# HUMAN-SPACE RELATIONS AND HOUSING POLICIES: A CONCEPTUAL INVESTIGATION

**Asst. Prof. (Ph.D.) Abdulkadir ALTINSOY** * iD

## ABSTRACT

*The perception of space has important reflections on modern architecture, and modern architecture, unlike traditional architecture, is designed based on shelter rather than life. Traditional space, as a difference from modern space perception, refers to a place where people are calm and find peace. Contrary to the shelters produced by current housing policies, traditional spaces are places where tranquility is experienced deeply, and people grasp their reality with all its dimensions. The main purpose of this study is to question the relationship of human existence with space in terms of welfare state housing policies. Another aim of the research is to draw attention to the contrast between traditional space, where life continues with all its serenity, and modern space, which is only a shelter today, and to the different conceptions of life that continue in these places. For this purpose, the research has tried to determine the divergence points of the traditional space perception and the understanding of space of the welfare state housing policies. In this study, which was designed as conceptual analysis, the subject tried to be grounded by comparing the traditional space concept and the concept of space in the modern welfare state perception.*

*Keywords:* *Space Perception, Welfare State, Modern Architecture, Housing Policies, Conceptual Analysis.*

## İNSAN-MEKÂN İLİŞKİLERİ VE KONUT POLİTİKALARI: KAVRAMSAL BİR ARAŞTIRMA

### ÖZET

*Mekân algısının modern mimariye önemli yansımaları vardır ve modern mimari, geleneksel mimariden farklı olarak yaşamdan ziyade barınma üzerine kurgulanmıştır. Geleneksel mekan, modern mekan algısından farklı olarak, insanların sakin olduğu ve huzur bulduğu bir yeri ifade eder. Mevcut konut politikalarının ürettiği barınakların aksine geleneksel mekanlar, huzurun derinden yaşandığı, insanların gerçekliğini tüm boyutlarıyla kavradığı mekanlardır. Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, refah devleti konut politikaları açısından insan varlığının mekânla ilişkisini sorgulamaktır. Araştırmanın bir diğer amacı, yaşamın tüm dinginliğiyle devam ettiği geleneksel mekan ile günümüzde sadece bir sığınak*

* Sakarya University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, Sakarya/Türkiye,
E-mail: aaltinsoy@sakarya.edu.tr

**Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article**

*olan modern mekan arasındaki karşıtlığa ve bu mekanlarda devam eden farklı yaşam anlayışlarına dikkat çekmektir. Bu amaçla araştırmada, refah devleti konut politikalarının geleneksel mekan algısı ile mekan anlayışının farklılaştığı noktalar tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Kavramsal analiz olarak tasarlanan bu çalışmada, modern refah devleti algısındaki geleneksel mekan kavramı ile mekan kavramı karşılaştırılarak konu temellendirilmeye çalışılmıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Mekan Algısı, Refah Devleti, Modern Mimari, Konut Politikaları, Kavramsal Analiz.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Social policies have been shaped according to the basic needs of societies and are generally shaped according to the fields of health, education, housing, and personal social services. The need for shelter is at the forefront of the basic needs of societies. Housing, one of the main areas of interest in social policies, is where people continue their family life. Owning a house is a sense of belonging and a status symbol for the individual. Not having a house is both an economic problem and a source of unrest, especially for low- and middle-income families. It is also a feeling of inadequacy when a sense of belonging is not met. For these reasons, since the middle of the twentieth century, welfare societies have seen as a primary social policy objective to make every effort to facilitate their citizens' housing. In many developed and developing countries, housing policies have been included in government programs, social housing projects have been tried to be implemented, and governments have aimed to increase the welfare level of their citizens with such projects. On the other hand, after the half of the 19th century, rapid urbanization, population growth, and economic and social changes were experienced worldwide, and this situation rapidly increased the need for housing.

The housing problem has different social, economic, cultural, and legal dimensions. Therefore, housing means more than a physical structure in people's lives. Housing is not only an individual aspect but also an aspect that establishes social life. However, housing has different aspects, such as being a shelter, a consumption good, an investment tool, providing economic and legal security, and reproduction of social relations. It is also necessary to mention another function of housing, such as being the carrier of culture in creating the urban environment. For all these reasons, the house must have features that will meet the need for shelter safely and healthily because the so-called housing policy is a social, economic, and cultural phenomenon for society. In its historical development, housing, development level, income distribution, urbanization type, urbanization rate and family structure have been shaped according to the requirements of social life (Tekeli, 1999: 103; Pulat, 1992: 69). Housing and settlement style, climatic conditions, natural environment, and vegetation are determined by the society's mode of production and relations.

It can be argued that housing policies in the welfare states, which are the subject of this study, are not only for settlement but also for providing social services. Welfare states consider human life in terms

of housing, health, education, income protection, and the construction of personal social life. The welfare state aims to ensure the redistribution of income among various groups through compulsory state mechanisms and to make legal arrangements to achieve these goals (Özdemir, 2004, 85). As in housing policies, the welfare state sees it as a necessity of its social policies to intervene in the market and take measures to solve the problems. The welfare state tries to set minimum living standards by interfering with the job markets. One of the main goals of the welfare state is to ensure a fair distribution of income through tax and other policies and transfer expenditures by redistributing income. Housing policies in welfare states are also handled within the framework of this understanding. Because eliminating income imbalances between classes and building a social structure based on equality are among the main objectives of welfare states. Because of all these functions, the welfare state functions as an interventionist, regulatory and income redistributive state.

