Deconstructing the Fort — The Role of Postmodernity in Urban Development
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In medieval times, kings, queens and their court lived in fortified castles. In the late twentieth Century, residential fortification, traditionally associated with these medieval structures of defence, is re-emerging. Fortification is physically manifested in the contemporary built environment by the replication (either directly or in effect) of design elements such as moats, drawbridges, fences, walls, bars, and observation posts.

The psychological foundation of fortification is a ‘fortress mentality’ whereby people assume that exposure to difference is ‘more likely to be mutually threatening than mutually stimulating’. The assumed purpose behind this process of fortification is the protection of the ‘inner’/self from the disorder of the ‘outer’/other. This is considered negative as it prevents the individual from experiencing the realities of urban life. Until these realities are exposed and acknowledged the need for change can be ignored.

This paper investigates fortification through a case study analysis of the city of Prahran and addresses the following research questions:

How is fortification evident in the private residential built environment? What are the rationales behind private residential fortification? What implications does postmodernity have for Marxist political economy explanations of urban form?

The phenomenon of ‘fortification’ is ancient and spreads throughout the globe. However, recently, elements of fortification such as moats, drawbridges, walls, bars, observation posts, fences, and castles have re-emerged in the contemporary urban landscape. Jane Jacobs was among the first to deal with the notion of the contemporary fort. In *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, she describes ‘the barriers formed by new projects at the edges of Hyde Park’ as ‘fort-like’. The purpose behind this fortification is residential segregation which aims to establish enclaves of cognate people — ‘the technique here is to designate the turf and fence the other gangs out’. The ‘other’ is defined as anybody not within the fort, and it is the perception of this ‘other’ unknown element within society that is feared. Jacobs demonstrates that the ‘fortress mentality’ emerging from this fear, has expressed itself in the built form.

Thirty years on, Mike Davis pursues the notion of the fort in his text *City of Quartz — Excavating the Future of Los Angeles*. Chapter four is titled ‘Fortress L.A.’ and deals solely with the fortification of the built environment. Davis explicitly relies on urban imagery to relate fortification to the ‘militarisation of city life’. Davis explores fortification as it applies to the whole of Los Angeles, be it public/private, residential/commercial, or physical/mental. He considers elements such as the design of buildings, the erection of fences/walls, and the development of exclusive residential compounds. Davis reveals the rhetoric of ‘defensible space’ by exposing
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the semiotic meaning of fortification directed at the ‘other’. This meaning indicates the pharaonic desire of fortifiers to eliminate that ‘other’.

The trend to fortification has been observed in Australia both in the academic literature and by the media. Hillier and McManus look at the ‘fortress in mentality in the suburbs’, drawing on Perth, Western Australia as a case study. Their focus is residential fortification, particularly ‘the erection of new, walled elite suburban developments as enclaves’. It is argued that ‘these macho bastions of capitalist power admit only Us, the empowered wealthy, pulling up the drawbridge against the abject Others who reside outside’. Morgan and Johnson consider fortification on a Australia wide scale, in relation to defensible space and postmodernism, respectively.

It is considered that the ‘militarisation’ of urban life is contradictory to ‘residual hopes for urban reform and social integration’. In order to arrest the trend to fortification in Australia it is necessary to determine what it is about contemporary society that has resulted in the return to fortification.

In recent decades an expanding economy has tended ‘to increase crime rates by providing more things to steal and more activities exposing person and property to illegal attack’. However, the representation of this crime by the mass media has resulted in the ‘dissemination of fear ... far beyond the direct experiences of perpetrators and victims’. Accordingly, even though we might never have been personally assaulted or burgled ‘we have already been victimised [as] crime has produced in us a selfishness and a self-serving mentality which automatically sets us against the rest of the world’. It is the awareness of crime and the corresponding recognition of oneself as a potential target that has resulted in the paranoia of security.

Not surprisingly then, security constantly emerges as an aim of contemporary fortification. In the extreme case of Beverley Hills this is resulting in the erection of ‘high-tech castles (for which) residential architects are borrowing design secrets from overseas embassies and military command posts’. For example, a feature in high demand is the ‘“terrorist-proof security room” concealed in the houseplan and accessed by sliding panels and secret doors’. A more common manifestation of fortification for security is the inclusion of ‘home security devices’ such as burglar alarms, fences, security doors, etc. into the design of houses in an attempt to ‘shield against the threats and intrusions of an outside world’.

