



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

“The Right to Urban life”

Jesse Kempainen

ABSTRACT

Contemporary urban movements in Sweden emerge and are primary active in so-called million program neighborhoods. Many of these neighborhoods are some of the most deprived and socially vulnerable areas in Sweden. Million program neighborhoods have been objects for external descriptions ever since they were built. Depicted, on the one hand as “the heart” of diversity in Swedish society, and on the other hand as segregated, immigrant dense problem areas these descriptions have generated a stigmatizing discourse over the years. The urban resistance articulated in these areas can be derived to the discourse as they mainly target austerity policies and issues regarding the continuous commercialization of public goods, as well as, urban space. This thesis examines this resistance in the light of Lefebvre’s concept “The Right to the City” and argues that residents of million program neighborhoods fulfill the requirements that make them eligible to claim this right. Nevertheless, regardless many denominators, there are plenty of differences concerning the form of the urban resistance as well. Comparing the organization of resistance in the neighborhoods of Husby and Rinkeby in Stockholm, this thesis illustrates the importance of understanding the place specific context. These two neighborhoods are characterized by both processes of homogenization as well as fragmentation. These processes interplay over subscales and have a huge impact on the place specific conditions, which in turn influences the possibilities to mobilize an urban resistance. Focus in this thesis is to highlight the fragmented nature of these neighborhoods that usually does not shine through the homogenizing million program discourse. However, although the nature of this thesis is to problematize, it also highlights the possibilities to overcome place specific fragmentation in relation to processes of homogenization. In that light, the million program discourse appears to be a common ground, and thus this thesis identifies the first generation million program residents as possible agents of change.

KEY WORDS: Fragmentation, Homogenization, Husby, Million program neighborhoods, Rinkeby, The Right to the City, Urban Policy, Urban Social Movements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to show my gratitude to the respondents who participated in this study. Arne and Hagi your contributions are greatly appreciated. Fehmi, Sakil, Sadid and Tashnif, there are no words to show how much I value your participation. The voice of the million program is powerful thanks to all of you. As simple as it is, this thesis would not exist without your generous sharing of experience, thoughts and time. Finally, but not least, I want to thank my supervisor Guy Beaten for the valuable support when it was the most needed.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
TABLE OF CONTENT	5
INTRODUCTION	6
PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTION.....	8
Delimitations.....	8
THESIS OUTLINE.....	9
METHODOLOGY	9
What is critical urban theory?.....	9
Critical realism.....	10
Case studies	11
Case selection	12
Sources of knowledge.....	14
Interview selection and method	14
Criticism of sources	15
FIRST MODEL OF ANALYSIS: The Right to the City.....	16
THE URBAN SOCIAL MOVEMENT EVOLUTION	19
URBAN MOBILIZATION IN SWEDEN.....	22
Million program neighborhoods: a new stage for urban movements in Sweden ..	25
SECOND MODEL OF ANALYSIS: Three Pillars of Simultaneousness	29
THE CASE: Husby and Rinkeby.....	31
The respondents and their different backgrounds.....	31
Representatives of local movements in Husby and Rinkeby	31
Locals - first generation million program residents.....	32
Mistrust against the authorities.....	33
Järvalyftet: the beginning of many struggles	34
Dispossession by non-involvement: a cry for participation.....	37
A shared demand for better schools and more jobs	40
A transit City.....	45
Incoherence and fragmentation over scales	46
A new generation urban residents.....	50
DISCUSSION	53
Conclusion	57
REFERENCES	58
APPENDIX.....	62

INTRODUCTION

It was in the 1980s; urban researchers started to study the relationship between urbanization and the increasingly global aspects of contemporary political-economic change. Cities have gained an important role in the global economy and held an essential function for investment and competitiveness on widening international financial markets. It is the emphasis on cities, and the nature of urbanization, that distinguishes urban social movements from traditional social movements. Social movements conduct collective action that involves solidarity between participants, social conflict, and social change, whilst urban social movements act particularly to change the urban community (Stahre, 2007).

Within the Critical Urban Theory, urban social movements are treated as organized forms of urban resistance that mirrors contemporary political and economic conditions in cities. Emphasis is laid on the need for an autonomous civil society that can defend citizen rights in relation to the city and the market. The civil society is regarded to have an important role reinforcing a democracy, why citizens should be direct involved in the political life concerning urban issues (Kings, 2011: 33). Thus, globalization processes wherein urbanization plays a crucial role for economic, political, as well as social restructuring processes, has an enormous impact on what struggles urban movements articulate. Moreover, globalization processes, in combination with the development of social platforms on the internet, have reduced distances in time and space between movements in different cities. Movements around the world are able to mobilize around same issues and coordinate collective actions. The Occupy Wall Street movement is a good example on this, as they have supporting organizations across the US, Europe, and now recently also in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, the organizational structure of urban social movements always been characterized by diversity, representing a wide range of different agendas, conflicts, and covers numerous different groups. Nevertheless, although this difference, Margit Mayer (Mayer, 2013) argues that contemporary urban mobilization mainly revolves around two comprehensive fault lines: the continuous commodification of the city and the dismantling of the welfare system. Austerity policies and the privatization of public space are in particular popular targets for urban social movements.

However, although national boundaries have become less important due to globalization processes, the importance of the local context cannot be neglected. The materialization of globalization must be understood as an interaction between global processes and local outcome, an interaction that includes both adaptation and conflicts in a place-specific context (Sassen 2004). Consequently, it is necessary to relate local historical, cultural, and physical context to the overall global political-economic processes, but despite the overall context social differentiation in urban space gets local specific outcomes.

The place specific dimension becomes interesting when translated into a Swedish context. In contrast to the traditional urban connotation that took place in the central parts of the city, contemporary Swedish movements predominately operate in deprived areas that go under the generic name 'million program neighborhoods'. This new stage for urban resistance in Sweden represents a central role in the modernization of Sweden. Today many of these neighborhoods represents some of the most socially deprived, and social vulnerable areas in Sweden, with high unemployment as well as poor educational levels, among their residents. Depicted, on the one hand, as multicultural centers, and on the other hand as segregated, immigrant dense problem areas, the million program neighborhoods have always stood object for external descriptions.

Contemporary Swedish movements active in million program neighborhoods does similar to North American and other first world movements, primarily target austerity policies and mobilize around issues, such as, segregation and deprivation of social rights. It goes well in line with Lefebvre's ideas of claiming 'The Right to the City' entitled them who are, dispossessed of and depraved their freedom, due to the urban model of production. However, in this context, the relationship between global issues and place specific expressions becomes tangible. Because, although many million program areas share the same challenges, the urban resistance takes different shapes depending on the local environment.

This thesis compares the organization of civil society in two million program neighborhoods and takes off from the notion that the urban resistance is more visible in Husby than Rinkeby, two closely located neighborhoods in Stockholm. The primarily objective is to bring a better understanding on why it is like this. Structural, as well as underlying factors of common denominators as well as fragmentation within different sub-scales of local environments are being examined.

Therefore, this thesis has two parallel storylines. Firstly, one about the million program discourse, and how their residents shaped by it, fulfills the requirements to demand 'The Right to the City'. Secondly, one about the place specific context and how that stands in relation to a fragmented civil society and lack of mobilization.

PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTION

There is much literature available that scrutinize the nature of urban contemporary movements in Sweden, especially after the riots in Husby 2013. Reasons for an urban connotation primarily derive from the given circumstances of deprived neighborhoods. Explanatory models, as well as solutions to the problem, have mainly a starting point in neoliberal policies and theory. Impetus for urban resistance and the relationship to structural behavior are, therefore, common focus points, so it is also in this thesis. However, little research cross-examines both societal structures and place specific conditions in order to find out what effect the nature of the local milieu has on urban resistance and the possibilities for mobilization. Hence, the primary purpose of this thesis is to contribute to a better understanding on how and why contemporary urban social movements in Sweden are predominately located to so-called million program areas. Moreover, the intention is also to highlight what impact differences in the local environment have on urban mobilization. Therefore, I have developed the overall research question, which is:

What are the factors of incoherence regarding the urban mobilization in Rinkeby and Husby?

This central question is subdivided into the following two thematic questions.

- *How does the Swedish 'Million program' correspond to the concept of 'The Right to the City'?*
- *What impact has the place-specific context on urban mobilization in Husby and Rinkeby?*

I have gained increased knowledge about fundamental concepts, and historical events, that have had a crucial impact on the historical development of urban resistance. The theoretical starting point in this thesis takes off in the evolution of urban social movement in the Global North before it is narrowed to Swedish context. When answering the research question I take aid from Lefebvre's concept of 'The Right to the City, as well as, Lisa King's model called 'three pillars of Simultaneous.'

Delimitations

Urban policy and the relationship to urban social movements are multifaceted. Cities and their struggles differ widely. The complexity within this field stretches from global to local levels of diversity. In order to generate academically valuable research, it is necessary to narrow it down to a particular topic. Therefore, this thesis is limited to the Swedish context, and more specifically to examine the place specific context of two neighborhoods in Stockholm called Husby and Rinkeby. Hence, all conclusions and discussions have a starting point in these two areas and their relations to their entwining surroundings.

THESIS OUTLINE

This thesis begins with a brief introduction to critical urban theory and its view on global political-economic change and the impact on urban social movements in Swedish million program neighborhoods. The introduction will introduce the reader to the research problem which leads to the main research question presented at the end of the chapter.

The introduction follows by a method chapter. This chapter outlines methodological, as well as ontological and epistemological considerations of this thesis. Moreover, the reader will get a further description of the case study and interview method selected for this thesis.

The method chapter follows by the analysis. It introduces the reader to this thesis theoretical framework that stretches from global to contemporary Swedish urban social movements. The reader will also get familiar with key concepts and models of analysis used to answer the research question. Moreover, the main empirical part consisting of the material retrieved from the interviews will be presented in this chapter.

The analysis follows by a discussion where the author examines the findings and connects them to the theory presented. This chapter provides the reader with an answer the stated research question as well as with a suggestion for further research within the field before it ends with some concluding remarks.

METHODOLOGY

What is critical urban theory?

“perpetually question the obviousness and the very frames of civic debate so as to give ourselves a chance to think the world, rather than being thought by it, to take apart and understand its mechanisms, and thus to (re)appropriate it intellectually and materially”

(Loic Wacquant, 2004: 101)

The theoretical standpoint of this thesis takes off in the critical urban theory derived from the Frankfurt School. Critical urban research focuses on the structural dimensions of urban development, which implies an analytical understanding of neoliberalism as an economic experiment. Critical urban theory emphasizes that the "urban space" is under continuous development. This constant (re) construction urban space is of political and ideological nature, characterized by social connotations and relations of power. Critical urban theory is grounded on the belief that urbanism is a product of social relations, rather than an absolute-nature based on technocratic and economic rationales. Hence, the critical urban theory rejects the neoliberal urban form and claims *“that another, more democratic, socially just and sustainable form of urbanization is possible, even if such possibilities are currently*

being suppressed through dominant institutional arrangements, practices and ideologies." (Brenner, 2009: 198)

Translated into urban social movements context, they should be treated as "resistance". This resistance should be seen in the light of, and in relation to, the constant alteration of the capitalist society and its impact on cities and their citizens. To reach cities created by, and for people rather than for capital accumulation, critical urban theory emphasizes the importance of involving urban citizens in the political dimensions of the urban space. However, emphasis on the power of civil society should be done with the purpose to identify "agents of change", as well as "where", and "what" form it will take. 'The Right to the City'-concept coined by Henri Lefebvre in 1968 (further described on p. 16) is a guiding principle for critical urban researchers in this context (Kings, 2011: 33).

Critical urban theory argues that if there were no contradictions within the current neoliberal model of production and if there would exist something like a capitalistic social totality, there would be no critical theory. Critical urban theory rejects the possibility to observe objectively, and analyze reality distanced from historical, social formation. Instead, critical urban scholars argue that "*all social knowledge, including critical theory, is embedded within the dialectics of social and historical change; it is thus intrinsically, endemically contextual*" (Brenner 2009, 203). Moreover, critical urban theory takes off from a hermeneutic standpoint that all situated knowledge, but also goes beyond that, and emphasizes on how conflicting subjective knowledge and consciousness may emerge in social formations.

Critical realism

Moreover, this thesis ontological stance descends from critical realism. Critical realism encompasses both observable and social realities. Based on the notion that an objective reality exists, but however different to empirical realism since critical realist theory argues that this "reality" cannot be directly observed (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Critical realists distinguish between real, as in empirical observables and social concepts that we claim to have sufficient knowledge about, and real as in understanding the causal structures between "natural" or "social" objects (Sayer, 2000: 10). Critical realism does also employ a mind-dualism philosophy that distinguishes between the object and the observer or the transitive and intransitive dimensions of reality. Critical realists believe that the world exists independently (intransitive) from our mind and our knowledge about it (transitive). Hence, studies on social structures and phenomena take place in a transitive reality, whilst the earth and other physical entities like a house are part of the intransitive dimension. However, functions assigned to these objects seen as transitive reality belongs to the intransitive dimension of reality (ibid: 11). Critical realist theory employs transfactualism, when knowledge-claims made on causal structures. Transfactualism means that a scientist acknowledges unobservable entities that have a causal effect on our everyday life as real, such as bureaucracies, etc.

However, Critical Realism sought to identify mechanisms in society in order to explain causal structures. This requires identification of the "actual" which is what happens when, before and after an object has exercised its power over another object. Hence, the quintessence of "reality" is filtered through individual perspectives. It can only be understood if structures, and power relations that shape the perception, are recognized (Sayer, 2000: 12 & Jackson, 2011: 87, 98).

The main purpose with the overall research question in this thesis is to problematize the nature of urban space and social relations. Hence, critical realism corresponds well with the epistemology of critical urban theory, as well as with the case-study methodology used to examine urban social movements. In this light, the two neighborhoods selected for the case study represent the intransitive dimension, and historical symbols of ideology and politics (Sayer, 2000). Furthermore, this is a qualitative study. Emphasis is, therefore, on the subjective understanding on urban resistance represented by the respondents, which also constitutes the main empirical body of this thesis (Brenner, 2009).

Case studies

A case study is a qualitative research method suitable to use when, cases constituted by complex social relations, multiple variables, and phenomena tightly connected to its context are being examined. A case study, as defined by Yin, is: "*...an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident*" (Yin, 2003). Furthermore, case studies can be described as an introvert research method, meaning that focus is delimited only to study what happens within the borders of the case, and thus neglect possible impact caused by external factors. Hence, case studies provide the researcher with an in-depth knowledge about a specific area and can be used both to generate a hypothesis and to test one.

