ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY

INSTITUDE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

POWER RELATIONS IN CHILDREN PARK AND PLAYGROUNDS AS A PUBLIC SPACE

Gamze Örnek Akkuş

116679011

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ömer Behiç ALBAYRAK

İSTANBUL

2020

Power Relations In Children Park And Playgrounds As a Puclic Space

Bir Kamusal Alan Olarak Çocuk Park ve Oyun Alanlarında İktidar İlişkileri

Gamze ÖRNEK AKKUŞ

116679011

Tez Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ömer Behiç ALBAYRAK (İmza) .....

.....İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi

Jüri Üyeleri Doç. Dr. Ferda KESKİN (İmza) .....

.....İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Juri Üyesi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zeynep TALAY TURNER

.....İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi (İmza) .....

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : .....30/09/2020.....

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 63.....

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

1) iktidar
2) mekan
3) denetim
4) çocukluk
5) park ve oyun alanları

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

1) power
2) space
3) control
4) childhood
5) park and playgrounds

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS……iii

PHOTOSINDEX.....v

ABSTRACT.....vi

ÖZET……vii

CHAPTER I.....1

INTRODUCTION.....1

CHAPTER II 4

DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SPACE AND BOUNDARIES OF PUBLIC SPACE.....4

2.1. Public Space.....4

2.2. Urban Space.....9

2.3. Boundaries of the Public Sphere.....11

CHAPTER III.....13

WHAT IS POWER? 13

3.1. Power Discourse by Foucault.....14

CHAPTER IV.....19

CHILDHOOD 20

4.1. Is It Possible to Define a Childhood?.....20

4.2. Childhood.....21

4.3. Childhood from Past to Present.....23

4.4. Today's Childhood Concept 24

CHAPTER V……29

PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS AS A PUBLIC AREA.....29

POWER RELATIONS IN PARK AND PLAYGROUNDS.....31

A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PLAYGRAOUNDS: THE SPACE OF CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE.....44

5.1. Control of The Childon His/Her Own Body……..48

CONCLUCION.....50

POSSIBILITY TO EXPAND THE LIMITS OF THE RULING AREA AND FREEDOM 50

REFERENCES.....56

PHOTOS INDEX

Photo 1. A school playground in Germany.

Photo 2. ABD, New York City, Bronx Park

Photo 3. Examples of the first neighborhood park

Photo 4. Examples of the first neighborhood park

Photo 5. Playground in residential areas

Photo 6. Playgrounds in communal living areas

Photo 7. Thematic playground

ABSTRACT

In this study, the concept of power in a public space is examined. Children's parks and playgrounds as public spaces are studied together in terms of the concept of power. Emphasized are that parks and playgrounds are an indispensable part of urban life and the purposse for which these spaces are included in city life. The idea that power is ubiquitous draws the general framework of the study and makes these spaces eligible to assess in terms of power. In the study, the idea that parks and playgrounds are unexpected places of power is considered through the limits of the body and the limits of space. Approaches to childhood have been explained in historical terms and the definition of childhood have been opened to discussion. The hierarchical relationship, which has been overlooked, especially in playgrounds, is addressed through playgrounds and through the concepts of surveillance and supervision in parks. It has been argued that the way power is incorporated to urban life for reasons of security allows us to consider parks as a 'watch' place. Consequently, the physical and spatial ways of surveillance and control are problematized.

Key words: Power, space, control, childhood, park and playgrounds.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada iktidar kavramı kamusal bir mekân içerisinde incelenmektedir. Çocuk park ve oyun alanları birer kamusal mekân olarak iktidar kavramı ile birlikte ele alınmıştır. Park ve oyun alanlarının kent yaşamının vazgeçilmez birer parçası olduğuna ve bu mekânların kent yaşamına hangi amaçla dâhil edildiklerine vurgu yapılmıştır. İktidarın her yerde olduğu fikri tezin genel çerçevesini çizer ve bu mekânları iktidar üzerinden incelemeye elverişli kılar. Çalışmada park ve oyun alanlarının beklenmeyen iktidar mekânları oldukları fikri hem bedenin sınırları hem mekânın sınırları üzerinden görülmeye çalışılmıştır. Çocukluğa ilişkin yaklaşımlar tarihsel süreç içerisinde açıklanmış, çocukluğun tanımı tartışmaya açılmıştır. Özellikle çocuk parkları içerisinde gözden kaçan hiyerarşik ilişkiye, oyun alanları ve yine parklardaki gözetim ve denetim kavramları üzerinden değinilmiştir. İktidarın güvenlik gerekçesi ile kent yaşamına dâhil olma biçiminin, parkları birer 'gözetleme' mekânı olarak ele almamıza imkân tanıdığı savunulmuştur. Sonuç olarak gözetim ve denetimin bedensel ve mekânsal çıkış yolları sorunsallaştırılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İktidar, mekân, denetim, çocukluk, park ve oyun alanları.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When childhood is considered within the framework of different forms of space, it may prove to be a concept with various and changing meanings. Space offers us a wide perspective as a field in which human activities are carried out. Looking at human actions through space makes it imperative to consider the relational forms required by that space. Cities, as important representatives of public space, contain the major parts of today's living spaces. Cities allow for different social and communal classes to come together within the city hierarchy. Considering that cities have roads, squares, transportation networks, parks and playgrounds and boundaries determined by them, they are spaces that occupy a designated area and are covered with communication networks. It is a contradictory requirement of the city phenomenon that the borders of the city get wider while the residential areas are being moved out of the cities.

Studying a form of relationship within any space also requires exposing power relations. The existence of power relations and the forms of their establishment appear as determinants of human activities. This determination also means that the subject is re-established within the space.

The concept of power has taken different meanings throughout history. Complex urban life has also suggested that actions of power be carried out strategically. Increasing human activities have complicated relational networks, especially in public spaces. Managing these complex relationships in public spaces creates various forms of power. It can be said that the search for power relations in the practices of human actions is a way that Foucault has opened to us. Power does not just find representation in a central place. Each human action contains a strategy of power. Thus, it is possible to resolve power strategies by starting from a subjective experience. Power exists in human actions.

However it does not mean that political power is everywhere. Foucault explains these extremely complex forms of relationship as follows:

> The analyses I am trying to make bear essentially on relations of power. By this I mean something different from states of domination. Power relations are extremely widespread in human relationships. Now, this means not that political power is everywhere, but that there is in human relationships a whole range of power relations that may come into play among individuals, within families, in pedagogical relationships, political life, and so on. The analysis of power relations is an extremely complex area; one sometimes encounters what may be called situations or states of domination in which the power relations, instead of being mobile, allowing the various participants to adopt strategies modifying them, remain blocked, frozen. (Foucault, 1997)[1]

The main axis of this study is the search for the functioning of power in the parks and playgrounds as relatively free places where childhood is experienced. Foucault's work made it possible to examine the exercise of power in different spaces. For this reason, parks and playgrounds are chosen as subject of study.

Public spaces are places that have very complex relationships and that are diverse. All human activities that take place in a public space are social. There are various definitions of the public space. For this reason, what this study will try to reveal while examining parks and playgrounds as public space will be to emphasize the relationality of human actions rather than drawing an architectural perspective. İn other words, it will draw an ethical framework. These relations are those maintained with space, with the self and with power. The sense in which childhood corresponds to the constitution of this relationality is hidden in the meanings attributed to childhood and in history. It is essential in this respect to reveal the historical aspect of the concept of childhood. Thus, parks and playgrounds, which are the primary places of childhood, can show us how childhood is handled. In this study, the selection of parks and playgrounds in public space requires addressing the concept of childhood. There are some childhood behaviors that have been defined by various developmental specialists and that run at common intervals in all cultures.

[1] Foucault, M. (1997). **Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth**. (R. H. Others, Çev.) New York: The New York Press. p. 283.

This study is not intended to reveal a wide age of 'childhood'. The general aim is to reveal the perception of space in childhood by reminding the needs of childhood and emphasizing that childhood is subject to power. Thus, we redefine the concept of play, which is a very important part of childhood, by including it in a spatial production process. In other words, the main thing to be done is to reveal the control of the parks and playgrounds, which are defined as free spaces and which allow children to be more on their own. While doing this, the relationship of the child and the society, the relationship with childhood and its body and the relationship with the chosen place will be discussed. This will show that childhood is constituted again and strategically with space. At the same time, trying to look for a way out of all these determinations, the effects of the control mechanisms on childhood will be discussed.

After discussing parks and playgrounds as public spaces, their strategic presence in urban life will be highlighted. The place of childhood in urban life is undetermined or overdetermined. The fact that childhood practices are subject to supervision and surveillance has increased these determinations. On the other hand, is it possible to seek freedom through a childhood maintained through supervision and surveillance mechanisms?

In order for all these discussions to be possible, instead of using the factual definitions of the concepts, it would be the best approach to deal with the facts such as childhood, public space and space with their meanings in the historical process. A study based on given definitions will be too fairly incomplete before the study is finished. A historical and strategic approach has been tried to be put forward as a placeholder for discussions with topics such as how childhood is handled from past to present, where the public space corresponds, and power strategies within the public space.

CHAPTER II

THE DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SPACE AND THE BOUNDARIES OF PUBLIC SPACE

The public space is a field of activity where being active can be described as being in production. This production cannot be unilateral in the public space. The public space hosts a particular network of relationships. These relationships are determined in sometimes hierarchical and sometimes irregular ways. For example, the fields of activity managed by certain institutions with a central authority are hierarchical: schools, hospitals, courthouses etc. In any case, there is an interaction here. This interaction is determined according to the purpose of creating the public space and its architectural form. Public spaces do not always have to include massive architectural forms. A particular form may create public space by non-architectural elements. Areas such as squares, parks and gardens are the examples of this forms. In this study a non-architecrural example of public space will be examined. Parks and playgrounds are the areas that are defined within the public space. Therefore, it is possible to proceed first by asking questions such as what the public is, where the parks and playgrounds correspond within this public space.

Public space is a concept that emerged in Ancient Greece and has been evaluated and dealt with by many different circles. The public space has a long journey from being a place where citizens could express themselves in the agora in Ancient Greece to the formation of the public opininon today and to binge shaped under various ideologies.

2.1 Public Space

Public space does not refer to a place that can be defined in a snap, except that it sociologically and architecturally corresponds to a concrete area. It points to a variable place due to its structure and the new meanings it gained in the historical process.

