



Legal diversity and the strategies of negotiating public spaces in Christiania

Päivi Rannila

To cite this article: Päivi Rannila (2018): Legal diversity and the strategies of negotiating public spaces in Christiania, Journal of Urban Affairs, DOI: [10.1080/07352166.2018.1521703](https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1521703)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1521703>



© The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 31 Oct 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Legal diversity and the strategies of negotiating public spaces in Christiania

Päivi Rannila 

University of Turku

ABSTRACT

Although the conceptions of public spaces as open, equal, and democratic have proven to be problematic, they are even more complex in communities whose legal, moral, and political practices are unique. This article addresses the mundane strategies and tactics of negotiating publicity in the former Freetown Christiania in Copenhagen. By analyzing Christiania's current situation through interviews, documents, and participant observation, I argue that the possibilities of publicity are always reliant on the constitution of legal spaces: how laws and rules are spatially performed what kinds of visible and invisible regulation are at work, and how the conceptions of publicity become inscribed in the material elements and bodies in space. Christiania's case exemplifies perfectly the relationality of law, the legal diversity, and the multiplicity of legal actors within a neighborhood. It also shows how public spaces are complex legal settings where certain events have lawmaking or law-transforming power.

Introduction

The conditions of publicity are reliant on the constitution of legal spaces: on the ways in which laws and rules become spatially performed and inscribed in material elements and bodies in space. Public spaces may be conditioned differently in contexts and among communities that live within alternative legal, moral, and/or political logics. Exploring alternative communities may reveal elements of public spaces that usually remain less visible and unnoticed. This article addresses the everyday tactics and strategies of negotiating publicness, or publicity, in one such community: the former Freetown Christiania (population approximately 1,000) in Copenhagen. The debate on Christiania's public spaces dates back to the community's beginning when the former military area was squatted in 1971 in order to create an alternative community that could live outside of the reach of state laws and regulations. The community had a special legal status of a free town until 2011, which meant that it was self-governing and had consensus democracy and spoken laws.

The community drifted into a decades-long conflict with the Danish state, the city of Copenhagen, and the police over Christiania's ownership, the right to use the area, and its legal status (Rannila & Repo, 2017). Many conflicts were linked to a cannabis trade that originally began as small sales between the residents and led to extended business carried out by organized crime groups. Questions of publicity have been relevant in this fight because, from the state's point of view, the openness of the area has been one of the prerequisites for the community's usage of the area. In fact, the state's efforts to normalize Christiania have been justified by, among other things, the notion of public good, arguing that squatting is an unfair use of public space (Amouroux, 2011). The community itself has likewise emphasized the openness of all of its land area, which may have advanced the public's favorable attitude toward Christiania. Openness was also highlighted in 2011 after the prolonged squat in Christiania was found to be illegal by the Danish Supreme Court (2011)

and the community was forced to buy the area from the state. A foundation (Fonden Fristaden Christiania) was established, and it became the owner of most of the buildings and land area, and the state kept some of the conserved parts of Christiania and only rented them to the foundation. The board of the foundation consists of both internal and external members, and it has a mediating role between the community and the authorities (Aftale mellem Christiania og staten, 2011). The significance of public spaces was recognized when making the agreement between the state and Christiania: the agreement included clauses requiring that all the land area has to remain public after the change in ownership (Aftale mellem Christiania og staten, 2011). Therefore, if and when taken literally, there are no private yards in Christiania because the privacy is restricted to the houses the residents live in. The residents rent only the buildings they live in, and—according to the ideology of Christiania—all land areas can be used by the public.

Two questions consequently emerge: How should such public spaces that work within alternative logics be approached as legal spaces? And how are these legal spaces constituted in the mundane practices and as a result of pivotal events? Several scholars have problematized the conceptions of public spaces as open and democratic locations where citizens are free to exchange ideas and express themselves (e.g., Delaney, 2010; Iveson, 2007; Massey, 2005; Mitchell, 2003; Smith & Low, 2006). They have also suggested that public spaces could be regarded as being constituted and contested in various negotiations that are linked with the ways of performing and misperforming laws in particular spaces (cf. Braverman, Blomley, Delaney, & Kedar, 2014; Mitchell, 2003). I agree with these views and also address how the relations between many forms and geographies of publicity (Iveson, 2007) might need rethinking in an alternative context.

Kurt Iveson (2007) writes about the problems of understanding public space in a topographical sense, as a certain urban public space like a street or a square. Iveson (2007) argues that access to such space has “no fixed/privileged relationship to acts of ‘public address’ or to one’s status as a member of ‘the public’” (p. 8) and thus concentrating on the topographical reading of public space is inadequate. Defined procedurally, instead, public space is any space that becomes a site of power through political action and public address and is not restricted to a certain topographical location. Nonetheless, my starting point for discussing publicity in this article is topographical in the sense that I concentrate on Christiania’s land areas that are defined as public by the community itself and/or by the authorities. Special emphasis is given to Pusher Street, which is the hub of the drug dealing and is the main reason for the current discussions over Christiania’s publicity both inside and outside of the community. Though a public space in a topographical sense, Pusher Street and Christiania are also power spaces (cf. Hellström, 2006) where the hierarchies of different legal actors are implemented. Although Christiania’s common meetings, newspaper, mailing lists, and social media networks are public spaces as well, people still have a craving to use their main street without feeling anxious. Pusher Street’s illegal activities and the hash dealers’ specific rules of behavior have created exclusion, violence, and anxiety that have prohibited the street’s public use and have raised demands for making the street public again.

Christiania’s spoken law that is based on consensus democracy is the first and foremost law for the residents, although the law does not have legal value from the state’s viewpoint. The overlapping of the community’s own decision-making process with the state’s laws has led to legal pluralism (Rannila & Repo, 2017; von Benda-Beckmann & von Benda-Beckmann, 2014) and a hyperpoliced neighborhood. As a result of this, legally ambivalent public spaces have developed where different actors—such as the residents, drug pushers, and the police—perform their own tactics and strategies. The situation exemplifies the importance of acknowledging the legal diversity and the multiplicity of legal actors *within* the city (cf. Blomley, 2013) and questioning the scalar logic; that is, assuming nested and hierarchical scales of legal practice, legal powers, and legal knowledge (cf. Blomley, 2013; Valverde, 2009).

Furthermore, Christiania’s case exemplifies the importance of acknowledging the “everydayness” of spatiolegal matters (cf. Blomley, 2016; Jackson & Valentine, 2017) and how legal spaces are constituted by the actions and utterance of individuals or groups while negotiating who should

govern and control public spaces (cf. Jackson & Valentine, 2017). As David Delaney (2010) argues, public space “is a fundamental nomic setting for many situations that make up most versions of everyday life” (p. 87). The legal orders of public spaces develop over time as laws are established, implemented, and contested in mundane spaces. The process of creating a constitution is not, however, a continuous process, but various disturbances may reorder or redefine law/space relations.

