

SOLIDARITY REPORT:

Two Witness Seminars
on Danish and Swedish
Welfare Housing in Crisis

English / dansk / svenska

**AKTION
ARKIV**

Contents

3 Introduction
Solidarity Report

8 Glossary

Copenhagen

12 Caring for Plans: Narratives
of the Parallel Society Package

48 Omsorg for planer: fortællinger
om parallelsamfundspakken

84 Quotes

Stockholm

92 Solidarity in Times
of Repressive Politics: A Seminar
On the Effects of the Term
“Particularly/Vulnerable Areas”

130 Solidaritet i tider av repressiv
politik: Ett seminarium
om verkningarna av begreppen
”särskilt/utsatta områden”

166 Quotes

175 Related Reading

Solidarity Report

This report documents the conversations that occurred during two seminars, “Caring for Plans: Narratives of the Parallel Society Package”, held at the Copenhagen Architecture Festival CAFx, October 17, 2021,¹ and “Solidarity in Times of Repressive Politics: A Seminar on the Effects of the Concepts ‘Particularly/Vulnerable Areas’”, held at Folkets Husby, October 15, 2022, in the Stockholm suburb of Husby.

Narratives about the “failure” of large-scale housing from the postwar decades are now guiding major physical, social, and economic changes in neighborhoods all over Europe. Denmark and Sweden have long been known for their welfare-state systems and benevolent housing policies. However, in recent years, both countries have enacted new national “anti-segregation” measures that call for major physical and social changes to neighborhoods built in the 1960s and 1970s. In these processes, the opinions of local communities and residents of the neighborhoods have seldom been heard. By working with “witness seminars,” a method adopted from oral history, it is our aim to foreground residents’ perspectives and how they have enacted solidarity and collective resistance to these measures.

“You can simply say no” are the words of a resident, housing organization board member and housing activist from Copenhagen, Søren-Emil Schütt who suggests resistance among the architectural and planning communities currently working to implement the recent Danish policies, commonly known as the “ghetto law” or the “parallel society package” and implemented in 2018. These resulted in mass demolitions, changes of use and displacements, but he says that practitioners might just choose to refrain from fulfilling these work assignments, their status quo. Instead, he encourages architects and planners to take a more critical position and refuse.²

The transcripts that comprise this publication document accounts from residents and other local actors who are now targeted by these policies, and we inquire into what we call the affects and effects of current housing policies in Denmark and Sweden. By this, we mean the emotional costs and fallout from these policies, and the impact that they have on both physical space and on residents’ everyday lives. To document this, witnesses of the current historical events gave their own accounts, in their own words, while researchers and an informed audience carefully listened. These stories were recorded, transcribed, and edited by the witnesses; this process,

in turn, created new archival material.³ Aktion Arkiv organized the two seminars in 2021 and 2022, respectively, in which we called on residents and other local actors to describe their lived experiences and own perspectives about the policies and categorizations affecting their local areas.

Terminology for neighborhoods

In 2004, under the right-wing government led by Anders Fogh Rasmussen, Denmark adopted an official so-called “Ghetto Policy” for the first time.⁴ In 2010, criteria for Danish “ghettos” were defined as part of a 32-point plan and a list of 29 residential “ghetto areas” that meet these criteria was drawn up. The criteria were neighborhoods with residents who were unemployed, had a criminal record, and had immigrated from a “non-western” country.⁵ Since then, this list has been updated annually and the number of criteria was expanded in 2018 to include education and income level.⁶ In 2018, then prime minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen announced, in his infamous New Years’ speech, the dismantling of “ghettos” through demolition, the resettlement of their inhabitants, and a new focus on densification.⁷ In the new strategy that followed the same year and that is still being implemented today – “One Denmark Without Parallel Societies – No Ghettos in 2030” – areas are divided into “vulnerable areas” [Danish: udsatte områder], “parallel societies” [Danish: parallelsamfund, first named “ghetto areas”], “transformation areas” [Danish: omdannelsesområder, first named “hard ghettos”], and “prevention areas” [Danish: forebyggelsesområder].⁸

The Swedish Police have used the term “particularly/vulnerable areas” since 2015 to describe and categorize areas with “low socioeconomic status”, where a small number of criminals exert an influence over the local civil society, and where they see evidence for “parallel society structures”.⁹ While the criteria for the categorizations focus today on criminality, the first mappings happened as early as the 1990s, covering non-Swedish background, unemployment, level of education, and participation in municipal elections.¹⁰ The focus on violence was introduced in a study by the Police in 2014 and published in a report in 2015.¹¹ Criteria for categorizing neighborhoods as “vulnerable”, “particularly vulnerable” or “risk areas” have served what the Police deem as: the willingness of residents to participate in judicial processes, the ability of the police to carry out their duties, and the possibility of parallel social structures. In 2017, the criteria “extremism, mainly violent Islamist extremism” was added to the document.¹²

The Seminars in Copenhagen and Stockholm

The Danish seminar title was “Caring for Plans: Narratives of the Parallel Society Package” [Omsorg for planer: fortællinger om parallelsamfundspakken]. Panelists included Alex Young Pedersen, resident, chairperson of Bispehaven housing association in Aarhus and active in Almen Modstand [Common Resistance], the activist network in Denmark that fights against housing discrimination, demolitions and forced evictions, Copenhagen;¹³ Fatma Tounsi, resident of Bellahøj in Copenhagen, housing activist and active in Almen Modstand; Elsebeth Frederiksen, resident of Gellerupparken in Aarhus; editorial secretary at the resident produced journal *Skræppebladet*, and active in Almen Modstand; and Søren-Emil Schütt, resident of Lundtoftegade in Copenhagen; chairperson of Lundtoftegade housing association and active in Almen Modstand. The seminar was moderated by Heidi Svenningsen Kajita and Svava Riesto, Aktion Arkiv. Beata Hemer and Marie Northrup Christensen, founders of Almen Arkiv [Common Archive] which collects official documents of the resettlement processes talked about and exhibited material of their Almen Arkiv. Further, students of the course Theories and Methods in Landscape Architecture of the University of Copenhagen exhibited their work on neighborhoods targeted by the “parallel society package”.¹⁴ The seminar was simultaneously interpreted into English with headsets provided, to allow for an international audience.

In the Danish seminar the panel told a series of stories about the significance of the “anti-segregation” policies and action plans for their everyday lives and in relation to architecture and urban planning. The panelists described their own efforts in dealing with the parallel society package in ongoing, local urban processes. They told personal stories about how the introduction of the “parallel society” policies affected their sense of home and neighborly relationships, and they described how new forms of democratic organization had arisen in the struggle to maintain diversity in “common housing” and contribute to more inclusive and fair urban planning processes.

The Swedish seminar was overshadowed by the election, just a month before, which had resulted in a regime shift from a Social Democratic-led government to a government led by an alliance of parties on the political right and supported by the far-right party. The so-called “Tidö agreement” [Tidöavtal] among the four parties (the Moderates, the Christian Democrats, the Liberals, and the Sweden Democrats) was just made public the day before the seminar. The agreement

contained plans that promised to take a harder grip on “gang criminality” and to follow the apparently positive example of Denmark. The title of this seminar was “Solidarity in Times of Repressive Politics: A Seminar on the Effects of the Terms ‘Particularly/Vulnerable Areas’” [Solidaritet i tider av repressiv politik: ett seminarium om effekterna av begreppen ‘särskilt/utsatta områden’]. Panelists included Nazem Tahvilzadeh, urban scholar, Stockholm; Marlen Eskander, resident of Södertälje and co-founder of Läsfrämjarinstitutet [Institute for Promotion of Reading]; Ilhan Kellecioglu, resident of Husby/Kista, in Stockholm and activist with Ort till Ort [Place to Place; Hood to Hood]; and Beata Hemer and Marie Northrup Christensen, founders of Almen Arkiv. Marie is also active in Almen Modstand, Copenhagen. The seminar was introduced by Sara Brolund de Carvalho and moderated by Maryam Fanni, Aktion Arkiv.

The Swedish seminar compared Swedish and Danish legislation and their impact on the neighborhoods labeled “vulnerable areas”. A discussion came up about whether institutions such as the tenants’ association are still relevant or if they need to be radically changed from within. The possibility that alliances could form between architects and residents was also raised, with the aim of avoiding an “us-and-them” division and arguing for a need for radicalization within the architectural profession. There was talk about the aesthetics of architecture, but also the everyday social networks that architecture creates over a long period of time, and how these are destroyed by resettlement projects. From this point of view, it was argued, renovation as means of raising rents and displacing residents can also be seen as a way of not taking care of architecture.

The witness seminars were organized by Aktion Arkiv in collaboration with Copenhagen’s Architecture Festival – CAFx, Lundtoftegade housing association, and Folkets Husby in Husby, Stockholm. They were made possible through the generous support of stipends from ARQ c/o White AB, and FFNS Foundation for research, development, and education.

We are greatly indebted to all seminar participants! Thank you!

1

<https://www.cafx.dk/event/omsorg-for-planer-2>, accessed March 10, 2024.

2

For a more detailed discussion, see Sara Brolund de Carvalho, Maryam Fanni, Heidi Svenningsen Kajita, Jennifer Mack, Helena Mattsson, Svava Riesto, Meike Schalk, “You Can Simply Say No: Narrating the Affets and Effects of Danish and Swedish Housing in Crisis”, *Radical Housing Journal* 6.1, 2024.

3

Helena Mattsson and Meike Schalk, “Action Archive. Oral History as Performance,” in Janina Gosseye, Naomi Stead, Deborah van der Plaats (eds.) *Speaking of Buildings. Oral History in Architectural Research* (New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 2019), 94–113.

4

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

5

Regeringen (2010) *Ghettoen tilbage til samfundet - et opgør med parallelsamfund i Danmark*, Socialministeriet. See also “Sensitive Urban Zones” [ZUS, Zone urbaine sensible], in France, since 1996, with which the government targets areas with high percentage of public housing, high unemployment, and a low percentage of high-school graduates.

6

Regeringen (2018), Aftale mellem regeringen og S, DF, og SF om initiativer der modvirker parallelsamfund, 9. maj. Kbh.: Regeringen. *Aftale mellem regeringen og S, DF, og SF om initiativer der modvirker parallelsamfund*

7

Statsministeriet (2018) Statsminister Lars Løkke Rasmussens nytårstale 2018, Regeringen.dk.

8

Regeringen (2018) *Et Danmark uden parallelsamfund – Ingen ghettoer i 2030*. Økonomi- og Indenrigsministeriet. For a critical view on governmental naming practices, see Jennifer Mack, “Words and Things: Taxonomies of Demolition in Scandinavia,” *Platform*, December 2023. <https://www.platformspace.net/home/words-and-things-taxonomies-of-demolition-in-scandinavia>, accessed March 19, 2024.

9

<https://polisen.se/om-polisen/polisens-arbete/utsatta-omraden/>, accessed March 10, 2024.

10

Manne Gerell, Per-Olof Hallin, Kim Nivall, Stig Westerdahl, Att vända utvecklingen – från utsatta områden till trygghet och delaktighet, Malmö Universitet, Mapius 26, <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1422318/FULLTEXT01.pdf>, accessed March 20, 2024.

11

Polismyndigheten, nationella operativa avdelningen (2015), *Utsatta områden – sociala risker, kollektiv förmåga och oönskade händelser*. For a discussion on the use of visual material such as brochures and maps as for implementing anti-segregation measures, see Heidi Svenningsen Kajita, Jennifer Mack, Svava Riesto, Meike Schalk, “Between Technologies of Power and Notions of Solidarity: A Response to the Danish *Ghetto Plan* and Swedish *Vulnerable Areas Documents*”. In Kirsten Marie Raahauge, Deane Simpson, Martin Søberg, Katrin Lotz (eds.), *Architectures of Dismantling and Restructuring: Spaces of Danish Welfare 1970-Present* (Zürich, Switzerland: Lars Müller Publishers, 2022), 148-159.

12

Riksrevisionen RIR 2020, *Rätt insats på rätt plats – polisens arbete i utsatta områden*, 2020:20, p. 20. For a comparison of how these Swedish and Danish policies are enacted through security-focused renovations, including quotes from the seminars, see Jennifer Mack, “Modernism in the present tense: ‘Dangerous’ Scandinavian suburbs and their hereafters,” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 41(4), 656-682.

13

<https://www.alexyoung.dk>, accessed March 20, 2024.

14

Course instructors were Ellen Braae, Heidi Svenningsen Kajita, Kris Nilsson, and Svava Riesto.

Almen Modstand

[Common Resistance] is a campaign initiated in 2018 by local residents in response to the Danish Parallel Society Legislation. Almen Modstand is a politically neutral platform anchored in social housing areas across Denmark. www.almenmodstand.dk

Almen Arkiv

[Common Archive] is an independent archive established to collect documentation of the processes following in the wake of the Danish Parallel Society Legislation and to make this documentation available publicly. Its files contain agendas from meetings between municipalities and housing organizations; letters, documents from legal proceedings, and more.

Folkets Hus och Parker

[Houses of the People and People's Parks] (FHP) is a Swedish organization formed in 1999 when two labor movement-related organizations merged, the Central Organisation of People's Parks (formed in 1905) and the National Organisation of the Houses of the People Associations (formed in 1932). FHP comprises almost 500 meeting places across Sweden: in cities, suburbs, and villages, such as houses of the people, people's parks, cinemas, and similar community spaces. The people's houses offer rooms for associations and groups to meet, cultural events, and social activities. Every people's house is self-managed by its own association.

Ghettoplanen and Ghettopakken

[The Ghetto Law] is a Danish national policy that has been in effect since 2018, leading to major changes in cities across the country. The policy has the full title

“Ét Danmark uden parallelsamfund: Ingen ghettoer i 2030” (One Denmark without Parallel Societies: No Ghettos in 2030), but is also called “Ghettopakken” (Ghetto Package) or “Parallelsamfundspakken” (The Parallel Society Package).

Gårdstensmodellen

[The Gårdstens Model] is a transformative process initiated in the 1990s by *Gårdstensbostäder*, a municipal housing company in the Gothenburg suburb Gårdsten. This suburb was previously on the Police list of “vulnerable areas.” *Gårdstensbostäder* attributes the area's positive development since 2019 to their unique approach to changing it. Their transformative process/model has frequently been used as an example of a positive collaborative approach between public and private actors such as social organizations, the housing company, schools, the police, etc. in an effort to reduce crime. Simultaneously, this model has been heavily criticized by residents and researchers for its controlling and repressive features and its shortcomings in positively influencing residents' wellbeing in the area.

Hembla

see Victoriahem

Hyresgästföreningen

[Tenants' Association] is the national organization for renters in Sweden. It originates from and still consists of local neighborhood associations, and the national central organization was formed in 1923. Today, it is a members' association with more than 500,000 members nationwide. In addition to supporting their members in various matters related to tenants' rights,

the Tenants' Association's primary function today is to negotiate rents with the public housing companies and private property owners. Until January 1, 2011, the approved rents constituted a kind of rent ceiling for other equivalent apartments in each area. Today, however, the municipal housing companies do not have a rent-setting role. Instead, collectively negotiated rents, regardless of the parties to the agreement, are considered normative when the reasonableness of a rent is evaluated. The Tenants' Association negotiates almost all rents in Sweden, even for those who are not members of the Tenants' Association. <https://www.hyresgastforeningen.se>

Husby arbetarcentrum

[Husby Workers' Center] is a trade union that operates in the Järva area and works to give more power to local workers. Husby Workers' Center's purpose is to: Organize as many workers as possible within the area of its operations and spread knowledge about how to fight for one's rights. Husby Workers' Center wants to work in particular to support the workers who work under precarious employment and without a contract at all.” <https://www.arbetarcentrum.nu/om/>

Initiativet for retfaerdig boligpolitik

[The Initiative for Just Housing Politics] is a fundraising campaign done by Almen Modstand. See Almen Modstand.

Läsfrämjarinstitutet

[Institute for the Promotion of Literacy] is an organization dedicated to promoting literacy and reading skills in Sweden. Its primary focus is on encouraging reading

habits among children and young people, as well as supporting literacy initiatives in schools and communities.

Ort till Ort

[Area to Area] is a network of local organizations in Stockholm that works to transfer ownership by slum landlords to the community, and works against evictions, rent increases, insecure contracts, privatizations, and the displacement of the poor from their areas. The organization was formed in Stockholm in 2015. The first conflict in which the network participated was fought by 35 families with children who were threatened with eviction by the non-profit housing company Svenska Bostäder in Tensta. orttillort.wordpress.com

Parallelsamfundspakken

see Ghettoplanen and Ghettopakken

Folkrörelsejurister

[People's Movement Lawyers] is an organization of lawyers that works with social justice and civil rights movements. The concept was developed as a critique of the individualized legal representation of poor and working class people in a legal system that lacked structural solutions. It originates in the legal thinking that took shape during the rise of the civil rights movement in the United States. See, for example, the report “Movement Lawyers” by Rami Al-Khamisi (Stockholm: Arena idé, 2015) and <https://www.movementlawlab.org>

Socialt Center

[Social Center] was started by three organizations: the union SAC Syndicalists, the lawyers of Folkrörelsejuristerna [People's

Movement Lawyers], and the housing rights network Ort till Ort. It began at Husby Träff and aimed to support residents in conflicts related to labor, housing, rights of residency, and with authorities.

Tidöavtalet

[The Tidö Agreement], published on October 14, 2022, is a written agreement between four Swedish political parties: the Moderate Coalition Party (Moderaterna), Christian Democrats (Kristdemokraterna), Liberals (Liberalerna), and Sweden Democrats (Sverigedemokraterna). The last party is a far right party with roots in the neo-Nazi movement. The Tidö Agreement was the basis for a deal that allowed the formation of a right-wing government after the September parliamentary elections.

Uppdrag granskning

[Mission: Investigate] is a Swedish television program for investigative journalism that is broadcast on Swedish Public Television (Sveriges Television).

Utsatta områden och särskilt utsatta områden

[Vulnerable Areas and Particularly Vulnerable Areas] are terms that the national Swedish Police have been using since 2015 to describe geographically defined areas or neighborhoods with a low socioeconomic status and where crime is said to have ravaged the local community. The areas are divided into three categories: vulnerable areas, risk areas, and particularly vulnerable areas (särskilt utsatta områden).

See “The Government’s Political Priorities” <https://www.government.se/articles/2022/11/the-governments-political-priorities/>

Welfare Housing in Sweden and Denmark

Welfare state housing politics emerged during the 1930s in Sweden and Denmark. Previously, the housing question was considered a problem for individuals or families, to be solved within the logics of a free market and limited philanthropic and governmental programs. By the 1930s, housing policies that understood the right to housing as a universal question developed across the two countries. In early welfare states, policies grew from the notion that everyone should be entitled to decent housing. State investigations on housing resulted in new laws and propositions. In Sweden, the introduction of a housing law after the Second World War facilitated public, municipality-owned housing companies - “Allmännyttan” [The Common Good]. Within the framework of the so-called “Million Program”, the Swedish state built one million housing units between 1965 and 1974. The plan was that new housing areas would be furnished with social and public services. In Denmark, almene boliger [social or common housing], known as almenyttige [The Common Good] until 1996, is a form of housing where residents rent their homes from a housing association. Approximately 70% of the public housing construction was built after 1960, with a particular emphasis on the period between 1965 and 1975. The model differentiates between family housing, senior housing, and student housing. Within housing associations, all non-profit housing is governed through a system known as “tenant democracy.” Under this organizational framework, tenant-elected representatives, who serve voluntarily and without compensation, collaborate with paid individuals such as

CEOs, caretakers, and administrative staff. These paid professionals handle tasks such as maintenance, managing waiting lists, and planning, among other responsibilities.

Victoriahem

Formerly known as **Hembla**, is one of Sweden’s largest rental housingowners, specializing in the Million Program housing areas. Victoriahem is a subsidiary company to **Vonovia**.

Vonovia

was the leading real estate company in Germany as of March 7, 2024, with a market capitalization amounting to approximately 23 billion US dollars. In Sweden, the company owns the real estate company **Victoriahem**, which is a merger of **Hembla** and **Victoria Park**. Vonovia has become Sweden’s largest landlord, and with around 550,000 apartments in Germany, Sweden, and Austria, it is also currently Europe’s largest.

Witness seminar co-organized by Aktion Arkiv with Søren-Emil Schütt, tenant board of the Lundtoftegade Housing Area, and Copenhagen Architecture Festival, with support by ARQ Forskningsstiftelsen för samhälls- och byggnadsplanering, projektering (5:2020) and FFNS Stiftelse för forskning, utveckling och utbildning (2020:14).

Panellists	Elsebeth Frederiksen, resident of Gellerupparken; editorial secretary at the resident produced newspaper <i>Skræppebladet</i> , and active in Almen Modstand
	Alex Young Pedersen, resident, chairperson of Bispehaven housing association and active in Almen Modstand (Common Resistance)
	Søren-Emil Schütt, resident of Lundtoftegade; chairperson of Lundtoftegade housing association and active in Almen Modstand
	Fatma Tounsi, resident of Bellahøj and active in Almen Modstand
	Beata Hemer, founder of Almen Arkiv (Common Archive)
	Marie Northrup Christensen, resident of Aldersrogade, founder of Almen Arkiv (Common Archive) and active in Almen Modstand
Moderators	Heidi Svenningsen Kajita and Svava Riesto, Aktion Arkiv
Event team assistants	Students of landscape architecture, University of Copenhagen. Especially thanks to Alicia Sima

Caring for Plans: Narratives of the Parallel Society Package

Transcript

Witness seminar in Copenhagen 16.10.2021

Søren-Emil Schütt: Hello Everyone. While Adam has a cup... no, not coffee, a cookie, I will begin by welcoming you all. My name is Søren-Emil, and I am the chairperson of the tenant association on Lundtoftegade, where we find ourselves today. First, I would just like to say something about this building we are inside. It is practically a construction site we are being installed into, and this is actually because the city of Copenhagen has had this building for over 30 years, but in the past five years it has stood empty, and that is very symptomatic, when you have been living in an area that is defined by others in different ways, that a city chooses to be so poor at administering their building that it has just fallen into disrepair. But now we have taken it over and I will tell a little more about that a bit later. It's just so you are aware of the framework we find ourselves in.

I just want to say that there is a coffee, cake and fruit table here, and there is a toilet in the laundry, which is right in the extension of this building, so you can go there if you need the toilet. I hope that the interpretation box is under control. Yes, and I have a little ... well, this automated translation device which we set up this morning, and which is very impressive, I think. It was on a little tour before it landed here. It has been in Sweden, where it was used by the Swedish king, and it has just come almost directly from [Hotel] d'Angleterre, and it was at [the Red-Green Alliance] Enhedslisten press conference the other day on Refshaleøen. But I think it has found its home now. Here on Lundtoftegade. So, I will call on Heidi, who is the co-organiser of today's event, and Heidi will tell about what we are doing today.

Heidi Kajita: Yes. My name is Heidi Kajita. Welcome. And I would like to start by thanking Copenhagen Architecture Festival for letting us hold this event here as part of their programme. Thanks to the residents on Lundtoftegade for letting us be here. And, on behalf of our group, which I will get back to, I would like to express our thanks to Sweco and ARQ White Architects who have provided us with financial support including for this interpretation box over here and for the translation. But we would like to welcome you to our seminar today, which is part of several activities through which we enlighten politicians about "parallel society" plans and lists of "vulnerable areas", in both Denmark and Sweden and what they mean for the specific neighborhoods.

Our focus is on architecture and urban planning. We are a group of Danish and Swedish researchers and practitioners. So, it's me and Svava Riesto, then we have Meike Schalk, Helena Mattsson, Jennifer Mack, Maryam Fanni and Sara Brolund de Carvalho. Today we have invited residents to join the panel. The next time we think that it might be urban planners. But then we have a series of activities. I would like to start by just briefly saying the names of the panel participants, who will introduce themselves a bit more afterwards. I would like to welcome Elsebeth Frederiksen from Aarhus, and Alex Jung Pedersen, also from Aarhus, Fatma Tounsi and Søren-Emil Schütt from Copenhagen. And then after their presentations, Beata Hemer and Marie Nortrup Christensen will read aloud from some of the documents from their archive which they are exhibiting. And then there are some students present. We'll talk more about that later.