Social housing policies have an important place in the social policies of the modern welfare state. However, social housing policies have generally included many approaches and have never been a comprehensive and single-handed state policy. Today, the problems of families about housing are not only about having a house they can live. Apart from the existing housing lacking the standards to accommodate the family, there are also problems such as homelessness and unhealthy living conditions. To solve these problems, welfare states felt the need to take responsibility and intervene in the conditions of the market economy for a solution (Alcock et al., 2011: 452; Platon. 2001: 53). This research aims to examine housing policies in welfare states and whether the housing problem is seen as a social policy tool.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1. Human-Space Relationship from Past to Present

Plato separates the realm of objects and ideas in the Timaios dialogue and argues that there is no connection between space and humans because the realm of ideas is immobile. According to him, "space," "dwelling," or "place" should, above all, have a reassuring quality. The meaning and content of the space have not yet been granted to the dwelling. The place's instilling confidence provides tranquility and soothing the people living in it stems from the content in question. Aristotle also saw space as a relation of identity between matter and meaning. According to him, space is neither just matter nor just a form; on the contrary, it is a bridge that provides the link between the past and the future (Plato. 2001: 53; Aristotle, 2001: 149). Descartes, who places the thinking thing (res cognates) and the extended thing (res extensa), that is, two different substances, in the center of ontology, ends the human-space association in this way (Lefebvre, 2014: 33). It can be argued that it has exclusionary content. Likewise, he claims that space and time cannot be perceived with the qualities of experience and knowledge but can be grasped intuitively. Space can be defined according to the situation in which people live, but it

does not express a spatial reality. Housing or shelter is related to mentality, not ontological. It is a mental, material, and spiritual design that includes the relations of.

Heidegger expressed the first rebellion against the space imagination of Western philosophy in his work titled Being and Time (Heidegger, 2004: 518). For Heidegger, who filters Cartesian architecture through hermeneutic and phenomenological criticism, space expresses a reality, not an abstraction. The way capitalism uses space is based on the understanding of realizing its dominance through reproduction by creating a different space. Capitalism has a two-pole conception of space as social and mental production of space. The Cartesian philosophy of space is built on dichotomy.

Contrary to the Cartesian understanding of space, Lefebvre classifies space as physical (natural), mental and social space. Space is an area that is inherent in property relations and contains both material and spiritual multi-valuedness. Housing, a used and consumed product, is a means of production in the Capitalist Cartesian logic. Exchange networks, raw materials and energy flows shape and are shaped by space (Mulhall, 1998: 47; Lefebvre, 2014: 33). The space of capitalism is abstract, not the use value of the space, but the exchange value. Those who direct the operation, form and meaning of time, money and space are also the actors who determine the basic rules of social organization. In the Marxist characterization, on the other hand, space is only a question of infrastructure.

Cartesian space is an absolute, infinite, homogeneous structure that removes the sacred from human beings. It has a side that deepens the gap between man and his natural environment. There is an incongruity between time and space, their textures. In this understanding, time consists of the sum of "moments." According to Lefebvre, the ordinariness of everyday life becomes meaningful with space. Space is not in a passive position but in an active structure where collective memory is formed. It has a historical context. The order and form of the space, its genesis, past, current and future promise, abstract and concrete, and nature and society are inseparable (Lefebvre, 2014: 173). This is the place of contemplation and contact with nature, where a man confronts himself. Even a few pebbles here establish his contact with nature. Objects do not have merely symbolic or symbolic meanings; these natural objects are the means of touching lives. Space is never empty; it always has meaning. It puts the human mind, heart, and mind into context.

According to Heidegger, who has made important studies on modern spaces, everything that contributes to the formation of space is a part of a large whole. Regarding the phenomenological tradition, space is not a place isolated from the environment but a time-dependent phenomenon. There is a simultaneous cognitive, affective, and behavioral relationship between man and his environment. There is a close relationship between the perceived object and the perceiving subject. In the phenomenological approach, a close relationship is established between "what is," "was," and "will be." A certain part of the city or building gives clues about the structure of consciousness. The space acquires a certain consciousness contained within the framework of traditional interpretations. The "structure,"

which has only a material meaning to this understanding, becomes a space when it gains meaning to content. Unlike the residence, the place requires intuitive understanding and is a place of peace and traditional spirit. In the traditional understanding, the concepts of place, space, dwelling and dwelling cannot be considered independently (Husserl, 2003; Heidegger, 2008: 63). These are different forms of expression of traditional space. Contrary to Cartesian architecture, space is not just a three-dimensional structure organization; it is a place where an understanding surrounding a deep past, a vast present and a future is preserved.

Heidegger characterizes the traditional space and human relationship as "authentic understanding." According to him, in the traditional space, the person comprehends the world in which he exists in its context and in his conditions. He sees that space should be considered an object of "sensory perception"; therefore, traditional space sees the human relationship as an "authentic experience." In Heidegger's phenomenological perspective, space is not a three-dimensional construction but the embodiment of the content of consciousness. Heidegger's perception of space is a past with holistic features and many unforgettable experiences, a complete living space where all kinds of actions are experienced, and a reality formed at the level of consciousness where hopes are raised. Here, matter and meaning, subjective and objective values, concrete and abstract, are grasped together. The "meaning," "value," and "purpose" existing in the codes of life form the codes of space (Heidegger, 2008: 13; Merlau-Ponty, 2006: 47). The house, neighbor, street, fountain, and other social, cultural, historical, and psychological backgrounds emerge as a huge domain.

Transferring Heidegger's concept of space to architecture, Norberg-Schulz states that he prefers to use a street rather than living with houses that are disconnected from each other. According to him, if there is an opportunity to live together on the street, it is a place. Otherwise, a mass of boutique stores and adjacent structures with walls built between each other is nothing but a freak of Cartesian architecture. For Heidegger, the street is a medium of experiences, memories, and possibilities. Consciousness contents that emerge in everyday life make a certain structure "space" (Norberg-Schulz, 2000: 37). Streets, houses, and neighborhoods reflecting the spirit of traditional architecture are shaped as representations of a metaphysical entity. Norberg-Schulz states that there is an organic bond between space and place. The spirit of the place gives character to the place. The traditional space is not where disconnected people live but where "co-existing lives emerge, where the past, future and present are built together" in the neighborhood.