> In this context, public space can be defined as the “official space”. There is a meaning between the concepts of "public" and "common" that cannot be clearly established and sometimes collides with each other. (Eren, 2016)[2]

Even though children's parks and playgrounds can be defined as public spaces and their functions seem fixed, it is more difficult to grasp what the ‘public’ is than to comprehend its elements. Children's parks and playgrounds are areas that are not always present throughout history. However, in each period, spaces called public or common have emerged. Therefore, we can say that parks and playgrounds are places that are related to and articulated with the concept of public in the period they emerged. If the parks and playgrounds were observed in a context in which the public and the common were defined differently, it perhaps might not have been possible to define them as public entitites. The change here seems to be in a conceptual network that we can associate within these spaces, not in the definition of a space which is always referred to as ‘public.’ However, in this study, I will try to look at the social and operational functioning of the concept rather than its meaning in the language. I will approach this issue with the logic that this functioning narrowed and expanded the meaning of the conceptual content of space. With the claim that space is a produced place, I will try to reveal that a space is not just a spatial form, but also there are fields of activity that comply with or even exceed that spatial scheme.

Space is an area with defined limits. These limits are formally drawn. Each action or discourse that emerges within these limits redraws them, can go beyond them or sometimes not even reach them.

In this part of my study, I will try to define public space and try to deal with the limits of public space both architecturally and discursively. Children's parks and playgrounds are the areas whose limits seem clear in this respect. I will try to look here again with the exercise of power and try to reveal the effect of this exercise in terms of border. In other words, do the parks and playgrounds that are designed as

[2] Eren, A. (2016). **Public Space as a Space for Freedom**. Ankara University Journal Database, 2005, C IX, p. 3-4

areas that are beyond limits create their own limits with the rationale of security and control? Is it possible to overcome this?

The issue of what the public space is requires also a discussion of the private space. The concepts of public space and private space have been conceptualized by thinkers based on different approaches, political and historical periods. When it comes to the public space, Jürgen Habermas, one of the first thinkers that come to mind, describes the public as follows:

> The public sphere is a social phenomenon just as elementary as action, actor, association, or collectivity, but it eludes the conventional sociological concepts of "social order." The public sphere cannot be conceived as an institution and certainly not as an organization. It is not even a framework of norms with differentiated competences and roles, membership regulations, and so on. Just as little does it represent a system; although it permits one to draw internal boundaries, outwardly it is characterized by open, permeable, and shifting horizons. The public sphere can best be described as a network for communicating information and points of view (i.e., opinions expressing affirmative or negative attitudes) ; the streams of communication are, in the process, filtered and synthesized in such a way that they coalesce into bundles of topically specified public opinions. Like the lifeworld as a whole, so, too, the public sphere is reproduced through communicative action, for which mastery of a natural language suffices; it is tailored to the general comprehensibility of everyday communicative practice. (Habermas, 1996).[3]

According to Habermas, public space can be said to be the areas where citizens come into contact and form a partnership. Here, the media aspect of the public emerges. There is an interaction in various media channels. It should be emphasized that Habermas defined public space beginning with the medieval period in a historical perspective. Habermas's concept of public space is related to the emergence of bourgeois society.

> “The bourgeois public sphere arose historically in conjunction with a society separated from the state. The "social" could be constituted as its own sphere to the degree that on the one hand the reproduction of life took on private forms, while on the other hand the private realm as a whole assumed public relevance. The general rules that governed interaction

[3] Habermas, J**. Between Facts And Norms:** Contributions to a DicourseTheory. (W.Rehg, Çev.) USA: The Mit Press. p. 360.

> among private people now became a public concern. In the conflict over this concern, in which the private people soon enough became engaged with the public authority, the bourgeois public sphere attained its political function. The private people, gatheredto constitute a public, turned the political sanctioning of society as a private sphere into a public topic." (Habermas, 1991)[4]

Evaluating the concepts of public space and public opinion through historical developments, Habermas examines, describes and idealizes the public as a bourgeois public. Representative public space, defined through a leader in feudalism, has been replaced by public authority, which emerged with national and regional states. From then on, the public no longer expresses the representative palace of a prince with authority. The public is now understood as an institution with the legal use of authority. Public space has existed since the Ancient Greek times. It is the area of freedom where individuals who make up the society share ideas. Habermas does not extend the definition of public space to the Ancient Greek period. However, it should be emphasized that the public and the private are very clearly separated in the ancient Greek civilization. The public does not mean works carried out completely under the control of the state, but the for the benefit of the public. This interpretation by Habermas is mostly about the discussion by the social contract philosophers of how the the relations between the citizens of society are organized. However, public sphere does not only mean spaces that are created by one authority, but run with the participatory power of the people. Today, it is necessary to talk about a adequate type of communication in order to talk about the public sphere as a place where citizens can come together, exchange ideas and discuss public issues and produce a 'temporary proposal of solution.For this, the type of communication defined by Habermas in the public sphere is communicative action.

Communicative action refers to a milieu of communication in which individuals express their ideas freely, do not exercise superiority over others, and do not humiliate each other for their opinions. In today's world, from this point of view,

[4] Habermas, J. (1991). " **The Structural Transformation of The Public Sphere**." Cambridge: The Mit Press, Massachusetts. p. 127

the defining limits of the public space have been considerably expanded. Or they have gained meanings close to its meaning in Ancient Greece.

Another definition of public space belongs to Hannah Arendt. Similar to Habermas, Arendt explains the emergence of the separation of public and private spaces in historical terms. While Habermas focuses on the centuries in which the bourgeois public emerged, Arendt takes the public-private distinction back to the ancient Greek times. If we go back to the puclic and private spehere for Arendt;

> According to Greek thought, the human capacity for political organization is not only different from but stands in direct opposition to that natural association whose center is the home *(oikiri)* and the family. The rise of the city-state meant that man received "besides his private life a sort of second life, his *bios politikos.* Now every citizen belongs to two orders of existence; and there is a sharp distinction in his life between what is his own (idion) and what is communal. (Arendt, 1958)[5]

Arendt reflects on the intellectual and practical activity of man in life and looks at the concepts of public space and private space from an ethical perspective. Arendt participates in the discussion of public and private spheres, based on Aristotle's thought. Keskin defines this ethical perspective as follows:

> The public sphere has always been exclusionary since ancient Greece. It can be said that the public-private distinction began to emerge with the birth of the police, that is, the city-state in Ancient Greece. In ancient Greece, while the public sphere included the practices and activities that should be attended in order to become citizens, the private sphere meant family practices that only concern the individual. Aristotle talks about three main forms of association: the family, an economic unit built to meet simple needs such as breeding and survival, the village made up of multiple families, and the polis as a political community, which aims at the highest good where human nature can fully realize itself. According to Aristotle, the 'good life' is politically qualified life (Keskin, 1998).[6]

According to Arendt,

[5] Arendt, H. **"The Human Condition."** p.44
[6] Keskin, F. (1998). **Kamusal Alan ve Yalın Yaşam (Public Space and The Lean Life)**. Doğu-Batı Dergisi. p. 105-109.

> The term "public" signifies the world itself, in so far as it is common to all of us and distinguished from our privately owned place in it. (Arendt, 1958)[7]

For example, all public spaces, especially architectural spaces, are bureaucratic spaces created by the state's legislative power, where citizens are in on behalf of the state as the executive power, and where jobs are carried out on behalf of citizens. Institutions like hospitals, schools, courthouse buildings, police offices etc. can be called public institutions. The public architectural spaces appear especially during the nation-building process of Turkey. The main reason for me to consider public spaces architecturally is to open the the public space to discussion when non-architectural spaces were recognized as public spaces. Obviously, there are both architectural and non-architectural areas in the process in which a number of separate definitions such as private, legal and public are formulated. By observing the emergence of this prerequisite, the subject of the thesis is that parks playgrounds are part of the public space. I will try to reveal when and for what purpose parks and playgrounds were built in history. In order to talk about places like parks and playgrounds, the phenomenon of city is needed.

2.2. Urban Space

In the TDK, space is defined as "location."[8] It defines space as "the empty place that separates people from the environment to a certain extent and is convenient for them to continue their action in it".[9] Space is classified as internal and external. It is the external space that forms the basis of this study. External or urban space can be defined as "the space that exists between streets, areas, parks, gardens, in sum between human works and that limits them".[10] According to Madanipour, urban space is a "physical and accessible location, the places within the towns, cities and rural areas that foreigners and locals can enter with very few restrictions".[11]

---

[7] Arendt, H. **"The Human Condition.".** p. 52.
[8] **TDK (Turkish Language Istitute)**. Aktaran: Erdönmez, E. (2014). **Kamusal Alan ve Toplum (Public Space and Society).** İstanbul: Esenler City and Thought Center. p. 21
[9] Hasol, D., (1998), **Ansiklopedik Mimarlık Sözlüğü**, Yapı – Endüstri Merkezi Yayınları, İstanbul. Aktaran: Erdönmez, E. **Kamusal Alan ve Toplum (Public Space and Society)**. p. 21
[10] Hasol, D., **Ansiklopedik Mimarlık Sözlüğü**, Aktaran: Erdönmez, E. **Kamusal Alan ve Toplum (Public Space and Society)**. p. 21
[11] Madanipour, A. , (1999), 'Why are the design and development of public spaces significant for ities', **Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design**, 26(6), 879-891. Aktaran: İNCEOĞLU ve AYTUĞ, p.132.

According to İnceoğlu and Aytuğ, urban space is called, "the space formed by outdoor structures and their relationships and closeness to each other and to other elements".[12]

Cities are settlements that contain specific places where social relations are established. The activities these social relations give rise to make the city the bearer of the public space. The main distinction here is how the cities are ruled, how power activities are established. Any place created in a city can be defined through the network of relationships that arise there. The most important urban theorist who evaluates the city in relation to space is Henri Lefebvre. According to Lefebvre, the city is the projection of the society on a piece of land *(Lefebvre, The Right to the City*).[13] Lefebvre treated the city as a field of relations, including the relationship of time with space.

