ICCAUA Proceedings Journal
Proceedings of the international conference of contemporary affairs in architecture and urbanism-ICCAUA
Volume 9 (December 2026), 2610221

Journal homepage: https://journal.iccaua.com/

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38027/ICCAUA2026EN0221

Biopolitics, Space, and the Critical Position of the Architect-Subject

* [1] **Nazlı Yıldız** , [2] **Özlem Arıtan**
[1] Architectural Design Ph.D. Program, The Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Türkiye
[2] Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Türkiye
[1] E-mail: yildiz.nazli@ogr.deu.edu.tr, [2] E-mail: ozlem.aritan@deu.edu.tr
[1] ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0281-9872 , [2] ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4168-1717

Received: 19.04.2026
Revised: 19.06.2026
Accepted: 01.07.2026
Available online: 10.07.2026

Copyright © 2026 by the author(s). All rights reserved.
This article is published under an open-access model and is made available in accordance with the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence (CC BY).

The publisher maintains a neutral stance concerning jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This article has been selected and peer-reviewed for publication in this journal as part of the 9th International Conference of Contemporary Affairs in Architecture and Urbanism, held on 7–8 May 2026 in Istanbul, Türkiye.

Abstract

Space is a heterogeneous construction involving interplay between social actors and physical components that is produced and consumed through everyday experiences and bodily practices. The fact that space is not merely a physical expression but also an embodiment of sociality is the basis of the complex relationship between humans and space. While it defines the movements, expressions, and boundaries, it also reveals the power relations that mold the body. The aim of this research is to examine biopolitics as mechanism of power that regulates biological life and spatiality of bodies. By adopting a historical perspective, the research demonstrates how space has been biopolitically instrumentalized as an apparatus, while questioning the position of architecture and the influence of the architect-subject. The research offers current perspectives by providing recent critiques about the architect-subject's position within the creative process.

Keywords: Biopolitics; Architecture; Space; Subjectivation; Foucault.

1. Introduction

Space is a multidimensional and multi-layered medium that defies singular definition. What constitutes it as a medium is its profound entanglement with human existence. With the overcoming of the Cartesian conception of space as absolute, homogeneous, and static, space has come to be progressively apprehended within a dynamic cycle of social construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction. In the non-overlapping moments of this cycle, the definitions of space are continuously reconfigured, giving rise to diverse modes of interaction between human beings and space. Space therefore exhibits an inherently creative and productive ontological structure across its physical, mental, and social dimensions. This creativity and productivity are an inseparable part of the reticular and relational formation of power relations; the spatial extensions that knot and condense within this network of relations eventually crystallize into concrete spaces. Spaces are the manifestations through which inherently scaleless and decentralized power relations are scaled and rendered visible.

One of the most critical turning points deepening this transformation in spatial comprehension is the novel conception of spatiality that crystallized alongside modernity. The collapse of the Cartesian paradigm gave rise to a new understanding of space, one grounded in phenomenological and sociological foundations that foregrounds the body, experience, and time, thereby radically dismantling the monocentric narrative of space. Paralleling this transformation in spatial comprehension, a profound paradigm shift likewise occurred in the understanding of power: centralized and negative notions of power gradually gave way to decentralized, relational, and productive models. Michel Foucault's genealogical intervention at this juncture provides a conceptual framework that remains highly relevant today for analyzing the profound intertwining of power and space. Foucault's works demonstrated that space is far from its ostensibly objective and neutral appearance; by exposing the deep connections between visible systems of knowledge and power, he revealed that space has never been a simple, passive void.

The progressive articulation of power relations into architectural space makes it essential to understand the architecture-power interface. While historically functioning as a medium that renders visible, makes observable, confines, and sanctifies, architecture has transformed over time into a sophisticated apparatus designed for the calculation of openings, of filled and empty spaces, permeabilities, and transparencies. These radical shifts occurring in space pave the way for physical deformations as increasingly scaleless power relations articulate within defined and scaled spaces. This kind of architectural space is a formation that enables internalized, articulated, and detailed control, rendering its contents permanently visible (Rabinow, 1984). To understand space as the temporary nodes of the relational and reticular structure of power is to accept its ontologically power-dependent nature. This acceptance necessitates examining space not merely

as a physical object, but as a meaning-laden discursive field where the visible and invisible dimensions of power relations intersect.

