

---

*Leila Hosseini*

**SPATIAL GOVERNMENTALITY  
OF MOSCOW PARKS AS BIOPOLITICAL  
AND BIOCULTURAL IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION**

This article studies the spatial governmentality of Moscow parks and the way it contributes to the biopolitical construction of identity. Mapped on the Foucauldian notion of governmentality, this research investigates how spaces rather than people are governed to produce self-governing subjectivities and, thereby, social order. It argues that the governing of spaces based on inclusion/exclusion techniques fosters the circulation of some behaviours while obscures the others as threatening the creation of safe spaces for the included subjects. Invoking the municipal rules of behaviour at parks, we elaborate on the included/excluded activities to demonstrate the ways that the knowledge produced through the regulation of parks informs the bodily conduct of the individuals, producing subjectivities who regulate their freedom in a state-controlled way. The technique of including health-cautious self-governing subjects fosters people's behaviour in alignment with biopolitical objectives of the state to produce a healthy race and economically efficient human capital. At the same time, the spatial governmentality of parks problematizes some activities to produce a securitized space through the exclusionary mechanism of removing the unwanted or health threatening behaviour. This kind of securitization increases the risk of exclusion from the spaces for certain behaviours. As a result of this process, the spatial governmentality of parks provides a common biological and cultural ground based on which the subjects govern their conduct. Common culture of managing physical issues constructs biocultural identity as it produces a sense of 'us' and the outcast 'others,' bonding the group with a homogenous behaviour as a nation.

*Keywords:* spatial governmentality, Moscow parks, biopolitics, identity, conduct of conduct

---

Leila Khadem Makhsuos Hosseini – Doctoral student, MGIMO University, Moscow, Russian Federation; Associate Researcher at University of Religions and Denominations, Qom, Iran. Email: leila.hosseiny60@gmail.com

DOI: 10.17323/727-0634-2023-21-2-361-374

Cities are built with various kinds of spaces such as administrative, education centres, shopping malls, theatres, transport infrastructure, parks, and recreation places, which all assist people in making their everyday life experiences. All these different places are constructed as more than simply abstract grounds. Rather, they are fabricated at the intersection of spatiality and sociality. Kim Dovey acknowledges that places are a form of 'discourse without intrinsic meaning,' with which 'identity becomes enmeshed, naturalized and depoliticized' (2010: 4). However, some places like hotels lack a 'sense of place' and belonging due to being transient, while the others convey 'authentic sense of place' and belonging, offering 'people a space that can potentially empower their identity, where they can meet other people with whom they share social references and histories' (Wilkinson 2020: 220).

Urban parks, among other social infrastructures of a city, are places to bring people together. Creating bonds between the place and the long-term residents, urban parks foster 'place attachment,' 'place dependency,' and 'place identity' (Bazrafshan et al. 2022). In addition, unlike most other urban infrastructures, parks interconnect nature and culture. Although exposed to political, social, cultural, and technological interventions, these cultured landscapes are natural domains of the urban space. Providing intrinsic aesthetic attraction, they have considerable potential in socializing people and bringing them together through fostering a shared identity.

In this article, we examine the spatial governmentality of Moscow parks and the way it can produce self-governing responsabilized subjectivities. Addressing the question of governmentality of parks, the study is aimed to explore how the construction of desirable subjectivity, as structured by spatial regulations, contributes to biopolitical and biocultural identity construction. We view the parks as the site where culture and biology have interwoven, making the park a matrix of biopolitical and biocultural study.

The study is based on the Foucauldian notion of 'governmentality' which refers to the governance of self and others. This power is exercised by modern states to reduce state governing to proliferate self-governing. The research investigates the cultural rationality of governing Moscow parks and the ways in which the truth, desired by the authorities, is produced through park regulations. Eventually, this process contributes to governing the nation's conduct, so that free subjects self-monitor their conduct in accordance with state-controlled regulations. We demonstrate the role of parks in biopolitical regulation of corporeality in the sense how appearance of certain bodies is excluded to produce a common base which identifies a nation.

The paper discusses the theoretical framework of spatial governmentality, and embarks on a practical approach to study the biopolitical role of parks in health management of Moscow residents in production of a healthy and economically more efficient 'human capital.' The final section examines the interaction of

culture and biology, bringing to light the cultural grounds of biopolitics and exploring the ways of how the governmentality of parks can be effective in internalizing and constructing cultural aspects of identity including religious, gender, and national identity.

### **Theorizing Spatial Governmentality**

The term governmentality coined by Michel Foucault (2007) in his lecture series 'Security, Territory, Population' (1977–1978) refers to a way of exercising power that emerged in 18<sup>th</sup> century Europe, which was different from sovereign power. It suggests how the governing of self and others occurs through new means. Governmentality stipulates that behaviour and bodily habits are controlled via production of a particular subjectivity by discourse (Huxley 2008). According to Foucault, '[t]he subject is constantly dissolved and recreated in different configurations ... The subject is a form, not a thing, and this form is not constant, even when attached to the same individual' (cit. in O'Farrell 2005: 113).