A common critique against case studies is that, it is hard to generalize upon the findings. As with all methods, there are both advantages and disadvantages, with using case studies. With a case study, you gain a qualitative insight in a specific case, rather than a quantitative holistic overview. The inconsistent nature of case studies does, therefore, not invite to any larger societal generalization (Merriam, 1994: 53). However, accumulate quantitative knowledge is not the predominating purpose of qualitative research, but to investigate, and reflect over social relations within a given subjective context. Hence, the results of a case study should not be treated as an attempt to describe a comprehensive reality, but rather as a detailed part of it.

The individual and her perception of life and reality are the center of attention in qualitative research. With that in mind, and in light of the above, the choice to use a case study as the methods framework in this thesis corresponds well with the nature of the research topic being examined.

Case selection

This comparative case study is limited to Husby and Rinkeby, two neighborhoods in Stockholm. The main focus of the case is to compare both differences and similarities regarding the organization of urban resistance in these neighborhoods.

The distance between Husby and Rinkeby is about 2.5 km, and they are both located in the Northwest part of Stockholm, less than 20 minutes from the City center by Metro. Rinkeby and Husby do, together with four other closely located neighborhoods, Akalla, Kista, Hjulsta and Tensta, embody the concept of 'Järva'. It is a comprehensive term for all deprived and socially vulnerable million program neighborhoods surrounding the green area called Järvafältet. Although, geographic proximity Järva can be divided into North and South, whereas, Rinkeby, Tensta and Hjulsta represent the North, and Kista, Husby and Akalla the South (refer to map). Every neighborhood is independent, but nevertheless they share many common denominators regarding socio-economic development as well as their population structures. The concept of Järva does not entail any official administrative distinctions but is still an established concept when these geographies of Stockholm are being described, both by authorities and locals. Therefore, Järva marks a central point of reference in this study.

Map: Neighborhoods around Järvafältet (source: hitta.se)



If we look closer at Rinkeby and Husby, we see that they are both part of the same administrative district in Stockholm called Rinkeby-Kista. Rinkeby-Kista has a population of 47.000 residents and encompasses, besides Rinkeby and Husby, also Akalla and Kista. Rinkeby has the largest population of 16.000 residents, followed by Husby with 12.000 residents. The majority of the residents, 90 percent in Rinkeby, and 85 percent in Husby are either first- or second-generation immigrants¹. The employment numbers for men (52 %) and women (60 %) in Rinkeby-Kista is way below Stockholm average (76/ 78 %). The yearly income follows the same pattern as it is more than 100,000 SEK lower in Rinkeby-Kista compared to Stockholm average (Kista-Rinkeby 2014: 3). Regarding housing types, Rinkeby's housings stock consists out of 100 percent rental units. The equivalent for Husby is 78 percent. These numbers can be compared to Stockholm average, which is 49 percent (Stockholms stad, 2014).

However, the more specific reason I chose to compare Husby and Rinkeby in this case study is that, although the geographical, as well as socioeconomic proximity, is striking, similarities regarding an explicit urban mobilization are few. Husby is well-known for urban resistance in Sweden. One reason is the media attention Husby gained during the riots in 2013. Especially 'The Megaphone'² became famous in media when they offered an alternative reading on the events, from the "million program residents"–perspective. However, urban mobilization in Husby is not delimited to one organization. Husby is the home of several famous urban movements, and behind media portrayals there is a wide mobilization among local movements engaged in community issues.

Rinkeby is also famous in Sweden. Known for being the home-base for many Ethno-national associations, Rinkeby adopt the branding name "The World Village" (Världens by) in the late 90s. Similarly, to Husby, Rinkeby is mostly depicted as a problem neighborhood, and occasionally as a multi-cultural center, by the public and media. Both descriptions refer to the fact that many residents of Husby and Rinkeby hold a non-European background.

There are many similarities between these two neighborhoods. There is a vivid organized civil society in both Husby and Rinkeby, and they share many struggles. However, while there is both a visible, and to some extent successful, urban resistance in Husby, there is a lack of any visible mobilization in Rinkeby. These differences become evident when measured against the articulated struggles against local authorities, particularly in the case of Järvalyftet.

¹ **First generation immigrant** = born outside Sweden. **Second generation immigrant** = born in Sweden with both parents born abroad. *Definition by the City of Stockholm (2014).*

²² Original Swedish name: Megafonen

The choice to compare Husby and Rinkeby is further motivation by their relation to Järvalyftet, which is another central point of reference in this study. It encompasses all six neighborhoods in Järva and is the largest urban revitalization project ever launched, in so called, million program neighborhoods as it was initiated in 2007 by the City of Stockholm. The impact on Rinkeby and Husby is evident. Furthermore, Järvalyftet has engaged urban social movements to take action, and rally around issues derived from this project.

Sources of knowledge

Interviews constitute the main empirical base in this thesis. Scientific journals, books as well as news articles are used as complementary secondary sources of data in order to deepen the understanding of the topic. Nevertheless, all sources are equally valuable, as they complement each other, and consequently, contribute to a deeper understanding on the research topic.

Interview selection and method

In order to capture place specific particularities, interviews were carried out with one active local from both Husby and Rinkeby. The respondents were randomly selected by a so-called snowball sampling. The snowball sampling method implies that the researcher use other peoples knowledge, and recommendations, to find suitable respondents (Morgan, 2008). In the case of Husby, I used Facebook to get in contact with Arne Johansson, a representative of the local movement. Thereafter, Arne recommended me to take contact with Mohamed Hagi Farah, active in the community development, in Rinkeby.

I conducted one semi-structured interview with each of them. I recorded both interviews, and to my help I had an interview template with open questions around the following four categories:

Ambition and motivation

Järvalyftet

Differences and similarities

Barriers and opportunities

Furthermore, in order to bring a better understanding on the relationship between the million program discourse and impetus for urban resistance, a group interview was carried out with four locals, representing different neighborhoods in Järva. All four are personal friends of mine. Thus, the selection of respondents for the focus group is based on highly personal knowledge of each and one of them. Similar to the individual interviews the focus group was conducted as a semi-structured interview. It was also recorded. Regarding the thematic scheme I made as smaller change

compared to the individual interviews as I replaced the category of "differences and similarities" with "The Million Program"

Ambition and motivation

Järvalyftet

The Million Program

Barriers and opportunities

Furthermore, the urban social movement 'The Megaphone' in Husby declined to participate in this study, due to a re-organization after the riots in 2013.

In addition, it should also be mentioned that I tried to contact the project leader at the urban planning department, at the City of Stockholm responsible for Järvalyftet, without any success. However, interesting enough, I profile on LinkedIn was visited by a senior planner in a leading position at the same office, just hours after I had announced my research purpose in an email to them. Neither did I have any luck with getting in contact with the two public housing companies Familjebostäder and Stockholmshem, both with large housing stocks in Rinkeby. While Stockholms hem did reply on my first mail, the project leader at Familjebostäder responsible for their engagement in Järvalyftet did not reply on any of my mails. However, neither did Stockholmshem reply on my second mail either, when I asked about how they intend to involve their residents in the planned renovation of their housings stock.

All interviews were carried out in Swedish and thus, translated to English by the author.

Criticism of sources

As mentioned above, all knowledge is subjective, and so is also the gathering process. First of all, the qualities of answers retrieved from the interviews vary depending on the researcher's capability to create a comfortable situation where the respondent openly answers the questions. Secondly, it is always the researcher who categorize among the interview material and selects what literature to use in the research. The researcher's possibility to steer findings according to a hypothesis through data selection is a common critic against qualitative research in general, and against case studies in particular. Therefore, the data processing should be understood as a subjective action as it implies both a selection and omitting of information based on subjective decisions. Another aspect worth mentioning is that researchers who conduct a case study tend to exaggerate details, details that might be important in a particular case, but less important in any bigger context (Merriam, 1994). Consequently, the researcher's subjective perception as a filter in the research process should be taken in considerations when findings and conclusions are being presented.

FIRST MODEL OF ANALYSIS: The Right to the City

The idea of a resistance against the capitalistic system materialized in our cities derives from Lefebvre's thoughts proposed in 1970. Lefebvre was the first European scholar who explicitly raised the question about urbanity as a central trigger for social mobilizing, as new politicized issues emerged in the 60s that was predominantly visible in cities, required researcher to take in account urbanity, and treat it as a possible transformative force (Mayer, 2012; Peter et al., 2012). In *La révolution urbaine (1970)* he presents an emancipatory line for interpreting motives for social mobilization in cities. Lefebvre's main concern is the commodification of every realm of society. He worries about how that creates spaces of separation and alienation within cities, and among their citizens. Lefebvre argues that as the urbanization of society's increases and reaches global dimensions it accelerates the force of commodification and capitalization of cities, why urban space cannot be perceived as anything else than a new mode of production. The destructive force of commodification of urban space can only be prevented if it is countered by a revolution that emancipates the "lifeworld" of cities - that is the collective subjective perception of reality - from the neoliberal doctrine that stimulates a continuation of urbanism as a force of production. For this Lefebvre received a lot of critic from other academics.

Manuel Castells underlined e.g. in his initial critic that "*...there is nothing specifically urban about the way history progresses*" (Mayer, 2012: 3; Peter et al., 2012), and rejected the possibility that the industrial capital-labor context could be replaced by an urban mode of production for political contention. In line with other traditional social movement theorist, Castells (1977) argues that politicized issues, such as the concern of collective consumption, which emerged in cities, were only "*...contemporary manifestations of the capital-labor conflict*" (Castells, 1977; Mayer, 2012: 5)

Another renowned critical urban scholar, David Harvey, accuses Lefebvre off ascribing urbanity a greater importance on social mobilization, than it really has (Harvey, 1973). Harvey writes that the balance of dependency is still in favor for the industrial capital compared to urbanity as the industrial capital is much stronger than the land capital. Therefore, he argues in line with Castells, that "urban" cannot be perceived as a new mode of production (Mayer, 2012: 6).

Nevertheless, as the global political-economic scene begins to take a turn towards a neoliberal dominance in the 70s, Lefebvre's ideas become relevant. From being criticized, Lefebvre is now celebrated as the founder of the concept of 'The Right to the City', that was to become one of the most important mottos and concepts of urban social movements (ibid: 2, 6). As the liberalization of society continues, and accelerates faster than ever before, David Harvey even revisited Lefebvre's claims from the 70's, in later days. Harvey now views urbanization as a key drive for neoliberal policy implementation as financial markets are integrated on a global scale trough the commodification of urban space. He also underlines that it is "*...the*

shifts in the political, economic context that have enabled the rise of urban movements around the globe" (Mayer, 2012: 7)

The idea of ‘The Right to the City’ was first introduced by Lefebvre in his book, *Le Droit à la ville* from 1968 before it was conceptualized in *La révolution urbaine* (1970), and then further developed throughout his other works: *Le Droit à la ville, II - Espace et politique* (1972), *The production of space* (1974), and finally in *Writings on Cities* (1996), (Schmid, 2012:45). However, Lefebvre's legacy is characterized by a battle between the very popular and powerful slogan ‘The Right to the City’ and the actual meaning of it. He never left behind any a distinct definition of what the ‘right’ to the city is, why the significant meaning of it became, and still is, an object for interpretation (Marcuse, 2012:29). As it comes natural for philosophers his text are floating, and to a certain extent abstract. The clearest definition of ‘The Right to the City’ that he contributed with is perhaps this one: “... *the right to the city is like a cry and demand*”

“The right slowly meanders through the surprising detours of nostalgia and tourism, the heart of the traditional city, and the call of the existent of recently developed centralities”

(Lefebvre, 1996: 158; Marcuse, 2012:29)

And the following quote is perhaps one of the more clear definitions regarding the meaning of ‘The Right to the City’ in practice:

“In these difficult conditions, at the hearth of a society which cannot completely oppose them and yet obstruct them, rights which define civilization [...] find their way. These rights which are not well recognized, progressively become customary before being inscribed into formalized codes. They would change reality if they entered into social practice: right to work, to training, and education, to health, housing, leisure, to life. Among these rights in the making features the right to the city, not to the ancient city, but to urban life, to renewed centrality, to places of encounter and exchange, to life rhythms and time uses, enabling the full and complete usage of these moments and places...”

(Lefebvre, 1996; Schmid, 2012: 43)

Lefebvre’s writings has troubled many intelligent people and opened up for multiple interpretations. David Harvey (2008:23) did, for example, interpret ‘The Right to the City’ as in “...*the right to change ourselves by changing the city*”. Harvey rests this argument on the belief that cities are human creations and impossible to separate from the social ties to their creators. Their relations to nature, lifestyles, technologies and the esthetic values, are all intertwined parts making up the city. These relations create the fundamental prerequisites needed to realize ‘The Right to the City’ as it is the humans, the citizens, demand for equal rights that should control the urban process (Harvey, 2008:28). Nevertheless, some people claim that Harvey is too weak in his interpretation. Schmidt, (2012: 60) claims that

Lefebvre went a step further than Harvey did in his analysis, claiming that ‘The Right to the City’ is equal to the right to urban autonomy, or self-management.

In addition, Purcell (2002) argues that few has elaborated with the concept deep enough to see what Lefebvre really meant, as he presents the idea that we can go beyond a view of ‘The Right to the City’, as a counter movement to neoliberalism. He suggests that:

“Lefebvre’s right to the city is more radical, more problematic, and more indeterminate than the current literature makes it seem. /.../ that the right to the city does offer distinct potential for resisting current threats to urban enfranchisement/.../ It must be seen not as a completed solution to current problems, but as an opening to a new urban politics, what I call an urban politics of the inhabitant”
(Purcell, 2002: 99)

Peter Marcuse (2011) is another one who been struggling with this concept. He also focuses on Lefebvre's notion about the cry and demand, and presents perhaps the most comprehensible interpretation when he argues, that only them who are materially or legally deprived, and them who are discontented with life in a way that their freedom is limited by the potential of economic growth and creativity, are eligible to appropriate ‘The Right to the City’. Thus, Peter Marcuse interpret ‘The Right to the City’ as a moral claim for redistribution based on fundamental principles of justice and ethics, and should be used to transform the society in opposition to the claims of rich and powerful, and in line with those who can appropriate redistribution, which are those deprived of-, or in need of it (Marcuse, 2011:30-34). This, of course, entails that there are those in society who cannot appropriate these right, the rich and those who oppress people to increase their own power in society. However, since there are many groups in society who fulfills these requirements and under that banner of ‘The Right to the City’ they can always gather, mobilize and bridge between their differences in order to achieve a higher purpose together.

In the light of the above, I will use the understanding that there is a “Right to The City” when I, later in chapter 3, examine the impetus for, and agents of urban mobilization in Rinkeby and Husby.

