

T.C.
ORDU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

DAVID GREIG'İN *THE ARCHITECT* OYUNUNDA MEKÂN
VE İNSAN İLİŞKİLERİ

ESMA NUR ÇETİNKAYA KARADAĞ

DANIŞMAN
DR. ÖĞR. ÜYESİ CÜNEYT ÖZATA

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

ORDU 2021

ÖĐRENCİ BEYAN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans/Doktora/Sanatta Yeterlik tezi olarak savunduĐum “David Greig’in *The Architect* Oyununda Mekân ve İnsan İlişkileri” adlı çalışmamın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmadan yazdığımı ve yararlandığım kaynakların “Kaynakça” bölümünde gösterilenlerden farklı olmadığını, belirtilen kaynaklara atıf yapılarak yararlandığımı belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

22/04/2021

Esmâ Nur ÇETİNKAYA
KARADAĞ
1953140003

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks of gratitude to my supervisor Asst. Prof. Cüneyt ÖZATA for his supportive attitude and feedbacks in this study.

I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Turgay HAN and Assoc. Prof. Yavuz ÇELİK for their reviews, suggestions and comments.

I would also like to thank to my husband Haydar KARADAĞ, my daughter Elif Vera KARADAĞ, my friend Jacqui O'NEILL ÖZÇELİK, my cousin Hatice İrem TAŞAY for their great encouragement and trust in me during the preparation of this thesis. My completion of this thesis could not have been accomplished without the support of them.

Finally, I am dedicating this study to my younger brother Mehmet Âkif ÇETİNKAYA whose light is as bright as the Moon. I miss him with all my heart and my soul.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1

FIRST CHAPTER

1. DESIGNING BUILDINGS AND DESIGNING LIVES IN A NEOLIBERAL WORLD	8
1.1. Neoliberal City Dynamics	12
1.2. The Role of An Architect in A Neoliberal World	21

SECOND CHAPTER

2. THE COMPLEXITY OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN DIFFERENT SPACES	31
2.1. Father and Son	34
2.2. Father and Daughter.....	41
2.3. Husband and Wife.....	46
2.4. The Daughter and the Truck Driver	54
2.5. The Son and His Lover	58
2.6. Leo and Sheena.....	64
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	74
ÖZGEÇMİŞ.....	75

ABSTRACT

SPACE AND HUMAN RELATIONS IN DAVID GREIG'S *THE ARCHITECT*

Space is one of the most important phenomena that humans created. The creation of space depends on different social and economic factors in historiography. People, despite the social and economic status, created appropriate spaces for themselves and their life practices. Due to the transition from an agriculture society to industrial society; many new concepts are included in the discourse of space such as the owning of space, the exclusion of the space, or the size of the space's size.

Within the context of today's neoliberal economy model, the concept of space has evolved. It can be bought and sold; it is open or close to some people, in which part of the city mass housing can be built, briefly the rise of rentier economy are the indispensable elements of neoliberal economy. The perception of space embittering social inequality is a result of this economic model. In the very core of the problem of space are politics and governmentality. However, it is man who is influenced by them. Man, collecting the crisis of modern life in himself, cannot be thought separate from the problem of space.

David Greig, one of the most important representatives of the British Theatre, depicts how space is produced in and around the city. He shows the social and psychological crisis of the subjects who are involved in this production. He makes the reader question delicate issues such as the quality and design of space and the dispersion of families with different social backgrounds to the city. Thus, *The Architect* offers diverse sociological content to the researchers of literature. The thoughts of David Harvey on the sociology of space and Henri Lefebvre's evaluations about our lives in modern times are the primary sources of this thesis. Furthermore, to interpret the interpersonal relations and their appearances in different spaces, I benefited from Zygmunt Bauman and Anthony Giddens.

Keywords: David Greig, space, architecture, neoliberal, inequality, relations.

ÖZET

DAVID GREIG'İN *THE ARCHITECT* OYUNUNDA MEKÂN VE İNSAN İLİŞKİLERİ

Mekân, insanların kurguladığı en önemli olgulardan biridir. Mekânın kurgulanması çok farklı faktörlere bağlıdır. Tarihsel yazım içinde, mekânın kurgulanmasını başlatan ve geliştiren en bariz etmenler sosyal ve ekonomik olanlardır. İnsanlar bu etmenlere bağlı olarak kendilerine uygun mekanlar yaratmışlar ve bu mekanlara uygun yaşam pratikleri geliştirmişlerdir. Tarım toplumundan endüstri toplumuna geçişte mekân söyleminin içine pek çok yeni kavram dahil edilmiştir; mekânın sahiplenilmesi, kuşatıcılığı, dışlayıcılığı ve büyüklüğü gibi.

Günümüz neoliberal ekonomi modeli kapsamında bu kavramlar farklı formlara dönüşmüştür. Mekânın alınıp satılabilirliği, bir mekânın kimlere açılıp açılmayacağı, şehirlerin gittikçe artan nüfus ihtiyacını karşılamak için toplu konutların şehirlerin hangi bölgelerine yapılacağı, kısaca mekân üzerinden bir rant ekonomisinin doğuşu neoliberal ekonomi modelinin olmazsa olmazlarından. Sosyal eşitsizliği körükleyen bir mekân anlayışı bu modelin doğurduğu sorunlardan biridir. Mekân sorunun temelinde hükümetler, politikalar ve yönetim biçimleri vardır. Ancak tümünden etkilenen tek varlık insandır. Modern hayatın krizlerinin tümünü kendinde toplayan insan mekân sorunundan da elbette ayrı düşünülemez.

İngiliz tiyatrosunun önemli isimlerinden David Greig, *The Architect* oyununda, şehir içinde ve etrafında mekânın nasıl kurgulandığını gösterir. Bu kurguya dahil olan öznelerin sosyal ve psikolojik krizlerini mekân bağlamında gösterir. Mekânsal tasarımın kalitesinden, farklı sosyal geçmişlere sahip ailelerin mekanlara dağıtılmasına kadar hassas konuları her bir karakteri konuşturarak sorgulamamızı sağlar. Bu anlamda *The Architect*, edebiyat çalışmacılarına sosyoloji temelli çok zengin bir içerik sunar. David Harvey'in mekân sosyolojisi üzerine görüşleri ve Henri Lefebvre'nin günlük hayatımızın modern dünyada nasıl şekillendiğine dair değerlendirmeleri bu tezin en büyük kaynakları olmuştur. Ayrıca karakterlerin birbirleriyle ilişkilerini ve farklı mekanlardaki görünümelerini yorumlarken Zygmunt Bauman'dan çok faydalandım.

Anahtar Kelimeler: David Greig, Mimari, Neoliberal, Mekân Üretimi, Eşitsizlik, İlişkiler.

INTRODUCTION

David Greig has contributed a lot to the British theatre as one of the most prolific playwrights of the twenty-first century. He adapted to the changing role of theater in Great Britain and he produced plays which are essentially associated with the politics of his time. He primarily focuses on themes such as globalization, cosmopolitanism, nationalism, immigration, and terror attacks, which are closely embodied with the political, social, and economic structures of Western countries. Greig incisively uses different cities and towns in his works and proves that how space influences people in a global world.

In this study, Greig's *The Architect* is examined in detail. Following the introductory chapter, the present thesis comprises two main chapters: "Designing Buildings and Designing Lives" and "The Complexity of Relations in Different Spaces."

In "Designing Buildings and Designing Lives," the focus is mostly on space. The rapid change of space under the politics of urban transformation, the housing problems in and around cities, how housing influences the quality of life, the comparison of design from one place to another, the hierarchy among residential areas as situated from the ghetto to the city center, how the politics of the state form the space in modern life, the hierarchical status of jobs to one another are mapped out with the subtitles 'Neoliberal City Dynamics' and 'The Role of an Architect in a Neoliberal World.'

In this chapter, the ideas of Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey, the two groundbreaking social theorists of space in the last century are employed. Lefebvre's depiction of people's everyday life in modernity and Harvey's socialist view referring to the inequalities in capitalist economies and the increasing social conservatism in the world guided me when writing this chapter.

Harvey (2000:75) states that spatial hierarchies are produced as a result of man's activities and his understanding of the world. These hierarchies reflect different scales such as global, continental, regional, local or personal ones. All of them must perform in a harmony to generate one big space in the contemporary world (Harvey, 2000: 75).

There are twin concerns in *The Architect*. First, spatial hierarchies in *The Architect* are so clear that the houses and the location of the houses in and near the city affect the living standards of people directly. The city is divided into parts that are reserved for people from different economic groups. This division affects people's access to health and education as well as defines their social inclinations. Harvey indicates that there are spatial calculations in the city, depending on people's economic prosperity. For example, while Leo Black, the protagonist of *The Architect*, lives in a big house that he designed for his family in a decent area near the city. Sheena, as a single mom, lives in a flat with lots of blocks of apartments in a socially decayed region. There is an economic and social gap between those two families in the center of the play. Both Leo and Sheena try to guide and protect their families in different parts of the city.

Zygmunt Bauman, introducing the term *liquid modernity* into social sciences states that city life means different for people because the stories and the backgrounds of people are naturally different. The city becomes a common ground for the survival of different groups. For him, strangers in the city are of great importance because they represent the subcultures in space. Though having negative traits, cities offer their dwellers the gift to act freely and flexibly without worrying about their social realities. To him 'postmodern city' can offer democracy in terms of moving and being flexible to the dwellers and strangers in the city (Bauman, 2002: 183).

His statement shows us that thanks to those different groups of people in the same space, the heterogeneity of the city is guaranteed. Heterogeneity is essential for the healthy process of big cities. Lefebvre clarifies that every society has the power to create its own space, depending on the modes of production (Lefebvre, 1991: 31). In *The Architect*, space is produced differently for all individuals depending on their social and economic welfare. The constant flow into the city may bring some malfunctions. People who belong to lower groups are forced to form their ghettos where the state has less power to penetrate. The prosperous groups run away from those ghettos as the economic gap motivates them to create more distance and exclude the other. From a Foucauldian perspective, this division shows the neoliberal governmentality and surveillance in

different parts of the city because they all turned into political subjects in the context of the city (Foucault, 1982: 496).

The premises of modernism greatly influence the formation of cities. There have been dramatic changes; traditional familial values disappeared, individualism in the city is positively encouraged, sexuality is publicized, and even reified in the city system. Georg Simmel states that the extreme individualism peculiar to city life stems from the abundance of the city's neurotic stimulus (Simmel, 1972: 484).

Second, the division of labour in the city is undoubtedly of great importance. Cities are places where modern life is established and the modern division of labour in the city determines people's social status. Jobs give people a higher or lower social rate in the city. The most common classification of jobs is white collar or blue collar, which defines people's social status. This separation is obvious in the city, and so is in *The Architect*. The protagonist, Leo Black, believes that as an architect, he has an impact on the world. He also thinks that other jobs, although they are important, do not affect the world as much as the architects. Architecture is one of the most powerful signifiers of the city, and design has an impact on the world. Leo relies on his job in society because the system makes him believe that 'gender, race, and class inequalities are matters of personal responsibility' that is why hierarchies exist across time and place (Disch and Hawkesworth, 2016: 294).

However, Leo's prestige as an architect ends when his first big project Eden Court is demolished due to the region's social deterioration. As an architect, he could calculate many things on the project. However, he could not calculate the social changes in the region. Since Leo carried out precisely what was expected by the government, he naturally disregards the social change that has happened there. Therefore, he unwittingly signs the petition to demolish Eden Court. Eden Court's demolition reminds us of Marshall Berman's statement that the twenty-first-century architecture's distinctive feature is first to demolish and then to rebuild (Berman, 2012: 224).

In "The Complexity of Relations in Different Spaces," all forms of relationships are elaborately depicted by taking different perspectives. Firstly, the

relations are clarified as 'Father and Son', 'Father and Daughter,' 'Husband and Wife,' 'The Daughter and the Truck Driver,' 'The Son and His Lover,' and lastly 'Leo and Sheena.' I examined the Black Family elaborately, how neoliberalism has influenced people's lives, the characters' pursuit for a different life. I also delineated their alienation from each other with references mostly to David Harvey, Zygmunt Bauman, and Anthony Giddens. Their conceptualization of modernism, people's motive to make more money while sacrificing more humane values like expressing your true identity in front of others, the merchantability of the goods in a modern liquid life, which Bauman strongly emphasizes, the dilemmas of neoliberalism are exemplified with the quotes from the play. We can divide the characters into two groups depending on their familial bonds: Leo, Paulina, Martin, and Dorothy belong to the Black family, while Billy, Joe, and Sheena separate from the Black family.

A short Biography of David Greig

David Greig, who was born in Scotland in 1969, grew up in Nigeria, where his father worked in construction. Upon moving to Scotland, he studied English and Drama at Bristol University. He co-founded Suspect Culture, a Scottish theatre group with Graham Eatough. He was twice nominated for The Guardian Student Drama Award and won a Scotsman Fringe First for *Stalinland* (Middeke et al. 2011: 204-205).

His works have been staged in Europe, the USA, Australia, Brazil, Japan, and Korea. His primary works are *Europe* (Traverse,1994), *Caledonia Dreaming* (Traverse, 1997), *Casanova* (Tron, 2001), *Dr Korczak's Example* (Tag, 2001), *San Diego* (Tron, 2003), *8000m* (Suspect Culture, 2004), *Pyrenees* (Paines Plough,2005), *Midsummer* (with Gordon McIntyre, Traverse, 2008) and *Dunsinane* (RSC, 2010). His adaptations are Jarry's *Ubu the King* (RSC, 1996), Camus's *Caligula* (Donmar, 2003), Euripides's *Bacchae* (NTS, 2007), and Strindberg's *Creditors* (Donmar, 2008) (Middeke et al. 2011: 204-205).

He has also led projects with Middle Eastern writers, especially those from Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Tunisia, and Morocco. The book *Stories of Spirit and Cement* was produced by The Street, a group dedicated to writing in Syria, in 2010 (Middeke et al. 2011: 204-205).

Using globalization as a background theme in his works, Greig touches upon a delicate issue in our world. I think he criticizes ‘globalization as the product of bourgeois ideology’ (Bewes, 2017: 28). That is why he finishes many of his plays with explosions, showing that nowhere in the world guarantees a safe life because of social and economic inequalities.

The Architect was also filmed with the same name in 2006 with some minor changes. The film shows Leo both as an academic and architect whose career is about to wane because of the technical defaults of his project. Although there are some disconnections in the movie’s plot compared to the dramatic text, it gives the main points (*The Architect* movie, 2006).

When the scope of his works and his influence on other countries are taken into consideration, David Greig can be regarded as not only a dramatist but also an international activist in the field. His literary products are the sociological and political reflections of his time, proving Michael Billington’s statement on the theatre’s changing role in Britain since the end of the Second World War.

British theatre since the war has acted as a uniquely informative mirror to the shifts and changes in our society. But, for all the achievements of the interpreters, it is to the writer, in his or her truculent solitude, that we have looked to gain a greater understanding both of ourselves and of the insanely perplexing world that we all inhabit. In the beginning was the Word (Billington, 2007: 401).

As a successful representative of the British theatre, Greig excelled at creating plays that were closely associated with the politics of his time. As a strong critique of political discourse, his works touch upon the global issues of neoliberalism, the prevailing economic system in the world.

A Brief Summary of *The Architect*

Leo Black, the main character in *The Architect*, has some struggles in his family life in addition to the problems at work. His wife Paulina, a suspicious woman, spends her time doing housework and dealing with the garden plants. Paulina thinks that the world is polluted and there are a lot of poisonous chemicals in the foods. She also believes that Leo deceives her and rejects his intimacy. That is why she criticizes all his behaviors and questions him. Their son Martin has just returned home because of financial troubles, and he always speaks about how unhappy he is as he has to live with his parents again. Martin is harsh towards his father and rejects his father's guidance. We see Martin as he is wandering around

the city with his boyfriend, Billy, and Leo's daughter, Dorothy, hitchhiking in a relationship with a trucker. Dorothy, who starts accusatively towards her mother after having learned that her parents divorced, is at the same time accusing her brother Martin of misbehaving towards his father.

In addition to Leo's family troubles, he is also experiencing struggles at work. Namely, Sheena a woman who lives in Eden Court, the corporate housing development built by Leo twenty years prior. Sheena, a tenant in Eden Court, corporate housing in a remote area built by Leo with state support twenty years ago. Now, she is collecting signatures for its demolition by asserting that Eden Court has become degenerated within time. Eden Court has become a potential crime nest and has also turned into a crime center for the teens. Since he is the architect, Leo's key signature for the demolition is important. However, Leo resists signing the petition. His problems both at home and at work have driven Leo to despair. On the one hand, he dreams of a comforting future for his family; on the other hand, he tries to prevent his family and his projects from breaking. Unfortunately, since he is alone in his efforts, Leo is not able to prevent family destruction and the demolition of Eden Court.

Method

This study aims to show as many aspects as *The Architect* from different social theorists, academics, and architects. The text is as diverse as Greig's other plays. Greig vividly portrays the social changes within his literary works and touches upon the delicate issues of modernism such as globalization, immigration, borders, class conflicts in welfare economies, and marginalized groups in both underdeveloped and developing countries.

In *The Architect*, there are twin concerns. First the production of space, which has always been a serious matter in social science. Both sociologists and economists have endeavored to investigate and interpret space. In this study, David Harvey and Henri Lefebvre are two pioneering sociologists who write about neoliberalism, the neoliberal subject, everyday life, spatial inequalities, and modernism's implications in everyday life. We can track all these concepts by making an analogy of space in the *The Architect*. Therefore, in the two main chapters, the focus is on examining the sociological references in terms of space.