Acting from a historical perspective, this research aims to de-scale space and reconceptualize the undefinable by rethinking the defined boundaries of space through power relations. In this direction, the following questions serve as a guide: How has space been instrumentalized as an apparatus of power to govern bodies and populations throughout history? In this context, what is the position of architecture, and how can the ideological influence of the architect-subject within the creative process be evaluated? The research draws attention to the critical importance of the answers to these two fundamental questions in terms of repositioning architecture both as a discipline and as a practice.

2. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative approach based on theoretical analysis and critical inquiry. Using discourse analysis as its primary method, the study examines the relationship between space and power by analyzing the architectural production practices of each period within the context of power relations, thus revealing how space has been instrumentalized in different historical moments. Based on Foucault's theory of power, the theoretical framework first allows the study to define various power mechanisms and their interaction with the body through spatial configurations.

Then, the analysis addresses the exercise of power over the body through the lens of biopolitical conceptualizations, examining the spatial manifestations of each power regime. Finally, the study initiates a critical discussion on the role of space and the architect-subject within these power mechanisms. In terms of its structure, the study follows a non-linear analytical method that moves from historical processes to the present, situating concepts within their contexts and conducting a comparative critique. The scope of the research is delimited to Foucault's genealogical studies. The perspective Foucault offers remains, due to the paradigm shift it introduced in the understanding of power, one of the most comprehensive and explanatory frameworks available on the concept today. Moreover, by positioning power mechanisms through recourse to spatial practices, Foucault opens a significant field of discussion for spatial disciplines. In this respect, limiting the scope of the research ensures the depth and consistency of the analysis while maintaining the interdisciplinary nature of the study.

3. Foucault's Theory of Power

Michel Foucault's analysis of power in relation to space treats space not merely as a physical entity, but as a concrete manifestation of social practices, discourses, and power relations. According to Foucault, power is not a centralized and singular force; it is a reticular, relational, and comprehensive set of strategies operating through institutions, discourses, and practices. Unlike behavioral, institutional, and juridical models of power, this understanding locates power not in a fixed center but across the entire social body. In classical political philosophy, the concept was defined through macro-political structures such as state mechanisms, sovereignty, and authority. The 19th century pluralized it considerably: Marx reframed power through relations of production and class structure, while Nietzsche situated it in the will to power as an existential force permeating all of life. In the 20th century, Max Weber (1978) defined power as the probability of realizing one's own will despite the resistance of others, a definition that laid the foundational ground for the concept's subsequent expanded formulations (Weber, 1978). Robert Dahl (1957) carried this understanding onto a scientific and measurable terrain, formulating power as "the capacity of actor A to impose their will on actor B despite B's resistance" (Dahl, 1957). This understanding, however, remained limited to observable behaviors between persons and institutions, overlooking the invisible structural and spatial operations of power. Steven Lukes (1974) designated Dahl (1957)'s conceptualization as the first dimension of power, criticizing it as behavioralist for grounding power solely in observable decision-making processes. Bachrach and Baratz (1962) argued that power can exist not only through decision-making but through non-decision, and that the invisible dimensions of power therefore cannot be excluded from analysis (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962). Lukes (1974) carried this discussion further still, inviting consideration of latent conflicts in which individuals consent through the shaping of their perceptions and preferences; with this three-dimensional approach, he opened the way for treating power in a position that exceeds the individual (Lukes, 1974).

Foucault's radical transformation of this accumulated body of thought is sharpened by post-structuralist critique. Foucault conceptualizes power not as a merely negative, repressive, and restrictive force, but as a productive and positive structure that constructs subjects, identities, desires, and realities (Foucault, 2015). In this understanding, power cannot be identified with the state apparatus; it must be grasped as a network that extends to our very nerve endings, permeates micro-relations,

and carries a topographic quality. Foucault (2004) demonstrates that power has developed three distinct strategies throughout history: Sovereignty, Discipline, and Governmentality (Foucault, 2004). These three models differ sharply from one another in terms of their operating mechanisms, and each has undergone radical transformations in its relationship with space. These transformations directly determine the position and function of architecture within power.