THE URBAN SOCIAL MOVEMENT EVOLUTION

Manuel Castells was the one who introduced the concept of Urban Social Movements to academic studies in the late 1970's. This was a critical point for urban social movement's theory. It broke loose from the traditional social movements theory, and begun to develop an own theoretical body. This new school sought to challenge the dominant picture in urban sociology, which perceived social integration being the principal factor causing social problems and spatial structures. In contrast to this view, new research primarily focused on urban conflicts as struggle over political power. Inspired by the conflicts taking place over housing policies and renewal projects, a view where urban social Movements was perceived as a multifunctional phenomenon, was evolved (Mayer, 2012: 6). Castells writes in 1977 that urban social movements does not only challenge the structural inconsistency of late-capitalist societies “...*but also as capable of bringing about, together with labor unions and political parties, fundamental change in politics and society*” (Castells 1977, 432; Mayer, 2012: 2)

The 1980s is an important period of time for urban resistance. Mayer (2009: 364) calls this the "roll back" –phase of the Keynesian welfare society as austerity politics were implemented on large societal scale. Social collectivist institutions, earlier providing movements a material base for their issues, were now phased out as a global shift towards a neoliberal paradigm was initiated. Urban researchers started to study the relationship between urbanization and the increasingly global aspects of contemporary political-economic change, such as the crisis of Fordism, the new international division of labor, as well as the advancement of transnational corporations on widening international financial markets (Kings, 2011). Saskia Sassen (1991) shows in her book *The Global City. New York, London, Tokyo* how the concentration of dominance in the international financial sector follows a hierarchy of urban centers. She argues that different types of processes are linking services to production, and consumption in a global network, wherein the meaning, and global ranking of places varies depending on the relation to the hierarchy's top layer. Sassen claims, that the intertwining of flows organized around global cities illustrates a new spatial order, a structure in which cities and city regions' role as economic, political and symbolic centers of power in the new global economy, challenges the traditional state-centered system (2004: 651). Consequently, with a strong focus on economic value and regional development, cities play an important role, and have a key function in the new economy a key function in the new economy characterized by economic, political, as well as social restructuring processes, as they are increasingly regulating the global urbanization.

As more protest, and other various forms urban conflicts emerged in cities, a broader and less normative perspective, on urban activism was introduced. Struggles for political self-management, strengthening of community cultures, in combination with activism around the topic of collective

consumption³, characterized the movements' agenda and urban riots in deprived neighborhoods also occurred for the first time⁴. Castells states (1983: 305; Mayer, 2012: 2) that urban movements *are "urban-oriented mobilizations that influence structural social change and transform the urban meanings"*, and that the transformation of the 'urban meanings' is to be interpreted as a battle for a more democratic urban setting, with more political decentralization of participatory character. Moreover, activism around collective consumption in the sense of urban meanings implies *"a city organized on the basis of use value"* (Mayer 2012: 2) instead of a city based on social hierarchies.

Globalization and restructuring processes, as well as, the implementation of new urban policies over the last decades has resulted in increased social polarization, illustrated by socio-spatial separation among different groups in our cities, in the wake of the 90s. Mayer calls this period of time for 'the roll-out neoliberalism' (Mayer). The spatial expression can be described in terms of, one side an intensified homogenization, and on the other an intensified fragmentation. Homogenization, mainly in the form of reduced distance in time, but also in culture, and form of standardization in terms of the architectural design of cities financial districts and well-off residential areas. David Harvey (1989) tries to describe the general characteristics of the post-industrial city and the role of the city in society in his article *From managerialism to entrepreneurialism. The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism*. He puts emphasis on the increased promotion of cities economic development. Cities are marketing their sites through e.g. events aiming to lure new establishment of business and industries, and to attract highly qualified labor. International competition requires that cities have a good intelligence function and adjustment capacity, in relation to global economic trends. In order to attract investments, cities have to adjust their urban policies as fast as possible to new trends, and preferably further develop them. This focus in urban policy on entrepreneurship and competition, should according to Harvey's analysis, be contrasted against its previous focus on governance, local service functions, and distribution of welfare. Harvey believes that the city during the Industrial Revolution was a subcategory of the nation, and then with the primary function to stabilize capitalism, while the city's role in the post-industrial era has increasingly shifted toward promoting the growth, as well as spreading, of the capitalistic doctrine (Harvey, 1989).

If "The Entrepreneurial City" is one way to describe the post-industrial city, 'the divided city' is another. In contrast to the homogenization, fragmentation is a polarization in terms of increased spatial stratification between territories, regions, and scales (Friedman 2002). The city has increasingly become to consist of socially differentiated rooms. This

³Collective consumption is a concept that refers to the many goods and services that are produced and consumed on a collective level, such as in cities. These include schools, libraries, roads, bridges, public transportation, health care, welfare, fire and police protection, etc. Source: sociology.about.com

⁴Brixton, London. Urban riots in 1981.

fragmentation, expressed horizontally, and made visible in people's everyday lives through the increased importance of borders and boundaries between social, cultural, and political spaces, is also known as segregation, that is, the accumulation of wealth versus the concentration of poverty as visualized spatially through spatial hierarchies in the city (Kings, 2011: 28). Gentrification of inner-city neighborhoods has increased dramatically during the 80s and 90s in cities like New York and London. In his book *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City* (1996) Neil Smith, explains how gentrifications of neighborhoods create new barriers in the city. Negative social reality, like visible poverty, is not accepted in regenerated areas. Homeless people are forced to move from parks, and shelters are being removed or demolished. Practically anything it takes to make the gentrified area more attractive to investors and potential rich inhabitants will be done (Stahre 2007: 47). This homogenization and fragmentation of cities has given birth to a new urban form where poverty and luxury, side by side, has become central characteristic of cities.

Consequently, new movements emerged and were developed as a counter response to the intense liberalization of western cities. They gave birth to 'Reclaim the City'-movements that swept across the big cities of Europe and the US. Anti-gentrification actions also became popular, and protest campaigns were held, for example, in New York, Paris and Amsterdam, proclaiming that another city is possible (Mayer, 2009: 365 & Stahre 2007).

The "dot.com"-crash of 2000⁵ had a dramatic impact on the global political-economic scene, as well on the struggles articulated by urban movements. At this point urbanization has gone global through the integration of financial markets, which opened up for new possibilities for growth policies. Cities are now playing a key role in the maintenance of the global economic structure as the flexibility to debt-finance urban development projects across the world are being used extensively.

The neoliberal development over the last decade has limited the space for urban contestation. In contrast to the Keynesians society where movements were given space and liberty to act, neoliberal policies actively minimize every possible intention for urban activism (Mayer, 2013: 23). This has, of course, quite the opposite effect. The relationship between the state and urban social movements has become more intense, and between some of them also more aggressive, e.g. violent confrontations between police and activist groups emerged in Greece and other EU countries that suffered heavily of the financial crisis in 2008 (ibid: 24).

The global dimensions of urban mobilization have also become evident lately. Causes and goals are being shared, as well as campaigns being jointly

⁵ The dot-com bubble (also referred to as the dot-com boom, the Internet bubble and the information technology bubble) was a historic speculative bubble covering roughly 1997–2000, during which stock markets in industrialized nations saw their equity value rise rapidly from growth in the Internet sector and related fields /.../the collapse of the bubble took place during 1999–2001. Source: wikipedia.org

coordinated, across the globe. As national states continuously reduce space and possibilities for urban conflicts, the social media have done the opposite. Movements can quickly create an event and use for example Facebook or Twitter to spread it. In a few minutes, organizations can reach out to hundreds and hundreds of people all around the world with their message and invite them to join. Occupy Wall Street⁶ (note) is just one example on how movements can grow big and strong by the help of social media. Around the world, people and movements support Occupy's ideas and cause, and even organize their own Occupy protests (Mayer, 2013). A new multi-scalar architecture of urban protest has emerged from the interplay between different urban movements across the world. Mayer (2012: 10) argues that the accelerating transnational impetus might even “...boost and strengthen local grassroots movements, or specific urban initiatives may turn into beacons of the global social justice movement”.

URBAN MOBILIZATION IN SWEDEN

Examining the historical development of the Swedish urban social movement scene from a macro perspective, it follows the same structures and trends as other countries in the global north. However, in a national context the development of movement's stands in a very close relation to the transformation of the Swedish society- from a people's home to a neoliberal experiment. I do not intend to give the reader a comprehensive summary of the movement's development in Sweden, but rather give the reader a short summary of, before I describe the contemporary urban movement scenery more in detail.

Motivated by the political radicalization of Swedish society, urban social movements grew stronger in the early 1970s. One of the most important events took place in Gothenburg, which is the second largest city in Sweden. Inspired by occupy movements in Copenhagen, a group of young activist occupied houses in Haga, a working class district located in the center of the city in Gothenburg. Alva and Gunnar Myrdal studied Haga in their research on social hygiene. This research resulted in their two most influential works: ‘*Kris i befolkningsfrågan*’, and *the social housing investigation*⁷ from 1947. These two contributions was of fundamental importance for the coming decade of housing policies in Sweden, entailing clean-up and demolition, of

⁶ Occupy Wall Street is a people-powered movement that began on September 17, 2011 in Liberty Square in Manhattan's Financial District, and has spread to over 100 cities in the United States and actions in over 1,500 cities globally. #ows is fighting back against the corrosive power of major banks and multinational corporations over the democratic process, and the role of Wall Street in creating an economic collapse that has caused the greatest recession in generations. The movement is inspired by popular uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia, and aims to fight back against the richest 1% of people that are writing the rules of an unfair global economy that is foreclosing on our future. Source: (occupywallst.org)

⁷ Original title: SOU (1947:26) Bostadssociala utredningen, del 2. Slutbetänkande: saneringen av stadssamhälleas bebyggelse: organisationen av låne-och bidragsverksamheten för boendeändamål.

working class neighborhoods, modernization of Sweden, and the prevailing as well as fully realizing the idea of an 'People's home'⁸ (Thörn, 2013: 110, 112).

The occupation movements that would become a milestone for urban activism in Sweden occurred in Haga in the 1970s. Haga was in this time on the edge of becoming a part of the modern Sweden, by demolition and rebuilding. The occupation of Haga was a recurring topic in local newspapers at this time, covering multiple perspectives. On the one hand accused of being sanctuary for drug users, but, on the other hand, Haga was also pictured as a symbol for free and vibrant culture. The community center, Hagahuset, gets occupied in 1972, after it has been shut down by the authorities a few days earlier. This occupation symbolizes the most critical event in Haga (Thörn, 2013: 78). It results in both police interventions and negotiations with the municipality. Finally, the municipality promises the activist's that they could move the center to other premises in the same neighborhood. This battle was an isolated victory for the movements. However, it gave birth to a thriving development for all kinds of activism. Haga was in the late 70s, together with Christiania in Copenhagen perhaps the most important center of social movements in northern Europe (ibid: 78).

Due to the successful endeavors carried out by the occupations movement Hagagruppen (Group of Haga, authors translation) was formed. Their main goal was to stop the municipality's plan to replace the old and run-down quarters with modern housing. Hagagruppen won the battle, and most parts of Haga's housing stock was, therefore, preserved. This victory is however characterized by paradoxes as it meant the unpredictable end of Haga as a center for alternative culture and urban activism. The result of preserving the old quarters inevitably meant a "gentle restoration" instead of taking everything down, and thus initiated another development. Haga is today regarded as one of the most gentrified inner city neighborhoods in Gothenburg (ibid: 80-82)

"The events of Kungsträdgården" in Stockholm 1971, is another milestone in the history of Swedish urban social movements. Thousands of people, primarily young activist, gathered to protect thirteen elm trees from being chopped down and replaced by a new subway exit. It was an intense battle between activists and the local authorities, backed up by the police. The activist stood strong, and chained themselves to the trees, when the police accompanied by wood-workers equipped with chainsaws, tried to force people to leave the garden. However, the activist would not give up, and the elm trees were preserved (Stahre, 2007: 71).

It may seem like a minor issue, but the elm tree battle, was beyond important, as it was a symbolic turning point for urban development in

⁸Folkhemmet (The People's home) was coined by the Swedish prime minister, and leader of the Social Democratic party, Per-Albin Hansson in 1928. Source: www.nordiskamuseet.se/kunskapsomraden/folkhemmet

Stockholm. After this battle, the city administration abandoned their agenda of urban rationalism (Stockholms stad, 1977). It meant the end of radical restructuring of the city. It meant no more demolitions of old city quarters. It was an era of modernistic city plans that came to its end with the erection of Kulturhuset (Culture House, author's translation) at Sergels Torg SvD, 2010-10-02).

At this time when functional architecture and complex highway construction was the dominate trend among urban planners, the elm trees symbolized an alternative city (Stahre, 2007: 72). But, more important is that the elm-battle meant a huge deficit for the city planners and decision makers of Stockholm. All of the sudden they had to pay attention to what they described as, undemocratic organizations, groups of people that did not respect the democratic process. This, of course, only lead to the legitimization of urban social movements agenda and increased their influence over urban planning to that extent that it stopped a prolonged modernization of inner city Stockholm.

The following decade was slow. Nothing much happened on the urban social movement scene in Stockholm during the 80s (ibid: 73). The city administration did not launch any large development project plans that had the potential to trigger any mobilization. The 90s was however characterized by more conflicts. The introduction of neoliberalism on a global level a few decades earlier started to have an impact on urban policy making as well, especially in Stockholm that now sought to compete for global investments. Critical voices were raised against planned infrastructure projects that would claim large green areas and against plans to build more office space to attract international companies.

Yet, it was not until the end of the 90s, as the political economic climate changed in Sweden, movements articulated a resistance against neoliberalism. Ulf Stahre (2007: 142) points out the retrenchment policies implemented at the beginning of the decade as possible reasons for this shift. Cutbacks in the public sector lit a spark that now blazed into a big fire. The articulated opposition changed as well. It was the “new” urban policy, and its impact on the city that engaged movements (Stahre, 2007). Many new movements emerged around the turn of the century. One organization called ‘The Network against neoliberalism’ was formed in 1997. They hosted a number of demonstrations and seminars under slogans and banners, such as “*Take Back the City*”⁹, and *Against the market dictatorship*¹⁰ (ibid: 169). They were among the first in Sweden to address globalization issues and are today treated as forerunners of the anti-globalization movements that would grow strong in the early 21st century.

“*Stockholm not for sale*”¹¹ was another network that grew strong in the late 90s. This network consisted out of organizations located on the political left,

⁹ Original title: “Ta tillbaka staden”

¹⁰ Original title: “Mot marknadens diktatur!”

¹¹ Original title: “Stockholm inte till salu”

and mobilized against privatization of public sector and commodification of public space. They also conducted a number of demonstrations in the early 2000s demanding a stop to the increasing privatization of public housing companies, and public transport in Stockholm. They demanded that publicly owned companies', financed by tax money, should solely serve the interest of the citizens of Stockholm. These protests were not very fruitful as the operation of the public transportation in Stockholm was put on contract, divided among several private companies in 1996. Privatization and sales of former publicly owned rental apartments have also only increased the last 15 years in Stockholm (SvD, 2012-03-07). "*Stockholm not for sale*" did almost bring about a referendum regarding these two topics, but failed to meet the formal requirements that apply to the collection of signatures handed over to the city's political administration. It meant the end of the network. However, throughout the first decade of the 21st century, several unions and political organizations, often youth division of parliamentary parties, continued the struggle against privatization and profiting on welfare services (Stahre, 2007: 175).