Second is the transition from the traditional family to nuclear family with the industrialization and urbanization of the cities. These transitions are supported with references to Zygmunt Bauman, Anthony Giddens, and Talcott Parsons, who all state that the self in modern life cannot act freely. Because the self is bound to the structures which surround him/her in a modern society. For example, the living standards, the family, the career path, the laws and rules, and the institutions can be regarded as some of the restricting factors in the journey of the self. Namely, the existing of the self depends on many other issues and the self is split into pieces and has turned into a fragmented individual attached to the various structures of the society.

The fragmented subject has to borrow a suitable mask every day to adjust himself to changing conditions. Furthermore, Bauman's point on the frailty of human relations when the modern and the postmodern have merged into each other and have changed the essence of the relations. Now, people's extreme individuality does not let them establish permanent relationships because the flexibility of time and space in modern times requires people to be far from each other. In brief, metapolitics define the intimacy of all kinds of relationships in our century. The ideas of these theorists helped establish a sociological and psychological basis used to interpret *The Architect*.

Apart from the sociologists above, Douglas Spencer who wrote a book called *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance* is employed to interpret the relationship between the architecture and politics in a neoliberal world. Spencer wrote a comprehensive book about how neoliberal politics influenced the architecture in the modern world by giving different examples from different countries. As the name of the play indicates, *The Architect* focuses on the importance of design, architecture, and the impact of the architects in the text. Therefore, it would be reasonable to benefit from the ideas of the architects on this broad topic.

FIRST CHAPTER

1. DESIGNING BUILDINGS AND DESIGNING LIVES IN A NEOLIBERAL WORLD

People have always created spaces. They have adjusted places according to their life situations, which are often defined by their economic practices. In the late twentieth century and the early twenty-first century, the definitive economic model in the world is neoliberalism in which the concept of property has utmost importance both for people and states. Ritzer's statement that 'neoliberalism is radically individualistic' clearly shows the twenty-first century's motto in government politics (Ritzer, 2008: 599). People's lives are arranged according to extreme individualism, which is a requirement of a market-based economy.

Housing is one of the world's major problems of the world population. The type, size, and the location of housing depends on people's economic power and social status. Pierre Bourdieu clearly explains in the below quote:

The effect of size of settlement is well known. The main point, however, is that this has specific effects according to the volume and structure of capital possessed. The gap between social classes increases as we pass from rural districts to large conurbations, both in terms of home ownership and of the occupation of single-family houses (Bourdieu, 2005: 31).

Cities have grown from extreme immigration from rural areas since the 1940s and the second industrialization revolution. This led to the development of a housing problem because people who could not afford the houses in the city center began to buy houses in the suburbs of the city or build their own houses in remote areas. The appearance of cities has changed a lot with these dynamics. Cities gradually have been divided into social sections, and as a result, city planning has gained utmost importance. Creating and renewing cities, depending on industrialization premises, brought spatial products that have to be reconsidered when planning space. Harvey proposes a method to evaluate the spatial results in the city:

The only adequate conceptual framework for understanding the city is one which encompasses and builds upon both the sociological and the geographical imaginations. We must relate social behaviour to the way in which city assumes a certain geography, a

certain spatial form. We must recognize that once a particular spatial form is created it tends to institutionalize and, in some respects, to determine the future development of social process. We need, above all, to formulate concepts which will allow us to harmonize and integrate strategies to deal with the intricacies of social process and the elements of spatial form (Harvey, 1993: 27).

Housing and property became the two important aspects of the rentier economy, and the politics of the governments increasingly depend on this economy. New construction projects have always appealed to politicians, and the discourse of governments mainly included gigantic construction projects ranging from shopping centers to skyscrapers. These expensive projects have become the signifiers of a neoliberal economy in the city. For instance, in Great Britain, the Community Architecture movement in the 1990s aimed to meet the needs and wishes of its users. Architects were expected to work in the community for whom they are designing. They also had to cooperate with their clients during the construction process (Christopher, 2002: 196).

Leo's struggle to build new projects in the city represents one aspect of Community Architecture. Leo's career path is also specified within the neoliberal economic structures in the city. Henri Lefebvre, theorizing the everyday life in modern times in the example of France, states:

The quotidian is what is humble and solid, what is taken for granted and that of which all the parts follow each other in such a regular, unvarying succession that those concerned have no call to question their sequence; thus it is undated and (apparently) insignificant; though it occupies and preoccupies it is practically untellable, and it is the ethics underlying routine and the aesthetics of familiar settings. At this point it encounters the modern. This word stands for what is novel, brilliant, paradoxical and bears the imprint of technicality and worldliness; it is (apparently) daring and transitory, proclaims its initiative and is acclaimed for it; it is art and aestheticism – not readily discernible in so-called modern spectacles or in the spectacle the modern world makes of itself to itself (Lefebvre, 1971: 24-25).

What David Greig achieves in *The Architect* is telling the everyday life situations of a family and their social circle with a couple of familial and occupational crises. As a Scottish origin playwright, Greig mostly uses Western cities as a setting in his plays, and in *The Architect*, his focus is on London.

The Black Family, whose life fragment is processed in the play, can be seen anywhere in the modern world. First, they are a nuclear family led mostly by the father, Leo Black. The father has an appropriate job suitable to the dynamics of modern life in the city. The mother, Paulina, is constantly at home and stays

busy with flowers and plants in the garden. She is only an observer of the outside world, and she is obsessed with cleanliness. Their familial crisis, which ends up with a divorce and the demolition of Eden Court, can be either seen as a simple crisis or the results of modernity in general.

Lefebvre stresses that his study is based on everyday life in France in his work. However, modern life as a virus has spread worldwide, and everybody has his share. Leo's role as a father can be interpreted deeply by Lefebvre's below quote:

A high standard of rationality was attained by the middle classes where the head of the household, husband or father, held the purse strings; he gave the woman, wife or daughter, a household allowance and put aside the remainder in the form of savings; if he did not economize and save but chose to enjoy the present rather than invest in the future he went counter to his conscience, his family and society. A typical middle-class family saved and invested at the least possible risk for the best possible income; the good father founded the family fortune or increased it, and it was transmitted by legacy, even though experience had proved that middle-class fortunes were dispersed by the third generation and that the only way to avoid this was to raise one's financial standard (Lefebvre: 1971: 34).

As a good father in *The Architect*, Leo always looks for ways to set up his own business with his son Martin. He tries to convince Martin to work together. He thinks that Martin can benefit from his occupational experiences and create their investment area in the city. Leo's first thought is to work at small scales and then increase their wealth through hard work. In this process, his daughter Dorothy can also help them, so Leo's dream of having a family business would come true. As a rational entrepreneur, Leo wants to divide the labour among his family members to keep the money in the family. However, Leo's attempts to establish their own business and unite his family are futile. The domineering conditions of modern life, disguised as everyday life, dispersed them to different places. They cannot find a common ground.

In *The Architect*, the city both reveals and conceals the problems of modern people. The transitions from one place to another in the city can be both smooth and complicated. Bauman's view that dwellers in the city are free to move in the city is a notable point because it is one of the most significant modernism projects involving both restrictions and freedom. The dilemmas of the city are revealed by the presence of strangers in the city. Bauman states:

The city that emerged at the far end of modern development is anything but a homogeneous space. It is rather an aggregate of qualitatively distinct areas of highly selective attraction, each distinguished not only by the type of its permanent dwellers but also by the type of incidental strangers likely to visit it or pass through it. The borderlines between the areas are sometimes clearly drawn and guarded, more often blurred or poorly signposted, and in most cases contested and in need of constant realignment through borderline skirmishes and reconnaissance forays (Bauman, 2002: 130).

In *The Architect*, the usage of space is a basic problem in the city. The size and the location of the houses naturally depend on the economic situations of the people. The secondary problem is the property right of people. The city has become a space where people from all walks of life contribute to the city. The politics of their everyday life has become the politics of modern life in the city. Lefebvre sees this as a result of city planning with the high industrialization:

The great event of the last few years is that the effects of industrialization on a superficially modified capitalist society of production and property have produced their results: a programmed *everyday life* in its appropriate *urban setting*. Such a progress was favoured by the disintegration of the traditional town and the expansion of urbanism. Cybernetization threatens society through the allotment of land, the widescale institution of efficient apparatus and an urban expansion adapted to specific ends (directing offices, the control of circulation and of information) (Lefebvre, 1971: 65).

Urban setting organized by sociologists, economists, engineers, architects, and politicians requires lots of time and energy. The making of a city depends on various factors, and at the top of the city, the capitalist economy takes place. The programmed everyday life of city dwellers is defined according to a capitalist economy. The city dynamics greatly direct their moves and motives in the city. Individuals contribute to the making of the city with their different roles. The totality of the city is ensured with the diverse life situations of people under the shade of wild capitalism. Guy Debord's thought on the part of city planning shows the issue from a broader perspective:

The society that reshapes its entire surroundings has evolved its own special technique for molding its very territory, which constitutes the material underpinning for all the facets of this project. Urbanism-"city planning"-is capitalism's method for taking over the natural and human environment. Following its logical development toward total domination, capitalism now can and must refashion the totality of space into its own particular décor (Debord, 1992: 89-90).

Leo, as an architect, leads construction projects in the city. His projects are only governmental methods for the survival of capitalism. Architects, engineers and workers reshape space to ensure the survival of capitalism. Cities have the most convenient environment to provide this reshape. Architecture does not only

have monetary value in a neoliberal economy but also it is the signifier of a societal change. It shows the direction of progress in society (Kunz, 2019: 25). In *The Architect*, we witness such a societal change utilizing different people in different parts of the city during the day. At night, the interactions and encounters of other characters make us hear the voices of diversities in the city from Greig's point of view.

1.1. Neoliberal City Dynamics

Leo The tower's going to be over there. At the head of the docks. Where the fish market used to be. They're still digging foundations. but you can imagine.

Martin Is this one of yours? The tower? Did you dream it?

Leo A lot of people are involved in the project.

Martin Did you think it up though? Your dream?

Leo I'm part of the design team, obviously ... so in that sense, yes. Everyone has their role, everyone has input (Greig, 2002: 96).

The above quote between Leo and Martin implies constructive changes in the city. Because the previous fish market is no longer needed in the city, a tower is being built in the space. Since cities are similar to living beings that change in time, the buildings also gain new functions at different times. Different examples of functional change are apparent in many other cities. For example, the famous art gallery of Tate Modern in London was once a power station, and it changed into a modern and contemporary art gallery in 1992. Also, the Cer Modern, in Ankara was a train maintenance atelier in the 1920s. Cer Modern was turned into an art gallery in 2010. Frederic Jameson, who sees modern life as a ceaseless rotation of elements, tells us that all structures are apt to change depending on the conditions (Jameson, 1997: 90). So constructive changes in any part of the world are normal.

The immediate growth of cities with industrialization led to the construction of many big buildings in the city center. However, the new architectural design of cities has not allowed them to function correctly in the city center. That is why they had to gain new functions depending on the latest social practices of the city. Furthermore, the word 'modern' in Tate Modern and Cer Modern cannot be coincidental. On the contrary, the term 'modern' reflects the displacement of the old and the introduction of the new. That is to say, the new always requires the demolition of the old. Aihwa Ong says that 'neoliberal

governmentality reflects the infiltration of market-driven truths and calculations into the domain of politics' exemplifies the constructive changes in the society (Ong, 2007: 4).

When Leo states that many people are involved in the project, he refers to the magnitude of his work. Even though he has an undeniable contribution to the building project, he cannot achieve it without a profitable division of labour. Emile Durkheim claims that the division of labour is associated with the advancement of society. A division of labour causes work to be accomplished well, and it refers to the progress of society. Therefore, Leo's success as an architect depends on the success of everyone in the project. Although it was his dream to create a new site, cooperation must finalize the project.

In the first act, Leo stands close to the architectural models in the office. Martin often makes Leo angry by muttering and touching the models. He implies that the models do not look real. Instead, they look like artificial buildings. In the below quote, this clash is apparent:

Leo They're technical models. They're not toys.

Martin They're so delicate. So perfect. They look solid but you only have to nudge them and something breaks.

Leo You could have damaged them.

Martin The model's clean. Is that deliberate? When you make them? They don't look anything like real buildings. There's no dirt. No mess around them. Just white card, patches of green felt and pretend trees. They look like film buildings. They look as though the sun's always shining on them (Greig, 2002: 101-102).

The difference between a model building and a real building is inevitable. In the model, there are not people. The human element, which Leo later mentions, is essential here. However, when the social reality does not fit in the promises of the model, there arises another problem. Because people can be easily manipulated and directed with the models shown in the beginning. The models conceal the realities. They have the power to warp them because they are necessary tools of advertisement. In *The Architect*, the gap between the model and the social realities is processed well. Martin and Sheena oppose Leo as the models do not associate with the real buildings of Eden Court.

When Sheena visits Leo at the building site, Leo insistently tells her to wear a hard hat if something falls. In that sense, Leo is a careful architect and depends on insurance.

Leo There's obviously been some –

Some kind of mix up.

I'm sure we can sort it out. The thing is ... you need a site pass. You understand we can't have people wandering round in case there's an accident. If you hold on, my son'll ring the security people. Martin, could you give Mrs Mackie your hat. While you're on site you need a hard hat. In case anything falls on your head. For insurance ... (Greig, 2002: 104).

Insurance is an essential tool to compensate for unexpected accidents or natural disasters in a neoliberal market economy. It is indeed the monetary substitution of life. If Sheena or anyone gets hurt in the building site because of not wearing a hard hat, it will produce many problems. For example, the legal permission to build the site may be invalidated by the authorities, or Leo's work permit or license can be canceled. As a neoliberal subject, Leo is experienced in risk management, and he avoids the possible risks.

Eden Court was built with the support of the government at the time, and Leo was hired to lead the project. As a cheap way to place lower-class people in specific parts of the city, mass housing has been a serious matter of neoliberalism. Sheena, as the representative of the tenants in Eden Court, is aware of the political weakness. She does not want to lose years in court, so she started a petition and collected many signatures from people, including a political and royal figure, Prince Charles. She tries to deal with Leo, either.

Sheena The council don't want to build a new estate. They say there isn't the money. It's cheaper to slap a bit of paint on and leave the place fall apart. We could take them to court but something like this could take years. The only way we'll get what we want is if embarrass the council. And if you say they need to be rebuilt they'll have to do something. They can hardly argue with the architect, can they?

Leo Or Prince Charles (Greig, 2002: 107).

In the above quote, Prince Charles reference is meaningful. Because Prince Charles was a critique of modern architecture in Britain, therefore he supported Community Architecture which primarily aimed to reflect people's needs and wants not those of the architects (Christopher, 2002: 193). However, the negative impacts of social housing in the form of Community Architecture

appeared later in the Thatcher regime. Harvey, as a critique of the Thatcher regime, stresses the long-term negative impacts of social housing in the UK:

At first, for example, Thatcher's programme for the privatization of social housing in Britain appeared as a gift to the lower class, whose member could now convert from rental to ownership at a relatively low cost, gain control over a valuable asset, and augment their wealth. But once the transfer was accomplished housing speculation took over, particularly in prime central locations, eventually bribing or forcing low-income populations out to the periphery in cities like London and turning erstwhile working-class housing estates into centres of intense gentrification. The loss of affordable housing in central areas produced homelessness for some and long commutes for those with low-paying service jobs (Harvey, 2005: 163-164).

Leo was disappointed because his project was to be demolished. Although he solely cannot be blamed for the social corruption in Eden Court, he may have disguised something in the process of construction. This is clear in the below quote:

Leo They were designed to be built easily.

Sheena Built in factories. Pre-cast.

Leo It's a simple method.

Sheena Easy to skimp on as well. Difficult to check up on mistakes.

Leo I didn't hire the contractors.

Sheena A few bolts missing here and there. They always over-design these things anyway. If the odd panel doesn't fit, never mind.

Leo I admit there was a lack of supervision but the contractors were under pressure. Time was pressure. You may not remember but it was you people who were demanding houses.

Paulina That's not how I remember it.

Leo What?

Paulina I remember you talking about it. At the time. You said the job was rushed. You said it was a scandal (Greig, 2002: 166).

According to this dialogue, we see that the constructional problems of Eden Court are inexpensive materials, lack of supervision, too much pressure on the contractors, and timing. People who expect their houses immediately and the company forcing the contractors to rush are two main spheres. Sheena, as a conscious tenant, knows all the weaknesses of the construction, so she does not let Leo lay the responsibility on others. In any case, Leo's wife, Paulina, interferes with the situation and reveals Leo's ideas then. We understand that Leo had to rush to finish the project but he professionally tries to conceal the problem.

The silhouette of cities has changed a lot since industrialization. The cities mainly change due to immigration and industrialization. Sheena's below quote indicates how construction projects influenced the city in the long run:

Sheena You can see your new site, from here.

I've watched it. Watched the cranes pull it all up.

Watched the wrecking ball.

It look pretty from distance. The docks and everything.

The water in the background. It's pretty.

It looks nice with the sunset.

When I first lived here I watched the ships. Watched the men loading and unloading.

Cars and crates of whisky loads of coal and sacks of bananas.

I thought it was a privilege. Living above the docks.

Watching over the city's front door. And then the front door closed.

Containers.

You know the containers you put on ships, on lorries ...

As soon as they invented containers there was no need for docks in the city centre. No need for dockers. A port and a motorway's all you need. The crane lifts the box out of the ship and onto the back of the truck. Done.

So the dockers and sailors lost their jobs and you got yours ... making museums and restaurants out of warehouses and whisky bonds.

Even the tarts moved inland.

All that got left here was people who were stuck.

