A Place Outside Danish Society

Territorial Stigmatisation and Extraordinary Policy Measures in the Danish 'Ghetto'

Sara Høier Olsen

Department of Human Geography
SGEM08
Spring 2019

Examiner: Eric Clark
Supervisor: Henrik Gutzon Larsen

Abstract

In November 2018, the Danish government passed a bill that introduced the category 'severe ghetto' to the law on non-profit housing. Moreover, the bill prescribes extraordinary policy measures in the targeted areas in order to encourage urban regeneration. The non-profit housing associations in 'severe ghettos' are forced to reduce the share of non-profit housing stock to 40% through relabelling, demolition and sale of buildings. The area-based measures are extraordinary and overwrite the tenant's collective property right in the name of dissolving the 'severe ghetto'. This thesis critically examines the spatial production of the 'ghetto' and the 'severe ghetto' and its impact on everyday life practices in the targeted areas through a theoretical framework of territorial stigmatisation and the production of space. The thesis shows that the spatial representation of the 'ghetto' within a formal discursive practise, and the early institutionalisation of its limits, have continuously provided a strong framework for the development of a hegemonic 'ghetto' discourse. The 'ghetto' discourse has allowed the 'severe ghetto' to be articulated as a space of emergency, necessity and exception. The analysis of everyday life in the targeted areas illustrates that the inhabitant's experience of the 'ghetto' discourse is embedded in societal power structures and that inhabitants actively seek to negotiate the representation of the 'ghetto' through spatial and non-spatial practices.

Table of Content

1. Introduction

In his 2018 New Year speech, Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen describes a map of Denmark with 'holes' in it. These 'holes', according to the prime minister, are 'areas that are not Danish in their values' (Løkke Rasmussen 2018). What he describes is a Denmark with enclaves of non-Danish values in urban non-profit housing[1]. The 'holes' in the Danish map are what later would be termed 'severe ghettos' (*hårde ghettoer*) in the strategy paper 'A Denmark without parallel societies – No ghettos in 2030' (Regeringen 2018).

In the strategy paper, the government suggests several extraordinary policy measures to be applied in 'severe ghettos'. The paper includes regulations that restructure the tenant composition in severe 'ghettos' through relabelling, demolition and sale of non-profit housing estates, area-based initiatives in crime-prevention and policies aimed at children and youth. The strategy paper resulted in several bills known in general as the 'act against parallel societies'. The most central bill to this thesis is the L38 amendment to the law on non-profit housing (Folketinget 2018b). The amendment defines 'severe ghettos' as areas that have been on the Ministry for Transport, Building and Housing's so-called 'ghetto list' for four consecutive years. Furthermore, the amendment stresses that the non-profit housing associations together with the municipalities will be involved in decreasing the non-profit housing stock in the 'severe ghettos' through urban regeneration plans that prescribe demolition, sale and relabelling. It is made clear that if the non-profit housing associations do not meet the requirements of the amendment L38, the ministry can decree that 75% of the non-profit housing stock in 'severe ghettos' is dismantled through demolishment and sale. Thus, the L38 amendment has crucial consequences for the non-profit housing associations as it paves the way for extraordinary urban regeneration initiatives in a housing sector that is non-profit and formerly protected by the collective property right.

---

[1] The Danish non-profit housing sector is a mode of housing that is collectively owned by its tenants and financially supported by the state and the municipalities. 1/6 of the Danish population live in non-profit housing (the non-profit housing sector will be elaborated on in Chapter 5).

The concept of the 'ghetto' is not new in Danish politics at this point. The Danish 'ghetto' has been in the political debate since 2004, where the then prime minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, addressed the topic in his New Year speech. Currently, the 'ghetto' refers to urban non-profit housing areas with a socioeconomically disadvantaged tenant composition and additionally over 50% non-western immigrants and descendants. However, the Danish 'ghettos' are multicultural and many different ethnic minorities, as well as ethnic Danes, live side by side. The 'ghetto' as a label for these urban areas is rather peculiar since it originally referred to urban areas of homogeneous population groups, for example, the African-American 'ghetto' in the US.

Loic Wacquant uses the 'ghettos' of south-side Chicago and the French banlieues as a backdrop to describe what he terms 'territorial stigmatisation'. Fuelled by popular culture, the areas that Wacquant describes are somewhat easy to picture before one's inner eye, as defamed and materially deprived housing estates, often concrete high-rises, populated with socioeconomic disadvantaged people, people of colour and ethnic minorities. Wacquant argues that the 'ghettos' of Chicago and the French banlieues have developed through distinct economic and social transformations in history. However, they are both territorial stigmatised and, as he argues, sites of spatial fixations of a marginalised population (Wacquant 2008).

The stigmatised housing estates are easily recognised as a generic place present in many different national contexts. However, these places are in various ways heterogenic and produced through specific structures on national housing markets, political discourses, policies and settlement patterns. It becomes evident that the 'ghetto' as a symbol is the framework that orders and categorises a complex phenomenon of housing, residential segregation, material deprivation and racialisation. The same is conspicuous in the context of the Danish 'ghetto'. The non-profit housing estates on the 'ghetto list' all vary in size, state of the buildings, communities and social challenges. In this sense, the 'ghetto' can be seen as a category that homogenises many differentiated housing estates into one general place – what I in this thesis will term the 'ghetto-place' – and a general policy problem.

Policy discourses produce space which, in the case of the 'act against parallel societies', is the spatial context of tenants that live in 'ghettos' and 'severe ghettos'. The everyday

lived experience is affected by the discursive production of the 'ghetto' as well as the material impacts of the act. However, tenants in 'ghettos' are not only being influenced but actively negotiate and reproduce their neighbourhoods through everyday practices of resistance. These practices are also a productive force that is fundamental to understand the becoming and the consequences of the 'act against parallel societies'.

1.1 Aim and Research Question

The purpose of this thesis is to critically investigate the discursive process in formal political practices, which led to the 'act against parallel societies', and to explore the impact of the act, in the targeted areas. This entails carefully attending the spatial representation of the 'ghetto' within formal political practices. Moreover, it requires attention to how inhabitants of the targeted areas relate to and negotiate the so-called 'ghetto' through their everyday practices. To this end, I propose the following research questions:

How has the 'act on parallel societies' been spatially produced within formal discursive practices, and how do the resulting spatial representations influence everyday life in the targeted areas?

In order to answer the research question, I have conducted two separate analysis. The first part of the question will be addressed through a discourse analysis of central documents in the political process leading up to the passing of the law in November 2018. The discourse analysis will be focused on three nodal points in recent history; 2004, 2010 and 2018. The main focus of the discourse analysis is on how a certain definition of the 'ghetto' as a place and as a policy problem has gained acceptance and been institutionalised in the law on non-profit housing. Moreover, in the discourse analysis, I critically probe how the 'ghetto' policy problem is embedded in the simultaneous production of spatial representations. The aim is to provide insight into what kind of constructs, spatial and non-spatial, that has been decisive in producing the 'act against parallel societies' and to question the power relations that these constructs are derived from. This emphasises the importance of recognising and including how local inhabitants of 'ghettos' are inflicted by the 'act against parallel societies'.

The second part of the research question will be approached through an analysis of how different actors relate to and negotiate the spatial and non-spatial constructs identified in the discourse analysis. This part will be an analysis of empirical material collected during a fieldwork carried out in a non-profit housing association on the 'ghetto list'. The aim is to illustrate and critically examine the interconnectedness of the discursive formation of the 'act against parallel societies' and the everyday life in the areas.

The following thesis will unfold as follows. Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical framework of the thesis. Chapter 3 elaborates on the methodological framework, philosophy of science, discourse analysis and the study of everyday life experiences. Chapter 4 provides an introductory background and historical review of the Danish non-profit housing sector. Chapter 5 contains the discourse analysis. Chapter 6 contains the analysis of everyday life in the targeted areas. Chapter 7 concludes and reflects the thesis.

2. Territorial Stigmatisation

I approach the research problem presented above in a framework of territorial stigmatisation and the production of space. The following section will take point of departure in Wacquant's work on territorial stigmatisation.

The concept of territorial stigmatisation refers to the production of stigmatised urban areas through the circulation of negative spatial representations on a structural scale, among powerful actors and media representations, and on a local scale among the inhabitants of the stigmatised areas (Wacquant 2007, 2008a, 2014). Wacquant uses the concept of territorial stigmatisation to describe the production of what he calls fixed advanced marginality and its consequences for the people living within its borders. Territorial stigmatisation refers in this sense to the production of a spatial taint that is superimposed on inhabitants living in stigmatised urban areas (Wacquant 2007). With the concept of territorial stigmatisation, Wacquant emphasises a symbolic dimension to urban processes of spatial concentration of poverty and marginalisation that has increased under the era of neoliberalism. Within this framework, territorial stigmatisation is framed as a producing force that shapes policy outcomes as well as influence the everyday life experience of dwelling in marginalised neighbourhoods (Slater 2017:3). The theory, in this sense, highlights the close connection between structural representation and individual experiences.

Territorial stigmatisation was introduced by Loïc Wacquant (Wacquant 2007, 2008a, 2008b) and the concept is based on Wacquant's work on structure and inhabitant trajectory in urban sites of advanced marginality, specifically Chicagos south-side 'ghetto' and a banlieue in the periphery of Paris (Slater 2017). The work of Wacquant on territorial stigmatisation has since stirred the development of a broader research body and discussions on how territorial stigmatisation works in practice

Wacquant takes his point of departure in Goffman's theory of stigma and Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power. In Wacquant's work on territorial stigmatisation, the theory of stigma and the theory of symbolic power work in conjunction with each other. Wacquant makes use of Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power to describe the struggles among actors to impose symbolic meaning to material space. The struggle results in a more or less

stable consensus of the meaning of the social world dominated by powerful actors (Slater 2017: 4).Wacquant focuses on how powerful actors, such as politicians and journalists, produce a negative symbolic representation that imposes stigma on places and thereby its residents. Wacquant makes use of Goffman's theory on stigmatisation, to illuminate the dynamics of production and reproduction of stigma within the local community (Wacquant et al. 2014: 1272). The two theories shed light on the how 'noxious representations of space are produced, diffused, and harnessed in the field of power, by bureaucratic and commercial agencies, as well as in everyday life in ways that alter social identity, strategy, and structure' (Wacquant et al 2014: 1273). Territorial stigmatised areas are easily recognised but it requires careful analysis of the production of space to gain insight into how they are produced.

2.1 The Production of Space

Wacquant's account of space is derived from Bourdieu's thesis on relational social space. Bourdieu argues that structures of the social world are inscribed, through symbols, in the physical space. Bourdieu's relational understanding of the social world frames the urban space as 'contradictory, fragmented and fluid as the contests played out in the manifold, overlapping fields of social space' (Garbin and Millington 2011: 2069). Dynamics of the production of space is of great importance to the theory of territorial stigmatisation and in order to deepen the understanding of space in terms of power and resistance, I will here add Lefebvre's theory of the production of space. The production of space in the Lefebvrian sense, emphasises the dialectic relationship between differentiated spatial dimensions and its embeddedness in power structures.

Lefebvre's (1991) concept of space emphasises the production of space within a conceptual 'triad', consisting of the dialectic tension between three spatial dimensions. The first dimension refers to a 'spatial practice'. To Lefebvre, the spatial practice is the embodied tactile experience of material space which is produced and reproduced through everyday life of its inhabitants. In this sense, the spatial practice refers to the everyday life experience of the materiality of space, moreover, the materiality itself (Lefebvre 1991:38). The second dimension of the triad is the 'representation of space'. The representation of space refers to a process wherein powerful actors conceptualise and categorise space. The representations of space are in this sense produced by planners,

scientists, urbanists and other powerful and institutionalised actors in society. The representation of space is embedded in dominant, and hegemonic societal discourses and actors make use of knowledge and objectivity in order to produce them. However, Lefebvre points out that since the representation of space is influenced by ideology and knowledge it is subjected to constant change as dominating discourses changes over time. The third spatial dimension, 'representational space', refers to the lived space which is experienced through subjective imagination and symbolic meaning-making. Lefebvre argues that: 'it overlays the physical space, making symbolic use of its object' (Lefebvre 1991:39). The representational space is the lived imaginaries and fantasies that appropriate and changes space through systems of symbols and signs. It is the individual symbolic experience of space and the reproduction and negotiation of dominant spatial representations through everyday life processes of symbolic spatial appropriation.

The production of space, as conceptualised in the spatial triad, emphasises the dialectic relationship between the three concepts. 'Representations of space have practical impact … they intervene in and modify spatial textures which are informed by effective knowledge and ideology' (Lefebvre 1991:42). The dialectic tension stresses the constant becoming of space through an ongoing spatial process. Lefebvre asks: 'producers of space have always acted in accordance with a representation, while the 'users' passively experienced whatever was imposed upon them inasmuch as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by their representational space. How much manipulation might occur[?]' (Lefebvre 1991:44). What Lefebvre questions here is the interconnection between the representation of space and the representational space through questioning how far away from each other that the two can be, before there occurs a dissonance. In this sense, Lefebvre indicates that the representational space is not solely subjected to spatial representations. Instead, he suggests that there needs to be a degree of consistency between the spatial representations of a space and the representational symbolic meaning of that space. This emphasises the importance of framing the spatial production as embedded in power relation.

Adding Lefebvre's spatial triad to the conceptualisation of the production of territorial stigmatisation emphasises the importance of specific representations of space in the structural production of the territorial stigmatised areas. Moreover, it also emphasises the relationship between the production of spatial representations and spatial practices as well

as representational space. This constant and interdependent production of space involves a range of different actors – according to Lefebvre, 'all residents of the city, even the least powerful, are involved practically … in the production of space' (Garbin and Millington 2011: 2071). In the following analysis, this is expressed in the emergence of the 'ghetto-place'. The 'ghetto-place' is both a representation of space produced within a dominant policy discourse but simultaneously a representational space, that consists of an imaginary that appropriates and alters spatial practice.

The spatial triad stresses the importance of including spatial practices as also being tactile and material. Lefebvre argues that the material is central in the production of space. 'We may be sure that representations of space have a practical impact, that they intervene in and modify spatial textures which are informed be effective knowledge and ideology … Their interventions occurs by way of construction … a project embedded in a spatial context and a texture which call for 'representation' that will not vanish into the symbolic or imaginary realms' (Lefebvre 1991:42). In this sense, the production of space is not only a matter of the construction of symbolic meaning and discurses, but rather it is influenced by the bodily encounter with the space itself. However, in the case of this thesis, it has been necessary to limit the scope of this study to the representation of space and its relation to everyday life spatial practices and representational space. This excludes the study of the material space and the bodily experience of it. This is not because I find these aspects to be of less importance, on the contrary, I find it to have great importance when dealing with issues of territorial stigmatisation. I will return to reflect upon this in the methodology (Section 3.1)

2.2 The Structural Production of Territorial Stigmatisation

According to Slater (2017), the broad literature on territorial stigmatisation has been mainly focused on individual negotiation and reproduction of territorial stigma, which has left little room for the analysis on how the territories become stigmatised in the first place. In a Danish context, Shultz Larsen (2014) has researched the process of territorial stigmatisation of non-profit housing in Copenhagen's 'West End' (Vestegnen). Shultz Larsen follows Wacquant and focuses attention to the structures that produce and fuel territorial stigmatisation rather than focus on the stigmatised territories as they appear (Larsen 2014:1387). He argues that in order to understand the stigmatisation process it is

important to shift focus from the stigmatisation as based in certain areas to a relational understanding that frames the stigmatisation as a consequence of the historical transformation of symbolic, social and physical space:

> To understand the symbolic and collective downward trajectory of the Copenhagen West End in general, and Tåstrupgård in particular, we must break with substantialist notions of place and reinsert the housing estates into the structures of the relations between symbolic, social, and physical space and their transformations over time (Schultz Larsen 2014: 1393)

Framing the process of stigmatisation as a process over time that is, to some degree, detached from the inherent materiality of the targeted place, makes room for an analysis that conceptualises the territorial stigmatisation as a product of the transformation of the symbolic, social and physical world and not solely a product of the place itself. Shultz Larsen concludes that the territorial stigmatisation of the Copenhagen West-End is based on a number of political negotiations made throughout the past four decades as well as specific dynamics of the Danish housing marked. Schultz Larsen argues that the nexus between non-profit housing (as a concept not as a locality) and certain social problems, has become the foundation for the territorial stigmatisation that non-profit housing estates throughout the country are subjected to. I will return to this specific issue in Chapter 4. Schultz Larsen's take on territorial stigmatisation as a product of abstract transformations of symbolic, social and physical space offers insights into how the symbolic representation of space is embedded in historical political discourses and specific dynamics of the housing market. The detachment of the production of territorial stigmatisation from its spatial fixation yields valuable insight into the structural conditions of territorial stigmatisation but falls short on including the many dimensions of the production of space.