Extra-parliamentary movements emerged as well in the late 90s. Young activists, inspired by the English "*Reclaim the Street – Earth First!*" movement, brought the same concept to Stockholm under the banner "*Reclaim the Streets Stockholm*" (Stahre, 2007: 225). Their impetus had its starting point in a critic against the commercialized city and the threats that come with the globalization finances. Thus, they wanted to reclaim the city from these economic powers and bring it back to the people. Reclaim the City attracted media attention due to the aggressive confrontations with police and vandalism that followed their so-called street parties. Reclaim the streets were dismissed as a group of youth rebellion, and was never treated as a serious movement in media or among the public. After a couple of arrangements, the movement died out in Stockholm (ibid: 227).

Million program neighborhoods: a new stage for urban movements in Sweden

The Swedish urban social movement scene changed dramatically during the 21st century. Movements primarily target austerity policies and mobilize around issues, such as, segregation and deprivation. Similarities to North American and other first world urban struggles are now easy to distinguish. Moreover, in contrast to the traditional urban connotation that took place in the central parts of the city, contemporary movements predominately operate in immigrant dense neighborhoods, in so-called 'million program neighborhoods'.

The million programs were since the beginning treated as a problem in the public debate. Huge modernistic concrete buildings erected in the Swedish urban landscape, profoundly contrasting the traditional Swedish small-scale neighborhoods perceived as safe and inviting environments. The Social democratic government launched The Million Program in 1964 as a cure for the housing shortage in the big cities of Sweden. During a ten-year period, 940 000 housing units were built. However, only 300 000 of them are still

remembered, usually depicted as inhuman and hostile concrete-neighborhoods. These new neighborhoods represent the modernity, and have been central objects of the Swedish segregation debate as long as they existed (Molina, 2012: 104). The million programs were since the beginning treated as a problem in the public debate. Huge modernistic concrete buildings erected in the Swedish urban landscape, profoundly contrasting the traditional Swedish small-scale neighborhoods perceived as safe and inviting environments. The Social democratic government launched The Million Program in 1964 as a cure for the housing shortage in the big cities of Sweden. During a ten-year period 940 000 housing units were built. However, only 300 000 of them are still remembered, usually depicted as inhuman and hostile concrete-neighborhoods. These new neighborhoods represent the modernity, and have been central objects of the Swedish segregation debate as long as they existed (Molina, 2012: 104).

Although the phenomenon of 'Gated Communities' is extremely rare in the Swedish housing market context, there is a subtle system of spatial division and differentiation, however without any visible or physical gates. The first level of spatial separation in the Swedish cities is created through housing policy instruments, particularly in terms of the physical separation between three dominant forms of tenancy - rental housing, tenant-owned condominiums and outright ownership. These forms are not only different in space but also represented by different types of buildings and building types. Rental housing areas, are predominately, occupied by apartment blocks while small houses occupy outright ownership areas. Tenant owned condominiums, are characterized by more mixed housing types. The division between neighborhoods because of class and ethnicity has become more or less permanent due to this housing structure (Andersson & Molina, 2003).

“...that the categories of outright ownership, tenant-owned condominiums and rental housing demonstrate a relatively clear spatial separation, and people of foreign background are concentrated in the so called Million Dwellings Program areas where rental housing is the most common form [...] Various forms of housing and forms of tenancy in particular are at the disposal of differing social groups. Despite everything, one of the paradoxes of Swedish housing policy is that it has experienced little success in living up to its objective of avoiding residential segregation...”

(Andersson & Molina, 2003: 266)

In the light of the above, Irene Molina (2012) highlights the power of discourses and deceptive mindsets. She argues that there is a clear and reoccurring message in society about modernity, class differences, and view on immigrants generated from the negative portraits of million program neighborhoods. These perceptions have been developed and enhanced by the most influential voices in the segregation debate, within and outside the academy. The mass media have a central role in spreading this view as they over time have showed a picture of the million programs, as anonymous

neighborhoods, and breeding grounds for social problems and criminality. One of the tabloids, *Expressen*, published several articles on this topic in the 60s and 70s. Headlines, such as “New built Slum”¹², or “Blast the high risers – Ghost towns in raped nature”¹³ reached the eyes of the public (Wirtén, 2010: 127).

Three decades later the debate has shifted. In the report "Million Programs and media perceptions of people and neighborhoods" ¹⁴the authors have gone through newspapers' coverage of the million program from the mid-60s. The most noticeable finding was how the problem articulation shifted, from being a Swedish-, to become an immigrant problem.

A new feature has followed the stigmatization of million program neighborhoods; it is the "sexualization" of places and people. The sexualization entails made up constructions of, for example, patriarchal enclaves, unsafe environments, dangerous rapists, sexually attractive men and women, oppressed women or patriarchal and unequal male.

The combined racialization and negative sexualization that we experience million program neighborhoods is part of the vicious circle that maintains segregation. Images where these areas are being described as the cause of segregation, and the following problems, complete the anti-modernist portrait of these neighborhoods as hostile and inhuman environments. This stigmatization, which is a fruit from the cultural racist discourse, helps to strengthen the mental segregation between different groups in Sweden. Some neighborhoods, so stigmatized that it is enough just to say their names in order for people to make negative associations, and generate a set of biased images about crime, conflict and just disorder in general. The mass media have a central role in spreading these images and prejudices. Residents of million program neighborhoods, especially the youth, described in terms of gangs and immigrant groups. Thus, an individual who lives in a million program neighborhood is labeled by its physical appearance. In the same way, the physical construction of the million programs is characterized by the people living there. In other words, they are hard to detach from each other. Together they involuntarily represent the modern residential segregation of the Swedish housing market, and the mass media are effective mediators- and creative directors, of this discourse (ibid, 2012)

Contending that residents of million program neighborhoods were earlier treated as victims of unfriendly modernistic housing policies, Irene Molina argues that these neighborhoods, are today, depicted as immigrant dense areas, problem areas or deprived areas. Consequently, residents in million program neighborhoods are no victims but instead treated as the source of the problem. The discursive power is palpable as the debate disregards the existence of other equally segregated areas; neighborhoods that represent

¹²Original title: "Nybyggd Slum"

¹³Original title: "Spräng höghusen – spöktäder i våldtagen natur"

¹⁴Original title: "Miljonprogram och media- föreställningar om människor och förorter"

another social stratum predominately consisting of high-income earners and few households with non-European representation. Molina (2012) describes it as barriers between different parts of the urban landscape. Not illustrated by walls and fences surrounding neighborhoods, but by mental barriers and deceptive mindsets through which the division between 'us' and 'the others' is being enhanced.

Irene Molina (2012: 114) suggests that the development since the 90s has made it hard to separate the individual from the place, due to the power of discourses. Language is one of the key tools in the creation of discourses as it plays an important role when notions about others, processes and relationships are being developed, and entrenched in society. Equivalent to the postwar working class, immigrants are now embodying the discursive concept of 'the other', and just like then, the discourse has a cultural approach (Andersson & Molina 2003: 270). A stigmatization of million program neighborhoods has been ongoing since their construction, but, it was not until the 1990s million program neighborhoods became victims of the vocabulary of cultural racism. Cultural racism in the form of associations reminiscent of colonialism and the eugenics discourse in the early 20th century used to describe 'the others' in terms of people and places.

In his article *'Kampen finns där makten finns'* Håkan Thörn (2011) writes that new urban movements in the million program communicate a feeling of frustration with authorities, never before seen this clearly articulated in Sweden. This frustration can take different shapes, and besides mobilization organized by urban movements, has also been expressed as riots in some million program neighborhoods lately. The first urban riots arose in areas around Malmö, Gothenburg and Uppsala in 2009. Images of young rioters setting cars on fire and throwing stones at the police appeared like lightning from a clear sky in the Swedish society. Four years later, in May 2013, was the last time large-scale riots took place in Sweden, now in Husby, Stockholm. It went on for a week, and international press got interested this time as the suburbs in the Swedish capital were set on fire by young rebellions (Schierup, Ålund, & Kings 2014).

In their article *Readings on the Stockholm riots* Schierup et al. (2014), suggest that riots should be treated as unarticulated movements, symbolizing symptoms of a society in crises. They argue that, non-violent organizations such as 'The Megaphone' in Husby, and 'The Panthers' in Gothenburg, have emerged beyond the exposed violence, providing an alternative reading of the riots. In these readings, they articulate claims for democracy and inclusive citizenship for those oppressed and deprived social rights by neoliberal urban policies. Members of these new urban social movements consist primarily of young people living in million program neighborhoods. Many of these movements have been active for several years already, but not acknowledge. However, their legitimacy increased as they attracted much media attention around the riots in 2013, and thus constituted the contemporary scene and trends of urban social movements in Sweden. Schierup et al. (2014: 4) call them "social justice movements."

SECOND MODEL OF ANALYSIS: Three Pillars of Simultaneousness

Lisa Kings dissertation 'In defense of the local. Civil Society in the urban periphery' (2011) is one of the better contributions on organized civil society in Sweden. She conducted her dissertation studying the organized civil society in Rinkeby, and her point of departure takes off from the notion of parallel global restructuring processes of homogenization and fragmentation, identified by the critical urban tradition. She examines the cross-fertilization between urban and civil society and how it stands in relation to the restructuring, and 'rescaling' of global political-economic context the last decades wherein cities have gained an important role. Kings argues that the contemporary critical research on collective urban action tends to fail to incorporate both the homogenization and fragmentation in their analysis. She believes that global homogenization and 'new' movements are being given prominence in contemporary research, and thus the place specific context being neglected as a crucial factor.

"...within this line of thinking, the development tends to follow an adaptive model, whereby contemporary complex forms of identification are operating as a social base, networks have taken over the forms of organization, the global is the main level, and demands and visions are the content of the strategies"

(Kings 2011: 202)

Lisa Kings developed a model called three pillars of simultaneousness (figure 1), in which she does not contrast new movements against old forms of collective social movements, as the new adaptive development does, which she argues has both empirical and theoretical limitations. Kings provide a flexible and nuanced model by redesigning an already existing model which is used to distinguishing between traditional and new social movement. She does this by adding a third pillar as well as the horizontal processes of homogenization and fragmentation to it.

The third pillar categorizes daily life with a social base (what brings people together) constituted by complex forms of subordination as it is affected by the underlying oppressive and invisible fragmentation processes (2011: 41). She consults the micro-political research tradition (Scott 1991) when she argues that the spatial, political context is crucial for why and in which form urban activism emerges. She points out that it is as common misperception that people that engaged in urban movements are committed to improving the society at a large level. Organization in the civil sphere is in reality, less radical and revolutionary to its character than people believe. For those who live under precarious circumstances with failing social services and few opportunities to make their voice heard, individual or collective strategies are essential to developing and realize in order to survive and improve the daily life.

Activism must be examined in relation to possibilities, but also in relation to political restrictions, which can vary among countries, but also within cities.

The notion of power-balance on the local level is, therefore, important to understand. Neither can resistance be expected to be a universal practice. Furthermore, 'interaction' is the form that characterizes civil organization. The local sub-scale and the daily life orientation create specific conditions for collective action, why Kings emphasizes the importance of place specific context. Regardless the form of the organization some personal relation is required for people to help each other in their daily life, which is helped by the physical proximity in the neighborhood. Thus, the organizational forms are of secondary importance and vary from loose networks to a membership organization (Kings 2011: 42-43). Moreover, the addition of the horizontal processes of homogenization and fragmentation is necessary if we sought to understand the relation between global and local urban resistance as process of sub-scales rather than contrasts.

So, instead of favoring one distinct new form of mobilization Lisa Kings “...attempts to capture the relationship between stability and the processes of change” (2011: 203). With other words, she offers us a supplementary perspective on urban movement's development in the light of the relation of these three conceptualized pillars as they work simultaneously in time and space.

Lisa King's study provides an interesting and sharp model of analysis as she examines the relationship between the place specific context och the organization of the civil society. I will use her notions about the fragmentation of society, stability as well as processes of change, in my analysis as I examine why visible urban mobilization emerge in one neighborhood but not the other.

Figure 1. Three pillars of simultaneousness (Kings, 2011: 41)

Social base	Complex forms of subordination	Category	Complex forms of identification
Form	Interaction	Membership	Network
Content	Daily life	A vision	Multiple alternatives
Scale	Local	National	Global
Fragmentation		←————→	Homogenization

THE CASE: Husby and Rinkeby

In order to examine the impetus of urban movements and place specific conditions, interviews were carried out with representatives from urban movements, as well as non-active locals of Järva. Rinkeby and Husby, their shared identity as million program neighborhoods create breeding grounds for common struggles. Nevertheless, their place specific differences are sources for fragmentation. The following chapter begins with a short introduction of the respondents, and follows by a presentation of their perspectives on these issues.

The respondents and their different backgrounds

Representatives of local movements in Husby and Rinkeby

I met two representatives from local movements in Husby and Rinkeby and conducted one interview with each of them. Arne and Hagi are both well-known characters among residents in their neighborhoods, famous for their engagement in the local community development. They know each other well, and Arne was the one who recommended me to take contact with Hagi.

Arne Johansson moved to Husby in 1976. He is one of the front figures of Nätverket for Järva framtid [The Network]. It is a protest movement, formed in 2007, by locals against the authorities' plans to renovate the housing stock in Husby. Arne calls himself for a left-wing activist and is a member of the Socialist Justice Party (Rättvisepartiet Socialisterna), as well as editor of the leftwing newspaper *Offensiv*. Besides all of this, he is also the Chairman of the neighborhood council of northern Järva, which is an extension of The Network, and has come to replace The Network as the most important domain lately. The objective of the neighborhood council is to gather as many local associations as possible in order to present a collective force for the authorities.

Mohamed Hagi Farah came to Sweden from Somalia 25 years ago and is a resident of Rinkeby since 15 years back. He is a member of the Future committee of Rinkeby, a compound of local organizations active in Rinkeby. The Committee is equivalent to The Network in Husby and consists of about 20-30 local associations. Cultural associations, sports clubs, work together with the church and representatives from the local mosque. The objective of the Committee is to work together in order to improve the neighborhood, as well as improve the cooperation between the associations and their relationship with the authorities. Hagi is predominately engaged in questions regarding the school and youth. He is a member of the Parental Alliance that gathers around thirty parents from all neighborhoods around Järvafältet. They organize homework assistance, monitor performance in school, and try to influence local politicians, as well as prevent drug use among youth and overcrowded housing. Moreover, Hagi works as a citizen host (medborgarvärd) in Husby and is a front figure in the local Somalian society.