Stuck in boxes on the dockside waiting to be picked up. Hoping someone's going to stop for us and take us with them (Greig, 2002: 185-186).

Sheena silently observed the commercial traffic on the docks from her house. She witnessed the working cycle of men and saw the flow of import and export goods. The goods that she mentions above represent different types of trade. For example, cars and crates of whisky will be served to upper-class people, loads of coal will be used in factories to produce more industrial products, and bananas may be linked to the tropical countries. These products are the signifiers of overseas trade, which is highly promoted in neoliberalism. However, the trade growth brought new consequences, and then the goods were put into enormous containers, which allowed to transport more goods by ships. However, a more professional system was required to provide this capacity. Neoliberalism cannot be thought of without an advanced method of transportation, either. As a result, the city's front door closed because of the excess trade, which led to dockers losing their jobs. Since neoliberalism is a meta-spatial concept, it must first open a

free space to grow freely. So, the docks turned into a port, and a motorway was built. On the one hand, a group of people lost their jobs. On the other hand, a group of people got new jobs according to the changing conditions. Harvey, focusing on the importance of spatiality stresses:

The diffusion of cultural forms, diseases, biota, ideas, consumption habits, fashions; the networks of communications, energy transfers, water flows, social relations, academic contacts; the nodes of centralized power, of city systems, innovation and decision-making; the surfaces of temperature, evapotranspiration potential, of population and income potential; all of these elements of spatial structure become integral to our understanding of how phenomena are distributed and how processes work thorough and across space over time (Harvey, 2001: 223).

The success of neoliberalism in terms of transforming spaces is not a new phenomenon. On the contrary, the countries closer to the seas, like Great Britain, efficiently used this geographical advantage. It is once proved that the free market of neoliberalism cannot be restricted to one space. Instead, it is a meta-spatial concept. Harvey emphasizes the importance of transportation in the areas:

The capitalist mode of production promotes the production of cheap and rapid forms of communication and transportation in order that 'the direct product can be realized in distant markets in mass quantities' at the same time as 'new spheres of realization for labour, driven by capital' can be opened up. The reduction in realization and circulation costs helps to create, therefore, fresh room for capital accumulation. Put the other way around, capital accumulation is bound to be geographically expansionary and to be so by progressive reductions in the costs of communication and transportation (Harvey, 2001: 224).

Sheena's words are like a lament over the unrestrainable change of the city dynamics in time. Once she could see what was brought from overseas countries, she cannot see what the containers include now. Big companies occupy the port, and a closed system runs it. She also mentions the museums, restaurants, and warehouses as the new places in the city. As a white-collar worker, Leo is included in the system because the city's new façade allows him to perpetuate new projects in the city. However, the residents of Eden Court fell into disuse. Therefore, the spatial crisis is not a simple one but a complicated one. When Sheena refers to the 'tarts' as they moved inland, another scary result reveals. Harvey describes these drastic results as:

The social consequences of neoliberalization are in fact extreme. Accumulation by dispossession typically undermines whatever powers women may have had within household production / marketing systems and within traditional social structures and relocates everything in male-dominated commodity and credit markets. The paths of women's liberation from traditional patriarchal controls in developing countries like

either through degrading factory labour or through trading on sexuality which varies from respectable work as hostesses and waitresses to the sex trade (one of the most lucrative of all contemporary industries in which global deal of slavery is involved) (Harvey, 2005: 170).

The male-dominated system of neoliberalism creates its unprivileged groups. The ‘tarts’ Sheena mentions is just another result of the new system. Both Leo and Sheena are aware of the crisis. However, they are mere subjects in the system and do not have the power to put things right immediately:

Leo The new place if they build it, it’ll be exactly the same, you know.

Sheena I’m not stupid. I’m not a silly woman who doesn’t like modern buildings. You’re right. I know this is ‘good design’. ‘Good design’ isn’t the point. The point is control. Who has the power to knock down and who has the power to build it (Greig, 2002: 189).

Sheena’s focus on power to knock down and construct the buildings is indeed a thematic problem in *The Architect*. The answer to Sheena’s asking of who has the power cannot be given quickly because the power is distributed between the money holders and the country's political governance. So, the control mechanisms are up to change in time. Because the free-market economy requires a flexible environment in which the flow of money is not interrupted. Neoliberalism is ‘characterised by uncertainty, insecure employment, and hyper-responsibilization’ (Hilger, 2011: 361). Like Sheena, Leo is also aware of the change in the city. His perspective is as follows:

Leo In the past we built cities on top of cities...
in the middle of cities...
around them...
Haphazard, unplanned... encrustations.
Layers of mistakes corrected by more mistakes...
Never a clean slate.
Never a clear vision.
So when they asked me to build something I thought ...
Duty required me to ...
I thought I had to make ...
Because of the future ...
A new idea. A better thing.
Look.
A thousand families ... self-contained flats ... connecting
Walkways ... public galleries and ... space and structure and ...
And the stones ... each block represents a stone, a
monolith ...
Do you see? Timeless.
A family in each flat.
Each block a community.
The whole estate a village.
The city encircled by estates, each one connected to the others
And to the centre.
Do you see?

A design.
But it's the human element, isn't it?
Materials, structure and so on But the human
element...
Eludes you. You can't design for it (Greig, 2002: 192-193).

It is obvious that Leo despises the old structures in the city because they were wrongly planned and constructed. Thus, his goal was to build a timeless housing project for Eden Court. He calculated every angle of the building from the walkways to galleries. He also thought of a strong centre for Eden Court. Hence it would be easier to dominate the people. Design is about the millimetric calculations of space, materials can be chosen, and structures can be built with those materials. However, the human element is incalculable. According to Leo, humans are unpredictable, and they may not fit into the design so perfectly. That is why humans elude the design and the designer. In the end, Leo's biggest dream, to be timeless, does not happen because the destruction of Eden Court becomes another new adjustment in the city.

Today cities are divided into different parts, and the conditions of each part differ from one another. For example, the region where Leo and his family live in the city is cleaner and more spacious than where Eden Court rises up. According to Leo, the social splitting in the city is normal, but the human element is unpredictable. The quote below supports Leo's ideas about the structural schemes of the city:

The city is splitting into different separated parts, with the apparent formation of many "micro-states." Wealthy neighborhoods provided with all kinds of services, such as exclusive schools, golf courses, tennis courts and private police patrolling the area around the clock intertwine with illegal settlements where water is available only at public fountains, no sanitation system exists, electricity is pirated by a privileged few, the roads become mud streams whenever it rains, and where house-sharing is the norm (Balbo, 1993: 24).

The micro-states that Balbo mentions in the above quote are the inevitable results of the city. While one neighbourhood can easily access social services mentioned above, another neighbourhood cannot. Due to the social and economic inequalities between these spaces, people are also segregated. The clash of neighbourhoods and the segregation of people are in the centre of *The Architect*.

Saddened by Eden Court's destruction, Leo turns back to his family and focuses on preventing the destruction of his family. He even daydreams of going somewhere with his wife and children and starting from scratch:

Leo But you start with things, you draw up plans and then they get confused. People spoil things and ... time and you lose the clarity. So you have to get back to the original ... go back to the drawing board.

...

We'll get out of the city. Paulina. A village somewhere. We'll do up a house or something. I'll work from the attic. Get back to the original us ... all of us ... You, me, Dorothy, Martin (Greig, 2002: 136).

Leo, tired of his job and the city's necessities, holds on to a romantic dream of leaving the city with his family. He thinks that village life would be better for them and have a chance to have a happier life. Even though they have a beautiful house and recognition in the city, he cannot stand the inaccuracy of the city for themselves. That is why he thinks that they have lost clarity in the city. In a sense, they have consumed themselves in the city. The extended effects of neoliberalism are also seen in many life areas because it created its cultural logic:

In neoliberalism, the technologies of the market work as mechanisms through which persons are constituted as free, enterprising individuals who govern themselves and, consequently, require only limited direct control by the state. The idea of enterprise pertains not only to an emphasis on economic enterprise over other forms of institutional organization, but also, on personal attributes aligned with enterprise culture, such as initiative, self-reliance, self-mastery, and risk taking (Sugarman, 2015: 104).

The psychological effects are apparent in *The Architect* when we examine the characters. Similar to Sheena, Leo is alienated from his environment and hopes to change it. He also feels stuck in the city, and therefore, he wants to go back to his original state. Harvey's statement on the neoliberal ethic of individualism helps us clarify the issue:

This is a world in which the neoliberal ethic of intense possessive individualism can become the template for human personality socialization. The impact is increasing individualistic isolation, anxiety, and neurosis in the midst of one of the greatest social achievements (at least judging by its enormous scale and all-embracing characters) ever constructed in human history or the realization of our hearts' desire. But the fissures within the system are also all too evident. We increasingly live in divided, fragmented, and conflict-prone cities (Harvey, 2012: 14-15).

Coming from different social realities, both Leo and Sheena want the best for their families. Family is their priority, and they have to achieve this together in the city. At the end of the play, David Greig opens the door to unite Sheena and

Leo despite their social differences. However, this can only happen after the explosion of Eden Court. In that sense, Greig offers the destruction of old structures to build new ones. However, the city is always unpredictable. Last, people in the city have to adapt to different conditions because they require to be fast, flexible, and ready for any unforeseen situations. Douglas Spencer sees the capacity to adjust to other positions as necessary for our existence. He refers to the unifying feature of neoliberal thought and states:

Adaptability and flexibility appear, through the neoliberal lens, as the qualities of conduct, the ethos that the subject must cultivate in order to the truth games of neoliberalism there is no choice for the self, politically or ontologically, but to govern, and to have itself governed, according to these imperatives (Spencer, 2016: 23).

In *The Architect*, we see different forms of neoliberal subjects scattered in and around the city. The city has become a secure place for them because everybody has to cope with many city problems. Everybody is the rival of each other, and they all have to make concessions to attach to the dynamics of the city successfully.

1.2. The Role of An Architect in A Neoliberal World

People choose their career paths depending on various factors such as their interests, social backgrounds, and economic advantages. As the title of the play refers, the focus of this study is on being an architect. Leo Black, having a formalist approach to life, adopts the opinion that jobs are divided into two groups; the ones that affect the world and those that do not. He is so proud of his career that he often suggests Martin do the same job:

Leo Some professions, Martin, exist only or mainly, to provide particular people with a congenial way of earning their living. Publishing, for example, or radio, you mentioned radio. These people, these publishers and so on, they're interesting. I've met them sometimes. They're creative people. Their surroundings are, if you like, seductive. But in the end, these are people without the effect in the world. Do you see what I'm saying? They have no ... power to shape, no responsibility (Greig, 2002: 95).

To Leo, being creative can be interesting for a job. However, the power lies in designing and building. Leo is right to some extent because architecture has always been a meaningful sign to show how civilized a place is. Norman Foster, one of the most distinguished British architects famous for his modern buildings, stated, "As an architect, you design for the present, with an awareness of the past, for a future which is essentially unknown" (*Ted Talk*, 2007). Architecture is

responsible for the past, the present, and the future; that is why it affects the world. Foster's statement supports Leo's idea about the role of architects in the world.

Leo ... Now, building, construction, engineering, architecture. These have effects. Here you have responsibility. Obviously you can dream, use your imagination, of course but there's a purpose. You put your dreams on paper... blueprints, drawings. The smallest line, the merest gesture of the pencil can be the curve of a motorway flyover, or pull a tower up from the slums, or shape a square from a mess of alleys. That's what we do, Martin, we dream these structures and then (Greig, 2002: 95-96).

It is clear that there is a hierarchy between the jobs in the world. An architect's job is superior to many other jobs because their imagination on paper can transform a space into a totally different one. Cities are formed and reformed according to these architectural drawings. Since structures are of great importance for a city, an architect's designs and architectural plans are also of prime importance. Japanese philosopher Kojin Karatani makes an analogy of architecture since its early ages and concludes:

Among Greeks, architecture was considered not merely a skill of craftsmen but an art practiced by those technologies, and who therefore plan projects and lead other craftsmen. In this context the term *techne* meant not only technology in a narrow sense but also *poiesis* (making) in general. Plato defined it in the following way: "By its original meaning [*poiesis*] means simply creation, and creation, as you know, can take very various forms. Any action which is the cause of a thing emerging from non-existence into existence might be called [*poiesis*], and all the processes in all the crafts are kinds of [*poiesis*], and all those who are engaged in them [creators]" (Karatani, 1995: 5-6).

Leo separates his creativity and genius in architecture from those of other jobs. Karatani's perspective presents us with an artistic and archaic aspect of architecture. Leo also sees architecture as a way of life and architects as the pioneers of civilization. His perspective is similar to Karatani's depiction of *poiesis* mentioned in the above quote. Architects design space, and they are the *doers* of the civilization. That is why Leo is so proud of himself and his job:

Leo Look around you Martin – beyond the fencing, over there – what do you see?

Martin Houses. Some people.

Leo Houses, yes, but – look at the immediate environment – the surroundings.

Martin ...

Leo Understand? This site's in the middle of no-man's land. Look at it. Devastation. Someone in the planning department told me, this is officially third world status. Which means vandalism, burglars, and Christ knows whatever else. It's a prime example.

You dream up ideas, but you have to think, you have to see potential problems. Solve them. Before they happen – understand? I saw the problem – that ... and this is the physical solution (Greig, 2002: 97).

This dialogue highlights the multi-dimensional part of Leo's work. Eden Court was built in a place where there was nothing. Leo regards the location as no-man's land. This supports the idea that property has a definitive role in economies and is distributed to people unfairly. Leo describes it as third world status, which refers to this inequality. The term third world refers to a social rank, and in *The Architect*, we see the clash of these ranks. Leo belongs to the first world thanks to his occupational advantage, and Sheena belongs to the third world because of her social background. In the third world, there is vandalism and burglary, which are invisible in the first world. Harvey writes on how the transformation of a city happens through geographical inequalities:

The geographical disparities in wealth and power increase to fashion a metropolitan world of chronically uneven geographical development. For a while the inner suburbs drained wealth from the central city but now they, too, have 'problems' though it is there, if anywhere, where most new jobs are created. So the wealth moves, either further out to ex-urbs that explicitly exclude the poor, the underprivileged, and the marginalized, or it encloses itself behind high walls, in suburban 'privatopias' and urban 'gated communities.' The rich form ghettos of affluence ('their bourgeois utopias') and undermine concepts of citizenship, social belonging, and mutual support (Harvey, 2000: 189).

Based on Harvey's insight, it is reasonable to say that Eden Court was built to remove the underprivileged groups from the city. Ensuring that they would not be a problem for the rich. When Sheena visits Leo in his home, she is fascinated by the spacious atmosphere and the private garden. Her experience is juxtaposed with her reality; the residents of Eden Court have to deal with many problems, beyond the fact that their houses are uncomfortable and poorly constructed. The geographical differences, which Harvey insistently mentions, create these two families' social realities.

The compulsory segregation of underprivileged groups from the privileged groups generates hierarchical chaos in the city. This spatial division in the city creates different problems. As Harvey emphasizes, the city right must be distributed to people from different walks of life:

The right to the city is not an exclusive individual right, but a focused collective right. It is inclusive not only of construction workers but also of all those who facilitate the

reproduction of daily life: the caregivers and teachers, the sewer and subway repair men, the plumbers and electricians, the scaffolding erectors and crane operators, the hospital workers and the entertainers, the bank clerks and the city administrators. It seeks a unity from within an incredible diversity of fragmented social spaces and locations within innumerable divisions of labour (Harvey, 2012: 137).

In *The Architect*, Leo's occupational superiority over other jobs is obvious. However, Leo fails to see that without the contribution of different positions, he cannot do his job. In the city, all jobs unite and create one big reality; that is the city.

Leo's explanation about the necessities of building a structure shows two crucial aspects of the work. Although it is theoretically possible to build any type of installation, nature and humans are two unpredictable elements. These two can influence the stability and the practicality of any structure. However, the architects may fail in calculating these two factors. Harmony is the most crucial thing in creating, and if you exceed the limits, there may be some hazards. Thus, even the most robust structure may bear some unexpected results:

Leo Design, materials and nature are what you have to think about. A good design can take poor materials higher. Good materials can support a poor design. And then there's nature – wind, damp, heat, earthquakes, the imponderables. You overcompensate for nature ...

Martin How high then?

Leo The base of the building would have to be wide ... to support the height. Lifts are a problem, over a certain number of floors and you need separate lifts ... then there's the human elements ... vertigo. People do get vertigo. I suppose that counts as a nature. Materials, design and nature ... if one of these factors is out of harmony then, when you get beyond a certain point, the structure overbalances, things get dangerous. You can work it out. Theoretically, though, there's no limits (Greig, 2002: 98).

Materials, design, and nature are the three critical factors for a structure to be stable. Without harmony of them, things can get dangerous.

Leo It's a typical attitude, of course. Blame the architect. People are poor. Blame the architect. Place is a slum, blame the architect. They fill a place with pigs and then complain it's turned into a pigsty (Greig, 2002: 122).

Leo, dissatisfied with the petition campaign to demolish Eden Court, does not see himself responsible for the social deterioration that happened there. He cannot be the one to blame; he instead faults the government. He argues that the space that the architect created as a model cannot fight against the social realities

created by the authority. Leo indicates that the issue is much bigger than the design of an architect. Ahlava's theoretical statement can be enlightening to understand:

If the architects and planners wish to look for initiatives in the process of developing the environment, it is crucial for them to study the role of architecture and architects' potential for influence in the turmoil of both economics and the consumption of signs. Answers to the question of consumer society architecture could be found elsewhere than in individualism and alternative life styles. The urban space has transformed into a disconnected spatialized fabric exactly because of individualistic consumption habits (Ahlava, 2000: 40).