Svava Riesto: Yes. Today's programme is basically that we provide space for

our panel. We look forward to hearing some individual narratives about the effects that the parallel society policy has in specific neighborhoods. We will also get around to the citizen initiative "Against Ghetto Lists" and the demolition and sale of social housing. As you can see, our colleague Sara [Brolund de Carvalho] is here taking pictures because we think that it is important to document an event like this one here today. If any of you are already thinking that you don't want to be in any of the pictures that Sara is taking, then just go over to her afterwards and let her know. We will also write down everything that is said today, and then the panel will be allowed to edit it of course. But we would like to look at this as a series of many historical events, and therefore, we would like to document what is happening today. In just a bit we're going to give the floor to our panel, who will then tell a series of different narratives about the specific residential areas. Then there will be a conversation here in this room. At the end it can continue informally as we attack the cakes on the table over there. And there are also two exhibitions which we can say something about in little while. But, Elsebeth, won't you start?

Elsebeth Frederiksen: Yes, I'll start. I'm not sure how ... Yes, my name is Elsebeth and I live in Gellerupparken, which is in Aarhus, or Brabrand, and I have been living there for 16 years. And it was, you could say, it was a pretty major change for me to move into social housing. Gellerupparken was the first social housing I have lived in, because I come from ... grew up in a neighborhood with single family homes in western Jutland where there was no social housing at all. So I did not know anything at all about what a tenant democracy was, and what it's like to live together with so many different people, and how the whole social housing sector works. So, in the beginning when I moved to Gellerup, I didn't know about all that. So it was really hard to find out how it all worked and that I had a contributory influence on something or other. Then there were some years when I didn't really go to the tenant meetings, and I didn't really know what was happening. I was minding my own business. And then suddenly, I thought, well, maybe I should begin to go to some of the tenant meetings and be a little active in the area. And through that I found out that there was actually a tenant democracy, and what we can really get out of that.

And that is, you could say that when it has to do with these so-called "ghetto" areas, you could say that we have minimal influence we who live in these areas. The politicians say that they're listening, but they have a different position. And we can vote as much as we want, and we can say that we are against it, but very often the

politicians have really made up their minds and cannot really be swayed. And that is, of course it is a problem in general that politicians are difficult to talk with, but when you live in the kind of residential area where I do, then you certainly see (it) a lot more. And you could say that Gellerupparken has been on the “ghetto list” ever since it was introduced. And in the beginning I didn’t really think so much about what that “ghetto list” really meant. Well, I know there was something about that then they could make a master plan, and we were categorized based on different things, but it wasn’t like ... I thought that that wasn’t really Gellerup because that isn’t how I experience Gellerup. So I began to experience Gellerup as a really great place, and (with) a lot of really nice people. And there is a lot going on and nice neighbors and things like that, you know. I hadn’t thought about all of those things that were written in the criteria, that there were a lot of criminals and a lot of unemployed people and things like that, because you focus on other things when you live there. So of course that is why every single year on the first of December, I think, no. Are we on the “ghetto list” again? And it’s also exciting, but it wasn’t until this bill came, that I was ... I really informed myself of what it was and what it does.

You could say that Gellerup has been working for a long time in relation to the conversion of the area. We have also had a master plan where there were five blocks that were torn down, and we’ve had a new city park made and things like that, but ... and it is also ... I hadn’t associated it so much with that time that ... It also had something to do with our being on the “ghetto list”, and it was possible to get support in the start, and so on. But then the tenants felt a little more like they were being included, so there were workshops and tenant meetings and things like that. And we voted on it and so on, you know. So, I think that most (people) there thought, “well, okay. Yes, it’s fine. We have ... we should also have some changes in the area and now we have a really nice city park, that we” ...that I am very happy with. I am at any rate.

But then there was this New Year’s speech by Lars Løkke [Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Danish prime minister] on the first of January 2018, when he began to talk about “cracks in the map of Denmark”, and a “parallel society” and “social control”. And I just sat there and was completely ... I became so angry, because basically the whole New Year’s speech was just about that. I mean that is not how Gellerup is for me. And so the DR [Danish broadcasting company] phoned me the next day. Apparently I had spoken with them in the past, so I went up and was supposed to be interviewed on the radio on top of the new building in Gellerup. We had a new

municipal building. And so I was standing up there on the first of January and gave my opinion of his New Year’s speech and that really sparked me off. I thought that now, something should be done now, and then I thought it could take some time, but already on the first of March there was a huge press. What do you call it? Press conference about Mjølnerparken, where ten politicians came and talked about how terrible it is to live in these residential areas, and that we should really change that.

And what was strange about it is that, what I am also saying, a lot of people come from the outside and make a lot of decisions about how our area should be and how things are. And I have often ... I’ve often been accused of being a bit naïve in my ... in the things I say about Gellerup. Because why won’t I admit that there is a lot of criminality? And why won’t I admit that there is social control? And this and that. But that is because I experience it from another vantage point than the media and politicians do, because I actually live in the area. And that’s why it is also that about all these changes there are in the area. That is, some of them are good. And some of them are things that we have not really participated in the decision-making with, even though they actually say that we have. I heard a conversation in the city council, a debate in Aarhus city council here the other day. It wasn’t about Gellerup, but it was very symptomatic for the politicians that they say, “Yes, but we have listened to you. But we don’t agree so we aren’t doing that.”

And I think that’s just how it is with Gellerup too. That “Now we’ve had these workshops, and we’ve listened to you, and you’ve been admitted to the committee. That’s fine. Thank you for coming. But we haven’t changed our minds.”

How much time do I have? Okay. So what I did was, I thought now I’m simply going to fight for my area. So we found out that there was something called Almen Modstand [Common Resistance, activist network on housing policies], which had their first meeting in Copenhagen. We were a few who went there and attended the meeting there. And since then, we’ve been working slavishly against this law. And as I said, I am opposed to it. I write letters to the editor, I write things on Facebook, I am active on Twitter, and I have a blog. I do all kinds of things. And when the media calls then I make a statement on something. So I’m really trying to make a difference, but sometimes it’s just ... sometimes it’s just ... What difference am I making? Because the politicians haven’t changed their positions anyway. Well, once in a while it is just ... Ugh. Then does what we are doing make no difference at all? So, I often feel like that. It’s just like ... Ugh. It’s all so hopeless. So we can hang up some banners and say that we won’t move, but we’ll probably end up doing it anyhow.

Then there is that about, so, if I could just touch on the architectural contribution, right? I was at a meeting the other day at Museet Køn [Gender Museum Denmark], where there were some nice young people from the Gellerup area, who had been given a week to prepare some changes at Gellerup, how they saw Gellerup. And it was very interesting. They had so much focus on the community, and art, and culture, and a shared appreciation of food. All of it was about community, and it should ... and there should be some clubs for girls, because there were way too many clubs for boys, and they wanted to have something too, and things like that, you know? They had some really interesting suggestions as to how Gellerup should be developed. And I wish that these young people would have influence on how the area could be developed, because they're the ones who will live there in the future. And I felt totally optimistic while I was listening to them, you know? It was just, wow. What great ideas these ninth grade students have. Well, they should be heard, but the problem is ... The problem is that these areas will be converted, not for those who live there, but for those who will live there. So that's why they don't care about what we think, because anyhow we will ... They want us to move. But I wish that in the future the people who should do the developing, that they would talk with the ones who live there. Because it might be that we actually have some good ideas as to what should happen. Just maybe. Yes, it seems ... isn't it ... about time?

Alex Young Pedersen: Yes, well. Hi. My name is Alex Young Pedersen. I live in social housing in Aarhus west. I live there together with my wife and three children and we've been living there for 15 years. I moved to Bispehaven because it was a place where you could get a flat rather quickly without very long waiting lists. We also had priority because of measures put in place to get people getting an education and employed in more quickly and reshape the area in that way. So, we, my wife and I, got a flat out there pretty quickly and really became very happy with it, especially the neighborliness, especially the urban environment there is in a place like Bispehaven. And just like Elsebeth, I grew up in a small town in western Jutland where people know each other or at least who each other are. And the same was true for this housing area. There are some things I could see were the same as what I grew up with and that made me feel safe.

So you greet each other, not just those in the same stairway, but also other people who live there, after you have lived there for a while of course. It doesn't happen right at first, but it comes. We really liked the area and had our first child in that

little flat we moved into, and we decided that we would like to stay here and wanted to stay here for the rest of our lives. Then we had to arrange for an internal move. So we moved into a little bit bigger flat where our next two children were born. So, now we have children ages 12, 10 and 8 years old. The last one was actually born in the relevant flat that stands to be torn down now. This goes back to 2018, which Elsebeth has also mentioned, when the legislation went into effect. And I might have been naïve with the idea that a home is a human right. And that is something you can take for granted. It was not that way at all, we suddenly realized in 2018.

I was at a children's birthday party with my middle daughter and the news came out and began to show up in all the media. We were talking with the parents at this birthday party and she overheard it and burst out in tears and started crying because she realized that now her childhood home evidently stands to be torn down. And of course it was a pretty harsh way to find out. That she overheard a conversation between adults, which probably should have been only adults only and not for children. So, how do you move on from this naivety that it is a right? It is that you have to fight for these areas and for the rights you have. And of course I was personally touched and affected by this, which also meant that you should start up an informational campaign for yourself in order to try to make heads or tails of what this legislation actually means for us. And how it can be that our home will be torn down? Maybe we can say a little about the background. Well, we live in a diverse housing area where there are many different cultures, but also many different social classes represented in these housing areas. And I think that it's a positive thing that people are different and live together and can see ourselves reflected in our differences. But also just like caring for your children and the things tie us together.

I have studied the history of ideas in Aarhus and am a secondary school teacher. My wife is a doctor at Skejby Hospital and is a specialist there. We had decided even before 2018 that this would be our home. The flats were big and nice. There was enough space to have three children. We could stay there for the rest of our lives for a pretty reasonable rent too. So we decided on that and then we got an allotment garden house so we could do the classic thing by living in the allotment garden house during the summer half of the year and living in the social housing flat during the winter half of the year.

In 2018 legislation was introduced and that meant that I started getting involved a bit outside, because I was outside the tenant board [afdelingsbestyrelsen], then I began to go to demonstrations and informational meetings with the group

called Almen Modstand [Common resistance]. And there I met Elsebeth and Fatma and I came across others who could help to give some of the background of and information about the case. I made a petition in the housing area in an attempt to conduct a case so that the tenants could be heard and whether it was necessary that it would come to terminations of their tenancies. And in the end I ended up running for tenant board and was elected as the new chair of the tenant board Bispehaven. I could say a little about the human consequences because people who come from the outside also have a perspective from the outside and not from the inside. And the result is, I think, a lot of misunderstandings and notions of what these kinds of areas are. And I don't recognize all of the things that the politicians talk about in these housing areas. Well, it's not because I'm blind. I can see that there are challenges and there are some that we handle locally and take care of. But I can't see how you can judge areas in this way, that actually account for a social elevator effect.

The fact is that the social lifting capacity in these areas is higher than most places in Denmark and that is because there is both a targeted social effort, which there is, and there are incredibly resourceful people who live here. And when I say that I say it to emphasize that when you look at it from the outside, you might think that these people, many of whom have retired early, or are retired in general, people who are loosely connected to the job market, or who get other forms of support, that they lack resources. Yes, that's a judgement I had myself, and I had to just pack it up because I have never met such resourceful people who actually do something and lift their area in whatever way they can. So, they are actually very engaged. That doesn't mean that they are engaged in housing politics, but then they are engaged in being volunteers at a lot of different events in the housing area. And they take care of and help each other. So this image of people without resources is not one I could confirm. It may be that on the surface and seen objectively they are not [socioeconomically] advantaged, but when it comes to doing the heavy lifting and what they do, that work, then there are a lot of resources in these areas.

318 flats out of 880 flats in Bispehave are going to be torn down and that will affect a lot of people. "One" has decided, and the "one" is the municipality, the housing association and other interests, to take the heart out of Bispehaven; of course it is the most attractive area of Bispehaven. It has been decided to tear down six apartment buildings in all, so you get a connected housing area that is located in the heart of Bispehaven. When this is put into effect, then "one" also moves people who have been living there for many years. I'm not even the one who's been living

in my stairway the longest, and as I mentioned before, I've only lived in the current stairway for 12 years. But these communities of neighbors are broken up. It may be that there will be new housing and new kinds of housing, and some private housing, but it is the social networks that disappear, it is the social relationships, and it is the networks that people have built up over countless years that are broken down. That is what is disgraceful here, and it is not emphasized enough. That is what is destroyed along with the housing.

The ones I perhaps feel sorriest for are the Danish widows. It's terrible for them. Many have been living here since the seventies and now they are alone because they've lost their husbands. But then they have their network here and come to the local club for pensioners, go on trips to Germany and to Christmas parties. All of their friends and all of their social relationships are in this area and they are being forced out. There was one resident who said it at the first tenant meeting when we were informed of it back in 2019. She said that if she had to move from here then it would be "in a one room with a lid." In other words, she would be carried out in a coffin. It was a bit harsh but an understandable expression of the desperation people feel. But while we are on the subject, by virtue of being a representative for the residents, first outside the board, are now inside. Then there are people, who I know only peripherally, who come and knock on my door. An older woman on early retirement came over and said that she was lonesome and that the only thing that she really had to live for was these weak relationships, these loose social relationships you have. That she was recognized on the street in the cityscape, that people knew who she was, that she could stop and speak with someone. That is what means something to her. Her children are far away and she doesn't have a very close connection with them. And she is really alone, but that is what creates a network for her. She is afflicted in all kinds of ways, but is a very strong woman who shows up at all of the tenant meetings and expresses the unfairness of this.

I don't know if I should say much more, but I'd like to end by saying that this distancing gaze that comes from the outside is shared by everyone who doesn't live here. Many people who come from the outside with good intentions, people who do a lot of volunteer work and people who just see the area from the outside do not necessarily have insight into what it means to live in Bispehaven and the qualities that the area offers. You can never get this insight under your skin just by coming there; you can get it only through living there. The same is true when one is planning an urban area. Then too much of the time you plan from the outside looking in.

Again, there is that outsider gaze that looks down on the city and sees the dwelling from the outside, and that is what needs to be changed. It is the renovation of facades, park grounds. It is window units, gable ends that should be opened up. It should be nice for those who come by and move through the area.

It's things like this when it is all about a gaze from the outside. Whereas the ones who live there might have most need for interior renovation that raises the quality of their homes. You live in the flats from the inside and out, not the other way around. It's not so often that I sit outside and look at my home from the exterior. I live inside it and so do all the people who live inside the flats. And they are really varied from flat to flat, which you can find out when you visit. People arrange their lives in different ways. That is where you live your life, and there is seldom focus on or understanding of that. It would really be beneficial with interior renovations, so you do not live in a "made-up corpse", when you work on urban renewal. But that is always at the bottom of the list when it comes to urban renewal. Housing blocks had just been newly renovated in Bispehaven in the summer of last year for three quarters of a million Danish kroner. Now they will be torn down. So they stood there for a year and a half. So although it looks nice in Bispehaven, and it really does, but on the interior they really lack a lot. So that is something one could, as an outsider, focus on, just as you could focus more on the ones who are living there now instead of the ones you imagine will live there in the future.

Søren-Emil: Yes, it was both depressing, maybe most of all depressing, and not very caring situation in the presentation we just had from Aarhus. And mine might be a little more of the same, but also a bit different. But, as I said, my name is Søren-Emil Schütt and I am the chair here at AKB Lundtoftegade, in this building where we find ourselves. I have been chair for three years but have been living here for about eleven. And I moved here after some years when I had been living in the private rental market in Copenhagen, practically from sofa to sofa, when I suddenly had the opportunity to get a flat on Lundtoftegade in social housing. So I first experienced Copenhagen from a caring side because I moved in here. Then I was received by neighbors and a community that welcomed me with open arms. And to start out with I think that surprised me a bit, because a little like you just said, Elsebeth, I didn't know very much about what the social housing sector was like either, and I have learned since, including by becoming engaged with the tenant democracy here, but also, just like you others, being active in Almen Modstand and

sitting on the board of the organization AKB Copenhagen and in a regional board [BLs 1. Kredts], so in that way I am a housing policy activist spread across a few different places. And sometimes it's really hard, but I also think that it's absolutely necessary. Because if we want to be able to find out what is happening at these different levels then I think that it is essential to be represented in different places. When I had to prepare this, and it has to do with caring urban planning, then I began to consider what it would mean for something to be caring? And now I won't claim that Martin Heidegger was necessarily especially caring for his era, but even so, he has a concept around care that is quite interesting. And that is ... he tries to define care, welfare work in two different ways. The one is about an attention, that is where you take care of the other like a thing, and consideration is, as he describes it, that you move first and set the other free. And that concept I have personally tried to impose on some of the things we have done in Ludtoftegade in the past three/four years. So this about trying to create... open up a space, create opportunities for each other as neighbors. Really to be truly caring toward each other in everything we do.

And it is hard to work out from a concept of care. And basically, we have not done that, but what we did in the wake of it, not so much the New Year's speech in 2018, but more the repressive invasion of Mjølnerparken tenants' house, which happened a couple months later, when a united parliament quite brutally sent away or threw the local yoga group out of the tenants' house, and tell more thoroughly about this... about this policy document, the parallel society plan One Denmark Without Parallel Societies by 2030, where it happens is that the main concept is about "non-Western". That is so ... It is clearly the most problematic term from which to define the housing areas and people, and it recurs in the text that Lars Løkke reads in the Mjølnerpark tenants' house. The foreigners are defined by a lack. They are non-Western. They are not democratic. They do not want to be Danish. They do not want to learn the language. That is how they define some people rhetorically, as the opposite of what it is to be Danish.

And I think that was some of what provoked me and made me most unhappy. It was that that "othering" or alienation that they tried to put down on my neighbors. And that was definitely not care in any form. It is maintenance and I think that a political distinction has to be made. Consequently, people have to be made into objects to be able to treat them in the way that is being planned in the parallel society legislation. Because when you are a foreigner, then you can be managed, and that is what they're trying to do with us, isn't it? I don't know if it comes as a direct

consequence of this brutal attack on Mjølnerparken and on the social housing sector in March of 2018, but in any case, we at Lundtoftegade decided that ... we are really based on this quite activist legacy here, so in that way we have some very good conditions at Lundtoftegade for building further on our tenant democracy. So we have decided to do this, precisely because we cannot see ourselves in this alienating light that the politicians have tried to introduce. So we wanted to prove them wrong. So then we had to display our tenant democracy. And so what you mentioned, that outsider perspective that we don't recognize, then we have to demonstrate in some way that we are the opposite of what they think we are.

I can't dismiss the idea that we would probably have done the same irrespective of the parallel society plan. I think that we would have, but in another way. So that document was very motivating for us. Then we sat down as a committee and created visions for what we thought characterized Lundtoftegade, what characterizes care, what characterizes our sense of community. And we came up with three values that we wanted to work on. That was social responsibility, solidarity and participation. So these three values guide the strategy that we have attempted to work from since 2018 at Lundtoftegade.

And of course this is a strategy we made as a committee. And then we might have started to think that we also knew how our neighbors felt, and of course we wanted to avoid falling into that trap. So we invited (everyone) to a big tenant meeting in the fall of 2018 where 130 people came and we discussed everything between heaven and earth. That is, we simply made our own definitions of problems in relation to what people experienced as some challenges or some potentials at Lundtoftegade. And the result was that we were able to restructure our tenant democracy. In the past we actually had block committees where each apartment building had self-determination. You could call it democratic, but it turned out that it was easier to break up our structure by letting people get together on the basis of a matter more than that they lived in the same building. So based on this tenant meeting we were able to make 30 working groups that could continue with the things that they thought were interesting. And basically, that resulted in that we somehow made a very bottom-up democratic system, where now, in Lundtoftegade, if you want something, or want to change something or do something, then you can more or less just do it.

And that is a somewhat radical response to that about being non-democratic, or being a "crack" territory on the map of Denmark, isn't it? Because it means that

a whole lot of us are engaged in our local areas. And that could actually be about a cat committee or a solar cell committee or those who work specifically with developing our courtyards into some nice common courtyards where there is room for everyone. An example is that we have developed a collaboration with ... well, we have begun to organise together with many local organisations and clubs, so for example in one of the courtyards, we undertook a project with Nørrebro United, which is a local football club. And the way in which we developed these common spaces was to begun to work processually, inviting everyone in. Well, especially those who were not interested in football, in order to take this definition of lack [of interest/need] seriously, and to involve knowledge from people, who would probably not be interested in football. This, then means that we ...for one and a half year, I think, worked on developing these shared outdoor spaces which Well, now it's been designed, not yet realised, but drafted. And you can play football, but you can also do a lot of other things, so that this is basically a space, which somehow also ...when it has materialized, can continue to be a part of the democratic exchange. And people will come across each other and meet, both people from the rest of Nørrebro, but also neighbors who might not necessarily meet each other normally. Come and, hopefully, meet each other in the courtyard space when it is finished.

And why it is not finished yet? Well, that is something you might start by asking the [municipal] technical and environmental administration about. That's probably where the first big hurdle lies. The next big hurdle is found in this huge jumble of plans that we are subject to. When sometimes I'm not sure that the ones who really should be in control of it, such as the municipality, are actually clear about what a change plan is, what a master plan is, what an urban area renewal [områdefornyelse] is, what a local rainwater management [LAR- lokal afledning af regnvand] plans are. There is such a huge amount of complicated things. And I hear them saying different things about the same subjects, or mixing things up. So that is ... so this about actually knowing what is, what projects coming from outside of the neighborhood are coming up that we need to act according to which we should in fact be able to act toward it by having a plan of our own, because the ones in the municipality or the state would like to make it for us, wouldn't they? That is where we have been frustrated in a big way, because it is extremely difficult when some architects come who cost 1000 DKK per hour. Because there's a limit as to how many you manage to talk with for 1000 (kroner/DKK) per hour. So it has to happen very quickly to hand over the procedural work we've been doing for the last year and a half for this courtyard.

And there is a good chance that the architects who come, at least in our experience, actually do not agree with our process, because a football field ... They had some prototypes of football fields with, right? And it was as if, this is the way you can play football. So this translation, which actually comes from our tenant democracy and neighborhood development, when it has to be translated into a professionalized language, so many things go wrong in our experience.

So I think that a clear recommendation, I don't know if it's a call. I think it is: (To) go to this architectural community about taking these discriminatory racist policies seriously and acting critically toward them. Just because someone is an architect or urban developer, doesn't necessarily mean that those of us who live here don't have the will and an idea of how our lives should unfold. So all that about both listening, but also really taking seriously whether you say yes to working for a policy that is incredibly problematic and has been criticized by the UN and Amnesty. That would be my warmest recommendation. You can simply just say no. And I think that would be my appeal, unless you want to liberate things and be caring in your work with the development of residential areas and have the tenants, have those of us who live there, participate in it. What time is it? That's perfect.

Fatma Tounsi: Okay. Well, now it is my turn. My name is Fatma Tounsi and I live in a social housing association in Bellahøj. And in the housing organization that's called B, and I am on the committee in my own department. But that's not really what I've come to talk about. I've come to talk more about my experiences with my activism in Almen Modstand. Yes, like the others on the panel today, I quickly became aware of the "ghetto legislation" in 2018 soon after it was announced that there was a plan to make this legislation. And I quickly realized that something dangerous was happening. Well, not in the beginning, but after I ... a friend asked me to go and read what this legislation is about, what this plan is about. Then I realized that it was about the privatization of the public housing and that was something I thought that I should work against. And then I found some tough people who I've been working with. And so, yes, you meet more and more and more who want to fight against it, and so we are collaborating in different ways. And we share our information and experiences with each other.

Well, one of the most bizarre things about this legislation is that they claim to work against segregation in the city and segregation in the housing market by actually forcing people to move and taking away the rights from the ones who are

most discriminated against in the housing market. And that is ... it's bizarre that they were able to sell such an opposing idea at all. A real package of inconsistencies, but yes, in the end we learned that anything can be done in Danish politics if they just add enough racism to it. Then they can sell anything.