Davis argues that ‘security’ has less to do with personal safety than with the degree of personal insulation, in residential, work, consumption and travel environments, from ‘unsavoury’ groups and individuals, even crowds in general. To use the imagery of Marcuse ‘stucco walls’ are erected to ‘shelter gated and exclusive communities, where walls exclude for status and social control, protecting privilege and wealth from the threat of physical intrusion’. The use of fortification to erect barriers between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’, ‘renters’/owners’, or employed/unemployed, in an exaggerated effort at residential segregation represents what this research is defining as the elitist rationale for fortification.

Greg Vann, the immediate past Queensland president of the Royal Australian Planning Institute, is disturbed by the segregation ‘of elements of the community rather than integrating them, which from a social point of view is probably the cause for potential breakdowns in understanding and communities not operating properly’.

The third rationale for fortification is privacy. Sennett argues that ‘the way cities look reflects a great, unreckoned fear of exposure’ to difference, based on the
assumption that this difference is ‘more likely to be mutually threatening than mutually stimulating’. Consequently, there is an obsessive desire for isolation from the ‘other’ as separation is sought between us/them, known/unknown, order/disorder, inside/outside, public/private, self/other. It is considered that the ‘other’ reigns in the public sphere creating disorder and uncontrollable by self. Contrastingly, the private sphere of the home is considered to be ordered and safe. The result of this perception is that all outside is considered a threat and ‘the very sight of their need is an intrusion upon the self’. To prevent this intrusion, all that is not self is treated as neutral as a mechanism to deal with (ignore) the ‘disturbing’ and ‘demanding’ outside — ‘neutrality is built in order to legitimate withdrawal’. Unfortunately this process of fortifying ‘self’ from ‘other’ through the built environment has created a ‘strange contrast between an inner life to which nothing outward corresponds, and an outward existence unrelated to what is within’.

The notion of disorder is central to the rationales of security, elitism and privacy as the assumptions traditionally relied on in relation to safety, status and the public sphere are perceived to be dissolving. Davis describes Los Angeles as a city out of control, using terms such as ‘spatial apartheid’, ‘kill the crowd’, ‘corporate citadel’, ‘barricaded streets’, ‘carceral inner cities’, and ‘criminalised poor’ to convey an image of a chaotic war zone. Fortification is a response to this image of chaos/disorder in the city. In The Uses of Disorder, Sennett explains that the abundance of the postwar years enabled freedoms which threatened to disrupt the supposed order of society. Berman echoes this sentiment in All That is Solid Melts into Air and draws on Nietzsche to suggest that the ‘solution to the chaos of modern life is to try not to live at all’. On the supposition that disorder in the city is negative, people withdraw, creating for themselves private enclaves of order. The residential fort is one such enclave. However, Wilson argues that the perceived disorder is simply the ‘urban-ness of urban life’ and cannot be denied by city dwellers tackling urban problems.

The literature deals with two main bodies of theory — Marxist political economy and postmodernism. It is imperative that the theoretical understanding of a socio-urban process is valid or else action in pursuit of change will be ineffectual. Each approach is outlined below thereby establishing a comparable base for analysing the empirical data.

A political economy approach concentrates on the capitalist roots of urban conditions. The assumption is that the state and the owners of capital are the ones who have the power to influence urban form. There have been changes in the global political-economy of capitalist nations since the 1970s which have set the context for the development of contemporary urban form. The production process, the demands on labour, use of space, role of the state, and ideology have all become more flexible. Harvey acknowledges these ‘shifts in the surface of capitalism’ as an attempt to contain the latest ‘grumblings’ of a ‘crisis-prone’ mode of development.

