Freedom by Design: The House that Slavery Built

Egbert Alejandro Martina

In his address to the Bundestag in Berlin in May 2002, President George W. Bush emphasized the need for a unified Europe, noting:

> Different as we are, we are building and defending the same house of freedom—its doors open to all of Europe's people, its windows looking out to global challenges beyond. We must lay the foundation with a Europe that is whole and free and at peace for the first time in its history. This dream of the centuries is close at hand.[1]

Bush remarked that the bond between the US and the European Union transcends military cooperation, and economic exchange, arguing that "we are heirs to the same civilization." The integration of European markets, and a shared currency formed "the conditions for security and common purpose." The fates of Europe and the US, the president argued, are interconnected: "when Europe grows in unity, Europe and America grow in security." Bush also turned his attention to Russia, believing that "Russia has its best chance since 1917 to become a part of Europe's family."

In 1989, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev had already outlined in an address to the Council of Europe a programmatic concept of "a common European home,"[2] arguing that "if security is the foundation of a common European home, then all-round co-operation is its bearing frame." Both Bush and Gorbachev establish an inextricable connection between security, freedom, capital, homeliness, and, implicitly, whiteness. This is, as Gilbert Caluya would argue, an "intimate security"[3] that is founded upon White domesticity. Naming Europe as a family or a common home invokes a communality that transcends nationality and territorial boundaries, both of which underlie the common understanding of 'homeland'. Here, whiteness takes on the meaning of homeland, acting as as "a form of positive residence."[4] Operating under the sign of security and freedom, whiteness is the unifying identifier that "'extends' the family form," connecting all of these disparate nations despite their ideological and national differences.

The political metaphor of Europe as a house, a bounded area in which Europeans live together as a family, sheltered and protected from external threats, has been one of the key metaphors in the discourses concerning European integration and security.[5] The idea of the house as a protective sphere is perhaps best captured

in the pithy axiom "a man's home is his castle." This phrase conveys an image of *home* as both an enclosed circle of intimacy, and a fortified structure that provides its inhabitants both protection from the elements and ontological security, "a feeling of safety, predictability and security in life which provides the baseline for an improvement in mental health and well-being."[6] The enduring power of this axiom reflects the importance of the *domus* in shaping conceptions of safety, security, and authority: the domestic is the primary means of achieving and securing the basic values of freedom or autonomy. To quote Walt Whitman, "a man is not a whole and complete man, unless he *owns* a house and the ground it stands on."[7] In other words, a house is always more than just shelter. Paula Chakravartty and Denise Ferreira da Silva note that,

> A house is a juridical-economic-moral entity that, as property, has material (as asset), political (as dominium), and symbolic (as shelter) value. Houses, as such, refer to the three main axes of modern thought: the economic, the juridical, and the ethical, which are, as one would expect, the registers of the modern subject.[8]

Historically, the house has played a pivotal role in the ideological (re)production of 'proper' citizens. The *domus* is a site of surveillance that mediates the porous boundary between the private sphere of familial intimacy and reproduction, and the public realm of capital. The metaphor of the Europe Union as a house thus bespeaks an architectural imaginary that informs an idea of politics as a patriarchal, heteronormative, and racialised control of space. Moreover, the metaphor of "house of freedom" suggests that freedom is not a set of rights and obligations, but a securitized spatial construct that is of central importance for the ordering and governing of the European Union. What the metaphor conveys is the strong belief that security and freedom are not only interrelated, but isomorphic concepts.

The ongoing "migrant crisis," which is perceived as a security risk and, as such, a threat to the "house of freedom," has put a strain on the EU's area of freedom, security, and justice (AFSJ) policies.[11] In 2019, the European Parliament remarked in a resolution on search and rescue in the Mediterranean that "Europe should not be seen as catchall for economic opportunists from Africa or prospectors from other regions around the world."[12] The fantasy of Africa as a void, populated by voracious opportunists in pursuit of fortune, is constitutive to the production of Europe's security regime. In this context, the newly instituted commission "to protect the European way of life"[13] should be understood as an intensification of a racialized regime of "securitized freedom."[14] To regard Europe as being under threat from Africans is a stunning reversal of historical facts. European politicians have a long history of obfuscating the violence and "little human sustenance"[15] to which "the European way of life" owes its coherence. The ontological security that the "house of freedom" provides for its white inhabitants has been made possible through genocide, displacement, dispossession, and slavery, which make up the very foundation and supporting frame of the house itself. The 'migrant crisis' is not

an aberrant tragedy, but the direct outcome of the violent practices that are necessary to maintain the structural integrity of a house held together by white fantasies of humanitarian interventions, and illusions of freedom and justice. These latest anxious attempts to "protect the European way of life" have been criticised as playing into the rhetoric of far-right populists. However, they stand in a long line of efforts to secure the survival of a struggling Europe.