Adopting a Baudrillardian perspective in his work, Antti states that architecture has many aesthetic aspects, and it cannot be thought of separately from economics and consumption. Therefore, Leo is right in his reproach:

Leo It's an exact model, Mrs. Mackie, an exact model of the Eden Court design. I wanted you to see this to make a point.

Sheena The grass. You've made the grass green. Put green felt down.

Leo This is the original design. Six standing towers. Aerial walkways linking each tower, platforms linking each balcony. The whole enclosing a central park.

Sheena It shouldn't be green. That part of the estate's all mud now. It catches the rain. It's like a draining bowl. You want to put down brown before felt for that.

Dorothy The models aren't supposed to be realistic. They're impressions (Greig, 2002:164).

Sheena implies there are infrastructural weaknesses to Eden Court in the above quote. She fixates on the grass in the model because it is covered in mud in reality. She insists that the model is misleading because it warps the real conditions of Eden Court. However, Dorothy argues that the models do not have to reflect the realities; thus, nothing is misleading about it. From a Baudrillardian perspective, the most definitive feature of the simulations or the models in *The Architect*, they replace the real Eden Court buildings (Baudrillard, 201:34). Leo's responsibility was design; he did have to deal with the follow-up. So he did not see the region again, but he also did not feel like he needed to because his job was done.

And this idea alienates him from the finished product of his work. As an architect, he is not interested in the infrastructural problems of Eden Court. Greig calls out another point here. Today the properties are sold by showing the models in an office or advertised on TV. So the advertised models are the idealized versions of

the buildings. They offer lots of green space, vivid colors on the buildings, and happy families with their kids around the model. However, the infrastructural and superstructural realities of the models do not necessarily fit in them. Advertisements can mislead people. Leo defies the counter-attacks of Sheena by telling her that he based his work on originality:

Leo The original design was, in fact, loosely based on Stonehenge.

Paulina I didn't think anyone lived in Stonehenge.

Leo Standing stones were the inspiration.

Paulina Too draughty I thought.

Sheena Didn't you win an award for this?

Dorothy He did.

Leo I won some recognition at the time.

Sheena It looks good. From this angle. From above.

Dorothy It's about space. Architecture's about shaping space. If you look at it from here you can see how he's moulding a communal space (Greig, 2002: 164).

Leo was inspired by Stonehenge when he designed Eden Court. The historical structures of the past are supposed to be built in cities. Leo made his dream true in his work. So his power as an architect appears. The Stonehenge simulation is also important here because in Great Britain, neo-classical architecture was supported both by the government and the public in the 1990s (Christopher, 2002: 196). Harvey also does not miss the power and genius of architects in the production of space, and he writes:

The architect has been most deeply enmeshed throughout history in the production and pursuit of utopian ideals (particularly through not solely those of spatial form). The architect shapes spaces so as to give them social utility as well as human and aesthetic /symbolic meanings. The architect shapes and preserves long-term social memories and strives to give material form to the longings and desires of individuals and collectivities. The architect struggles to open spaces for new possibilities, for future forms of social life (Harvey, 2000: 200).

It is notable to see that Harvey theoretically emphasizes Dorothy's responses in the above quote. In that sense, Greig successfully reflected the issue to the characters. Leo, who won recognition for Eden Court, has had a prestigious career. However, the social memories of Eden Court are filled with negativities. However, Leo continues to defend himself:

Leo I was asked to build cheap homes. Cheap housing. High density accommodation. Eden Court is a council estate, Mrs. Mackie, but I built connecting areas, and public spaces, I designed it so everyone's front room gets the sun at certain times of the day. They're not luxury homes, but architecturally, they're well designed. That's the point I'm making. I put as much imagination, as much thought, as much of my self into these buildings as any –

Dorothy I think they're beautiful.

Leo Objectively, aesthetically, functionally ... Eden Court is a good estate.

Sheena People are queuing up to leave.

Dorothy It's a free country (Greig, 2002: 164-165).

Leo sees that he cannot resist Sheena anymore because he is frustrated with the campaign. He asserts that he did what the council expected from him. Thus, she must focus on other factors beyond the architectural defects or the role of the architect. Leo's struggle to prove the complexity of the job is also supported by Harvey who sees doing architecture as spatiotemporal practice. Harvey writes:

The architect has to imagine spaces, orderings, materials, aesthetic effects, relations to environments, and deal at the same time with the more mundane issues of plumbing, heating, electric cables, lighting, and the like. The architect is not a totally free agent in this. Not only do the quantities and qualities of available materials and the nature of sites constrain choices but educational traditions and learned practices channel thought. Regulations, costs, rates of return, clients' preferences, all have to be considered to the point where it often seems that the developers, the financiers, the accountants, the builders, and the state apparatus have more to say about the final shape of things than the architect (Harvey, 2000: 204).

Harvey sociologically summarizes Leo's architectural references in the above quote. Leo cannot be accused of the complications in Eden Court. His imagination was hired by the council at that time and he designed Eden Court. He is just a piece in a gear wheel. Leo's argument here is also supported by Spencer's stress on the limitation of the architect in the political field with a reference to Zaha Hadid who was criticized for alienating herself from the responsibilities of a construction site. Because she insisted that they were beyond the responsibility of the architect:

Rather than the evidence of the moral failings of the architect, however, Hadid's perspective is perfectly consistent with the 'new agenda' of architecture already theorized by her partner in practice, Patrick Schumacher. Social, political and governmental matters are not to be reflected upon or criticized by architects (Spencer, 2016: 73).

Zaha Hadid, one of the most distinguished architects of the last century, emphasized the architect's limitations in a project. Leo's defense of himself and his work is surprisingly similar to Hadid's perspective. An architect is an

influential job in the world, yet architects are also contingent upon the social and political order of the country. Thus, they cannot be held responsible for the problems such as the safety of the construction site, the quality of the material used in the project, the appropriate conditions of the working staff, or the environmental degradation in the region. Leo makes a clear-cut division between what can be regarded as his responsibility and what cannot be attributed to him.

Sheena Would you say Eden Court was yours? Your building?

Leo I designed it.

Sheena Would you say it was your responsibility?

Leo It was my responsibility. It's not my fault the council turned into a ghetto. I didn't put the people in it.

Sheena Were you there when the flats were built?

Leo I supervised the project.

Sheena Did you actually supervise the work? Watch every bolt go in? See every panel in place?

Leo Of course not (Greig, 2002: 165-166).

In architecture, the external conditions define the scope of the work. Harvey also believes in the symbolic power of architecture in our lives and states:

The architecture of dialectical utopianism must be grounded in contingent matrices of existing and already achieved social relations. These comprise political-economic processes, assemblages of technological capacities, and the superstructural features of law, knowledge, political beliefs, and the like. It must also acknowledge its embeddedness in a physical and ecological world which is always changing (Harvey, 2000: 230-231).

The world is constantly changing, and some structures need to be demolished, rebuilt, or redesigned. Architects have the role of adapting the buildings according to the new requirements. Otherwise, the nature of the design will be skipped. Eden Court, once an excellent place for its residents, is now a place of deterioration. Thus, it needs to be demolished and rebuilt again. However, it cannot be assured that this will not bring new problems. Because as Leo often states, the human element is the most critical factor in a space. So the utopia that Leo hoped to put into practice cannot be established. The symbolic power of the architecture indeed depends on many factors Harvey mentions in the above quote:

Sheena I don't mean to seem rude, Mr. Black. You're probably a nice man. You've a nice family. You probably meant for it to be a nice place to live. Isn't that what architects are for? I remember the brochures we got. A drawing of the sun shining and kids playing in the park. When they came round looking for tenants I signed like that. I saw the models.

But it was all ‘vision’, wasn’t it? Vision’s the word you would use. Not houses, but a vision of housing. Cheaply accommodated. Eden Court might look like Stonehenge to you, it might have won an award but it’s build like a pack of cards (Greig, 2002: 166-167).

Sheena once comes to the point that the visionary buildings were offering a nice vision of a place for people to live with sunlight and happily playing kids. The brochures and the models seduced the people who are going to live there. However, now, Sheena understands that they were all about vision, not reality. It is clear that money was the determinant of the project, so high-rise buildings were preferred at that time. It was proper enough for the landscape. The happiness of the people was not the focus but the success of the project. Particularly, the vision of the project was a medium to conceal the other problems. While the word ‘house’ refers to the buildings solely, ‘a vision of housing’ indicates a bigger perspective. ‘A vision of housing’ is also a reference to the film named *A Vision of Britain* which was made in 1988 by Prince Charles for the BBC *Omnibus* programme (Christopher, 2002: 193). Prince Charles tells his personal opinions about environment and housing, which can be made better by the collaboration of both public and private sectors, community groups, and local politicians (Wates and Knevitt, 2013: 15).

Sheena comes to a point that when the architect’s role is removed from the building, nothing is left. Because life, by which Sheena probably means the quality of life, is the distinguishing effect on a space. Although Eden Court was supposed to be a nice place to live, life was not as lovely as it was supposed to be. The dialectic objective of architecture has not been achieved in Eden Court:

Sheena It’s not your building tough, is it? It never was. You just did the frippery bits that win prizes. Your stuff’s just the façade. Take it away and the place is a dormitory block. Stonehenge, communal space, it doesn’t mean anything if there isn’t life in the place – shops, work, kids, pubs.

Leo There was supposed to be.

Sheena But there wasn’t.

Sheena Architecture’s for the people who pay. Always. All we want to do is take control. It’s not about good or bad buildings, it’s about who decides. Don’t we have the right to not like good buildings? You do. (Greig, 2002: 167).

The construction of modern cities depends on spatial productions. Especially how the communal spaces and green spaces can change the vision of

the cities. Architecture is one of the most potent tools for producing space. However, it is a tool that not many people can reach. People did not pay much for Eden Court, so they do not have the right to claim better services. Kunz's perspective shows this issue better:

Neoliberalism has reorganized our society around market relations resulting in extreme inequality. Architecture has been both captive and complicit in this process because it relies on the largeness of its clients who benefit most from neoliberalization (Kunz, 2019: 140).

The residents of Eden Court lost control of the space, and in time, it turned into a ghetto. Now, Sheena believes that upon demolishing Eden Court, a new control mechanism can be put into place. However, her wish to take control of the space may bring some unexpected results. Because space changes according to the social and political dynamics, the residents cannot be the only authorities there. Nevertheless, Sheena's struggle to make her place a better one puts her in an important position. Like Harvey's conceptualization, she is an architect for her own life. She is coping with difficulties to design a better life for herself and her community. Harvey's perspective can be quite helpful:

Herein lies perhaps the most difficult of all barriers for the insurgent architect to surmount. In facing up to a world of uncertainty and risk, the possibility of being quite undone by the consequences of our own actions weighs heavily upon us, often making us prefer 'those ills we have than flying to others that we know not of' (Harvey, 2000: 254).

Harvey's Marxist side is clear in the above quote. Furthermore, Sheena's hopeful resistance to creating a much better place for them is similar to Harvey's courage statement.

When Eden Court was to be demolished, Sheena and Leo met again. Leo, despite being depressed by this situation, explains how the destruction is done. Leo states that not only the building but also demolishing requires the right calculation. Otherwise, it cannot be controlled, and this may also bring other problems.

Leo The demolition people need blueprints so the explosives can be placed correctly. At the points of weakness. They need to know where the weaknesses are so they can design the explosion. They want the structure to fall in on itself.

Sheena And you know where the weaknesses are?

Leo I thought so.

Sheena I just thought you'd put a bomb under it.

Leo It's a complex job destroying buildings as big as this. You can't just watch it topple. It's more clinical than that, more surgical. The taller the building the more you need to control it, or else the whole thing falls sideways, takes other buildings with it, falls into the crowd. It's an interesting operation (Greig, 2002: 197).

The dialogue between Sheena and Leo can be interpreted differently. The building refers to a well-designed society ruled by control mechanisms. Still, it has to be torn down in the end because the problems in society have gone so far that they cannot be solved without totally demolishing it. Greig perceptively gives an indirect message about how problems in society can go far; and that they cannot be solved without total demolition.

SECOND CHAPTER

2. THE COMPLEXITY OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN DIFFERENT SPACES

In *The Architect*, there are different forms of human relations which can be examined categorically. These relations reflect the interaction of people from all walks of life. It is also important to see how the characters form a relationship with themselves and with each other. Their dialogues, inner voices, and even their silences become meaningful to comprehend human relations dynamics in the modern world.

Although four of the characters belong to the same family, they are alienated from each other, and are trying to find a proper place to express their

true identities. Their search for a safe place, other than their own house, shows that they are dissatisfied with the house where they live together. Here, the house represents a common space for all of them. However, they cannot unite in the same house as a family. They have already been fragmented into pieces like the society in which they live. So, they are dissatisfied with both themselves and the system they live in. The characters' dissatisfaction causes different problems for each family member, and they become so self-engrossed that they are indifferent to each other's crises. Belonging to the same family and having the same family name does not make them closer to each other; rather, they get further from each other, and as a result, they become alienated from each other. Harvey often refers to the contradictions of the capitalism in practice and states:

On the negative side we have not only the periodic and often localised economic crises that have punctuated capitalism's evolution, including inter-capitalist and inter-imperialist world wars, problems of environmental degradation, loss of biodiverse habitats, spiraling poverty among burgeoning populations, neocolonialism, serious crises in public health, alienations and social exclusions galore and the anxieties of insecurity, violence and unfulfilled desires. On the positive side some of us live in a world where standards of material living and well-being have never been higher, where travel and communications have been revolutionised and physical (though not social) spatial barriers to human interactions have been much reduced, where medical and biomedical understandings offer for many a longer life, where huge, sprawling and in many respects spectacular cities have been built, where knowledge proliferates, hope springs eternal and everything seems possible (from self-cloning to space travel) (Harvey, 2010: 120).

Harvey's analysis of the positive and negative aspects of capitalism indicates that the remodeling of the world has always brought drastic changes for humans. For example, a war in any part of the world influences people everywhere. The impact extends beyond the actual location of the conflict. The anxiety that is veritably caused by the politics of the capitalist world influences people either individually or socially because all people are connected in the same capitalist system. On the other hand, life is constantly blessed, and technology serves to embellish life in this age. The services of capitalism are disguised within the discourse of freedom. Capitalism can easily present itself as an impeccable medium for people. However, the offerings of capitalism always come with a price, and people live in a kind of illusion; this is what Karl Marx defined as 'false consciousness.'

In a postmodern age, the vulnerability of human relations pervades in all domains of life, from love to sexuality, from loneliness to isolation and connection

to alienation. It has become more difficult to establish secure relationships, not only with the outer world but also with our inner world and people. As a result of this vulnerability and insecurity, people may experience an identity crisis, making them more alienated and depressed. Furthermore, the high expectations and the social requirements of the neoliberal age push people into a crisis where they cannot find their true identities. In this century, neoliberalism is the grand narrative, and all human beings are influenced by it separately or collectively:

People are competitive beings focused on their own profit. This benefits society as a whole because competition entails everyone doing their best to come out on top. As a result, we get better and cheaper products and more efficient services within a single free market, unhampered by government intervention. This is ethically right because success or failure in that competition depends entirely on individual effort. So everyone is responsible for their own success or failure. Hence the importance of education, because we live in a rapidly evolving knowledge economy that requires highly trained individuals with flexible competencies. A single higher-education qualification is good, two is better, and lifelong learning a must. Everyone must continue to grow because competition is fierce. That's what lies behind the current compulsion for performance interviews and constant evaluations, all steered by an invisible hand from central management (Verhaeghe, 2014: 112-113).

Verhaeghe's focus on the role of neoliberalism as 'an invisible hand from central management' is significant because it shows that people wittingly or unwittingly directed by a mechanism that disguises itself in very different forms. These forms can be obsessions, material desires, addictions, lies in relationships, relationships that are devoid of true love, or the eternal quest for love. These are all some of the themes of *The Architect*. Furthermore, the body as a medium of neoliberalism becomes prominent to understand the depth of relations in the play.

In this chapter, I focus on the alienation of family members from each other, their existential crises, their search for a better place in the hectic pace of a modern world, and how they form a love relationship either in a marriage or in a typical dating relationship. Furthermore, the characters trapped in their personal stories contribute to the general flow of the acts separately. Their struggle to create a different personal account in different places makes them both close to each other and alienated from each other, as Bauman states:

None of the connections that come to fill the gap left by the absent or mouldy bonds are, however, guaranteed to last. Anyway, they need to be only loosely tied, so that they can be untied again, with little delay, when the settings change – as in liquid modernity they surely will, over and over again (Bauman, 2003: vii).

In the whole of the play, there is an ongoing change both for the people and for the places. These changes may reference the liquidity of modern life, as Bauman expresses in the above quote. Nowadays, no one can count on having a comfort zone instead. Instead, everybody must be ready for changes. Because the political, economic, and social circumstances of life for human beings have always been changing, and humans have become the subjects of these changes.

Harvey also focuses on the effects of neoliberalism on the structure of family and other types of relationships. He states:

This is a world that has become increasingly characterized by a hedonistic culture of consumerist excess. It has destroyed the myth (though not ideology) that the nuclear family is the solid sociological foundation for capitalism and embraces, however, tardily and incompletely, multiculturalism, women's rights and equality of sexual preference. The impact is increasing individualistic isolation, anxiety, short-termism and neurosis in the midst of one of the greatest material urban achievements ever constructed in human history (Harvey, 2010: 175-176).