Governmentality, as Daniele Lorenzini explains (2018), is the combination of two words, 'govern' and 'mentality,' referring to the rationality behind governing and the reasoning of the state in its concern of population management. Neoliberalism is now the main rationality behind governing the subjects by controlling the 'conduct of conduct' of the individual: neoliberal art of governmentality exercises power by 'promoting new kinds of freedom conducts individual behaviour by incitation and not by coercion' (Lorenzini 2018: 3). Governmentality as a diffuse kind of power which 'is associated with satisfactory arrangement of people in relation to their surroundings' (Hepworth 2018: 509).

Exercising this kind of power relies on techniques through which knowledge is manipulated, that is the regimes of truth. Foucault maintains that '[e]ach society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth, that is the type of discourse it accepts and makes function as true' (1980: 131). This technique includes delineating true statements from false, the behaviours that can be visible, and those that must be obscured. Foucault believes in a circular relation between power and truth: 'Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power that produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which induce and which extend it, a regime of truth' (1980: 133).

Denying the existence of universal truth, Foucault acknowledges the socially constructed nature of knowledge whereby certain representations, relations, and ideas are legitimized, and certain exploitations and oppressions are made natural to sustain power relations. The constructed truth operates through power strategies supporting the discourses of the regime of truth to falsify and exclude other versions. The means through which some knowledge is affirmed as truth and other remains unknowable is discourse. The produced discourses promote certain aspects of neoliberal subjectivity – 'responsibility, flexibility, rational calculation' to 'internalize certain neoliberal values' as mechanisms to

formulate the desired subjectivity (Weinder 2009). The discourses that limit the boundaries of our knowledge are governmental in the sense that they direct the behaviour of individuals. According to Foucault, governmentality 'designate[s] the way in which the conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed <...> to structure the possible field of action of others' (Foucault 1982: 790).

The geographical approach to governmentality adds material spaces of different kinds as instruments and projects of control over the population. Foucault's fourth lecture of 'Security, Territory and Population' reflects on the spaces of scrutiny and special governmentality in terms of circulation of people and goods within and between the territories. The new mechanisms of establishing social order through spatial regularizations are called spatial governmentality (Perry 2000).

While structuring spaces is a material technology, this is also a part of governmental programmes and regulations, and thereby it is a governmental instrument in production of truth. Space as the locus of population affects the conduct of the individuals. The way the individuals' conduct is structured is specific to that particular space different from others. In *Discipline and Punishment*, Foucault mentions that control must be based on 'codification that partitions as closely as possible time, space, movement' to decide the kind of subjects and behaviours that are acceptable in a specific space (Foucault 1977: 137).

The governmentality of space defines movements, positionality, hierarchies, and relationships between individuals. Controlling the flow of people and materials encourages some behaviours and excludes others. Such spatial governmentality contributes to the production of viable subjectivity. In our research, it refers to the subject whose bodily performances, such as sexual behaviour or maintenance of fit and healthy body along with cultural views are defined by the dominant discourse of the state.

The exclusion of certain behaviour from a space problematizes that behaviour as violating and defines the security regime associated with the removal. Thomas Dillon (2004) maintains that '[h]istory of security is clearly a history of changing problematizations.' Thus, security is being (re)defined based on 'the regime of truth and its moral economy' to 'shape rational behaviour by empowering security-conscious subjectivities' who regulate their 'changing well-being' (Dillon 2004: 81). On the one hand, excluding threatening behaviours shields the included ones and produces security. On the other hand, it provides uniformity to the population of a territory. As a material representation of 'us' vs 'other,' this delineation contributes to the construction of a national identity.

There are other techniques of exclusion through crafting spaces. For example, necropolitics is the power and capacity to dictate 'who may live and who must die...to exercise control over mortality' (Mbembe 2003: 27). Thus, while biopolitical governmentality is concerned with the control of the body of the population, necropolitics aims to use dead bodies to regulate the living bodies through the invocation of collective memory and mythmaking, 'forging a sense of solidarity and

delegitimizing the enemy outside' (Yilmaz, Erturk 2021:2). This is especially evident in military-theme parks and war memorials. According to Judith Butler, '[w]e might think of war as dividing populations into those who are grievable and those who are not' (2009:38). The necropolitical technique of constructing iconic images of martyrs while consolidating the nation, is a technique of deploying living bodies. Drawing a line between holy bodies of 'us' and 'invaluable' others, emotions are provoked to internalize the borders between 'us' and 'them' (Ahmed 2014:27).