According to Merleau-Ponty, space reflects the formation of a consciousness based on geometric fiction. In this state of consciousness, the transformation of perception into knowledge occurs with certain references; each act of perception takes place with references from the previous one during a successive lifetime. The essence of spatial consciousness is not just superficial images; it is bodily in the synchronicity of all the senses. Certain themes are not attributed to concepts such as size and depth

grasped in the image. These are the values given to the subject arising from the existence characteristic of the object of perception (Merleau-Ponty, 2006).

The qualities that transform the space into a livable place, expand it beyond its geometric features, and make it comfortable and peaceful. The transformations of the new perception of space and, therefore, of space inevitably differ over time. In the traditional understanding, space is where people belong. Just as things that burn belong above and things that are on the ground below, so man belongs to the house where he was born and grew up and to the street where the house is located. These places (sky above, earth below) are special; because distances and relations are determined through them (Nalbantoğlu, 2008). It is not the place that determines the place of today; on the contrary, all places are places where houses, streets, social relations, and briefly experiences.

The simultaneous relationship of space, time and life includes the deep meaning of spatial experience. According to this point of view, time is a bridge connecting the past to the present and the present to the future, where all the activities occurring in the space occur. The relationship of the space we live in with the "now" is considered together with "remembering the past" and "anticipating the future". The most basic state of "existence" of humans can be realized by "settlement-dwelling." According to Heidegger, the transformation of the space into an environment of peace can only be possible when a culture surrounds it over time. The concept of "genius loci" (spirit of the place), updated by architectural historian Christian Norberg-Schulz by referring to the "protective spirit" myth in Roman culture, reveals the meaning of space. As one of the scenes where the place's deep meaning, values, and individual and social relations can be seen concretely, the city has undergone a great change since the Industrial Revolution. The contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie that emerged with the Industrial Revolution, and the spatial reflections of the mass migrations from the countryside to the city manifest themselves in the city. With this character, the city becomes a space of contradiction. While soulless cities feed these contradictions, they also contain the potentials for struggles to be waged through contradictions.

## 2.2. Perception of Space and Housing Policies in Welfare States

Housing policy has an important place in the social policies of modern welfare states. Housing policy has included many approaches and has not been a single-handed state policy. Despite the adverse housing conditions in big cities after the industrial revolution, governments did not pay much attention to the need for housing until the First World War. Housing production depends on the size of the share allocated to housing from the national income and the rational use of this share. The resulting low income compared to the resources allocated for the housing sector can be interpreted as inefficient housing investments. However, housing production and policies are not an inefficient field, but an investment field that provides products for a long time and creates value like education (Yavuz, 1953:

113; Geray, 1981: 54). As in other social policies, housing and housing policies were not generally monopolized by the state, but the state played an important role in solving their problems.

Social housing policy is all of the measures included in the development plans, have some priorities and must be compatible with the relevant country's urbanism and regional development policies. The first of element of the social housing policy is to ensure that the social housing policy is compatible with the objectives of development. Social housing policies and practices in the 20th century significantly affected cities and towns. The word "social" began to be added to the beginning of the term housing policy in the 1950s and later. The concept of social housing policy is an area with priorities such as housing standard, social class and income priority. The city and regional planning policies of the relevant countries, which are included in the national development plans, are the whole objectives and measures carried out together. It is expected that the social housing policy will comply with the countries' urban and regional development policies (Keleş. 1966: 166, 473). The only purpose of housing policies is not to meet the housing needs but the environment in which the housing is located, the solution to the economic, social and cultural problems of the people living in this environment, and urban services. It produces solutions by considering problems such as income distribution, working conditions and human relations.

While the housing policy includes the entire policy related to housing, the social housing policy includes the policies for taking measures that emphasize the benefit of society in the use of all public and private lands. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the social housing policy and regional development policies. Therefore, social housing policy may have priorities of social class, income level, or housing standard. Social housing, also called "public housing" in Turkey for a period, emerged because of the research made to determine the surface area and square meter price of the most economical housing type for the country after the planned period was entered. Accordingly, public administrations carry out duties such as dealing with the housing situation of all classes of the society, providing necessary assistance and making controls. One of the main reasons for this development in understanding social housing policy is to enable society to reach higher living standards. Therefore, the decrease in the differences in living standards and consumption preferences between the working class and the middle class accelerated the implementation of these policies (Eronat, 1977: 23; Keleş, 1966: 167). Housing policies were oriented only to the poor segments of society and later expanded to include all classes. In this process, the feature of public aid has also developed toward service and duty understanding rather than philanthropy.

Regarding social housing policy, the increasing intervention of the state in the housing market, the need for social housing and the insufficient economic opportunities have brought the housing problem to the agenda, especially in underdeveloped countries. It is intended to provide additional housing assistance to economically deficient classes. For this reason, social housing policies need to have certain priorities. Each country follows the paths required by its own social, economic, and

historical conditions in determining its priorities. Despite the great differences in practice, it aims to prioritize certain social classes, certain income groups and finally, certain residence standards (Keleş, 1966, p. 169). There are, of course, situations where a country chooses and implements more than one of these priorities. Occupational groups such as workers, civil servants, the elderly, retirees, teachers and army members, families with many children, and social class were prioritized. It is seen that the main criteria determining the social class priorities that shape the housing policy are profession and title (Yavuz: 66-274; Keleş, 1966: 170; Keleş, 1996: 169). In some countries, it has become quite common to deal with the housing situation of certain social classes individually and to try to solve their problems. It can be accepted that social class priority is applied in countries where cooperatives, which started as a workers' movement, take priority.