Various inventive tactics and strategies are used in contesting laws and the ideals of publicity. Following Forrest Stuart (2016) and Michel deCerteau (1984), *strategies* are here understood as collective and organized manipulations of power relationships. These become possible

as soon as a subject with will and power ... can be isolated. It postulates a *place* that can be limited as its *own* and serve as the base from which relations with an *exteriority* composed of targets or threats ... can be managed. (deCerteau, 1984, pp. 35–36)

Everyday forms of resistance are, in contrast, often tactical: they seize opportunities and may influence temporarily but do not challenge the larger, structural situations (Stuart, 2016). Moreover, tactics do not have a space of their own but have to “play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of foreign power” (deCerteau, 1984, p. 37). In some cases, individual tactics may develop into collective strategies, or the residents may change their own tactics into strategies that can be used more collectively (cf. Stuart, 2016).

Although not the only factor, many conflicts between the residents of Christiania and the authorities have originated from the sale of cannabis and the criminal activities linked to it. The sale of cannabis has also partly determined the attitude of the residents, authorities, and other actors to the publicity of the area and their actions for or against it. A certain kind of turning point was reached in August 2016 when two police officers were in the process of arresting a suspected drug dealer in Christiania. During the chase, the suspect fired a gun toward a bystander and two police officers. This incident became one of the culmination points in the discussion concerning the publicity and accessibility of Christiania and Pusher Street as the hub of the hash trade. Two days after the shooting, the Christianites began to take a stand against organized crime and to fight for the openness of the area. They made action statements by demolishing the pushers’ stalls, by painting over signs prohibiting photographing in the area, and by setting special rules for Pusher Street. In the media and in the streets of Copenhagen they also asked people to buy their drugs elsewhere and thus support the community in their fight against organized crime. Although it was clear that the drug dealing would continue despite these efforts, it was unclear in which form and whether the residents’ actions could advance the openness of the street.

I argue that these few days in August and September 2016 became an *event of law* in a sense that they transformed Christiania’s legal interactions and their spatial utterances, as well as hardened the attitude of the authorities toward Christiania, especially those of the police. There is also a slight resemblance to the events the end of the 1970s when Christianites acted against drug dealers and the users of heavy drugs (Karpantschhof, 2011) and with the actions in the early 1980s against the biker gangs. As a result of the 1980s actions, rules were established abandoning gang-related regalia, violence, and the dealing of hard drugs (Nilson, 2011). The shooting in 2016 again mobilized Christiania and became a lawmaking moment that disturbed the legal order and made Christiania resist the rules of the pushers and create new rules of their own. It also justified increasing the police’s use of force on Pusher Street.

With the support of the interviews, documents, and participant observation, this article explores how the colliding conceptions of the law (understood widely as laws, rules, regulations, and conceptions of normalcy and acceptability) and Christiania’s publicity are inscribed in the material elements of space and the bodies of the users of those spaces. It is of interest to explore how—and with what kinds of tactics and strategies—the residents, the pushers, and the police inscribe their own ideologies and the contested conceptions of laws into the everyday life of Christiania’s public spaces. Moreover, it is interesting how such events of law—like the 2016 shootings—have a law-making or law-transforming capacity.

The research material (from 2015, 2016 and 2017) consists of 20 long interviews, documents, and several months of participant observation, including extensive photo documentation with notes. The material has been analyzed discursively, supported by theoretical readings on the constitution of public and legal spaces and governing strategies and tactics. Special emphasis has been placed on acknowledging various power structures that people express in their discussions and in their everyday practices. The gathering of the research material was influenced by the fact that I am not an insider in the area but know it only through several visits and by participating in the Christiania Researcher in Residence program. Although some residents felt suspicious about an outsider, most of them were keen to relate their views and talk about their experiences.

Twenty individuals were interviewed, including representatives of both the authorities and residents, and some were interviewed several times. The authorities were key informants working within Christiania in several sectors. When interviewing Christianites, however, it soon became apparent that conversations with average residents were the most fruitful as the spokesmen and -women tended to reiterate the ideals of Christiania and to avoid discussion about inner conflicts and power relationships. During an interview, a spokes(wo)man who had been reluctant to talk about anything wanted to tell me who I should contact and asked about those people I had already agreed to meet. As a result of that meeting, I changed my plan and decided to put more effort into hearing the views of average Christianites in addition to the activists. Some of the interviewed Christianites were found accidentally when spending time in the area, and some were suggested by other Christianites. Interview duration varied from 30 min to 3 h. All interviews were transcribed and anonymized, and in order to keep them anonymous, they are referred to merely as interviews without specifying whether an authority or a resident was interviewed.

The greatest challenge with the material was the scarcity of documentation on Christiania's inner decision making. Decisions—that are made in the residents' meetings—are described in the community's weekly newspaper *Ugespejlet*, which can only be collected from a few locations in Christiania and sometimes not even from these places. Moreover, the descriptions of the meetings do not relate an absolute truth—in a sense that there are often conflicting interpretations about what, if anything, has been decided. Thus, talking with the informants, socializing with the residents, and spending time in the area are the only means of acquiring a sense of the current situation in the community.

The first section of the article includes a scholarly discussion about the constitution of legal and public spaces and the ways of conceptualizing policing and governing in alternative contexts. The second part analyzes Christiania's public spaces and the various tactics and strategies used by the residents, pushers, and police while negotiating the publicity and legality of these spaces. The third section summarizes the findings and discusses the possibilities of understanding the legal diversities and the events of law in public and legal spaces and how these spaces are marked by invisible and visible regulations.

The legal geographies of public space

As argued by Doreen Massey (2005) and various others, spaces are not stable but relational in a sense that they become constituted through events, relations, and various contexts (e.g., Delaney, 2010; Doel, 1999; Kymäläinen, 2005; Murdoch, 2006). This also applies to public spaces whose publicness takes many forms (Iveson, 2007) and is subject to alterations. The relationship between what is public and what is private is by no means natural but can rather be described as historical, political, ideological, ambiguous, and unstable (Delaney, 2010). As argued by Massey (2005), a public space as an open space is a dubious concept; it is a fantasy that can never be reached but has value as something that can be pursued in the midst of the explicit rules, regulations, negotiations, and antagonisms that regulate spaces. Or as characterized by Vigneswaran, Iveson, and Low (2017), public space seems like an elusive political ideal “that is only realized by enduring struggles for power, resources and recognition” (p. 498).

Beginning here with topographical public spaces—a neighborhood’s public land areas and a street—can easily be criticized. Topographically, public spaces can be understood as streets, squares, parks, and other such places that are or should be open to the public. Interpretations, however, diversify by acknowledging the power relations and the actions of certain groups, policies, or technologies that may transform spaces into being more exclusionary. Those justifying measures such as limiting access or using guards, private security patrols, guard dogs, and surveillance cameras often claim that instead of or in addition to increasing control, they guarantee order in public spaces (Iveson, 2007; see also Low, 2017). The situation is twofold: On the one hand, legal order is needed for the democratic and open use of space. On the other hand, some disorder and unpredictability is needed so that democratic public spaces can exist, indicating that the limits of democracy develop in the interplay between transgression and legal order (Mitchell, 2003).

