



Property and carceral spaces in Christiania, Copenhagen

Journal:	<i>Urban Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	CUS-196-17-03.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Discipline: Please select a keyword from the following list that best describes the discipline used in your paper.:	Geography
World Region: Please select the region(s) that best reflect the focus of your paper. Names of individual countries, cities & economic groupings should appear in the title where appropriate.:	Europe
Major Topic: Please identify up to two topics that best identify the subject of your article.:	Community, Governance
Please supply a further 5 relevant keywords in the fields below::	property, legal pluralism, carceral geography, law, Christiania

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Property and carceral spaces in Christiania, Copenhagen

Abstract: This article addresses the recent legal and property changes, and their socio-spatial consequences in Christiania, Copenhagen. During recent years the community that has always been against private ownership has lost its special legal status, and became a property owner of a vast area in the middle of Copenhagen. We analyze the situation in relation to Christiania's current housing condition, individual residents' privatization efforts, and decades-long normalization efforts by the state. We argue that the processes of normalization, legalization, criminalization and privatization are expressions of the carceral in more-than-institutional context, and that questions of property are strongly involved in these carceral practices in Christiania. Not only in the relations between Christiania and the state, but also in socio-spatial relations inside of the community, defining who is included or excluded, or how people behave towards each other. Moreover, a part of the community is cultivating a carceral culture towards those in favor of privatization, using the rights of the property owner and the community's ideologies as justifications.

Keywords: property , legal pluralism , carceral geography , law , Christiania

Introduction

It has been widely acknowledged that carceral practices exist throughout society, and that there is a need to study carceral spaces in more-than-institutional contexts. The creation of carceralities aims at defining what people are supposed to think or how they

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 should act. The punishments for behaving or thinking in ‘wrong’ ways are manifested
10 spatially; for instance, if people are removed from their homes or if their mobility is
11 limited because of the fear of punishment (Altin & Minca, 2017). The conditions,
12 qualities, and experiences of carceralities are multiple (Peters & Turner, 2017: 4) – so
13 that punishing does not happen merely inside of institutions, but in various contexts
14 where normalizing forces are at work.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 This article addresses these questions in relation to the housing and property issues of an
25 alternative community of the Freetown Christiania in Copenhagen. The future of
26 Christiania changed drastically when the Danish Supreme Court handed down its
27 judgment on February 18th, 2011 in the case concerning “the right to the Christiania
28 area”. The judgment started a process during which Christiania (population approx.
29 1000 inhabitants) both lost its special legal status, and became a private property owner.
30 The change in ownership was significant: the community that had always been against
31 private ownership became an owner of a vast property in the middle of Copenhagen.
32 This article addresses this transformation in ownership and legal status, and the
33 processes of confinement that have resulted from it.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 We argue that much of the history of Christiania and the struggle over its existence have
49 been about controlling the area: who owns the land; how it is managed, governed and
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 policed; and with which socio-spatial consequences. We ask how are the recent changes
10 in ownership and property laws taking place in Christiania, and how these processes
11 have embedded carceral practices in the everyday life of the community. These
12 questions are linked with the wider questions concerning the more-than-institutional
13 contexts of carceral spaces and practices, discussing notably how the efforts of
14 legalization, normalization and privatization may produce carceral milieus within
15 alternative communities (cf. Gill et al., 2015: 2–3; Vasudevan, 2015a: 346–347).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The story of Christiania began in 1971 when a group of people squatted in an old
27 military area in Christianshavn, near the city center of Copenhagen. In 1973, the Social
28 Democratic government of Denmark gave Christiania a status of a freetown. This meant
29 autonomy in a sense that the community could organize their living and government
30 rather independently, leading among other things to consensus democracy, creative
31 building, and an extensive hash trade. Freedom from the law and policies also led to
32 uncertainty. Depending on the political situation – like the power division of the right-
33 and left-wing parties in the parliament – Christiania’s existence has been questioned on
34 a regular basis. The social experiment status lasted until 1978 when the High Court
35 ruled the immediate clearance of Christiania. However, this did not have any
36 consequences, partly because of the wide supportive demonstrations. In 1989, the
37 Danish Parliament accepted The Christiania Act, which legalized the squatting (Thörn
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 et al., 2011: 7), but also included a district plan whose purpose was to prevent illegal
10 constructing (Klima-, Energi- og Bygningsministeriet, 1989: §3). The district plan did
11 not have an effect on the building practices in Christiania.
12
13
14
15

