



An Architectural Reading of Zamyatin's Intersectional Elements in The Novel "We"

Rabia Çiğdem Çavdar¹, ORCID: 0000-0002-5574-9831

Abstract

"We" was written by Russian novelist Yevgeny Zamyatin in 1921 after the Soviet Revolution. To be at the edge of the conflicts was scrutinized at the novel, in which the protagonist, labeled as D-503, having a tentative position at the well-defined ground by the power which presented itself as the truth or the law. The narration was constructed via the diary of protagonist; how D-503 perceived the paradigm, which he had lived in, what kind of conflicts and contradictions he had been living with the system was questioned. Zamyatin chose very specific architectural elements to explain and criticize the dominant paradigm of the era -early 1920's, and the periphery of that dominancy; like Green Wall, Glass Wall, logical labyrinth, cube square, and etc. These intersectional elements were constructed as in the form of blurred voids in order to unfold the ideological positions of the written period of the novel. The materialization and meaning of the walls, could be read as dialectic conceiving of how Zamyatin scrutinized both the revolution and the paradigm. As being a dystopia, the novel "We" criticizes the idealized beliefs, which were presented as transparent, lucid and conductive.

Keywords

Zamyatin; Intersectional Elements;
Wall; Revolution; Dystopia;
Ideology

Article Information

Received:

01.12.2020

Received in Revised Form:

27.01.2021

Accepted:

28.01.2021

Available Online:

30.01.2021

Article Classification:

Research Article

Contact

1. Department of Architecture,
Çankaya University, Ankara,
Turkey - rccavdar@cankaya.edu.tr

PRELUDE

“Dreaming up stories, telling stories, putting stories in to writing, reading stories are all complementary arts that lend words to our sense of reality, and can serve as vicarious serving, as transmission of memory, as instruction, or as warning. In ancient Anglo-Saxon, the word for poet was maker, a term that blends the meaning of weaving words with that of building the material world.”

—Alberto Manguel, City of words. Understanding Civilization through Story

Manguel put forward that the writer/the poet as a “maker” could be capable to build the material worlds with the words; this notion makes two different disciplines –literature and architecture–neighboring in one realm. The neighboring relations between the literature and architecture make possible that to impose/ to show off/ to criticize some dramatic situations via imaginary literary spaces. An architectural reading of a literary material could have a potential to unfold the aura of the written time of that material, without any disadvantages of material realization. The conditions of a period and the critique of those conditions will be deciphered by using the method of content analysis on a written text. In order to criticize the conditions, what kind of architectural themes were created/chosen by the author will be pursued. Via dissolving/analyzing the architectural themes in written text, the critical position of the author will be constructed.

In order to unfold the conflicted issues/binary oppositions of the early 1920s of Soviet Russia, the novel “We”, written by Zamyatin, was chosen. The main aim of this article is to expose/ to unravel how Zamyatin signified the weak points of the dominant regime of the 1920s Soviet Russia, with the help of the intersectional elements created to emphasize the extraordinary and dichotomical situations seen after the October Revolution. The focus of the article is decoding the intersectional elements, which were created to indicate the fatal failures of the literary constructed Authoritarian High Modernism. In this context, five frames were written in order to dissolve both the aura improved after October Revolution and the response of the author to that aura. The reason behind composing frames is that the author Zamyatin also preferred to write in frames, which were referred to the ended temporality in themselves. By resembling the frames of Zamyatin, each frame of this article involves one structural subject of the whole. By dividing the text into frames, linear flow of the article is deconstructed and temporal exposition will be loaded to the article; each frame deals with one spatio-temporal conditions. The first frame, entitled as “Garden”, opens the

discussion, the second frame deals with the position of Zamyatin against the paradigm of 1920s Soviet Russia, the third frame is opening a window to the written times of novel, at the fourth frame, the structure of the novel is discussed, and the last frame focuses on the intersectional elements that were constructed to indicate the dialectical gaps of the regime in the novel.

