The Management of Spatial Order

Pär Altermark

Abstract

In recent years, people using public space in ways that are seen as problematic has been a recurring topic of public debate – for example about begging EU-migrants and marginalized youth causing unrest in shopping malls. This study sets out to understand how government responds to in such cases. By analyzing interviews with social workers, policy documents and secondary reports about efforts to manage the use of public space, I derive two regimes of government. Inspired by Michel Foucault's work on government and Doreen Massey's analysis of the politics of space, I show that these regimes entail (i) understandings of the appearance of certain groups at certain places as problems, (ii) technologies that answer to these, and (iii) implicit conceptions of space that underpin the relationship between problematization and response. I call the first regime *the narrowing of space,* as it delimits the spatial accessibility to urban public space for certain groups. The second regime is called *governmentality of space,* as it sets out to motivate people to voluntarily use urban public space differently. Drawing on the empirical descriptions of these, I argue that they are both characterized by how they conceptualize space and, more generally, that the linkages between government and spatiality is key to make sense of the management of spatial order.

Key words: government, space, European migrants, Foucault, homelessness,

Words: 16 654

Table of contents

1 Introduction

In the autumn of 2016 and the spring of 2017, one could almost on a weekly basis read in Swedish newspapers about the shopping center Nordstan in Gothenburg, Sweden. For some time, Nordstan had been the place to hang out at for migrant urchins that were perceived as disturbing and that brought unrest in the shopping mall. Nordstan, we were told, were no longer safe (expressen.se, 2017-01-14). Provided this way of understanding their presence, this situation was a problem that needed to be solved. One attempt to answer to the situation was by increasing the number of police officers in the area, another was to assign social workers to support and help the youngsters. A more conspicuous suggestion was that Nordstan, and other places with similar problems, should be turned into prohibition zones where 'disturbing people' are not allowed to be at all (gp.se, 2017-02-14). After a while, it was reported that the adolescents had left Gothenburg and Nordstan (expressen.se, 2017-08-03). Nevertheless, later in 2017 the municipality wanted to forestall any potential problems during the coming winter by encouraging 'ordinary people' to utilize Nordstan in order to nurture a sense of safety (gp.se, 2017-11-18).

Two years later, in the Swedish city of Eskilstuna, the local municipality advanced a unique method to solve the much-disputed issue of mendicancy, which has been a recurring topic in the public debate for a couple of years. Here, it was proposed that people who are engaged in what is referred to as 'passive money collecting' in public spaces must file an application and pay for a permit to do so. 'This is an attempt to see how we can use the local article of order, as we know that a prohibition is not allowed according to the Swedish law', a local politician explained (svt.se, 2018-01-30).

Beyond Sweden, in the end of 2017, a local animal adaptation group in San Francisco deployed a robot outside their facilities to deter homeless people from settling down along the sidewalk. The robot followed a pre-set route across the neighborhood and was equipped with cameras, sensors, and lasers to detect and intimidate those who were camping along its way. Once the robot was put to use, the homeless people disappeared. However, the City of San Francisco concluded that the robot interfered with public accessibility and therefore had to be put aside. In other words, the robot that was used to deter people from living on the sidewalks was itself deemed a problem due to its appropriation of urban public space (bizjournals.com, 2017-30-08).

These scenes illustrate how certain groups, using public space in certain ways, are interpreted as problematic in ways that calls for government action. There are situations when some people are not expected to be at certain places, behaving in certain ways, and when they do, their presence is problematized and answered to by government. The politics of this, of understanding the spatial presence of some

groups as a problem and of setting up measures to make them go away, is the topic of this thesis.

~

This study sets out to investigate efforts to govern people that are perceived to disturb the urban spatial order. The above examples all points to how certain groups appropriate and utilize urban and public spaces in manners that defy our perceptions of how these are to be used and by whom. We can see this in the language of exceptionality that underpins the request of Nordstan as a 'no-go zone' for certain people. But we can also see this in the creative attempts to prevent mendicancy by introducing charged applications for permissions to beg or in the use of a robot to remove homeless people from sidewalks. Although I will engage with other examples of the government of spatial presence, this thesis starts from the proposition that efforts to manage how certain groups use public space can teach us a lot about power and about the relationship between government and spatiality.

I will attend to these issues by empirically examining a number of efforts to manage people whose behavior and use of urban public space is deemed problematic. More specifically, my empirical examination will focus on a protest conducted by homeless intra-European migrants outside the City Hall in Malmö during the fall 2016, the efforts to reduce mendicancy and the presences of beggars in Stockholm, and the practice of urban outreach work in Malmö, Gothenburg, and Stockholm, which is centered on locating, approaching, and meeting groups such as homeless or socially marginalized youths. All of these cases share the recognition that groups appear in public spaces in ways that are seen as problematic, which leads to efforts set up to make them reside elsewhere or use public space differently. These are cases of management of spatial order.

This study will describe two different regimes of government that are mobilized to manage people who are deemed spatially disturbing. The first operates by delimiting the spatial accessibility for certain people through direct interventions, for example, by using policies of accessibility for disabled people to remove beggars from the sidewalk. I will call this regime the narrowing of space. The second regime seeks to motivate and support people so that they, out of free will, transform their situation and thereby also the ways in which they use urban spaces. Following Foucault, I will call this a governmentality of space. These two models of governing the use of public space are derived from my empirical examinations of instances where different groups challenge conventional ideas about how urban spaces are to be used. After this empirical mapping, I will theorize the foundation of these two regimes, arguing that different conceptions of space shape the management of spatial order. This thesis is therefore a study of power; of how some people act upon others, how groups of people are commanded to act in specific ways, and how people are cultivated to attend to space in accordance with certain prescriptions.

1.1 Problematization of Presence

Before presenting my research question and analytical approach, a few clarifying notes on the topic are required.

To start with, people are always physically present and embodied in space. For most of us, this becomes highly concrete when we meet and appear to each other in our shared public spaces (Gehl, 2011:9). The regimes of government that I will trace and characterize sets out to manage the relationship between certain people and urban public spaces. The need to govern how certain people use urban space, emerge from the fact that the intersection between urban public space and bodily appearance of people sometimes is characterized by disharmony. In short; some people do things in certain places that are seen as problematic, as was highlighted by the introductory examples.

In a similar way, Craig Johnstone has discussed how groups such as homeless people and socially excluded youth, due to their visibility and spatial appropriation, disrupt norms inscribed onto the urban fabric (Johnstone, 2017:2f). Similarly, Quentin Stevens analyzes how the presence of such groups are turned into urban problems (Stevens, 2009:376ff). In other words, although everyone appears physically in space, *some* do this in ways that are understood as problematic and disturbing. The character of these *spatially disturbing subjects*, as I will call them, is therefore ambiguous: they reside physically *in* space, but *outside* the norms that dictates the terms of its use and appropriation. Thus, they seem to be simultaneously located inside and outside of urban spaces, which is why they are understood as problematic.

As is clear, the construction of people and groups as 'problems', in this case in terms of their spatial presence, is a central aspect of this study. Following Foucault, Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller have described how a foundational operation of modern forms of government is to *produce* political problems to be managed (Rose & Miller, 1992:175). Carol Bacchi have described this procedure as instances of *problematization* (Bacchi, 2012:1). Following from this, I will call the process of pitching the appearance of certain groups in certain places as problems *the problematization of presence*, which turns people into spatially disturbing subjects.

As a last remark relating to this, ashough these reflections can lead one to believe that the political stakes here only concern those who are perceived as deviant or unruly, I argue that the regimes of government I will examine concern all of us. Everyone always reside in space. This is an inescapable aspect of being an embodied person. It is true that this study will focus on events and instances of government taking place in the borderlands of normalcy, by virtue of investigating events that are perceived as spatially disturbing. But it is important to understand how the politics that I examine here encompass everyone that reside in space; when we interact, use, and appear in space, we relate to norms, rules, and prescriptions that dictate how we are supposed to behave. In a sense, my ambition is to highlight these norms by examining what happens when they are transgressed. Foucault highlights in *Discipline and Punish* how the production of the criminal subject constitute our ideas of criminality and therefore impinge on all of us (Foucault,

1995). To study how the spatially disturbing subjects are governed can, in a similar way, also tell us about the norms and rules that dictates how we should behave in the urban public and illustrate what happens if we do not.

1.1.1 The Research Question

Drawing on these reflections, the overarching research question that will guide this investigation is formulated as follows:

How are spatially disturbing subjects governed?

As mentioned above, I will answer this question by mapping two regimes that are being used to govern spatially disturbing subjects. The purpose here is to empirically delineate how certain groups are constituted as spatially disturbing and how government set out to manage their spatial behavior. Drawing on this empirical mapping, I will analyze how different conceptions of space lies at the heart of these regimes of government. My main theoretical argument will be that government operates through different conceptions of space, which means that implicit understandings of what space is and how it should be used is a fundamental aspect of how power is exercised over groups that defy norms about how public space should be utilized. It is perhaps not surprising *that* space is central to the government of spatial order, however, my main contribution is that I describe *how* different conceptions of space operate in the management of spatial order. As we shall see below, this is also an aspect that is rarely focused on in the literature on the politics of space. This means that I will answer the overarching research question both by my empirical mapping and through my theorization of the management of spatial order. Hence, the topic here is not the situation or living conditions of the groups that are seen as spatially disturbing, although that is an important are of study, but rather how they are being governed.

I will present my analysis in two chapters. The first is primarily empirical in character, focusing on the two regimes of government that are used to govern different people that are seen as spatially disturbing. Here, I will describe several concrete ways in which people are turned into spatially disturbing subjects and how they are targeted by regulatory practices that govern their spatial behavior and appropriation. In the second analytical chapter, concluding the thesis, I will draw on my empirical observations to describe how these regimes of government both rely on different conceptions of space, where the very act of implicitly drawing on these different conceptions is central for the management of spatial order. By making use of different conceptions of space, different technologies of government become possible. Before turning to these matters, however, I will use the reminder of this introductory chapter to locate my study within a broader scholarly context and discuss the theoretical as well as methodological propositions that guide the investigation.

1.2 Cities, Space, and Politics of Urbanization

By investigating the methods utilized to govern how people use urban spaces, this study is situated in a broader theoretical context of attempts to understand the political and theoretical dimensions of space, cities, and urban phenomena. Hence, the reflections and propositions that I develop throughout this study are related to a vast field of scholarly literature that address these issues. Hereunder, I will describe the broader academic context of my study. I will conclude this exposition by discussing how my investigation contribute to the literature on the political and spatial aspects of the urban.

Henri Lefebvre is generally thought of as one of the most prominent and influential political theorists that have dealt with the issues of space and urbanism. In *The Urban Revolution*, he traces the transition from an industrial society to a post-industrial urban society (Lefebvre, 2003), arguing that the framework of urbanization is instrumental for the endurance of capitalism and, accordingly, is the locus of political confrontation and class struggle (Lefebvre, 2003:154ff). Similarly, David Harvey states that:

> From their inception, cities have arisen through geographical and social concentrations of a surplus product. Urbanization has always been, therefore, a class phenomenon, since surpluses are extracted from somewhere and from somebody, while the control over their disbursement typically lies in a few hands. This general situation persists under capitalism, of course; but since urbanization depends on the mobilization of a surplus product, an intimate connection emerges between the development of capitalism and urbanization (Harvey, 2008:24).