The latest crisis of capitalism, evidenced through ‘falling profit rates’ and the ‘over-production of commodities’, has led to the ‘shift of capital investment from the sphere of production to the built environment’. The corresponding encouragement of home ownership, encapsulated in the ‘Great Australian Dream’, then becomes a means to create ‘a mass market for consumer goods’. According to Castells it is the sphere of consumption rather than production that is the ‘source
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of class-based conflict.\textsuperscript{43} This argument is supported by Harvey’s\textsuperscript{44} concept of residential differentiation. Here it is argued that social relations are reproduced in space through the ‘differential access to scarce resources’.\textsuperscript{45} This has historically distinguished various socio-economic groups. However, in ‘advanced industrial societies’ mass consumption threatens class differentiation, requiring the continual ‘refinement of consumption objects’.\textsuperscript{46} Furthermore, the style of consumption ‘becomes crucial to the maintenance of social differentiation’.\textsuperscript{47}

The privately owned home is usually the most expensive commodity purchased by an individual. According to Agnew\textsuperscript{48} ‘financial self-sufficiency in order to own objects and the expression of self through objects are ... the marks of identity in capitalist society’.\textsuperscript{49} This supports Marx’ position that a basic human need is for ‘self-evaluations based on income or material commodities purchased through income’.\textsuperscript{50} However, for self-evaluations to be meaningful, the object on which they are focused must also be ‘relatively scarce and appreciated’\textsuperscript{51} by the general public. In this way, the home becomes not only an asset to be bought and sold, but an indication of ‘who one is, what one’s class, lifestyle, and tastes are’.\textsuperscript{52}

Postmodernism contrasts with this political economic based theory as it is predominantly a cultural paradigm.\textsuperscript{53} Culture is understood as the ordered meaning communicated through images, language and signs.\textsuperscript{54} To consider culture, therefore entails an investigation of individual feelings, perceptions and sensibilities at a local level. So whilst postmodernism is concerned with intimate local details, Marxist political economy is a global theory which purports to explain urban form universally.

The particular conditions that constitute postmodernity include; disorder, nostalgia confusion between reality and illusion, the dominance of media, the use of images, schizophrenia, the turmoil of public and private, social polarisation, and narcissism. As a result of these conditions, the individual is left only with themself, attempting to establish an identity and becoming increasingly narcissistic.\textsuperscript{55} It is this obsession with ‘self’ as opposed to ‘us’/‘we’ in response to the perception of increasing disorder that has resulted in the urban form of fortification. Bishop\textsuperscript{56} verifies this stating that ‘responses to the supposed free-floating anarchism of postmodernism have been varied, as people desperately seek out some firm ‘ground’ upon which to base their lives, their hopes, fears and aspirations.’ A purpose of this research is to determine whether fortification is an attempt to create this ‘firm ground’ in response to the postmodern condition.

The first houses were built in Prahran in the 1840’s. By World War Two most blocks had been built on, and the front fences were about three feet high, made of wood or open wire mesh and permeable.\textsuperscript{57} This provides a stark comparison to the fences being erected today.

A series of in-depth qualitative interviews were carried out with residents of fortified houses within the City of Prahran with the purpose of understanding the impact of and rationales for fortification. The interviewees used predominantly negative imagery to describe the(ir) fences demonstrating the impact of fences on the public street is not benign.

Interviewee 3 stated, ‘I put this bloody well six foot high monster around my property.’ He indicated that the monster fence had been erected under sufferance, a motivation he applied to other elements of fortification - ‘All those things people are enduring because they feel it is necessary to do so, not because they want to’. Interviewee 6 felt ‘walls just stick out like a sore thumb ... they spoil the streetscape’
and commenting on a streetscape lined with high fences, interviewee 4 stated, ‘the whole block looks like a prison’.

By blank facades it is meant that the wall of the house facing the street is bare, without any ‘projections or materials to improve appearance’, preventing surveillance of the street by the occupants. It was found that new developments are being built to this design if not this specific brief. There are the dwellings that have no windows overlooking the street at the front, instead presenting a blank wall to the whole upper level facing the street and there are dwellings that due to their scale and bulk are so dominant are just a physical barrier straight to the street.

The third element of fortification has been termed ‘images of security’. Almost every house had at least one or a combination of the following signs which were acting as deterrents. They included ‘beware of the dog’ signs, where there was obviously no dog; neighbourhood watch stickers where the fences were so high that it wasn’t possible to watch over the nearby neighbourhood; and private security company posters. In addition there were video cameras, intercoms, sensor lights, and the latest gadget, a telecall, which gives a visual video component to the traditional intercom. This allows the occupier of the house to see who it is that presses the door bell which is located on the front wall. If all this isn’t enough to indicate to the user of the public street that they are not welcome, one house had the additional touch of a silver plaque, reading ‘Warning, this premises is guarded by electronic and photographic surveillance equipment. 24 Hour monitored surveillance system’.