In this essay, I highlight two efforts in particular: the 1920s utopian architectural and geopolitical projects of "Eurafrica" and "Atlantropa"—both projects emphasised the exploitation of African resources and labor power as essential for Europe's unification, continued growth, and development. These projects offered a framework for post-1945 unification debates.[16] The "house of freedom" metaphor, as well as the Eurafrica and Atlantropa projects, raise unsettling questions about European integration, and architecture's role in the EU's geopolitics of freedom, security and expansion through its Neighborhood Policy. The metaphor organizes not only an understanding of the EU as an architectural and residential project situated in a changing neighborhood, it also organizes, at the same time, a distinctive understanding of freedom—contingent on a constitutive division between interior and exterior. As a final point, I draw out, by way of a brief reflection on Fanon's leap of invention, some architectural and political implications of Fanon's discussion of colonial architecture and urbanism, and his program of decolonization.

Eurafrica and Atlantropa

The European Union, as a supranational post-war project, was created with the objective of securing peace "by integrating the economies of their members in such a way that war and armed conflict between them is impossible as well as unthinkable."[17] From its inception, the European union has imagined itself as a space of freedom, security, and justice. However, as Wolfgang Burgdorf argues, "political unity in Europe was inexorably linked to the age-old question of imperial reform."[18] The Berlin Conference of 1884-85, which regulated the partitioning of Africa between imperial powers, was "the first true act of European co-operation in Africa."[19] The late-stage imperial projects Atlantropa and Eurafrica presented utopian, technologically audacious, plans for a unified Europe that surpassed the imperialist design programmes of the Berlin Conference both in scale and geopolitical scope.

Eurafrica was the brainchild of Austrian aristocrat Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, who believed that intra-European stability could only be achieved if European nations pursued a joint imperial objective—the exploitation of Africa. Coudenhove-Kalergi formulated Eurafrica as a practical solution to mitigate tensions between European colonial powers and foster cooperative security. "European security was," as Bruno Charbonneau notes, "tied to European cooperation in Africa, but it was an imperial understanding of cooperation that was devoid of Africans."[20] In *Europe Turns to Africa*, Coudenhove-Kalergi couched the imperial designs of Eurafrica in humanitarian terms.[21] He asserts that "healing, educating, and

improving the black race" would "compensate morally for the political conquest of Africa." In other words, it is through a civilizing mission, bringing "light to this darkest of all continents," that "Europe can repay Africa for value received." He notes further that,

> Europe must be the liberator of the black race in Africa, not the exploiter. She must free the African from poverty, barbarism, hunger, anarchy, sleeping sickness, and the other diseases from which he suffers. The women of Africa, who are today mere beasts of burden, must be freed from their condition of bitter slavery.

Coudenhove-Kalergi's 'concern' for the plight of "the black race" in general and African women in particular is, to say the least, dubious and amounts to a kind of "concern-trolling."[22] African development, his proposed solution, would only exacerbate colonial violence and further entrench patriarchal structures in line with European views of women's domestic work and roles.[23] Coudenhove-Kalergi believed that "the task of colonizing the deserted districts of Africa concerns all Europe, and indeed the entire white race, for the exploitation and colonization of Africa will lead to the extension, growth, and consolidation of Europe."[24]

European nations could reap the economic advantages only "if Europe erects for herself a solid federal system to do away with the danger of war and national rivalry."[25] Europe was to transform "Africa into a great European plantation"[26] which "would improve the whole economic condition of [Europe] and would raise the standard of living among all its peoples."[27] Yet, this coordinated "transformation of Africa into a great European plantation" would be, in effect, an isometric transformation, a transformation that remains congruent to the original figure in the white imaginary. The plantation is "the condition of black death-life in modernity."[28]

What allows Coudenhove-Kalergi to conceptualize Africa "as the ultimate sign for expansion and unending space within the symbolic economy of settlement"[29] are the "figurative capacities of blackness."[30] 'Africa' served merely as a screen for white flights of fantasy and a conduit for European self-actualization. Europe, the plantation house (of freedom), built by slave labour and maintained through violence, would grow into a monstrosity of a building, sprawling across the vast African continent.

German architect Herman Sörgel's 1920s plans for Africa were no less infused with imperial ambitions. Atlantropa proposed the construction of a massive dam at the Straits of Gibraltar and the Dardanelles to serve as a power plant. This new source of unlimited hydroelectric power would ensure European economic security, energy independence,[31] and peace in Europe. According to Sörgel, "the interlacing of Europe through high-voltage wires is a better guarantee of freedom than treaties on paper since the destruction of the wires would imply the self-destruction of each people."[32] Atlantropa would require a complete redesign of the Mediterranean Basin that would drastically change the political landscape of

Europe. Sörgel's geographic, geopolitical, and architectural mission was nothing less than to bring about a 'new' world order by exploiting Africa through European technological prowess and turn the "empty continent devoid of history and culture"[33] into a "territory actually useful to Europe." His plan encompassed "the environmental and climatic transformation of the entire African continent."[34] In Sörgel's architectural vision, only the unification of Europe could provide "a final and lasting victory over chaotic international tendencies" and secure "the might that is unconditionally necessary to create the sufficient *Lebensraum* for the demographic and production power of the white race."[35]