Going back to the distinction between the public and the privat, according to Arendt,

> .. to live together in the world means essentiall that a world of things is between those who have it in common, as a table is located between those who sit around it; the world, like every in-between, relates and separates men at the same time. (Arendt, 1958)[14]

Hence,

> ... the distinction between a private and a public sphere of life corresponds to the household and the political realms, which have existed as distinct, separate entities at least since the rise of the ancient city-state; but the emergence of the social realm, which is neither private nor public, strictly speaking, is a relatively new phenomenon whose origin coincided with the emergence of the modern age and which found its political form in the nation-state. (Arendt, 1958).[15]

According to Arendt, the person trapped in the private space is not visible. However, it exists by going out of private or property area. A world of things is like

---

[12] Aytuğ, M. I. (2009). **Kentsel Mekanda Kalite Kavramı (The Consept of Qualty in Urban Space)**. Mageron, p.132.
[13] Henri LEFEBVRE, "The Right to the City" içinde (Ed.ve Çev.Eleonore Kofman – Elizabeth Lebas), **Writing on Cities Oxford: Blackwell Publishers**, Oxford, USA(orijinal olarak Le Droit á lá Ville, Paris, Anthropos olarak basılmıştır). Aktaran; ERTAN, p.130.
[14] Arendt, H. **"The Human Condition."** p. 52.
[15] Arendt, H. **"The Human Condition."** p. 28.

a table that is co-owned by those sitting around it, like everything in between, this world connects and separates people (Arendt, 1958).[16]

In Arendt, the private area is considered as property related. Arendt states that living a fully private life means to be deprived of what is essential for a real human life. The reality provided by being seen and heard by others, an objective relationship provided by uniting and separating with a world of common things with others, the possibility of life to achieve something more permanent than itself can be realized by being outside the private field (Arendt, 1958).[17]

If we go over the concept of 'being visible' that Arendt talks about, what is being visible? Does the public space make people visible? The concept of being visible here actually makes public spaces too optimistic. The claim that a good public space makes people visible may highlight an expectation in today's world. Because most of the public spaces are built on identification. Considering children's parks and playgrounds, the fact that children exhibit the same moves reopens this visibility to discussion. This issue will be expanded in the park and playground areas as an area permeated by power.

2.3. Boundaries of the Public Space

As a presupposition, this study follows an idea according to which public space is restricted, restricts, and becomes limited by producing a limit as a result of its activities. The concept of limit may be evaluated here by defining it according both to the architectural features and a particular network of relationships of the space considered. For example, in a public field of activity, we see actions that are predetermined, adequate to the the cultural operations or exercises of power. A public building is limited bt service it provides. The human activities that emerge in it are both part of and the producers of this limitation. Areas such as parks, squares and streets, which can rather be considered as areas of free activity are relatively less limited. For example, parks, squares and streets have the possibility of turning into political places at any time. We often witness in history that they

[16] Arendt, H. **"The Human Condition."** p. 72.
[17] Arendt, H. **"The Human Condition."** p. 78.

have gain a meaning outside their definitions of activity. In fact, this situation is quite normal considering the precondition that the public is political. Hovewer, the situation should be reconsidered according to what is understood by the political. Hannah Arendt does not evaluate the phenomenon of the public space in terms of a political convention. She adds concepts such as ethics, meaning and freedom to political discourse. The ways in which the concept of public space is trearted in the historical process may be quite diverse. However, each discourse defines a limit by means of the definitions it offers. We can say that Hannah Arendt is standing here in a different place.

According to Arendt:

> "The raison d'etre of politics is freedom, and its field of experience is action… Men are free as distinguished from their possessing the gift for freedom as long as they act, neither before nor after; for to be free and to act are the same" (Arendt, 1961)[18].

Arendt advocates that being able to act is the same as freedom. The most complete expression of freedom is manifested in action. But in order for the action to take place, relationships between individuals must be free relationships. This complex relationship between action and freedom is the hallmark of Arendt's understanding of public life. She rejects an understanding of freedom as free will which is characteristic of the Western tradition. She reminds that the will is individualized, whereas the plural of the public expresses differences. It is clear that freedom of the will or freedom coming from a certain sovereign brings with it the limit. Public action should be an activity crossing the limits. Being human and being free is the one and the same thing.

[18] H. Arendt, **"What is Freedom?" Between Past and Future.** p. 146, 153.

CHAPTER III

WHAT IS POWER?

In this part of the study, instead of giving a definition of power, the aim is to reveal the difference of Foucault's analysis of power from the established definitions. Foucault's analysis of power is historical. From this point of view, the changes of parks and playgrounds in the historical process are taken into an account with the aim of explaining that the subjective experiences emerging in these spaces are historical and not given. The Foucaultian idea that power is everywhere makes parks and playgrounds observable in terms of power relations. In further parts of this study, it will be tried to establish a relationship between power and the parks and playgrounds chosen as space. There will be an ethical consideration of whether this form of relationship can be overcome, and the possibility of changing the normative behaviors created by the discourse of power will be discussed in terms of the limits of the public sphere.

We encounter a wide variety of power practices in the history. These practices bring different definitions of power. But as a common attitude, we can say that power expresses a potential force. Giving a factual definition of this power, which is highly relative to its use by whom, for what purpose and in what way, will be to ignore historicity.

However, it could still be argued that power is identified with political mechanisms. When power is in question, what commonly comes to mind is the activity of a state to govern a society. Wherever there is a state model, it is understandable that there is a ruling power, a political power. But there are also other arguments. Societies' governmental activities reveal a form of power too. Archaic or modern, such a relationship is found in all societies. Nevertheless, the most talked about form of power has been the understanding according to which power comes from a central state administration. Political discourse is based on an exercise of power coming from the center. This idea was legitimated through various theories of political

sovereignty. To explain power by arguing that it follows from a social contract as Thomas Hobbes did or to evaluate it as a result of the economic domination of a social class as Marxism did are such theories.

The history of political thought reveals that power can be treated at two different levels that complement each other. The first one concerns all the measures and the exercise of powers that provide a relative balance between different social forces. In this context, the classical power analysis was formed at the level of principles in order to determine who can determine the characteristics of social life and for what purposes; and when the problem of legitimacy of power was addressed, it was called the problem of interest. In this case, power defines the organs that are politically established to provide the general interest. The approach in question is a legal and political approach that is concerned with representation, and addresses power within the framework of prohibitions and interests while highlighting its suppressive function.

In contrast, the second level concentrates its analysis on the functional quality of power, focusing on power implementation strategies that integrate individuals into a socio-economic structure. While the level, approach or type of analysis focuses on the pluralistic view of power, it takes power not as limited to certain institutions, but as as widespread and exercised at all stages of hierarchical relationships that form social units such as family, school, army, etc. Instead of grasping power within the framework of interest, prohibition and oppression, it is necessary to understand it by placing it in a series of possible effects that power mechanisms can create. We can say that Michel Foucault, who will draw the main axis of power in this study, has led the second approach.

3.1. The Power Discourse in Foucault

Foucault stated that the main element of his work is not power, but the subject. The most fundamental issues he deals with in his work are subjectivity, subjective experience and subjectification.

When evaluating his studies, it is generally said that Foucault explained the formation of discourse as a science using the archaeological method in the 1960's, tried to determine the types of power by revealing the relationship between science and power in the 1970's, and focused on ethics and freedom in the 1980's. This point of view imposes a sharp distinction as we try to understand Foucault. It also fragments Foucault's philosophy. The acceptance that he is more interested in the concept of ethics after the 1980's also gives support to the assumption that he ignores the concept of subject in his studies prior to 1980'S. However, Foucault argues that rather than drawing a historical profile of the subject in, a number of discursive and nondiscursive practices should be examined to understand subjective experience. When examining power relations, he sees the subject as the founder of discourses and practices that have an ethical relationship with power mechanisms and a transformative power over powers, rather than seeing it as a passive, receptor shaped by power. From this point on, Foucault's interest in subjective experience, not just subject, strengthens his approach to taking subjective experience as an ethical relationship established with oneself. The ethical subject is in relation to itself. This form of relationship is called subjectivity. In other words, subjectivity is a relationship of consciousness maintained with oneself. These ethical practices are acquired through subjective experience. In examining the practices of power under the name of governmentality, Foucault is concerned with how these practices transform the subject and how subjective experience is constituted by a discourse, rather than dealing only with the political power types and with presuppositions on how they transform society. In this way, the idea that power mechanisms emanate from the center disappears.

According to Foucault, power has no center. It is not something that can be possessed, taken or given. It would not be correct to treat power as the homogeneous domination of one group over other groups. Nor should power be thought of as something shared between those who hold the sovereignty and those who do not have it, those who are subject to it. In this respect, for Foucault, power must analyzed as a set of relations that has no fixed place, that must never be seen as a wealth and a commodity in somebody's hands, that cannot be owned, but that

merely circulates and is exercised. From this point of view, we should not think that the subject stands before power, but that it is both its effect and its agent. Power reveals unequally distributed forms of relationship that permeate all layers of society. Hence, hegemony or domination points to the crystallized forms of these conflicting forms of relationship. Power works through subjects, by subjectifying human beings at a normative level, buy making them subjects of certain experiences. These experiences are not universal bu rather historically constituted as a relationship of consciousness that one maintains with oneself. And according to Foucault, these subjective experiences constitute what he calls an 'identity,' or an 'individuality:

> This form of power that applies itself to immediate everyday categories individual, marks him by him on the individualty, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize him. It is a form of power that makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the subject: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to.[19]

Foucault calls the resistance to the subjectifying and identifying effect of power the constitution of the ethical subject, because '*ethos*,' with its meaning in Ancient Greek (character), is a relation of consciousness that one maintains with oneself.

> When I speak of power relations, of the forms of rationality which can rule and regulate them, I am not referring to Power - with a capital P – dominating and imposing rationality upon the totality of the social body . In fact, there are power relations. They are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or within an institution, or an administration – or between a dominating and a dominated class p ower relations having specific forms of rationality, forms which are common to them, etc . It is a field of analysis and not at all a reference to any u nique instance. (Foucault, 1988)[20]

Since power operates through the subjectification of individuals, Foucault reveals his method for analyzing the constitution of these subjective experiences.