FRAME 1: GARDEN

Alessandro Baricco (2000) creates the character, Mr. Langlais, who collects and judges sea stories from the seamen, in his poetic novel, *Ocean Sea*. In the novel of Baricco, Mr. Langlais gives job to Adam in his rose garden for clarifying Adam's mind that was confused with the stories in the bosom of sea. For Mr. Langlais, garden is a mechanical habit with a poetic warm of safety and has an unforeseeable recovering power on uncertainty of chaotic processes. Baricco prefers to use the concept of garden as the place that has potential to clarify the uncertain thoughts of Adam. In this respect, it is possible to organize a literary garden that clarifies the dispersed thoughts of human beings. In this article, the literary text of Zamyatin, "We", will be chosen as a representative garden, which has potential to clarify the aura of the 1920s, early years of Soviet Revolution.

"We" is a dystopian novel, written by Russian novelist Yevgeny Zamyatin in 1921. "We" was written with a profound critical gaze, in order to scrutinize the conditions of Soviet revolution. "We" is not only reflecting the conditions of 1920s of Soviet Russia, but also it constructs a new social system in itself that contains the extremity of those conditions. At this point, it is possible to claim that literary text turned into a critical apparatus that both evaluates and reconstructs the order of its written time. Eagleton (2002, 56) stated how to see literature as a socio-economic activity that creates intersections with other forms. Zamyatin's novel, "We", as being the early sample of the dystopian genre, mainly re-configured both the positive and the negative sides of the intellectual aura of 1920s of Soviet Russia. The author, Zamyatin preferred to use many architectural elements both to unfold and to expand the system and systemic relationships; the form of textualization could be assessed as being a constructivist approach. Although the novel, "We" was written in a mathematical order, it has an original critique of positivism in itself. Additionally, it constructs a genuine thought through the concept of "revolution", which has an in-between place on the concepts both of energy and of entropy.

The order/system represented in the novel "We" has quite similar features with the Authoritarian High Modernism. Scott (2016, 76-77) depicts the three elements of Authoritarian High Modernism; the first feature is "administrative ordering of nature and society", the second element is "the unrestrained use of the power of the modern state" and final element is "a weakened civil society". All these features/elements were a part and parcel of the literary space of the system constructed in "We". In Authoritarian High Modernism, state power has a comprehensive role to manipulate/to subordinate the society in order to form the whole habits and patterns of people; for the sake of ordering a cultural unity, every condition was tried to be degraded into a quantified/measurable feature, thus, society was turned into a scientifically described object (Scott, 2016). The qualifications of Authoritarian High modernism stated by Scott have parallelization with the regime of 1920s Soviet Russia depicted by Zamyatin in the novel "We"; how a realized utopia turned into a dystopia was the main backbone of the novel.

FRAME 2: ENTRANCE

"Name me the final number, the highest, the greatest. But that's absurd! If the number of numbers is infinite, how can there be a final number? Then how can you speak of a final revolution? There is no final one. Revolutions are infinite."

Yevgeny Zamyatin, On Literature, Revolution, Entropy, and Other Matter.

"We" was discussed as being a political satire on totalitarianism, because of the radical approaches of the author, Zamyatin, whom has oppositional thoughts with the regime; it is possible to claim that Zamyatin tends to believe "perpetual revolution", which was a dismissed/exiled thought by the Soviet government of 1920s. At this point, it is obvious to state that he was an avant-garde and path-breaking author of the dystopian genre. As Clarence Brown (1993, xxiii), translator of the novel "We", pointed out, the merit of the author had been stemmed from the capability to transform a fable into an idea with the imagination, so that he became an inspirational figure for the others. The idea that transformed the novel into an enduring fable is that, as Zamyatin (1923) expressed, "Nothing is final. The only reality is change." Zamyatin's thoughts were not in the same direction with the government of early 1920's regime in Soviet Russia. He preferred to use literature as a tool to criticize both the current ideology of 1920s and the methods of that ideology.