2.3 Extraordinary Measures in Stigmatised Territories

Shults Larsen argues that the political discourse and the structure of the housing market is crucial to the understanding of the production of territorial stigmatisation. The

importance of political and structural influence in producing and reproducing the stigmatised areas is put forward by Wacquant:

> 'once a place is publicly labelled as a 'lawless zone' or 'outlaw estate', outside the common norm, it is easy for the authorities to justify special measures, deviating from both law and custom, which can have the effect – if not the intention – of destabilising and further marginalising their occupants, subjecting them to the dictates of the deregulated labour market, and rendering them invisible or driving them out of a coveted space' (Wacquant 2007: 69).

The possibilities of extraordinary state-led measures in territorial stigmatised areas are of great importance to this thesis. In order to nuance what Wacquant refers to as 'outside the common norm', I have here included theoretical insights from Agamben's (2005) work on the 'state of exception'. In doing so, I take point of departure in Gray and Porter's (2015) analysis of urban regeneration in the state of exception. Gray and Porter show how politics of 'necessity' and 'serving the public good' provide legitimacy for 'spaces of exception' wherein normal universal rules and laws can be excepted by the sovereign power (Gray and Porter 2015: 385). They argue that the 'exception appears as a gap where the law is suspended in the face of necessity: private property rights must of necessity be transcended for exceptional public interest reasons' (Gray and Porter 2015: 393). The authors stress that the 'exceptional public interest reasons' are constructed through politics and thereby emphasises that the gap, which is the state of exception, is as well.

Agamben argues that the state of exception refers to the construction of a space which is positioned outside the norm yet belongs to it. 'The state of exception represents the inclusion and capture of a space that is neither outside nor inside (the space that corresponds to the annulled and suspended norm)' (Agamben 2005: 35). The space of exception, in this framework, is a space where general norms and laws of society are absent which makes room for the implementation of extraordinary measures. Agamben argues that the act of producing a space of exception, that is, delimiting the spatial expansion of society's laws and common norms, is central to the nation as a sovereign power. For the state to construct the state of exception, there is a need to produce a notion

of the state of emergency and necessity. The 'state of emergency … becomes the ground through which sovereign power constitutes and extends itself' (Gregory 2006: 407). Minca (2006) supports this claim through putting forward the spatiality of society's laws in the first place. 'All rights, all laws are thus applicable only to specific 'territorial situations' – and can only be suspended, with respect to such specific 'situations', within the exception' (Minca 2006: 389). Thus, political discursive practices of emergency and necessity and the delimitation of spaces as being specific and outside general norms and laws of society, are embedded in how sovereign power constitutes itself. Gray and Porter add to this that the construction of the state of emergency and necessity can be obtained through 'transposing the vocabulary of war to the civil sphere, providing the necessary 'fictional' state of emergency to justify exceptional measures in urban planning' (Gray and Porter 2015:387). The work on the state of exception provides insight into how territorial stigmatisation and the production of a state of emergency and necessity can provide a space that is open to extraordinary measures. Additionally, it also shows that 'law becomes the site of political struggle not only in its suspension but also in its formulation, interpretation and application' (Gregory 2006:420).

Agamben's work on the state of exception has generally been used to analyse cases of concentration camps, refugee camps and Guantanamo Bay (Gregory 2006). However, drawing on Gray and Porter's work on the state of exception, I will use the concept to probe the dynamics of political discourses that produce spaces of exception which in turn allow extraordinary measures within an urban regeneration framework.

The production of the 'act against parallel societies' and its extraordinary measures in 'ghettos' and 'severe ghettos' will in this sense be investigated through a discourse analysis that emphasises the discursive production of the spatial limitation of certain spaces of exceptions by the means of a creation of a state of emergency and necessity as well as territorial stigmatisation. I will return to discuss the discourse analysis in Section 3.2

2.4 Possibilities for Negotiating the Stigma

As stated at the beginning of this theory section, Wacquant's theory on territorial stigmatisation emphasises the co-production of stigma structurally and locally.

> Rather than being disseminated throughout working-class areas, advanced marginality tends to concentrate in isolated and bounded territories increasingly perceived by both outsiders and insiders as social purgatories, leprous badlands at the heart of the post-industrial metropolis where only the refuse of society would accept to dwell (Wacquant 2007: 67)

Wacquant describes that in response to the structural spatial stigmatisation, residents internalise the stigma of their neighbourhood. This is expressed in residents devaluing their neighbourhood, retreating to their private spheres and exiting the neighbourhood when they achieve economic possibilities (Wacquant 2008: 116). The assumption that locals internalise the territorial stigma has since been discussed and critiqued widely by scholars of territorial stigmatisation (Jensen and Christensen 2012, Kirksness 2012, Gilbert 2010, Shultz Larsen 2011).

In a Danish context, Jensen and Christensen (2012) reject that stigma is internalised. Jensen and Christensen draw on a critique of Wacquant that emphasises the lack of focus on emancipatory politics from within marginalised communities (Jensen and Christensen 2012:76). The study finds that residents in Aalborg East, a heavily stigmatised area, have a 'positive view of the area and consider it a good place to live' (Jensen and Christensen 2012: 88). Jensen and Christensen emphasise that the residents are aware of the stigma and actively respond to the stigma but that it does not lead the residents to understand their neighbourhood as a poor place to live.

The critique is repeated by Kirkeness (2014), in his study of two French banlieues. He argues that the actors living in stigmatised territories do not internalise the stigma but rather they negotiate it throughout everyday practices of resistance. In this framework, 'negotiation' refers to the way in which actors produce, reproduce or resist dominant discourses. Kirkeness finds that actors perceive the spatial stigma highly ambivalent while still being strongly attached to their neighbourhoods:

> '...I focus not on the existing (and numerous) organised forms of resistance to territorial stigmatisation, but rather on the strong

links that many residents develop with their neighbourhood and the ways in which they cope with territorial stigmatisation, at times resorting to specific tactics that challenge, distort, and question the stigmatic language that is ascribed to their place of residence (Kirkness 2014: 1282)

The main focus of Kirkeness' study is the way in which residents cope with the stigma and shows that the strategies employed by residents are manifold. He finds that the actors everyday life negotiations 'can reposition the relations of domination in such a way that they are, even temporarily, reconsidered, toyed with, or transformed' (Kirkeness 2014: 1293). Kirkness argues that the focus on everyday resistance in stigmatised areas makes room for understanding the inhabitants as capable individuals who negotiate their conditions rather than being totally subjected to the domination of territorial stigmatisation. Relating this critique to the production of space as elaborated on above, the importance of representational space, expressed through everyday life negotiation of territorial stigmatisation, is put into the foreground.

The focus on everyday negotiation of territorial stigma will guide the second part of the subsequent analysis along with a focus on the production of space. Critically probing how stigma is negotiated and resisted through everyday practices within a spatial situated framework emphasises the embeddedness of actors in historical, social and spatial transformations.

2.5 Territorial Stigmatisation as a Theoretical Framework

This thesis seeks to gain insight into how the 'act of parallel societies' has been produced and with what consequences. Wacquant's theory on territorial stigmatisation frames stigmatisation as a spatial process and guides the double focus on the structural and the local production of stigmatised territories. The production of space is central to territorial stigmatisation and therefore framed within Lefebvre's spatial triad. The triad foreground the dialectical tension between spatial practice, representations of space and representational space in the production of space. Moreover, it emphasises the production of space within multi-scaled spatial struggles. The production of space provides a theoretical basis for understanding processes of representation and everyday life spatial

practices. The concept of the state of exception provides insight into how policy-making and extraordinary measures are spatially embedded.

The critique of Wacquant and his concept of inhabitants internalising the territorial stigma provides room for an investigation of how actors reflect and negotiate the stigma in their everyday life. The territorial stigma is in this case analysed as a lived event, grounding the experience of residents in the territorial stigmatised areas. Drawing on the insights from Lefebvre, the lived life is important when gaining insight into the production of space.

3. Methodology

In this section, I will reflect upon the methodological and theoretical base of this thesis. As stated above, the main analysis consists of two parts including a discourse analysis of the production of the 'act against parallel societies' and an exploration of the impacts of the 'act' on inhabitants in the targeted areas through the study of everyday life. First, I will elaborate on the philosophy of science that underpins the analytical framework for this study. Second, I will reflect theoretically and methodologically on the discourse analysis that I conduct in the first part of the analysis. At last, I will reflect on the methodological implications of the study of everyday life. A consistent theme throughout this section will be how the methodological choices that inform the analysis are grounded in the philosophy of science.

3.1 Philosophy of Science: Poststructuralism, Discourses and Policy Analysis

The relevance of discourse analysis in the setting of this thesis is founded in a poststructural approach to ontology and epistemology. Choosing to conduct a discourse analysis is not only a methodological choice but also a theoretical and philosophical one. The discourse analysis relies on theoretical conceptualisations of how phenomena should be understood (ontology) as well as it is a method that guides the researcher in how to produce meaningful knowledge about social and physical phenomena (epistemology). Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) argue that 'discourse analysis [...] is not just a method for data analysis, but a theoretical and methodological whole' (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 4) This is not to say that other methodologies cannot be combined with the discourse analysis, but those other methodologies should be supported by the same ontology and epistemology that underpins the discourse analysis. When working with different methodologies in conjunctions with each other, as in this thesis, it is important to reflect on the different out come that stem from each methodology: 'Multiperspectivalism requires that one weighs the approaches up against each other, identifying what kind of (local) knowledge each approach can supply and modifying the approaches in the light of these considerations' (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 4).

Discourse analysis is many different things to many different scholars. In this section, I will focus on a poststructuralist origin of the discourse analysis, which this thesis will adapt in order to make use of the concept of the discourse.

In a poststructural approach, phenomena (here understood as both social and physical) cannot be understood as fixed entities with inherent qualities and meaning. Phenomena cannot be understood or grasped outside of socially founded ideas and representations. This does not imply that physical and social phenomena do not exist or do not have any importance. Instead, it emphasises the importance of the context in which they appear. Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) argue that phenomena 'are not singular, fixed, or discrete entities that can be attributed an essence. Instead, they are best viewed as combinations or patterned networks of diverse elements and relations that are coordinated, arranged combined or patterned to *appear as a convergence*' (Bacchi and Goodwin 2016:14, emphasis added). The stressing of the appearance emphasises the importance of the framework through which a phenomenon is experienced. The framework can be theoretically conceptualised in terms of discourse. Discourses have been theorised in many ways but are (very broadly) defined as structures that contribute meaning to the experienced phenomena. In a poststructuralist approach to knowledge, the understanding of phenomena goes through language which structures how people at a given time and in a given space experience it. 'With language, we create representations of reality that are never mere reflections of a pre-existing reality but contribute to constructing reality [...] Physical objects also exist, but they only gain meaning through discourse.' (Jørgensen ad Phillips 2002: 8-9) In this approach, language is not a reflection of a real reality out there. Instead, language is structured in patterns of discourses, or system of meanings, that produce and reproduce the experienced reality. The connection between language and the experienced reality is arbitrary and therefore, changeable over time. 'The meaning we attach to words is not inherent in them but a result of social conventions whereby we connect certain meanings with certain sounds' (Jørgensen and Philips 2005: 10) The result of social conventions embedded in power structures, is the structure of language and it is continuously sustained and transformed through discursive practices. In the framework of this thesis, discursive practices are understood as the use of language embedded in identifiable social practices such as routines, rules and institutions. All practices that provide coherence in social life (Hajer 2005:302).

Jørgensen and Philips argue that knowledge and truth are not reflections of reality but rather a system of meaning that makes sense in a specific time and space: 'Truth is a discursive construction, and different regimes of knowledge determine what is true and false' (Jørgensen and Phillips 2005: 13). This suggests that a discourse is social and historical specific, which means that the historicity of a specific concept influences its limits and to what extent it can be used in different contexts.

The account of reality and truth is manifold in poststructuralism as well as the understanding of poststructuralism itself. What is central to this thesis' account of poststructuralism is the assumption that reality only can be accessed through the language and that it is through the language that reality is constituted (Stormhøj 2006: 42) The appearance of reality as convergent, takes form through the ongoing discursive practices of producing and reproducing certain dominant systems of meaning. Creating knowledge in a poststructuralist framework consist of acknowledging that knowledge production is also situated in specific discourses which make the knowledge account one out of many (Stormhøj 2006: 42). This does not mean that I imply a relativist epistemology in this thesis. Postmodernism has been critiqued for being relativist and idealist due to it's claim that all knowledge is discursively constructed and thereby lack the ability to acknowledge some accounts of the world better that others. Sayer (2000) emphasises the importance of language in the sense of 'naming' phenomena. However, he stresses the naming's importance in everyday life practices as central to the production of knowledge hereof: 'Postmodernists are right to note the importance of naming in empowering or disempowering people, but naming is only important if it has effects in terms of practical reference, and hence makes people act differently' (Sayer 2000: 71). Drawing on insights from critical realism among others, I have chosen to conduct an analysis that investigate the emergence of specific discourses in formal policy making as well as its impact of everyday life practices.

Exploring recent research within the field of poststructural policy analysis provides important insight into the implications of discourses within a political field and how that relates to the lived life. Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) pinpoint the need for attending the representation of problems in understanding the discursive struggles that make up policy. They argue that 'by asking how 'problems' are represented or constituted in policies, it becomes possible to probe underlying assumptions that render these representations

intelligible and the implications that follow for how lives are imagined and lived' (Bacchi and Goodwin 2016: 6) The authors argue that the discursive practices within a given policy field produce different subject positions that discoursing subjects can inhabit. Subject positions are not limited to the group of people that the policy targets out in society. Instead, the subject positions embrace everyone and everything that is involved in the discursive practice, e.g. policymakers, institutions and documents. The authors argue that 'we are governed through these constituted 'problems', meaning that governing takes place through problematization' (Bacchi and Goodwin 2016:17). The understanding of policy-making as embedded in discursive practices and closely connected to the lived life, will inform this thesis' approach to the analysis of policy documents.

Bacchi and Goodwin argue that the main focus of a poststructural policy analysis should be focused on the problematisation process. They argue that policies are producing problems: 'to intervene, to institute a policy, 'government', including but beyond the state, has to target something like a 'problem' that needs fixing' (Bacchi and Goodwin 2016: 16). Bacchi and Goodwin offer methodological guidance on how to analyse what the problem is represented as, in policy strategies and documents. The approach offers a systematic questioning that unveils the patterned network that constitutes the phenomena of contemporary policies. However, the approach only offers vague methodological guidance on how to answer the questions. This leads me to implement an argumentative discourse analysis by Hajer (1995, 2005) as well as an exploration of everyday life through interviews and observation. I will return to these in the following sections.

Discourses structure how phenomena are experienced by people and thereby they also influence peoples' life and possibilities in life. This is evident in the production of certain subject positions that actors can inhabit. The discussion on agency and structure within discourse and discourse positions is rehearsed in the discussion unfolded among the scholars of territorial stigmatisation dealing with the subject position of inhabitants in stigmatised areas (see Section 2.4). Following the theoretical critique of Wacquant, Lefebvre's spatial triad and Hajer's conceptualisation of discourse (elaborated below) I argue that policy discourses produce how reality is experienced but is continuously negotiated through actor's discursive practices of producing and reproducing the framework through which reality is understood.

3.2 Argumentative Discourse Analysis

In the following section, I will introduce Maarten Hajer's 'Argumentative discourse analysis'. The argumentative discourse analysis approach will guide the discourse analysis of the policy process, allowing the analysis to concentrate on the production of story-lines and the struggle for domination of signs and symbols within policy-making. 'Language has the capacity to make politics, to create signs and symbols that can shift power-balances and impact institutions and policy-making' (Hajer 2005: 300).