---

[19] Foucault, M. **Power.** The Essential Works Of Foucault, p. 331

[20] Foucault, M. (1988). **Politics, Philosophy, Culture**: İnterviews And Other Writings of Michel Foucaul 1977- 1984. (B.A. Other, Çev.) Chapman & Hall, London. p. 62

> As you may notice, what I have been trying to do this evening is not to solve a problem but to suggest a way to approach a problem. This problem is similar to those I have been working on since my first book about insanity and mental illness. As I told you previously, the problem deals with the relations between experiences (like madness, illness, transgression of laws, sexuality, self-identity) knowledge (like psychiatry, medicine, criminology, s exology, psychology), and power (such as the power which is wielde d in psychiatric and penal institutions, and in all other institutions w hich deal with individual control (Foucault, 1988).[21]

> Power is not a substance. Neither is it a mysterious property whose origin must be delved into. Power is only a certain type of relation between individuals. (Foucault, 1988)[22]

> Such relations are specific, that is, they have nothing to do with exchange, production, communication, even though they combine with them. The characteristic feature of power is that some men can more or less entirely determine other men's conduct – or but never exhaustively coercively. A man who i s chained up and beaten is subj ect to force being exerted over him. Not power. But if he can be induced to speak, when his ultimate recourse could have been to hold his tongue, preferrin death, then he has been caused to behave in a certain way. His freedom has been subjected to power. He has been submitted to government. If an individual can remain free, however little his freedom may be, power can s ubj ect him to government. There is no power without potential refusal or revolt. (Foucault, 1988)[23]

At the same time, in Foucault, power is not domination. There is a relational network that can be reversed at any time.

> When one speaks of *power*, people immediately think of a political structure, a government, a dominant social class, the master and the slave, and so on. I am not thinking of this at all when I speak of *relations of power*. I mean that in human relationships, whether they involve verbal communication such as we are engaged in at this moment, or amorous, institutional, or economic relationships, power is always present: I mean a relationship in which one person tries to control the conduct of the other. So I am speaking of relations

[21] Foucault, M. **" Politics Philosophy Culture."** p. 95.
[22] Foucault, M. **" Politics Philosophy Culture."** p. 83
[23] Foucault, M. **" Politics Philosophy Culture."** p. 83, 84.

> that exist at different levels, in different forms; these power relations are mobile, they can be modified, they are not fixed once and for all. (Foucault, 1997)[24]

At this point, it must be said that this perspective makes it difficult to analyze power. There is a power which is not a given substance and can only be analyzed in terms of practical activities. Moreover, each free singular relates both to himself and to each other. In this way, an extremely grippy form of power emerges. Since the concept of power can be understood through subjective experience, it is necessary to look at the history of experiences, that is, the subject. Foucault supports this claim with his method of doing history, which reveals a nonlinear historical process. Foucault treats history with the genealogy method. In Foucault, there is a historicity that is not based on an original acceptance and does not emerge from an ontological presupposition. For example, traditional history turns to important historical events, individuals, by putting events under certain explanation systems; however, genealogical analysis returns to individual events that traditional history ignores or excludes.[25]

Foucault looks at institutions to understand how a subjective experience is constituted. A spatial form gives us the opportunity to analyze how subjective experience is constituted. Looking at how an architectural structure or a spatial form emerged in the historical process and what needs it is lead to the analysis of subjective experience. By doing this, it can be revealed which power relations involve a spatial form in the historical process. Power relations are strategies that can be laid out in a spatial plane.

Power relations need to be examined in order to establish an ethical existence. There is no other way than accepting power as a form of domination. It is that our own relationship with the government allows us to make it change.

[24] Foucault, M. **"Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth."** p. 191

> Well, I don't think the word trapped is a correct one. It is a struggle, but what I mean by power relations is the fact that we are in a strategic situation toward each other. For instance, being homosexuals, we are in a struggle with the government, and the government is in a struggle with us. When we deal with the government, the struggle, of course, is not symmetrical, the power situation is not the same; but we are in this struggle, and the continuation of this situation can influence the behavior or nonbehavior of the other. So we are not trapped. (Foucault, 1997)[26]

In the boundaries of the public sphere, we mentioned that public spaces limit human behavior. According to Foucault, power mechanisms also carry out an identification activity by establishing a new consciousness relation through a subjective experience. On the other hand, Foucault explains that discourse and knowledge are not universal, but historical, and offers us the way out, the possibility to cross borders.

[26] Foucault, M. **"Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth."** p. 167

CHAPTER IV

CHILDHOOD

4.1. Is It Possible to Define a Childhood?

The attitude of people in their social life vary in every different culture. With the assumption that childhood is a cultural phenomenon, we can assume that giving a general definition of childhood is difficult. It is well known that the attitudes of individuals in social relations vary from one society to another, and that single, general passive and inclusive definition of the child cannot be made (Öktem, 2012).[27] Studies show that the image and the concept of a child change with structural and cultural factors. It's been shown that there is no sufficient evidence to provide a definition of a childhood which would be valid in for all categories and layers in any society (Tan, 1989).[28]

Parks and playgrounds are public spaces the definition and purpose of which are quite clearly expressed: However they are the most complex areas in terms of their function. The reason for this can be said that the definition of childhood, which has found its place in history with a late conceptualization in terms of both personal developmen and citizenship status cannot be made clear. However, in order to talk about a playground, it is still necessary to look at the definition of childhood or the common characteristics of the period of personal development called childhood. It is stated for centuries that the child is seen as a biological transition stage that is not an adult and is not able to make his/her own decisions. It is stated that this paradigm resulted in the reduction of childhood to a 'stage', temporary, incomplete state. As a result of this, it is emphasized that the understanding of "unqualified child, who does not have an independent existence, and dominated according to the current

[27] Öktem, D. (2012). **Türkiye'de Çocuk Adalet Sisteminin Yönetimi (The Management of Child Justice System in Turkey).** Ankara: Kapasite Geliştirme Derneği. p. 5

[28] Tan, M. (1989). **Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*.p. 88.

point of view" has emerged (Öktem, 2012).[29] From this point of view, there is no problem in seeing childhood as a development stage shaped by adult attitudes and behaviors. The general need to look through in this framework, the question of how childhood takes on a meaning through can only be met by looking at a certain historical period. And this will also be the period in which parks and playgrounds were built. We will try to look at what historical process and for what purpose children's parks and playgrounds that are evaluated in public space emerged. The historical and spatial emphasis of this period will be discussed under the titles of public space and playgrounds as public space. Therefore, it will be necessary to briefly touch on the phenomenon of childhood and how this phenomenon has been treated in certain periods of history.

4.2. Childhood

Treating childhood as a developmental period is rather historically recent. For this reason, developing some childhood-specific inventories has started to appear in a recent historical period. The idea that childhood has its own developmental differences requires the presupposition of keeping the childhood process separate from an adult behavior. It is argued that for a long time in history, childhood and adulthood were seen to be the same and there was no separate concept to describe childhood. It is emphasized that the terms puberty and childhood are confused until the 18th-century (Tan, 1989).[30] From the ancient Greek societies until the 19th century, childhood is not associated with the concept of play. We also do not encounter any attempt to build a childhood-specific area or to develop materials related to childhood. Until the industrial revolution, it wass normal for children (boys) to be raised as managers or soldiers, and even in ancient civilizations, children toys are seen as potential elements of a militarist tradition such as arrows and bows. Tan states that Aries wrote that children's games and entertainments did not go beyond infancy in the 1600s and ended after the age of 3, 4 (Tan, 1989).[31] It can be easily examined in history that there is a significant difference in the

[29] Öktem, D. **Türkiye'de Çocuk Adalet Sisteminin Yönetimi (The management of child justice system in Turkey).** p. 5
[30] Tan, M. **"Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk" (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. p. 77
[31] Tan, M. **"Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk" (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. p. 78.

upbringing style of girls and boys. The tradition of not giving girls, disabled or sick children the right to live very much appears to be common. We can say that boys are seen as potential managers, soldiers, warriors and labor force. It is reported that some changes related to childhood occurred in parallel with the development of the bourgeoisie and its experimental sciences first after the fourteenth century and in a slow manner. It is emphasized that a language that defines children and childhood was developed and at the end of this century. Hence, children games and adult games were separated through the invention of the first children's toys (Tan, 1989).[32] The increasing need for labor after the industrial revolution is again not addressed by a pedagogical discourse, and children who are forced to work under harsh and difficult conditions seem to be deprived of basic human rights. How,, then in today's societies childhood has become a period that calls for education, needs to be handled as a different development process from adulthood, and at the same time, deserves protection from hazards and to have a good and fun time??

In this part of my thesis, in trying to address the history of the Parks and Playgrounds, I could not do without going into the history of childhood experiences. Considering the playground and park specially built for it in the cities, it will be necessary to emphasize what kind of meaning was attributed to childhood with modernity or late modernity, the efforts to keep the crisis of the period after the second world war away from children, and that childhood was nevertheless transformed into a life experience that is confined, controlled and supervised. It has been stated that in child-centered bourgeois families, the child is constantly being watched and the previous freedoms of the children disappeared (Tan, 1989).[33] It turns out that children have been left with the definition of an adult since it was dealt with a process of development called childhood. They were conceptualized under adult supervision and control. His section, I will briefly try to share the materials used as a child's play or field since the primitive process in history. Then, I will try to deal with the architectural and sociological aspects of the parks and playgrounds that appeared for the first time in history. Later, I will try to address

[32] Tan, M. **"Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk" (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. p. 78.
[33] Tan, M. **"Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk" (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. p. 78.

how the parks and playgrounds were built, how they changed, how they should be handled today, both in terms of architecture and in socio-economical terms due to urban sociology. In this context, of course, I will try to relate what is understood from childhood experience, the meaning attributed to childhood, the concepts of security and control society of parents, society and political mechanisms in the context of power.

4.3. Childhood from Past to Present

Childhood was established historically and socially. It is stated that in every society and in every period of history, parents have legal and economic control power over the child, but this power differs according to the time (Tan, 1989).[34] In the Middle Ages, it is stated that people do not consider childhood as a distinct period of life, do not regard years between the ages of six and eighteen as decisive, and do not take into account the nutritional needs of growing people (Gardiner & Gander, 2010) (Aktaran: Mehmet Sağlam, Neriman Aral).[35] In the Middle Ages, it is stated that the understanding that sees children as small adults is reflected in the artworks of the period, and in the paintings made at that time the children were dressed in adult clothes, and they were drawn with adult facial expressions and sometimes adult body proportions (Gardiner & Gander, 2010)[36] In this period, due to the difficulties in life conditions as well as lack of information on child care, it is reported that infant and child deaths were so high thatchildren up to the age of six were not accepted as members of the family and families were afraid to emotionally relate to children until this age (Gardiner & Gander, 2010).[37]

The concept of childhood can be introduced under a variety of topics, looking at specific periods of history. As can be seen below, childhood has been conceptualized with different aspects, and the idea has been made that children have different needs.