Thus, for both Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey, urban phenomena are inscribed into the very foundation of political struggle in capitalist societies. From this point of view, urbanism is not just a matter-of-fact concerning the development of cities, but an essential political phenomenon that dictates the character of post-industrial capitalism. Similar propositions have been further developed and investigated by scholars such as Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore (2017:65), who are arguing that urban regions are made targets of neoliberal policy experiments (see also Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2013). For all these scholars, cities and urban phenomena are approached from a theoretical viewpoint, describing political struggles and processes of exclusion as fundamental dimensions of urbanization and the life of cities (see also MacLeod, 2002).

This literature also relates to broader questions regarding the political aspects of space. In the article 'Reflections on the Politics of Space', Lefebvre argues that 'space is not a *scientific object* removed from ideology or politics; it has always been political and strategical' (Lefebvre, 2009:170, italics in original). Seth Low, in turn, emphasizes how linguistic practices shape and constitute space (Low, 2017:119) and Stuart Elden describes how the notion of 'territory' can be understood as a political technology constituting geographical space as governed by sovereign

states (Elden, 2013). Finally, Dan Bulley analyses spatial aspects of migration and refugee politics through Jacques Derrida's notion of 'hospitality' (Bulley, 2016).

There are also scholars who have investigated how these overarching struggles revolving around urban phenomena are concretized. The literature on gentrification highlights how urban reconstruction projects transform traditional working-class areas into locations for commerce and the modern urban middle-class (Lees et al., 2013; Zuk et al., 2017; Stouten, 2017; for a Swedish context see Hedin, 2010). As with Harvey and Lefebvre, urban reconstruction is seen as a playing field of modern capitalism and an arena of class-struggle. Another form of politicization of urban space is highlighted through the concept of hostile architecture, focusing on how architectural design can be used to make urban space physically inaccessible. This literature analyses, for example, how public benches are constructed in ways that make them impossible to sleep on, how spikes are deployed in urban places to prevent people from using them, and how transit stops are tactically placed to avoid certain people to visit them (Schindler, 2015; Petty, 2015).

There are also a number of studies that, in a similar way to my investigation, focus on groups such as homeless people, marginalized youth, and drug users. For example, Craig Johnstone and Quentin Stevens, referred to above, highlight urban exclusionary politics of such groups in the UK. Johnstone describes the historical development of policies that legitimize spatial exclusion of unwelcome subjects (Johnstone, 2017) and Stevens analyzes how the discourse of 'liveability' legitimizes a range of exclusionary measures that sets out to remove unwanted subjects from visibility in the urban public (Stevens, 2009:385; see also Beckett & Herbert, 2008; Sparks, 2012; Murphy, 2009; May, 1999).

As is clear from this, there are profound political dimensions of cities and urban phenomena. How, then, does my study fit with this literature? There are, as I have already mentioned, similarities between this investigation and the accounts of Johnstone and Stevens, respectively. However, whilst both Johnstone and Stevens attempt to explain empirical phenomena, my aspiration is to characterize the *regimes* of government targeting the people whose spatial presence are deemed problematic. On the other hand, both Lefebvre and Harvey analyze urban phenomenon from a highly theoretical perspective, seeking to characterize the political dimension of the urban as such. Here, my approach, I think, is more empirical in nature, as I draw on empirical observations and examinations. My main focus is not the political ontology of space as such. Rather, this study examines how conceptions of space are utilized as tools to govern people.

It follows from the above that my study contributes to this literature in two ways. First, I aim to empirically describes regimes of government that are mobilized to manage how people uses urban spaces. Some of the literature I have described investigates spatial exclusion of certain groups, but my study investigates and highlights the regimes of government as such. Hence, my study contributes with empirically generated insights into mechanisms of government. Secondly, this study also illustrates how the notion of space becomes instrumental for these regimes of government. By emphasizing how notions of space are integrated both into the processes that turn people into problems and the techniques utilized to

govern them, this aspect of my study theoretically informs the scholarly understanding of spatially excluded groups.

1.3   Theoretical starting points

The purpose of this chapter is to present a set of theoretical propositions that inform my investigation. These will function as the vantage points from where I will explore how spatially disturbing subjects are being governed. I will here engage with theoretical ideas and concepts developed by Michel Foucault and Doreen Massey, where Foucault will inform my discussion of the techniques used to govern spatially disturbing subjects, whilst Massey's reflections in *For Space* will function as a starting point for my discussions on urban space and spatiality. Neither of them will be utilized as doctrines or rigid frameworks for how to think about space and government, as I believe that such an approach would deprive these ideas of their theoretical dynamism. Rather, I will explore the relationship between government and the notion of space, *in discussion with* the theoretical propositions presented hereunder Lastly, I will conclude this section by considering how the theoretical propositions of Foucault and Massey relate to each other.

1.3.1   Techniques of Government

The overarching ambition of this study is to investigate the government of subjects that are perceived as spatially disturbing. An integral aspect of this is to describe the techniques and methods that are used to manage their spatial presence. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault investigates the transition of the punitive system during the 17th, 18th, and 19th century, where corporal and often public punishment vanish to be replaced by a disciplinary mode of punishment developing with the emergence of the carceral system. Here, a punitive logic of retaliation was transformed into a scheme of disciplinary techniques that aimed to correct and drill the inmates of the prison. By tracing the emergence of disciplinary power in different branches of society – from the military to the school system – Foucault describes how the carceral system aimed to produce docile and governable subjects. Throughout his investigation, Foucault describes a specific set of characteristics that reappears in the techniques of disciplinary power. These technologies operate on the micro-level, with the purpose to correct, regulate, and drill how people conduct themselves (Foucault, 1995:6, 135ff): '[d]iscipline is a political anatomy of detail' (Foucault, 1995:39). In *Discipline and Punish*, thus, Foucault describes a form of power that sets out to manage subjects by studious supervision and regulation that operates on the level of detail; whereas the old punitive techniques where grand and laden with symbolism, the disciplinary mode of power is quotidian in character and operates through intervention into the smallest details of life.

In his later writings, Foucault explores a radically different assemblage of techniques. In 'The Subject and Power', he writes:

> Perhaps the equivocal nature of the term "conduct" is one of the best aids
> for coming to terms with the specificity of power relations. For to
> "conduct" is at the same time to "lead" others (according to mechanisms of
> coercion which are, to varying degrees, strict) and a way of behaving within
> a more or less open field of possibilities. The exercise of power consists in
> guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible
> outcome.[…]. "Government" did not refer only to political structures or to
> the management of states; rather, it designated the way in which the
> conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed" (Foucault,
> 1982:789).

In this quote, Foucault expand on a mode of power that governs through the act of constructing the ideals and norms which constitute how people recognize themselves – a mode of power today often referred to as *governmentality*. Following Foucault on this, Mitchell Dean states that 'to analyse government is to analyse those practices that try to shape, sculpt, mobilize and work through the choices, desires, aspirations, needs, wants and lifestyles of individuals and groups' (Dean, 2004:12). In a similar fashion, Rose et al. describes how what Foucault calls 'technologies of the self' are 'ways in which human beings come to understand and act upon themselves within certain regimes of authority and knowledge, and by means of certain techniques directed to self-improvement' (Rose et al., 2006:90). In contrast to the disciplinary mode of government, power here operates through the maneuver of producing self-regulating subjects that voluntarily conduct themselves in accordance with the ideals and norms that dictates what is presumed as desirable. In contrast to the disciplinary mode of power, which acts by restricting the freedom of the individual by meticulous interventions, governmentality takes the freedom of the individual as its target.

From these perspectives, then, government consists of actions that shape how people conduct themselves. Both forms of government described here operate by shaping subjects. And as he states in the opening lines of 'The Subject and Power', his main interest is not to examine 'power' itself, but rather to 'create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects' (Foucault, 1982:777).

1.3.2 Politics and the Dynamics of Space

If Foucault provides the basic understanding of government that I start from, Doreen Massey offers a set of important insights on space and spatiality, where her main point is to accentuate the ambiguous character of our conventional ways to conceive space (Massey, 2015:1ff). Throughout the book, she argues that the dynamism and multiplicity of space have been restrained in our dominating political and philosophical imaginaries, stating:

> The imagination of space as a surface on which we are placed, the turning of
> space into time, the sharp separation of local place from the space out there;

8

these are all ways of taming the challenge that the inherent spatially of the
world presents (ibid:7).

Hence, she embarks on a journey exploring an alternative to these static, totalizing,
and de-politicized ideas of how space is usually conceived, in order to outline an
understanding of space that acknowledge its political dimensions. Massey starts
from three propositions that runs through her book and that summarize the
alternative understanding of space that she develops. First, she proposes that space
should be understood as produced by interrelations and interactions. Secondly, that
space is a sphere of coexisting heterogeneities, or of a 'contemporaneous plurality'.
Lastly, she argues that space is always under construction, that is, that space is 'a
product of relation-between, relations which are necessarily embedded material practices which
have to be carried out, it is always in the process of being made.' (Massey, 2015:9).

Taken together, these propositions suggest that space is produced through
practices and that the identities and multiple meanings of spaces are contingent and
can be renegotiated, where different spatial identities can operate simultaneously in
relation to the same physical places. This means that that seemingly different places
cannot be completely separated from each other, but are interrelated in a web of
spatial identities that constitute each other (ibid:179, 195). Hence, Massey is
arguing that the identity and political character of places are constituted by the
interaction of different social relations. This entails that the identity of places is not
monolithic or categorical, but rather open-ended and ever-changing. Thus, what a
physical space represents, or what the meaning ascribed to it is, is never fully
determined or complete. Massey writes:

> What if space is the sphere not of a discrete multiplicity of inert *things,*
> even one which is thoroughly interrelated? What if, instead, it presents us
> with a heterogeneity of practices and *processes?* Then it will be not an
> already-interconnected whole but an ongoing product of interconnections
> and not. Then it will be always unfinished and open. This arena of space is
> not firm ground on which to stand. In no way it is a surface.
>
> This is space as the sphere of a dynamic simultaneity, constantly
> disconnected by new arrivals, constantly waiting to be determined (and
> therefore always undetermined) by the construction of new relations
> (ibid:107).

It is, Massey argues, through these dimensions of space that its political potential
emerges, since it is *in* space that we interact and live together: 'places as an ever-
shifting constellation of trajectories poses the question of our throwntogetherness' (Massey,
2015:151). She expands on our throwntogetherness stating that '[p]laces poses in
particular form the question of our living together. And this question, […], is the central
question of the political' (Massey, 2015:151). In other words, to recognize the
inherently political potentials of space, we must acknowledge its openness and
dynamism.

By turning to these – admittedly very theoretical – reflections of Massey, it
becomes possible to start to explore the shifting nature and political aspects of ideas
about space, spatial demarcations and definitions of space. Here, our taken-for-

granted assumptions of what space is are both potentially both destabilized and politicized. But these propositions can also be expanded upon to investigate how spaces are constituted by the interactions that are taking place in them. Throughout this study, I will turn to Massey to discuss how techniques and practices of government can be entangled with spatiality, discussing how the notion of space is central for how different people are turned into subjects that needs to be governed and for the design of practical measures that are set up to do so.