The relational approach calls for an understanding of space/law relations by taking into account a temporality in policing and governing (Valverde, 2016) and the various ways in which the laws are enacted in particular spaces and at particular times (e.g., Braverman et al., 2014; Mitchell, 2003). These implementations do not, however, work within scalar logic that assumes that laws produced on wider national scales can be applied at a smaller local scale. Rather, there are various legal actors, relations, and knowledges (Blomley, 2013; Valverde, 2009). The national written laws overlap with everyday law consisting of various regulations and enforcement practices that shape urban life (Valverde, 2012). Consequently, as the shooting case in Christiania in 2016 demonstrates, certain occasions may turn into events of law that function as turning points that alter long-term legal orders.

In addition to laws, different kinds of rules, regulations, behavioral codes, and their contestations are inscribed on matter and bodies in space. These inscriptions mark legal spaces and give hints about the “shoulds” and “should-nots” of these spaces. In addition to punishment, bodies are often marked by the *possibility* of punishment. People may behave in a certain way so as not to be punished, or they may act in various ways in order to prevent themselves from being caught not obeying the rules. As deCerteau (1984) suggests, “Living beings are ... transformed into signifiers of rules, and the reason or logos of a society ‘becomes flesh’” (p. 140) in that process. This occurs either if a person is caught or if the person’s behavior or utterance is limited because of the possibility of being caught.

Much of the interplay between the public, the spatial, and the legal occurs in the sphere of the visual. It is inadequate to equate being public with being seen in public, but it is important to understand how different modes of visibility constitute different ways of being public (Iveson, 2007). Visibility can simultaneously be a resource and an impediment for public-making (Iveson, 2007). Hannah Arendt (1958/1998) suggests that privacy and private property mean hiding places from public view, from being seen and being heard. Therefore, the boundaries separating the privately owned from other parts of the world are strongly protected (Arendt, 1958/1998). In addition to being important in the constitution of publicity (e.g., Mitchell, 2003), appearance before others is also linked with social control and the means by which certain ways of being in public are normalized with the techniques and technologies of discipline (Iveson, 2007).

Remaining invisible—or in the private sphere—means being hidden from both the street-active “eyes of power” (deCerteau, 1984, p. 217) and the “eyes upon the street” (Jacobs, 1961, pp. 44–45). Hiding may be a form of resistance but may also be enforced or a result of tactical evasion (see also deCerteau, 1984). Although the ideas of *eyes of power* and *eyes upon the street* share an interest in controlling the uses of public spaces, there are fundamental differences. Eyes of power refers to various ways of policing public spaces—such as policing by the police or by the community. The eyes upon the street—as Jacobs (1961) describes it—belong, instead, to “those we might call the natural proprietors of the street” (p. 45). The more everyday users there are, the more eyes on the street there are, controlling public behavior “through a web of reputation, gossip, approval, disapproval, sanctions.” These are powerful means *if* people know each other. In other cases, more direct and straightforward methods are more effective in the effort to control (Jacobs, 1961, p. 45).

Such straightforward methods may be offered with the more official eyes of power: the police or other quarters whose actions are mostly law preserving (cf. Benjamin, 1921/1978; Smith, 2014). These are not necessarily separate from the eyes on the street because there are various forms of

third-party policing (e.g., Stuart, 2016) where responsibility for controlling crime and the actions of the people is diffused to the citizens (Stuart, 2016). This may occur under the name of *community policing* (see, e.g., Hansford, 2016; Mitchell, Atttoh, & Staeheli, 2016), *neighborhood watch*, or *night watch*, for instance. It has become common that the carceral state and punitive social control are extended to the whole community (Vitale & Jefferson, 2016)—in countries and contexts where public services have traditionally covered crime or security issues. At the same time, the architecture of policing and order maintenance have gained less-obvious forms because the target of policing is not necessarily suspicious individuals but the normalizing efforts may be applied to the whole suspicious community. The forms of micromanaging may, for instance, include surveillance, intensified policing, policing of dissent, and low-level arrests and summonses (Vitale & Jefferson, 2016).

Another question is who comprises the community (Hansford, 2016), especially if the initiative for policing has come from the police or from some other state quarter. In such cases, only those groups who share the state's conceptions of law, order, and proper behavior may be regarded as legitimate for the task of policing (Hansford, 2016; Mitchell et al., 2016). Community policing may also be an effort to reinforce the police's own legitimacy (Mitchell et al., 2016) if the police's actions are not fully accepted by the residents. When enforcing law, the police do not rely merely on law but rather on the vaguer conceptions of order (Hansford, 2016) defining what is appropriate within a given location (Stuart, 2016). The governing is temporal in a sense that in addition to law enforcement and punishment, prevention is an essential part of maintaining spatial order (Valverde, 2009).

There is a tendency that instead of—or in addition to—individuals, the police style of regulation focuses on organizing spaces and making distinctions in order to discourage certain activities (Valverde, 2009, 2016). Both uniformed police and police power—referring to the regulatory power of local bodies (Valverde, 2016)—use spatial strategies in their managing efforts. Sylvestre, Damon, Blomley, and Bellot (2015) have studied area restrictions (also known as red zones or no go orders) as policing tools that prevent access to designated sites and thus help the police clean problematic neighborhoods of chronic offenders. A person with area restrictions becomes a potential offender that may easily be arrested if found in a certain area. Although the governance of space always includes the governance of people, spatial restrictions redirect attention from the person to space, thus making it harder to make arguments related to the rights of a person. The rights of a person are, in a way, invisibilized by spatial restrictions.

Stuart's (2016) findings suggest that especially in neighborhoods where policing is a part of the day-to-day reality, those people who have nothing to hide may also use avoidance techniques to prevent contact with the police, thus reorganizing at the same time space and spatial practices. Moreover, the results of less policing are equally spatial: the absence of the police may enhance a view that crime and/or violence are normal in this certain area (Stuart, 2016). The effects of official policing and peer policing on the publicity of spaces are thus an ambiguous matter because the people's conceptions of the conditions of publicity vary. For some, the confident use of spaces may require feelings of safety that are gained through policing and surveillance, whereas for others such control may mean initiatives toward the privatization of spaces. The various effects of policing on communities are evident as well. As Stuart (2016) suggests, policing generates cultural contexts through which people evaluate and judge the behavior and strategies of others (and themselves). In hyperpoliced communities (including Christiania), "cop wisdom" may also develop, meaning that individuals learn to avoid surveillance and police contact in creative ways, particularly if policing has become embedded in their everyday reality (Stuart, 2016, p. 7). The practices of cop-wise individuals can become the neighborhood's collective practices (Stuart, 2016) or may motivate individuals to perform their views publicly according to shared "scripts" (cf. Jackson & Valentine, 2017, p. 224).