In line with Bacchi and Goodwin and their concept of patterned network that appear in convergence, Hajer defines a discourse as 'an ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categories through which meaning is given to social and physical phenomena, and which is produced and reproduced through an identifiable set of practices' (Hajer 2005: 300). Hajer's argumentative discourse analysis focuses on the analysis of the argumentative structure within policy documents, written and spoken material and practices wherein these are produced. In this way, Hajer argues that 'discourse analysis then opens up methodologically sound ways to combine the analysis of the discursive production of meaning with the analysis of the socio-political practices from which social constructs emerge and in which the actors that make these statements engage' (Hajer 2005:300). This analysis is, therefore, a way to understand the context (struggling discourses) through which policy outcomes are produced. The discourse has to go through different states before it can be considered hegemonic.

For Hajer, policy problems must first be defined in discursive practice. Hajer conceptualises this process as *discursive closure* and as the beginning point where actors relate different claims of the policy problem to each other and create a particular definition of the policy problem. In this sense, the discursive closure refers to the process of an issue getting collectively recognised as a problem that can be targeted with policy measures. The ongoing act of linking fragmented understandings of a given policy problem can in this framework be described in the process of discursive closure (Hajer 1995:22)

Hajer argues that when a discourse, and thereby a particular definition of the policy problem, has been defined, actors struggle for the discourse to achieve hegemony within

a specific field, through producing and reproducing the discursive practice that underpin it. In order to analytically relate to the process of struggle for hegemony, Hajer offers the theoretical concepts of story-lines and discourse-coalitions. I will return to these two concepts below. Hajer argues that a discourse becomes dominant when it starts to influence its field, forcing other discoursing subjects in the field to make use of the discursive practices to make sense. Hajer conceptualises this process as *discourse structuration.* Discourse structuration is a way to assess the embedded power relations that discourses emerge from. Discourse structuration refers to the point where a large group of actors within a given field makes use of a discourse so that it becomes dominant. A discourse can become additionally dominant if it solidifies within legal frameworks, measuring systems or other schemes. Hajer conceptualises this point as *discourse institutionalisation.* 'If both criteria are fulfilled, we argue that a particular discourse is dominant' (Hajer 2005: 303). Hajer here sketches a process of how a discourse develops from being conceived as a particular definition of a policy problem, through dominating other definitions of that policy problem to become institutionalised and hegemonic.

The analysis of how a discourse obtains hegemony within its field, is a study of how the problem is represented and an examination of 'how the definition of a political problem relates to the particular narrative in which it is discussed' (Hajer 2005: 299). This emphasises the importance of the focus on how the policy problem is articulated.

3.2.1 Story-lines

For Hajer, story-lines are important because they represent the simplification of complex discourses into a dense narrative which can be exchanged between discoursing subjects: 'A story-line is a condensed statement summarising complex narratives, used by people as 'shorthand' in discussion' (Hajer 2005: 302). Story-lines refer to the discursive practice of communicating and reproducing a discourse within a field of many different discourses. The discursive practice of structuring and relating metaphors, analogies, historical events etc. is producing and reproducing certain story-lines. The story-line gives meaning to an array of different concepts and offers a specific understanding of reality and claim specific political results (Hajer 2005: 63). 'Story-lines fulfil an essential role in the clustering of knowledge, the positioning of actors, and, ultimately, in the creation of coalitions amongst the actors of a given domain' (Hajer 2005: 63) In this

framework, story-lines presents the 'sensemaking' of a discourse without relying on the discursive complexities: 'Story-lines, in other words, not only help to construct a problem, but they also play an important role in the creation of social and moral order in a given domain. Story-lines are devices through which actors are positioned, and through which specific ideas of 'blame' and 'responsibility', and of 'urgency' and 'responsible behaviour' are attributed' (Hajer 1995: 64-65). In the following discourse analysis, story-lines are understood as certain logic narratives that give meaning to specific phenomena.

3.2.2 Discourse-coalition

Discourse-coalition refers to a period in time where a group of discoursing subjects share a number of specific story-lines in the context of a discursive practice (Hajer 2005: 302). Discourse coalitions take place when discourses are actively being related to each other through a discursive practice: 'Discourse-coalitions are formed if previously independent practices are being actively related to one another, if a common discourse is created in which several practices get meaning in a common political project' (Hajer 1995: 65). The shared discursive practice is based in the linguistics of the story-lines. This does not imply that the actors share a political interest but rather that they share the language and practice that the political project is framed within (Ibid: 66). Within the discourse-coalitions, transformations of discourses happen because of the story-lines capacity to mediate different positions. The discourse-coalition approach suggests that politics is a process in which different actors from various backgrounds form specific coalitions around specific story-lines. Story-lines are the medium through which actors try to impose their view of reality on others, suggest certain social positions and practices, and criticise alternative social arrangements (Hajer 2005: 304)

3.2.3 Practical choices in conducting the argumentative discourse analysis

In order to conduct the discourse analysis, I have chosen to focus on three different moments in time where the policy problem of the 'ghetto' has been discussed within a political practice. The analysis is centred on chains of events in 2004, 2010 and 2018. This is not an indication that the policy problem or the discursive practice that defines it disappear in the meantime; instead, it should be understood as a way to operationalise the research question in doable terms. Additionally, I have found that these moments in time

are specific moments of discourse closure, discourse structuration and discourse institutionalisation.

The discourse analysis is conducted through a document analysis. Three types of documents have been included in the main part of the analysis. These are the prime minister's speech transcripts, political strategy papers and transcripts of first treatment of the bills in the parliament. Additional sources of information have been included in the analysis among them, questions to the minister, the bills, the yearly 'ghetto list' and the Danish constitution. The documents that I have included in the discourse analysis are mainly in Danish, which means that I have been translating the quotes into English. As the language plays a significant role in this discourse analysis, I have included all original quotes in Danish in Appendix 1.

In order to obtain the documents, I have systematically gone through the parliament's web archive identifying the relevant parliament debates. In the analysis of the document, I have systematically read all documents for story-lines and discursive practice while mapping them out.

3.3 Conceptualising Everyday Life

Understanding how actors relate to territorial stigmatisation and making sense of their place of living is continuously emphasised in the literature on territorial stigmatisation. Moreover, the everyday life experience is emphasised in the theoretical foundation of the production of a space as well as for the poststructural discourse analysis. I will here draw an outline of the theoretical foundation for grasping how actors make sense of stigmatised spaces thorough everyday life practices. Subsequently, I will elaborate on methods and the empirical material.

The production and reproduction of space through discursive and everyday practices are put into focus in the humanistic geography through the use of phenomenological insights. Seeing space as a mere container of social life has been critiqued by human geographers. Simonsen (1996) suggests that spatiality should rather be conceptualised as a dimension of social life, foregrounding the process of meaning-making in spatial practices, than being subjected to be a mere backdrop to everyday life (Simonsen 1996: 506). Humanistic

geography has contributed to the understanding of space as embedded in processes of meaning-making through its phenomenological understanding of the human experience as the core subject of research. As Buttimer argues: 'space is a dynamic continuum in which the experiencer lives and moves and searches for meaning' (Buttimer 1976:282). In this sense, phenomenology in humanistic geography foregrounds the spatial situatedness of the human experience. The inclusion of the spatial dimension to the human experience emphasises the co-production of space itself and the subjective experience: 'Phenomenologies of the body … tell us how the spatiality of the body takes the form of active engagement with the surrounding world, involving simultaneously a production of that world and a social constitution of the 'body-subject' itself' (Simonsen 2008:146). The 'active engagement with the surrounding world' takes place in an everyday setting through everyday practices and encounters. The focus on the spatial embeddedness of everyday life, stresses the ongoing process of producing and reproducing local space. In this thesis, this means that through a phenomenological approach to everyday life, I am able to focus on the subjective experience of certain spaces and the performative practice of producing space and counter space. Moreover, it paves the way for looking into how the discursive production of a certain representation of space influence the everyday in stigmatised neighbourhoods.

The focus on the individual experience and negotiation of spatial stigma stresses the importance of conceptualising the territorial stigmatisation as lived events. This entails a focus on everyday life, and it brings the spatialities of intimacy and bodily encounters to the foreground. According to Price (2012), the intimate turn in geography refers to a focus on the asymmetrical power relations of material bodily encounters within everyday life. She refers specially to race and ethnicity as bodily materialities that influences how encounters unfold, and stress the importance of conceptualising events as lived. She argues that contacts zones, where everyday encounters happen, are both places of '[c]onnections, understandings, and interruptions of racial and ethnic formation [and places that] can become inhibitory sticky, entrapping racialised bodies, fixing them in space, excluding or immobilising them' (Price 2012: 584). These places, contact zones, where everyday life practices take place, are central to understand how practices of stigma are negotiated. Focusing on everyday practices within a contact zone points out the importance of the relationship between place and lived events: 'Emplaced bodies develop rhythms, habits, and attachments which shape embodied places. Places are defined by

their margins, and the boundaries of places are delimited racially through habit, 'choice', and inertia at least as much as through edict' (Price 2012: 584). The focus on the embeddedness of social life in spatial transformations allow the subsequent analysis to probe how the 'ghetto-place' is constructed on a political scale and how residents of these spaces make sense of the space, are influenced by it and negotiate it.

3.3.1 A mixed method approach

I have employed an ethnographic fieldwork as my methodological approach to gaining empirical material on the meaning-making in everyday life practices and its spatial embeddedness. My approach to the field is based on a feminist critique of knowledge production, which emphasises the awareness of inherent power positions in doing research in marginalised communities. Drawing attention to the asymmetrical power relations of production, feminist researchers seek for methods that 'subvert power-loaded research relationships by engaging in a process of knowledge co-production between researchers and research participants' (Caretta and Riaño 2016: 259). I seek to include this critique in this thesis. However, I have not had the time to conduct participatory methods in knowledge production, though I have been inspired by it. The main contribution from feminist scholars to this thesis is the acknowledgement of situated knowledge. Situated knowledge describes the embeddedness of knowledge production within a context. In this sense, I draw on Haraway's critique of what she terms the 'god trick' which refers to the claim of objective knowledge. She argues that instead, knowledge should be pursued through the acknowledgement of it's contextual becoming. She argues for: 'a view from a body, always a complex, contradictory, structuring, and structured body, versus the view from above, from nowhere, from simplicity ' (Haraway 1988: 589). Haraway's critique forces me to consider my position in the field as an outsider to the non-profit housing community and furthermore to marginalised communities in stigmatised places. Furthermore, it reflects the importance of the theoretical framework that is employed, in order to provide a clear framework for what kind of knowledge that his thesis produces.

The empirical material for this part of the analysis includes three interviews, two articles written by tenants and participant observation carried out at two public events. I acknowledge that the size of the empirical material is small, which challenges my ability

to speak in general terms on the everyday experience of living in the 'ghetto-place'. As I state above, I am not interested in concluding in general terms due to the acknowledgement of the positionality of knowledge. Instead, I seek to provide particular insights on the dynamics of territorial stigmatisation and production of space. This approach does not capture the wide scale of nuances that characterises the lived experience. However, it provides insights into particular and situated experiences that illustrate broader tendencies and suggests paths for further research.

The empirical material has been gathered in a fieldwork, that took place through March and April 2019. During the fieldwork, I have attended two seminars related to housing politics. The first seminar was conducted in The Trampoline House[2] the 20. of March 2019, in their Centre for Art on Migration Politics. The seminar evolved around a panel debating the intersection between housing issues, migration issues and segregation issues. The panel consisted of a journalist, an architect and two tenants from non-profit housing on the 'ghetto list', both involved in an organised political resistance against the 'act against parallel societies'. At the seminar, I became aware of an article written by the one tenant, Aysha Amin. This article is included as a part of the empirical material. I reached out to Aysha Amin in order to give her the opportunity to elaborate on her statement. Unfortunate, she has not returned to me.

The second seminar I attended was carried out in AKB Lundtoftegade, a non-profit housing branch on the 'ghetto list'. The event was a public event that took place in AKB Lundtoftegades common facilities, and it entailed movie screening and a panel debate on housing political issues. At this event, I took contact to the chairman of AKB Lundtoftegade's tenant democracy, who I later interviewed for the purpose of this thesis. Furthermore, I became aware of an article written by Johanne Østervang, a tenant in the 'severe ghetto' Mjølnerparken. I have included the article in the empirical material as well as initiated contact to her, in order to give her the possibility to elaborate on her article. Unfortunate, she has not returned to me either.

---

[2] The Trampoline House is a community centre for asylum seekers, refugees and other citizens in Denmark

The seminars have served as fieldwork for me, since I here conducted participant observation, identified and took contact to key persons and became aware of the different publications in the field. Adding to the interview with the chairman of the local tenant's democracy, I have interviewed two persons. The second interview was the head of the housing social unit in a housing area on the 'ghetto list'. I have not included the interview in the analysed empirical material since the interviewee was not a tenant in the area. Rather I conducted the interview as an expert interview that provided knowledge of the work that the non-profit housing association carry out in relation to being placed on the 'ghetto list'. Although I have not implemented the interview as empirical material, it has still been a source of knowledge and produced my view on the field. The third person I interviewed was a friend of a friend and a tenant in AKB Lundtoftegade. All three interviews where semi-structured and I had prepared an interview guide beforehand. One of the interviews was conducted by phone, and two were conducted face-to-face. I chose to conduct semi-structured interviews due to my focus on both the lifeworld experience of living in the 'ghetto-place' and strategies of negotiation in the 'ghetto-place'.

The voices covered in this empirical material mainly include tenants that are already mobilised in the political struggle over the 'ghetto-place'. Furthermore, it is crucial to notice that the chairman of the tenant democracy not only speaks as himself but also as a representative for his local democracy, which limits the focus on the personal experience and emphasises the systematic negotiation practices.

I have carried out fieldnotes at the seminars and used them as my empirical material. I find it important to emphasise the seminars as both being a source of tenants' individual accounts of living in the 'ghetto-place' as well as a negotiation practice in itself. I will elaborate on this in the analysis. The published articles that I have included in the material can be viewed in the same way, simultaneously accounts of the lifeworld experience and as a negotiation practice. It is important to notice that the authors of the articles do have a political aim with writing and publishing as they do.

4. Background of the Danish Non-profit Housing Sector

The Danish non-profit housing sector is unique. Per 1. January 2018, 987,319 people live in the non-profit housing sector which corresponds to one-sixth of the Danish population (Landsbyggefonden 2018). In a Danish context, non-profit housing is an alternative to owner-occupied housing and private rental housing, and it aims to provide affordable and quality housing for all segments of society. This makes the Danish non-profit housing sector stand out from other social housing projects, as it does not cater only to the most disadvantaged groups of society.

The non-profit housing sector is collectively owned by its tenants and organised in independent housing associations. The sector receives indirect financial support to the construction of new estates through loans from the municipalities that cover 10% of the construction cost. The remaining costs are covered by tenants (2%) and mortgage loans on market conditions (78%) (Rogaczewska 2015). The non-profit housing sector has a common fund called the National Building Trust (Landsbyggefonden) where the collective savings of the tenants are accumulated. The fund is established by law, and its expenditures are politically decided on.

