



LUNDS UNIVERSITET
Samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten

Ungdomshuset

Resistance Within a Normalization Process and the Production of
Subversive Situations

Mentor: Despina Tzimoula
Lund University
Centre for Gender Studies
Bachelor Thesis, 15hp
Daniel Blennow
2009-05-27

Abstract

This thesis answers questions of what it is that constitutes a struggle enclosing the conflict between Ungdomshuset and the municipality of Copenhagen during the years of 2006-2008 and what this struggle produces in terms of different stories and different futures. The purpose is to create a link between a poststructuralist critique and a critical theoretical strategy as the thesis argues that such a link would be fruitful for feminist activist strategies. The theoretical framework of this thesis takes its point of departure in this link between a poststructuralist critique of change and subjectivation as instable omnipresent effects of discontinuous power processes and a critical theoretical inspired strategy that affirms subject positions roll in producing conditions of life. The conclusions of this thesis are mainly that actions illuminating or constituting a failure in the reproduction of the logics of market economy and the heterosexual matrix produces, through reversed interpellations, intensified webs of connections between practises of resistance with a subject position of disobedience as its effect.

Keywords: Ungdomshuset, Resistance, Queer, Poststructuralist, Power, Normalization process, Subversive

Table of Contents

1	A Moonbeam in Your Hand	1
1.1	“A double path of politics”	2
1.1.1	Ungdomshuset	3
1.2	Doing Interviews with Activists	4
1.3	“New Social Movements”	5
1.4	Contents	7
2	Subjectivation – Power & Resistance	8
2.1	Normalization process	8
2.1.1	Discontinuity and Instability.....	9
2.1.2	Mobilising the Signifier.....	11
2.1.3	Interpellating demands.....	11
2.1.4	Knowledge and Interpretations.....	12
3	A Dream Taking Shape	14
3.1	”Ungdomshuset” – a Location.....	15
3.1.1	Autonomous space.....	16
3.1.2	Pirate Party Group	17
3.1.3	A Field of Intelligible Things	18
3.2	”Ungdomshuset” – an Interpellation.....	18
3.2.1	Naked Supper.....	19
3.2.2	Association For More Opera Houses.....	20
3.3	Summary.....	21
4	Another Story - Different Futures	23
4.1	”Ungdomshuset” – it’s Subjects	24
4.1.1	The Riots of 16 th of December 2006.....	25
4.1.2	Euphoria and Squatting Dorotheavej.....	26
4.1.3	The Roskilde Festival and the G8- summit	27
4.1.4	G13 – A Success	28
4.2	Summary.....	29
5	Conclusive Remarks	30
6	References	32

1 A Moonbeam in Your Hand

”How do you solve a problem like Maria?
How do you catch a cloud and pin it down?
How do you find a word that means Maria?
A flibbertijibbet! A will-o'-the wisp! A clown!

Many a thing you know you'd like to tell her
Many a thing she ought to understand
But how do you make her stay
And listen to all you say
How do you keep a wave upon the sand?

Oh, how do you solve a problem like Maria?
How do you hold a moonbeam in your hand?”

(Sound of Music, 1965)

The song is sung by the disconsolate nuns who tries in vain to catch to understand, understand to stabilize, form through categorizing, categorizing thorough naming, Maria, the clown and “flibbertijibbet” who, disobeying the nuns demands, constantly runs away. On the mountains she is the desire for a dream and the wave, inconstant in its appearance and diffusely articulated as veiled in clouds. In this essay I am to study the uncatchable moonbeam and I will let the desire for a dream tumble up onto the sand in order to withdraw and I will call these waves, this diffuse Maria, resistance. What I want to catch is a field of power relations, and I am going to examine the productivity of certain power relations and their strategic usage in specific contexts while bearing in mind what Elsa Barkley Brown once wrote about the knowledge of politics. How a linear history will lead us to linear politics, and how neither will serve us well in an asymmetrical world. (Barkley Brown 1997:281) At the same time, this dichotomous division of the Nuns and the Maria is problematic. For as soon as you look, as soon as you do or speak about things you are reproducing knowledge. The usage of a term such as woman, that very categorisation, is a reproduction of a naturalized ideal that makes a subject position possible and intelligible. This, though, should not be understood as that the term should never be used, as if neglecting the power of a subject position like “woman” would be to neglect the power relations in which the bodies that reproduces them are inflicted. Rather it should be understood as a way of understanding reproduction of power and knowledge through a diversity of discourses in which the instability of meaning is highlighted and, as a consequence, resistance. I would argue that this point of view puts our understanding of power, knowledge and discourse in a central position, as well as showing the possibilities of categorizations as we start to map our field. The field that will be mapped is what Joan Wallach Scott (1996) in the book “Only Paradoxes to Offer” draws our attention to. That of how feminists have needed to prove sameness in order to qualify for

equality and at the same time argue for equality *as women*, raising the issue of difference. The tension between reproducing unequal power relations, as they are discursively acted out on the one hand and the notion of resistance, change and instability of knowledge on the other is an interesting one to articulate and explore for everyone who aims at challenging subordination and inequality. The situation of being positioned within this paradox will further on be referred to as the feminist dilemma.

As a student in gender studies, I have wanted to participate in a critique against a production of knowledge that naturalizes and universalizes isolated categories. I understand it as a way of maintaining asymmetrical power relations. To identify the nexus from which power and knowledge rises to the field of intelligible things and to illuminate the ways in which a field meets its points of discontinuity and fails to constitute the intelligibility it promises is, according to me, a necessary point of departure for radical change and critique of asymmetrical power relations (Butler 2004:216). This thesis aspires to concretize aspects of feminist theory in relation to reproduction of subordination and resistance within this reproduction. With an understanding of power relations not as a one way communication of oppressors and oppressed but as institutionalized practices of norms and ideals, I think it is fair to ask questions of how an understanding of resistance might change with this point of view. I think that emancipatory practices could benefit from a discussion and an exploration of the tension between reproduction and resistance. In this thesis I am going to discuss a definition of power that allows me to understand historical processes as discontinuous and fragile in order to open up for an exploitation of this above briefly discussed tension. How can we theorize the notion of our own reproduction of power relations as we try to mobilize them by a definition of power based on an understanding of intelligibility as reproduced within and through discontinuous discursive processes? With “our own” meaning, navigating among norms articulated through disciplinary discourses. I think questions like these are core issues of much of the contemporary critical- theory as well as poststructuralist influenced researches’ that could be described as produced within the field of gender studies. Questions which, would I argue, urge for a discussion not constrained by differences of ontological and epistemological standpoints but one that is open and non-dogmatic. The main analytical focus to meet this purpose, explicitly articulated in the chapter part that follows, is the subversive potential of movement of power relations based on six youth house activists’ perception of the conflict between the Ungdomshuset¹ movement and the municipality of Copenhagen, Denmark, during the period of 2006 and 2008.

1.1 “A double path of politics”

Up until now I have posed a question that is oscillating between Scott’s discussion on “the feminist dilemma” of having to approach the demand for equality on the basis of difference and Butlers urging for a double path of politics in which we both affirm

¹ In this thesis the term “Ungdomshuset” will be used and a direct translation of the term in to English is “the youth house”.

sexualities and genders constitutive role in producing and reproducing conditions of life *and* subject our categories to critical scrutiny, in so doing so, mapping the conditions of acceptability by following the breaking points that indicate its emergence (Scott 1996:168 & Butler 2004:37, 215). The question of how to theorize the notion of reproduction of power relations as they are forced into a mobilizing situation i.e. fails to constitute a specific truth and fails to constitute specific power relations, takes an overall theoretical focus in this thesis. First, it implicates my definition of resistance as productive failures constituting something beyond a disciplinary system of acceptable claims of truth. Second, it gives the opportunity to analytically identify concrete activist strategies within the framework of a system where it is these ruptures of a system that both constitutes it and enable us to see its subversive potential, its possibilities of reaching beyond the dilemma. And finally, it serves *this thesis purpose of creating a link between critical theoretical strategies of illuminating, empowering and emancipating subordinated subjects constituted within and through the intersection of disciplinary logics of market economy, the heterosexual matrix and racialized discourses on the one hand. And, on the other, a poststructuralist critique of identifying discontinuities, failures and the instabilities within the reproduction of a system of acceptable claims of truth.* Ultimately, this is a double folded purpose oscillating between a theoretical and an analytical one, in the sense of making an intervention in the development of the Ungdomshuset movement, during the period of 2006 and 2008, and my theoretical intervention in relation to “the double path” and “the feminist dilemma”. As pointed out in the introduction, I think emancipatory practices could benefit from such an intervention.

1.1.1 Ungdomshuset

In August of 2006 the Eastern High Court of Denmark ruled in favour of the church Fadershuset in the conflict of the right to use of the building at Jagtvej 69. Jagtvej 69 was a building that, since 1982, had been used and governed as an autonomous youth house by youngsters from Copenhagen, particularly from the area of Nørrebro. The appeal was later denied and the eviction of the users of the house was to be implemented on the 14th of December 2006 at the latest (ungeren.dk). Apart from interviewees’ identification and discussion of a shift in the acceptability of difference in practises of resistance, enclosing the Ungdomshuset conflict somewhere around 2006-2007, which will be thoroughly discussed in my analysis, the activists interviewed articulate an orientation within mainly three intersecting trajectories. One follows a path constructing a set of norms surrounding logics of the market economy with private property as its central point. A second follows a path constructing a set of norms surrounding the logics of the heterosexual matrix with compulsory heterosexuality as central point. And a final and peripheral path constructs a set of norms surrounding the logics of racialized discourses. This path is mainly brought up by the interviewees in terms of the movements’ failure to produce what they identify as sustainable contact or cooperation with people of colour or immigrants. This path will hence take a peripheral part of this thesis due to delimitations I’ve chosen in relation to its purpose and questions.