Within the framework of housing policies, groups that will benefit from public assistance are determined according to their income level. Those in a higher income bracket than this fall outside the protected area of the social housing policy. Denmark, France, Italy, and Switzerland fall into this group. In some countries, the state does not put forward conditions regarding the income and occupational status of those who will benefit from this aid. Income priority is applied in many countries such as Germany, Denmark, France, Switzerland, and Italy. The priority of the housing standard, closely related to the other priority criteria, is used to specify the lower and upper limits of the houses to which public aid will be managed. This priority can also be called cost priority since the material and area standards of a house, as well as its features such as the number of floors, building style and roof shape, constitute the main elements of its cost (Keleş, 1966: 171). Moreover, especially in underdeveloped countries, building many houses in a short time with the limited resources available can only be achieved with the simplest and cheapest construction methods possible.

There was significant economic growth in developed countries after the Second World War. Until the 1970s, the number of houses increased, and a remarkable improvement in housing quality was observed in developed industrial countries. The quality of the housing stock can be measured by the increase in the proportion of houses with electricity, water, adequate toilets, bathrooms, and central heating. The average number of rooms per residence has also increased. This growth has led to a boom in housing construction, and housing shortages in these countries have decreased significantly. By the 1980s, central governments began to feel the pressure of the economic recession and production in the construction sector decreased in many countries. Due to the country's economies facing increasing economic difficulties, the development in the housing sector started to slow down and even reversed. The housing stock in these countries has started to age, and maintenance and repair problems have come to the fore. Many countries have made policy changes, and the existing housing stock has been repaired rather than built (Iula-Emme, 1993, 23). The population in England has increased very slowly since the Second World War. Population flow in and out of the country is quite balanced. The urbanization process in England was essentially complete by the turn of the century. Major cities in the country have

had a population shift towards suburbs, especially since 1945. There are important problems related to depopulation in big cities' centers and inner parts (Iula Emme, 24).

Although the forces behind the housing offer in industrial countries are the profit motive and market mechanisms, there are differences from country to country regarding different aspects of this process. The differences that arise in this context are mostly related to the entry of investments into the system and the conditions of profit realization. In the beginning, the factors that make a difference in this area is the different role played by the central government in different societies. On the other hand, rental social housing policies have started to shift to home ownership-oriented policies. In recent years, in the European Union countries, the rate of residences owned by the homeowner has been higher than the residences for rent. The increase in living standards in the post-war period led many segments of the population to become homeowners. In addition, central governments have applied various subsidies to the housing sector for incentive purposes. Although it differs from country to country, what is meant by social housing policies in European Union countries is the aim of being a "homeowner." When the housing markets are examined, it is observed that homeownership is rapidly increasing and the rental sector is declining (Iula Emme-TOKİ, 6. 24).

Classifying social housing in Europe in three different ways according to the country is possible. The government provides affordable housing to those in need with privately rented housing in Germany and Switzerland. On the other hand, owner-occupied social housing dominates in the United Kingdom, Spain, and Italy. Social rental housing schemes are common in the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria, and France. In developing countries, central governments have tried many methods for housing policy. Governments directly engaged in housing production and provided subsidies to low-income families. Public housing projects have not successfully provided housing to low-income groups. Such projects are far from meeting the housing preferences of low-income groups in developing countries. Direct public investments in housing have also tended to hinder private savings and housing investments.

After the Second World War, Western European countries took a more active stance in ensuring the welfare of the people compared to the USA, Canada, and Australia. This was because the war devastated these countries' economies and markets. Western Europe's view that the central government should play an active role in housing has received widespread support. In welfare societies, housing is seen as a right. The rental sector is divided into social and private rents in the five market-oriented European Union countries. Social rents should be understood as leasing the real estate owned by the state and private rents by individuals who own their own houses (Paul Balchin, 1996: 33; Iula Emme-TOKİ, 1993: 11) 25 In the European Union countries, housing is a property. However, it is subject to more special regulations compared to other goods. In recent years, welfare state housing policies have shifted towards the market sector rather than the central government orientation. This policy change is due, in part, to the end of the war-induced housing shortage. However, at the same time, a philosophy that has become widespread today also affects this policy change ideologically. According to this policy,

the housing sector should also be left to market forces and free enterprise. This is particularly the case for the UK and Germany. In the Netherlands, its impact was more limited. Over a million council houses have been sold to tenants or others in the UK.

### 2.3. Perception of Space and Housing Policies in Liberal Welfare States

As in many countries, housing cost is the most important item of expenditure for most families in the United States. Housing expense is a fixed expense that must be paid before food, clothing, and healthcare bills. Families live on the remaining income after the housing expenditure during the month. The federal government has developed housing programs for low-income families because of the issue's importance. However, despite the issue's importance, housing assistance is not provided as a right to all eligible families. Housing assistance is provided to the working poor in the USA in two ways: The first is to provide social housing, and the second is to help the state to rent housing (subsidized housing). Both types of aid are limited and do not serve much of the poor (Iula Emme-TOKİ, ibid: 6; Karger and Stoesz, 2002: 442). Another dimension of housing-centered public policy is income support and in-kind transfer programs designed to provide housing to low-income people. The first is to provide support for the construction projects of housing units for low-income households (Project-based aid), and the other is to provide direct home-based aid. In recent years, federal policy has shifted towards housing programs that provide home-based support. Public housing funds aim to support housing construction for low-income residents. In the USA, these projects were generally managed by local governments. The public housing fund strategy that underpinned housing policy in the 1960s and 1970s was largely abandoned, and transfer programs were developed to exploit market mechanisms to provide housing assistance. These government programs have significantly impacted the quality of housing and the supply of affordable housing for the low-income.