The Danish model on non-profit housing has its origin in 1887, where the first support law on housing of a philanthropic kind was passed (Jensen 2005). However, it was not before 1917 that a non-profit housing association was defined by the 'non-profit' principle (det almennyttige princip). The non-profit housing principle is that the tenants own the properties collectively in the association and that the tenants have individual use right to the apartments. The non-profit housing sector emerged from a political coalition between the Social Democrats (Socialdemokratiet) and the Danish Social Liberal Party (Det Radikale Venstre) after the Second World War. The Ministry of the Interior released a report that dictated the 'housing social path' (den boligsociale linje)[3] which prescribed that the housing market should provide 'good quality housing for as many tenants as

---

[3] I have translated 'det boligsociale' into the housing social. I this context, the concept covers a political aim to solve social problems through housing initiative. Today, the concept refers to social work carried out in disadvantaged non-profit housing branches.

possible, at as low cost as possible and as quickly as possible' (Jensen 2005: 173). This was the beginning of a construction boom in the non-profit housing sector, and it took its departure in an assumption that the housing of the future should be economically available for low-income groups, without being for low-income groups alone (Jensen 2005: 173). 'The housing social path' was a solution to a policy problem that was defined as a problem of poor quality housing in the cities along with an overall housing shortage. The policy outcome became a strong non-profit housing sector, supported by the state and the municipality and owned by its tenants, that invested massively in housing in order to accommodate the growing demand. The new housing estates were mainly built in the suburbs, influenced by modern architecture with a focus on rational interiors with great inflow of light as well as green and safe surrounding areas. Helped along by technical advancement in the construction industry, the housing was built in prefabricated concrete constructions, effectively installed in rational and effective urban plans. The housing took form as large housing estates, typically characterised by monotonous repetitions and populated with high-rises in concrete. The construction boom continued, and between 1945 and 1974, 270,000 non-profit housing units were constructed (Søndergaard et al. 2001: 54, 89). At first, there was a great demand for the affordable housing provided by the non-profit housing associations. However, the demand for non-profit housing declined through the 1970s. Jensen argues that the decline was a result of the increasing popularity and affordability (due to taxreduction) of owner-occupied housing (Jensen 2004: 177). Bech-Danielsen and Christensen agree and add that renovation costs and decreasing demand for large non-profit housing units left some non-profit housing estates with poor economy and increased rent. Moreover, the three authors agree that through the 1970s, a critique of the rational and modern architecture emerged. The critique pinpointed the modern idealistic architectural vision as inhuman, as well as the quantitative and profit-maximising foundation that the construction boom was built on, lost its legitimacy. Another important critique was that the monotone buildings limited the tenant's possibilities for identification and individualisation (Bech-Daniselsen and Christensen 2017:22). The authors suggest that the decreased popularity of the non-profit housing sector stirred a negative spiral wherein families that had the economic means to do so, exchanged their non-profit housing with owner-occupied housing, leaving a more disadvantaged population in the non-profit housing sector.

In 1985, the Centrum Democrats (Centrum Demokraterne) and the Liberal party (Venstre) appointed the Winther commission whose main task was to investigate non-profit housing branches that faced problems of poor economy, maintenance and social problems. The committee was made up by stakeholders, and the work in the committee was conducted with an eye on the privatisation of the non-profit housing sector (Bech-Danielsen and Christensen 2017). The political focus on the non-profit housing sector's inadequacy to perform on the market was fuelled by the contemporary rise of neoliberal political currents across Europe that questioned the sustainability of the welfare state and therefore also the fundament of the non-profit housing. As an example, Thatcher's 'right to buy' policies of privatisation of social housing was thriving in these years (Jensen 2005). The work of the committee resulted in a report released in 1986, which categorised non-profit housing areas with severe economic and social problems as 'maladjusted' (*samspilsramte*). Furthermore, the report showed that there was increasing social segregation on the Danish housing marked, which meant that a disadvantaged population became increasingly concentrated in non-profit housing areas (Jensen 2005:179).

Shultz Larsen (2014) argues that the report of the Winther commission framed the problem of segregation and concentration of a disadvantaged population in non-profit housing as inherent to non-profit housing, rather than as a consequence of dynamics between private housing and non-profit housing on a dual housing marked. 'Petersen [the liberal minister of housing at the time] and the entrepreneurial position he represented in the bureaucratic field managed to rearticulate the housing question as an area-based problem, thereby undercutting the question of equality between different social groups at a national scale' (Shultz Larsen 2014: 1398). The construction of an area-based nature of the problems in non-profit housing was adopted widely and is prevalent in the area-based focus for interventions present up until today. The report thereby linked social problems to non-profit housing. It can be argued that the non-profit housing sector at this point became a more institutionalised part of the welfare state and thereby gained legitimacy. However, the report also questioned the non-profit housing sector as housing for all segments of society. Furthermore, the work of the Winther committee provided political ground for the application of a number of legislation in the following years. Funds were redistributed from advantaged non-profit housing branches to disadvantaged branches and into big renewal projects as well as housing social work, with the overall goal to make the 'maladjusted' branches more popular (Bech-Danielsen and Christensen 2017).

In the 1990s, the non-profit housing sector still dealt with economic and social problems. In 1994 the Social Democratic-led government appointed a council (Byudvalget) whose main task was to solve housing social problems related to a socially vulnerable population and poor integration among immigrants in the non-profit housing sector. The problem of non-profit housing was in this period increasingly articulated as a problem of the concentration of immigrants in non-profit housing (Munk 1999: 5). The work of the council resulted in initiatives of housing social work in the designated areas. The housing social work had an individual character focusing on supporting the individuals to have better better conditions and stregthened oppurtunities. The councils work was mainly targeted immigrants, supporting activities such as Danish language courses and leisure activities. The work was funded by the National Building Trust, the municipality and the state (Munk 1999: 6)

In 2001 a liberal-led government came into power and succeeded in accomplishing two legislations in the years 2002-2004 that each influenced the non-profit housing sectors legal situation; the appropriation of the National Building Trust and the accomplishment of a Danish 'Right to Buy' scheme (Larsen and Lund Hansen 2015). First, the government appropriated the National Building Trust in 2002 by reformulating how the fund should be used and demanding the fund to finance originally municipally funded projects, e.g. In this way, the fund came to cover welfare tasks together with the original emphasis on maintenance and renewal (Larsen and Lund Hansen 2014: 269). In the light from the above-mentioned events in the late 1980s and the start 1990s, the rearticulation of the trust can be understood as the result of an area-based understanding of socio-economic problems. Social problems are in this case, ascribed to the non-profit housing itself and not to the society as a whole, which leads to the placement of the bill for social work within the non-profit housing sector.

In 2004, the Liberal-led government wanted to implement a way for non-profit tenants to become homeowners instead of tenants, believing that it would solve the non-profit housing sector's problems. This became the Danish 'right to buy' scheme. Jensen (2005) argues that the urge to privatise the non-profit housing had been prevalent in the liberal party since 1966 and therefore not a new idea. Furthermore, at this point, liberal parties in England, The Netherlands and Sweden had accomplished similar housing policies

(Jensen 2005: 161). Nevertheless, the government came to face problems with succeeding in their task due to political and sectoral resistance and institutional barriers. Jensen emphasises the institution of the collective property right as the main barrier for privatisation. In 2004 the 'right to buy' scheme was introduced but for a three-year trial period. After the trial period, 63 housing units had been sold, which can be considered as a minimal output (Bech-Danielsen and Christensen 2017). However, Jensen argues that the liberal government succeeded with questioning and delegitimising the institution of non-profit housing as the 'best choice' for providing affordable housing for the general population. Jensen argues that the liberal government succeeds in changing the perspective from society to individual in housing policies by:

> '[disputing] the non-profit housing association's ownership to the
> housing – and thereby their protection from the constitution … to
> delegitimise the collective ownership as an expression of tenant's
> influence on their own housing situation and replace it with the
> individual [ownership]' (Jensen 2005: 169)

Following Jensen, the liberal-led government suffered for not being able to push through a successful 'Right to Buy' scheme but still succeeded in questioning the legitimacy of the non-profit sector. This is important when understanding the following events.

In this section, I have sought to highlight a number of events that have been influential on how the concept of the 'ghetto' was later constructed. The important events I have highlighted above is, first, how the non-profit sector emerges, second, how the Winther committee succeeded in framing social problems of segregation as inherent in the non-profit housing sector and thereby providing an area-based rationale in the following regulations. Third, how the problem increasingly throughout the 1990s was framed as a problem of poor integration of immigrants in the non-profit sector. Fourth, how the Danish 'right to buy' scheme succeeded in questioning the legacy of the non-profit housing sector.

5. Discourse Analysis

The discourse analysis is going to be centred around three points in time; 2004 (5.1), 2010 (5.2) and 2018 (5.3). As elaborated on in the methodology (3.2.3), these points represent crucial moments in the becoming of the 'ghetto' discourse as we know it today. Table 1 shows the main characteristics of the 'ghetto' discourse at each point in time. The table provides an overview of the development of the discourse, the representation of the 'ghetto-place' and the transformation of the institutionalising definitions. 'The 'ghetto' policy problem' and 'The 'ghetto-place'' refer to how the two concepts are articulated in the formal political discourse. 'Spatial limitation' refers to how the targeted areas are limited through discursive articulation and their institutionalisation. 'Story-lines' refers to the specific story-lines that circulate in the certain moment in time.

Table 1: Overview of the Discourse Analysis

Year	The 'ghetto' policy problem	The 'ghetto-place'	Spatial limitation
2004	Concentration and isolation of poorly integrated immigrants Lack of non-Danish values	Places with concentration of non-Danish values Ethnic enclaves without contact to society Place of violence	**Discourse** High share of inhabitants on social benefits High share of people with low education Areas of non-profit housing Specific moving patterns Lack of private investments **Institutionalised** 'Problem affected' areas: Non-profit housing areas with more than 1200 tenants and more than 50% of the tenants in one branch in the area is unemployed or 40% of the tenants in the whole area is unemployed
	Story-lines 2004 Value-based 'us' and 'them' Concentration of 'them' creates violence The non-profit housing sector as inherent platforms of social obligations		
2010	Concentration of non-Danish values in Non-profit housing Architecture Individual (selective segregation) Unfavourable tenant composition	Places that lack of Danish values Hostile materiality Outside Danish society	**Discourse** High share of unemployment High share of convicts High share of immigrants and descendants with non-western background **Institutionalised** 'Ghetto' areas: Physical coherent non-profit housing branches with at least 1000 tenants. The area's population meets two out of three following criteria: 1) the share of immigrants and descendants from non-western countries exceed 50%, 2) the share of tenants in the age 18-64 years without association to the labour market or education system exceeds 40%,

			3) the share of convicted residents exceeds 207 persons per 10,000 tenants
	Story-lines 2010 Value-based 'us' and 'them' Concentration of non-Danish values Tenant composition Selective segregation Spaces of emergency		
2018	Concentration of non-Danish values Negative spiral in 'ghettos' Countercultures in 'ghettos'	Places that lack Danish values Place of crime, tentacles, war, emergency A threat to the Danish society Threat to the common good Space of exception	**Discourse** 'Severe ghetto' **Institutionalised** If an area meets two or more requirements listed below it is categorised as disadvantaged area. 1) over 40% of residents (18-64 years) are without affiliation to the labour market or the education system, 2) the share of convicted is three times as high as the Danish average (from age 15), 3) the share of the population (30-59 years) with no education other than primary school is over 60%, 4) the average income level is less than 55% of the regional income average level If two criteria are met and additionally over 50% of the population is of non-western origin, the area is categorised as a 'ghetto'. An area is categorised as a severe 'ghetto' when it has been categorised as a 'ghetto' in 4 years.
	Story-lines 2018 Value-based 'us' and 'them' Selective segregation No-go zones The 'ghetto-place' as a threat to the common good		

5.1 The Consolidation of the 'Immigrant Ghetto' and the 'Ghetto-place'

Ander Fogh Rasmussen (the prime minister of Denmark 2001-2009) argued in his New Year speech in 2004 that many years of unsuccessful immigration and integration politics had created 'immigrant-ghettos' (Fogh Rasmussen 2004). Immigration and integration had been an important political topic in the previous years due to the Danish People's Party (Dansk Folkeparti) political position as the as the supporting party for the government. Through a systematic review of the parliament debates and media coverage in the years 1995-2004 it has become clear, that it is in this speech, that the concepts of an 'immigrant-ghetto'(*indvandrerghetto*), 'ghettoisation'(*ghettoisering*) and 'ghetto formation' (ghettodannelse) appear as politicised concepts in a public speech to the nation. The concept of 'ghettos' had been used in debates in the parliament the previous

years but mostly by members of the Danish People's Party. Some examples are Kjærsgård's question to the minister of housing in 1997 (Folketinget 1996) and a question to the minister of social affairs (Folketinget 2002). In the prime minister's speech in 2004, the 'ghetto' as a concept is articulated within a powerful discursive practice for the first time. The articulation of the 'ghetto' in that specific discursive practice, provided the emerging 'ghetto' discourse with a legitimacy that it had not been befitting from before.

In his speech, the prime minister describes how the population in the 'immigrant-ghetto' perceive Danish values: 'they unintentionally mix up the Danish 'liberal-mindedness' (*frisind*) with capriciousness. Danish freedom with emptiness. Danish equality with indifference' (Fogh Rasmussen 2004). The most prevalent story-line in this account of the 'ghetto' population is based on an already existing discursive construction of value-based 'us' and 'them'. 'Us' refers to people with Danish values such as liberal-mindedness, freedom and equality and a 'them' refers to people that lack or misunderstand these values. In this sense, the prime minister frames the policy problem of the 'ghetto' as regarding the concentration of poorly integrated immigrants with non-Danish values. He states that the concentration ('ghetto' formation) leads to 'violence, crime and confrontation. We know that from foreign countries' (Fogh Rasmussen 2004).

The speech was followed by a strategy paper named 'The Government's strategy against ghettoisation' (Regeringen 2004) and, amongst other initiatives, a bill that made it possible to govern the influx of people into disadvantaged non-profit housing areas. In the strategy paper, the government describes the 'ghetto' policy problem and offer suitable solutions. In the following I will stress three main issues in the strategy paper that are important for how the policy problem is discursively constructed, namely the definition of the 'ghetto' policy problem, representation of the 'ghetto-place' and the delimitation of the 'ghetto-place'.

5.1.1 The 'ghetto' policy problem and the 'ghetto-place'

The government is discursively constructing the spatial representation of an 'immigrant-ghetto' as a specific place and as a specific societal problem. In the strategy paper, the government frames the 'ghetto' policy problem as a problem of the 'ghetto's' physical and mental isolation from the surrounding society: 'real ethnic enclaves or parallel

societies without significant economic, social or cultural contact to the surrounding society' (Regeringen 2004: 12). The focus on segregation is linked to a spatial take on integration. The spatial, economic, social and cultural segregation is seen as a problem for the integration of ethnic minorities. The claim is supported by framing housing areas as 'platforms for general integration in society and for a heightened knowledge about norms and values, that count here [in Denmark]' (Regeringen 2004:11). In this sense, housing areas are highlighted as platforms of integration. The strategy paper itself does not delimit housing areas to non-profit housing alone, but the following housing bill frames non-profit housing areas as specifically inclined to be platforms of integration. This can be understood in the light of the events developed through the 1980s and 1990s that designated the non-profit housing associations as inclined to social responsibility. In this sense, the government draws on a story-line that frames the non-profit housing associations as inherent platforms of social obligations, and thereby represent certain places as a part of the policy problem.

At this point it is also evident that there is a need for articulating the policy problem as a spatial delimited problem. 'The government's strategy against ghettoisation is targeting larger disadvantaged housing areas with massive social problems' (Regeringen 2004: 8). The quote provides an initial argument for area-based and extraordinary measures for urban renewal. This issue is not developed further in the strategy paper nor in the following parliament debate. However, we will see in the following years that there occurs a need for legitimising area-based initiatives in 'ghettos'. This will be discussed further as this analysis progress.

5.1.2 Delimitation of the 'ghetto' policy problem and the 'ghetto-place'

The strategy paper is concerned with the spatial delimitation of the identified policy problem. The delimitation of the policy problem involves a definition of areas that are understood to be 'ghettos'. The delimitation of the 'ghetto-place' is throughout this analysis a central theme and the first official definition of the areas is evident in this strategy paper (Regeringen 2004:15). The definition consists of five indicators. The first indicator states that a rather high share of the residents in a 'ghetto' is receiving cash benefit (*kontanthjælp*)[4] The second indicator states that a high share of the residents has

---

[4] Cash benefit is the lowest rate of monthly welfare benefit that people residing in Denmark can receive

no or low education. The third indicator states that the majority of disadvantaged areas are large non-profit housing areas. The fourth indicator states that the moving patterns in 'ghetto' areas suggest that socio-economically advantaged tenants move out while disadvantaged move in. The fifth indicator states that there is a lack of private investments in a 'ghetto' area. These indicators give some sense of what kind of areas that the government want to target. However, the indicators are not decisive, which let the reader interpret what a 'ghetto' is for her/himself. The third indicator is articulated so that it is suggesting that the majority of disadvantaged housing is non-profit. This is important due to the subsequent delimitation of 'ghettos' exclusively to non-profit housing. The indicators can be seen as an attempt on *discourse closure*, that is to identify and delimit the 'ghetto' policy problem and the 'ghetto-place' as a particular problem in an enclosed physical space.