The most obvious rationale for fortification to emerge from the interviews was security. Historically, security from attack by the enemy generated the need for fortification. In contemporary society that threat is still present, whether in reality or as a mentality. The interviewees explained that the threat is posed by ‘criminals’, ‘gangs’, ‘drunks’, beggars, ‘the other’, ‘the unknown’, ‘rapists’, ‘men going in to bash up little old ladies’, etc. Furthermore, as explained by pilot interviewee 1 that threat was perceived to be increasing and it was no longer possible to ‘rely on the law to put these people away’. It is argued that fortification is an attempt by people to reclaim control over their own(ed) private living environment — control that the state no longer can or does provide, control that never really existed in the same way that society was never ordered. Interviewee 5 explains:

It [the house] has a dual alarm system — a perimeter system and a detector system. We have an electric operated front gate, a high fence, deadlocked doors and windows. The alarm is connected to a surveillance company whereby if the alarm goes off they deal with it.

This array of security devices was typical amongst all interviewees and represents hundreds of thousands of dollars which are being spent. A political economy argument would say that the paranoid demand for security devices is being artificially generated by the owners of capital to ensure a continuous increase of profit. On the other hand a postmodern explanation would argue that the collapse of the distinction between what is real and what is illusion in relation to safety and crime rates has meant that people are not prepared to take a chance. This is despite the reality of crime which demonstrates that crime rates for homicide and robbery have in fact not increased for the last twenty years, and Victoria in relation to the Australian average is the least violent place to live.
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This confusion between reality and illusion is also applicable to the implementation of devices that the interviewees put in place to protect themselves. Every interviewee had a high fence, somewhere between two and fours metres. In every case except one, the interviewees acknowledged that there is absolutely no security in a fence, yet had it there for the explicit purpose of protecting themselves from harm. Ironically, when asked what their ideal would be, most of the interviewees said it would be to have no fences and open sprawling front gardens.

Elitism was the second rationale for fortification that emerged, as demonstrated by these two quotes from interviewee 7 and 1 respectively:

You park the car in the street; there are people there all day long because there are rented houses and flats. It’s a different socio-economic group and you were forced to communicate with people who are poles apart. That’s why we bought this, because we drive expensive cars we were continually losing the badges and getting scratches on them.

People who are better off have this perception that they want a nice house with a big fence because it implies they have done well. ... Fences are status symbols. ... Your display to the world of what you perceive yourself to be, it shows something about you and what you do and how you feel, and what you are.

The first quote represents a desire for what the political economists would explain is residential segregation, whereby different socio-economic groups are physically separated in their location of housing. The justification is that it increases the property values of the higher socio-economic group and eliminates the need for them to interact with people outside that grouping. The second quote indicates that the fence is being used as a postmodern image to portray a meaning to the user of the public street of who the person behind the fence is. In most cases the owner/builder consciously built higher than his neighbours and had high fences and bland facades to produce a domineering effect whereby he would be looking down onto nearby properties. The aim is not only to indicate one’s position financially, but to make it quite clear to the public other that they are not welcome in this supposedly public street.

The third rationale for fortification was privacy as evidenced by the following quote from interviewee 4:

We are very private people and we don’t like being looked at. We want to place a big fence around us and we don’t want to know anybody. ... We are self-sufficient, we don’t need anybody else, we live unto ourselves and our families.

Interviewee 4 bought the house mainly because ‘it was closed off from the street’. Not only was the front of the property protected by a 2 metre high fence, the ‘backyard was (also) totally private’. The explanation was that ‘we don’t want you watching us’. Interviewee 6 justified the desire for privacy as ‘instinctive’, stating ‘people like their own little private space’. Finally, interviewee 9, perhaps the strongest crusader for privacy, argued that ‘the ideal approach is to put windows onto a private area rather than a public area’ and create private space by erecting fences, thereby giving the occupier more ‘control’ over their property.

Several authors argue a causal relationship between this desire for privacy and
the dominance of home ownership as a form of housing tenure. The assumption is that as the owner-occupier becomes increasingly absorbed, socially and economically, in the private house, ‘participation in collective life’ diminishes, reinforcing the trend to ‘privatism’.63

As capitalism is ‘organised around the search for profit’64 it could be argued that the fortification of the built environment in order to ensure privacy is a product of this search for profit. Several of the interviewees told stories of developing their property as a dual occupancy in order to get a higher return. To maximise use of the site private open space for one of the dwellings needed to be located at the front of the property. That space could only be privatised if it were enclosed by a high front fence. Private open space was demanded by the market and was taken into consideration by the owner/builders when considering the resellability of their property. Thus the capitalist drive for profit forces the owners of capital to maximise returns by developing the site to the extreme. The marketable item of private open space is enabled by fortifying the built form. The implication of this is that ‘the material context of personal and social experience’65 enjoyed by the ‘other’ outside the fort is controlled by capital.