But I came to Denmark 17 years ago. I've been living in social housing since I was almost three years old, when my family and I were living in private rentals. And until then we were not very aware of the difference between public and private tenancies. And you quickly become aware of it when you are dealing with a private rental company that won't fix things in the flat and would prefer to be free of all of the expenses they can and are very slow in their responses. So when we returned to the social housing we could see the good service and the good housing conditions. But the more I got engaged with the social housing ... What do you call it? Tenant democracy. The more I could see that it was something that functioned really well when it comes to the service and when it comes to the circumstances when you compare it to private rental. But there was something that doesn't work when it comes to tenant democracy.

And I would really like to focus on this today with information. And just like Søren-Emil spoke about, this professional language and these complicated structures and complicated systems and decision-making procedures that are called "tenant democracies", but which, in reality, set a lot of limits for people in relation to having influence and getting influence on how their neighborhood and how their city looks. So, when there are such complicated decision-making procedures and a very intricate language that is used when doing urban planning or making plans for a neighborhood, whether it is master plans or development plans or change plans or something. Many of these kinds of plans that you work on as just an ordinary resident in order to be able to have some kind of influence on it. Then you have to sit down and read a whole lot of things, make heads or tails of it, and make a lot of mistakes. Every time you make a mistake you are informed that you don't really understand anything, and you'd better let the ones who understand things work on it.

That is something I have experienced myself and I've also seen others in areas that are destined as vulnerable, in housing areas on the "ghetto list", have witnessed people from housing organizations say to the tenants, "But you don't understand any of this. You're naïve. You're such ... Yes, you're getting involved in something you don't understand anything about. And that is why you should leave it up to those of

us who really understand what it’s all about.” So then the question is, yes, but what is the purpose of this procedure? Are there really procedures and structures that are set in motion in order to achieve something? Or is the point to exclude people? Yes, I’m becoming more and more conspiratorial the more active I am in housing policies and have become convinced that there are many things that are set in motion in order to exclude people.

Linguistically, structurally, procedurally, financially – all these things are set in motion so that we ordinary people have nothing to say. And as for me, I think that people who work in this branch, if they truly wish to give people the opportunity to have influence, then you have to work in one way by simplifying things, that is, working on dismantling structures that are unnecessary, stop using the kind of language that is unnecessarily complicated. Or if there is something that is necessary, such as if there are some specialized terms that are absolutely necessary to use, there are some decision-making processes necessary to ensure that something has the necessary quality or safety or whatever it is, then work on teaching ordinary people what it is so they can get acquainted with what it means and how they can have influence on it.

So I find that there are such very divided opinions between those of us who are active against the “ghetto law”, but generally active around a better tenant democracy and more democratic urban planning. So there is this difference between us and those who think that if you understand, if you are a housing nerd, to put it like that, if you understand these things, or if you are a professional in this area, and you understand better than a completely ordinary or average person who lives in the city, then you can have a right to decide.

But that is not how it is. Obviously a doctor cannot decide, and so when I go to the doctor with something, the doctor can’t just decide what will happen with me, whether I should have an operation or not. They should explain to me why they think I should have an operation, what they think is the matter, why they think I need an operation, what are the best ... What do you call it? Options for me and so on. And they should also listen to me, such as what I am experiencing. So, yes, I should be able to rely on their professional expertise, but then they also have to explain to me what their professional expertise says.

And then I think the relationship between the residents in the city and the people who work with urban development and architects, that is ... You who have the professional expertise, but we are the ones who live in the city and we should have

something to say about it. And therefore, it’s a part of the professionals’ ... What do you call it? Job, to explain to us what it’s about and tell us what is good and bad about this way of doing it or that way of doing it. That is not what we are experiencing with the “ghetto law”. We find that there are some who have decided for one reason or another that it makes sense to tear down apartment buildings and take in new residents, and that will somehow create social change, or it will somehow help people out of unemployment. How this can be done? What is the specialist evidence and basis for this? We don’t understand it.

And not when it comes to the architectural either. That is, we do not get an explanation as to why one thing is better than another. Yes, but people who live in the apartment building think that it is fine. They have some ideas as to how it could be improved. But then some stranger, someone from the outside, who isn’t someone who explains how. Why is it that that is better? Some of what we have worked very hard on, as people who are active in opposition against the “ghetto law”, is by spreading information, spreading information about legal rights, spreading information about tenant democracies, how they work, and spreading information about what is being planned up in the organizations, and mobilize resistance against it. When you do that then you are called all kinds of things. You are called “naïve.” That is one of the mildest things to be called. You are called a “rumour spreader,” you are called ... What was it Frank Jensen [former mayor of Copenhagen] called us? “trouble makers.”

So... you are called all kinds of things if you try to spread information, if you try to start a conversation about what it is that should happen with the neighborhood, and how people can defend their rights, and how people can join in the conversation. You get only one version of the things, version of, what do you call it? The story/narrative. And if there is someone who tries to tell another version, then they are denounced very quickly. We have experienced this in a lot of places, most recently in Birkeparken where, yes, there was a very dramatic housing administration meeting [afdelingsmøde] where the housing association wanted to tell ... Yes, Birkebakken is located in Vollsmose in Odense, yes. The housing association came with one version of the story, where we found a lot of mistakes and outright lies. And when you try to tell the residents about it, then you are informed that ... either it is so far out that it has to be acknowledged, that they actually, that what they write or what they tell the residents is not correct, or then you are labelled because you try to tell another version of the story.

Yes, so, we, unfortunately, we have a social housing sector today with a small minority of tenants who are active. And there are many reasons for this, but I find the “ghetto law” to be something that mobilized us. And we realise that, hey, the fact is that we haven’t been good at defending our rights, and we have sort of taken it for granted that we have democratic rights. And we have rights, such as that a dwelling is a right. But now we’ve realized that if we don’t continue to defend these rights, just as the housing movement has always done, then they will be taken from us. And the only way we can do it is by spreading information, by explaining and mobilizing. And yes, working together and helping each other. And we do that a lot in Almen Modstand. We call each other and ask questions and help each other to understand things. Yes. So, yes. I would encourage all architects to help do this. So it is not enough that you sit with the ones who are controlling things from the top. You also have to be engaged in explaining to very ordinary people why things are being done in the way they are being done, so they can have an actual influence on how things can be done. Yes. Yes, that was what I had to say.

Beata Hemer: Hello. Thanks for the invitation by ... My name is Beata Hemer. I am an architect and lecturer. I don’t live in public housing myself, and I have ...

Marie Nortrup Christensen: Yes. My name is Marie Northrup I am an anthropologist and tenant in one of the social housing areas that is on the “ghetto list”, which is Aldersrogade, it’s called. It’s located here in outer Nørrebro.

Beata: And we want to put up some pictures from two documents that we have gathered as a part of what you can see down in the corner there. Which is, yes, a newly started archive work we call Almen Arkiv (Common Archive). And it is documents from the process around the implementation of parallel society legislation. And you will present some background context, won’t you?

Marie: Yes. So that document we will start to read aloud from, it’s a document that we have received via the right of access to documents, or I have sought access to the documents. I can do

that as a citizen. At the meetings there have been in the municipality, in the technical and environmental administration, where steering committee meetings have been held for plans for the area (where) I live for more than a year. And there haven’t been any informational meetings for tenants about it yet. But so we have ... It is so good that it is possible to seek access to documents. So this is one of the ... yes, the minutes from one of the steering committee meetings that we will start by reading aloud from.

Beata: Okay.

The city’s developmental, technical and environmental administration, minutes, date of meeting 10 December 2020, time 14:30 – 16:00. Location, Microsoft Teams, link to the notice of a meeting. Meeting participants: Bo-Vita, Vibu, Copenhagen municipality, the technical and environmental administration, the design studio Vandkunsten. Change management plan for Aldersrogade. Committee meeting number six. 1. Welcome. X welcomes (everyone). 2. Presentation from the drawing department of Vandkunsten. Since the last meeting, Vandkunsten has been working with both the joint advisory commission, which should qualify the connections and urban spaces in the quarter, as well as the first considerations in relation to the coming physical master plan, the ‘green triangle’. These two tasks should be solved in close collaboration. The design studio Vandkunsten takes part and presents their work. The steering committee discuss the proposal in what follows. Do the overall narrative and arguments hold? Is anything missing? X from the design studio Vandkunsten presented their work. The steering committee expressed a very positive general response to the presentation and thought it was a solid bid for the future development of the area. The overall story is clear by now and the arguments hang together. It is most powerful when it can be formulated in phrases, such as: from grey to green, from closed to open, from insecure to secure, and so on. It’s about communicating the goals clearly. It is important that we

remember to prepare for both scenarios A and B: not hard ghetto/hard ghetto. Among other things, it is necessary that Bo-Vita comes with a volume study of concentration options for the green triangle. Otherwise it is hard to make the calculations that will be necessary if the area is singled out as a hard ghetto in 2021. Bo-Vita continues in dialogue with Vandkunsten about a more precise volume study. The steering committee thinks that it was very interesting to continue working on the connections from Superkilen over toward the housing area, both on Rovsinggade and Sigyngsgade. There was a discussion about the degree to which the projects should be communicated individually or together. The steering committee agrees that we should create a cohesive narrative, so, for example, the new storeys from existing apartment blocks are also reflected in the rendering of new urban spaces, and so on. It is important that we quickly get an overview of the parking situation in the area, as that is central for both the physical master plan and urban space project. The technical and environmental administration will contact the housing organisations so we can get an overview.

Marie: Yes, so that was just a piece from the minutes. And then at this steering committee meeting there was an attachment which was shared with everyone who was present there. The attachment which was drafted by the housing organization Bo-Vita, a strategy for tenant collaboration and communication, which as they should have towards the tenants, because these plans should actually ... in order to have democratic legitimacy then they have to be voted on at a department meeting, which we do not know when will happen. We have not received any information about these plans yet. It's a rather long document. We will only read aloud points three and four. So, yes:

Point three. Goals. Throughout the entire project we have to have focus on why we make these different tenant efforts, our joint goals with ... What our joint goals with the strategy are.

1. The tenants support the project.

2. We have coordinated the tenants' involvement in the project with the tenants.

3. The tenants feel secure and well-informed about the project. We communicate so that it is easily understandable without difficult jargon. We communicate through many different channels of communication, both analog and digital formats. Our communication is coordinated and comes on a regular basis so that the tenants know what they can expect as far as communication. We take the time to meet with the residents both at big meetings and also in smaller forums and in one-to-one conversations with key people.

Flipping through ... And point four:

4. Crises and conflicts. A crisis slash event slash criticism is an unpredictable big threat which can have a negative influence on our project, organization, collaborators or branch if it is managed wrongly. Crises can for example come up because of ...

and then there are a lot of points:

Point one. Negative influence from the tenants from Almen Modstand. Negative influence from critical residents. Myths about misunderstandings between tenants. Negativity in the building committee, the effects of living on a construction site, negative press, if communication is incomplete and too early in relation to the project's time schedule. We have to always have focus on the good story, what kind of objectives the master plan solves, how the master plan contributes positively to the tenants and the housing area. We should only communicate what we actually know and keep the department committees and tenants informed continuously. In addition it is important that we partners occasionally throughout the project inform the group about critical points so that they can be addressed within the project and in the communication.

Yes.

Beata: Yes. So after this conversation, then we will, as you also said, answer ... Then there is an hour and a half or one hour to just go around and visit Almen Arkiv down there. There are more papers, more documents that you can look at and read and sit with. We will place some chairs around the table. There are more examples of documents for it.

Heidi: So, yes. Many thanks to the panel for your both chocking but also touching and enthusiastic stories. That it can be enjoyable to be a critical person, is perhaps worthwhile noticing ... I thought that we would open up to questions from you who are in the room, but before that would just like to hear briefly if you have anything you would like to ask each other about or comment on?

Søren-Emil: Very briefly, I really think that ... I am glad that you touched on it, Fatma, but this about the significance of the market, you know, this process of gentrification, which is also a very important part of the parallel society legislation, and I really think that when you combine the market and othering, and such colonial perspectives, then it is three evils that are considerably worse than the parallel society legislation, but they are all solidly present in the parallel society package. And that is what I think we sometimes feel that we can be up against in one way or another. And I think that we really think that genuine care exists in the communities we have in social housing, where everyone can live. And that the improper care might ... I am not saying that you can't care for others if you live in a single family house. But when you have parceled out around yourself then you have some very different interests in the market and so, you have to capitalize on each other. And that is what we have no part in. And that is the fight we are really fighting. So it is both the parallel society legislation and also some really bad legacies from the history that we are somehow up against. And I think it helps to say that this trinity of evils is a fierce struggle, in which there is a real need for a lot of support from many, isn't there? And this is just a call for us to take it seriously.

Elsebeth: Yes. I would also like to say that it was because you spoke, Alex, about it. And I completely forgot ... what is going to

happen in Gellerup. If I could quickly ... So, because I was talking so much about all of these changes we're having ... But I didn't tell about which changes will happen. That is, the city council and the parliament and the committee of representatives and everyone possible have decided that seven apartment buildings in Gellerup-parken will be torn down. That is a little over 400 dwellings. And that has just been ... The tenants voted it down in a ballot. They thought, the housing association didn't think that we could have an ordinary meeting and an ordinary ballot due to corona. It could have, but they didn't think it should happen, so we held a ballot and then the committee of representatives and the housing association also voted. Voted yes. So it has been voted in favour. And now what happens, the next thing that happens is that the department has sued the housing association and Aarhus municipality and the Danish state. And that's how it is. That is what we are waiting for. What is happening now in relation to ... There are a lot of things happening right now in relation to the other court cases around Denmark. So the way it is, is that ... in relation to having to wait, which court case you should conduct first...

Fatma: It is important that you explain what a committee of representatives is, just so ...

Elsebeth: Okay. Yes. But a representative committee [repræsentant-skabet] is ... yes, representatives for the different department boards in a housing association [afdelingsbestyrelser i en boligforening], and they are the ones who should vote on the master plan for Gellerup. And then there is also that about, that there are some people who live somewhere else altogether, who should decide about my department, and whether my apartment building should be torn down. It is a pretty strange construction, also because some of them are afraid of their own department's finances. There are also some of them who are afraid that some of us would come out to them. That's what I've heard. Tenants' meetings I have been out to, "Yes, but can we risk getting some of them from Gellerup over to us?" Then there is that about there not being so much interconnection within the housing association other than that we are members of the same housing association. Yes, what was it I was about to say? Just ... yes, so it was just that about that there are some court cases happening now, or there will be some cases made. So that is why it is sort of, which order should we do them in relation to what makes the most sense or something? I don't know. Do you know more about it, Fatma?

Fatma: I don't think that I know more about it. But it is ... in a legal sense there are two different kinds of cases: those that you do collectively, which are more principal cases, whose real goal is to get the court to take a position on this legislation, whether it is legal at all to make such legislation, and then the other is individual court cases from each tenant. When they get a contract termination then you can also make complaints to the tenant complaints board and the equality, the non-discrimination, board. And all of these legal measures that different residents from different areas have used. So yes, you can say that everything is being tried. And then we'll see how we can get the word of the court that is being done to the tenants is discriminatory and against Danish law and, or the Danish constitution, and international human rights agreements.

Heidi: I would like to just try to start with a brief question. I think that this parallel with the story about the doctor who has a professional ethic and ... or caring practice, which means that you are in dialogue in order to make the right decision when you see a patient. I think that it's interesting to try to think from this perspective of care. The roles of the architect and the urban planner there ... then we hear about documents in circulation, that time is spent making volume studies because there might be a decision out in the future, and then you also mention that architects cost a lot of money, so they don't have enough time to speak with you. Really ... Then there is something about how you use the architect's time. I think if you have some experiences ... as to what is needed ... besides, I know, that there is ... What I hear you say is that there is a need for ... that the architects spend time listening and entering into processes of translating or explaining things so they can be understood. There is also a need for architects to be involved in these processes. Or do you have any good examples of something that has actually worked, that you could learn from as an architect?

Alex: Well in my experience from Bispehaven, the architects had the outsider perspective, but they also possess a lot of specialized knowledge. At the same time they find themselves in a difficult situation. They are under pressure from the municipality's demands as to how a master plan should be worked out, which forms of renovations should take place, and so on. There is, I can sense, massive pressure. They are also under massive pressure from the entrepreneurs who should take over an area, and these demands might often be more

extensive than ... How can you put it? The wishes of the tenants. And therefore the architects can sometimes actually act something like a bulwark against some of the worst things. At any rate that is my experience from Bispehaven, where the city council really wants to change a lot more housing types, which is strange, because it is an area that has long waiting lists. There have never been empty hallways in the buildings. So it seems once again that they, the municipality, want to remodel the area much more radically than what there is an actual need for.

The architects play an important role by trying to speak out against these intensive remodelings. That is something positive. I would like to say one last thing about entering into a dialogue. Here, all the tenants are in one way or another subjected to what could be called "repressive tolerance", through which we are embraced with all the dialogue we could desire – without really being listened to. If you are elected to be a member of the board, as I have been, then we are invited to meetings constantly, as if we do not have anything else in our lives other than building meetings. And it is night after night after night. There are private conversations over coffee with the top management, and then you are really spared. But a lot of information is held back, important information. All the simple numbers like: How many tenants are subject to compulsory transfer? Exactly how many flats we are talking about should be renovated and which ones? How do the finances look? What are the numbers? When does it need to be paid back? How much does the rent go up? All of these specific numbers, which they could actually say. Why don't they say them? They're sitting there with the information. They hold it back until the last moment, and unfortunately, that has been the process the whole way through. In this way the tenants are placed in a position with asymmetric information all along. It is a way of manipulating people. It is a way of keeping people in ignorance, because they possess the specialized knowledge and they do not share it until the very last moment, and even then they try to put a damper on it. In Bispehaven an informational meeting was held for tenants. First there we realized what the financing is.

Now I will just briefly tell what the financing is, and then you can try to get an understanding of what we are subjected to. The price of the demolition of our housing area, plus the loss of the rent as the buildings are standing empty (tomgangsleje), plus the renovations is a total bill of 424 million (Danish) kroner. On top of that is an expense for infrastructure of 52 million. Who has to pay this money? The remaining tenants of Bispehaven will. Of course they can't afford it. There is nobody there who

has, what I have calculated is the equivalent of 750,000 kroner per rental unit, all the way down to the small 30 square meter flats. That is the price on average for taking out a loan. The loans have to be taken from the private loan market at market price. That is to say that the running expenses just with having a loan can't be paid. That is, the tenants, the remaining tenants, have to foot the whole bill, but they can't afford it, so then we are forced to take out yet another loan of 17 million kroner, which the tenants have to take out with guarantees from the National Building Fund to maintain the running expenses.

What do they tell the tenants? "Yes, but there will not be rent increases for anyone." That is a lie. That is factually wrong. "No, but it only applies to those who have renovations done. You can understand that." Yes, we understand that. But when should we pay back the money? It's not as if we get it. But there is no one who can tell the tenants that. They want to make a draft, they say, they want to make it. That information will come later. So even at a so-called informational meeting, an honest answer cannot be given to the tenant who raises the question. We do not get any information.

And it is so intense and undermining for a department with 560 apartments who are left with this huge debt. We are bound hand and foot for decades in the future. Our right of managing our financial affairs is taken from us. We should just click our heels together and wait until the rent is raised. Then you can say that those who were not thrown out in the first round will be pushed out on an ongoing basis via raised rents.

That is how they can convert an area at the tenants' own expense. That is how you make housing policies for the middle class. And that is what is happening. I really don't think that people know it, but that is what is happening.

Audience: Hello. Is it the same thing that will happen in Gellerup and on Lundtoftegade? Do you know that?

Alex: I know that it is the same budget draft. That is why it is important to get the tenants to click their heels and say "Yes, thanks." And they should accept it all the way up through the system. Because that is what this "yes" at department meetings in organization committees and committees of representatives, that is what makes us voluntarily take out a loan. If everyone rejected this, where would they end up? Then it would land on the investment table,

and then they can no longer afford it because then they would have to pay themselves. So it is the taxpayers' money that has to be used. There is no one who can afford to carry out such massive demolitions for so many millions of kroner. It is not at all affordable. So you have to remember this ... I think that people are not aware that this financing is happening with the National Building Fund's money. It's a big money bin that everyone who lives in social housing pays into every month. Even when their loan on their particular residence is paid, they pay what is equivalent to the loan's costs, which are always ongoing every single month for everyone who rents from public housing in Denmark, no matter where they live, paid to the National Building Fund. So that is a lot of money. It is the tenants' equity and it is being used for demolitions. And again, as a loan. That's insane. Really. And therefore it is a very nice thing to have as a politician, when you have a big chest of money and can promise the moon, isn't it? The new bill that has been set forth is a transfer of 10 billion kroner from the National Building Fund. Kaare Dybvad, the housing minister, can say that we want more social housing. Then he just forgets to tell that they are at the head of the demolitions at a scope never seen before. We would like to have new social housing and where does the money come from? The existing tenants.

So you take the existing tenants' money and their cheap rents, and then make sure to ghettoize all of these social areas in this way with their money. Then they will be pushed out and pay for the destruction of their own dwellings. This is insane. Really it is just ... To understand it, I think, that is what ... that is also why the opposition could be felt, because it is simply ... unreal. It's the cash box. It is ... the dimensions are so tremendous that it goes beyond the comprehension of most people. Can this really be possible in a community founded on the rule of law in the year 2021? That you can do this, and even using legislation that is discriminatory. It is insane. That is you think that this can't be right. It cannot be happening. But it is being forced on all of us and it is happening with the greatest political backing you could have for anything. Yes, I am dumbfounded.

Audience: It's a little technical about the finances. What happens with the money that the housing association earns by selling the flats? Then does it go into the housing association? And ...

Alex: No, it doesn't, because even the expenses of making the sites ready for private investors very probably exceeds the income

from the sale. You have to remember that buildings have been built in these areas. They may be from the 1970s, but they have not recovered expenses yet, so there is actually a residual loan (restlån) in these buildings. And in order to pay off the residual loan, a lot of what could have been a surplus, then some money also goes to – that the tenants have to get the area ready and make it attractive to private investors, so that they do not have any expenses when entering into the area.

So the site is developed and infrastructure is made, and roads are made, and all of these things are necessary in advance so the private investors have as few expenses as possible. Then you can fulfill the Aarhus municipality's noblest task: maximum profit for private investors. And they don't even try to hide it. That is what might be the most heavily weighted reason for doing these things. That is part of the purpose.

Fatma: So I want to tell about, in Mjølnerparken at any rate, what Bo-Vita has said, but which we do not think is attended to in practice, and that is ... So when they came out to the tenants with this plan to sell flats, in Mjølnerparken, they said, "Yes but this is the right model to choose, because then we have some money that we can use to build new other places in Copenhagen". But the tenants are not interested in that. They are interested in staying in their homes. But as Alex explains, then there are a lot of calculations that disappear and which ...

Is it really worth spending, so because you spend so much money on renovating the housing and then on getting other whole areas so that it suits the private investors, who would like to invest in the area, that it actually ... How much do the residents or the housing association earn from it? Not so much I think. Not after all of this money has been spent on ... So, for example, in Mjølnerparken they want to tear down the community centre. So there is a community centre called Fælleshuset. They will tear it down and then build something else somewhere else. And that makes no sense at all. So why should it be done in this way? But so our speculation or guesswork is that it has to do with allowing less and less space for tenant activities and for tenant democracy to unfold, and more space for ... that the municipality and housing association should, and then the private rental firm should be present, and then ... be active in the area.

And that reminds me. In Mjølnerparken a lot of club spaces have been closed by the municipality several years ago. Just like, yes, here on Lundtoftegade, just like

Søren-Emil told about, a space like this is being closed by the municipality. The same thing is happening in Vollsmode. The same is happening in many places, so that tenant democracy cannot ... is not allowed to unfold because, politicians would like to control what ... yes, what happens in the area and what the premises is used for.