1.3.3 Producing Subjects and Spaces

In order to set the scene for my analysis, I here want to say a few words about how Foucault and Massey are combined. For Foucault power is intrinsically intertwined with the practices of its deployment; power is not an abstraction that are concretized in 'real life'. Instead, power emerge out of, and are grounded in, these practices themselves. This is reflected also in my study, where I draw on the empirical instances of power to abstract the regimes of government of socially disturbing subjects that I examine. In Foucault's analysis, the disciplinary power, for example, emerges out of the myriad of techniques and measures that were developed and utilized to regulate the behavior of people. In turn, this implies that the operations of power are foundational in the production of subjects; it is through practices that are interrelated with relations of power that 'human beings are made subjects' (Foucault, 1982:777). In *The History of Sexuality. Vol 1*, Foucault phrases it as follows:

> Relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relations (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations), but are immanent in the latter; […]; relation of power are not superstructural positions, with merely a role of prohibition or accompaniment; they have a directly productive role, wherever they come into play (Foucault, 1978:94).

Similarly, Doreen Massey emphasizes how space is continually reproduced through interaction and practices (Massey, 2015:10); spaces are always in a state of 'becoming' through the practices that are taking place there. Hence, both of these two thinkers emphasize how meaning is produced. For Foucault, it is the production of subjects that is under consideration, whilst Massey analyzes how space is produced.

The important notion that underpins these ideas, is that knowledge and meaning seems to be embedded into dominant political and historical configurations. For Foucault, this aspect is central: the question of knowledge does not concern whether something is true or false in the traditional sense, but how phenomena and ideas become possible to think about in terms of 'knowledge'. Carol Bacchi describes it as the act of setting the rules of what can be thought of as 'true' or 'false' (Bacchi, 2012:4). I think that a similar assumption can be traced in the account of Doreen Massey when she highlights how the predominant conception of space as static emerge out of specific political configurations (Massey, 2015:7, 63, 81f). Thus, there is no 'truth' about space, but only ways to conceptualize it to make it a bearer

of meaning. As we shall see in the empirical analysis, this has important implications when we analyze the management of spatial order.

In this way, both Foucault and Massey understand social reality as constituted by politics; there is no essence of human subjectivity and there are no truth about space. Drawing on these meta-theoretical similarities, I think that there are possibilities to fruitfully combine these two theorists. Both Massey and Foucault emphasize the productiveness of power, and emphasize the contingent character of social reality. But I also think that my combination of them can highlight how the making of subjects is intertwined with the making of spaces; as we shall see later on, concepts of spaces and the making of subjects are entangled with each other in the government of spatially disturbing subjects.

1.4   On the method of the investigation

Hereunder, I will address some central methodological considerations that have guided this study. I will first discuss some meta-theoretical underpinnings and describing how I go about deriving the two regimes of government. I will finish the methods section with a presentation of my empirical sources, how I attend to these, and describe the delimitations of this study.

1.4.1   Theory of Science

As seen above, both Foucault and Massey see social reality as contextualized and constituted by politics and practices of power. In *Critique of Urbanization,* Neil Brenner argues that critical theoretical approaches should reject instrumental modes of theoretical application in favor of more reflexive approaches (Brenner, 2017:20). This position emerges out of the acknowledgement, akin to the propositions of Massey and Foucault, that theory cannot position itself outside of the social reality that it sets out to make sense of. Thus, we need to acknowledge how our propositions are always situated in a specific political and historical context.

For me, this means that I cannot study social reality from a position external to the political structures that dictates any idea of knowledge. The aim in this study is not to present an exhaustive theory that can uncover a pre-political reality, but to utilize theory to explore the mechanisms that constitute regimes of government of how people make us of space. Here, theory must be open-ended and invite reflections, rather than delimited to a narrow theoretical framework, where I offer an interpretation, rather than a mirror of reality. This, however, does not mean the insights generated in this study cannot be used to illuminate other instances when certain groups are seen as calling for government intervention due to how they use public space.

To study the government of people that are problematized through their spatial behavior, I will begin in the observations of my empirical sources to map the regimes of government that is mobilized to manage these people. Following from

the above, this is therefore not at study that just applies abstract theoretical concept to a set of empirical sources. Instead, I start from these empirical observations to trace these regimes and their theoretical underpinnings as seen in light of my theoretical starting points. This approach is informed by the empiricism described by Colin Koopman in his comparison of Giorgio Agamben's and Ian Hacking's respective readings of Foucault. Here, he describes Foucault's dedication to empiricism. The theoretical concepts that Foucault developed are derived from his engagement with concrete empirical sources, detailing practices of power, rather than from abstract theoretical reflections (Koopman, 2015:572ff). It is therefore not an empiricism concerning the status of knowledge and how it can be attained. Instead, the empiricism Koopman traces in Foucault can be characterized as way to think *through* empirical observations and to take the empirical as a starting point for theoretical inquires. I have attempted to work in a similar way, where the two regimes of government that I will go on to describe are to be seen as the results of my engagement with my empirical materials.

1.4.2 Empirical Material and Delimitations

It follows from the discussion above that relations of power comes into play and emerge out of a multiplicity of relations and interactions. Then, to study how spatially disturbing subjects are governed, I must investigate concrete practices and relations, as well as the sites where these instances of government plays out. There are, I think, no singular empirical source that encapsulates the web of relations and practices that constitute the instances of government that I want to investigate in my study. Instead, I must engage with a wide array of sources that taken together makes it possible for me to study the mechanisms of government.

The empirical sources of this study consist of text material, informant interviews, as well as in-depth interviews. They all speak of efforts to manage groups such as intra-European migrants, homeless people, and marginalized youth. I will focus on instances of government of spatially disturbing groups in Sweden's three biggest cities: Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Malmö, which means that this investigation is delimited to government that takes place in urbanized areas. My intention is neither to describe, nor to illuminate, the situation of the spatially disturbing groups as such. Such a project would run into several of the problems that theorists such as Spivak (1988:80) and Mohanty (1988:62) highlights regarding representability. Rather than a study about the situation of certain groups, this is a study of how certain groups are governed.

The text material is gathered to understand events related to intra-European migration in Malmö and Stockholm. It consists of court orders, appeals and dictums, police warrants, information flyers, internal juridical guidance documents for the police, and an array of local and national rules and laws regarding urban spaces. To complement this material, I have also conducted two informant interviews with persons that are involved in civil society initiatives concerning the situation for European migrants in Sweden. Here, I have also turned to secondary material such as news reports and public statements by politicians and police

representatives. I will examine this material and the informant interviews by piecing together information from these sources about how government is exercised, but also in order to analyze the ideas that they mirror.

The qualitative in-depth interviews are conducted with urban outreach workers in Malmö, Gothenburg, and Stockholm, and comprises social workers from four different working groups. Three of these groups are focused on adults in homelessness and with drug abuse, and the fourth targets socially excluded youth. I have interviewed eight urban outreach workers during six interviews. Two of the interviews was conducted with two social workers present, due to time constraints on their part. I do not think that this circumstance had any significant influence on these conversations. Instead, the interviewees discussed and contemplated the topics in way reminiscent of focus group interviews. The aim of my interviews is to get insight into the function and proceedings of outreach work towards people that are understood as spatially disturbing.

Kvale emphasize how qualitative research interviews is a sensitive tool to capture the experiences and stories of the interviewees' everyday life (Kvale, 2007:11). The qualitative research interview is therefore a method that gives in-depth understanding of the empirical problem that is investigated. During the interviews, the urban outreach workers were given the opportunity to bring forward aspects that they think of as important and I, as the interviewer, followed up with questions to develop important themes. Thus, the interviews conducted for this study, should be understood as in-depth conversations structured by open-ended questions concerning the functions, aims, and operations of urban outreach work (see interview guide in Appendix 1). The interviewees were promised anonymity and our conversations lasted for approximately one hour each. All interviews have been recorded and transcribed. In the analysis, I will present quotes that illustrates important aspects that exemplifies how the insights generated.

All in all, then, my empirical material consists of interviews with eight urban outreach workers conducted at six occasions, two informant interviews, and around one hundred pages of text material and articles about the government of spatially disturbing groups.

2 Governing Spatial Order

In this chapter, I will present the empirical examination of this study. As described in the introduction, I will trace and describe two different regimes of government from my empirical sources. First is a discussion of the regime of government I call the narrowing of space, then the regime called governmentality of space.

2.1 The Narrowing of Space

This part will investigate a regime of government that operates through the *narrowing of space*. As we shall see, it operates through detailed and meticulous regulatory techniques, which are grounded in a volatile invocation of different rules, laws, and policies. These do not specifically address the spatial behavior of spatially disturbing subjects, but are nevertheless made use of to control how certain groups use public space. Throughout this part, I will show that this regime of government relies on different conceptions of space, which in turn enable the regulatory techniques put to work to remove spatially disturbing groups.

The empirical sources I examine in this part speaks of two different events: the police intervention towards a political manifestation conducted by homeless European immigrants in Malmö, Sweden, in the fall of 2016. This manifestation took place outside the City Hall in Malmö between the 4th to 14th of April, 2016 and was carried out as a 'sleeping-protest', with the purpose of highlighting the precarious situation of homeless European migrants and, more specifically, to protest against the recent eviction of a settlement located in Malmö (CFR – Appeal:1). The second case consists of a set of policies, spanning from 2012 to 2018, that guides how the police in Stockholm addresses issues relating to mendicancy. My discussion in this part primarily builds on an examination of text materials describing how a number of technologies were applied in these two cases to constrain how people use public space. In the aftermath of the protest in Malmö, the organization Center for Social Rights filed a police report against the procedures of the police, and parts of my text materials are related to this court case. The ensuing discussion also draws on the two informant interviews with persons that are involved in civil society initiatives focusing on the situation for European migrants in Sweden.

An important backdrop for my discussion in this part, are ideas concerning ethnicity and ethnic identity, especially in relation to questions regarding people that are identified as of Roma heritage. In the scholarly literature about minorities, diasporas, and migration in Europe, there is a tendency to oscillate between a terminology of cultural and ethnic demarcations and more political concepts such

as 'European migrants' (see for example Agarin, 2014; Mäkinen, 2013; O'Donovan, 2006; Tremlett et al., 2014). There can, of course, be important reasons to separate between these, however, the differences in terminology are also somewhat ambiguous and difficult to uphold. For example, it is important to note that not all European migrants identify themselves as Roma, even though a significant proportion does (Swärd, 2015:271). Throughout this section, I will use the term 'European migrants' or 'intra-European migrants', since issues related to cultural or ethnic identity are not under consideration in my study[1]. However, occasionally, I will discuss ideas of 'Roma' heritage when I discuss literature that utilize this terminology.

2.1.1 European migration, Exclusion, and Spatial Norms

Before I turn to the two empirical events of this part, a few words need to be said about the politics of intra-European migration and the broader Swedish political debate about the phenomenon.

In the wake of the enlargements of the European Union in 2004 and 2007, which entailed the inclusion of the new member states Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria into the open-border region of Europe, the presence of poor intra-European migrants increased rapidly in Western Europe and Sweden (Swärd, 2015:269f; Ivlevs & Veliziotis, 2018:176). In addition, the global financial and economic crises of 2007-2008 had severe effects on marginalized groups in these countries (Swärd, 2015:270). The enlargement of the European Union, accompanied by the global financial crises, is therefore often understood to have paved the way for the recent intra-European migration to Western Europe and Sweden.