Literature was a heretic character for Zamyatin (1923, 1); according to him, literature had to be distinguished from canonical tracks and it would be lived with the tomorrow's clock. The novel "We" had to be revolutionary in itself more than reflecting the revolution; just like Zamyatin, he was a revolutionary figure with his life style, his writings and his discourse. Patrick Parrinder expanded Zamyatin's revolutionary presence, when comparing him with another author H.G. Wells. Parrinder (1973, 20) depicted the fictional technique of writings of Zamyatin as "futuristic", then he stated (1973, 21) "Well's concern is with facing the unknown, Zamyatin's, with being the unknown." Additionally, Parrinder (1973, 25) claimed that, "Zamyatin aims to create the experience and language of an alien culture directly" where Wellsian model seemed as humanist narrative fable. The novel, "We" was a narration of pursuit; pursuit of a personal place between many things, pursuit of will to situate. Zamyatin firstly created a new system that contains some similarities with the system he has to live in his personal life, and then unraveled some conflicts of the system, he constructed, and finally he preferred to pose some alternative forms into the system. Thus, the novel, "We", became a composition of thresholds. It was turned into a narration of spaces and spatial concepts settled at thresholds.

FRAME 3: WINDOW – CAPTURING THE SEASON ON LAND

In order to capture the environment/milieu of the written time of "We", it is significant to pose the novel according to its genre, dystopia. After explaining that how Russian utopian literature written at the late nineteenth century was exposed to the satirical attacks from fictional and polemical writers of its own time, Patricia Carden (1987, 1) emphasized that twentieth century utopian and anti-utopian writings of Soviet Russia (Zamyatin's "We" was also one of the members of this cluster) were sprawl to all other societies where modernity was examined.

At this point, it is important to emphasize that the novel “We” written just after the World War I and October Revolution in 1921, was not published in Russia, until 1988. The reason behind the decision of non-publishing the novel in Soviet Russia is the “heretical” thoughts of Zamyatin that conflicted with the government. A naval architect, Zamyatin was building icebreakers in England during the period of World War I. He came back to his country after Tsarist regime overthrown and became a leading figure in Soviet Russia until his thoughts were announced as heretic by the rigid controlling regime of late 1920s. With his radical thoughts, Zamyatin became a “persona non grata” and had to migrate to Paris with the help of Maxim Gorky in 1931. William Hutchings (1981-82) signified that Zamyatin proclaimed in his essay “On Synthetism” that the literary avant-garde must operate by a process of negative definition, aligning itself always against the status quo in art and society. Hutchings (1981-82, 90) stated that “+, -, --. These are the three schools in art, and there are no others. Affirmation, negation, and synthesis-the negation of negation. The syllogism is closed, the circle is completed. Over it arises a new circle-new and yet the same. And out of these circles, the spiral of art, holding up to sky.”

FRAME 4: STRUCTURE OF BUILT MATERIAL

“In 120 days from now the building of the Integral will be finished. Near at hand is the great, historic hour when the first Integral will lift off into space. A thousand years ago, your heroic forbears subjugated the whole of planet Earth to the power of One-State. It is for you to accomplish an even more glorious feat: by means of the glass, the electric, the fire breathing Integral to integrate the indefinite equation of the universe. It is for you to place the beneficial yoke of reason round the necks of the unknown beings who inhabit other planets- still living, it may be, in the primitive state known as freedom. If they will not understand that we are bringing them a mathematically infallible happiness, we shall be obliged to force them to be happy. Before taking up arms, we shall try what words can do.”

Yevgeny Zamyatin, We, Record 1

The novel “We” is accepted as a modern novel, and early example of Russian constructivist movement, although constructivist style began to use in architecture after 1924. The narration was constructed via the diary of protagonist. A diary is different from the memoirs, it narrated not far past, but the instant past. Every note taken to the diary by the protagonist constitutes a frame which has interdependence with the protagonist life period and speed of his time. As Hutchings (1981-82, 84) stated, “Zamyatin deliberately avoids the leisurely pace of most reminiscences- a pace that is manifestly inappropriate in the newly heralded age of dynamic speed.” Zamyatin structured the “We” via eliminating chapters and subchapters, he used frames in concise narrations. He preferred to write the novel with the first-person narration that was the protagonist, D503, who was the inhabitant of the One-State.