5.1.3 The parliament debate

Following the prime minister's New Year speech and the government's strategy paper, all parties except the Red-Green Alliance (Enhedslisten) approved a law that implemented a categorisation of non-profit housing as 'problem affected' (problemramte). Moreover, the parliament passed the possibility for the municipalities to reject tenants from the non-profit housing's waiting list, if the tenant had been on cash benefit in a longer period of time, and that the area categorised as 'problem affected'. In the wording of the act, the areas are no longer named 'ghettos'. In the law, an area is 'problem affected' if it is a physical coherent non-profit housing area with one or more branches and more than 1200 tenants, and that at least 50% of the tenants in one branch are unemployed or 40% of the tenants in the whole area is unemployed. The definition of a 'ghetto' is in this sense, is very far away from the one in the strategy paper including only the indicators of non-profit housing and of unemployment. The spatial limitation of the 'ghetto-place' institutionalises at this point but in a form far from the discursive construction in the New Year's speech and the strategy paper. This shows that the process of discourse closure is not completed, however a categorisation of the non-profit housing is institutionalised.

The discussion in the parliament leading up to the passing of the law was characterised by general consent. Politicians from all parties agreed on the problematic 'ghetto'. As the Red-Green Alliance (Enhedslistens) puts it: 'We do not look the same way at the problem,

even though the thing with the 'ghettos', of course, is a problem. We do acknowledge that' (Folketinget 2004a) The social democrats take the step further and describe the 'ghetto' in the same terms as seen in the new year's speech and governments strategy paper: 'inequality has increased, also among kids and youngsters … unemployment has increased, the walls around our ghetto areas are becoming higher and higher' (Folketinget 2004a) and as the Conservatives put it: 'There are some real problems, that we want to solve, namely to dissolve this ghettoisation, for everybody's good' (Folketinget 2004a).The parliament articulates the policy problem with the use of the term 'ghetto' although it is vaguely defined. This parliament debate can be considered a process towards discourse closure. The discoursing subjects are increasingly using the same language in order to discuss a policy problem. In this sense, the politicians are agreeing on the 'ghetto' as a problem even though there is no specific definition of what the 'ghetto' is. Each discoursing subject can interpret this in their own way and the law only targets the bare minimum of what was first defined as the policy problem.

The work with implementing the law was delegated to the municipalities and the non-profit sector. The government appointed a committee, Programbestyrelsen, that investigated the state of problematic affected non-profit housing and provide the government with recommendations for their further work. The committee was appointed in 2004 and their results were published in 2008 (Programbestyrelsen 2008).

5.2 The First 'Ghetto list'

In 2010, the debate on 'ghettos' reopened. In the meantime, Lars Løkke Rasmussen had become prime minister and Programbestyrelsens recommendations had been published in 2008. Only a few of the recommendations had been carried out and the prime minister addresses the 'ghetto' problem in his 'opening of the parliament' speech in October 2010.

In the speech, the prime minister addresses what he terms 'holes in the Danish map' (Løkke Rasmussen 2010). These holes are 'places, where Danish values clearly are no longer leading' (Løkke Rasmussen 2010). The prime minister primarily defines the 'ghetto' policy problem as a problem of lack of what he calls 'Danish values'. According to the prime minister, Danish values are: 'freedom to be different. Responsibility for the common. Respect for the laws of society. Freedom of speech. Equal opportunities for

men and women' (Løkke Rasmussen 2010). 'Ghettos' are areas where these values are 'missing'.

5.2.1 Representing the 'ghetto-place'

In his speech, the prime minister represents the 'ghetto-place' as a homogenous category of real and material space. It is evident that the prime minister is influenced by the actual materiality of the housing estates that he seeks to target. However, I will not deal with the actual materiality of the 'ghetto-place' in this analysis as discussed in the Section 2.1 and in Section 3.1. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind, the dialectical relationship between spatial practice, the representation of space and the spaces of representation in the analysis below.

In his speech, the prime minister uses the fortress as a metaphor to describe how the 'ghetto-place' is a place that is physically closed off from the surrounding society. He states 'We want to tear down the walls. We want to open the ghetto towards society … They are stone deserts without connection to the surrounding society. Those are the fortresses that we have to break through' (Løkke Rasmussen 2010). These descriptions of the 'ghetto' discursively construct a representation of the 'ghetto-place' as being a homogeneous mass, characterised by lots of concrete and a hostile architecture. By picturing the 'ghetto' as hostile architecture and concrete, the prime minister draws on a story-line that relates a certain architectural style to specific values. In this case, it is the materiality of the construction boom from the 1950s to the 1970s which has been inflicted with values of deprivation and poor living conditions since the beginning of 1980, as elaborated on in Chapter 4. The articulation of the 'ghetto-place' as hostile materiality draws on long term territorial stigmatisation as well as reproduces the stigma in new forms. In the speech, the prime minister merges the story-line of hostile architectural materiality with the story-line of a value based segregation of 'us' and 'them' proving a strong image of how the 'them' are distant, hostile and difficult to reach behind the walls of the concrete fortress. In this sense, the framing of the policy problem becomes a matter of materiality and architectural design and therefore invites solutions to regard the same, which we will see in the events that follow.

Drawing on these story-lines, the prime minister produces the 'ghetto-place' as being outside of the Danish society. This is exemplified through the metaphor of 'value-holes in the Danish map' and in the quote: 'We must bring the ghetto back to the society' (Løkke Rasmussen 2010). The construction of the 'ghetto-place' as a place outside of society is central and is used to name the strategy paper later released by the government. It serves the purpose that it shows that the 'ghetto' is extraordinary for the Danish society. It is not 'normal'.

To follow up on the speech, the government releases a strategy paper called 'The Ghetto back to the Society' (Regeringen 2010). Just as the prime ministers opening speech, the strategy paper legitimises the spatial delimitation of extraordinary policy measures by drawing on a story-line of spatial state of emergency. 'It is not sufficient to continue the former measures. There is a need for new and direct tools to change the areas into normal Danish urban areas. Normal solutions are not sufficient. We face special problems, which demand special solutions' (Regeringen 2010: 6). The spatial state of emergency converts the 'ghetto-place' into a state of exception (Agamben 2005) where it is possible for the state to deprive citizens and associations for basic legal rights. In this case, the state of exception relies on the representation of the 'ghetto-place' as being outside the Danish society. As we will see in the following section, there is no deprivation of the citizens and associations legal rights at this point in time. However, it is important to notice due to the chain of events that takes place in 2018.

5.2.2 Parliament debate and the institutionalisation of the 'ghetto'

The strategy paper resulted in a housing agreement between the government, the Danish Peoples Party and the Danish Social Liberal Party. The strategy paper included, among other, the 'ghetto' as a legal concept. (Socialministeriet 2010). The results of this political agreement were three bills (L60, L61 and L62) that were debated in parliament on 17 November 2010 (Folketinget 2010a). The 'ghetto' debate was more divided than in 2004 and the members of parliament got to discuss many different aspects of the bills. In the following analysis I will emphasise two main issues, namely 1) the definition of the 'ghetto' policy problem, 2) the definition of the 'ghetto-criteria'

The 'ghetto' policy problem

The definition of the 'ghetto' policy problem is to some degree consistent throughout the parliament debate. The agreement within the parliament mainly relies on a story-line that implicates that the tenant composition in the targeted areas is 'out of balance'. The Liberals frame it in the following way: 'In the most disadvantaged (*udsatte*)[5] residential areas, there are more than six out of ten residents who are immigrants or descendants of immigrants from non-western countries. That is a distortion in relation to the rest of the society, that we want to break with' (Folketinget 2010a: 36). This quote shows how the story-line is used in order to make sense of an incomplete articulation of what the problem is. The quote does only imply that the composition of the residents is a problem, not why it is a problem. The story-line allows the speaker and the recipients to make sense and agree over an incomplete statement. This is a story-line that the Conservative People's Party (Folketinget 2010a: 48), Danish Peoples Party (Folketinget 2010a: 42) and the Social Democrats repeat throughout the debate. The Social Democrat's commitment to this definition of the policy problem is evident in a statement 'The Liberals used the phrasing 'we need a better balance in the disadvantaged areas', and I can say that that does the social democrats totally agree in' (Folketinget 2010a: 37). But the Social Democrats shifts the emphasis of the problem in his subsequent argumentation 'The problem in the areas is … a too homogeneous resident composition with a large concentration of poverty, unemployment, crime and some places unfortunate parallel cultures' (Folketinget 2010a: 39). This quote exemplifies that there is an agreement on the storyline of the residential composition as problematic although the definition of the problem is still fragmented from ethnicity to economy. This disagreement is evident in the following institutionalisation of the 'ghetto-criteria'.

The 'ghetto-criteria'

The discursive construction of the policy problem leads to the discussion of the definition of the 'ghetto' areas. The definition of a 'ghetto' in the law (Folketinget 2010b), is a

---

[5] In this case I have used disadvantaged to translate for 'udsatte'. Udsatte can also be translated to vulnerable or exposed. In the material about 'udsatte' areas in a Danish formal context, the term disadvantaged is used and I have therefore chosen to translate udsatte to disadvantaged. See 'Policy for disadvantaged areas' (Københavns Kommune: 2013)

prolongation of the criteria introduced in 2004. The new criteria are three main criteria and one condition. The condition is that residential areas can be categorised as 'ghettos' if they are physical coherent non-profit housing branches with at least 1000 tenants. Additionally, the area has to meet two out of the three of the following criteria: 1) the share of immigrants and descendants from non-western countries exceed 50%, 2) the share of tenants in the age 18-64 years without association to the labour market or education system exceeds 40%, 3) the share of convicted residents exceeds 207 persons per 10,000 tenants. The definition is questioned in the debate. The Danish Social Liberal Party and the Red-Green Alliance continuously demands a critique of the criterium regarding the tenants' ethnic origin. However, the remaining parties do not share this critique when they are confronted with it. Furthermore, it is important to notice that the non-profit housing as a condition for being considered as a 'ghetto' is not being addressed in the debate at all, neither is the rest of the criteria. The lack of critique yields evidence that the relationship between non-profit housing and the 'ghetto-place' is already closely knit.

The construction of the policy problem and the definition of the 'ghettos' in the parliamentary debate show that the parliament increasingly agrees on the policy problem and its spatial limitations. This is the point where the definition of the 'ghetto' institutionalises in the law and the 'ghetto' discourse becomes hegemonic.

5.3 The Great 'Ghetto' Plan to End them All

Between 2010 and 2018 there is a number of events that should be mentioned before diving into the analysis of contemporary events. First of all, there is a change of government in 2011. The Social Democrats form a government together with the Social-Liberals and the Socialist People's Party from 2011-2014. In 2013 the government adds two criteria to the 'ghetto' definition; income level and educational level (Folketinget 2013b). The adding of the criteria is passed in the parliament by the government together with the Conservative People's Party and the Liberal Alliance. The Liberals and Danish People's Party voted against, due to the persuasion that the new criteria dilute the 'ghetto' concept (Folketinget 2013a: 40, 43). The Liberals comment that according to the new 'ghetto-criteria' the idea of what makes a 'ghetto' is no longer accurate: 'It is apparently alright that there are parallel societies and lots of criminals [in the ghetto] if they just have

an education, income and affiliation to the labour marked' (Folketinget 2013a:40). This is evidence that there at this point is a struggle of how the 'ghetto' concept should institutionalise and thereby how it should be defined. This means that the 'ghetto' discourse is not as hegemonic at this point as it was at the end of 2011. However, the new definition is institutionalised in the law. In 2015 there was a governmental change and the Liberals and the Conservative People's Party again formed government with Lars Løkke Rasmussen as the prime minister. During the prime minister's New Year speech in 2018, the prime minister addresses the 'ghetto' policy problem and shortly after that, the government releases a strategy paper that is named 'A Denmark without parallel societies – no ghettos in 2030'. As the title indicates, the terms parallel society and 'ghetto' overlap to a degree that the two are used as a synonym to each other.

In his New Year speech, the prime minister articulates the 'ghetto' policy problem to be a problem of lack of Danish values in certain urban areas. The prime minister is drawing on a story-line of 'us and them' which has been present since the 2004 speech. The story-line has continuously developed and enforced a discursive construct of the opposites 'Danish values' and 'non-Danish values'. In this sense, the 'ghetto-place' is produced as a place of 'the other'. A place that is defined by its mere opposition to what is Danish (Andersson and Molina 2003, Simonsen 2008). The prime minister indicates this by drawing on already established story-lines of 'selective segregation' and 'counter cultures'. 'Around the country, there are parallel societies. Many people with the same problems are bunched together. It creates a negative spiral. A counterculture. Where one does not take responsibility, do not participate, do not use the opportunities, we have in Denmark – but place oneself outside [society]' (Løkke Rasmussen 2018). The story-lines rely on historical construction of the 'ghetto-place' as hostile to the surrounding society and the 'ghetto' as outside society the Danish society.

5.3.1 The 'ghetto-place' as an enemy to the Danish society

In his speech, the prime minister builds upon an already established and dominant representation of the 'ghetto-place' in his construction of a state of emergency in the 'ghetto-place'. He argues:

> 'the ghettos also send out tentacles out on the streets, where
> criminal gangs create insecurity. Into the schools, where

45

neglected kids hang on the edge. Down to the finances of the municipality, where the tax income is smaller, and the expenses are larger than they have to be. And out in the society, where Danish values as equality, open-mindedness and tolerance lose ground (Danske værdier taber terræn).' (Løkke Rasmussen 2018).

In this quote, the prime minister frames the 'ghetto-place' as an entity which has its own inherent will to do things. Here the properties of the 'ghetto-place' include being able to send tentacles to the streets, to the schools and to the municipality. The 'ghetto' is acting in its own right which makes it into an almost mythic phenomenon. The framing of the 'ghetto-place' in this way, pushes the boundaries on how and why society should intervene. Furthermore, the quote makes use of a war terminology which juxtaposes the 'ghetto' policy problem with the one of a war between Danish values and non-Danish values. In this quote, the prime minister constructs the 'ghetto' as being an enemy to the Danish values, and to the Danish society. The construction of the 'ghetto-place' as hostile to the Danish society and in a state of emergency appears as an attempt to construct the 'ghetto-place' as in a state of exception. I emphasise this construct here because it is crucial to the subsequent passing of extraordinary measures in the parliament.

5.3.2. Spatial limitations and the 'ghetto-criteria'

In the strategy paper, there is a renewed focus on the spatial limitations of the 'ghetto' areas. The government argue that they want to subject only the areas and citizens where the problem is the biggest. 'We do not want to limit the many in order to target the few. In that way, we can take more severe and consequent action against the parallel society.' (Regeringen 2018: 7). The quote draws on the discourse of spatial state of emergency present in the debates in 2004 and 2010 as well as in the speech by the prime minister. The quote makes sense due to the construction of the 'ghetto' as being 'outside of society', an abnormal phenomenon and an urgent threat to the Danish society as well as it categorises it as in a state of exception.

As showed in the prior analysis, the construction of the 'ghetto-place' is deeply embedded in the definition of its spatial limitations. In the strategy paper, the government suggest changing the definition of the 'ghetto-criteria' which are met in the following parliament

debate. The 'ghetto-criteria' changes to being a matter of 1) over 40% of residents (18-64 years) being without affiliation to the labour market or the education system, 2) the share of convicted is three times as high as the Danish average (from age 15), 3) the share of the population (30-59 years) with no education other than primary school is over 60%, 4) the average income level is less than 55% of the regional income average level. If two of these criteria are met, the area is categorised as a disadvantaged area. If two criteria are met and additionally over 50% of the population is immigrants and descendants of non-western origin, the area is categorised as a 'ghetto'. Furthermore, there is a new category added which is the 'severe ghetto' When an area has been on the 'ghetto list' for four years, it is categorised as a 'severe ghetto'. In the strategy paper, it is suggested that the non-profit housing areas which are categorised as 'severe ghettos' are subjected to a range of different measures (Folketinget 2018b). The category 'severe ghetto' is thereby a historical categorisation that is based on the number of years that a specific non-profit housing area has been on the list. The adding of the category 'severe ghetto' made it possible for the government to spatially define the 16 most 'severe ghetto' areas in 2018. This is a rather small sample, but eventually, it will grow because as the years will pass more and more areas will accommodate the requirements and when an area is categorised as severe, there is no way to get rid of the label. This gradual definition of the 'ghetto-place' allows the government to point out areas that should be met with the extra ordinary measures.