Advancing publicity in Christiania?

Public spaces are important in Christiania's lifestyle. Unlike many other neighborhoods, in Christiania you can *see* many of the people, things, and problems that are usually hidden in private spaces. As one of the interviewees describes:

Christiania is an open wound. ... People don't sit inside in small apartments, drinking their brains out and smoking. ... They're sitting here. ... You can see crazy people. You can see people who have addiction problems. You can see people who have health problems. ... It's not hidden away somewhere. (Interview, July 9, 2015)

Yet, especially Pusher Street is not accessible to all, but it is highly regulated and represents what Maria Hellström Reimer (2009) calls "prodigious economic interests" (p. 70). For many Christianites, it is also "a transgressive space inhabited by criminals" (Amoroux, 2009, p. 115).

A group of Christianites declared in the autumn of 2016 that they had had enough of the violence and insecurity related to organized crime and wanted to free Pusher Street for the public use of the residents. The residents' actions were significant and resembled the inhabitants' previous support for normalizing Pusher Street in 1979 when hard drugs were banned (Hellström Reimer, 2009; Karpantschov, 2011; Nilson, 2011) or when the residents fought against the biker gang in the 1980s (Nilson, 2011). The kind of reaction that the residents had in 2016 had been hoped for by authorities who state that it is impossible to help Christianites unless they themselves want to change the situation on Pusher Street (e.g., Interview, February 25, 2016). When the residents declared the need for a change, there seemed to be a shared interest in fighting against crime. The situation was not simple, however, because the Christianites had a decades-long history of being afraid of the police (Interview, June 29, 2015), and most residents consider cooperation with the authorities and especially with the police unthinkable (*Københavns Politi*, 2015). As a consequence, the residents, the pushers, and the police have different tactics and/or strategies for operating on Pusher Street.

The everyday decision-making processes of Christiania are based on spoken law and consensus democracy. Presence is preferred in governing: decisions are made in lengthy meetings where community members discuss until they reach a consensus. This kind of law-making is problematic considering both attendance at the meetings and the decision-making process. Many residents cannot attend the meetings if they have other obligations (e.g., taking care of small children) or if they are tired of the aggressive atmosphere of the long meetings (Interviews, July 7, 2015, July 9, 2015; see also Jarvis, 2011). Some Christianites are also scared of expressing their opinions publicly if they do not agree with the dominant opinions. If a resident has the "wrong" opinions, she or he might not (only) be called an idiot, but she or he will be exposed to the "personal law" that makes the residents lose the hidden privileges they are used to. For example, the person might not be greeted, might not be able to buy things on credit anymore, or might find out that some services have become more expensive for him or her (Interview, July 9, 2015).

Moreover, the pushers have a disproportionate amount of power in decision making because they have a great deal of money and people are scared to disagree with them (Interview, April 8, 2016; cf. Amoroux, 2011). The achieved consensus is thus essentially a consensus of the few—or the democracy of those who shout the loudest (cf. Valverde, 2012). Because of the requirement of consensus, it is very difficult to make any decisions because one person may prevent a decision from being reached (Interviews, June 30, 2015, July 15, 2016; cf. Starecheski, 2011). A consensus democracy is well suited to a community with defensive negotiation strategies because it is "difficult to acquire a mandate to negotiate that could create any great reforms" (Interview, April 8, 2016; cf. Starecheski, 2011, p. 265). Moreover, it is problematic that it is sometimes unclear for those partaking in the meeting whether a decision has been made or not. The decision may be announced in *Ugespejlet*, although some residents still have the impression that no consensus had been reached (Interviews, April 8, 2016, December 6, 2016).

The new rules for Pusher Street were declared in September 2016 after they had been discussed in a common meeting in which every resident could participate. The community agreed that the working methods of the pushers had changed and needed a reaction. After reaching a consensus, the decision was transformed into new rules that were set for Pusher Street. The dealers could not have stalls, guards, parasols, fires, or spot lamps. In addition, as had been the case earlier, violence and weapons were to be prohibited, and hash could be sold only by Christianites (Marta/Nordområdet, 2017; Interview, December 5, 2016). Along with the new rules, the shooting of August 2016 became a lawmaking (cf. Benjamin, 1921/1978) momentum for the community.

Although the community's own rules do not have legal value from the state's point of view, they are the primary law for the residents. Many individuals, however, regard the community's rules as naïve with regard to, for instance, hash dealing. For instance, one of the interviewees criticized the view that there could be only "a little bit" of hash dealing, because "organized crime is not some social project." S/he argued that (cf. Amouroux, 2011)

there are some very nasty people in the background. So you cannot come as a citizen of Christiania and sell a little bit of hash. You do that for five minutes and then you're punched down and told to stay away. (Interview, December 6, 2016)

The main reason for Pusher Street's criminal nature is claimed to be "a deal with the devil" (meaning the drug dealers) that Christianites made "thirty years ago and cannot get out of it" (Interview, December 6, 2016).

The state and Christiania have agreed that all land areas remain public—that is, there is a guarantee of free public access to the area (Aftale mellem Christiania og staten, 2011). Although both residents and authorities emphasize publicity (e.g., Interviews, June 30, 2015, March 7, 2016, March 30, 2016), some of the community's practices and expressions do not support the ideals. The "etiquette for visiting Christiania" (Christianites, 2006), for instance, characterizes Christiania as "one of Copenhagen's most open areas," in which "paths and roads are often so close to the houses that you can look directly into people's rooms, when you walk around" (p. 5). The etiquette, however, reminds people that they should not "enter people's gardens" (Christianites, 2006, p. 3). This prohibition contradicts the fact that private individuals can only possess the houses they live in, whereas the land areas outside of them are "free areas"—as Christiania's alternative regime suggests. The privatization of the gardens has been justified by the number of visitors whose behavior disturbs Christianites' everyday lives (e.g., Interviews, July 1, 2015, March 7, 2016, March 30, 2016) and by the problems with the pushers (Interview, December 5, 2016). Disagreements about the public bicycle route passing through the area have also raised conflicts related to public spaces. Christianites, however, acknowledge that much of the support they have gained from Danish society has been based on the openness of the area and thus they cannot complicate the uses of the land area too much (Interview, June 30, 2015).

Christiania's situation is somewhat exceptional because of its complex legal spaces and multiple layers of control that result from the overlapping of Danish law, Christiania's own spoken law, the ordinances of the city, and the rules of the police and the pushers (Rannila & Repo, 2017). Nevertheless, it opens up discussion about the legal orders in less normative contexts. With the focus on everyday law, I will explore what kinds of tactics and strategies are used when the residents, pushers, and police use Christiania's land areas and how these practices inform the conceptions of publicity and the problematics involved in them.