Language and concepts used in the novel are structured in a form where mathematical terms took place; like “Integral”- name of the airplane, “square root of mines one” as the signifier of irrational, “triangle” for showing the friendship of three people, “x” for explaining his unidentifiable feelings, and “cube square” as a sacred place of the One-State. Zamyatin formed language in order to show the rational social structure. The novel, “We”, has an aesthetic materiality of mathematical-rational world. Architectural elements were used for expressing and constituting the material world. The

material form of the “One-State” is artificial and separated from the nature. A material like “glass” could able to define everything in the society of the One-State; glass cells for living, glass faces on women, glass wall for covering the One-State. As Tony Burns (2000, 69) pointed out, the novel “We” is based on scientific worldview of the enlightenment – “a perfect mechanical world.” The main realm of the novel is the One-State, “a great state machine” cited by the protagonist, whom labeled as D-503. The One-State was a state where science and technology were used for managing and controlling human behaviors. Human-beings were labeled as numbers in the One-State. In order to distinguish the sex of the number, vowel or consonant letters are used in front of the number; vowels were used for woman and consonants were used for man in order to identify the sex. Daily life of numbers was planned according to “table of hours” arranged by the rules of Taylorism. There was no differentiation on the style of living; all numbers (people) did the same things at the same time, like machines. They were in surveillance by the One-State, they were identical, and they call themselves as “We”.

One-State were using different kinds of methods for maintaining its own ideological hegemony, “Integral” was one of them. For expanding their hegemonic state, “Integral”, a kind of airplane (spaceship) was built; that could be seen as a kind of vehicle, which was produced in order to transmit the ideology of One-State to the other worlds. D-503, the protagonist was the head engineer of the Integral. Novel basically was shaped around D-503’s conflicts with the system, One-State. The source of these conflicts was the second character of the novel, I-330, who has a rebellion character against the One-State. She was totally opposed of the order of the One-state; she was doing all the behaviors banned by the system. After encountered with I-330, D-503 was confused, he found some “X”, unknown/unidentifiable thoughts in himself, but the protagonist, D503 could not keep thysel apart from her. The more discovery of I-330 caused the more conflicts with the order inside him.

Other significant but hidden character was “Benefactor”, who was the head of the One-State. Benefactor and his guardians work for the permanency of the order. Benefactor creates a new type of surgery operation for the sake of order, which is announced as the “resurrection”, which means coming back to life as perfect as machines without imagination. At this point, it is significant to state that “imagination” that drags the individuals to think out of the system, is proclaimed as a menace by the dominant ideology/by the power. That’s why, to keep and to unite all the minds of “numbers” in the systemic thought, the great operation- “resurrection” was arranged by the system. The fundamental reason why the imagination was perceived as a threat (menace) could be clarified with an explanation that has an emphasis on the distinction between imagination and fancy; Fredric Jameson (2007, 44) defines the concept of imagination as “a theoretical concept, designating the primal creative force of God” beside the concept of fancy is only a rhetorical decoration. Jameson (2007, 44) prefers to make a quotation from Coleridge in order to reveal the difference between two concepts; Coleridge depicted the primary imagination as a “prime agent of all human perception”, but on the contrary, fancy was “a mode of memory emancipated from the order of time and space”.