Locals - first generation million program residents

I carried out a focus group interview with four childhood friends. Sakil, Tashnif, Sadid and Fehmi grew up together in the 90s, in the neighborhoods around Järva. These four friends represent stereotypical so-called second-generation Swedes and "first generation million program residents". Meaning, individuals raised in million program neighborhoods by immigrant parents. None of the participants are members of any local urban social movements, but they are all members of By LTG, a non-formal group of friends primarily from million program neighborhoods in Stockholm. By LTG, arranges happenings and originates from the thought that too many people are missing out on this amazing gift called life by focusing too much on their hardships; hence the name: Life's Too Good.

Sakil Hossain grew up in Rinkeby and was a resident for 26 years before he moved in January 2014. He is an entrepreneur interested in the culture of the first generation million program kids in Sweden. Sakil has a dream of reviving the Rinkeby Festival just one more time to show how much love and power Rinkeby has to offer the rest of Sweden.

Sadid Hossain grew up in Husby and lived there until 2013 before he moved to Kista. He is a public officer at The Swedish Social Insurance Agency and a member of the Swedish social democratic party. He is interested in local community development questions especially regarding the low degree of election participation in immigrant dense neighborhoods.

Tashnif Ali grew up in Tensta. He is still a resident and an entrepreneur who tries his best to highlight the capacity of million program residents, by e.g. arranging workshops on youth employment issues. Tashnif is convinced that a positive change can only be achieved if it incorporates, and is driven by the residents of the million program.

Fehmi Demirtas grew up in Rinkeby and still a resident. He works as a student assistant at a primary school in Stockholm. Fehmi is concerned about the recent year's development in his neighborhood, but like the others in the group he rather focuses on the positive aspects and opportunities. All he wishes for is that Rinkeby would retrieve some of that love it once had.

Mistrust against the authorities

Arne Johansson on the question: who they are fighting against?

"It's partly the politicians in the City Hall and the local politicians. And it is Svenska Bostäder as well as other property owners, and we will, of course, have much to do with authorities concerning educational matters in the future."

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Both Hagi Farah and Arne Johansson identify local authorities as common opponents. Hagi Farah perceives the local politicians as the greatest barrier to democratic development in Rinkeby.

The changed relationship between residents and local authorities in Rinkeby can be derived to the district reform conducted in 2006. After the district reform, Rinkeby does not any longer constitute an own administrative district but is instead, as mentioned in the case description, a part of a larger district named Rinkeby-Kista. With the district reform, Rinkeby lost their autonomy in terms of own political board and district administration. Rinkeby was Stockholm's smallest district with about 15 000 inhabitants but became a part of the district with nearly 45.000 residents. Thus for obvious reasons, the distance between the resident of Rinkeby and officials, as well as decision makers, have increased. Moreover, in the wake of this reform, the district administration, The Swedish Social Insurance Agency's local office, as well as the Employment agency moved. Altogether, this means that the area lost some of its largest employers, which have affected the commercial service selection in Rinkeby negatively.

"Politicians constantly decide on school reforms above our heads, they never consult the citizens /.../ and now the Social insurance agency, an employment agency, and the district administrations moved from Rinkeby. How are we supposed to feel optimism for the future now?"

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

Järvalyftet: the beginning of many struggles

“People still live there but are poorer.”
(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Over the years, several projects have been initiated in the neighborhoods around Järva. "Järvalyftet," initiated by the City of Stockholm in 2007, is the largest one so far. The overall objectives of the project are:

- Good housing and a more varied urban environment
- Improved education and language teaching
- More jobs and enterprise
- Everyday safety and security

Järvalyftet has gained much media attention over the last years. Many critical voices have targeted the poor transparency and lack of involvement of the local community in these interventions. For example, Järvalyftet includes the renovation of more than 3000 apartments, which is about 78 percent of the entire housing stock in Husby (Westing, 2011).

In contrast to what Svenska Bostäder, the public housing Company, would have hoped for, the consultation process preceding the renovations have been heavily questioned. They have been criticized both by the tenants and their local association, but also by the general public. The poor consultation process has left many tenants with the feeling that they have no impact on their housing situation and that professionals are taking decisions over their head (Westin, 2011).

Looking back at the situation that emerged in late 2007, Arne Johansson explains that the planned renovation was the reason The Network came alive in the first place. The Network was formed shortly after the announcement that the renovations would mean a 70 percent rent-increase for a four-room apartment in Husby. A demonstration gathering 500 people followed and got plenty of media attention. Cooperation between The Network and the tenants association was initiated at this point. It did not take more than six months (in March 2008) before the city of Stockholm decided to replace the responsible commissioner, as well as the project leader for Järvalyftet. Moreover, the chief executive officer of Svenska Bostäder was also replaced. Thus, it meant a total retake of the whole project. The new commissioner promised that no demolitions would be conducted without acceptance from tenants. He also promised affordable rent-increases. 18 months of negotiations followed between SVB and the tenants association. The final agreement is based on three levels of renovations that tenants can choose from. In practice, the negotiations resulted in just one level, the cheapest. However, it is also very extensive and implies a monthly rent-increase of 20 percent, which equals about 1000kr.

The gap between the City of Stockholm, Svenska Bostäder and the residents of Husby has also increased since Järvalyftet was initiated 2007 according to

Arne Johansson. The planned renovations in 2007/ 2008 were the beginning of a long journey consisting of many struggles between local movements and the authorities.

"Our campaigns have varied. There have been many battles between the authorities and us. Obviously, it started with housing issues. We raised many questions regarding the substantial renovations, and unfair taxation of rental apartments [...] In 2010 things start to happen again. The public health center moved from Husby. It did not take longer than a month, before a private medical center opened in the same premises, which had been dismissed as useless by the previous owner...people react on this."

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Media reports about an ongoing occupation in Husby January 2012. One newspaper published following headline:

"About 70 people are occupying the art center, Husby Träff, in Husby since last Sunday, protesting against a planned relocation."

(Stockholms Fria, 2012-01-19)

The new location mentioned in the article was a former local pub in Husby, which lays on the same square as Husby Träff, the facilities are however much smaller. In the same article, we can read that the leader of the conservative party in Kista, Bo Sundin, blames Arne Johansson for the occupation.

"This is a pure political campaign by the Socialist Justice Party. It is Arne Johansson from the Justice Party who is behind this."

(Bo Sundin (M), Stadsdelsråd i Kista-Rinkeby)

Arne does not share this picture. According to him The Network was only supporting the events.

"The public housing Company [Svenska Bostäder] decided to transform facilities used by local organizations into offices instead. At the same time, they decided to close the local pub. This lead to a new crisis in Husby with the consequence that Husby Träff gets occupied by citizens and The Megaphone, supported by The network"

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

A representative from the Red Cross, active in Husby, confirms this picture, and explains it was citizens of Husby, who occupied the meeting point, not any single political party (Stockholms Fria, 2012-01-19).

One of the participants in the occupation says that the events must be seen in a bigger picture, which entails an allocation of a wide range of services Husby lately. The social insurance agency, postal and bank services have all been moved, and now the school is also threatened. The occupation is a way to demand a more democratic and participatory planning procedure in Husby, where the locals can be part of the decision process. In the negotiations that took place, the occupants presented four demands (Stockholms Fria, 2012-01-19. Authors translation):

- 1) Husby Träff remains in the existing premises
- 2) Husby Träff should be funded by the City of Stockholm
- 3) Stop the retrenchments in Husby and in the areas surrounding Järvafältet
- 4) Establish a local steering committee consisting of local representatives in Järva that holds veto-possibility regarding political decisions affecting these neighborhoods.

The negotiations failed. The City of Stockholm and Svenska Bostäder did not agree with any of the demands. Eventually, Husby Träff was relocated to smaller and more expensive facilities.

"We were forced to move to smaller localities, where the old pub used to be. Thus, we lost both the meeting point and the only pub in the neighborhood."

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

New protest followed the Husby Träff events, as the City tried to implement the structural plan. The structural plan is a great part of Järvalyftet as it encompasses huge changes in the physical environment.

"The last major battle before the riots in 2013 concerned the structural plan. They wanted to demolish the footbridges, and even out the height differences between them, and the streets. This is crazy. The existing traffic separation is very popular among us who live here. It creates a safe traffic environment, but instead the architects want to have "exciting" meetings between cars and people[...]They Tried to enforce the demolition of the footbridges secretly, but members of The Megaphone "got wind of" an information meeting, and went there. This prompted new protests; soup kitchens were placed on the bridges, and eventually, after many turns, the politicians stopped the planned demolitions. The footbridges are constant, and the whole structural plan, which included several radical physical interventions, is put on ice. Thus, in doing so, the public school building (Dalhögskolan) was also rescued."

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Dispossession by non-involvement: a cry for participation

There are many advantages to invite the public to participate as James L. Creighton argues in his book *The Public Participation Handbook*. A public participation process improves the quality of decisions in many ways. Involving the public maintains the credibility and legitimacy of authorities and agencies that has the mandate to implement decisions, which in turn means that public participation is a good way to avoid tough confrontation. Altogether the greatest advantage of a successful public participatory process is that the process becomes smooth and democratic but also cost and time saving. When decisions are being taken under consensus, the implementation tends go smoothly without any bigger appeal cases (Creighton, 2005: 18-19).

Järvalyftet is based on the strategy named 'Vision Järva 2030'. In this document The City of Stockholm emphasizes the importance of involving locals in the planning and claims that a participatory process preceded the implementation of Järvalyftet. It says:

“Järva is an area that presents many challenges. Far too many people have no job to go to. Children and young people need more education opportunities. Furthermore, the homes that were built during the 1960s and 70s are in need of renovation. Vision Järva 2030 presents ideas on how to develop the neighbourhoods around Järvafältet. Vision Järva 2030 has emerged from intensive discussions involving all the local stakeholders: politicians, government administrations, entrepreneurs, clubs and associations, as well as countless Järva residents”

(Vision Järva2030)

However, this description is not shared by everyone...

“I will tell you what Järvalyftet is. We handed in many suggestions when it was introduced. We encouraged people to contribute with their dreams and visions. Everyone contributed: moms, dads, children and grandmothers, attended the dialog. They received thousands of suggestions! What happened? Nothing! The proposals ended up in the closet. We never asked for any footbridges to be demolished, or for new markets to be opened in Familjebostäders house. We have never asked for any of it, but they will decide what is best for me, they decide what I want. The city administration undermines us all the time and that is the fundamental principle that we are tired of”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

As in Hubsy, there is a Structural Plan for Rinkeby. The level of impact is huge in Rinkeby as well. It entails, for example, the establishment of a new

vivid shopping street (referred to as 'the new markets'). This shopping street will be built in the ground floors of apartment buildings owned by Familjebostäder, which is another public housing Company (Stockholms stad, 2011). However, the difference between Husby and Rinkeby is that, whilst it was being pulled back, and put on ice Husby due to protest among the locals, it is being fully implemented in Rinkeby.

Moreover, the dialog that Hagi refers to is the Järva Dialog¹⁵ (In Swedish, Järvadialogen). It was initiated when protests were held against the renovation of apartments in Husby, and the City of Stockholm as well as Svenska Bostäder, were criticized for enforcing a none-democratic procedure. In the Vision Järva 2030, this Järva Dialog is referred to as the involvement of "countless residents". However, it has created a lot of controversy among participants since the authorities are accused, once again, of not paying attention to the needs and wishes of the locals.

Arne Johansson took part of this dialog in Husby and was as disappointed as Hagi Farah.

"At one point they arranged a few sessions and received 30,000 proposals from locals. They had exhibitions. We were encouraged to put red or green patches on the map depending on if we liked the place or not. They also engaged architects who hold tours with people here. We got to share our opinions about the outdoor environment in Husby, which was good. But, there has not been any followup, it has not even been compiled. Instead, the structural plan suddenly pops up from nowhere, out of the blue. [And] I am sure that none of the 30,000 proposals received during the dialog proposed any demolishing of footbridges [...] Thus the irony was total when we read in the local newspaper a few weeks ago that the Järva Dialogue was promoted at a UN conference as a great example of citizen dialogue."

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Another aspect on the involvement of locals is that although the project has been going on for about six years, the majority of the respondents in the focus group cannot define what Järvalyftet is. They did not even know they were entitled to participate in the planning process.

"I have heard of it; there are plenty of signs everywhere; one is located down at the gas station. It says Järvalyftet and something like 7800 housing units. That is it. Otherwise, I have no idea."

(Fehmi Demirtas, 2014)

All of the respondents in the focus group know that Järvalyftet exists, that it is a project and that their neighborhoods are somehow a part of it. After

¹⁵ Järvadialogen: <http://www.jarvadialogen.se/om-jarvadialogen>

some discussions, Tashnif Ali and Sakil Hossain try to identify some projects that they have seen, or heard about that might be part of Järvalyftet. Seen to the theme of their discussion, they relate to Järvalyftet as physical interventions. However, on a direct question Sakil Hossain is very clear:

“What is Järvalyftet? No idea actually.”
(Sakil Hossain, 2014)

Sadid Hossain is the only respondent that knows more about Järvalyftet. He belongs to the more critically oriented group of people. He is convinced that Järvalyftet is a state-led gentrification, a so-called renoviction¹⁶. He argues that the city neglects the current resident as their only objective is added economic value. It will be carried out by renovations of the housing stock and increased rents, which will significantly increase the risk of displacing existing residents.

“It is bullshit. They must have the best salesmen in Sweden contracted on this assignment. We will lift Järva, and it is going to be attractive, was the message. Obviously, that is certainly the goal. But attractive for whom? Järva is dam strategically located. Close to the inner city, good public transport connections, especially the metro. We have everything here. However, we have a large migration to Stockholm, and you do not know where to place people. The easiest is to displace the poor. Move them to other neighborhoods located in the further periphery, outside the city. That is probably the thought behind it all...because I mean, the rent increases that follows. People can barely afford to pay the rent here today. And If the rents gets increased by 20-30% each month...that is tough [...] they claim that they have engaged local associations in Järvalyftet, but there are no results. They say they want to create an idyll, but I do not see it.”