I tell this simplified story not in order to describe how discourses operate or with the pretension of showing a full picture of what I think the interviewees wanted to bring about. During the analytical process I have related to the statements made by the interviewees as narrative moments of resistance which should be seen as nothing else than the effects of constitutive processes within and through the social body and that is how those trajectories are to be considered in this thesis. I tell this story by way of introduction in order to establish a link between my analytical purpose of making an intervention in the development of the Ungdomshuset movement, during the period of 2006 and 2008 and my theoretical intervention. To follow my double path of politics and making an intervention in what I have called the feminist dilemma I first aim to answer the question of *which utterances and images of actions that are articulating a struggle, that is, a tension between continuities and discontinuities within the reproduction of possible subject positions identified by the activists*. This question will allow me to identify and illuminate the breaking points of a system of acceptable claims of truth. Furthermore, this paper is ultimately about resistance, and as I have been arguing that identifying and illuminating continuities and discontinuities of acceptable claims truth brings the risk of falling in to a purely descriptive situation – this is how it moves, how it changes, this is how it is, which would be to stagnate in ones story. By following up the question I aim to open up for more cogent understanding of the possibilities, depth and potential of a linkage between different theoretical and activist strategies, which might show something that goes beyond the dilemma. The second question is; *what does this struggle produce in terms of different stories, subjects and centrally, in terms of different futures*. This question will allow me to go beyond a purely descriptive situation and identify and produce an understanding of the effects of the process of power and resistance.

1.2 Doing Interviews with Activists

During two weeks in march 2009 I carried out six semi structured interviews with persons who took some sort of organising part in actions or initiatives enclosing the conflict between the municipality of Copenhagen and the Ungdomshuset at Jagtvej 69, during the period of the summer 2006 and summer 2008. Reinhartz says that “The use of semi structured interviews has become the *principle means* by which feminists have sought to achieve the active involvement of their respondents in the construction of data about their lives” (Reinharz: 1992:18). As working in the intersection between open end discussion allowing me to “explore”² the interviewees views on reality it complements a close end interview allowing me to keep stringency in relation to the thesis purpose (Ibid). Practically I had a set of questions all aimed at what the activists *did* in terms of actions and *experienced* in terms of perceived feelings and in this sense could the interviews be said to have been thematic even though the open end feature could, in some cases, bring us out on interesting discussions regarding power and resistance. Regarding

² With exploring I do not mean finding the essential truth as it would be to subscribe to a positivistic tradition of ahistoricity, neglecting my participation in the reconstruction of the interviewees stories but rather a situation in which I can follow the paths I perceive as significant in relation to purpose and questions.

the selections of interviewees the process has been done on the activists terms and could be resembled as rings on the water through which one contact gives their contacts and so on.

I have chosen to make general references to the interviewee's utterances to a limited extent and instead work with the citations, as they are, in order to reconstruct a story. This I have done not in order to assert a narrative authenticity in relation to me making general references, which would be to ignore the stories historicity but rather to let the activists utterances serve a double purpose of being the narrator of an interesting story of resistance that I reconstruct while the quotes also are subject for analyses. (Compare Ramazanoglu & Holland 2007:90). Ultimately I find this to be a question of respect for their stories and still, due to the delimitations in relation to this thesis purpose, questions and main focus, a lot of stories and perspectives are not told. It might be that the interviewees does not perceive the quotes as their, as I put their quotes in my context (Ramazanoglu & Holland 2007:159 & Czarniawska 2005:29). Diana Mulinari writes that an analyst's are to link the empirics to ones theoretical frame, intermediate an interpretation not a description (Mulinari 1999:45). In this thesis I have reconstructed a story in which fragments, narrative moments of resistance, can be analyst with few pretensions of describing a fully covering picture.

1.3 “New Social Movements”

In order to historicise subjects and identifying production of different futures I am to study normalization processes, resistance within this process and hence mapping a field of power relations. Relevant, in the context of this thesis, is that Denmark, since the end of the 1960s has had a very active squat movement. During the 1980s the so called BZ movement³ was close to synonymous with what could be seen as the autonomous or the radical left of Denmark, at the time. Some literature such as, “BZ Europa – Ungdomsbevægelsen i 80'erne” (1982), “De Autonome – En bog om og af den autonoma bevægelse” (1995) or “Uro – 25 års gadekamp” (1995), has been written on the subject and a lot of it has been produced by the activists them selves. In a Swedish context classic literature as Lundberg et al. (1970) “Demonstranter – En sociologisk studie” and Wennerhag et al. (2006) “Aktivister – sociala forum, globala rörelser och demokratins förnyelse” or Wijk (2002) “Göteborg och processerna” are developing a tradition of making theoretical as well as analytical interventions, in mass actions, with large empirical material, studying existing struggles and how they give rise to social movement. Very recently, the sociologists, and well known social movement theorists, René Karpantschhof together with Martin Lindblom, came out with a book, “Kampen om Ungdomshuset - studier i et oprør” (2009). They are making a solid intervention in the conflict enclosing Ungdomshuset, going from discussions enclosing police and municipality strategies to developments of activist tactics. As much of contemporary Swedish literature, regarding activists, are focusing on movements enclosing social

³ BZ from the German word Besetzen which means to occupy.

forums and mass actions during international political summits, I believe that Karpantschofs and Lindbloms book is the first, in a range of more academic researches, discussing Ungdomshuset and struggles on a regional/local level in particular.

Positioning this thesis in a relevant field of study takes us oscillating between a poststructuralist theoretical feminist debate and developments within social movement theory. In the contemporary field of study of social movements, “resource mobilization theory” (RMT) and “new social movements” (NSM) are two salient theoretical trajectories. Charles Tilly (2003, 2004) is one of the most influential theorist and researcher in the American school of RMT and argues that the social movements changed in the 1750s, from a single event of mass meeting to consisting of three elements. Campaign, social movement repertoire, and public representation or a participation in the public sphere and Specific for this trajectory is the study of how existing struggles give rise to social movements (Tilly 2004:3-4). I would argue that the movement enclosing the Ungdomshuset is a part of this change. Melucci (1992, 1996), one of many influential theorists of the European school of NSM theory, directs a critique towards RMT and argues that it is a lack of analytical stringency to have an open definition of social movements detached from social change producing a situation in which “everything that moves” becomes what signifies the social movement. He stresses that a significant aspect of social movements are the symbolic challenges of systems of acceptable claims of truth pointing towards “something else possible” (Melucci 1992:9-15). I would argue that such a critique are, theoretically, positioned in between a poststructuralist definition of change and ruptures and a critical theoretical tradition of discussion on structural continuity (Melucci 1996:16). Diani and Eyerman are though arguing that what distinguish RMT is it’s focus on micro level analyses and that NSM works on a macro level “adopting a ‘identity- oriented’, instead of an strategy- oriented’ framework.” (Diani & Eyerman 1992:7-8). Melucci’s relevance in positioning this thesis within the field of social movement theory is the development of a definition in which a movement is seen, not as a unitary subject, but rather as fragmented, dispersed and a result of diverse actions rather than a point of departure for unity (Melucci 1992:41 & 73-74). This takes us back to feminist theory in which contemporary developments are stating that boundaries of coalition should not be set in terms of who we are but in terms of what we want to achieve, ask for the message not the messenger and so on (Yuval- Davis 1997, Butler 2006, Edenheim 2005a).

As a result of an ontological and epistemological understanding of how the feminist subject is reproduced through negotiation, resistance and coercion within a process of production of knowledge and asymmetrical power relations, a shift within a feminist academic discourse has taken place. From one- dimensional analysis of change and reproduction of the subject inspired by Marxist theories such as “the base→ superstructure” where economy and/or patriarchy is placed in the determining “bottom” i.e. a situation with determining and absolute coherency, a view on power as being produced through various and intersecting discursive practices, defined as a complex of strategic situations and determined by time and space is winning ground (Foucault 1978:93). From text written by Wittig (1997) criticizing Marxist theory discussing subject definition beyond the categories of sex or Sandells (2005) developments of a queer cognitive map as a methodological strategy to construct other understandings of the world with a point of departure in Harraway’s (1988) discussions on situated knowledge, this shift can be traced. Further on, to bigger research projects such as, Andersons (2000)

or Lewis (2000) discussing domestic labour and the social welfare, that could be argued to come from a critical theoretical tradition of postcolonial studies, are also examples. I would characterize this “shift of understanding” as a result of a poststructuralist epistemological critique and discussion of power, reproduction and change in relation to the subject that makes it possible to show solidarity in accordance to which explicit changes one desire. It is a shift, not limited within one field, and one that allows a research to study collective strength in heterogeneous movements.

1.4 Contents

This thesis is divided into one theoretical and two analytical chapters with the aim of answering to the purpose and questions posed in the part “Double Path of Politics”. In chapters two, “*The Paradoxes of Resistance*” I aim to outline the theoretical standpoints of this thesis in order to link a critical- theoretical strategy to a poststructuralist critique. This I aim to do by discussing a definition of power and resistance based on Foucaultian interpretations of how subjects are reproduced through discursive processes constrained by disciplinary systems of acceptable claims of truth. This will show how I relate to processes of normalization and with a discussion based on Butlers notion on reiterative performative acts I will create a theoretical basis for understanding the activists articulations of struggle and resistance in terms of continuities and discontinuities in (re)productive social processes. As mapping a field of which power and knowledge give rise to intelligible things and to identify breaking points within this field is a matter of illuminating a dynamic social process I have structured the two following chapters so that chapter three, “*A Dream Takes Shape*”, allow me to orientate in the normalization processes identified by the activists. In the second analytical chapter, four, “*Another Story – Different Futures*” I will discuss the explicit breaking points within this process and what these breaking points produces in terms of rearticulations, constructing a subversive situation beyond disciplinary systems of acceptable claims of truth. Reconstructing a story told by the activists does not allow one to separate the parts of what constitutes it and the theoretical division between the different chapters are not solid and traces of the entire process studied in this thesis are present throughout all chapter parts of this thesis.