3.1. Sovereign Power

Sovereign power is the first model of power in the historical process. It demonstrates its strength directly and visibly by establishing borders on a territory, enacting laws, and sanctifying these borders. In this model, power is centralized, hierarchical, and most often embodied in the will of a monarch or sovereign. Sovereignty is declared through space itself; space serves as a theatrical stage that reflects the magnificence and might of power to the masses. Architecture in this period functions as a one-way instrument of monologue through which power delivers its message and legitimacy to the people; it is, in other words, a discursive apparatus that reinforces sovereignty through representation.

Sovereigns throughout history have declared their sovereignty through demarcation, definition, and sanctification of territory in order to secure the representational legitimacy of their power. The relationship that almost all cultures and civilizations have established with architecture has converged with the representational power of space, and architecture has thus functioned as the concrete extension of power. In Flesh and Stone, urban sociologist Richard Sennett (1994) relays the historian Fergus Millar's formulation that “the emperor was what the emperor did”, emphasizing that among these acts, the most critical was the construction of intimidating and impressive buildings both for the emperor's own prestige and for the empire (Sennett, 2022). Seen from this perspective, architecture is the instrument through which emperors literally built their legitimacy in the eyes of their subjects; the permanence of stone and space is presented as the guarantee of the permanence of power.

In the sovereign model, space is as much a discursive production of power as it is a product of human action. Architecture, which shapes space, speaks the language of power; parameters such as form, proportion, monumentality, and ornamentation carry a political meaning-load. Through space, the sovereign simultaneously legitimizes power and reproduces sovereignty on the spatial plane. One of the most telling examples of this is the ritual of public punishment. Foucault (1995) describes execution ceremonies in detail in the opening pages of Discipline and Punish: in these spectacles, the sovereign's dominion is represented through the criminal's body in the public arena, reconstituting the presence of power across the assembled crowd (Foucault, 1995). Space, in this production, is part of a regulatory ritual that reconstitutes the beliefs, fears, and loyalties of the people. Yet the hierarchical narrative sovereignty sustained through space in the sovereign model is seen to weaken over time. As Tanyeli (2023) relays through Victor Hugo's Notre-Dame de Paris, Hugo's concern was not so much the destruction of architecture's power to communicate as the message becoming uncontrolled: “Therefore, Hugo's actual argument and concern is not so much the destruction of architecture's power to convey a message as the message becoming uncontrolled” (Tanyeli, 2023, s. 21). In other words, the monologue expression through which sovereign power held dominion via architecture was transformed, with the advent of the printing press, into a mode of production that could be reproduced, carried, and thus rendered scaleless. This scaling-out transformed the sovereign's absolute control over space and dispossessed architecture of its status as the sole and privileged discourse of power.

3.2. Disciplinary Power

The transition to the second model of power brings with it a mechanism that differs considerably from sovereignty in terms of its operation. In the disciplinary model, power is no longer a ritualistic monologue performed across a territory. Space is transformed from a monumental or symbolic stage into a machine that establishes continuous surveillance and control over the body. Through the effect that space establishes over the body, the subject internalizes the workings of power and renders control autonomous. Among the spatial representations of disciplinary power, the Panopticon prison model designed by Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century is the most striking example. Designed in a circular form, the Panopticon features a central observation tower and cells surrounding it, with each cell having two openings, one facing outwards and the other towards the center (Foucault, 1995). Light entering from the outer opening makes every movement of the prisoners in their cells visible against the backlight in relation to the central observation tower, while the tower itself is concealed from the prisoners by shutters and partitions. In this way, architectural arrangement makes it impossible for the prisoners to determine when they are being watched, subjecting them to an autonomous internal self-regulating mechanism. Because the subject cannot know exactly when they are being observed, they gradually internalize the surveillance and begin to exert power over themselves without any external imposition. Through this mechanism, the body becomes its own jailer; architecture becomes a device that produces docile bodies individuals whose habits, movements, and behaviors are calculable and correctable. These docile bodies are subjugated and practiced bodies produced by disciplinary mechanisms (Foucault, 1995). Discipline aims to normalize the individual: it identifies, classifies, and intervenes against those who deviate from the norm. Therefore, the Panopticon functions as a scheme whose principles permeate various institutional areas of society. In this process, geometry, lighting, observation angles, and access points of space become tools of normalization. Hospitals, schools, factories, and barracks have been characterized as the modern political spatial arrangements in which panoptic principles are applied across different contexts and through which normalization is produced (Şentürk, 2013).