[34] Tan, M. **"Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk" (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. p.73
[35] Gardiner, M. J., & Gander, H. W. (2010). **Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi (Child and Adolescent Development)** Ankara: İmge. Aktaran: Mehmet Sağlam; Neriman Aral. (2016). Çocuk ve Medeniyet Dergisi.p. 48.
[36] Gardiner, M. J., & Gander, H. W. (2010). **"Child and Adolescent Development"** p. 48
[37] Gardiner, M. J., & Gander, H. W. (2010). **"Child and Adolescent Development"** p. 48

The modern paradigm of childhood was inspired by the 18th century Enlightenment, especially by Rousseau on the one hand and by Locke on the other (Tan, 1989).[38] John Locke defined the child's mind as a tabula rasa, that is, a clean slate which should be shaped by families, teachers and the state through education. According to Rousseau, what is necessary is a romantic understanding of children, different from adults, with a unique originality (Akbaş & Reyhan Atasu Topçuoğlu, 2009).[39] In Pastollazi and Frobel's views on education, they put forward an understanding that emphasizes children, and that scientists such as Vygotsky and Piaget highlight the developmental aspect of the child brought new approaches to children. It is stated that after the industrial revolution, with the domination of colonialism in the United States, the children were seen as a commercial earning tool by working in agricultural areas or outside the home, and the children of the slaves were far away from this understanding and stayed with the animals and worked until dawn (Elkind, 1999) (Aktaran: Mehmet Sağlam Neriman Aral).[40] It can be said that the world reached a new point in children when the 19th and 20th century ended and the 21st century started, when the children were experiencing difficulties, on the one hand, while there was a serious change of understanding.

4.4. Today's Understanding of Childhood

> It should be stated that academic activities that focus on the concept of childhood are mostly fed from two different approaches. The first approach is based on the impact of cultural and to a certain extent political structures on children's lives, formations and perception of childhood in society. The second approach is based on the assumption that biological features affect child development and the relationship adults have with children. The basic resources used by both approaches also differ. (Öztan, 2019) [41]

[38] Tan, M. **"Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk" (Childhood Throughout Periods)**. p. 7.
[39] Akbaş, E., & Reyhan Atasu Topçuoğlu. (2009, Nisan). **Formation of the Modern Childhood Paradigm- A Critical Evaluation.** *Society and Social Service, 20(1)*. p. 95- 103
[40] Elkind, D. (1999). **Çocuk ve Toplum (Child and Society)** . Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Çocuk Kültürü Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Yayınları. p.34- 35
[41] Öztan, G. G. (2019, Masıs). **Türkiye'de Çocukluğun Politik İnşası** (The Political Formation of Childhood in Turkey). İstanbul Bilgi University Press. p. 3.

Since the target in this study aims to address childhood politically and rather socially, a methodology that is suitable for the first approach is followed.

The pioneer of research on childhood history is Philippe Ariés, a historian of Annales School and his book *L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'Ancien Regime.* This work, which provides important data for social scientists, also raised considerable interest among sociological circles due to its main argument. This argument was that childhood is not a biological, but a social and cultural category and fiction.

When we look at the phenomenon of childhood from past to present, it can be seen how it was shaped culturally and socially, rather than being treated as a process in terms of the developmental characteristics of childhood, especially until the twentieth century.

The new understanding, which started to change in the 18th and 19th centuries and where the identity and personality of the child became prominent, increased the studies on children and also led to the emergence of new ideas and evaluations. The destruction caused by world wars has increased the interest in the child. The studies of scientists who highlight the effects of interaction with the social environment like Vygostky, who emphasize the sexual development of the child like Freud, who treat the child like Piaget in many dimensions, emphasizes his mental aspect and his interaction with the environment in this process, who emphasize socialization and the developmental aspect of life and expresses how effective his childhood like Ericsson, enabled children to be evaluated with a multi-dimensional and developmental understanding in this process (Khun & Siegler, 2006). [42]

The concept of childhood started to be considered constitutionally and within the framework of law too. In this context, it is stated that the first attempt was taken to International Organization for Children, which was established to meet the urgent needs of children after the First World War. This organization was later renamed

[42] Khun, D., & Siegler, R. S. (2006). **Handboook of Psychology** (Sixth Edition b). Canada: John Wiley& Sons.

the “International Child Welfare Union,” and with the efforts of the organization, the “Geneva Declaration of the Rights of Children,” which was the first international and comprehensive policy on children, was adopted at the General Assembly of the League of Nations on September 26, 1924 . Hence, Childhood begun to be considered within an international legal framework. After the establishment of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted on 10 December 1948, but special arrangements for children were not included in this document. However, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, human rights have been declared to be children's rights as well.

It has been stated that the acceptance of human rights as child rights causes problems in practice. In this context, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child was adopted at the United Nations General Assembly in 1959 to raise an awareness concerning children. With this declaration, children's rights such as education, health and protection were included, and the year 1979 was declared as the International Year of the Child worldwide. The Convention on the Rights of the Child, which emerged as the most important step of these efforts, was adopted by the United Nations on 20 November 1989. This contract is the widest document accepted by 195 countries.

While the childhood acquires a constitutional and legal definition, it is reduced to an object that is reconstructed within the definition of the adult world.

It is emphasized that children, who became an object of discussion since the nineteenth century, could not avoid being a complete consumption “object” with many apparently acquired rights in the 20th century, and that children around the world could not escape being pushed into crime, prostitution, streets, weaving looms (Akbaş & Reyhan Atasu Topçuoğlu, 2009)[43]

[43] Akbaş, E., & Reyhan Atasu Topçuoğlu. F**ormation of the Modern Childhood Pardigm- A Critical Evaluation**. p. 95-103

There is a very strong disagreement over the application of rights dealt with in legal texts in social life. Especially the introduction of technology into human life, the use of television, computer and internet directly affected both children and the understanding of childhood in today's society. With the change of understanding that rejects the child and ignores the concept of child, the interest shown to the children of “noble and rich” families has expanded over time to include other children.

As a result of social changes over the centuries, just like the change in the concept of adulthood, there has been a change in the concept of childhood. Although childhood was conceptually accepted and defined, discussions of the disappearance of childhood began in the late 20th century. As a result of social changes over the centuries, like the change in the concept of adulthood, change has been observed in the concept of childhood. Although childhood was conceptually accepted and defined, discussions about the disappearance of childhood began in the late 20th century. In other words, childhood was a process that could not be defined and did not have a social and legal status, but with the pedagogical and legal definitions made, it has become an object of consumption.

It is stated that the image of the child consuming it with the effect of capitalism and neoliberal policies fed by modern society has emerged. (Sormaz & Yüksel, 2012)[44] Postman considers the use of volatile, drug and alcohol-containing substances, concepts of sexual activities and crime among children, as an indication of childhood extinction, as well as the concepts of sexual activities and crime among children (Postman, 1994).[45] In fact, among the reasons for the establishment of the first parks, we will come across the idea of saving children from the crime environment. From this point of view, the likelihood that children will be part of any crime in the parks and playgrounds decreases relatively. In addition, out-of-

[44] Sormaz, F., & Yüksel, H. (2012). **Transforming Childhood, Industrialization of Play and Toys**. *Gaziantep University Social Science Journal, 11*(3). http://sbe.gantep.edu.tr adresinden alındı

[45] Postman, N. (1994). **The Dissappearens of Childhoohd**. New York: Vintage Books. p. 11- 12

school inspections and supervision of children in parks and playgrounds are facilitated.

CHAPTER V

PLAYGROUNDS AND PARKS AS A PUBLIC AREA

Children's parks are categorized under various titles as venues built for the purpose of play in history. Traditional playgrounds are the most frequently encountered playgrounds and contain playground materials designed for the child's use alone, such as slide swing. The tools and materials used today have made the parks more complex. For this reason, there are many different materials and sizes of playgrounds apart from traditional playgrounds. However, playgrounds and areas built in new types of settlements in urban life also restrict and uniformize playgrounds.

> ‘With the tendency of new types of residential settlements (*closed / secure sites, gated community*) to be located outside the city, social and recreative activities in the city centers are also moved to these areas. (Önal, 2014) [46]’

Considered as a phenomenon in a certain period of history, childhood brought changes in social, communal and political life. Urbanization and industrialization will be required for parks and playgrounds that are handled with a public framework today. It is not surprising that the first industrialized countries such as the United States (USA), England, Germany were also the countries where the first playgrounds were designed. The "Open Air Gymnastics Area", which was established in the garden of the Latin School in Massachusetts in 1821 in the USA, was included in the literature as the first children's playground. The children’s playground established in Germany in 1837 followed this. These first established playgrounds are areas that allow more physical activities and are designed using natural materials.

Parks and playgrounds were not originally created for the education and entertainment of the child. It was the primary goal to save the child from a number

[46] Önal, F (2014) **“Bir Kamusal Alan Olarak Parkları Yeniden Düşünmek”,** Mimar. İst. Dergisi , (sayı: 49)

of harmful habits that are the return of urban life for various reasons mentioned above (Postman). For this reason, the first park examples were places with simple materials and leisure activities. As the title to which these places will be associated in the following, 'Parks as a space of control' gets its first support from here. Childhood, which requires family supervision and surveillance, is redefined under the control of another eye with parks and playgrounds. Hence, it could be said that that childhood gains a more public identity in yet another way. Hence, it could also be said that childhood has began to become an element of urban life as well as being defined legally and developmentally.

Children's parks and playgrounds, designed as a common area of use of urban people, get their definition in the public space from here. The qualitative and quantitative features of the use vary depending on the layout of the playground and parks. Initially, they were built exclusively for public use in the city squares. Housing types also determine our limits within our city practices. In any form, being a resident of a settlement also shapes our public space borders. The types of public housing that are moved out of the city centers are examples of this (closed, secure, etc.). The proliferation of such residential settlements also results in the promotion of the privatization of public space (Önal, 2014) (cited by Zukin, 1991).[47]

Melek Göregenli defines public spaces as places that are not controlled by any group (Göregenli, 2018).[48] Although it changes according to the architectural structure of the city, economic and social norms, parks and playgrounds refer to places that are defined in public space and open to common use. Our public space practices are directly related to urban architecture.