Harvey's stress on the evolution of the spaces and the evolution of human relationships are linear because any change in one of them requires a change in the other. Therefore, humans and relationships are formed differently under capitalism and the neoliberalism of the last century. However, the impacts of these mechanisms are not necessarily good for humans. Although neoliberalism pretends to put the individual in the center of his/her actions and success in modern life, it employs the individual as a puppet for long-term goals. Humans are generally not aware that they are the system's puppets for the sake of neoliberalism because the blessings of it surround them.

However, in the above quote, Harvey expresses that 'individualistic isolation, anxiety, short-termism, and neurosis' are the other impacts of neoliberalism. Namely, both the blessings and the adverse effects of neoliberalism dominate humans and their relationships in this age. These contradictions smoothly penetrate the minds, bodies, and relationships of human beings. However, this leads them to be anxious, neurotic, isolated, and alienated.

Anthony Giddens indicates that the personal crises of people and the crises in human relationships do not separate themselves from the crises of modernity. The consequences of this are important:

The coming of modernity, it might be accepted, brings about major changes in the external social environment of the individual, affecting marriage and the family as well as

other institutions; yet people carry on their personal lives much as they always did, coping as best they can with the social transformations around them. Or do they? For social circumstances are not separate from personal life, nor are they just an external environment to them. In struggling with intimate problems, individuals help actively to reconstruct the universe of social activity around them (Giddens, 1991: 13).

In this chapter, we will see the connection of people to each other and their separation from each other. The characters' pursuit of love and space, their perception of sexuality and home, their approach to jobs, and most importantly, to their true selves will be the major concerns of this chapter. Furthermore, how the characters deal with their internal problems and the outer problems are of great importance because both of these types of problems can be interpreted as the product of modernism. Therefore, to understand these relationships and the dynamics of these relationships, we often need to refer to modernity and its crises in the scope of postdramatic theatre.

2.1. Father and Son

As a symbol of procreation, ownership, domination and courage, the father is an inhibiting and, in psychoanalytic terms, a castrating figure. He stands for all figures of authority in education, employment, the armed forces, the law, and for God himself. The role of the father is regarded as one which discourages attempts at independence and exercise an influence which impoverishes, constrains, undermines, renders impotent and makes submissive (Chevalier and Gheerbrant, 1996: 372).

Leo, the protagonist of the play, is at the core of all forms of relationships in *The Architect*. His dream of creating new urban areas for people literally causes him to act like a God, even in other domains of his life. He acts like a God in his familial and professional relationships. Throughout his marriage, he has never faced resistance from his wife and children, thus he feels that he is a strong man both at home and at work. In any case, Greig's choice of Leo as the protagonist's name cannot be coincidental. Because in Greek mythology, Leo, as a zodiac sign, refers to Zeus 'archetype of the patriarchal head of family' (Eliade, 1958: 77), and it corresponds to:

This zodiacal type corresponds to the high-powered character of the strong-willed fanatic driven by the obsession to do. The love of action, that emotionally active strength, is controlled and directed towards a goal and subservient to the long-term designs. A strong nature, inherently endowed with a full-blooded enjoyment of life, finds justification for existence by making the heavens ring with its achievements (Chevalier and Gheerbrant, 1996: 594).

Leo, who is galvanized by projects, designs, and buildings, concentrates on achieving more. He always has long-term plans in his mind. In that sense, he is an entrepreneurial character who always aims for the most for himself. He wants to impart his ambitious and energetic personality to his son; however, Martin constantly denounces his father, which makes Leo despondent.

In *The Architect*, the relationship of father and son is introduced at the very beginning of the play. When Martin first returns home from school, because he has run out of money, he and his father have a positive encounter. They talk to each other in the building site where Leo is responsible for the construction process. Leo talks to Martin boastfully about his job, especially his role in the building site.

Leo Some professions, Martin, exist only or mainly, to provide particular people with a congenial way of earning their living. Publishing, for example, or radio, you mentioned radio. These people, these publishers and so on, they're interesting. I've met them sometimes. They're creative people. Their surroundings are, if you like, seductive. But in the end, these are people without effect in the world. Do you see what I'm saying? They have no... power to shape, no responsibility (Greig, 2002: 95).

Leo is so proud of himself and his job; he believes he creates ideal places for people in the world. He tries to convince Martin of the importance of his job. According to Leo, people demand him as an architect, but he does not need others to form his life. However, Martin is quite indifferent to his father's job and his boastings. Instead, he implies that his father is equally as important as the other people contributing to the project. Martin insistently asks for his father's exact contribution to the project. Leo patiently replies to these questions; however, Martin is still pushing the limits. Since he asks such questions several times, Leo becomes annoyed at Martin.

It becomes clear that Martin is challenging his father, when he asks if his father could build a building that is so high, that he would not hit the ground if he fell. At this point Martin is blatantly questioning his father's competence. He pushes his father further, but stating that the model of the building site is quite different from the real one. Highlighting that his father's visionary design at the beginning of the project and the real design are totally different from each other:

Martin You said there was going to be a tower. There's a tower on the model.

Leo The buildings take shape, become solid.

Martin There's no tower here.

Leo People live in them, work in them...

Martin There's some lumps.

Leo We have an effect. You understand?

Martin *refers to the model.*

Martin Nothing like that.

Leo The tower's going to be over there. At the head of the docks. Where the fish market used to be. They're still digging foundations. But you can imagine (Greig, 2002: 96).

Martin's insistence that there is a difference between the model and the real architecture creates tension between him and his father. When Martin refuses to wear a hardhat while entering the building area, Leo loses his temper and shouts:

Leo What the hell is the problem with you?

There's no pain in wearing it.

It won't hurt your head.

I said to put on (Greig, 2002: 99).

Martin's resistance to his father makes Leo angry because he also dreams of Martin working with him. Martin is vital for Leo because he is a necessary component for establishing a family business in the near future:

Leo I wanted you to see the work.

I'm offering you a job, Martin.

You don't do anything... you're drifting... you don't – I've been thinking for a while now, just the time hasn't been right, I've been considering the idea of setting my own. Small scale. Nothing big, not yet anyway. It's only an idea at the moment but this job is coming to an end and...

I want to get back to... a certain control. Understand?

There's prestige but there's no control (Greig, 2002: 101).

Leo dreams of establishing his own business, and he looks for support from his son. However, Martin refuses this offer. He is only interested in the models of the buildings:

Martin The model's clean. Is that deliberate? When you make them? They don't look anything like real buildings. There's no dirt. No mess around them. Just white card, patches of green felt and pretend trees. They look like film buildings. They look as though the sun's always shining on them.

Leo Do you want to work with me or not?

...

It would be a job.

Martin Can I do the models?

Leo You'd have to start at the bottom... but you'd be trained. I could start you off with –

Martin I could be in charge of making the models look real. Cover the walls in graffiti or something ... put little models of dossers under the bridges... Use my know-how. Could I do that (Greig, 2002: 102)?

Martin's focus is so far from his father's dream that his interest is childish compared to Leo's purpose in life. Leo and Martin do not approve of each other's preferences; therefore, they cannot clearly express themselves. For example, Leo accuses Martin of muttering, which makes Leo too furious.

Leo You mutter, Martin, do you know that? You're a mutterer. Under your breath. You speak behind your hand. Do you notice yourself doing it?

Martin (*muttering*) No.

Leo If you've got something to say. Say it clearly. Make the point.

...

You have to think about your presentation.

Think about how you come across.

...

He offers Martin a cigarette.

Martin I don't smoke.

Leo Quite right too (Greig, 2002: 99-100).

Leo regards that he has a traditional role as a father so he must guide his son choose the same job as him, they must establish a family business together and enhance it, because only a family business can provide wealth, prestige, and control for his family. Importance and management are two crucial concepts for Leo because, in a neoliberal economy, only a few families share a country's wealth. Therefore, Leo, a lively character, tries to start from the bottom to manage his family's life well by making more money with his son. However, Martin does not support his father. Instead, he sometimes despises his father's job. He tells Dorothy:

Martin Dorothy, I came home because I ran out of money.

No other reason.

A business arrangement.

...

Does that shock you (Greig, 2002: 112)?

To Martin, forming a family is similar to signing a business arrangement. He could not separate himself from his father because he is penniless. The family bonds, which he does not care about, can be used for materialistic wishes. As Bauman states that family bonds have changed in time:

According to Max Weber, the constitutive act of modern capitalism was the separation of business from the household - which meant, simultaneously, the separation of producers from the sources of their livelihood (as Karl Polanyi added, invoking Karl Marx's insight). That double act set the actions of profit-making, as well as making one's livelihood, free from the web of moral and emotional, family and neighbourly bonds - but by the same token it also emptied such actions of all the meanings it used to carry before (Bauman, 2001: 29).

The bonds that Bauman mentions above have been emptied and people are left with a sense of discontent because if there is not a material profit in something, then it is useless to maintain them. Martin precisely represents this type of materialistic person. If he had been able to afford his life himself, he would not have returned to his family house back. He frankly says this. Martin is so alienated from his father that he thinks Leo is not his biological father:

Martin I'm going to be a chef. I've been thinking about it. In France, I'll get taught. It's an admired art in France you know. Cuisine. Means kitchen and cooking. Same word. I think I might be a bastard.

Dorothy You are.

Martin Not, really. An actual bastard. I think mum fucked someone else. I'm not like him, am I? Do you think I'm like him?

Dorothy Yes.

Martin No, I'm not. I'm like mum (Greig, 2002: 112).

Martin's refusal of his father is severe in the play. He tries to earn his sister's approval as he does not resemble his father. When Martin learns that his father and mother will split up, Martin is again indifferent to this family crisis. He is only interested in the financial situation he will find himself in, in case of a divorce. The dialogue below shows the family crisis:

Martin What do you want me to say?

Leo This doesn't affect you, of course, this is still your home ...

Martin Am I supposed to say something?

Paulina Say what you want to say.

Dorothy Does anybody want any water?

Leo If you want to talk about it. Of course we can talk about it.

Martin ...

No.

Dorothy Anyone? Water?

Leo We'll still be a family, of course. Obviously we still... both of us... still love –

Martin What about money?

Dorothy Martin.

Martin I'm sorry. I didn't mean to say that. I meant...

Leo I don't think you need to worry about money.

Martin Sorry.

Silence.

What are you going to do? (Greig, 2002: 190).

Martin's perception of family is associated with money, as seen in the above quotation. His reaction to a family crisis shows that he does not care about familial relationships and does not pretend to seem more interested in this situation. According to him, money is the bond that ties family members to each other; this is why he is concerned about his financial future. Leo and Martin have already been separated from each other for a long time, and his separation from home and his mother will also not influence Martin negatively.

Leo represents a traditional family father; Martin, however, is representative of change because he is unconcerned about his father's traditional role and his father's attempt to establish a new family order together. Leo is lucid about his life and his capabilities. He puts feasible goals ahead of him, and he is progressive. Conversely, Martin does not depend on his father, and when compared to his father, he is an escapist. Their alienation from each other, as a father and a son, indicates that family bonds do not function properly in the tough structure of capitalism and modernism in today's world. Relationships can easily be reduced to money and finance, which have become the new authoritative forces.

Responsibility lies with mothers; there are no fathers anymore. They disappeared because their function was undermined. Until recently, the West possessed a tradition of authority symbolically vested in individuals ('Thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother'). Representatives of authority were themselves subject to the system, and could also be held accountable. These days, we live in a world where power is anonymous and cannot be localised, and therefore no longer exercises any moral authority (Verhaeghe, 2014: 213).

Verhaeghe's stress on fathers vanishing in a modern world is applicable when examining the relationship of Leo and Martin. Leo, dedicated to his job, is

alienated from his son, and his authority is not accepted in his own home. We can say that Leo is dominant at his workplace. However, he fails to be a dominant father figure at home. His power as an architect does not transcend into his familial life.

In that sense, Leo's identity is divided into subgroups, as powerful and powerless depending on where he is. One notable difference between his professional and familial lives is that at home everybody is a different individual, and they do not need their father to validate their actions.

Parson's statement can also be interpreted to assess Leo and Martin's relationship as a father and a son. Parson states that:

When we speak of the father as role model or as the prototype of masculinity, we are directly emphasizing his symbolic significance. It is more than the relationship to this particular man which is involved, but it is what this man *means* in a generalized sense. What he means, in turn, must be interpreted in terms of his being an example of a generalized pattern of qualities and behavior. At the beginning of the process the boy experiences his father only as exclusive and particular as an individual. In the course of time he comes to see him as an *example* of the generalized pattern. Only then can he be said to *evaluate* his father as distinguished from *reacting to* him (Parsons, 1970: 46).

Martin does not see his father as a role model. Instead, he chooses a different life path compared to Leo. Martin's muttering and Leo's speaking up reflect their separation because they cannot find common ground to understand each other. For Martin, Leo is only an '*example* of the generalized pattern' just like Parson's statement.

Although Leo is dissatisfied with the tension between him and Martin, he still hopes that he and Martin can do business together because he innately trusts in him. Thus he seeks support from his daughter. Leo tells:

Leo He would be good at it, you know, he doesn't think so but he could do it... he only needs to get to grips with himself. He's still drifting but if I can... now that he's come home if we can bring him in... give him some solidity. He said he used to play with the models. When he was little. I'd forgotten that (Greig, 2002: 115).

Martin fails to map out a route for himself. On the one hand, he harshly criticizes his father and his job. On the other hand, he unrealistically wishes to be a chef, a sandwich maker, or a carpenter. His distracted ideas indicate that he cannot actually assess himself and his capacity, like his father. He is indeed a

wanderer in the neoliberal market, which exploits the people's unconscious mind. Martin, unemployed in the system, humiliates his father.

Leo believes that he thinks the best for Martin because the neoliberal economy, which people are bound to, neither tolerates economic defaults nor gives them a second chance. He does not want his son to be suppressed on his own in such a rough economy. Hence he instinctively tries to guide and support his son. Otherwise, Martin will drift from one job to another in a harsh system. Leo sometimes blames himself for not having a stable relationship with Martin, but he does not recognize that he is also trapped in the system.

2.2. Father and Daughter

The relationship between Leo and Dorothy as father and daughter is superficial. Dorothy works with her father as a secretary; she is responsible for public relations with his father, Leo. Unlike her brother Martin, Dorothy's work approach is more accountable because she regularly goes to work and acts professionally. Although Dorothy seems alienated from her father, she actually loves him. This is seen in how she attacks her mother and brother, lashing out at them because they do not treat Leo decently. She tells Martin:

Dorothy Why do you have to say such horrible things about him?

Why do you have to attack him?

Martin I'm not attacking him.

Dorothy You are. He thinks you avoid it.

Martin I do (Greig, 2002: 112).

Dorothy also gets angry with her mother, Paulina, because she does not defend her husband in front of Sheena:

Dorothy Why did you do that, Mum?

Paulina Do what?

Dorothy Behave like that? In front of that woman. Why?

Paulina How did I behave?

Dorothy As though you were neurotic. You behaved as though you were neurotic.

Paulina I only said –

Dorothy He was humiliated. In front of –

Paulina I only said ...

Dorothy In front of everyone –

Paulina I was commenting on ...

Dorothy you made him look small (Greig, 2002: 170-171).

Dorothy, ashamed of her mother's behavior, urges her to apologize to Leo. Dorothy believes family members, whether they are right or wrong, must be defended by other family members. They must create unity among them. In a sense, family must disguise their defects in front of everyone. Dorothy goes on attacking her mom:

Paulina Dorothy

Dorothy Why do you have to make him ...

Why can't you be decent to him?

You used to be decent to him?

Paulina It's difficult ...

Dorothy Try.

Paulina It's complicated. You wouldn't – (Greig, 2002: 171).

Paulina, who wishes to divorce Leo, cannot explain her nonsense behaviors to Dorothy. To her, her marriage is a disaster, and no one can help solve it. Dorothy's insistence in defending her father against Martin and Paulina stems from her devotion to her father. Furthermore, as mentioned in the previous section, Leo's symbolic meaning can also be supported by Dorothy as Electra.

In any case Electra symbolizes passionate love for parents going so far as to equate them in death. In this equality in the grave, in the demand for justice against injustice, Electra becomes once more at one with the symbol of the myth and restores the Harmony ordained by Fate (Chevalier and Gheerbrant, 1996: 344).

This quote epitomizes Dorothy's inner devotion to Leo, as well as her mission to seek justice for him. However, she is also pursuing a more adventurous life, and so to fulfill her desire, she hitchhikes at night. She likes to meet strangers and express herself clearly to them. However, she avoids a close connection with her father, even though she often supports him when he is not with her. This avoidance may stem from Leo's psychological absence from the family as a father for a very long time. This absence ironically came because he is a workaholic who tries to find new income for his family and their future.

When Dorothy is in her bedroom, Leo talks to her about work and Martin's refusal of his job offer. Leo is no confrontational in the discussion, but she is still uncomfortable and doesn't want to talk with him. She sees her father's entrance to the room as a threat, and she wants to exit from the room immediately. When Leo does not let her go, she stays inside and listens to his father. Yet, she does not actively participate in the conversation:

Leo You see, Dorothy.

This is difficult for me to say.

But ...

I feel slightly... alone.

At the moment.

Dorothy Oh.

Leo I'm telling you this because...

Well things are ...

Martin... your mother. I can't seem to talk to them...

Dorothy I told you. You're my dad.

Leo I want you to know that I love you.

Leo Dad. I'm sorry. I don't want to seem. It's your business, isn't it? You and Mum. I'm glad you feel you can talk to me. I love you. You love me. It's difficult to talk about that sort of things so the effort is... appreciated. But you don't have to say. That's the nice thing about families, isn't it? You just know. You don't always have to say (Greig, 2002: 177-178).