3.3. Governmentality

Governmentality is one of the most important power models for understanding contemporary society. In this model, power mechanisms manifest as a fluid network that permeates the entire fabric of society and shapes the population through governance. With population growth and the expansion of capitalism in the 18th century, the primary political aim shifted towards securing the free movement of goods, capital, and people. The body is no longer conceived as an object to be

directly disciplined, but as part of a population that needs to be managed, possessing its own statistical, demographic, and biological data. The lineage of governmentality is based on the management of the family unit. The word economy, derived from the Greek oikonomia which refers to household management carries the linguistic imprint of this relationship. Foucault (2004) demonstrates that the art of government, which historically modeled itself on family administration, underwent a fundamental transformation in the 18th century when it came to be understood that population has its own specific, complex, and unpredictable realities that cannot be reduced to the family model (Foucault, 2004). With this rupture, population moved to the center of political calculation and the management of its biological and economic cycles became the main focus of modern power. Foucault's concept of *the milleu* is the spatial manifestation of this transformation. Power operates through the milleu encompassing all natural and artificial environments to which humans are relationally bound. While people seemingly act of their own free will, the environment manages risks through the calculation of probabilities.

One of the most striking spatial reflections of this managerial rationality is the extensive urban restructuring of Paris undertaken by Baron Haussmann in the 19th century. Between 1853 and 1870, Haussmann constructed wide boulevards ostensibly to ensure security by preventing the construction of barricades. Yet behind this stated purpose, the spatial transformation was fundamentally driven by the ambition to accelerate, intensify, and bring under control the circulation of capital, air, goods, and population. New connections established between barracks and working-class neighborhoods strategically transformed the city into a panoptic space, while public space was reorganized and stripped of its usual heterogeneity. Thus, urban space ceased to function as a disciplinary enclosure that exerted direct pressure on bodies and instead became the stage for a new biopolitical power strategy where circulation, fluidity, and risk were managed.

The “strategic beautification” (embellissement stratégique) works carried out in this process harbor a paradoxical dimension to which Walter Benjamin draws attention. In the Arcades Project, Benjamin (2002) notes that the layout of long boulevards designed to create perspective gave rise to a distinctive aesthetic sensibility, defining this as “the tendency toward the ennoblement of technical necessities through artistic goals” (Benjamin, 2002, s. 101). Within this framework, urban reorganization conceals its security and control functions beneath a veil of aesthetic phantasmagoria. In Haussmann's Paris, while the working class was pushed toward the city's periphery, the modern urban subject identity was reconstituted around the image of the intellectual, the stroller, the consumer, and the socializer. The emergence of café culture, the development of boulevard journalism, and new public space practices simultaneously produced and legitimized the type of population that governmental power targeted.

Foucault (2004) explains this specific relationship that governmental power establishes with space through the concept of *milieu* (Foucault, 2004). Everything to which human beings are relationally connected (diseases, fertility, resources, climate, trade, death etc.) constitutes the totality of data that makes up the milieu. Power processes this data through statistics, risk calculation, and security mechanisms to govern the population. In this context, urban space is transformed into a domain of biopolitical intervention through its vital components such as hygiene, ventilation, water supply, and circulatory infrastructure. The security anxieties generated by 19th century health crises and tuberculosis epidemics make this transformation concrete. In this era when bacteria were declared global enemies, architecture was reconstituted around a discourse of sterility through the smoothing of surfaces, the elimination of cracks and recesses, and the painting of spaces white (Colomina, 1997). This purification practice, extending from domestic interiors to carpets, curtains, and wallpaper, is a clear indication that space had been transformed into a biopolitical prescription and the architect into a physician tasked with protecting society from disease. In this respect, the principles of flexibility, transparency, and freedom of circulation so frequently invoked in contemporary architecture represent not the disappearance of control but its transformation into a more dynamic and diffuse form. By targeting the biological and social life of the population as a whole and managing the very conditions and environment of life, power leads us directly to the next fundamental concept, biopolitics.