Søren-Emil: I might be able to follow up a little. To continue with this doctor metaphor. Then what we did at Lundtoftegade ... (which is) by the way, as things look now, not on any list (of housing areas that are designated as "ghettos" or parallel societies), but we might be on a "prevention" list, which has exactly the same consequences as the old lists. And they were made public on the first of December. I could imagine, and what they have done, that is, they have changed the percentage of "non-Western", which used to be 50 percent. That has been reduced to 30 percent. So there cannot be more than 30 percent "non-Westerners" in a housing area. And that is basically a criterion we cannot and will not work with. But it is such a vicious cycle which we will probably never come out of. So it's very good political craftsmanship, you could say, because we simply cannot do anything about it. That we can work with people's connection to the job market and all kinds of other things, but we can't do it with diversity. And we don't want to.

But what can architects do to contribute real care for people like us, who live in social housing? I think that it's about working with some supporting institutions in one way or another. And it is both the architecture school, but maybe also in the landscape architecture training, that you could bring in some of these things and take them seriously. Because you know then the field could become one that protects people's housing areas. Because there is the policy that we have tried to tell about. And when we began to make these plans at Lundtoftegade, then it was actually very difficult to find an architect who wanted to work with democratic architecture. Because what would that mean? What would it mean to make a process where we find out in collaboration what it is we would like, what the local needs are, but also creating something material, so we really have a democratic afterlife? Those are some rather abstract dimensions to work with.

We found an architect, who wanted to take part. And after some time we found a design studio in Aarhus that was willing to make a plan for Lundtoftegade. And we developed a concept called "the Open Wound". And now we can go back to that about the doctor. Because we developed a concept called the open wound, and the open wound was really about keeping the process open at all times, right?

That you could not be able to close a process, because then it would be, in one way or another ... Then it dies, you could say. Right? And the way the drawing studio from Aarhus did it was, it was that we turned Lundtoftegade into a cow. And then you could work with different cuts. So we could have democratic processes in selected areas of our housing area. And that was just their way of attempting to design what it was we wanted to ... how we could focus on a single area and get our neighbors involved in it and attract local actors, who should be a part of this, this building. A good example. Where we are going to install five socio-economic businesses that all work with people, organised people outside the job market in different ways? It is Frak and I Tråd med Verden and People Like Us and the women's centre among others, you know? So we think that we have some solutions in relation to working within these criteria, that are not part of the legislation, but in some completely different, much more humane ways. And this requires that you have the ability to keep the wound open, of course, but not to the point of getting gangrene. At some point you might also have to materialize something, right? But this whole idea of listening to each other and talking together and finding out what it is we want for our city, how we can make a solidary, or: What does the solidary development of the city look like in reality? And that is what I think the architecture profession and those who have influence should really be taking seriously. It is not about letting yourself sink into the understandings, that ... politicians are trying to depict of us, but simply dare to let themselves to glide along in the "open wound". And it may not be a pleasant space, but it is a democratic space.

Fatma: I actually have a question for the architects who are in the audience. And that is, is your training in communication and education are a part of your studies? Or the abolishment of democratic participation for that matter? Is that a part of your training? Is there anyone who would like to answer that?

Søren-Emil: That is my point. We have to build some strong institutions, don't we? We have to get to that level so that some changes can take place.

Audience: Yes, very briefly. I started in Copenhagen but actually moved again, while studying architecture, because there was not

much discussion of why we build and who we build for. There has been a bit more of that recently, but there is clearly a flaw with a school that is first and foremost, maybe, an art academy. And where there is not necessarily a strong academic tradition either.

I just have a quick question if I may be so bold. And while I am talking about it, I thought, just to understand completely the importance of the area committee's yes to the financing of the demolition, and so on. Well, I know ... In Tingbjerg, in relation to the Housing Association fsb's s area committee, I know how insistent the residents have been for a long time specifically to not to yield or cast a yes vote, also even though in different minutes it appears in that a yes was given. Yes, this whole process from a legal perspective, how is it, that you work with both, you can say ... showing the importance of ... what the tenants' voices in the area committee mean for the realization of these plans, but also what the consequences will look like when a housing association claims that a yes was given even though that was not the case.

Alex: Well that is a good question. There haven't been any ... Well they have anticipated, I think, from the politicians' team, and a lot of the social housing sector's administrations, that they could drive this home. And I think that people are beginning to realize that they can't do this on the area level at any rate. Now Bispehave is a department among many departments in a housing association that's called Østjysk Bolig, which you may have heard of. The housing association is structured in such a way that there is a committee of representatives [repræsentantskab] and there is an organization board. Back to, I think it was in 2009, they decided once again to run over tenant democracy, so those "stupid tenants" would not decide on anything they shouldn't. So they made what is called a "call-in of the decision". And that means that the committee of representatives would be able to take another vote on every decision that takes place on the level of each housing area or department, if they don't like what the tenants in the area decided. And this call-in of a decision can be used. And it is applied in the places where the master plan has been voted against at a department meeting. Then they would say, yes, that's fine, but now we will submit the same case to a representative committee, and if it doesn't toe the line, then I think they would even try to push it through with a business manager installed on the organization board, so it can be forced through.

And then we have destroyed the tenant democracy all the way up. Then you can say that participatory democracy only has a voice if we accept the basic premise and say yes to the master plan. That is the access to the collaboration (is) being allowed to sit and talk a bit with some architects about finding other kinds of housing, or another colour for the façade. Then that's okay. Then we are part of the process. And when we say no, then I think that we are more or less left out of the process. I don't know how it will end up, but you can't burden people with a debt or take on a debt if there is not a vote of approval for it. Nevertheless, you cannot force a debt on a department committee that is self-owned. We often forget that although social housing is not private, it is self-owned. It is just the form of ownership that is a little different from living privately, but the people who live in social housing always own it in partnership within the structure of a social housing association, so it is not as if you can just come and expropriate it by force.

There are powerful rules in the constitution, so it is a question of private property rights, and this is also a private ownership right. If it gets to that point, then there will be a lot more in play. Then we find out whether people who live in social (housing) have more rights than mink. If they want to go through with it with expropriation, then there is the matter of financial compensation. In addition, there is also the question as to whether this is legal to do in general. But until we reach that point, then everyone can be pushed all the way through the system until you have a yes (vote) at the board level of the organization in all of the housing associations, so that you can say "this is what the residents want. They voted yes". When we are talking about tenant democracy, then that is what the politicians have in focus. It is the elected representative committees and organization boards.

Fatmai: Yes, in relation to Tingbjerg, then there is, well, as Alex explains, then there is the department meeting and a vote of yes or no. The committee, that is in the social housing departments, there is very direct democracy, in which the committee takes care of the tenants' interests and the department in general throughout the year. But actually, it cannot make decisions about finances independently. The department meeting makes decisions about that and votes on it.

In Tingbjerg, at any rate, there has been the local department committee in the fsb department in Tingbjerg ... (that) has been very much against these plans that are being made. Now these plans are being divided into smaller plans, so voting

happens one section at a time. And it's really also a process, whose purpose is, I think, to make things more confusing for the tenants. Also this about.. things getting started in Tingbjerg without anyone knowing what is being agreed upon, and where, and when. So, I've spoken with many tenants in Tingbjerg who really don't have an overview of ... there are people who have different fragments of information, but no one has a comprehensive view of what is being agreed upon. And one of the tenants, who was a board member, had exactly the same experience as what Alex told about. You are invited to meetings constantly and don't find out anything, so you always have to be there just in case something important is said at the meeting. And since she is under a "flex job" scheme, had that kind of job, but also had an illness. And when you also have all of your family responsibilities and all kinds of things that you would like to spend your free time doing, but instead you end up spending time sitting at all kinds of meetings and listening to all kinds of nonsense, because there might be something important said at some point. But yes, as Alex explained, they legally they can use this "call-in of the decision" to impose their will over tenant democracy, but we still see that the housing association is trying to ... the tenants of the political ... What do you call it? Reasons. Because a vote from the tenants can shut it all down. They can be met with protests and objections, and then they say, "Yes, but the residents have voted in favour of that." And that is what we saw last week in Birkebakken, for example, where they lied to the tenants in order to get them to say yes. But actually, the tenants, master ... or, demolitions have already taken place, but are not a part of this plan that we have to vote on. And that was an outright lie. The master plan says that you have to demolish among other things, but yes, they lied to the tenants to get them to say yes. And yes ... the tenants ended up saying no. But now it is being forced through, but at least, then they haven't had that political victory of getting a yes from the department meeting.

Svava: Thank you very much. There was a brief comment.

Elsebeth: Yes, but it was just what Fatma said. That's how it was in Gellerup, wasn't it? Well it was also divided up in demolition and divide into ... What do you call it? Renovations. And it was just as if (...) this vote, it was not about demolition. It was only about renovation, but it is a big package we are voting on. You can't just say that now we are voting yes to the one thing and no to something else. So it's just like, that's how it is.

Svava: Yes, absolutely. I think that we will say thanks. Many thanks to the panel once again for sharing with us.

And now I will take the microphone. Most of all out of care to our interpreters, who need a short break, but it is not to stop the conversation, which will hopefully continue now just in a more informal framework. There are also some refreshments here. And we will also lay out the parallel society plan for those who have not read the document. It is quite interesting to read it. And of course also the citizens' initiative that was drawn up against this policy. There is also an exhibition from the students of landscape architecture and planning from the University of Copenhagen, from a course that is basically about reflecting over this outsider perspective. The exhibition shows some first impressions from Tåstrupgård and Tingbjerg that the students have worked on, and then some portraits in the dialogue with the tenants that the students are engaged in. And I would like to say that many of the students are present here today and students, who all played a role in arranging this event today, so thanks very much for that. And thank you all for coming. Yes, the refreshments are now served. Thank you!

Vidneseminar organiseret af Aktion Arkiv med Søren-Emil Schütt, Beboer-demokratiet i Lundtoftegade, og Copenhagen Architecture Festival, med støtte fra ARQ Forskningsstiftelsen för samhälls- och byggnadsplanering, projektering (5:2020) og FFNS Stiftelse för forskning, utveckling och utbildning (2020:14)

Panel	Elsebeth Frederiksen, beboer i Gellerupparken; redaktionssekretær ved beboerbladet <i>Skræppebladet</i> , og aktiv i Almen Modstand
	Alex Young Pedersen, beboer og forperson for Afdelingsbestyrelsen i Bispehaven og aktiv i Almen Modstand
	Søren-Emil Schütt, beboer og forperson i AKB Lundtoftegade og aktiv i Almen Modstand
	Fatma Tounsi, beboer i Bellahøj og aktiv i Almen Modstand
	Beata Hemer, grundlægger af Almen Arkiv
	Marie Northrup Christensen, beboer i Aldersrogade, grundlægger af Almen Arkiv og aktiv i Almen Modstand
Ordstyrere:	Heidi Svenningsen Kajita og Svava Riesto, Aktion Arkiv
Assistent	Studerende i landskabsarkitektur ved Københavns Universitet. Særlig tak til Alicia Sima.

Omsorg for planer: fortællinger om parallel- samfundspakken

Transskribering

Vidneseminar i København den 16.10.2021

Søren-Emil Schütt: Hej alle sammen. Mens Adam lige får en kop ... nej, ikke kaffe, en kiks, så vil jeg starte med at byde velkommen. Mit navn er Søren-Emil, og jeg er beboerformand i Lundtoftegade, hvor vi befinder os i dag. Først så vil jeg bare lige sige en lille kort ting omkring det hus, vi er i, fordi det er jo nærmest en byggeplads, som vi har fået os installeret i, og det er faktisk fordi, at Københavns Kommune har haft det her hus i over 30 år, men i de sidste fem år har det bare stået tomt, og det er jo sådan ret symptomatisk, når man bor i et område, som af nogen bliver defineret på forskellige måder, at en kommune så vælger at være så absurd ringe i deres forvaltning af deres bygninger, at det bare har stået til forfald. Men nu har vi så overtaget det, og det vil jeg fortælle lidt mere om lidt senere, men

det er bare for, at I ligesom er klar over, hvad for en ramme vi sidder i. Så skal jeg sige, at der er sådan kaffe-kage-frugtbord her, og der er toilet i vaskeriet, som ligger lige i forlængelse af denne her bygning, så der kan man gå hen, hvis man skal på toilettet. Så håber jeg, at der er styr på oversættelsen, ja, og jeg har lige en lille ... altså den her oversættelsesboks, som vi stillede op i morges, som jo altså er sådan ... er meget imponerende, synes jeg, den har været på en lille rundtur, inden den kom herud, den har blandt andet været ovre i Sverige, hvor den har været brugt af den svenske konge, og den kommer fra... nærmest lige inde fra Hotel D'Angleterre, og den har også været en tur omkring Enhedslistens pressemøde forleden dag ude på Refshaleøen. Men jeg tror, at jeg tænker, at den er kommet hjem nu. Her i Lundtoftegade. Så vil jeg give ordet til Heidi, som er ... ikke, jo, som er medarrangør af dagens arrangement, og Heidi vil fortælle lidt om, hvad vi skal i dag.

Heidi Svenningsen Kajita: Ja, så jeg hedder Heidi Kajita. Velkommen til. Og jeg vil starte med at sige tak til Copenhagen Architecture Festival for, at vi kan holde arrangementet her som en del af deres program, tak til beboerne i Lundtoftegade for, at vi må være her, og så vil jeg også udtrykke på vegne af vores gruppe, som jeg kan komme tilbage til, en tak til Sweco og ARQ White Architects, som har givet økonomisk støtte blandt andet til boksen hernede og til oversættelsen. Men vi vil byde jer velkommen til vores seminar i dag, som er en del af flere aktiviteter, hvor igennem vi belyser politikker, som parallelsamfundspakken og lister over udsatte områder, både i Danmark og i Sverige, og hvad de betyder for de konkrete boligområder. Vi har fokus på arkitektur og byplanlægning, og vi er en gruppe af danske og svenske forskere og praktikere, så vi er udover mig selv og Svava Riesto her ved siden af, Meike Schalk, Helena Mattsson, Jennifer Mack, Maryam Fanni og Sara Brolund de Carvalho, som sidder her i rummet. Jeg vil starte med bare at kort sige navnene på vores paneldeltagere i dag, som så introducerer sig selv lidt mere efterfølgende. Jeg vil byde Elsebeth Frederiksen velkommen fra Århus, og Alex Young Pedersen også fra Århus, Fatma Tounsi og Søren-Emil Schütt fra København, og så har vi efter deres præsentationer, der vil Beata Hemer og Marie Nortrup Christensen, de vil læse højt fra nogle dokumenter, som de udstiller i deres arkiv, og herefter ... og så er der nogle studerende fra Københavns Universitet til stede også med en udstilling, ligesom ... vi vil tale lidt mere om senere.

Svava Riesto: Ja, og programmet i dag går jo ganske enkelt ud på, at vi vil

give plads til vores panel og glæde os til at høre nogle konkrete fortællinger om de effekter, som parallelsamfundspakken har i helt konkrete boligområder. Vi vil også komme omkring et borgerforslag mod ghettolister, nedrivning og salg af almene boliger. Som I kan se, så står vores kollega Sara [Brolund de Carvalho] her og tager billeder, for vi synes, at det er vigtigt at dokumentere en sådan begivenhed som denne her i dag, og det kunne også godt være, at vi tager med noget af den dokumentation på noget af den næste ting, vi laver, så hvis nogle af jer allerede tænker, at de ikke vil være med på nogle af de billeder, som Sara tager, så bare gå over bagefter og giv besked. Vi vil også simpelthen skrive ned de ting, der bliver sagt i dag, og så selvfølgelig skal panelet få mulighed for at redigere i det, men vi ser også på det her som en sådan ... en række af mange historiske begivenheder, og vi vil dermed gerne dokumentere det, der sker i dag. Men vi skal lige om lidt give ordet videre til vores panel, som vil, altså, komme med en sådan kæde af forskellige fortællinger fra konkrete boligområder, så bliver der en samtale her i rummet, som helt til sidst kan fortsætte helt uformelt ved, at vi mødes ved kagebordet derovre, og der er også to udstillinger, som vi kan sige lidt mere om lige om lidt. Men Elsebeth vil du ikke lægge ud?

Elsebeth Frederiksen: Ja, nu skal jeg lægge ud, så det ved jeg ikke helt, hvordan ... ja, jeg hedder Elsebeth, og jeg bor i Gellerupparken, som ligger i Århus, eller i Brabrand, og der har jeg boet i 16 år, og det er sådan ... man kan sige... det var en sådan ret stor omvæltning for mig at flytte i almen bolig. Gellerupparken er den første almene bolig, jeg har boet i, fordi jeg kommer fra sådan ... er vokset op i et parcelhuskvarter i Vestjylland, hvor der bare slet ikke var nogen almene boliger, så jeg har ikke anet noget som helst om, hvad det der beboerdemokrati er, og hvordan det er at bo sammen med så mange forskellige mennesker, og hvordan hele den der almenboligsektor fungerer. Så i starten da jeg flyttede til Gellerup, der vidste jeg ikke alt det der, altså det var virkelig svært at finde ud af, hvordan det hele foregik, og hvad ... det der med, at jeg havde også medindflydelse på et eller andet ... så der gik faktisk nogle år, hvor jeg ikke rigtigt kom til beboermøder, og jeg vidste ikke rigtigt, hvad der skete, og jeg var meget sådan ... passede meget mig selv, og så lige pludselig så tænkte jeg nåh, men det kunne da egentlig godt være, at jeg skulle sådan begynde at komme til nogle beboermøder og være lidt aktiv i området, og så der igennem fandt jeg så ud af, at nåh, men der er faktisk det her beboerdemokrati, og hvad kan vi egentlig ... hvad får vi ud af det.

Og det er ... det kan man jo så sige, at når det handler om de her såkaldte ghettoområder, så er det jo sådan ... kan man sige, minimalt med medbestemmelse, som vi har i de her områder. Politikerne siger, at de lytter, men de har en anden holdning. Og så kan vi jo stemme alt det, vi vil, og vi kan sige, at vi er imod det, men politikkerne har rigtig meget, meget ofte taget deres standpunkt, som ikke rigtigt er til at rokke ved. Og det er altså ... det er selvfølgelig et problem generelt, at politikere er svære at snakke med, men i hvert fald, når man bor i sådan et boligområde, som jeg gør, så ser man det ekstra meget. Og man kan sige altså, Gellerupparken har jo været på den her "ghettoliste" lige siden, at den blev indført, og altså i starten tænkte jeg egentlig ikke ... heller så meget over, hvad den der ghattoliste egentlig var for noget. Jeg vidste godt, at der var sådan noget ... så kunne man lave en helhedsplan, og man blev kategoriseret ud fra nogle forskellige ting, men det var ikke sådan ... jeg tænkte, at det er jo ikke rigtigt Gellerup, fordi det jo ikke sådan, jeg oplever Gellerup, altså ... Jeg begyndte sådan at opleve Gellerup som et rigtigt fedt sted, og rigtigt mange søde mennesker, og der sker en masse ting, og søde naboer og sådan noget, ikke, jeg havde ikke tænkt på alle de der ting, der står i kriterierne, at der er mange kriminelle, og der er mange arbejdsløse og sådan noget, fordi man fokuserer på nogle andre ting, når man bor der. Så derfor var det selvfølgelig hvert eneste år 1. december, så tænkte jeg, nej, er vi nu på ghattolisten igen, og det er også spændende, men det var ikke før, at det her lovforslag faktisk kom, at jeg sådan blev sådan helt ... satte mig helt ind i, hvad det egentlig er, det gør, altså ...

Man kan sige, at Gellerup har jo været ... har jo været i gang længe i forhold til omdannelser af området. Vi har også haft en helhedsplan, hvor der er fem blokke, der er blevet revet ned, og vi har fået lavet en ny bypark og sådan nogle ting, men ... og det er jo også ... det havde jeg ikke sådan forbundet så meget med, at den gang at ... det har også noget at gøre med, at vi var på ghattolisten, og så kunne man få nogle tilskud fra starten, og ... osv. Men der følte beboerne lidt mere, at de var inkluderet, altså at der var workshops og beboermøder og sådan nogle ting, og vi stemte om det og sådan noget, ikke, så jeg tror, at de fleste der var sådan, tænkte "nåh, okay, jamen, det er fint nok, vi har jo ... vi skal også have lidt forandringer i området, og nu har vi fået en rigtig flot bypark, som vi ... som jeg i hvert fald er rigtig glad for". Men så kom den her nytårstale der fra Lars Løkke 1. januar 18, hvor han begynder at snakke om "huller i verdenskortet" og "parallelsamfund" og "social kontrol", og jeg sad bare og var helt ... jeg blev så gal altså, fordi stort set hele nytårstalen handlede bare om det, altså det er jo ikke det, som ... som er Gellerup for mig, altså. Og så ringede

de faktisk til mig fra Danmarks Radio dagen efter, jeg har åbenbart snakket med dem før, og så kom jeg op og skulle interviewes til radioen oppe på toppen af den nye bygning ude i Gellerup, vi har sådan en ... der er kommet sådan en ny kommunal bygning, og så stod jeg deroppe den 1. januar og udtalte mig om hans nytårstale. Og så var det faktisk, at der gik der sådan lidt ild i mig, altså, at nu tænkte jeg, at nu skulle der altså gøres noget, og så tænkte jeg, det kan jo godt tage et stykke tid, men allerede 1. marts, der kom der den der store presse ... hvad hedder det pressemøde om Mjølnerparken, hvor der kom ti politikere, der fortalte, hvor forfærdeligt det er at bo i de her boligområder, og vi skulle virkelig lave om på det.

Og det mærkelige ved det, det er jo, at det der med som jeg også siger, der kommer en masse mennesker ude fra, og tager en masse beslutninger om, hvordan vores område skal være, og hvordan tingene er. Og jeg har også tit ... jeg er sådan tit blevet beskyldt for, at jeg er sådan lidt naiv i min sådan ... i de ting, jeg siger om Gellerup, fordi hvorfor vil jeg dog ikke indrømme, at der er meget kriminalitet, og hvorfor vil jeg ikke indrømme, at der er social kontrol, og dit og dat, men det er jo fordi, at jeg oplever det fra et andet udgangspunkt end medierne og politikkerne gør, fordi jeg faktisk bor i området. Og derfor er det også det der med alle de her forandringer, der er i området, det er ... nogle af dem er gode, og nogle af dem er jo noget, som vi ikke rigtigt har nogen medbestemmelse på, selvom de egentlig siger, at vi har det. Jeg hørte en snak i byrådet, en debat i Århus byråd her forleden dag, hvor det handlede ikke om Gellerup, men det var sådan meget symptomatisk for politikkerne, at de siger, at jamen, "vi har lyttet til jer, men vi er jo uenige, så det gør vi ikke". Og det synes jeg sådan, passer meget godt til Gellerup også, at "nu har vi haft de her workshops, og vi har hørt jer, og I har været til foretræde inde hos udvalget", og de siger: "det er fint, tak fordi I kom, men vi ændrer ikke mening".

Hvor lang tid har jeg? Okay. Så det jeg sådan gjorde, det var, at nu tænkte jeg, at nu vil jeg simpelthen til at kæmpe for mit område, så vi fandt ud af, at der var det her, der hed Almen Modstand, som havde deres første møde i København, så var vi nogle stykker, der tog over og var med til det møde der, og så siden da har vi bare kørt slavisk på ... imod den her lov, og jeg ... som sagt, jeg er modstander, jeg skriver læserbreve, jeg skriver ting på Facebook, jeg er aktiv på Twitter, og jeg har en blog, jeg laver alle mulige ting, og når medierne ringer, så udtaler jeg mig og sådan noget, så jeg prøver virkelig at gøre en forskel, men nogle gange så er det sådan ... nogle gange er det sådan lidt ... Hvilken forskel gør jeg? Fordi politikkerne har jo ikke ændret mening alligevel, altså, så en gang imellem så er det bare sådan ... uha, altså, er det

fuldstændigt lige meget, hvad vi gør, altså, og sådan har jeg det tit, det er bare sådan, årh, det er helt håbløst det her. Altså, vi kan hænge nogle bannere op og sige, at vi ikke vil flytte, men det kommer vi jo nok til alligevel.