In the following sections, we explore the role of governmentality parks on biopolitical national identity construction. Moscow parks serve as a case study in which we investigate how spatial governmentality influences the production of subjectivity.

### **Governmentality of Parks and Biopolitical Identity Construction**

As an apparatus of governmentality, biopolitical identity construction governs individuals' bodily conducts. It reveals how specific aspects of identity are associated with the physical issues of the population, and how the population is bound together based on a defined body management. The establishment of identity in bodily matters concerns the way in which the state targets the health, longevity, and fertility of the population in order to manage the bodies according to its desired way. The techniques of inclusion/exclusion based on physical characteristics represent the politicization of the physical body, that is, in Giorgio Agamben's (1998:4) words, blurring the lines between *zoe* (biological life) and *bio* (the life of the citizen), when *zoe* is brought to the surface of *bio*. The physical *zoe*, such as features of race and ethnicity that may seem natural, is shaped by the ideological norms of a society. Any set of such norms shaping the bodies provide a common sense of belonging to a group or a nation (Makarychev, Yatsyk 2017).

In neoliberal societies, the state's biopolitical intervention is achieved through the rationality of governing which aims at producing free entrepreneurs who are responsible for their choices and would feel guilty over their health problems (Khadem, Jabbari 2022). The neoliberal model of government either cuts or eliminates services such as recreation programmes, shifting the responsibility of a problematized issue to the individuals to pay or care for (Newmeyer 2017). The power-knowledge technique is used to govern the conduct of free entrepreneurs, whereby the knowledge produced by dominant discourses stimulates the individual's conduct in a state-desired way. Thus, sedentary disease, obesity, and depression have concerned the authorities who deploy health policies. Therefore, the dominant discourses are crowded by health issues (Wright, Harwood 2012: 116).

With the globally growing concern about health issues, the plethora of medical, cultural or social discourses are producing knowledge about a healthy

and fit body gained through the physical activities and healthy diet in order to define a healthy body as the sole viable national subjectivity. This in turn constructs a responsabilized subjectivity of a healthy citizen. The correct lifestyle is defined in association with a healthy fit body. Parks offer easy access to physical activity which is then framed as a rational choice to make, because parks become an accessible medium for this healthy lifestyle goal. Different cultural and medical discourses infuse the knowledge about the betterment of life conditions by reconciling people with nature and familiarizing them with the significance of physical activity like hiking or biking in the parks (James et al. 2019). To be a viable subject who is in alignment with desired social frameworks, the individuals self-govern their bodies choosing rational choices to stay fit and healthy.

Today, Moscow residents spend 135 minutes a week in the parks; the number of visitors to the parks has increased 10-fold in the last 7 years (Pyysiäinen et al. 2017). The self-governing subjects, however, do not exonerate the state from responsibilities and demand provision of more and better recreation spaces. Workout sites in Moscow parks have recently been amplified by more than 90 sites (Zelen'kova2020). Free yoga classes are organized in over 20 Moscow parks every summer. Some parks are equipped with special tents for yoga classes on rainy days (Nikitina 2022). In 2022, 100 sites opened in Moscow parks for active winter recreation. Deputy Mayor of Moscow said:

Every year, Moscow parks become centers of urban winter recreation. In November, 21 artificial turf skating rinks were opened in them, more than 100 sites will be added by the end of December – ski slopes with a total length of almost 165 kilometers, slides and skating rinks with natural ice (Russia Posts English 2022).

Sport festivals organized in the parks gather lots of people in the parks for cheerful competitions (Mos-holidays 2019). On Athlete Day, almost all parks offer different sports, such as free basketball classes at Gorky Park, body combat and move up dance at Hermitage Garden, all seeking to regulate healthy habits and add sports to daily schedules (Kudamoscow 2022). Yauza Park offers contests of street football and table tennis together with children's sport challenges under the title of 'Mom, Dad, I am from a sporty family' (Fomenko 2022). The project of 'Moscow Longevity,' the largest health, educational, and leisure project for older Muscovites, offers sports training, and creative and educational classes for free in more than 30 parks (DSZN 2022). Healthy Lifestyle Festival at Krasnaya Presnya Park as a part of the celebration of Moscow Parks Day on May 18–19<sup>th</sup> offers free consultation of specialists in improving the body along with free yoga, qigong, and dance, as well as children's yoga and educational games. Moreover, a culinary performance-carnival instructs the citizens in healthy diet styles (OSD 2013).