In this respect, imagination is the signifier to be able to take decisions out of rulers’ hand, and this situation means to be “individual” and to keep the self out of the crowds that were subordinated by the system. In the novel “We”, imagination had been illustrated as an “illness”, which has an

emancipator character against to the society represented as in “one-true totality”; in this context, the rebels, who do not want to make “resurrection” operation, which means to get rid of the imagination, were forced to be lived at the edge of the system. This surgery operation is another radical type of method used by dominant ideology for maintaining itself; cleaning the minds from undesirable thoughts that are against the system. S-4711, R-13 and O-90 are the secondary characters in the novel. O-90 is girlfriend of D-503, who escapes from One-State to the Green Wall to have a baby. R-13, who is close friend of D-503, is a poet, who writes poems related to the One-State, at the same time he is against the One-State. S-4711, who is suspicious guardian of the One-State, is also a member of rebellion groups. All characters around the protagonist were depicted as Janus-faced people; they had roles both in dominant ideology and in alternative ideologies.

FRAME 5: ELEMENTS BOTH AT THE CENTER AND AT THE EDGE

“Knowledge! What does that mean? Your knowledge is nothing but cowardice. No, really, that’s all it is. You just want to put a little wall around infinity. You are afraid to look on the other side of that wall. It is the truth. You look and you screw up your eyes. You do!Walls, I began, Walls are the basis of everything human.”

Yevgeny Zamyatin, We, Record 8

The novel was structured as in the form of in which the reader encounters separate conflicted objects representing the crisis or the dichotomy. One of the conflicted objects signified two crises in itself is the One-State with its rival form called as Mephi. The second conflicted object is the protagonist, D-503, who lived crises in himself against to the system; D-503 was situated at a bifurcated path in the novel as both being a member of the One-State, that was the strict follower of the dominant ideology and becoming “individual”, whose thoughts were separated from the doctrines of the One-State. Zamyatin preferred to constitute intersectional elements to decipher the transition from one conflict to another. In the former, two different systemic thoughts, on one side the ideology of One-State, on the other side the alternative ideology of Mephi, were came to face to face via the intersectional elements, which have spatial characters. In the latter form of crisis, the Protagonist was encountered with I-330 that was posed as transition element, which transfer/introduce the alternative thoughts to become an individual (to construct ego). In the novel “We”, both the dominant and the alternative situations are confronted each other as binary oppositions. However, it is significant to emphasize that the author preferred to create/to construct some intersectional elements, such as corridors or passages, in order to pass from one thought to another, from one concept to another.

Spatial Passages for Dissolving Crisis

The first intersectional transition element is the Green Wall, a physical/spatial passage, which is constituted as a realm surrounding the Glass Wall. While the Green Wall is worked as a tampon area (realm), in which all types of alternative and unknown thoughts against the One-State were settled, the Glass Wall, which is situated at the edge of the One-State, is depicted as a physical visual barrier that covered the One-State. At this point, it is significant to emphasize that the Glass

Wall is more transitional than the Green Wall; the Glass wall, as being transparent, causes a visible interaction with the Green Wall in which all the rival forms are hidden. Although the Green Wall seems more “natural”, it shelters alternative savage man-made formations. All numbers of the One-State lived inside the glass wall, but the rival forms were situated (or may be claimed that exiled to) behind/in the Green Wall. Intriguingly, the protagonist, D503, thought that none of numbers (members of the One-State) passed to the other side of the Green Wall; “I think you’ll probably look at me the same way when I tell you that not one of us ever since the 200-Years War, has never been on the other side of the Green Wall.” (Zamyatin, 1921, 11)

Although the protagonist had been thinking the opposite, rebels found/constructed place/country, which was labeled as Mephi, to themselves at the other side of the wall in order to be alternative of the One-State. The dialectical tension between the One-State and the Mephi is given by double skinned wall constructions; the Glass Wall and the Green Wall, in which the ratio of transition from the former to the latter is increased. By covering the One-State, the glass wall is keeping the system in order and makes the system closed; it is designed to be a kind of fragile protective shell that had a visual connection with the Green Wall. Besides the feature of being a visual fragile transition element, Zamyatin prefers to add one more feature to the Glass Wall, as making it as the sample of both the culture and the order of the humanity. Man-made figures/elements were totally protected by a glass hemisphere; the dichotomy of nature versus culture was obviously represented by the author with the Glass Wall. The Protagonist, D-503 noted his diary that how he was educated to see both the Green Wall and the Glass Wall; D-503 tends to see the Green Wall that was out of “the precise mechanisms” as an irrational and ugly formation, besides that Glass Wall was seen as “the most magnificent of all inventions” by him (Zamyatin, 1921, 91).