16
17 The new law was revised in 2004 by the Liberal-Conservative government with strict
18 rules about the uses of the area and buildings (Thörn et al., 2011:7; Klima-, Energi- og
19 Bygningsministeriet, 2004). The law was based on the newly made plan for Christiania,
20 including the idea to normalize the area and to increase its openness
21 (Christianiaområdet fremtid – helhedsplan og handlingsplan, 2004). For the
22 community this appeared as an attempt to diminish their lifestyle (Christiania, 2015). In
23 2008, Christiania brought a lawsuit against the state, claiming permanent right of use of
24 the area on the grounds of the fact that the community had inhabited the area for over
25 thirty years. Christiania, however, lost the case in February 2011 (Bygningsstyrelsen,
26 2016).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 We argue that Christiania's existence has relied on the questions of property and
42 ownership from the beginning. The situation only culminated when the Supreme Court
43 handed down its judgment in 2011. As a result of the decision, Christiania and the state
44 made an agreement concerning the future ownership of the area. In June 2012, buildings
45 and land were transferred to the Foundation for the Freetown Christiania
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 (Bygningsstyrelsen, 2016), whose Board was composed of five residents of Christiania
10 and six outside members. The Board would be responsible for implementing the
11 elements of the agreement, and to work as a buffer between authorities and Christiania.
12
13 The Foundation bought from the state those Christiania's land areas that were not
14 protected as cultural sites, and most of the buildings that had belonged to the state.
15 Moreover, the Foundation rented the cultural site areas and those buildings that the state
16 did not agree to sell. It was also agreed on how Christiania should take care of the area,
17 how vacant apartments could be applied for, or how the residents would have a right to
18 become so-called privatists who would rent the land under their houses from the state,
19 not from the Foundation (Aftale mellem Fonden Fristaden Christiania og Den Danske
20 Stat, 2013).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Furthermore, in June 2013, a legislative proposal for repealing the Christiania law was
36 approved by a broad majority in the Danish parliament (Bygningsstyrelsen, 2016). This
37 meant abandoning Christiania's special legal status and replacing it with Danish law.
38 This was expected to require special solutions while reconciling Christiania's lifestyles
39 with the new laws. There was also a significant change in the ways that properties
40 would later on be governed by and managed as the rights of the property owner were
41 removed from the state to the Foundation.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 This paper is based on the analysis of three kinds of research material: firstly, official
10 documents, such as agreements, plans and laws concerning Christiania; secondly, semi-
11 structured interviews; and thirdly, participant observation. Interviews and participant
12 observation have been carried out in two phases: in a two-week period in June and July
13 2015, and in a three-month period between January and April in 2016. All material is
14 analyzed discursively, concentrating not only on the contents, but even more so on how
15 topics are talked about, what is left unsaid, and what kinds of hierarchies and power
16 relations are revealed in the material. Much emphasis is put on interviews because the
17 decisions and happenings in Christiania are scarcely documented. Speaking with people
18 and partaking in the life in Christiania are thus the only ways of gaining an
19 understanding about the practices, opinions and power relations in the area.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 While gathering the research material it became apparent how important the change in
36 ownership had been, and how it had touched many individual lives. It was hard for
37 many interviewees to talk about the change, and thus, handling the research material
38 ethically and ensuring the anonymity of the interviewed persons is especially important.
39 We have, therefore, divided the persons who we interviewed or discussed with into two
40 groups: the category of authorities that consists of the representatives of the state, the
41 city, the police, the outsider members of the Foundation, and the experts – such as
42 researchers, architects, lawyers, social workers etc. – whose work is linked with
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Christiania. The category of residents consists of all those interviewed persons who live
10 in Christiania – despite their expertise, and including also some insider members of the
11 Board of the Foundation. The same division is used if the information has been received
12 during the participant observation, in which case there are not recorded and transcribed
13 interviews, but only notes made during or after the discussions.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Neither one of us authors has an insider's position in Christiania. We know the
23 community only through our several visits to the area during which we have conducted
24 research, socialized with people, or participated in the Christiania Researcher in
25 Residence program. We feel that our position as outsiders helped us in gathering the
26 research material. Although some individuals were suspicious towards us, most people
27 shared with us delicate issues and emphasized how important it is to talk about
28 questions that are denied or avoided inside the community.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 In the first part of the article, we develop the conceptual basis for analyzing
41 Christiania's legal and property changes, and the processes of confinement they have
42 created. In the second and third section, we use this conceptual background for
43 analyzing Christiania's current housing situation and efforts to privatism, asking how
44 legal pluralism and property owners' rights and responsibilities have formed social
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 spaces in Christiania. The conclusion of the article summarizes our views of the socio-
10 spatial consequences of the changes in ownership.
11
12

13 14 15 **Carceral spaces of property** 16 17

18 19 20 *The conceptions of the carceral* 21

22
23 A sub-field of carceral geography has earlier concentrated mostly on spaces of
24 confinement inside of, or linked with, institutions (e.g. Pallot, 2005; Moran, 2012;
25 Moran and Keinänen, 2012; Turner, 2012, 2013; Milhaud and Moran, 2013; Schliehe,
26 2014). Nowadays scholars acknowledge and encourage exploring carceral spaces more
27 widely in different contexts and outside of institutions (e.g. Milhaud and Moran, 2013;
28 Moran et al., 2013). The notion of the carceral is now regarded as concerning not only
29 the ‘studies of incarceration *per se*’, but also ‘the restriction of autonomy in a much
30 broader context.’ (Moran, 2015: 71). There is research, for instance, on shadow carceral
31 states in which punitive power occurs when civil, administrative, and criminal legal
32 authorities blend (Beckett and Murakawa, 2012: 2), or on carceral landscapes resulting
33 from neoliberalism and the ‘criminalization of poor and othered communities’ (Gill et
34 al., 2016: 2). Within urban geography, Mike Davis (1990: 253–256) wrote in his *City of*
35 *Quartz* about Los Angeles as a carceral city where the police’s growing role had led to
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 increasing surveillance, police data gathering, controlling the sky, and naturalizing the
10 prison-look of buildings (see also Fludernik, 1999; Alexander, 2007).
11

12
13
14
15 Much of the **thinking on** carceral spaces lean on Michel Foucault's (1975/1995)
16 arguments in 'Discipline and Punish' about how carceral mechanisms have spread
17 outwards from institutions, and function throughout society (Foucault, 1975/1995: 297–
18 298). These mechanisms operate transformations on individuals through their politico-
19 moral schema of individual isolation and hierarchy, and the techno-medical model of
20 cure and normalization (Foucault, 1975/1995: 248), which function through 'the judges
21 of normality' such as doctors, social workers and other suchlike authorities. The
22 conceptions of the normative are based on such authorities, and individuals are expected
23 to adjust their lives and behavior to their logics (Foucault, 1975/1995: 304). From this
24 offset, Foucault proceeds to what he calls the carceral city whose elements – such as
25 walls, institutions, rules and discourses – exercise a power of normalization. At the
26 center of the carceral city are punitive mechanisms, such as the formation of petty
27 cruelties, small acts of cunning and calculated methods. Foucault states that recognizing
28 these processes helps in understanding the multiple mechanisms of incarceration,
29 powers of normalization and the formation of knowledge behind these processes
30 (Foucault, 1975/1995: 307–308).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Danish State's normalization efforts towards Christiania have been researched rather widely (e.g. Lund Hansen, 2006; Amoroux, 2009; Coppola and Vanolo, 2015; Wasshede, 2016). Not much has been thought, however, **has been given as to** what kinds of mechanisms of normalization may appear inside of the community itself. Following Foucault (1975/1995: 293–295), we understand the carceral as concentrated on coercive measures and on the normalizing power that tries to eradicate the abnormalities in society (cf. Foucault 1975/1995: 298). For us, spaces of confinement are found in everyday urban spaces: in daily practices, acts of governing, and in the ways of behaving towards other people. Moreover, we couple the idea of carceral space with the questions of property: the ways in which expectations, rights, duties, desires and resistances are linked with the squatted areas and alternative communities, and the efforts of their privatization, criminalization, normalization, and utilization in the neoliberalist urban development (e.g. Vasudevan, 2015a: 346–347; Gill et al., 2016: 2).