2 Subjectivation – Power & Resistance

In this chapter I aim to outline my theoretical and methodological points of departure. Joan W Scott states that the ontological understanding of the feminist subject is reproduced through the myth of a subject, which sustains continuously through space and time. It implies that not the category, but only the historical circumstances varies over time (Scott 2001:285ff). As she, in the book “Only Paradoxes to Offer”, discuss the tension between assertions about the liberal universal human rights on the one hand and exclusion attributed to “sexual difference” on the other in a feminist discourse she means that feminist agency is constituted through this contradiction which implies a discontinuous theoretical relationship towards the discursive formations of subjects as historicized (Scott 1996:168). First, this is why I will start this chapter by introducing a theoretical base in which a Foucaultian understanding of power and resistance is central in the reproduction of power relations as we try to mobilize them. That is to historicize categories that the present takes to be self-evident realities. Second, in this chapter I will argue that theoretical conclusion such as Scott’s can be reached by constructing an understanding of subjects as not preceding its discursive framework. Third, an understanding of historical processes as discontinuous is fundamental in this type of conclusions. I use Scott here only to illustrate my theoretical and methodological points of departure and will not further elaborate Scott’s conclusions.

2.1 Normalization process

I will argue that the limits of what is knowable is a question of power, and power is according to Foucault an omnipresent producer of intelligibilities in every relation from one point to another. In those relations there are no binaries between rulers and ruled but rather manifold relationships of force, which works within and through the whole social body. Further, power should not be understood only as coercive (as abjection of certain positions and “truths”) but also as productive in the sense that it creates possible positions and “truths” (as subjectification). The understanding of resistance in this conceptualisation of power becomes the site from which power both takes departure and meets its refusals. It constructs temporary unities and producing cleavages within and through the social body (Foucault 1978:93ff). It is, according to me, in this understanding of resistance (and power) that Butler is underlining the necessity to track down the way in which a field meets its, above mentioned breaking points, and the way in which power, knowledge and resistance meets their nexus. It is in this way one could start to understand the reproduction of subjects, not as preceding its discursive framework. Identity does not become an indicator of a cluster of experience but a normative ideal of intelligible positions (Butler 1990:16). In order to elaborate the relationship between coercive and productive sides of power, I am going to introduce Foucaults concept of Panoptism.

Foucault's discussion on Panopticon origins from Bentham's architectural prison construction in which one is seen but can not see and in which one becomes an object from which information is gathered. By making the "prisoner" aware of that one *can* see her, the power works automatically through a *potential relation*. In this relation, she becomes the principle for her own subordination i.e. she is regulating herself through awareness of norms and normality that governs her interpretations of "reality" and/or "right/good" behaviours (Foucault 2003:201ff). Consequently or in the same way, the awareness or perceptions of norms is also governed. It is according to me in this way one can understand power as an instable omnipresent producer of intelligibilities with a purpose to produce new truths and disband old ones, through which patterns of behaviour can change or be corrected and in which individuals can be punished. It is, furthermore, through the panoptical systems design as a categorising and correcting schedule that we can understand how productive and coercive perceptions of norms can work as institutional practices concerning reproduction of gender, class, sexuality and ethnicity intersections and vice versa and. It is, would I argue, enabling a situation in which one can historicize categories that the present perceives as self-evident realities. The point is not to postulate a mutually exclusive division between coercive and productive power, but rather to see how the one can work *through* the other, and to theorize this relation is a step towards exploiting the tension between reproduction and resistance (Lewis 2000:28). At the same time, let's be more explicit and say that reproduction works through resistance and vice versa. Then, on the one hand we have the problem that no grand revolutionary point of departure for resistance is to be found. On the other hand, potentially we have possibilities for subversive changes of subject positions asymmetrical power relations as resistance, cleavages, breaking points and discontinuities are working at the very point of power, even though they do so in a non-deterministic and unequal way.

In this first part of chapter 2, I have tried to construct a position from which it is possible to theoretically exploit the tension between reproduction and resistance by conceptualizing power as manifold productive relationships of force, constituting a normalization process. In the coming part I will expand this discussion by looking at strategies of power and resistance from the perspective given by Judith Butler who, to some extent, has been influenced by Foucault.

2.1.1 Discontinuity and Instability

Let's hold on Panopticon, the prison, for a while. To explain the regulatory power of norms and normality through a metaphor such as a prison, with inescapable cells, might very well give the impression that nothing is changeable unless it gains the power of normality. That would be to indicate a historical determinism which risks giving norms and power relations the status of natural necessity or an unopposed fact. I don't want to do that. Butler argues that "although there are norms that govern... what will and will not be intelligible, they are called in to question and reiterated at the moment in which performativity begins its citational practice" (Butler 2004:218). Performativity is here the way in which the norms are reproduced. Through citational practices, imitations of the norms, of which the "prisoner" is aware, power and resistance, are reproduced through performative acts. They are social, and for subject positions constitutive acts. At the same

time, what we are talking about is an imitation, and as such it cannot be identical to what it repeats. I mean that what Butler is arguing for is that in the reproduction of subject positions, within a panoptical system of power, there is a constitutive instability that works through the repetition of norms. As I argue that ontological stability of certain “truths” is a strategy by which bodies are fixed and power relations are reproduced, within the logics of market economy, the heterosexual matrix and racialized discourses, elaborations of repetitions of norms as historically unstable, proves important. Butler is, to some extent, using the terms “original” and “copy”⁴, in order to illuminate constitutive practices, used to create “continuity”. By doing so she shows how one can understand heterosexuality as incessant imitation of its own naturalized norms (Butler 1997a:308). For heterosexuality to be able to confirm itself as the original i.e. as a stable historical continuum and maintain the, on norms created, hegemonic position, a differentiation and exclusion is *presumed* – heterosexuality *in relation to* homosexuality (Butler 1997:307, Butler 2004:209). Butler is arguing that if homosexuality is *presumed* within a heterosexual frame, then heterosexuality cannot be understood as the original. Rather, as a copy of a copy, it is reproduced, through imitations of imitations, heterosexuality is claiming authenticity in relation to “badly” performed masculinities or femininities of non-heterosexual identities. Hence, through incessant repetitions it is constantly failing to claim authenticity, as a result of its own fragile foundation (Butler 1997a:204-309). By filling empty categories with intelligible significations, the awareness of norms works to secure identity and, as Butler shows, the source of the norms is not to be found, but it constitutes itself through discontinuous performative processes, discontinuous as they incessantly try to fulfil the norms. In this way one can understand how heterosexuality, and more explicitly, norms attached to its naturalized ideal are working as productive and coercive institutionalized practices. “Correction” becomes the mode by which sexuality is sustained. And it is in the understanding of series of repeated transformations one is able to pose a threat to subject positions asymmetrical power relations as a self-evident fact. I am arguing that it is within this theoretical framework, Butler means that we must follow a double path of politics. I am arguing that to simultaneously be able to do this, the discontinuity of constitutive elements of power and knowledge must be underlined if one is to challenge subject positions asymmetrical power relations.

In these two parts of the chapter, I have elaborated a way to understand power as a process in which production works through coercion, and shown how locating subject positions must be done by identifying their discontinuities and fragilities. By using concepts as Panopticon and imitations of imitations, I have created a framework from which one can understand how meanings are reproduced and I have highlighted some central strategies such as the emphases on authenticity in relation to those processes.

⁴ I understand the concept of “original” and “copy” as a theoretical extension of the concept of “we” and “them” in discursive reproduction of asymmetrical power relations. By using the terms “original” and “copy” (or rather “copy” of a “copy”) though, is to say something explicit about authenticity and hence subscribe to historical interpretations of identity as fragile repetitions.

2.1.2 Mobilising the Signifier

Considering the theoretical framework discussed above “sex” for example, does not describe a prior materiality but rather produces and regulates the intelligibility of the materiality. The performative reproduction, is establishing what will and will not signify, and be included within, the intelligible (Butler 1992:17, 2004:223-224). When Butler dialogue with a Foucaultian concept of regulatory power she elaborates significations and deconstructions in relation to the term “sex” and argues that:

“If a deconstruction of the materiality of bodies suspends and problematizes the traditional ontological reference of the term, it does not freeze, banish, render useless, or deplete of meaning the usage of the term; on the contrary, *it provides the condition to mobilize the signifier* in service of an alternative production” (Butler 1992:17 *my italics*).

Theoretically, mobilizing signifiers is to illuminate the ways in which a field meets its points of discontinuity and fails to constitute the intelligibility it promises. Practically, I find this process to be the heart of struggle. To take advantage of the instabilities and discontinuities in which we are able to reconstruct our reproduction of subject positions, in service of an alternative production does, would I argue, pose a threat to asymmetrical power relations. It would be a matter of repeating subject positions subversively by breaking “rules”, and to intensify the web of connections between practices of resistance. Deconstruction would, furthermore, be the means by which the processes of mobilizing signifiers are made intelligible. I mean that a feminist subject would emerge from such a definition of resistance, one that “takes advantage” of instabilities. A position that would not neglect regulatory norms, complex power processes, experience, class, gender, sexualities, ethnicities, their complex discursive intersections, difference, agency, but rather be produced *through* the refusal of subordination, *through* the resistance. This would, in a sense be to ask for the message and not the messenger, to listen for refusals and hear resistance. As resistance becomes the site from which power both takes departure and meets its refusals this is not a tension without complexities. I would though argue, that to listen to refusals is a central strategy for intensifying the web of connections between practices of resistance, and, that it will construct temporary unities and produce cleavages within and through the social body. Producing a situation in which the webs of connections between practices of resistance is intensified and constructing unities and cleavages through the social body is, furthermore, the definition of social movement that I will use throughout this thesis (Melucci 1992:53).

2.1.3 Interpellating demands

While discussing imitations of imitations, the communication between those performative acts are, would I argue, of vital importance, as one is to produce an understanding of how webs of connections, between different practises of resistance, are made. When talking about the panoptical system of disciplinary surveillance, in a fictive or actual relation to an authoritarian instrument of power, to its operations permanently omnipresent and to its actions and effects discontinuous, the sketching of such a regulatory mechanism, is to be considered as a broad and imprecise description of *a principal* of constitutive

significations i.e. of subjectifying processes. The direction of omnipresent power from one point to another does not, according to me, follow continuous or straight trajectories, but non the less, it shows us a situation of signifying performative practices governed by “awareness” of normative ideals. The Althusserian discussion of and contribution to an understanding of the production of the social subject through linguistic means, where the “authority” calls out to the subject who turns around and hence answers, provides us, would I argue, with a base for understanding subjectifying processes. According to Althusser, the theory of interpellation stages a social scene where the subject is hailed by an authority, the subject turns around and then accepts the terms by which he or she is hailed (Butler 1997b:106). Although, those practises are, according to me and according to the theoretical framework above outlined, neither singular nor able to be reduced to linguistic acts of speech (Butler 1997b:5). I would argue for the importance not to ignore or fail to illuminate the possibility of failures within those signifying performative practises, which would be a reduction of the subject, turning it into an object of power (or ideology) in an orthodox Marxist kind of way.