The first social housing in England was built by charitable organizations that wanted to solve the problem of unhealthy and unsafe accommodation for certain groups working at low-income levels. Also in England, with the government aid before the start of the First World War, affordable housing for the working class was provided to local governments. To a limited extent, local governments have started to provide subsidies for social housing. After the Second World War, social housing started to play an important role in the housing market (Whitehead & Scanlon 2007: 54). In line with the effects of the First World War, rent controls implemented to prevent abuse in the event of war and commitments to provide suitable homes for post-war "heroes" have led to new policies. An important development in housing policies was the treasury aid for municipal housing applications in 1919. Over the next sixty years, local governments assumed an increasingly important position in the housing.

The negative effects of the Second World War were felt in all areas as well as in the field of housing construction. As a result of the attacks made during the war, there was a significant housing shortage. In the post-war period, housing was not subjected to a rapid reorganization at the same time

as other welfare state elements. The National Welfare Service has not yet been established in the post-war period. Local governments have played a key role in public housing practices in a system dominated by private ownership. Local governments, especially newly established towns, received large amounts of state aid, and thus housing construction gained an unprecedented speed. After the Second World War in England, the population increased slowly, and the population flow into and out of the country was balanced. The urbanization process in England was essentially complete by the turn of the century. Major cities in the country have had a population shift towards suburbs, particularly since 1945. There are important problems related to decreasing population in the center and inner parts of big cities. In the UK, governments have consistently promoted home ownership and private property rental practices, often neglected. In 1979, 93% of social rental housing was owned by local governments (Whitehead, & Scanlon, 2007: 54). After the 1990s, with the changing state policies and economic systems worldwide, social-rental housing has lost its importance, and an expansion of ownership has occurred.

With the election of the Conservative government in 1979, the "Right to Buy" policy was implemented with the Housing Law, which came into force in 1980, and the social rental housing was mostly sold to the residents. After the "Right to Buy" policy, two million of the total 6.5 million residences were sold to their tenants. With the modernization of housing used in this period, significant developments were experienced in housing conditions. The construction of new buildings and renovation of slums and old settlements has improved the housing layout, relieved congestion, and eliminated inappropriate housing. In addition, more affluent groups became homeowners, and government subsidies allowed the municipal housing sector to develop. After 1988, the central government established new housing associations to finance the construction of social housing. Housing associations have become the preferred tools of a newer social housing structure. Social housing practices have changed due to the "Right to Buy" policy and housing stocks have been transferred to housing associations. (Whitehead, 2007: 56; Alcock, 2011: 257). On the other hand, the private sector has started to provide funds for social housing in return for mortgages throughout the housing sector.

Expenditures for the sale of municipal housing, produced as a requirement of social housing policies in England, are not perceived as public expenditures. In addition, public expenditures within the official housing program were cut, and resources were provided through the privatization of social housing. In the late 1990s, housing policy reached its lowest point. The lack of a basic program to build homes in line with general household needs has emerged, and the process of dismantling high-quality homes or homes for low-income households and housing management has begun. The development of policies has been towards reducing government intervention in housing practices, relying on the private sector for housing provision, and meeting people's housing costs through income research-based social security support. With the new financial regulations, housing associations have become a part of the private sector, and in 2001 they provided 6.5% of the housing stock. In 2002, the government started implementing a new "rent structuring" system in the entire social housing sector. With this arrangement,

it was decided to determine the rents of individuals according to their earnings, size of housing and property values until 2012. While the United Kingdom was a nation of tenants in the 1900s, in the 2000s, it became a nation of homeowners. High employment, income and fixed interest rates have made homeownership risk-free (Whitehead, 2007: 57; Alcock, 2011: 258).

The main area of the struggle of the UK government is to reconstruct housing policies under different social, economic and political conditions. Global problems and inter-economic competition have hampered the public sector, which collects and taxes resources. In this case, the preferred method by governments is to transfer ownership of public housing to new entities outside the public sector. The ten-year stock transfer program has been the cornerstone of the Labor government's approach in the UK after 1997, and the "Right to Buy" has symbolized political continuity between the Labor and Conservative governments, thanks to continued practices. On the other hand, the Workers Party program includes raising the standards of all social housing and a new strategy that points to social exclusion and ensures the renewal of districts. Systematic attempts to reorganize housing policy in the UK have also emerged recently. Examples are the Communities Plan 2003 (Housing for Sustainable Communities – ODPM) and the 2004 Barker Report. The Communities Plan includes localizing housing policy and emphasizes a sustainable approach to housing and planning. The Plan also recognizes the need to develop different regional and market policies. This includes the Housing Market Renewal Areas policy, which constitutes the main investment project in the North. In the south and east of England, continuing housing shortages, labor shortages and increasing purchasing power problems point to the need for a much more comprehensive public spending package for emerging areas and workers. The Barker Report highlights the weakness of the "newly established" housing market in the face of rising housing prices and points to the treasury's concerns that this may have undesirable economic consequences (Alcock, 2011: 259).

### 2.4. Housing Policies in Conservative Welfare States

France in the first periods, social housing in France was produced for the "accommodation of wage workers." Social housing stock increased significantly in France after the Second World War, as in many European countries. As in many countries, social housing in France is based on income ranges. According to the household's income, there are two types of housing. 35% of the upper and lower standard housing is for low-income people; the rest is standard social housing. Individual subsidy opportunities are provided depending on these agreements. Government and local governments have accelerated the production of rental social housing since 1988, and this system gained momentum at the end of the 1990s. The rental social housing system is quite common in France. Socially rented houses constituted 17% of the country's housing stock, which is 4.2 million housing units. France also has a large private rental sector (about 20%). In France, 69 out of 1,000 residences are socially rented residences. This rate is 155/1,000 in the Netherlands and 106/1,000 in the UK (Levy-Vroelant, & Tutin, 2007: 70). In addition to the traditional social housing sector HLM, France has other types of affordable

housing provisions. It is privately rented housing, called de facto social housing, and is known as semi-social housing and is offered at lower prices. In addition, social housing is provided under the name of social property right in France. This system is another form of affordable housing ownership. The state recently supported it to encourage private investment (Levy-Vroelant, & Tutin, 2007: 85). For this purpose, tax incentives were introduced with the "Borloo Populaire" program, and economic housing production in the private sector was supported.