Normalization through legalization and ownership

Much of Christiania's history and its whole existence have been about property: how Christiania was born when squatters took over the property of the state; how the community has been against private ownership; how the land and buildings have been used as commons; how the state has disciplined the community through law and policing; and how the normalization culminated when the community was forced into

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 private ownership. Issues of property have thus had an essential role in the everyday life
10 of Christiania, and in the ways its existence has been justified over the decades.
11 Although these issues have been grasped in several studies (e.g. Midtgaard, 2007;
12 Amoroux, 2009; Moeller, 2009; Thörn et al., 2011; Karpantschhof, 2011; Hellström
13 Reimer, 2012; Thörn, 2012; Vanolo, 2013; Hall Thorbjörg, 2014), few studies have
14 focused on property-questions *per se* (e.g. Lund Hansen, 2006; Coppola and Vanolo,
15 2015). The recent study of Coppola and Vanolo (2015) discusses the potential effects of
16 the 2011 agreement, and the hybridization of the forces of autonomy and
17 neoliberalization that could result from that. Basing their research on fieldwork between
18 2010 and 2012, Coppola and Vanolo speculate on the future effects of the agreement.
19 Now that five years have passed from the agreement, we analyze what has actually
20 happened through material from 2015 and 2016, and what kinds of spatio-legal
21 outcomes the agreement has produced.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Along with **concessions in recent years** towards private ownership, property is today
40 perhaps a hotter topic than ever before in Christiania – not only when justifying the
41 community's lifestyle to the state, but also because of the increase of property-related
42 inner conflicts. From our spatial perspective, ownership is most of all a matter of
43 governing and bordering of space. Here we follow Nicholas Blomley, according to
44 whom 'property entails boundary-work' (Blomley, 2010: 205–206) through which
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 spaces become individualized, separated, privatized, and sometimes even exclusive
10 (Blomley, 2003: 121). Property rights have had a dominant role throughout the history
11 of capitalism (Lund Hansen, 2011: 293), and struggles over borders and their
12 controlling have become common urban practices (Lund Hansen, 2006: 101). Due to
13 these practices, property is not just a question of land use, but also a moral question
14 (Blomley, 2003: 122), creating struggles and spheres of exclusion.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Squatting produces exceptional spaces in terms of ownership. By concentrating on
25 collective world-making, collective forms of self-determination, and alternative
26 urbanism (Vasudevan, 2015a: 348–349; 2015b: 323–324), squatting resists private
27 ownership and its inability to create affordable housing or to enhance alternative ways
28 of living. The question of property is thus also for squatters a politically and
29 ideologically loaded topic, subject to intense, and at times violent, conflicts (cf. Benda-
30 Beckmann, 2000: 151–152). In a way, Christiania’s normalization process resembles
31 the legal transformation of colonial societies in which European rulers replaced
32 common ownership and consensual decision-making (Benda-Beckmann, 2000: 152,
33 161) with their own ideas about property rights. The processes of governing and
34 decision-making were occupied by the administrative organization of the state, and
35 governing became more distant both geographically and politically (Benda-Beckmann,
36 2000: 165–166).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 Normalization efforts have led to a similar kind of legal transformation in Christiania as
12 its current legal system has developed into a mix of the state's and Christiania's rules.
13
14 The legal focus is shifting from the community to the state and is moving governing
15 further away from the area. Even though Christiania's special legal status is not valid
16 anymore, it is inscribed in the customs and habits. The inner decision-making is mostly
17 based on spoken law, consensus democracy, and on the community's control over the
18 area. Overlapping legal systems and the legal pluralism have, however, led to a mixed
19 legal identity (cf. Blandy and Sibley, 2010: 280), and to the hyperregulation of the area
20 (cf. von Benda-Beckmann and von Benda-Beckmann, 2014: 31). By that we refer to the
21 formation of several layers of control that are created and managed by the state and the
22 Foundation, but also by the city, the police, the community, the pushers, their guards,
23 and so forth. Although this is not exceptional in urban settings (e.g. Valverde, 2014:
24 387–389), we argue that overlapping regulations may easily cause exclusion and control
25 which are – according to Dolovich (2011: 9) – ‘first and foremost the logic of
26 imprisonment’, which can lead to wider acceptance of carceral practices as a part of
27 everyday life.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Even though exclusion and control do not automatically create carceral spaces, in
49 Christiania's case we argue differently. Many mechanisms of discipline have become
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

more or less naturalized (cf. Foucault, 1975/1995: 303–306) parts of the everyday life of the community. As our analysis will show, the question is not simply about mechanisms that result from ‘normal’ governance or the changed ownership status. Instead, the creation of carceral spaces is shown in the citizens’ ways of self-regulating their opinions and movement in order to avoid disciplinary measures.

Property and housing in Christiania

Normalization in the making

Ten years ago, Anders Lund Hansen (2006: 7–8) wrote about the Danish governments’ normalization-plans for Christiania. The neo-liberal strategy aimed to close down the hash trade, to legitimize buildings and to remove the community from joint ownership towards private property and free market forces. Much has happened during the latest 10 years in this respect. Although many Christianites deny the proceeding of the normalization-process, authorities – such as the officials of the city and the state, or the police – see the present situation exactly as normalization in the making. Most parts of the neo-liberal strategy that Lund Hansen mentioned 10 years ago, have come about or are on their way to coming true: the buildings have been legalized with a few exceptions; the Foundation has become a property owner; and market forces are functioning effectively in the area. And most recently, the battle against Christiania’s hash trade took a step forward when the residents began to stand against organized

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 crime and fight for the openness of the area after a tragic shooting of two policemen and
10 a bystander in August 2016.
11

12
13
14
15 According to Mary Manjikian (2013), the Danish Liberal Party and the Liberal
16 Conservative alliance have had a wide influence on the rhetoric concerning Christiania,
17 as they have taken a 'businesslike approach' to it. They have treated Christiania as real
18 estate where common ownership should be replaced by the logic of private property
19 (Manjikian, 2013: 129). Manjikian (2013: 135–137) states that the community was not
20 purchasing sovereignty but rather legality when making the agreement with the state.
21 She argues that the new legislation aimed to regulate the spaces and collective behavior
22 instead of individuals. This argument is in line with the fact that the Foundation is now
23 the property owner in Christiania, so that the residents do not own the houses, but they
24 pay rent to the Foundation who owns and governs the buildings.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The ownership change has, however, had a great deal of impact on residents. One of the
40 interviewed authorities emphasizes the importance of understanding that 'for 40 years
41 people living in Christiania were every day afraid that today might be the day when the
42 police came and throw them out'. According to the interview, that had taken a lot of
43 energy, and now that they do not need to fear anymore, it is still a long process to start
44 to be creative and turn the energy towards other issues (Interview, authority, June 29,
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 2015). Although the property change indicates that the fear of the state's punishments
10 has diminished, some residents are more skeptical and consider the arguments for 'less
11 fear' as a 'modified truth' (Interview, resident, July 9, 2015).
12
13
14
15