Adrian Forty (2000, 236-237) explains that how nature was dismissed to be an organizing category in theory of art and architecture in the twentieth century; the machine was the constitutive figure, rather than the nature. Early twentieth century art (in literature, architecture, painting and so on) was in a pursuit of new elements, which will represent new life styles (new systems); the Glass Wall, in the novel “We”, is an example of that kind of pursuit in literary form. All the regulations inside the Glass Wall mean to constitute a physically ordered place for maintaining politically stable One-State. Meanwhile, the Green Wall is a “forgotten” region where the exiled numbers of the One-State sheltered. New aesthetic thinking was inspired from the inside of the Glass Wall, as Zamyatin (1921, 48) emphasized; “I personally see nothing beautiful in flowers, nor in anything else that belongs to the savage world long ago banished behind the Green Wall the only thing that is beautiful is what is rational and useful: machines, boots, formulas, food, and so on.” Only resistance could be dwell behind the Glass Wall; by taking place in the Green Wall, Mephi generated an alternative life system, in order to turn back to center and to break the Glass Wall. Revolution was very close to the dominant ideology.

In the novel “We”, the second intersectional transition element, which posed as an intellectual passage from one thought to another, is the “Revolution”, a concept at the edge of order/disorder intersection. Zamyatin preferred to use the concept of “Revolution” as a transmitter that oscillates from entropy to energy. According to second law of thermodynamic, Entropy Law, a closed system always has stable entropy. Close system is a system that does not conduct with substance and energy. As Zamyatin (1923) pointed out that “Revolution is everywhere, in everything. It is infinite.

There is no final revolution, no final number. The social revolution is only one of an infinite number of numbers: the law of revolution is not a social law, but an immeasurably greater one. It is a cosmic, universal law –like the laws of the conservation of energy and of the dissipation of energy (entropy).”

In order to emphasize the tension between dominant ideology (the One-State) and its alternative (the Mephi), the author prefers to point out another dialectic tension between energy and entropy. It is possible to claim that Zamyatin advocates the perpetual revolution; as he (2009, 184-185) explained, via the speech of I-330, that revolution is kind of energy, which creates the life passing from one body to another; it never stops, it is infinite and perpetual. On one side, the dominant ideology wanted to be stable and perpetual, but, on the other side, the alternative forms of the dominant one wanted to be revolutionary in order not to be as alternative; this is/was almost a “natural” order of the social life. However, omnipresence and equal dissipation of one ideology is not possible in terms of the second law of the thermodynamics, which is entropy. The reason behind the selection of the concept of revolution, as an intersectional transition element, is that revolution is a threshold/an interval between two realms/ two substances/ two ideologies; it is neither the one, nor the other.

Bodily Passages for Dissolving Crisis

The second crisis that was dissolved by the bodily passages is the dialectical tension on two inseparable concepts, individuality and collectivity (unity). In order to open the discussion, Zamyatin’s choice is to select/to use the protagonist, D-503, as the intersectional element. Protagonist, D-503 finds himself in the inquiry of what is he, a member of “We”, or, of who is he, discovery of the self. D-503 is a transitional character, whom is situated on the dialectics of “We” versus “I”, or, of “united” versus “individual”, nor, of “the rational” versus “the irrational”. At the novel “We”, D-503 (Zamyatin, 1921, 56) tried to decipher his personality; “I became glass. I saw into myself, inside. There were two me’s. One me was the old one, D503, Number D-503, and the other... the other used to just stick his hairy paws out of his shell, but now all of him came out, the shell burst open, and the pieces just about to fly in all directions... and then what?”