Så det er det der med, altså, hvis jeg lige hurtigt må komme ind på den der arkitektoniske indsats, ikke. Jeg var til et møde forleden dag på Museet Køn, hvor der var nogle søde, unge mennesker fra Gellerupområdet, som havde fået en uge til at forberede sådan forandringer af Gellerup, hvordan de så Gellerup, og det var helt vildt spændende, altså de havde sådan fokus på fællesskab, og kunst og kultur og fælles madglæde og altså, det hele skulle handle om fællesskabet, og det skulle ... og der skulle være klubber for piger, fordi der er alt for mange klubber for drenge, og de ville også have noget, og sådan noget, ikke. De havde sådan bare helt vildt spændende sådan forslag til, hvordan Gellerup skulle udvikles, og jeg ville ønske, at de her børn også fik en indflydelse på, hvordan området skulle udvikles, fordi det er faktisk dem, der skal bo der i fremtiden, og jeg blev sådan helt optimistisk, da jeg hørte på dem, ikke, det var bare sådan helt hold da op, sikke nogle tanker, de har de der 9. klasser der, altså, de skal altså også høres, men problemet er jo ... Men problemet er jo, at de her områder de bliver jo omdannet, ikke for dem der bor der, men dem der skal bo der, så derfor er de jo ligeglade med vores mening, fordi vi skal jo alligevel ... de vil gerne have os til at flytte. Men jeg ville ønske, at de mennesker der skulle udvikle i fremtiden, at de snakker med dem, der bor der, for det kan jo godt være, at vi faktisk har nogle gode ideer til, hvad der skal ske. Bare måske. Ja, det var vist ... var det ikke ... på tiden.

Alex Young Pedersen: Ja, men hej, mit navn er Alex Young Pedersen, jeg bor i et alment boligområde i Århus V, der bor jeg sammen med min kone og tre børn, og der har vi boet i 15 år. Jeg flyttede til Bispehaven, fordi det var et sted, hvor man havde mulighed for at få en bolig ret hurtigt, uden alt for lange ventelister. Vi havde også fortrinsret med de redskaber, som var taget i brug for at få folk i uddannelse og beskæftigelse hurtigere ind og omdanne området på den måde. Så vi ... min kone og jeg var ret hurtige til at få en bolig derude, og blev egentlig også meget glade for det, specielt naboskabet, specielt det bymiljø som er sådan et sted som Bispehaven. Jeg er også ligesom Elsebeth opvokset i en lille by i Vestjylland, hvor man kender hinanden, eller i det mindste ved, hvem hinanden er, og det samme gør sig gældende for det her boligområde, så der er jo nogle ting, jeg godt kunne se, var de samme, som det jeg er opvokset i, så det gjorde mig tryk.

Så man hilser på hinanden, ikke bare dem i opgangen, men også andre folk der bor der, selvfølgelig efter at man har boet der noget tid, det er ikke det første, der sker, men det kommer. Vi var rigtig glade for området, og fik vores første barn i den lille bolig, vi flyttede i, og besluttede os så for at jamen, vi skal nok blive boende her, og ville gerne blive boende her resten af vores tid, og så blev vi nødt til at lave en intern flytning, så vi kom over i en lidt større lejlighed, hvor vores to næste børn så blev født. Så vi har nu børn på 12, 10 og 8 år. Den sidste blev faktisk født i den pågældende lejlighed, som nu står til at rives ned. Det her går tilbage til 2018, som Elsebeth også var inde på, hvor lovgivningen trådte i kraft, og jeg var også måske naiv i den forestilling om, at en bolig er en menneskeret, og det er noget, man kan tage for givet, det var det jo på ingen måde, gik det pludselig op for os i 2018.

Jeg sad til en børnefødselsdag med min mellemste pige, og så kom den her nyhed ligesom ind, og den begyndte at dukke op i alle medierne, vi snakkede sammen forældrene til denne her børnefødselsdag, og det kom hun så til at overhøre, hvorfor hun pludselig bare brød sammen og gav sig til at græde, fordi hun fattede jo nu, at hendes barndomshjem åbenbart stod til at skulle rives ned. Så det var selvfølgelig også lidt en brutal måde at få det at vide, at hun overhørte en samtale mellem voksne mennesker, som måske kun skulle have været for voksne mennesker og ikke for børnene. Så hvordan kommer man ud af den her naivitet om, at det er en ret? Det er jo, at man skal kæmpe for de områder og for de rettigheder, man har, og jeg blev selvfølgelig personligt berørt og personligt ramt af det her, hvilket betød jo også, at man måske starter sådan en oplysningskampagne for sig selv for at finde hoved og hale i, hvad er det egentlig, det her lovværk betyder for os og hvordan kan det være, at vores bolig skal rives ned? Vi kan så måske sige lidt om baggrunden, altså vi bor jo i et blandet boligområde, hvor der er mange forskellige både kulturer, men også mange forskellige sociale klasser repræsenteret i det her boligområde, og det synes jeg også, er en positiv ting, at man er forskellig og bor sammen og kan ligesom både spejle os i hinandens forskelligheder, men også ligesom vise omsorg for sine børn, og de ting der binder en sammen.

Jeg er selv uddannet som idéhistoriker i Århus, og gymnasielærer, min kone er læge på Skejby Hospital, og er speciallæge der. Vi havde besluttet allerede inden 2018, at det her skulle være vores hjem. Lejlighederne var store og fine, de var rummelige til at have tre børn i, vi kunne blive boende her resten af vores liv til en nogenlunde rimelig husleje også. Så det besluttede vi os for, og så fik vi kolonihavehus, så

vi kunne lave denne her klassiske måde med at bo i kolonihavehus i sommerhalvåret, og så bo i almen bolig, lejlighed i vinterhalvåret.

I 2018 kom den her lovgivning så, og det betød så, at jeg først engagerede mig lidt udenfor, fordi jeg stod udenfor afdelingsbestyrelsen. Så jeg begyndte at gå til demonstrationer og oplysningsmøder i det, der hedder Almen Modstand. Og der mødte jeg blandt andre Elsebeth og Fatma og andre mennesker, jeg stødte på, som ligesom kunne være med til at give noget af den her baggrund for og oplysning omkring sagen. Jeg lavede en underskriftindsamling i boligområdet til at forsøge at føre retssager for at beboerne blev hørt, og hvis det var nødvendigt, at det skulle komme til opsigelser af folks lejemaal, og i sidste ende endte jeg også med at stille op til afdelingsbestyrelsen, og blev valgt her for tre uger siden som ny formand for afdelingsbestyrelsen i Bispehaven. Jeg kan måske sige lidt om de menneskelige konsekvenser, fordi folk der kommer udefra, har jo selvfølgelig også et blik udefra og ikke indefra. Og det afspejler sig i, synes jeg, mange misforståelser og forestillinger om, hvad det er for områder, det er, og jeg kan heller ikke genkende alle de ting, som politikerne omtaler, som de her boligområder. Altså det er jo ikke fordi, at jeg er blind, jeg kan godt se, at der er udfordringer, og det er jo nogen, vi løser lokalt og tager hånd om, men jeg kan ikke se, at man på den måde dømmes områder ude, som faktisk udgør en social elevatoreffekt.

Det er sådan, at den sociale løfteevne i de her områder faktisk er højere end de fleste steder i Danmark, og det er jo fordi, at der er både en målrettet social indsats, som er der, og så er der sindssygt ressourcestærke mennesker, der bor her. Og når jeg siger det, så fremhæver jeg det for at sige, at når man måske udefra betragter det, så tænker man, at de her mennesker, hvor der er mange førtidspensionister og pensionister i det hele taget, folk der har en løs tilknytning til arbejdsmarkedet, eller på en anden form for overførselsindkomst, at de er ressource svage. Ja, det var en fordom, jeg selv havde, og dem måtte jeg jo bare pakke sammen, fordi jeg har aldrig mødt så ressourcestærke mennesker, som faktisk gør noget og løfter deres område med det, de nu kan. Altså de er meget engagerede faktisk. Det betyder ikke, at de er engagerede i det boligpolitiske, men så er de engagerede i at være frivillige til forskellige arrangementer i boligområdet. Og de tager hånd om hinanden og hjælper hinanden. Så det der billede med ressource svage mennesker, kunne jeg ikke opretholde. Det kan godt være, at de på overfladen og objektivt set måske ikke er ressourcestærke, men når det kommer til løftearbejdet og det, de gør, det arbejde, så er der en masse ressourcer i de områder.

Der skal nedrives 318 boliger i Bispehaven ud af 880 boliger, og det kommer til at berøre en masse mennesker. Man har valgt, og "man" er developere, kommunen og andre at tage hjertet ud af Bispehaven, selvfølgelig det mest attraktive område af Bispehaven. Man har simpelthen valgt at rive seks boligblokke ned i alt, så får man så et sammenhængende boligområde, som ligger i hjertet af Bispehaven. I kraft af at man gør det her, så flytter man så også folk, der har boet der i rigtig mange år, jeg er ikke engang den, der har boet længst tid i min opgang, som jeg sagde før har jeg kun boet 12 år i den nuværende opgang. Men de her nabofællesskaber bryder man op, så det kan godt være, at der kommer nye boliger og nye boligtyper, og der kommer private boliger ind, men det er de sociale netværk, som ryger, det er de sociale relationer, og det er de netværk, som folk har opbygget gennem utallige år, som nedbrydes. Det er jo det, der er det skammelige her, og det bliver ikke rigtigt fremhævet nok, at det er det, der bliver ødelagt samtidig med boligerne. Jeg kan have ondt af mange, men dem jeg måske har mest ondt af, er de danske enkekoner. Det er jo frygteligt for dem, mange har boet her siden 70'erne, nu er de alene fordi de har mistet deres mand, men så har de deres netværk her, og kommer blandt andet i den lokale pensionistklub. Alle deres venner og alle deres sociale relationer er i det her område, og de bliver tvunget ud. Der var en beboer, der sagde på det første beboermøde, hvor vi blev informeret om det tilbage i 2019, så sagde hun, at hvis hun skulle flytte herfra, så blev det "i en etværelses med låg". Med andre ord hun skulle bæres derfra i en kiste, det var hårdt sagt, men et forståeligt udtryk for den desperation folk oplever. Men når vi er ved det, så i kraft af at man er repræsentant for beboerne, først udenfor bestyrelsen, er nu indenfor, så er der også folk, som jeg kun kender perifert, som kommer og banker på min dør, en ældre dame på førtidspension var ovre ved mig og sige, at hun var ensom, og det eneste der bandt hendes liv sammen, var faktisk de også svage relationer, altså løse sociale relationer, man har, det at hun bliver genkendt på gaden i bybilledet, at folk ved, hvem hun er, at hun kan stoppe og snakke med nogen. Det er det, der har betydning for hende, hendes børn er langt væk, og hun har ikke særlig stor forbindelse med dem, og hun er ret alene, men det der skaber netværket for hende, er det. Hun er også ramt på alle mulige forskellige planer, men er en virkelig stærk kvinde, og stiller op til alle beboermøder, og ytrer sig mod den her uretfærdighed det er.

Jeg ved ikke, om jeg skal sige så meget mere, men jeg vil måske sige til sidst, at dette her udefrakommende og distancerede blik er delt af alle som ikke bor her. Mange folk, der kommer ude fra, med gode intentioner, folk der yder et stort

frivilligt arbejde og folk der bare betragter området udefra har ikke nødvendigvis indsigt i hvad det vil sige at bo i Bispehaven og de kvaliteter som området byder på. Indsigten kan man aldrig få ind under huden ved bare at komme der, den får man kun ved at bo der. Det samme gør sig gældende, når man skal planlægge byområdet, så planlægger man alt for ofte udefra og ind, altså det er igen det udefrakommende blik, der kommer ned på byen, og så ser de boligerne udefra, at det er det, der skal laves om, det er facaderenoveringer, parkanlæg, det er vinduespartier, gavle som skal åbnes op. Det skal være behageligt for dem der kommer forbi og dem som bevæger sig gennem området.

Det er sådan nogle ting, hvor alt handler om et blik udefra, hvorimod dem der bor der, måske mest har brug for indre renovering, der højner bokvaliteten. Man lever jo i boligerne indefra og ud, og ikke omvendt. Det er jo sjældent, at jeg sætter mig ud og kigger på min bolig udefra ... Jeg bor inde i den, og det gør alle mennesker. De bor inde i lejlighederne, og de er vidt forskellige fra lejlighed til lejlighed, hvilket man kan erfare, når man kommer på besøg. Man indretter sit liv forskelligt, det er der, man har sit liv, og det er der sjældent fokus på eller forståelse for. Det kunne virkelig gavne noget med interne renoveringer, så man ikke bor i et sminket lig, men det står altid sidst i køen, når der skal laves byfornyelse, så er det altid indre renoveringer, der kommer sidst. Boligblokke er lige blevet nyrenoveret i Bispehaven i sommers sidste år for trekvart milliard kroner, nu skal de så rives ned, så det nåede at stå i halvandet år. Så selvom det ser pænt ud i Bispehaven og det gør det virkelig, men indvendigt mangler der virkelig meget, så det kunne man jo som udefrakommende godt have fokus på, ligesom man kunne fokusere mere på dem, der bor der nu, frem for dem man forestiller sig, der skal bo der i fremtiden.

Søren-Emil: Ja, det var både deprimerende, måske mest af alt deprimerende, og ikke en særlig omsorgsfuld situation i det oplæg, vi lige havde fra Århus og mit bliver måske lidt det samme, men måske også lidt anderledes. Men jeg hedder som sagt Søren-Emil Schütt, og er forperson her i AKB Lundtoftegade, i den bebyggelse vi befinder os i, det har jeg været i tre år, men har boet her i ca. 11. Og jeg flyttede her til efter nogle år, hvor jeg havde levet på det private lejemarked i København, nærmest fra sofa til sofa, så da jeg lige pludselig fik mulighed for at få en lejlighed i Lundtoftegade i et alment boligbyggeri, så oplevede jeg for første gang København fra en omsorgsfuld side. Fordi da jeg flyttede ind her, så blev jeg mødt af naboer og et fællesskab, der tog imod med åbne arme, og det tror jeg

faktisk i udgangspunktet, overraskede mig lidt, for lidt ligesom du også sagde, Elsebeth, så var jeg heller ikke specielt klog på, hvad den almene boligsektor var. Og det er jeg så blevet sidenhen, blandt andet ved at engagere mig beboerdemokratisk her, men også ligesom I andre, har været aktiv i Almen Modstand, og sidder også i organisationsbestyrelsen i AKB København, og i BL's 1. kreds. Så på den måde er jeg boligpolitisk aktivist spredt lidt forskellige steder, og det er faktisk nogle gange ret hårdt, men jeg tror også, at det er en nødvendighed, fordi hvis vi skal kunne gennemskue, hvad der foregår i de forskellige lag, så tror jeg, at det er væsentligt at være repræsenteret forskellige steder. Jeg ville også skrue ... altså fordi da jeg skulle forberede det her, og det handler om omsorgsfuld byplanlægning, så begyndte jeg at tænke over, jamen, hvad er ... Hvad vil det egentlig sige, at noget er omsorgsfuldt? Og nu vil jeg ikke påstå, at Martin Heidegger nødvendigvis var specielt omsorgsfuld i hans samtid, men han har alligevel et omsorgsbegreb, som er ret interessant, og det er ... altså han prøver at definere omhu eller omsorg på to forskellige måder: det ene handler om en varetagelse, altså hvor man tager vare på den anden som en ting, og omsorgen er, han beskriver det som, at man springer forud og befrier den anden. Og det begreb har jeg personligt prøvet at presse ned over nogle af de ting, vi har gjort i Lundtoftegade de sidste tre-fire år, altså det her med at forsøge at skabe ... åbne et rum op, skabe muligheder for hinanden som naboer, altså være egentligt omsorgsfulde overfor hinanden i alle de ting, vi har foretaget os.

Og det er jo svært at arbejde ud fra et omsorgsbegreb, og det har vi sådan set heller ikke gjort, men det vi gjorde i kølvandet, ikke så meget på nytårstalen 2018, mere den repressive invadering af Mjølnerparkens beboerhus, der skete et par måneder efter, hvor et samlet folketing på ret brutal vis afviser eller smider det lokale yogahold ud af beboerhuset, og fortæller mere indgående om den her ... om det her policy-dokument eller parallelsamfundspakken *Et Danmark uden Parallelsamfund i 2030*, hvor det der sker, det er, at det væsentligste begreb handler om "ikke-vestlige," det er også ... det er klart det mest problematiske begreb at definere boligområder og mennesker ud fra, og det er ret gennemgående i den tekst, Lars Løkke læser op i Mjølnerparkens beboerhus, de fremmede bliver defineret ved en mangel, de er ikke-vestlige, de er ikke demokratiske, de vil ikke være danske, de vil ikke lære sproget. Altså sådan, så man retorisk definerer nogle mennesker, som en modsætning til det der er dansk.

Og det tror jeg, var noget af det, der provokerede mig, og gjorde mig allermest ked af det, det var, at den andengørelse eller fremmedgjorthed, som man

ligesom forsøgte at lægge ned over mine naboer. Og det er i hvert fald ikke omsorg på nogen måde, det er varetagelse, og jeg tror, at man er nødt til at lave sådan en distinktion politisk, altså man er nødt til at gøre mennesker til en ting for også, at kunne behandle dem på den måde, som man lægger op til i parallelsamfundsløvgivningen. Fordi når man er fremmed, så kan man ligesom forvaltes, og det er jo det, man prøver at gøre med os, ikke. Jeg ved ikke, om det kommer som en direkte konsekvens af det her sådan brutale overgreb på både Mjølnerparken og på hele den almene boligsektor der i marts 2018, men i hvert fald besluttede vi i Lundtoftegade os for, at ... vi er egentlig ... funderet på en ret aktivistisk arv her, så på den måde har vi nogle ret gode forudsætninger i Lundtoftegade for at bygge videre på vores beboerdemokrati. Så det vi besluttede os for, fordi vi netop ikke kunne se os selv i det fremmedgjorte lys, som politikerne prøvede at præsentere, så fik vi lyst til at "prove them wrong," altså så må vi simpelthen vise vores beboerdemokrati frem, og så det som I er inde på, altså ... sådan er et udefra-blik, som vi ikke kan genkende, så må vi jo på en eller anden måde vise, at vi er det modsatte af, hvad de tror, vi er.

Jeg kan ikke helt afvise, at vi nok ville have gjort det samme uanset parallelsamfundspakken, det tror jeg, at vi ville, men på en eller anden måde, så blev det dokument også ret mobiliserende for os. Så vi satte os ned i bestyrelsen og lavede nogle visioner for, hvad vi synes, kendetegnede Lundtoftegade. Hvad kendetegner omsorg, hvad kendetegner vores fællesskab? Og der fandt vi frem til tre værdier, som vi ville arbejde ud fra, det er: "socialt ansvar," "solidaritet" og "deltagelse". Så de tre værdier er styrende for den strategi, vi ligesom ... ja, siden 2018 har forsøgt at arbejde ud fra i Lundtoftegade. Og det er jo selvfølgelig en strategi, vi lavede i bestyrelsen, og så var vi måske på vej til at tro, at vi også vidste, hvordan alle vores naboer havde det, og den fælde ville vi selvfølgelig gerne undgå at falde i. Så derfor inviterede vi til et stort beboermøde i efteråret 2018, hvor der kom 130 mennesker, hvor vi diskuterede alt mellem himmel og jord, altså vi fik simpelthen lavet vores egne problemdefinitioner i forhold til, hvad folk opfattede som nogle udfordringer, eller som nogle potentialer i Lundtoftegade. Og det medførte at vi kunne omstrukturere vores beboerdemokrati. Tidligere der havde vi faktisk blokråd, altså hvor hver blok var egenrådigt, kan man sige, demokratisk, men det viste sig, at der var ... det var lettere at bryde vores struktur op ved at lade folk finde sammen på baggrund af et indhold mere end, at de boede i den samme bygning. Så vi kunne ligesom på baggrund af det her beboermøde lave 30 arbejdsgrupper, som så kunne arbejde videre med hver de ting, de nu synes, der var interessante. Og det resulterede sådan set i, at vi på en

eller anden måde fik lavet et sådan ret "bottom-up" demokratisk system, hvor man nu i Lundtoftegade, hvis man vil noget, eller vil ændre noget eller gøre noget, så kan man "more or less" bare gøre det.

Og det er jo sådan lidt radikalt modsvar på det at være ikke-demokratisk, eller være en "sort plet på Danmarkskortet," ikke, for det betyder, at vi er enormt mange, der er engagerede i vores lokalområde, og det kan sådan set både handle om et katteudvalg eller et solcelleudvalg, eller nogen der arbejder specifikt med at udvikle vores gårdrum til nogle gode fællede, hvor der er plads til alle, og et eksempel på det kan være et samarbejde, vi har med ... altså vi er begyndt at organisere os med mange lokale foreninger, så fx i et af gårdrummene, der har vi lavet et projekt sammen med Nørrebro United, som er en lokal fodboldklub, og måden vi lavede det gårdrum på, eller begyndte at arbejde processuelt med det, det var egentlig ved at invitere alle dem, der ... eller vi inviterede alle, men i særdeleshed dem, som ikke interesserede sig for fodbold, altså for at tage denne her mangeldefinition alvorligt, og for at inddrage viden fra folk, som måske ikke interesserede sig for fodbold. Og det betyder så, at vi ... i halvandet år tror jeg, arbejdede med udvikling af det her gårdrum, som ... altså nu er det tegnet, det er ikke etableret, men det er tegnet. Og man kan spille fodbold der, men man kan også en masse andre ting, altså det er simpelthen et rum, som på en eller anden måde fortsat også ... når det bliver materialiseret, kan blive ved med at være en del af en demokratisk udveksling, og mennesker kommer til at møde hinanden på tværs. Både mennesker fra resten af Nørrebro, men også naboer der ikke nødvendigvis ville møde hinanden normalt, kommer og ... forhåbentlig til at møde hinanden inde i det gårdrum, når det står færdigt.

Og hvorfor står det ikke færdigt endnu? Altså det kan man jo måske i første omgang spørge Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen om, det er nok der, den ... den første store hurdle ligger. Den næste store hurdle ligger i det her kæmpe virvar af planer, som vi er underlagt, hvor jeg nogle gange ... er i tvivl om, om dem der egentlig burde have styr på det, fx fra kommunen, hvem er overhovedet klar over, hvad er en "forandringsplan," hvad er en "helhedsplan," hvad er "områdefornyelse," hvad er "LAR" [lokal afledning af regnvand] masterplaner, altså sådan et kæmpe spænd af komplicerede ting, og jeg kan høre, at de taler forskelligt om det samme, eller ... blander ting sammen, altså sådan ... så det her med egentlig at vide, hvad er der ... hvad har vi af udefra kommende ting, som vi skal tage højde for, som vi i virkeligheden skal kunne imødekomme ved selv at have en plan, for den de i kommunen eller staten gerne vil lave for os, ikke, det er der, vi er strandet ret meget, fordi det er enormt svært,

når der kommer nogle arkitekter, som skal have 1.000 kroner i timen, for det er begrænset, hvor mange man kan nå at tale med for 1.000 kroner i timen, så det skal gå enormt hurtigt med at få overleveret det arbejde, vi processuelt har lavet over halvandet år for det her gårdrum, og der er en rigtig stor sandsynlighed for, at de arkitekter, der kommer, det har vi i hvert fald oplevet, i virkeligheden ikke var enige i vores proces, fordi en fodboldbane altså ... de havde nogle prototyper af en fodboldbane med, ikke, og det var ligesom den måde, man kunne spille fodbold på, så denne her oversættelse der egentlig sker fra vores beboerdemokratiske naboskabende udvikling, når det skal oversættes til et professionaliseret sprog, så går der enormt mange ting galt, har vi oplevet.

Så jeg tror, at en klar anbefaling, jeg ved ikke, om det er en opsang, altså det tror jeg, ville gå til sådan arkitektstanden om at tage de her diskriminerende racistiske politikker alvorligt og forholde sig kritisk til dem. Bare fordi man er arkitekt eller byudvikler, så er det ikke nødvendigvis sikkert, at os der bor her, ikke har en vilje og en ide om, hvordan vores eget liv kunne udvikle sig. Så det der med både at lytte, men også i virkeligheden tage alvorligt, om man siger ja til at arbejde for en politik, der er sindssygt problematisk og kritiseret af FN og Amnesty. Det tror jeg, vil være min varmeste anbefaling, man kan simpelthen godt sige nej, og det tror jeg, vil være min opfordring med mindre, at man vil sætte tingene mere fri og være omsorgsfuld i sit arbejde med udvikling af boligområder og have beboerne ... have os der bor der med i det. Hvad siger tiden? Det er perfekt.