Tactics and strategies of negotiating public spaces

The residents: (In)visible regulation, watching, and demolishing

Christianites have spoken out for publicity, especially when arguing against organized crime, drug sales, and the presence of pushers that are considered to limit residents' everyday lives and cause

anxiety. As one interviewee related, residents are “either scared (of pushers) or dead” (Interview, February 19, 2016; cf. Amouroux, 2011). An interviewee described how the residents sometimes pretend that they do not know about a neighbor’s businesses or how some citizens have moved out because of the threat of violence or the “little signals” (e.g., thrown bottles and threatening gestures) they have received. The pushers have also taken over some of the most central squares and buildings, which could have developed into places of gathering and socializing, such as the former meeting house and official building of the *Tinghuset* and the square outside (Interview, December 5, 2016).

Land areas outside many homes are privatized not only by visible means (e.g., fences, rocks, signs) but also by invisible regulation (e.g., placing footpaths, prickly bushes, and shrubs strategically; Interview, March 30, 2016). In addition to the pushers, many residents feel violated by the tourists and use their presence as justification for marking or bordering the spaces around their houses. The bordering happens with small gestures such as placing plants, rocks, art objects, flags, and signs to public routes or by having gates and dogs in the privatized gardens. Large flowerpots border many outside areas of houses and several signs declare some spaces to be private. In addition, an attempt to prevent access to the public bicycle path has been made using large rocks and signs that claim that the route is only allowed to be used by Christianites (Interview, July 15, 2015). The public use of land is also prevented by littering, because garbage and recycled material serve as visible markers of the residents’ control over territories they consider private.

The tactics of marking a personal space around houses are accompanied by the community’s wider strategies that aim to restrict the pushers’ usage of the areas. Collective decisions have led to closing commonly used routes or allocating some spaces for children (Interviews, March 7, 2016, December 5, 2016). More invisible regulation includes the narrowing of the streets, because that way the residents try to direct their usage toward merely passing by and to prevent “things happening in a broad street” or “people settling down” (Interview, December 5, 2016).

The residents negotiate publicity through rules and watching as well. Christiania’s inner “alarm chains” operate in cases of violence or other threats (e.g., *Ugespejlet*, 2016; Interview, December 5, 2016), and a night watch (Natteravn) patrol during weekend nights, trying to prevent violence and overdoses (e.g. *Ugespejlet*, 2015, 2015; Interviews, July 6, 2015, July 9, 2015). The residents also control how the pushers obey the community’s rules that prohibit the usage of stalls, parasols, and fires that would offer them comfort and long-term selling spots where they can feel warm or throw the items they sell onto the fire in case of a police raid. In addition, there is a prohibition on the use of masks and spot lamps that allow the pushers to see others while remaining themselves invisible, thus creating an unwanted power hierarchy (Interview, December 5, 2016).

The demolition of the pushers’ stands and joint factories is a more radical way of fighting against organized crime. The shooting incident in the autumn of 2016 was a “momentum” after which the active residents began to fight against the pushers as a group (Interview, December 5, 2016). They painted over the pushers’ “no photo” signs that had prevented photographing and created conflicts with visitors who had not known or cared about the ban. The residents also demolished all of the stands along Pusher Street and later continued smashing down other targets elsewhere in Christiania. In December 2016, for instance, Christianites demolished a building whose holder was then in prison. The building was supposed to be a shelter for vehicles but had been used as a joint factory. Although the house was in exceptionally good condition and could have been used for other purposes, the activists wanted to make a clear and visible statement (Participant observation, December 4, 2016; Interview, December 4, 2016). Nevertheless, it is difficult for Christianites to fight against organized crime, because people are afraid of getting into trouble. People also “get tired” and “feel stupid” if they have to go and demolish the pushers’ stalls “for the fifth time” (Interview, December 5, 2016). The actions are, however, necessary for political reasons as well, because Danish society and politicians may turn against Christiania if the community does not clearly condemn violent acts. Some authorities thus doubt the sincerity of the actions and regard them more as a means to “look good in public” (Interview, December 6, 2016).

The community was not unanimous about the measures taken in 2016, and some residents were shocked when they saw their neighbors pulling down the stalls on Pusher Street (Participant observation, December 2, 2016). Disagreement with fellow citizens was accompanied by conflict with the police. Although both the activist residents and the police wanted to free Pusher Street for public use, there was no intention to work together. Perhaps this was most prominently seen in the surveillance camera episodes in the autumn of 2016. The police installed surveillance cameras on Pusher Street that were taken down by the residents and/or pushers several times. Although the Christianites' effort was to avoid police control, it did not seem to be relevant whether the control was real or imagined. The residents took down the large, old-fashioned cameras that the police had installed, although it seemed that the police were only directing attention to meaningless items. During the same autumn, drones could be seen flying above Pusher Street, and in earlier years, undercover policemen had used small cameras attached to their clothes. It is thus unlikely that the large cameras would have been used as a primary means of surveillance, and the whole episode appeared like a theater where the two opposing parties were performing their understanding of the situation. That which could be seen—the large cameras—became the symbol of control, whereas people were not so much bothered by less visible yet more effective forms of surveillance.

After the residents' actions against the pushers, there was what one resident (Marta/Nordområdet, 2017) described as “music and good spirit” and “bazaar stalls occurring on Saturdays.” However, soon afterward, the residents became frustrated and had to admit that the pushers were not obeying the rules the community had set for them (Informant, March 1, 2017). In May 2018, the residents built barricades and thus closed Pusher Street temporarily. They stated that it has become unbearable for them to handle the situation in the middle of the violent conflict between the organized criminals and the police. The residents' actions are symbolically significant as the Christianites demonstrate not only to themselves but also to the rest of society how tired they are of the crime and violence that Christiania is hosting.

The pushers: Invisibilizing, guarding, and ruling

The pushers resist control both by the police and by the Christiania community and try to govern the Pusher Street area with the processes of invisibilizing, guarding, and ruling. Hellström Reimer (2009) calls them “pusher-tacticians” (p. 71) who transgress the place and its conventions. If the aim of the residents is to enhance Pusher Street's publicity, the pushers strive to privatize spaces they consider too public while trying not to be caught in illegal actions. Their business and rules for Pusher Street and its surroundings—such as “no photos,” “no cell phones,” or “no running”—have created a continuous state of emergency (cf. Hellström Reimer, 2009) that appears in the clashes between the drug dealers and other people, including the police.

Visitors have obeyed the pushers' rules rather well, not least because of the guards who watch everyone entering the street, and react immediately if they see someone using a phone or a camera or carrying out some other “unacceptable” behavior. The residents' painting over the “no photo” signs in the autumn of 2016 sent a strong signal of not accepting such bans, yet this signal may have been too weak for the individuals who continue to be watched by the guards while walking on the street and are confronted if they behave contrary to the pushers' norms.