16 17 *Housing as means of punishing* 18

19
20 'But perhaps the most important effect of the carceral system and of its extension well
21 beyond legal imprisonment is that it succeeds in making the power to punish natural and
22 legitimate, in lowering at least the threshold of tolerance to penalty' (Foucault,
23 1975/1995: 301).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 The new legal status of Christiania has normalized housing in at least three ways:
32
33 Firstly, through the change in the construction processes and the regulation of the
34 buildings. Secondly, through the requirements to remove some illegally built buildings
35 located in the conservation area. And thirdly, through the demands of the more
36 transparent and open selection process of new residents.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Firstly, the legislation concerning building processes has been hard to accept for the
45 Christianites, who have considered themselves as an autonomous community (cf.
46 Coppola and Vanolo, 2015: 52). Forcing the community under the state's control has
47 been experienced as a punishment that aims at normalizing the community. One of the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 interviewed authorities says that the Christianites regard building permits as
10 'bureaucratic and stupid nonsense because they see this as their property'. S/he states
11 that authorities are trying to 'get them to behave as normal citizens who have to apply
12 in order to build and to make sure it's safe and acceptable to the area' (Interview,
13 authority, July 7, 2015). There are, still, Christianites who are not familiar with the
14 permit processes even if they had been active in construction works. One interviewee
15 says s/he has 'heard that some papers should be filled in', but does not 'know what that
16 thing is' (Interview, resident, July 7, 2015). Some residents also characterize
17 Christiania's own building control as frustrating. Constructing a bathroom, for instance,
18 requires going to the meeting and convincing other residents that you need a bathroom.
19 After that, the builder, the area, and the community each pay one third of the bathroom.
20 There is, however, 'a lot of administration', and sometimes 'it's much easier just go to
21 the bank and borrow some money' (Interview, resident, February 9, 2016). That means
22 skipping the process and investing personally in the renovation of collectively owned
23 buildings.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 One of the authorities notes that it takes time to get things to proceed efficiently in the
45 current situation 'with the many different rules' (Interview, authority, March 7, 2016).
46 The overlapping legal systems have led to exhausting bureaucracy. For instance, when
47 applying for a building permit, first the community's acceptance must be obtained, after
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 which the process depends on which part of Christiania you live in. If the area is owned
10 by the state, the permit is needed from the municipality, from the state, and possibly
11 from the state institution that governs cultural sites. There may thus be three different
12 authorities evaluating and accepting/denying the permit. (Interview, authority, June 29,
13 2015).
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Secondly, the buildings that do not meet the Danish criteria are required to be renovated
23 and legalized. At the moment, the legalization has mostly been finished with a few
24 exceptions (Interview, authority, July 3, 2015). Some authorities think that the situation
25 has improved ‘because Christiania has accepted that they are now legalized’, or that
26 ‘they are part of the society’ (Interview, authority, July 8, 2015). In addition to
27 renovation and legalization, five houses were ordered to be removed in 2012, nine
28 houses until 2022, and six more until 2042. Some interviewees regard these
29 requirements as *par excellence* political acts, and as a part of the symbolic politics that
30 aim at showing the normalizing power of the state. The removal of illegal houses has
31 been justified with the aim of conserving the historical ramparts and increasing their
32 visibility, yet the number of condemned houses and the justifications of their removal
33 have varied over the years. This has increased the impression that the question is more
34 of a symbolical gesture than the actual need to change the current state of affairs
35 (Interview, authority, March 30, 2016).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 The first houses were removed as agreed, and built at a new location designated by the
12 state. Some authorities have a strict view that 'what is built on the ramparts, have to be
13 removed', and that it is 'what the state says and a part of the legalization of Christiania'
14 (Interview, authority, July 8, 2015). Some interviewees accept the removal as a means
15 of conservation, or as a part of the agreement that Christiania has signed (e.g. Interview,
16 resident, February 19, 2016). There are still hopes that the rest of the houses will not
17 have to be removed: 'People accepted that to get the agreement, but it's difficult to
18 understand why you have to build a completely new house somewhere else and remove
19 a house where people can live in' (Interview, authority, March 7, 2016). Moreover,
20 some authorities are not convinced that the future relocations will happen as smoothly
21 as the first ones, and forewarn of 'a huge fight between the government and Christiania'
22 (Interview, authority, July 7, 2015). On the one hand, Christiania's role as a property
23 owner may inspire the community to resist the change in order to claim the right to the
24 space, and to invest the space with new political possibilities (cf. Blomley, 2003: 122).
25 On the other hand, Christiania is expected to follow the responsibilities of a property
26 owner and the agreement they have signed.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The agreement's third effect on housing is related to the selection process of residents,
49 which is expected to be transparent and equal. According to Christiania's consensus
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

democracy, all decisions are made in common meetings and area meetings. Every resident is entitled to take part in the meetings, and the decision is reached only after the meeting is unanimous about the matter under consideration (see e.g. Jarvis, 2011). The future residents are chosen in area meetings after available apartments have been announced in Christiania's weekly paper 'Ugespjelet'. In practice, it has been impossible to become selected if you are not already living in Christiania, or do not have friends there speaking on your behalf (xxxx, 2013: 37–38). The agreement between the state and Foundation (2011: 5) requires a public announcement of vacant houses, treating applicants equally, and entitling complaints about the decisions. Still, neither interviewed authorities nor residents recall that much change would have happened in this respect. Processes of exclusion still dominate in the selection process, and sometimes it is considered case-by-case if a vacant house will be publicly announced (e.g. Ugespjelet, 36/2016: 10).