Leo is desperate, and he appeals to his daughter for the mistakes he has made in the last project because he ignored the advice from other people. Leo's loneliness does not bother Dorothy; thus she dismisses from her father's plea. Dorothy does not want to share the same room with Leo. They cannot form a togetherness out of their loneliness, as stated by Bauman below:

It is because of our loneliness that we open up to Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being-with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in present (Bauman, 2002: 102).

Leo, who is in the middle of a family and career crisis, feels lonely. When he sees that no one supporting his attempts to economically prosper in his family, his loneliness makes him

depressed, and he finally unburdens himself to his daughter. According to the Bauman quotation above, the feeling of loneliness can change people's behavior, and it makes people connect with other people because of ethical responsibility. In that moment, Leo's close attitude towards his daughter can be explained by his ethical struggle to overcome his loneliness.

This feeling of loneliness is not just a problem for Leo. Loneliness in a crowd or a family is one of the outcomes of neoliberalism. Individualism and freedom are the core values of neoliberalism. These values cannot be restricted to the economic sphere; they also show their effect in personal and familial spheres. To comprehend the highly individualistic behavior of people, this effect must be examined within all scopes, including family, health, education, tourism, and culture:

As the entrepreneur of its own self, the neoliberal subject has no capacity for relationships with others that might be *free of purpose*. Nor do entrepreneurs know what purpose-free friendship would even look like. Fundamentally, freedom signifies a *relationship*. A real feeling of freedom occurs only in a fruitful relationship – when being with others brings happiness. But today's neoliberal regime leads to utter isolation; as such, it does not really free us at all (Han, 2017: 12-13).

Leo is driven by the psychological forces of gaining more money and establishing a business with his son. He is an example of one of the greedy members of a neoliberal society focusing on monetary gain. However, his greediness in the economic system does not stem from a defect of his character but from being surrounded by neoliberal media. Leo is a neoliberal agent of the system, as is stated above by Byung-Chul Han. He is devoid of a close connection with his daughter, and they are not happy with their togetherness in the same place, home. As a common place for them, the home does not help them repel their loneliness; but they are bound to live there together in loneliness as passive agents of neoliberal hegemony. Michael Schluter and David Lee specify the changing role of homes as in the below quote:

Homes are no longer warm islands of intimacy among the fast-cooling seas of privacy. Homes have turned from shared playgrounds of love and friendship into the sites of territorial skirmishes, and from building sites of togetherness into the assemblies of fortified bunkers. We have stepped into our separate houses and closed the door, and then stepped into our separate rooms and closed the door. The home becomes a multi-purpose leisure centre where household members can live, as it were, separately side by side (Schluter and Lee, 1993: 37).

Dorothy does not want to speak with her father. She is not accustomed to such proximity between the two of them, and with the excuse of being thirsty, she attempts to leave the room:

Leo You think if you could go back

I've been thinking...

If I could go back.

Go back to the point where the mistake happened.

At the moment.

Dorothy Oh God.

Leo What?

Dorothy I can't.

Leo Can't what?

Dorothy This conversation.

Can't do it. Sorry.

Leo I feel lost, Dorothy.

I have no plans for this.

It's not part of the design.

Tell me the truth, Dorothy...

Does he hate me?

Does he despise me?

Dorothy As a matter of fact I feel very thirsty now.

She puts on her dressing gown and leaves (Greig, 2002: 178).

Dorothy has an avoidant attitude towards Leo, and she feels insecure in this relationship. Leo feels loss, and is far off course on a project he is working on. This means double the psychological exhaustion for him. Furthermore, Leo's self-disclosure in the above quote gives us a clue about his character as well. Leo is accustomed to having specific plans and designs for his actions. In that sense, he can be interpreted as a control freak, a workaholic man in the neoliberal system where he must

be flexible enough to adapt himself to changing conditions at work, and minor issues must not beat him. However, Sennett interprets flexibility as a destructive force against the identity of humans. Although flexibility seems to give people freedom, it is actually in the interest of power because it creates a new form of disorder and limits (Sennett,1998: 65). However, this ambiguity traps him, and he does not know how to deal with the ambiguity, disorder, and undersigned and unplanned future.

The neoliberal imperative of self-optimization serves only to promote perfect functioning within the system. Inhibitions, points of weakness and mistakes are to be therapeutically eliminated in order to enhance efficiency and performance. In turn, everything is made comparable and measurable and subjected to the logic of the market. It is not concern for the good life that drives self-optimization. Rather, self-optimization follows from systemic constraints – from the logic of quantifying success on the market (Han, 2017: 37).

Leo feels lost when he cannot perform well at the market as an architect, and this sense of loss spreads to other spheres of his life, like family issues. The tension he lives with can be explained with the quotation below:

If the family is indeed ‘a haven in a heartless world’, an oasis where non-market relations can hold sway while the rest of our social lives the public world remains the desert created by the neoliberal values of competition, aggression, greed and exploitation, then why is it that today’s neoliberal revolutionaries are such staunch advocates of the family an institution that stands in contrast to, and thus as against, the homo economicus of the public world? If neoliberalism requires that we treat each other merely as means to each other’s economic ends as it does then how can it even tolerate, let alone insist on, a fundamental social institution whose central values and precepts stand in clear and direct contradiction to all that it otherwise stands for? (Brecher, 2012: 169-160).

The neoliberal values stated above by Brecher prevail freely in the market, and they are both willingly and unwillingly absorbed by people. They make people more competitive, aggressive, greedy, and exploitative in the market and every sphere of life. The nuclear family, as an important unit of a neoliberal society, is highly influenced by those values. Traditional values no longer define the relationships in the family

but the values of the market. It is also notable that the transformation from extended family structure to nuclear family structure is the consequence of changing Western market values. To understand any family structure better, we must apply it to anthropology, but the association between neoliberalism and changing family structures in the last century is quite explicit.

Between Leo and Dorothy, there is not a hierarchical relationship between father and daughter. Leo's focus on his job and profitable projects have put him at a great distance from his children, and now, he cannot close this gap by simply telling her daughter that he loves her. This is mainly because to Dorothy, family is formed spontaneously; it is unnecessary to express feelings at home.

2.3. Husband and Wife

Leo and Paulina have been married for nearly twenty years, and we witness the last days of their relationships as a husband and a wife. They seem quite indifferent to each other, and they cannot generate a coherent conversation between the two of them. The questions they ask each other are either unanswered or responded differently in the conversation's general harmony.

As the loneliest character in the play, Paulina lives in a different world full of plants, flowers, pots, and an obsession with purity and cleanliness. Paulina is introduced to the readers in the sixth scene. While Leo is quite eager to attend an evening invitation, Paulina refuses to go with her husband. They argue about going to the invitation. Finally, Leo does not go to the invitation alone and excuses that his wife is ill that night. This is the first relational crisis between them, and through the play, the troubles get bigger. The second encounter between Leo and Pauline hints even more at their disconnect. They are eating dinner together:

Leo This is nice.

Paulina Do you think so?

Leo Really?

Good.

Home cooking.

Paulina I bought it.

Leo Shame the kids...

Seems silly to call them kids...

Doesn't seem the right word, does it?

Shame they couldn't eat with us.

We should eat together more. As a family.

If I'd known we... I'd have asked...

Paulina They're out. Didn't say where.

Leo A family dinner. Now Martin's home. Everyone round the table. Do the washing up together... like we used to (Greig, 2002: 120).

Leo's yearning for a family dinner is obvious in his speech because he knows that he has been quite far from his family and home due to his excessive work. As one of the ambitious workers in a neoliberal system, Leo cannot balance his family and work. In a system where overworking is both obliged and appreciated, Leo ignores his family and home both wittingly or unwittingly. In this scene, family dinner represents a bond that belongs to a traditional value. The superficial dialogues between Leo and Paulina may stem from the tenuous bond in their relationship. They both are the puppets of a society based on consumption values. From a Baumanian perspective, this can be interpreted as:

No lasting bonds emerge in the activity of consumption. Those bonds that manage to be tied in the act of consumption may, but may not, outlast the act; they may hold swarms together for the duration of their flight (that is, until the next change of target), but they are admittedly occasion-bound and otherwise thin and flimsy, having little bearing, if any at all on the subsequent moves of the units, while throwing little if any light on the units' past histories (Bauman, 2007: 78).

Leo and Paulina cannot cooperate in their relationship like they cannot cooperate at the dinner table. They both feel insecure in their marriage, and they drift further apart by keeping more and more of themselves and their lives from each other.

When we dive into Paulina's character, we see that she distrusts her husband's assertion that he has not cheated her before. She does not believe that he has not cheated on her, even though he has assured her that he has remained faithful. As if a mind reader, she has always believed that she knows what Leo is thinking:

Leo You remember Eden Court? Paulina?

The housing estate I did... for the council...

'71 I think, feels like yesterday of course,

Martin was just born.

A woman came to me today.

She wants it blown up.

Paulina Are you having an affair?

Leo ...

I'm sorry?

Paulina Have you had one? Recently?

Leo What makes you think ...

Paulina I'm asking.

Leo No. No. I haven't, Paulina. No.

...

I'm not having an affair.

Paulina You wouldn't tell me if you were.

Leo Is there some kind of problem here, you don't believe me?

Paulina You were chatting. You usually chat to me when you feel guilty about something.

Leo For God's sake. I was talking about work (Greig, 2002: 121).

Leo, bored with defending himself to Paulina, becomes unhappy at home, and he sees that he cannot share his true self with anyone in the family. We also learn that Paulina is strict with her diet; she is concerned about the pesticides and chemicals in the fruits and vegetables. She always worries about the pesticides, chemicals, acidic rains, and infections that may influence her. She states that she would be a fruitarian (Greig, 2002: 125) because she cannot bear the thought of flesh inside her. Giddens's point can be beneficial to understand Paulina's obsession:

The members of this generation drank a great deal of alcohol, and smoked millions of tobacco goods, before the toxic effects of these were fully realised; environmental pollution, believed by many medical specialists to increase susceptibility to major diseases of various sorts, has sharply increased; and for much of their lives they have eaten food containing many additives and treated by chemical fertilisers, with consequences for health that are at best unknown and at worst may help produce some of the leading killer diseases. In terms of basic life security, nonetheless, the risk-reducing elements seem substantially to outweigh the new array of risks (Giddens, 1991: 95).

Paulina's obsession is indeed a real problem in modern times because of the growing awareness of their effects of pollution. Production and consumption has transformed society into a throwaway society, where people have increased the value of convenience and disposable products, which is harmful to the

environment. Paulina feels responsible for the wellbeing of the planet and stands at an eco-centric point in the play. Her discomfort and awareness of being polluted or eating polluted things actually make her sick; this can be interpreted as one of the illnesses of modern times.

Apart from her obsessions, Paulina also has a fear of abandonment deep inside. Although she gives Leo a hard time because she believes that he is cheating on her, she does not want him to leave her. She cries a lot and cannot overcome her fear. She begs Leo:

Paulina Don't leave me, Leo.

Don't go away.

Leo I'm not going anywhere.

Paulina They are gone. Don't you go too (Greig, 2002: 126).

Paulina's desperate cry to Leo reveals her vulnerability because she feels that her children leave her as they have grown up. Her fear also seems to center around the fact that she also does not want to be left by her husband. Her relationship with her children does not give her a sense of security; on the contrary, her motherhood is no longer valued. When she loses the dignity and privilege of being a mother, she begs her husband to stay with her. However, she is obsessed with the cleanliness, poison, and her husband's cheating that she cannot approach Leo sincerely. Leo attempts to soothe Paulina, but he fails. When Paulina breaks a plate accidentally, Leo says:

Leo You snapped. That's all. What with Martin coming home and... I've not been in the best moods. I've not helped. You snapped. It's probably a good thing.

Paulina Such a poor gesture.

Leo The thing is ... we need to get things clear between us. I've left you drift away from me. We don't communicate. The two of us. In our own worlds. But we're lucky. That's what we have to remember. We're the lucky ones. We have everything... that's what's important to remember.

He is now standing behind her. He tries to kiss her. Her resistance is tired.

You feel so good.

Paulina Leo.

Leo So soft.

Paulina Go to bed.

Leo So lovely.

He starts trying to undress her. She is stiff. Corpse-like, she gives nothing. He continues. He kisses her breasts. She holds his head. She tolerates him.

So lovely. Such a beautiful woman. So beautiful (Greig, 2002: 138-139).

Leo is aware of some mistakes in their relationship, for example, he focuses on their lack of communication or that they live different lives in their own worlds, separate from each other. He attempts to soften Paulina with his words. However, Paulina is stiff and unresponsive. Furthermore, Leo's statement that they have everything strictly refers to the material things they have. Leo is materialistic and a workaholic. He gives much importance to commodities they own as a family. After acquiring commodities like a house and a car imposed by the system, he believes they have everything. However, they lack intimacy with each other, and their commodities cannot guarantee an intimate relationship between them as a husband and a wife. The broken plate refers to their broken relationship, and Paulina's stiffness can be interpreted as a sign of their upcoming break-up.

The problems between this couple grow like a snowball and even minor issues ignite an argument. When they are in the garden:

Paulina I want you to put concrete over the grass.

Leo I won't lose you.

You have to...

We both –

Paulina I don't want grass.

Leo All of us have to stop this... falling apart that's happening here.

Paulina I want a patio.

Leo This is my family.

Families have problems. It's natural. You expect it.

Paulina Leave space for the roses.

Leo But you can't just...

You have to pull things back together.

Paulina All the rest concrete (Greig, 2002: 147).

Both Paulina's indifference and Leo's attempts to solve some hidden problems represent the silent crises in their marriage. Here, Paulina's wish to put concrete over the grass serves as a metaphor for their marriage. Their marriage can be likened to the garden's green grass, and the grey concrete symbolizes their upcoming break-up. Furthermore, Paulina's last words are also outrageous because tall concrete structures are the symbols of neoliberalism. This is

especially true in metropolitan cities. They show the power of the market economy, which has been mostly based on concrete buildings. Soon, their family connections will remain under concrete realities, and they will fall apart. Paulina cannot carry the burden of the marriage. She cannot rescue herself from her deep loneliness and meaninglessness even after so many years of togetherness. Like Kierkegaard's emphasis that marriage does not let individuals act freely, Paulina has never been able to think freely, let alone act (Kierkegaard, 1992: 266). Paulina's meaningless insistence on Leo about what he should call her constantly worsens their relationship:

Paulina You want me to be touched. Moved. As though your voice making that sound might stir me up.

Leo Doesn't it?

Paulina No. That's the interesting thing. Paulina. It feels like it isn't my name any more. Feels more connected with you now than with me.

Leo What then?

What can I say to stir you up?

Paulina Dressing-table. Bedroom. Husband. Living-room. Sofa. Carpet. Wall.

Leo What?

Paulina Dinner party. Garden. Cheeseboard. Paulina.

Leo Are you having a break-down? Is that what this is?

Paulina Making love. Making love (Greig, 2002:181).

Paulina's fragmented sentences in her speech show that her mental discomfort is deep because she is obsessed with the objects at home and is constantly rearranging things at home or in the garden. Since she has a formalist attitude, design is important for her. Her fragmented and discordant sentences in the dialogue reveal that she does not listen to Leo and reply to him accordingly, she just keeps talking. At the end of this conversation, Paulina wants Leo to leave the house, and Leo is shocked:

Paulina I realise it's your house as much as it's mine. More maybe. But I'd like you to leave it. Would you do that for me? As a gesture of affection. You're not an unusually cruel man. You'd be better at living somewhere else than me.

Leo For Christ's sake. It's not gone that far, has it?

Paulina It will.

Leo A trial separation.

Paulina Not trial. A separation.

Leo You want to throw away a marriage. Just like that.

Paulina Not 'throw-away'. Those are the wrong words.

Leo I'm sorry. I don't have a thesaurus.

Paulina If you could throw it away forget it, start again etc. all those things but... go back to a time before it happened and follow a different route but... wherever I go now, for the rest of my life I'll take this marriage with me. For better or worse, I'm not throwing it away.

Leo Why now? More than twenty years you've had, and now, today you say it's a mistake... why not yesterday, why not years ago? (Greig, 2002: 182).

Leo and Paulina fail in their marriage because their expectations for their relationships differ from each other. Now because of Paulina's wish to split up, we learn that their marriage is like a disposable product. Their marriage petered out in time, and has transformed into a thing to throw away. Paulina wishes to end this marriage because she feels burn-out after twenty years. Paulina's unfulfilled desires bring her to this end. However, she is still desperate about her future because her divorce will not enable her a fresh start. Paulina says that because of her fear, she could not attempt to divorce in the past but now that has changed:

Leo Fear? Afraid of me? Don't make me laugh.

Paulina Afraid of me. Afraid there wasn't any of me left.

Afraid I'd eroded.

...

I am trying, Leo...

Does that explain?

Leo No, it fucking doesn't.

Paulina Don't you feel it? Feel yourself eroding?

Leo No. No, I don't. (Greig, 2002: 182).

Paulina's fear of herself is due to her loneliness and estrangement from her husband and children throughout their marriage. However, she realizes that she is not afraid of herself any longer. She does not want to be eroded in the union, her character has been oppressed under Leo's presence for a very long time, and she could not reveal her identity. Their marriage became a prison for Paulina, and even after a very long time she does not want to miss an opportunity if there is for herself.

Paulina You're part of a situation that developed. That's all. Not your fault.

Leo I mean more to you than that.

I think you forget sometimes, Paulina, that I know you.

I know you better than anyone.

Paulina You know your wife. When you leave you'll notice a wife-shaped space (Greig, 2002: 184).