The current social housing system in Germany is market-based. Historically, the state has occasionally subsidized private firms or rehabilitated the existing housing stock. Among these subsidies, programs that provide conveniences to the private sector, such as grants or tax reductions, have been developed. In return, rent ceilings and income limits were set, and the public sector provided support to those who had difficulty paying for houses rented out or sold as mortgages to the low-income. This varies depending on the length of the rental period, the type of residence and the subsidy program. After the end of the payments, the owners of the houses are free to rent or sell their houses at market prices. In addition, the rental of residences owned by companies belonging to municipalities continues. The legal framework for these programs is based on Germany's non-profit laws and subsidy regulations that began in the early twentieth century.

In the 1950s, with the enactment of the Second House-Building Law, the size, equipment, rent level or mortgage payments, and maintenance cost of these houses was reconsidered, and the social group's structure of the population was aimed to be improved. This law was amended in September 2001 with the "Housing Reform Law." While the new law continues the production of housing, it has regulated rented social housing and owner-occupied housing (Levy-Vroelant, & Tutin, 2007: 86; Donner, 2000: 366; Whitehead and Kathleen, 2007: 90). The law placed more emphasis on personal subsidies than on certain types of housing funds available on the market. German housing policy's previous massive grants and tax breaks focused on direct and indirect subsidies have been cut since the 1980s, prioritizing small and special-needs groups, often outside of high housing standards. The late 1980s are important for the direction of housing policies. Since then, Germany's housing policy has focused more on specific groups than the public, focusing on priority groups such as single parents and large families. However, new urban problems have emerged, including regional economic inequalities, demographic changes, and urban polarization. As a result, the housing policies of the welfare state have started to be discussed again.

### 2.5. Housing Policies in Social Democratic Welfare States

Sweden's deep-rooted social housing policies based on the principle of need show the importance it attaches to the principles of justice and equality. The first law enacted in the 1930s allowed pensioners and poor families with children to receive government loans. In Sweden, the central government has provided subsidies for housing construction at traditional interest. The state implements direct housing

support programs by providing tax relief and subsidies. Governments are responsible for housing planning for children, retirees, and the elderly. In Sweden, the government gave this authority to municipalities (Whitehead: 93; Droste and Knorr-Siedow, 2007: 95; Turner, 2007: 148). The new housing policy, implemented in 1946, gave municipalities a strategic role. In this direction, with the new legislation in 1974-1975, municipalities significantly impacted state housing, including the right to set rents. Municipalities decide on the location for all residential construction projects, and municipal authorities issue all permits under the law. Firms or institutions established for public housing are usually run by a municipality. These businesses help the public by providing cheap housing without a profit motive. Until recently, no criteria were set for any income level by governments.

In Sweden, all citizens can use municipal housing and housing is allocated according to waiting lists. No upper-income limit is sought, but although council housing is available to all citizens, the social profile of tenants residing there differs from the overall Swedish average. It is possible to encounter groups such as the elderly, single parents, immigrants, and citizens of other countries. Municipalities and municipal housing companies determine rental rates of tenants residing in government housing by market conditions. Municipal housing companies are the responsibility of each municipality. Housing companies have been established because municipalities want to run these organizations as independently as possible. Municipal Housing Corporations (MHC) set rents through negotiation with local tenant associations. This brought along regional problems. This brought the subsidies issue to the top of the agenda. Because rent rates determined below market conditions put private sector investors in a difficult situation (Murdie, & Borgegård, 1992; Borgegård, Turner, 2007: 152)

The representatives of the private sector, who argue that the Swedish system is contrary to the European Union legislation, want the private sector to compete with the public sector on equal terms, as in the EU. From the 1990s, it was planned to reduce the level of subsidies for the surplus housing that occurred. For this reason, ideas have been put forward for a new housing policy. Among the main topics discussed are; There are issues such as high standard needs per housing, own limited resources of subsidies, failure to meet housing targets, high construction costs and increasing national fiscal deficit. The government specifically provided tax relief and reduced general housing subsidies based on these reasons. All differences in borrowing conditions were equalized and gradually disappeared over five years. According to 2007 data, 1.4 million tenants live in approximately 850,000 residences in Sweden. While 20% of the population lives in mass housing and 17% in cooperatives, 60% is the homeowner (Whitehead: 153 37 Borgegård: 1-17; 38 Turner, 2007: 148).

Traditionally, housing in the Netherlands has been seen as a problem the state should solve without leaving it to the market mechanism. Despite current policies to increase home ownership, the Netherlands still has the highest social housing average, with an average of 45%. The Netherlands's history of social housing policies goes back to the 1800s. Nevertheless, real improvements were observed after the Housing Act was enacted in 1901. This law is more about the housing stock's

quantitative characteristics and aims to provide basic living conditions. It also includes financial support for local building specifications, urban plan implementations and social housing construction. The opportunities provided by this law started to be used to solve the large housing deficit in the Netherlands, especially after the Second World War. Unlike early social housing due to population growth, the houses produced in the 1960s and 1970s were generally large apartment communities. In the 1960s, efforts were made to switch to a market-centered housing system, but they were unsuccessful. The biggest factor in this failure is that the generation born after the war started to form separate households, and the demand for housing increased again in the post-war period. Therefore, the state had to meet the increasing demand instead of the market. The central role of the state in housing supply continued into the 1970s. One of the important developments in this period is the unexpected increase in the stock created by the households living in their residences, increasing from 40% - 60% between 1974-1978. In 1977, the obligation to sell social housing was encountered for the first time to support home ownership. The Netherlands's housing sector was influenced by several important non-sector factors in the 1980s (Whitehead: 153; Borgegård, 2011; Turner, 2007: 148; Sarıoğlu, 2007: 1-16).

