, which is claimed to bring about the violence inside the eponymous edifice when analysed from the perspective of Henri Lefebvre's production of space. Unlike Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, however, there is no governmental oppression or surveillance in *High-Rise*. Yet still, the architecture of urban and technological landscape plays a significant role in shaping the psychological conditions of the characters. Hierarchical social structure in the building, which is actually built on the model of the social class structure, determines one's access to certain amenities and conveniences the building offers, and lies at the centre of all the problems. When analysed from a Lefebvrian perspective, both this class structure with respect to the floors and the consequent problems derived from the use of the building's amenities are evaluated in this chapter as the result of the clash between the wishes and impositions of the architects and the upper floor people and the lived experiences of the residents, especially the lower floor people. Additionally from the perspective of de Certeau, while the enforcements and rules that the upper floor residents put with respect to the use of the services of the building for their own benefits are evaluated as "strategies," the lower floor residents' reactions against them are taken as "tactics." The problem among the residents beginning initially with small-scale clashes, and then transforming into violent clan wars, and finally to the struggle for survival with a hunter-gatherer mentality, is born out of the clash between strategies and tactics. Such quick deterioration of the conditions and the residents' rapid adjustment to these conditions are discussed with respect to Freud's notion of civilisation, because he claims that beneath the so-called mask of civilisation lie humans' uncivilised and untamed instincts ready to be targeted at the people nearby. One's neighbour in this respect is the one who becomes the target of his uncivilised instincts. In this respect, initially promiscuous sexual life of the residents, and then accelerating rate of rape cases, and some other perversities in the building are claimed to be born as a result of its vertical structure, which as the embodiment of phallic structure ignites the clash between upper and lower floors, and hence sets the stage for the unmasking of the residents' uncivilised faces. Eventually, this chapter concludes that high-rise project beginning as a utopia ends up as a nightmarish dystopia due to the negative impact of architecture on the residents,

which is born out of the clash of the plans of the upper floor residents and architects with the lived experiences and hence resistances of the lower floor residents.

It is finally concluded that in the formation of utopias and dystopias the role of space and place is of great importance in general, and architecture in particular. Architecture is used more than a mere setting or background, for the writers use it as the central character to give the utopian/dystopian theme of the novel. In utopian narration, the idealised society is depicted through the help of the user-friendly and orderly depiction of the new order that is better shaped by architecture. In dystopias however, it is just the opposite of what utopias suggest, for almost all the buildings are in ruin, and nobody can really take shelter in such derelict and decaying buildings. Either with ruined architectural structures in wrecked quarters, or interestingly, with grand new but totally transparent structures, or not surprisingly, with huge monumental ones in some other cases, architecture is used in dystopias as a very functional tool of domination, suppression, control, and manipulation. Consequently, it is deduced that both utopia and dystopia take their critical nature from the functional use of architecture. In this respect, none of the architectural structures in the works explored in this dissertation are ends in themselves, but means for different ends, and the end is the promotion of socialism and the principles of the Arts and Crafts in William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, the critique of totalitarian politics in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and the criticism of modernist architecture and capitalism in J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*. Due to its central role, in these works architecture becomes an ideological tool, and when it is taken out of them, almost nothing remains.

## CHAPTER I

### THE ARCHITECTURE OF PLEASURE: WILLIAM MORRIS'S *NEWS FROM NOWHERE*

This chapter scrutinises the positive role of utopian architecture on the emotions and psychology of the characters with a detailed analysis of the Victorian artist and writer William Morris's utopian novel *News from Nowhere*. Perhaps the best-known of Morris's prose works, *News from Nowhere* emerges as a significant one, which might be depicted as the best manifestation of the writer's political and artistic views that shaped and were shaped by socialism and the Arts and Crafts movement, comprised of the revolutionary and celebrated figures of art, literature and philosophy such as Walter Crane (1845-1915), Phillip Speakman Webb (1831-1915), Edward Burne-Jones (1833-1898), and Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882), who reacted against the mechanisation that the Industrial Revolution brought. Through the application of the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement and his socialist views to the landscape and architecture of his utopian land, Nowhere, and to the daily lives of its citizens, the Nowherians, Morris transforms the heavily industrialised London of the late Victorian Era into a much better and an agrarian, imaginary, and hyper-idealised medieval-in-spirit land in his utopian fiction. Regarding the profound impact of architecture on the psychology of its occupants and observers, the utopian writer Morris wields architectural psychology as a means to prepare a pleasant setting to contribute to the health and happiness of his characters. Unlike the mechanical fabric of Victorian architecture, which Morris finds very ugly and soulless, the architecture of this agrarian landscape is designed in harmony with each other, and with nature to offer a pleasant atmosphere for the inhabitants. Morris's artistic and political ideology as represented here is based on his preference of the simplicity and craftsmanship of the Middle Ages to the mechanic nature of their industrial age. As these ideologies give shape to the gist of the novel, by exploring the intersection of his political and artistic views with respect to the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, the foundation of his firms, "Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co.," and "Morris & Co.," design and decoration of his beloved Red House,

and decoration of his Kelmscott Manor, and Kelmscott House, this chapter argues that utopian literature uses architecture as a principal character to prepare a well organised society, which offers an atmosphere of peace and order for the utopian characters. In the exploration of this rural landscape, the criticism of architecture will move on two main strands with respect to the exploration of “human-made architecture” and “human-designed landscape.” As stated in the Introduction, – with no specific emphasis on the artistic values of constructs, – architecture, or the human-made architecture to put it more clearly, as a term will be used to refer to all kinds of human constructs, that is, buildings, bridges, and gardens, among many others, with specific emphasis on both their construction and decoration. Human-designed landscape will be used to refer to the natural yet human-preserved and/or human-supported landscapes like forests and woods. While this part of the discussion will be supported by specific information about the parks movement and the establishment of the first public parks in Britain in the nineteenth century, the whole analysis of the novel will be conducted with specific emphasis on Morris’s essays regarding his views on art, architecture and socialism, which form the specific utopianism of the book.

*News from Nowhere* was initially serialised “in thirty-nine weekly instalments” (Lieberman 349) in the Socialist paper *Commonweal* “between 11 January and 4 October 1890” (Pinkney, “*News from Nowhere*” 405), and was published as a book in 1891 (Holland 16). Its first edition in a book form was “published by Reeves and Turner” (Lieberman 349; Holland 17). Written as a response to Edward Bellamy’s *Looking Backward*, Morris’s *News from Nowhere*, a “utopian masterpiece” (Parrinder 266), is an account of the narrator William Guest’s dream/vision of an agrarian utopian land called Nowhere, in which the beautiful and healthy citizens lead a very happy life in harmony with the physical and built environment by incorporating the work-pleasure principle as part of their daily lives. Returning from a meeting of the Socialist League, William Guest falls asleep in the early winter in the late Victorian Era to wake up in a bright and hot summer morning in June in the year 2102, that is, some 200 years later. As opposed to the heavily industrialised and mechanical world of the Victorian Era, Guest finds himself in a rural London, where the “malign influence of the industrial revolution [...] [is] finally erased” (Coverley 105) due to a “successful socialist



revolution” (Latham 10) in 1952, which comes after a bloody civil war. In this socialist society, there are no divorce courts, no private property, no monetary system, no crime, no prisons, no big cities, no politics and government, no commercial marriage, no formal schooling, but practical learning, mutual affection, pleasurable work, and respect and love for nature and one another. These healthy people of Nowhere also dwell in user- and eco-friendly houses, which are decorated in line with the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, scattered around the human-designed landscape, consisting of woods and forests. Such harmony of the built environment with the physical environment is indeed the primary source of happiness for them. After learning the new world order of this utopian land from old Hammond, an old and wise character informing Guest about the change since the revolution, and also observing the changes through first-hand experience manifesting in the form of a tour initially from Hammersmith to the British Museum in Bloomsbury in a horse cart, and then another one from Hammersmith to an ancient manor house, – which is revealed to be Morris’s Kelmscott Manor in Oxfordshire, – on a boat on the Thames, Guest finally finds himself in his bed in his “house at dingy Hammersmith thinking about it all” (*NFN*<sup>12</sup> 181), and wishing it to be a vision rather than a dream<sup>13</sup> so that others might also see.

Indeed, the one wishing all these to be a vision rather than a dream in his Hammersmith House by the Thames is not William Guest but William Morris himself. Projecting all his artistic and political views unto a utopian land of pleasure, William Morris augured such a pleasant life as an escape from the ills of machinery that industrialisation brought. Besides the greyness of the Victorian landscape due to the heavy soot of the smoke coming from the chimneys of the factories, what troubled Morris the most was the dehumanising mechanic ideology of the age, which enslaved workers to the machines and increased the gap between upper and lower classes. Morris believed that

---

<sup>12</sup> Hereafter the title of the book will be referred to as *NFN* in parenthetical references.

<sup>13</sup> While exploring the landscape of the Middle Ages by setting his utopia in such a pre-industrial environment, Morris might seem to be exploring the boundaries of a medieval literary genre, namely dream vision poetry. There are scholarly articles exploring *News from Nowhere* as a dream vision narrative. Yet still, such use of dream or vision as a literary tool cannot be reduced only to dream vision poetry, because in most of the euchronias as in Bellamy’s *Looking Backward: 2000-1887* (1888) or some dystopias such as H. G. Wells’s *The Sleeper Awakes* (1910), dream is used a device so that the protagonist might awake in the utopian or dystopian environment, which is far distant with regards to time but very familiar in terms of topography.

the realisation of the principles of his political and artistic views, namely, socialism and the Arts and Crafts movement, was the only way out of this plight. To this end, while constructing his utopian land, which negated the industrial culture of the Victorian Era with its beautiful architecture and peaceful nature, and socialist social structure and joy of everyday life based on a joy-work balance, Morris benefited from the profound impact of architecture on its users.

Trying his hand in writing poetry and prose, designing unique textiles, tiles, stained glass, wallpapers, embroidery and furniture, and engaging in socialism wholeheartedly, William Morris was a successful Victorian novelist, poet, translator, designer, craftsman and an activist of socialism. As Florence S. Boos also argues, he was also a “decorative artist, [...] romance writer, calligrapher, book designer, preservationist, journalist, political leader, and theorist of socialism and the decorative arts, [...] the author of fantasy writings, and utopian literature” (Introduction 1). Due to this versatile background, as Frye posits, “[t]here is no one in English literature who raises more fascinating and complex questions connected with the relation of art to society than William Morris” (“The Meeting” 303). As “the 19<sup>th</sup> century’s most celebrated designer” (“Introducing William Morris”), Morris spearheaded the Arts and Crafts movement in Britain (McDowall; Crawford 15), and following the art critic John Ruskin’s (1819-1900) footsteps with respect to the moral value of the handicrafts of the medieval guildsmen and the glory of Gothic architecture, he had a deep interest in the handmade products and Gothic architecture. By realising the principles of this movement through special handmade designs in his companies, successively Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co., and Morris & Co., Morris actually “championed a principle of handmade production that didn’t chime with the Victorian era’s focus on industrial ‘progress’” (“Introducing William Morris”). Quite the contrary, he actually yearned for the simplicity and dignity of the Middle Ages, when human beings were in harmony with nature. Morris’s wealthy family background and peaceful childhood in the countryside are evidently the pivotal grounds lying beneath his intimate interest and organic bond with nature. However, it is not only his love of nature, but also interest in the Middle Ages and its architecture and artefacts that is deeply entrenched in his childhood. Because Morris was born in a country house at Elm House, “a respectable, comfortable

late-Georgian villa [...] at Clay Hill North of Enfield” (Miele 170) in Walthamstow<sup>14</sup> to “wealthy parents” (Todd 68). Walthamstow, as Cody posits, was then “a village above the Lea Valley, on the edge of Epping forest, but comfortably close to London” (“William Morris”). Morris is known to have visited Epping Forest<sup>15</sup> frequently as a child riding his pony in the costume of a knight-errant, and to have visited some ancient churches and cathedrals, both of which born as a result of his interest in the Middle Ages and medievalism, especially thanks to his readings of Walter Scott’s *Waverley* (1771-1832) novels, all of which Morris began reading at the age of four, and “had finished them all by the time he was nine” (Cody, “William Morris”). Consequently, “[t]ime spent exploring local parkland, forest and churches, and enthusiasm for the stories of Walter Scott, helped Morris develop an early affinity with landscape, buildings and historical romance” (“Introducing William Morris”). It can thus be argued that due to his wealthy background and the advantageous landscape into which he was born, Morris had a specific love of such physical environment and nature, the repercussions of which actually might be traced in his artwork, philosophy, and literary works.

Morris’s attachment to medievalism and nature as opposed to the mechanic and industrial values of the age was actually further reinforced at Exeter College, Oxford, where he read the books of the significant reformers of the age, such as Charles Kingsley (1819-1875), Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), and John Ruskin, whose moral principles and ideology he adopted and reflected in his art. Their ideas actually created an opposition to the Industrial Revolution. Although he did not graduate from Oxford, his years there are worthy of note in the making of William Morris the artist and the socialist, because with his close friend, or in other words, his “college chum” (Triggs 43) Edward Burne-Jones, who later became an important artist and member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, Morris became a part of an “undergraduate aesthetic circle,” which had a yearning for the Middle Ages, and was overwhelmingly affected by the philosophy lying behind Thomas Carlyle’s *Past and Present* (1843), and John Ruskin’s *The Stones of Venice* (1851-1853) (Cody, “William Morris”). As David Cody puts it,

---

Ruskin “would provide him with the basis for his portrait of a Mediaeval society which was all that his own grotesque age was not — organic, communal, pre-capitalistic, and pre-industrial” (“Morris’s Medievalism”). As Morris “despised Victorian society” (Cody, “Morris’s Medievalism”), and its capitalistic and mechanic nature, he actually sought a sort of refuge in the Middle Ages to escape from the unbearable burden of the age, because good old days of the Middle Ages, in the words of Cody, “held all of the values — heroism, chivalry, beauty, and love — which made life worth living; all the values which his own age (in which industrial capitalism, in the process of creating a spiritually dead society, was busily violating the human spirit) so conspicuously lacked” (“Morris’s Medievalism”).

With respect to the major impact of Ruskin’s ideas on the Arts and Crafts movement, and Morris’s appreciation of architecture, it will be helpful to begin with the exploration of the Ruskinian aesthetics based on his ideas discussed thoroughly in his noteworthy books on architecture, namely, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849) and *The Stones of Venice*, both of which affected Morris deeply. Ruskin was critical of the industrial nature of his age for numerous interconnected reasons such as the unhappiness of the workingmen, the division of labour, and the loss of the work-pleasure, among many others. While examining the three periods of Venetian architecture, namely, Byzantine, Gothic, and Renaissance periods, in his *The Stones of Venice*, in which he elaborated on the issues that he handled in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* formerly, Ruskin also shed light on the intertwinement of art and life. As opposed to Renaissance architecture, which was for him devoid of morality, Ruskin evaluated Gothic architecture as the embodiment of art, architecture and morality. He especially focused on the moral dimension of the Gothic style, because he believed that Gothic architecture was constructed for the glory of God, not as mere architecture of an architect. What is more however, he favoured the rough surface and asymmetrical structure of Gothic architecture over the smooth surface and symmetrical structure of Renaissance architecture with the claim that the former conveyed emotions better than the latter, which he found rather cold and emotionless. Indeed, Ruskin promoted the “imperfection” of art, for imperfection for him was “the sign of life in a mortal body, that is to say, of a state of progress and change. Nothing that lives is, or can be, rigidly

perfect; part of it is decaying, part nascent [...] No human face is exactly the same in its lines on each side, no leaf perfect in its lobes. [...] All things are literally better, lovelier, and more beloved for the imperfections which have been divinely appointed” (*TSV*:<sup>16</sup> *The Sea Stories* 172).

As is clear, Ruskin was critical of the symmetrical and smooth structure of Renaissance architecture, that is to say, its perfection, for such attention to the perfection of the shape reduced the value of art in labour. Ruskin actually privileged the significance of the value attached to labour, for labour transformed into art when the worker enjoyed what he was doing. To enjoy one’s labour, Ruskin suggests “not try to make all these pleasures reasonable, nor to connect the delight which you take in ornament with that which you take in construction or usefulness” (*TSV: The Foundations* 58). Gothic architecture is actually the best manifestation of the artistic value of labour, from which the labourer takes pleasure. This is so, because there was no distinction between the artist and artisan, they were both the same person, in the Middle Ages. However, in his own age, Ruskin could not find such artworks due to the division of labour between the artist and the artisan. He evaluated such division of labour as division of men, who were “[d]ivided into [their] mere segments [...] – broken into small fragments and crumbs of life; so that all the little piece of intelligence that is left in a man is not enough to make a pin, or a nail, but exhausts itself in making the point of a pin, or the head of a nail” (*TSV: The Sea Stories* 165). Ruskin was critical of such division, because, he thought that “one man’s thoughts can never be expressed by another: and the difference between the spirit of touch of the man who is inventing, and of the man who is obeying directions, is often all the difference between a great and a common work of art” (*TSV: The Sea Stories* 169). Besides that however, such division of labour results, for Ruskin, in a society of “morbid thinkers and miserable workers” (*TSV: The Sea Stories* 170), who despise and envy one another. Under these circumstances, the production of artwork is not possible at all, because the artist or the artisan cannot give his soul to architecture. And hence, what is produced is just a mere building, which has no moral value, no glorification, and no depth. In this respect, for Ruskin, “[a]ll art is great, and good, and true, only so far as it is distinctively the work of *manhood* in its entire and

---

<sup>16</sup> Hereafter *The Stones of Venice* will be abbreviated as *TSV* in parenthetical references.

highest sense; that is to say, not the work of limbs and fingers, but of the soul, aided, according to her necessities, by the inferior powers; and therefore distinguished in essence from all products of those inferior powers unhelped by the soul” (*TSV: The Fall* 156, emphasis original). Consequently, he argues that, “all great art is the work of the whole living creature, body and soul, and chiefly of the soul” (*The Fall* 165). Such great art, in return, influences humans in positive way. Architecture as the manifestation of such great art “may contribute to [...] [one’s] mental health, power, and pleasure” (*The Seven Lamps* 8).

The production of such Gothic architecture in the Victorian Age, for Ruskin, was not possible due to the dehumanising effects of mechanisation and industrialisation, for there was a distinction between the architect and the worker. Additionally, all the products were machine-made, and hence they were far away from the artistic labour that the labourer must enjoy. If the carver, or the artisan is not happy while doing his job, the product will not be an artwork, because “it will not be living” (*The Seven Lamps* 173). Consequently, in line with Ruskin’s argument it can be deduced that in the heavily industrialised and capitalistic Victorian Era, the production of such art works was beyond the point, and hence only tasteless buildings were produced.

Morris was actually deeply affected by Ruskin’s ideas with respect to pleasure in one’s work, handcraftsmanship, and adoration of Gothic architecture. He especially adored the chapter “On the Nature of Gothic Architecture” in *The Stones of Venice* so much that he published this chapter as a separate book entitled *The Nature of Gothic* in his Kelmscott Press, and wrote a preface for it. In his preface, Morris summarises Ruskin’s suggestion of pleasure in labour, which makes labourers happy, and this is possible only when labour is realised in the form of art:

For the lesson which Ruskin here teaches us is that art is the expression of man’s pleasure in labour; that is possible for man to rejoice in his work, for, strange as it may seem to us today, there have been times when he did rejoice in it; and lastly, that unless man’s work once again becomes a pleasure to him, the token of which change will be that beauty is once again a natural and necessary accompaniment of productive labour, all but the worthless must toil in pain, and therefore live in pain. (i-ii)

As is clear, Morris and most of his fellow artists adopted Ruskin's ideas to such an extent that they put these ideas into practise in their artefacts and architecture. Morris, perhaps the truest follower of Ruskin, applied all Ruskin's ideas to his art works, ranging from stained glass, wallpapers, textiles, carpets, embroideries, and furniture to buildings. Moreover, he had a deep interest in the Middle Ages and medievalism partly due to Ruskin's influence. Nevertheless, his was not "an unreasoning medievalism, but he sought out the lost threads of the various crafts, and wherever an art had reached its highest development, there Morris directed his studies," and moreover, "he was not a mere copyist of ancient or foreign excellencies, but that his purpose was to discover the principles of a craft by a study of its best examples, and to work there from in the modern spirit" (Triggs 62). As opposed to the mechanic nature of the mass produced goods of the Victorian Age however, he favoured craftsmanship, and yearned for the simplicity and art of the Middle Ages, that is, handicrafts, which gave pleasure to both the designer and the user. This idea of pleasure in one's work became one of the primary principles of the Arts and Crafts movement in the following years.

Art, as Jessie Kocmanova and J. E. Purkyné also argue, "for Morris was life, he could not contemplate the one without the other" (414). Therefore, although he entered Oxford to study theology and to enter the Anglican church, especially through the influence of these reformers, Morris decided to become an artist rather than a clergyman as his family wished. As well as the influence of the above-mentioned thinkers however, Morris's visit to the Gothic cathedrals of northern France with Edward Burne-Jones played a significant role in shaping his ideas and interests better towards art and architecture, which actually became his lifetime passion and attachment. Already critical of the Anglican church, and deeply fascinated by the glory of these cathedrals, they were "soon considering the advisability of giving up the church and devoting their lives to art – the one aspiring to be a painter, the other an architect" (Triggs 43). Following this decision, Morris became an apprentice in the office of the architect George Edmund Street (1824-1881) in 1856 (Todd 68; Harvey, Press and Maclean 42). As Chris Miele argues, what Morris did in Street's Office is unknown, but "[a]s a pupil in articles he would have been set certain rudimentary tasks, copying drawings, measuring buildings, preparing contract documentation according to set forms and

probably attending site visits” (174). Even though Morris left Street’s office to become a painter soon after meeting with the leading Pre-Raphaelite artist Dante Gabriel Rossetti, who encouraged him to be a painter, his apprenticeship there is still very valuable, for it was in Street’s office that “Morris met another nascent architect, Phillip Webb (1831-1915), with whom he would develop an enduring friendship” (Frederick 210). Later, along with Webb, Morris designed, and built his dream house, the Red House.

Built in fifteen months (Allen 25) in 1859 and 1860 by Morris in collaboration with Philip Webb (Todd 68), the L-shaped two-storey Red House is a very special one named after its red bricks and tiles. Described as “the beautifullest place on earth” (qtd. Mabb 229) by Burne-Jones, the house was actually designed by Webb, and Morris engaged in the interior decoration (Miele 176). Situated in Upton, Kent, “in an orchard and meadow plot near London” (Triggs 46) with its specific structure, the Red House is actually a breaking point in return to the native tradition in architecture, and as Pamela Todd also puts it, this movement was “initially founded upon a strong love of England and all things in English” (95), and the house hence “broke the classical mold, embraced the vernacular, and began a revolution in domestic architecture” (Todd 95). What is more however, this house, as Todd further argues, “[f]or the next half century [...]pointed the way for succeeding generations of architects who were keen to put function first, to relate their buildings to the landscape, and to build them from carefully selected, often local, materials” (95).

Besides the building’s external traits, the Red House manifests itself as a quintessentially Morrisian example with respect to its inner decoration, which is the embodiment of the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement. Additionally, Morris and his wife Jane Burden (1839-1914), Rossetti and Burne-Jones, and their wives were also involved in the decoration of the house. As Oscar Lovell Triggs posits in this respect, the house carried out “in practice for the first time their theories of domestic building and decoration” (46), which might simply be exemplified as foregrounding simplicity and aesthetics, using handmade artefacts in decoration, and the house’s seamless harmony with nature. Even now, the Red House, as Carolyn McDowall



argues, “retains many of its original features including furniture by Morris and Philip Webb, ceiling paintings by Morris, wall-hangings designed by Morris and worked by himself and his wife Jane, furniture painted by Morris and the Pre-Raphaelite painter Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and wall-paintings and stained- and painted glass designed by Edward Burne-Jones.”

Besides the collaborative effort of Morris and his friends, the decoration of the Red House can be accepted as a milestone in the development of the Arts and Crafts movement. As he was “appalled by the shoddiness of the mass-produced furniture then on offer and felt sure he could offer a better, handmade alternative” (Todd 150), Morris and his friends founded the company, Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co.,<sup>17</sup> also known as the Firm, in April 1861 (Allen 22), which was later dissolved in 1875, and reconstituted as Morris & Co. (Cody “William Morris”), to produce the necessary furniture, wallpapers, stained glass, tiles, and textiles to decorate the Red House. The aim of the Firm was actually “to evoke the spirit of a medieval workshop, where there was pride in work and joy in working together” (Todd 149). Hence, they favoured simplicity and traditional craftsmanship, and followed Morris’s art slogan “*art made by the people, for the people as a joy to the maker and the user*” (Morris, “The Beauty of Life” 545, emphasis original).

Even though the Morrises and their friends built and decorated the house with special interest in each detail, they lived there only for a period of five years, and then sold it in 1865, for commuting between the house in the countryside and the Firm in the city centre was rather difficult for Morris, who had then some health problems. Soon enough, Morris and his family began living in his Kelmscotts; that is to say, he “was dividing his time between his two Kelmscotts – Kelmscott House on the banks of the

---

<sup>17</sup> Morris founded the company along with his friends, Edward Burne-Jones, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Philip Webb, Ford Madox Brown (1821-1893), Charles Joseph Faulkner (1833-1892), and Peter Paul Marshall (1830-1900), and it “sold furniture designed by Philip Webb, Ford Madox Brown, and later, George Jack, stained glass, painted tiles, wall paintings, embroidery, tapestries and woven hangings, carpets, table glass, metalwork, wallpapers, and chintzes, designed by Burne-Jones, William De Morgan, Walter Crane, and others” (Todd 68).

Thames at Hammersmith in London, and Kelmscott Manor,<sup>18</sup> a hundred and thirty miles upriver in Oxfordshire – each decorated in his highly personal style” (Todd 127). Actually, Morris continued to live in Kelmscott House at Hammersmith, but visited permanently Kelmscott Manor, which he never bought but completely decorated its inside, at weekends and during short holidays (Miele 178).

The Arts and Crafts movement was born as a reaction to the mechanisation and industrialisation of the Victorian Age, and to the mass production of goods that were “shoddy” for Morris and his fellows. Hence, as McDowall also puts it, such “[a] reaction to the de-humanizing affect of late nineteenth century industrialism revived the artisan guild system, which was similar to that of medieval times.” Instead of the domineering machinery of the Industrial Age, “[t]he Arts and Crafts Movement was, primarily, an attempt at social reform with an emphasis on group work in guilds of craftsmen and designers” (Todd 153). Although Morris sold this special house in 1865, the Red House was an important agent not only in the establishment of the Firm, but also as the beginning of the Arts and Crafts Movement. For Triggs, in this respect, “[t]he year 1860 was counted as the approximate year of its beginning, when William Morris built his famous Red House on the outskirts of London, and served his apprenticeship to the industrial arts by designing and executing the decoration and furniture of his home” (7). But, the theory of the movement “appeared before 1860 though, through the writings of Ruskin and Morris” (Triggs 7). The primary aim of this movement was both to unearth the dignity and value of handicraft, and hence to emphasise the pleasure of handmade labour; or in the words of Todd, “the dignity and joy of labor,” “emphasis on handcrafted methods,” and “honesty to function” (152). The primary aim of the movement was actually to bring art and labour together (Triggs 7). This vernacular tradition was actually a kind of yearning for the past and its glory. As Alan Crawford argues, the gist of the movement can be expressed as such: “The inspiration of the Arts and Crafts movement lay in the Romantic critique of industrial

---

<sup>18</sup> This manor seems like an Elizabethan house, and its picture is printed on the cover page of *News from Nowhere*'s Kelmscott Press. As Berry argues, “Morris never owned this most famous of his dwellings, he rented it from 1871 until his death” (25). Morris, for Julia Griffin, “used Kelmscott as an escape from the city, whilst his much-treasured visits to the country were mostly short” (89).

society, that is, in antimodernism. At its heart was the conviction that creativity can be a part of the lives of ordinary people” (26).

For Crawford, this movement was animated in Britain by “three principal ideas” respectively: “the Unity of Art” (16), “Joy in Labor” (17), and “Design Reform” (19). To begin with the first principal idea, that is, “the Unity of Art,” Crawford posits that “Arts and Crafts people opposed the hierarchy in which the arts were arranged in late-Victorian Britain” which put painting and sculpture on top of fine arts, architecture to the middle and decorative arts at the bottom (16). These people, as Crawford posits, “argued that, in the Middle Ages, this hierarchy had not existed; and that in their own day, painters, sculptors, architects, and decorative artists should be on an equal footing again” (16). The second principal idea, “Joy in Labor,” “was that the ordinary experience of work can become a source of pleasure through the play of imagination” (17). This idea for Crawford was “rooted in a Romantic sense of the past, and specifically in a long passage called ‘The Nature of Gothic’ in the second volume of John Ruskin’s *The Stones of Venice*” (17-8). One can see “the impact of this idea on Arts and Crafts objects whose appearance declared that they are handmade – the hammer marks on metalwork, the fluid, irregular contours of some pottery and glass, and the marks of the adze or chisel on wood or stone” (Crawford 18). The third idea is actually “a movement to improve the design of objects consumed by the public. Unlike the previous two ideas, it was not peculiar to the Arts and Crafts movement. [...] The Arts and Crafts movement inherited much of this approach. Arts and Crafts designers were generally high-minded people and they talked about their work in terms ‘honesty,’ ‘simplicity,’ and ‘the nature of materials’” (Crawford 19).

Morris’s contribution to the Arts and Crafts movement was mostly on “textile and wall-paper design,” which are “crucial, and relate directly to Morris’ notions of the Earthly Paradise in actuality. His designs normally incorporate a floral or foliage motif. They are, broadly speaking, inventive, well-wrought, and pleasing” (Berry 26). In the production of these handmade goods, Morris was actually inspired by “both nature and medieval world” (McDowall), “some piece of nature: usually a plant or flower, occasionally a bird” (Berry 27). For instance, his famous “Fruit” and “Trellis” designs

were “inspired by the flowers and fruit found in his garden at Red House,” and similarly, “Willow” design “was inspired by the willow-bordered river that ran through his country property, Kelmscott Manor” (Todd 206).

Morris’s interest in different arts is evident, because as Florence Boos also argues, his art “embraced any form of human labour and intellectual beauty that gave innocent pleasure and raised consciousness.” Yet still, as Boos further argues, Morris “especially admired the craft of architecture” (“The Ideal” 154). Because, as Phillipa Bennett aptly puts it, “[a]rchitecture functioned for Morris as the consummate expression of man’s triumph in artistic creation” (114). Although he was never a practising architect,

Morris was passionate about architecture, its past, present and future. His youthful engagement with it was intensely romantic, sensual even. Later he came to understand it as a particular expression of the time and place of its making, though without losing that earlier strength of feeling for it. In both respects, he was walking a well-worn path. The Romantic poets and painters of two generations earlier had described architecture in emphatic, emotive terms. And an earlier generation of historians and critics had developed the notion that architecture reflected the spirit of the age, what a later generation of art historians would call the *Zeitgeist*. (Miele 169)

His adoration of the craft of architecture can clearly be seen in his meticulous decoration and design of the Red House, and his decoration of his Kelmscott Manor and Kelmscott House. As Todd puts it, “[f]or the Arts and Crafts architect [...] beauty resided in line, proportion, texture, workmanship, and most of all in appropriateness. The importance of integrating the designs of furnishings and buildings was paramount, and indulgence in ornament for ornament’s sake was anathema” (112). In the late Victorian Era, however, it was not only Morris and his fellows that designed and decorated their houses in line with the main principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, but many other middle-class people also adopted such an approach especially towards interior design, and hence there was “a conscious move away from the clutter and comparative gloom of the traditional Victorian interior toward a lighter, more rational scheme, often unified by recurring decorative motifs in the fabric, fittings, and structural decoration of a room” (Todd 128).