Forcing Christiania into the sphere of Danish law seems like a carceral, normalizing act towards an alternative inhabiting of the city (cf. Vasudevan, 2015b, 318–319) and towards a community that has been contrasted with the law-abiding citizens (cf. Amoroux, 2009: 110). Before the agreement with the state, constructing was not regulated in any way that would be equivalent with the state's or the city's control mechanisms. The construction without permits was condemned by the state throughout

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the years in laws, regulations and court sentences, which did not have much effect on
10 practices in Christiania (Interview, authority, July 7, 2015). Tearing down illegal houses
11 in 2007 and 2008 had only led to severe conflicts between Christiania and the police
12 (Amoroux, 2009: 128), and can easily be interpreted as legal, authorized violence
13 (Blomley, 2003: 130) that manifested itself through the contestation of the right to build
14 and dwell in a house. Such violence works inside and through the law: tearing down
15 someone's home may not be morally right, but when being legal, it is regarded as a
16 justified act.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Many authorities consider Christianites **to be** living on the margins and think of
29 Christiania as a place for those with difficulties to integrate into the society (Interview,
30 authority, July 8, 2015). Another thing is how and if the 'othering' or 'criminalization'
31 has affected the community or justified disciplinary acts towards it (cf. Frost, 2006;
32 Moran, 2015: 106–107; Gill et al., 2016: 2). The riots suggest that the area is united in
33 its efforts, and that the residents are willing to support each other to the extent that
34 enforcing the laws in Christiania could lead to 'huge consequences' (Interview,
35 authority, July 7, 2015). However, a Christianite mentions that when some buildings
36 were doomed to be demolished, the community began to divide. The residents whose
37 homes were threatened, were upset. Some others said that perhaps these buildings
38 should be demolished as they were in poor condition. **One** resident describes the
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 situation as being in the middle of ‘divide and rule’ strategy that was far removed from
10 Christiania’s ideologies of the common lands and buildings (Interview, resident,
11 February 12, 2016). As Gill (2013, 30) argues, ‘holding’ is not the only way of
12 confinement, but people may equally be restricted by moving them against their own
13 will. Thus, removing houses or condemning them to be demolished is undoubtedly the
14 punishment for the crime of being different or living differently compared to the
15 conceptions of the ‘normal’ in society. It is a form of spatial regulation that is a
16 significant force in carceral culture and social control (Moran et al., 2011: 449).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 One interviewed authority says that s/he does not expect normality from Christianites,
29 but only that they ‘follow the law’ (Interview, authority, February 25, 2016). Another
30 authority states that they just want to normalize the legislation, and make the
31 Christianites equal compared to other citizens (Interview, authority, July 7, 2015). Some
32 authorities or politicians want to normalize the area in respect to housing, some others
33 in respect to law, some others in respect to ownership, and so forth. The notions of
34 normalization are thus various, and all these combined make it easy to find justifications
35 for the punitive actions in Christiania.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Carceral spaces of privatists*

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 ‘It was not easy for us to admit that the worst problems were within’ (Interview,
10 resident, February 19, 2016).
11
12

13
14
15 When the agreement with the state proceeded, every Christianite had a chance to
16 choose whether they would make a deal about their living with the Foundation or would
17 become privatists who operate directly with the state. The rights of the privatists had
18 been assured in the agreement between the state and the Foundation (2013). An
19 interviewee told that everybody got a letter saying that they could buy their houses
20 directly from the state. The prices were very low, and the offer considered houses other
21 than those that had been ‘erected privately’ or had ‘historical value’ (Interview, resident,
22 June 29, 2015). However, the residents had a hard time understanding what being a
23 privatist would mean, and only a few had enough competence or money for using legal
24 assistance. Furthermore, the Christiania community strongly recommended making a
25 deal with them instead of the state:
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 ‘We had to fill out some papers that the government sent us. And N.N. says,
40
41 ‘They just gonna treat you wrong, they gonna take away your rights. So you’re
42 going to fill out our papers, instead of the government papers, because
43 government is cheating.’ Do I need to say that of course the papers were equal?
44
45 A lot of students of law showed up, take your papers and go there, and they fill it
46 out for you. But when you reach to the bottom of this paper, and when you sign
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 that, you also sign that you give all your rights to a Foundation or to some kind
10 of organization that was not even made yet.' (Interview, resident, February 19,
11 2016)
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 Despite the persuasion, few households were interested in becoming privatists. A
19 chance to influence the future of the houses may have been a significant motivation for
20 them (Interview, authority, June 30, 2015), as well as an attachment to houses where
21 some of them had lived for decades, invested in them, or even build for themselves. For
22 some residents, the apparent unity of the rest of Christiania against the privatization of
23 the area seemed like 'a very strong signal both to the state and to the public' that they
24 consider the area 'as one' (Interview, resident, June 29, 2015). Yet, some other residents
25 expressed distrust at the way the Foundation was managing Christiania (Interview,
26 resident, July 9, 2015), or even regarded its establishment as the end of Christiania
27 (Interview, resident, February 19, 2016). Moreover, understanding the meaning of being
28 a privatist was not only difficult for the residents, but for authorities as well. One
29 authority states that the legal status of the privatists' houses is ambiguous, and that not
30 even authorities know who owns the houses – the Foundation or the Christianites who
31 live in the houses (Interview, authority, July 7, 2015).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 The complexity of the issue and its side effects are discussed by many Christianites;
10 regardless of whether they have themselves considered becoming a privatist or not. The
11 residents mention several acts by Christiania community members against the privatists:
12 isolation, demonization, vandalism, throwing bombs, smashing windows, painting
13 doors, painting the houses with graffiti, and booing out from meetings (e.g. Interviews,
14 residents, February 19, 2016; July 7, 2015; July 9, 2015a; July 9, 2015b; July 10, 2015).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 These acts are punitive in a sense that they confined the privatists to their homes and
23 prevented them from taking part on the community life as usual. The actions against the
24 privatists are well known by the community, yet no one mentions that anything had
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Some authorities are aware of the privatists' problems. According to one interviewee,
'it's the state who decided this and has to make sure that the people who wanted this
could have the possibility' (Interview, authority, March 7, 2016). An authority says that
the rights of the privatists have been respected by most people, 'but of course there are