In the scholarly literature, the intra-European migration from Eastern Europe is often portrayed as causing 'public disorder', for example manifested in mendicancy or illegal settlements (van Baar, 2016:222; Kóczé, 2017:7). Hence, the physical presence of European migrants and the character of their spatial appropriation constitute a fundamental aspect of how the European migrants appear as a political problem. Huub van Baar highlights this by arguing that the situation of Roma subjects in Europe are characterized by the notion of 'evictability', which defines the condition of being a potential subject of physical expulsion and removal (van Baar, 2016:214). Through this concept, Van Baar illustrates a spatial dimension of the politics of intra-European migration. Similarly, Kate Hepworth (2012) discusses how the expulsion of Roma people in Italy rests on the production of their settlements as 'abject spaces' and De Genova and Yildiz emphasize how the spatial openness of the European Union is intrinsic in the problematization of the European migrant subject. This spatial openness grants these people the right to reside in spaces throughout the European Union, simultaneously as their political exclusion constitute them as subjects that needs to be controlled (De Genova & Yildiz, 2017:9ff). Hence, their *right* to reside in spaces have, paradoxically, led to a myriad

---

[1] I also think that a terminology that rests on ideas of Roma heritage is running the risk to de-politicize ideas of cultural and ethnic identity, and to essentialize certain characteristics in a problematic way (for similar discussion see Brubaker, 2005; De Genova, 2002; Spivak, 1988).

of attempts to limit their *access* to the very same spaces. Then, as is seen in the work of the scholars referred to here, the spatial presence of European migrants is central to the political debates following their emergence in Western Europe. These people are turned into problems through the problematization of presence. These scholarly examples also highlight how this problematization is entangled with the racialization of the European migrant subject as mendicancy, of their settlements as 'illegal', and of them being a cause of 'public disorder' – ideas which are linked to their ethnic and cultural identity.

These tendencies have also been present in Sweden. For example, there have been calls for illegalization of mendicancy, facilitation of evictions of settlements, and reformulation of parking rules to enable removal of people sleeping in cars (svt.se, 2018-04-5; aftonbladet.se, 2016-05-26; sydsvenskan.se, 2016-11-18) – all brought up as possible solutions to the situation with intra-European migrants. I described at the outset of this study how the physical presence of certain subjects appearing at certain places are politicized and problematized in relation to norms of how urban spaces are supposed to be used. This problematization of presence echoes through the examples of Sweden sketched here and the above depictions of European migrants more generally.

Now, the following pages will be devoted to an analysis of two particular instances of such policies, focusing on the demonstration in Malmö and the mendicancy policies of Stockholm. They need to be comprehended in relation to the discussion outlined in this section.

2.1.2 The Invocation of Rules

In a legal guidance document of the police in Stockholm, the first lines declare:

> Mendicancy is in itself not criminal or prohibited. There is no legislation that prevent it from being conducted in an organized manner; with coordinated activates, traveling, or accommodation. There are, however, some laws that restrict the possibility for mendicancy (Legal Guidance Document).

This extract illustrates that there is not always a legal framework that fully respond to problematization of the presence of European migrants or other spatially disturbing groups. Instead, as I will describe further below, the absence of a responsive regulatory framework has the consequence that a variety of other rules concerning spatial order are invoked to manage these people. The invocation of these rules is meant to restrict the spatial behavior of the European migrants, as well as the spaces where they reside, in a manner that makes these people governable. Hence, the invocation of rules[2] defines the spatial behavior of these people as problematic *in relation to* regulatory frameworks, often invented for some other purpose, which enables practical intervention. In other words, this particular group

---

[2] When referring to 'the invocation of rules', I use the term 'rules' in a broader sense. It refers to prescriptions, rules, laws, policies, and similar regulatory frameworks.

of spatially disturbing subjects are made governable by harmonizing the problem they pose with an already existing regulation that can be applied to narrow their use of urban public space. This is what is implied in the quote with the formulation that there are 'some laws that restrict the possibility for mendicancy'. The act of begging cannot, in itself, be subject to regulation, but it can be managed in other ways.

This creative use of regulations was central to the police interventions targeting the demonstration by homeless European migrants in Malmö. On a police warrant handed to a protester in Malmö, it is stated that 'a mattress [was] forfeited because of violation of the local article of order' (Police Warrant). In the court decision by the Administrate Court in Malmö, issued due to the report against the actions of the police, it is explained that this and other personal belongings were confiscated with reference to the Prohibition of camping in the local article of order:

> The night between the 4th and the 5th of April, her [the inquired party] mattress was confiscated as well as belongings of other protesters. The basis of this actions of the police was that these belongings where forfeited based on the prohibition of camping in the local code of spatial order, whereas it should be confiscated (Court Decision).

This empirical example illustrates a more general tendency of the invocation of rules. One can see how the practical measure of confiscation, is grounded in a rule that concerns camping, which is defined as temporary living in a tent, camper, or similar arrangements (Local article of order, §15). The invocation of a prohibition of camping in this context, of managing a demonstration of European migrants, matches the spatial behavior of the protesters to this regulatory framework, as was pointed out above, an already existing regulation is harmonized with spatially disturbing subjects. Thus, this intervention relies on a specific definition of the spatial appropriation that is made by these people. This definition, of the protesting European migrants as 'camping', enables the use of the Prohibition of camping to regulate their use of public space. However, the application of the local article of spatial order, and the Prohibition of camping, was later deemed invalid. In the police statement to the Administrate Court, which is related to the appeal against the police filed by Center for Social Rights, one can read that the police warrant issued to the protester when the mattress was confiscated 'incorrectly referred to the local article of order' and the prohibition of camping therein (Police statement:4). Instead, forthcoming confiscations were legitimized through the Public Order Act, which meant that their legal justification had to be re-coded and changed in hindsight (Police statement:3). We have, then, two different rules at work here, both invoked in relation to the same behavior of the European migrant protester.

The confiscation of matrasses and other personal belongings illustrate several important aspects. First, we see how the spatial behavior of the protesters is defined by the rule referred to. However, we also have a re-definition of the very same spatial behavior when the first regulation was deemed inapplicable. Through this re-negotiation, the spatial appropriation underwent a transformation to correspond to another spatial rule that, in hindsight, enables the practical measure of confiscating the matrass. Thus, logic at work here is not that rules are to be followed

and certain spatial behaviors are defined as out of order with respect to certain regulations, but that regulations and rules are matched *in order to* make it possible to confiscate personal belongings.

A similar maneuver of definition and re-definition was applied as regards to people sleeping and laying down on the ground. This is highlighted in a self-critical police statement:

> It was not correct by the police to refer to the local article of order ,[…]. Some individuals have been reported for violation of the prohibition of camping in the local article of order, but these cases were recoded to concern the ch. 3 § 1 in the Public Order Act when the mistake was discovered (Police statement:2).

Yet again, a set of practical regulations are applied, but the juridical underpinnings diverge and changes. Still, the concrete practices remain constant – this is always about regulating the behavior by the protesters – although the justifying regulations changes. This implies, however, that the *problem* of cluttering by the European migrant protesters precedes the regulations referred to that are used to state that it is not permitted. Similarly, another example is that the police, seeking to deal with people that were sleeping at the protest in Malmö, invoked rules that regulate the conditions and appropriateness of sleeping outdoors. 'The need of sleeping cannot be satisfied at the location', it says in an internal policy document that outlines the police's approach to the protest (Internal Guiding Document:2). Here, the spatial behavior of the protesters is defined with reference to the inappropriateness of sleeping outside of the City Hall in Malmö.

These examples from the protest outside the City Hall illustrates how the behavior of the European migrant protesters is comprehended and defined in relation to a set of rules, which enables practical intervention and makes these people governable. The overarching problem of their 'alien' spatial behavior and 'public disorder' described in the previous section is here exchanged for a set of problems derived from the rules that are available. More generally, in the statement by the police handed to the Administrate court and in the court decision, it becomes clear that the actions of the police never rested on any overarching rule, but rather on numerous different regulations and prohibitions (Police Statement:2ff; Court Decision:8ff). Hence, the behavior of the protestors is divided into a variety of different and separated violations, matched with whatever regulations can be found. It appears as clear that the overarching rationale of how the police acted, what to restore social order faced with a demonstration of European migrants. But in order to do this, they needed to refer to numerous specific violations of local regulations – none of which had anything to do with their right to demonstrate.

This way of using rules has also been relied upon in attempts to govern European migrants that is begging and residing in the urban public in Stockholm. In the information flyers handed out to beggars by the police, the spatial behavior of these people is framed as a problem concerning accessibility (Informational flyer). The spatial appropriation of the European migrants is described as impeding the mobility of by-passers, cars, or cyclists. Here, the problem of the spatially disturbing subjects is conceptualized solely through their physical materiality: they

are turned into physical objects that need to be removed *as* physical objects, since they hamper accessibility. The flyer also has illustrations, for example portraying a begging person sitting on the sidewalk with an informative text: 'Loitering is not permitted on pavements or roads if doing so obstructs drivers, riders or pedestrians' (Informational flyer).

The technology of defining European migrants as accessibility problems is even more apparent in the project *A Sidewalk accessible for everyone*. Here, it is explicitly stated that it is the accessibility of people with physical disabilities that is at stake (dn.se, 2016-05-09). In the information sheet outlining the objectives of the project, it is said that advertising signs, containers, outdoor torches, that interfere into the spatial accessibility of people are not allowed (*A Sidewalk accessible for everyone*: Information Sheet). However, this regulation is also used to define beggars as accessibility problems. A police representative commented on this by saying that '[w]e tell them, "No, begging is not illegal, but you cannot sit on crates or similar objects, with all your belongings because you claim the public street space that belongs to everybody".' (dn.se, 2016-05-09). The example of *A Sidewalk for Everyone* is illustrative of how begging people are defined by their material presence, made into problems of spatial accessibility in the same way as advertising signs or containers. They are things that take up place. Again, the spatially disturbing group is made possible to manage by matching their appearance in public space to a regulation that explicitly is designed to deal with something else.

In summary, what we have here is an array of spatial rules that enables government by defining the spatial behavior of the European migrants *through* a set of rules. Hence, my discussion here highlights how these rules are used to define the spatial behavior and appropriations of the European migrants in ways that turn them into governable subjects. The invocation of spatial rules operates, consequently, as a problematization of presence. In this process, the problematization of presence *harmonize* the problem posed by these people with existing regulations that can be used. The problems of 'illegal' settlements, mendicancy, or 'public disorder', are transformed into problems of accessibility, camping, or cluttering. And through this act, these people become governable.

Finally, there is an aspect to this that I have left unexplored, but that can be illustrated by the police statement that, with reference to the demonstration outside the City Hall in Malmö, stated that 'the need of sleeping cannot be satisfied at the location'. Here, sleeping, seen as a problem, is intertwined *with* a specific space; it is the relationship between the behavior and the space that constitute this problematization. For the spatial behavior and appropriation to be defined as problematic and governable, it must be so in relation to the spaces where it takes place. Defining the spatial behavior of people through the invocation of spatial rules is also to rely on conceptions of the norms that are associated with these spaces. Hence, spaces come with prescriptions that separate the permitted from the unpermitted. Massey argue that spaces area open-ended and defined by how they are seen and used. From this perspective, simultaneously as the invocation of rules defines the spatial behavior of the targeted subjects, it also defines the spaces through the norms that regulate their use.