In the end, both Coudenhove-Kalergi and Sörgel 'failed' to realize their designs. What is central here, however, is not the question of whether they managed to realize their white supremacist fantasies. Rather, their designs tell us a lot about how Europe's intellectual elite imagined the European peace and freedom project as only achievable *through* a (re)development of Africa—a process that would make the continent suitable for European modes of living. It required redesigning both the architectural and climatic conditions of the African continent to accommodate European comfort. We can find the same violent consumptive desires in the declaration of Robert Schuman, one of the EU's founding fathers: "With increased resources, Europe will be able to pursue the achievement of one of its essential tasks, namely, the development of the African continent. In this way, there will be realised simply and speedily that fusion of interest which is indispensable to the establishment of a common economic system; it may be the leaven from which may grow a wider and deeper community between countries long opposed to one another by sanguinary divisions."[37] Schuman, much like his predecessors, considered the development of Africa not as a necessity for the good of African peoples, but rather an essential tactical move to assuage and even resolve long-standing intra-European conflicts of German and French economic and national interests. African development, with all its attendant planning policies and institutions, would form a pathway through which European market integration could be accessed and realized. Africa, as a space of unending potential, opens up and fuels the very structural possibility for the (infinite) expansion of a unified and stable Europe. In other words, Africa signals not a discrete territorial entity with a spatial integrity of its own but stands for "the ways the natural world could be imagined as manipulable and an open landscape of flux."[38]

The coordinated development and exploitation Africa, an undifferentiated space subject to all manners of use, would not only allow for efficient resource extraction and capital accumulation, but more importantly, it would provide the key conditions of possibility for the consolidation of European geopolitical and economic power. Tiffany Lethabo King, in her theoretical elaboration on Black fungibility as a spatial analytic, offers a way to conceptualize this imperial process of space-making. In *The Black Shoals*, King explains that Blackness "enabled the human to self-actualize as an expression of unfettered spatial expansion and human

potential."[39] *Africa*, as the paradigmatic articulation of black fungibility, is both "a form of raw material and an expression of spatial expansion" as well as "an abstract, always moving process that enables human geographical projects."[40] As such, Black fungibility not only makes the production and expansion of space possible, but it is also fundamental to the transformation of space into a *unified whole*.

Architecture has proven a necessary adjunct in maintaining the EU's anti-black structure and securing its geopolitical aims.[41] Herman Sörgel was one of the first architects, but certainly not the only one, to understand architectural design's geopolitical potential. Most recently, in 2010 the research branch of Rem Koolhaas' Office for Metropolitan Architecture, known as AMO, and management consultancy McKinsey & Company[42] submitted a report to the European Climate Foundation called "Eneropa"[43] that matches Sörgel's Atlantropa in its geopolitic and strategic ambitions. The report proposed a large-scale redesign of Europe's energy infrastructure that also included North Africa (the Spain-Morocco submarine cable connects Europe's electricity grid to North Africa). AMO's proposal restructures the entire continent, redrawing national borders, and creating regions based on the method of renewable energy generation that will supply the larger Eneropa grid.[44] In the vein of its spiritual predecessor Atlantropa, Eneropa envisions a completely energy-independent and low-carbon European continent.[45]

Liberalism, Architecture, and Freedom

Historically, architects have used architecture and urban planning as material vehicles of propaganda and violence to facilitate social control and consolidate colonial power.[46] Architecture is not only a powerful instrument for remaking spaces, but also for forging and supplementing political agendas. French colonial architect Joseph Marrast, for example, incorporated features of Moroccan indigenous/Islamic architecture in his design of Casablanca's courthouse so as to "help quell the hostility of Moroccans toward European domination."[47] Marrast wielded architecture as a weapon to enforce conformity, noting "little by little we conquer the hearts of the natives and win their affection, as is our duty as colonizers."[48] Here, architectural drawings (such as plans, elevations, and sections) and other architectural objects (such as buildings, and infrastructure), rather than being *merely* expressions of a specific architectural style, function as techniques for the projection and translation of spatio-legal and racial enclosures. Put differently, architecture is not only, or I would argue even primarily, an aesthetic art, but an apparatus for the production of subjectivities appropriate to its design and function. Architecture creates, constrains, and regulates the spatial conditions in which we might experience "freedom." Its primary function is to establish lines of demarcation *and* lines of conduct that precede any architectural object.

In this regard, architecture as a design discipline is concomitant with and extends liberalism's regime of demarcation, or as political theorist Michael Walzer crisply put it, liberalism's "art of separation."[49] Liberalism, like architecture, draws

lines separating institutional spheres, and "the most famous line" liberalism draws is "the 'wall' between church and state."[50] Both liberalism and architecture are equally bounded by what Achille Mbembe calls a racial logic of enclosure, "a more or less coded way of dividing and organizing a multiplicity, of fixing and distributing it according to a hierarchy, of allocating it to more or less impermeable spaces."[51] Liberalism, as Walzer argues, creates "a world of walls, and each one creates a new liberty."[52] Liberal freedom, then, is produced as an effect of walling, and can, paradoxically, only be experienced within "a world of walls," whether the *oikos* (the house) or the *polis* (the city). Yet, at the same time, the wall, as an architectural element, embodies coercion and regulate mobility. How one experiences the effects of walling depends on how one is situated in relation to the wall.