Although Leo claims that he knows Paulina better than anyone else, Paulina thinks the opposite. The situation that developed is the wreckage of their marriage in which Leo and Paulina were alienated from each other. Leo tries to overcome this alienation:

Leo We need to have fun again. That's all it is. We stopped having fun. Kids and everything. Responsibility. Changes to you. We need to rekindle... get back, and ... I can't believe you feel nothing. I can't believe there's nothing there.

Paulina There's knowledge. I know you. Knowledge and a sort of disgust. The sort of disgust a prisoner feels for a cell mate. That's all (Greig, 2002: 184).

The prison statement above is of great importance because Leo takes the prison metaphor, and he uses it for his work later:

Leo No point in planning if anything you build can be turned into a prison.

Paulina Houses though, Leo.

Leo Anything you think up can be made dangerous.

Paulina Still. You and Martin. You could teach him. Talk to him. Make progress.

Leo No matter how high you build something. No matter how well you build it. No matter how beautiful it is. You can't build a thing high enough that if you fell of you wouldn't hit the ground (Greig, 2002: 193).

After an unsuccessful attempt to build a prestigious project in the city, Leo's sadness makes him disappointed. He sees that his disappointment is not limited to his work but his marriage. The survival of their marriage depended on their children's existence for twenty years, but now Paulina wants to end it. Once their marriage created a safe zone that united Leo and Paulina, but now their marriage has created a dangerous spot for themselves. In time, the meaning of their marriage changed, and they are surrounded by commodities, secrets, and lies which haunted their marriage. Leo's well-designed projects in the city turned into a poorly designed marriage life at home. The plans did not work well, and they hit the ground. Furthermore, Martin's question, in the previous stages about how high of a building his father can build, is indirectly answered here.

2.4. The Daughter and the Truck Driver

Dorothy and Joe, the truck driver, meet coincidentally one night. Dorothy sometimes leaves home and hitchhikes at night because she has an adventurous

side which is not known by her family. Since she is bored with her family's monotonous cycle, she hitchhikes at night to meet strangers:

Joe They must be worried.

Dorothy No.

Joe I'm sorry. I don't mean to pry. Only I get runaways. Hitching. You feel responsible.

Dorothy I just needed to get away. I'm not ... It's just something I do from time to time. No one worries.

Joe If your father got hold of me he'd go mad. Wouldn't he? If he could see us?

Dorothy He won't notice.

Joe You've been away all night.

Dorothy I'll be back in the morning (Greig, 2002: 128).

Joe's concerns about Dorothy and her family and Dorothy's indifference are important. First of all, because Joe, just like a father, feels responsible for Dorothy. However, Dorothy resentfully states that her father will not notice her absence. Dorothy, on the one hand, is simultaneously escaping from a father at home and is in pursuit of a father at night in the darkness:

Joe I enjoyed your presence. That was company enough. As a matter of fact it's nice to have a girl beside you as you drive. Do your parents know where you go? When you're on these trips?

Dorothy They never ask.

Joe With a boyfriend?

Dorothy Probably.

Joe Don't they want to meet him? Talk to him?

Dorothy We don't have that in our family?

Joe What?

Dorothy Asking and telling (Greig, 2002: 130).

To Dorothy, asking and telling represent being interested in other people. However, this does not happen in her family. She believes that home should be warm, but she cannot find this warmth with her family. So, the meaning of home for Dorothy is not restricted to a block of a concrete and stable building, on the contrary, home can be a vehicle as long as there is warmth. In that sense, Dorothy is a naïve girl who is looking for a home at night. Her silent mourning for a home is repressed by her nonchalance towards her parents. Deep inside, she wants her parents to be curious about what she is doing and where she is going; she wants them to worry about her.

Dorothy and Martin do not get along well. Martin's statement that Dorothy is an available girl offended her. So she asks Joe whether he sees her as an available girl:

Dorothy Do you think I'm available?

Joe I shouldn't have asked you do this?

Dorothy It's an important question, Joe. Do you think I'm available?

Joe No. Of course not.

Dorothy It's important. Available, Joe.

Joe ... Yes. I don't know (Greig, 2002: 145).

Dorothy wants Joe's approval, as she is not available which indicates a humiliation for her female identity. Dorothy feels that she does not exist in her parents' eyes. That is why she disappears from time to time, because nobody cares about her absence. Thus, Dorothy can be interpreted as a naïve girl absent at home for her parents but present for strangers at night:

Joe I drive a truck. I'm used to my own company. I wouldn't say I enjoy it but I tolerate. I'm like an old married couple. I tolerate myself.

Dorothy It was warm. You had the heater on. I couldn't keep my eyes open. I always sleep best in trucks.

Joe Did you dream?

Dorothy No dreams.

Joe You looked peaceful (Greig, 2002: 129).

Dorothy and Joe disperse each other's loneliness by being friends at night. Their talks reveal their hidden thoughts, feelings, and experiences. They are strangers and because of that anonymity, they can open themselves to each other. In a sense, their physical intimacy turns into a psychological intimacy where they do not feel any restrictions. The darkness of the night becomes a soothing tool for them, and they can share anything about them in the truck.

Joe and Dorothy, alienated from the rest of the world in a truck, are also brought to sadness and disappointment because Joe feels guilty about his discussions with Dorothy because he cannot talk to his wife so openly:

Joe You don't want your wife to know you have these thoughts. This. Me. Here. You. My heart thumping like this. A young woman. I couldn't stand it if she knew these things about me. Looking at girls. Looking at you. I mean. I love my wife.

Dorothy Do you?

Joe Not love exactly. Care. No. It's hard to know the word. There's a connection between a man and his wife. You can't break it. Sometimes I think she knows what's disgusting about me. You think she can read your mind. Horrible. But you never say anything. You just couldn't.

...

We should stop talking about this stuff (Greig, 2002: 132).

Joe, talking about the pressure of being married and loyal to his marriage, shows that he is trapped in his life as well. He disapproves of his actions, even though they are unknown by his wife, and he feels depressed and sad. He cares about family bonds, and that is why he asks Dorothy about her father all the time. Joe, who cheats on his wife from time-to-time states that looking at his wife would be like looking at mother (Greig, 2002: 132). This comparison of wife and mother is important in terms of showing that their relationship has reached a level of comfort, with a lack of intimacy, that comes with being familiar with someone for a long time. The romantic nuance between them has disappeared over time. That is why he feels guilty towards his wife, but he does not refrain from his pleasures when she is not with him. Dorothy bravely tells Joe about her violent feelings in the truck:

Dorothy Sometimes I want to run at the side of a house.

I get the feeling.

A red-bricked gable end.

Just turn and run at it straight. Full speed, as though it wasn't there. Smack it and feel the bricks cut me.

Feel my skull smack.

Slide down half conscious.

Pick myself up and do it again.

Joe Any particular house?

Dorothy Mine. Anyone's. It doesn't matter so long as it's made of bricks. I don't even need to be near a house to get the feeling. I could be anywhere. At a party, in the office, in a field and suddenly I want to smash myself against an outside wall (Greig, 2002: 118).

Dorothy's virulent thoughts full of violent actions towards herself indicate an uneasiness that can stem from her existential crisis I mentioned above, being both present and absent before her parents. She is not at peace with herself.

It is also notable that Joe transports barbed wire, sheet metal, fences, and security gear, which are to be used at construction sites in his truck from one place to another. Like Leo, he contributes to space production in the city. He has an

important job for the neoliberal system because mobilizing the goods is of great importance to promote growth. Powerful systems do not tolerate being fixed. When Dorothy asks him about whether they are near the destination, the below dialogue happens:

Dorothy Are we nearly there?

Joe If you look out of that window you can see the lights of the skyscrapers, the tallest ones. See... That's forty miles away. Forty miles. Amazing. Would he go mad? Your father?

Dorothy What's in between?

Joe what?

Dorothy Here and there.

Joe Road.

Dorothy There must be more than just road.

Joe Well. Road and ...

Obviously there's towns.

Dorothy Which ones?

Joe Small ones. You know. More suburbs in fact. Suburbs you'd call them.

...

And fields I suppose (Greig, 2002: 128-129).

The modern cities of neoliberalism are always bright, and the sense of time is lost in these cities. The brightness of metropolitan cities indicates that cities are lively; this also explains that money, the fuel of neoliberalism, is continuously used in the market. The brightness helps provide the fluidity of money. Furthermore, the suburbs Joe refers to that stay in the peripheries of those big cities.

Lastly, being far from their families and hiding, Dorothy and Joe can be interpreted as the ghosts of the cities. They frequently move from one place to another. They cannot stick to a fixed place except inside the truck. These two foreigners can talk about their domestic issues without getting too closer to each other. Both are scared of the liveliness of the city and prefer to move around the city or towards the cities without becoming involved in the life there. In that sense, Joe's truck becomes a place to talk about their sincere feelings, thoughts, and frailties. They are both confused with loneliness, guilt, and some sexual pleasures.

2.5. The Son and His Lover

Martin and his lover Billy wander in different parts of the city. Billy who is a tenant in Eden Court, often follows Martin and tries to talk to him. They appear in several places like public toilets, the top of skyscrapers, and streets. Billy wants to start a love affair with Martin, but Martin is trying to avoid him. In his avoidance, Martin becomes violent, and in one instance, he punches a shop window and bleeds. Martin is a passive-aggressive character because he represses himself both at home and in public. Martin refuses his father's choices for himself and refuses Billy's company. When they are on the top of a skyscraper, they express themselves:

Martin I come up here to get away from... for silence. Because it's pure. No voices. No talking.

Billy I came up for you. I'm the one who should be sorry.

Martin Twenty floors up you'd think there'd be nothing.

No people, no sound, no signals, no feelings.

And then you.

I had it. Just for a moment.

And then you.

Billy I spoiled it.

Martin Blankness. Purity. And then that trash (Greig, 2002: 148).

Martin feels sorry for punching Billy and reveals that his real aim is to be isolated from people because he thinks a city is a wild place where there is noise, crowds, and demonstrations. The trash that he mentions is the trash of civilization because of obsessive human consumption in modern times. The blankness refers to the condition of Earth when it was not populated and polluted by human beings. In a sense, Martin refuses to find peace in the indicators of the city.

Martin, like his mother, Paulina, feels that he is polluted in the city. People are sources of pollution and loneliness can keep him clean. Thus, he does not want Billy's company:

Martin Pollution.

Billy Looks almost like the Milky Bar kid.

Martin We could have fucked.

We could have.

Us, alone, no mess.

You spoiled it.

Billy You're upset.

Martin Yes (Greig, 2002: 148).

It is notable that pollution is emphasized in the play several times. As one of the most unsolved issues of big cities, pollution is the result of neoliberal economic policies. Dues to the excessive consumption of developed countries, the whole planet has turned into a trash bin that cannot be cleared. Harvey mentions the main problems of this system in the quote below:

In the broad scheme of things the disappearance of a wetlands here, a local species there and a particular habitat somewhere else may seem trivial as well as inevitable given the imperatives of human population growth, let alone the continuity of endless capital accumulation at a compound rate. But it is precisely the aggregation of such small-scale changes that can produce macro-ecological problems such as global deforestation, loss of habitat and biodiversity, desertification and oceanic pollution (Harvey, 2010: 74).

Martin contemplates moving alone to another city or country. He is tired of city life and wants to make a fresh start in a different place. In that sense, he represents modern people who feel trapped and polluted in a city but cannot break the chains of the city. Freud's below quote can be useful to understand this trap:

Human life in common is only made possible when a majority comes together which is stronger than any separate individual and which remains united against all separate individuals. The power of this community is then set up as 'right' in opposition to the power of the individual, which is condemned as 'brute force'. This replacement of the power of the individual by the power of a community constitutes the decisive step of civilization (Freud, 2005: 42).

Martin feels the burden of civilization and restricted by the community. This is because his dissatisfaction mostly stems from the power community holds over him. As a separate individual, he cannot overcome the restrictions imposed by the community and he retaliates in a violent way; to show his power. He starts by directing violence towards Billy, but he does not punch him. However, after while he directs the violence towards himself. There is not a place to escape from this violent action:

Billy I try to run off the top buildings.

Martin That's natural. You're poor.

...

I just can't ... I'm not ... not any more.

I need to get pure. I got off on the wrong foot somewhere.

Somewhere around when I was born. Now I need to go back.

Go back get clean and start again.

...

I'm going to learn to make furniture (Greig, 2002: 160).

Martin has a wish to get pure and clean, so he wants to be born again. He wants to feel like a newborn baby who is not polluted or formed by modernity. For most human beings, the most secure place on Earth is in the mother's womb, and the fetus who is unaware of what is happening in the outer world is the happiest there. However, after the baby is born, the external world surrounds him/her with many insecurities and frailties. These insecurities and flaws increase as the baby grows up because modern society and its mechanisms surround it. These mechanisms are mostly what Foucault mentions as schools, hospitals, prisons, buildings, and public places. They all start to restrict humans the moment they are born, and when modern man is incapable of going beyond these structures, he feels more depressed. Martin is depressed as a modern young man who dreams of being pure and living in a different space. In the quote above, there is also a contradiction. Martin, who is refusing his father's career plan for himself, wants to make furniture. He does not want to be in the construction sector designing and creating new places in the outside world, instead, he would prefer to create things like furniture. In that sense, he is similar to his father:

Martin You'd only talk. When people talk they clog your head with shit. The shit they talk gets in your head and slops around. More and more shit. Television schedules. Opinions about sport. Property prices. It all slops around until eventually it slops out your mouth and back into someone else's head.

Billy You're fucked up?

Martin Course I'm fucked up (Greig, 2002: 160).

Martin refers to buckle to the impositions of consumer society in the above quote. Television and sports are the most popular time-killing activities for modern people, and properties are the cutest things to show off. Modern people are encircled with them, and they are always forced to spend more to consume more which Giddens stresses below:

Consumption addresses the alienated qualities of modern social life and claims to be their solution: it promises the very things the narcissist desires - attractiveness, beauty and personal popularity - through the consumption of the 'right' kinds of goods and services. Hence all of us, in modern social conditions, live as though surrounded by mirrors; in these we search for the appearance of an unblemished, socially valued self (Giddens, 1991: 139).

With these considerations in mind, we can say that people are mentally busy with things, and Martin cannot bear these impositions defined by the system, and he does want to be designed by the system:

People who fear the future attempt to 'secure' themselves with money, property, health insurance, personal relationships, marriage contracts. Parents attempt to bind their children to them. Some fearful children are reluctant to leave the home nest. Husbands and wives try to guarantee the continuance of the other's life and services. The harsh psychological truth is that there is no permanence in human relationships, any more than there is in the stock market, the weather, 'national security', and so on this clutching at security can be very discouraging to interpersonal relationships, and will impede your own self-growth (Giddens, 1991: 60).

By rejecting his parents, especially his father, Martin tries to establish his own life in a different space. Because he believes that his self-growth will be only possible by rendering the job he wanted and leaving the comfort zone that his family created for him. He wants to follow his dreams, but Billy somehow prevents him:

Billy Have you told your mom and dad?

Martin I'll leave a note.

Billy They'll worry.

Martin It's for the best.

Billy They'll be hurt.

Martin Don't try and tell me what they'll feel. You haven't got a fucking clue.

Billy Neither have you.

Martin I know exactly what they'll feel. I know precisely.

I can feel it for them. Better than them.

They'll feel pain.

A great amount of pain (Greig, 2002: 161).

Billy refers to Martin's father and mother as authorities, and he feels that Martin has to inform them about his plans of leaving. However, Martin hates this authority, and he wants his parents to feel lots of pain in his absence. His alienation from his family is apparent with his words, and this alienation is a result of the changing family structures over time:

Billy So stay.

Martin I don't like them.

Billy So. Stick it.

Martin The longer I stay the more I want to hurt them.

Billy Everyone gets that. That's not special.

Martin Stay or go. Makes no difference. Either way there'll be a great amount of pain (Greig, 2002: 162).

Martin's confession that he does not like his family shows his sadist feelings toward Leo and Paulina. Once a neglected child, Martin becomes the victim of poor parenthood, and now as a young man, he wants to take revenge against his family by leaving them forever. In a sense, Martin accuses his parents of his unhappiness, being restricted, and burnt-out in life. This is why, he cannot attach to them, and he does not want to be attached to Billy or another person:

Billy I'll miss you.

Martin So.

Billy I'll feel a great amount of pain.

Martin You attached yourself to me. If you attach yourself to someone like me you deserve pain. I have to go away and make furniture for a while. If I make furniture in a lonely place for long enough then maybe, I'll become a good person.

Billy You believe that?

Martin Of course, I fucking don't (Greig, 2002:162).

Billy, who desperately loves Martin, cannot stand the idea that he is leaving; however, Martin's response is to tease him. Martin firmly refuses all kinds of attachments because, in modern life, passion gives pain to people. In any relationship, there is the risk of losing the lover and becoming alone again, or there is the risk of being cheated on or to be cheater. Therefore, relationships have to develop on fragile grounds, which can be torn down. Martin tries to avoid a second decline because he is already dissatisfied with his existence in the world.

In that sense, Martin's search for meaning is similar to Dorothy's search for meaning. Because the two siblings avoid their families and find a secure place far from them, they are wanderers in the city and drifting from one place to another, which makes them more vulnerable in their search for a security, like a fetus in a mother's womb:

Billy Martin, we could go somewhere. Both of us. We could both just ... fuck off
If we went away together.

Martin We won't.

Billy But if we did. We could even go abroad. You've got money. I could work. In a foreign country I could work. We could just get on a train now. Get on a train and fuck off to the sunshine. You and me.

Martin No (Greig, 2002: 175).

Both Billy and Martin want to move to another place because they are unhappy about where they live. They look for opportunities, but the dilemma between them, being alone and being together, can never be solved.