2.1.3 The Attention to Detail

The invocation of rules is one element of the narrowing of space as a regime of government. While the previous section described how the invocation of rules enables practical regulation by turning the European migrants into governable subjects, this section will examine the regulatory techniques that are utilized to govern those subjects. I will here describe how variety of meticulous techniques are activated to directly intervene into how European migrants use public space in order to regulate how they conduct themselves. In parallel to the numerous rules referred to make this group governable, there is not one overriding resolution at work here. Instead, the measures used set their sights on the details, the small acts, and the specifics. The techniques of government that emerge here operates through intervention that restrict how the targeted people can behave and is conducted on the level of detail.

In the internal guiding document of the police concerning the protest in Malmö, it is said that:

> The police in Malmö shall, through the agency of outer command, continually supervise the location and inform the protesters that the mission of the law-enforcement is to make it easier for them to carry out their assembly […], in the cases where the area is cluttered in relation to the assembly, reports shall be filed as violations of the Law of Order and the material shall be confiscated (Internal Guiding Document:1).

Furthermore, if the material belongings of the protesters is confiscated 'the responsible police officer shall carefully examine which personal belongings should be confiscated' (Internal Guiding Document:1). These extracts encapsulate the attentiveness to detail that characterize these techniques of government. The attention to detail also means that there is a need for careful supervision, assessing every situation in order to see if practical intervention is necessary. The targeting of the material belongings of European migrants is a recurring characteristic. For example, in the appeal of the court case in Malmö, the inquired party states:

> She [the inquired party of the appeal] have during the protest been targeted by several decisions from the law-enforcement regarding belongings on the ground. […]. The decision (BIS, 2016-04-06) states however that the police officers shall act against cluttering by telling people to remove material. It must be supposed that this also comprise personal belongings that have been placed on the ground next to persons that participated in the manifestation because of the way that the decision was executed (Court Decision:4).

Compare this to what is said in a police document regarding mendicancy in Stockholm:

> If the beggar is using a public space as stockpile for example of goods, packages or other belongings, a permission from the Law enforcement is required (Police Document Regarding Mendicancy:1).

In Stockholm, furthermore, 'insignificant' and 'temporary' appropriations of public space can be allowed, although it is also stated that 'what temporary and insignificant entails have to be decided individually in every case' and that 'a guideline can be that appropriation lasting for at most an hour is "temporary" and appropriation of an area lesser then 60x60 centimeters is "insignificant".' (Guiding Document Regarding Mendiancy:1). Yet again, one can see the rigor and attentiveness to detail that saturate how the European migrants are governed; every single one of them shall be individually evaluated, so that the regulatory apparatus instantly can be activated as soon as your blanket, pillow, or bag happens to be 61x61 centimeters rather than 60x60. Similarly, at the protest in Malmö, the court order states that material belongings that were placed next to the owners were targeted and deemed cluttering; bags, for example, should be carried by the person and not be placed on the ground or sat upon. Of course, other groups are allowed to put down and sit on their bags. But then, they are not problematized as spatially disturbing and hence they are not subjected to government geared to narrow their accessibility to public spaces.

In addition to the focus on material belongings, the empirical sources also describe a variety of techniques that target the persons themselves, for example seen in the above example of sleeping at the demonstration in Malmö, where the guiding document read:

> In the cases where people are sleeping at the location, they shall be awoken and informed that they are not allowed to sleep at the location (Internal Guiding Document:2).

Furthermore, in the appeal filed by the Center for Social Rights and the police statement answering to it, it becomes clear that the police systematically woke people up that had fallen asleep (Appeal by CSR:4; Court Decision:10; Police Statement:2f). Likewise, waking up sleeping European migrants is also a common way to handle mendiancy in Stockholm. The information flyer, discussed above with regards to accessibility, also addresses the conditions of sleeping in the urban public. A short informative text explain that it is not allowed to sleep 'on sidewalks and streets, in parks, cars or other public areas'. This text is complemented by a crossed-out image depicting a person in a tent, a car, and a person sleeping on the ground (Information Flyer). Again, this form of government make use of an interplay between monitoring and intervention; supervise behavior and correct when necessary.

During the protest in Malmö, the regulation of sleepers was coupled with another form of regulatory technique utilized by the police. It is described how the police intervened into how the bodies of the protesters was positioned; any instances of people laying down was rectified – the European migrant protesters were only allowed to stand or sit (Court Decision:3; CSR - Appeal:4; Complement by CSR:6). The protesters were targeted as embodied subjects by detailed intervention into how they positioned their bodies in public. Here, the difference between sitting and laying down, becomes the demarcation line of when it is possible to govern.

~

In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault writes:

> A meticulous observation of detail, and at the same time a political awareness of these small things, for the control and use of men, emerge through the classical age bearing with them a whole set of techniques, a whole corpus of methods and knowledge, descriptions, plans and data. (Foucault, 1995:141)

Here, Foucault describes how one of the central aspects of disciplinary government in a way that is reminiscent of the attentiveness to details that I have described. What we have here, then, is a set of measures and techniques that are used to correct and regulate different aspects of how subjects behave and utilize urban public spaces. Although these techniques are used in different ways, they all focus on correcting the behavior on level where it all boils down to whether you are having your bag in your hand or on the ground beside you, how big your blanket is, or if you are laying down or sitting up. I described in the previous section how the invocation of rules makes certain people governable. This section illustrates how these people are actually governed.

A central aspect of the techniques I have described here, is that they act upon people through the relationship between physical presence and space; they regulate how to behave and what to do *in* urban public spaces. The spatial aspect, however, is also present in the disciplinary power of Foucault, but in a very different way. He emphasizes how discipline functions through spatial division that orders and systematize; the deviant people that are subjected to disciplinary techniques of power are placed in institutions such as prisons or residential care units. For Foucault, this mode of power is intertwined with spaces that are separated, demarked, and exceptional in relation to ordinary public spaces. My descriptions of the management of how European migrants use public space shows that the attention to detail, to the posturing of one's body and the instant corrections when one's blanket is too large, also takes place in public. At least when it comes to groups that are problematized as spatially disturbing. The detailed and attentive techniques, that I have mapped here, set its sight on the quotidian and ordinary spaces of the urban public; the practices of the regulatory mode of spatial governing manage how these urban spaces are utilized. Thus, Foucault highlights how spatial arrangements can operate as means to shape subjects through the techniques of disciplinary power, while I have systemized a set of techniques that, on the level of detail, govern spatially disturbing subjects by regulating how they utilize and behave in space.

2.1.4 Conclusion: Narrowing of Space

In the last two sections, I have described how European migrants are governed by regulatory techniques and the invocation of rules that makes people governable. As I will summaries here, these two elements together operate by a narrowing of space of spatially disturbing subjects.

It is important to note that the invocation of rules and regulatory interventions described above have consequences beyond the immediate context where they are deployed. In Malmö, the empirical sources witness that the measures and interventions by the police made it hard for the protesters to carry out their protest and that it had to be given up after a couple of days (CSR – Complement:7; Informant 1), even if the police stated that wanted to help the protesters. In Stockholm, the systemic nature of intervention meant that the targeted subjects had to move their activities to other places or cease begging. Hence, the goal was not merely to make a particular person chose a smaller blanket or a particular beggar to take up lesser space on the sidewalk, but to tackle the more general problem posed by them as members of spatially disturbing groups. Hence, what I have traced throughout the last two sections of this part is a regime of government that acts upon the spatially disturbing subject by dictating and conditioning their relationship to urban public spaces, to the effect that the spatial accessibility for these people is narrowed. Spaces are narrowed by the dual maneuver of framing these subjects as spatial problems, by the invocation of rules, and through practical interventions. This is therefore not a form of government that operates through general prohibitions, but by matching the behavior of spatially disturbing groups with regulations that allows for corrections and prohibitions regarding the details of how European migrants conduct themselves in public space.

In the first section of this part, I described how European migrants in Western Europe are constituted as spatially disturbing subjects through an overarching problematization of 'public disorder'. In absence of regulatory frameworks that is responsive to this problematization, one can see how the narrowing of space can fill this absence, by transforming the problem of 'alien' spatial behavior into a multiplicity of minor public order offences.

2.2 Governmentality of Space

I will now turn to the second regime of government of spatially disturbing groups, focusing on urban outreach work in Malmö, Gothenburg, and Stockholm. This is a branch of municipal social work that targets vulnerable groups that resides in urban public spaces, such as homeless persons, drug-abusers, or socially marginalized youths. Urban outreach is practiced through locating, approaching, and meeting these groups in the urban environments where they reside. As will become clear in the pages that follow, urban outreach work tackle the problematization of presence through motivation, support, and guidance, rather than through correction and direct intervention. Thus, the main objective of the urban outreach workers is to support

and motivate spatially disturbing subjects to, out of free will, transform their situation. Nevertheless, the targeted people are simultaneously problematized through their spatial behavior and appropriation of public spaces. Thus, I will discuss how urban outreach work manifests a regime of government characterized by the *governmentality of space*.

The analysis that follows is based on the interviews conducted with urban outreach workers in Malmö, Gothenburg, and Stockholm. The spatial aspects of urban outreach work have, for example previously been studied by Robin James Smith and Tom Hall (2017), who investigate urban outreach work in Cardiff, Wales. They argue that this form of social work can understood to negotiate spaces and to produce what they term 'spaces of care-giving' (Smith & Hall, 2017). Although I agree that space is re-negotiated in outreach work, in contrast to Smith and Hall, I understand it as a tool of government.

The analysis of the governmentality of space is divided into four parts. The first one will discuss how the problematization of the targeted groups relates to their spatial presence and thus turn them into spatially disturbing subjects. I will then, in the second part, highlight how outreach work operates by the logics of governmentality. The third part shows that recognition of how spatially disturbing subjects use space is central to this, whilst the fourth part summarizes the overarching characteristics of the governmentality of space.

2.2.1 Identify Deviant Behavior

Like the regime of government that operates through the narrowing space, an intrinsic dimension of this regime of government is to define and identify the groups to be targeted. Central here is that certain ways of conducting oneself is seen as deviant. Hence, the deviating spatial behavior of for example homeless persons is *in itself* a problem that define this group, but it is also a *manifestation* of a broader social problematic and vulnerability. This dual way of understanding the groups to be targeted recurs in the interviews with urban outreach workers. The definition of these groups by merit of their 'deviant' spatial behavior, furthermore, operates as a problematization of presence which constitute them as spatially disturbing subjects. Thus, the problem posed by these people are intertwined with the notion of spatiality; the fact that they appear in places where they are not supposed to be, doing things that they are not supposed to do, is what motivates that they are targeted by the urban outreach workers. This way of problematizing their presence reoccur throughout the interviews in many different shapes, expressed both explicitly and implicitly.