In addition to occupying Pusher Street, the drug dealers border their own territories and privatize them with parasols, lamps, dogs, and signs. They have made themselves unidentifiable by using masks and hoods and by covering their stalls with fabrics. This stage of extreme individual hiding began a few years ago when the police's invisible means of surveillance (such as cameras attached to clothes) became common (Interview, June 29, 2015). The young boys, especially “the wannabe-gangstas,” masked themselves and, by doing so, actually stated that they belonged to the group of dealers (Interview, July 7, 2015; cf. Jackson & Valentine, 2017). Christianites' new rules for the pushers in 2016 banned such concealment, but various ways of invisibilizing are still used; for

instance, the spot lamps that are directed toward passersby so that the pushers can see who is coming and going but remain invisible themselves as the passersby are dazzled by the light. The Christianites call the spot lamps “paranoia lamps” because they mirror the pushers’ paranoia of being caught conducting illegal actions (Interview, December 5, 2016).

The selling of drugs, the links to organized crime, and the violent acts are examples of the misperformances of state law. The selling of hard drugs, violence, and the selling of cannabis by others than Christianites are against the community’s own laws as well. The pushers’ misperformances of the law are thus diverse—depending on whose opinions of propriety they are compared to.

The police: Patrolling, watching, and demolishing

Although the police’s primary interest is to preserve the law, enhance legality, and fight against drug sales and organized crime, the (delayed) subproduct might be an increase in publicity. Christiania has been of special interest to the police since it was established. Today, the police’s operation in the area mostly concerns hash sales, acts of violence, and organized crime. Because of its alternative lifestyle and resistance to authorities, the area has appeared as a welcoming environment for criminals. The members of the community have not caused much of the violence, but the community has hosted the violence (Manjikian, 2013).

Earlier, the absence of the police, in a sense, “normalized” the existence of crime (Interviews, June 29, 2015, June 30, 2015; cf. Stuart, 2016), and some residents related how hard it was previously to get the police to help with burglaries or vandalism, for instance (Interviews, June 29, 2015, June 30, 2015, July 7, 2015, July 9, 2015). The presence of the police has, however, increased considerably and, today, it is “less comfortable” to carry out illegal activities in the area (Interview, December 6, 2017). Moreover, the clear tendency in Christiania is that instead of individuals, the police now tend to regulate spaces and collective behavior (Interview, February 25, 2016; cf. Manjikian, 2013; Stuart, 2016).

The work of the police is not easy in Christiania because of the conflictual history. The older generation is highly skeptical toward the police, whereas some newcomers or second-generation Christianites have a somewhat more positive attitude toward the police (*Københavns Politi*, 2015). Nonetheless, from the residents’ viewpoint, you do not make friends in Christiania by communicating with the police (Interviews, February 19, 2016, February 25, 2016). It is also rare that residents contact the police in case of problems, because the community is used to handling crimes by themselves. For instance, Christianites have meetings in which it is decided whether a suspect will be handed over to the police or whether she or he can still live in Christiania or enter it in the future (Interviews, June 29, 2015, July 6, 2015, February 25, 2016, December 5, 2016).

The police, on the other hand, are aiming to improve their image with the “Your Officer” (*Din Betjent*) program, which includes police officers patrolling Christiania in casual clothing and communicating with the people. The effort is designed to increase trust in the police and to advance relations so that the police can work in Christiania in a way similar to that in other neighborhoods (cf. Gilmore & Gilmore, 2016; *Københavns Politi*, 2015; Interviews, June 29, 2015, July 7, 2015). There is a dialogical connection between the police and the Christiania Foundation, but many residents lack trust in the foundation and criticize its actions with regard to making deals and cooperating with authorities (Interviews, February 19, 2016, July 1, 2015, July 9, 2015, February 25, 2016, December 5, 2016). Taking care of criminals is still clearly regarded as a task for the police force, whereas the foundation only supports or does not support the actions of the police (Interviews, June 30, 2015, July 6, 2015, March 7, 2016). Nevertheless, Christiania’s consensus culture complicates any collaboration, because it is hard to reach a consensus when deciding about cooperation with the authorities (e.g., Interviews, June 30, 2015, February 26, 2016).

The attitude of the police toward Christiania has intensified after the shootings in 2016 and especially in 2018. Advancements in surveillance technologies have led to very precise raids where the police officers know exactly who they are looking for (Interviews, July 9, 2015, February 2, 2016).

In 2016, Task Force Pusher Street had 431 cases related to the sales of narcotics, which was 160 more cases than in the previous year (*Københavns Politi*, 2015, 2016). By May 8, 2018, the police already had 100 operations in the area (*Københavns Politi*, 2018). During the spring and summer of 2018, the police were present in the area and demolished the pushers' stalls almost daily. At the moment, the emphasis seems to be on what Amouroux (2009) calls "coercive normalization" (p. 127), including arrests, the policing of streets, and a permanent presence of the police.

In March 2017, the special unit Task Force Pusher Street became a part of a wider organization, which according to a representative of the police forces increased the possibilities for the police to operate in Christiania. Moreover, on April 1, 2017, the old law of "zone ban" (*zoneforbud*) was renewed, by which a person can be given a ban on entering within a 500- to 1,000-m radius of an area for 3 months, if there is reason to suspect that the person might be a threat to the area's security. The ban can be given to pushers but also to their assistants and guards who have not been convicted of a crime (Justitsministeriet, 2017).

Due to these actions, the pushers have found their business riskier than earlier. For some, the "cleanup" by the police signifies an increase in the possibilities for using Christiania's public spaces; however, some interviewees regard the presence of the police and police violence as problems. The presence of the police makes the pushers' actions less transparent than earlier and has generated many other "unpleasant things" such as a frequent change of dealers who may use children as their guards or who do not live in Christiania and thus "don't give a shit how they behave" (Interviews, June 30, 2015, July 6, 2015, March 7, 2016).

Discussion

There is a range of normative perspectives on what makes a good public space (Iveson, 2007). These include free access to the area, the possibility to see and to be seen, a chance to communicate and express opinions, an opportunity not to be governed and monitored, or a possibility not to encounter groups causing feelings of insecurity. Whichever options and combinations are preferred, they are not realized in Christiania because it has a highly paradoxical relation to the normative ideals of publicity. From the city's and state's points of view, Christiania should be public—particularly with regard to accessibility. Many other users, however, have a more complex concept of publicity that both enriches and complicates the negotiations over public spaces.

Christiania's public spaces are being transformed because of changes over recent years, such as an (estimated) increase in the number of visitors (Wonderful Copenhagen, 2018), the loss of Christiania's special legal status, changes in ownership, the new rules set for the pushers, and the pushers' responses to the rules. On the one hand, publicity in terms of accessibility is enhanced when measures are taken to prevent organized criminals from operating in the area. On the other hand, Christiania's microgeographies of privatization are seen in the pushers' efforts to maintain their own rules, or in the residents' actions around their houses, or when the streets are narrowed in order to prevent people loitering. Law, or the fear of the law, is becoming flesh (cf. deCerteau, 1984) as it is being inscribed on the status of people (guards, pushers, police officers), actions (no photos, no running, no phones), objects (spot lamps, flower pots, gates), and bodies (masks, hoods). In addition to the physicality of the law (Braverman, 2009), one can also talk about *the physicality of resistance to the law*, which includes a clear performative element when the residents place plants, rocks, signs, and garbage in spaces that they want to mark as their own. A large part of this resistance is *invisible regulation*—such as narrowing streets or planting prickly plants—that requires knowledge of the context in order to be recognized as regulation.