The interpellating act does in fact prerequisite a subject to call upon and could not be considered to be the authentic (or the foundation of a ontological) point of emergence. The power of interpellating acts could on the same grounds not be unitarily ascribed to a subject or an institution since, even though it does act and speak, it does not possess total control over the multiple discourses through which it does speak and act (Edenheim 2005b:63). Interpellations are, would I argue, rather a certain kind of restriction without which the production of the subject cannot take place, and a turn towards those restrictions, expressed through confessions, confirms the subjectifying process and constitutes the embodied norms. I would argue that a myriad of interpellating demands and acts of confession, with differently and unequally subsidized, and within the power process legitimized, intersecting logics of the market economy, the heterosexual matrix and racialized discourses produces multiple and historically instable positions. Interpellations and confessions, as productive mechanisms of power within this theoretical frame are to be considered as the means by which the incessantly reiterated imitations of disciplinary norms are communicated. The effect, would I argue is the possibility of temporary unities and cleavages within and through the social body. To understand those means of communications is, would I argue, a vital part of being able to develop feminist strategies of resistance within a poststructural theoretical tradition. This, as it provides not only the site from which the subject is formed and framed but also the site from which the subject can be reformed, reframed or resignified through mobilizing acts. To put it more accurately, this is a subversive site as interpellations works through confessions in the same way that power both takes departure and meets its refusals through resistance, resignifying and hence, producing a chance for mobilising gendered, racialized, class related and sexualized signifiers in the process of subjectification. That is challenging the sets of rules or naturalized ideals of norms from which power relations are structured.

2.1.4 Knowledge and Interpretations

As mentioned in the beginning of this essay a central driving force has been the desire for participation and well argued critique of how power and knowledge intersects, how

failures reproduces resistance and how a fruitful understanding of these processes could be produced through an understanding of “the double path of politics” in order to further expand their subversive potential. In line with the ontological and epistemological starting points that argues for an understanding of knowledge, not as an object lying out there for better or worse description, but as effects of, and in dynamic relation to, the repetitions of regulatory norms. This desire for participation does not, would I argue, induce a nihilist relation to neither truth nor reality. What it does do is to enable a position from which I am able to situate myself within the reproduction of knowledge, power and discourse, as well as the pretensions of the valid conclusions that I am making. Validity in this sense is not only about logical coherence, but what I would consider trustworthy and substantially cogent claims, concepts that emphasize my desire, and as such implies a lack of control over the process of research. To produce a condition under which knowledge is situated in time and space and to acknowledge a lack of control over this process is to take, what Beverley Skeggs calls epistemic responsibility (Skeggs 1997). In order to map a field in which power and knowledge produces intelligible things and to illuminate the ways in which this field meets its points of discontinuities, I have made a series of interviews with persons active in the Ungdomshuset movement. The distance between now and then are put to question, as the repetition of the memories of those years produces a story that changes, and that (still) is under negotiation within the struggles for claims of truths, producing a discontinuous and changing material of study. I would argue that the interviewees are committed to this process and as soon as I started to think about this subject of study, making limitations in time and material, presenting my aim and focus and as I start to analyse the narratives I am to.

3 A Dream Taking Shape

”My interest in the Ungdomshuset conflict was not only the house, it was, it became clear, that this conflict had an attractive force for several different people, young people of course, and on many different places. The systems reaction towards it was on the other hand so violent that the oppositions became very clear but still diffuse. Was the conflict about the right to play punk music? Was it about the right to make vegan food? Obviously it was about a whole lot of things. It just became an expression, creating a channel to act out ones dissatisfaction against a lot of things. Copenhagen became the point of departure for this conflict. That became the conflict, or at least what I think was interesting, what the conflict was about, *a conflict about what kind of city Copenhagen is*” (Tim 2009-03-18⁵).

Initiating this chapter with Tim’s story articulates the diversity of points of departures for different people within the conflict enclosing Ungdomshuset, and a trouble to pinpoint the exact object of it. This is a trouble that I will later on consider as an important condition for intensifying the webs of connections between different activist strategies constituted through the activist’s utterances and images of actions that are articulating a struggle. Starting a discussion of the productive and coercive norms that are identified to be in motion enclosing the Ungdomshuset conflict is thus a precondition in order to map a field of power relations in which utterances of resistance are taking place and hence identifying how the nexus of power and knowledge give rise to intelligible things. In other words, when Tim asks whether the conflict was about the right to make vegan food or play punk music and further on concludes that it was about a whole lot of things, he is trying to identify a normalization process, which he both situates in the city of Copenhagen and states as diffuse though constitutive for the struggle. Deconstructing these stories will identify the productive and coercive norms and how they work as institutionalized practices concerning reproduction of gender, class, sexuality intersections and vice versa. The heterogeneous subject of resistance in the Ungdomshuset conflict is, will I argue, an effect of a multitude of, by the activists identified, intersecting discursive demands correcting, producing and directing its subjects into an understanding of society, power relations and conflicts within those relations, such as Tim’s acknowledgment of a normalization process that is not allowing punk music, vegan food or rather; “a whole lot of things”. This field is, will I argue, constructed through the identification of reiterations of norms through its breaking points and, in this chapter, I will discuss this “whole lot of things” in order to create a situation from which I can discuss the moments of discontinuities in the normalization process. Discussing the interviewees’ orientation within this field will indicate the immediate power relations in productive motion, constructing ways in which claims of truth are made intelligible. This will be the point from which I can later produce a link between

⁵ All quotes used in this thesis, done by the activists, are my translations from Danish

critical theoretical strategies and a poststructuralist critique. This chapter will mainly focus on the period between the summer of 2006 and the spring of 2007.

3.1 "Ungdomshuset" – a Location

Lisa has been a feminist as long as she can remember and came to participate in activities enclosing Ungdomshuset through her older sisters and through an environment consisting of actions regarding feminist empowerment. The feminist common kitchen at the Peoples' House at Stengade 50 worked as a gathering point for queer feminist groups on the left wing and Lisa hold this place to be of importance in so far as it provides a social forum where people can meet. As we talk about the relationship between gender and autonomous spaces, Lisa starts to reflect upon the situation during the end of 2006 and identifies an effect of a normalization process.

"Within this normalization of the city, the gentrification and all that, lies also a normalization of gender. Well, not normalization, but stereotypification of possible gender in the city. For example, the parks, that they are totally filled up with heterosexual couples and there children, like H.C. Ørstedsparken that has been, for like a hundred years, a place for fags. It has also been normalized as the hedges have been cut down, preventing the possibilities to hide and have sex. There was a lot of critique from young couples and from the municipality, who were really mad at the fags as they thought they could not take their children to the park and such. I think that is one way of seeing how the normalization of the city relates to the narrowing of space for being ones gender in different ways or ones sexuality." (Lisa 2009-03-24)

Cutting down the hedges in parks which have worked as a gathering point and site for cruising works as coercive and productive practises constituting a norm of compulsory heterosexuality abjectifying any discontinuity within the story of heterosexuality as an original authentic subject in relation to deviant and badly performed masculinities or femininities. Heterosexual couples' and the municipality of Copenhagen's urge to and actual cutting down of hedges are, would I argue, a protective strategy incessantly performed in order to constitute an authentic original heterosexuality with the effect of Lisa experiencing a narrowed up space. It is productive in the sense that it constitutes continuous stories of a stable heterosexuality, coercive in the sense that it constitutes a continuous story of a stable deviance from which heterosexuality can constitute it self as a hegemonic norm in turn producing the dichotomy and categorization of possible and intelligible subject positions of heterosexuals and homosexuals. I would argue that this is the narrowness identified by Lisa limiting her "to be" the gender or sexuality of her wishes and forcing her into a situation in which she can exist as person only within the realm of this particular dichotomy of inclusion and exclusion, reproducing asymmetrical power relations. I would argue that Lisa has to work within those borders, simultaneously, heterosexuality's need for deviance to constitute itself shows its instability, as a result of its fragile foundation through Lisa's reflection upon non heterosexual practises and on the H.C. Ørstedsparken as a place for fags, opening up for an rearticulating beyond the dichotomy. I would argue that Lisa has identified a set of norms surrounding logics of the heterosexual matrix with compulsory heterosexuality as a central point that represents a trajectory in the normalization process. The norms are

produced through a claim of truth that the parks are for heterosexuals in order to constitute an ontological continuous story of coherence between sex, gender and desire reproducing asymmetrical power relations.

To state that the mapping of a field of identified trajectories in a normalization process constitutive for the struggle enclosing Ungdomshuset in a comprehensive manner would be to neglect the diversity and omnipresence of those processes. To start listening to and illuminate the stories told by the activist can function as a beginning of understanding which immediate power relations constructs the conflict giving rise to articulations, utterances and actions of resistance. In the following three chapters parts, I will continue to construct a map over the normalization process identified by the activists.

3.1.1 Autonomous space

Relating gender politics to autonomous spaces puts Ungdomshuset in a central position. It shows relevance both for being able to produce an emancipatory or empowering situation in which solidarity regarding gender can be built and, simultaneously, a space for rearticulation of the meaning of gender categories. Lisa continues to orientate within the normalization process through reflection upon sexism in public space.

”No matter if you choose to look at Ungdomshuset as a place for concerts or just a place to hang out on it was the only place I could feel relaxed as I new that it was a place where I could be a woman in the way I wanted or a human in the way I wanted to or being my sexuality in the way I wanted to... the feminism is in need of autonomous spaces in order to be able to discuss, develop and enable one to rearticulate ones gender. In the same way are autonomous spaces in need of feminism in order not to copy the same unwanted structures of the society.” (Lisa 2009-03-24)

Lisa identifies a possible way to articulate her subjectivity in the space produced within Ungdomshuset. I would argue that the subjectivity articulated by Lisa moves within a subject position of woman with a possibility for something else, something generally “human”. This humanity is, would I argue, Lisa’s way of trying to articulate something beyond the normalization forced upon her, that which (tries to) constitutes her as woman. The interaction between a general feminist articulation of power relations such as Lisa’s reflection on possibilities of being a woman in the way she wants to, and the autonomous space as a subversive location for rearticulations shows this process to be an omnipresent producer of restrictions and power struggles but also of possibilities.