On the other hand, it is argued that as the distinction between the private and public spheres becomes more confused, the individual withdraws from the public into the realm of the private. The individual legitimates their own experience, ‘alienating and anonymous’, and so the individual becomes isolated.66 The resulting image is one of privatised consumption67 and the image has been reduced to the unit of one person as highlighted by interviewee 5:

> You see all our activities now at home are more solitary — we watch television, we use computers. My daughter has her own computer, telephone, bathroom and toilet. Everything is in there so she only comes out to eat. Whereas the children used to sit at the dining table and spread a whole lot of homework out and say ‘hey mum, what do I do now?’, now mum can’t actually do it. So therefore children go off and do their own thing. If they’re not working on their homework or watching a video, they’re on the telephone. Usually it’s all three at once ... oh dear!

The resulting focus on self has dire consequences for the ‘other’. Sennett68 explains that the response of the narcissistic individual, obsessed with the their own being, to the ‘interference’ of the homeless, mentally disturbed or beggar, is to ‘treat the outside as neutral’, therefore avoiding the situation where their need is an ‘intrusion upon the self.’ Morgan69 argues that this ‘anonymity’ which reduces the circle of trust in a city to the individual is ‘at the heart of the moral panic around crime.’ Accordingly, to echo the psychological fortification of self from other in the built environment is to reinforce the problem rather than address it.

All of the interviewees made mention of the fact that life was busier, more chaotic and less ordered and predictable. The issue of increasing disorder emerged repeatedly in relation to the state of the economy, the plight of the family and safety in public. It is argued that because people have a perception of the outside/external, public world as being chaotic, they will seek protection, or a haven from this by fortifying themselves in the home.

Fortification of the private residential built environment of Prahran is a response to the perception of disorder in the city. The perception of disorder influences the
increasing desire for privacy, security, and display of elitist attitudes. The following quotes are examples where the interviewees 9, 3 and 2 respectively, made the link between how their perception or experience of the disordered nature of society has increased their desire for privacy and/or security and their fear of the ‘have nots’ (elitist attitudes) respectively, which in turn resulted in them reacting by fortifying their immediate built environment:

I’m sure there are more people per hectare living in an area, and as a consequence you have lots of little people walking down the street so you have to go ‘hello’ all the time, whereas in the old days you do it once a day. Consequently, I think people value their privacy more than they did.

[A fence offers] a psychological feeling of security, it’s nothing else but psychological because if anybody wants to break in they can jump over the fence and it doesn’t matter if it’s six foot high or six inches high, but it gives you a certain feeling of security and I guess that is what people want for their house. They want to know that in this crazy and unsafe world they are at least safe at home.

[There is an] increasing fear between the have and the have nots. Certainly a fear of those people that are unemployed. A whole generation of unemployed that I suppose no longer know how to earn the things they want and just take them. So therefore the people who have things that are maybe considered by society to be desirable are in a sense trying to protect those things more and more.

Economic disorder, particularly increasing unemployment, emerged as a major cause of uncertainty for all interviewees as they linked it directly to their perception of an increasingly violent society. Lash and Urry argue that unemployment is a result of the current process of global economic restructuring which is leading to an economic form known as ‘disorganised capitalism’. Castells explains that the dominance of information/communication technology within ‘disorganised capitalism’ has prompted an urban response that includes ‘the rehabilitation, revitalisation, improvement, and protection of a limited exclusive space of residence ... insulated from its immediate surroundings by a computerised army of bodyguards, and related to other islands of the elite’.

These explanations provide a rationale for the withdrawal of the individual into the private sphere, where security is provided by increasingly sophisticated technology and interaction with ‘undesirables’ is minimised, as is the situation of fortification in Prahran. However, this theory fails to explain why fortification, as a reaction to disorder, is happening now. A brief analysis of history shows that ‘there have been few periods in history when man(sic) felt his(sic) world to be durable’. There is crisis inherent in a capitalist economic system and so economic disorder, and its chaotic reflections in the city, is constant. Consequently, additional explanation is necessary to understand what it is about contemporary society that results in fortification.