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 always some who say everybody should be part of community and became angry
10 because there were some who didn't' (Interview, authority, March 7, 2016). Another
11 authority suspects that the privatists 'have been harassed to the point, where I think they
12 are about to move out.' S/he agrees that the state authorities 'sort of have a
13 responsibility for the situation', but admits that there is not a lot they can do about it
14 (Interview, authority, July 7, 2015).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Some 'spokesmen' or 'spokeswomen' of Christiania, instead, tell of the official truth of
25 the community: the zero tolerance of violence, how everyone is accepted and given
26 'space enough to have their opinion', and how no one is 'bullied into some kind of an
27 opinion' (Interview, resident, July 6, 2015, Interview, resident, July 9, 2015). The denial
28 and silence about the problems seem to have enabled punitive practices towards the
29 privatists. As if the community tried to draw strict boundaries inside of which problems
30 could be controlled, but also define how these problems are talked (cf. Philo, 2011: 5) –
31 or rather not talked – about. One of the interviewed authorities describes the attitude as
32 "double moral", claiming that in one way, Christianites 'have a high grade of moral, but
33 other times it conflicts with some basic things about being a human being living with
34 other humans' (Interview, authority, February 25, 2016).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The expectation of the community was that Christiania's citizenship should be
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 performed and given meaning (cf. Yarwood, 2014: 69) by resisting privatization and
10 supporting the Foundation. The fear was that because of privatism, ‘there would be
11 living very rich people’ in Christiania, and that ‘the whole idea about freedom and
12 wider kinds ways of thinking and having tolerance would be gone’ (Interview, resident,
13 July 9, 2015). Some residents and authorities have associated privatism with diverging
14 from the community’s ideals (e.g. Interviews, authority, June 29, 2015, July 7, 2015;
15 resident July 10, 2015) of self-determination, autonomy and collective world-making
16 (cf. Vasudevan, 2015b, 323–325). Some residents, instead, strongly express that no
17 matter what, the privatists will always stay their neighbors (e.g. Interview, resident, July
18 7, 2015). Everyday actions and the active contribution to public life have been essential
19 in reproducing one’s citizenship and belonging to the community in Christiania (cf.
20 Yarwood, 2014: 4–5, 19; Staeheli, 2011: 399). The conceptions of a community are still
21 various: for the ones, community is based on ownership, ideologies, and agreeing with
22 the Foundation. For the others, community is based on common experiences and sharing
23 the everyday life with their neighbors. Different interpretations of the community have
24 also spatial consequences as they direct the ways people use their territories with or
25 against each other.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Although the residents have faced several normalizing measures during the existence of
49 Christiania, these experiences have not prevented the community from adopting a
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 similar kind of carceral culture towards those who think differently. Also here the
10 question is of legal violence (cf. Blomley, 2003), which in this case is not authorized by
11 Danish law, but by the Christiania community. The dispute over property has caused
12 exclusion and divided Christiania both socially and spatially. It can be claimed that
13 property has acted in violent ways (cf. Blomley, 2003) and has aimed at ‘curing’ the
14 persons from the undesired opinions (cf. Foucault, 1975/1995: 269). Although the
15 community’s controlling is more allusive than in the actual punitive institutions or
16 methods (e.g. Gill, 2013: 20), it still directs people’s behavior towards those who think
17 differently (cf. Foucault, 1975/1995: 269), and creates feelings of being trapped in
18 situations where inter-personal conflicts threaten one’s belonging (Jarvis, 2013: 950).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Conclusions**

33
34
35 This article has shown that the recent changes in property and legality have **not** been
36 easy **either for the community or for** the residents of Christiania. Christiania has always
37 been against private ownership, yet property issues have become the ones defining the
38 existence of the community: who is included and who is not; and whose rights are
39 respected. The social and spatial organization of the community has been defined by a
40 continuous struggle over who owns and controls the area, and what people should think
41 or say about privatization or legalization of the community. Many authorities and
42 residents regard the recent changes as signs of successful normalization, and the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 advancement of the gentrification process. These processes do not tell merely about
10 Christiania, but they concern the whole understanding of the carceral in more-than-
11 institutional contexts, especially when it comes to alternative housing and communities
12 that are 'othered' or criminalized in order to justify different kinds of carceral processes
13 – whether they are given a label of normalization, legalization, privatization, or
14 something else. Through these processes, the carceral becomes performed spatially by
15 ordering houses to be demolished, by forcing people to move, or by limiting people's
16 movement because of the fear of violence.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Our study suggests that Christiania's role as a property owner and its new legal status
29 have led to a hyperregulated area where different legal systems are overlapping and
30 producing multiple layers of control. The realization of the legal system is disordered as
31 Danish law is mixed with Christiania's 45-years old habits and consensus democracy.
32
33 The land use of Christiania is orchestrated by the state, the city, the police, the
34 Foundation, the community, the pushers, the guards, and other instances. This has made
35 the legal (dis)order of Christiania confusing both for individuals and the community.
36
37 Individual residents have had a hard time trying to follow different laws and codes
38 affecting their housing, rights, and everyday life. The Foundation is more aware of the
39 legal situation, and is regularly using legal assistance.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 The community has so far followed its agreement with the state and Danish law rather
10 strictly when it comes to legalizing and removing the buildings. Moving the houses to
11 the designated areas, renovating the houses, and applying for building permits are steps
12 towards Christiania as a space that is on the verge of becoming legal in the face of
13 authorities. Legal pluralism is still seen in building practices: how different degrees of
14 formality and foundations of legitimacy coexist within the same space (cf. von Benda-
15 Beckmann and von Benda-Beckmann, 2014: 34). Also, when it comes to the selection
16 process of new residents, or to the responsibilities of the Foundation as a property
17 owner, the practices are rather vague, and require negotiating with the state, the city and
18 neighbors.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Although Christiania seems to be on the verge of solving its controversies with the state,
34 at the same time new kinds of carceral spaces have emerged that are not created only
35 from the outside, but equally from the inside, by the community's own ways of
36 governing, and the resulting behavior of the residents towards each other. Moreover, if
37 the earlier conflicts had mostly been between Christiania and the state, new property
38 issues seem to have increased pressure towards individual residents – such as those
39 living in houses that are required to be removed, or privatists who wanted to use their
40 right to make a deal about their housing directly with the state. Although for some
41 residents the ownership change has meant the disappearance of fear, there are
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 contrasting views as well. We have been told how the community has been divided;
10 how land and buildings are used as a means of governing with fear; or how some
11 residents have been tied to their homes because of the fear of physical or mental
12 violence. Each one of these worries is directly linked with the questions of ownership,
13 and who has or wishes to have control over spaces.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Christiania's history of oppression has not prevented the community itself from
23 adopting the same kind of carceral culture. The community resists the privatization
24 process to the extent that they have used normalizing violence towards those who think
25 differently. This violence is authorized by the rights of the property owner and the
26 community's ideologies. Bullying, vandalism and court cases have been used as
27 punishments that have restricted the life of the privatists and have aimed to normalize
28 them so that they would fit better in the community. The strategy has been somewhat
29 successful: of the three privatist households that were left in 2015, one gave up at the
30 end of the year. The other two lost the negotiations with the Foundation in the court in
31 the beginning of 2016. Although the rights of the privatists were included in the
32 agreement with the state, neither the Foundation nor the state monitored the realization
33 of the rights, or did anything to stop the punitive acts towards the privatists. It remains
34 unclear why these rights were included in the first place in the agreement if there was no
35 intention to respect them.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 Resisting privatization is nowadays complex in Christiania as the community has
12 become a property owner and attained the owner's rights and responsibilities. The
13 community's resistance is thus no longer opposed towards private ownership *per se*, but
14 rather towards individuals' interest in it. If pressure and punitive acts were earlier
15 targeted against the community of Christiania by the outsiders, today these acts are
16 equally against individuals and also by the community itself. Thus, property issues are
17 not acute only in the relations between Christiania and the state, but also in the socio-
18 spatial relations inside of Christiania. If property is enforced in violent ways, as
19 Blomley (2003: 130) suggests, it can also be enforced in carceral ways when excluding,
20 controlling and normalizing the citizens because of their conceptions of ownership.
21 These aspects of property become apparent in those borders where the community-
22 based ownership ideologies encounter wishes for private ownership. In the collision of
23 these, the power of property can act as an instrument of legal and illegal violence,
24 exclusion and punishment.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Acknowledgements:**