4. Biopolitics of Space

As Michel Foucault identified, the nature of power in the modern era underwent a profound historical transformation. The shift moved from sovereign power, which held life in its grasp, to a new political strategy focused on administering, regulating, and optimizing biological life itself: the power to "make live." In this model, biological life itself becomes directly the object of political calculation and strategy. Biopolitics, derived from the Greek bios (life) and politikos (political), designates this governmental mentality of power over life (Foucault, 2015) . Taking shape under the conditions of modernity in the 18th and 19th centuries, this strategy centers not on merely obedient subjects but on a population whose life, health, and productivity must be governed. Architecture, in turn, operates as a machine of subjectivation that shapes desires, identities, and forms of subjectivity. To grasp the biopolitical workings of space, it is possible to undertake a reading through three interrelated yet independently illuminating cases.

The first is materialized in the critical analysis Levent Şentürk develops through Le Corbusier's Modulor. According to Şentürk (2011), the Modulor is far more than a utilitarian architectural proportioning system; it is a colossal cage that subjugates the body and space, and a biopolitical allegory. This system strips the human body of all its contingency, molecular diversity, and indeterminacy, confining it within a rigid molar structure. The ideal norm placed at the center of the Modulor organizes the world from a hierarchical perspective and is in reality the body of a white, Western, young, athletic, and masculine English police officer. This universalist, phallogocentric, and heteronormative geometry marginalizes and renders invisible women, different ethnic identities, people with disabilities, and all non-normative forms of existence by excluding them from the spatial imagination. By pinning the body to a dimensionless proportional grid and subjecting it to a right-angled order, this approach reduces the unpredictable nature of life to a plateau of knowable things, aiming to create a sterile, biohygienic, and homogenized order of control that negates desire and difference. The Modulor therefore operates as a project of *homosacer* that attempts to transform bare life (zoe) into a purely utilitarian political body (bios). It positions architecture as a totalitarian enclosure machine that destroys the

liberatory potentials residing in the body without organs and converts individuals into docile and standardized subjects of capitalist conventions (Şentürk, 2011).

The second concerns the functioning of space as a biopolitical diagram that governs the performances of beings, as conceptualized by Erdem Demirtaş. According to Demirtaş (2023), the fundamental operating mechanism of this diagram is the inseparable coupling between architectural program and performance. The architectural program, which determines the intended use and internal organization of a space, is in fact a strategic apparatus that dictates the forms of performance of the human and non-human beings within it. In this process, termed the "enterprising-up of life" in accordance with capitalist objectives, space assumes three interconnected fundamental models of biopolitical governmentality: a laboratory in which beings are conditioned according to a particular mode of subjectivity through scientific or disciplinary methods; a factory in which these conditioned beings are put into serial production and exploited; and a museum in which the produced beings and subjectivities are put on display so as to acquire economic exchange value. These three spatial models do not operate independently of one another; they are contingent processes that produce one another in the service of enterprising life. Within this biopolitical diagram that brings daily life, production, and consumption together at their points of intersection, not only the individual's labor but also their rest, socialization, and physical and mental potentials are comprehensively optimized. (Demirtaş, 2023).

The third concerns the functioning of contemporary architecture as a neoliberal instrument of control and compliance, as conceptualized by Douglas Spencer. According to Spencer (2018), the formal configurations foregrounded by today's architecture, such as fluidity, flexibility, smoothness, and complexity, are not liberatory gestures that dismantle hierarchical or disciplinary rigidities. They are instead truth games staged by neoliberal governmentality in the spatial realm. Neoliberalism operatesthrough a post-political rationality in which subjects adapt to competitive market logic, boundaries become transparent, and circulation is absolutized. In this context, architecture surrenders to an aesthetics of affect that aims to penetrate the body and nervous system directly, bypassing critical reflection and cognitive perception. The subject is thus reduced to a passive component that can only react momentarily to spatial stimuli, prevented from grasping the political totality of the exploitation network within which they exist. This fluid spatiality, organized around continuous circulation, encounter, and communication, creates an architectural phantasmagoria. Therefore, contemporary architecture positions itself as a sophisticated biopolitical control machine that transforms individuals into entrepreneurial selves compelled to remain permanently accessible, to market their creativity, and to voluntarily commodify their existence as human capital (Spencer, 2018).