There was an interest in the Gothic revival in the second half of the Victorian Era, and

hence most of the architects were involved in this revival, and were engaged in the restoration of old buildings, or building new ones imitating Gothic architecture poorly. Despite his deep interest in the simplicity and craftsmanship of the Middle Ages, Morris was totally critical of the Gothic revival, and objected to the restoration of the old buildings, which for him destroyed the authenticity and spirit of the building. Morris referred to restoration as “foe” (“The Lesser Arts” 508). And with respect to the preservation of the ancient buildings instead of restoration, Morris argued: “That ancient buildings, being both works of art and monuments of history, must obviously be treated with great care and delicacy: that the imitative art of today is not, and cannot be the same thing as ancient art, and cannot replace it; and that therefore if we superimpose this work on the old, we destroy it both as art and as a record of history” (“The Beauty of Life” 555). As Andrea Elizabeth Donovan argues, despite the high number of restorations from 1840 to 1870, “[i]n many cases, restorations were not terribly accurate, and in all cases, restorations were a by-product of the perspective of the person or people responsible for the restoration” (47). Instead, he preferred protection and preservation of the old buildings; and to this end, founded the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), also known as Anti-Scrape, in 1877; and “[u]ntil his death, Morris remained involved with the SPAB and the fight for quality historic preservation” (Donovan 47).

Besides his engagement with the Arts and Crafts, and the preservation of the ancient buildings, his commitment to socialism particularly in the later phase of his life is another distinguishing characteristic of Morris that goes hand in hand with his appreciation of art. Hence, it is easy to see the intertwinement of Morris’s political and artistic ideals, which actually breed and feed one another. Although it might sound strange, or even controversial, to associate Morris’s socialism and artistry, – for the goods produced in the Firm and Morris & Co. were extremely expensive for ordinary people to afford, as they were handmade, and hence violated the ideal of egalitarianism that socialism suggested, – his motives for both craftsmanship and socialism were inextricably bonded at the intersection of his critique of capitalism and industrialism, and seeking of joy in one’s labour. Donovan therefore aptly states that long before he adopted the socialist view, Morris “espoused a notion of ‘craft socialism’” (17).

Morris turned to politics late in his life (Todd 68), but then continued as a staunch supporter of socialism till his death by contributing to the socialist cause with his lectures, writings, art, and speeches on street corners. He initially joined the Democratic Federation in 1883, and declared himself a socialist (Cody, “William Morris”); but in 1884, he resigned from the Federation and founded the Socialist League, and “became its first treasurer as well as editor of *Commonweal*, the official party organ” (Cody, “Morris’s Socialism”). However, when anarchists took control of the Socialist League in 1890, Morris withdrew from his post (Cody, “Morris’s Socialism”). Yet, his withdrawal “did not shake his belief in revolutionary socialism, it restricted his influence on the wider movement. Following the split the Hammersmith Branch was renamed the Hammersmith Socialist Society on 23 November 1890” (Salmon 13).

In his speeches on the street corners, Morris was explicitly asking for a socialist revolution so as to cure the damage that the Industrial Revolution caused only by returning to the craftsmanship of the guilds in the Middle Ages, when the production of handmade goods gave pleasure to both the user and the maker, away from the hierarchic structure of the capitalist system, in which the workers were the ones doing the real work with very little income, but it was the employers getting the whole benefit of this manipulative system.<sup>19</sup> Morris believed that such a socialist revolution would ease the burden of the workers by bringing egalitarianism among all classes; and away from the dehumanising effects of the machines, people would enjoy their jobs. Because labour, as Florence Boos and William Boos argue, can be “fully pleasurable to the worker and valuable to others,” when they come to learn that “the deepest human joy derives from

---

<sup>19</sup> Here it is easy to see Morris’s unrealistic depiction of the Middle Ages in that it was the epitome of the hierarchic societies, and serfs and villeins were at the bottom of this social structure, and they were responsible for doing all kinds of labour, the majority of which were not pleasurable. As Morris romanticises too much about the Middle Ages, he disregards this strict class system of the Middle Ages. In this respect, as Trevor Lloyd also puts it, in this respect, “[i]n his poems and in several of his lectures on social and political topics, he accepted the idea of the Middle Ages as a time of considerable violence. He was never worried by this, and sometimes argued that the impersonal economic exploitation of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was considerably more inhuman than the hot-blooded violence of the Middle Ages. This may explain why Nowhere is, as utopias go, an unusually lively place” (92). What is more, “Morris never claimed to give a complete analysis of medieval society. What he wanted, and what he claimed to have found in medieval townlife and craftsmen’s activities, was an example of how life could be lived that the 19<sup>th</sup> century would do well to imitate. No doubt he praised this part of medieval life more than it deserved” (Lloyd 96).

love of one's fellows and the earth" (495). This motive of joy can be traced in Morris's own adoption of socialism. As Crawford argues, in this respect, "it was his work as a designer and the joy it brought him which led to his socialism," and hence it is apt to claim that "his politics was design inspired than that his design was politically inspired" (Crawford 25).

Morris was "passionate about architecture, its past, present and future" (Miele 169), and his deep interest in architecture was part of his socialist motivation in that he believed that there must also be an architectural revolution just before a socialist revolution, because there was no way of escaping from architecture. In this respect, as Bennett also argues, "[i]n his various visions of how human society might be organised after a Socialist revolution, buildings thus serve as structural affirmations of the values Morris believed would underpin a new era of social harmony and artistic achievement" (122). As a manifestation of Morris's artistic and political visions, in Nowhere the socialist revolution in 1952 is completed fully by an architectural revolution, which wipes all the reminiscences of the capitalist and mechanic Victorian Age away, and makes London an agrarian society as it used to be. Old Hammond expounds this change as follows:

'England was once a country of clearings amongst the woods and wastes, with a few towns interspersed, which were fortresses for the feudal army, markets for the folk, gathering places for the craftsmen. It then became a country of huge and foul workshops and fouler gambling-dens, surrounded by an ill-kept, poverty-stricken farm, pillaged by the masters of the workshops. It is now a garden, where nothing is wasted and nothing is spoilt, with the necessary dwellings, sheds, and workshops scattered up and down the country, all trim and neat and pretty.' (*NFN* 62)

England, as Hammond also states, has now become a garden of pleasure, where the inhabitants lead a very happy life with no burden of the previous ages. In this paradise-like garden, perhaps the most remarkable change is the annihilation of the "shoddy" and "ugly" architecture of industrialised London, which is replaced by user- and eco-friendly human-made architecture and human-designed landscape. This peaceful architecture of Nowhere is evidently the primary source of the citizens' health and welfare. Properly designed and appealing new houses of Nowhere surrounded by beautiful gardens, and in harmony with nature are the peaceful living quarters of the citizens. By means of the application of the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement and the Ruskinian aesthetics to the architecture of Nowhere, Morris distances the

residents from the bleak atmosphere of the Victorian Era, and the ills of machines, factories, mechanisation, and industrialisation. Free from the troubles of the machine age, and surrounded by the peaceful atmosphere of this well-decorated architecture, the Nowherians lead a happy life. Therefore, this idealised land of utopia as the negation of the industrial Victorian Era is indeed a never-never land.

The title of the novel alludes to Thomas More's *Utopia*, as the word "utopia" as discussed previously refers to both "an ideal place" and "nowhere." Etymologically, utopia is a place, which is a non-place, "simultaneously constituted by a movement of affirmation and denial" (Vieira 4). In classical utopias such as *Utopia*, *The City of the Sun*, and *New Atlantis*, or even Margaret Cavendish's (1623-1673) *The Blazing World* (1666), the idealised society depicted is an unknown place that is accidentally discovered. Borrowing the idea of utopia, both as a good place and no place, from the classical utopian tradition, Morris actually complicates matters further by setting his utopian land in an agrarian London, where the names of buildings, districts, and locations are not even altered. This is in fact the idea behind echronia in that echronias are set in familiar *places* but distant *times*. Hence, it is better to refer to Morris's *Nowhere* as "now-here" more than "no-where" (Laurent 53). Reading *Nowhere* as now-here is actually "more productive" (Holland 14), for Morris's aim in depicting *Nowhere* is actually to present the negation of his society to criticise the ills of industrialisation and mechanisation. While defamiliarising the readers on the one hand, he also deals with contemporaneous problems.

As observed in the Introduction, the depiction of landscape, architecture, and town planning occupies an important place in classical utopias. Morris takes the issue one step further, and makes architecture and landscape the principle element that has a significant impact upon the emotions and psychology of the characters rather than presenting it as a backdrop, where only events take place. As a matter of fact, soon after the revolution in 1952, the old landscape of Victorian London is totally changed except for some of the buildings such as Westminster Abbey, Windsor Castle, St. Paul's, Eton, the Houses of the Parliament, and the British Museum. As the waterman Dick Hammond also states, most of these old buildings are kept specifically as "foil" to the



beautiful ones they built so as to show the stark contrast between past and present: “you know at the worst these silly old buildings serve as a kind of foil to the beautiful ones which we build now”(NFN 28). Some others like Morris’s Kelmscott Manor are well adapted to the fabric of the new landscape, and hence act as a mnemonic agent to demonstrate the historical transformation. In the lush landscape of Nowhere, as opposed to the bleak landscape of Victorian London, the natural and built environment are in harmony with each other. In addition to the constructed architecture in the form of renewed buildings, marketplaces, and bridges, the human-designed environment, that is, the green landscape, be it forests or woods, are all depicted by Morris meticulously, and they are the significant details that set the tone for such a peaceful atmosphere. As Bennett also posits, in this regard, “[t]he Nowherians have learned once more how to give structure and expression to happiness and aspiration in their buildings” (124). What is significant here with respect to the depiction of architecture, human-made and human-designed alike, is that Morris presents this peaceful landscape as the manifestation of his socialist views that are well supported by the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, and owes a lot to Ruskin’s ideas of architecture’s organic bond with nature.

Whilst exploring the positive impact of architecture and landscape on the psychology of the characters, rather than focusing on mere buildings; things and objects, humans and nonhumans, and the relationship among them will be explored, for as Nathanael Gilbert argues, “[h]ere, landscape consists not just of things or objects – the flowers, the house, the people – but of the relationships between these things” (23). As Gilbert further argues,

[a] significant feature of his utopia is the open integration of people, architecture, and nature into the landscape so as to proclaim and celebrate a new society, a new world, rather than idealise or preserve an old one. Thus, as Guest travels about the countryside, he continually remarks on the garden-like riverbanks *and* the houses, the ‘romantic’ woods *and* the children in them, the flowers *and* the conversation, the new buildings *and* the stone masons. His observations culminate in a description of the thoughtful management of the landscape on the opposite bank of the river where ‘the slender stream of the Thames’ is broken by ‘a beautiful little islet begrown with graceful trees.’ (31, emphasis original)

With respect to architecture's positive contribution to the happiness of the characters, another Morrisian trait emerges: everybody should live in beautiful dwellings so as to lead happy lives, and to produce beautiful artefacts. What is more however, since architecture includes all other arts in itself, if it is not good, the others will not be good, either. Hence, Morris says:

I have spoken of the popular arts, but they might all be summed up in that one word Architecture; they are all parts of that great whole, and the art of house-building begins it all. [...] Architecture would lead us to all the arts, as it did with earlier men: but if we despise it and take no note of how we are housed, the other arts will have a hard time of it indeed. Now I do not think the greatest of optimists would deny that, taking us one and all, we are at present housed in a perfectly shameful way, and since the greatest part of us have to live in houses already built for us, it must be admitted that it is rather hard to know what to do, beyond waiting till they tumble about our ears. ("The Beauty of Life" 558-59)

Evidently, putting his ideas into practice in the portrayal of the paradisaical landscape of *Nowhere*, Morris delineates an impeccable architecture, where human-made architecture and human-designed landscape are inextricably linked in harmony. Perhaps as the mouthpiece of Morris, Ellen, the wise maiden, who actually guides and illuminates Guest about many things, criticises the people of the Victorian Age for not using beautiful houses by saying that "'I find that hard to understand,' [...] 'I quite understand that these poor people were not allowed to live in such a way as to have these (to us) necessary good things. But why the rich men, who had the time and the leisure and the materials for building, as it would be in this case, should not have housed themselves well, I do not understand as yet'" (*NFN* 165). Let alone the wealthy ones who can actually afford living in such beautiful and pleasing houses, Ellen wants even the poor to be housed in such pleasant dwellings, for she is in the belief that human beings deserve living such happy and pleasing lives. If they live in beautiful houses, they can be happy and produce beautiful things, and hence contribute to the wellbeing of society. That is to say, individual happiness brings with it societal happiness, too. Ellen's thoughts with respect to the housing of all people, regardless of class boundaries, is the manifestation of Morris's socialism, which requires "a condition of society in which there should be neither rich nor poor, neither master nor master's man, neither idle nor overworked, neither brain-sick brain workers, nor heart-sick hand workers" ("How I Became a Socialist" 655). To put it more clearly, what he yearns for is a condition of society, "in which all men would be living in equality of condition, and would manage their affairs

unwastefully, and with the full consciousness that harm to one would mean harm to all—the realisation at last of the meaning of the word COMMONWEALTH” (“How I Became a Socialist” 655). What is significant with respect to Morris’s socialist ethos as represented in *News from Nowhere* is that the book “does not attempt to preach socialist ideology,” but makes one “desire socialism by giving us the *feel* of a socialist society” (Kumar, “*News from Nowhere*” 143). Such unique stance of Morris’s utopia, in this respect, owes a lot to his success in bringing his interest in architecture and handicrafts together at the intersection of his socialism.

What both Ellen and Morris desired is obviously equal rights for all in each step of life. Hence, like Ellen, Morris also believed that everybody regardless of their economic background must live in pleasing houses. Although such conditions were not possible under the dehumanising effects of industrialisation and capitalism, which enslaved workers to get more benefit, in *Nowhere*, everything has been renewed and changed for the better. In this new order, old houses and buildings, marketplaces, and bridges have been annihilated, and replaced by “many pretty new ones” (*NFN* 152), which make the inhabitants of *Nowhere* feel comfortable and happy. Therefore, wherever he goes either in the city centre or up the Thames, what Guest encounters is beautifully designed houses that are surrounded by trees, flowers, and gardens. The houses on both sides of the Thames is the first image of the landscape that he encounters early in the morning on his first day in *Nowhere*:

Both shores had a line of very pretty houses, low and not large, standing back a little way from the river; they were mostly built of red brick and roofed with tiles, and looked, above all, comfortable, and as if they were, so to say, alive, and sympathetic with the life of the dwellers in them. There was a continuous garden in front of them, going down to the water’s edge, in which the flowers were now blooming luxuriantly, and sending delicious waves of summer scent over the eddying stream. Behind the houses, I could see great trees rising, mostly planes, and looking down the water there were the reaches towards Putney almost as if they were a lake with a forest shore, so thick were the big trees; and I said aloud, but as if to myself— . (*NFN* 8)

Not surprisingly, such pleasing houses are not only situated by the Thames, but also scattered around the whole city. On their ride to the British Museum in Bloomsbury from Hammersmith, Guest observes some other beautiful houses made of red brick, very similar to the ones at Hammersmith:

There were houses about, some on the road, some amongst the fields with pleasant lanes leading down to them, and each surrounded by a teeming garden. They were all pretty in design, and as solid as might be, but countryfied in appearance, like yeomen's dwellings; some of them of red brick like those by the river, but more of timber and plaster, which were by the necessity of their construction so like mediæval houses of the same materials that I fairly felt as if I were alive in the fourteenth century; a sensation helped out by the costume of the people that we met or passed, in whose dress there was nothing "modern." (*NFN* 20)

In a similar fashion, "elegantly-built much ornamented houses" standing in the gardens of cherry-trees and other fine fruit in Trafalgar Square (35), or the "pleasant enough and fitting for the wood" (*NFN* 24) cottages just scattered around in the Kensington woods have a point of intersection: they are all well built, ornamented, and peaceful dwellings among trees and gardens. Besides their harmony with nature, or in some cases with the human-designed architecture, another vital point related to these houses is the material used in their construction and their size, which have considerable impact on the thoughts and feelings of the users or observers of these houses. As emphasised more than once, these houses are made of red brick, timber, and plaster, and they are not tall or big edifices that dominate the whole landscape. The use of brick, stone or wood for the construction of the houses, marketplaces, and bridges, among many others, is an apt choice for the depiction of such an agrarian landscape, and it contrasts with the frequently used iron of the Victorian Era. Wood or stone as opposed to iron are natural elements, and thus in harmony with nature. Consequently, these materials further reinforce the citizens' close relationship with nature, which actually influences them in a positive way. The low and small sizes of the houses of Nowhere are another functional trait of Morris's utopian land in that he takes advantage of these small houses to create a pleasing atmosphere. As discussed in the following chapters with respect to the discussion of architecture in dystopias as represented in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Ballard's *High-Rise*, gigantic or monumental edifices, which are used by the manipulators as a means to manipulate and control the subordinate groups, have a negative effect on human psychology. By dwarfing all the landscape and human beings, such edifices influence the psychology of the citizens in a negative way, by creating a sense of uneasiness and helplessness. Quite the contrary, such small houses tinged with natural materials have a positive effect on the moods of the dwellers and make them self-confident and happy. Morris's Red House, in this respect, with its red brick as the construction material, with its low-rise with respect to its two storeys, and its location in

the countryside might be accepted as the quintessence of Morrisian architecture of houses.

On their way to Bloomsbury from Hammersmith, it is not only houses and their gardens that attract Guest's attention, but also a range of marketplaces, which with their specific architectural design have a deep impact on its observers. Upon seeing Hammersmith market amidst beautiful fields, which gives the "expression of such generosity and abundance of life," for example, Guest just chuckles "for pleasure" (*NFN* 21). Realising the peaceful impact of architecture on Guest's mood, Dick Hammond also feels a sense of pleasure, and tells him that it is their Hammersmith market that they are "really proud of" (*NFN* 21). What is perhaps most significant with respect to the marketplace is its architecture, which embraces "the best qualities of the Gothic of northern Europe with those of the Saracenic and Byzantine, though there was no copying of any one of these styles" (*NFN* 21). Needless to say, one can see Morris's appreciation of the true Gothic style that he observed in northern France during his visit with Burne-Jones while they were at college. Referring to his distaste of the Gothic revival in the nineteenth century with respect to poor imitations of the style or the terrible renovations of the old ones, which was the common practice during the second half of the Victorian Era, Morris especially puts emphasis on the originality of the style with the words: "no copying" (*NFN* 21). As well as the splendour of architecture, it is the originality and uniqueness of the Hammersmith market that makes it so attractive and pleasant. Moreover, this is not the only marketplace they see on their way; they also see the Kensington Market, or Piccadilly, or even the so-called Dung Market, that is, the Houses of Parliament, which give Guest the gist of their concept of marketplace. Maybe the most significant detail with respect to these marketplaces is that while others are depicted as very beautiful and pleasing representations of human-made architecture, Dung Market is depicted not so favourably, as it is one of the buildings belonging to the past that creates a total contrast to the well-decorated and peaceful appearance of the ones erected after the revolution. That is why, Dick says that since it is not so beautiful, the things sold there are not so beautiful like turnips and the like. What is worse however, as an antiparliamentarian and hence critical of the parliament, Morris transforms it into a "dung market" which is used

to store manure. For Frank C. Sharp, the use of the building of the government for such a purpose is “Morris’s most famous statement on parliamentary government” (396).

In addition to the clearing of the ugly buildings of the Victorian Era, perhaps the most significant of the renovations is that the land is totally cleared off all the ugly factories of the age, which actually harmed both the landscape with their grotesque appearance and also the environment, with respect to both air and water pollution. Instead of the noisy and grotesque factories of the previous age, in Nowhere there are what they term “Banded-workshops,” “where people collect who want to work together” (*NFN* 39). Unlike those old factories however, in which machines were used, in these Banded workshops it is human beings that gather to be involved in any kind of pleasurable craftsmanship that they wish. As Dick states in this respect, “folk collect in these Banded-workshops to do hand-work in which working together is necessary or convenient” (*NFN* 40). Perhaps the most significant aspect of these Banded shops is that there is no smoke coming out of their chimneys, because they are not mechanic places where machines dominate the whole realm. Additionally, both its inside and outside are depicted as plain: “It’s a nice place inside, though as plain as you see outside” (*NFN* 40). These Banded-workshops are actually the embodiment of what Morris suggests as Socialist factories in his essay “A Factory as It Might Be.” Morris’s factory as he proposes is in “a pleasant place [...] for all the country is in itself pleasant, or is capable of being made pleasant with very little pains and forethought” (647). What is more, his factory must be situated “amidst gardens as beautiful (climate apart) as those of Alcinoüs, since there is no need of stinting it of ground, profit rents being a thing of the past, and the labour on such gardens is like enough to be purely voluntary, as it is not easy to see the day when 75 out of every 100 people will not take delight in the pleasantest and most innocent of all occupations” (“A Factory” 647). Located in such a pleasant realm, Morris’s factory “must make no sordid litter, befoul water, nor poison the air with the smoke” (“A Factory” 648), and must have an aesthetic dimension, as well, as opposed to the grotesque and ugly factories of the Victorian Age. Hence, Morris states:

it is usually supposed that they must of necessity be ugly, and truly they are almost always at present mere nightmares; but it is, I must assert, by no means necessary

that they should be ugly, nay, there would be no serious difficulty in making them beautiful, as every building might be which serves its purpose duly, which is built generously as regards material, and which is built with pleasure by the builders and designers; indeed, as things go, those nightmare buildings aforesaid sufficiently typify the work they are built for, and look what they are: temples of overcrowding and adulteration and over-work, of unrest, in a word; so it is not difficult to think of our factory buildings, showing on their outsides what they are for, reasonable and light work, cheered at every step by hope and pleasure. So in brief, our buildings will be beautiful with their own beauty of simplicity as workshops, not bedizened with tomfoolery as some are now, which do not any the more for that hide their repulsiveness. (“A Factory” 648)

As a result, these Banded-workshops are nice places, and they are not ugly and grotesque as the factories of the Victorian Era. The pleasing handwork produced here must give great pleasure not only to the maker, but also to the user. Such re-establishment of the factories in Nowhere in line with the basic principles of the Arts and Crafts with respect to both their functionality and aesthetic appearance, and socialism with respect to communal gathering of the citizens for the common good of the whole society is a manifest indication of how architectural spaces are embedded by competing ideologies of the dominant forces. To put it more clearly, while they are indeed shaped by the capitalist ideology of the industrial Victorian Era, these buildings are remoulded by Morris’s imaginary utopia so as to offer better opportunities for the whole society, not only for the capitalist factory owners.

Besides houses, marketplaces, and even Banded-workshops, the renovation of the human-made architecture is completed with the alteration of bridges. The “cast iron bridges” of the Victorian Era are replaced by “handsome oak and stone ones” (*NFN* 137) in Nowhere. With these new materials used in the construction, the bridges also become a part of the new landscape that is both pleasing and also in harmony with nature. What is more however, the reminiscences of industrialism with respect to the use of iron are totally wiped away, as they have a negative impact on the psychology of the citizens. Hence, Guest says: “I saw with pleasure that my old enemies the ‘Gothic’ cast-iron bridges had been replaced by handsome oak and stone ones” (*NFN* 137). These iron bridges are interestingly the products of the Gothic revival, and hence they are, for Morris, just poor imitations of the originals. Besides Morris however, these remarks also remind one of Ruskin’s deep hatred of the use of iron as a material and his critique of the Gothic revival, which he believed to kill the soul and glory of the original

architecture. With these bridges of Nowhere made of natural materials, in this respect, human-made architecture's oneness with nature is completed.

As most of the events unfold in the external setting, the descriptions regarding the buildings are actually about their appearance. At the other end of the strand with respect to the depiction of human-made architecture lies the description of their inner decoration. In the formation of a peaceful atmosphere, the inner design of the human-made architecture is as significant as the construction of the buildings, for only with the inner decoration, architecture is completed. Therefore, in his essay, "Gothic Architecture," Morris states that "[a] true architectural work rather is a building duly provided with all necessary furniture, decorated with all due ornament, according to the use, quality, and dignity of the building, from mere mouldings or abstract lines, to the great epical works of sculpture and painting, which, except as decorations of the nobler form of such buildings, cannot be produced at all" (475). The depiction of the halls of the guesthouses that Guest visits emerges as the embodiment of Morris's definition of a true architectural work. To begin with the spacious hall of the Hammersmith Guest House, where he eats lunch with Dick Hammond on his first day in Nowhere, Guest is predominantly occupied with the handsome decoration, gaily painted walls, and spaciousness of the hall, which make it a regal place for the inhabitants:

There were no windows on the side opposite to the river, but arches below leading into chambers, one of which showed a glimpse of a garden beyond, and above them *a long space of wall gaily painted* (in fresco, I thought) with similar subjects to those of the frieze outside; *everything about the place was handsome* and generously solid as to material; and though it was not very large (somewhat smaller than Crosby Hall perhaps), one felt in it that exhilarating *sense of space and freedom* which *satisfactory architecture* always gives to an unanxious man who is in the habit of using his eyes. (NFN 12, emphasis added)

Such depiction of the hall can be accepted as the epitome of perfect architecture with respect to Morris's taste, as it is "inclusive of [almost] all the serious arts" ("Gothic Architecture," 475) on the one hand, and rather simple, on the other. For Morris, "simplicity and solidity are the very first requisites of" architecture ("The Beauty of Life" 559). He especially focuses on the principle of simplicity, and in his essay "The Beauty of Life," states that: "All art starts from this simplicity; and the higher the art rises, the greater the simplicity. I have been speaking of the fittings of a dwelling-house-



[...]; but when you come to places which people want to make more specially beautiful because of the solemnity or dignity of their uses, they will be simpler still, and have little in them save the bare walls made as beautiful as may be” (562). The simplicity of architecture is also related with the sufficient use of furniture in its decoration, because too much furniture, especially unnecessary and ugly ones, will have a negative impact on the psychology of the dwellers. Therefore, with respect to the economical use of furniture Morris states that “if we want art to begin at home, as it must, we must clear our houses of troublesome superfluities that are for ever in our way: [...] if you want a golden rule that will fit everybody, this is it: ‘*Have nothing in your houses that you do not know to be useful, or believe to be beautiful*’” (“The Beauty” 561, emphasis original). He simply advises to avoid clutter. Therefore, not only in this guesthouse, but also in the others, there is actually nothing useless with respect to decoration. Hence while depicting the hall of the Bloomsbury Guest House, Guest claims that

[t]he furniture and general fittings of the hall were much of a piece with the table-gear, beautiful in form and highly ornamented, but without the commercial “finish” of the joiners and cabinet-makers of our time. Withal, there was a total absence of what the nineteenth century calls “comfort”— that is, stuffy inconvenience; so that, even apart from the delightful excitement of the day, I had never eaten my dinner so pleasantly before. (*NFN* 87)

Such functional use of everything in the decoration of buildings, as opposed to the Victorian habits, gives them pleasure, and Guest gets his share of this pleasant atmosphere. In much the same way, the manor house that Guest visits with Ellen when the novel nears its end, which is in fact Morris’s Kelmscott House in Oxfordshire, there is again reference to the sufficient use of furniture as part of its decoration: “there was but little furniture, and that only the most necessary, and of the simplest forms. The extravagant love of ornament [...] seemed here to have given place to the feeling that the house itself and its associations was the ornament of the country life amidst which it had been left stranded from old times, and that to re-ornament it would but take away its use as a piece of natural beauty” (*NFN* 174-5). Such a depiction of Kelmscott Manor with little furniture so as to keep its natural beauty is the best manifestation of Morris’s famous dictum as discussed above, for as Guest also claims, the manor itself is the ornament of the beautiful landscape.

Turning back to the depiction of the hall of the Hammersmith Guesthouse, another very significant Morrisian trait emerges: the significance of the sense of space and freedom. Albeit not so large, the hall gives a sense of space and freedom, which is achieved through the functional and economical use of furniture, and keeping the decoration as simple as possible. The positive impact of such big or spacious spaces are described by Morris as follows: “note how the huge free space satisfies and elevates you, even now when window and wall are stripped of ornament” (“The Beauty of Life” 563). As opposed to the dystopian architecture, where freedom of the individual is mostly restricted with their oppression in very limited architectural spaces as in the example of the canteen in Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* or the cell-like rooms in Forster’s “The Machine Stops,” in utopias especially freedom of the individual is supported by free and spacious architecture, which indeed generates a very relaxing atmosphere. Similar examples are also observed in the precursors such as *Utopia* and *The City of the Sun* in all of which, ordinary houses, – in Campanella’s case palaces, – are spacious enough to give individuals enough free space so that they can use as they wish.

While keeping the interior design simple, Morris also proposes to decorate it with aesthetic paintings, wallpapers, or even tapestries. He is actually in the belief that if these decorations on the walls are appealing and attractive to the observers and the users, they are not luxury, but a part of the design. Hence, in “The Beauty of Life,” he states: “you may hang your walls with tapestry instead of whitewash or paper; or you may cover them with mosaic, or have them frescoed by a great painter: all this is not luxury, if it be done for beauty’s sake, and not for show: it does not break our golden rule: *Have nothing in your houses which you do not know to be useful or believe to be beautiful*” (562, emphasis original). In this respect, the mythological paintings on the walls of one of the guesthouses in Bloomsbury similar to the depiction of the buildings on the walls and ceilings of Morris’s Red House, are manifestly an extension of Morris’s artistic ideology, which aims at pleasing the dwellers:

We went into the market-place which I had been in before, a thinnish stream of elegantly dressed people going in along with us. We turned into the cloister and came to a richly moulded and carved doorway, where a very pretty dark-haired young girl gave us each a beautiful bunch of summer flowers, and we entered a hall much bigger than that of the Hammersmith Guest House, more elaborate in its architecture and perhaps more beautiful. I found it difficult to keep my eyes off the

wall-pictures (for I thought it bad manners to stare at Clara all the time, though she was quite worth it). I saw at a glance that their subjects were taken from queer old-world myths and imaginations. (*NFN* 86)

The depiction of such minute details regarding the interior decoration of the houses is actually an indication of how Morris uses architecture to convey his ideology with respect to the application of the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement on architecture to please the dwellers.

Besides human-made architecture, human-designed landscape is also significant with respect to the formation of this nice atmosphere. Perhaps the most significant distinction of human-designed landscape from human-made architecture is that, while the latter is totally planned and constructed by human beings, the former is based on the development or preservation of the physical environment, and hence consists of forests and woods in the whole land. One significant point is that gardens are part of the human-made architecture not that of the human-designed landscape, for they are specifically constructed around the houses. Claiming that “houses should by their obvious decency and order be ornaments to Nature, not disfigurements of it” (“How We Live” 583), Morris actually paid attention to the garden, and considered it “inseparable from the house and rejecting the formality of High Victorian fashion, he drew inspiration from medieval and Tudor gardens” (Mabb 227). All the houses are therefore surrounded by gardens in Nowhere. Besides gardens surrounding houses, there are also lots of woods and forests, which are naturally there but widely planned and controlled by human beings. Consequently, the green landscape in Nowhere is planned and developed by human beings but in a natural manner. Therefore, while examining the contribution of architecture and landscape on the psychology of the characters, exploring the positive impact of the woods and forests will be much helpful.

At this juncture, the parks movement in the nineteenth century and the establishment of the first public parks not only in Britain but also in continental Europe and North America emerge as an important case in point, for Morris seems to be influenced by this movement, the aim of which communicates well with his utopian ideal. The need for open space or the public parks in the nineteenth century was born as a result of the negative effects of the Industrial Revolution, primarily with respect to “the rapid and

unplanned proliferation of urban dwellings across the country” (Taylor, “Urban Public Parks” 202). As there were the problems of slum settlement, poor housing, and overcrowding due to a move from the rural environments to the city centres, both the middle class and the newly arrived working class needed a space for medical, moral and even aesthetic reasons, and these spaces were the parks.