> "Essentially, human behavior occurs in a particular physical environment. The city is one of the most important of these circles and therefore, research on perception and representation of the environment has been carried out on a city scale (Göregenli, 2018).[49]"

[47] Önal, Feride. **"Bir Kamusal Alan Olarak Parkları Yeniden Düşünmek"**. s. 27
[48] Göregenli, Melek.(2018) "Kişisel Mekân ve Alansallık." **Çevre Psikolojsi.** İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.s. 106
[49] Göregenli, Melek. "Çevrenin Algılanması ve Temsili". **Çevre Psikolojisi**. s.16

POWER RELATIONS IN PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS

Children's parks and playgrounds are products of urbanization. These spaces correspond to the public sphere during the formation of modern cities. The fact that these areas are examined in terms of power is related to the constitution of the modern subject by modern power. Modern power categorizes the individual. Urban life constitutes individuals by categorizing and identifying them. The modern subject establishes a relationship of consciosness with herself through this setup. This setup can impose limits, and it can be discriminatory. However, this situation is not always perceived negatively by the subject. It is sometimes so unnoticed that it becomes a natural part of life.

Thus, how is the situation in parks and playgrounds in terms of childhood which is constituted as an identity?

Foucault does not refer to power in a positive or negative way. While a city is governed within the city life, the decisions of the political sphere regulate how the public, social and even private spaces should be. Although the relationship of children with power may seem to be weak or absent, the school as a cultural activity is the primary area of the exercise of power. This does not surprise us because this is the taking representational authority of the political, which means that it expands its power by empowering certain institutions. However, spaces outside the public institutions seem to be outside the exercise of power, revealing a more secret form. Let's continue with the part that concerns this thesis in terms of creating parenting styles and spaces, and limiting the physical and spatial activities of children, without discussing whether this is a good or bad situation in itself.

One of the elements of a city are playgrounds and parks. Including the situations where most of these playgrounds are determined by local governments in an architectural form suitable for the city, most of the spaces are uniform, they are restricted areas of activity, public spaces. Public spaces can be divided into formal and informal. Parks and playgrounds as determined by adults, urban and regional

planners and by local governments, belong to a formal area. Children playing in parks accompanied by parents are confined to certain limits. Foucault's approach to power and space relationship opens up space for us to study power relations. As highlighted in the section titled “Power strategies and space”, being spatial brings along power relations. Power works by invading bodies. Since the body has turned into a concept that needs discipline and control, it has brought with it various institutions. At this point, it is necessary to explain the power techniques mentioned by Foucault.

The concept Foucault defines as dispositif includes areas such as institution, administrative functioning, and architectural arrangements. Parks and playgrounds can be envisioned within this concept as they are architectural arrangements. But to say this would not be sufficient to put forward a power context. Many spaces in urban life contain architectural arrangements. However, when parks and playgrounds are considered together with the concept of local government, they are open to evaluation since they are places created for a specific target audience with a political administrative function. As in all places where there is a social functioning, a physical being, they are filled with strategies of power. In fact, if we remember the purpose of the parks and playgrounds, this would be more understandable. Childhood spaces have also expanded after the social, legal and scientific acceptance of childhood. The relation of discourse, knowledge and space can be sought in such an acceptance.

In the childhood section, the historical process of childhood was considered. It is understandable that this process has its own normative values, knowledge of the field and of course a spatial response. Children's parks and playgrounds come side by side with discipline and supervision activities. Retention from crime finds many spatial responses. Parks are one of the most difficult examples to determine. However, this is exactly the purpose of their construction. To keep children away from the existing negative social effects by giving them a good time. From the perspective of Foucault's power analysis, discursively constituting childhood and determining certain principles of childhood with a normative approach is to accept

childhood experiences that have not been lived under a common name and in common practices in history, as universal and unchangeable. Following this new identity, the emergence of new power strategies, various places and arrangements regarding childhood reveal the main claim of the thesis. As tried to be put forward in the childhood section, this developmental partnership, which has similar behavioral and developmental characteristics in history, corresponds to a new discourse, with childhood seen as a problem. The concept of childhood is thus constituted. The child individual redefines himself/ herself through the adult power/ discourse. This redefinition is not simple.

> The transformation of a discursive practice is tied to a whole, often quite complex set of modifications which may occur either outside it (in the forms of production, in the social relations, in the political institutions), or within it (in the techniques for determining objects, in the refinement and adjustment of concepts, in the accumulation of data), or alongside it (in other discursive practices). And it is linked to them in the form not simply of an outcome but of an effect that maintains its own autonomy and a set of precise functions relative to what determines the transformation. (Foucault, 1997)[50]

The concept of childhood, which becomes evident through certain institutions, is constituted through power strategies, similar to the mechanisms of subjectivation in the historical process. What Foucault calls disciplinary power works perfectly through childhood. Creating a new social impact and building a childhood phenomenon through that impact. Childhood supervision corresponds to a period to be observed. To consolidate the reduction of crime. Or to reduce the potential for children to develop action outside of the perspectives drawn for childhood. All of the operations here include an inspection. These disciplinary systems, the most obvious example of which we see in schools, function perfectly.

> Discursive practices are not purely and simply modes of manufacture of discourse. They take shape in technical ensembles, in institutions, in behavioral schemes, in types of transmission and dissemination, in pedagogical forms that both impose and maintain them. (Foucault, 1997)

[50] Foucault, M. **Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth**. p.12.

The historical and social establishment of childhood is a product of power strategies. This explains why childhood should also be included in power strategies. While including this, the issue can be addressed in two ways:

A. The purpose of the installation of Parks and Playgrounds.

B. The restrictive effects of Parks and Playgrounds on children's bodies.

A. Power strategies in the context of the construction of Parks and Playgrounds

Is it possible to think that the parks and playgrounds still have the purpose of crime detention as they were meant to be built for? Will the construction of parks and playgrounds different diverse, complexity reduce the impact of parks on childhood?

Asking these questions is the same as bringing the childhood to a line that has evolved historically to the best of the technical developments that have occurred over time in a play venue. Has the issue, which Foucault calls 'great confinement', transformed into modern prisons, modern hospitals, modern mental hospitals in the historical process changed the strategic goal of the practice of confinement? In other words, all these different groups of people, who were initially together, were separated in order to control the population. Before describing this as good or bad in itself, we can say that this is a diversification of the institutions to be controlled and audited. Through this diversification, power processes are carried to a more complex level and strengthened. It is similar to this diversity that a children's playground takes various forms of architecture, is built in various parts of the city and even gained socio-economic determinations. The diversity of parks and playgrounds is not the main subject of this study. It is revealed that the same effect may have been observed in parks and playgrounds in terms of supervisory and power strategies with this increased diversity. At this point, it may be useful to present the first playground examples with visuals. In terms of seeing the process

of parks and playgrounds as inventory and materials, the first examples of playgrounds from history are as follows:

Photo 1. A school playground in Germany.

Photo 2. ABD, New York City, Bronx Park

Photo 3, 4. Examples of the first neighborhood park

Based on these examples, we can say that the parks and playgrounds were built in neighborhoods, city squares and school gardens. They were created within the framework of an observable plan that is open to external auditing. We can say that the first playground materials consisted of less safe materials and dangerous devices. So that while the aim was to keep the child away from the outside dangers, possible crimes, they were placed in danger in some other way. We can say that the military training tracks and the spirit of war are reflected in the playgrounds. The main feature is the physical movements of the children. The parks are far from being creative and reflect the spirit of the period whith their colours and shapes. The new park materials have been changed with teh reconsideration of childhood in pedagogy, especially after the Second World War. Instead of reflecting the spirit of war into a playground, parks have emerged to distract children from the real World as much as possible. Childhood is reconstructed in colourful and safe materials. American Playground Association was established in the USA in 1906. This association was established to develop ideas, construction, layout and design ideas about playgrounds. Parks have started to take a legal formality. Although playground reforms have slowed down after the First World War, they have evolved and changed to the present day.

The use of hazardous materials, which we saw in the first park examples, has now been replaced by safer materials. Although the preferred materials have differentiated thanks to technological developments, they have gained an architectural appearance away from dangers, and become colourful and functional. When we examine the examples of today's parks, the definition of the park materials in terms of usage value is clearer. Thus, the use of materials suitable for the purpose aims to save children from possible dangers. The first examples of parks that resemble military tracks have been separated from this view until today. Dangerous physical activities have been replaced by controllable physical activities. In addition to the use of material, the situation is not different in terms of the places where the parks are located. With the new city models, intra-site and secure park and playground models have become widespread. In contrast to the greying of the urban life, the parks have a colorful and fabulous look. Thematic parks seem to aim to

isolate childhood from the outside world with a fictional world. It has been made to be more secure, isolated from urban life and more controllable.

Examples of today's playground are as follows:

Photo 5. Playground in residential areas

Photo 6. Playgrounds in communal living areas

Photo 7. Thematic playground

Children's parks and playgrounds where we can increase the examples of today seem to be enriched in terms of material use. However, we cannot observe a great change in terms of the function of the park materials. However, it is possible to see that potential dangers are reduced to a lesser extent. Of course, there are more alternative parks in terms of material use and more useful parks because of where they were built. However, there are public parks containing the above materials in the complex, small areas of mass housing, city squares and even in villages and school gardens. Today's children's playgrounds have been replaced by large shopping centers and large playgraounds, inside them under the name of children’s living areas. Nevertheless, we can say that the above park examples are the most used in the limited time period of urban life.

So, has there been a differentiation in the purpose of setting up the parks since the first examples of parking have been seen? We have said that the first parks were built to drive the child away from the crime phenomenon. Considering today's conditions, taking into account that the schooling rate has increased and education has become compulsory, parks and playgrounds are not primary places for child supervision. However, we can say that they have functions such as facilitating the control of post-school activities. Power strategies are obvious in an institutional field such as a school. However, the parks and playgrounds are the continuation of the institutions in terms of reducing the activities of children that may reach the street. In this respect, we can again say that the meaning attributed to parks and playgrounds over the years has not changed much. Even though it is not clear, but parks helped children to be alienated from possible problems in urban life.