Moscow ranks second after Hong Kong among the world's megacities in terms of parks in urban areas. In Moscow, smart public parks are part of the

city's sustainable and social approach to park planning. Russian parks, using modern technologies such as the cartographic geographic information system, are getting smarter to attract more visitors (Sergunina 2020). Sport fields in the parks are equipped with necessary equipment under the 'My District' program. Football fields, long bike paths, basketball and volleyball courts, which usually turn to ice rinks in winter are prominent characteristics of most Moscow parks. Also, in 2019, the Cherkizovsky Children's Park was created in the Preobrazhenskoye district under the My District program (Dorogomilova, 2020). The number of parks in the capital has increased from 230 to 570 from 2011–2017 (TASS 2017). The promotion of park visits points at the growth of the number of citizens with proper lifestyles that prioritize fit and slim bodies achieved in connection with their natural environment. Health conscious individuals enjoy a healthy life as well as construct the desirable subjectivity. At the same time, the state benefits from a healthy human capital, physically strong population, and economically efficient labour force. Russia's current propaganda campaign to promote healthy lifestyles is one of the government's tactics to remedy the legacy of the 1990's, when rampant alcoholism rose after the collapse of the USSR and male life expectancy plummeted to just 57 years.

The governmentality of parks includes healthy behaviours and excludes threatening behaviours. According to Moscow Park rules (Appendix to the Order 2017), visitors to parks must behave in accordance with the generally accepted rules of public order, keep cleanliness, not use obscene language, and not take actions that endanger the safety and health of other visitors. If someone violates this order, park keepers can remove them from the park. Visitors are banned from carrying weapons, flammable, explosive, poisonous, odorous and radioactive substances, and piercing, cutting, and bulky items into parks. Carrying or drinking alcoholic beverages, except beer, is prohibited on the territory of parks. Smoking on the territory of the parks is forbidden to protect the health of citizens from the effects of passive smoking. In general, any actions that endanger the safety of life and health of the visitors and employees of parks are unacceptable.

Moreover, in alignment with the state's policies, the propagation of 'non-traditional sexual behaviours' is prohibited in Russia. Moscow's parks are no exception to this rule. For instance, Sokolniki and Gorky Park stated that they could not agree to hold an LGBT action (BFM.RU 2013).

Spatial governmentality of parks is enacted by removing certain behaviours and people who are threatening the 'safety!' This creates a safe space for those who are regarded as law-abiding citizens. Thus, the mechanism of exclusion by preventing unwanted behaviours in a specific space controls risks and produces security (Perin 1977). At the same time, the included subjects are those who can self-govern their behaviours. Mechanism of spatial governmentality builds individual self-governance as 'they establish areas to which only people seen as capable of self-governance have access and incarcerate those who cannot be reformed' (Merry 2001: 17). Free subjects choose to conduct

their bodily manners within the limits articulated by spatial governmentality to enjoy a healthy body and accepted subjectivity.

The art of government constructs its truths discursively to formulate the mentalities and limit what can be thought, while truth governs the conduct of individuals in their daily routines and their bodily affairs, producing self-governing subjects. The produced subjects are free agents whose self-regulation is in line with state-desired ways. Scholars claim that freedom of choice has become a 'resource for, and not merely a hindrance to the government' (Barry et al. 2013: 8). Performances of self-regulating individuals sustain and legitimize the state power. Neoliberal rationality behind governmentality blurs the boundaries between state and capital. Thomas Lemke explains that 'in the history of governmentality, Foucault endeavours to show how the modern sovereign state and the modern autonomous individual co-determine each other's emergence... It links technologies of self with technologies of domination' (Lemke 2002: 2). Neoliberal governance produces responsabilized and self-monitoring subjects (Hajak 2019). In Russia's case, however, the opposite is true: the neoliberal governance of the 1990's produced social chaos, high crime rates, and drug/alcoholism related problems. On the contrary, Russia's current authoritarian-conservative-technocratic model has succeeded in this endeavour. Specifically, health-cautious and responsible for their behaviour park visitors in Moscow prove that the knowledge produced by discourses control the rationality of the subjects and govern their liberty.

### **Governmentality of Parks as Biocultural Identity Construction**

Here we demonstrate that one of the roles of parks as the natural and cultural heritage of a country is to cultivate the visitors' national identity and their sense of belonging to a community called nation. Anthony Smith (1991: 11) argues that 'nations must have a measure of common culture and a civic ideology, a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas, that bind the population together in their homeland.' In this respect, national identity is a combination of shared culture and land. Parks binding territory and culture can be conceived as a locus of nation making and reproduction where the population is tied with land and culture. The park as a landscape shared by the inhabitants of a common territory and governed by the state to represent and include a shared history, myths, custom, symbols, and values unites the population both with the territory and the state and demonstrates a considerable potential for articulation of identity.

Below we survey the role of governmentality in Moscow parks as a process of construction of citizens' cultural identity. We explore how governmentality of parks, including their structure as well as different programmes, ceremonies, and festivals held in the parks demonstrate the values celebrated



there to reinforce Russian gender, ethnic, and religious norms, which bind the nation under a homogenous identity.