For Zamyatin, individuality is something that can not to be abandoned. The concern of Zamyatin was to unravel that the system of the One-State had similarities with the regime of the 1920’s of Soviet Russia. He was also sharing the thoughts of Constructivists, like Chernikov, about that individuality and constructivism were interdependent concepts, instead of being contradictory. As pointed out by Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour (1988, 58); “What he objected to was the splitting off of reason from fantasy, the separation of the world inside from the world outside by that wall of diamond-hard glass.” By encountering with I-330, the protagonist (D-503) found himself in a contradiction; he was in the irrational world with I-330. Although individuality, which is represented in the character of I-330, is worked as a pathfinder of D-503, D-503 lost all paths that were guided him to be a member of the One-State; he is ideologically broken and found himself at a bifurcated path. As seen in the spatial intersectional elements which are both wall shaped barriers, here, the crisis was tried to be dissolved via two “numbers” (member of the One-State), which are the bodily intersectional elements. While one bodily passage (D-503) was set on as a boundary at the intersection of individual and collective, like the Glass Wall, the other bodily passage (I-330)

was set on as an interval at the intersection of individual and collective, like the Green Wall. Although I-330 was living as an individual rival form in the One-State, she is a member of the collective life of the One-State; she is ideologically the other of both the protagonist and the represented world by the protagonist.

EPILOGUE

This article exposes that an artistic production could be written both to criticize and to indicate that dominant ideologies first organize and then exile the revolutionary thoughts. The article analyzes the content of the novel "We", in terms of intersectional elements that were created to show of the conflicts and the contradictions of authoritarian high modernism of the 1920s Soviet regime. In the novel "We", Zamyatin constituted/created different types of intersectional bodily and spatial elements that were loaded on one single pattern in order to show the relations between the revolutionary thoughts and the dominant ideology. It is possible to claim that the writing style of Zamyatin and his creative character reflected/resembled all the confictions and the contradictions of the early twentieth century. Zamyatin harshly criticized the authoritarian high modernist government of the 1920s Soviet Russia with constituting intersectional elements that were at neither-nor position. By including alternative thoughts into its intersectional elements, Zamyatin constructed a double-faced futuristic imaginary response to hegemonic power. It is possible to claim that the imaginary response of Zamyatin against hegemonic power was signified that how the artists and the artistic production became apparatuses of the dominant power, in order to manipulate the people. Actually, the author of "We", Zamyatin posed/situated himself, as a threshold that oscillated between the current regime, which turned into a state machine, and the alternative thoughts.

It is also obvious that the life of Zamyatin had also neither/nor position that could be labeled as being double faced; his life was situated to be an ordinary, or, to be an extraordinary. Although the written year of the novel "We", 1921, was very close to the date of Soviet Revolution, the foresight of author, which was that the revolutionary regime would be evolved to the hegemonic state at the late 1920s, could be followed through the whole structure of the novel. This frightening foresight was also encircled the last frames of the novel; especially in the systematized deliriums, which were revealed by the contradictory positions of the characters. Additionally, it is possible to claim that the author was also in delirium, because of the having alternative thoughts against the current regime of the 1920s. As a result, it is significant to emphasize that the author also lived all conflicts of the protagonist of the novel at his life. The more conflicted situations caused the more systematized deliriums in the lives of members of the cogito in 1920s.

While artistic productions were used as condensers by the dominant power for the sake of ideological continuation, the creators of those artistic productions preferred to upload double faced intersectional elements for dissolving the affects of the condenser in order to open a niche for the alternative ideologies. Both the bodily and spatial passages in the novel "We" were constructed as the signification of the opposition to conjectural situations of 1920s' authoritarian high modernism. Zamyatin not only constructed a "One State" of idealized/utopian world of 1920s Soviet Russia,

but also embedded the oppositional/alternative thoughts of that “One State” to his dystopian novel by organizing architectural passages.