(Sadid Hossain, 2014)

The respondents perceive the implementation of Järvalyftet differently than the City of Stockholm. Their view on the involvement of locals clearly stands in a clear contrast to what is stated in the Vision for Järva 2030. Fehmi Demirtas particularly emphasizes the lack of information and active involvement of locals. He is aware of the fact that all blueprints and strategies are available online. However, he does not think that is enough, because, if he does not know what he is looking for, it is impossible to search for it. The information on the signs attached to buildings does not reveal anything about economic impacts on the individual household. It

¹⁶ Renoviction, Coined by Heather Pawsey in Vancouver, means the eviction of tenants resulting from a planned renovation of their apartment building. Source: <http://sv.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=renoviction>

should be mandatory for authorities to have a much more outreaching approach towards the resident, and ensure that everyone affected by Järvalyftet are aware of the personal impact. They should also make sure that everyone is aware of their possibilities to participate in the planning process. He compares the lack of information with teaching in school. No one expect the student just to pick up a book and look for random information; it is the teachers' responsibility to provide students with questions (Demirtas, 2014). Tashnif Ali argues in line with Fehmi and finds it unfair to put the whole responsibility on the individual.

“Politicians and officials who work and decide in these questions have no incentive to involve locals. Their incentive is to pursue their questions and get further in the process as fast as possible, which is a crucial problem. Because if it is more or less beneficial for them, not to involve anyone, and have closed processes...well then maybe you work against open processes. And I think that is our biggest obstacle. The responsibility to find information is being put on each, instead of the other way around; it should be the responsibility of society to involve people.”

(Tashnif Ali, 2014)

Arne Johansson explains that The Network has approached the politicians a number of times with the suggestion that it would be good to establish a reference group among interested citizens. Create a channel, through which locals can share their opinions and thoughts about suggested plans. However, they have not received any response on that matter yet, and sadly, it does not seem like Arne is expecting any.

A shared demand for better schools and more jobs

Since the beginning of 1990s, both social conditions and the political context in Sweden changed dramatically. A neoliberalization of the society was introduced as austerity policies followed the recession in the early 1990s. Unemployment numbers skyrocketed to levels unseen in Sweden since the 1930 and the great depression. The whole society was suffering. However, some suffered more than others. Unemployment among foreign-born increased from 3, 5 percent to 24 percent between the years 1989-1993, which is high compared to the Swedish average, which increased from 1.5 percent to 8.1 during the same period. People born outside the EU, and their Swedish-born children suffered particularly hard on the Swedish labor market (Schierup, Hansen & Castles, 2006).

Roger Andersson (2010: 60) explains that this status describes above is, more or less, the prevalent condition in Sweden. Moreover, it is striking substantially hard on disadvantaged million program neighborhoods located around the big cities. Residents of these neighborhoods consist of a large amount recently immigrated and in general of many people with ethnic backgrounds outside Europe.

“Participation in the formal labor market is significantly lower in these areas than the Swedish average, or the average in the large cities, and the average income among those who do have work significantly lower”

(Schierup, Ålund, & Kings 2014: 9)

The employment rate in Husby is, for example, almost 24 percent lower than Stockholm average. What is also significant for disadvantage is that the majority of those who are employed hold low-income jobs. Moreover, the numbers of youth between 20-25 years old in these neighborhoods, who neither hold a job nor are occupied with studies, are normally double the national average which is 20 percent. In addition, Tapio Salonen (2012) presents in his work published by Safe the Children in 2012 that child poverty in Sweden is increasing (between 28-60 percent). Similar to unemployment, the highest numbers are to be distinguished in stigmatized million program areas. Also, the deregulation of the public school system that was initiated in the 90s has, by inviting private companies to speculate and make a profit on it, contributed to the “...widened gap in educational opportunities and school results, between high income areas, and deprived suburban areas” (Kornhall, 2013 Schierup, Ålund, & Kings 2014: 8).

Järvalyftet has as presented on p. 34, four objectives, two of them incorporate improved education and more jobs as well enterprises in the Järva area. When we discuss possible reasons and impetus for urban mobilization during the interviews, the respondents are unanimously disappointed regarding these two issues. They all stress how poor the school results are and that it is a palpable problem that there are so many unemployed residents in their neighborhoods.

Arne Johansson and Hagi Farah are both involved in questions concerning schools and jobs. The Network has according to Arne started to focus more on social questions after the riots in 2013. They initiated, for example, a new campaign demanding that the empty old school building, Dalhögskolan¹⁷, should be reopened as a youth community center. Since the facilities are in need of renovation, The Network sees big opportunities in employing young unemployed locals in this project. They contacted Fryshuset¹⁸, and they were interested in hosting activities and arranged necessary education programs for construction work.

¹⁷ Dalhögskolan was saved from being demolished when the structural plan was pulled back

¹⁸ Fryshuset is often referred to as the largest youth center in the world – but it is actually much more than that. Above all it is a vision based on the conviction that encouragement, confidence, responsibility and understanding are necessary in order to enable young people to develop their innate abilities and find their way into society/.../ Fryshuset runs several schools and programs for vocational training, seminars and conferences, courses in theatre, music, and sport as well as hosting events, concerts, parties and discotheques.” Source: www.fryshuset.se

“They will employ a number of young people. To begin with they will be trained in demolition, and then we will see if they succeed to design a construction training as well. So we [The Network] run this question and focus on the large group of young people who are unemployed, that lack sufficient education and work experience, and that already might have something in the criminal record and the bailiff. We believe that it is important to focus on this group. We would like to see some "second chance" programs that give them the upper secondary level degree, but also links to practical work...It is that kind of training programs we want...”

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Arne emphasizes that there are about two thousand unemployed youth in the whole Järva area that are on the edge of social exclusion and criminality. It is good that Fryshuset takes responsibility and offers this possibility to some young in Husby, but it is not enough. The city and the politicians have to do something as well. The public sector has a responsibility that they cannot ascribe to an actor from the third sector. Moreover, Arne sees big problems with the fact that Fryshuset wants to open a high school business in Dalhögskolan. Opening a school is a way to finance social projects and pay their rent, because it entails the actor money that is connected to each pupil. Arne is well aware of this dimension, but he is afraid that this solution would undermine, the already vulnerable public school in Husby (Johansson, 2014).

The opportunity of involving unemployed locals in Järvalyftet is great. Nevertheless, all respondents are dissatisfied with the outcome so far. Tashnif Ali questions the fact that no jobs are given to those who in the end will pay the rent increases. By that he also questions how much this project is “for” the locals, rather than and not aimed to gain others primarily. Sadid feels that the residents are unfairly treated compared to better-off neighborhoods, regarding policy decisions concerning tax deduction programs that he claims, favor rich people. The Swedish tax deduction program called ROT ¹⁹ does, for example, not apply on rental apartments, but does for condominiums. Hagi Farah argues in similar terms.

It is the largest renovation in history. It will cost five billion Swedish kronor. Five thousand apartments will be renovated, but our unemployed do not get a single job. At the same time, we [the tenants] are the ones who will pay for the rent increase. We have been waiting several years for renovations, and when it is time I will not even be entitled the same tax deductions (rotavdrag) as homeowners or condominium owners are entitled to. Also, moreover, our young people do not get jobs. It is a disaster; it is a fiasco.”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

¹⁹www.skatteverket.se/foretagorganisationer/skatter/rotrutarbete/vemharratttillrotavdrag.4.2ef18e6a125660db8b080002709.html

The big differences in education and work become extremely tangible in the close surrounding area. It is something Hagi perceives as a problem as well as something with great potential.

“In Swedish neighborhoods, you have good grades, you work and you vote. The relationship between them is clear. [...] we think that if we can recognize the problems, perhaps we could also acknowledge the potential. We have poverty, but we also have Kista. Besides the famous shopping mall, there are 50,000 highly skilled people working here. Erickson, IBM and many other large companies are located here, and thousands of students are studying here. How can it be like this? Two different worlds 2-3 kilometers apart. It is problematic, but at the same time I looked at what we have to offer. Their labor consists out of Indians and Chinese people.....so we knocked on the door to some of the companies and said that we have a workforce of tomorrow. In every class, in every school there are some thirty nationalities represented. What can they offer the companies? Expanded export opportunities of course! /.../ they say Hagi we can provide you some computers. However, I do not want computers. I want to have hundred places within in their business. Offer internships or summer job for a month so our children can try that world. It is enough to be an errand boy or something else that is simple, just to make them curious, attracted and find out what it takes to work here.”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

In addition, together with the Future commission for Rinkeby, Hagi Farah handed in a proposal to the local politicians on how unemployed youth in Rinkeby could be included in Järvalyftet. It was an idea similar to what Fryshuset is doing in Husby. They suggested that the municipality should hire young unemployed individuals who cannot handle secondary education, according to the so-called ‘Sigtuna-model’. That would mean a one-year employment divided on half time studies, and half time practical work. They even proposed that the old service building that stands empty in Rinkeby could be used in this purpose. It could be rebuilt by the young, and afterward they could live there in pairs. It would, according to Hagi Farah, in one year it lead to both a housing-, as well as a study career and a foothold in the labor market, for some of the young who are on the edge of social exclusion.

“Together with the Police, The Minister of Justice invests money in order to send more police officers here because they believe that we have three hundred young criminals here. However, we do not need more police officers; we need more jobs [...] sure fifty new police officers is great, but we need to employ two hundred young unemployed who are totally outside the societal system[...]we cannot just keep on and prosecute people. We need to try other alternatives.”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

In combination with low election participation and unemployment, Hagi perceives the school results as the biggest issue in Rinkeby and the main underlying source of many other problems. He stresses the important relation between the failing school and high unemployment numbers in Rinkeby in the public debate, and when he meets with local politicians. In line with Arne Johansson, he emphasizes the importance of focusing on both education and work, in a local context if social exclusion among youth is to be prevented. Hagi is concerned about the huge differences between schools in the neighborhoods of Järva and surrounding middle-class areas, located as he says, “on the Swedish side.” He presents a paper full of statistics on the amount of students that pass all subjects in the ninth grade in Stockholm. The figures speak for themselves. None of the Schools located in Rinkeby, Tensta and Hjulsta, show a better result than 50 percent while 90 percent of all ninth graders in Spånga²⁰ manage all subjects

In 2013, The Future Commission submitted a list of twelve demands to the local politicians (Stockholms stad, 2013). It was a diverse list that included both improvements in the physical environment, as well as social measures. They were successful with some of the demands, but when it came to school issues, they could not reach any common understanding. Hagi and the others wanted the city to invest in the local schools in order to ensure a high educational quality, but the politicians did not listen. Hagi among many others saw this as a reason to move their kids to schools in surrounding neighborhoods, and he blames the city for the close-down of five schools in the Järva area during the ten years period.

“...and then we thought, ok if they do not want to cooperate, then I can, as a parent, decide what to do. If they do not want to improve the school in Rinkeby, we move our children [...] and the kids we moved passed their grades in their new schools. In turn this resulted in the closure of five schools in Järva...not because there were no students, but because people moved their children from their own neighborhoods. The municipality must ask themselves why so many parents move their kids. But they do not. It is arrogant.”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

²⁰ Spånga is a neighborhood adjacent to Rinkeby, Tensta and Husby. See map on p. 12 for further geographical reference.

A transit City

Rinkeby is as well as Husby, characterized by a high proportion of residents with a foreign background. Those immigrant groups represented in Rinkeby over the years largely follows the different waves of labor migration and the recent refugee and family immigration to Sweden. Rinkeby has for many of its current, as well as former residents, been the first stop in Sweden. Moreover, Rinkeby can along with several other million program neighborhoods, be described as a transit location. These neighborhoods are characterized by a high in- and outflow of residents. In 2008, did for example 16 percent of the total population in Rinkeby leave the neighborhood (Lisa Kings 2011: 150).

The transit character is according to Hagi Farah a key barrier to reach stability among residents of Rinkeby. He argues that immigrants, who get established in the Swedish society, move from Rinkeby when they get a good job, and want to make a housing career. The remaining ones are the weak, unemployed and poor. After a couple of years the successful move and leaves a weak social capital behind, according to Hagi.

“Immigrants who arrive are homogeneous in the beginning. Some are academics and some are illiterate, but when they arrive they are equal. However, after five years in Sweden the differences between them becomes visible again, and for those who are doing well, Rinkeby is not enough. They want to move. Transit and they are gone.”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

Hagi refers a lot to the need of stability within the local community and perceives the transfer character as a big hinder for achieving that in Rinkeby. Moreover, he argues that these transit patterns stands in relation to the poor school results in Rinkeby.

“Families with students who perform well in school move their kids to an environment where other students also pass their grades. [And] those students who do not perform well stay in Rinkeby and get new classmates when the well performing ones leave. These new classmates might have even tougher or worse preconditions. For example, perhaps someone newly arrived in Sweden that do not master the Swedish language. Stability will never be achieved. If we compare Rinkeby with Spånga, their neighbors know each other. Their kids are growing up together, and they go with the same classmates throughout primary school. It is a healthy and advantageous stability. It is not like that here or in Tensta. They have “bombed” our schools with millions of kronor, but it has never been stable, people move.”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

Incoherence and fragmentation over scales

The global immigrant flows have also had an impact on the organized civil society in many million program neighborhoods, primarily characterized by the major immigrant groups that arrived Sweden from the 1960s until now. In the 70s, the Swedish government granted funds to Ethno-national organizations to enable them to maintain their “cultural heritage” (Kings 2011: 169). It resulted in the formation of many Ethno-national associations in both Husby and Rinkeby as well as many other million program neighborhoods. Only in the center of Rinkeby, there are Turkish, Greek and Pontic associations. What many of ethno-national associations have in common is that they were established in Rinkeby because a large proportion of their members were residents there, or in some adjacent neighborhood (Kings, 2011: 150).

The Swedish scholar Ulf Stahre (2007:223) portrays the generational contrast in the light of the increasing amount of Ethno-national organizations. In 1992, he interviews a woman, active in the community development in Rinkeby. She shares a picture of a flourishing civil society, constituted by many Ethno-national associations. It contributed to the positive and enjoyable multicultural atmosphere in Rinkeby. However, due to the high levels of in- and outflow of residents, members of these associations did not get rooted in Rinkeby. According to the lady, many immigrants were planning on returning to their home countries at some point. In her perception, their primary focus was therefore to preserve their cultures. Thus, their commitment to the neighborhood development was a secondary priority (Stahre 2007: 224). Lisa Kings picks up on this and suggests that the primary focus on developing the own association rather than a neighborhood can partly be described by the multi-cultural policies launched in the 70s. She reasons that the grants might have contributed to the strengthening of an “ethnic” preference, rather than the “neighborhood context” in the formations of-, and activities performed, by local organizations in Rinkeby (Kings, 2011: 169).

Sadid Hossain elaborates his thoughts on the generational differences and connects to Stahre and Kings above. He argues that second-generation immigrants are more conscious about their rights and possibilities to have an impact on the Swedish society, and therefore demand access to these rights to a greater extent than their parents. The second generation is less disconnected to the Swedish society as their parents are.