The 'ghetto-criteria' is subsequently discussed in the parliament. The criteria are mainly criticised by the opposition. Two issues are targeted. One is that the government has randomly chosen and redefined the criteria so that more areas would fall into the definition. This critique is put forward by the Red-Green Alliance (Folketinget 2018a: 22) and the Alternative (Folketinget 2018a: 21). In this critique, it is further emphasised that the boundaries are arbitrary and that in some cases only 22 residents determine if an area is a 'ghetto' or not. What is not addressed is that the definition only regards non-profit housing branches. This is evidence that the 'ghetto' discourse dictates the 'ghetto' policy problem to be understood as a problem of non-profit housing. The linkage has been institutionalised continuously since 2004 and can at this point be considered hegemonic. The critique of the remaining criteria is not debated extensively. The Socialistic Peoples Party argues that definitions are necessary. 'To start the initiatives that the housing agreement [Regereingen 2018a] allow, then it is necessary to establish a set of criteria,

that determine which housing areas that the agreement goes for' (Folketinget 2018a: 32). The Danish Peoples party argues more generally that there are unintentional consequences regarding all kinds of laws and draws on the emergency of the policy problem to legitimise the unintended consequences of the definitions (Folketinget 2018a: 18).

5.3.3 The amendment L38

The government presented a number of different laws, that all was discussed in parliament. In the following section, I have focused on the law complex that regards the housing policies. Specifically, the amendment L38 to the law on non-profit housing. Parts of the act was also implemented within policies on children and youth and on criminal law (Transport-, Bygnings, og boligministeriet 2018), these are not included in this analysis. The government, the Danish People's Party, the Social Democrats and Socialistic Peoples Party enter a housing agreement in May 2018 and this housing agreement is the fundament for the subsequent bill that is politically treated first time in October 2018. When the debate starts in October, the before mentioned parties support the agreement while the Danish Social Liberal Party, the Red-Green Alliance and the Alternative are in opposition.

The agreement has a number of housing political initiatives, one of them is the new definition of the 'ghetto list' and the implementation of the category 'severe ghetto', as introduced above. Furthermore, there is a number of measures that target the 'severe ghetto'. The most central measure is that 'severe ghettos' have to reduce the share of non-profit family housing (the most normal apartment unit) down to 40% of the original housing stock (Transport-, Bygnings, og boligministeriet 2018). The law forces the non-profit housing association and the relevant municipality conjointly to produce a development plan for how they want to reduce the number of family units. The law sets forth a set of strategies for reducing the number of family units which are as follows: 1) sale to private investors, 2) demolition of housing and 3) relabelling. Relabelling refers to converting family units into units for elderly or youth (however, there are special physical requirements for elderly and youth housing). The Ministry for Transport, Buildings and Housing must approve the development plan. If the non-profit housing association and the municipality do not succeed in getting approval from the minister, the housing association and the municipality are forced to dismantle the 'severe ghetto' which

means that they have to reduce the share of non-profit housing to 25% of the original housing stock through forced sale or demolition (Folketinget 2018b). Additionally, new rules are applied for all disadvantaged and 'ghetto' areas according to rental agreements. Here it is introduced that there should be an exclusion of tenants on social benefits and convicted in all areas categorised as 'severe ghettos' (Transport-, Bygnings, og boligministeriet 2018).

The forced reduction of the non-profit housing stock can be seen as an overwrite of the collective property right that the tenants possess in the non-profit housing associations. However, it is stated in the Danish constitution that 'the right of property shall be inviolable. No person shall be ordered to surrender his property except when required in the public interest (hvor almenvellet kræver det)' (Statsministeriet 2018). The construction of the 'ghetto-place' as a space of exception is crucial to understand why and how the law gets passed in the parliament with a wide support.

5.3.4 The 'ghetto-place' as a threat to the common good

The articulation of the ghetto policy problem in the parliament debate is increasingly being framed as a problem that is a threat against the public interest. The areas are framed as being unsafe: 'there are many residents in these areas that actually feel threatened and unpleasant about the community that they have' (The Liberals in Folketinget 2018a: 21, for similar descriptions by Liberal Alliance p. 24, 26 and Danish People's Party p. 29). A story-line that recur throughout the debate is of 'areas' that are 'no-go zones' for authorities. The story-line is articulated by Danish People's Party (p.29), Conservative People's Party (p. 31) and the Liberal Alliance Minister of Transport, Building, and Housing (p. 39). The minister has been the leader of the negotiations up to the parliament debate and the main proposer of the L38 bill. He articulates the problem in these words:

> When I talk about norms that are important, it is the fundamental
> norms in our society, norms about how one behaves towards
> others … You see that challenged, when we in some of these areas
> cannot send out the police, the mail service or ambulances,
> without them being encountered by young people, who are not
> being corrected by the other residents, when they throw rocks or

in some way or another attack the authorities when they get out into the areas. I do not have knowledge of any areas, that are not a ghetto area in Denmark, where these things happen. These things only happen in the areas that we talk about here … the anti-public spirit (*antisamfundssind*) that I talk about here, exist in these areas and … only in these areas (Folketinget 2018a: 39).

In this quote, the 'ghetto-place' is constructed as a dangerous place that is outside of the normal society's law and order. The 'ghetto-place' is hostile and has an 'anti-public spirit. The quote also emphasises the importance of the discursive connection between the 'ghetto-place' and its spatial limitations. In the minister's quote, the construction of the problem is closely entangled with its spatial limits. The definition and the spatial limitation mutually support and legitimise each other's claims in creating a certain discursive reality.

In this debate, the framing of the 'ghetto' policy problem increasingly connects to an emerging story-line that dictate the 'severe ghetto' as a threat to the public interest. The story-line has not been present in the discursive development assessed in 2004 or 2010, however, the 'severe ghetto' as a threat to the public interest is recurrently brought up in this debate. The 'severe ghetto' as a threat to the common good is articulated by the Social Democrats (Folketinget 2018a: 16) the Liberals (p.20), Liberal Alliance (p.25), the Conservatives (p. 30) and the minister of transport, buildings and housing: 'There can be different ideas of what serves the public interest. I have the perception that it serves the public interest to break with these parallel societies' (Folketinget 2018a: 40). The focus on the public interest is rooted in the legal condition that the state only can conduct expropriation when it is in the public interest. Constructing the 'ghetto' as being a threat to the Danish society, supports the 'public interest' of tearing it down. Drawing on the literature on the spatial state of exception, this can be framed as an imaginary gap that is the construction of emergency and necessity. The understanding of whether or not something is positive for the common good is subjective and constructed through discursive practice and embedded in the categorisation and the limitation of place.

5.4 Partial conclusion and critical reflections on findings

The discourse analysis shows that the institutionalisation practice of the spatial limitation of the 'ghetto' and spatial representation of the 'ghetto-place' has been of great importance in passing the 'act on parallel societies'. Through these, the severe 'ghetto' has been produced as a space of exception and therefore has allowed extraordinary policy measures. The representation of the 'ghetto-place' relies on the constructs that the 'ghetto-place' is outside the Danish society, it is a place hostility and an enemy to the Danish society.

The issues of the 'ghetto-criteria', the 'ghetto-place' and the space of exception will be reflected in the second part of the analysis. In the following, I will discuss how a postcolonial critique of the discursive practice is appropriate at this point. Afterwards, I will discuss the insights that the discourse analysis yields on the dialectic relationship between the representation of space and representational space.

The discursive production of the 'ghetto' and the 'severe ghetto' heavily relies on a story-line of the existence of areas that lack Danish-values. The immense focus on Danish values, which is present in the discursive practice of producing the 'ghetto-place' can be seen in a postcolonial framework as a process of 'spatial othering'. 'Places in the city are by means of signification and categorisation constructed as spatialised 'otherness', which at the same time homogenises them and produces boundaries between those being inside or outside the area' (Simonsen 2008: 147). Simonsen draws on a postcolonial critique that emphasises the power of spatialised otherness in order for the dominant discourse to categorise and devalue acts that take place within the boundary of the 'ghetto'. It can be argued that the discursive practice of producing the 'ghetto-place' is done through a delimitation of what is Danish through the othering of specific places and thereby highly relies on postcolonial and unequal power relations (Anderson and Molina 2003). The othering of specific cultures and spaces can be seen as a way to legitimise the extraordinary measures that the spaces are subjected to. I will come back to this critique in the second part of the analysis.

Furthermore, I want to discuss the centrality of the spatial representation in the discourse analysis. The representation of the 'ghetto-place', along with the institutionalisation of its

delimitation, is crucial to the production of the 'severe ghetto' as a space of exception. However, the practice of representing the 'ghetto-place' in a policy discourse also yields insights into the dialectic relationship between Lefebvre's spatial concepts of the representation of space and the representational space. Representing the 'ghetto-place' as a space of tentacles and war, as the prime minister did in 2018 (Section 5.3.1) shift the spatial production practice within policy discourse from being a representation of space that relies on objectivity, to be evidence of a lived representational space . In this sense, the 'ghetto-place' is no longer a mere representation, but a lived spatial fantasy or imagination. In this sense, the prime minister's account of the 'ghetto-place' can be framed as a poetic image that represents the lived experience of a space which is heavily influenced by emotions. As Harvey (2006) articulate Lefebvre's 'spaces of representation': 'We may also seek to represent the way this space is emotively and effectively as well as materially lived by means of poetic images, photographic compositions, artistic reconstructions' (Harvey 2006: 279). By framing the 'ghetto-place' as a space of representation, the dialectic tension between representation and lived space is stressed. According to Lefebvre the representation of space is subordinated to a certain logic while representational spaces do not need to obey the same 'rules of consistency' (Lefebvre 1991: 41). The poetic image of the 'ghetto-place' of tentacles and war, presented within a formal discursive policy practice indicate that representational space, as lived and imagined, pushes the borders for the representation of space.

6. Analysis: Negotiating the 'Ghetto-place'

The spatial limitation of the 'ghetto' and thereby the definition of the 'ghetto-criteria' is an ongoing theme in the discourse analysis as well as in the empirical material. The categorisation of a non-profit housing association as a 'ghetto' is done on the basis of the tenant's socio-economic status and ethnicity. In that sense, the 'ghetto-criteria' take into account the personal history of all individual tenants in non-profit housing areas. In the empirical material, the 'ghetto-criteria' are articulated as mediating a direct and individual relationship between the 'ghetto-place' and its tenants. Thus, the 'ghetto-criteria' are central to the analysis of how the relationship between the tenants in 'ghettos' and the 'ghetto-place' as a discursive representation unfolds.

6.1 The 'Ghetto-criteria'

Aysha Amin, an activist, developer and artist, born and raised in Gellerup, a 'severe ghetto' in Denmark's second largest city, Aarhus, articulates the experience of being recognised by the state through the 'ghetto-criteria'. In her article 'Being a percentage, rather than a human being in Denmark', Amin writes: 'Your skin colour and name suddenly imply whether or not you are improving or degrading your neighbourhood. You become a percentage rather than a human being' (Amin 2017). Amin in this way stresses the individual experience of having a personal history that influences the categorisation of one's neighbourhood negatively. She articulates the experience in terms of being recognised by the state as negative numbers on a spreadsheet.

The issue that Amin addresses is also present in the panel debate at the event in Lundtoftegade. Throughout the debate, there are residents that address similar experiences of being 'reduced to a percentage'. Among the residents, there is one woman who explains how she is unable understand the purpose of the 'ghetto-criteria'. She explains that she only has obtained a primary education (folkeskole) but still has been working her whole life as a social worker. She articulates that it seems as she counts as one of the 'unwanted' according to her lack of formal education. This statement is echoed by a member of the local board and a long-time tenant. She stresses her own lack of education, but also the amount of volunteer work that she has done for the local community and asks: 'How can that be a minus?' During the interview, the chairman of a housing association on the 'ghetto list', points out the consequences of the 'ghetto-

criteria' for the individual tenants. He argues that 'the stigmatisation of specific groups can result in specific self-images of the targeted tenants … suddenly one [the tenant that count in the criteria] is affected on one's shame or one's identity' (Interview 2). In her article, Amin also articulates shame connected with the 'ghetto-criteria': 'The majority of us may have non-western backgrounds, but we are Danish citizens. What is a statistic like this supposed to prove? That having a non-western background is shameful?' (Amin 2017). The chairman and Amin articulate the shame that comes from counting negatively in the 'ghetto-criteria' in two different ways: the chairman describes the shamefulness as an individual experience, while Amin refuses to feel shameful. Instead, Amin exhibits the absurdity of the statistic itself.

These accounts of the relation to the 'ghetto-criteria', and thus the 'ghetto-place', are diverse and suggest different ways of relating to the stigma. However, they all paint a picture wherein the criteria are demeaning to one's self-image. In the framework of territorial stigmatisation, this can be understood as a matter of stigma superimposed on the tenants because they live in a stigmatised neighbourhood. However, the empirical material analysed above suggests that the tenants do not feel stigmatised as a result of their mere inhabitation of a stigmatised territory. Instead, they experience the stigma through the knowledge that they contribute in making their place of living into a 'ghetto' because of their personal history. The tenants are all individually recognised as being degrading their neighbourhood based on their origin, their past, their income or their affiliation with the labour market. This analysis illustrates how stigmatised individual personality traits (as joblessness or ethnicity) are amplified in the 'ghetto-place' through the 'ghetto-criteria'.

The personal experiences of the 'ghetto-criteria' indicate the importance of framing lived experiences as embedded in social, historical and spatial transformations. The individual experience of the 'ghetto-criteria' shows that the experience of the stigma is a composition of different and intersecting forces. Making use of the theory on geography of intimacy, the 'ghetto-place' can be understood as a contact zone that 'become inhibitory sticky, entrapping racialised bodies, fixing them in space, excluding or immobilising them' (Price 2012: 584). Price draws attention to the fixation of a stigmatised body within stigmatised space. In the case of the tenants in the 'ghetto', it is illustrated how the already stigmatised tenants are fixated in space through the 'ghetto-

criteria'. The 'ghetto-place' and its discursive construction as a place outside of society and a place of otherness, is in this sense central to the intersection of the stigmatisation. The 'ghetto-place' becomes a space that devalues certain personality traits through institutionalised categorisation and bordering. The use of the vocabulary of shame and anger indicates that the implications of living in the 'ghetto-place' as an already stigmatised person is severe. The 'ghetto-place' itself become an indicator of how inhabitants experience and relate to their past.

The 'ghetto-criteria' is a concrete example of how the discursive production of a 'ghetto-place' within the policy field, relates directly to actors living in the 'ghetto-place'. The 'ghetto-criteria' are articulated and reflected upon, showing that residents are quite aware of the stigmatisation that they are subjected to. The analysis suggests that the intersection of living in a 'ghetto-place' and personally meeting the 'ghetto-criteria' has a significant impact on the affected tenants.

6.2 Living in a 'Ghetto' Outside of the Danish Society

The discourse analysis concludes that the production of the 'act against parallel societies' is based on a spatial representation of the 'ghetto' as being a place outside of society which has led to what can be termed a space of exception. This is reflected in the artist and tenant in Mjølnerparken[6], Johanne Østervang's article with the name: 'Urban Regeneration :-(Or how Mjølnerparken is getting whitewashed too, or how I surprised myself by wanting more raw concrete and boring asphalt' (Østervang 2018). In the article, Østervang articulates the lived experience of the 'ghetto-place' as detaching her from society as a whole.

> I become sad and feel isolated from the rest of Nørrebro here in
> Mjølnerparken because it does not mean too much when there are
> shots fired here. It is not severe before it happens on the Red Square
> [a place near Mjølnerparken] or other places where normal citizens

---

[6] Mjølnerparken is a small 'severe ghetto' that is located in outer Nørrebro, Copenhagen.

live and come about. One just has to stay away from Mjølnerparken,

that is where all the troublemakers live, they say' (Østervang 2018).