It is a monitoring activity that children who are gathered are doing free play activities under parental control and even under the control of the whole society. Children forget that they are being watched while playing, and because of that they are natural. They create a small clan among themselves and show a movement. This movement, which is compatible and incompatible with each other, is extremely open to external control and intervention. A watcher of parks and playgrounds surrounded by benches is always available. The great surveillance is the managers.

By leaving the child's control in the public space to the parents, they turn the parents into mechanisms of power. A controlling and supervisory role is also assigned to the parent. Parenthood is, of course, established by having a power relationship over the child. Foucault calls this positive power. So it's a role that narrows the child's set of possible choices. However, when considered in terms of power strategies, we can say that an installation that creates parenting models and reproduces parenting behaviors through discourse, reproduces parenting activity through the child by incorporating it into this strategy.

B. Power strategies in the context of the restrictive effect of Parks and Playgrounds on the child's body:

Children's parks and playgrounds are physical activity areas. The child comes into existence through these physical movements. There is a common use of the materials where the same movements are performed many times and whose functions and limits are determined in advance. The game is played in a limited space. There is limited physical movement. There is also a limit to be created by materials whose function has been determined. Transgression of the designated space can pose a danger, for it may open to settlements, streets and a number of other things. The physical boundary is drawn through the materials with determined function. Swinging, sliding, climbing etc. movements are fixed by the type of instrument used. Even if the child somewhat feels free from the stagnation of daily life, it will be difficult for her to go beyond these boundaries. She may not even need to go beyond the border. For she has already come from within an obvious boundary: school, home, traffic etc.

The idea that we are being watched while sitting in a park is less common, but we feel it more in a public institutions. This secret exercise of power is partly more dangerous.

Foucault's bio-political analysis may also be applied to children’s bodies, which are partlu constituted in the activity of play.

> “Bio-power has developed in two main forms. The first form, which approaches the human body as a machine, is a disciplinary power. The purpose is to discipline the body, improve its abilities, make it more useful and docile, and integrate it with economic control systems; the second form approaches the human body as a natural species and focuses on a regulatory control of the population. ” (Keskin, Şiddet ve İktidar, 1996)[51]

The re-constitution of childhood in parks and playgrounds is mostly based on the first, disciplinary power model. To tame children's bodies. Disciplining the bodies. The second is to make the population controllable. Childhood now refers to a single whole. Childhood is thought to contain a holistic structure rather than various and different definitions. This facilitates the supervisory control of childhood.

The game, the natural setup of childhood, is reconstructed with a claim of need. Childhood is deprived of playing freely, interactively and physically without restriction. The game becomes formal.

[51] Keskin, F. (1996). **Foucault’da Şiddet ve İktidar**. **(Violence and Power in Foucault).** *Cogito*, 121.

A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PLAYGROUNDS: THE SPACE OF CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE

The main purpose of this section of the study is to reveal that parks and playgrounds are inspection and surveillance spaces. The claim that children's parks and playgrounds are related to power strategies requires determining the way these strategies work. This part of the study aims to observe the parks and playgrounds, that is, to look at them again from within a disciplinary approach.

Disciplinary society was conceptualized by Foucault. Foucault treats this as ' the great confinement'. Of course, the concept, which was initially handled through confinement spaces, was later used for all urban spaces that did not contain an architectural form. In this context, parks and playgrounds, which are a public area in the city, are actually confinement spaces.

Surveillance and control is not a new formulation in terms of power strategies. They have been used in areas such as auditing, keeping records, registering the population, and maintaining public activities. Supervision and subsequent surveillance mechanisms have been used as a discipline model with the development of capitalism. But it was necessary to wait for Foucault to deal with discipline in detail and strikingly. Foucault addressed surveillance as a spatial model in social functioning. Foucault used the 'Panopticon' metaphor of Jeremy Bentham to describe the concept of surveillance in modern society. Panoptikon was designed as the ideal prison. Panoptikon:

> The panoptic structure for the Benthamite prison was a circular atrium with cells along the perimeter facing inwards, and with a single watchtower in the middle where the watchman would be able to observe without being observed. In this set up, the prisoners could be watched at all times, but they would not know whether or not there was someone in the watchtower to observe them. As they were subjected to this gaze, they would modify their behavior and be less likely to instigate trouble. The panopticon ensures economy in both personnel and time and efficiency in both monitoring the subjects and in the application of

> its observers, allowing for continuous function and a near automatic operative mechanism. (Foucault, 1977)[52]

According to Foucault, this is a strategy, not a metaphor. An economic and efficient discipline mechanism is put into use by using it in different institutions of a society. Since prisoners in Panoptikon do not know when they are being watched, they tend to show a tendency as if they are being watched at all times. After a while, they become their own watchdogs. Discipline is internalized and becomes a control mechanism. Thus, power reproduces the mechanism through inmates, making each prisoner self-supervised.

> A central point [that] would be both the source of light illuminating everything, and a locus of convergence for everything that must be known; a perfect eye that nothing would escape and a center towards which all gazes would be turned.[53]

This confinement technique has become a model not only for prisons but also for other institutions as a tool for capitalism. According to Foucault, the 20th century capitalist systems have experienced a great change in their power strategy. The domination of a one-man, domineering, one-man power that is constantly visible, has been replaced by vague strategies. Observers now become their own watchdogs.

This space-power perspective offered by Foucault gives us the opportunity to diversify the spaces in terms of surveillance and control mechanisms.

> Establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual.[54]

Therefore, positive power creates more participatory, productive and voluntary maintainers of power.

How does this situation hold in the parks and playgrounds?

Today, with the changes brought about by city life, control has spread from closed spaces to open spaces. Children's parks and playgrounds are common usage areas

---

[52] Foucault, M. (1977). **Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison**. New York: Pantheon. p. 206
[53] Foucault, M. **"Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison."** p. 173
[54] Foucault, M. **"Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison."** p. 143

open to the society due to their architectural forms. Parks are usually designed to spend time under the supervision of a parent. However, they are areas that can be watched not only by the parent but also by many other eyes. Each parent is the watcher of another child. Playgrounds that are extremely open to control are under control by many eyes. Childhood is a period when this awareness is not fully formed. Nevertheless, school age is an appropriate period for understanding what it means to be monitored as a childhood development period and the functioning of discipline models. The perception of freedom in the parks can take the child away from this idea of being watched. He/ she is aware that he is watched by the parent. It may receive alerts from time to time. It may face various directions. These directions and knowing that the eye is self-translated will speed up internalization of common social behavior. Social norms internalize in a park area full of communal materials. Although Panopticon expresses metaphorically one eye, Foucault's crystallized power approach reminds us that He/she is no longer a single eye. Each person is now in the role of supervisor.

Apart from the above-mentioned surveillance mechanism, there is also the control of the public areas by the executive power. The parks and playgrounds, which are not closed like other public places, are open to all kinds of external effects. The use of cameras in parks and playgrounds, which has been recently voiced by managers for the purpose of enhancing control and security, strengthens the analogy of panopticon.

The idea that parks and playgrounds are open to all kinds of danger that may come from outside has been discussed for many years. For this, more controllable parks and playgrounds are designed in accordance with the architecture of the city. Especially with the change of housing types in urban life, parks suitable for new housing types often appear. These are parks within the site and private security parks in the mass housing areas. There are several new trials for publicly restricted parks. Trial examples of the CCTV cameras, which we can call the panopticon of this century, have been implemented around the parks. This strengthens the example we have given. Both the crystallized eye and the park and playgrounds,

which will be monitored by a central eye, are highly influential on the internalization of controlled behaviors and turning into a habit. Childhood is a very favorable period for acquiring such normative behaviors. Primary surveillance is the job of the parent. But the parent is also watched. This situation reminds of Hannah Arendt's thought that we came up when discussing the topic of public space and boundaries. "Freedom and activism are one and the same." Hannah Arendt rejects the will of freedom from will. It seems that all the measures under the name of security taken reinforce the status of freedom based on a will. It is very difficult to reveal the relationship of childhood with freedom due to the peculiar development characteristics of childhood. However, we can say that childhood under the supervision of a parent is under the influence of all decisions taken by the parent on his/her own behalf.

5.1 Control of The Child on His/Her Own Body

Parks are areas where physical activities are relatively increased for children. Childhood is kneaded with physical activity. Even cognitive limits are very much related to physical limitations. Play is an activity with body and mind. However, the limited physical movements in parks will also bring the limited mental activation. Parks are mechanical devices due to their own characteristics. The physical movement to be made is in the form of the park material. For example, the child does not think about how to swing on a swing. Forward and reverse swing movements bring along a restricted mind activity as well. All physical activities in the park are done repeatedly and in the same way by every child. Thus, physical adaptation is facilitated both by monitoring others and by the nature of the materials. Rather than thinking about how to play, the child focuses on developing ethical and normative values that are compatible with the environment. In this case, we can say that parks and playgrounds are the fields of producing a norm and reproducing a given value. A worker at the factory no longer thinks about how he does his job. It integrates with it. It turns into work. The same is true for any child in a playground. According to Foucault, capitalism reproduced it with discipline models by using human labor and seeing the body as a machine.

> Discipline must also increase the parcitular utility of each element of the multiplicity, but by means that are the most rapid and the least costly, that is to say, by using the multiplicity itself as an instrument of this growth. Hence in order to extract from bodies the maximum time and force, the use of those overall methods knows as time- tables, collective training, exercises, total adn detailed surveillance. (Foucault, 1991)[55]

From this perspective, we can say that one of the most hidden production places of childhood is parks and playgrounds. We can say that the mechanics and monotonous movements in the parks narrow the complex world of childhood by restricting physical activities. Play, which is an indispensable element of childhood, now connects the body to a mechanic that adapts to the given movements. Social norms are also more easily internalized in this way. It could be said that the body

[55] Foucault, M. (1991) **Discipline and Punish: "The Birth of The Prison"**. London: Penguin. p. 221

control turns into a social, repetitive activity as the child's decision-making over his/her own body decreases relatively.