The complexities of governing Christiania show how diversely the law may function in the constitution of public spaces. Public and legal spaces most definitely appear as relational, and the variety of legal actors have their own conceptions of what is acceptable or avoidable behavior in public. Everyday law is constituted in relation to these various laws and has its own specificities; for

instance, what an interviewee called “personal law” that occurs when a person begins to lose his or her privileges if he or she does not behave in the way the community wishes.

It is paradoxical that an alternative hippie community has, in a sense, been turned into a hyperpoliced area with overlapping rules, laws, and behavior codes. Despite the various control mechanisms, it is sometimes a matter of imagined rather than real controlling, as in the case of the old-fashioned surveillance cameras and the theatrical element included in their installation and tearing down. The reality is that the extent of surveillance and its forms are not fully known by anybody (Interview, December 5, 2016). By making rules and by resisting each other’s control, the residents, pushers, and police each imagine the current state of affairs and have visions about the preferred future. This perfectly exemplifies the legal diversity and the multiplicity of legal actors *within* the neighborhood (cf. Blomley, 2013).

The Christianites’ activities in 2016 were not targeted merely at the pushers but were also aimed to prove to Danish society that the community did not accept violence and organized crime. The shooting incidence was a lawmaking (cf. Benjamin, 1921/1978) or law-transforming event. At the core of residents’ statements was the resistance of the pushers and their hiding places where they could not be seen (cf. Arendt, 1958/1998). The publicity of space is advanced by a mutual relationship of being seen. In this respect, being more visible means being more public, but it can also mean being more legal, because it becomes more difficult to break the law without being disguised or concealed. In many ways, the law and its enforcement operate by visual means, relying on that which can or cannot be seen. Remaining invisible means remaining hidden from both the eyes of power (deCerteau, 1984)—such as the police—and the eyes upon the street (Jacobs, 1961)—such as the members of the community who may either police (cf. Stuart, 2016) or operate through *personal law*, meaning regulating by gossiping, condemning, or taking away privileges.

Invisibility is often produced for tactical and strategies reasons. The means of invisibilization may have begun as an individual tactic of cop-wise individuals (cf. Stuart, 2016), from where it has been adopted by the community and has been developed into strategies. Invisibilizing guarantees that the pushers can remain unidentified but, at the same time, the masked individuals also become signifiers of the group to which they belong and their relationship with the law. The law and the possibility of punishment are materialized in the physical symbols of belonging to a group of pushers and their guards. Their appearance and behavior in public are scripted in a sense that with their attire and behavior, they show engagement with the group of pushers and become this group’s official face (cf. Jackson & Valentine, 2017). Though not following the normative conceptions of appearing in public, these people in a way become more visible and discernible from others (cf. Iveson, 2007; see also Arendt, 1958/1998).

Conclusions

No doubt, Christiania is unique with regard to publicity, the law, and law enforcement. It is also exceptional with respect to its layers of control or the different groups’ ways of governing public spaces. Christiania is characterized by a highly relational attitude toward publicity with a strong temporal element: publicity is negotiated in everyday discussions, and sometimes repeatedly; for instance, in the currently frequent operations of demolishing and rebuilding the pushers’ stalls. Each of the laws, norms, hopes, desires, needs, and fears regarding publicity and the uses of public spaces are inscribed in the streets and yards of Christiania. There are, nonetheless, also momentums that can turn into events of law that motivate lawmaking or law-preserving actions.

The law becomes visible in the material elements and bodies that perform the law. In Christiania, the law’s inscription on bodies can most clearly be seen in the police officers who have become the faces of normalization and legal order; the drug dealers and their guards who, in their fear of possible punishment, struggle not to be seen; the active residents who make statements and express their fears and hopes by demolishing pushers’ stalls and buildings; and the residents who place flower pots around their homes in order to achieve a feeling of privacy and safety. These actions indicate who is

micromanaging and governing—or seeking to govern—certain spaces and how various legal actors and legal knowledges can be at work within a neighborhood.

Christiania's negotiations on publicity could not occur as such anywhere else, which makes it an even more important target of urban research. With its legal diversity and alternative ideologies, Christiania is an urban space where power relations are visible in extreme ways. While being different, and not hiding its difference, Christiania reveals much about taken-for-granted assumptions and ways of governing and policing. The kind of power relations and legal practices that can be encountered in Christiania are characteristic of urban spaces more generally, yet problematic relations and practices are usually invisibilized in order to show the “propriety” of public spaces. Thus, the understanding of urban power structures and their spatiolegal connections benefits from analyzing alternative communities where the problems can be seen on the streets and the backyards, without the pressure to seem proper in the eyes of the public.

Acknowledgments

I express my gratitude to my informants in Christiania and Copenhagen for their invaluable help during the research. I also thank Don Mitchell, Tiina Vainio, and Virve Repo for commenting on the first version of the article and Eric Clark and three anonymous referees for suggestions that helped improve the article.

Funding

This article is a part of the research project “Nomospheres of Publicity,” funded by the Academy of Finland (SA279425, SA284368).

About the author

Päivi Rannila is an Academy Research Fellow at the University of Turku in Finland. Her research interests include legal geographies, public spaces, and planning.

ORCID

Päivi Rannila  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7911-2838>

References

- Aftale mellem Christiania og staten. (2011).
- Amouroux, C. (2009). Normalizing Christiania: Project clean sweep and the normalization plan in Copenhagen. *City & Society*, 21(1), 108–132. doi:10.1111/j.1548-744X.2009.01017.x
- Amouroux, C. S. (2011). Normalisation within Christiania. In H. Thörn, C. Wasshede, & T. Nilson (Eds.), *Space for urban alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011* (pp. 235–262). Vilnius, Lithuania: BALTO Print.
- Arendt, H. (1958/1998). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1921/1978). Critique of violence. In P. Demetz (Ed.), *Benjamin, W.: Reflections: Essays, aphorisms, autobiographical writings* (pp. 277–300). New York, NY: Schocken Books.
- Blomley, N. (2013). What sort of a legal space is a city? In A. M. Brighenti (Ed.), *Urban interstices: The aesthetics and the politics of the in-between* (pp. 1–20). London, UK: Routledge.
- Blomley, N. (2016). The boundaries of property: Complexity, relationality, and spatiality. *Law & Society Review*, 50(1), 224–255. doi:10.1111/lasr.12182
- Braverman, I. (2009). *Planted flags: Trees, land, and law in Israel/Palestine*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Braverman, I., Blomley, N., Delaney, D., & Kedar, A. (2014). Introduction: Expanding the spaces of law. In I. Braverman, N. Blomley, D. Delaney, & A. Kedar (Eds.), *The expanding spaces of law: A timely legal geography* (pp. 1–29). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Christianites. (2006). *Christiania guide*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Lassen Offset.