44 Päivi Rannila would like to thank Roskilde University, and the MOSPUS group for providing
45 inspiring research environment during the research. She would also like to thank Kirsten
46 Simonsen and Lasse Koefoed for commenting the manuscript. Both authors would like to
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 thank Christianites and other informants for their invaluable help during the research process.

10 Both authors would also like to thank Ronan Paddison and the anonymous referees for their
11 helpful comments.
12

13 **Funding**

14 Suomen Akatemia

15 **Kulttuurin ja Yhteiskunnan Tutkimuksen Toimikunta**

16 SA279425

17 SA284368

18 **References**

19 Aftale mellem Christiania og staten (2011)

20 Aftale mellem Fonden Fristaden Christiania og Den Danske Stat (2013). Aftale om
21 Fonden Fristaden Christianias forpligtelser til renovering, drift og vedligeholdelse af
22 fortidsmindet, de statsbygninger, der udlejes til fonden, infrastruktur, belysning,
23 forsyning, samt boligtildeling og privatister (aftale nr. 5).
24

25 Alexander N (2007) The Carceral City and the City of Refuge: Belfast Fiction and
26 Urban Form. *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 33(2): 28–38.

27 Altin, R., Minca, C. (2017). The ambivalent camp: Mobility and excess in a quasi-
28 carceral Italian asylum seekers hospitality centre. In J. Turner, K. Peters (eds.) *Carceral*
29 *Mobilities: Interrogating Movement in Incarceration* (pp. 30–43). Routledge, London.

30 Amoroux C (2009) Normalizing Christiania: Project Clean Sweap and the
31 Normalization Plan in Copenhagen. *City and Society*, 21(1): 108–132.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Beckett K and Murakawa N (2012) Mapping the shadow carceral state: Toward an
10 institutionally capacious approach to punishment. *Theoretical Criminology* 0(0): 1–24.

11
12 Benda-Backmann F (2000) Relative Publics and Property Rights. In Geisler C and
13 Daneker G (Eds.) *Property and Values. Alternatives to Public and Private Ownership*.
14 Island Press: Washington, pp. 151–173.

15
16
17
18 Blandy S and Sibley D (2010) Law, Boundaries and the Production of Space. *Social
19 and Legal Studies* 19(3): 275–284.

20
21
22
23 Blomley N (2003) Law, Property, and the Geography of Violence: The Frontier, the
24 Survey, and the Grid. *Annals of Association of American Geographers*, 93(1): 121–141.

25
26
27
28 Blomley N (2010) Cuts, Flows and the Geographies of Property. *Law, Culture and
29 Humanities* 7(2): 203–216.

30
31
32
33 Bygningstyrelsen (2016) Christiania. Available at:

34
35 <http://www.bygst.dk/english/knowledge/christiania/> (accessed 15 February 2016).

36
37
38
39 Christiania (2015) Christiania 2013. Available at:

40
41 <http://www.christiania.org/info/christiania-2013/> (accessed 11 April 2016).

42
43
44
45 Christianiaområdet fremtid – helhedsplan og handlingsplan (2004).

46
47
48
49 Coppola A and Vanolo A (2015) Normalising autonomous spaces: ongoing
50 transformations in Christiania, Copenhagen. *Urban Studies* 52(6): 1152–1168.

51
52
53
54 Danish Supreme Court (2011) On the right to the Christiania area. Judgment 18.

55
56
57
58
59
60 February 2011. Available at:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 http://www.supremecourt.dk/about/decided%20cases/HumanRights/Pages/Ontherightto
10 theChristianaarea.aspx (accessed 15 February 2016).

11
12 Davis M (1990) *City of Quartz. Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. London: Verso.

13
14 Dolovich S (2011) Exclusion and Control in the Carceral State. *Berkley Journal of*
15
16
17
18 *Criminal Law* 16(2): 259–339.

19
20 Fludernik M (1999) Carceral topography: Spatiality, liminality and corporality in the
21
22 literary prison. *Textual Practice*, 13(1): 43–77.

23
24 Foucault M (1995) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Orig. Surveiller et
25
26
27 punir (1975). Translated by Alan Sheridan. 2nd ed. New York: Vintage Books.

28
29 Frost, N. (2006). *Punitive State: Crime, Punishment, and Imprisonment Across the*
30
31 *United States*. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC. Electronic publication.

32
33 Gill N (2013) Mobility versus Liberty? The Punitive Uses of Movement Within and
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Outside Carceral Environments. In Moran D, Gill N and Conlon D (Eds.), *Carceral*
42
43 *spaces. Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*. England:
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Ashgate Publishing Limited, pp.19–36.

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Hall Thorbjörg D (2014) Countercultural Space Does Not Persist: Christiania, and the
10 Role of Music. In Whiteley S and Jedediah S (Eds.), *Countercultures and Popular*
11 *Music*. Surrey: Ashgate, pp. 205–222.

12
13
14
15 Hellström Reimer M (2012) Christiania Copenhagen: A Common out of Ordinary. In
16 Jorgensen A and Keenan R (Eds.), *Urban Wildscapes*. Routledge, Oxon, pp. 120–130.