CONCLUSION

THE POSSIBILITY OF EXPANDING THE LIMITS OF THE RULING AREA AND FREEDOM

Firstly, we could say that since parks and playgrounds are public spaces, they are open to various influences. When I was defining public space, I stated that the spaces named in this way are not the places that come together for communication purposes only and where collective activities are carried out. At the same time, I have stated that they are places of freedom, which have an ethical content and where human activities are carried out in this way. In this direction, if we follow the path of Hannah Arendt, it becomes necessary to revisit the parks and playgrounds in an ethical framework such as visibility and freedom. Accordingly, we can say that parks and playgrounds make the person visible and controllable. It seems very difficult for an activity that will be carried out together and in the city under the supervision of parents and the community to provide freedom. In this context, the game activity restricted acoordfing to the purpose of the parks becomes a phenomenon that needs to be reconsidered. In addition, there is a reconstitution of the childhood phenomenon, which is in the position of playing the game or the subject of the claim in the whole study. This supports the main argument of the study. If we recall, it can be said that children's parks and playgrounds are areas of power at the same time.

When we consider power as a set of relations rather than domination, it is becomes more understandable that relations of power are to be discussed on an ethical basis. The quest for freedom in a set power relations that constitute the subject, reproduce it through various social norms will be quite open to debate. In fact, the exercise of power. When considered in Foucaultian terms shows us that the purpose of the establishment of the parks and playgrounds should be opened to discussion. Parks and playgrounds are not just for entertainment. When we look from this point of view, is it necessary to reconsider parks and playgrounds according to the purposes

of their establishment? Or do parks and playgrounds need to expand in terms of freedoms?

The concept of power often includes a spatial definition. A given spatial behavior determines the modes of existence of the subject there. Norms suitable for the space determined by the authorities play a great role in the establishment of the ethical subject. It is no longer possible to see a space as free from ethical norms and a subject as inappropriate for spatial norms.

Foucault's analysis of powerraises the question of where the concept of freedom corresponds surrounded by power. Interpreting the concept of power and its relation to freedom, Foucault says that wherever there is power, there is the possibility of resistance, or resistance itself.

> If there was no resistance, there would be no power relations. (Foucault, 1997)[56]

In this sense, Foucault's latest studies on technologies of the self, ethics, freedom and the effectiveness of the agent in these matters have guiding value.

Foucault's latest works mostly tend towards these areas (self-freedom-ethics). In these works, Foucault states that “technologies of domination (power)” and “technologies of the self” work together and feed each other.

For Foucault, freedom is the precondition for the exercise of power relations. Hence, in the case of a spatial exercise of power, the apacity to transform this space is available both to the power mechanisms and to the rsistingsubject. As we have demonstrated before, an ethical framework and the establishment of a conscious identity make it possible to reverse the processes of power.

It is not possible for an individual who is not free to perform ethical behavior. While doing this, the person must establish an ontological and historical relationship to himself.

[56] Foucault, M. **Ethics: “Subjectivity and Truth.”** p. 167

It should also be emphasized that one cannot speak of a single ethical relationship. There cannot be a universal ethic. The most important innovation brought by Foucault is the general claim that freedom and power, which were previously considered to be in a binary opposition, such as being subject and subjugat, are applied simultaneously in the same space and simultaneously in power relations.

In Foucault's early work, the techniques applied by institutions (prison, asylum, hospital) on individuals within the framework of power/knowledge and how these produce the subject were examined. In his recent studies, he focused on the technologies applied by the neo-liberal technologies of power appied to to individuals. Here, he emphasized it as a spontaneous formation practice rather than a coercion or discipline. At this point, we can say that Foucault saw individuals as self-determining factors that could challenge and resist structures of domination in modern society. Resistance is inherent to power. In fact, power gains continuity here, more or less thanks to resistance. Power verifies and reproduces itself every time through the existing resistance.

Parks and playgrounds are of course another control area of childhood, in terms of the installation purposes mentioned earlier. They show an architectural feature other than the buildings that Foucault uses as examples of spatial closure in his early works. However, they are still spaces in which a behavioral model is determined. For example, playgrounds are not adult spaces. Or they only appeal to childhood from the perspective of the defined needs of childhood. But parent adults can be found here. As observers, they observe children's behavioral patterns with an ethical perspective. Parks and playgrounds, where adults can exist as observers, are also the freest places to be when evaluated in terms of other places where childhood passed. It would be appropriate to try to separate these two statements that seem contradictory with Foucault's early and late discourses. For, although any space has a function of establishing domination, it is also full of the possibility of eradicating borders in terms of freedoms. Power can function positively. Given roles of power are also suited to changing those roles. Otherwise, it will not be possible to talk about a subject. While subjective experience is established in this way, one can

develop a new discourse within this production as a reproducer of subjective experience.

When we consider Foucault's concepts of freedom and going beyond limits, it is not contradictory to consider parks and playgrounds as places of freedom. Supervision and surveillance is the reality of parks as public spaces in terms of administrative and power functions. However, the fact that they are only public spaces does not make parks and playgrounds mere places of closure. Even though there are physical and equipment limitations, park spaces are places where the body, the children’s body, are relatively independent in a public space.

Here, All I want to show that these questions can be raised rather than answered in explanation of all these problematizations. Also, these questions were answered in other parts of the study. However, if we seek the answer to the need to expand a space in terms of surveillance and supervision, we need to go back to the urban and public space phenomena. An understanding of urbanism has increased, in which the architectural structures in the city are rebuilt with a central surveillance model. It means safe sites, camera systems, the eyes of each city dweller, and control of all city activities. Surveillance activities overflowing to the public space crystallize the centrality of the eye, making each subject surveillance. The intricate relationship here makes the boundary constantly carried by another subject. The spatial limit overflows. Being able to go beyond the border is no longer measurable for the purpose of activity in a place. If we express without departing from the argument of the study, the public space becomes a place of unification where visibility disappears over another rather than one liberation and being visible. Being the same is very understandable in terms of parks and playgrounds. Common parking materials are set up to reject the move beyond their function.

For example, in the natural flow of the city, it can be transformed into a spatial richness that increases the participation of childhood in the city rather than being an activity and free time activity. Otherwise, control and surveillance over the child will increase. It would be wrong to attribute this increase to the architectural planning of the parking spaces only. There is a huge power strategy all over the

background. Being able to cease to be a passive subject of power strategies is secret in the form of our relationship with space. There is also our relationship with ourselves within the space. The main conclusion here is that the mechanisms of power are everywhere. Even power is comprehensible within the space. The result where this study indicates is reducing the determination of the functioning of power on the subject in our spatial practices. I do not negatively address the basic argument of the study, namely the existing power strategies in the context of power. I am trying to demonstrate the possibility to expand the existing boundaries. Childhood is integrated with play. A play venue such as parks and playgrounds rebuild the childhood. This integrity is directly related to the way that the city relates to a power.

*

REFERENCES

Akbaş, E., & Reyhan Atasu Topçuoğlu. (2009, Nisan). Formation of the Modern Childhood Pardigm- A Critical Evaluation. *Society and Social Service, 20(1).*

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1961). *Between Past and Future.* New York: Vicing Press.

Aytuğ, M. İ. (2009). Kentsel Mekanda Kalite Kavramı (The Consept of Quality in Urban Space). *Mageron*, p.132.

Elkind, D. (1999). *Child and Society.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Çocuk Kültürü Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Yayınları.

Erdönmez, E. (2014). *Kamusal Alan ve Toplum (Public Space and Society).* İstanbul: Esenler City adn Thought Center.

Eren, A. (2016, 04 09). *Public Space as a Space for Freedom.* Ankara University Journal Database, 2005, C IX, S. 3-4: http://.setav.org/Files/Pdf/ozgurlukler-meki. as-kamusalalan-abdurrahman-eren.pdf adresinden alındı

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison.* . New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1977-78). Security, Territory, Population. *LECTURES AT THE COLLÈGE DE FRANCE,* (s. 16). François Ewald and Alessandro Fontana.

Foucault, M. (1981). *The History of Sexualty.* London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics Philosophy Culture: İnterviews and Other Writing of Michel Foucault, 1977- 1984.* (B. A. Others, Çev.) London: Chapman & Hall.

Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline And Punish: The Birth of The Prison.* (A. Sheridan, Çev.) London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1997). *ETHICS Subjectivity and Truth.* (R. H. Others, Çev.) New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2011). *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History.* https://noehernandezcortez.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/nietzsche-genealogy-history.pdf.

Foucault, M. (tarih yok). *POWER: Essential Works of Foucault 1954- 1984.* (R. H. Others, Çev.)

Gardiner, M. J., & Gander, H. W. (2010). *Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi (Child and Adolescent Development).* Ankara: İmge.

Göregenli, M. (2018). Kişisel Mekan ve Alansallık. *Çevre Psikolojisi*, 106.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The Structural Transformation of The Public Sphere.* Cambridge: The Mit Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts And Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory.* (W. Rehg, Çev.) USA: Mit Press.

Keskin, F. (1996). Şiddet ve İktidar. *Cogito,* 121.

Keskin, F. (1998). Kamusal Alan ve Yalın Yaşam (Public Space and Lean Life). *East West Tought Journal*, 105-109.

Khun, D., & Siegler, R. S. (2006). *Handboook of Psychology* (Sixth Edition b.). Canada: John Wiley& Sons.

Lefebvre, H. (tarih yok). *The Right to the City.* Oxford,USA: Blackwell.

Öktem, D. (2012). *Türkiye'de Çocuk Adalet Sisteminin Yönetimi (The management of child justice system in Turkey).* Ankara: Kapasite Geliştirme Derneği.

Önal, F. (2014). Bir Kamusal Alan Olarak Parkları Yeniden Düşünmek (Rethinking Parks as a Public Space). *Mimar. ist*(49).

Öztan, G. G. (2019, Masıs). Türkiye'de Çocukluğun Politik İnşası (The political formation of childhood in Turkey). *İstanbul Bilgi University Press*.

Postman, N. (1994). *The Dissappearens of Childhoohd.* New York: Vintage Books.

Sharp, J. P. (2000). *Entanglements of Power geographies of domination / resistance.* London: Routledge.

Sormaz, F., & Yüksel, H. (2012). Transforming Childhood, Industrialization of Play and Toys. *Gaziantep University Social Science Journal, 11*(3). http://sbe.gantep.edu.tr adresinden alındı

Tan, M. (1989). Çağlar Boyunca Çocukluk (Childhood Throughout Periods). *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 71- 88.