An important theme in my interview material is that the urban outreach workers acknowledge the vulnerability of groups that they target and that their ambition therefore is to help these people. Thus, the deviant spatial behavior of these groups is regularly invoked to illustrate the precariousness of their situation, where their spatial behavior is seen as mirroring the precariousness of their living conditions. Consider for example the following quotes:

> A big part of our job is to scout, "this person looks a lite bit fishy, and we have not seen this person at this location before", and then lookout and see this person again. And there are some attributes one is looking for. If the person looks to be intoxicated, of course. No socks, blue IKEA-bags, dirty clothes. Those are very clear attributes, or if the person is mentally ill, and walks around in a way that makes this apparent. […]. It's hard to… these stereotypes *are* present [when they are looking for individuals to target]. And we find a lot of people by looking for these attributes (C1).

> We focus on adolescents that dwell in the city over time and we pretty soon get an overview of which ones come back night after night. So we can filter out the these from people that are shopping, drinking coffee at a café, or that do something else. They [the targeted group] reside in our environment over time (D1).

The act of residing in certain urban spaces, in certain ways, is here explicitly stated as the feature that characterize the targeted subjects. The first quote both focus on the physical appearance of persons, which marks them from other people, but also how they move around and behave. The second quote illustrates that it is central that the target groups of urban outreach work *do not* conduct themselves normally in public or engage in what is considered to be normal activities, like shopping or having coffee. Hence, it appears as central here to be able to discriminate between targets by observing how people appear and what they do.

The deviant behavior looked for is on numerous occasions illustrated by examples of how targeted groups use certain elements of the urban fabric, such as benches:

> We are often told "thank you for being here" […] we hear that a lot, which is some kind of evidence that we are doing a good job. But some are still sitting on the same bench and drinking, and we have been talking with them for two years. But it can still be that we have done minor things for them (A1).

The use of benches can also be important to detect targets whose physical appearance does not indicate any social problems:

> They are harder to detect. But if we see that the very same person has been sitting on the same bench ten times in a row, you start to take notice. Even though the person is sitting there in a suit (C1).

In this, and all of the quotes, it is clear that people are constituted as problematic by merit of their spatial behavior and appropriation. As was seen in the quote above that describes how some people appear as hard to reach out to, the ambition seems to be to transform the spatial behavior of targeted persons – it is implied that the goals is that people *will not* be sitting on the same bench drinking alcohol if the urban outreach workers are allowed to thoroughly help them.

To transform the behavior of people is also often expressed as an aspiration of the outreach workers, for example seen in the re-occurring stories in the interviews

about accommodation for persons who are homeless. Here, the urban outreach workers emphasize how issues of accommodation is central for the general vulnerability of these people:

> You may have to put a lot of effort into helping someone to get accommodation, but there are a lot of problems with rules and bureaucracy. When you actually succeed and the person have moved in, and you see that this works out really good and the person grows, and feels better, and get new goals in lives. Then it is very obvious that you have succeeded with our work (A1).

Similar aspirations of saving people may also concern marginalized youth:

> We are pretty interested in moving these people to their home districts or municipalities [instead of being in the city center] (D1).

Of course, these goals are admirable and may well truly help people. However, my ambition is to understand this as a spatial form of government. In this section, I have described how deviant spatial behavior define how people define who is targeted by urban outreach work. Thus, here, the problematization of presence is located at the instances where urban outreach workers spot behaviors and attributes that they believe speak of a broader social problematic, but that appears in public spaces. Here, certain people are turned into spatially disturbing subjects that reside in space, but outside the norms that dictates what is perceived as normal. It is implied that the help of the urban outreach workers will transform the spatial behavior of these people. But as the deviant behavior is understood to be a part of the vulnerability and exposure of the group, the efforts to make them change how they use public spaces is also framed as a way of helping the targeted persons. The way that public space is used necessitate the 'outreach' of urban outreach work.

~

The urban outreach worker defines the homeless, straying youths, or drug addicts, through their spatial behavior. Throughout my discussion here, I have highlighted how these groups are defined and described with reference to their deviant behavior, appearance, and appropriation of urban public spaces. There may be a variety of problem that surrounds these groups, but these are throughout the interviews understood as aspects of their spatial presence. Thus, the dissonance between their behavior and the urban spaces where they, are becomes the marker that constitute them as subjects that needs to be managed or helped.

However, it is not only the people that are being targeted by urban outreach work that is defined in this process, but also space itself. The deviant spatial behavior that the interviewees say characterize their targeted groups, also speaks of the norms concerning how these spaces are supposed to be used, that is, not sitting at the same bench day after day, not hanging around in shopping malls, not carrying IKEA-bags and not acting as if you have a mental illness.

2.2.2 Techniques of Governmentality

I will now turn to how the people identified as behaving in ways that defy norms about spatial behavior are governed. As we will see, the detailed regulation of the last part is completely absent. Instead, urban outreach work build on support, motivation, and guidance, where focus lies on the voluntary cooperation and self-determination of the targeted persons. Rather than narrowing how space can be used, the task is to make people becomes new persons that use space in a different way.

Voluntarism and freedom is absolutely central here. Throughout the interviews, the urban outreach workers repeatedly describe how their profession need to acknowledge and respects the self-determination of the people they work with; it is the will of the persons themselves that are important, and the urban outreach workers cannot tell them how they are to live their lives. Instead, the urban outreach work describes their function as supporting:

> You try to make these people reflect themselves by using open questions. But not to put the solution in the hands of them, but, like "how do you want your situation to be solved?". It is a lot of focus on autonomy and independence (A2).

> It is the client who knows what he or she needs. It is all too easy for us social workers to think that we know best (C2).

> We work with voluntarism, which entails that we respect that we are on the youths' arena and that we do not own the place in the same way as if we meet in a social office. We have to make ourselves interesting, so they want to stay and talk to us, and in the next stage ask for help or think that it is okay that we give them help (D1).

In this way, recognizing the freedom of the individual permeates the stories that of the urban outreach worker. Yet, as the quotes indicate, the recognition of freedom is intertwined with an underlying aspiration to support these subjects to use their self-determination to transform their situations; the urban outreach work will never operate through coercion, but will instead motivate people to conduct themselves in certain ways. Continuously, this is described as an issue of being supportive (rather than coercive) and to motivate people:

> We might say "I think that you have right to economic aid, I would like you to go to a social office, how do you feel about that? We can go with you, we can drive you there." We try to motivate them (B2).

> We do linking work, we try to help people to feel motivated to come in touch with social services (B1)

> We use the method Motivating Conversations. It emphasizes, in short, that
> you should start in the person you talk to. That you are curious and asks
> open questions (C1).

These supportive and motivational techniques are interlinked with the problematization of their perceived deviant spatial behavior that I mapped above. This way of working, by recognizing the freedom of the individuals that they work with, is implicitly seen as tool to change how targets make use of public space and, by extension, to also counter the social problems that the deviating spatial behavior is understood as a reflection of.

The overarching image that emerge out of this discussion, is that cultivation of freedom is instrumental for the operation of urban outreach work; instead of forcing people to act in specific ways, they rely on techniques that support and motivate these people do so out of free will. The urban outreach workers do not rule in a traditional sense; they motivate them to strive for change and to transform their situation. Hence, as Foucault teaches, recognizing and respecting someone as 'free' does not imply that government becomes impossible, rather it activates another set of governmental technologies. Fundamental to this is the relationship between the urban outreach worker and the targeted individuals. Instead of authority, the interviewees stress interpersonal relationships of equality and respect that are utilized to support and motivate.

> You have to build the relationships to even get the opportunity to help,
> many people do not trust you from the beginning. It can be that we talk for
> months. Before they talk about what they want to get help with, and to let
> us help them (A1).

> We have people we have been talking to for years, and to build a
> relationship is first and last (C1)

> The most important is to create a good relationship, it is first when you
> have that you can do anything (B1).

> To talk with us, is like talking to an 'imaginary friend' (A2).

~

I showed above how Michel Foucault's examination of disciplinary power can be used to understand the regulatory techniques of the narrowing of space. The motivational techniques that I have mapped in this section is highly different. The support, motivation, and cultivation of self-determination that I have discussed here are instead akin to the Foucauldian concept of *governmentality*. Rather than restricting and directly intervening in how people make use of public space, government can also operate by cultivating subjects that utilize their self-determination and freedom in accordance with an overarching political cause. This is similar to what Barbara Cruikshank, also following Foucault, has called 'the will

to empower'; a way of governing by producing subjects that govern themselves in accordance with the overarching rationalities of government (Cruikshank, 1999:3f).

Interestingly, in the lecture series where Foucault first outlined this model of government, the notion of territory is central in a surprising way. The techniques of power that comprised under the concept of governmentality are the result of a translocation of the focal point of politics – from the governing of territory, to the nurturing of the population (Foucault, 2007:70). Hence, Foucault argues, that modern government pays attention to subjects rather than to space. My discussion here, however, suggests the opposite, namely that the very notion of space constitute the certain groups as problems to be managed. Although Foucault may be right when stating that government has shifted focus – from space to population – I would argue that the government of subjects, and the way subjects are turned into political problems, still may rely on conceptions of space.

2.2.3 Unconditioned Spaces

There is still a dimension of urban outreach work that I have left unexplored up until this point, namely how the motivational work and the will to empower of the urban outreach workers rely on a specific conception of space that accept and acknowledge the spatial appropriation of the targeted groups. In this section, I will highlight how the invocation of this conception of space lies in the heart of the motivational techniques that is manifested in urban outreach work.

The urban outreach workers continuously point out that they see themselves as visitors in spaces belonging to the people that they target. By virtue of being 'guests', furthermore, the urban outreach workers see it as important to respect those who 'owns' these spaces:

> You have to think about that we are on their arenas, and it is their places and their spare time. You have to respect that (A2).

> I think something happens when you share environment with people. In our regular social office, it is the social worker that controls the premises of the encounter, that possess power and therefore there is an expectation on the interaction that is very different [from meeting these groups in 'their' arenas]. We are meeting the youths impartially, we meet them their terms (D1).

> We meet these people where they are. It says so on our cards [that are handed out to potential targets] and I think that is a really good thing (C2).

> We meet them where they are, we come to their bench, to their living place. And that makes us 1000 times more humble. We are at their arenas, at their place, and how do you behave when you are at others? You show respect (B2).

In this way, it appears as fundamental for the urban outreach workers to attend to these spaces as owned by the people they work with. To recognize the spatial appropriation of their targeted groups, is thus also to recognize their own professional responsibilities in these spaces. The recognition of the spatial appropriation made by their targeted groups highlights the limits of the form of work they do; they cannot evict people from the spaces where they reside.

The recognition of the spatial appropriations made by the targeted groups and the responsibilities this entail for the urban outreach worker, imply that spaces constitute the relations between people. Something happens when the urban outreach worker interacts with the targeted subjects in 'their' spaces. As the urban outreach workers meets their targeted subjects in these places, it becomes easier to develop equal, motivational and supportive relationships of the kind that is seen as central to be able to empower people to change their situation.

> The benefit of meeting them in the city, is that we can follow and work with the youths over time (D1).

> Many of those who are threatening at a social office, we never see those tendencies when we meet them outside [in urban public space]. We meet them under totally different premises, and have a totally different position. You can also get to these people in other ways and build different forms of alliances that we can use better their situation (A2).

> I was with a person having a meeting at a social office. And that meeting was one of the worst experiences of my life. It was horrifying. We sit in the waiting room. And then he went into a little room, it felt like an isolation room. One wall was made out of glass, and on the other side it was a social office worker. I wanted to puke (B2).