Christian speaks of the heterogeneity of the users of Ungdomshuset that shows how parts of this process are in constant motion.

”You could say that it was important for the movement or it was a part of the movement that was queer- feminist or were thinking queer... as far as the struggle for autonomous spaces are concerned it was very easy to move some of the very concrete questions to some of the queer feminist groups on the left wing... It was a constant struggle between many different interests within the house, was it not? It was not a homogenous group or movement in any way” (Christian 2009-03-21)

I would argue that Christian is talking about three interesting parts of autonomous space. Not only does Christian describe how the heterogeneity of Ungdomshuset

produces an inclusive space from which articulations of resistance can melt together, as he concludes that it was easy to generalize conflicts. He is also identifying how a coercive normalization process of norms of gender connects to the normalization process of which Ungdomshuset is an effect, leaving the cause open although focusing on queer initiatives. Finally, as he reflects upon the constant struggle between interests, he articulates the same omnipresence that Lisa identifies. I would argue that coercive and productive power works through one another without an inside in relation to an outside but rather, Christians story shows a complex situation of struggles, power relations and attempts to articulate something beyond a normalization process.

3.1.2 Pirate Party Group

In the previous chapter part I began to discuss how a web of connections between practices of resistance starts to be articulated by the interviewees, as an orientation within a normalization process is taking place, but is still more or less moving only within discussions concerning queer initiatives within a heterogeneous social movement enclosing Ungdomshuset. Following Christians story, he has participated in initiatives trying to challenge private property or an incessant pursuit of money as the norms surrounding logics of market economy, done by squatting a house or a space for a number of hours having a party without entrance fee or intended profit. He tells about the pirate party group.

"I have participated in a group called pirate party group... The group worked practically with questioning private property... and worked concretely with different ways of popularising the breakage with an idea of private property and to create right-to-use in the situation... We put a lot of focus on being accessible for everyone regardless of ones income or what position you had in society. In addition to that we handed out CDs at every party with perhaps 20 different songs made by artists considering different issues, often concerning *breakage against* private property or gender or culture, well *the right to your own culture.*"
(Christian 2009-03-21 my italics)

Christian reflects over the work done by the group as something that both challenges norms such as private property through creating a right-to-use "in the situation" and the right to one's own culture. I would argue that this reflection shows a moving between reproducing continuities of "our culture" and discontinuities, "the breakage" of reproduction of intelligible claims of truth. One can not postulate a mutual division between (dis)continuities in Christians story but rather see how the production of "our culture" goes hand in hand with the breakage constructing something beyond the demands of a normalization process. The resistance to the norm of private property have, would I argue, a productive effect in producing something beyond those demands, in Christians story. Furthermore would I argue that a subversive location starts to take shape as a story of different points of departures intersects through the utterances and images of actions, breaking different norms surrounding different structuring logics of normalization, finding connections, constructing a web. The breakage done by the pirate party group works, would I argue, within the same logics as breakage, ruptures and discontinuities done by non heterosexuals claiming public space, producing possibilities of movement and of questions, enabling trajectories to intersect. In a similar way as Lisa,

Christian identifies a set of norms surrounding the logics of market economy with private property as a nodal point that represents a trajectory in the normalization process, which reproduces asymmetrical power relations.

3.1.3 A Field of Intelligible Things

The mapping of a field of points of departure or the immediate constitutive power relations in the struggle enclosing Ungdomshuset, I would argue, can be nothing but fractured and incomplete. In mapping this field I have illuminated two main trajectories of norms surrounding logics of the heterosexual matrix and the market economy directing and governing the activists and producing intelligible subjects. I have also shown how this constitutive process is a result of fractured and instable power relations full of resistance. I would argue that the activists identifies a situation in which the discursive frames, from which the activists could act change, sometime during the period of autumn 2006 and the spring 2007 but most centrally that regulatory mechanisms of power are under constant negotiation. In the introduction to this chapter, Tim talks about the trouble to pinpoint the problem or the conflicts exact object and I would argue that it is a result of this change towards an openness to any actions attempting to or actually braking up social relations produced through a generalized normalization process. Christian continues:

”There was respect for many groups, I think that one can not see this movement as one with consensus but rather as many groups. It was respect for those groups who did queer feminist things and it was like they also, suddenly had strength, they were useful. You had suddenly found a common project and it was Ungdomshuset. Who then did identify them as useful? Well it was the original users of Ungdomshuset... It actually opened up as they discovered how they had been using a lot of time on this [power struggle] in relation to that they were about to be evicted and so it was opened up so it was allowed to play techno for instance. I don't think there were any rules not to play techno but it was like this. Not many homo groups would like to have parties in the house if they could not play techno. It is an important part of their culture or my culture.” (Christian 2009-03-21)

Christians reflection upon the heterogeneous group of people enclosing Ungdomshuset is an identification of how different trajectories starts to intersect and the becoming useful of different initiatives or points of departures are an identification of the result of this intersection. The relationship, though, between cause and effect is nothing but continuous but rather a process of power - a normalization process reproduced through resistance - ruptures within this process and knowledge - a challenge of the system of acceptable claims of truth regarding who the park are for, the right to play punk music or make vegan food, the right-to-use or rather ‘a whole lot of things’.

3.2 ”Ungdomshuset” – an Interpellation

Identifying a normalization process of power working through resistance producing something beyond acceptable claims of truth does, would I argue, something with the

activists. To further expand my discussion of the normalization process and its ruptures, I aim to identify and illuminate the communication between different constitutive utterances and images of actions articulating a struggle. In the first part of this chapter, I have discussed a normalization process and shown how ruptures within this process are immanent. To understand the productive force of these processes providing the site from which the subject is formed and framed as well as the site from which the subject can be reformed, reframed or resignified through mobilizing acts. Tim, who I let introduce this chapter with identifying a normalization process as consisting of a whole lot of things states that:

“We had such a weak starting point. The groups of activists in Copenhagen and Ungdomshuset was so divided and weak that they got surprised by all the people who started to participate and that’s why we were forced into something new... within a few days it [the conflict] got proportions that no one could believe and maybe, as such a crack in the facade of society occurs, a lot of conflicts tends to push out of it” (Tim 2009-03-18)

The perception of going from weak to strong, from retreating to energetic within a few days, identifying how practises of resistance are intensified and even identifying the web of connections between them as conflicts pushes out of the crack of society are, would I argue, an interpellation of refusals. A normalization process demands obedience and direction in stable and continuous accordance to the heterosexual matrix and the logics of the market economy producing intelligible subjects. The demand is refused, illuminating a crack throughout the social body and in turn producing a subversive interpellation. This subversive interpellation takes as point of departure the same diversity as the normalization process and the ruptures within it. As Tim talks about a conflict taking proportions no one could ever believe it is a subversive interpellation giving Tim possibilities beyond certain, by logics of the market economy and/or the heterosexual matrix’s subsidised demands.

In this chapter part I will continue to discuss the normalization process and its ruptures, and expand the discussion to also include how these ruptures communicate, constructing a productive subversive field in which power relations are challenged, reformed and possible resignifications are made intelligible. This will be done by illuminating the stories told by Thomas and Laura’s participation in the actions/groups “Naked Supper” and “Association for More Opera Houses”.

3.2.1 Naked Supper

During the summer of 2006, initiatives for putting focus on the conflict between the municipality of Copenhagen and the activists were intensified. Thomas saw himself as a part of the users of Ungdomshuset, thus directing a critique towards its possibilities to communicate its diverse demands beyond the walls of the building at Jagtvej 69.

”It was like a museum where you got the feeling of constantly having to watch out so not to break anything, as if it was the last remains of politics, of radical politics. It was very powerful to say that here we got something that goes back to the time where everything was big and wild and everyone was drunk all the time and you were as strong as the police. It was like a story of decline where you could see the palmy days

that had now declined extremely, which in turn made it hard to see a context of anything else... At the same time, we were very tired of saying the same things and meaning the same things all the time, not to have any new spaces to move within. That was the effect of the disappearance of the house. The possibilities of what could be said and what could be done got bigger. The space of what you could mean and what you could say widened.” (Thomas 2009-03-21)

The interplay between continuous reproductive discursive processes relying on a constitutive history of “greatness” of an autonomous radical left in Copenhagen and the possibilities of ruptures and discontinuities within this history are identified both as a presumption for radical politics and a limiting burden, concerning the possibilities to be able to identify, orientate within and, even less, challenge a system of acceptable claims of truth. Tomas is moving within the borders of a constitutive system of constraining conventions enclosing the movement, limiting the possibilities of reaching beyond interpellating demands of being big, strong and drunk and are simultaneously giving rise to the disentanglement of being able to avoid those demands as the scene changes. I would argue that a rupture such as the eviction and demolition of Ungdomshuset changed the discursive space to identify and orientate within the location of conflicts enabling initiatives such as a critique of how public space is organised. Thomas engaged in an initiative doing “Naked Suppers”: naked people having supper in a public space, and says:

“To move out to the public space was a way of saying that this was about all of Copenhagen, the whole city. Some of us said something about making an autonomous space where you didn’t have to wear clothes and to illustrate the importance of having a space where one could experiment with different ways of handling things, with other rules for how to behave. And of course, we wanted attention, which was also a reason for being naked... It was a border many found joy in infringing... Well, that one could show people who you are in the public space. Everybody have a facade that people are not offended by, one that you don’t have to think about, a public look... we wanted to find a new language to talk about confrontation on... it is about ‘hideous- making’... to show something that you don’t want to show, that you don’t think is funny. Well, that is the boarder you want to exceed” (Tomas 2009-03-21)

Making the autonomous space and experimenting with different ways of how to behave in the public space works as an interpellating demand as it through a “hideous-making” challenges the public look or appearance of something normal. I would argue that Thomas’ search for another language of confrontation is an attempt to find another way of communicating refusals, and this communication, would I further argue, is directed in several ways. First towards the institutional practices of structuring the public space, including cutting down hedges or preventing a breakage against private property, secondly towards the by-passers getting a feeling of hideousness (or not), and finally towards other initiatives of action trying to identify the conflict by resisting or challenging the institutional practices that constitutes a normalization process.