Initially royal or private parks such as St. James’s Park, Hyde Park, Green Park, Kensington Gardens and Regent’s Park were rendered public in the nineteenth century (Taylor, “Urban Public Parks” 201-202). Over time, new public parks funded by municipalities were opened. Birkenhead Park, Liverpool, designed by Joseph Paxton and opened in 1847 is “the world’s first public park in the sense that its development was authorized by an Act of Parliament (Birkenhead’s Second Improvement Act of 11843); it required the use of considerable public funds [...] and it was designed explicitly and solely for public use” (Lee and Tucker 65). Especially with these public parks, which were accepted to be *rus in urbe*, that is, the countryside in the city, people were provided with airy and spacious green sites where they could socialise and do exercise. Nan Hesse Dreher summarises the motives for the opening of public parks as “concerns for improving public health,” “moral standards,” “urban aesthetics,” and “economic development” (28). To begin with the medical reasons, referred to as the “lungs” of the city (Jordan 85; Malchow 102), public parks offered fresh air, and sunlight and hence were seen as a solution for “filth” produced by inefficient sanitary systems (Clark 30), “periodic outbreaks of epidemics” (Clark 31), and cholera epidemics. Morally speaking, as H. L. Malchow also argues, “the public parks reformed by providing an alternative to public house amusements and bringing the poor into visual contact with the respectable bourgeoisie on the park promenade” (99). This is actually a reciprocal solution for both parts in that the upper classes who saw the working class “as a threat to their refined living conditions” (Taylor, “Urban Public Parks” 207) had the chance of teaching their so-called refined ways of life to the uneducated working class when they intermingled in the public parks. In this respect, parks were very useful for the latter, for they were actually deprived of all the opportunities of the cities albeit living there. What is more, these parks provided a space for exercise and functioned as “recreational sites” (Malchow 102), and prevented people

from going to the pubs (Dreher 1). Consequently, with all these functions, “[p]ublic parks were considered to be an answer to most of the ills of the times” (Clark 31).

Morris actually seems to have benefited from this concept of the public park for its healing and edifying aspects by making such green spaces a constant and indispensable part of the whole landscape. The human-designed landscape is somehow equivalent of these public parks, and used by Morris as part of his ideology in the portrayal of his utopia. In this respect, as Tony Pinkney aptly puts it, the book is an “open-air text,” therefore focusing on the green landscape is noteworthy:

*News from Nowhere* is in many ways a memorably open-air text, with its early morning plunge into the Thames, its leisurely journey by horse and cart through a leafy, transformed London, and its long, strenuous, 120-mile journey by rowing-boat up the river from Hammersmith to Kelmscott. The utopian bodies the book presents to us are accordingly well-honed, boundlessly energetic, and often sun-burnt with the vigorous outdoor existence they lead – rowing, mowing, camping and carving being its most emphasised manifestations. (“*News from Nowhere*” 404)

Obviously, architecture’s harmony with nature is a reassuring feeling, and makes the characters happy. However, another significant point is the enchanting pure nature of Nowhere that gives joy to them. When he wakes up in Nowhere, what Guest observes is that “the entire country transformed into an idyllic garden, a communist paradise where all are healthy and happy, where all work is virtuous and a source of pleasure, and where the environmentally and morally corrupting influences of industrial capitalism have been eliminated” (Kent 72). Since they are respectful to nature, and there is no trace of industrialism any longer; the air, water, and environment are all very clean and clear, and hence they really enjoy what nature provides them with. In this paradise-like world, which is specifically designed, humans actually have found their original place as part of nature, not its master. Such holistic view of nature, as opposed to the anthropocentric world-view, which is the root cause of all the environmental degradations, prepares a peaceful atmosphere so that the citizens can have a happy life. The bonny, well-knit, and sun-burnt bodies of the characters in Nowhere are given as an extension of the positive effect of the human-designed landscape on them, because they are very close to nature and can manage to be one with it. Like the public parks, this human-designed landscape provides an opportunity to exercise as part of their daily

activities. Life is not all about work, but leisure is also essential for everyone. Since the Victorian life is primarily based on work, Morris seems to be reversing this fact by providing his utopian characters with leisure as well as pleasure. This leisure is derived mostly from being one with nature.

Waking up in Nowhere, what Guest first realises is actually a sort of welcome by the pleasing weather of this utopian land, which is crystal clear. In much the same way, the second thing that shocks him is the clarity of the Thames, which is full of salmon. Hence as Kathleen Maloney also posits, “[t]he most significant change in the future is the renewed environment” (47). As Béatrice Laurent also puts it, nature is restored to its former dignity:

In this moralised landscape, bountiful Mother Nature, who during the Industrial Revolution had been abused by wicked men, has been restored to her former dignity. The personification of Nature places her relationship with humanity in the perspective of gender, generational and class oppression. Morris the Romantic insists on the organic link between Nature and humanity, whilst Morris the Marxist stresses the egalitarian ethos, which does not tolerate the domination of one class over the other. Both point to the necessary and natural interrelation of humanity and nature, and to the absurdity of ‘looking upon everything, except mankind, animate and inanimate – “nature”, as people used to call it – as one thing, and mankind as another’ which leads to the enslavement of nature: ‘it was natural to people thinking in this way, that they should try to make “nature” their slave, since they thought “nature” was something outside them.’ (57)

The result of such restoration of nature is actually a peaceful landscape, where the boundaries between city and country are blurred, because even in the city centre people are living among the woods and forests along with the music of birds and fresh scents of flowers and trees. Even the British Museum and Piccadilly, which are in the city centre, are among trees in the woods. Morris’s utopian architectural space actually breaks down “the rigid dualism of city and country” (Pinkney, “Cycling in Nowhere” 30), and hence people benefiting from the pros of the city can simultaneously get the benefits of the country life, as well.

Making the most of this advantageous landscape, the Nowherians enjoy fully what nature offers them. Perhaps as the reflection of Morris’s childhood memories in Epping Forest, small children coming from all parts of London, for example, gather in the

Kensington woods on their own to have parties, and to play in the woods during the summer. These children get some practical knowledge here about swimming, and cooking; and what is more, they “get to notice the wild creatures” (*NFN* 24). To put it more clearly, they are not confined to closed realms to be taught theoretical knowledge as part of formal schooling, because they are in the belief that “the less they stew inside houses the better for them” (*NFN* 24). In such an age, which is notorious for the mistreatment of children under very poor conditions for very long hours in the coalmines and factory chimneys, Morris’s specific landscape creates a stark opposite. Evoking Morris’s remark that “every child should be able to play in a garden close to the place his parents live” (“How We Live” 583), such function of the forests and woods in *Nowhere* can be taken as the extension of the edifying aim of the public parks embodied in Morris’s utopian landscape.

Obviously, it is not only small children but also adults that enjoy spending time in the forests, and hence, Dick claims: “I must tell you that many grown people will go to live in the forests through the summer; though they for the most part go to the bigger ones, like Windsor, or the Forest of Dean, or the northern wastes. Apart from the other pleasures of it, it gives them a little rough work” (*NFN* 24). In the garden of Hampton Court, for example, there are numerous tents, adults as well as children are obviously enjoying life outdoors in the physical environment: “many gay tents with men, women, and children round about them. As it seemed, this pleasure-loving people were fond of tent-life, with all its inconveniences, which, indeed, they turned into pleasure also” (*NFN* 126).

Evidently, there is a new world order in *Nowhere*, in which human domination of nature is abolished, and hence “their actions are governed by an ecological consciousness, the natural world begins in turn to shape them” (Kent 73). Such ecological consciousness, needless to say, has a profound role in the physical and psychological wellbeing of the *Nowherians*. This atmosphere of happiness in this utopian land lies in Morris’s celebration of the harmonious intertwinement of human-made and human-designed architecture in *Nowhere*. As an intruder on this paradise-like place, where the reminiscences of the industrial past are totally erased, Guest is aware of the stark

difference between past and present, and wonders how they have handled the slums, and asks about it to old Hammond. Hammond, perhaps the only one in Nowhere who is aware of the drastic change on the landscape since the Victorian Era, states that there is “[n]ot an inch” of them, and he claims that they commemorate “The Clearing of Misery, as it is called” on May-day (*NFN* 57). Evidently old Hammond like the rest of the population is very happy for the clearance of the slums, for they cannot tolerate seeing any dehumanising architectural structure in their paradise-like country. However, the vehemence of the difference between past and present can be best appreciated by Guest, as he was a part of the Victorian Age just yesterday. Early in the morning, hence, Guest is surprised by these drastic changes in the landscape, and he muses on it as follows:

For though there was a bridge across the stream and houses on its banks, how all was changed from last night! The soap-works with their smoke-vomiting chimneys were gone; the engineer’s works gone; the lead-works gone; and no sound of rivetting and hammering came down the west wind from Thorneycroft’s. Then the bridge! I had perhaps dreamed of such a bridge, but never seen such an one out of an illuminated manuscript; for not even the Ponte Vecchio at Florence came anywhere near it. It was of stone arches, splendidly solid, and as graceful as they were strong; high enough also to let ordinary river traffic through easily. Over the parapet showed quaint and fanciful little buildings, which I supposed to be booths or shops, beset with painted and gilded vanes and spirelets. The stone was a little weathered, but showed no marks of the grimy sootiness which I was used to on every London building more than a year old. In short, to me a wonder of a bridge. (*NFN* 7-8)

Similar psychological effects of architecture and landscape on human psychology might be better understood with reference to the first chapter of the book, in which there is a short description of how discontented people seem on the train:

[H]aving said good-night very amicably, [Guest] took his way home by himself to a western suburb, using the means of travelling which civilisation has forced upon us like a habit. As he sat in that vapour-bath of hurried and discontented humanity, a carriage of the underground railway, he, like others, stewed discontentedly, while in self-reproachful mood he turned over the many excellent and conclusive arguments which, though they lay at his fingers’ ends, he had forgotten in the just past discussion. But this frame of mind he was so used to, that it didn’t last him long, and after a brief discomfort, caused by disgust with himself for having lost his temper (which he was also well used to), he found himself musing on the subject-matter of discussion, but still discontentedly and unhappily. (*NFN* 3)

The industrial landscape of the late Victorian Era is actually so different from the agrarian land of Nowhere that the difference between the moods of people can be



clearly observed. On the train, it is not only Guest himself that is discontented but also everybody else. In their unhappiness the burden of the industrial landscape and atmosphere obviously plays a major role.

Despite Morris's aim in delineating a user-friendly environment for the citizens of this utopian land, one cannot help agreeing with Sargent's claim that utopias are not perfect, but better than the present, for albeit egalitarian in lots of ways, women are still pushed to the periphery in *Nowhere*. Like other key utopias discussed in the Introduction, almost the whole utopian land is regulated in a flawless way but for the male characters. Although there is no specific sex division of labour in *Nowhere*, and women can also engage in manual labour if they wish, the women in this utopian land are mostly allocated the domestic tasks. The meals in the guesthouses, for example, are prepared and served by beautiful and self-confident young women, who are portrayed to be rather content with the roles attributed to them. In this respect, although not so strictly regulated as in More's *Utopia*, in *News from Nowhere*, one can also talk about gendered architecture. As it has been repeated time and again, no architecture is neutral; it is in one way or another loaded with the dominant ideology. In this specific case, albeit well intentioned, Morris offers his male-centric ideology, and delineates his utopia from this perspective. Hence, the female characters in this utopia are attributed domestic roles, and are mostly confined into domestic spheres. Yet still, their case is much better than many other utopias with respect to the space assigned to women.

In conclusion, the so-called peaceful atmosphere of the socialist society of *Nowhere*, which is primarily based on the work-pleasure principle,<sup>20</sup> is created by means of a functional and balanced use of human-made architecture and human-designed landscape. In the formation of such an ideal land, Morris borrows a lot from the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, and enmeshes them with his socialist views and environmentalism. Human-made architecture, with its average size and natural fabric, and its location among gardens and trees is the primary agent of this happiness.

---

<sup>20</sup> As such, old Hammond, in a rather humorous way, claims that "Thou shalt not steal, had to be translated into, Thou shalt work in order to live happily" (*NFN* 70), because for them, "happiness without happy daily work is impossible" (*NFN* 80).

Architecture is very functional, simple, and useful for its inhabitants. Therefore, it does not dominate or suppress their psychology with its gigantic size, but gives them satisfaction. Similarly, human-designed landscape also emerges as significant as the former, for it is this lush landscape that lays the ground for the construction of such functional buildings. What Morris showcases here is therefore the celebration of the unity of the human-made architecture and human-designed landscape to generate such a peaceful atmosphere. Exploring the limits of the functional use of architecture in utopias, Morris actually presents it as the principal element that sets the scene for happiness. Such functional use of architecture in the book evidently shows that in utopias the role of architecture is significant, and architecture is never neutral but always imbued with the ideologies of the ones, who dominate it. Consequently, as Morris uses it to demonstrate the pleasing effect of his artistic and socialist ideology on the moods of the characters, architecture is used here as a means of happiness, but in dystopias as discussed in the following chapters, it is used as a means of oppression and manipulation of the characters.

## CHAPTER II

### THE ARCHITECTURE OF OPRESSION: GEORGE ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR*

The utopian manifestation of London in Morris's idyllic landscape is transformed by George Orwell into a war-torn urban landscape teeming with derelict and ruined buildings in his seminal dystopia *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.<sup>21</sup> Set in a dystopic future, namely in the fictional Oceania, one of the three super states controlling the world, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* explores the depths of a dehumanising world, in which individuals are suppressed by the manipulative Inner Party members through pervasive governmental surveillance, perpetual propaganda, and total control. The Party oppresses and manipulates individuals and society with a series of techniques such as revising and rewriting the historical truths to support its ideology, inventing a new language called *Newspeak* to support its discourse, with the widespread use of the posters of Big Brother, and continual surveillance, among many others. Besides these manipulative techniques, which dominate the psychological realm, the citizens are also controlled and oppressed by the use of monumental and monolithic architecture, manifesting in the form of enormous ministry buildings, which dwarf and dominate the citizens with their panoptic and phallic messages. As opposed to the monumental architecture of the Party, the war-torn landscape in which the citizens live are specifically left in ruins and teem with derelict buildings to instil a sense of helplessness to keep them under their control. Hence, Orwell uses architecture very functionally to show the manipulative and oppressive nature of the Party. In this respect, this chapter scrutinises the role of architecture and architectural psychology in totalitarian dystopias through the analysis of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

---

<sup>21</sup> In some of its editions, the title of the novel is also written as *1984*, but in this dissertation *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will be used.

Drawing heavily on the French philosopher Michel Foucault's (1926-1984) notion of disciplinary power which sheds light on the intricate relationship between space, power and knowledge, in the first part, it is argued that perhaps more than above-mentioned manipulative techniques, the citizens are manipulated and controlled by the manipulation of architecture, be it landscape, town planning or buildings themselves. As opposed to the war-torn landscape of Airstrip One, which is specifically left in ruins and decay, and further destroyed with frequent bombings, the Party manifests its authority, power and grandeur by erecting monumental ministry buildings that are scattered around the city as the most poignant and centrepiece edifices. Such use of monumental architecture at the centre of the city is a "strategy," as de Certeau would say, used by such totalitarian governments to exercise power and authority over the subordinate ones to intimidate them. The Party further reinforces this strategy by the manipulation of their inner spatial structures, which are at least as daunting as their external façades, and by contrasting their gargantuan mass with the low-rise, and decaying fabric of the architectural structure and landscape of the members of the Inner Party and the proles. In line with the role attributed to these monumental buildings with respect to power exercise, by borrowing Foucault's concept of Panopticism, it will also be argued that these pyramidal government buildings along with numerous other architectural structures and their specific details such as the alcove in Winston Smith's flat or the hidden *telescreen* behind the rosewood frame in the room above Mr Charrington's shop are used as a means of monitoring and control mechanism to keep the citizens disciplined so as not to rebel against the authority of the Party.

Not surprisingly, as Foucault also pithily reminds, if there is power exercise somewhere, there is also resistance, be it visible or invisible. Starting from this viewpoint of Foucault, and adopting the views of Michel de Certeau with respect to his notion of spatial everyday practices at the intersection of strategies and tactics, the second part focuses on Julia and Winston's spatial practices such as walking on the streets of the prole districts, hiring the room above Mr Charrington's shop, and exploration of the function of some ruined churches that connect them with their forgotten past. Although Julia and Winston's weak reaction to the domination of the Party by means of these

spatial practices turn these places from geometrical places to spaces of resistance, their attempt fails in the end, because the Party leaves no room for any manoeuvre.

Since George Orwell is generally pigeonholed as a “political writer” (Rossi and Rodden 1), who tried to interweave his art with his political views as a response to the tumultuous and unstable war atmosphere of his age, before an in-depth analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it will be much helpful to explore the intersections of his literary career and political views, which will provide a fruitful background to discuss the novel not only within the historical and socio-political context of its time, but also with respect to the writer’s personal history, which is imbued with numerous contradictory experiences at Eton, in Burma, Barcelona, London, and at the BBC. As this diverse background, comprising numerous different forces most of which contradictory though, made Eric Blair the political writer George Orwell, “it is necessary to see his life and work as a totality in order to understand the unusual combination of circumstances – in environment, psychology and temperament – which helped to shape him as an artist and mould his distinctive attitude of mind” (Hammond 27).

Even though he is mostly known as a novelist due to the success of his last work, two dystopian novels, namely, *Animal Farm* (1947) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and to a lesser extent with respect to his less significant earlier novels, which were written in the traditional manner, such as *Burmese Days* (1934), *A Clergyman’s Daughter* (1935), *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936), and *Coming Up for Air* (1939), George Orwell was definitely “far more than a novelist; he wrote essays, reportage, opinion columns, book reviews and even film reviews and poetry” (Rodden xi). However, for Valerie Meyers, he was indeed “primarily a journalist and essayist,” and “made his living as a shrewd and prolific book-reviewer, critic, broadcaster, political journalist and pamphleteer” (1). Orwell wrote columns and essays in some newspapers, and journals such as the *Tribune*, the *Observer* and the *Manchester Evening News*. What is more interesting however, when considered from an aesthetical angle, for Harold Bloom, he was actually a “far better essayist than a novelist” (1). With his essays, as Peter Davison also puts it, “he has been instrumental in broadening and redefining concepts of culture” (147). Despite such importance of his essays and columns however, the extraordinary success

of his above-mentioned dystopian novels, that is, his “political satires” (Cain 77), which have indeed secured Orwell’s “place in literary history,” has sadly “prevented us from gauging the full power and richness of the work he produced in the same decade in essays, newspaper columns, review articles and book reviews” (Cain 77). Worse still however, in addition to his essays and columns, Orwell’s non-fictional works, such as *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933), *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937), and *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), all of which actually sold very few copies in his lifetime, and were not so much appreciated, have actually been overshadowed by the success of these dystopian novels, and hence have mostly been disregarded. Yet still, despite the abyss between his fictional and nonfictional corpus with respect to their popularity and appreciation by their readers, Orwell’s manifest political stance emerges as a common point of intersection.

In his noteworthy essay “Why I Write?,” while explaining his motivation for becoming a writer, which was actually his childhood dream, dating back to the age of five or six, Orwell unveils the reasons for becoming a politically-oriented writer. For him, in addition to earning money to survive, “there are four motives for writing, at any rate for writing prose. They exist in different degrees in every writer, and in any one writer the proportions will vary from time to time, according to the *atmosphere* in which he is living” (3, emphasis added). These four motives are 1) “sheer egoism,” which is directly related with the “[d]esire to seem clever, to be talked about, to be remembered after death, to get your own back on grown-ups who snubbed you in childhood, etc;” 2) “aesthetic enthusiasm,” which stands for “[p]erception of beauty in the external world;” 3) “historical impulse” that seeks to search and “find out true fact and store them up for the use of posterity,” and 4) “political purpose,” which is directly related with the “[d]esire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter other people’s idea of the kind of society that they should strive after” (“Why I Write?” 3-4). Believing that “no book is genuinely free from political bias” (“Why I Write?” 4), Orwell posits that for a writer living at such a tumultuous age like his own, no writer has the chance of becoming apolitical. In much the same way, in another essay entitled “The Prevention of Literature,” he claims that “[t]here is no such thing as genuinely non-political literature, and least of all in an age like our own, when fears, hatreds, and loyalties of a

directly political kind are near to the surface of everyone's consciousness" (65, emphasis added). Hence, "the continuous war atmosphere" of his chaotic age actually had a profound impact not only on the ordinary citizens but also on the writers ("The Prevention" 60). The troublesome years of both World Wars, the rise of totalitarian dictatorships in Europe and beyond, and Britain's imperial engagements in the Indian subcontinent as Orwell experienced, all played a worthy role in the formation and development of his political stance, and in the making of George Orwell a political writer. That is why, it is necessary to explore briefly his extraordinary experiences in different parts of the world from his birth to death, to better appreciate the development and maturation of Orwell's political orientation.

Born as Eric Blair "at Motihari in Bengal on 25 June 1903" (Hammond 4), George Orwell was the middle child of the Blair family, who had two daughters, one older and the other younger than him. His father Richard Blair was "a minor colonial official" in India (Meyers 3). He served as "an official in the Opium Department of the Government of India, and served in that Department from the age of eighteen (1875) until his retirement from the service in 1912" (Hammond 4). His mother Ida Mabel Limouzin had lived since her early ages in Burma, where the French Limouzins "had extensive business interests" (Hammond 4). As a matter of fact, in the words of John Rossi, "Orwell's roots were linked to the British Empire" with respect to his father's "administrative position in the Opium Department of the Indian Civil Service," and due to his mother's descent from "a French commercial family in Burma" (88). Despite his roots in the Indian subcontinent however, Orwell indeed was brought up in England (Rossi 88), as her mother brought him to England when he was only one year old. Nevertheless, the family's connection with the Empire is worthy of note, for Eric Blair's sense of belonging to the continent, and his family's choice of an imperial post for their son, besides revealing the ills of British imperialism, also unearths Orwell's hatred of authority.

The roots of this genuine hatred of authority go back to Eric's early years at Eton, where he had a good education as a King's Scholar. After spending his whole five years except for holidays at St Cyprian's, a boarding school in Eastbourne, between the years 1911

and 1916, and spending a few months at Wellington in 1917, Eric entered Eton as a King's Scholar (Hammond 10). As a King's Scholar, "Blair belonged to an elite within an elite, with a justifiable sense of intellectual superiority vis-a-vis other Etonians" (Rose 32), and had some privileges such as being "exempt from tuition fees," among many others (Rose 32). Especially when compared with the unpleasant experiences that he had at St Cyprian's, his experiences at Eton were much more positive (Rossi and Rodden 1). Although Orwell's political views were "largely unformed during his time at Eton," one thing was for sure: "he flirted with socialism like most young men," and "rebelled against all forms of authority" (Rossi and Rodden 2).

This hatred of authority that Orwell developed at such an early age at Eton was further reinforced in Burma while working as a police officer in the British Imperial Police. His Burma venture began soon after his graduation from Eton in 1921, when he chose a career in the Indian Imperial Police in the Indian Civil Service, instead of pursuing his career as a writer as he had always dreamt of, or pursuing a university degree at Cambridge or Oxford universities like other Etonians. While for Meyers, "[h]e had not worked hard enough to win a scholarship to Oxford or Cambridge, and it would have taken more time and money to establish him in a profession" (6), this choice, for J. R. Hammond, had actually something to do with the choice of his parents, which was actually a "family tradition," for his "grandfather had served in India, his father had served there for many years, and his mother's family were teak merchants in Burma" (13). Besides his parents' choice however, Orwell's own individual motivation such as his wish to go out "East in the service of the empire, [...] [most probably] based on his boyhood reading of Kipling," and his feeling of "a sense of kinship with that vast continent" (Hammond 13), also brought about this choice.

Unlike his initial expectations and romantic yearnings for heroism however, Orwell "witnessed imperialism at its worst, saw hangings, floggings and filthy prisons, was forced to assert a superiority over the Burmese which he never really felt" (Woodcock 237). This profession that Orwell found "unsuitable" for himself actually increased his "natural hatred of authority," made him "for the first time fully aware of the existence of the working classes," and gave him "some understanding of the nature of



imperialism” (“Why I Write?” 4). Disillusioned with what he found in Burma, “Orwell’s naive rebellion against authority [...] [took] on a bitterly anti-imperial atmosphere” (Rossi and Rodden 2). Due to his manifest hatred of British imperialism, “when he went on leave in 1927 he decided not to return, and became steadfastly anti-imperialist” (Meyers 7). Although these troublesome years in Burma further reinforced Orwell’s hatred of authority in general, and the ills of imperialism in particular, “these experiences were not enough to give [...] [him] an accurate political orientation” (“Why I Write?” 4); and hence, “[h]is political ideas remained unformed” (Rossi and Rodden 3).

Indeed, Orwell’s criticism was directed not only at the ills of British imperialism but also at all other forms of inequalities between classes, born as a result of the disruption of egalitarianism. Therefore, after spending a few weeks at the house of his parents, who were not actually happy with his resignation from the Indian Civil Service, Orwell left them, both to explore the living standards of the underclasses, the oppressed groups, and also to become a writer. To this end, after spending a period of time in the poorest parts of London and Paris among vagrants and some marginalised others, he delineated his experiences in his book *Down and Out in Paris and London*, which came out in 1933 with the penname George Orwell. Besides writing the book however, during this period, “he was continuing his descents among the tramps of London and Kent, changing his clothes at the homes of friends and re-emerging into civilisation after expeditions of days or even weeks at a time” (Hammond 17), and “he went tramping and once went hop-picking in Kent” (Meyers 8) so as to learn “how institutions for the poor, such as hostels, prisons, lodging-houses and hospitals, worked,” and to understand “his own background better” (Meyers 8). These experiences among such oppressed groups and their record in the book actually contributed to the better development of Orwell’s socialist viewpoint. Victor Gollancz, his “left-wing publisher” (Meyers 9), continued to work with Orwell for the publication of his next book, as well. To this end, “[i]n January 1936 Orwell was commissioned by Victor Gollancz to make a study of poverty and unemployment in the North of England: a proposal that was to culminate in one of his most celebrated works of reportage, *The Road to Wigan Pier*” (Hammond 21). This nonfictional work was actually “a major step toward socialism” (Rossi and

Rodden 5), for he presented socialism as an answer to England's problems. Yet still, as he was not happy with the way it was practiced in England, he claimed that socialism failed to attract the masses, as socialists "were isolated from the working classes, and what is worse, looked down their noses at them" (Rossi and Rodden 4). What is more however, for him, unlike these working-class people who had "a real culture," "socialism attracted a strange type of intellectual cut off from the people – in a celebrated passage he labelled them an unhealthy amalgam of fruit juice drinkers, nature cure quacks and nudists" (Rossi and Rodden 4). Due to "Orwell's emphasis on egalitarianism," which actually "separated him from many of his fellow socialists," his socialism still remained an "eccentric" one (Rossi and Rodden 5). In effect, as Carl Freedman also puts it, "[f]rom the time that he had any clear and articulate political ideas until his death, Orwell considered himself a socialist" (615-6). However, he described himself as "a democratic socialist" so as to "distance himself, and indeed socialism itself, from the various totalitarian tendencies that claimed, spuriously in his view, to be socialist" (Williams 100).

Besides his explorations of the conditions of the poor and marginalised groups however, the rise of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin as totalitarian dictators in Germany, Italy and Russia respectively, and more significantly, Orwell's own observation of the disruption of the socialist ideology in the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), which was fought between the supporters of communism and fascism, contributed to the development of his socialism. During Spain's Civil War, Orwell fought against Fascists as a militiaman in the Aragon and Huesca fronts on the side of the POUM, that is, Workers' Party of Marxist Unification, which was actually a "Trotskyist group [...] loosely affiliated with the British Independent Labour Party (ILP)" (Meyers 15). During this war, Orwell was disillusioned with the corruption of socialist ideals due to its communist practice; and furthermore, his thoughts regarding socialism were shattered with the corruption of power in the hands of communist leaders, for "his comrades in the POUM were labelled as objectively pro-fascist and then ruthlessly purged" (Rossi and Rodden 5). Therefore as John Rossi and John Rodden further argue, "[a]mong the lasting impressions Orwell took from his time in Spain was that true socialism was possible, but the Communists would destroy any left wing forces they could not control" (5). Hence as George

Woodcock claims, Spain emerged as “[a] second turning point in his career” (239). As Orwell also argued, especially after the Spanish Civil War, he knew exactly where he stood, and “[e]very line of serious work” that he produced from 1936 onwards were “written, directly, or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic Socialism” (“Why I Write?” 5-6).

His *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), Orwell’s memoir about the Spanish Civil War that he wrote soon after his return, actually showcases his disillusionment with the collapse of his ideals due to “communist perfidy” (Rossi and Rodden 6). Hence, in the words of Meyers, “the betrayal of the decent, ordinary man by the Communists, who replace the old feudal government with one even more oppressive; and the similarities, in practice, between Fascist dictatorships and Communist regimes” emerge as two prominent themes of this book (17). Especially after the Spanish Civil War, Orwell’s distrust of communism “has become his best-known single characteristic” (Woodcock 236). After this war, his “writing became more overtly political,” and Orwell himself transformed into “a full-blown socialist” (Rossi 90). Hence, for Hammond, “his journey to the coal mining areas of the North, and his participation as a militiaman in the Spanish Civil War – were of decisive importance in the making of George Orwell” (22).

After the Spanish Civil War, Orwell joined the British Labour Party in 1938; however, with the outbreak of the Second World War (1939-1945), he left it, for it “remained committed to pacifism” (Rossi 92). As he was not accepted to the military due to his health problems based on his tuberculosis, Orwell could not take active part in the war, but still managed to get involved in politics. Unlike the majority of the leftists, he linked socialism with patriotism, as “[h]e saw no contradiction between socialism and patriotism” (Rossi and Rodden 7). For Rossi and Rodden, in this respect, “[t]he war also matured Orwell’s socialism” (7).

In August 1941, he “became an official of the BBC in their Indian service” (Woodcock 240) “as a full-time talks assistant and later producer, broadcasting cultural and political programmes to India” (Meyers 17). After working there for two years however, he “became bored and frustrated with what he considered ineffectual propaganda and

resigned in late 1943” (Meyers 19). Just two months after his resignation from the post at the BBC, Orwell got affiliated with the *Tribune*, “a weekly Socialist newspaper, serving as its literary editor and writing for it a weekly ‘personal’ column; he wrote eighty of these columns from December 1943 to April 1947” (Cain 78). His experiences at the BBC during the war are also important, for they contributed to Orwell’s dislike of governmental oppression based on his own experience of censorship there. In depicting the hellish atmosphere of the totalitarian society in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Orwell evidently borrowed a lot from his own experiences at the BBC with respect to the manipulation and censorship of knowledge and communication in the Ministry of Information situated at the Senate House during the war, because his position at the BBC, as Meyers also puts it, “gave him insight into the dangers of government control of information, and the power of mass media to limit thought and debase culture” (123). Consequently, drawing heavily from his experiences not only with respect to the rise of totalitarian dictatorships, disruption of socialist ideals, and the oppressive burden of any authoritarian system, but also through his own experiences of governmental censorship of information and media due to his job at the BBC, Orwell could depict such an appallingly frightening society. Indeed, Actually it is not only the governmental censorship of information that Orwell adopts from his experiences at the BBC, but also some others such as “[t]he Ministry of Truth, some elements of Newspeak, and the ghastly cafeteria” (Rossi and Rodden 8).

Considering all of these negative experiences, as Orwell also believed the subject matter of a writer is “determined by the age he lives in” especially at such “tumultuous, revolutionary ages like” his own (“Why I Write?” 3), one can argue that if he had not been exposed to such troubling times of wars, and had lived “[i]n a peaceful age,” he “might have written ornate or merely descriptive books, and might have remained almost unaware of [...] [his] political loyalties” (“Why I Write?” 4). However, as he went through all of these troubling experiences in those hard times, he could not actually escape from being a political writer. Yet still, he did not write merely about politics, but tried to bring political writing into dialogue with art, because for him the aesthetic and the political must meet and intermingle. Hence, especially after the Spanish Civil War, his primary aim was “to make political writing into an art” (“Why I

Write?” 5-6). *Animal Farm* is actually the first book in which Orwell fused his “political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole” (“Why I Write?” 7). Definitely a milestone in his career in becoming a political writer, *Animal Farm* not only introduced his political art, but also introduced him to “a far wider audience” (Dickstein 133), as his previous work had mostly been published in small journals. The second book written with this consciousness is evidently his last novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Despite their numerous differences however, these two dystopias, for Morris Dickstein, have a common point of intersection as being “tracts against totalitarianism,” and *Animal Farm* as the latter’s “light-handed predecessor” (135).