The architectural wall, whether conceptual or physical, is a "scriptive thing"; it creates a set of instructions for organized space that encourages or discourages certain behaviours.[53] Robin Bernstein notes that "scriptive things archive the repertoire—partially and richly, with a sense of openness and flux."[54] Liberal freedom thus rides on the tension between, on the one hand, "enclosure," a space of coercion and surveillance, and on the other, a space of limitless self-creation (within a neoliberal free market system), in which the "self" can be (re)invented. Enclosure thus provides, counter-intuitively, a space for both coercion and "openness and flux." Freedom, to put it plainly, can only be experienced within restrictions, whether material or legal. In this sense, it is not so much enclosure as a spatial manifestation—that is, a quality of architecture—that I am interested in, but enclosure as a structure that precedes and supersedes its spatial appearance *altogether*.

We might consider the family as one such enclosure. Bush's reference to Europe as a family was certainly not original. The idea that Europeans were united through their 'common ancestry' has long and deep roots. François Lenormant and Elisabeth Chevallier write the following about Europeans:

> The race of Japhet is then that which is also designated, to indicate the extent of its domain, the *Indo-European race*. To this race we ourselves belong. It is a race noble beyond all others, the race to which Providence has assigned the mission of carrying a degree of perfection, unknown to other races, arts, sciences, philosophy.[55]

What underpins the notion of a "Europe as a family of nations," then, and what whiteness invests itself in, is "a particular version of race *and* a particular version of family, predicated on 'likeness', where likeness becomes a matter of 'shared attributes'."[56] Yet, as president Bush underlines in his address, white sociality is homogeneous and heterogeneous at the same time, both indivisible and divisible in parts**.** The "house of freedom," which is built from these intimate kinship structures, represents an enclosed sociality of whiteness, that is invested in *being threatened*, and *being threatening*. After all, the house of freedom is both a *home* and a *fortress*. The violence of threat (the home as fortress) and being threatened (the home as permeable, open to invasion) are intricately entwined in this architectural metaphor.

A familial intimacy of sorts is implicit, at least in Germanic languages, in the etymology of the word "free," whose Indo-European root *priyos[57] indicates "one's own, the personal, but with a connotation of affection or closeness rather than of legal property."[58] It was used to refer to "personal possessions, of parts of one's body, but also of people with whom one had an emotional connection," and could also be translated as "dear, beloved." The latter meaning *dear, beloved* is still preserved in the Dutch verb *vrijen*, which could be translated as either *to woo* or *to have intercourse with* (it translates literally as "to free"). Liberty comes to us from the Latin word for *free*, liber, whose etymological root is *(e)leudheros. Émile Benviste notes that the free man in Greek and Latin is "positively defined by his membership of a "breed," of a "stock.""[59] He further notes that "to be born of good stock is to be free; it comes to the same thing." In Germanic languages the connection between "free" and "friend" allows us "to reconstitute a primitive notion of liberty as belonging to a closed group of those who call one another "friends."" The individual "owes not only his free status but also "his own self"" to the group to which he belongs. Hanna Fenichel Pitkin tells us that "the oldest sense of all these words [seems] to be a status classification, the contrast between slave and non-slave, which, in turn, depends on a notion of group membership."[60] Freedom, then, emerges as a way to assess belonging *in* and *to* the world. It connotes a sense of a close identification; of one's relation to friends and those who can be enslaved. Freedom, in a sense, is about how 'those who belong' experience attachment through different kinds of institutional affiliations and abstractions like race, gender, class, nation. The slave is the 'negative' space that defines freedom. The legal enclosure of the slave, to riff off Saidiya Hartman,[61] makes the enclosures of the (social) body, and kinship possible.

Conclusion: Decolonization as Invention

The spatial metaphor of the 'house'—as a symbol for freedom—reveals how the domestic blurs the line between the home and the world. The house of freedom, a formal order where the private and public domains converge, is the outcome of embedded architectural and geopolitical practices that create lines and surfaces that both enclose and produce space without creating impermeable barriers between an interior and an exterior.[62] Yet, what does it mean to conceive of freedom as being contained in specific spaces, or as the effect of space-making practices? Or, to put it succinctly: can architecture produce freedom?