Østervang writes about shootings related to the 'gang-war' in summer 2017, where local criminal formations from Nørrebro (with relations to the rest of the country) conducted drive-by shootings in and around Mjølnerparken and other locations in Nørrebro. In the quote, Østervang points out a feeling of isolation from the rest of her neighbourhood. It becomes evident to her, that crucial events are not ascribed as much meaning when it happens in stigmatised areas like Mjølnerparken, as it would have had, if it has happened in 'normal' places. Østervang emphasises a feeling of lacking solidarity and sympathy from the surrounding neighbourhood. The territorial stigmatisation of the 'severe ghetto' Mjølnerparken, is in this case not experienced as a personal stigma but as a fragmentation of the neighbourhood as a whole that results in a lack of solidarity and as mental segregation from the rest of the neighbourhood. For Østervang, the 'ghetto' category and the stigmatisation become a symbol of the lack of connectedness and community with the rest of the city.

Østervang points out the difference between two places, Mjølnerparken and the Red Square: they are geographically proximate but, in her view, relationally far away when it comes to receiving solidarity from the surrounding society. Drawing on the story-line of selective segregation, the 'ghetto-place' is constructed as a place that is a result of tenants that do not participate in the Danish society on purpose. The connectedness between the 'ghetto-place' as being outside society and the framing of its tenants as self-segregating provides a space that devalues its inhabitants in society. The experiences that are articulated by Østervang, but present as well in the rest of the empirical material, can be seen as a lived experience of the spatialised othering that categorises and homogenises people according to the spatial construct. Moreover, it illustrates representation of the 'ghetto-place' as border-making which defines the inhabitants experience of coherence with the rest of the neighbourhood. Østervang's account of the 'ghetto-place' suggests that the devaluation of inhabitants through specific spatial constructions is experienced as isolation and detachment from the surrounding society.

6.3 Events and Debates as Collective Negotiation Practice

The emphasis on the dual production of territorial stigmatisation from dominant policy discourses above and local defamation from below in Wacquant's theory indicate a theoretical focus on the local production and the negotiation of space. Moreover, this thesis relies on a conceptualisation of the production of space as a being dialectically produced through representation of space, representational space and spatial practices. Accordingly, I will probe how the 'ghetto-place' is negotiated collectively and individual.

Through the fieldwork, I have attended two debate seminars dealing with housing politics. Framing the events as a practice of resistance, yields insight into how the 'ghetto' discourse is negotiated in practice within the community. The seminar 'LTG:DOX, They call us a ghetto' took place in AKB Lundtoftegade, a non-profit housing branch on the 'ghetto list'. AKB Lundtoftegade was on the 'ghetto list' 2010 to 2013 but had managed to get off, but was listed again in 2018. The area is currently on the 'ghetto list' because it meets the 'ghetto-criteria' of the number of convicts, the number of tenants with low education levels and the number of tenants with non-western background. There were around 170 people at the event and after a show of hands, it was evident that 1/3 of the attendees were tenants from AKB Lundtoftegade.

At the event, there was two movie screenings and one-panel debate. The first movie, called '70 Acres in Chicago' (2014) treats themes such as 'ghetto' formation, urban renewal and social mix policies, through twenty years of video footage of a local community living in the deprived housing estate Cabrini Green, Chicago, and their resistance against urban regeneration. Second, there was a screening of the documentary 'Høje Historier' (Tall Stories, 1999), a documentary that documented everyday life in AKB Lundtoftegade with all that it entailed in late 1990. The panel debate represented a broad palette of stakeholders. Present were a professor in urban studies from Roskilde University, the head of the housing social unit in AKB[27], the head of the local housing social unit, a member of the local tenant democracy and a tenant from a non-profit housing branch in Aarhus.

---

[7] AKB København is a non-profit housing association that counts 9000 housing units in Copenhagen

The name of the event, in itself, suggests the presence of a particular negotiation practice. The title, 'They call us a ghetto', implicitly positions the seminar as a place where the 'ghetto' discourse can be questioned and critiqued. At the seminar, the negotiation of the 'ghetto' discourse is present on more than one level. The screening of the documentaries is used to inform and educate tenants on the dynamics of spatial politics. The first documentary explicitly addresses 'social mix' policies in a critical view, emphasising the consequence for low-income communities when it comes to urban regeneration. The second documentary is an ode to the everyday life lived in AKB Lundtoftegade in the late 1990s. The documentary captured the neighbourhood, the familiar local tenant democracy and housing social work anno 1999, including a trip to 'Lalandia' with maladjusted youngsters. The movie partly took place in the same rooms as we sat in that day. The response among the attendees to the documentaries suggested that the films worked as spaces of representation. The documentaries made room for alternative imaginaries of AKB Lundtoftegade, which stood in sharp contrast to political representation of the 'ghetto-place' as hostile and a threat to the Danish society. At the seminar, the documentaries simultaneously represented a community approach to education on social mix policies and a historical identification with the stigmatised subjects providing political ground for belonging, solidarity and action. Furthermore, it stirred the collective memory of AKB Lundtoftegade, creating a sense of community for the tenants. This issue was expressed when a lady stood up and expressed how she had been living in AKB Lundtoftegade for the past 50 years and articulated her anger towards the 'ghetto list'. She ended her speech by saying 'Lundtoftegade is actually the pearl of Nørrebro'. Her statement was received with applause from the room. The practice of stimulating community formation can be framed as a negotiation of the 'ghetto' discourse because it reimagines/appropriates the space of AKB Lundtoftegade as a space of a 'we' instead of a space of hostile materiality and non-Danish values. The negotiation practice indicates that there is a sense of collective rejection and negotiation of the stigma within the community of AKB Lundtoftegade. This kind of negotiation suggests that the tenant's community plays a central role in rejecting the 'ghetto' discourse instead of internalising it. I do not imply to reject the idea that some tenants internalise the stigma; rather, I point towards the importance of further research into the significance of community development in stigmatised territories and the collective imagination and appropriation of space.

The local negotiation of the 'ghetto-place' going on at the seminar also counts the performative action of inviting outsiders into the 'ghetto', showing the 'ghetto' as an average residential area. At this seminar, the space of AKB Lundtoftegade appeared in a positive light. The tenants had been preparing snacks (falafels, bread with spinach, popcorn, etc.) and drinks (ayran, juice) and in the entrance there was a red carpet. The common facilities in AKB Lundtoftegade was full of kindness, hospitality and a sense of community. A representation far from the spatial representations that prevail in the Danish parliament. The chairman of the local board articulates the strategy as follows:

> … if somebody thinks that this is a hermetically closed area where nobody can enter, then we have to emphasise additionally that that is not the case and has never been the case. Then we simply have to put more effort into creating a proper setting for openness and make it really clear that we really like to share things with the surrounding world. It is ridiculous [åndsvagt] that it has to be in this way, but it is. (Interview 2 2019).

The chairman shows that the representation of the 'ghetto' is a concern to the 'we' and that it takes collective action to show the world that the political representation of the 'ghetto-place' is incorrect. In this sense, the seminar come to be a matter of an alternative representation, of the place of AKB Lundtoftegade and thereby the inhabitants. But the chairman also articulates the negotiation practice as inherently problematic for the community by articulating the stupidity of making an effort to represent the positive side of AKB Lundtoftegade. His statement indicates the power relations that the production of space is embedded in. The representation of the 'ghetto-place', which is to be found within the formal 'ghetto' discourse, takes form as a representation, detached from inhabitant's everyday experience of it. He emphasises the overruling of the local's experience of their place of dwelling by dominant and powerful political representations. The chairman argues that it feels 'ridiculous' to have to prove to the society that his experience of his neighbourhood as a positive place is valid, as politicians continuously represent the space as negative. The chairman here offers a valuable insight that points towards the power inequality of the representation of space. The people living in AKB Lundtoftegade do not have the power to construct a dominant representation of their space and is therefore subjected to the representation done by politicians that targets their

neighbourhood. The analysis illustrates that the neighbourhoods on the 'ghetto list' will be stigmatised and will be recognised as space out of the norm, no matter whether the local residents agree or not.

6.5 Partial Conclusion and Critical Reflections on Findings

The findings of the analysis of everyday life experience of the 'ghetto-place' works to illuminate the importance of the dual focus in Wacquant's theory on territorial stigmatisation as well as Lefebvre's dialectical production of space and the spatial embeddedness of everyday life. In this sense, this analysis emphasises the patterned network of meanings and symbols that make out the 'ghetto-place', indicating that the dominant discursive representation of the 'ghetto-place' is not exclusively how the space is understood by locals. The analysis has drawn attention to how the lived experience is embedded in spatial transformations. The analysis indicates how the stigmatisation of space, in the context of the 'act against parallel societies', is experienced through intersecting personality traits. It illustrates that territorial stigmatisation inflicts actors according to their background's resonance with the 'ghetto-criteria'. Furthermore, it has suggested that the spatial representation of the 'ghetto-place' and territorial stigmatisation devaluate inhabitants by pointing out spaces as outside the society. This indicates that the 'ghetto-place' is deeply embedded in spatial practices of othering and that the tenants experience the othering through their everyday life events. The focus on collective spatial practices of negotiating the 'ghetto-place' indicates the importance of communities within a stigmatised space, however, it also emphasises the embeddedness of spatial representation in power structures.

7. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to critically probe the discursive production of the 'act against parallel societies' and to explore its consequences for inhabitants in the targeted areas. In order to examine these matters, I have conducted an argumentative discourse analysis of the policy process leading up to the passing of the act and an analysis of inhabitant's everyday life experiences and their spatial embeddedness.

The thesis shows that two central practices have each played significant roles in the production of the 'act against parallels societies'; the discursive institutionalisation of the spatial limitation of the 'ghetto' through the 'ghetto-criteria', and the spatial representation of the 'ghetto-place' as a space of exception. The two practices continuously legitimise each other throughout the discursive formation. Both practices draw on historical territorial stigmatisation of the non-profit housing sector, as well as reproduce the stigmatisation in the 'ghetto' areas in new forms. The analysis of everyday life of inhabitants in the targeted areas illustrates that the inhabitant's experience of the 'act against parallel societies' is embedded in societal structures, but also that they are negotiated through spatial and non-spatial practices.

The spatial delimitation of the 'ghetto' was established in 2004 with the institutionalisation of 'problem affected areas' in the law on non-profit housing. At this point, the 'ghetto' discourse can be grasped as an articulation of a policy problem that concerns the concentration and isolation of people with non-Danish values in non-profit housing. The discourse was institutionalised although it was in a process of discourse structuration. This means that the particular definition of the policy problem had not yet gained full support. In 2010, the discourse was further institutionalised with 'ghetto' as a legal term in the law on non-profit housing. At this point the 'ghetto' discourse is an articulation of the 'ghetto' policy problem as in 2004 but also increasingly as a problem of selective segregation and hostile materiality. At this point, the discourse can be considered dominant, as the vocabulary is extensively used in order to refer to the 'ghetto' policy problem and because it has been institutionalised in the law. In 2018, the category 'severe ghetto' institutionalises as a prolongation of the 'ghetto' category. Up until 2018, the 'ghetto' category had not been inflicting major legal consequences on the non-profit housing associations that it targeted. This changed with the category 'severe ghetto'. The

early institutionalisation practice of delimiting the 'ghetto-place' and thereby the manifestation of the 'ghetto-place' in concrete and material space, has paved the way for a continued institutionalisation of the 'ghetto' discourse.

The institutionalisation of the spatial limitations of the 'ghetto' and the ongoing discursive production of the 'ghetto-place' have simultaneously defined the 'ghetto' policy problem and legitimised it through its presence in the law and as material space. These findings suggest that further research should examine the role of material space in processes of discourse structuration and institutionalisation.

The discourse analysis shows that the 'ghetto-place' as a spatial representation is central to the production of the 'severe ghetto' as a space of exception. The 'ghetto-place' is continuously being discursively produced in dominant story-lines on 'disadvantaged tenant composition', 'us and them', 'hostile architecture' and 'selective segregation'. This discursive process has represented the 'ghetto-place' as a place of non-Danish values, as a place that is hostile towards the Danish society and as a place outside the Danish society. These spatial representations are central to the increasing articulation of the 'ghetto-place' as a place of emergency and of exception. The 'severe ghetto' is in this case produced as a space of exception through the spatial representation of the 'ghetto-place' and its institutionalised limitations. The 'severe ghetto' as a space of exception allows the parliament to approve the 'act against parallel societies', which allows extraordinary policy measures to encourage urban regeneration.

The analysis indicates that the 'ghetto-criteria' are central to the everyday experience of living in a 'ghetto' and suggests that the experience of the 'ghetto-criteria' is embedded in societal power structures of ethnicity and class. Moreover, the analysis illustrates how the 'ghetto' discourse produces spaces that devalue certain personality traits and homogenise people within it. The analysis also shows how tenants in 'ghettos' employ a range of different ways to negotiate the representation of the 'ghetto-place'. This includes spatial practices of building and empowering the local community and representing their neighbourhoods according to their own experiences of it. The analysis illustrates that inhabitants' experiences are embedded in the formal discursive representation of space; however, actors do not passively experience the representation of the 'ghetto'; rather, they actively seek to negotiate the representation through spatial and non-spatial practices.

The extraordinary measures that the 'act against parallel societies' introduces has physical consequences for the non-profit housing associations as well as the tenants living in the affected areas. It is beyond the purpose of this thesis to address the major physical restructuring of buildings and people that is currently going on the non-profit housing sector. However, the thesis has sought to illuminate the discursive formations that has allowed the 'ghetto' discourse to become hegemonic and the local negotiation hereof. Future research should address the implications of physical restructuring in terms of the production of space as well as in terms of the negotiation of the stigma among inhabitants and for community development in the targeted areas.

8. Sources

8.1 Bibliography

Agamben, G. (2005) 'The state of exception as a Paradigm of Government', *State of Exception, 1-33,* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Anderson, R. and Molina, I. (2003) 'Racialization and Migration in Urban Segregation Processes. Key issues for critical geographers' in J. Öhman and K. Smonsen (eds.) Voices from the North – New Trends in Nordic Human Geography', 261-282, Farnham, UK: Ashgate

Amin, A. (2017) 'Being a percentage rather than a human being in Denmark', *The Funambulist* (13): 6-8.

Bacchi, C. and Goodwin, S. (2016) *Poststructural Policy Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. New York.

Bech-Danielsen, C. and Christensen, G. (2017) *Boligområder i bevægelse: Fortællinger om fysiske og boligsociale indsatser i andledning af Landsbyggefondens 50 års jubilæum*. Copenhagen: Landsbyggefonden.