With respect to the reputation of these last two novels, Orwell seems to have succeeded in his effort in bringing politics and art together. Perhaps “the greatest political writer in English during the twentieth century” (Rodden xi), Orwell’s “public reputation far exceeds that of any other writer of his generation, and indeed of any other political writer of the twentieth century” (Rodden x). What is more significant however, “[t]he world fame of George Orwell is due to a combination of high esteem from intellectuals and immense popularity with the general reading public” (Rodden xi). That is to say, he managed to appeal to the ordinary citizens as well, not only to academics or intellectuals.

*Nineteen Eighty-Four*, as the best manifestation of Orwell’s serious work produced with deep political motives, was written to criticise the dehumanising and oppressive effects of totalitarian societies on individuals, and hence “[f]or the form of his novel, Orwell drew on the rich satiric tradition of English utopian fiction” (Meyers 116), in which setting in general and architecture in particular have an important role as a convention. Especially through the functional use and depiction of deteriorating architecture, ruined structures, city plans, and landscapes, the unfavourable conditions of the totalitarian dystopias are further reinforced. With the help of these spatial arrangements, dystopia writers actually manage to show that corruptive and domineering governmental powers and/or misleading technological developments oppress and manipulate subordinate groups for their vested interests. Still, Orwell actually goes beyond the explorations of architecture and architectural spaces as a medium of convention, and uses them as a

means to his own ends: to delineate his criticism of the domineering ideology of the corrupt government, which has actually penetrated into architecture.

As opposed to Morris's dream-like rural depiction of London in *News from Nowhere*, London depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is an urban wasteland, where derelict buildings, bombed landscapes, and decaying sites replace the well-built, ornate, orderly and user-friendly architecture and landscape of *Nowhere*. As Claeys puts it, dystopias delineate a darker world, where "ruin, death, destruction, [...] cataclysm, war, lawlessness, disorder, pain, and suffering" pervade, and hence "derelict buildings, submerged monuments, decaying cities, wastelands, [and] the rubble of collapsed civilizations" (*Dystopia 3*) replace the utopian architecture and setting of the peaceful utopias. The delineation of the landscape in such ruin and decay is a part of the Party's strategy to exert power over the citizens so as to intimidate them by affecting their psychology in a negative way. Although taken to the extremes as a characteristic of dystopia as a genre, the nightmarish world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the exact replica of post-war London, with all the negative consequences of both of the World Wars with respect to ruin, decay, and poverty that they caused. Julian Symons, a contemporary of Orwell, sheds light on the explicit parallels between post-war English society and the society of Oceania as follows:

The picture of society in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has an awful plausibility which is not present in other modern projections of our future. In some ways life does not differ very much from the life we live to-day. The pannikin of pinkish-grey stew, the hunk of bread and cube of cheese, the mug of milkless Victory coffee with its accompanying saccharine tablet—that is the kind of meal we very well remember; and the pleasures of recognition are roused, too, by the description of Victory gin (reserved for the privileged—the 'proles' drink beer), which has 'a sickly oily smell, as of Chinese rice-spirit' and gives to those who drink it 'the sensation of being hit on the back of the head with a rubber club.' (253)

With all these problems, rationing, exploding bombs in the quarters of the proles, and with many more, what is depicted in the novel is a vivid description of "the immediate postwar period" (Crick 146). Orwell's borrowings from the real life events are specifically important with respect to the points that he wanted to draw attention, because he wrote it as a cautionary tale to warn people against the suppressive and manipulative nature of totalitarianism on individuals, but not as prophesying as some

critics argued. For Meyers, “Orwell describes the worst possible ‘state of England’ to shock his audience into imagining what it would be like to live under a totalitarian government, and to urge them to preserve their traditional rights to privacy, freedom and obedience to the rule of law” (115). Hence, in the words of Bernard Crick, “it is not a prophecy, it is plainly a satire” (146-7). This satire attains its effective function by means of the functional use of the psychology of architecture along with other oppressive techniques mentioned above.

What contributes to the depressing atmosphere of this ruinous landscape is the lack of natural realms. As opposed to Nowhere, where human-made architecture and human-designed landscape present a perfect harmony of tranquillity, there is no trace of nature in Oceania except for the fields, in which Julia and Winston meet for the first time. Having sexual intercourse in the fields with the assumption that the fields are free from the all-seeing eyes of the Party, the couple is deceived, because it is later revealed that the hidden mikes there gave them away. That is why, the only natural realm in the novel does not go beyond creating a false hope. At this juncture, the Golden Country that Winston sees in his dreams time and again emerges as another landscape of false hope, albeit an unreal one. Disconnected from his past by the manipulative techniques of the Party, as it both rewrites history perpetually by rectifying all official documents and destroying old buildings, and suffocated in the concrete and ruined landscape, Winston escapes to the Golden Country to reconnect with his mother and baby sister that he barely remembers. As a matter of fact, Winston is disillusioned, for unlike his misperception that the door of Room 101 in the Ministry of Love opens to the Golden Country, it emerges as a notorious prison of torture, in which he encounters his biggest fear, and hence betrays Julia. Such manipulation of the characters by means of a kind of imprisonment into only the built environment is a feature of dystopia that might be traced in some other examples such as Zamyatin’s *We*, Huxley’s *Brave New World*, Forster’s “The Machine Stops,” and Ballard’s *High-Rise*. The glass city of the One State in *We* is surrounded by the Green Wall, which separates them from nature and the so-called “savages” living there. Likewise, in *Brave New World*, civilisation is associated with sterility, and they prefer to live away from the natural landscape, and keeping it only as a “savage reservation.” In “The Machine Stops,” as they are living in an

artificial construction underground, they do not have a notion of nature, and dread contacting the surface of the earth. Even if they want, they cannot actually visit the surface of the earth, for it is strictly forbidden. In *High-Rise*, which seems to be closest to today's world, there is no glimmer of the natural landscape, and they are totally imprisoned in the built landscape of concrete. Although they are not aware of this fact, the physical environment that they avoid is the real space of freedom, while built ones are nothing more than metaphorical prisons.

Although most of the characters are not aware of this sense of imprisonment in the majority of these works, it prevents them from having a sense of rootedness, because they do not, both literally and figuratively, feel at "home." The concept of home is perhaps one of the most significant features of architecture that moves it to a far distant level more than being a mere shelter. Home is actually the place where one feels safe and secure, away from the dangers of the outside world. However, in Oceania, it is not possible to talk about the concept of home, because all houses are monitored ceaselessly by *telescreens* situated in each room, including bedrooms, by police patrols peeping through the windows from the helicopters, and hidden mikes. With respect to *telescreens*, Winston Smith thinks that

[a] Party member lives from birth to death under the eye of the Thought Police. Even when he is alone he can never be sure that he is alone. Wherever he may be, asleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected without warning and without knowing that he is being inspected. Nothing that he does is indifferent. His friendships, his relaxations, his behaviour towards his wife and children, the expression of his face when he is alone, the words he mutters in sleep, even the characteristic movements of his body, are all jealously scrutinized. Not only any actual misdemeanour, but any eccentricity, however small, any change of habits, any nervous mannerism that could possibly be the symptom of an inner struggle, is certain to be detected. He has no freedom of choice in any direction whatever. (*NEF*<sup>22</sup> 240-1)

Likewise, the faulty elevators, insufficient infrastructure, poor ventilation, decaying and dark coloured walls of the house are some of the architectural elements used specifically to prevent the sense of home, and hence have a negative impact on their psychology.

---

<sup>22</sup> Hereafter, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will be referred to as *NEF* in parenthetical references.



Besides providing safety, home is also the place, where individuals gather together with their acquaintances and family members to share specific moments and memories. However, as the disintegration in the family of Winston Smith's neighbours the Parsons shows even the families in Oceania cannot have a sense of home, because, in addition to the above-mentioned issues, they cannot be at ease due to their children, who chase their parents like all other children in Oceania, to detect any sense of unorthodoxy against the Party and its impositions. Ironically enough, although Mr Parsons is perhaps the most loyal of all the citizens, he ends up in prison, as he is denounced by his children for having unorthodox thoughts. What is interesting in this context is that Mr Parsons is such a dumb man that he also believes that he is guilty and must be punished to be cured.

As a matter of fact, Mr Parsons is actually the ideal citizen that the Party seeks, for the Party wants to create unquestioning masses as opposed to questioning individuals like Winston Smith. To prevent individuality, the Party opposes to the idea of privacy. In *Newspeak* there is a word called *ownlife*, which describes the situation of one's being on their own, and is defined as "individualism and eccentricity" (NEF 94). Evidently the Party's intrusion of the individuality of the citizens is the extension of its corrupt ideology, for very few of citizens who strive to find glimpses of individuality in themselves are the ones who are deeply possessed by unresolved questions in their minds resulting from their overwhelming yearning for truth in their private lives. Consequently, to prevent the citizens from committing the crime of *ownlife*, the Party does not allow the *telescreens* to be turned off, but to be dimmed for a very short time. While preventing privacy through the functional use of the *telescreens* inside the houses, the Party hinders it in their workspaces by bringing them together in the crowded and hectic canteen of the Ministry of Truth, or in enormous meeting places, where individuality is totally abolished, and thereby the masses are easily kept under control and brainwashed. To better explain the functional use of internal and external settings for such ends, one can refer to the two minute Hate sessions in the enormous meeting rooms inside the ministry building, and Hate Week gatherings in the broad Victory Square, in both of which the masses are so much under the control of the Party's manipulation that they are easily brainwashed. In one of the Hate Week

gatherings, for example, when the speaker suddenly changes the names of their allies and enemies in the middle of the speech, the citizens cannot even realise this manipulation. The Party takes advantage of the use of big areas for mass social events so as to coerce the community to herd psychology, through which the manipulation of the individuals becomes easier, as they accept what is imposed on them without questioning.

Perhaps the most significant manipulation is actually achieved by means of the contrast between pyramidal ministry buildings and the ruined and decaying houses of the members of the Outer party, and the proles. Hence, in the words of Gerald S. Bernstein, “Orwell’s symbolic expression of a society controlled through its architecture is a continuing theme throughout the novel” (26). To this end, the narrator gives precise descriptions and minute details regarding the architecture and urban landscape of London, through which the readers are made to better experience the ideological functions of these buildings with respect to their suppressive and manipulative nature. What is more however, for Bernstein, from the very first paragraph onwards, architectural structure of London is depicted with the juxtaposition of the past and the present. The portrayal of the Victory Mansions built in the 1930s, where Winston Smith lives, “presents us with one half of a juxtaposition between the surviving architecture of the so-called pre-Revolutionary period and the monumentally scaled structures of the State bureaucracies” (Bernstein 26), with their central positioning and colossal mass which actually loom over and domineer not only each and every building around them, but also all the citizens of Oceania.

One can argue that criticism in the novel by means of architecture moves mainly on two levels: first, the juxtaposition of the architecture of pre-revolutionary times and the Party’s colossal edifices; second, the juxtaposition of the monumental architecture of the State and those of the citizens’ ruined and rotting, grimy, dark houses. This comparison also works on two levels with respect to the stark contrast of the quarters of the members of the Inner Party and those of the members of the Outer Party, on the one hand, and their comparison with the prole district, on the other.

Monumental architecture of the ministry buildings actually tell us even more than what the narrator conveys, for they have symbolic meanings standing for the power and authority of the government. In direct relation to monumentality, the centrality of these governmental buildings is also significant, for the powerful position themselves at the centre, while pushing the others to the periphery to give the latter the sense of being under total control. Hence, these four ministry buildings, namely, the Ministry of Truth, the Ministry of Peace, the Ministry of Plenty, and the Ministry of Love, and their gigantic pyramidal structures are definitely part of the oppressive nature of this totalitarian government. Known as *Minitrue* in *Newspeak*, the Ministry of Truth “concerned itself with news, entertainment, education and the fine arts;” *Minipax*, that is the Ministry of Plenty, “concerned itself with war,” *Miniluv*, that is the Ministry of Love, “maintained law and order,” and finally *Miniplenty*, that is the Ministry of Plenty, “was responsible for economic affairs” (NEF 6). Not surprisingly however, as the plot unfolds in the following parts, it is revealed that these ministries are indeed concerned with just the stark opposite of what their names seemingly suggest. In *the Book*, which is allegedly written by Goldstein, but in fact written by O’Brien and other members of the Inner Party in collaboration, the functions of these ministry buildings are shortly mentioned as follows: “The Ministry of Peace concerns itself with war, the Ministry of Truth with lies, the Ministry of Love with torture and the Ministry of Plenty with starvation” (NEF 246). These contradictions derived from the names of the ministries and their real functions are actually “not accidental, nor do they result from ordinary hypocrisy; they are deliberate exercises in *doublethink*. For it is only by reconciling contradictions that power can be retained indefinitely” (NEF 246). The citizens also disregard these contradictions, as they believe in the propaganda of the Party without a shadow of doubt in their minds.

Perhaps more threatening than the real functions of these ministries however, “between which the entire apparatus of government was divided” (NEF 6), is their enormous size and colossal mass. Just before exploring the dehumanising details of the oppressive techniques of the Party used effectively to manipulate and keep citizens under control, the narrator casts light on the profound impact of the constructed environment on the psychology of the characters by delineating the domineering physical appearance of

these ministry buildings, the gigantic mass of which augurs how urban planning and architecture are used as instrumental ideological vehicles to showcase the power and authority of the Party, which simultaneously suppress the subordinate groups by dwarfing them psychologically. As a matter of fact, such use of monumental architecture is the proof that tower in such totalitarian regimes is turned into power.

The power of the towering ministry building is felt by Winston deeply like everybody else. Early in the novel, while looking through the window of his flat in the Victory Mansions, the thing Winston Smith sees is the domineering building of the Ministry of Truth: “A kilometre away the Ministry of Truth, his place of work, towered vast and white above the grimy landscape” (*NEF* 5). Seeing the huge structure of this governmental building, with its “enormous pyramidal structure of glittering white concrete,” with its gigantic height “soaring up, terrace after terrace, 300 metres into the air,” and with its presumably “three thousand rooms above ground level, and corresponding ramifications below” (*NEF* 6), Winston feels a sense of helplessness, and weakness when compared with the power of the Party. His feelings are depicted as follows: “The sun had shifted round, and the myriad windows of the Ministry of Truth, with the light no longer shining on them, looked grim as the loopholes of a fortress. His heart quailed before the enormous pyramidal shape. It was too strong, it could not be stormed. A thousand rocket bombs would not batter it down” (*NEF* 32). Perhaps unconscious though, Winston is aware of the inescapable strength of these buildings. The negative impact of such gigantic, and even grotesque, Party buildings on the psychology of the individuals is evident, because, as Spurr also argues, “[t]he human body and psyche are affected by architectural space in powerful but often imperceptible ways. Beyond the literal interior of architectural space, then, there lies a further interiority opened up by the subjective experience of that space in feeling and in spirit, derived from the manifold perception of substance, material, depth, light, shadow, and sound” (Foreword xvii). As such, these minute depictions of the building’s colossal mass and Winston’s feelings of uneasiness are specifically given with such meticulous attention to details with respect to the juxtaposition of the government’s power with the weakness of a single citizen to shed light on the fact that these are not only the places where the government operates, but also symbols of the unvanquishable power of the

State. That is why, similar in appearance, all four of these pyramidal ministry buildings “dwarf the surrounding architecture” (*NEF* 6). Hence, in Foucauldian terms, these buildings act as vehicles of the Party’s authoritative control over others. In this respect, as Marcin Terezewski also posits, “[t]hese vertical structures project a sense of dominance over the rest of the dilapidated Victorian buildings, bringing attention to the hierarchical difference between structures of authority and the subjugated surroundings, which have benefited little from the utopian ideals upon which that society was seemingly founded” (“The Confines of Subjectivity” 59).

Besides the monumental surface of these ministry buildings, their inner spatial arrangements are also rather significant in shedding light on the power and authority of the Party. The windowless long halls in the Ministry of Truth, where Winston Smith works inside a small cubicle along with fifty other colleagues have a repressive impact on the psychology of the characters. It symbolises “the repressive society of the Orwellian future” (Bernstein 26). These workplaces are specifically created as claustrophobic realms to have direct control on the psyche of the subordinate Outer Party members. It is such a controlled society that even the ones in the same department working in the same workspace do not know their fellow colleagues like the prisoners of Bentham’s model penitentiary. The following passage from the text might shed light on this explanation:

Winston hardly knew Tillotson, and had no idea what work he was employed on. People in the Records Department did not readily talk about their jobs. In the long, windowless hall, with its double row of cubicles and its endless rustle of papers and hum of voices murmuring into speakwrites, there were quite a dozen people whom Winston did not even know by name, though he daily saw them hurrying to and fro in the corridors or gesticulating in the Two Minutes Hate. He knew that in the cubicle next to him the little woman with sandy hair toiled day in day out, simply at tracking down and deleting from the Press the names of people who had been vaporized and were therefore considered never to have existed. (*NEF* 49)

Likewise, when Winston Smith learns that the dark-haired girl called Julia is in love with him, and is working in the Fiction Department, he cannot know where the Department is: “but he had only a very dim idea whereabouts in the building the Fiction Department lay, and he had no pretext for going there” (*NEF* 126). This is specifically done by the Party to prevent the commingling of the workers. Socialising in small

numbers is especially prevented so that interaction and developing resistance may be prevented.

In much the same way, the inner spatial arrangements of the Ministry of Love have an enormous and frightening impact on the psychology of the prisoners. Of all the Ministry buildings, the Ministry of Love actually emerges as the most frightening one with its glittering white, windowless surface, and hyper security precautions:

The Ministry of Love was the really frightening one. There were no windows in it at all. Winston had never been inside the Ministry of Love, nor within half a kilometre of it. It was a place impossible to enter except on official business, and then only by penetrating through a maze of barbed-wire entanglements, steel doors, and hidden machine-gun nests. Even the streets leading up to its outer barriers were roamed by gorilla-faced guards in black uniforms, armed with jointed truncheons. (NEF 7)

What makes the building of the Ministry of Love so frightening is actually its monolithic architecture, which is impenetrable like a wall, and hence impossible to escape from. As the only one of the four ministry buildings, which includes the cells, where the criminals are disciplined, this monolithic architecture can also be accepted as the defence centre of the State's ideology.

Winston Smith's own experiences in its numerous cells and Room 101<sup>23</sup> soon after being captured by the Thought Police in the room above Mr Charrington's junk-shop as criminal of *thoughtcrime* and *sexcrime*, prove the initial expressions of fear regarding the grotesque appearance of the Ministry of Love true. His experiences actually shed light on the terrible effects of architecture on the prisoners. In these cells, to cure them of their unorthodox thoughts against the dictates of the Party, the *thoughtcriminals* are tortured verbally and physically through several means such as beating, kicking, flogging, insulting (NEF 313), and electroshock therapy. Hence, when they are captured by the Thought Police in the room above Mr Charrington's junk-shop, Winston and Julia are brought to the Ministry of Love: "He did not know where he was. Presumably he was in the Ministry of Love, but there was no way of making certain" (NEF 259).

---

<sup>23</sup> Peter Davison claims that Room 101 is "one of Orwell's private jokes" for "[i]t was the number of the room where BBC Eastern Service Committee meetings were held at 55 Portland Place and these Orwell was required to attend" (134).

Due to “a low, steady humming sound” supposedly stemming from the “the air supply” (*NEF* 259), the unceasing blinding artificial light, “glittering white porcelain” walls of the “high-ceilinged windowless,” and the *telescreened* cells of the Ministry of Love, with no mark of daylight or darkness, Winston cannot even determine the time, and cannot know how many days he has stayed there. He gives details about how architecture is enmeshed with bad smells around, by describing the cell, to which he is taken initially, as “a noisy, evil-smelling place” (*NEF* 260), and some others as “filthily dirty and at all times crowded by ten or fifteen people” (*NEF* 260). The architectural structure of the building contributes to the psychological downfall, and hence he tries, for example, “to calculate the number of porcelain bricks in the walls of the cell” (*NEF* 263). Similarly, he is also very much disturbed with not knowing where the cell is placed, above or below ground. He cannot know the time because it is always bright, day and night alike:

More often he wondered where he was, and what time of day it was. At one moment he felt certain that it was broad daylight outside, and at the next equally certain that it was pitch darkness. In this place, he knew instinctively, the lights would never be turned out. It was the place with no darkness: he saw now why O’Brien had seemed to recognize the allusion. In the Ministry of Love there were no windows. His cell might be at the heart of the building or against its outer wall; it might be ten floors below ground, or thirty above it. He moved himself mentally from place to place, and tried to determine by the feeling of his body whether he was perched high in the air or buried deep underground. (*NEF* 263-4)

But, as it is later mentioned, he can follow the difference between the air pressure above or below the ground: “Possibly there were slight differences in the air pressure” (*NEF* 325). He is much affected with the lack of windows that he frequently muses on this fact by looking for windows: “His eyes flitted round the walls, as though he half expected to find a window somewhere. ‘There is no difference between night and day in this place. I do not see how one can calculate the time’” (*NEF* 266). Such delusion of the perceptions of the criminals with bright artificial light and glittering white porcelain walls inside the windowless cells of the Ministry of Love is definitely an extension of the Party’s manipulation of the psychology of its citizens by means of the exploitation of architecture. In this respect, not being able to tell the time or the place, Winston becomes disoriented in a short while; and worse still, this disorientation wears down his strength for resistance. Therefore, perhaps more significant than the heavy physical torture is the psychological repression of the polits, that is, the “[p]arty prisoners” (*NEF*

262), by means of the oppressive architectural apparatuses. Yet still, the specific architectural features of each cell accompany the physical torture. Hence, as Bernstein puts it, “[i]t is within this hermetically sealed interior, as repressive and degrading as any of the techniques of brainwashing, that Winston finally breaks down” (28). Yet what is more however, dreadful Room 101, where the criminals are confronted with their biggest fears, which in Winston’s case turns out to be a cage in the shape of a mask full of hungry rats, is also situated in the frightening building of the Ministry of Love.

The sense of helplessness in the citizens is further reinforced through the juxtaposition of these monumental governmental buildings with the buildings in the living quarters of the Outer Party members, which are actually ruined with the perpetual bombings. These quarters are described in such a poor way that they just create a contrast with the gigantic structures of the Party. Hence, as opposed to the enormous buildings of the Party, the Victory Mansions, where the Outer Party members live, are depicted as old decaying tenement houses, the erection of which goes back to the pre-revolutionary times. As stressed by the narrator, any building or statue of big size is built after the Revolution. The statue of Big Brother on horseback in the Victory Square, in this respect, is a clear manifestation of the power of the Party. Actually Trafalgar Square is transformed into Victory Square, and described as such: “the base of the enormous fluted column, at the top of which Big Brother’s statue gazed southward towards the skies where he had vanquished the Eurasian aeroplanes (the Eastasian aeroplanes, it had been, a few years ago) in the Battle of Airstrip One. In the street in front of it there was a statue of a man on horseback which was supposed to represent Oliver Cromwell” (*NEF* 130). The Victory Mansions, on the other hand, date back to the pre-revolutionary times, and are described as

old flats, built in 1930 or thereabouts, and were falling to pieces. The plaster flaked constantly from ceilings and walls, the pipes burst in every hard frost, the roof leaked whenever there was snow, the heating system was usually running at half steam when it was not closed down altogether from motives of economy. Repairs, except what you could do for yourself, had to be sanctioned by remote committees which were liable to hold up even the mending of a window-pane for two years. (*NEF* 25)

For Bernstein, “Victory Mansion [...] seems remarkably similar to the worker housing projects built between the two World Wars” (27). Among all sorts of ruin and decay,



they emerge as a dingy house, where there is hardly any heating, the plumbing system barely works and usually gets blocked, and the hallway smells of “boiled cabbage and old rag mats” (*NEF* 3). This unpleasant and heavy smell of boiled cabbage, which reveals the unsatisfactory and poor ingredients of the daily diet of the members of the Outer Party, is the indication of the poor ventilation in the building. When he is in the flat of the Parsons to help Mrs Parsons with the plugged plumbing, Winston gets this unpleasant smell once more, and thinks that the whole building is actually permeated with this nasty smell: “There was the usual boiled-cabbage smell, common to the whole building” (*NEF* 25). As Erika Gottlieb also puts it, with “Orwell’s unerring eye for detail,” the reader is also made to “feel, touch, and smell the poverty and neglect” these people experience in these poor quarters (51). Orwell’s depiction of olfactory imagery is not limited to the description of the living quarters of the Outer Party members, but also contains that of their workplaces. The canteen of the monumental building of the Ministry of Truth, where the workers are given free lunch, is described as a claustrophobic place with its low-ceiling, underground location, with its crowdedness, deafening voice, and sour metallic smell: “In the low-ceilinged canteen, deep underground, the lunch queue jerked slowly forward. The room was already very full and deafeningly noisy. From the grille at the counter the steam of stew came pouring forth, with a sour metallic smell which did not quite overcome the fumes of Victory Gin” (*NEF* 56). Later on, Winston again muses on this fact as follows: “A low-ceilinged, crowded room, its walls grimy from the contact of innumerable bodies; battered metal tables and chairs, placed so close together that you sat with elbows touching; bent spoons, dented trays, coarse white mugs; all surfaces greasy, grime in every crack; and a sourish, composite smell of bad gin and bad coffee and metallic stew and dirty clothes” (*NEF* 68). These sour smells that penetrated the walls of the canteen as well as other details such as its over-crowded atmosphere are given to the reader as an extension of the repressive function of architecture. In effect, such construction of dirty space, be it with respect to all these sourish and nasty smells or greasy surfaces of the canteen, is also an extension of the Party’s manipulation of the psychology of the subordinate groups, because being confined to such places makes them feel insignificant, neglected, and valueless, which is perhaps the primary objective of the Party to control these people. In much the same way, the sense of entrapment due to the

low ceilings of the building leads to the feeling of worthlessness, because their human dignity is brought under attack. Such feeling of insignificance is further reinforced with worse conditions in the quarters of the proles, who are reduced to the status of animals with such depictions: the proles are “natural inferiors who must be kept in subjection, like animals”(NEF 82), and “[p]roles and animals are free” (NEF 83). Therefore, while visiting an old prole prostitute, who sells herself to survive like many other prole women, Winston is deeply affected by yet another unpleasant odour that seems to be given as an extension of the architectural design: “He seemed to breathe again the warm stuffy odour of the basement kitchen, an odour compounded of bugs and dirty clothes and villainous cheap scent, but nevertheless alluring” (NEF 74). Likewise, the pub in the prole quarter is also depicted with a heavy “smell of urine, sawdust, and sour beer” (NEF 97). As Irving Howe also puts it, in this respect,

[i]n all of his books Orwell had shown himself only mildly gifted at visual description but remarkably keen at detecting loathsome and sickening odors. He had the best nose of his generation -his mind sometimes betrayed him, his nose never- and he judged societies by their smell, literally and metaphorically. In the world of *1984*, he seems to be suggesting that all of the rubbish of the past, to get her with some that no one had quite been able to foresee, had been brought together. (200)

As opposed to the ruined and decaying quarters of the Outer Party members, the districts where the Inner Party members live create another contrast. Unlike such old, narrow, limited, and destroyed architectural spaces of the Outer Party members, the flat of O’Brien is depicted as a spacious one, which is adorned with luxurious furniture. It is described, as follows:

The room they were standing in was long-shaped and softly lit. The telescreen was dimmed to a low murmur; the richness of the dark-blue carpet gave one the impression of treading on velvet. [...] It was only on very rare occasions that one saw inside the dwelling-places of the Inner Party, or even penetrated into the quarter of the town where they lived. The whole atmosphere of the huge block of flats, the richness and spaciousness of everything, the unfamiliar smells of good food and good tobacco, the silent and incredibly rapid lifts sliding up and down, the white-jacketed servants hurrying to and fro — everything was intimidating. [...] The passage down which he led them was softly carpeted, with cream-papered walls and white wainscoting, all exquisitely clean. That too was intimidating. Winston could not remember ever to have seen a passageway whose walls were not grimy from the contact of human bodies. (NEF 194-5)

Unlike the decaying architecture of the quarters of the Outer Party members and the proles, the depiction of O'Brien's luxurious apartment in such a flamboyant manner also brings about their loss of human dignity, and they feel themselves despised. Because unlike the grimy, tenebrous, ruined, and dirty spaces of the Outer Party's unhygienic quarters – born as a result of the density of population in these districts – even the passage to the room in O'Brien's apartment is very fresh and decorated with all sorts of privileges, be it soft carpets, cream-papered walls or white wainscoting. Even the rapid lifts hurrying up and down as opposed to the “seldom working” (*NEF* 3) lifts of the Victory Mansions demonstrate the chasm between these two groups. What is more however, the privileges are not limited to these, but include much more significant ones such as turning the *telescreens* off even for thirty minutes. When Winston and Julia are bewildered upon seeing O'Brien turning off the *telescreen*, he claims: ““we can turn it off. We have that privilege”” (*NEF* 196). All these privileges, in the words of Bernstein, create “a jarring contrast between the dilapidated condition of Victory Mansion and the smoothly functioning structures of the Inner Party” (27). The whole block of flats gives them this sense of intimidation with not only this luxury and spaciousness, but also with the high quality and unfamiliar smells of good food that they are not used to. Used to the oily taste of the Victory gin, when Winston and Julia are served wine in O'Brien's house, they cannot even tell what it is (*NEF* 198).

Perhaps more significant than these material differences however, is actually the perception of the chasm between the two different groups of the Party, created specifically by the manipulation of the Party. Hence, all of these luxuries that these Inner Party members are familiar with, suggest, in the words of Bernstein, “that it was more than the color of one's overalls that distinguished one's position in the hierarchical society of *1984*” (27).

From a Foucauldian perspective with respect to power relations in disciplinary societies, both the monumental architecture of the Party and ruined architecture in the rest of the whole city are used by Orwell to demonstrate how they are used as means of architectural surveillance. Since monumental ministry buildings are the manifestation of panoptical architecture *par excellence* with respect to their stark resemblance to

Bentham's inspection tower, it is beneficial to begin with them. Despite their similarities due to their grotesque and gargantuan appearance and height, the Ministry of Truth is slightly different from the others, for it displays three slogans of the Party "in elegant lettering," namely, "WAR IS PEACE," "FREEDOM IS SLAVERY" and "IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH"(NEF 6), which are also broadcast from the ubiquitous *telescreens* ceaselessly. Such demonstration of the main principles of Ingsoc on the building of the Ministry of Truth, constantly reminds them of the fact that they are being monitored by the Big Brother, the "infallible and all-powerful" ruler of the Party (NEF 238), who actually comes at the top of the social hierarchy.

Besides demonstrating the Party's propaganda, the Ministry of Truth also serves as its centre of censorship. Perhaps the most striking aim of the Party is to manipulate the historical facts, and records in line with its own manipulative aims. As put most blatantly in the novel, in the corrupt world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, "[t]he past was erased, the erasure was forgotten, the lie became truth" (86). Such functioning of the Ministry of Truth as the centre of censorship as well as its huge white appearance is also important with respect to its similarity to the Senate House, the library of the University of London in Bloomsbury, which emerges as the tallest building in the neighbourhood. It was "requisitioned by the Ministry of Information (MoI)" during the Second World War (Goulding 5). Working at the BBC as a talks producer for a few months during the war, Orwell actually had the first hand experience of how governmental censorship functioned. For Simon Goulding in this respect, "[t]he MoI as a part of the Government machine possessed the tools to suppress, invent (if and when required) news and generally control the dissemination of information. The act of censorship became more tacit in its approach as the war progressed" (14). Hence, for Meyers, "Orwell uses the Ministry of Truth to satirise both the Ministry of Information, the government department responsible for collecting and disseminating facts and monitoring the news, and the British Broadcasting Corporation, nominally independent but subject to Ministry of Information censorship in wartime" (122). Not surprisingly however, "Winston's job at Minitrue satirises Orwell's own often tedious work of preparing news summaries and cultural programmes at the BBC. The Newspeak jargon of Winston's instructions is based on cablese, the shorthand language of messages conveyed by cable" (Meyers 122).