### **Moscow Parks and Gender identity**

The art and rationality of governing Moscow parks embrace Russian traditional gender norms. The celebration of the Defender of the Fatherland on February 23 (Russell 2021) honours the gender role of a 'real' Russian masculinity as protective, strong, and heroic defending family and the country. A course of sword fighting for boys at Mitino Park as well as free artillery exhibitions and open-air manoeuvres at Gorky Park display the heroic deeds of the forefathers to defend the fatherland and signify the gender stereotypes ascribed to male body.

The 8<sup>th</sup> of March is an International Women's Day and, while not popular in western countries, it is celebrated in every corner of Russia honouring the beauty of femininity (Masterrussian 2022). Almost in all parks they distribute flowers to female visitors to honour womanhood. Festive concerts, musical performances, theatres, dedicated to the theme of mothers and women, along with free art and painting classes are organised in most Moscow parks. Moreover, 'Maternity Support Centre' holds free programmes to teach women on reconciliation of maternity and career (MosTrek 2021).

On the 8<sup>th</sup> of July, Russian Family Day is celebrated in the parks such as Tsaritsino in glorification of love, loyalty, and nuclear family (Russian Events and Holidays 2022). In most parks, the visitors find free art classes, family readings, tea tables, and festive programmes on the theme of family and fidelity (KudaMoscow 2022). On the last Sunday of November, Russian Mother's Day is celebrated in parks hosting various festivals, games, concerts, and exhibitions in honour of the woman 'who gives life and love' (OfficeHolidays 2022).

These cases demonstrate the cultural governmentality of Moscow parks resonating with traditional gender norms. The heteronormative rationality behind governing park festivals, and the art of park architecture, including statues or art galleries in the parks, naturalize heterosexual bodily relations marginalizing the other gender expressions and identities. The cultural internalization of the binary gender system delineating the included/excluded borders of biological traits affects the individuals' biological behaviour directing them toward reproductive sexual behaviours. According to Edenborg, in Russia, 'the state-promoted heteropatriarchal definition of the people... conditions the appearance of Russia as a nation of traditional values' (Edenborg 2019: 109). This biologically based identity ensures normal subjectivity and viability and consolidates the nation in contrast to acceptable Western fluid identities (Sleptcov 2017).

### **Moscow Parks and Ethnic National Identity**

Moscow parks are abundant in festivals and iconic events that nourish people's sense of belonging to the roots of Russian descent. Magnitude celebrations of the Victory Day on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May in the parks host lots of people

waving flags and wearing black and yellow ribbons in memory of those who sacrificed themselves for Russia (Ekmanis 2017). On this day, park visitors enjoy brass bands, military exhibitions, fireworks, workshops, and open concerts honouring their Russianness. The 'symbolically charged celebrations of national days' create the 'us' vs. 'them' dichotomy (Stinson, Lunstrum 2021), binding those who enjoy a sense of honour with the land to construct a nation.

Russia's military Patriotic Park displaying kilometres of artillery hardware visualizes the value of defending the homeland in wartime. The irreconcilable merge of death and life symbolized in militarization of natural landscapes exemplifies the biopolitical practices of killing the others in protection of the lives that matter. Artillery exhibition in nature naturalizes and depoliticizes 'objects of violence by representing them as necessary for ensuring safety at home' (Edenborg 2018: 74).

In addition to biopolitical art of governmentality of parks, necropolitical techniques can also be noticed in park areas embedding tombs of unknown martyrs. The glorification of the nameless fallen and the idealization of dying for homeland constructs patriotic bodies through the politicized and valorised dead. Moscow Victory Park, Patriotic Park, and Vorontsovsky Park are some examples of the parks that have the tombs of unknown soldiers who fought to defend Russia. Statistically, every family in the Russian Federation has lost one or more members in the flames of this war. Hence, the patriotic values cherished in the parks mobilize the emotions of park visitors eliciting feelings of military honour and love of homeland and consolidate the community as a nation. Moscow Victory park also hosts an Orthodox church, a Jewish synagogue, and a Muslim mosque to commemorate major religions of Russia that contributed to the victory over Nazi Germany.

### **Moscow Parks and Religious Identity**

The governmentality of Moscow parks also includes the celebrations of religious values to produce homogenous self-regulating bodies with desired governmentalized performances. The church buildings present in almost all Moscow parks signify the centrality of Orthodox values. In Foucault's words, the church 'is a superb instrument of power' (Foucault 1991: 107) still able to 'discipline and affect bodies and practices' (Garmany 2010: 910). Religion constructs as material representation of a value translate supernatural symbolic ideas to material expressions making it easier to communicate an abstract religious belief and pass it to the next generation.