3.2.2 Association For More Opera Houses

Laura participated in an initiative called ”Association for More Opera Houses” (AMOH) during the period up till the eviction and demolition of Ungdomshuset. AMOH grew out

of different initiatives enclosing the conflict between the Danish state and the free town of Christiania, squatted since 1971 and questioning private property and cultural mainstreaming. In 2006, as the eviction of Ungdomshuset grew nearer, their work intensified, and Laura tells about the groups tactics to resist a normalization process which can be parable to “drag”, as a practise showing the instability of coherence between sex, gender and desire in such a way that it disrupts the attempt to construct a story of who the city is for, what cultural projects to support and how to behave in the public space following logics of the market economy.

“It was very easy to make a parody on that and say ‘no – we want more opera houses’ and use that upper class slogan. It evolved into a critique of the cultural politics of the municipality of Copenhagen, how they choose to prioritise an opera- house and meanwhile choose to exchange it for the youth- house that was given as a present in the 80th... It was foremost to be theatre. To be in the theatre roll and to actually use it in the meetings with people who are not in that roll, people who are just in the streets, and see how they reacted and see what one could create in that situation of doubt and ambiguity maybe. That they might have had those prejudice that we were only spoiled brats and through jokes try to get people to understand that it was not that simple or easy. Like a tactic.” (Laura 2009-03-10)

Laura is, as Thomas, would I argue, looking for a language of confrontation and finds it in the AMOH’s slogan parodying the discursive demands directed towards her by the municipality of Copenhagen. While Laura identifies the municipality of Copenhagen’s naturalisation and necessity to build opera houses and evict and demolish the autonomous youth house, the actions of this group as well as Laura’s utterances of them, makes a parody on this necessity, breaking up a normalization process. She has also identified how this process creates doubt and ambiguity, and I would argue that this ambiguity has an interpellating effect on the by-passers, showing another way of structuring the public space as well as their possibilities of categorising the subjects of Ungdomshuset, giving the activists more and widened space, of action beyond “spoiled brats” and of communicating and articulate confrontations.

3.3 Summary

Identifying and illuminating a field of productive and coercive power relation, diffuse and flighty, is hard to catch and summon. In this chapter I have identified the nexus of which power and knowledge rises to the field of intelligible things by discussing the interviewees reflections on a normalization process. The normalization process I have identified consists of two intersecting trajectories, of the heterosexual matrix and logics of the market economy. I have illuminated the ways in which this field meets its points of discontinuity by discussing the interviewees’ reflections on ruptures within those trajectories. The interviewees are oscillating between reproducing a normalization process, such as Lisa being forced into the dichotomy categorization of heterosexuals and homosexuals, or between reproducing the normalization process thus with an empowering function, such as Christians discussion of “our culture” and the techno music. They are also making reflections showing discontinuities and constitutive failures within those processes, such as Lisa’s reflection on autonomous spaces as a location for

subversive rearticulations, or her discussion of H.C. Ørstedsparken. It is in these processes that dreams are taking shape and the dreams are communicated, as I have been arguing, as subjectifying interpellations working in multiple directions, reproducing and deproducing intelligible subjects (as in producing something beyond the normalization process and its system of claims of truth), creating webs of connections between strategies of resistance. In the following chapter I aim to continue to reconstruct the stories told by the activists and more explicitly discuss what is produced in terms of different subjects and futures hence enabling a more cogent exploitation of tension between reproducing unequal power- relations, as they are discursively acted out on the one hand and the notion of resistance, change and instability of knowledge on the other, that which I in the introduction to this thesis called “the feminist dilemma”

4 Another Story - Different Futures

“If I were to make anything in another way, it would most definitely be that we didn’t have any room to discuss this without falling into polemics... That is also why Ungdomshuset didn’t evolve into a huge organization, because when we were done all those things surfaced and we could not cooperate, as we could not cooperate in feminist issues. I can’t do it – work with communists about those things for example. I can work very well with them on Ungdomshuset, but not on issues concerning queer feminism... I don’t see that as a negative thing, as it has become a lot larger now, I mean the left wing radical movement in Copenhagen and the queer feminist movement as well.” (Linda 2009-03-13)

In the previous chapter I have constantly been referring to productive failures, ruptures or attempted challenges of intelligible claims of truth within a normalizations process as “something beyond” or “possibilities beyond certain demands” being the normalization process a process of intersecting discourses reproduced through power and knowledge and vice versa, producing a certain truth or reality. As a story of stable coherence within claims of truth produces ineligible subjects, such as the heterosexual woman constituted through a class relation in which she is economically exploited and stigmatized, is challenged, broken or shown not to be of natural necessity the subject positions are, would I argue open, for rearticulations as what signifies them are discursively mobilized. The 14th of December 2006 the Eastern Supreme Court of Denmark decided that the youngsters should be evicted, ruling in favour of Fadershuset. The period before that date was filled with initiatives, as discussed in the previous chapter. Being able to see how social relations are mobilized and how struggles are structuring webs of connections between practises of resistance in an empowering way, I let Linda open this chapter as she talks about how a movement enclosing not only Ungdomshuset but rather one that goes beyond that narrow path has grown larger, and how temporary unities are made possible in order to fade away. Even if Linda is torn between the benefits/losses due to the conflicts in identifying the object of struggle, it is not the discussions or necessarily the way of legitimizing the actions that are at centre. Rather it is the ways in which the actions are producing cleavages throughout the social body, challenging naturalized social relations and/or breaking an absolute coherence in the claims of truth that are producing boundaries of coalition in relation to what *is* achieved in terms of resisting incessantly naturalized norms and what the messages *are* in terms of interpellating demands beyond those power relations reproduced through the norms producing new possibilities. In this chapter I will not stop illuminating the normalization process but more explicitly focus on the breaking points within this process and what is produced in terms of rearticulations, desubjectifying processes and the mobilising of signifiers that is constructing something beyond disciplinary systems of acceptable claims of truth, constructing other stories and different futures. I will continue to let the activists tell a story of the struggle enclosing Ungdomshuset, this time oscillating between general discussion on strategies of resistance and the events of the riot 16th of December 2006,

the squatting of Dorotheavej in January 2007 and the mass action of G13 in 6th of October 2007.

4.1 "Ungdomshuset" – it's Subjects

I will argue that to lift up ones head and listen for different futures and constructing different stories are two of the main objects for the activists constructing unity enclosing not Ungdomshuset necessarily but rather their way of life and the condition under which life is made possible in general terms. Christian, who in previous chapter worked with the pirate party group tells us about being involved in several initiatives working from a diverse range of points of departure, amongst some a culture association called Spektakel 14. Spektakel 14 that was not directly connected to Jagtvej 69, it had it's own meeting place but organized street parties, questioning the organisation of the public space and worked as a forum for discussions on gender politics and asymmetrical power relations relating to gender gets Christian to further reflect on how the group of activists tried to go beyond regulatory mechanisms of power.

"At some point we realized that we quite quickly got captured within our gender, that we had been talking about those things and that it would be fun to say "hey, what if I don't se myself as a man" or take a more foundational discussion on how we break down gender and with that I mean in a positive way. Not as a way of destroying our self but to follow up and make ones gender to a sort of avant-garde or something exiting." (Christian 2009-03-21)

The heterosexual matrix and the power relations constituting possible subjects positions are constantly absorbing attempts to go beyond the regulatory practises legitimizing claims of truth of absolute coherence of sex, gender and desire, producing gendered bodies as its effect. The matrix prevents anyone from waking up one morning and deciding to meet the world as anything beyond the dichotomous categorization of men and women. Queer, transgender or intersexual persons are also governed within the borders of this matrix (compare Butler 2004 or Edenheim 2004). The joke 'hey, what if I don't se myself as a man' is though, would I argue, interesting not only as a parody of the absolute coherence of the heterosexual matrix and in that way as a mobilisation of what signifies for example a man, exposing its (possible) failures as a dream of another position. Not, would I argue, necessarily as the "opposition" within the dichotomous categorization imposed by the matrix but through gender as an avant-garde, a possible 'totally different', and as a consequence not explicitly named nor articulated as anything else then something exiting. I will argue that this exiting something is generalized through the conflicts enclosing Ungdomshuset. Tim talks about the conflict in general terms and says that:

"...the popular rising in the city was at the same time both disorganized and without direction and in that way it was about everything. It was about the totality of the way we live in and that a lot of people feels squeezed and then act simultaneously... it is hard to se the common denominator for what makes those people act simultaneously... (Tim 2009-03-18)

Tim's reflection upon the disorganized rising without any clear direction being the precondition for challenging the totality of life is, would I argue, a way of creating order in a multitude of intersecting refusals and strategies of resistance. It illuminates how these practises are challenging every aspect of life and producing something exiting, not only concerning gender relations, but rather putting emphases on cleavages through out the whole social body, producing subject positions with peoples simultaneous acts and their will for something else as the productive force. In what follows I aim to follow the activists stories and discuss their actions in service of an alternative production.

4.1.1 The Riots of 16th of December 2006

The eviction was set to be implemented at the 14th of December 2006 and the users of Ungdomshuset planned for a demonstration with high militancy and a strategy of confrontation in which clashes with the police would produce a situation in which it was more costly not to have a youth house than having one. During the interviews several utterances of critique occurs towards this kind of confrontation, such as Thomas discussions on a new language for it, with actions such as the "naked supper". At the same time the activists are reflecting on what those riots that later took place produced in terms of other stories and possible futures, in terms of mobilized signifiers.

"It was so fucking exiting to have the city in that way where you could, I mean during the riots, to have the city- space in another way than originally planed" (Linda 2009-03-13).