- Danish Supreme Court. (2011). *On the right to the Christiania area. Judgment* Retrieved from <http://www.supremecourt.dk/about/decided%20cases/HumanRights/Pages/OntherighttotheChristianiaarea.aspx>
- deCerteau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Delaney, D. (2010). *The spatial, the legal and the pragmatics of world-making: Nomospheric investigations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Doel, M. (1999). *Poststructuralist geographies: The diabolical art of spatial science*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gilmore, R. W., & Gilmore, C. (2016). Beyond Bratton. In J. T. Camp & C. Heatherton (Eds.), *Policing the planet: Why the policing crisis led to black lives matter* (pp. 173–199). London, UK: Verso.
- Hansford, J. (2016). Community policing reconsidered: From Ferguson to Baltimore. In J. T. Camp & C. Heatherton (Eds.), *Policing the planet: Why the policing crisis led to black lives matter* (pp. 215–225). London, UK: Verso.
- Hellström, M. (2006). Steal this place: The aesthetics of tactical formlessness and ‘the Free Town of Christiania’. *Alnarp: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, 2006*, 27.
- Hellström Reimer, M. (2009). Pusher street and the theatre of emergence. *Scroope: Cambridge Architecture Journal*, 19, 66–76.
- Iveson, K. (2007). *Publics and the city*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jackson, L., & Valentine, G. (2017). Performing “Moral Resistance”? Pro-life and pro-choice activism in public space. *Space and Culture*, 20(2), 221–238. doi:10.1177/1206331217697142
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of Great American cities*. (50th anniversary edition, 2011). New York, NY: Modern Library.
- Jarvis, H. (2011). Alternative visions of home and family life in Christiania: Lessons for mainstream. In H. Thörn, C. Wasshede, & T. Nilson (Eds.), *Space for urban alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011* (pp. 156–180). Vilnius, Lithuania: BALTO Print.
- Justitsministeriet. (2017). Skrivelse om zoneforbud for overtrædelse af forbuddet mod at etablere og opholde sig i lejre, some er egnede til at skabe utryghed i nærområdet.
- Karpantschof, R. (2011). Bargaining and barricades—The political struggle over the freetown Christiania 1971–2011. In H. Thörn, C. Wasshede, & T. Nilson (Eds.), *Space for urban alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011* (pp. 38–67). Vilnius, Lithuania: BALTO Print.
- København's Politi. (2015a). Københavns Politis indsats på Christiania.
- København's Politi. (2015b). Resultater for task force pusherstreet.
- København's Politi. (2016). Resultater for task force pusherstreet 2016.
- København's Politi. (2018). Politiets indsats på Christiania I 2018.
- Kymäläinen, P. (2005). Geographies in writing: Re-imagining place. *Nordia Geographical Publications*, 34, 3.
- Low, S. (2017). *Spatializing culture: The ethnography of space and place*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Manjikian, M. (2013). *Securitization of property squatting in Europe*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marta/Nordområdet. (2017). Christianias Fællesmødes beslutninger. *Ugespejlet*, February 17–24, 2017.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Mitchell, D. (2003). *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Mitchell, D., Attoh, K., & Staeheli, L. A. (2016). “Broken Windows Is Not the Panacea”: Common sense, good sense, and police accountability on American cities. In J. T. Camp & C. Heatherton (Eds.), *Policing the planet: Why the policing crisis led to black lives matter* (pp. 237–257). London, UK: Verso.
- Murdoch, J. (2006). *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Nilson, T. (2011). ‘Weeds and Deeds’—Images and counter images of Christiania and drugs. In H. Thörn, C. Wasshede, & T. Nilson (Eds.), *Space for urban alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011* (pp. 205–234). Vilnius, Lithuania: BALTO Print.
- Rannila, P., & Repo, V. (2017). Property and carceral spaces in Christiania, Copenhagen. *Urban Studies*, 004209801771344. doi:10.1177/0042098017713447
- Smith, M. D. (2014). States that come and go: Mapping the geocalities of the Afghanistan intervention. In I. Braverman, N. Blomley, D. Delaney, & A. Kedar (Eds.), *The expanding spaces of law—A timely legal geography* (pp. 142–166). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Smith, N., & Low, S. (2006). Introduction: The imperative of public space. In S. Low & N. Smith (Eds.), *The politics of public space* (pp. 1–16). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Starecheski, A. (2011). Consensus and strategy: Narratives of naysaying and yeasaying in Christiania’s struggles over legalisation. In H. Thörn, C. Wasshede, & T. Nilson (Eds.), *Space for urban alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011* (pp. 263–287). Vilnius, Lithuania: BALTO Print.
- Stuart, F. (2016). *Down, out, and under arrest: Policing and everyday life in skid row*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sylvestre, M.-E., Damon, W., Blomley, N., & Bellot, C. (2015). Spatial tactics in criminal courts and the politics of legal technicalities. *Antipode*, 47(5), 1346–1366. doi:10.1111/anti.12161
- Ugespejlet Christiania*. Nro 10/2016. March 11–18, 2015.
- Ugespejlet Christiania*. Nro 27/2015. July 3–10, 2015.
- Ugespejlet Christiania*. Nro 28/2015. July 10–31, 2015.

- Valverde, M. (2009). Jurisdiction and scale: Legal 'Technicalities' as resources for theory. *Social & Legal Studies*, 18(2), 139–157. doi:10.1177/0964663909103622
- Valverde, M. (2012). *Everyday law on the street: City governance in an age of diversity*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Valverde, M. (2016). Beyond the social control of space: Towards a multidimensional approach to local security networks. In B. Bradford, B. Jauregui, I. Loader, & J. Steinberg (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of global policing* (pp. 46–60). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Vigneswaran, D., Iveson, K., & Low, S. (2017). Problems, publicity and public space: A resurgent debate. *Environment and Planning A*, 49(3), 496–502. doi:10.1177/0308518X17690953
- Vitale, A. S., & Jefferson, B. J. (2016). The emergence of command and control policing in neoliberal New York. In J. T. Camp & C. Heatherton (Eds.), *Policing the planet: Why the policing crisis led to black lives matter* (pp. 157–172). London, UK: Verso.
- von Benda-Beckmann, F., & von Benda-Beckmann, K. (2014). A legal anthropological perspective on the temporalities of space in plural legal orders. In I. Braverman, N. Blomley, D. Delaney, & A. Kedar (Eds.), *The expanding spaces of law—A timely legal geography* (pp. 30–52). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wonderful Copenhagen. (2018). *Tourismbarometer*. Retrieved from <https://copenhagen.tourismbarometer.com/Module/Index/1>