“...the first-generation immigrants were grateful. They came here, they were protected, they got a job and roof over their head...they were grateful. But the second-generation immigrants, most of us are Swedish citizen and we feel that this is our country, we will continue to live here and we want to make a difference. We have in comparison to our parents taken part of the Swedish system in another sense. [...]Our parents came here and then they were planning on going home again, back to their home countries one day. That is how they

were thinking, but we, or at least me, I have realized, I will stay here and that is why I want to influence this society. [And] that is the reason why I believe these new urban movements have emerged. Earlier we had cultural associations. These were formed to retain the Turkish identity, The Bengali identity and so on. But now, we are Swedes and we do not accept that people point their fingers and say that we are one way or another. They should not be left unchallenged. We have to share our picture, and say that we are also Swedes and that we also want to develop in this country and that we want you to respect us. They have simply created a voice that I think many young people in million program neighborhoods can recognize and identify themselves with...you want to be a part of the public debate...not only accept every decision made above your head”

(Sadid Hossain, 2014)

Moreover, Lisa Kings (2011: 152) study shows that an increased fragmentation between the old and new Ethno-national associations have occurred in recent years. It is particularly representatives from the older groups who show a negative attitude against new groups.

There has been a change in the population structure of Rinkeby, in which one ethnic group has become increasingly dominant. Although Rinkeby always been an area with a high proportion of residents with a foreign background, the spread between the different countries immigrant groups has been great. However, as a result of the recent migration patterns, this spread between different groups has decreased, and today about 30 percent of the residents in Rinkeby (in 2008) are born in Somalia. It makes Somalia the second biggest country of origin, after Sweden in Rinkeby. It can be compared to Husby, where the population structure is similar to the previous of Rinkeby. Hence, the balance between different immigrant groups is much more evident in Husby (Stockholms stad, 2014). This change in the balance has according to members of old local organizations in Rinkeby contributed negatively to the cohesion and solidarity among different local associations in the neighborhood. Some say that, there once was a Rinkeby Spirit, similar to the Husby Spirit, among locals engaged in the local community development, but that it does not exist anymore (Kings 2011: 152).

Ulf Stahre (2007: 220) compares the urban mobilization capacity in Husby with Rinkeby. He writes that it requires a significant affiliation to a place before people actively engage in it, and claims that Rinkeby lacks the ability to develop such strong ties to the residents. A symptom that Ulf argues can be derived to the transit character of the neighborhood. In comparison, he argues that many have lived in Husby long enough to perceive it as a home worth fighting for.

Hagi Farah compares Husby and Rinkeby and argues in line with Stahre that Husby is characterized by much more stability. People move from Rinkeby while Husby is residence for some who has lived there for 30 years. These

individuals are key characters that are important to have in your local community. They possess valuable experience and knowledge about the neighborhood development over the years. According to Hagi, Husby also has a greater mix of people and housing. No single immigrant group dominates in the community. Rinkebys housing stock consist of 100 percent rental units, which should be compared with Husby, where 22 percent of the housings stock is condominiums. The difference is not huge, but Hagi argues that it is important. According to him, all these factors contribute to an increased neighborliness. He suggests that all together, this is what distinguishes Husby from Rinkeby. Namely that there are plenty of people in Husby who have developed strong emotional ties to their neighborhood, which make them want to fight for it, as well as develop it. It goes through generations, and Husby becomes a breeding ground for youth organizations as The Megaphone.

“...there are more people in Husby that are engaged in the local community development. That is a crucial factor. There is also a greater mix of people in Husby, a greater integration /.../ there is a better balance between the different groups in Husby. There are no dominant groups. And there are also people who lived there for a long time. People move from Rinkeby, it is a problem for the neighborliness. New groups move in with their norms. It takes time to adapt. Even small things like learning how to share a laundry room with people takes time. There is no time to establish neighborliness. It's tough at the same time as it is fun with new people. But, since it's tough, people are moving. However, in Husby you have people who lived here for 20-30 years. They stayed and fought for their neighborhood. [And] so the old and the new generation find each other which leads to success stories like The Megaphone or The Network in Husby.

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

Continuing that topic, Arne Johansson agrees with Hagi Farah. He underlines the meaning of the subjective factor and emphasizes the importance of having people who take initiative when it is time to do so. According to Arne that is exactly what Husby possess, and what Rinkeby lacks. The urban resistance in Husby has been well articulated and to some extent successful compared to Rinkeby. Arne describes this as The Husby Spirit, which cannot be described as anything other than a willingness among residents, to fight for their neighborhood. He explains that when needed, Husby has an amazing ability to mobilize forces. Arne emphasizes the importance of The Husby Spirit, a feeling shared by many residents outside the movement context. It is based on a feeling of proudness connected to the notion that they (read: Husby) a number of times ben able to put themselves in respect of those in power. Arne does also stress the importance to have people who are willing to invest their free time in the organization of a movement. According to Arne, Husby has the privilege of housing key actors that have time, common objectives, and widespread

connections. Moreover, they have legitimacy within the local community, and thus can quickly rally people.

“We are a number of locals that have become aware of each other. We have been forced together because we had to fight together. It is an external pressure on Husby that has forced us to get to know each other. And I think that is a positive effect”

(Arne Johansson, 2014)

Hagi Farah continues...

“...there is a tradition in Husby where people are actively fighting for their area. They struggle over Husby farm and Akalla Village has going on for those last 30 years. That is what Husby has, the power to struggle. That is something we [Rinkeby] still do not have. People stayed in Husby and moved from Rinkeby. This has resulted in the growth of new flowers in Husby, like The Megaphone and struggles over health centers and the meeting point, as well as arrangements like ‘From Husby Square to Tahir Square’...”

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

However, although the protest movement in Husby has been quite successful, there are also barriers. The incoherence among groups in Rinkeby also has an effect on other sub-scales. Although Arne is very positive to The Future Committee of Rinkeby, he still misses the coherence between the Northern (Kista, Husby, Akalla), and Southern Järva (Rinkeby, Tensta, Hjulsta). He refers to the Neighborhood Council of Northern Järva and says that the initial ambition was to create a collective voice representing whole Järva. Discussions about alternative names for the organization that was more comprehensive were in the beginning. However, it failed due to a weak foothold in other neighborhoods. Instead, after discussion with Hagi Farah and The Future Committee of Rinkeby, they decided to start with the Northern Järva concept, and then develop their relationships with other neighborhoods and organizations over time.

Moreover, Arne points out that although it is called the Neighborhood Council of Northern Järva, they do not have any strong ties with Kista either, and that the participation is low in Akalla as well. Consequently, their activities are predominately located to Husby (Arne Johansson, 2014).

A new generation urban residents

According to Arne, the urban mobilization in Husby is still predominately run by an older generation. However, although he argues that it is hard to attract the youth organizations to participate in the regular community development meetings, he stresses how important it is to try. He emphasizes the significant difference it makes when more and more urban social movements representing the first generation million program residents arises as it has done lately.

Ulf Stahre (2007: 212) is another one who discusses the phenomena of the first-generation residents that grew up in million program neighborhoods, in his studies on an urban social movement called Husby United. Husby United was formed in 2004 and was one of the first urban movements that emerged in a million program neighborhood. Their first protests were held when the municipality decided to close the local gym which was used as a youth center. The gym was however only the tip of the iceberg. This protest evolved into a mobilization for urban resistance as unjustified increase of rents and retrenchment measures hit hard on the local community. They rallied around slogans such as, '*Husby Unite Ready to fight*', and '*We get sick; they get rich*'²¹, and '*No more rent increase*'²².

Stahre (2007: 214) writes that, although it is well known that these neighborhoods traditionally inhabit many local organizations that play a significant role in the community, these new movements contribute with new perspectives. They consist of first-generation residents that are born in the Million Program. Unlike their parents, the first-generation residents point out inequalities that characterize the place where they live. Hence, they initiated an urban mobilization trend which is still very much alive (Stahre 2007: 214).

One central theme in the focus group is the differences, between first and second generation immigrants, in their relationship to their neighborhoods. The relationship between ethnicity and group belonging is still strong. However, the respondents claim that the second-generation immigrants have, indifference to their parents, developed a strong affiliation to other million program residents and to their neighborhoods, rather than to their ethnic background. What connects them is a notion about a million program identity, a culture that they all share and can gather around. They have as first generation million program residents, developed a local patriotism to their neighborhoods.

²¹ Original title: "Vi blir sjuka dom blir rika"

²² Original title: "Inga fler hyreshöjningar"

“...nowadays our group identity is marked by the area we live. It is not that I am a Bengali and that I should just hang around with other Bengalis. Instead, we are all citizens of Rinkeby or citizens of Tensta...that is at least how I perceive it [...] I think it is because people from elsewhere always trash-talked us. When that happens, when outsiders say you are bad, and that you are this and that...you identify with others in the oppressed group. We [residents of the million program neighborhoods] have become a stronger unit because people dislike us”

(Sadid Hossain, 2014)

The million program identity is characterized by love and hate relationship. It is clearly that the respondents have strong ties to their neighborhoods. They take every chance they get to defend, and promote their areas. However, the reason why the need of doing that is so strong is clearly connected to how the respondents feel that their neighborhoods have been deprived by policies and mistreated by media. Sakil Hossain elaborates his thoughts about being a first generation million program resident and the need of challenging the dominating picture in media and general society with the help of social media.

“We are a little bit identity-less. People do not call us Swedes and we do not feel that we belong in our home countries either [...] the difference today is that we can make ourselves heard through social media. I mean Facebook...what is happening now was not possible ten years ago since the mass media had much more power. Today we are able to challenge that power with our own thoughts. We can raise our voices and point out that what media communicate is wrong [...]. There was this guy who walked around in Husby during the riots asking people if everything was ok, and filming at the same time. He showed a very calm environment, no action at all. At the same time the Swedish tabloids, Aftonbladet and Expressen, broadcast show a completely other picture of riots and violence. This polarization...I believe it is one reason why them [new social movements] emerge and become more visible. They provide an alternative portrait that people here can easily identify with”

(Sakil Hossain, 2014)

Hagi Farah is also hopeful. He believes that the first generation million program residents are unlike their parents equipped with more knowledge and stronger ties to the Swedish society, and Rinkeby, which gives them the power to claim their rights.

...we see how people are starting to care. First generation Rinkeby children that have graduated, studied at college and maybe become politicians or public officers come back and want to develop Rinkeby in ways their parents cannot. It makes me happy. Because they make demands, their parents cannot articulate..."

(Mohamed Hagi Farah, 2014)

Nevertheless, listening to Tashnif Ali, it all seems quite simple. It is part of human nature that people want to be able to influence their surroundings to the better. However, sometimes it just takes a generation before you possess that ability.

"One cannot expect anyone else than the residents to care wholeheartedly about these areas. And now, I would like to think that it is the first generation that was born here, and who manage the Swedish language without problems, that want to make the neighborhood where they come from better"

(Tashnif Ali, 2014)

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this thesis is to answer the overall research question formulated as *‘what are the factors of incoherence regarding the urban mobilization in Rinkeby and Husby?’* In order to be able to answer the main questions it was divided into the following sub-queries

- 1) *How does the Swedish ‘Million program’ correspond to the concept of ‘The Right to the City’?*
- 2) *What impact has the place-specific context on urban mobilization in Husby and Rinkeby?*

The empirical part of this thesis gives the reader an understanding on the nature of urban resistance, barriers as well as factors of success, in the neighborhoods of Husby and Rinkeby in the Northwest part of Stockholm. With a starting point in that notion, I would like to begin this discussion by revisiting Lefebvre’s notion about the right to urban life.

“In these difficult conditions, at the hearth of a society which cannot completely oppose them and yet obstruct them, rights which define civilization [...] find their way. These rights which are not well recognized, progressively become customary before being inscribed into formalized codes. They would change reality if they entered into social practice: right to work, to training, and education, to health, housing, leisure, to life. Among these rights in the making features the right to the city, not to the ancient city, but to urban life, to renewed centrality, to places of encounter and exchange, to life rhythms and time uses, enabling the full and complete usage of these moments and places...”

(Lefebvre, 1996; Schmid, 2012: 43)

This thesis took off in the notion that articulated urban resistance is more visible in Husby than Rinkeby. This perception is being confirmed both by Mohamed Hagi Farah and Arne Johansson. Hagi Farah’s description of Rinkeby as a neighborhood lacking enthusiasts who are prepared to fight for their neighborhood sharply contrasts the picture of mobilization power in Husby that stimulates the reinforcement of “The Husby Spirit”, shared by Arne Johansson.

The lack of mobilization capacity in Rinkeby can be explained by the fragmented nature of the organized civil society, a fragmentation that can be derived to immigration patterns and integration politics. The high in- and outflow mobilization among residents in Rinkeby is described in terms of “transit character” typical for million program neighborhoods. Both Hagi Farah and selected literature suggest that the “transit character” of Rinkeby leads to instability within the local community. Thus, the answer on the questions *‘what impact has the place-specific context on urban mobilization in Husby and Rinkeby?’* is that it is two-sided. The place specific context becomes a barrier in Rinkeby, whilst it is a success factor in Husby. However, adopting Lisa King’s idea of homogenization and fragmentation, I

suggest that the instability in Rinkeby is a place specific materialization of global neoliberal politics. More than “transit character”, the fragmentation within the civil society in Rinkeby is a result of austerity politics and commercialization of public goods that hit hard on school standards and unemployment levels in the neighborhood. Hence, the depriving nature of contemporary urban politics in Husby and Rinkeby become tangible when expressed in practice through Järvalyftet.

The planned renovations with following rent increases and the establishment of a new shopping street are good examples on ignorance. Järvalyftet is a project characterized by vague information and without any intention of involving the locals in any decision making. Every participation act carried out has been either bounded by law or initiated by the locals. The Authorities even neglect the possibility to involve locals concerning school issues, as well as how to fight the high levels of unemployment in the area although they are them who are mostly affected. It clearly illustrates how local authorities in Stockholm experience the residents of Järva as barriers rather than local assets and natural parts of the community development. Such behavior expressed by the authorities corresponds well with Irene Molina’s (2012) understanding about the million program discourse entailing a stigmatizing notion about the resident being the reason to many socio-economic challenges striking these neighborhoods.

Hence, although the resistance is articulated in different ways, and the outcomes vary, Hagi and Arne rally around the same issues, austerity policies and the privatization of public space. These are struggles that clearly corresponds with the two fault-lines presented by Margit Mayer; ‘the continuous commodification of the city’, and ‘the dismantling of the welfare system’. Furthermore, if one examines these struggles in the light of Lefebvre’s quote above, it is hard to separate the “urban” from the social dimensions in the context of million program neighborhoods. Therefore, I argue for the possibility to perceive contemporary urban resistance in Rinkeby and Husby as struggles over the right to urban life. Moreover, the urban dimensions is constituted by the social struggle taking place in a specific urban environment, but is also based on those factors which the social struggle emerge from.