"We created a new street- culture quite rapidly so to that if you wanted a party you could just as well do it in the streets. Suddenly the street was open for divergence, it opened up of divergence in the streets... The riots focused on creating an idea of a whole city in large uprising... People started to plunder a lot more and steal during the riots. Because, well there might have been a lot of reasons, many times just because people wanted things but it also evolved into a new tactic that had previously been seen as apolitical or something you couldn't do. Now suddenly a lot of normal people were stealing... It was decentralized with bonfires and burned cars. It was different, very visual and concrete" (Christian 2009-03-21)

Linda has identified a norm of how the public space is to be, and finds joy in discovering how that story is disturbed and how another story occurs through the riots. The divergence in the street and 'the normal people' plundering, breaking the norms of the incessant pursuit of money or private property enclosing logics of market economy, creates a story in which one, by restructuring the city space in another way than *originally* planned, creates something new. A change in normality has been identified in Christians story through 'the normal people' now structuring the public space as they see fit, challenging norms of private property, mobilizing what signifies normal behaviour. A position of disobedient subjects is made possible through the intersecting breakages that constitutes productive cleavages throughout the social body as it communicates together with other strategies of resistance that are challenging naturalized social relations. Thomas, who among other things did "the naked supper", reflects on this communication.

"In both situations it is about having this feeling of putting your foot down and take space and to say that this is our area, we define the rules. In the 16/12 situation it was about showing that you were

physically unsurpassable or in physical power to win over the police or to be as strong as the police. The naked supper is more about 'we dear you', but it is same same but different." (Thomas 2009-03-21).

The disobedient subject is here, would I argue not produced in stable and continuous trajectories, but rather in the intersections of refusals against a normalization process built up, not in simplified relations as worker and the owner of the means of production or the man in relation to the subordinated women, but of a multitude of intersecting discourses reproduced through resistance.

4.1.2 Euphoria and Squatting Dorotheavej

Linda was one of the initiative taker and active participant in the actions performed by the AMOH during the summer and autumn of 2006. During the spring of 2007, the eviction was still not carried out by the authorities, but some of the activists talks about a intensive conflict with no or little possibilities of negotiation between Ungdomshuset and the municipality, with no breakthrough what so ever. At the 1st of January 2007 a group of people, amongst them people who had previously been taking part in initiatives such as AMOH or Spektakel 14, started to plan the action of squatting a building at Dorotheavej. Two weeks later the house was squatted.

"... like this with Dorotheavej, Villa Villekulla, it generated, I mean total eupho..., I mean as we run the last part over the intersection towards the ground was totally euphoric, I mean together. Both that it succeeded and that we did it together and that we managed to mobilize all those people and all this strategy of being the ladies in the great squatting- movement, to be the women, the gays in the big project, it really worked!" (Linda 2009-03-13)

For 48 hours the building was squatted and when the police came, Lisa tells of 80 people getting arrested for trespassing. Linda gives rise to the discussion of how the actions now had made webs of connections enabling the full assembly of legitimizing features within the social movements and attempts of reconstruction of social relations as emancipatory and empowering discourses conjoin with the euphoria of ruptures. The ruptures are, for the activists not isolated but directed both through logics of the market economy and regulatory power relations limiting discursive space and subordination of women or gays. The euphoric feeling described by Lisa is, would I argue, the effect of desubjectifying interpellations of taking advantage of the instabilities and discontinuities of regulatory mechanisms of power going towards the diffuse and unarticulated position of disobedience. This process is not emancipatory in the sense of going from subordinate to free, but it can very well be empowering, as Lisa clearly articulates, and centrally, it works in the intersections of continuities and discontinuities, in stories taking advantages of the instabilities of certain systems of naturalized truth claims. I would argue that through the squatting of Dorotheavej, the social movement enclosing Ungdomshuset starts to listen to refusals and hence intensifies the webs of connections reaching beyond former barriers of who *we* are or who the messengers are.

4.1.3 The Roskilde Festival and the G8- summit

The 1st of March 2007, the youth house on Jagtvej 69 was evicted and the activists describe some weeks of riots, actions and chaos as the main expression of the struggle. As some activists are talking about the months following the eviction as a diminishing intensity of actions, and some are talking about how the cooperation between different groups are intensified and how the summer of 2007 came to be a summer of mobilization of strength. Christian was during this period deeply active in organizing actions enclosing Ungdomshuset, and together with many different groups he got invited to the Roskilde festival.

“It was a much larger group with a lot of people from Christiania, feminist groups and original users... then something quite, something new happened. People who previously didn’t talk to each other talked... We had a queer- action, one in which you kiss... people should kiss other people of the same sex, but that was not explicitly defined... Well, the gender politics were an integrated part of the project... While we were at Roskilde some was in Germany and the G8-summit who came home with some good ideas. It was an odd mix. People came home from Roskilde, people came home from Rostock and there was a lot of spirit...” (Christian 2009-03-21)

I would argue that the effects of a widened discursive space, the acceptance for different utterances of refusals and the intensified webs of connections between practises of resistance, created an environment in which another community could be produced, another we, with traces of something beyond regulatory dichotomous categorizations. The webs of connections between practices of resistance had, would I argue, not only produced a social movement producing cleavages throughout the social body but also connected people “who previously didn’t talk” or previously didn’t see themselves as struggling together. Struggles connected to one another now creating temporary unities through resistance. Christian reflects about how ideas and strategies to meet a regulatory normalization process working throughout the social body could work together so that people coming from the actions and refusals enclosing the G8- summit with experience of mass- actions got possibilities to conjoin. Furthermore, several activists do, among them Christian in the quote above, reflect over how feminist strategies of resistance and actions of refusals are taking space within this movement not by arguments, difference or a certain experiences but as a consequence of intensified webs of connections, through the mobilizing acts, through the refusals. A seemingly harmless “kissing action” as described above does, would I argue, in itself mobilize the signifiers, as it refuses demands within the heterosexual matrix, but when conjoined with a range of actions directed against a normalization process throughout the social body, the social movement becomes a movement with possibilities of rearticulating, producing a position of disobedience in which the unity lies. During the summer of 2007, the ideas of a mass-action started to take shape. The mass action took the name G13 after the address of the building that was to be squatted. Grøndalsvænge Allé 13.

4.1.4 G13 – A Success

October 2007. With an intensive mobilizing work done by several hundreds of activists, with an action strategy of confrontational non violence and with inspiration from the G8-summit and its five- finger tactics of a demonstration of mobile block divisions, about 5000 persons gathered in order to squat Grøndalsvænge Allé 13. It is hard not to dramatize G13, as if it was an action movie, and not to make a linear history out of a multitude of intersecting actions, happenings, breakages, refusals and productive regulatory power relations. Simultaneously they tell a story of change and resistance within this “movie”, and Linda, who worked with G13, makes reflections upon the atmosphere during the action:

“There were so many different forms of actions that could be included under the umbrella... As we came to the planning of G13, there was no doubt that we did the right thing in the right way. You showed your political engagement in the way you squatted or didn't squat, *everything was totally accepted and in that way you were just as everyone else*. It came to be very important for the queer feminist block” (Linda 2009-03-13)

Linda's reflection on the G13 action as a moment in which everything was accepted and hence everybody was like everyone else is, would I argue, a situation in which she tries to bring about and identify a situation in which she and “everyone else” are made independent of the historically reconstructed and naturalized subject categories. I would argue that it is not a question of a colonizing liberal sympathy for one another, nor is it a question of equivalence based on an insight of social identity as partially constituted, but rather it is a sight from which a future community can be constructed that is not ignoring regulatory norms, complex power processes, experience, class, gender, sexualities, ethnicities, their complex discursive and regulatory intersections, difference or agency but formulates something new, something not yet captured, named and still only diffusely articulated. That is, would I argue an effect of subversive resistance and social movement. That this articulation is diffusely articulated and not named is a precondition as if it get categorized it becomes the copy of which the norm constitute it self as the original through.

The process is, as argued not detached from contradiction but one with conflicts negotiations and dilemmas. Lisa reflects on the effect the social movement had:

“We just found a way to participate in this anti- normalization struggle that just fell on our lap and what a effect it had on us all and how much it could include! Suddenly my family could identify themselves with this struggle and went into the houses and they could suddenly see what it was all about. I mean that it was about them as well, about their city, about their lives. Because of that they could also see all those crazy creative youngsters who could be strange, different or abnormal and a lot of weird things but also understand what kind of importance it had ...” (Lisa 2009-03-24)

Lisa's reflection on her family being able to, within intelligible terms, identify with and be included within the queer, different or abnormal is, would I argue, a productive rupture mobilizing what signifies them as subjects constituting possibilities for other communities. I would argue that an autonomous space is not, anymore, the museum Thomas were talking about in chapter part 3.2.1, nor is it the space within the walls of a

building, but rather the space and field constructed through a multitude of intersecting demands for something beyond a normalization process open for crazy creativity in relation to the totality of our lives. Still, the strange, different and abnormal are present as the normality's insurance, ready to step in as soon as it threatens the coherence within a normalization process. Something new is shown, but is it reached?

4.2 Summary

Reproduction of asymmetrical power relations as they are discursively acted out is an immanent part of subjectifying processes, and in this chapter I have shown its complexities as different activist strategies have constructed, reproduced, illuminated and fantasised about a subject position, a future, and about boundaries of coalition beyond this reproduction and beyond a normalization process. In order to understand what the struggle enclosing Ungdomshuset produces in terms of different stories, subjects and futures, I have illuminated how a web of connection between practises of resistance such as reflections on restructuring the public space through riots or naked suppers, the euphoric feeling of squatting Dorotheavej or the feeling of rearticulating the totality of life, are making a position of disobedience possible. A position, have I been arguing, reproduced through the refusals and ruptures, exposing possible failures of intersecting processes of the heterosexual matrix or logics of the market economy. Furthermore, have I been arguing that this position is not a point of departure of the grand revolutionary practice, but one filled with contradictions and negotiations through which resistance might be intensified or fade away. A central point I wanted to articulate in this chapter was that the field of power and knowledge which gives rise to intelligible things are the site from which a situation in which the activists are trying to make themselves independent of historically reconstructed subject categories is formulating something new or "exiting" and through the mobilizing performative acts enabling temporary unity.