Fanon's analysis of architecture and city spaces offers some important insights into the connections between freedom, architectural form, subjective space, and racialization. In *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon probes the colonial practices of control and domination through juridical and architectural means, i.e. military operations, and housing units: colonialism is an architectural project, "built to last, all stone and steel."[63] Using a bodily metaphor, Fanon describes colonial urban space as a pervasive gluttonous and engorged spatial system. "The colonist's sector

is a sated, sluggish sector, its belly is permanently full of good things. The colonist's sector is a white folks' sector, a sector of foreigners."[64] Conversely, the colonized's space is "a world with no space, people are piled one on top of the other, the shacks squeezed tightly together." It is "a famished sector, hungry for bread, meat, shoes, coal, and light"—"a sector that crouches and cowers, a sector on its knees, a sector that is prostrate."[65] Architecture and urban planning are both implicated in the production of a contingent and disjunctive "humanity." Fanon's description of colonial spatiality captures how the ossified structure of colonial domination creates not only "a hierarchical architecture of containment designed to rearrange and stack up categories of colonial subjects,"[66] but also a sensory politics—what Adrienne Brown might call a "racial sensorium"[67] of colonial urbanism. Fanon offers a clear description of how racial violence is spatialized and materially inhabited. There is an essential and irreconcilable antagonism between the "native" sector and the European sector. "The two," Fanon argues, "confront each other, but not in the service of a higher unity. Governed by a purely Aristotelian logic, they follow the dictates of mutual exclusion: There is no conciliation possible, one of them is superfluous."[68]

A study of the lines of force that separate the spacious neighborhood from the slum, Fanon tells us, will enable us "to delineate the backbone on which the decolonized society is reorganized."[69] And he proposes a program of decolonization that targets the totality of spatial organization. For Fanon, decolonization—the destruction of the colonial world—is "nothing less than demolishing the colonist's sector, burying it deep within the earth or banishing it from the territory."[70] Such a point might seem hyperbolic, but Fanon is careful to disabuse us of the notion that architecture and urban planning are innocent: architecture itself is "violence ritualized."[71] And through its practices, protocols, and forms, architecture monumentalizes colonial violence in a very material, physical sense. Colonial urbanism, Fanon emphatically argues, cannot be rehabilitated. Decolonization demands the complete razing of the structures that support the colonial world and regulate the 'native' sector.

For Fanon, decolonization is a logic of destruction *and* invention: the emergence of a new world involves the ruin of an old system.[72] Yet, it is important to note that the destruction of the colonist's sector is not simply the removal of its architecture from 'public' space, but rather the complete rejection of its imposed architectural spatial order—its spatial divisions, its lines, its surfaces, and ultimately its meaning and purpose. The destruction of the colonial world makes space for alternate modes of inhabitation. Thus, destruction and invention are not opposing terms, but together constitute a refusal to repeat, or even tolerate, the colonial spatial order. With this in mind, perhaps, we might (re)think the popular language of the riot as a way to spatially articulate *liberation* from an architectural order understood as anti-black.

As a final point, I want to turn to a different context in which Fanon examines anti-black racism through spatial processes and architectural metaphors. In

Black Skin, White Masks, Fanon draws explicitly on architectural tropes to delineate the form of the book, and the effects of anti-black racism. Fanon describes the text's "architecture" as one framed by "temporality," because "every human problem must be considered from the standpoint of time."[73] The future, a new epoch, too takes on an architectural form. He writes that, "the future should be an edifice supported by living men." In his words, this edifice is "connected to the present to the extent that I consider the present in terms of something to be exceeded." Fanon also uses architectural imagery to signify "civil society's gratuitous violence against the Black body."[74] The racial epidermal schema is a confined space; Fanon is "sealed into crushing objecthood."[75] He writes, "I was walled in."[76] An image that Dr. Martin Luther King jr. also employs in his essay *Negroes Are Not Moving Too Fast*: "the Negro is still the poorest American walled in by color and poverty."[77] The "fact of blackness" or "the lived experience of the black" is an architectural reality—an effect of liberal humanism.

What Fanon refers to as "the real leap," which introduces "invention into existence" is, I argue, a heretical leap that requires an upending of the architectural order upon which colonial power and, in a sense, freedom depend. Fanon's leap is a form of destruction through transition that brings about a new state of existence—something new emerges in the wake of the leap that had not been there before. This leap is a creative act that reinvents the spaces we exist in. Fanonian invention is a "leap" to break the lines of enclosure (or rather, *freedom as enclosure*), and undo the planned world-order of ossified anti-black structures.