Hence, by recognizing themselves as visitors, the outreach workers produce the conditions for the techniques that govern through support and motivation; by relying on a specific conception of the spaces of these meetings, specific ways to govern people become possible.

~

The recognition of the spatial appropriations made by the spatially disturbing subjects, underpins the techniques that are utilized by the urban outreach workers to govern. This recognition implies that space constitute relations between people, and by invoking a specific conception of space the urban outreach worker can produce specific interpersonal relationships. The interviewees describe that the spaces of the encounters define the interactions. Following Massey's analysis of space as socially constituted, however, I would rather suggest that the purpose of making government possible defines the spaces as 'theirs', 'owned by them', etcetera.

In the first part of my description of the governmentality of space, I described how urban outreach work relied on a conception of space that functioned as the

border between normality and deviancy, where targets were identified with reference to their deviating spatial behavior. It is a very different conception of space that is manifested here, when places are recognized as owned by these people. We shall return to this duality of conceptions of space below.

2.2.4 Conclusion: The Underlying Logic of Outreach

This part have investigated three different dimensions of how urban outreach work governs groups such as homeless people and marginalized youth. I describe here how urban outreach work manifests a regime of government that sets out to motivate and cultivate spatially disturbing subjects to transform their situation by their own free will. As these people are defined and problematized through their deviant spatial behavior, a transformation of their situation also entails a transformation of how they use public space. I illustrated in the last section how the motivational techniques that operates in this regime of government rests on the recognition of the spatial appropriation made by the subjects that are to be governed. This conception of space makes it possible to govern the spatially disturbing subject through motivational and supportive dialogue.

In other words, the notion of space is intrinsic to this regime of government. However, the recognition of space as 'theirs' is not the only way space is conceptualized through the work of urban outreach. As was seen under the first heading outlining this regime of government, norms about how spaces are to be used are intrinsic to the judgements that some people are to be targeted. Simultaneously, thus, urban outreach work both recognize that the spaces that the groups that they target appear are governed by norms that they break with and that these spaces are theirs. The first is the rationality turning these people into problems to be solved, the second is to facilitate technologies of motivations and support. Then, rather than to solely delimit space, which was the case with the narrowing of space, the governmentality of space both produce people as problems with reference to their spatial behavior and accept their presence in these spaces. This is, then, a regime of government that rests on two opposing conceptions of space.

3   Ending: Government and Conceptions of Spaces

I shall start by providing a summary of my empirical investigation, before ending with some theoretical reflections about the government of spatially disturbing groups.

Up to this point, I have considered two highly different regimes utilized to govern how urban public is used. In the first part of my empirical chapter, I described a regime of government that operated through the narrowing of space and that consists of two intertwined elements. First, the invocation of spatial rules serve as a problematization of European migrants that harmonize their behavior with regulatory frameworks. Thereby, beggars can be frames as problems of accessibility for disabled people and demonstrators as problems since they are camping in ways not allowed. Secondly, I mapped a variety of detailed measures that are enabled by this invocation of rules. These measures govern how space is utilized by a number of meticulous and detailed practical interventions, which in turn rely on supervision and, when necessary, intervention. These two elements constitute the regime of government that operates through the narrowing of space; the spatial behavior of the certain people is continually defined, and re-defined, in a manner enables that enables interventions that restrict their access to urban public space. I also situated my this in the broader context of how debates about European migrants are underpinned by racialized ideas of alien spatial behavior. Since, there are no regulatory framework with the explicit purpose of regulating their presence in Sweden, the narrowing of space makes these people governable by dividing their behavior into a number of offences of public order and by using regulations set up for other purposes.

In my exploration of the governmentality of space, I discussed a regime of government that is operates by cultivating responsible subjects who conduct themselves in accordance with ideas of what is desirable. By studying urban outreach work, I described how the spatially disturbing subjects are motivated, through support and guidance, to pursue a transformation of their situation; the ambition is to encourage people to conduct themselves, and use their self-determination, in ways that change their deviating spatial behavior. Rather than narrowing space, the idea is to make them norm-complying individuals that appear is space as supposed to. This regime of government, moreover, rests on two different conceptions of space. The targeted groups – such as homeless people, stray youth, and drug users – are initially problematized through their spatial behavior in the urban public; the way they conduct themselves disturb the urban spaces where they reside. On the other hand, and at the same time, their spatial appropriations are recognized and accepted. This recognition enables support and motivation,

fostering an equal and interpersonal relationship between the urban outreach workers and the people they target. In other words, the people targeted are first defined as spatially disturbing subjects, but in a second step governed through techniques that act upon their freedom which implies that they are seen as 'owners' of the spaces where they reside.

In first pages of this study, I presented the following research question: *how are spatially disturbing subjects governed?* Drawing on these two descriptions of regimes of government, one way to answer to this question is: spatially disturbing subjects are governed through the two different forms of government – the *narrowing of space* and the *governmentality of space*. The governmental answer to the problematization of presence can be to restrain access to space and how it is used, but it can also be to transform the subjects so that they, out of free will, will not use space in ways that disturb order. The description of these two regimes of government compose the empirical findings of this study.

3.1   Spatialized Government

When I described my ambition for this study, I was also suggesting that I would outline and characterize the theoretical underpinnings of these regimes of government. This is what I will devote the rest of this concluding chapter to.

In *The Birth of Territory*, Stuart Elden investigates the emergence of the political, spatial, and geographical concept of 'territory'. In the closure of his book, he writes:

> Territory should be understood as a political technology, or perhaps better as a bundle of political technologies. Territory is not simply land, in the political-economic sense of rights of use, appropriation, and possession attached to a place; nor is it a narrowly political-strategic question that is closer to a notion of terrain. Territory comprises techniques for measuring land and controlling terrain. Measure and control—the technical and the legal—need to be thought alongside land and terrain. […]. Understanding territory as a political technology is not to define territory once and for all; rather, it is to indicate the issues at stake in grasping how it was understood in different historical and geographical contexts (Elden, 2013:322).

The political aspects of territory, which is the focal point of Elden's book, is an issue very different from those that I have examined throughout this study. In this extract, however, Elden illustrate a very important aspect that also saturates the instances of government that I have investigated, namely how spatiality can inform and shape how people are governed. Now, in the following pages, I will argue that the invocation of different conceptions of space lies *at the heart* of both of the regimes of government that I have described. These regimes rest on different conceptions of space which shapes how they operate – by turning people into spatial problems and by structuring techniques that manage how these subjects make use of urban public spaces.

Again, the problematization of presence, although manifested in different ways, turns people into spatially disturbing subjects. In the section on the narrowing of space, I described two ways in which the European migrant subjects are problematized through their spatial presence and behavior. I discussed an overarching spatial problematization of these people, often portrayed as 'Roma persons', which is underpinned by racialized ideas about 'public disorder' that are expressed in the 'alien' spatial behavior of these people. But, more importantly, I also examined how the invocation of rules operates as a problematization of these people by defining their spatial behavior through a set of spatial rules that enable techniques to govern them. In the section of the governmentality of space, I highlighted how groups such as homeless and socially marginalized youth are defined and identified through their deviant spatial behavior, which expresses the problematization of their use of public space. Here, their behavior is perceived as problem as such, but also a manifestation of a broader social vulnerability.

What we have here, then, are different ways to turn people into spatially disturbing subjects. But both of these rely on a specific way of thinking about space. I described in the beginning of this study how the problematization of presence emerge out of a dissonance between how certain people appear in space and the norms that dictates how spaces are to be used; the spatially disturbing subjects appears *in* space, but *outside* its norms. This, however, rests on the assumption that spaces are constituted by norms, or prescriptions, or rules, that are static and that dictate how people should behave in these. The problematization of presence presuppose that there *are* spatial norms inscribed into space and that these *can* be disturbed. This conception of space is, then, present in all of the different forms of spatial problematizations described in my empirical examination of the two regimes of government. It is assumed in the overarching and racialized problematization of the European migrants. It underpins the deviant spatial behavior that defines the homeless or the marginalized youth, and it is also manifested in the invocation of rules that define the behavior of the European migrants as problematic. Spaces are therefore continually re-characterized, but these characterizations do always rely on ideas of space as entangled with prescriptions for how to behave. Hence, space is continuously reconfigured in order to make different forms of government possible, but it is nevertheless also always implicitly understood as ruled by static norms that render certain groups disturbing.

Furthermore, different conceptions of space are also structuring the technologies that are used to govern those who are produced as spatially disturbing. In the section on the narrowing of space, I described how a variety of detailed regulatory techniques were *enabled by* the invocations of rules. Thus, the detailed regulatory techniques draw upon a conception of space that defines certain people as spatially problematic. In the section on the governmentality of space, I highlighted how the motivational techniques that are used to govern are made possible by recognition of the spatial appropriation made by the people targeted by urban outreach work. These recognitions manifest an unconditioned conception of space, where the spatially disturbing subjects 'owns' the spaces where they reside.

Then, both the problematizations and the techniques that comprise these two regimes of government, are intertwined by conceptions of space. However, the

governing that is taking place is also spatialized as such. In both the narrowing and governmentality of space, the logic is that space is conceptualized so that government becomes possible, either by removing the spatially disturbing subjects or by shaping them so that they are not disturbing anymore.

~

The discussion above illustrates how implicit conceptions of space runs through government. As have become clear, these conceptions are not necessarily coherent and consistent. Instead, they comprise a variety of ideas, definitions, and characterizations; there is not just one characterization of space at work here, but a bundle that simultaneously operates in these regimes of government. Throughout my empirical investigation, I have illustrated how these different spatial conceptions are intertwined with the techniques and practices that are mobilized to govern the spatially disturbing subjects.

Doreen Massey writes that spaces are made through processes and practices. In this investigation, spaces are conceptualized through regimes of government, utilized to govern people. Drawing on Massey, one can highlight how the particular conceptions of space that I have discussed are not preceding the regimes of government, but arise *out* of them. Thus, *spatialized government rests on, and is characterized by, conceptions of space.* Hence, another answer to my overarching research question can be formulated: *the spatially disturbing subject are governed through a spatialized government that rests on conceptions of space.*

This have implications for the how one should think about the relationship between politics and space. Here, space certainly is not a neutral materiality where politics plays out, which is the idea of space that Doreen Massey is critical of. Neither does my study discuss space as only political, even though this is also one aspect of what I have discussed and proposed. Rather, throughout my investigation, space appear as a *condition* of politics, where the elasticity of the concept allows for re-configurations that make government possible. I have described how the different concepts of space both produces and manage political problems. Thus, my study does not only highlight how spaces are constituted by politics, but it also illustrates how these constitutions in themselves can be a political catalyst that creates problems and solutions.

4 References

Books and articles

Agarin, Timofey (2014), 'Travelling without moving? Limits of European Governance for Romani Inclusion', *Ethnicities,* 14(6), 737-755.

Bacchi, Carol (2012), 'Why Study Problematizations? Making Politics Visible', *Open Journal of Political Science*, vol. 2 No. 1.

Beckett, Kathrine & Herbert, Steve (2008), 'Dealing with Disorder: Social control in the post-industrial city', *Theoretical Criminology.* 12(1), 5-30.

Brenner, Neil (2017), *Critique of Urbanization: Selected Essays.* Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag.