Following up on this acknowledgment of different dimensions I believe it is suitable to add Lisa Kings understanding about sub-scales when investigating the relation between urban contention and the global political-economic situation, to this context. I also suggest that the processes of homogenization and fragmentation regarding urban resistance in Husby and Rinkeby are tightly connected to overall million program discourse, which I argue constitutes a body of homogenization. The notion of million program neighborhoods embodies so much more than just residential areas or another stop on the metro line. They are products of political measures and ideological beliefs that have created a stigmatizing discourse, which embodies much more than just the household. Poor school results and high employments numbers among their residents could be described as an effect of a higher threshold on the labor market for people with immigrant

background. Indeed, there are multiple explanations that might explain the substantive nature of the problem. However, the predominant explanatory models in society of rational economic character fail to explain the urban concentration of the problem. Therefore, I believe Irene Molina's notion about the stigmatizing million program discourse substantiated by years of process of segregation, combined with neoliberal politics being implemented since the 90s, have a higher explanatory value.

Does this make the residents of many million program neighborhoods eligible to appropriate 'The Right to the City'? I believe so. Struggles over basic needs and democratic rights, as well as ignorance by authorities in Rinkeby and Husby provide a good fundament for such claim. Supplemented by literature that covers societal structures regarding million program neighborhoods portraits a stigmatizing reality. Many groups are materially or legally deprived, or discontented with life in a way that their freedom is limited by the potential of economic growth. And thus, I suggest that a large proportion of million program residents fulfill the requirements needed to appropriate 'The Right to the City' (Marcuse, 2012). It is, of course, only a moral claim. But, nevertheless valuable in the sense that it distinguishes between those who are privileged, and those who are deprived and suppressed by the urban model of production. However, most of all, it is probably the most appropriate slogan ever been available for urban social movements to rally around.

Hence, the answer to the question '*how does the Swedish 'Million program' correspond to the concept of 'The Right to the City'?*' is that million program neighborhoods possess the prerequisites needed to appropriate Lefebvre's moral claim. However, a lack of acknowledgment and processes of place specific fragmentation still create barriers for them to do so. In that light, it is necessary to problematize Lefebvre's original meaning of the 'The Right to the City', which is it tightly affiliated to the working class, and the labor-market conflict. I believe Purcells (2006) interpretation of the concept is valuable in this context as he argues that challenging an urban development fueled by the market discipline is the fundamental connotation. But, he also stresses that it is as important in the contemporary city to comprehend the wide spectra of groups corresponding with the requirements needed to appropriate their rights. What unites them is diversity. Therefore, if urban policy based on fair redistribution ever going to be developed and legitimized by those in need of it we need to focus more on the "urban inhabitant" rather the working class.

If we take this in consideration as we examine the case of Husby and Rinkeby it is easy to fall back on homogenization processes, and thus the million program discourse. However, as Kings points out, we cannot allow ourselves to disregard the fragmentation on local levels, only because we identify processes of homogenization on a scale higher up. The case study does not only disclose fragmentation within the organized civil society in Rinkeby, but also entails a story about incoherence among neighborhoods. Although, there are a will and ambition, there are few collaborative actions taking place, contemporary mobilization in Järva is tightly connected to one

neighborhood, namely Husby. Furthermore, even though we can explain why the urban resistance in Husby is unique in comparison to surrounding neighborhoods, those explanations does not offer us any solutions on how to overcome the incoherence. Consequently, what David Harvey (2008) would call militant particularisms, urban movements in Rinkeby and Husby are rather concerned with place specific interest than engaged in trying to bridge differences. It counters the possibility to share and rally around same struggles. Nonetheless, there is one particular group within the wide range of urban inhabitants that I believe have the capability of bridging between groups and generations, and that is the first generation of million program residents. Sakil Hossain states that they are “identity-less”. That is an expressions of a feeling closely related to the stigmatizing million program discourse, a discourse that tightly connects the individual to the place (Molina, 2012). Thus, I suggest that the "identity-less-ness" also reveals another side of the story, that is, the common denominator with other first generational resident. Unlike their parents, they have developed a strong affiliation to other million program residents and to their neighborhoods, rather than to their ethnic background. They aspire to develop their areas, an aspiration illustrated by a general moral claim for an equitable development in all million program neighborhoods. In my understanding, this moral claim is opposing the stigmatizing outcomes of the million program discourse. This emotional attachment to a subjective notion about the million programs is shared by regular first generational residents, as well as expressed by youth organizations. I suggest it is a metaphysical concept built upon urban contrasts where the physical body, as well as social life, is what distinguishes million program neighborhoods from other areas. Many first-generation million program residents share an understating about a “unique” culture illustrated, by and within, their areas. And because of that, they are key agents to overcome militant particularism and fragmentation in a place specific context. Consequently, I believe that first-generation million program residents have the prerequisites necessary to bring about a social transfer. However, the remaining question that this thesis cannot answer is whether they will ever seize the window of opportunity to turn this mental agreement into practice.

Last, the answer to the main research question ‘*what are the factors of incoherence regarding the urban mobilization in Rinkeby and Husby?*’ is that multiple processes of fragmentation and homogenization stretching over different subscales have an impact on the articulated urban resistance in Rinkeby and Husby. This case study has identified some of them, as well as identified possible agents of change in the first generation of million program residents. However, it has only touched upon this topic. More research is needed in order to be able draw any greater conclusions about this generation’s capacity and capability, to claim their rights. Hence, I suggest that this is an interesting field for further research. Traditional research has mainly focused on particular minorities among youth in the million programs, e.g. urban culture groups, and now lately also urban movements and riots. Thus, the majority of first generation million program residents are not well described in research. Therefore, as a continuation on this thesis I find it particularly important to continue the examination of the

relationship between a broader group of first generation million program residents and their neighborhoods.

Conclusion

Conclusively, this thesis is built upon two parallel storylines. First, one about the million program discourse, and how their residents shaped by it, fulfills the requirements to demand 'The Right to the City.' Secondly, one about the place specific context and how that stands in relation to a fragmented civil society and lack of mobilization. The case study is limited to examine Husby and Rinkeby, and thus it is not possible to generalize findings in any larger extent. However, I believe that the main empirical part consisting of the answers received from the interviews, supported by the theory presented, clearly shows how these two storylines are intertwined. Moreover, it shows how homogenization and fragmentation can be two sides of the same coin in a place specific context. Nevertheless, the most valuable in this study is the insight in how one part of reality appears to be, an insight shared by the respondents.

REFERENCES

Literature

Andersson, R. et. al., *Contextualising ethnic residential segregation in Sweden: welfare, housing and immigration-related politics*. Research report. Helsinki: Helsinki University, 2010.

Andersson, R. & Molina, I. (2003). *Racialization and Migration in Urban Segregation Processes. Key issues for critical geographers*. In Öhman, Jan & Simonsen, Kirsten (Eds) "*Voices from the North - New Trends in Nordic Human Geography*". Ashgate.

Brenner, N. (2009). *What is Critical Theory?* City 2009, Vol. 13. London and New York: Routledge

Castells, M. (1977). *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*. London: Edward Arnold.

Castells, M. 1983. *The City and the Grass-roots: A Cross-cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. London: Edward Arnold.

Creighton, J. (2005). *The Public Participation Handbook: Making Better Decisions Through Citizen Involvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

David L., Morgan (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. pp. 816–817.

Ericsson, U., Molina, I. & Ristilampi, P. (2000). *Miljonprogram och media. Föreställningar om människor och förorter*. Riksantikvarieämbetet och Integrationsverket.

Friedmann, J. (2002). *The prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Harvey, D. (1973). *Social Justice and the City*. London: E. Arnold.

Harvey, D. (1989). *The Urban Experience*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harvey, D. (1989). *From managerialism to entrepreneurialism. The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism*. *Grafiska Annaler*, 71B, 3-17.

Harvey, D. (2008). "*The Right to the City*". *New Left Review* Vol. 53. pp. 23–40.

- Jackson, P. (2011). *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge
- Kings, L. (2011). *Till det lokalas försvar. CIVILSAMHÄLLET I DEN URBANA PERIFERIN*. Lund: Arkiv förlag
- Kornhall, P. (2013) *Barnexperimentet. Svensk skola i fritt fall*. Stockholm: Leopard förlag
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The urban Revolution*. Original title: *La révolution urbaine (1970)*. Translated by Bononno, Robert. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marcuse, P. (2012). *Whose right(s) to what city?* In Brenner, N. (eds.), Marcuse, P. (eds.) & Mayer, M. (eds.) *Cities for people not for profit. Critical urban theory and the right to the City*. London and New York: Routledge
- Mayer, M. (2009) *The 'Right to the City' in the context of shifting mottos of urban social movements*. *City 2009, Vol. 13*. London and New York: Routledge
- Mayer, M (2012). *Social Movements in Urban Politics: Trends in Research and Practice*. In John, P. (eds.), Mossberger, K. (eds.), Clarke, E. (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mayer, M. (2013). *First world urban activism. Beyond austerity urbanism and creative city*. *City, 2013. vol. 17*. London and New York: Routledge
- Molina, I. (2005). *Miljonprogrammet och förortens rasifiering*. I Broms
- Salonen, T. (2008). *Barnfattigdomen i Sverige. Årsrapport 2008*. Stockholm: Rädda barnen.
- Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City. New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Also cited in: '*Local actors in Global Politics*'. *Current Sociology* 52: 649-670
- Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and Social Science*. London: Sage Publications.
- Schierup, C., Hansen, P. & Castles, S. (2006). *Migration, Citizenship and the European Welfare State. A European Dilemma*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Schierup, C., Ålund, A. & Kings, L. (2014) *Reading the Stockholm riots - a moment for social justice?* *RACE & CLASS*, (55), 3. UK and US: Sage Publications

Sharan, M. (1994). *Fallstudien som forskningsmetod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Schmid, C. (2012) *Henri Lefebvre, the right to the city, and the new metropolitan mainstream*. In Brenner, N. (eds.), Marcuse, P. (eds). & Mayer, M. (eds.) *Cities for people not for profit. Critical urban theory and the right to the City*. London and New York: Routledge

Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London and New York: Routledge

Stahre, U. (2007). *Den globala staden - Stockholms nutida stadsomvandling och social rörelser*. Stockholm: Bokförlaget Atlas

Stockholm stad. (1977). *Cityplan 1977: förslag till generalplan för Stockholms city*. Stockholm: Stockholms stadsbyggnadskontor.

Stockholms stad (2007). *Järva 2030. A future vision becomes reality*. Stadsledningskontoret, Stadshuset.

Stockholms stad. (2011). *Rinkeby allé. Förslag till strukturplan*. Stadsbyggnadskontoret Stockholm. Dnr 2011-15423.

Stockholm stad. (2013). *Förslag från Rinkeby framtidskommitté. Tjänsteutlåtande. Rinkeby-Kista stadsdelsförvaltning*. Dnr 1.6.-480-2013

Stockholms stad. (2014). *Rinkeby-Kista. Stadsdelsområdet, Stadsdelsnämnden, Stadsdelsförvaltningen*. Rinkeby-Kista stadsdelförvaltning

Wessel, O. (red.), Tunström, M. (red.), & Bradley, K. (red.). *'Bor vi i samma stad. Om stadsutveckling, mångfald och rättvisa'*. Sverige: Pocky.

Purcell, M. (2002). *Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the Inhabitant*. *GeoJournal Vol. 58*, 99–108, 2002.

Thörn, H. (2011) *Kampen finns där makten finns*. *Arena 2011, Vol.6*.

Thörn, H. (2013). *Stad i rörelse. Stadsomvandlingen och striderna om Haga och Christiania*. Sverige: Bokförlaget Atlas.

Wacquant, L. (2004). *Critical Thought as Solvent of Doxa*. *Constellations Vol. 11, Nr. 1, s. 97-101*. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Westin, S. (2011). *"...men vart ska ni då ta vägen?" Ombyggnation ur hyresgästernas perspektiv*. Arbetsrapport/Working Paper No. 57, pp. 1-78, Uppsala University.

Wirtén, P. (2010). *Där jag kommer ifrån. Kriget mot förorten*. Sverige: Albert Bonniers Förlag

Yin, R., (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Applied Social Research Methods Series. Vol. 5. London: Sage Publications.

News articles

”Celsings hus en upprepning av slottet”. Tomas Lewan, SvD kultur, 2010-10-02. Source: http://www.svd.se/kultur/understrecket/celsings-hus-en-upprepning-av-slottet_5435789.svd, Retrieved: 2014-11-13

”Allmännyttan säljer ut i Stockholm”, SvD Nyheter, 2012-03-07. Source: http://www.svd.se/nyheter/stockholm/allmannyttan-saljer-ut-i-stockholm_6908049.svd, Retrieved: 2014-11-13

”Husby träff ockuperat”, Stockholms Fria, 2012-01-19. Source: <http://www.stockholmsfria.se/artikel/91492>, Retrieved: 2014-11-13

Oral sources

Individual interviews

Arne Johansson, May 14, 2014, YAS Café in Hubsy

Mohamed Hagi Farah, May 24, 2014, Medborgarvårdskontoret, in Husby

Focus Group (Bengaliska föreningen in Tensta, May 25, 2014)

Fehmi Demirtas

Sakil Hossain

Sadid Hossain

Tashnif Ali

APPENDIX

Interview guide

All interviews held were semi-structured. Hence, questions and topics were adjusted while the interviews were carried out, to the given particular situation. However, below follows the interview guide used as a base during the interviews.

Specific questions: Individual interviews

- Vem är du?
- Vad gör du/ ni?
- Vad är Nätverket för Järvas Framtid/ Rinkebys Framtidskommitté?
- Vad är er främsta drivkraft?
- Vilken målgrupp arbetar ni för?
- Har ni någon moståndare, vem i så fall?
- Om du fick sätta en etikett på er, vad skulle det stå?
- Finns det skillnader mellan Rinkeby och Husby gällande mobilisering av motstånd? Om, hur ser dessa skillnader ut och vad tror ni att det beror på?

Common topics

- Vad tror du/ ni är den största anledningen till att urbana rörelser växer fram i miljonprogramsförorter idag?
- Kan du/ ni identifiera några centrala framgångsfaktorer?
- Kan du/ ni identifiera några hinder för urbana rörelser generellt, och för mobilisering specifikt?
- Varför tror du/ ni att vissa urbana rörelser lyckas i bättre än andra i sitt engagemang?
- När anser du att du/ ni har fullföljt ert uppdrag/ När anser ni att det inte längre behövs ett motstånd?

Specific questions: Focus Group

- Vad är det första ni tänker på när jag säger Miljonprogram?
- Vad är det första ni tänker på när jag säger Järvalyftet?
- Vad skulle ni behöva för att vara med och mobiliser och vara med och påverka?
- Föreställ dig ett drömscenario. Hur skulle din stadsdel vara för att du skulle vara nöjd?
- Kan ni utveckla begreppet första generationens miljonprogramsbarn?