Along with religious spaces, the ceremonies held in the parks also use different techniques such as songs, rhythmic movements, dance or clapping that have the ability to manipulate bodily and mental states to direct the minds. Armin Geertz affirms 'such techniques tug deeply at the psychological and somatic foundations of each and every individual and have the ability to arouse, shape and form emotions and mental states, thus allowing the transfer and sharing of norms and ideals' (Geertz, 2010: 307). Maslenitsa is one of the

festivals held in Moscow parks every year at the end of February to welcome spring. Though it goes back to paganism, it was preserved by the Russian church celebrating the last week before Orthodox Lent. Dancing, chanting, games, sleigh riding, and having special foods internalize Russian moral and religious values such as forgiveness, sharing food, spending time with the family and relatives (Riabkov 2020).

The Russian epiphany evening of baptism usually held in park ponds is another way of sustaining religious traditions through physical manipulation of bodies (Ustimenko 2017). Ivan Kupala, another festival originated in paganism, and attributed to John the Baptist by Orthodox church is celebrated in Moscow parks, such as Gorki, Sokolniki, Troparevsky parks or the park by the Moscow River where wreaths made out of medical herbs are floated in the water with a candle in it. (Expatica 2022). Festivals in the parks to celebrate Easter and Christmas as two other religious occasions verify the significance of parks as the locus for internalizing and sustaining Orthodox religious values.

It is also important to point out that Russia is a multinational country hosting Orthodox Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and Judaism as its main religions. Hence, Moscow's parks are not exclusively limited to celebrating the Orthodox religious holidays. Every year the Muslim celebration of Kurban-Bairam gathers thousands of people. In 2023, the celebrations lasted for three days on 53 different geolocations in Moscow and the Moscow region, including the stadiums and Sokolniki Park. The interaction of religious culture with the governmentality of parks internalizes and sustains these values and induces the visitors' conduct based on a common culture. Such a collective base of self-governing bonds the group with homogenous behaviours and bodily practices as a nation.

## Conclusion

This study is aimed to explore the spatial governmentality of Moscow parks and the way it can contribute to the construction of biopolitical and biocultural identity. Using the Foucauldian notion of 'governmentality' as the basis for the research, we discussed how managing a space can manage the people. We examined the spatial regularizations through the technique of inclusion/exclusion and its influence on production of responsabilized and self-governing subjectivities established on biological and cultural traits that bind people together.

To demonstrate the park regulations, we invoked the municipal rules of parks in Moscow. Referring to the sport and healthy lifestyle programmes in the parks of Moscow, we illustrated the way knowledge about body management is established through governmentality of the parks. The produced knowledge governing the bodily conduct of the individuals, produces subjectivities who regulate their freedom in a state desired way. The technique of including health-cautious self-governing subjects encourages these behaviours in alignment with biopolitical objectives of the state to produce a healthy race

and economically efficient human capital. The spatial governmentality of parks, through an exclusionary mechanism of removing the unwanted or health threatening behaviours, problematizes some traits such as alcohol or drug use or homosexuality to produce biopolitical security. This kind of security diminishes the risky behaviours and produces a space regarded as safe according to the state norms that aim to curtail the behaviours threatening what they define as security.

The study of cultural regulations of parks revealed an abundance of cultural programmes in the parks of Moscow to cultivate cultural-territorial aspects of nation making. The spatial governmentality of parks, with specific rationality to produce truth, provides a common culture based on which the subjects govern their conduct including their bodily conduct. The investigation of cultural programmes and designs of parks indicate the ubiquity of traditional Russian culture to bond the people with the homogeneous identity. Valorising heteronormative gender norms, necropolitical idealization of dying for the homeland and the presence of Orthodox religious centres in the parks define the frame within which free subjects can regulate their subjectivities.

## Sources

Appendix to the Order (2017) *Pravila poseshcheniya Gosudarstvennogo avtonomnogo uchrezhdeniya kul'tury goroda Moskvy 'Izmaylovskiy PKiO'* ot 23 avgusta 2017 g. № 66 [Rules for Visiting the State Autonomous Cultural Institution of the City of Moscow 'Izmailovsky PKiO', dated August 23, 2017 No. 66]. Available at: <https://www.izmailovsky-park.ru/images/doki/NovieDOKI/pravila.pdf> (accessed 13 December 2022).

BFM.RU (2013) *Gayd-parki otkazali gey-paradu* [Gayde Parks Turned down the Gay Pride Parade]. Available at: <https://www.bfm.ru/news/216559> (accessed 10 November 2022).

DSZN (2022) *Moskovskoe dolgoletie* [Moscow Longevity]. Available at: <https://dszn.ru/dolgoletie> (accessed 02 December 2022).

Expatica (2022) *The best Russian Festivals and Celebrations*. Available at: <https://www.expatica.com/ru/lifestyle/holidays/russian-festivals-507821/> (accessed 17 July 2022).