5. The Architect-Subject and the Paradox of Freedom

These three perspectives point to a fundamental question at the center of this research: Can architecture produce freedom? And what position does the architect occupy in this process? According to Michel Foucault, freedom is a practice that cannot be established through space or architecture (Rabinow, 1984). The reason is that space is a heterogeneous and multi-stakeholder construction that cannot be reduced to the architect's will. Space is devoid of meaning without the bodies that experience, use, resist, and transform it. Freedom is a dynamic formation that can only be enacted through practices and everyday bodily resistances. Architecture is therefore not the sole stakeholder operative within the networks of power that constitute space; it can guarantee neither the production of oppression nor the production of freedom on its own.

On the other hand, Theorist Peggy Deamer puts forward a paradox concerning the architect-subject. Deamer (2018) argues that the very nature of architectural practice structurally prevents architects from creating free or liberatory spaces (Deamer, 2018). Today's architects operate in working environments that are fundamentally devoid of freedom, marked by extreme competition, unpaid labor, perpetual overtime, and the effective collapse of work-life balance. When the lengthy and costly processes of entry into the profession, precarious working arrangements, and the structural inequalities of the design economy are considered together, the architect themselves becomes a circumscribed and exploited subject of biopolitical relations of production. Furthermore, architectural production is not solely dependent on the architect's autonomous will; it is subject to countless external actors and factors such as profit-oriented private clients, zoning laws, construction standards, contractual relationships, commercial restrictions, and legal regulations. In this context, the real problem lies not in how the architect produces freedom through their designs, but in how the architect perceives their own freedom, that is, in the subjective image of freedom. The construction of the state of submission and the subjective image within the discipline of architecture is rooted in architectural education, which functions as a field of epistemological conditioning. Modern architectural facilities essentially function as capitalist apparatuses that produce system-compliant professional knowledge workers. Architectural candidates are instilled, even during their education, with a tendency to willingly consent to the pressure of excessive productivity and mental and physical exploitation (Deamer, 2018).

Through this process, the myth of creativity replaces the reality of exploitation. Architects reframe low wages, unlimited working hours, and job insecurity as personal sacrifice and creative freedom through creativity. This situation leads to what Deamer (2018) describes as a schizophrenic identity: the architect-subject, while on the one hand imagining himself to be a heroic and autonomous creator, on the other hand exists largely as an anonymous and exploited knowledge worker, subservient to the demands of institutional and market forces (Deamer, 2018). This subjective distortion obscures the profound tension between creative autonomy and systemic subservience, creating a structural obstacle to the architect's critical examination of his own conditions. Furthermore, the enactment of architectural production by the performance subject thus constructed brings with it a brutal work rationality in which the individual becomes alienated from their own labor and creative action.

Drawing on Han's (2020) formulation, this paradox stems from the continuity between power and freedom being established through the subject's own domain of selfhood. Han argues that absolute power is attained not through violence but through the freedom of others, and that this form of power emerges precisely at the moment when freedom and representation converge (Han, 2020, s. 47). Power does not exclude freedom; on the contrary it can reach its most absolute

form through freedom itself. Within this framework, the architect-subject's creative freedom is itself the very biopolitical mechanism that integrates them into the system and results in a deeper subjection. The architect-subject's place within this system is experienced as being grounded in their own “free” choices. At this point, the historical position of the architect-subject takes on a deeply paradoxical form. Architects are both the productive and consumptive parts of the biopolitical diagram that subjectivates and brings others under control. The doubly layered position interrogated through this research offers a critical starting point for the transformation of architectural practice. Every imagining of a free space produced without confronting this internal contradiction of architectural practice will ultimately face the risk of becoming a reproduction strategy of the biopolitical system.

6. Conclusions

This research demonstrates that space is a complex manifestation through which power relations shape bodies, populations, and subjects. Foucault's models of sovereignty, discipline, and governmentality show how space has been transformed throughout history and how power over the body has grown progressively subtler, more invisible, and more pervasive. In each model of power, the form and function of architectural space has been reconstituted, yet its articulation with power has continued without interruption. Within the biopolitical framework, architecture has evolved from a passive disciplinary tool producing docile bodies into a more comprehensive machine of subjectivation that shapes desires, identities, and illusions of freedom from within. The historical line presented within the scope of this research, extending from Le Corbusier's Modulor to Haussmann's Paris and as we approach the present to neoliberal architectural practices makes visible how architectural space has related to power in every era. The relationship between space and power resembles a palimpsest in which the relational technologies power has developed over time operate alongside older mechanisms that remain actively at work.