Like Orwell, Winston Smith works in a small cubicle along with some forty-nine colleagues in the Records Department of the Ministry of Truth. As one of the branches of the Ministry of Truth, which in general concerned itself with the production of all sorts of items of culture, producing newspapers, and controlling media as well as rectifying the historical truth, and rewriting it to support the Party's slogans and claims, the Records Department is occupied with eliminating the factual events from newspapers, books, periodicals, pamphlets, cartoons, photographs and numerous historical documents, and "to every kind of literature or documentation which might conceivably hold any political or ideological significance. Day by day and almost minute by minute the past was brought up to date" (*NEF* 47).

As significant as the function of the Senate House is actually its gigantic appearance, for it was definitely the biggest building in London during the war. When the building's functioning as the centre of censorship is considered side by side with its huge appearance, Orwell must have felt a sense of domination and oppression of the large edifice looming over all other buildings and citizens; and the huge ministry buildings might be claimed to be modelled on it. That is why, like the Senate House, which loomed over other architecture, the Ministry of Truth gave the message that they were being watched. In this respect, as Goulding also posits, "Minitru needs to be the principal physical presence in order to underline its implied message – we are watching you! [...] For Ingsoc the result is the impression of a public being constantly watched: Minitru must dominate the skyline as a symbol of force: a phallic signifier if you like, its brutality of political power dependent on the means of constraint to maintain its will" (14). However, it is not only the Ministry of Truth, but also all of the ministry buildings, which give the message that they are being perpetually watched by the Party, which reminds one of Foucault's notion of disciplinary power that brings about "a disciplined society" (*Discipline* 198), whose primary aim is to control the subordinate groups. Like the inmates in the individual cells of the Panopticon, the citizens of Oceania can see these edifices, and are sure that they are under constant monitoring of these towering buildings. Furthermore, like the prisoners in the cells, the citizens cannot know exactly what is going on inside these buildings.

As Strub also puts it, the Panopticon plan layout is based on a single principle, which is, “visibility of all points from the center” (41); that is to say, “all-encompassing, panoramic observation” (Strub 41). From an architectural perspective, “scattered around London” (*NEF* 6), the four ministry buildings, which can be seen from everywhere, emerge as the metaphorical manifestations of Bentham’s inspection house. Besides giving a sense of the domineering power of the Party, these buildings actually remind them that they are under constant surveillance, and thereby, under the constant control of the Party. Visibility for Foucault is a trap, but for the ones who are observed. The visibility of the subjects “assures the hold of power that is exercised over them” (*Discipline* 187).

Like the inmates of the cells in Bentham’s annular building, the citizens of Oceania cannot know when they are exactly being monitored by the Party, and therefore, they do not feel safe and secure, and hence have to self-regulate their own behaviour. Otherwise, they know that they will be captured by the Thought Police to be vaporised as if they never existed. Hence, they perpetually regulate their behaviour, and act in accord with the dictates of the Party.

The disciplining of society through panoptical surveillance is only the first step of this disciplinary society, because, as Michael Yeo also puts it, in this prisonlike police state, there are two kinds of surveillance: panoptical and surreptitious. As Yeo further elaborates, while panoptical surveillance is “interiorised self-surveillance,” which makes one censor “oneself so as to avoid unorthodoxy, [as] the detection of which would be detrimental,” the surreptitious one “works on the opposite belief: believing that one is in a private space not under surveillance, one is disinhibited and acts and thinks freely, thus making it possible for an unsuspected spy to detect what one really believes” (53). Unlike panoptical surveillance, which can be performed in numerous ways, surreptitious surveillance is mainly based on the manipulative use of architecture by the Party as a means to its corrupt ends. For Yeo, surreptitious surveillance works in the book as follows:

Surreptitious surveillance, which occurs in the contrary belief that one is in a private space, will detect unorthodoxy in people like Winston and Julia who are

good at playing to the camera, finding them out as they reveal or confess their private thoughts or beliefs without inhibition. Both panoptic and surreptitious surveillance are under the jurisdiction of the Thought Police, whose watching is sometimes public and visible, and at other times secret and invisible or disguised. They make use of available technologies – telescreens and microphones – and are aided by an organized auxiliary of enthusiastic child spies. (58)

Surreptitious surveillance is conducted insidiously to entrap the dissidents, and to this end, architecture is used to a much large extent. The alcove in Winston Smith's room is a very good manifestation of this:

For some reason the telescreen in the living-room was in an unusual position. Instead of being placed, as was normal, in the end wall, where it could command the whole room, it was in the longer wall, opposite the window. To one side of it there was a shallow alcove in which Winston was now sitting, and which, when the flats were built, had probably been intended to hold bookshelves. By sitting in the alcove, and keeping well back, Winston was able to remain outside the range of the telescreen, so far as sight went. He could be heard, of course, but so long as he stayed in his present position he could not be seen. It was partly the unusual geography of the room that had suggested to him the thing that he was now about to do. (*NEF* 8)

This architectural detail is designed specifically to deceive Winston so that he can put his rebellious thoughts into practice. Believing that he is free of the constant surveillance of the telescreens, Winston begins to write his diary in the alcove. Unlike his assumptions however, the telescreens have a 360 degrees of observance; and hence, Winston is being watched by the Thought Police from the very beginning. Thus, not only the minds and language of the people, but also the domestic spheres of the individuals are manipulated by the Party. In this respect, as Lisa Mullen also puts it,

[w]ithin the tyrannical architecture of visibility, the telescreens retrofitted into the fabric of every building act as a clever distraction. The screen in Winston's flat appears to have been put in the wrong place, offering him a shallow sanctuary in the alcove where he writes his diary, but like all Winston's feeble assertions of autonomy, this turns out to be an illusion: the alcove is another architectural trap, like the room above the junk shop. The real purpose of the screen is to misdirect the gaze of those who are, in fact, under 360-degree surveillance whether they are aware of it or not. (*NEF* 18)

Likewise, the room above Mr Charrington's junk-shop also emerges as another architectural entrapment, in that, thinking that they are free of governmental surveillance in this prole district, — for seemingly there is no *telescreen* there, — Winston and Julia are finally arrested in this specific place, which they ironically believe to be their sanctuary. Their capture by the Thought Police as *thoughtcriminals*

and *sexcriminals* in this room as an extension of Mr Charrington's plot, who is revealed to be a younger agent of the Thought Police, shows that there is no escape from the all-seeing eyes of the Party and Big Brother, and hence in such a society even a tiny indication of resistance is futile. Therefore as Yeo also puts it,

[s]urreptitious surveillance works not to prevent speech or action, as panopticism does, but to detect what people really think or believe by surveilling their speech and action when they are disinhibited in the (illusory) belief that they are in a private setting. Thus it works, and can only work, if the person being surveilled has a belief opposite to the one necessary for panoptic surveillance. When Winston believes he is in range of a camera, for example, he self-censors. He disguises his beliefs and thoughts by putting on an orthodox face, and even tries to avoid unorthodox thoughts lest he give himself away involuntarily. To the extent he succeeds, it is not possible to discern what he truly believes. However, when he believes that he is not in range of a camera, he is disinhibited and acts and thinks freely, thus revealing what he really believes. (54-55)

Although resistance to the impositions of the Party is futile as can be observed in the case of Julia and Winston, as James M. Decker also puts it, "as long as ideology exists, struggle prevails and hope continues" (153). Their weak resistance to the control of the manipulative Party can therefore be accepted as a hope of search for an identity in such a society, where individuality is suppressed and citizens are transformed into masses. Winston and Julia's spatial practices on the streets of the prole quarters and in their so-called sanctuary, also show the vital role of architectural spaces in creating spaces of resistance against the manipulative control of the Party. Unlike the oppressive architecture of the Party, looming over everything, the quarters of the proles and the architectural structure of these parts of the city are actually in ruins, and they are depicted with the image of a rathole so as to draw attention to the frightening atmosphere there:

He was somewhere in the vague, brown-coloured slums to the north and east of what had once been Saint Pancras Station. He was walking up a cobbled street of little two-storey houses with battered doorways which gave straight on the pavement and which were somehow curiously suggestive of ratholes. There were puddles of filthy water here and there among the cobbles. In and out of the dark doorways, and down narrow alley-ways that branched off on either side, people swarmed in astonishing numbers — girls in full bloom, with crudely lipsticked mouths, and youths who chased the girls, and swollen waddling women who showed you what the girls would be like in ten years' time, and old bent creatures shuffling along on splayed feet, and ragged barefooted children who played in the puddles and then scattered at angry yells from their mothers. (*NEF* 95)



Due to the hierarchical social structure in Oceania, the quarters of the proles are in a much worse condition than those of the Outer Party, and worse still they are further destroyed with frequent rocket bombings, in one of which Winston is “covered with fragments of glass from the nearest windows” (*NEF* 97). These bombings for Julia are specifically done by the Party “just to keep people frightened” (*NEF* 176). Interestingly enough, despite such manipulation of these parts of the city with frequent bombings and its decaying structure, as opposed to the strict control of the quarters of the Outer Party members, surveillance is kept seemingly at a minimum level, and there are no *telescreens* in most of the houses. Hence, Winston and Julia hire the room above Mr Charrington’s junk-shop, which for them becomes seemingly a heaven to meet secretly to have sex and exchange their views on numerous topics, which actually evokes a sense of individuality that is repressed by the dominant control of the Party. Although it is later revealed that this room was prepared by the Thought Police as a trap to tempt Winston and Julia to commit *thoughtcrime*, their unique experience in these parts of the city – even for a very short time – is significant, for it reveals how the Party itself, unwittingly though, prepares the way for the resistance of the subordinate groups to the authority. As myriad of daily needs and toiletries of the Outer Party members such as blades, soaps,<sup>24</sup> and shoelaces are not provided, these people visit the prole districts secretly to obtain their needs. As de Certeau puts it, our everyday practices are all tactical, and tactics are carried out as reactions against the impositions of the powerful. As a matter of fact, the Party uses all architectural realms as “strategies” to exercise its power. Likewise, the citizens also make use of architectural spaces for their tactics. Since the Party does not provide them with the above-mentioned products, Winston and Julia react against the Party in an invisible way by their spatial practices. Actually their visit to the prole district for their daily needs can be accepted as “the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary power” and hence they “poach in them” (de Certeau 36-7). While buying the products, they hire

---

<sup>24</sup> While writing the scarcity of these toiletries, Orwell might be influenced by his own experiences of poverty in Paris and London, for in his *Down and Out in Paris and London*, there are references to the scarcity of these daily needs as such: “you run out of soap and razor-blades” (14) and “a razor-blade two months old” (27).

the room. It gives them the chance of escaping from the oppressive control of the Party and its surveillance, and additionally, the architecture of these parts of the city makes Winston feel nostalgic, and he tries to find a way of connection with their past, which is specifically destroyed by the Party to propagate its propaganda and sustain its power. Due to this experience of connection with the past, the Outer Party members show slight instances of resistance to the domination, and authoritative control of the Party. For Phillips, in this respect,

[y]et by tacitly allowing members of the Party to traverse the city through necessity rather than simply look upon it as a passive landscape, the power of the city space to encourage questioning and thence memory is immeasurably enhanced. By traversing the city, Winston and his colleagues gain some measure of the relative freedom of the proles. This everyday experience of the city embodies (quite literally) the potential for resistance to and subversion of constraint and control. (140-41)

For de Certeau, everyday practices such as walking are “tactical in character” (xix). To escape from the domination of the Party, Julia and Winston walk on the streets, and visit some of the ruined buildings of the prole districts to cope with what is imposed on them by the Party. Walking as an empowering practice helps them to transcend the boundaries strictly drawn by the Party, for the ones walking the streets as opposed to those looking down the street from their high places are actually the ones who experience these spaces. One’s elevation to a high place actually “puts him at a distance” (de Certeau 92, emphasis original). Therefore, the members of the Inner Party, who actually constitute the top of the pyramidal structure of the Oceanian society, are situated in their high places in the ministry buildings, “looking down like a god” (de Certeau 92). As opposed to their detached position however, the walkers of the city are the practitioners of the city. While walking, their “bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban ‘text’ they write without being able to read it” (de Certeau 93). In this respect, Winston and Julia, as the walkers, and hence practitioners of the prole district, create their unique stories based on their individual experiences of these spaces free from the strict control of the Party’s authority. This practice of the urban experience brings about the discovery of the connection with the past, which is sustained by the help of the functional use of architecture. Lawrence Phillips underlines the significance of this urban experience as follows: “Much of what de Certeau suggests as the urban experience, of networks, moving and intersecting contradict a society predicated on

control and surveillance”(141). Unlike the huge buildings of the Party, which showcase its power and authority, the Victorian architecture in ruins in these parts of the city, – much worse than the quarters of the Outer Party members though – evokes a sense of nostalgia, or in the words of Orwell, an “ancestral memory” (*NEF* 111), and reminds them of their forgotten past, which is born as part of the memorial function of the lived spaces. This sense of connection with the past due to the nostalgic atmosphere in the prole districts pave the way for Winston’s and Julia’s silent resistance against the dictates of the Party, and yearning for a better exploration of their past. Their short-term refuge in this Victorian architecture with respect to their veiled resistance and relief in connection with the past might actually be better explored with respect to de Certeau’s distinction between space and place, which is simply explained by him as such: “*space is a practiced place*” (de Certeau 117, emphasis original). The prole district, while a place due to its geometrical definition by urban planning, is transformed into “a space by walkers” (de Certeau 117). Winston’s and Julia’s own stories and experiences make this place a space; to put it better, a space of resistance. While the Party’s aim is to erase all the traces of the past, the connection of the architectural space with the past lead them to question the Party’s dictates. Therefore, as Tereszewski also puts it,

[w]ith buildings and urban space stripped of their historical references, thereby severing them from symbolic continuity, the question of identity, which also depends on a network of symbolic space, is also raised. [...] In a city where there are no historicizing symbols, the inhabitants have no organic connection with their environment. Winston’s stroll leads him to Mr. Charrington’s antique shop, which, especially its room upstairs, functions in the story as Winston’s and Julia’s sanctuary and haven from the oppressive social space where they are constantly subject to supervision. This space also functions as a memorial of a past that they only faintly remember, or, in the case of Julia, does not remember at all. (“The Confines of Subjectivity” 62-3)

Besides the Victorian setting however, the picture of St. Clement’s Danes in a rosewood frame emerges as another important case in point in unveiling the organic unity of the individual with the past through the mnemonic function of architecture. In the room above Mr Charrington’s junk-shop, when the picture attracts Winston’s attention, the proprietor tells him that it is St. Clement’s Danes, one of the principle churches of London built by the famous architect Sir Christopher Wren (1632-1723) along with some others, all of which are mentioned in a nursery rhyme initiated by Charrington

himself as “Oranges and lemons, say the bells of St. Clement’s.” Although Charrington cannot remember how the rhyme goes on, he knows how it ends: “Here comes a candle to light to bed/ Here comes a chopper to chop off your head” (*NEF* 112). While a very ironic foreshadowing with respect to Winston’s inevitable doom, — because O’Brien, who actually completes the incomplete rhyme, comes as a symbolic chopper to chop off Winston’s head, — the nursery rhyme also emerges as an important vehicle to recall the names of these churches, which actually evokes “a vanished past of spontaneous children’s games, architectural magnificence, and religious values” (Elsbree 138). With respect to Winston’s attraction to the rhyme, Phillips claims:

There is something instinctual about Winston’s attraction to the rhyme. It is what it stands for as a synecdoche for an entire lost way of life in the city, rather than the recovery of its absolute meaning ‘that might throw light upon the past’. The material history embodied in architecture and the city’s street grid ultimately preserves more than the rewritable textual history. It anchors encoded memories like the rhyme or people’s memories. In this the rhyme is the textual equivalent of the pre-Revolutionary buildings. (143)

These architectural edifices, mostly destroyed or transformed into museums of propaganda, which is actually reminiscent of the practices of the Soviet countries, while unveiling a forgotten past, also shed light on the Party’s manipulative distortion of historical knowledge to disconnect people from their roots. Only when he sees this picture, Winston can figure out that St. Clement’s Danes is the church in ruins in the street outside the Palace of Justice. As stated by Charrington, it was bombed like many others. Hence, Winston muses on the function of architecture as such:

Winston wondered vaguely to what century the church belonged. It was always difficult to determine the age of a London building. Anything large and impressive, if it was reasonably new in appearance, was automatically claimed as having been built since the Revolution, while anything that was obviously of earlier date was ascribed to some dim period called the Middle Ages. The centuries of capitalism were held to have produced nothing of any value. 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. (*NEF* 112)

It is not only the texts or written past that the Party obliterates to erase the past memories of people, but also architecture. These buildings of the past are destroyed to prevent the citizens’ connection with the past. Here the significance of some of the pre-revolutionary buildings come to the foreground, in that, Winston can come to the

realisation that St. Martin's, as mentioned in the rhyme, albeit not destroyed like some others, is used for a totally different end: "for propaganda displays of various kinds – scale models of rocket bombs and Floating Fortresses, a waxwork tableaux illustrating enemy atrocities, and the like" (*NEF* 113). This fact actually shows that "[w]hat has not been destroyed[...] [by the Party] has been defaced by ideology" (Meyers 120). Here lies the significance of the nursery rhyme. It actually reminds him of the function of churches, which have long been forgotten due to the teachings of the Party.

Ironically, while reconnecting them with their past, the picture of St. Clement's Dabes in the rosewood frame on the wall simultaneously brings about their downfall, for it is later revealed that there is a hidden *telescreen* behind it, and they have actually been monitored surreptitiously since the day they first hired the room. Their capture by the Thought Police as *sexcriminals* and *thoughtcriminals* as an extension of the surreptitious surveillance in this room proves the so-called safety of the prole quarters wrong. Even though they have the chance of getting the taste of honey with respect to freedom from the strict control of the Party even temporarily in their sanctuary, their resistance does not lead to triumph, as they are captured by the Thought Police for their unorthodox thoughts. Eventually, it can be argued that this room, that is architecture, while giving them the chance of resistance to the dictates and teachings of the Party thanks to feelings of connection with and search for the forgotten past on the one hand, also brings their catastrophe as a space of entrapment. In this respect, as Tereszewski aptly puts it, "this haven that at first held the promise of existing outside Oceania's power structure turned out to be securely embedded within the state apparatus and that is how this shop, which initially represented an antithesis to Oceania, in fact co-exists within its rules. Oceania offers Winston little more than a false promise not only of security but also of identity" ("The Confines" 69). In much the same way, Mullen also believes that this specific architectural structure is used functionally to entrap Winston and Julia:

When Winston and Julia are arrested by the Thought Police in their secret hideaway above a junk shop, they realise how completely they are entangled in the architecture – both material and conceptual – of totalitarianism. This attic is a space where the lovers have believed themselves invisible. [...] Comforted by its crust of old furniture, he has failed to notice its payload of surveillance technology. At the novel's central moment of crisis, the privacy of this room is torn open, revealing

the lovers as sex-criminals, thought-criminals and – most devastatingly – as entirely deluded in their belief that privacy is even possible. [...] The contrast between the cosy hideaway which Winston and Julia had thought they had found, and the revelation that they have, in fact, been clearly seen and minutely scrutinised all along, hammers home the fallacy of freedom within an architecture of visibility without transparency, of brutality and power elaborated into scopic structures unilluminated by hope or truth. (13-4)

Eventually, although resistance is unavoidable if there exists ideology, unlike the assumptions of Winston and Julia, there is no way of escape from the all-seeing eyes and manipulative control of the Party. Therefore, Winston and Julia find themselves entrapped, and betrayed inside another architectural structure. That is to say, while they are escaping from the domineering impact of the Party's colossal buildings, they are actually entrapped in their so-called sanctuary. As can be seen here, even in the prole district, the citizens are oppressed by means of manipulative architecture. In the end, their escape from the domination of the Party and finding relief inside this room above the junk-shop all are revealed to be illusions created by the Party on purpose. Yet still, their individual experience of the practice of everyday space is perhaps the only thing that the Party cannot foresee.

In Oceania although all the characters are controlled and manipulated by the Party to a large extent, women are doubly marginalised and affected by these manipulations. As a matter of fact, as the monumental ministry buildings, which might also be taken as the phallic symbol of the power of the Party, are the embodiment of gendered spaces, for what they symbolise is the male power, that is, virility. In such a society, women are pushed to the periphery. Julia, one of the protagonists, is perhaps the best example of how women are marginalised in Oceania, for she does not even have a surname. Additionally, unlike Winston Smith, Julia is portrayed less interested in the functioning of the Party, but more interested in sexuality. That is why, she is accused by Winston of being ““a rebel from the waist downwards”” (*NEF* 179).

Other than Julia, who luckily has the chance of getting involved in everyday practices of life outside as a workingwoman, a few other women, who are portrayed in the novel slightly, are all confined to the domestic sphere. Mrs Parsons is a mother and housewife, who wants help from Winston for the plugged plumbing, and the only realm where she

is seen in the novel is her kitchen but nowhere else. In much the same way, an old woman singing a lullaby while hanging her clothes in the prole district is not given even a name, and she represents the domestic realm with which she is identified. Totally different from these domestic housewives is the old prostitute with her red lipstick, who survives by prostituting herself. In a society where patriarchal norms manifest themselves in the form of monumental and phallic government buildings, which are situated at the centre, women are either pushed to the domestic sphere, or can only survive by means of prostitution.

In conclusion, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* totalitarian architecture is used specifically by the Party to implement its authority over the subordinate groups to suppress the psychology of the individuals, and to manipulate them in line with its corrupt ideology. While the use of architecture and landscape is important as a means of convention in utopian/dystopian writing, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, they are used in a much more nuanced and functional way. The setting in general and architecture in particular are used as active agents in the unfolding of events, and revealing the messages of the book instead of being a mere background or a backdrop. Hence, evaluating each and every single detail such as size, height, decoration, lighting, and ventilation regarding architecture, is of particular importance, for they all serve some specific purposes. While the monumental and gargantuan buildings of the Party are used specifically to showcase the power of the Party and to dwarf individuals, the old Victory Mansions and the Victorian architecture in the prole district are especially left in ruins to make the individuals feel a sense of helplessness when confronted with the power and authority of the Party. Yet still, the four ministry buildings also serve as the symbolic tower of Bentham's Panopticon plan, where individuals are made to feel that they are under constant surveillance of the Party. This feeling of helplessness is further reinforced with the spatial inner design of these ministry buildings, where the members of the Outer Party can no longer feel themselves as individuals but as part of a mass. With such use of architecture, the loss of individuality is indoctrinated, and due to herd psychology, the citizens are better manipulated so as to prevent their rebellion against the Party's corrupt teachings. Consequently, one can argue that as a dystopia writer, Orwell uses

architecture as a central element, and hence without such functional use of architecture, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* would not be what it is.



## CHAPTER III

### THE ARCHITECTURE OF VIOLENCE:

#### J.G. BALLARD'S *HIGH-RISE*

Exploring architectural psychology through an in-depth analysis of J.G. Ballard's dystopian science-fiction novel *High-Rise*, this chapter claims that the negative impact of modernist architecture on its occupants brings about violence. The titular tower block, a Brutalist architecture built in accord with the principles of modernist architecture through the legacy of the Swiss-French architect Le Corbusier who prioritised verticality and order, demonstrates how it is replete with the ideologies of the capitalist authorities. In this respect, following a Lefebvrian trajectory of the production of space as a means of social control, this chapter claims that ideologically loaded spaces in the high-rise building affect the psychology of the characters in a negative way, leading to numerous violent breakouts such as instances of rape, murder, and cannibalism, among many others. The emergence of violence is also evaluated from the perspective of de Certeau's notion of everyday practices with respect to his concepts of "strategy" and "tactic," the conflict of which in Ballard's novel is the real source of violence. Moreover, the psychological aspect of this violence is scrutinised with respect to Freud's conceptualisation of civilisation in his *Civilization and Its Discontents* as a social construct to sustain order in a society by way of suppressing some inborn human instincts, which actually come to the foreground in case of emergence of the signs of the collapse of the so-called civilisation.

Before an in-depth analysis of the novel however, brief information about Ballard, his specific writing technique, and career will certainly shed light on the significance of architecture or the built environment in his whole *oeuvre*, and will set the tone for the discussion of the book within a larger architectural, socio-economic, cultural and political context. James Graham Ballard (1930-2009), better known as J.G. Ballard, is a

versatile writer, who tried his hand not only in the novel and short story, but also in essay writing with twenty novels, almost a hundred short stories, – in different collections – and numerous essays. However, as he began his writing career with the publication of his short stories in some American and British science fiction magazines in the late 1950s (Luckhurst, “J.G. Ballard” 13; Lewis 27), Ballard is mostly categorised as a science fiction writer. In addition to the number and variety of the works he produced, when his long-term writing career is at stake, pigeonholing Ballard just as a science fiction writer would belittle the value of his works, and therefore be a big mistake. Jonathan S. Taylor proposes to examine Ballard’s literary career in three different periods. According to his line of argument, in this respect, the first of these periods corresponds to Ballard’s early career in the 1960s, when he wrote his natural disaster novels, namely, *The Drowned World* (1962), *The Wind from Nowhere* (1962), *The Drought* (1965), and *The Crystal World* (1966). Set in the near future, these novels demonstrate how landscapes alter, and civilisations collapse due to drastic environmental changes. In these novels, for Taylor, two tendencies reveal themselves: a fascination with the altered landscape, and a yearning for the satisfaction of cruel and childish desires. When it comes to the second period of his career however, although the landscapes transform to urban ones, the theme of fascination and obsession that is observed in the first category is further explored. The second body of Ballard’s works, comprised of his urban trilogy of the mid-1970s, namely, *Crash* (1973), *Concrete Island* (1974), and *High-Rise* (1975),<sup>25</sup> and some of his short stories published earlier at the beginning of his career,<sup>26</sup> presents a critique of modern urban societies that have produced new types of urban environments, which enable us to scrutinise new psychopathologies. Following a similar trajectory, the third body of his work also focuses on the built environment. Compared to the urban trilogy and the short stories of

---

<sup>25</sup> Some of the critics evaluate Ballard’s *The Atrocity Exhibition* (1970) as part of this trilogy and therefore refer to them as tetralogy. Yet still, it is mostly accepted as a trilogy. While Keyes describes this urban trilogy as “concrete and steel trilogy” (49), Sebastian Groes refers to them as “urban disaster trilogy” (124).

<sup>26</sup> Although Jonathan S. Taylor does not give specific names of these short stories in his evaluation, it is possible to enumerate them as follows: “The Concentration City” (1957), “Chronopolis” (1960), “Billennium” (1961). For detailed discussion see Keyes p. 49. For Baxter and Wymer, in a similar fashion, especially “The Concentration City” and “Chronopolis” “set the tone for what would prove to be one of Ballard’s enduring fascinations: the psychological effects of the built environment on its human inhabitants” (3).

the second period however, the built environment is focused on leisure landscapes such as tourist resorts, hotels, and shopping malls (Taylor, “The Subjectivity” 95-6). In this vein, it is possible to claim that “J.G. Ballard’s novelistic production falls into a number of interrelated but thematically bound periods” (Beckman 271). In addition to the urban trilogy, his explorations of the condition of modern man in such modernist architecture and technological landscapes also continue in his last novels too, such as *Cocaine Nights* (1996), and *Super Cannes* (2000).

Evidently, instead of social satire, Ballard, in his novels, has a tendency to direct his focus on the landscape and setting in general, and architecture in particular. Similar to the utopias and dystopias discussed previously both in the Introduction and in the previous two chapters, architecture, or the built environment in a more general sense, does not just appear as a setting or décor. It is almost always attributed the major role, and the extraordinary events are the result of the inevitable impact of such settings on the psychology of the characters. Despite his deep interest in such built environments, architectural edifices and landscapes, in the words of W. Warren Wagar,

Ballard does not deal with landscapes in the manner of a contributor to *The National Geographic Magazine*. He is not a travel writer or a tour guide. The places he describes so bewitchingly are always, for Ballard, metaphors for states of mind and soul, ‘psychic’ or ‘spinal’ landscapes, as in the canvasses of Max Ernst. To know them, to examine them in meticulous detail, is to know the human spirit in all its mad convoluted joy. (53)

For Wagar, therefore, it is possible to refer to them as “explorations of landscape, both external and internal” (53). While ostensibly focusing on the external reality, Ballard actually explores what is hidden beneath such places, and how human beings interact with them. Hence, a brief look at Ballard’s “inner space,” a term that he coined to describe “the territory he has explored in his work – the world of the mind, and at the same that of the biological sciences” (Hennessy 60) is necessary. Ballard, in a similar fashion, in his famous essay “Which Way to Inner Space?” underlines his interest in the psyche of the characters, that is, the inner space, as follows: “[t]he biggest developments of the immediate future will take place, not on the Moon or Mars, but on Earth, and it is *inner space*, not outer, that needs to be explored” (*A User’s Guide* 197, emphasis original). In this essay, which is Ballard’s manifesto for Roger Luckhurst,

Ballard demands “an sf that abandoned outer space for the kinds of psychological climates and emotional territories his own work had been exploring” (“J.G. Ballard” 14). His focus on the innermost feelings of his characters is an invaluable quality that distinguishes Ballard from other science fiction writers. That is why, he has his own distinctive way of narration that is inserted into some sort of initially and ostensibly utopian, but virtually dystopic and bleak settings, which is best described with the adjective “Ballardian.” As defined in the *Collins English Dictionary*, Ballardian means “resembling or suggestive of the conditions described in Ballard’s novels and stories, esp dystopian modernity, bleak man-made landscapes, and the psychological effects of technological, social or environmental developments.” This term for Luckhurst is “rapidly entering the English-speaking lexicon as the shorthand for this alienated – yet ecstatic state induced by shopping malls, business parks, and the non-places of airports, motorway systems, and distribution centers” (“J.G. Ballard” 13).

Ballard’s use of such landscapes and their descriptions however deviates from realistic motives, and for Taylor, he uses them “much in the manner of the Surrealist painters who inspired him” (“The Subjectivity” 91). Similar to the Surrealists, in this respect, who painted imaginary and/or impossible landscapes to unearth the Freudian or Jungian unconscious, Ballard explored and reflected the depths of human psyche through his impossible landscapes (Taylor, “The Subjectivity” 91). While the former did this with their brushes, the latter did “the same through his prose” (Taylor, “The Subjectivity” 91). The roots of his unique writing style, that is the explorations of Ballardian inner space, which can be claimed to be a melange of distinct yet somehow interconnected fields, such as Surrealism, psychoanalysis, and geography, can be traced back to not only his childhood years as an internee in the Lunghua Internment Camp in Shanghai, but also his more than 40 years in Shepperton.

Ballard was born in Shanghai in 1930 (Ballard and Hennesy 60) “into a wealthy British expatriate family” (Luckhurst, “J.G. Ballard” 12). When he was born on 15 November 1930, “[h]is parents were among its 70,000 non-Chinese residents, who included three thousand US citizens, and numerous Jews and White (that is, not Red) Russians who’d fled the Revolution” (Baxter 7). Soon enough however, he was “[i]nterned in a

Japanese prisoner-of-war camp during the Second World War,” and “travelled to England for the first time in 1946” (Luckhurst, “J.G. Ballard” 12). According to John Baxter, after the defeat of the Chinese in the Battle of Midway in May 1942, foreign nationals, that is, all non-Chinese people were relocated in Civilian Assembly Centres. Those British citizens in good health and with families were sent to Lunghua Middle School, a former teachers’ college, comprised of seven three-storey concrete buildings on an empty zone (21). Baxter sheds light on the psychology of living in such an internment camp, as follows:

Initially at least, life in Lunghua was endurable. Apart from a few suicides, death by anything but natural causes was uncommon. The sick usually succumbed to malaria or dysentery; Margaret became particularly ill with the latter, and suffered intermittent attacks for the rest of her life. Though Jim complained of having contracted malaria, this is suspect, since his ‘attacks’ often coincided with a troublesome commitment he wanted to avoid. Getting enough food and, in particular, water became a major preoccupation. (22-23)

As the claustrophobic atmosphere of the camp had a profound impact on the psychology of the internees, the internment camp evidently played an important role in shaping Ballard’s worldview. Ballardian inner space might therefore be claimed to have its roots in this Japanese internment camp. Most of, if not all, the surrealist and extraordinary settings and landscapes in his work, might therefore be claimed to shelter bits and pieces of the repercussions of this childhood trauma.