The central government has expanded its construction program in the rental housing sector in Holland. With this, it was desired to ensure continuity in housing construction and to stop the increasing unemployment in the construction industry. By 1979 production had dwindled to 88,000 units; however, due to the policy followed by the central government, it increased to 123,000 units in 1982 and then started a gradual decline. As a result of the policies followed in the early 1980s, the appropriations allocated from the budget to housing increased. Although liberal trends began to influence all European policies in the early 1980s, fundamental changes in this direction in the Dutch housing system only started in the late 1990s.

Contrary to other Western European countries, government spending on housing increased during 1970-1990. In the early 2000s, "21. The circular, which entered into force with the name of "Housing in the 21st Century", aimed to give individuals options in their property choices to meet their housing needs without disturbing social justice (Boelhouwer, 1992; Sarıoğlu, 2007: 5. 45, Kempen, 1992). Compared to the post-war period, the Dutch housing policy aims to increase the urban quality, allowing more individualization of the society, is more suitable for different housing preferences, supporting home ownership and increasing urban quality.

Private entrepreneurs are supported to take on more responsibility, and more efforts are made to increase green and blue areas in urban areas. There are three main players in the organization of the housing sector in the Netherlands: These are municipalities, housing associations and citizens. In the Netherlands, municipalities gained control in the field of housing with the policies that emerged after 1990. Previously, they had no power to independently create and enforce a housing policy. Today, however, they are responsible for balancing the housing supply and demand of the urban areas under their administration. Housing associations are the main partners of the state in housing policy. Unlike

private entrepreneurs, their profits can be used for housing-related investments. The capital required for the construction and maintenance of the houses is received from the state (Boelhouwer., Sarıoğlu, 2007, p. 5. 45, Kempen, 1992). Housing associations have no financial risks and have very limited freedom to invest according to their own wishes. Apart from the housing associations that mediate the state's social housing policy, private owners also have a stake in the rental sector. However, their share in the housing stock is quite low compared to social owners (i.e., housing associations) and private owners in other European countries (Sarıoğlu, 2007: 9). Another actor is the citizens, namely the landlord or tenants. In the Netherlands, citizens under both property regimes are supported by different policies.

## 3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When the relationship of man with space is evaluated in terms of housing policies, it is understood that the problem is only considered in terms of housing. However, the physical environment is an environment that affects the traditions, cultures, values, judgments, and worldviews of its inhabitants. Interaction with the space is individual. For this reason, the meaning attributed to space changes according to time, situation, and people. The concrete elements that shape the space directly affect the person's cultural life. While the concrete elements that make up the space take their place on mental maps, they are interpreted with psycho-social situations and cause a series of psychological transformations. Mental/cognitive maps create the meaning of space in the collective memory of cities. Spaces formed and interpreted because of a two-way process between the person and his environment turn into environmental images. This environmental image; creates a world of identity, structure and meaning (Lynch, 2010: 8).

People not only live their spaces through associated symbols but also construct the meaning of space through interpretative and cognitive processes. A place is constructed physically by interpreting, feeling, perceiving, narrating, and briefly living it. This means that a place cannot be a place without being named, identified, or defined by people. This shows that the meaning and arrangement of space emerge as a product of social translation, transformation, and experience, in short, social-spatial. Belonging and place attachment plays an important role in forming the self and defining individual and social identity (Soja, 1989: 79-80; Giverny, 2000: 465; Pløger, 2001: 64; Spencer, 2005). sense of belonging, attachment to place and place; place, space, time, experience, memories, activities, social relations, and psycho-social needs reveal the meaning of space. All these factors need to be considered in the creation of healthy cities and the development of housing policies. Because connecting people to spaces is possible by understanding the social meaning of space, their social experiences rather than the physical elements bind people to places. Attachment to place primarily refers to ties related to emotion but also includes ties between individuals and certain places (Gustafson, 2001; 668). When the concept of belonging is used for an urban space, it means that people see themselves as a part of a space, and therefore feel entitled and responsible for that space. Attachment to the place nourishes the sense of

belonging and causes the individual to be a part of the settlement (Sancar and Severcan, 2010: 298). In addition, it is also expressed that the feeling of security supports spatial belonging. People feel more secure in familiar places and develop a sense of belonging after this condition is fulfilled.

Aside from the deep meaning that space creates for people, there are major problems in the housing sector in most developing countries today. Few of these countries have been able to develop policies and strategies to overcome the housing problem. Many of these countries face major political crises due to housing shortages. There is competition for limited resources and often foreign capital between the housing sector and other priority sectors of national importance. The housing provided can only meet a small part of the housing demand. As a result, a significant portion of the housing requirement in these countries is constructed illegally and illegally. The massive migration to cities is one of the main causes of the housing problem. The housing deficit resulting from the inability to meet the demand is being tried to be covered by these methods. Housing in most developing countries is of inadequate quality. These dwellings lack basic equipment, are overcrowded, and are often very densely located. However, it may not be realistic to think that the central government will make significant progress in the housing sector in the coming years due to the high rates of urbanization and the severe problems that underdevelopment imposes on the central government in developing countries. Most of the low-income segments of these societies must build their own houses with their resources and do not expect much help from the central government. Experiences in different countries of the world have shown that if inputs such as sufficient infrastructure, services, space, and a certain amount of capital are provided, it is possible for people from all income groups, as well as low-income segments, to finance housing construction.