In Intimations of Postmodernity, Bauman argues that ‘distinctive features of postmodernity are institutional pluralism, variety, contingency and ambivalence. Randomness and disorganisation are its signposts in contradistinction to the signposts of progress and unilinearity which typify modernity’. According to the postmodernists, there is no inherent order that can explain society. However, until
now individuals in the city have been able to live the myth of order. In recent
(postmodern) times this verified existence has been exposed. The result is that
people are retreating into the mind/built fort.

Each interviewee revealed a disorientation with the increasing pace, opportunities
and density experienced in the city. The following quote is an example of the recurring
type of comments that reveal the forces behind the perceived urban whirlpool of the
public sphere that has resulted in the fortification of the home in an attempt to create
‘secure moorings in a shifting world’.  

You have a fax machine and you have a mobile phone and there’s never a stop to it,
even in business. You used to write a letter overseas and you’d wait two weeks for a
reply and then did something. Now a fax goes and the next day you have your answer
and you’ve got to start doing things. People’s lives are different, there are more
options, there are more things to do, the pace is faster...

What is important when considering this comment is not whether or not there is
disorder and what has caused it, but rather why people perceive there to be disorder,
where once they didn’t. A postmodern interpretation is relevant because the
perception of disorder has been influenced by images portrayed through the media.

The fear of the public ‘other’, the fear of violence and the fear of the ‘have-
nots’ have been manufactured/exaggerated in the imaginations of people responding
to the media’s incomplete presentation of the facts. In this sense it is shown that
there is confusion between what is real and what is illusion. This confusion is
heightened by nostalgic comparisons with the past. Rundell describes the
postmodern world as ‘one of contingency where all fast, frozen relations have been
dissolved.’ This includes the relationship between the past and the present. As the
postmodern condition distorts the past, the influence that the past can exert on the
present, and the ability to formulate possible futures is lost. This adds to the
perception of disorder as identity of self is without a firm foundation. It is this
image of disorder, where there was presumed to be order, that people are responding
to with fortification. The irony is that there has always been disorder in the city, it
has just taken the postmodern condition to make the general public aware of it.
Consequently it has been the condition of postmodernity as opposed to the capitalist
system of development that has prompted the built form of fortification. This is not
to deny the power of class based interests, but rather to acknowledge that within the
existing economic system of capitalism, contemporary culture can independently
influence the relationship between society and space.

It has been established that postmodernism has influenced the emergence of
fortification. It is weak and inaccurate to trace the origins of postmodern conditions
such as nostalgia, narcissism, images and the confusion between reality and illusion,
and the private and public all back to a political economic explanation. Together,
these elements of the postmodern condition create a cultural force with its own
momentum, sometimes free of the restraints of capital and snowballing in it’s impact
on everyday life. Amariligo’s concept of parallel knowledges to explain a
relationship between society and space seems to reflect the situation of fortification
in Prahran. Accordingly, it is considered that fortification is undeniably subject to
the influences of the postmodern condition as manifested predominantly in culture.
This cultural paradigm is necessarily linked to the capitalist system of production
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existent in Western nations, however, remains independent of a totalising political-economy explanation. The implications of this analysis of the data collected on fortification are significant for policy, theory and the base on which social action is founded.

The challenge is to reverse the trend towards a ‘fortress mentality’ as reflected by the fortification of the residential built environment. To fortify implies the need for protection or desire for isolation from a particular fear. However, fear, be it of crime, difference, exposure, or the disorder of everyday life, ‘thrives on its own terror’\(^8\) and is self-defeating. Manipulation of the built form will not remove that fear, but merely displace it, and the resulting impact of fortification on society is not justified.

Isolation leads to a narcissistic sense of self, from which it is only possible to experience an adolescent life. Individuals and social relations need maturity to engage in the realities of life, before the lot of society as a whole can be improved. It is argued that maturity comes through a willingness to engage the disorder that exists within a city. In this way people ‘will become more in control of themselves and more aware of each other. That is the promise, and the justification, of disorder’.\(^8\) Furthermore, by confronting this disorder, that disorder will be deconstructed and the intricate order that controls society revealed.
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