Buttimer, A. (1976) 'Grasping the Dynamism of Lifeworld', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 66(2): 277-292

Caretta, M., A. and Riaño, Y. (2016) 'Feminist participatory methodologies in geography: creating spaces of inclusion', *Qualitative Research* 16(3): 258-266

Fogh Rasmussen, A. (2004) *Statsminister Anders Fogh Rasmussens Nytårstale 1. januar 2004.* http://www.stm.dk/_p_7458.html

Folketinget (1996) *1996-97 - § 20-spørgsmål: Om ghettodannelser*. http://webarkiv.ft.dk/?/samling/19961/spoergsmaal_oversigtsformat/s2131.htm

Folketinget (2002) *Folketingets Socialudvalg.*

> http://webarkiv.ft.dk/samling/20021/udvbilag/sou/l134_bilag13.htm

Folketinget (2004a) *L32 Første behandling. Samling 2004-05.*

> https://www.ft.dk/samling/20042/lovforslag/L32/BEH1-8/forhandling.htm

Folketinget (2004b) *L32 Lovforslaget som vedtaget. Samling 2004-05.*

> https://www.ft.dk/samling/20042/lovforslag/l32/20042_l32_som_vedtaget.htm

Folketinget (2010a) *Folketingstidende F. Torsdag d. 2. december 2010.*

> http://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20101/lovforslag/L61/index.aspx#dok

Folketinget (2010b) *L60 Lovforslaget som vedtaget. Samling 2010-11.*

> *https://www.ft.dk/samling/20101/lovforslag/l60/20101_l60_som_vedtaget.htm*

Folketinget (2013a) *Folketingstidende F. Torsdag d. 14. november 2013.*

> http://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20131/lovforslag/L45/index.aspx#dok

Folketinget (2013b) *L45 Lovforslaget som vedtaget.*

> *https://www.ft.dk/samling/20131/lovforslag/l45/20131_l45_som_vedtaget.htm*

Folketinget (2018a) *Folketingstidende F. Torsdag d. 11. oktober 2018.*

> http://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20181/lovforslag/L38/index.aspx#dok

Folketinget (2018b) *L38 Lovforslaget som vedtaget.*

> https://www.ft.dk/samling/20181/lovforslag/l38/20181_l38_som_vedtaget.htm

Garbin, D. and Millington, G. (2012) 'Territorial Stigma and the Politics of Resistance in a Parisian Banlieue: La Courneuve and Beyond', *Urban Studies,* 49(10): 2067-2083

Gilbert, M., R. (2010) 'Place, Space, and Agency: Moving Beyond the Homogenous "Ghetto"', U*rban Geography,* 1(2): 148-152

Gray, N. and Porter, L. (2015) 'By Any Means Necessary: Urban Regeneration and the "State of Exception" in Glasgow's Commonwealth Games 2014', *Antipode,* 47(2): 380-400

Gregory, D. (2006) 'The Black Flag: Guantanamo Bay and the Space of Exception' *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography,* 88B(4): *405-427*

Hajer, M., A. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse.* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Hajer, M., A. (2005) 'Coalitions, Practices, and Meaning in Environmental Politics: From Acid Rain to BSE', in D. Howarth and J. Torfing (eds.) *Discourse theory in European Politics,* 297-315, New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Haraway, D. (1988) 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599

Harvey, D. (2006) 'Space as a keyword', in N. Castree and D. Gregory (eds.) *David Harvey: a critical reader,* 270-293, Malden, MA: Blackwell

Jensen, L. (2005) 'Historiens lange skygger i dansk boligpolitik', in K. Ronit and B. Rothstein (eds.) *Den politiske forvaltning,* 155-195, Copenhagen: Forlaget Politiske Studier

Jensen, S., Q. and Christensen, A. (2012) 'Territorial stigmatization and local belonging', *City,* 16(1-2): 74-92

Jørgensen, M., W. and Phillips, L., J. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London: Sage Publications

Kirkness, P. (2012) 'The cités strike back: restive responses to territorial taint in the French banlieues', *Environment and Planning A.* 46: 1281–1296.

Københavns Kommune (2013) Policy for Disadvantaged Areas. København: Københavns Kommune

Larsen, G., H. and Hansen, L., A. (2015) 'Commodifying Danish housing commons', *Geografiska Annaler: Series B. Human Geography,* 97(3): 263-274

Landsbyggefonden (2018) *Beboere i den almene boligsektor 2018.* København: Landbyggefonden

Løkke Rasmussen, L. (2010) *Statsminister Lars Løkke Rasmussens tale ved Folketingets åbning tirsdag den 5. oktober 2010.* http://www.stm.dk/_p_13260.html

Løkke Rasmussen, L. (2018) *Statsminister Lars Løkke Rasmussens nytårstale 1. januar 2010.* http://www.stm.dk/_p_13031.html

Lefebvre, H. (1991) 'Plan of Present Work', *The Production of Space,* 1-68, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing

Minca, C. (2006) 'Giorgio Agamben and the new biopolitical Nomos', *Geografiska Annaler: Series B. Human Geography* 88B(4): 387–403

Munk, A. (1999) *Byudvalgets boligsociale indsats.* Hørsholm: Statens byggeforskningsinstitut

Price, P., L. (2012) 'Race and ethnicity II: Skin and other intimacies', *Progress in Human Geography* 37(4): 578-586

Programbestyrelsen (2008) *Fra udsat boligområde til hel bydel – Sammenfatning november 2008.* København: Velfærdsministeriet

Rogaczewska, N. A., Lønne, R. and Sørensen, K., F. (2015) *At huse alle/How to House*. Copenhagen: BL-Danmarks Almene Boliger.

Regeringen (2004) *Regeringens strategi mod ghettoisering*. København: Ministeriet for Flygtninge, Indvandrere og Integration.

Regeringen (2010) *Ghettoen tilbage til samfundet*. København: Socialministeriet

Regeringen (2018) *Ét Danmark uden parallelsamfund – Ingen ghettoer i 2030*. København: Økonomi- og Indenrigsministeriet

Sayer, A. (2000) 'Postmodernism and the Three 'Pomo Flips'', *Realism and Social Science*, 67-81, London: Sage Publications

Simonsen, K. (1996) 'What kind of space in what kind of social theory?', *Progress in Human Geography* 20(4): 494-512

Simonsen, K. (2008) 'Practice, Narrative and the 'Multicultural city', A Copenhagen case', *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15(2): 145-158

Schultz Larsen, T. (2014) 'Copenhagen's West End a "Paradise Lost": the political production of territorial stigmatization in Denmark', *Environment and Planning A* 46(6): 1386–402

Slater, T. (2017) 'Territorial stigmatization: symbolic defamation and the contemporary metropolis'. In J. Hannigan and R. Greg (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of new urban studies*, 111-125, London: SAGE Publications

Socialministeriet (2010) *Aftale mellem regeringen (Venstre og Konservative Folkeparti), Dansk Folkeparti og Radikale Venstre om styrket indsats I ghettoområderne og anvendelse af den almene bolig sektors midler*. København: Transport-, bygnings- og boligministeriet.
https://www.trm.dk/da/politiske-aftaler/2010/boligaftale-2010

Statsministeriet (2018) *The Constitutional Act of Denmark.* http://www.stm.dk/_p_10992.html

Stormhøj, C. (2006) *Poststrukturalismer – videnskabsteori, analysestrategi, kritik.* København: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur

Søndergaard, J., E. Højgaard, J. Klint, B. Madsen, J. Christiansen (2001) *Fysisk opretning og forbedring af almene boligafdelinger.* København: Landsbyggefonden

Transport-, Bygnings, og boligministeriet (2018) *Aftale mellem regeringen (Venstre, Liberal Alliance og Det Konservative Folkeparti) og Socialdemokratiet, Dansk Folkeparti og Socialistisk Folkeparti om: Initiativer på boligområdet, der modvirker parallelsamfund.* København: Transport-, Bygnings, og boligministeriet. https://www.trm.dk/da/politiske-aftaler/2018/aftale-om-initiativer-paa-boligomraadet-der-modvirker-parallelsamfund

Wacquant, L., Slater, T. and Pereira, V. (2014) 'Territorial stigmatization in action'. *Environment and Planning A.* 46(6) 1270–80.

Wacquant, L. (2007) 'Territorial stigmatization in the age of advanced marginality', *Thesis Eleven* 91(1): 66–77

Wacquant, L. (2008) *Urban Outcasts.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press

Wacquant, L. (2008) 'Ghettos and Anti-Ghettos: An Anatomy of the New Urban Poverty'. *Thesis Eleven* 94: 113–118

Østervang, J (2018) 'Områdefornyelse :-(eller hvordan også Mjølnerparken er ved at blive vasket hvis, eller hvordan jeg overraskede mig selv ved at efterlyse mere rå beton og kedelig asfalt'. In ed. A. Kvist, J. Kristensen, M. Larsen, I. Kristic and M. Jensen (eds.) *Bidrag til en nær bykritik,* 111-122, København: Bypolitisk Organisering

8.2 Other Sources

Interview 1 (2019) Interview with the head of the housing social unit in a non-profit housing branch on the 'ghetto list'.

Interview 2 (2019) Interview with the chairman of the board at a non-profit housing branch on the 'ghetto list'.

Interview 3 (2019) Interview with a tenant in a non-profit housing association on the 'ghetto list'.

Field notes (2019) Fieldnotes from the event 'CAMP x The Funambulist: Politics of spatial segregation – CAMP x The Funambulist', organised and hosted by The Funambulist and Center for Art on Migration Politics (CAMP). Streaming available on:
https://www.facebook.com/campcph/videos/2111175742285458/?__tn__=%2Cd%2CPR&eid=ARAQSBp9dKeBGiUav5L_7yeX5uHqIRho8AdZEZHxgR8P5pevpjmV-X13s36JDv1Bwzjr1T4pRssAcmQ1

Field notes (2019) Fieldnotes from the event 'LGT:DOX. De kalder os en ghetto' organised and hosted by AKB København, Til Vægs, Almen modstand and Bypolitisk Organisering

Ronit Films (2014) '70 Acres in Chicago'

Poul Martinsen Film ApS (1999) 'Høje Historier'

Appendix 1: Translated Quotations

Page 4, Areas that are…: Jeg oplever, at danske regler, love og normer kommer til kort i områder, der ikke er danske i deres værdier.

Page 30, Good quality housing…: En så god bolig til så mange som muligt, for så få midler som muligt, så hurtigt som muligt.

Page 34, The non-profit housing …: at anfægte boligselskabernes ejerskab til boligerne – og dermed deres beskyttelse af grundloven §73; at nedbryde en konsolideret korporativ forvaltningstradition, at deligitimisere det kollektive ejerskab som udtryk for beboernes indflydelse på egen bosituation og erstatte det med det individuelle

Page 37, They unintentionally mix… : De kommer til at forveksle det danske frisind medvægelsind. Den danske frihed med tomhed. Den danske lighed med ligegyldighed.

Page 37, Violence, crime and…: Ghettodannelser fører til vold og kriminalitet og konfrontation. Det kender vi fra udlandet.

Page 37, Real ethnic enclaves…: egentlige etniske enklaver eller parallelsamfund uden væsentlig økonomisk, social og kulturel kontakt til samfundet i øvrigt.

Page 38, Platforms for general…: Boligområderne skal være platforme for en generel integration i samfundet og for et øget kendskab til de normer og værdier, der gælder her

Page 38, The government's strategy…: Regeringens strategi mod ghettoisering er rettet mod de større problemramte boligområder med massive sociale problemer.

Page 39: We do not look...: Nu ser vi jo ikke på samme måde på problemstillingen, selv om det med ghettoer selvfølgelig er et problem. Det erkender vi også.

Page 40: Inequality has increased…: Uligheden er blevet større, også blandt børn og unge; der er blevet større afstand, arbejdsløsheden er steget, murene omkring vores ghettoområder er blevet højere og højere.

Page 40: There are some…: Der er nogle ganske reelle problemer, vi gerne vil have løst, nemlig at få opløst den her ghettoisering til gavn for alle.

Page 40: Holes in the Danish…: Men der er opstået en slags huller i danmarkskortet.

Page 40: Places where Danish…: Steder, hvor de danske værdier tydeligvis ikke længere er bærende.

Page 40: Freedom to be…: Frihed til forskellighed. Ansvar for det fælles. Respekt for samfundets love. Ytringsfrihed. Lige muligheder for mænd og kvinder.

Page 41: We want to…: Vi vil rive murene ned. Vi vil åbne ghettoerne mod samfundet. Da jeg besøgte Tåstrupgård i august måned, slog det mig, at der i et boligområde på størrelse med den by, jeg selv bor i, ikke er én eneste butik. I andre ghettoer er det nærmest umuligt at gå rundt. Det er stenørkener uden forbindelseslinjer til det omgivende samfund. Det er dé fæstninger, vi skal
bryde igennem.

Page 42: We must bring..: Vi skal have ghettoen tilbage til samfundet.

Page 42: It is not sufficient…: Derfor er det ikke tilstrækkeligt alene at fortsætte med den hidtidige indsats. Der skal helt nye og kontante redskaber til at omdanne områderne til normale, danske byområder. Almindelige løsninger er ikke tilstrækkelige. Vi står over for særlige problemer, der kræver særlige løsninger.

Page 43: In the most…: I de mest udsatte oligområder er mere end seks ud af ti beboere indvandrere eller efterkommere af indvandrere fra ikkevestlige lande. Det er en skævvridning i forhold til resten af samfundet, som vi vil gøre op med.

Page 43: The Liberals used…: Jeg bed mærke i, at Venstres ordfører brugte formuleringen, at vi skal have en bedre balance i beboersammensætningen i de her udsatte boligområder, og jeg kan sige, at det er Socialdemokraterne fuldstændig enige med Venstres ordfører

Page 43: The problem in…: Problemet i de udsatte boligområder er først og fremmest en alt for ensartet beboersammensætning med en stor koncentration af fattigdom, arbejdsløshed,

Page 44: It is apparently…: Det er åbenbart i orden, at der både er parallelsamfund og masser af kriminelle, hvis bare de har uddannelse, indkomst og tilknytning til arbejdsmarkedet

Page 42: Around the country…: Rundt om i landet er der parallelsamfund. Mange mennesker med de samme problemer er klumpet sammen. Det skaber en negativ spiral. En modkultur. Hvor man ikke tager ansvar, ikke deltager, ikke bruger de muligheder, vi har i Danmark – men stiller sig uden for.

Page 45: The ghettos also…: Fordi ghettoerne også sender fangarme ud på gaderne, hvor kriminelle bander skaber utryghed. Ind i skolerne, hvor forsømte børn hænger på kanten. Ned i kommunekassen, hvor indtægterne er mindre og udgifterne større, end de behøver at være. Og ud i samfundet, hvor danske værdier som ligeværd, frisind og tolerance taber terræn.

Page 46: We do not…: begrænse de mange for at sætte ind over for de få. Dermed kan vi sætte hårdere og mere konsekvent ind over for parallelsamfundene.

Page 48: To start the initiatives…: For at iværksætte de tiltag, som boligaftalen giver mulighed for, er det nødvendigt at opstille nogle kriterier for, hvilke boligområder aftalen gælder for

Page 49: There are many…: Men det, der er essensen, er jo, at rigtig mange beboere i de her områder faktisk føler sig truede og ubehageligt til mode ved det fællesskab, de har. Og så må man sige, at beboerdemokratiet jo altså også har nogle udfordringer i, hvor

mange der rent faktisk deltager i det i nogle af de her områder. Så der er nogle ud fordringer.

Page 49: When I talk…: Når jeg taler om normer, der er vigtige, er det de helt grundlæggende normer for vores samfund, nemlig normer om, hvordan man må opføre sig over for andre, hvilket samfundssind man skal udvise, når man er i fællesskaber osv. Det ser man bl.a. udfordret, når vi i nogle af de områder ikke kan sende politi eller postvæsen eller ambulancer eller brandvæsen ind, uden at de bliver mødt af unge mennesker fra området, som ikke bliver irettesat af områdets øvrige beboere, når de kaster med sten eller på anden måde angriber myndighederne, når de kommer ud i områderne. Jeg kender ikke til et eneste område, som ikke er et ghettoområde i Danmark, hvor den slags ting sker. Det sker kun i de områder, vi taler om her. Så ja, jeg synes, at der er ret stort bevis for, at dette antisamfundssind, som man taler om her, findes i de områder og i den udstrækning kun i de områder.

Page 50: There can be…: Så kan vi have forskellige opfattelser af, hvad der tjener almenvellet. Jeg har den opfattelse, at det tjener almenvellet at få gjort op med de her parallelsamfund

Page 54: The stigmatisation of…: stigmatiseringen af bestemte mennesker kan føre til en selvopfattelse hos de beboere som bliver ramt – det var du også selv lidt inde på i forhold til at en havde været på arbejdsmarkedet og det ene og det anden. Altså lige pludselig så bliver man jo ramt på sin skam nærmest, eller på sin identitet.

Page 55: 'Urban Regeneration :-(…: Områdefornyelse :-(eller hvordan også Mjølnerparken er ved at blive vasket hvis, eller hvordan jeg overraskede mig selv ved at efterlyse mere rå beton og kedelig asfalt

Page 55: I become sad…: Jeg bliver ked af det, og føler mig isoleret fra resten af Nørrebro her i Mjølnerparken. For det betyder ikke så meget, når der bliver skudt her, det er først alvor, når det er ved Den Røde Plads og andre steder, hvor almindelige borgerer bor of færdes. Man skal bare holde sig væk fra Mjølnerparken, det er der, alle ballademagerne bor, siger de.

*Page 59: If somebody thinks….:*Men altså helt generelt så tror jeg også bare at det handler om at hvis nogen tror at det er hermetisk lukket områder hvor man ikke kan komme ind, så må vi bare understrege yderligere at det ikke er tilfældet og at det aldrig har været tilfældet. SÅ må vi simpelthen ligge yderligere vægt på at skabe rammer for en åbenhed og gøre det rigtig tydeligt at vi rigtig gerne deler ting med omverden og det er jo åndsvagt at det bliver nødt til at være på den måde men det er et eller andet sted