Lastly, Martin and Billy are the two romantic wanderers in the city, they are constantly on-the-go, and they make love, argue, and fight in different parts of the city like public toilets and the top of skyscrapers. As if they are on a speed train where they tell each other their existential crises like being refused by their families, their dreams of going to different places, their search for a better life, and their struggle to change the situation they live in. Giddens's interpretation of the self in the below quote can help us understand the personal crisis in a vicious cycle of modern life. Giddens states:

To live our lives, we normally take for granted issues which, as centuries of philosophical enquiry have found, wither away under the sceptical gaze. Such issues include those quite properly called existential, whether posed on the level of philosophical analysis, or on a more practical level by individuals passing through a period of psychological crisis. They are questions of time, space, continuity and identity. In the natural attitude, actors take for granted existential parameters of their activity that are sustained, but in no way 'grounded' by the interactional conventions they observe. Existentially, these presume a tacit acceptance of the categories of duration and extension, together with the identity of objects, other persons and -- particularly important for this study -- the self (Giddens, 1991: 31).

Martin's questioning of the world leads him to have a crisis, and his skepticism about the order in the society makes him alienated from the rest of the society, even from his family. However, Billy's suicide makes him feel like more of a vagabond in the city because his death shows that modern people cannot acquire what they want or solve a crisis on their own. That is because they are small gears in a huge system where being fast, healthy, and constantly processing are appreciated and promoted. Durkheim argues that, an individual, despite being very desperate and lonely, commits suicide not because of his/her past but because of the society existing in his/her mind (Durkheim, 1951: 150).

The message of modernity is clear; until your death, you have to function well and make progress. Otherwise, you will be disqualified from the system:

The capitalist economy absolutizes survival. It is not concerned with the good life. It is sustained by the illusion that more capital produces more life, which means a greater capacity for living. The rigid, rigorous separation between life and death casts a spell of ghostly stiffness over life itself. Concern about living the good life yields to the hysteria of surviving. The reduction of life to biological, vital processes makes life itself bare and

strips it of all narrativity. It takes livingness from life, which is much more complex than simple vitality and health (Han, 2015: 50).

Martin is shocked by Billy's death and is now more desperate. Even though his goal was to go to a different place alone, Billy's suicide halts him. Billy's suicide indicates that even a bright young individual is not satisfied with his life. Therefore, Billy, who belonged to a marginalized group living in Eden Court, is disqualified from the system. Billy's suicide can be interpreted that he lost his hope of future accomplishment stated in *The Lonely Crowd* (Riesman et al., 1989: 125).

2.6. Leo and Sheena

Sheena is the most contentious character in the play. From the beginning of the play, she endeavors to collect signatures to demolish Eden Court. She believes that the area where Eden Court is situated has socially degenerated over time and has turned into a dangerous place for young people. Young people are surrounded by drug dealers, criminals, gangsters and aspire to be like them. Thus, she particularly struggles for the future of those young people; she does not want them to get lost in the evil. In this sense, she can be regarded as a socialist woman. She was even able to get the signature of Prince Charles for the petition, and she created public opinion in the media. Leo, who has not met much resistance in his life, is surprised to find out that Sheena is opposing him. He offers to refurbish Eden Court instead of demolishing it; however, he cannot cope with Sheena:

Sheena We're not asking you to say sorry or anything, Mr. Black. We just want you to consider the petition. These signatures. That's the people that live in Eden Court.

Leo But destruction.

Sheena People get things wrong... that's fair enough.

Leo These are understandable grievances but –

Sheena Individual problems like this can be solved.

Leo You've got a chance to make things right (Greig, 2002: 108).

When Sheena visits Leo for the second time in their family house, Paulina supports her which makes Leo feel humiliated:

Paulina If that's what people want.

At least they know what they want.

If they're sure. Then it's cruel, isn't it?

To stop them just because of history, or how things were
Supposed to be. The intention.
I think you should help them.

Leo This is about work, Paulina. This is about destroying my work.

Sheena I'm sorry you couldn't help us.

If you change your mind you know where to find me (Greig, 2002: 168).

The relational crisis between Leo and Paulina gets bigger after Sheena visits their house. Not only does Paulina support Leo in front of a stranger, instead she reveals a sore spot for Leo. Sheena overthrows the power of Leo as an architect:

Sheena You're not God, Mr. Black. You're an architect. God's a different campaign altogether. This is about housing. It's about people having an effect.

Leo A destructive effect.

Sheena Maybe (Greig, 2002: 188).

Sheena blames the social corruption in Eden Court for her son's suicide because he stepped off the balcony. He was one of the depressed victims of this place. However, she also thinks that the society let Eden Court be a den of iniquity. Her struggle to tear down Eden Court cannot only be associated with her mourning her son. Her conscious efforts to indicate the political and social weaknesses and the absence of the state in a ghetto is important:

Social power arises only through collective action, from a we. But the ego-ification and atomization of society radically shrink the space available for collective action, hindering the formation of a counterforce that could truly challenge the capitalist order. *Socius* gives way to *solus*. It is not multitude but *solitude* that typifies contemporary social composition. Isolation doesn't generate power (Han: 2018: 123).

Sheena created a resistance power to change their living conditions in Eden Court, and she is the sole representative of the ghetto people in the play. She is highly conscious of her loneliness in this campaign, but she never gives up. Leo, as an architect, did what he was ordered to do by the council. He was just the designer of Eden Court. Therefore, he does not feel any responsibility for the social corruption there. The crisis between Sheena and Leo symbolically refers to the problem between the people and the state. Sheena's focus is on people's unhappiness and the lack of infrastructure in Eden Court; however, Leo is only interested in the concrete project itself:

Sheena People are queuing up to leave.

Dorothy It's a free country.

Sheena They're unhappy. They get depressed. They get ill. The place they live in make them depressed.

Do you understand that?

Do you understand how important that is?

Leo It's mass housing. You can't build mass housing to suit individual desires. It doesn't matter who designs it. You can knock it down if you want but the problems will still be there. There'll still be unemployment, there'll still be poverty. If you want to change your circumstances Mrs Mackie –

Sheena Sheena.

Leo I suggest you vote Labour.

I do (Greig, 2002: 165).

Here, Leo indicates the root of the problem is not the design but the system and that demolishing buildings will not annihilate them. He remarks on the repugnant effects of mass housing in the city. However, he cannot be blamed for them because he is just one man who renders his job as stated. He accepts that unemployment and poverty can be severe problems in the city but argues that their removal does not depend on the actions of one architect but the political system. Sarcastically or not, Leo recommends Sheena vote for the Labour Party, which would have a chance to be in power in neoliberal economic models. In any case, Dorothy's interference and remark about it being a free country show that not only is she a supporter of her father, but she is also a young woman who has internalized the values of a free market economy in a Western country. Therefore, neither Leo nor Dorothy cares about the depression and the tenants' unhappiness in Eden Court. Leo and Dorothy are the representatives of the neoliberal market economy, and they unite when there is an attack from outside. Sheena is an outside attacker to their wealth and individualism here, and they need to connect to protect their neoliberal values.

We cannot think of London as independent from the context of the play, and London, as one of the most significant cities of neoliberalism and globalization, has a lot of spatial inequalities. Harvey also seeing the adverse effects of globalization based on social inequalities worldwide states:

Globalization entails, for example, a great deal of self-destruction, devaluation and bankruptcy at different scales and in different locations. It renders whole populations selectively vulnerable to the violence of down-sizing, unemployment, collapse of services, degradation in living standards, and loss of resources and environmental

qualities. It puts existing political and legal institutions as well as whole cultural configurations and ways of life at risk and it does so at a variety of spatial scales. It does all this at the same time as it concentrates wealth and power and further political-economic opportunities in a few selective locations and within a few restricted strata of the population (Harvey, 2000: 81).

Harvey's socialist perspective helps us understand Sheena's insistence on the destruction of Eden Court. The area where Eden Court was built is disadvantaged compared to the place where Leo and his family live in the city. When Sheena enters Leo's house, she does not hide her admiration for the building, garden, and spacious atmosphere they own. However, Eden Court, where Sheena lives, lacks basic infrastructure services, let alone spacious houses. Leo and Sheena's encounter is an excellent example of showing the inequality between these two areas depending on their lifestyles. The contradictory features of Sheena and Leo generate the contradictory features of the neoliberal system where they are bound to live.

The positive and negative effects vary in intensity from place to place. It is important to recall, therefore, that globalization has always been a specific project pursued and endorsed by particular powers in particular places that have sought and gained incredible benefits and augmentations of their wealth and power from freedoms of trade. But it is precisely in such localized contexts that the million and one oppositions to capitalist globalization also form, crying out for some way to be articulated as a general oppositional interest. This requires us to go beyond the particularities and to emphasize the pattern and the systemic qualities of the damaged being wrought across geographical scales and differences (Harvey, 2000: 81).

Harvey's statement clarifies that the progress in different parts of the city is additional due to the unequal geographical conditions. The whole world and these inequalities even create unemployment, degeneration, lack of natural resources, and worsening living conditions on a small scale. Harvey focuses on the political powers that are only owned by certain groups. In order not to lose this power, these groups benefit from the blessings of globalization and neoliberalism. In the end, before the destruction of Eden Court, Leo and Sheena talk:

Sheena You know I fancy this job, Mr. Black.

Do you think you can do courses?

At my age?

Leo I'm sure you can.

Sheena Now the campaign's finished I'm fired up for something new ... You know. I feel ... Do you think I'd be any good?

Leo You've got strong ideas.

Sheena I'd really like to do it.

Leo You should (Greig, 2002:198).

In the end, Sheena and Leo come to a point where they can appraise each other. Although Leo has disagreed with Sheena about the destruction of Eden Court since the beginning of the plot, he offers her a job as she has strong ideas that can be evaluated in the market. It is clear from Leo's appraisal that his market identity is shattered at the end of the play due to many factors.

All those characters create the city's daily life; their actions are meaningful because their alienation from each other despite their physical closeness can be described with the social and political mechanisms they are bound to. Harvey's description of neoliberal ethics can help us understand the relationships.

The market economy dominates the city life and also defines the economic, social, and psychological situations there. People dispersed in different parts of the city contribute to the production of urban space and the growth of the market economy in a neoliberal system.

Leo, Paulina, and Joe the truck driver, represent the older generation and Martin, Billy, and Dorothy, represent the younger generation. Naturally, the younger generation is more flexible than the older generation in the city. When walking, there is not a clear destination. Joe, a member of the older generation, as a truck driver has a clear destination and route he is following. Martin, Billy, and Dorothy are flaneurs in the city with no definite route to follow. The movement of these characters never stops at night or during the day. On the one hand, they escape from the rigid structures of their families and the mechanisms of the society, On the other hand, they try to find a secure shelter to create their self-identities.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The Architect, as a diverse text, involves social, economic, and political references that dramatically influence the lives of people. The play is divided into two acts, and the characters interact with each other in different parts of the city.

First, I focused on some of the space politics of neoliberal governmentality and the architecture and the role of the architects within the context of modernism

in the last century. Greig puts space in the center of *The Architect* and creates the social realities of the text depending on those spaces. He mainly shows that the structures in and around the cities are built based on a neoliberal economy. Eden Court, once built for immigrants, and economically lower classes by the state, eventually turned into a deteriorated ghetto far from the city. The purpose of building a mass housing site is associated with biopolitics because the best way to control people from lower classes or marginalized groups is by putting them in one specific space. Namely, the city is shared by both marginalized and advantaged groups depending on their social status.

On the one hand, there are small and dark flats in tall apartment buildings. On the other hand, there are spacious and bright houses in safer regions. This is to say the most visible inequality is the housing system in *The Architect*.

Second, I focused on the types of relationships among people, the hierarchies and dynamics between them, how their actions are formed in and around the city. These characters' common features are that they frequently move, and they contribute to the production of the city traveling like a *flaneur*. People from all walks of life encounter in different spaces, either deliberately or accidentally. We witness the everyday struggle of those people both in public and private areas.

Finally, family and traditional values appear at the center of *The Architect*. Leo's struggle to keep his family together and set up a family business for the future welfare of his children and Sheena's struggle as a single mother who dedicated herself to solve the societal corruption in Eden Court make them face off. Their wish to do the best for their children makes us think about social inequalities depending on the housing. The division of labour, the alienation of people from each other, and the personal crisis of modern man accompany *The Architect's* plot. *The Architect*, as a literary text, depicts all these themes in a sociological way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahlava, A. (2000). *Architecture in Consumer Society*, Helsinki: Publication Series of the University of Art and Design Helsinki.

- Balbo, M. (1993). Urban Planning and the Fragmented City of Developing Countries, *Third World Planning Review*, 15:1, 23-5.
- Baudrillard, J. (2018). *Simülakrlar ve Simülasyon*, İstanbul: Doğubati.
- Bauman, Z. (2002). *Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality*, UK & USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community, Seeking Safe in an Insecure World*, USA: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2003). *City of Fears, City of Hopes*, University of London: Goldsmith.
- Bauman, Z. (2003). *Liquid Love*, UK&USA: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Consuming Life*, UK&USA: Polity Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2002). *The Arcades Project*, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Berman, M. (2012). *Katı Olan Herşey Buharlaşıyor*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Billington, M. (2007). *State of the Nation, British Theatre Since 1945*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The Social Structures of The Economy*, UK&USA: Polity Press
- Brecher, B. (2012). The Family and Neoliberalism: Time to Revive a Critique, *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 6:2.
- Chevalier J, & Gheerbrant, A. (1996). *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols*, England: Penguin Books.
- Christopher, D. (2002). *British Culture: An Introduction*, New York: Routledge.
- Deboard, G. (2014). *The Society of Spectacle*, Canada: Bureau of Public Secrets.
- Disch L. & Hawkesworth M. (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide, A Study in Sociology*, New York: The Free Press.
- Eliade, M. (1958). *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, London and New York.

- Foucault, M. (1982). *The Subject and Power, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Freud, S. (2005). *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Norton, W. W. & Company, Inc.
- Giddens, A. (2006). *Modernity and Self-Identity*, UK: Polity Press.
- Greig, D. (2002). *Plays 1*, London: Methuen Drama.
- Han, B. C. (2015). *The Burnout Society*, California: Stanford University Press.
- Han, B. C. (2017). *Psychopolitics Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power*, London & New York: Verso.
- Han, B. C. (2018). *Topology of Violence*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Harvey, D. (2010). *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1993). *Social Justice and The City*, UK: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope*, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of Capital, Towards a Critical Geography*, New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Short History of Neoliberalism*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities, From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*, London & New York: Verso.
- Hilgers, M. (2011). *The Three Anthropological Approaches to Neoliberalism*, UNESCO: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Chapel Hill: Duke University Press.
- Karatani, K. (1995). *Architecture as Metaphor*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1992). *Either/ Or: A Fragment of Life*, UK: Penguin.
- Kunz, B. (2019). *Architecture in Neoliberalism*, Theses from the M. Arch. Program. University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

- Lefebvre, H. (1971). *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, San Fransisco & New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*, UK & USA: Blackwell.
- Middeke, M., Schnierer, P. P. and Sierz, A. (2011). *The Methuen Drama Guide to Contemporary British Playwrights*, London: Methuen Drama.
- Ong, A. (2007). *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*, Durham & London: Duke University Press
- Parsons, T. (1970). *Social Structure and Personality*, New York: Macmillan
- Riesman, D., Glazer, N., Denney R. (1989). *The Lonely Crowd: A study of the Changing American Character*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological Theory*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Schluter, M. & Lee, D. (1993). *The R Factor*, Hodder, and Stoughton.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *Karakter Aşınması Yeni Kapitalizmde İşin Kişilik Üzerindeki Etkileri*, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Simmel, G. (1972). *The Philosophy of Money*, London & Boston: John Hopkins University.
- Spencer, D. (2016). *The Architecture of Neoliberalism, How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Sugarman, J. (2015). Neoliberalism and Psychological Effects, *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 35 (2), 103–116.
- Verhaeghe, P. (2014). *What About Me, The Struggle for Identity in a Market-Based Society*, Melbourne & London: Scribe.
- Wates, N., Knevit, C. (2013). *Community Architecture: How People Are Creating Their Own Environment*, New York: Routledge.

Internet Resources

<https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0466665/> (The movie: *The Architect*)

<https://www.playwrightsstudio.co.uk/playwrights/david-greig.aspx> (03.11.2020)

[https://www.ted.com/talks/norman_foster_my_green_agenda_for_architecture?](https://www.ted.com/talks/norman_foster_my_green_agenda_for_architecture?language=tr)
language=tr (12.12.2020)

CURRICULUM VITAE

Esmâ Nur ÇETİNKAYA KARADAĞ received her BA degree in English Language and Literature Department at Ege University in 2008 and her first master's degree in Humanities and Social Sciences at Yıldız Technical University in 2016. Before starting to work at Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University as an EFL instructor in 2019, she worked at Karabük University for five years.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler	
Adı-Soyadı	Esmâ Nur ÇETİNKAYA KARADAĞ
Doğum Yeri-Tarihi	Hatay / Dört Yol – 20.09.1986

Eđitim Durumu	
Lisans Öğrenimi	Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü (2008)
Yüksek Lisans	Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı (2016) Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı (2021)
Bildiđi Yabancı Diller (varsa)	İngilizce
Bilimsel Faaliyetleri (varsa)	
İş Deneyimi	
Stajlar	
Projeler	
Çalıştığı Kurumlar	Karabük Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu (2014-2019) Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Rektörlük (2019, ...)
İletişim	
E-Posta Adresi	esmanurcetinkaya@gmail.com