Fatma Tounsi: Okay, jamen, så er det min tur, jeg hedder Fatma Tounsi, og jeg bor i en almen boligforening i Bellahøj, og i den boligorganisation der hedder B, og jeg sidder selv i bestyrelsen i min egen afdeling, men det er ikke så meget det, jeg kommer til at snakke om, jeg kommer mere til at snakke om mine erfaringer ud fra min aktivisme i Almen Modstand. Ja, som alle andre der er med i panelet i dag, så var jeg hurtigt sådan gjort opmærksom på det her med ghettoloven i 2018, kort efter det blev annonceret, at der var en plan om at lave denne her lovgivning. Og det gik meget hurtigt op for mig, at der var tale om noget farligt, altså ikke i starten, men efter at en ven opfordrede mig til at gå ind og læse, hvad denne her lovgivning går ud på, hvad denne her plan går ud på. Så gik det op for mig, at der er tale om privatisering af de almene boliger, og det var noget, som jeg mente klart, at jeg skal arbejde imod, og så fandt jeg nogle seje mennesker, som jeg arbejdede sammen med, og så ja, møder man flere og flere og flere, der vil gerne arbejde imod

det, og så samarbejdede vi med hinanden, og bliver ved med at samarbejde på kryds og tværs. Og deler viden og erfaringer med hinanden.

Altså en af de mest bizarre ting ved denne her lovgivning er, at man hævder, at man vil arbejde imod segregering i byen og segregering i boligmarkedet ved at faktisk, altså tvangsflytte og tage rettigheder fra dem, der er mest diskrimineret imod og mest undertrykt i boligmarkedet, og det er ... altså det er bizart, at man overhovedet kunne sælge sådan en ja, en ... modsætninger, altså en pakke af modsætninger, men ja, vi har jo lært på det sidste, at alt kan lade sig gøre i dansk politik, hvis man bare putter nok racisme i det. Så kan man sælge alting.

Men altså jeg kom jo selv til Danmark for 17 år siden, jeg har boet i almene boliger siden da på nær tre år, hvor min familie og jeg boede i noget privat leje. Og indtil da så var vi ikke så opmærksomme på det her med forskellen mellem almen og privat leje. Og det bliver man så meget hurtigt gjort opmærksom på, når man oplever en privat udlejer, der ikke vil fikse ting i boligen, og vil helst ja, slippe for alle de udgifter, de kan, og er sådan virkelig langsomme i deres svar, mens sådan da vi gik tilbage til almenboligen, så kunne vi se den gode service og de gode boligforhold. Men altså jo mere jeg engagerer mig i den almene bolig ... hvad hedder det ... beboerdemokrati, jo mere kunne jeg se, at ja, der var jo noget, der fungerede virkelig godt, når det kommer til sådan service, og når det kommer til ... altså i forhold til, når man sammenligner med en privat udlejer, men der var noget, der ikke fungerer, når det kommer til beboerdemokrati.

Og jeg vil faktisk gerne fokusere i dag på det her med viden og ligesom Søren-Emil talte om det her professionelle sprog og udviklede strukturer og udviklede systemer og beslutningstagningsprocedurer, som egentlig bliver kaldt for beboerdemokratiske, men i virkeligheden sætter virkelig mange grænser for folk i forhold til at have indflydelse og få indflydelse på, hvordan deres nabolag, og hvordan deres by ser ud. Altså der er ... altså når der er sådan nogle komplicerede beslutningstagen-procedurer og det er et meget indviklet sprog, man bruger, når man laver byplanlægning eller planer for et nabolag, om det er helhedsplaner eller udviklingsplaner eller forandringsplaner, eller sådan ... mange af de her ... sådan slags planer, som man arbejder med, som helt almindelige beboere, for at overhovedet kunne få indflydelse, så skal man sætte sig ned og læse en hel masse ting, finde hoved og hale i det, og så tage fejl rigtig mange gange. Hver gang man tager fejl, så får man at vide, at man faktisk ikke fatter noget, og man skal helst lade dem, der fatter noget, arbejde på det. Det er noget, som jeg selv har oplevet, og jeg har set

andre altså i udsatte boligområder, i listede boligområder, har oplevet folk fra boligorganisationer sige til beboerne, “men I forstår jo ikke noget af det her, I er naive, I er sådan” ... ja, “I blander jer i noget, som I ikke fatter noget af, og derfor skal I ... I skal lade det være til os, der faktisk forstår, hvad det går ud på”. Så bliver det et spørgsmål om, jamen, hvad er det, der er formålet med de her procedurer, er det egentlig procedurer og strukturer, der er ... der blev sat i verden for at opnå noget, eller er meningen med dem at holde folk udenfor, Ja, jeg bliver mere og mere konspirati-onsteoretisk, jo mere jeg er aktiv i boligpolitik, og bliver overbevist om, at der er så mange ting, der bliver sat i verden for at holde folk udenfor.

Sprogligt, strukturmæssigt, proceduremæssigt, økonomimæssigt, alle de her ting der bliver sat i verden for, at vi som helt almindelige mennesker ikke har noget at sige, og for mig jeg tror, at folk der arbejder i denne her branche, hvis man virkelig har et ønske om at give folk mulighed for at have indflydelse, så skal man arbejde på den ene led at prøve at simplificere ting, altså arbejde på at nedlægge eller sådan strukturer der ikke er nødvendige, lade være med at bruge sådan sprog, som er unødigt kompliceret, eller hvis der er noget, der er nødvendigt, altså der er nogle sådan faglige termer, som er simpelthen nødvendige at bruge, der er nogle beslutnings-tagningsprocedurer, som er nødvendige for at sikre, at noget har den nødvendige kvalitet eller sikkerhed, eller hvad nu det er, så arbejde på at uddanne helt almindelige mennesker i, hvad det er, og sådan sætte dem ind i, hvad vil det sige, og hvordan kan de have indflydelse på det.

Altså man ... jeg oplever, at der er sådan meget delte holdninger mellem, sådan os der er aktivt imod ghettoloven, men generelt aktive for et bedre beboerdemokrati og en mere demokratisk byplanlægning, altså sådan, der er den her forskel mellem os og så nogen, som mener, at hvis man forstår ... altså hvis man er sådan ... bolignørd, for at sige det på den måde, hvis man forstår de her ting, eller hvis man er professionel i det her område, og man ved bedre end den helt almindelige eller sådan gennemsnitlige person, der bor i byen, så har man ret til at bestemme.

Men sådan er det jo ikke, altså en læge kan jo ikke bestemme og sådan, når jeg går til lægen med noget, så kan en læge bare ikke sådan bestemme, hvad der skal ske med mig, om jeg skal opereres eller ej, de skal forklare mig, hvorfor de mener, at jeg skal opereres, hvad de mener, at jeg fejler, hvorfor de mener, at jeg skal opereres, hvad er de bedste ... hvad hedder det ... muligheder for mig og sådan, og de skal også høre fra mig, hvad jeg oplever, så ja, jeg skal kunne stole på deres faglige viden, men de skal også forklare mig, hvad deres faglige viden siger.

Og sådan synes jeg forholdet mellem beboerne i byen og folk der arbejder med byudvikling og arkitekter skal være, ja, det er ... jer der har den faglige viden, men det er os, der bor i byen, og vi skal også have noget at sige om det, og derfor er det en del af de professionelle ... hvad hedder det ... job, at forklare os, hvad det går ud på, og fortælle os, hvad er det gode og det dårlige ved denne her måde at gøre det på, eller denne her måde at gøre det på. Det er ikke det, vi oplever med ghettoloven. Vi oplever, at der er nogen, der sidder og har besluttet sig for, at af en eller anden grund giver det mening at nedrive boliger og sådan tage nogle nye beboere ind, og på en eller anden måde vil det skabe social forandring, og på en eller anden måde sådan så vil det hjælpe folk ud af arbejdsløshed. Hvordan kan det lade sig gøre? Hvad er den faglige evidens og basis for det? Det forstår vi ikke.

Og heller ikke når det kommer til det arkitektoniske, altså vi får heller ikke forklaret, hvorfor det ene er bedre end det andet, jamen, folk der bor i den blok synes, at det er fint nok, de har nogle ideer til, hvordan det kan forbedres, men så kommer der noget helt fremmed, noget udefra, som der ikke er nogen, der forklarer, hvordan ... hvorfor er det, at det er bedre. Noget af det vi har arbejdet virkelig meget på, som folk der er aktive i modstanden mod ghettoloven, det er det her med at sprede viden, sprede viden om juridiske rettigheder, sprede viden om beboerdemokratier, hvordan de fungerer, og sprede viden om hvad der planlægges oppe i organisationerne, og ligesom mobilisere en modstand mod det. Når man gør det, så bliver man kaldt alle mulige ting, man bliver kaldt naiv, det er noget af det mildeste, man kan blive kaldt, man bliver kaldt “rygtespredere,” man bliver kaldt ... hvad var det, Frank Jensen kaldte os ...“ballademagere” ...

Altså ... man bliver kaldt alle mulige ting, hvis man prøver at sprede viden, hvis man prøver at starte en samtale om, hvad er det, der skal ske med nabolaget og hvordan folk kan forsvare deres rettigheder, og hvordan skal folk ... kan blande sig i samtalen. Man får kun en version af ... hvad hedder det ... historien, og hvis der er nogen, der prøver at fortælle en anden version, så bliver de stempet meget hurtigt. Det har man oplevet rigtigt mange steder, senest i Birkeparken, hvor ja, der var et meget dramatisk afdelingsmøde, hvor boligforeningen ville gerne fortælle ... ja, Birkebakken ligger i Vollsmose i Odense, ja, boligforeningen kom med en version af historien, hvor vi kunne finde rigtig mange fejl og decideret løgn, og når man prøver at fortælle beboerne det, så får man at vide, at det ... altså enten så er det så langt ude, at de er nødt til at erkende, at de faktisk ... det de skriver eller det de fortæller

beboerne, er ikke korrekt, ellers så bliver man stemplet, fordi man prøver at fortælle en anden version af historien.

Ja, altså vi ... vi har desværre en almen boligsektor i dag, hvor der er et lille mindretal af beboerne, som er aktive, og det skyldes rigtig mange ting, men jeg oplever ghettoloven som noget, der er mobiliserende for os, at det ligesom er gået op for os, at hey, vi har faktisk ikke været gode til at forsvare vores rettigheder, og vi har ligesom taget det for givet, at vi har rettigheder demokratisk, og vi har rettigheder altså sådan så at bolig er en ret, men nu er det gået op for os, at hvis ikke vi bliver ved med at forsvare de her rettigheder ligesom boligbevægelsen altid har gjort, så bliver de taget fra os, og det kan vi kun gøre ved at sprede viden ved at forklare og mobilisere og ja, arbejde sammen og hjælpe hinanden, og det gør vi virkelig meget i Almen Modstand, vi ringer til hinanden og stiller spørgsmål og sådan hjælper hinanden med at forstå ting, yes. Så ja, det vil jeg opfordre alle arkitekter også til at være med til at gøre, altså det er ikke nok, at man sidder med dem, der styrer fra toppen, man skal også være engageret i at forklare helt almindelige mennesker, hvorfor ting bliver gjort på den måde, det bliver gjort på, så de faktisk kan have en reel indflydelse på hvordan tingene kan gøres, ja. Yes, det var det, jeg havde at sige.

Beata Hemer: Hej, tak for invitationen af ... jeg hedder Beata Hemer, jeg er arkitekt og underviser, jeg bor ikke selv i en almen bolig, og jeg har ...

Marie Nortrup Christensen Ja, jeg hedder Marie Nortrup, og jeg er antropolog, og beboer i et af de almene boligområder, der er på ghettolisten, som ligger i Aldersrogade, hedder det, det ligger herude på ydre Nørrebro.

Beata: Og vi vil læse op fra to dokumenter, som vi har indsamlet som en del af det I kan se nede i hjørnet der, som er ... ja, et nyopstartet arkivarbejde, vi kalder for Almen Arkiv, og det er dokumenter fra processen omkring og implementeringen af parallelsamfundslovgivningen. Og du vil give lidt baggrunds-kontekst, ikke sandt?

Marie: Jo, så de ... det dokument vi vil starte med at læse op, det er et dokument, som vi har fået via aktindsigt, eller jeg har søgt

aktindsigt, det kan jeg gøre som beboer, på de møder der har været i kommunen i Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen, hvor der har været holdt styregruppemøder for planer for det område, jeg bor i over et år, og der har ikke været nogen beboeroplysningsmøder overhovedet omkring det endnu, men vi har så ... det er så godt, at man kan søge aktindsigt, så det er en af de ... ja, referat fra et af de styregruppemøder, som vi vil starte med at læse noget op fra.

Beata:

Okay [læser op]:

Byens udvikling, Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen. Referat. Mødedato 10. december 2020. Tid 14.30 til 16.00. Sted: Microsoft Teams. Link i mødeindkaldelse. Mødedeltagere, Bo-Vita, Vibu, Københavns Kommune, Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen, tegnestuen Vandkunsten. Forandringsplan for Aldersrogade, styregruppemøde nummer 6. 1. Velkommen. X bød velkommen. 2. Oplæg fra tegnestuen Vandkunsten. Siden sidste møde har Vandkunsten arbejdet med både det fælles rådgiveropdrag, som skal kvalificere forbindelser og byrum i kvarteret, samt de første overvejelser i forhold til den kommende fysiske helhedsplan, den grønne trekant. De to opgaver løses i tæt samspil. Tegnestuen Vandkunsten deltager og fremlægger deres arbejde. Styregruppen drøfter oplægget herunder. Holder den overordnede fortælling og argumenterne, mangler der noget. X fra tegnestuen Vandkunsten fremlagde deres arbejde. Styregruppen udtrykte generelt en meget positiv holdning til oplægget, og syntes, at det var et stærkt bud på en fremtidig udvikling af området. Den overordnede historie står efterhånden klart, og argumenterne hænger sammen. Det er stærkest, når det kan formuleres i sætninger ... som fx fra grå til grønt, fra lukket til åbent, fra utrygt til trygt med videre. Det med at formidle målsætningerne tydeligt. Det er vigtigt, at vi husker at forberede os på både scenarie A og B, ikke hård ghetto/hård ghetto. Blandt andet derfor er det nødvendigt, at Bo-Vita kommer videre med et volumenstudie af fortætningssmulighederne af den grønne trekant. Ellers er det svært at

lave regnestykket, som vil være nødvendigt, hvis området bliver udpeget som hård ghetto i 2021. Bo-Vita fortsætter i dialog med Vandkunsten om et mere præcist volumenstudie. Styregruppen syntes, at det var meget interessant at arbejde videre med forbindelserne fra Superkilen over imod boligområdet, både af Rovsinggade og Sigynsgade. Der var en drøftelse af, hvorvidt projekterne skulle kommunikeres hver for sig eller i en sammenhæng. Styregruppen var enige om, at vi skal skabe en sammenhængende fortælling, så eksempelvis nye etager fra eksisterende boligblokke også afspejles i renderingen af nye byrum med videre. Det er vigtigt, at vi ret hurtigt får skabt et overblik over parkeringssituationen i området, da det er centralt både for den fysiske helhedsplan og byrumsprojektet. Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen vil kontakte boligorganisationer, så vi sammen kan danne os et overblik.

Marie: Ja, så det var bare en bid af referatet, og så til det her styregruppemøde, der har der været et bilag, som er blevet delt med alle, der har været til stede der, og det er et bilag, som er udarbejdet af boligorganisationen Bo-Vita, en strategi for beboersamarbejde og kommunikation, som altså ... ja, bilag til alle aktører, sådan hvordan de skal... den kommunikationsstrategi de skal have overfor beboerne, fordi at de her planer skal jo egentlig ... for at have en demokratisk legitimation, så skal de jo vedtages på et afdelingsmøde, som vi ikke ved, hvornår kommer til at være, vi har jo ikke fået nogen oplysninger om de her planer endnu. Det er et lidt langt dokument, vi vil bare læse op punkt tre og punkt fire. Så ja:

Punkt tre, målsætning, gennem helt projektet skal vi have fokus på, hvorfor vi laver de forskellige beboerindsatser, vores fælles målsætning med ... hvad vores fælles målsætning med strategien er. 1. beboerne støtter op omkring projektet. 2. vi har afstemt beboernes inddragelse i projektet med beboerne. Vi skal klarlægge, hvordan og hvorledes beboerne konstruktivt kan bidrage til projektet. 3. beboerne er trygge og velinformerede omkring projektet. Vi kommunikerer, så det er let forståeligt uden for svære fagudtryk, vi kommunikerer på flere forskellige

kommunikationskanaler, både analogt og digitalt format, vores kommunikation er koordineret og kommer i en fast takt, sådan at beboerne ved, hvad de kan forvente i forhold til kommunikationen. Vi tager os tid til at mødes med beboerne både til større møder, men også i mindre fora og i en-til-en samtale med ankerpersoner.

Skal lige bladre og

Punkt fire, kriser og konflikter. En krise skråstreg begivenhed skråstreg kritik er en uforudsigelig større trussel, som kan have negativ indvirkning på vores projekt, organisation, samarbejdspartnere eller branche, hvis den håndteres forkert. Kriser kan fx opstå pga ...

og så er der en masse punkter,

punkt et, negativ påvirkning af beboerne fra Almen Modstand. Negativ påvirkning fra kritiske beboere, myter om misforståelser blandt beboerne, negativitet i byggeudvalget, følgevirkninger af at bo på en byggeplads, negativ presseomtale, hvis der kommunikeres ufuldstændigt og for tidligt i forhold til projektets tidsplan. Vi skal hele tiden have fokus på den gode fortælling, hvad er det for opgaver, helhedsplanen løser, hvad bidrager helhedsplanen med positivt til beboerne og boligområdet, vi skal kun kommunikere, hvad vi reelt ved og holde afdelingsbestyrelse og beboerne løbende orienteret. Derudover er det vigtigt, at vi partnere ind i mellem i projektet løbende orienterer gruppen om kritiske punkter, således at de kan blive adresseret i projektet og i kommunikationen.

Ja.

Beata:

Ja. Så efter samtalen her, så vil vi, som du også sagde, Svava, så er der halvanden time eller en time til at bare gå rundt og

besøge alment arkiv dernede, der er flere papirer ... flere dokumenter, som man kan kigge på og læse og sidde ved ... vi vil placere nogle stole omkring bordet, der er så ... der er flere eksemplere af dokumenter til det.

Heidi: Så ja, tusind tak til panelet for jeres både chokerende men også rørende, og også fornøjelige fortællinger. Det kan være fornøjeligt at være en kritisk person, det er måske også rart at høre ... jeg tænkte, at vi vil sådan åbne for spørgsmål til jer, der er i rummet, men inden da bare lige kort høre, om I har noget indbyrdes, I gerne vil spørge hinanden om eller kommentere på?

Søren-Emil: Ganske kort tror jeg faktisk, at ... jeg er glad for, at du kommer ind på det, Fatma, men det her med markedets betydning, ikke, altså den gentrificeringsproces, som også er en ret væsentlig del af parallelsamfundsløvgivningen, og jeg tror faktisk, at når man kombinere markedet og andengørelse, og sådan nogle koloniale perspektiver, så er det tre onder, der er væsentligt værre end parallelsamfundspakken, men de er alle sammen massivt til stede i parallelsamfundspakken, og det er simpelthen det, jeg tror, at vi nogle gange føler, at vi kan ... på en eller anden måde være oppe imod, og jeg tror, at vi egentlig tænker, at egentlig omsorg eksisterer i de fællesskaber vi har i almene boliger, hvor alle kan bo, og at den egentlige omsorg måske ... jeg siger ikke, at man ikke kan drage omsorg, hvis man bor i et parcelhus, men når man har parcelleret omkring sig selv, så har man nogle helt andre interesser i markedet, og altså ... så er man nødt til at lukre på hinanden, og det er det, vi står udenfor, og det er den kamp, vi i virkeligheden kæmper, så det er både parallelsamfundspakken, men det er også nogle rigtig dårlige levninger fra historien, som vi på en eller anden måde er oppe imod, og det tror jeg bare, er med til at sige, at denne her treenighed af onder ... er den heftige kamp, hvor der er brug for stor opbakning fra mange i virkeligheden, ikke, og det er bare en opfordring til, at vi tager det alvorligt.

Elsebeth: Jo, jeg vil også lige sige ... det var fordi, at nu snakkede Alex om det, og jeg glemte helt ... hvad der skal ske i Gellerup, hvis jeg lige hurtigt ... altså ... fordi nu snakkede jeg så meget om alle de her forandringer, vi har ... men jeg fortalte ikke, hvilke forandringer der skal ske, altså byrådet og folketinget og repræsentantskabet og alle mulige har besluttet, at der skal rives syv boligblokke ned i Gellerupparken, det er lidt over 400 boliger, og det er lige blevet ...

beboerne stemte ned til det i en urafstemning, de mente ... boligforeningen mente ikke, at vi kunne have et almindeligt møde og en almindelig afstemning pga. corona, det kunne det umiddelbart godt, men det synes de ikke, at det skulle være, så vi holdt en urafstemning, og så repræsentantskabet og boligforeningen stemte så også ... stemte så ja, så nu er den sådan set stemt igennem, og nu sker der så til ... det næste der sker, det er så, at ... eller afdelingen har sagsøgt boligforeningen og Århus Kommune og den danske stat, så det er sådan det ... det er så det, vi sådan venter på, at hvad der sker nu i forhold til ... der er rigtig mange ting i gang lige nu i forhold til andre retssager rundt om i Danmark, så det er sådan, at ... i forhold til skal man vente, hvilken retssag skal man køre først?

Fatma: Det er vigtigt, at du forklarer, hvad repræsentantskabet er, bare sådan ...

Elsebeth: Okay, ja, men repræsentantskabet er ... ja, repræsentanter for de forskellige afdelingsbestyrelser i en boligforening, som så er dem, der har det højeste ansvar, og det er så også dem, der vælger bestyrelse for boligforeningen, og det er så dem, der også skal stemme om helhedsplanen for Gellerup, og det er også det der med, at altså så sidder der nogle mennesker, der bor et helt andet sted, som skal bestemme over lige præcis min afdeling, og om min blok skal rives ned, det er en lidt mærkelig sammensætning, også fordi nogle af dem er bange for deres egen afdelings økonomi, der er også nogle af dem, der er bange for, at der kommer nogen af os ud til dem, det har jeg hørt ... beboermøder jeg har været ude til, at jamen, "kan vi så risikere at få nogle af dem ude fra Gellerup ud til os?" altså ... så det er sådan det der med, at der er ikke så meget sådan sammenhæng i boligforeningen, andet end at vi er medlem af samme boligforening. Ja, hvad var det, jeg var ved at sige ... lige ... ja, så jo, det var bare det der med, hvilke ... der er nogle retssager i gang nu, eller der skal til at laves nogle retssager, så derfor er det sådan, hvilken rækkefølge vi skal tage dem i i forhold til, hvad der giver mest mening og sådan noget, jeg ved ikke, om du ved mere om det, Fatma?

Fatma: Jeg tror ikke, at jeg ved mere om det ... men altså der er jo ... rent juridisk er der jo to forskellige slags retssager, dem man laver kollektivt, som er mere principielle retssager, som egentlig formålet med dem er at få retten til at tage stilling til den her lovgivning, om det overhovedet er lovligt

at lave sådan noget lovgivning, og så det andet er ... individuelle retssager fra hver beboer, når de får en kontraktopsigelse, så kan man jo også lave klager til beboerklagenævnet og ligheds ... ligebehandlingsnævnet, og altså sådan alt det her er juridiske midler, som forskellige beboere fra forskellige områder har brugt, så ja, man kan sige, at det hele prøves af, og så ser vi, hvordan vi kan ligesom få rettens ord for, at det der bliver gjort mod beboerne, er diskriminerende og i strid mod dansk lovgivning og ... eller dansk grundlov, og internationale menneskerettighedsaftaler.