REFERENCES

- Baricco, A. (2000). *Ocean Sea*. USA: Vintage.
- Barratt, A. (1985). The X-Factor in Zamyatin's “We”. *The Modern Language Review*. 80(3), 659-672. Modern Humanities Research Association. pp. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3729293>
- Beaujour, E.K. (1988). Zamiatin's We and Modernist Architecture. *Russian Review*. 47(1), 49-60. Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The Editors and Board of Trustees of the Russian Review. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/130443>
- Berman, M. (2009). *Deceptions of the Self in Zamyatin's We*. Disguise, Deception, Trompe-loeil, Interdisciplinary Perspectives, (Leslie Boldt-Irons, Corrado Federici, and Ernesto Virgulti, Eds.) New York: Peter Lang Publishing. pp 113-148.
- Burns, T. (2000). Zamyatin's We and Postmodernism. *Utopian Studies*. 11 (1).
- Carden, P. (1987). Utopia and Anti-Utopia: Aleksei Gastev and Evgeny Zamyatin. *Russian Review*. 46(1), 1-18. Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The Editors and Board of Trustees of the Russian Review. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/130045>
- Dostoyevski, F. (1864). *Yeraltundan Notlar*. translated by Celal Öner (1994). İstanbul: Oda Yayınları.
- Carr, J. S. (2009). *Zamyatin's We: Persuading The Individual to Sacrifice Self*. Utah State University, Undergraduate Honors Theses, Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honors/23>
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *İdeoloji*. translated by Muttalip Özcan (1996). İstanbul:Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *Edebiyat Kuramı -Giriş*. translated by Tuncay Birkan (2004). İstanbul:Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Eagleton, T. (2002). *Marxism and Literary Criticism*, London:Routledge.
- Forty, A. (2000). *Words and Buildings: a Vocabulary of Modern Architecture*. New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Hutchings, W. (1981 - 1982). Structure and Design in a Soviet Dystopia: H. G. Wells, Constructivism, and Yevgeny Zamyatin's “We”. *Journal of Modern Literature*. 9(1), 81-102. Indiana University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3831277>
- Jameson, F. (2007). *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. London and New York: Verso.
- Landauer, G. (1907). *Revolution and Other Writings*. translated by G. Kuhn (2010). Oakland: PM Press.

- Mannheim, K. (1929). *İdeoloji ve Ütopya*. translated by Mehmet Okyavuz (2002). Ankara: Epos Yayınları.
- Manguel, A. (2008). *City of words: Understanding Civilization through Story*. Toronto- Canada: Continuum.
- Manuel, F. E., & Manuel, F. P. (1979). *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Parrinder, P. (1973). Imagining the Future: Zamyatin and Wells. *Science Fiction Studies*. 1(1), 17-26. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4238838>
- Scott, J. C. (2016). Authoritarian High Modernism. *Readings in Planning Theory*. (S. Fainstein and J. Defilippis, Eds.). UK :Wiley Blackwell. pp. 75-93.
- Zamyatin, Y. (1921). *We*. translated by Clarence Brown (1993). New York: Penguin Books.
- Zamyatin, Y. (1923). On Literature, Revolution, Entropy, and Other Matters. *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*, translated by M. Ginsburg (1974), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zamyatin, Y., & Mirsky, D. S. (1923). The Cave. *The Slavonic Review*. 2 (4), 145-153. Modern Humanities Research Association. University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4201694>
- Zamyatin, Y. (2009). *Biç*. translated by Algan Sezgintüredi. İstanbul: Versus Kitap.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

There is no such budget/fund has been received for conducting the research or for the preparation of the article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENTS

All the research has been conducted by the author.

BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR

Rabia Çiğdem Çavdar

Received her B.Arch. from Gazi University (1999). Earned her M.Arch. (2011) and PhD. degree (2018) in architecture from METU. Currently works as an Instructor Dr. at Çankaya University, Department of Architecture. Major research interests include architectural theory and criticism, literary spaces, economy-politics of space and relationships between ideology, subject and architecture.