17
18
19
20 Jarvis H (2011) Alternative Visions of Home and Family Life in Christiania: Lessons
21 for Mainstream. In Thörn H, Wasshede C and Nilson T (Eds.), *Space for Urban*
22 *Alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011*. Vilnius: BALTO Print, pp.156–180.

23
24
25
26 Jarvis H (2013) Against the ‘tyranny’ of single-family dwelling: insights from
27 Christiania at 40. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 20(8): 939–959.

28
29
30
31 Karpantschov R (2011) Bargaining and Barricades — the Political Struggle over the
32 Freetown Christiania 1971–2011. In Thörn H, Wasshede C and Nilson T (Eds.), *Space*
33 *for Urban Alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011*. Vilnius: BALTO Print, pp.38–67

34
35
36
37 Klima-, Energi- og Bygningsministeriet (1989) LOV nr 399 af 07/06/1989 (historisk),
38 Lov om anvendelse af Christianiaområdet.

39
40
41
42 Klima-, Energi- og Bygningsministeriet (2004) LOV nr 431 af 09/06/2004 Lov om
43 ændring af lov om anvendelse af Christianiaområdet.

44
45
46 Københavns Politi (2015). *Københavns Politis indsats på Christiania*.

47
48
49 Lund Hansen A (2006) *Space wars and the New Urban Imperialism*. Lund: Lund
50 University.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Lund Hansen A (2011) Christiania and the Right to the City. In Thörn H, Wasshede C and Nilson T (Eds.), *Space for Urban Alternatives? Christiania 1971—2011*. Vilnius: BALTO Print, pp.288–308.
- Manjikian M (2013). *Securitization of Property Squatting in Europe*. New York: Routledge.
- Midgaard SF (2007) ‘But Suppose Everyone Did the Same’—The Case of Danish Utopian Micro-Society of Christiania. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 24(3): 299–315.
- Milhaud O and Moran D (2013) Penal Space and Privacy in French and Russian Prisons. In Moran D, Gill N and Conlon D (Eds.), *Carceral spaces. Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, pp.167–182.
- Moeller KK (2009) Police crackdown on Christiania in Copenhagen. *Crime Law Soc Change*, 52: 337–345. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10611-008-9185-6>
- Moran D (2012) “Doing time” in carceral space: Timespace and carceral geography. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 94(4): 305–316.
- Moran D (2015) *Carceral Geography. Spaces and Practices of Incarceration*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Moran D and Keinänen A (2012) The ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of prisons: Carceral geography and home visits for prisoners in Finland. *Fennia*, 19(2): 62–76.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Moran D, Gill N and Conlon D (2013) Dialogues across Carceral Space: Migration,
10 Mobility, Space and Agency. In Moran D, Gill N and Conlon D (Eds.), *Carceral*
11 *spaces. Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*. England:
12 Ashgate Publishing Limited, pp.239–249.
13
14
15
16

17 Moran, D., Piacentini, L., Pallot, J. (2011). Disciplined mobility and carceral
18 geography: prisoner transport in Russia. *Transactions of the institute of British*
19 *geographers*, 37:3, 446–460.
20
21

22 Pallot J (2005) Russia's penal peripheries: space, place and penalty in Soviet and post-
23 Soviet Russia. *Transactions of the institute of British geographers*, 30 (1): 98–112.
24
25

26 Peters, K., Turner, J. (2017). Carceral mobilities: A manifesto for mobilities, an agenda
27 for carceral studies. In J. Turner, K. Peters (eds.) *Carceral Mobilities: Interrogating*
28 *Movement in Incarceration* (pp.1–14). Routledge, London.
29
30

31 Philo C (2011) Security of geography/geography of security. *Transaction of the*
32 *Institute of British Geographers*. Royal Geographical Society.
33
34

35 Rannila P (2013) Laki ja julkinen tila Christianian vapaakaupungissa Kööpenhaminassa.
36 In Forss A-M and Rannisto T (Eds.), *Kaupunkien estetiikkaa*. Tampere: University
37 Press of Eastern Finland, pp.28–41.
38
39
40

41 Schliehe AK (2014) Inside ‘the Carceral’: Girls and Young Women in the Scottish
42 Criminal Justice System. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 130(2): 71–85.
43
44

45 Staeheli LA (2011) Political geography: Where’s citizenship? *Progress in Human*
46 *Geography*, 35(3): 393–400.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Thörn H (2012) In between social engineering and gentrification: urban restructuring,
10 social movements, and the place politics of open space. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 34
11 (2): 153–168.
12

13
14
15 Thörn H, Wasshede C and Nilson T (2011) Introduction. In Thörn H, Wasshede C and
16 Nilson T (Eds.), *Space for Urban Alternatives? Christiania 1971–2011*. Vilnius:
17 BALTO Print, pp.7–37.
18

19
20
21 Turner J (2012) Criminals with ‘Community Spirit’: Practising Citizenship in the
22 Hidden World of the Prison. *Space and Polity*, 16(3): 321–334.
23

24
25
26 Turner J (2013) Disciplinary Engagements with Prisons, Prisoners and the Penal
27 System. *Geography Compass* 7(1): 35–45.
28
29
30
31 *Ugespejlet Christiania* 36: 10.
32

33
34
35 Valverde M (2014) Studying the governance of crime and security: Space, time and
36 jurisdiction. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14(4): 379–391.
37

38
39
40 Vanolo A (2013) Alternative Capitalism and Creative Economy: The Case of
41 Christiania. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(5): 1785–98.
42

43
44
45 von Benda-Beckmann F and von Benda-Beckmann K (2014) A Legal Anthropological
46 Perspective on the Temporalities of Space in Plural Legal Orders. In Braverman I,
47 Blomley N, Delaney D and Kedar A (Eds.), *The Expanding Spaces of Law – a Timely*
48 *Legal Geography*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 30–52.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Vasudevan A (2015a) The makeshift city: Towards a global geography of squatting.

9
10 *Progress in Human Geography* 39: 3, 338–359.

11
12 Vasudevan A (2015b) The autonomous city: Towards a critical geography of
13 occupation. *Progress in Human Geography* 39: 3, 316–337.

14
15
16
17 Wasshede C (2016) Normalization of children: Politics and images of children in the
18 Freetown of Christiania. *Childhood* 23(2): 207–220.

19
20
21
22 Yarwood R (2014) *Citizenship*. London: Routledge.