Heidi: Jeg kunne egentlig godt tænke mig bare prøve at starte med et kort spørgsmål, jeg synes, at denne her parallel med fortællingen om lægen, som har en professionsetik og ... eller omsorgspraksis, som gør, at man er i dialog, for at kunne tage en rigtig beslutning, når man ser patienten, jeg synes, at det er interessant at prøve at tænke i det her perspektiv med omsorg ... arkitekten og byplanlæggerens rolle der ... så hører vi om dokumentet omkring, at man bruger tid på at lave volumenstudier, fordi der måske kommer en beslutning ud i fremtiden, og så nævner I også, at arkitekterne koster mange penge, så de har ikke rigtigt tid til at tale med jer, altså ... så der er et eller andet med, hvordan man bruger arkitekternes tid, tænker jeg, om I har nogle erfaringer ... altså hvad er der behov for ... udover, at jeg ved, at der er ... det jeg hører, at I siger, at der er behov for, at man ... at arkitekterne bruger tid på at lytte og indgå i processer på at oversætte eller forklare ting, så de kan forstås ... er der også behov for, at arkitekter er med i de processer, eller har I nogle gode eksempler også på noget, der har fungeret egentlig, som man kunne lære fra som arkitekt?

Alex: Altså jeg har den erfaring fra Bispehaven, at arkitekterne har det udefrakommende blik, men de sidder også inde med en masse specialviden, samtidig befinder de i en svær situation. De er pressede fra kommunens krav til, hvordan en helhedsplan skal udformes, hvilke former for renoveringer, der skal foregå osv., der er, kan jeg fornemme, et massivt pres, de er også under massivt pres fra de bygherre, der skulle overtage et område, og de krav er måske ofte mere vidtgående, end ... hvad skal man sige beboernes ønsker, og derfor kan arkitekterne nogle gange faktisk godt agere sådan lidt som et bolværk mod nogle af de værste ting, det er i hvert fald min erfaring fra Bispehaven, der har byrådet et meget stort ønske om at lave mange flere boligtyper om, hvilket er underligt, for det er et område, der har lange ventelister, der har aldrig været

tomgang i boligerne, så det er ligesom om igen, at man ... kommunen ønsker at omdanne området meget mere radikalt, end der egentlig er behov for.

Arkitekterne spiller en vigtig rolle i at prøve at tale imod denne her voldsomme omdannelse. Det er en positiv ting. Jeg vil gerne sige en sidste ting, om det her med at indgå i dialog, her er beboerne i en eller anden form udsat for det man kunne man kalde repressiv tolerance, hvor vi bliver omfavnet med alt den dialog, vi kan have lyst til, uden egentlig at blive lyttet til. Hvis man bliver valgt ind på bestyrelsesposter, som jeg er blevet, så bliver vi indbudt til møder konstant, som om vi ikke har andet i vores liv end byggemøder, og det er aften på aften på aften, det er private kaffesamtaler med den øverste ledelse, så man bliver virkelig pakket ind, men mange oplysninger tilbageholdes, væsentlige oplysninger, alle de simple tal, som hvor mange beboere bliver udsat for tvangsflytninger, hvor mange boliger er der helt konkret tale om skal omdannes og hvilke, hvordan ser finansieringen ud, hvad er tallene, hvornår skal det tilbagebetales, hvad stiger huslejen med, alle de her konkrete tal, som man egentlig kunne sige, hvorfor siger I ikke bare dem, I sidder jo med den viden, den tilbageholder de til sidste øjeblik, og det har desværre været processen hele vejen. På denne måde sætter man beboerne i en position af asymmetrisk viden hele tiden. Det er jo en måde at manipulere folk på, og det er en måde at holde folk i uvidenhed, fordi de sidder inde med en specialviden og den deler de ikke før til aller-aller-allsidst, og selv der forsøger at lægge låg på. I Bispehaven blev der afholdt et informationsmøde for beboere, først der går det op for os, hvad finansieringen er.

Nu vil jeg bare lige sige, hvad finansieringen er, og så kan I prøve at holde det op med det, vi er udsat for. Prisen for nedrivningerne i vores boligområde plus tabet ved tomgangsleje, plus renoveringer er en samlet regning på 424 millioner kroner. Dertil kommer en udgift til infrastruktur på 52 millioner. Hvem skal betale de penge? Det skal de resterende beboere i Bispehaven. Selvfølgelig har de ikke råd til det, det er der ingen, der har. Jeg har regnet ud, at det svarer til ca. 750.000 kroner pr. lejemål helt ned til små lejligheder på 30 kvadratmeter. Det er i gennemsnit den pris, der skal optages lån for. De lån skal optages på det private lånemarked til markedspris. Det vil sige, at de løbende omkostninger ved bare at have det her lån, det er de resterende beboere, der skal betale for hele gildet. Så de er nødt til at optage endnu et lån på 17 millioner kroner, som beboerne skal optage med garantier fra Landsbyggefonden til at vedligeholde de løbende omkostninger. Hvad fortæller man beboerne: "jamen, der kommer ikke til at ske huslejstigninger for nogen". Det er jo

løgn. Det er jo faktisk forkert. “Nej, men det kommer kun til at gælde dem, der får lavet renoveringer, det kan I jo godt forstå” ... ja, det kan vi godt forstå. Men hvornår skal vi så tilbagebetale pengene, det er jo ikke sådan, at vi får dem. Men det er der ingen som kan fortælle beboerne. Man vil gerne lave en skitse, siger de så, det vil de gerne lave ... den oplysning vil man så komme med senere, så selv der på et såkaldt informationsmøde, kan der ikke gives et ærligt svar til den beboer der stiller spørgsmålet. Vi får ikke noget at vide, og det er jo helt voldsomt og undergravende for en afdeling af 560 boliger, som sidder tilbage med denne her kæmpe gæld, vi er bundet på hænder og fødder i årtier frem. Al vores råderet indenfor det økonomiske område er taget fra os. Vi har egentlig bare at klappe hælene sammen og vente på, at huslejen stiger. Så kan man sige, at dem der ikke bliver smidt ud i første omgang, de bliver presset ud løbende via huslejestigninger. Det er den måde, man kan omdanne et område på, for beboernes egen regning. Det er den måde, man laver boligpolitik for middelklassen på. Og det er det, som sker. Jeg tror faktisk ikke, at folk ved det, men det er det, der foregår.

Publikum: Hallo ... er det det samme, som der kommer til at ske i Gellerup og i Lundtoftegade? Ved I det?

Alex: Jeg ved, at det er den samme finansieringsskitse, det er derfor, at det er vigtigt at få beboerne til at klappe hælene i og takke ja, og de skal takke ja hele vejen op gennem systemet. Fordi det er det, det her ja på afdelingsmøderne i organisationsbestyrelserne og repræsentantskabet, det er det, der gør, at vi frivilligt optager lån. Hvis alle takkede nej til det her, hvor ville de så lande henne? Så ville det lande på ... investeringsbord, og så har de ikke råd til det længere, fordi så skal de selv betale, så er det skatteborgernes penge, der skal bruges. Der er ingen, der har råd til at gennemføre så massive nedrivninger for så mange milliarder kroner. Det er der slet ikke råd til. Så man skal huske på denne her ... jeg tror, at det går ikke op for folk, at denne her finansiering foregår jo med Landsbyggefondens penge, det er en stor pengetank, som alle der bor til leje alment, indbetaler til hver måned, selv når deres lån på deres pågældende bolig er udbetalt, indbetaler de svarende til lånets omkostninger, som hele tiden løbende hver eneste måned for alle, der bor til leje alment i Danmark, ligegyldigt hvor de bor, indbetales til Landsbyggefonden. Så det er mange penge, det er lejernes friværdis, og det bliver brugt til nedrivninger. Og igen som lån, det er jo vanvittigt, altså. Og derfor er det jo

en dejlig ting at have som politiker, at man har en stor pengekasse, man kan love guld og grønne skove for, ikke. Det nye lovforslag, som er blevet sat frem, er overførsel af 10 milliarder kroner fra Landsbyggefondens midler over i en anden fond, der hedder Nybyggerifonden. På den måde kan man sige, at man bruger 10 milliarder kroner, Kaare Dybvad, boligminister, kan sige, at vi vil gerne have flere almene boliger. Så glemmer han lige at fortælle, at de står i spidsen for nedrivninger i et hidtil uset omfang af boliger. “Vi vil gerne have nye almene boliger”. Og hvor kommer pengene fra, de eksisterende lejere, så man tager altså de eksisterende lejeres penge og deres billige husleje, og så sørger man for at gentrificere alle de almene områder på den her måde med deres penge, så de selv bliver presset ud og betaler for nedrivningerne af deres egne boliger. Det er jo vanvittigt, altså det er ... bare ... at forstå det, jeg tror, at det er det ... det er også derfor, at modstanden måske har været til at tage at føle på, fordi det er simpelthen ... uvirkelig, det er kafkask, det er ... dimensionerne er så voldsomme, at det overstiger de fleste menneskers fatteevne, kan det virkelig lade sig gøre i et retssamfund anno 2021, at man kan gøre det, og endda på en lovgivning, som er diskriminerende. Det er jo vanvittigt. Altså man tænker, at det her er ikke rigtigt, det foregår ikke, men det foregår hen over hovedet på os alle sammen, og det foregår med den største politiske opbakning, du kan have til noget som helst. Ja, jeg er paf.

Publikum: Det bliver lidt teknisk det der økonomi, hvad sker der med de penge, som boligselskabet tjener på at sælge boligerne, altså går de ind til boligselskabet? og ...

Alex: Nej, det gør de ikke, fordi ... at ... selve omkostningerne ved at klargøre byggegrundene til private investorer, overstiger med stor sandsynlighed indkomsten ved salget. Du skal huske på, at der er bygget huse på de her områder, de er godt nok fra 70erne, men de har ikke så at sige tjent sig ind igen, så der er faktisk restlån i de her boliger, og for at udbetale restlånet går der en stor del af det, der kunne have været overskuddet til det, så går der også penge til, at beboerne skal klargøre og gøre området lækkert til private investorer, sådan at de ikke har nogen omkostninger ved at gå ind på området, så det bliver byggemodnet, der bliver lavet infrastruktur, der er lavet veje, der bliver lavet alle de ting, der skal til før, så de private investorer har så få omkostninger som overhovedet muligt, så man kan opfylde Århus Kommunes fornemmeste opgave, som de siger: “maksimal profit

for private investorer”. Og det lægger de ikke en gang skjul på. Det er det, der er måske den mest tungtvejende årsag til at gøre de her ting, det er en del af formålet.

Fatma: Altså jeg vil lige fortælle om i Mjølnerparken i hvert fald, hvad Bo-Vita har sagt, men som vi ikke tror på, at det passer i praksis, og det er, at ... altså da de kom ud til beboerne med denne her plan om at sælge boliger i Mjølnerparken, så sagde de, at “jamen, det er den rigtige model at vælge, fordi så har vi nogle penge, som vi kan bruge til at bygge nyt andre steder i København”, men det er jo... beboerne er jo ikke interesserede i det, de er interesserede i at blive i deres boliger, men som Alex forklarer, så er der jo rigtig mange mellemregninger, som forsvinder, og som ... kan det egentlig betale sig at bruge, altså fordi man bruger så mange penge på at renovere boligerne, og på at få andre hele områder sådan, at den er tilpasset til de private investorer, som gerne vil investere i området, at det egentlig altså ... egentlig: hvor mange penge tjener de? Hvor meget tjener beboerne eller boligforeningen på det? Ikke så meget tror jeg ... ikke efter at man har brugt alle de penge på ... altså fx i Mjølnerparken vil man nu rive fælleshuset, altså der er sådan et beboerlokale, der hedder fælleshuset, man vil rive det ned og så bygge noget andet et andet sted, og det giver ingen mening for nogen som helst, sådan hvorfor det skal gøres på den måde, men altså vores sådan spekulation eller gætteri, det er, at det går ud på at give mindre og mindre rum til beboeraktiviteter og til at beboerdemokratiet ... kan udfolde sig, og mere plads til at ... at kommune og boligselskab skal ... og altså de private udlejere skal være til stede og sådan altså være aktive i området. Og det er for resten altså ... i Mjølnerparken er rigtig mange klublokaler blevet lukket af kommunen for rigtig mange ... for flere år siden, ligesom ja, altså her i Lundtoftegade, ligesom Søren-Emil fortalte om, at sådan et lokale her bliver lukket ned af kommunen, det samme sker i Vollsmose, det samme sker rigtig mange steder, så beboerdemokratiet kan ikke ... får ikke lov til at udfolde sig pga., at man fra politikernes side vil gerne styre, hvad der ... ja, hvad der sker i området, og hvad lokalerne bruges til.

Søren-Emil: Jeg kan måske lige følge op lidt for at blive i den der lægemetaforiske verden, så ... det vi i Lundtoftegade gjorde ... i øvrigt som det ser ud lige nu, ikke på nogen liste, men måske er vi på en forebyggelsesliste, som har nøjagtigt de samme konsekvenser, som de gamle lister, og de bliver nok offentliggjort 1. december, kunne jeg forestille mig, og det man har gjort, det er, at

man har ændret den procentdel af ikke-vestlige, som tidligere hed 50 procent, den har man nu sat ned til 30 procent, så der må ikke være over 30 procent ikke-vestlige i et boligområde, og det er sådan set et kriterie, vi hverken kan eller vil arbejde med, så det bliver sådan en skrue uden ende, som vi formentlig ikke kommer ud af nogensinde, så det er meget sådan ... godt politisk håndværk, kan man sige, fordi vi ikke kan gøre noget ved det simpelthen. Det vi ... vi kan jo arbejde med såda ... mennesker tilknytning til arbejdsmarkedet og alle mulige andre ting, men diversitet kan vi jo ikke. Og vil ikke.

Men hvad kan arkitekter gøre for at drage egentlig omsorg for mennesker som os, der bor i almene boligområder? Men jeg tror, at det handler om, at man simpelthen på en eller anden måde arbejder med nogle støttende institutioner, og det er så både arkitektskolen, men måske også ude på landskabsarkitektuddannelsen, at man tager nogle af de her ting ind og tager dem alvorligt, fordi ellers så bliver faget måske et, der kommer til at varetage menneskers boligområder, fordi at der er den politik, som vi har forsøgt at fortælle om, og da vi begyndte at lave de her planer i Lundtoftegade, så var det faktisk rigtig vanskeligt at finde en arkitekt, der ville arbejde med demokratisk arkitektur. For hvad vil det sige, hvad ville det sige at lave en proces, hvor man finder ud af i fællesskab, hvad det er, man godt kunne tænke sig, hvad for nogle behov man har lokalt, men også skaber noget materielt, så vi i virkeligheden har et demokratisk efterliv også? ikke, det er jo også nogle ret abstrakte størrelser på en eller anden måde at arbejde med.

Vi fandt en arkitekt, som ville være med, og så efter noget tid, så fandt vi en tegnestue i Århus, som ville være med til at lave en plan for Lundtoftegade, og vi udviklede et begreb, der hed “det åbne sår,” og nu kommer vi tilbage til det med lægen, fordi vi udviklede et begreb, der hed “det åbne sår,” og det åbne sår handler egentlig om at holde processen åben hele tiden, ikke, altså at man ikke må lukke en proces, fordi så bliver den på en eller anden måde ... så dør den, kan man sige, ikke. Og den måde tegnestuen fra Århus gjorde det på, det var ved, at vi lavede Lundtoftegade som en ko, og så kunne man ligesom arbejde med forskellige udskæringer, så vi kunne lave demokratiske processer i udvalgte områder af vores ... på vores matrikel, og det var ligesom deres måde at forsøge at tegne, hvad det var, vi gerne ville på ... altså hvordan vi ligesom kunne fokusere på et enkelt område og involvere vores naboer i det og trække lokale aktører ind, der skulle være en del af det her, huset her, et godt eksempel, hvor vi kommer til at installere fem socialøkonomiske virksomheder, der alle arbejder med mennesker udenfor arbejdsmarkedet på forskellige måder, det

er Frak og I tråd med verden og People Like Us og Center for Voldsramte Kvinder, blandt andet, ikke. Altså vi tror jo på, at vi har nogle løsninger i forhold til at arbejde med de kriterier, der ikke er i ghetto-lovgivningen, men på nogle helt andre meget mere humane måder, og det kræver, at man har mulighed for at holde såret åbent selvfølgelig ... der skal da heller ikke gå koldbrand i det, på et eller andet tidspunkt er man måske også nødt til at materialisere noget, ikke, men hele denne her tanke om, at lytte til hinanden og snakke sammen og finde ud af, hvad er det, vi vil med vores by, hvordan kan vi lave en solidarisk ... eller hvordan ser den solidariske bys udvikling ud i virkeligheden? Det er det, jeg tror, at arkitektstanden og dem der har indflydelse på det i virkeligheden skal tage alvorligt, det er ikke at lade sig synke ned i de forståelser, som i hvert fald ... ja, politikere med flere forsøger at tegne af os, men simpelthen turde at lade sig glide med ind i det åbne sår, og det er ikke nødvendigvis et rart sted, men det er et demokratisk sted.

Fatma: Jeg har faktisk et spørgsmål til de arkitekter, der er i publikum, og det er, om jeres uddannelse om formidling og pædagogik er en del af uddannelsen? Eller demokratisk inddragelse for den sags skyld, er det en del af uddannelsen, er der nogen, der har lyst til at svare på det?

Søren-Emil: Det der er min pointe med, at vi bliver nødt til at bygge nogle stærke institutioner, simpelthen, ikke. Vi er nødt til også at have det niveau med for at ... der kan ske nogle ændringer.

Publikum: Ja, bare helt kort, jeg startede i København, men smuttede faktisk igen, som arkitektstuderende, fordi der ikke var ret meget diskussion af, hvorfor vi bygger, og hvem vi bygger til, det er der så kommet lidt mere af på det seneste, men ... men det er klart en mangel ved en skole, der er et kunstakademi først og fremmest, måske, og hvor der ikke er en stærk akademisk tradition heller nødvendigvis.

Jeg har lige et hurtigt spørgsmål, hvis jeg må driste mig til det ... i samme omgang, jeg tænkte bare lige for at forstå helt det med vigtigheden af afdelingsbestyrelsens ja for finansieringen af nedrivning osv., altså jeg ved ... I Tingbjerg i forhold til fsb afdelingsbestyrelsen, ved jeg, hvor insisterende beboerne har været igennem lang tid på netop ikke at give eller afgive det ja, også selvom der i forskellige referater fremgår, at der er blevet sagt ja, hele den proces fra juridisk perspektiv, hvordan er

det, at I arbejder med både ... kan man sige ... at vise vigtigheden af ... hvad beboernes stemme der i afdelingsbestyrelsen betyder for realiseringen af de her planer, men også hvordan efterspillet ser ud, når en boligforening påstår, at der er blevet sagt ja, selvom det ikke har været tilfældet.

Alex: Altså det er jo et godt spørgsmål, der er jo ikke lavet nogen ... altså man har forventet, tror jeg, fra politikernes hold, og store dele af den almene boligsektors administrationer, at man har kunnet køre denne her hjem, og jeg tror, at det begynder nu at gå op for folk, at det kan man i hvert fald ikke på afdelingsniveau, nu er Bispehaven en afdeling blandt flere afdelinger i en boligforening, der hedder Østjysk Bolig, som I måske har hørt om. Boligforeningen er struktureret sådan, at der er et repræsentantskab, og der er en organisationsbestyrelse. Tilbage tror jeg, at det var i 2009, besluttede man sig endnu en gang for at køre beboerdemokratiet over, så de "dumme beboere" ikke vedtog noget, de ikke måtte, så lavede man det, der hedder en "call-in-bestemmelse." Det vil altså sige, at et repræsentantskab kunne omgøre enhver beslutning, der foregår på afdelingsniveau, hvis man ikke synes om det beboerne i afdelingen besluttede. Og det er den call in-bestemmelse kan man gøre brug af, og det kommer til at anvendt de steder, hvor der er stemt nej til en helhedsplan på et afdelingsmøde, der vil man så sige ja, det er fint, men nu forelægger vi den samme sag på repræsentantskabet, og hvis de ikke makker ret, så tror jeg endda, at man vil forsøge at gennemføre det ved en tvangsindsat forretningsfører i organisationsbestyrelsen så den kan gennemtrumfe det, og så har vi altså ødelagt beboerdemokratiet hele vejen op. Så man kan sige, at medbestemmelse er kun for så vidt, at vi accepterer grundpræmissen og siger ja til helhedsplanen, det er adgangen til samarbejdet, og få lov til at sidde og snakke lidt med nogle arkitekter om at finde andre typer boliger, eller en anden farve til facaden, så er det okay, så er vi med i processen. Når vi siger nej, så tror jeg, at vi mere eller mindre bliver sat udenfor den proces.

Jeg ved ikke hvad det ender med, men du kan ikke pålægge folk en gæld eller optage en gæld, hvis der ikke er et ja til det. Altså du kan ikke tvinge en gæld ned over hovedet på en afdelingsbestyrelse, der trods alt ejer sig selv. Ofte glemmer vi jo, at selvom almene boliger, ikke er private, så ejer de jo sig selv, det er bare ejerformen, der er lidt forskellig fra det at bo privat, men de mennesker der til enhver tid bor i en almen bolig, ejer den i fællesskab i struktur af en almenboligforening, så det er jo ikke sådan, at man bare kan komme og tvangsekspropriere.

Det er der jo stærke regler for i grundloven, altså det er jo et spørgsmål om privat ejendomsret, og der er også privat ejendomsret her. Hvis vi kommer dertil, så vil der komme meget mere i spil, så får vi at vide om mennesker, der bor alment har flere rettigheder end mink. Hvis man ønsker at gennemføre det ved ekspropriering, så bliver der også tale om økonomisk kompensation. Ydermere er der også spørgsmålet, om det hele ... i det hele taget er lovligt at gøre, men indtil vi når dertil, så kan alle presses hele vejen op igennem systemet, indtil du har ja på organisationsbestyrelsesniveau i alle boligforeninger, så kan man sige: "det er det, beboerne vil. De har stemt ja". Når vi taler om beboerdemokrati, så er det altså det, politikerne har i fokus, det er de valgte repræsentantskaber og organisationsbestyrelser.

Fatma: Ja, i forhold til Tingbjerg så er der altså ... altså som Alex forklarer, så er det afdelingsmødet, der stemmer ja eller nej. Bestyrelsen ... altså i almene boligafdelinger er der meget direkte demokrati, som styrelsen varetager i beboernes interesser og afdeling generelt i løbet af året, men egentlig så kan den ikke tage beslutninger om økonomi på ... sådan på egen hånd. Det skal afdelingsmødet tage beslutning om og stemme om.

I Tingbjerg der har været i hvert fald den lokale afdelingsbestyrelse i fsb-afdelingen i Tingbjerg ... har været meget imod de planer, der blev lavet. Nu bliver de her planer skåret ud i mindre planer, så der stemmes på sådan et stykke ad gangen, og det er faktisk også en proces, som jeg i hvert fald tror, har til formål at gøre det mere forvirrende for beboerne, også det her med at der ... man er kommet i gang med nogle ting i Tingbjerg uden, at der er nogen, der ved, hvad er der blevet vedtaget, og hvor og hvornår ... altså der er ...altså sådan jeg har snakket med flere beboere der i Tingbjerg, som virkelig ikke har overblik over ... Altså der er folk, der har ... forskellige sådan stykker af viden, men altså der er ikke nogen, der har det samlede billede af, hvad er det ... hvad det er, der er blevet vedtaget, og en af beboerne som var bestyrelsesmedlem, der oplevede præcis det samme, som Alex fortalte om, man bliver inviteret til møder konstant, og man får intet at vide, så man skal hele tiden være der, just in case, der er noget vigtigt, det bliver sagt til det møde. Og sådan hun er ... flex-jobber, havde ... ja, havde sådan selvfulgelig job, men havde også sygdom, og man har jo også alle sine familieansvar og alle sådan sine egne ting, som man vil gerne bruge sin fritid på, men i stedet for så ender man med at bruge tid på at sidde til alle mulige møder og lytte til alt muligt vrøvl for måske, er der noget, der er vigtigt, det bliver sagt på et eller andet tidspunkt. Men ja, som Alex forklarede, juridisk er der denne

her call-in bestemmelse, man kan bruge til at overtrumfe beboerdemokratiet, men vi ser stadigvæk, at boligforeninger prøver at (?) for beboerne for de politiske ... hvad hedder det ... årsager, for et ja fra beboerne kan jo altså nedlægge alt, hvad man kan møde af protester og indsigelser og så siger man, at jamen, det har beboerne stemt ja til, og det er det, vi har set den sidste uge i Birkebakken fx, hvor man løj decideret for beboerne for at få dem til at sige ja, man sagde faktisk til beboerne, helheds ... eller nedrivninger er allerede blevet vedtaget, det er ikke en del af den her plan, som vi skal stemme om, og det var ren løgn altså ... helhedsplanen går ud på, at man skal nedrive blandt andet, men ja, man løj for beboerne for at få dem til at sige ja, og ja, så ... beboerne endte med at sige nej, men det bliver nu overtruffet, men i det mindste så har det ikke fået den der politiske sejr i at få et ja fra afdelingsmødet.