Endnotes

1. George W. Bush, "Remarks to a Special Session of the German Bundestag May 23, 2002" in Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, George W. Bush (United States Government Printing, 2004), p. 855. President George W. Bush in the course of his speech invoked the same imagery his father used several years prior. In 1989, President George H. W. Bush argued that "there cannot be a common European home until all within it are free to move from room to room. And I'll take another message: The path of freedom leads to a larger home, a home where West meets East, a democratic home." Bush lamented that Americans and Europeans had forgotten their "common heritage and how the world we know came to be." Americans and Europeans were heirs to "gifts greater than those bestowed to any generation in history: peace, freedom, and prosperity." President George H. W. Bush argued that collective pan-European security "comes not from tanks, troops, or barbed wire; it is built on shared values and agreements that link free peoples." See: George H. W. Bush, "Remarks to the Citizens in Mainz, Federal Republic of Germany," May 31, 1989, accessed September 18, 2020, https://bush41library.tamu.edu/archives/public-papers/476
2. Mikhail Gorbachev, "Address given by Mikhail Gorbachev to the Council of Europe (6 July 1989)." CVCE.EU by UNI.LU, Last updated, July 3, 2015, https://www.cvce.eu/obj/address_given_by_mikhail_gorbachev_to_the_council_of_europe_6_july_1989-en-4c021687-98f9-4727-9e8b-836e0bc1f6fb.html.
3. Gilbert Caluya, "Domestic Belongings: Intimate Security and the Racial Politics of Scale," Emotion, Space and Society 4, no. 4 (2011): pp. 203-210, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2010.11.001.
4. Sara Ahmed, "A Phenomenology of Whiteness," *Feminist Theory* 8, no. 2 (2007), 154.
5. The rhetoric of "House of Freedom" and other cognate rhetorical devices like "area of freedom, security and justice" naturalize Europe/the European Union as *simply* geographic entities, or geopolitical fields, rather than a regime of humanitarian imperialism that operates through spatial development.

6. European Commission, Housing First (Providing Permanent Housing) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/dyna/bp-portal/getfile.cfm?fileid=75.
7. Walt Whitman, "Wicked Architecture," New York Dissected (Journalism) - The Walt Whitman Archive, accessed September 18, 2020, https://whitmanarchive.org/published/periodical/journalism/tei/per.00270.html.
8. Paula Chakravartty and Denise Ferreira Da Silva, "Accumulation, Dispossession, and Debt: The Racial Logic of Global Capitalism—An Introduction," American Quarterly 64, no. 3 (2012): pp. 361-385, https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2012.0033, p. 362
9. James Bennett Osborne, "Problem Families and the Welfare State in Post-War British Literature (1945-75)," PhD diss, University of Southampton, 2014.
10. See Claudia Anamaria Iov and Adrian Liviu Ivan, "Identity – (In)Security Nexus in the EU at the End of the 20th Century and the Beginning of the 21st Century," Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 149 (2014): pp. 428-432, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.08.202. As the writers note, "security has always been the purpose behind the European integration process." p. 429
11. See Hartmut Marhold, "The European 'Area of Freedom, Security and Justice' : Its Evolution and Three Fundamental Dilemmas," L'Europe En Formation 381, no. 3 (2016), https://doi.org/10.3917/eufor.381.0009, p. 9
12. European Parliament, "MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION on Search and Rescue in the Mediterranean," europarl.europa.eu, 2019, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/B-9-2019-0131_EN.html.
13. John Chalmers, "New EU Post to Protect European Way of Life Slammed as 'Grotesque'," Reuters (Thomson Reuters, September 10, 2019), https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-eu-jobs-life/new-eu-post-to-protect-european-way-of-life-slammed-as-grotesque-idUKKCN1VV26N.
14. Dace Dzenovska, "We Want to Hear from You," The Borders of "Europe," August 2017, 286.
15. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 1986, 129.
16. Peo Hansen and Stefan Jonsson, *Eurafrica: the Untold History of European Integration and Colonialism*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
17. Robert S. Jordan et al., *International Organizations: a Comparative Approach to the Management of Cooperation*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2010, 132.
18. Wolfgang Burgdorf, "Imperial Reform and Visions of a European Constitution in Germany around 1800," *History of European Ideas* 19, no. 1-3 (1994), 401.
19. Bruno Charbonneau, "Dreams of Empire: France, Europe, and the New Interventionism in Africa," *Modern & Contemporary France* 16, no. 3 (2008), 286 (Chipman cited in Charbonneau)
20. Ibid.
21. Count Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, "Europe Turns to Africa," in "THE LIVING AGE," *The Unz Review*, February 1, 1930, 653. Coudenhove-Kalergi posits in his article that "public opinion throughout the civilized world should oppose, not the colonizing principle itself, but only certain of its forms." Dutch landscape architect Adriaan Geuze channels a similar sentiment in his publication for the Venice Biennale "Colonizing the Void," an urban design manifesto in which he considers colonization (or the creation of land) the ultimate expression of human culture. Geuze writes about colonialism that "in the seventies it was universally condemned as a variation on capitalist exploitation. These days a somewhat milder view prevails, even among the supposed 'victims'." Geuze further notes that "The Netherlands was a colonial power too and so has some black pages in its history, but it was also responsible for an untarnished type of colonization [...] Because of these polders in the IJsselmeer, in Dutch the term 'colonizing' has kept some of its optimistic meaning." See: Hans van. Dijk and A. Geuze, *Colonizing the Void: Adriaan Geuze, West 8 Landscape Architects*, Rotterdam (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1996).
22. Concern trolling is "the action or practice of disingenuously expressing concern about an issue in order to undermine or derail genuine discussion." Definition of Concern Trolling by Oxford Dictionary on Lexico.com, Lexico Dictionaries | English, accessed September 18, 2020, https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/concern_trolling.
23. Maryse Condé, "Three Female Writers in Modern Africa: Flora Nwapa, Ama Ata Aidoo and Grace Ogot," *Présence Africaine* 82, no. 2 (1972), 133. Condé notes that "African women stand at the very heart of the turmoil of their continent." African women, she suggests, were "the first and principal victims of the encounter with the West." Conde provides a critique of this missionary attitude found in Coudenhove-Kalergi's text, noting that "missionaries did not understand the position [African women] held in their families and societies. They quickly labelled them « beasts of burden » and decided to liberate them through education." Yet, this liberation came at a price: African women were forced to cultivate land and grow crops for Europeans.
24. Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Europe*, 654.
25. Ibid., 654.
26. Ibid., 655.
27. Ibid., 655.