In addition to his early childhood in this internment camp, at the other end of the strand lies Ballard’s long-term residence in Shepperton. As Jeremy Lewis argues, after his traumatic years in the internment camp, Ballard returned to England at the age of fifteen, and lived at his “home in Shepperton, an anonymous backwater of London lying under the shadow of Heathrow Airport” (27) for more than 40 years till his death in 2009. As well as the significant role of the internment camp in Shanghai, Ballard’s life in Shepperton, and its closeness to the Heathrow airport also played an important role in shaping his ideas on modernist architecture, and technological landscapes. He, therefore, explored the undeniable importance of the built environment and architecture on the psychology of his characters in his literary works. For Jeanette Baxter and Rowland Wymer, as “[a] resident of the Thames-side town of Shepperton for over forty years, he has somehow managed to write with equal intensity and facility about the

idiosyncratic nature of contemporary life at the centre and the edges of the British capital” (9). Needless to say, for a writer whose focus is mostly on the built landscapes, the role of these places in his writing career cannot be denied. Consequently, one can deduce that his explorations of the inner world and psyche have its roots certainly in the internment camp. Similarly, his explorations of the technological landscapes owe much to his life in Shepperton.

As one of the best known of Ballard’s novels, *High-Rise* is a dystopian science fiction novel that explores a series of extraordinarily violent events that occur in a high-rise tower block, which is presumably built on the Swiss-French architect and urban planner Le Corbusier’s model of high-rise as a self-sufficient multi-storey entity. Set in a forty-storey ultra-modern high-tech tower block, which is one of the five identical units in a developmental project in the outskirts of London – “precisely the site where in the 1980s the London Dockland Development Corporation would build the massive high-rise business and residential complex known as Canary Wharf” (Spurr, *Architecture* 226-7) – in the 1970s, the narrative of *High-Rise* revolves around a series of extraordinary events ranging from vandalism, fights, manipulation of the services to murder, rape and even cannibalism, within the course of three months inside the eponymous high-rise building, which is the only setting in the novel. Besides one thousand living units for its two thousand residents, the tower-block is also equipped with a myriad of conveniences that modern life requires such as supermarkets, banks, gymnasiums, junior schools, restaurants, liquor stores, hairdressing salons, saunas and swimming pools, among many others. In addition to these amenities, however, one more thing, which attracts the attention of the majority of its residents, is the unlimited promiscuous sexual life that it offers. Even before the unleash of all kinds of sexual misdemeanours, molestations, perversities, and crimes with the social breakdown, Alice, one of the minor characters, tells her brother Dr. Robert Laing that there is claimed to be “a brothel operating somewhere” in the building (*HR*<sup>27</sup> 11). Mesmerised by the conveniences and the luxurious life that the building offers, and adopting a very different mentality, the tenants of the high-rise gradually loose interest in the real world outside, and begin to compete with each other to benefit much better from the

---

<sup>27</sup> Hereafter, *High-Rise* will be referred to as *HR* in parenthetical references.

conveniences of the building. As Sinem Yeşil Şahin posits, in this respect, such abundance of the conveniences are specifically planned to minimise the need to go outside (140). Undoubtedly, the residents refrain from going outside except for some compulsory reasons, and prefer enjoying the amenities of the building. However, such estrangement from the external world and its norms as well as their “willing imprisonment inside the tower block” (Yeşil Şahin 141) influence the psychology of the characters in a negative way, and hence instances of violence break out and chaos pervades the whole block.

The novel is mainly narrated through the perception of three main male characters with respect to the unusual and horrible events occurring inside the building. These primary characters, “whose lives are tied to the fate of the tower block” (Flanagan 434), are the architect Anthony Royal, residing with his wife Anne in one of the two penthouse apartments on top of the building; the physician Robert Laing, a divorcee in his early 30s living in a studio apartment on the 25<sup>th</sup> floor; and finally, the television producer Richard Wilder, who is also a former rugby-player, residing in one of the apartments on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor with his wife Helen and two sons. Although there are some minor characters, too, we mostly observe “the escalating chaos through the eyes of [these] three men” (Baxter 234).

Interestingly, these people have no sense of abashment, and resort to all sorts of above-mentioned violent acts and perversities without any glimmer of thought. Freud’s ideas concerning civilisation is applicable to this situation in the novel. Sigmund Freud in his *Civilization and Its Discontents*, in which he explores the tension between the individual and society triggered due to the clash between them that is imposed by civilisation, claims that civilisation suppresses some human instincts. Civilisation for Freud, in this respect, can be best described with “its esteem and encouragement of man’s higher mental activities – his intellectual, scientific and artistic achievements” (41). It, however, also requires the sacrifice of some sexual satisfactions (Freud 55), and humans’ inborn affinity to aggressiveness (Freud 58) and therefore to violence, among some others. Quoting the Bible’s famous dictum, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” Freud claims civilisation to require an ideal demand (56). In the case of a possible breakdown of the social order and collapse of human civilisation, the

neighbour that is suggested to be loved as oneself is the first to be targeted to satisfy one's aggressiveness and suppressed yearnings for his sexual instincts. Hence, he claims:

The element of truth behind all this, which people are so ready to disavow, is that men are not gentle creatures who want to be loved, and who at the most can defend themselves if they are attacked; they are, on the contrary, creatures among whose instinctual endowments is to be reckoned a powerful share of aggressiveness. As a result, their neighbour is for them not only a potential helper or sexual object, but also someone who tempts them to satisfy their aggressiveness on him, to exploit his capacity for work without compensation, to use him sexually without his consent, to seize his possessions, to humiliate him, to cause him pain, to torture and to kill him. *Homo homini lupus*. Who, in the face of all his experience of life and of history, will have the courage to dispute this assertion? As a rule this cruel aggressiveness waits for some provocation or puts itself at the service of some other purpose, whose goal might also have been reached by milder measures. In circumstances that are favourable to it, when the mental counter-forces which ordinarily inhibit it are out of action, it also manifests itself spontaneously and reveals man as a savage beast to whom consideration towards his own kind is something alien. (58-9, emphasis original)

As a result, Freud alleges that the above-mentioned dictum is “strongly counter to the original nature of man” (59); and therefore, “these endeavours of civilization have not so far achieved very much” (59).

As is clear, unlike Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, where the subordinate groups are manipulated by the help of the psychology created mostly through derelict and destroyed buildings and landscape, architecture in *High-Rise*, similar to the one in some other dystopias such as Zamyatin's *We* and Huxley's *Brave New World*, is a brand new one that is equipped with high-tech conveniences, for the aim of the writer is to criticise the defects of modernist architecture. Hence, in addition to the above-mentioned services and conveniences, which indeed make the building a self-sufficient entity, the tower block emerges as “the epitome of the Corbuserian aesthetics and planning” with its vertical nature (Tereszewski, “Modern Wastelands” 286). Therefore, it will be much helpful to discuss Le Corbusier's ideas regarding high-rise housing to shed light on its repercussions and shortcomings as reflected in *High-Rise*. In his book entitled *Towards a New Architecture*, Le Corbusier claims that “[m]odern life demands, and is waiting for, a new kind of plan both for the house and for the city” (45). This new kind of plan is centred on the idea of order, which is governed by geometrical and mathematical



forms. Claiming that people are living in unworthy houses that ruin their health and *morale*, Le Corbusier proposes to adopt new forms of housing, which is actually nothing more than the spirit of mass-housing. He promotes it as follows:

We must create the mass-production spirit.  
 The spirit of constructing mass-production houses.  
 The spirit of living in mass-production houses.  
 The spirit of conceiving mass-production houses.  
 If we eliminate from our hearts and minds all dead concepts in regard to the house, and look at the question from a critical and objective point of view, we shall arrive at the 'House-Machine,' the mass-production house, healthy (and morally so too) and beautiful in the same way that the working tools and instruments which accompany our existence are beautiful. (*Towards a New Architecture* 6-7)

The mass-production house that Le Corbusier adopts and promotes here as "House-Machine" is the high-rise unit that is built in accord with mathematical and geometrical forms, and therefore is the pure manifestation of plan and order. Indeed, there are manifold reasons for Le Corbusier's choice that are deeply rooted in his juxtaposition of nature, which he finds chaotic, and culture, which is, for him, planned and orderly. According to his line of argument in this respect, nature

presents itself to us as a chaos; the vault of the heavens, the shapes of lakes and seas, the outlines of hills. The actual scene which lies before our eyes, with its kaleidoscopic fragments and its vague distances, is a confusion. There is nothing there that resembles the objects with which we surround ourselves, and which we have created. Seen by us without reference to any other thing, the aspects of Nature seem purely accidental. (*The City of Tomorrow* 74)

As opposed to chaotic nature however, Le Corbusier claims culture to be planned and orderly, for it is governed by human reason. Therefore, in this tireless competition between nature and culture, humans are superior to nature, and reign over it with the houses they build: "Man has always done this, and he has built his houses and his towns. Human order, a geometrical thing, reigns in them, [...] it is the mark of great civilizations, and has left dazzling landmarks to be our pride and for our perpetual admonition" (*The City of Tomorrow* 86). As can be understood from his remarks, human order is the primary principle for the superiority of culture over nature. When there is order and plan, people will feel safe and secure, and therefore be happy: "All the

works that man has achieved are an ‘ordering.’ Seen from the sky, they appear on the earth below as geometric objects” (*The City of Tomorrow* 83).

Additionally, Le Corbusier identifies machinery, modern art and thought with geometry and mathematical forms. Associating the twentieth century with machinery, he claims that “[t]he age in which we live is therefore essentially a geometrical one; all its ideas are orientated in the direction of geometry. Modern art and thought—after a century of analysis—are now seeking beyond what is merely accidental; geometry leads them to mathematical forms, a more and more generalized attitude” (*The City of Tomorrow* 39). Due to this fact, he proposes “House-Machine” that is equipped with all kinds of mechanic features to help its residents to live their lives safe and secure.

Obviously, Le Corbusier put his thoughts into practice, contributing to modernist architecture with some magnificent and memorable buildings of the twentieth century such as Chapel at Ronchamp, Swiss dormitory at the Cité Universitaire in Paris, and Unité d’Habitation in Marseilles. The influence of Le Corbusier with respect to the erection of high-rise buildings was also felt in post-war London due to the dire consequences of the Second World War on economy and the landscape. To replace the destroyed landscape, and provide people with houses, high-rise tower blocks were preferred. As Sascha Klein eloquently states, these tower blocks

were cheap and quick to build thanks to the limited amount of space their vertical arrangement required and also to the new method of building called “system building”, which consisted of excessive prefabrication of the components such as walls, floors, windows, plumbing and even furnishings. These modules formed moderately-sized, hygienic apartments with vast open spaces around them. Hundreds of apartment complexes were built in London alone, with thousands of people rehoused within them. (79)

That being the case, high-rise tower blocks were erected extensively in the late 1950s and 1960s. However, such high-rise housing did not appeal to the general public due to its stark contrast with the traditional housing that they were accustomed to in Britain, and moreover, “[t]he general disillusionment [...] stemmed from the criminality and social problems which the high-rise became noted for” (Topolovska 79). These mass-houses built for the lower income groups soon became notorious for all sorts of violence, vandalism, and crimes. Balfron Tower in London’s East End and Trelick

Tower in West London, both of which were built by the famous architect Ernő Goldfinger, are the best cases in point. Soon after their erection, these tower blocks became notorious for disorder, chaos, vandalism, and all sorts of crimes. Aptly nicknamed “Tower of Terror,” Trellick Tower was destroyed in a very short time with graffiti on its walls, ruined elevators, vandalised corridors, ransacked apartments, broken bulbs and the like. Observing the total failure of his Trellick Tower, Goldfinger put the blame on the people residing there, and claimed: “I built skyscrapers for people to live in there and now they messed them up – disgusting” (qtd. in Topolovska 79). Unlike Goldfinger’s claims, however, the failure of this modernist architecture seems to be related with the structure of the building rather than the misuse of its tenants. The mechanic nature and verticality of the building, contrary to Le Corbusier’s belief, had a negative effect on the psychology of its dwellers, and led to crimes. These problems were the result of the failure of the architecture’s design. By the 1970s, therefore, there was already a critical stance against high-rise tower blocks in Britain when Ballard’s novel came out. Hence, as Chris Hall argues, “[t]here were [also] many architectural inspirations for *High-Rise* – Le Corbusier’s Cit. Radieuse in Marseille, the Montparnasse tower in Paris – but the closest model is probably the brutalist Balfron tower in east London, not far from where Ballard puts his cluster of five tower blocks” (para. 12). In a similar vein, Roger Luckhurst also draws parallels between Le Corbusier’s L’unité d’Habitation, and the tower block in the novel. In this respect, he claims:

In Marseilles, Le Corbusier’s L’Unité d’Habitation de Grandeur Conforme (The Standard Size Housing Block) was inaugurated in October 1952, the first element in the realisation of the Radiant City. L’Unité was intended to be the first of eight blocks, to house 20,000 people after a catastrophic loss of housing stock in the war. It had revolutionary social intent [...]. The building also announced a revolution in form: it was built ‘without regulations – against disastrous regulations’ and was one of the earliest experiments in concrete brut – raw and unfinished concrete, complete with the blemishes that retained the marks of its casting and construction. It would inspire the New Brutalism amongst the radical planners and architects of the post-war reconstruction. (“High-Rise 1975/2015” 63)

Referred to as a “vertical city” all throughout the novel, the edifice in the book emerges as a perfect and somehow exaggerated manifestation of Le Corbusier’s model. According to Sebastian Groes’s line of argument, in this respect, “*High-Rise* mimics and mocks Le Corbusier’s discourse, such as the architect’s idea of the apartment as a

‘the perfect human Cell, the cell which corresponds most perfectly to our physiological and sentimental needs. We must arrive at the ‘house-machine’, which must be both practical and emotionally satisfying” (134).

Evidently, in this critical work, Ballard aims to criticise the shortcomings of modernist Brutalist architecture, which failed to meet the former expectations of people. To put it in other words, the novel is certainly “a critical treatise on modern Brutalist architecture” (Bradshaw and Brown 346), and it “might well be read as representing the final failure of an attempt towards modernist spatial planning; as modernism’s death-knell” (Bradshaw and Brown 344). Indeed, the emergence of modernist architecture after the First World War is rather touchy and well-intentioned, for “an increasing number of European architects began to think of how they could express their desire to get away from the old regimes and what they saw as the overly complex, messy, and decadent way of life that had led to the war” (Glancey 20). With the new white and clean architecture, lots of architects “believed they could create an architecture that was free of the weight of history” (Glancey 20). However, as clearly observed in some of the examples, some very particular elements of modernist architecture such as “its extreme rationality, its pure functionalism, its brutal break with the past” (Spurr, *Architecture* 5) are not in tune with human nature and psychology, and hence ended up with some shortcomings. At this juncture, although Ballard’s interest in the built environment is rather clear, and there are some architects like Geoff Manaugh, claiming that architects “have more to learn from the fiction of J.G. Ballard [...] than [...] from Le Corbusier” (Sellars), since the aim of the dissertation is to shed light on the intricate relationship between human psychology and architecture as reflected in utopias/dystopias, the focus of this chapter will be on the effects of modernist architecture on the psychology of characters, rather than an exploration of the defects of modernist architecture. Hence, Ballard’s use of such architectural landscapes as a trope as part of his criticism will be evaluated with respect to domination, manipulation, and control of people’s everyday lives through Lefebvre’s conceptualisation of space as a social product, which is produced and reproduced perpetually through the control of the authorities and lived experiences of its occupants/users. For Lefebvre, space, besides being a means of production, “is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power” (30). As

discussed in the Introduction, to better explain the complex phenomenon of the production of space, Lefebvre offers a triadic division of space into three components: physical (perceived) space, mental (conceived) space, and social (lived) space, which are also known as, respectively, *spatial practice*, *representations of space*, and *representational spaces*.

Since the high-rise building is a structure that is conceived by the architects, it will be helpful to begin with Lefebvre's second level of the triad: the conceived space, that is, *representations of space*. This realm of the producers is modelled on Le Corbusier's notion of the "House-Machine," which is built in accord with the mere principles of geometrical and mathematical forms. Hence, Ballard's eponymous high-rise tower block is obviously a pure manifestation of the modernist architecture. In addition to numerous conveniences mentioned in the introduction, the equipment of the building with manifold high-tech engineering facilities such as high-speed elevators, air-conditioning conduits, garbage disposal chutes and electrical switching systems make the high-rise a self-sufficient machine-like entity. Yet what is more, besides these conveniences and services, the materials used in the design of the building also create this mechanic atmosphere inside the high-rise. The massive scale of the glass and concrete architecture (*HR 3*), and the metallic flash of the polaroid camera which is referred to as its "true light" (*HR 154*), in this respect, evince that the true nature of the building in the novel is mechanic. Added to these mechanic features, the verticality of the edifice transforms it into "a small vertical city" (*HR 4*), which gives its two thousand inhabitants the sense of "living in the gondola of a ferris wheel permanently suspended three hundred above the ground" (*HR 3*). In this level of the production of space, it is very difficult to distinguish ideology from knowledge, and hence in accord with the ideology of modernist architect, verticality is perhaps its most significant feature.

Verticality is a phallic symbol and it indicates a realm of male virility, phallic erectility, masculinity, and even masculine violence. Moreover, the aim of phallic symbol is to demonstrate power, be it political or economic. Referring to verticality as "*phallic verticality*" (36, emphasis original) in his *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre also

emphasises the role of verticality in demonstrating power: “The arrogant verticality of skyscrapers, and especially of public and state buildings, introduces a phallic or more precisely a phallocratic element into the visual realm; the purpose of this display, of this need to impress, is to convey an impression of authority to each spectator. Verticality and great height have ever been the spatial expression of potentially violent power” (98). As Yi-Fu Tuan aptly puts it, “the high-rise is the product of an age to which we all belong” (117), and hence, since we are surrounded by them, in our daily lives we might not seize their phallic symbolism and the message given. However, as the events in the novel also show, the verticality of the building is specifically given, and there is much emphasis on it. It symbolises economic power on the one hand, but also reveals the fact that it is a male dominated architecture, in which women are pushed to the periphery, and when appropriate conditions emerge with the unfolding of the events, this symbolic nature of the building is put into practice with the rape and molestation of women. They are raped in diverse ways by the male characters, and even used as a commodity to be exchanged for food. When the violent attacks among the floors begin, the condition of women worsen, as they are totally commodified, and transformed into sex objects by the male characters. In addition to many other unnamed characters, Helen Wilder is one of the characters, who is harshly molested and raped by Royal, for example. Likewise, Alice, along with another woman, is kept as her brother Laing’s woman.

Additionally, verticality is a Corbuserian technique, for he argues in his “A Contemporary City,” that erecting vertical buildings is necessary to “*increase the open spaces and diminish the distances to be covered*. Therefore the centre of the city must be constructed *vertically*” (382, emphasis original). At this point, recalling Corbuserian aesthetics of urban planning, the verticality of the building gives the characters a sense of culture’s triumph over nature:

The high-rises seemed almost to challenge the sun itself [...]. It was only fitting that the sun first appeared between the legs of the apartment blocks, raising itself over the horizon as if nervous of waking this line of giants. During the morning, from his office on the top floor of the medical school, Laing would watch their shadows swing across the parking-lots and empty plazas of the project, sluice-gates opening to admit the day. For all his reservations, Laing was the first to concede that these huge buildings had won their attempt to *colonize the sky*. (HR 20, emphasis added)

Moreover, while looking through the window of his studio apartment on the 25<sup>th</sup> floor,

this verticality also gives Dr. Laing the sense of “looking down at the sky, rather than up at it” (Ballard 5). Laing’s delight in the verticality of the building might not only be related with culture’s triumph over nature, but might refer to his satisfaction with the phallic symbol associated with the building, for while bragging about the height of the building, Laing might also – albeit unconsciously – be bragging about his virility.

Notwithstanding Laing’s intent regarding the verticality of the building, one thing is for sure, with his position of the 25<sup>th</sup> floor of a high-rise building, Laing reminds one of de Certeau’s viewer on top of the World Trade Centre, who has panoptic view of the streets of Manhattan. Despite the viewer’s God’s-eye view however, he/she cannot experience the streets like a walker. His/Her elevation to a higher place put him/her at a distance, and worse still, “[i]t’s hard to be down when you’re up” (92, emphasis original). Although he cannot experience the streets like ordinary walkers, and cannot write his own stories, Laing is actually pleased with his high place, for such detached position of the building not only from the physical environment, but also from the decaying nineteenth-century terraced houses, and empty factories in the neighbourhood evokes Le Corbusier’s belief in the “House-Machine” as a realm of safety and security, protecting its inhabitants from the external world. As a result, the tenants move to the building for its security by escaping the chaos of nature. Dr. Laing, for instance, moves to “the security of the high-rise,” which is “away from crowded streets, traffic hold-ups, rush-hour journeys on the Underground” (HR 3-4).

Not surprisingly, while the upper floor tenants enjoy this sense of verticality to a great extent, that is not the case for the lower floor people, because similar to the vertical structure of the building, there is also a vertical class hierarchy in the population of the tenants. Although it is ironically claimed in the beginning that the “two thousand tenants formed a virtually homogenous collection of well-to-do professional people – lawyers, doctors, tax consultants, senior academics and advertising executives, along with a smaller group of airline pilots, film-industry technicians and trios of air-hostesses sharing apartments” (HR 6), soon enough however, it is revealed that similar to the social class divisions in the outer world, there is a class hierarchy among the tenants of different floors, which is indeed divided into three distinct classes – lower, middle and

upper – based on the tenants’ income and occupations. In this hierarchic structure, while the first nine floors belong to the lower class people who are mostly film technicians and air-hostesses, the middle section of the high-rise, which extends from the 10<sup>th</sup> floor to the swimming-pool and restaurant deck on the 35<sup>th</sup> floor, is occupied by the self-centred but basically docile members of the professions such as doctors, lawyers, and accountants. Above them, on the top five floors, is the upper class of the high-rise, with television actresses and academics (*HR* 69-70). With this vertical class structure with respect to the density of its population, a realm of domination and control is imposed on the residents to sustain the powerful role of the upper floor residents. This class hierarchy from top to bottom, and consequent uneven distribution of the use of services and conveniences among different floor people – such as carpeted staircases; speediest elevators and nearest parking places in the parking lot being reserved only for upper floor tenants; similarly, their domination of the life within the high-rise by deciding on when the children of the lower floor tenants could use the swimming pools and organising the menus in the restaurants; their complaints being acted upon first while the problems of the lower floor people being disregarded – are, indeed, the primary reasons that influence the psychology of the characters residing in the lower strata in a negative way, and inevitably bring about the clash between these opposite groups. Although this distinction can be clearly observed from the very beginning, with the progress of the narrative however, as Stephen Graham also claims, “vertical class distinctions quickly become exaggerated and violent as the complex machines and systems sustaining modern urban life in the tower, and the norms of grudging social toleration, both collapse and decay” (2016, 393-4). Because, after a while, *spatial practices* of the *representational space* begin to replace the *spatial practices* of *representations of space*.

In the process of *representations of space*, Anthony Royal, one of the primary characters of the novel, dwelling on top of the building in his penthouse apartment on the 40<sup>th</sup> floor, emerges as an important figure not only with respect to his profession as an architect that contributed to the plan of the tower block, but also with his all-possessive presence on top of the building. As the owner of the highest apartment in the tower block, Anthony Royal feels himself like the “lord of the manor” – “a phrase that



he borrows from Anne's rule book" (*HR* 100), a "landowner" (*HR* 121), or more interestingly a "feudal chief to the hilt, presiding each evening over the council meetings held in his drawing-room" (*HR* 193), and wants to dominate, and control the whole block by implementing his rules on other residents. Even when the lower floor people begin to fight with the upper floor residents, Royal is very possessive, and therefore does not want to leave the building. As Klein claims, in this respect, "Anthony Royal, the only member of the architects' board to inhabit the building, justifies the social hierarchy as a powerfully coercive force necessary for upholding a basic sense of order when he claims that a rigid hierarchy of some kind was the key to the elusive success of these huge buildings" (7).

In a similar fashion, Royal's young wife Anne, the only daughter of a provincial industrialist, who was brought up in a large country house, "a finicky copy of a Loire chateau maintained by a staff of servants in the full-blown nineteenth-century manner" (*HR* 99), enjoys the whole tower block before the arrival of other tenants by riding the elevators "as if they were the grandly upholstered gondolas of a private funicular," swimming alone "in the undisturbed waters of the two swimming-pools, and strolling about "the shopping concourse as if visiting her own personal bank, hairdresser and supermarket" (*HR* 100). Besides that however, Anne's use of the mechanic facilities of the tower block such as "thermostats and humidity sensors, computerized elevator route-switches and over-riders" (*HR* 99), which substituted "the master-servant relationship" (*HR* 99) that she was accustomed to in her country house is nothing more than the *spatial practices of representations of space* imposed by the architects and the ruling upper class residents. Hence, when their rule and domination are challenged through the lived experiences of the lower floor residents as will be discussed in the following parts, Anne feels "irritated" (*HR* 100), and wants to leave the building. As opposed to Anne however, Anthony Royal is very much pleased with this chaos, and is in the belief that this new social order, triggered by violence, shows the success of their spatial planning rather than its failure:

Later, however, the collapse of the high-rise began to strengthen his will to win through. The testing of the building he had helped to design was a testing of himself. Above all, he became aware that a new social order was beginning to emerge around him. Royal was certain that a rigid hierarchy of some kind was the

key to the elusive success of these huge buildings. As he often pointed out to Anne, office blocks containing as many as thirty thousand workers functioned smoothly for decades thanks to a social hierarchy as rigid and as formalized as an anthill's, with an incidence of crime, social unrest, and petty misdemeanours that was virtually nil. The confused but unmistakable emergence of this new social order—apparently based on small tribal enclaves—fascinated Royal. To begin with, he had been determined to stay on, come what may and whatever the hostility directed against him, in the hope of acting as its midwife. In fact, this alone had stopped him from notifying his former colleagues of the mounting chaos within the building. As he told himself repeatedly, the present breakdown of the high-rise might well mark its success rather than its failure. Without realizing it, he had given these people a means of escaping into a new life, and a pattern of social organization that would become the paradigm of all future high-rise blocks. (HR 96)

This new order, triggered due to the clash between *representations of space* and *representational spaces*, seems to be the thing that Royal had desired. Zoos, like “the architecture of large structures, had always been Royal’s particular interest” (HR 112). Yet what is more, he is also known to have drawn many sketches of zoos, “one of them—ironically—a high-rise structure” (HR 112). As there are many references to the high-rise as a zoo, Royal seems to have converged his two dream structures in the form of a human zoo manifested in the form of a high-rise. Yet interestingly, this new order shows that one thing that he could not foresee is that the ones whom he wanted to dominate and control have learnt to struggle and react against them:

As for the new social order that he had hoped to see emerge, he knew now that his original vision of a high-rise aviary had been closer to the truth than he guessed. Without knowing it, he had constructed a gigantic vertical zoo, its hundreds of cages stacked above each other. All the events of the past few months made sense if one realized that these brilliant and exotic creatures had learned to open the doors. (HR 191)

And finally, “[t]he zoo had rebelled against its keeper” (HR 202).

As might be deduced from the discussion above, the architect and the ruling upper class people impose their ideologies and control not only over the building but also over other residents through some *spatial practices*, such as not allowing the lower floor people to use the swimming pool on the 35<sup>th</sup> floor, preventing the children of lower floor tenants from entering the sculpture garden on top of the building, which was originally planned for them, and keeping the fastest elevators locked and only for their own use, among many others. Therefore, initially, the social space inside the building is wholly

controlled by them. The vertical class hierarchy inside the building and impositions of certain things on the residents prove how *representations of space* is practiced inside the building. However, since such *spatial practices* influence the psychology of the characters in a negative way, soon enough *representational space* comes to the foreground through its *spatial practices*, ranging from ransacking, rape and murder to cannibalism. Through these *spatial practices*, what is observed inside the building is a reaction against the impositions of *representations of space*, which wants to establish and sustain its own domination, control, and order.

Even the earliest glimmers of the *spatial practices* of the *representational spaces* manifest themselves in the form of tensions and pettiest problems among the tenants that are born as a result of the chasm due to the hierarchical structure of this class distinction, which is imposed by the architect and ruling upper floor tenants. As nobody cares about the tenants two floors below them, especially in the noisy parties that continue till late hours in the morning, many people throw used bottles and cans, torn newspapers, cigarette butts, and even used condoms to the balconies below (*HR 2*; 80), which lead to the increase of tension between them. Yet what is more, the upper floor tenants, who are generally childless pet-keeping residents, are not so sympathetic towards the lower floor people, and they do not allow the children of the lower floor people to use the swimming pools with the claim that these children are urinating into the pool. Lower floor families, on the contrary, have very antagonistic feelings towards upper floor tenants, because the latter use the lower floor elevators as lavatories for their pets to urinate. What is more, the children of the lower floor tenants are not allowed to enter the sculpture garden on top of the building, which was originally designed for children, because lower floor people are not allowed to move to the upper parts of the building. Hence, as an extension of this clash between the pet-owner upper class people and child-bearer lower class tenants, parents of these children finally realize that these buildings are not designed for them, as they cannot even find a suitable place for their children to play apart from someone else's car park (*HR 25*). Additionally, frequent power cuts mostly in the lower parts of the building, debris thrown from the upper floor balconies and the damaged vehicles trigger anxiety much more among the tenants. Consequently, these seemingly petty conflicts born as a result of the unequal

distribution of the rights for the use of these conveniences as part of the top-down hierarchic order based on the building's vertical structure gradually gives way to an unreasonable competition between different groups, which gradually morphs into bigger clashes and finally clan wars among opponent groups. From then on, things move faster and “residents form parties and protection groups, elevators are hijacked, cars are smashed and assaults take place” (Hewitt and Graham 929).

From the perspective of de Certeau, the *spatial practices* such as rape, murder, vandalism, and ransacking might be evaluated as the tactics of the subordinate group, that is, the lower floor people. For de Certeau, our everyday practices such as reading, cooking, walking, and sleeping are all tactical in nature. As their perverse instincts have emerged with the removal of civilisation, these people adopt such kind of extraordinary tactics to react against the impositions of the rulers and the upper floor residents. In this respect, above-mentioned *spatial practices* of the upper floor people such as preventing the lower floor tenants from benefiting from the opportunities of the upper floors, are actually the strategies of the rulers to keep the others under control. While strategies of the upper floor tenants are related with power, and hence require planning, the tactics of the lower floor people are not planned, but operate “in isolated actions, blow by blow” (36-7). Since everything is taken to extremes in dystopias, the everyday practices of the characters in *High-Rise* are not so silent or ordinary as de Certeau suggests, but rather violent, loud and extraordinary. Some tactics of the lower class people might be exemplified from the beginning as follows: “soft drinks were poured on to the cars below, drenching the windscreens and roofs of the expensive limousines and sports saloons in the front ranks” (*HR* 34). Similarly, another example of tactics might be given as follows: “Far below him, the cars in the front ranks of the parking-lot were spattered with broken eggs, wine and melted ice-cream. A dozen windscreens had been knocked out by falling bottles” (*HR* 42).