5 Conclusive Remarks

“Everything was totally accepted and in that way you were just as everyone else”

In the summer of 2008 the users of the Ungdomhuset at Jagtvej 69 got a new house, not far away from the house squatted at Dorotheavej in January 2007, “Villa Villekulla”. In a discussion with Tim, we got in to questions of gains and losses of getting a new house and he said that they got a house and the municipality got peace, the activists had to get a clear victory and the municipality had, for one or another reason, to get calm. How do you solve a problem like Maria? How do you hold a moonbeam in your hand? This thesis has made temporary strokes in a process of normalization and in narrative moments of resistance within this process leading up to the establishment of a new youth house. I have used a diffuse chronology going from the summer of 2006 to the summer of 2008 focusing rather on the power relations and the resistance constitutive for the historical and political process reproducing an asymmetrical world, than on reproducing a linear description of course of events. If using municipality documents of city planning, media reportages or interviews with the church Fadershuset I might have got a more cogent dynamic in my claims but this thesis has focused on the stories of activists and the struggles in which they are involved. Apart from this thesis purpose I hope this has served as an illuminative and perhaps empowering intervention in a long struggle for a youth house of great importance in so many ways and in so many peoples life. Through the quotas I have let the activists tell a story simultaneously enabling a theoretical exploitation. I have, through these stories of struggles, shown how it is not unity, necessarily, in believes or even in action that enables solidarity but rather, it is the effects, aim and intentions of the actions that create the webs of connection between practises of resistance producing a subversive situation opening up a system of acceptable claims of truth for rearticulations that is still not named. Concretely expressed, the naked supper, the ambivalence produced in the meetings with the AMOH, the organizing of the streets in another way, the fags in the parks or autonomous spaces as a location in which gender expressions beyond regulatory mechanisms of power can be articulated does communicate as they are disrupting a “continuous” story of absolute coherence of logics of the market economy and the heterosexual matrix. It means that in the refusals and the concrete acts of reproduction of subject positions, in service of an alternative production is the site from which solidarity and subversive situations can be found. I have been arguing that it is the unnamed, uncategorized and diffuse articulation of something beyond a normalization process that is producing a subversive position of refusal and disobedience and that this diffuse articulation is reproduced through the tension between continuous and discontinuous historical processes working within and through the whole social body. How do you hold a moonbeam in your hand, the Nuns ask. I am arguing that it is as that very question is asked, a subversive, uncontrollable situation occurs, can be intensified and webs of connections be constructed. Hopefully those webs of connection

does not withdraw and the memory will not construct a museum but rather a fantasy of something that breaks every day showing signs of something new.

The purpose of this thesis has been to create a link between critical theoretical strategies of illuminating, empowering and emancipating subordinated subjects, and a poststructuralist critique of identifying discontinuities, failures and the instabilities within the reproduction of a system of acceptable claims of truth. I am arguing that this link is immanent in the processes of subjectivation and I have illuminated this process through Christian's discussion of autonomous spaces for instance or Lisa's discussion of the normalization of the city and parks. I have reflected upon how I in this thesis also reproduce continuous stories reproducing knowledge and asymmetrical power relations within a system of acceptable claims of truth as for example discussing dichotomous categorizations for instance. But, most centrally have I shown how the activists are constantly torn between interpellating demands and failures and how this conflict produces a situation that is empowering *through* those failures and emancipatory *through* the effects of intensified webs of connection between ruptures and failures in those processes. Does it take us beyond the feminist dilemma of reproduction of asymmetrical power relations as they are discursively acted out? No. But it shows a process in which possibilities are constantly present and that this presence produced a temporary situation in which you are like everyone else as everything is totally accepted.

This thesis has been following two main questions. The identification of how power and knowledge gives rise to intelligible things and illuminating failures within this process enabled giving answer to the first question of which utterances and images of actions that articulates a struggle. The utterances I paid special attention to, has been those of which I regard as an orientation within a field of power relations taking us from concrete acts and happenings such as organizing the public space in another way than originally planed to reflections on the importance of autonomous space as constitutive failures. Within this orientation I have identified how cutting down hedges for instance works as normalizing productive and coercive power through the rupture in the story of heterosexual hegemony as (re)productive *and* of the signifier mobilizing resistance. It is as this process has been discussed that I move on to the second main question of what this process produces in terms of different stories, subjects and futures that serves the purpose of enabling an illumination of the subversive productive effect of constitutive failures. The utterances I paid special attention to has been those in which a change has been identified, through the orientation, taking us from utterances such as the euphoric feeling of running across the intersection, towards the house to those of a generalized conflict and connections such as Lisa's story of her family realizing that the struggle concerned them as well. I have been arguing that it in those processes constitutes a position of disobedience, beyond productive regulatory mechanisms of the heterosexual matrix and logics of the market economy as the webs of connection between constitutive failures are intensified. That, would I argue is fruitful for feminist strategies and emancipatory practices.

6 References

- Anderson, Bridget; "Doing the Dirty Work – The Global Politics of Domestic Labour", Zed Books, London, 2000.
- Barkley Brown, Elsa; "'What Has Happened Here' – The politics of difference in Women's History and Feminist Politics" p. 272-288 in *The Second Wave – A Reader in Feminist Theory*, Nicholson, Linda (edit.), Routledge, London, 1997a.
- Butler, Judith; "Gender Trouble – Feminism and the Subversion of Identity", Routledge, New York, 1990.
- Butler, Judith; "Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of 'postmodernism'" p. 3-21 in *Feminists Theorize the Political*. Judith Butler & Joan W Scott (edit.), Routledge, New York, 1992.
- Butler, Judith; "Imitation and Gender Insubordination" p. 300-316 in *The Second Wave – A Reader in Feminist Theory*, Nicholson, Linda (edit.), Routledge, London, 1997a.
- Butler, Judith; "The psychic life of power : theories in subjection", Stanford University Press, California 1997b.
- Butler, Judith; "Undoing Gender", Routledge, New York, 2004.
- Edenheim, Sara; "När våldet blir en del av jaget – En kritisk analys av kvinnohistoria och dess effekter" i *Kvinnor och våld: en mångtydig historia* Östberg, Lindstedt- Cronberg, Nordic Academic press, 2005a.
- Edenheim, Sara; "Begärets Lagar – Moderna statliga utredningar och heteronormativitetens genealogi", Symposium, Stockholm/Stehag 2005b.
- Czarniawska, Barbara; "'Studying Up, Studying Down, Studying Sideways' – om ett dialogiskt förhållande till fältet" i *Att utmana vetandets gränser*, Liber AB, Malmö, 2005.
- Diani, Mario & Eyerman, Ron; "The Study of Collective Action: Introductory Remarks" in *Studying Collective Action*, Diani, Mario & Eyerman, Ron (edit.), SAGE Publications, London, 1992.
- Foucault, Michel; "The Will To Knowledge – History of Sexuality:1, Penguin Books, London, 1978.
- Foucault, Michel; "Övervakning och straff – Fängelsets födelse", Arkiv Förlag, Lund, 1993.
- Gotlieb, Jette & Krarup, Ole & Reumert, Hanne & Rode, Mille; "URO – 25 års gadekamp", Tiderne Skrifter, Viborg, 1995.
- Jensen, Carsten; "BZ Europa – Ungdomsbevægelsen i 80'erne", Tiderne Skrifter, Viborg, 1982.
- Karpantschov, René & Lindblom, Martin "Kampen om Ungdomshuset - studier i et oprør", Frydenlund A/S, København, 2009.
- Lewis, Gail; "Race Gender, Social Welfare – Encounters in a Postcolonial Society", Polity press, Cambridge, 2000.

- Lundberg, Svante & Månsson, Sven- Axel & Welander, Hans; "Demonstranter – En sociologisk studie", Nordstedts förlag, Stockholm, 1970.
- Melucci, Alberto; "Nomader I nuet – Sociala rörelser och individuella behov I dagens samhälle", Daidalos, Udevalla, 1992.
- Melucci, Alberto; "Challenging codes – Collective action in the information age", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- Mulinari, Diana; "Vi tar väl kvalitativ metod – det är så lätt" i *Mer än kalla fakta – kvalitativ forskning I praktiken*, Studentlitteratur, Lund, 1999.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline & Holland, Janet; "Feminist Methodology – Challenges and Choices", Sage Publications, London, 2007.
- Reinharz, Shulamit; "Feminist Methods in Social Research", Oxford University Press Inc, 1992.
- Sandell, Kerstin; "Enkla tekniker och besvärliga frågor" s. 75-90 i *Att utmana vetandets gränser*, Lundqvist, Åsa & Davies, Karen & Mulinari, Diana (Red.), Liber AB, Malmö, 2005.
- Scott, W Joan; "Fantasy Echo: History and the Construction of Identity" s. 284-304 in *Critical Incuiry*, Vol. 27, nr. 2., 2000.
- Scott, W Joan; "Only Paradoxes to Offer – French Feminists and the Rights of Man", Harvard, USA, 1996.
- Skeggs, Beverley; "Formations of Class and gender – Becoming Respectable", Sage Publications, London, 1997.
- Tilly, Charles; "The Politics of Collective Violence", Cambridge University Press, USA, 2003.
- Tilly, Charles; "Social Movements 1768-2004", Paradigm Publisher, London, 2004.
- Wennerhag, Magnus & Holm, Hilma & Lindgren, Johan & Nordvall, Henrik; "Aktivister – Sociala forum, globala rörelser och demokratins förnyelse", Bokförlaget Atlas, Halmstad, 2006.
- Wijk, Erik; "Göteborgskravallerna och processerna", Manifest kulturproduktion, Stockholm 2002.
- Wittig, Monique; "One is Not Born a Woman" page 265-273, in *The Second Wave – A Reader in Feminist Theory*, Nicholson, Linda (edit.), Routledge, London, 1997a.
- "De Autonome – En bog om og af den autonoma bevægelse", Autonomt Forlag, København, 1995.

Interviews:

- Laura 2009-03-10
- Linda 2009-03-13
- Tim 2009-03-18
- Christian 2009-03-21
- Thomas 2009-03-21
- Lisa 2009-03-24

Internet:

- www.ungeren.dk 2009-03-24