28. Calvin Warren, "Black Interiority, Freedom, and the Impossibility of Living," *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 38, no. 2 (2016), 108.Warren argues that "*The world is a plantation for blacks*. Whether "free" or captive, blacks are subjected to the technologies of pulverization, the forced choice between physical, mental, and social death, and the permanent exclusion from human-beingness in whatever space they inhabit."
29. Tiffany King, "Labor's Aphasia: Toward Antiblackness as Constitutive to Settler Colonialism," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, June 19, 2014, https://decolonization.wordpress.com/2014/06/10/labors-aphasia-toward-antiblackness-as-constitutive-to-settler-colonialism/.
30. Saidiya V. Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010, 22.
31. Elsewhere I argue that colonialism and New World slavery may be understood as systems by which Europeans violently extracted energy from sources external to them—both human and more-than-human. Slavers—as a result of the Spanish empire's ravenous consumption of slaves—referred to black Africans as "oro negro," black gold—long before oil received that moniker. Africa's "black gold" of today is no longer slaves, but oil. And, the phases in the development of oil—exploration, appraisal and production—eerily recall the processes necessary to unmake and conceive of black Africans as a fungible unit. The enslaved were essentially considered a renewable energy source, that could be "naturally" replenished on a human time-scale.
32. Sörgel cited in Sven Opitz and Ute Tellmann, "Europe as Infrastructure: Networking the Operative Community," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 114, no. 1 (2015), 178.
33. Antonio Petrov, "Mediterranean Frontiers: Ontology of a Bounded Space in Crisis," in The Design of Frontier Spaces, ed. Carolyn Loeb and Andreas Luescher (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 213-231, 222.
34. Philipp Nicolas Lehmann, "Infinite Power to Change the World: Hydroelectricity and Engineered Climate Change in the Atlantropa Project," *The American Historical Review* 121, no. 1 (2016), 82. Sörgel's plan to manipulate the African climate to make it suitable for Europeans illustrates the ways in which the climate and atmosphere (both in a literal and figurative sense) are foundational to an anti-black spatial imaginary. Christina Sharpe offers an insightful discussion on this particular point when she reads the weather as anti-black, noting "the totality of our environments…the total climate…and that climate is antiblack." See: Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake: on Blackness and Being*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016, 104.
35. Cited in David Thomas Murphy, "'Retroactive Effects': Ratzel's Spatial Dynamics and the Expansionist Imperative in Interwar Germany," *Journal of Historical Geography* 61 (2018), 88.
36. Eurafrica and Atlantropa, which were developed in the 1920s, were likely informed by The Rising Tide of Color, published in 1920, which predicted an apocalyptic future for "the white race."
37. Robert Schuman, "The Schuman Declaration – 9 May 1950," European Union, May 7, 2020, https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration_en.
38. Tiffany Lethabo King, "The Labor of (Re)Reading Plantation Landscapes Fungible(Ly)," *Antipode* 48, no. 4 (2016), 1023. I am thinking with and alongside Tiffany King, whose theory of fungibility, which is indebted to the work of Saidiya Hartman, has proven invaluable. Blackness and space, in my understanding, are isomorphic in that space itself, whether built (architectural) or abstract ((geometrical), is fungible; irrespective of its original or intended function, space can be put to many synchronous and asynchronous uses. As a discipline, architecture traffics in the creation of form and space. Yet, despite the fundamental relationship between Blackness and space, Black fungibility remains largely unthought in architectural theory.
39. Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2019, 24.
40. Ibid., 121.
41. Here, I am referring specifically to architecture's role in translating abstract concepts such as "justice," and "democracy" into logical, monumental designs. Architects have designed the vast network of buildings and institutional infrastructures, e.g. the International Criminal Court, the Seat of the European Parliament, but also detention centers, prisons, immigration offices, and police stations, that materially reinforce and architecturally embody the rule of law.
42. Ian Macdougall, "How McKinsey Helped the Trump Administration Carry Out Its Immigration Policies," The New York Times (The New York Times, December 3, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/03/us/mckinsey-ICE-immigration.html. McKinsey aided the Trump administration carry out its immigration policies, by helping ICE find "detention savings opportunities." On McKinsey's impact on European policy see Christopher D. Mckenna, "'THE AMERICAN CHALLENGE:" McKINSEY & COMPANY'S ROLE IN THE TRANSFER OF DECENTRALIZATION TO EUROPE, 1957-1975.," Academy of Management Proceedings 1997, no. 1 (1997): pp. 226-230, https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1997.4981932.