The murder of an Afghan hound owned by an upper floor tenant – an actress from the 37<sup>th</sup> floor – in the swimming pool of the 10<sup>th</sup> floor, and the sexual molestation of a woman in an elevator in one of the lower floors during a short blackout in the 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> floors – most probably the breaking point to trigger the first instances of

violent crimes – emerge as a result of the increasing tension between these opposing groups, stemming from the things that are imposed on them through the vertical nature of the building. Because the person drowning the hound – who is later revealed to be Richard Wilder – kills it not because of personal dislike, but to take revenge from the upper floor people; and in away, to take revenge from the building itself:

He was sure that he had drowned the Afghan, not because he disliked the dog particularly or wanted to upset its owner, but to revenge himself on the upper storeys of the building. He had seized the dog in the darkness when it blundered into the pool. Giving in to a cruel but powerful impulse, he had pulled it below the water. As he held its galvanized and thrashing body under the surface, in a strange way he had been struggling with the building itself. (*HR* 63)

Wilder's act is actually tactical. By killing the dog of an upper floor tenant, Wilder is getting back at the building, for he believes the building to be responsible for this oppression imposed on them by the upper floor tenants. Obviously, Wilder's struggle with the building is a profound one in that from the very beginning of the work, he feels the antagonism of the building, or more appropriately, the vertical class hierarchy so much that when lying on his bed he feels uneasy with the awareness of the pressure of the building: "conscious of each of the 999 other apartments pressing on him through the walls and ceiling, forcing the air from his chest" (*HR* 63). In this respect, one might claim that unlike some others like Laing who is a middle floor tenant, Wilder is aware of the oppressive strategies of the upper floor tenants. Most probably due to his position at the bottom of the ladder in the hierarchical structure, Wilder emerges as both the most aggressive and violent of all the primary characters, and also the most conscious one of the chasm between upper and lower floors. Hence, "[h]e rejects the system and revolts against it, his mind and body succumbing to the general disintegration" (Topolovska 80). To this end, at some point in the book, Wilder decides to ascend the building to make a television documentary about high-rises, demonstrating the physical and psychological pressures of living in such a huge condominium (*HR* 14). By taking the mysterious and ambiguous death of the jeweller from the 40<sup>th</sup> floor as the starting point, Wilder plans to examine life in the high-rise in terms of design errors and minor irritations in the first part, and then to switch to "the psychology of living in a community of two thousand people boxed up into the sky-everything from the incidence of crime, divorce and sexual misdemeanours to the turnover of residents, their health,

the frequency of insomnia and other psychosomatic disorders” (HR 68). Although he initially attempts to ascend the building for his documentary, after a while, he decides that he must “be accepted by his new neighbours as one of them” (HR 161). However, ironically enough, Wilder’s “desperate attempt to ascend the high-rise in the midst of this warfare,” proves the “futility of upward mobility” (Tereszewski, “Modern Wastelands” 287), for the higher he climbs, the “wilder” Wilder becomes (Klein 9). In this respect, even the names of the characters are very symbolic. The architect as the producer is on top of the hierarchy as an upper floor tenant is called Royal. Just on the contrary, another character at the bottom of the pyramid is called Wilder.

Wilder’s extraordinary reactions towards the building and the rulers are certainly related with his position on the second floor. However, whether he is not satisfied with the amenities allocated to the lower floors or not is not so clear. Returning to the issue of verticality, as a man from the second floor, Wilder might not be associated with the phallic symbol of the building, and hence might have felt himself emasculated. That is why, to prove his manliness, perhaps unconsciously, he tries to ascend the high-rise. And hence, on his way, he rapes and molests women. His ascent and rapes, molestations and other violent deeds might be taken as tactics of a man trying to survive within the system with what is assigned to him. Interestingly enough, as Spurr also puts it, “[a]s he draws nearer to the summit, however, Wilder’s mind and body are progressively marked by the disintegration of the order he set out to conquer” (*Architecture* 230). When he finally arrives at the sculpture garden, the summit of the building, probably to empower himself and to prove his virility, Wilder is like an emasculated boy. He initially takes off his clothes, and “[o]nly dimly aware of what he is doing, [...] kills the architect, thus, at the novel’s end, making possible the first signs of a return to normalcy” (Spurr, *Architecture* 230).

However, besides the vertical hierarchy inside the building, the mechanic nature of the edifice also plays a vital role in the deterioration of their psychology, and therefore leading to the emergence of struggles and then resistances in the *representational space*. Initially deluded by the ostensible security of the high-rise, the tenants imprison themselves willingly in the building. However, unlike Le Corbusier’s claims that the

“House-Machine” improves the life standards of people with respect to their health and *morale*, the mechanic nature of the architecture has a dehumanising effect on the psychology of the characters. Insomnia is an important psychosomatic illness born as a result of this mechanisation. Just from the very beginning, it emerges as a common complaint, “almost an epidemic,” of almost all the tenants as if it were a “built-in-design flaw” of the building (*HR* 10-11). Hijinks born as a result of hundreds of noisy parties thrown all throughout the tower block till late hours play an important role in the emergence of such an illness inside the building. However, perhaps even more significant than these noisy parties is the robotic structure of the building with all of its elevators going up and down restlessly, and the rest of the services such as air-conditioning conduits, garbage disposal chutes, and many others, working tirelessly to serve the needs of the tenants. With the artificiality of the light inside, things really get out of hand, and the tenants suffer severely from the dire consequences of insomnia. Worse yet, they get accustomed to the artificial light of the building so much that when they are rarely confronted with the daylight outside, the tenants are deeply disturbed by it. While leaving the building for one of his rare visits to his office at the medical school, for example, Dr. Laing feels a sharp sense of uneasiness: “He had not been to the medical school for days, and as he stepped through the glass doors he was struck immediately by the cooler light and air, like the harsh atmosphere of an alien planet” (*HR* 142). Laing’s uneasiness in the external world like a vampire dreading the daylight indicates, perhaps metaphorically, Le Corbusier’s false juxtaposition of nature as a source of chaos and danger, and house, as a human construct, as the epitome of order and safety. Laing’s disillusionment is therefore reinforced further as such: “Laing reached his car and leaned against the window pillar. He knew that he was testing himself against the excitements of the world outside, exposing himself to its hidden dangers. For all its present conflict, the high-rise represented safety and security” (*HR* 143).

Most probably, due to this false sense of security, the tenants prefer to keep themselves to themselves by pacifying the policemen and not reporting the instances of murder and rape even in the early days, and disconnecting all the telephones in the high-rise. In this respect, when he realizes that their telephone is disconnected due to the raids in their

penthouse apartment, Anthony Royal feels “a distinct sense of security” at knowing that they will not receive a phone call any more (*HR* 108). In a similar fashion, other residents also cut themselves off from the outside world by ripping out all the phone lines (*HR* 141). With this separation from the external world however, the tenants begin to alienate themselves from its rules and norms, as well. Not surprisingly, such separation from the real world brings about lack of human relations and moral control. Yet what is more, when the dehumanising effects of the mechanic nature of the building are added to this, the tenants focus only on their sexual desires and bodily instincts. The result is “a pleasant carnival atmosphere” (*HR* 34) of violence, crimes, and perversities. All the two thousand inhabitants of the building willingly join the “secret logic of the high-rise” (*HR* 170), and perform all sorts of vicious things easily. Especially with the decay of civilisation, that is born out of the clash between *representations of space* and *representational space*, it is easy to notice and unearth the hidden primitive instincts of the so-called civilised human beings. The residents show their lived struggles in the form of violence.

The manifestations of *spatial practices* in the form of all kinds of violence, ranging from sexual molestations, rapes, and perversities to murder and cannibalism, demonstrate that one’s neighbour is the first one to be targeted at one’s aggressiveness. With the rise of violence inside the building, the edifice is transformed into a battleground, where a battle for an unknown reason is fought among the rival groups of the tenants, who have now divided into distinct clans. This apparent division first into distinct clans, and then to individual hunter-gatherer savagery demonstrates that the so-called safety of the tower block is an illusion. Yet what is more, unlike Le Corbusier’s claims, geometrical forms, plan, and order do not necessarily bring peace and safety, because human psychology cannot be estimated with these geometrical forms and plans. Evidently, the result of such a delusion is violence. Therefore, especially soon after assuming the clan psychology, different clans barricade their floors against rival groups, and things really get out of hand: crude violence, sexual crimes and perversities pervade the whole block. Moreover, debris, kitchen garbage, and pieces of furniture float in the swimming pools among the corpses of the residents and animals. None of the lavatories or garbage disposal chutes work, and a faint spray of urine is felt everywhere. They



forget the real functions of the machines, since they use them for different ends. Furthermore, reminiscent of “the priapic figures drawn by cave-dwellers” (HR 152), they begin to draw different signs and figures on the walls, which is indeed the clearest manifestation of the primitivism that they adopt. In this chaotic atmosphere, the hierarchic structure is turned upside down: women are raped, initially pets and then humans are murdered, and most of the tenants, who begin to act with their deepest and most perverse instincts, take some sort of a perverted pleasure from all these happenings. To give an example, Dt. Steel begins to amuse himself with a myriad of corpses that can now be found here and there all throughout the building:

Dressing up corpses and setting them in grotesque tableaux was a favourite pastime of the dentist's. His imagination, repressed by all the years of reconstructing his patients' mouths, came alive particularly when he was playing with the dead. The previous day Laing had blundered into an apartment and found him painting a bizarre cosmetic mask on the face of a dead account-executive, dressing the body like an overblown drag-queen in a voluminous silk nightdress. Given time, and a continuing supply of subjects, the dentist would repopulate the entire high-rise. (HR 213)

What paves the way for such an atmosphere inside the building is the clash between two processes of the production of space, namely, *representations of space* and *representational space*. Lower floor people do not accept the impositions of *representations of space*, and therefore through the physical manifestation of their *spatial practices*, they react against the building itself and those who oppress them. As a result of the interplay of the three processes of space, *representational space* produces a new order. This new order in the building, which revolves around “three obsessions – security, food and sex” (HR 193), by shattering the impositions of *representations of space*, turns the vertical hierarchy totally upside-down with Wilder's shooting of Anthony Royal in the sculpture garden on top of the building. Soon after this event however, Wilder is also killed by a group of women, who try to survive in the new order by reacting against male dominance and violence.

In such a male dominated phallic realm, to see such solidarity among some women is significant, for all throughout the novel, they have been pushed to the periphery and used as the commodity of the male characters. The death of two primary male characters, Royal and Wilder, respectively the one who prepares the way for their

manipulation with the plan of such a phallic structure, and the other being perhaps the wildest towards women, is promising on the one hand. Yet, Laing's adoption of a new life style with two women under his wings simultaneously negates the conditions of women. When compared with the other dystopias discussed, the high-rise tower in the novel is perhaps the worst place to be for a woman. Even in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which is seemingly a bad place for everybody, women are treated much better. To put it in another way, at least there is no such a gap between the treatment of men and women.

Described by the narrator as the "most true tenant" (HR 101), Dr. Laing is the only one of the three primary characters, surviving all this violence and massacre in the building. For Baxter, Laing "survives only by reverting to the law of the jungle" (234). This is because he seems to be "a satisfied man, for whom anarchy has brought not disquiet but contentment" (235), while eating Anthoy Royal's Alsatian in his balcony in the beginning of the novel. Making the most of the decay of civilisation inside the building therefore, he enjoys the bad smell of his feet and genitals, and similar to the rest of his fellow tenants, sees "trouble as a means of enlarging [...] [his sex life]" (Baxter 235). As Jonathan Davies puts it, in this vein, "Laing is the one character who seems equally adapted to the dynamics of the building at the beginning of the novel as at the end, and it comes as no surprise that in the final scene he is thinking of returning to work and refurbishing parts of the high-rise" (1758).

What is interesting in this novel is that although the whole high-rise consists of a thousand living units for the tenants, there is actually no mention of the concept of "home." None of the residents either on the upper floors or the lower floors, with children or with pets, have any sense of home, and this is because of the fact that none of them feel themselves at home. As Allen argues, home is "a place for certain kinds of work carried out by various members of the family: pursuing hobbies, studying, writing letters, cleaning and repairing things, managing financial affairs" (20). What is more, home is the place where one can feel safe and secure. However, in dystopias it is very difficult to see such a place called home. Especially in *High-Rise*, they do not feel themselves at home, for they are continually ransacked, raped, murdered, and molested within the high-rise apartment building, which indeed needs must be a place of safety.

This violence inside the houses prove ironically the British saying that “An Englishman’s home is his castle” wrong, because these people are raped, molested, and killed in their houses.

Instead of giving the sense of home, the atmosphere of *High-Rise* reminds one of an imprisonment. Architecture both in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and in *High-Rise* gives the characters a sense of imprisonment. What is interesting is that while the citizens are imprisoned by the Party in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the ones in *High-Rise* imprison themselves willingly, and refuse to leave the building. Moreover, they are aware of this sense of imprisonment since the beginning, for there is a reference to Laing’s studio apartment as an “over-priced cell” (HR 7) just at the beginning. Perhaps that is why, after a while, Laing begins to think that this building is built “not for man, but for man’s absence” (HR 28).

When compared with the totalitarian dystopia, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, *High-Rise* is a very different one in that it begins with a utopian impulse, and then transforms into a dystopia. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is totally dystopic from the beginning, and might be utopian for only the members of the Inner Party. However, it is not the case for Orwell’s other dystopia, *Animal Farm*, for it begins as a utopia and turns into dystopia after the pigs’ betrayal of the revolution. Likewise, with all its conveniences, *High-Rise* begins as a utopia, but ends up as a dystopia, where there is no sense of neighbourhood, not a glimmer of hope, or no remains of civilisation.

In conclusion, “isolated from the world at large with its self-sustaining facilities and highly successful bourgeois inhabitants, the high-rise rapidly degenerates from a highly organized experiment in modern living to a carnivalesque orgy of destruction and barbarism” (Zhang, Spicer, and Hancock 896). Women are raped and used as commodity, bloody murders are committed just for sheer pleasure, and drunken children play with human bones among the debris here and there. By drawing graffiti on its walls, destroying the elevators and all other facilities, stealing bulbs, jamming garbage chutes, committing murder and sexual crimes, the tenants actually try to take revenge from the oppressive vertical structure of the building. In this respect, the high-rise block

built as a utopian place with the purpose of providing all the conveniences that its residents need gradually transforms into a nightmarish dystopia, influencing its residents and their psychology profoundly due to their interaction. From a Lefebvrian viewpoint, the violence and consequent collapse of civilisation can be best described as the clash of what is planned by the architects and the upper floor people in the *representations of space* and the lived experiences of the residents in the *representational space* through some *spatial practices*. *Spatial practices* of the residents, everything in the novel such as incidences of murder, crime, divorce, and rape, among many others, are certainly the result of the psychology of living in a community of two thousand people “boxed up into the sky” (HR 4). Therefore, one can claim that supported by engineering innovations, such a vertical “House-Machine” is not necessarily in tune with the psychology of the characters. Consequently, while scrutinising the limits of such architecture on the psychology of his characters with respect to the oppressive effects of modern and technological architectural designs, Ballard demonstrates that violence might sometimes come from “home” not from the outside.

## CONCLUSION

Drawing on the theories of Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and Michel de Certeau with respect to their conceptualisation of the inextricable relationship between space and power, and borrowing from architectural psychology for the general framework, it has been argued that architecture in utopias/dystopias is more than a mere setting or backdrop, in which events unfold, but an active agent or the principle element that triggers and directs the course of the events. Although such functional role of architecture, town planning, cityscape, and landscape in some other genres such as the Gothic novel and short story, horror novel and travel literature, to give a few examples, is also undeniable, architecture, and within the larger spectrum, town planning and landscape are significant in utopian/dystopian literature, for it attains its critical form by the help of the apt use of architecture. Therefore, in utopias/dystopias, there are detailed depictions of architecture, landscape, city plans or town planning. As a matter of fact, especially some classical utopias such as More's *Utopia* or Campanella's *The City of the Sun* are so schematically descriptive that it is possible to use them as the blueprints of these ideal good/no places. Perhaps the most significant reason for such reliance on architecture, setting, or city plans in utopias/dystopias is that the writers use them to reflect how they are employed as ideological tools to control the psychology of the characters by manipulating their thoughts and feelings, to indoctrinate the public and to suppress them, or to create the effects desired by the controlling bodies. Eventually, architecture in utopias/dystopias is used by the writers to establish and retain the social system of the dominant ideology. To emphasise such ideological use of architecture in utopias/dystopias, which is due to the profound impact of architecture on human thoughts, feelings, and behaviour, hitherto unnoticed spatial dimension of the familiar novels have been prioritised, and hence the inextricable bond between characters and their surroundings, be it the physical or the built environment, have been explored. The first novel is a utopia, and architecture is used to create an idealised land/country, whereas in the other two novels, which are dystopias, architecture functions as an agent to dominate, oppress, and manipulate people.

In William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, basically with the help of architecture, auspicious conditions are set for the unfolding of the events. That is to say, architecture is used by the utopian writer to manipulate the psychology of the characters in a positive way to establish a happy social system, and for its continuation. The peaceful atmosphere in the novel is created and sustained by means of the application of Morris's artistic and political views, namely, the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement, and socialism, to the architectural structure of Nowhere. While constructing such a peaceful setting, Morris depends on architecture's impact on human psyche and behaviour. The agrarian landscape of the utopian land, Nowhere, actually contrasts starkly with the dark and heavily industrialised London of the Victorian Era. Unlike the concrete and gargantuan architecture in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *High-Rise*, which are built as if for the absence of humans not for their usage, the materials used and the size of buildings in Nowhere, consisting of mostly two storeys, are specifically emphasised to shed light on the functionality of architecture. Especially with respect to the depiction of human-made architecture, one can claim that the materials used in their construction are natural elements such as stone or wood as opposed to iron and concrete, hence do not harm the natural fabric of the landscape. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the architecture of this utopian land is the size of the buildings. All the houses constructed after the revolution in 1952 are designed as small-sized buildings, which do not dominate or dwarf the landscape and human beings, and hence contribute to the psychological wellbeing of the characters. Additionally, the harmony of human-made architecture and human-designed landscape, which is certainly not the case in dystopias, is prioritised as a source of happiness.

Despite all the favourable conditions in the book, all of these details are too romantic, too idealised and hence too unrealistic. Yet still, they are very sound for Morris's own ends, for he portrays a paradise-like rural environment to uncover the ills of Victorian urbanisation and industrialisation, which caused both environmental degradation and altered the appearance of the whole landscape immensely, and additionally, widened the gap between the classes. In much the same way, Morris presents medievalism in a very optimistic and unrealistic manner by disregarding the strict class division and difficult

working conditions in the Middle Ages. As a result of this idealised and incorrect portrayal of the Middle Ages, Nowhere remains a never-never land.

As opposed to the peaceful atmosphere of utopias, there is mostly a bleak and chaotic atmosphere in dystopias, which has a negative impact on the psychology of the characters, and hence paves the way for their manipulation. Such a tenebrous and negative atmosphere is mostly created by means of the very functional use of architecture. George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is perhaps one of the most well known dystopian fictions in which architecture emerges as the primary source of domination and control. Gigantic and monumental ministry buildings, which dwarf the whole land and human beings, are used by the oppressive totalitarian government for both panoptical surveillance and to oppress the characters by giving a sense of uneasiness and helplessness, displaying the all-effective power of the state and domineering bodies and ideologies. The idea of continual surveillance, which is also seen in Zamyatin's *We* by the use of glass in buildings is developed here through technology, where all buildings and rooms are under surveillance by means of the ubiquitous *telescreens*. Like Bentham's Panopticon plan layout, the Outer Party members and the proles just observe the huge and pyramidal ministry buildings, which give them the sense of being monitored by the buildings, however, who is controlling them is not known. This is actually an important feature of Panopticism, for it, as Foucault puts it, disindividualizes power. In close connection with the panoptical aspect, the unavoidable power, strength, and even grandeur of these buildings make the citizens feel helpless, and very unworthy. Hence, in the first chapter, Winston is occupied with the power of the Party, and its ministry building, which seems so strong that he thinks that nothing can destroy it. Due to this sense of helplessness all the subordinate groups in Oceania are very submissive, and hence do not react against the Party. Not surprisingly, as Foucault also puts it, where there is power, resistance is unavoidable. Thus, Julia and Winston show a very thin and veiled resistance to the impositions of the Party by engaging in a love affair and trying to be the members of the underground resistance group known as the Brotherhood. Although they do not react against the dictates of the Party explicitly, Julia and Smith resist silently by hiring the room above the junk-shop and by walking on the streets of the prole districts. These

spatial practices actually make much sense when analysed with respect to de Certeau's notion of "strategies" and "tactics" in that while the Party keeps the architecture and landscape of those parts of the city in decay and ruins as part of its manipulative strategy; the users, Julia and Winston, use the same architectural landscape and architecture as tactics to rebel against the Party. Their walk as an everyday practice is especially significant, for while walking on the streets, their unique experience of the city turns these places into spaces, that is, spaces of resistance. Since the Party's strategies overwhelm their tactics, in the end both Julia and Winston end up being like everybody else. Consequently, such exploration of these pyramidal structures as a means of the indication of the Party's power as opposed to the ruined quarters and decaying houses of the citizens, demonstrates that Orwell uses architecture in a much successful way than other techniques such as *Doublethink* and *Newspeak*. What is more, in this dystopia, which ironically claims to be classless, there is a sharp division between the ruled and the rulers, which is particularly evinced and maintained via stark division of the places, where they live. While the Party as the powerful one positions itself at the centre, the members of the Outer Party and proles are pushed to the periphery.

Although Orwell's fictional ministry buildings are rather intimidating with their huge volume and sometimes windowless façade, and underground ramifications, they are not totally imaginary. Orwell borrows the idea from the practices of the real totalitarian governments such as Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy. In all of these totalitarian societies, the dictatorial rulers try to redesign the whole landscape in line with their political views, and hence commission to erect huge and monumental buildings as the symbol of their unvanquishable power.

In much the same way, the characters in *High-Rise* are also influenced by the domineering effects of the eponymous monumental edifice. Instead of an oppressive government, or the surveillance of a controlling political system, the characters fall victim to their yearnings for a luxurious life that capitalism offers. Distancing them totally from nature and surrounding them with only concrete and steel, Ballard's modernist architecture of the high-rise building has certainly a negative impact on the



psychology of the characters. As distance from the physical environment is against the nature of human beings, in a short while everything in the high-rise gets out of hand, and the residents destroy the whole building and its facilities, and begin to commit sexual crimes, murders, and even instances of cannibalism. Such violent deeds of the so-called civilised residents, who finally end up with hunter-gatherer primitivity, are manifest signs of the negative effects of this vertical architecture on their psychology, and they are actually taking revenge from this oppressive structure. Analysed from a Lefebvrian perspective, the production of space with respect to Lefebvre's triad, which reveals that the conceived space of the technocrats and architects in the capitalist world order, manifesting itself in the character of the architect Royal, is in conflict with the lived space of the residents. Hence, the residents reacting against the impositions of the conceived space, attack the building itself. Their attack might be evaluated as tactics from the perspective of de Certeau. When compared with the tactics of Julia and Smith in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, their tactics are rather manifest, and hence the result is an unceasing violence inside the building. Such malfunctioning of the high-rise actually shows modernist architecture's defects and failures when put into practice. Although the primary objective of the dissertation is not a critique of modernist architecture, all the violent events taking place inside the high-rise are born as a result of the defects of the Brutalist architecture, and show how psyche and behaviour of the residents are affected by the environment surrounding them.

The use of such gigantic buildings as opposed to the small houses in *News from Nowhere* is perhaps the biggest contrast between utopian and dystopian use of architecture. In the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is these huge monumental buildings that influence the psychology of the characters much more than some other techniques invented by the Party. Additionally, it is again architecture that leads to the manipulation and control of masses in big meeting spaces by means of herd mentality. In a like fashion, it is the vertical building itself that brings about all this chaos in *High-Rise*, due to its repressive influence on them. However, on the other hand, it is the small size of the user-friendly houses in *Nowhere* that prepares the peaceful atmosphere in *News from Nowhere*.

What is common in both of the dystopias is that there is the use of monumental architecture, which stands for the manifestation of power through architecture. While it is used to embody political power in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is the manifestation of the power of capitalism in *High-Rise*. In both of them, these tower-like buildings stand for the power of either politics or capitalism. With the huge volume and mass of these tower-like buildings, the rulers or, in the words of de Certeau, the producers, use these buildings as their strategies to manipulate and control the users, because human psyche is deeply affected by the environment surrounding them.

All three of the novels are set in London: an urban setting. While Morris brings the rural into the urban, the dystopia writers further urbanise it. Therefore, as well as the built environment, the absence or the presence of the physical environment in utopias and dystopias is actually another point in case. In contradistinction to Morris's agrarian landscape of *News from Nowhere*, where human-made architecture, human-designed environment, and the physical environment are in harmony, and help the citizens lead a happy and peaceful life, the rural landscapes of both of the dystopias are totally distant from nature, and therefore have a negative impact on the characters' psyche. While there is reference to nature in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* only once when Winston Smith and Julia meet, there is no mention or even a glimmer of the physical environment in *High-Rise*. This field in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is evidently used to create false-hope in that while Julia and Winston believe themselves to be out of the Party's control in this field, it turns out to be the other way around, because it is later revealed that there are hidden mikes there, and they are being controlled even in their most intimate moments. There is actually no escape from the all-seeing eyes of the Party, and its manipulative control. In *High-Rise*, just on the other hand, there is no mention of nature in any way. Everything is made of concrete. Consequently, the concrete building away from nature gradually reveals the untamed face of human beings that they hide behind the mask of so-called civilisation.

Another point to be deduced from the analysis of these works is that while dystopias are hellish places for everybody, with no distinction among men, women, and children, utopias are generally believed to be hyper-ideal places for each and every member of

the given society. When Morris's utopia is taken into consideration along with some others such as More's *Utopia* and Campanella's *The City of the Sun*, it seems to be the other way around, for there are slaves and harsh punishment in some of them such as *Utopia*, and in general, there is no gender equality. Although not so severe in each one of them, women in these utopias are pushed to the secondary position, and they are allocated mostly domestic housework. They are basically confined to gendered domestic spaces. Such position of both slaves and women with respect to unequal distribution of rights and gender inequality reminds of Sargent's claim that utopias are not "perfect" places, but just better ones when compared with a contemporaneous society. Sargent is especially critical of the use of the words "perfect" and "perfection" for the definition of utopia for two reasons: first, perfection requires completeness, but utopias are not complete but dynamic; secondly, since human nature is not perfect, the thing that they produce cannot be perfect. Harkening back to *News from Nowhere*, it is apt to say that although it offers a peaceful atmosphere, and everybody is pleased with what they have, Nowhere does not necessarily offer egalitarianism with respect to the distribution of work between men and women. While women are also involved in each step of everyday life and dealing with whatever they want, including jobs requiring hard labour such as road repair, they are also attributed the domestic duties such as preparing and serving the meals in the guesthouses. That is to say, even in an ideal society, women are confined to the domestic realm. However, when compared with the blueprint utopias such as *Utopia*, the conditions for women are much better in Nowhere. Such conditions of women, slaves, and children prove that utopias especially written by male writers are generally ideal places for adult men, but not necessarily so for women, children, and slaves. As Claeys states, one's utopia might certainly be another's dystopia.

As opposed to utopias, in dystopias, it is not only female characters but also males, who are mistreated by the system. Yet still, women are generally doubly marginalised and manipulated. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the majority of the characters are male, and only a few female characters like Julia, Mrs Parson, the prostitute, and the old prole woman singing lullabies while hanging clothes are either marginalised or reduced to just sex objects, or attributed only domestic responsibilities. Mrs Parsons wants help from

Winston for the plugged plumbing. As a loyal member of the Outer Party, she is pleased with the Party and its dictates, although the building in which they are living is literally falling down with unpleasant smells due to poor ventilation, plugged plumbing, faulty infrastructure, among many others, and hence she seems to be a part of the kitchen. Another neighbour woman, this time in the prole district, albeit unnamed, is worthy of note, for she is the epitome of motherhood and domesticity with all the domestic issues attributed to her such as hanging the clothes, along with other housework. The old prostitute with her red lipstick is totally silenced and reduced to a mere sex object, who sells herself like most of the prole women to survive. Similar to the prostitute but certainly in a much better condition, Julia is the most significant female character. Albeit one of the principle characters, Julia's surname is not given, or we do not know much about her. The only thing we know about her is that she is a young Outer Party member, who secretly has sexual intercourse with a lot of Party members, and in this way, in a way, takes her revenge from the Party by violating its rules. Although her relationship with Winston seems to be much deeper and different than her previous affairs, as she does not get involved in understanding the principles of the Party, Smith looks down on her by claiming that she is a rebel from the waist downwards. Different from the other women mentioned above, Julia has a job in the Ministry of Truth's Fiction department and hence has the chance of experiencing different parts of the city ranging from the gathering places to the fields. Nevertheless, she does not have a room of her own, to quote from Virginia Woolf out of context. Though it is ceaselessly monitored and controlled by the help of *telecreens* and the police patrols, Smith has an apartment, but Julia does not even have such a place, but lives with a group of girls in a dormitory.

When compared with *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the circumstances are much worse for women in *High-Rise*, for in such a phallic architectural structure, where men dominate, such subordinate position of women is not a surprise. That is why, when the so-called civilisation evaporates, the first thing they do is to rape women or even kill them. When things get worse, they adopt a hunter-gatherer savagery, and begin to use women for different ends, such as a commodity to be owned and sold. And interestingly, perhaps adopting an animalistic instinct, some of them try to protect their females from the

threats coming from the outside. Dr Laing, who seems to be a survivor at the end of the novel, keeps one of his female neighbours and his sister, both of whom he abuses sexually, as his possessions, and tries to protect them from the others. Consequently, it can be argued that when compared with *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, women are treated more violently, and in a much worse way in *High-Rise*. Although both men and women live in the same perpendicular building, while male characters are portrayed as the embodiment of this phallic structure with their broad sexual lives and virility, women are the passive toys who live in the same architectural structure, but by no means have any right to it as its active owner or user. This is because men dominate and control these spaces, not women.

Such subordinate position of women in these novels, be it either dystopia or utopia, is obviously the result of the fact that they are all written by male writers, who perhaps unconsciously implement their own male viewpoints. As they do not have gender consciousness in the sense that we as twenty-first century readers have, they make use of the dominant and cliché gender stereotypes of women and men, as the homemaker and breadwinner in the most general sense. Therefore in the so-called ideal societies of utopias, few women would like to live, as they are generally made to conduct domestic work and are positioned in a subordinate position to men. Unlike these utopias written by male writers who focus more on social, administrative, and educational issues than the issues of women, female utopia writers, by disregarding these socio-economic issues, generally seek a way of liberating themselves from male subordination in their utopias, and hence privilege female characters. Margaret Cavendish's *The Description of a New World, Called the Blazing World* (1666) is a good case in point for the female utopian ideal, in which the writer aspires for a better world where she can have the rights that are denied her in the real world. Cavendish makes herself the empress of her utopian world, and by incorporating elements of fantasy in the form of what can be called "humanimals," half animal, half-man entities, and assigns different tasks to these animal-men. In a similar fashion, when instructing her religion, i.e., Christianity, she wants to construct two towers, and wants only women to visit them while ordering men to say their prayers by themselves at home, because women were previously barred from these religious assemblies. Consequently the changing position of male and female

characters in different utopian/dystopian narratives is a matter of the perspective of the writer. Since the utopias/dystopias that are explored in this dissertation are written by male writers, female characters are not given much space to experience, and hence, they are perhaps the ones, who are affected by the negative impact of architecture on their psyche more.

The last but maybe the most important finding of this dissertation is that although all three of the novels privilege architecture, and give detailed explanations, what is lacking is actually the notion of “home.” When architecture is at stake, the concept of home inevitably manifests itself. As a matter of fact, since dystopias are hellish places, looking for a place called home is in vain in the dystopias, although one of them takes place ironically in a high-rise building. What is interesting however is that in *News from Nowhere*, there is actually no place called home. Instead of individual houses, where separate families dwell, there are only guesthouses, where people live together. This is a clear indication of how, even in utopias very much like in dystopias, individuality is annihilated. As honestly stated in More’s *Utopia*, “everybody’s eyes are on you.” That is to say, these are strictly controlled societies, and hence nobody can be an individual even in utopias. When it comes to dystopias however, as discussed thoroughly in both of the chapters, both Orwell and Ballard, having been abroad for some time under very difficult conditions, the former as an unwilling coloniser in Burma, and the latter as an intern in a Japanese war camp in Shanghai during the Second World War, probably did not feel at home even in their homelands, and therefore preferred the genre of dystopia to better reveal their sense of uprootedness.