Fomenko A. (2022) *V parke v Yurlovskom proezde proydet sportivnyy prazdnik* [A Sports Festival Will be Held in the Park in Yurlovsky Passage]. *Novosti rayona Otradnoe* [News of the Otradnoe District]. Available at: <https://gazeta-otradnoe.ru/v-parke-v-yurlovskom-proezde-projdet-sportivnyj-prazdnik/> (accessed 2 December 2022).

Dorogomilovo: Newspaper of In the West of Moscow (2020) *Natalya Sergunina (Zamestitel' mera) rasskazala o sportivnykh parkakh Moskvy* [Natalya Sergunina (Deputy Mayor) Spoke about the Sports Parks in Moscow]. Available at: <https://upravadorogomilovo.ru/natalja-sergunina-rasskazala-o-sportivnyx-parkax-moskvy> (accessed 29 September 2021).

Kudamoscow (2022) *Den' fizkul'turnika v parkakh Moskvy 2022* [Athlete's Day in Moscow parks 2022]. Available at: <https://kudamoscow.ru/event/den-fizkulturnika-v-parkax-moskvy-2022/> (accessed 15 August 2022).

Masterrussian (2022) *March 8: International Women's Day*. Available at: [http://masterrussian.com/russianculture/womens\\_day\\_march8.htm](http://masterrussian.com/russianculture/womens_day_march8.htm) (accessed 17 July 2022).

MosTrek (2021) *8 marta v parkakh Moskvy* [March 8 in Moscow Parks]. Available at: <https://mostrek.ru/8-marta-v-parkah-moskvy/> (accessed 21 August 2022).

Mos-holidays (2019) *Sportivnyy prazdnik v parke Druzhby* [Sports Festival in Friendship Park]. Available at: <https://mos-holidays.ru/sportivnyj-prazdnik-v-parke-druzhby/> (accessed 24 July 2022).

Nikitina M. (2022) *Sports in Moscow*. HSE University. Available at: <https://www.hse.ru/recommends/moscowports> (accessed 15 November, 2022).

OfficeHolidays (2022) *Mother's Day in Russia in 2022*. Available at: <https://www.officeholidays.com/holidays/russia/mothers-day#:~:text=In%20Russia%2C%20Mother's%20Day%20is,love%20and%20care%20for%20them> (accessed 20 September 2022).

OSD (2013) Festival 'Zdorovaya Moskva' v parke 'Krasnaya Presnya' [Festival 'Healthy Moscow' in the park 'Krasnaya Presnya']. Available at: <https://www.osd.ru/newsinf.asp?nw=5430> (accessed 15 June 2022).

Russian Events and Holidays (2022) *The Day of Family, Love and Fidelity*. Available at: <https://www.rusevents.info/prazdnik/the-day-of-family-love-and-fidelity/> (accessed 29 August 2022).

Russia Posts English (2022) *Over 100 Sites for Active Winter Recreation to Open in Moscow Parks*. Available at: <https://news.russia.postsen.com/local/120073.html> (accessed 25 August 2022).

TASS (2017) *Lystseva Marina. Poseshchayemost' parkov Moskvy vyroslo v 10 raz za sem' let* [Attendance at Moscow Parks Has Grown 10 Times in Seven Years]. Available at: <https://tass.ru/moskva/4827462> (accessed 10 September 2022).

Zelen'kova A. (2020) Bolee 90 vorkaut-ploshchadok otkryty v moskovskikh parkakh [More than 90 workout sites open in Moscow parks]. *RGRU*. Available at: <https://rg.ru/2020/08/13/reg-cfo/bolee-90-vorkaut-ploshchadok-otkryty-v-moskovskih-parkah.html> (accessed 21 August 2022).

## References

Agamben G. (1998). *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press,

Ahmed S. (2014) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Barry A., Osborne T., Rose N. (2013) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government*. London, Routledge.

Bazrafshan M., Mikaeili T. A., Bauer N., Kienast F. (2022) Place Attachment Through Interaction with Urban Parks: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 61 (1–2): 1–11.

Butler J. (2009) *Frames of War, When Is Life Grievable?* Verso, London.

Dillon M. (2004) The Security of Governance. In: W. Larner, W. Walters (eds.) *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*. London, New York: Routledge: 76–94.

Dovey K. (2010) *Becoming Places: Urbanism/Architecture/Identity/Power*. London, New York: Routledge.

Driver F. (1985) Power, Space, and the Body: A Critical Assessment of Foucault's Discipline and Punish. *Society and Space*, 3 (4): 425–446.

Edenborg E. (2018) Homophobia as Geopolitics: 'Traditional Values' and the Negotiation of Russia's Place in the World. In: Mulholland J., Montagna N., Sanders-McDonagh E. (eds.) *Gendering Nationalism*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham: 67–87.

Edenborg E. (2019) Russia's Spectacle of 'Traditional Values': Rethinking the Politics of Visibility. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 22 (1): 106–126.