The research also opens an unsettling interrogation of the position of the architect-subject. As one of the actors in spatial production, the architect may be a stakeholder in the relational entanglement of space with mechanisms of power, while simultaneously remaining a circumscribed subject of capitalist relations of production who renders their own exploitation invisible through the myth of creativity. Architects trained to design free spaces are slow to recognize that the professional practices of architecture operate from within to produce domination; for the myth of creativity is a powerful obstacle standing before that awareness. So, what can be done with this contradiction? As Foucault reminds us, freedom is not something already present in space; it is something produced through practices, everyday resistances, and modes of reclaiming. This does not mean that architecture is ineffective, on the contrary it underscores the idea that architecture's effect is always incomplete, open to negotiation, and transformable. It is precisely here that the indefinable boundaries of space acquire meaning: the reach of power is never absolute, and it is this non-absoluteness that constitutes the interval in which resistance becomes possible. What is required in this direction is the will to confront this contradiction of architecture and to rethink both space and architectural practice from a more honest, more accountable perspective that remains close to the everyday experiences of architect-subjects. Every imagining of a free space produced without this will ultimately carries the risk of becoming a more sophisticated reproduction strategy of the system.

Acknowledgements

The authors declare no acknowledgements for this study.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

This study is a theoretical and conceptual research. No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study. Accordingly, data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Institutional Review Board Statement

This study did not involve human participants, animal subjects, or any form of empirical data collection. Ethical review and approval were therefore not applicable.

CRediT Author Statement

Conceptualisation: N.Y.; Methodology: N.Y.; Writing - original draft: N.Y.; Writing - review & editing: N.Y., Ö.A.; Supervision: Ö.A. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

References

Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Two Faces of Power. *The American Political Science Review, 56*(4), s. 947-952.

Benjamin, W. (2002). *Pasajlar* (4. Baskı b.). (K. Taşkent, Çev.) İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Colomina, B. (1997). The Medical Body in Modern Architecture. C. C. Davidson (Dü.) içinde, *Anybody, MIT Press, 1997, ISBN 0-262-54088-6 (288 pages), 228-239.* (s. 228-239). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Dahl, R. A. (1957). The Concept of Power. *Journal of the Society for General Systems Research, 2*(3), s. 169-248.

Deamer, P. (2018, 05 01). (Un)Free Work: Architecture, Labour and Self-Determination. *Architectural Design*(88), s. 16-23.

Demirtaş, E. (2023). *Mekânın Biyopolitikası: Yaşamın Teşebbüsleştirilmesinde Mekânın Rolü.* İstanbuk: NotaBene Yayınları.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison.* New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (2004). *Güvenlik, Toprak, Nüfus: Collige de France Dersleri (1977-1978).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Foucault, M. (2015). *Biyopolitikanın Doğuşu: Collage de France Dersleri (1978-1979).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Han, B.-C. (2020). *İktidar Nedir?* (M. Özdemir, Çev.) İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View.* Londra : Macmillan Press Ltd.

Rabinow, P. (Dü.). (1984). *The Foucault Reader.* Newyork: Pantheon Books.

Sennett, R. (2022). *Ten ve Taş.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Spencer, D. (2018). *Neoliberalizmin Mimarlığı: Çağdaş Mimarlığın Denetim ve İtaat Aracına Dönüşmesi.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

Şentürk, L. (2011). *Modulor'un Bedeni: Modern Mimarlıkta Hegonomik Erilliğin Eleştirisi.* İstanbul: Altıkırkbeş Yayın.

Şentürk, L. (2013). *Mimarlığın Biyo-politika Sözlüğü.* İstanbul: Altıkırkbeş Yayın.

Tanyeli, U. (2023). *Yıkarak Yapmak: Anarşist Bir Mimarlık Kuramı İçin Altlık.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society.* California: University of California Press.