In conclusion, the utopian/dystopian atmosphere in the books discussed is mostly generated through the functional use of architecture. What is more, the defining attributes of utopias/dystopias are also conveyed to the reader by means of architecture, landscape, and city plan. And therefore, the desired good and bad ends in utopias and dystopias respectively are achieved mainly through the manipulation of the psychology of architecture. Consequently, this study deduces that architecture in utopias/dystopias is certainly much more than a setting or backdrop, but an important element in triggering of the events

## WORKS CITED

### Primary Sources

Ballard, J.G. *High-Rise*. London: 4<sup>th</sup> Estate, 2016. Print.

Morris, William. *News from Nowhere or an Epoch of Rest Being Some Chapters from a Utopian Romance*. Ed. David Leopold. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin, 2013. Print.

### Secondary Sources

Abel, Alexandra. "What is Architectural Psychology?" *Dimensions. Journal of Architectural Knowledge* 1.1 (2021): 201-08. Web. 10 Jan. 2022.

Allen, Edward. *How Buildings Work: The Natural Order of Architecture*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Allen, Rob. "Why William Morris Left His Joyous Gard." *The Journal of William Morris Studies* 14.3 (Winter 2001): 21-30. *Morris Society*. Web. 7 Sept. 2019.

"Architecture." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Vol I. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1978. Print.

Baccolini, Raffaella, and Tom Moylan. "Introduction: Dystopia and Histories." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Ed. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 1-12. Print.

Bacon, Francis. *New Atlantis*. Ed. Haldeman-Julius. Girard, Kansas: Haldeman-Julius Company, n.d. *Internet Archive*. Web. 20 Aug. 2018.

Ballard, J.G. *A User's Guide to Millennium*. New York: Picador, 1996.

---, and Brendan Hennessy. "J.G. Ballard: Interviewed by Brendan Hennessy." *The Transatlantic Review* 39 (Spring 1971): 60-64. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2021.

"Ballardian." *Collins English Dictionary*. Web. 5 May 2021.

Baxter, Jeannette, and Rowland Wymer. Introduction. *J.G. Ballard: Visions and Revisions*. Ed. Jeannette Baxter and Rowland Wymer. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 1-18. Print.

Baxter, John. *The Life of J.G. Ballard: The Inner Man*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2011. Print.

Beckman, Frida. "Chronopolitics: Space, Time and Revolution in the Later Novels of J.G. Ballard." *symploke* 21.1-2 (2013): 271-89. *Project Muse*. Web. 25 Dec. 2021.

Bennett, Phillippa. "The Architecture of Happiness: Building Utopia in the Last Romances of William Morris." *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal* 4 (Spring 2004): 133-34. Web. 24 Nov. 2019.

Bentham, Jeremy. *Jeremy Bentham: The Panopticon Writings*. Ed. Miran Bozovic. London: Verso, 1995. Print.

Bernstein, Gerald S. "The Architecture of Repression: The Built Environment of George Orwell's *1984*." *Journal of Architectural Education (1984-)* 38.2 (Winter 1985): 26-28. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 July 2020.

Berry, Ralph. "The Symbolism of William Morris." *The Journal of William Morris Studies* 3.4 (Winter 1978): 20-34. *William Morris Achieve*. Web. 25 Dec. 2019.

Bille, Mikkel, and Tim Flohr Sørensen. "Into the Fog of Architecture." *Elements of Architecture: Assembling Archaeology, Atmosphere and the Performance of*



- Building Spaces*. Ed. Mikkel Bille and Tim Flohr Sørensen. London: Routledge, 2016. 1-29. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. Introduction. *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Orwell*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Updated ed. New York: Chelsea House P, 2007. 1-7. Print.
- Bonnes, Mirilia, and Gianfranco Secchiaroli. *Environmental Psychology: A Psycho-Social Introduction*. Trans. Claire Montagna. London: SAGE P, 1995. Print.
- Booker, M. Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. London: Greenwood P, 1994. Print.
- Boos, Florence. "The Ideal of Everyday Life in William Morris's *News from Nowhere*." *The Literary Utopias of Cultural Communities, 1790-1910*. Ed. Marguérite Corporaal and Evert Jan van Leewuen. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010. 141-70. Print.
- Boos, S. Florence. "Introduction: Visions not Dreams: Morris as a Designer, Socialist, Entrepreneur, Poet..." *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 1-23. Print.
- Bradshaw, Alan, and Stephen Brown. "Up Rising: Rehabilitating J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise* with R.D. Laing and Lauren Berlant." *Society and Space* 36.2 (2018): 331-49. Web. 21 Aug. 2021.
- Brosseau, Marc. "In, Of, Out, With, and Through: New Perspectives in Literary Geography." *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space*. Ed. Robert T. Tally Jr. London: Routledge, 2017.9-27. Print.
- Bruce, Susan, ed. *Three Early Modern Utopias: Utopia, New Atlantis, The Isle of Pines*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

- Cain, William E. "Orwell's Essays as a Literary Experience." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 76-86. Print.
- Campanella, Tommaso. *The City of the Sun*. Cosimo, Inc., 2007. *Google Books*. Web. 7 May 2018.
- Canter, David V., and Kenneth H. Craik. "Environmental Psychology." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 1 (1981): 1-11. Web. 3 Mar. 2018.
- Cavendish, Margaret. Duchess of Newcastle. *The Description of a New World, Called The Blazing World and Other Writings*. Ed. Kate Lilley. New York: New York UP, 1992. Print.
- Charley, Jonathan. "Introduction: Narrative Construction and Constructing Narratives." *The Routledge Companion on Architecture, Literature and the City*. Ed. Jonathan Charley. London: Routledge, 2019. 1-6. Print.
- Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia: A Natural History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. Print.
- . "The Five Languages of Utopia: Their Respective Advantages and Deficiencies; With a Plea for Prioritizing Social Realism." *Spectres of Utopia: Theory, Practice, Conventions*. Ed. Arthur Blaim and Ludmiła Gruszevska-Blaim. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012. 27-34. Print.
- . "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 107- 31. Print.
- . "Three Variants on the Concept of Dystopia." *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*. Ed. Fátima Vieira. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013. 14-18. Print.

- , and Lyman Tower Sargent, eds. *The Utopia Reader*. New York: New York UP, 1999. Print.
- Clark, Frank. "Nineteenth-Century Public Parks from 1830." *Garden History* 1.3 (Summer 1973): 31-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Jul. 2019.
- Cody, David. "Morris's Medievalism." *The Victorian Web*. 7 July 2019.
- . "Morris's Socialism." *The Victorian Web*. 7 July 2019.
- . "William Morris: A Brief Biography." *The Victorian Web*. 7 July 2019.
- Coleman, Nathaniel. "Introduction: Architecture and Utopia." *Imagining and Making the World: Reconsidering Architecture and Utopia*. Ed. Nathaniel Coleman. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011. 1-25. Print.
- Coverley, Merlin. *Utopia*. Harpenden: Pocket Essentials, 2010. Print.
- Crawford, Alan. "Ideas and Objects: The Arts and Crafts Movement in Britain." *Design Issues* 13.1 (Spring 1997): 15-26. *JSTOR*. 30 Jul. 2019.
- Crick, Bernard. "Nineteen Eighty-Four: Context and Controversy." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 146-59. Print.
- Davies, Jonathan. "Transition, Abstraction and Perverse Concreteness in J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*." *Textual Practice* 32.10 (2018): 1741-61. *Taylor and Francis*. Web. 2 Sept. 2021.
- Davison, Peter. *George Orwell: A Literary Life*. New York: Palgrave, 1996. Print.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988. Print.

- De Young, Raymond K. "Environmental Psychology." *Encyclopedia of Environmental Science*. Ed. David E. Alexander and Rhodes W. Fairbridge. Dordrecht, Boston and London: Kluwer Academic P 1999, 223-24.
- Decker, James M. *Ideology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.
- Dickstein, Morris. "Animal Farm: History as Fable." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 133-45. Print.
- Donovan, Andrea Elizabeth. *William Morris and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Dreher, Nan Hesse. "Public Parks in Urban Britain, 1870-1920: Creating a New Public Culture." Diss. U of Pennsylvania, 1993. Web. 27 Jul. 2019.
- Elsbree, Langdon. "The Structured Nightmare of 1984." *Twentieth Century Literature* 5.3 (Oct. 1959): 135-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Feb. 2021.
- Evans, Gary W. "The Built Environment and Mental Health." *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 80.4 (Dec. 2003): 536-55. Web. 7 Sept 2018.
- Flanagan, Kevin M. Rev. of Ben Wheatley's *High-Rise*. "Wheatley's Progress: *High-Rise* (2015) and the Burden of Ballard." *Adaptation* 9.3 (2016): 434-38. Web. 8 May 2021.
- Forster, E.M. "The Machine Stops." *The Eternal Moment and Other Stories*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Vintage, 1995. Print.

- . "The Eye of Power." *Power and Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Trans. Colin Gordon et al. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980. 146-65. Print.
- . *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. 1. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon, 1978. Print.
- . "Of Other Spaces." Trans. Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics* (Spring 1986):22-27. Web. 3 May 2018.
- . "Space, Knowledge, and Power." *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984. 239-56. Print.
- . "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8.4 (Summer 1982): 777-95. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2018.
- . "Questions on Geography." *Power and Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Trans. Colin Gordon et al. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980. 63-77. Print.
- Frederick, Margaretta S. "William Morris and Interior Design." *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 207-26. Print.
- Freedman, Carl. "Antinomies of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 30.4 (Winter 1984): 601-20. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Aug. 2020.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc, 1961. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. "The Meeting of Past and Future in William Morris." *Studies in Romanticism* 21.3 (Fall 1982): 303-318. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 Dec. 2019.

---. "Varieties of Literary Utopias." *Daedalus* 94.2 (Spring 1965): 323-347. *JSTOR*.  
Web. 10 Jun. 2018.

Gardiner, Michael E. *Critiques of Everyday Life*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Gilbert, Nathanael. "The Landscape of Resistance in Morris's *News from Nowhere*." *Journal of William Morris Studies* 16.2 (2005): 22-37. *William Morris Archive*.  
Web. 15 Jul. 2019.

Glancey, Jonathan. *Architecture*. London: DK, 2006. Print.

Gleason, Abbott. "'Totalitarianism' in 1984." *Russian Review* 43.2 (April 1984): 145-  
59. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Jan. 2019.

Goldberger, Paul. *Why Architecture Matters*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2009.  
Print.

Gordin, Michael D., Hellen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash. Introduction. *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Ed. Michael D. Gordin, Hellen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010. 1-17. Print.

Gottlieb, Erika. "Room 101 Revisited: The Reconciliation of Political and Psychological Dimensions in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *George Orwell: A Reassessment*. Ed. Peter Buitenhuis and Ira B. Nadel. London: Macmillan, 1988. 51-76. Print.

Goulding, Simon. "Senate House: Utopia, Dystopia in Charles Holden's Architecture and Its Place as London Literary and Visual Landmark." *The Literary London Journal* 15.1 (Spring 2018): 3-20. Web. 20 July 2020.

Graham, Stephen. "Vertical Noir: Histories of the Future in Urban Science Fiction." *City* 20.3 (2016): 389-406. *Taylor and Francis*. Web. 3 Feb. 2021.

- Griffin, Julia. “‘Kelmscott Manor. Mr Morris’s Country Place’ (1871-1896).” *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 87-144. Print.
- Groes, Sebastian. “The Texture of Modernity in J.G. Ballard’s *Crash*, *Concrete Island* and *High-Rise*.” *J.G. Ballard: Visions and Revisions*. Ed. Jeannette Baxter and Rowland Wymer. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 123-41. Print.
- Hall, Chris. “Why J.G. Ballard’s *High-Rise* Takes Dystopian Science Fiction to a New Level.” *The Guardian*. 3 Oct. 2015: n.pag. Web. 5 Mar. 2021.
- Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology*. New York, Boston: Back Bay, 1998. Print.
- Hammond, J. R. *A George Orwell Companion: A Guide to the Novels, Documentaries and Essays*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Macmillan P, 1985. Print.
- Hard, Robin. *The Routledge Handbook of Greek Mythology*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Harvey, Charles, Jon Press, and Mairi Maclean. “Business in the Creative Life of William Morris.” *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 40-57. Print.
- Hewitt, Lucy, and Stephen Graham. “Vertical Cities: Representations of Urban Verticality in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Science Fiction Literature.” *Urban Studies* 52.5 (2014): 923-37. Web. 18 Apr. 2021.
- Holland, Owen. *William Morris’s Utopianism: Propaganda, Politics and Prefiguration*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Howe, Irving. “Orwell: History as Nightmare.” *The American Scholar* 25.2 (Spring 1956): 193-207. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 Feb. 2020.

- Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 1946. Print.
- Jordan, Harriet. "Public Parks, 1885-1914." *Garden History* 22.1 (Summer 1994): 85-113. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Aug. 2019.
- Kneale, James. "Space." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Mark Bould et al. London: Routledge, 2009. 423-432. Print.
- , and Rob Kitchin. "Lost in Space." *Lost in Space: Geographies of Science Fiction*. Eds. Rob Kitchin and James Kneale. London: Continuum, 2002. 1-16. Print.
- Kent, Eddy. "William Morris's Green Cosmopolitanism." *The Journal of William Morris Studies* 19.3 (Winter 2011): 64-78. Web. 1 Jan. 2020.
- Keyes, Jarrad. "From a 'metallized Elysium' to the 'wave of the future': J.G. Ballard's Reappraisal of Space." *Literary Geographies* 2.1 (2016): 48-64. Web. 3 Apr. 2021.
- Klein, Sascha. "'A Sealed Rectilinear Planet': The Skyscraper as Vertical Heterotopia in J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise* and Ben Wheatley's Screen Adaptation." *Space and Culture* (2019): 1-16. Web. 7 Nov. 2021.
- Kocmanová, Jessie and J. E. Purkyně. "The Aesthetic Opinions of William Morris." *Comparative Literature Studies* 4.4 (1967): 409-24. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 Dec. 2019.
- Kumar, Krishan. "News from Nowhere: The Renewal of Utopia" *History of Political Thought* 14.1 (Spring 1993): 133-43. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Oct. 2019.
- . "Utopia's Shadow." *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*. Ed. Fátima Vieira. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013. 19-22. Print.



- Laurent, Béatrice. "The Landscapes of Nowhere." *The Journal of William Morris Studies* (Summer 2009): 53-65. Web. 18 Jan. 2020.
- Le Corbusier. "A Contemporary City." *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 2016. 379-87. Print.
- . *The City of Tomorrow and Its Planning*. Trans. Frederick Etchells. New York: Dover P, 1987. *Google Books*. Web. 3 Feb. 2021.
- . *Towards a New Architecture*. Trans. Frederick Etchells. New York: Dover P, Inc., 1986. Print.
- Lee, Robert, and Karen Tucker. "'It's My Park': Reinterpreting the History of Birkenhead Park within the Context of an Education Outreach Project." *The Public Historian* 32.3 (Summer 2010): 64-97. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Aug. 2019.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell P, 1991. Print.
- Lewis, Jeremy, and J.G. Ballard. "An Interview with J.G. Ballard." *Mississippi Review* 20.1/2 (1991): 27-40. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Feb. 2021.
- Liberman, Michael. "Major Textual Changes in William Morris's *News from Nowhere*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 41.3 (Dec. 1986): 349-56. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Mar. 2019.
- Luckhurst, Roger. "High-Rise 1975/2015." *Critical Quarterly* 58.1 (2016): 63-69. Web. 21 Jan. 2021.
- . "J.G. Ballard (1930-2009)." *Fifty Key Figures in Science Fiction*. Ed. Mark Bould et al. New York: Routledge, 2009. 12-16. Print.

- Lyon, David. *The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994. Print.
- Mabb, David. "William Morris and the Culture Industry: Appropriation, Art, Critique." *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 227-58. Print.
- Malchow, H. L. "Public Gardens and Social Action in Late Victorian London." *Victorian Studies* 29.1 (Autumn 1985): 97-124. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Aug. 2019.
- Maloney, Kathleen. "Studying the Past, Envisioning the Future: Teaching History via William Morris's *News from Nowhere*." *The Journal of William Morris Studies* (Summer 2007): 41-53. 25 Sept. 2019.
- McDowall, Carolyn. "William Morris, the Arts and Crafts Movement – Art that is Life." *The Culture Concept Circle*. 8 Jun. 2014. 3 Jun. 2019.
- Meyers, Valerie. *Macmillan Modern Novelists: George Orwell*. London: Macmillan, 1991. Print.
- Miele, Chris. "Morris and Architecture." *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 169-87. Print.
- Molotch, Harvey. Rev. of Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*. "Review: The Space of Lefebvre." *Theory and Society* 22.6 (Dec. 1993): 887-95. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Aug. 2018.
- Morris, Brian. "What We Talk About When We Talk About 'Walking in the City.'" *Cultural Studies* 18.5 (2004): 675-97. *Taylor and Francis*. Web. 9 Oct. 2018.
- More, Thomas. *Utopia*. Trans. Paul Turner. London: Penguin, 1965. Print.

- Morris, William. "The Art of the People." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 517-37. Print.
- . "The Beauty of Life." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 538-64. Print.
- . "A Factory as It Might Be." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 646-54. Print.
- . "Gothic Architecture." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 475-93. Print.
- . "How I Became Socialist." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 655-59. Print.
- . "How We Live and How We Might Live." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 565-87. Print.
- . "The Lesser Arts." *William Morris*. Ed. G.D.H. Cole. New York: AMS P, 1978. 494-516. Print.
- . Preface. *The Nature of Gothic: A Chapter of the Stones of Venice*. By John Ruskin. Hammersmith: Kelmscott P, 1892. i-v. *Internet Archive*. Web. 5 May. 2019.
- Mullen, Lisa. "The Architecture of Visibility: Blitzed Modernism in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *George Orwell Studies* 1.2 (2017): 13-28. Web. 20 May 2020.
- Murphy, Graham J. "Dystopia." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Mark Bould et al. London: Routledge, 2009. 473-77. Print.
- Nichols, Grace. "Wherever I Hang." *Lazy Thoughts of a Lazy Woman*. London: Virago, 1989. 10. Print.

Orwell, George. *Down and Out in Paris and London*. London: Penguin, 2013. Print.

---. "The Prevention of Literature." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and, Letters of George Orwell: In Front of Your Nose 1945-1950*. Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. IV. London: Secker & Warburg, 1968. 59-72. Print.

---. "Why I Write." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940*. Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. I. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968. 1-7. Print.

Parrinder, Patrick. "News from Nowhere, *The Time Machine* and the Break-Up of Classical Realism." *Science Fiction Studies* 3.3 (Nov. 1976): 265-74. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Aug. 2019.

Phillips, Lawrence. "Time, Space, and Resistance: Re-Reading George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Reassessing the Twentieth-Century Canon: From Joseph Conrad to Zadie Smith*. Ed. Nicola Allen and David Simmons. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 134-45. Print.

Pinkney, Tony. "Cycling in Nowhere." *Journal of William Morris Studies* 9.2 (Spring 1999): 28-33. *William Morris Archive*. Web. 24 Apr. 2019.

---. "News from Nowhere in the Museum of Literary Interpretations." *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 404-21. Print.

Pol, Enric, "Blueprints for a History of Environmental Psychology (II): From Architectural Psychology to the Challenge of Sustainability." *Medio Ambiente y Comportamiento Humano* 8. 1-2 (2007): 1-28. Web. 3 Marc. 2018.

Rodden, John. Preface. *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. x-xi. Print.

- Rogan, Alcena Madeline Davis. "Utopian Studies." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Mark Bould et al. London: Routledge, 2009. 308-16. Print.
- Roman, Luke, and Monica Roman. *Encyclopaedia of Greek and Roman Mythology*. New York: Facts on File, 2010. Print.
- Rose, Jonathan. "Englands His Englands." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 28-42. Print.
- Rossi, John. "'My Country, Right or Left': Orwell's Patriotism." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 87-99. Print.
- , and John Rodden. "A Political Writer." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 1-11. Print.
- Roth, Leland M., and Amanda C. Roth Clark. *Understanding Architecture: Its Elements, History, and Meaning*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2018. Print.
- Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Hazell, Watson, and Viney, LD., 1889. *Internet Archive*. Web. 10 May. 2019.
- . *The Stones of Venice: The Foundations*. Vol. 1. Boston: Estes and Lauriat P, n.d. *Internet Archive*. Web. 24 May. 2019.
- . *The Stones of Venice: The Sea Stories*. Vol. 2. Boston: Dana Estes & Company P, n.d. *Internet Archive*. Web. 23 Jun. 2019.
- . *The Stones of Venice: The Fall*. Vol. 3. London: J. M. Dent & Co., n.d. *Internet Archive*. Web. 28. Jul. 2019.

- Sargent, Lyman Tower. "Authority & Utopia: Utopianism in Political Thought." *Polity* 14.4 (Summer 1982): 565-84. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Apr. 2018.
- . "In Defense of Utopia." *Diogenes* 209 (2006): 11-17. 20 Apr. 2018.
- . "Do Dystopias Matter?" *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*. Ed. Fátima Vieira. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013. 10-13. Print.
- . "More's 'Utopia': An Interpretation of Its Social Theory." *History of Political Thought* 5.2 (Summer 1984): 195-210. *JSTOR*. 2 May. 2018.
- . "The Problem of the 'Flawed Utopia': A Note on the Costs of Eutopia." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Ed. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 225-31. Print.
- . "Theorizing Utopia/Utopianism in the Twenty-First Century." *Spectres of Utopia: Theory, Practice, Conventions*. Ed. Arthur Blaim and Ludmiła Gruszevska-Blaim. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012. 13-26. Print.
- . "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited." *Utopian Studies* 5.1 (1994): 1-37. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Apr. 2018.
- . "Utopia." *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. Ed. Maryanne Cline Horowitz. Vol. 6. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2005. 2403-09. Print.
- . "What is a Utopia?" *Morus: Utopia e Rinascimento* 2 (2005): 153-60. 14. Apr. 2018.
- Sargisson, Lucy. "Dystopias Do Matter." *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*. Ed. Fátima Vieira. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013. 40-41. Print.

- Sellars, Simon. S. (2006) "The Politics of Enthusiasm: An Interview with Geoff Manaugh." *Ballardian*. 2006. Web. 3 Feb. 2021.
- Sharp, Frank C. "William Morris and British Politics: From the Liberal Party to the Socialist League." *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*. Ed. Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 387-403. Print.
- Shoemaker, Francis. "The Correlation of Literature with Architecture." *College Art Journal* 9.2 (Winter 1949-1950): 181-86. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 May 2018.
- Soja, Edward W. "Taking Space Personally." *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. Barney Warf and Santa Arias. London: Routledge, 2009. 11-35. Print.
- "Space." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Vol. IX. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1978. Print.
- Spurr, David. *Architecture & Modern Literature*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 2015. Print.
- . Foreword. *The Routledge Companion on Architecture, Literature and the City*. Ed. Jonathan Charley. London: Routledge, 2019. xv-xviii. Print.
- Steg, Linda, Agnes E. van den Berg, and Judith I.M. de Groot. "Environmental Psychology: History, Scope and Methods." *Environmental Psychology: An Introduction*. Ed. Linda Steg, Agnes E. van den Berg, and Judith I.M. de Groot. Chichester, West Sussex: BPS Blackwell, 2013. 1-11.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. "A Gossip on Romance." *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr Hyde and Other Stories*. By Robert Louis Stevenson. Ed. Roger Luckhurst. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. 139-50. *Google Books*. Web. 25 Apr. 2022.

- Strub, Harry. "The Theory of Panoptical Control: Bentham's Panopticon and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *The Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 25 (January 1989): 40-59. Web. 3 Feb. 2020.
- Symons, Julian. Times Literary Supplement, 10 June 1949. In Jeffrey Meyers's (ed) *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 2002. 251-57. *E-book*. Web. 20 March. 2020.
- Şahin Yeşil, Sinem. "Gökdelen'in Beton Duvarşarı Altında Modernist Mimari Ütopyanın Çöküşü." *Moment: Hacettepe Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Kültürel Çalışmalar Dergisi* 6.1 (2019): 130-49. Web. 3 May. 2021.
- Tally, Robert T., Jr. "Introduction: The Reassertion of Space in Literary Studies." *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space*. Ed. Robert T. Tally Jr. London: Routledge, 2017. 1-6. Print.
- . "Introduction: Spaces of the Text: Literary Texts after the Spatial Turn." *Spatial Literary Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Space, Geography, and the Imagination*. Ed. Robert T. Tally Jr. New York: Routledge, 2021. 1-10. Print.
- . "The Space of the Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Novel*. Ed. Eric Bulson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2018. 152-67. Print.
- . "Spatial Literary Studies versus Literary Geography?: Boundaries and Borders amidst Interdisciplinary Approaches to Space and Literature." *Spatial Literary Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Space, Geography, and the Imagination*. Ed. Robert T. Tally Jr. New York: Routledge, 2021. 317-31. Print.
- . *Spatiality*. London: Routledge, 2013. Print.
- Taylor, Hilary A. "Urban Public Parks, 1840-1900: Design and Meaning." *Garden History* 23.2 (Winter 1995): 201-21. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Aug. 2019.



- Taylor, Jonathan S. "The Subjectivity of the Near Future: Geographical Imaginings in the Work of J.G. Ballard." *Lost in Space: Geographies of Science Fiction*. Ed. Rob Kitchin and James Kneale. London: Continuum, 2002. 90-103. Print.
- Tereszewski, Marcin. "The Confines of Subjectivity: Spaces of Resistance in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 18. 1(2019): 54-71. Web. 7 Apr. 2020.
- . "Modern Wastelands: The Psychogeographical Dystopia of J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*." *More after More: Essays Commemorating the Five Hundredth Anniversary of Thomas More's Utopia*. Ed. Ksenia Olkusz, Michal Klosinski, and Krzysztof M. May. Kraków: Facta Ficta Research Centre, 2016. 280-92. Print.
- Todd, Pamela. *The Arts and Crafts Companion*. New York: Bulfinch P, 2004. Print.
- Topolovska, Tereza. "The Poetics of the Constructed Environment in J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*." *American and British Studies Annual* 11 (October 2018): 76-86. *Researchgate*. Web. 3 May. 2020.
- Triggs, Oscar Lovell. *The Arts & Crafts Movement*. New York: Parkstone International, 2009. Print.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2001. Print.
- V&A (Victoria and Albert Museum). "Introducing William Morris." Web. 19 Sept. 2019.
- Vale, Lawrence J. *Architecture, Power and National Identity*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

- Vieira, Fátima. "The Concept of Utopia." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 3-27. Print.
- Wagar, W. Warren. "J.G. Ballard and the Transvaluation of Utopia." *Science Fiction Studies* 18.1 (Mar. 1991): 53-70. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 Mar. 2021.
- Wallenstein, Sven-Olov. *Architecture, Critique, Ideology: Writings on Architecture and Theory*. Stockholm: Axl, 2016. Print.
- Warf, Barney, and Santa Arias. "Introduction: The Reinsertion of Space in the Humanities and Social Sciences." *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. Barney Warf and Santa Arias. London: Routledge, 2009. 1-10. Print.
- Williams, Ian. "Orwell and the British Left." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 100-11. Print.
- Woodcock, George. "George Orwell, 19<sup>th</sup> Century Liberal." *Politics*. December 1946. In Jeffrey Meyers's (ed) *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 2002. 235-46. *E-book*. Web. 20 Mar. 2020.
- Yeo, Michael. "Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Two Sides of the Same Coin." *Global Media Journal – Canadian Edition* 3.2 (2010): 49-66. 3 Feb. 2020.
- Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We*. Trans. Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Avon, 1987. Print.
- Zhang, Zhongyuan, André Spicer, and Philip Hancock. "Hyper-Organizational Space in the Work of J.G. Ballard." *Organization* 15.6 (2008): 889-910. 7 Nov. 2021.



HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
DOKTORA TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 27/07/2022

Tez Başlığı : "Architectural Psychology in Utopias/Dystopias: William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*"

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 165 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 27/07/2022 tarihinde şahsım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda işaretlenmiş filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 4'tür.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

- Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç
- Kaynakça hariç
- Alıntılar hariç
- Alıntılar dâhil
- 3 kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

27/07/2022

**Adı Soyadı:** Adem Balcı

**Öğrenci No:** N14143000

**Anabilim Dalı:** İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

**Programı:** İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

**Statüsü:**  Doktora  Bütünleşik Dr.

**DANIŞMAN ONAYI**

UYGUNDUR.

(Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol)



**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
Ph.D. DISSERTATION ORIGINALITY REPORT**

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT**

Date: 27/07/2022

Thesis Title: "Architectural Psychology in Utopias/Dystopias: William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*"

According to the originality report obtained by myself by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options checked below on 27/07/2022 for the total of 165 pages including the a) Title Page, b) Introduction, c) Main Chapters, and d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 4%.

Filtering options applied:

- Approval and Declaration sections excluded
- Bibliography/Works Cited excluded
- Quotes excluded
- Quotes included
- Match size up to 3 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

27/07/2022

**Name Surname:** Adem Balci

**Student No:** N14143000

**Department:** English Language and Literature

**Program:** English Language and Literature

**Status:**  Ph.D.  Combined MA/ Ph.D.

**ADVISOR APPROVAL**

APPROVED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol)



HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ETİK KURUL İZİN MUAFİYETİ FORMU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 27/07/2022

Tez Başlığı / Konusu: "Ütopyalarda/Distopyalarda Mimari Psikolojisi: William Morris'in *Hiçbir Yerden Haberler*'i, George Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört*'ü ve J. G. Ballard'ın *Gökdelen*'i"

Yukarıda başlığı/konusu gösterilen tez çalışmam:

1. İnsan ve hayvan üzerinde deney niteliği taşımamaktadır,
2. Biyolojik materyal (kan, idrar vb. biyolojik sıvılar ve numuneler) kullanılmasını gerektirmemektedir.
3. Beden bütünlüğüne müdahale içermemektedir.
4. Gözlemsel ve betimsel araştırma (anket, ölçek/skala çalışmaları, dosya taramaları, veri kaynakları taraması, sistem-model geliştirme çalışmaları) niteliğinde değildir.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Etik Kurullar ve Komisyonlarının Yönergelerini inceledim ve bunlara göre tez çalışmamın yürütülebilmesi için herhangi bir Etik Kuruldan izin alınmasına gerek olmadığını; aksi durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Adı Soyadı: Adem Balcı

Öğrenci No: N14143000

Anabilim Dalı: İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

Programı: İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

Statüsü:  Y.Lisans  Doktora  Bütünleşik Dr.

**DANIŞMAN GÖRÜŞÜ VE ONAYI**

Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol

(Unvan, Ad Soyad, İmza)

Detaylı Bilgi: <http://www.sosyalbilimler.hacettepe.edu.tr>

Telefon: 0-312-2976860

Faks: 0-3122992147

E-posta: [sosyalbilimler@hacettepe.edu.tr](mailto:sosyalbilimler@hacettepe.edu.tr)



## ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM FOR THESIS WORK

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE TO THE DEPARTMENT PRESIDENCY

Date: 27/07/2022

Thesis Title / Topic: "Architectural Psychology in Utopias/Dystopias: William Morris's *News from Nowhere*, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and J.G. Ballard's *High-Rise*"

My thesis work related to the title/topic above:

1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people.
2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc.).
3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity.
4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, measures/scales, data scanning, system-model development).

I declare, I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

**Name Surname:** Adem Balci  
**Student No:** N14143000  
**Department:** English Language and Literature  
**Program:** English Language and Literature  
**Status:**  Masters  Ph.D.  Integrated Ph.D.

### ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL

Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol

(Title, Name Surname, Signature)