In developing countries, the central government has entered the housing market by introducing programs that provide subsidies to low-income groups. At the same time, resources transferred as subsidies can be spent on urban infrastructure because central and local governments in these countries do not have the financial resources to provide necessary quality housing to large population segments. According to one view, subsidies ensure a fair distribution of national wealth. However, experience shows that although subsidies are for low-income groups, middle- and upper-income groups generally benefit. Thus, subsidies result in spending limited central government resources for purposes other than providing basic urban services. Many countries charge interest rates below real long-term capital expenditures to subsidize housing. Such "implicit" subsidies can limit the recovery of cost expenditures.

**REFERENCES**

Alcock P., May M. and Rowlingson K. (2011) "Sosyal Politikada Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar", Siyasal Kitabevi, Ankara.

Aristoteles (2001) "Fizik" (Çev.) S. Babür, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Bengt T. (2007) "Social Housing in Sweden", Social Housing in Europe London, London School of Economics and Publication, London.

Boelhouwer P.J., Van Der Heıjden (1992) H.M.H. Housing systems in Europe, Delft University Press, Delft; Sarıoğlu, a.g.e.: 1-16.

Dieleman, F. M. and Van Kempen, R. (1994) "The mismatch of housing costs and income in Dutch housing", Netherlands Journal of Housing and the Built Environment: 159-172.; Sarıoğlu, a.g.e.: 1-16. 43.

Donner C. (2000) "Housing Policies in the European Union - Theory and Practice": 366. 28; Donner, a.g.e , 2007: 366.

Droste C. and Knorr-Siedow T. (2007) "Social Housing in Germany; Social Housing in Europe London", London School of Economics and Publication: 95. 32.

Emme I. and TOKİ (1993) "Konut Politikaları ve Finansmanı", T.C. Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Eronat, A. İ. (1977) "Türkiye'de Konut Sorunu ve Politikası" Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi, Yayın No: 111, Ankara.

Geray C. (1981) "Konut Gereksinmesi ve Karşılanması", Amme İdaresi Dergisi, 14(2): 54.

Gustafson, P. (2001a) "Roots and Routes Exploring The Relationship Between Place Attachment And Mobility", Environment And Behavior, 33(5): 667-686.

Heidegger, M, (2008) "Varlık ve Zaman", (Çev.) Kaan H. Ökten, Agora Kitaplığı.

Husserl, E. (2003) "Fenomenoloji Üzerine Beş Ders", (Çev.) Harun Tepe, Bilim ve Sanat,Ankara.

Keleş R. (1966) "Sosyal Konut Politikası Kavramı Üzerinde Bir Deneme ve Türkiye'de Sosyal Konut Politikası", Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt XXI Sayı: 2, Ankara.

Lefebvre, H. (2014) "Mekânın Üretimi" (Çev.) I. Ergüden, Sel Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Levy-Vroelant, C. and Tutin C. (2007) "Social Housing in France", LSE Publications, London.

Levy-Vroelant, C. and Tutin C., a.g.e., 2007: 86. 27.

Lynch, K. (2010) "Kent İmgesi", (Çev.) İrem Başaran, 1. Baskı, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.

Merlau-Ponty, M. (2006a) "Göz ve Tin", (Çev.) Ahmet Soysal, Metis, İstanbul.

Merlau-Ponty, M. (2006b) "Algının Önceliği", (Çev.) Yusuf Yıldırım, Kabalcı, İstanbul.

Mulhall, S. (1998) "Heidegger'de Varlık ve Zaman" (Çev.) K. Öktem, Sarmal Yayınevi, İstanbul.

Murdie R. and Borgegård L.-E (1992) "Social Differentiation in Public Rental Housing: A Case Study of Swedish Metropolitan Areas", Scandinavian Housing & Planning Research, 9(1): 1-17.

Nalbantoğlu, H.Ü. (2008) "Nedir Mekan Dedikleri?", (Ed.) Ayşe Şentürer, Şafak Ural, Özlem Berber, Funda Uz Sönmez, Zaman-Mekan, (çev) E. Orman,Yem Yayın, İstanbul.

Norberg-Schulz C. (200) "Arhictecture, Presence, Language, Place," Skira, Milano.

Örücü E. (1972) "Sosyal Refah Devletinde Bir Sosyal Kamu Hizmeti Konut", İ.Ü. Yayını No: 1761, İstanbul.

Outwaite, W. (1991) "Hans-Georg Gadamer", "Çağdaş temel kuramlar", (Der.) Quentin Skinner, (Çev.) Ahmet Demirhan, Vadi Yayınları, Ankara.

Özdemir, S. (2004) "Küreselleşme Sürecinde Refah Devleti", İTO Yay., No: 2004-69, İstanbul.

Platon (2001) "Timaios", (Çev.) E. Güngör ve L. Ay, Çağdaş Matbaacılık Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Pulat G. (1992) "Dar gelirli Kentlilerin Konut Sorunu ve Soruna Sosyal İçerikli Mekânsal Çözüm Arayışları", Ankara Kent-Koop. Yayınları No:98, Ankara.

Sancar F. and Severcan Y. C., (2010) "Children's Places: Rural-Urban Comparisons Using Participatory Photography in the Bodrum Peninsula, Turkey", Journal of Urban Design, 15-3.

Sarıoğlu, G. P. (2007) "Hollanda'da Konut Politikaları ve İpotekli Kredi Sistemi", METU Journal of Faculty of Architecture (JFA), 24(2):1-16.

Tekeli İ. (1999) "Kent Planlaması Konuşmaları", T.B.M.O.B Mimarlar Odası Yayınları, Ankara.

Whitehead C. and Scanlon K. (2007) "Social Housing in Europe London", London School of Economics and Publication: 90.

Yavuz F. (1953) "Şehircilik Ders Kitabı", Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayını, Ankara.