43. Rowan Moore, "Roadmap 2050 by Rem Koolhaas's OMA | Architecture Review," The Guardian (Guardian News and Media, May 8, 2010), https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2010/may/09/roadmap-2050-eneropa-rem-koolhaas.
44. Petrov, *Mediterranean Frontiers*, 223
45. David Basulto, "Roadmap 2050: A Practical Guide to a Prosperous, Low-Carbon Europe.," ArchDaily (ArchDaily, April 13, 2010), https://www.archdaily.com/56229/roadmap-2050-a-practical-guide-to-a-prosperous-low-carbon-europe.
46. See e.g., Fabiola López-Durán, *Eugenics in the Garden: Transatlantic Architecture and the Crafting of Modernity*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2019.
47. Ambe J. Njoh, Planning Power Town Planning and Social Control in Colonial Africa (London: UCL Press, 2015), p. 31
48. Marrast cited in Njoh, *Planning Power*, 31.
49. Michael Walzer, "I. Liberalism and the Art of Separation," *Political Theory* 12, no. 3 (1984), 315.
50. Walzer, *Liberalism*, 315.
51. Achille Mbembe, *Critique of Black Reason*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017, 35.
52. Walzer, *Liberalism*, 315.
53. See e.g. Susan Geason and Paul R. Wilson, *Designing out Crime: Crime Prevention through Environmental Design* (Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology, 1989); Lee Davies, "Designing out Crime: How Good Architecture Can Save Money," The Guardian (Guardian News and Media, November 23, 2012), https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2012/nov/23/designing-out-crime-antisocial-behaviour; Alex Andreou, "Defensive Architecture: Keeping Poverty Unseen and Deflecting Our Guilt," The Guardian (Guardian News and Media, February 18, 2015), https://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/feb/18/defensive-architecture-keeps-poverty-undeen-and-makes-us-more-hostile.
54. Robin Bernstein, *Racial Innocence: Performing American Childhood and Race from Slavery to Civil Rights*. New York: New York University Press, 2012, 13.
55. François Lenormant and Elisabeth Chevallier, *A Manual of the Ancient History of the East to the Commencement of the Median Wars, vol. 1* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1871), p. 62
56. Ahmed, "A Phenomenology of Whiteness," 155.
57. The etymology is particular to Indo-European languages and therefore a particular conception of freedom.
58. Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, "Are Freedom and Liberty Twins?," *Political Theory* 16, no. 4 (1988): pp. 523-552, https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591788016004001, p. 529
59. Benveniste Émile, "The Free Man," in *Dictionary of Indo-European Concepts and Society*, trans. Elizabeth Palmer (Chicago: Hau Books, distributed by University of Chicago Press, 2016), p. 261
60. Pitkin, *Are Freedom and Liberty Twins,* 530. It is important to note that according to Fenichel Pitkin, "the etymological origins of "freedom" and "liberty" remain disputed, then, and thus cannot authoritatively settle anything about the essence of these concept."
61. See Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection*, 62.Hartman argues that "the slave is the object or the ground that makes possible the existence of the bourgeois subject and, by negation or contradistinction, defines liberty, citizenship, and the enclosures of the social body." The forced reproduction of "kinlessness" is inseparable from the imperial expansionist projects of "the European family," 'freedom', whiteness, kinship, the intimacies of desire, sexuality, and the ideological formation of Europe.
62. Doors and windows, which connect the exterior and interior, are designed, of course, to allow and facilitate flows and crossings. Doors and windows are the point at which flow is regulated and access is controlled. Far from being uncomplicated symbols of openness, transparency, or points of access (think of the idiom "my door is always open), doors and windows are well-planned and positioned to "allow those gathered inside to control vision," and "to see clearly what happen[s] outside while restricting what those gathered outside [can] see inside." Doors and windows, especially when open, obscure this logic of spatial and visual control. See Stella Nair, *At Home with the Sapa Inca: Architecture, Space, and Legacy at Chinchero*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015, 125-126.
63. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2004, 4.
64. Ibid., 4.
65. Ibid., 4-5.
66. Obioma Nnaemeka, "Racialization and the Colonial Architecture: Othering and the Order of Things," *PMLA* 123, no. 5 (2008), 1750.
67. Adrienne R. Brown, *The Black Skyscraper: Architecture and the Perception of Race*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019, 3.
68. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 4.
69. Ibid., 3.
70. Ibid., 6.
71. Bernard Tschumi, *Architecture and Disjunction*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996, 125.

72. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2. Fanon writes that "decolonization, which sets out to change the order of the world, is clearly an agenda for total disorder."
73. Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 14-15.
74. Frank B. Wilderson III, *Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010, 124.
75. Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 109.
76. Ibid., 117.
77. Martin Luther King, "Negroes Are Not Moving Too Fast," *Saturday Evening Post*, November 7, 1964, p. 8.