Brenner, Neil & Theodore, Nik (2017), 'Cities and the Georaphies of Actually Existing Neoliberalism' in *Critique of Urbanization: Selected Essays.* Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag.

Brubaker, Rogers (2005), 'The 'Diaspora' Diaspora', Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28(1): 1-19.

Bulley, D. (2017). *Migration, ethics & power: Spaces of hospitality in international politics*. London: Sage.

Cruikshank, Barbara (1999), *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. New York: Cornell University Press.

De Genova, Nicholas (2002), 'Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life', *Annual Review of Anthopology*, 42(1): 249-265.

De Genova, Nicholas & Yildiz, Can (2017), 'Un/Free mobility: Roma migrants in the European Union', *Social Identities,* 1-17.

Dean, Mitchell (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Elden, Stuart (2013), *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

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

Foucault, Michel (1990), *The History of Sexuality: Vol. 1. The Will to Knowledge*. Hammondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (1995), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, Michel (2007), *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gehl, Jan (2011), *Life Between Buildings.* London: Island Press.

Harvey, David (2008), 'The Right to the City', *New Left Review*, 53: 23-40.

Hedin, Karin (2010), *Gentrifiering, socialgeografisk polarisering och bostadspolitiskt skifte*, Media-Tryck, Lunds Universitet.

Hepworth, Kate (2012), 'Abject citizens: Italian 'Nomad Emergencies' and the deportability of Romanian Roma', *Citizenship Studies*, 16(3-4), 431-449.

Ivlevs, Artjoms & Veliziotis, Michail (2018), 'Local-level immigration and life satisfaction: The EU enlargement experience in England and Wales', *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 50(1), 175-193.

Johnstone C (2017) 'Penalising presence in public space: Control through exclusion of the 'difficult' and 'undesirable'', *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy,* 6(2):1-16.

Kipfer, Stefan & Goonewardena, Kanishka (2013), 'Urban Marxism and the Post-colonial Question: Henri Lefebvre and 'Colonisation'', *Historical Materialism,* 21.2, 76-116.

Kóczé, Angéla (2017), 'Race, migration and neoliberalism: distorted notions of Romani migration in European public discourses', *Social Identities*, 1-15.

Koopman, Colin (2015), 'Two Uses of Michel Foucault in Political Theory: Concepts and Methods in Giorgio Agamben and Ian Hacking', *Constellations*, No.4, 571-585.

Kvale, Steinar (2007), *Doing Interviews.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Lees, Loretta & Slater, Tom & Wyle, Elvin (2008), *Gentrification*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, Henri (2009), 'Reflections on the Politics of Space' in *State, Space, World: Selected Essays.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press.

Low, Setha (2017), *Spatializing Cultur: The Ethnography of Space and Place*. New York: Routledge.

MacLeod, Gordon (2002), 'From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a "Revanchist City"? On the Spatial Injustice of Glasgows Renaissance', *Antipode*, 43:3, 602-624.

Massey, Doreen. (2005) *For Space*. London: Sage.

May, Jon (2000), 'Of nomad and vagrants: single homelessness and narratives of home as place', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 18, 737-759.'

Mohanty, Chandra (1988), 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', Feminist Review, 3, pp. 61-88.

Murphy, Stacey (2009), ''Compassionate' Strategies of Managing Homelessness: Post-Revanchist Geographies in San Francisco', *Antipode,* 41(2), 305-325.

Mäkinen, Virpi (2013), 'Are There Fundamental Rights For Roma Beggars In Europe?', *Political Theology*, 14.2, 201-218.

Rose, Nikolas & Miller, Peter (1992). 'Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government.' *The British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 173-205.

Rose, Nikolas & O'Malley, Pat & Valverde, Mariana (2006), 'Governmentality', *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 2, 83-104.

Schinlder, Sarah (2015), 'Architectural Exclusion: Discrimination and Segregation Through Physical Design of the Built Environment'. *The Yale Law Journal*, 1934-2024.

Smith, J. Robin & Hall, Tom, (2017), 'Everyday territories: homelessness, outreach work and city space', *The British Journal of Sociology,* 1-19.

Sparks, Tony (2012), 'Governing the Homeless in an Age of Compassion', *Antipode,* 44(4), 1510-1531.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1995), 'Can the Subaltern Speak?'. In *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. (Book chapter), pp. 24-29.

Stevens Q (2009) 'Broken' public spaces in theory and in practice'. *Town Planning Review* 80(4-5): 371-391. DOI: 10.3828/tpr.2009.3.

Stouten, Paul (2007), 'Gentrification and urban design in the urban fabric of Rotterdam', *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal,* 11(1), 92-103.

Swärd, Hand (2015), 'EU-medborgarna, tiggeriet och den synliga nöden – en kunskapsöversikt', *Socialmedicinsk tidskrikt*, 3, 268-285.

Tremlett, Annabelle & McGarry, Aidan & Agarin, Timofey (2014), 'The work of Sisyphus: Squaring the circle of Roma Recognition', *Ethnicities,* 14(6), 727-736.

Van Baar, Huub (2016) 'Evictability and the Biopolitical Bordering of Europe', *Antipode*, 49(1), 212-230.

Zuk, Miriam & Bierbaum, Ariel H. & Chapple, Karen & Gorska, Karolina & Loukaitos-Sideris (2017), 'Gentrification, Displacement, and the Role of Public Investment', *Journal of Planning Literature*, 33(1), 31-44.

News articles

aftonbladet.se, 2016-05-26. 'Lättare avhysa EU-migranter'. Accessed on 16 May 2018 from
https://www.aftonbladet.se/senastenytt/ttnyheter/inrikes/article22891484.ab

bizjournals.com, 2017-30-08. 'Security robot that deterred homeless encampments in the Mission gets rebuke from the city'. Accessed on 21 February 2018 from https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2017/12/08/security-robot-homeless-spca-mission-san-francisco.html

dn.se, 2016-05-09. 'Poliskampanj mot sittande tiggare'. Accessed on 15 mars 2018 from https://www.dn.se/sthlm/poliskampanj-mot-sittande-tiggare/

expressen.se, 2017-01-14. 'Droger och våldsbrott – ny vardag i Nordstan'. Accessed on 15 May 2018 from https://www.expressen.se/gt/droger-och-valdsbrott--ny-vardag-i-nordstan/

expressen.se, 2017-08-03. 'Gatubarnen har lämnat Nordstan för Stockholm'. Accessed on 15 May 2018 from https://www.expressen.se/gt/gatubarnen-har-lamnat-nordstan-for-stockholm/

gp.se, 2017-02-14. 'Moderaterna: Gör Nordstan till 'No go-zon''. Accessed on 14 May 2018 from http://www.gp.se/nyheter/moderaterna-gör-nordstan-till-en-no-go-zon-1.4158192 gp.se

gp.se, 2017-11-18. 'Stor satsning på Nordstan inför vintern'. Accessed on 20 February 2018 from http://www.gp.se/nyheter/göteborg/stor-satsning-på-nordstan-inför-vintern-1.4835995

svt.se, 2018-01-30.'Eskilstuna vill införa krav på tillstånd för tiggeri'. Accessed on 14 April 2018 from https://www.svt.se/nyheter/lokalt/sormland/majoriteten-vill-infora-tiggeriforbud-i-eskilstuna

svt.se, 2018-04-05. 'Var fjärde kommun vill ha tiggeriförbud'. Accessed on 16 May 2018 from https://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/var-fjarde-kommun-vill-ha-tiggeriforbud

sydsvenskan.se, 2016-11-18.'Malmöpolisen vill förbjuda folk att sova i bilar'. Accessed on 15 May 2018 from https://www.sydsvenskan.se/2016-11-18/nya-regler-ska-kora-ivag-p-sovare

Other text material

A Sidewalk accessible for everyone: Information Sheet – 'A Sidewalk accessible for everyone' ['En trottoar tillgänglig för alla'].

Appeal by CSR – 'Center for Social Rights: Appeal to the Administrative Court in Malmö' ['Centrum för Sociala Rättigheter: Överklagan till Förvaltningsrätten i Malmö'].

Complement by CSR – 'Center for Social Rights: Complement to the Supreme Administrative Court' ['Centrum för Sociala Rättigheter: Komplettering till Högsta Förvaltningsdomstolen'].

Court Decision – 'Court decision by the Administrative Court in Malmö' ['Förvaltningsrättens avgörande'].

Guiding Document Regarding Mendicancy – 'Mendicancy in public space from the perspective of the Public Order Act' ['Tiggeri på offentlig plats ur ordningslagens perspektiv'].

Information Flyer – 'Information to EU-citizans who visits Sweden and lives or sleeps outside' ['Information till eu-medborgare som besöker Sverige och bor eller sover utomhus'].

Internal Guiding Document – 'Internal Guiding decision regarding the assembly outside the City Hall in Malmö' ['Beslut i stort avseende pågående allmän sammankomst vid stadshuset i Malmö'].

Legal Guidance Document – 'Legal guidance regarding mendicancy' ['Juridisk vägledning angående tiggeri'].

Local Article of Order – 'Local article of order for the municipality of Malmö' ["Lokal ordningstadga för Malmö Kommun"].

Police Statement – 'Police Statement regarding Appeal' ['Yttrande i anledning av överklagande'].

Police Warrant – 'Police Warrant: Confiscation of mattress, 2016-04-05' ['Fullmakt: Förverkande av madrass, 2016-04-05'].

5   Appendix

5.1   Appendix 1: Table of Interviewees

Urban outreach workers

Working Group A – Malmö, working with vulnerable adults in urban public spaces
A1, **A2**

Working Group B – Gothenburg, working with vulnerable adults in urban public spaces
B1, **B2**

Working Group C – Stockholm, working with vulnerable adults in urban public spaces
C1, **C2**

Working Group D – Gothenburg, working with vulnerable youths in urban public spaces
D1, **D2**

Informant Interviews

Informant 1 – Working for an NGO focusing on health issues for intra-European migrants in Malmö.

Informant 2 – Member of a civil society organization focusing about homeless intra-European migrants in Stockholm.

5.2 Appendix 2: Interview guide

1. General questions regarding urban outreach work.

   - What is urban outreach work?

   - What is the purpose of urban outreach work?

   - What does a normal working day look like?

   - Is there anything that is unique with urban outreach work?

   - What is the most important tasks you have as an urban outreach worker?

   - How do you know if you have done a good job?

   - Are there any aspects of your work that is hard or problematic?

   - How should you motivate the need for urban outreach work?

2. Questions regarding the targeted groups.

   - Who are your targeted groups?

   - Is there anything specific with your targeted groups?

   - How do you practically go about when you meet your targeted groups?

   - Is there anything that is important in these meetings?

   - How are you treated by your targeted groups?

   - How do you identify your targeted groups?

3. Questions concerning urban public space.

   - Where does your targeted groups reside?

   - Why does your targeted groups reside in urban public spaces?

   - How do you find the locations where your targeted groups reside?

   - Are there any specific locations that is frequented by your targeted groups?

- Do you think the meeting with the targeted groups is affected by the fact that you interact in urban public spaces?

- What is important to think about when you meet your targeted groups in urban public spaces?

- Are there any aspects of the vulnerability of your targeted groups that is linked to the attribute of residing in urban public spaces?

- Is your work situation affected by the fact that you work in urban public spaces?