Ekmanis I. D. (2017) Host Land or Homeland? Civic–Cultural Identity and Banal Integration in Latvia. *Washington.edu*. Available at: <https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/handle/1773/39884> (accessed 9 December 2021).

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

Foucault M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon books.

Foucault M. (1982) The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8 (4): 777–795.

Foucault M. (1991) On Religion. In: J. Carrette (eds.) *Religion and Culture: Michel Foucault*. Routledge, New York: 106–109.

Foucault M. (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at College De France, 1977–1978*. New York: Picador.

Garmany J. (2010) Religion and Governmentality: Understanding Governance in Urban Brazil. *Elsevier Science*, 41 (6): 908–918.

- Geertz A. W. (2010) Brain, Body and Culture: A Biocultural Theory of Religion. *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion*, 22 (4): 304–321.
- Hájek M. Šrám, K. Kolomojets M. Cuker, I. (2019). Uneasy Neoliberal Governance in a Low-Trust Society: Barriers to Responsibilisation in the Czech Republic. *Sociological Research Online*, (1–18).
- Hepworth K. (2018) Governmentality, Technologies, & Truth Effects in Communication Design. In: P. Vermaas, S. Vial (eds.) *Advancements in the Philosophy of Design. Design Research Foundations*. Springer: 497–521.
- Huxley M. (2008) Space and Government: Governmentality and Geography. *Geography Compass*, 2 (5): 1635–1658.
- James J. J., Richard W., Battista R. (2019) A Historical and Critical Analysis of Park Prescriptions. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 50 (12): 1–19.
- Khadem M. H. L. and Jabbarinasir H. (2022). A Study of Russian Biopolitical Techniques in Women's Beauty and Health Care. *Praxema, Journal of Visual Semiotics*, 2 (32): 172–189.
- Lemke T (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, 14 (3): 49–64.
- Lorenzini D. (2018) Governmentality, Subjectivity, and the Neoliberal Form of Life. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 22 (2): 154–166.
- Makarychev A., Yatsyk A. (2017) Biopolitics and National Identities: Between Liberalism and Totalization. *Nationalities Papers*, 45 (1): 1–7.
- Mbembe A. (2003) Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15 (1): 11–40.
- Merry S. (2001) Spatial Governmentality and the New Urban Social Order: Controlling Gender Violence through Law. *American Anthropologist*, 103 (1): 16–29.
- Newmeyer T. (2017) 'Obligations and Entitlements': Neoliberalism, Governmentality, and Community Parks. In: K. Spracklen, B. Lashua, E. Sharpe, S. Swain (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Leisure Theory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan: 835–854.
- O'Farrell C. (2005) *Michel Foucault*. London: Sage.
- Perin C. (1977) *Everything in its Place: Social Order and Land Use in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Perry R. W. (2000) Governmentalities in City-scapes: Introduction to the Symposium. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 23 (1): 65–72.
- Pysiäinen J., Halpin D., Guilfoyle A. (2017) Neoliberal Governance and 'Responsibilization' of Agents: Reassessing the Mechanisms of Responsibility-Shift in Neoliberal Discursive Environments. *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, 18 (2): 215–235.
- Riabkov V. M. (2020) Maslenitsa v istoriografii kul'turologii i istorii sotsial'no-kul'turnoy deyatelnosti [Maslenitsa in Cultural Science Historiography and Social-Cultural Activity History]. *Vestnik of Culture and Arts*, 61 (1): 62–72.
- Russell A. (2021) *Defender of the Fatherland Day: When, Where and Why? Liden & Denz*. Available at: <https://lidenz.ru/defender-of-fatherland-day-2021/> (accessed 18 January 2021).
- Sleptkov N. (2017) Political Homophobia as a State Strategy in Russia. *Journal of Global Initiatives*, 12 (1): 140–161.
- Smith A. D. (2005) The Genealogy of Nations: An Ethno-Symbolic Approach. In: A. Ichijo, G. Uzelac (eds.) *When is the Nation? Towards an Understanding of Theories of Nationalism*. London: Routledge: 94–112.
- Stinson J., Lunstrum E. (2021) Biocultural Nation Making: Biopolitics, Cultural Territorial Belonging and National Protected Areas. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848621995189> (accessed 4 December 2021).
- Ustimenko A. L. (2017) Narodnaya religiya Rusi: 'Mezhdru' yazychestvom i pravoslaviyem [Folk Religion of Rus': 'Between' Paganism and Orthodoxy]. *Tsennosti i smysly* [Values and Meanings], (2): 33–45.
- Weinder J. (2009) Governmentality, Capitalism and Subjectivity. *Global Society*, 23 (4): 387–411.
- Wilkinson S. (2020) Power, Identity and Place. In: T. Edensor, A. Kalandides, U. Kothari (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Place*. Routledge: London, York: 219–224.