Elsebeth: Ja, men det var bare det, Fatma sagde, sådan var det jo også i Gellerup, ikke, altså den var jo også delt op i nedrivning og delt op i ... hvad hedder det ... renoveringer, og der var det ligesom, at man (?) ... denne her afstemning, den handler ikke om nedrivning, den handler kun om renoveringer, men det er jo en stor pakke, vi stemmer for, man kan ikke bare sige, at nu stemmer vi ja til det ene og nej til det andet, så det er ligesom det, der er ...

Svava: Ja, absolut. Jeg tror, at vi vil sige tak ... tusind tak til panelet en gang til, for at dele med os.

Og nu griber jeg mikrofonen, mest af alt for at vise omsorg mod vores oversættere, som har brug for en lille pause, men det er ikke for at stoppe samtalen, som forhåbentlig vil fortsætte nu, bare i lidt mere uformelle rammer, der er altså lidt servering her, og vi lægger også frem de altså parallelsamfundspakken, dem der ikke har læst dokumentet, det er ganske interessant at faktisk gå ind og læse det, og selvfølgelig også det borgerforslag, der blev stillet imod denne her politik. Her er der så også en udstilling fra netop landskabs- og planlægningsstuderende fra Københavns Universitet, fra et kursus, som sådan set også handler om at reflektere over det her udefra perspektiv, udstillingen viser nogle første indtryk fra Tåstrupgård og Tingbjerg, som de studerende har arbejdet med, og så nogle portrætter i den dialog med beboere, som de studerende er i gang med. Og jeg vil så sige, at mange af de studerende er med her i dag, og har også spillet en rolle i at arrangere arrangementet i dag, så tusind tak for det. Og tak for at I kom alle sammen. Ja, så nu er der serveret. Tak for nu!



“... det er de sociale netværk, som ryger, det er de sociale relationer, og det er de netværk, som folk har opbygget gennem utallige år, som nedbrydes. Det er jo det, der er det skammelige her, og det bliver ikke rigtigt fremhævet nok, at det er det, der bliver ødelagt samtidig med boligerne.”

– Alex Young Pedersen

“... it is the social networks that disappear, it is the social relationships, and it is the networks that people have built up over countless years that are broken down. That is what is disgraceful here, and it is not emphasized enough. That is what is destroyed along with the housing.”

“Men så kom den her nytårstale der fra Lars Løkke 1. januar 18, hvor han begynder at snakke om ‘huller i verdenskortet’ og ‘parallelsamfund’ og ‘social kontrol’, og jeg sad bare og var helt ... jeg blev så gal altså, fordi stort set hele nytårstalen handlede bare om det, altså det er jo ikke det, som ... som er Gellerup for mig, altså.”

– Elsebeth Frederiksen

“But then there was this New Year’s speech by Lars Løkke [Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Danish prime minister] on the first of January 2018, when he began to talk about ‘cracks in the map of Denmark’, and a ‘parallel society’ and ‘social control’. And I just sat there and was completely ... I became so angry, because basically the whole New Year’s speech was just about that. I mean that is not how Gellerup is for me.”

“... men ja, vi har jo lært på det sidste, at alt kan lade sig gøre i dansk politik, hvis man bare putter nok racisme i det. Så kan man sælge alting.”

– Fatma Tounsi

“... but yes, in the end we learned that anything can be done in Danish politics if they just add enough racism to it. Then they can sell anything.”

“Jeg sad til en børnefødselsdag med min mellemste pige, og så kom den her nyhed ligesom ind, og den begyndte at dukke op til alle medierne, vi snakkede sammen forældrene til denne her børnefødselsdag, og det kom hun så til at overheøre, hvorfor hun pludselig bare brød sammen og gav sig til at græde, fordi hun fattede jo nu, at hendes barndomshjem åbenbart stod til, at skulle rives ned.”

– Alex Young Pedersen

“I was at a children’s birthday party with my middle daughter and the news came out and began to show up in all the media. We were talking with the parents at this birthday party and she overheard it and burst out in tears and started crying because she realized that now her childhood home evidently stands to be torn down.”

“Så det der med både at lytte, men også i virkeligheden tage alvorligt, om man siger ja til at arbejde for en politik, der er sindssygt problematisk og kritiseret af FN og Amnesty. Det tror jeg, vil være min varmeste anbefaling, man kan simpelthen godt sige nej ...”

– Søren-Emil Schütt

“So all that about both listening, but also really taking seriously whether you say yes to working for a policy that is incredibly problematic and has been criticized by the UN and Amnesty. That would be my warmest recommendation. You can simply just say no.”

“... men det var sådan meget symptomatisk for politikerne, at de siger, at jamen, vi har lyttet til jer, men vi er jo uenige, så det gør vi ikke. Og det synes jeg sådan, passer meget godt til Gellerup også, at nu har vi haft de her workshops, og vi har hørt jer, og I har været til foretræde inde hos udvalget, det er fint, tak fordi I kom, men vi ændrer ikke mening.”

– Elsebeth Frederiksen

“... but it was very symptomatic for the politicians that they say, ‘Yes, but we have listened to you. But we don’t agree so we aren’t doing that.’ And I think that’s just how it is with Gellerup too. That ‘Now we’ve had these workshops, and we’ve listened to you, and you’ve been admitted to the committee. That’s fine. Thank you for coming. But we haven’t changed our minds.’”

“Så hvordan kommer man ud af den her naivitet om, at det er en ret, det er jo, at man skal kæmpe for de områder og for de rettigheder, man har ...”

– Alex Young Pedersen

“So, how do you move on from this naivety that it is a right? It is that you have to fight for these areas and for the rights you have.”

“Man bliver kaldt naiv, det er noget af det mildeste, man kan blive kaldt, man bliver kaldt 'rygtespreder', man bliver kaldt ... hvad var det, Frank Jensen kaldte os ... 'ballademagere' ...”

– Fatma Tounsi

“You are called naïve. That is one of the mildest things to be called. You are called a 'rumor spreader', you are called ... What was it Frank Jensen [then mayor of Copenhagen] called us? 'Troublemakers!'”

Witness seminar organized by Aktion Arkiv at Folkets Husby Supported by ARQ Forskningsstiftelsen för samhälls- och byggnadsplanering, projektering (5:2020), and FFNS Stiftelse för forskning, utveckling och utbildning (2020:14)

Panellists

Marlen Eskander, social antropologist, executive director and founder of Läsförämningsinstitutet (Institute for the Promotion of Literacy), Sweden

Beata Hemer, architect and founder of Almen Arkiv (Common Archive), Denmark

Ilhan Kellecioglu, researcher and active member of Ort till Ort (Place to Place/Hood to Hood) and author of Rapport inifrån Hemblahelvetet (A Report from Hembla's Hell), Sweden

Marie Northrup, antropologist and member of the association Initiativet for Retfærdig Boligpolitik (Initiative for Just Housing Politics), the platform Almen Modstand (Common Resistance), and co-initiator of the group Almen Arkiv (Common Archive), Denmark

Nazem Tahvilzadeh, political scientist and researcher, Sweden

Moderators

Maryam Fanni, Aktion Arkiv

Introduction

Sara Brolund de Carvalho, Aktion Arkiv

Solidarity in Times of Repressive Politics: A Seminar On the Effects of the Term “(Particularly) Vulnerable Area”

Transcript

Saturday 15 October 2022, Folkets Husby

Sara Brolund de Carvalho: Hi! Exciting to see so many people in the audience today!

Thanks for coming and thank you to our guests, who I will present shortly. Welcome to “Solidaritet i tider av repressiv politik” [Solidarity in Times of a Repressive Politics], a seminar about the effects of the terms “vulnerable” and “particularly vulnerable areas.” The organizers of this event are Maryam Fanni, Heidi Svenningsen Kajita, Jennifer Mack, Helena Mattsson, Svava Riesto and Meike Schalk and me, Sara Brolund de Carvalho.

You could describe today’s seminar as Part 2, or as a continuation, of a seminar that we organized one year ago in Copenhagen, which was called “Caring for Plans: Narratives of the Parallel Society Package”. There, tenants and activists – predominantly from the group *Almen Modstand* [Danish for “common resistance”]

– shared stories about the consequences, and their experiences, of the so-called “parallel society legislation,” which became later known as “the ghetto plan” or “the ghetto package.”

I will shortly give my colleague Maryam Fanni the floor, and she will present our panel, but briefly first, I would like to bring to the audience’s attention the material that is exhibited in the room. The yellow posters are from the seminar that I just referred to, the one we held last year, and they contain quotes from the tenants and activists who were present. I encourage everybody to have a look at them afterwards. Our guests from Denmark have also mounted a small exhibition, *Almen Arkiv* [Danish for “common archive”], over there – please take a look at that too. We are also showing the maps produced within “Dekonstruktionen av välfärdssamhället” [Swedish for “Deconstruction of the Welfare Society”], a comparative study by Maria Ärlemo that looks at the years 2014 and 1977. So do take a look at that too!

[applause]

Maryam Fanni: Hi there! My name’s Maryam Fanni. As Sara already said, it’s fantastic to see that so many people have chosen to spend a Saturday evening together with us here at Folkets Husby. I’ll be moderating today’s panel discussion, and as such, my first task is to invite our panelists to take the stage. Welcome up!

[applause]

Before I present our panelists, I’d like to pose a question to the room. One of our panelists can either present in Danish or in English, so I’d like to ask if there are any preferences amongst the audience regarding this? Is this something ... [laughs] ... that we can decide together? Is it better if it’s in English?

[audience agreement]

OK [laughs]. Is that OK, Marie? Yes? Because we talked about this earlier: for those of us that haven’t had much exposure to Danish – if you’re not accustomed to it – it can be hard to follow along. And in the same spirit, given that we have Danish speakers here who may not be accustomed to Swedish, I would like to encourage our

panelists – that is, the Swedish speakers – to speak clearly and perhaps a little slower than normal (particularly if you’re a person who speaks quickly!). In this way, we’ll be able to understand each other.

I’m going to present each panelist briefly, and each person will then have 5 minutes to offer a more in-depth presentation of themselves, their work, and their connection to today’s theme – as Sara already explained, our research group organized this panel discussion today in order to explore the similarities and the differences between Sweden and Denmark with respect to what in Sweden is called “vulnerable areas” or “particularly vulnerable areas” and what in Danish policy terms is called the “parallel society legislation.” With us with us today, and sitting closest to me, is Nazem Tahvilzadeh, who holds a PhD in Public Management and is a researcher at Malmö University and (soon) at Södertörn University. Nazem conducts a lot of research into questions of democracy and civil society. We also have Marlen Eskander, a social anthropologist who is based in Södertälje; Marlen is the operations manager of Läsfrämjarinstitutet [Swedish for “Institute for the Promotion of Literacy”], which you will hear more about shortly. We are also joined by Ilhan Kellecioglu, political scientist and research assistant at the Institute for Housing and Urban Research at Uppsala University (if I have understood correctly?); Ilhan is also active in *Ort till Ort* [Swedish for “Place to Place/Hood to Hood”] and is author to the report “Rapport inifrån Hemblahelvetet” [“A Report from *Hembla*’s Hell”], which takes Husby as its site of inquiry.¹ Anthropologist Marie Northrup is based in Copenhagen and is a member of the association *Initiativet for retfaerdig boligpolitik* [Danish for “Initiative for Just Housing Policy”] and is engaged in *Almen Modstand* och *Almen Arkiv*. And at the far end, we have Beata Hemer ... [cough] ... who is today accompanied by her son. Beata is an architect who is based in Copenhagen and is engaged in *Almen Arkiv*. And with that said, I would like to give the word to Nazem. I will ask you to begin by explaining a little more about who you are, what you work with, and the ways in which your engagement in research is connected to today’s theme.

Nazem Tahvilzadeh: Thank you so much. Can you hear me? I’m so sorry, but can you repeat today’s theme (just so that I don’t do the wrong thing!)? [Laughs].

1

Link to the report: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1603995/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.

Maryam: Sure. The title for today's panel discussion is "Solidaritet i tider av repressiv politik" [Solidarity in Times of Repressive Politics] and in focus in today's discussion are the terms "vulnerable areas" and "particularly vulnerable areas"; we're curious to follow developments in Denmark and to think through how Swedish politicians have expressed the idea that Denmark could be seen as a forerunner in this question. We're naturally curious to learn more about the situation there and to understand how that situation relates to how these terms ("vulnerable areas" and "particularly vulnerable areas") are playing out in Sweden. What do these terms mean? How should we think in relation to them? How can we approach them?

Nazem: Thanks for the opportunity to be here today and to speak. Thank you to everyone for being here on a Saturday night – I don't really know what I've done [laughs] to deserve this, but I hope that we can have a good conversation, because I believe that, given what's going on in Swedish politics at the moment, we need to have more of these kinds of discussions. And it's going to be particularly interesting, given that our Danish comrades can join us – thank you! What I'm most looking forward to hearing you speak about are your experiences, given that it has become pretty clear for us, here in Sweden, that our government policies are headed down what we might call "the Danish Road." And what does that mean? Well, it means that with the help of right-wing populist, or directly and openly racist, forces, we have a new right-wing government that is supported by ... that the Swedish Democrats actively participate in. What this will result in probably won't surprise us so much, with a view to what Swedish right-wing politics are generally all about (i.e., lowering taxes and eroding welfare); but the new element that is being introduced lies in a strongly conservative, nationalist, and racializing political "turn," am I right? And we've known that we've been going in this direction – particularly when you look at how the Swedish Democrats have performed in the opinion polls, but also looking at how the political rhetoric and the political discourse has developed over the last, say, 10 to 15 years in Sweden, with its focus on – its *obsession* with – policies relating to "vulnerable areas," a term which sets so many different political themes in relation, right? It connects to migration, which is talked about in terms of "integration," and more generally it connects to hate towards Muslims and a general conservative turn in the values of our political discourse, whereby criminality also becomes a key area.

So why is it interesting to talk about "vulnerable areas"? I want to thank you for organizing this event because as a researcher ... you work with something like this – I mean, I work with these questions specifically – and you can feel that you're shouting into the wind. Because the conversation is going in a completely different direction and focus is on completely other questions. As a rhetorical move to draw attention to the fact that this is something that we probably should be taking seriously, at almost every lecture that I hold for students or for a general audience, and in almost every text I write, I try to raise the case of Denmark – of how absurd it is a democracy can retool itself politically so that even though it still calls itself "democratic," still calls itself "liberal," in reality the foundations of democratic politics (amongst other things, legal certainty and respect for basic human rights, particularly in public management, and so on) have been demolished. And I think that this political maneuver, which the right-wing coalition is performing in Sweden, is greatly inspired by Denmark. In my view, what this plays off is a generalized fear that exists, a general aversion to, or a sense that you "just don't like it" [laughs] in, places like Husby and other so-called *förorter* ["suburbs"] – those "Million Program" neighborhoods that have in common the fact that a majority of their residents are immigrants (or have parents or grandparents who immigrated) and belong to the working class. I hope that we can all agree about this.

Why does it seem reasonable that what goes in these areas, these neighborhoods, can be raised, and stigmatized, and racialized, and painted as posing the greatest political challenge and problem that we face in Sweden? How is this possible, when everyone knows that we have so many other, much greater, problems to face? The climate crisis. The economic crisis. We exist within a generally unstable world order that is increasingly reliant on conflicts to cement positions and interests, and *this makes us anxious*. We are anxious for ourselves, for our future, for our children, and so on, but our political agenda is kidnapped by a fear of what is happening in "vulnerable areas." Because of this fear, rather unlikely governmental departments and experts – the security ministries and the police – become spokespeople, when earlier this role was perhaps occupied by social workers and sociologists. Today, it is the police that come out and explain, "This is how it is in Sweden today these are the problems that we have." I say the following with all respect to the police (I hope that there is someone here tonight from the Police Authority), but: *it's not your area of expertise*. Your expertise lies in something else. Despite this, today the police are made responsible for solving our complex social problems.

How have we ended up in this absurd situation? In my view, it's the result of political power relations and a particular political equation through which politicians who want to seize power, who want access to positions of power, are able to play on this type of fear and these general aversions. Surveys show that approximately 6 of 10 voters in Sweden, typical voters, rank criminality as the political question that they are most scared or concerned about. About 6 of 10. The proportion of the population who are actually affected by criminality is perhaps one or two percent. In this lies the absurdity: we have a political agenda that uses criminality – something that we can agree hardly constitutes a huge problem in reality – as the primary question driving what will happen in the coming four years of governmental rule. And the hatred that exists in relation to the suburbs, the fear, the hatred of immigration and immigrants, the hatred of Muslims: all of this comes together in a single ideology, which is presented to the public as a policy position that is advanced in the name of democracy. It's sad, it's absurd, but from an epistemological viewpoint, we can also see that it is effective. They won the election, OK. *They won the election.* In Denmark, they have won elections using these methods many times in a row, and I think we need to listen to that and ask: How could they do that? In what ways did the forces that I see as being present here tonight lose? How did we lose these struggles? And how can we learn from our neighboring country, in order to stop this happening in Sweden?

My personal concern with all of this lies in the fact that the gap that we actually need to deal with is the one between conversations that address large cities or urban environments in Sweden and those that address other parts of the country. A clear rift exists here in terms of both political mobilization and the formulation of political ideas, and as such while solidarity with the suburbs and with “Million Program” areas is important, if we're going to try to get a grip on this highly successful political equation, we also need to develop a way of thinking about solidarity with other peripheries in Sweden. I'll stop there. Thank you very much.

[applause]

Marlen Eskander: I just want to continue listening to you, Nazem [laughs]! He's, like, the best storyteller! No, but really, I'm also concerned about these things, and I agree with what you're saying. I'm going to keep it brief and explain a little bit about our organization, which began as an answer to all of this, and

which has been working on these questions for quite some time. I remember being so damn angry when I started it. Läsföräldrarinstitutet is an organization that works with the promotion of reading, literature, and culture amongst children and their adult caregivers in so-called “socioeconomically vulnerable areas.”

We almost never talk about this: we say that these are structurally disadvantaged areas, but *why* are there not adequate activities, but why – we are asking – isn't enough being done to raise health and wellness in these areas? Why aren't there any museums? Why aren't there libraries? Why don't these things exist in such areas? We started working with areas where everything had been dismantled, where beyond perhaps a housing company, there was nothing left. Even when it comes to how these areas are viewed from the outside. We thought: “OK, how did this become such a big problem in reality? And what if it's the Swedish language that is the problem ...?” Because I was seeing people born in the seventies speak better Swedish than people in their twenties, my friends. Something was wrong – something *is* wrong: parents are speaking better Swedish than their children. [Swedish] kids are being assessed as speaking Swedish [at a level commensurate with having Swedish] as a *second language*. What is that, even, that ordering principle?! What's going on?

On the basis of these perspectives and questions, we started an organization that would give children the power that comes with words, and an arena to act within, partly through reading, which is incredibly important, particularly for kids who are not getting adequate training in literacy through the pre-schools and schools in their neighborhoods. Politicians talk about how these children have to speak Swedish – “they *have* to speak Swedish!” – all the time, when, in reality, these kids speak nothing other than Swedish. And so, the real question is: What kind of Swedish do they speak, then? And where are all the Swedes? Against a backdrop of “white flight,” where do we meet the Swedish language, if not at school? What can we do about this?

Children are only children once. [Laughs]. They are a bit like dogs, you know, they grow up really quickly. A bit like projects too. Kids are like that. It sounds terrible when I say it, but I want to be a little dramatic in my description here. [What if] during a child's most formative years ... nothing happens? They go to daycare centers where the adults barely speak good Swedish, because statistics show that regardless of how much you raise teacher salaries many teachers choose not to work in the areas that we work in. And what should we do if it is the case that these children are simply not meeting the Swedish language? Then we have only books to

rely on. It may sound simplistic – you might think “these are only kids’ books” – but children’s books are in fact an effective way to build on and to work with language, and thus a tool to gain power. This argument is also used against these children all the time, against their parents: the parents have to read to them, the parents have to do this and that. But we have also dismantled so many of the social services that existed in these areas! So, what we do, beyond the weekly activities that we organize, in Södertälje (where we started) and also in the building we are currently sitting in, Folkets Husby, and in Rinkeby, Tensta, and Hjulsta, is to also run training programs for parents and for childcare teachers, so that they can work with the methods and perspectives that we use. I think I will stop there.

[applause]

Ilhan Kellecioglu: Hi all! Great that you’re all here and thanks to those who arranged this event. I am a Husby local; I’ve lived here for about 10 years. When you said that I was a research assistant at Uppsala University, that’s not the case right now – I’m actually on a year’s sabbatical. So, I would say that I’m not a researcher, and I’m not a politician either: today, I’m primarily here as a social product of Husby. And what do I mean by that? Even if we define Husby, or *they define* Husby, as a “vulnerable area,” we’ve been organizing at the local level here for a long time. I’ve been a part of those efforts and they have had an impact on me and pushed me towards the struggle that I am fighting today. And what is it that I have been a part of? Well, in recent years, since 2019, we have created a platform here that is called *Socialt Center i Husby* [Swedish for “Social Center”]. We collaborated with three different organizations in that work: *Ort till Ort*, which I represent; *Husby arbetarcenter* [“Husby Workers’ Center”], which is a part of *Syndikalisternas fack* [“The Syndicalists’ Union”], which is a labor union; and then we have *Rörelsejuristerna* [“Movement Lawyers”], who work with providing legal advice. And the thinking behind this is to gather people’s problems here – by making people interested in coming here to socialize with other people, we bring people, not problems, together, and through that, lots of issues come up – tax questions, or questions about *Försäkringskassan* [the “Department of Social Security”] or immigration, or issues relating to housing or employment. So, when housing questions come up, for example, I work with *Ort till Ort* in order to take care of these questions as best we can. It might be the case that a landlord is really bad at

communicating or isn’t performing necessary maintenance. Problems might exist with the interior of the dwelling or the building’s exterior or the courtyards and so on. It could be a matter of high rents. It could even be a crisis situation, where someone is being evicted.

Ort till Ort was founded in 2015, when many refugees from Syria came to Sweden and were given short-term rental contracts; as a result of those contracts, 35 families with children were to be evicted in Tensta. Activists from the area gathered and tried to stop that from happening, and from that point on we’ve been fighting the battle to try to stop evictions, but also to struggle against (predominantly private) landlords. My personal battle started in around 2019 when *Blackstone*, at that time – and later I’ll get to examples from Denmark – sold [a large number of apartments in Husby] to the German housing company *Vonovia*, which is today Europe’s largest housing company; they are located on this side of Husby, where I live. *Vonovia* entered Sweden by taking over housing areas in the suburbs where 85% to 90% of people have a foreign background, where reading and writing skills are low, where unemployment is high, and education is limited. And this is what this housing company does: it’s like it’s advantaged by repressive politics, which is something we’ve seen for a long time – this didn’t happen yesterday, as we’re going to talk about, it’s been happening for ages. They exploit racist housing policy, and they stand on a capitalist foundation. And, in this way, the housing market has been opened up, and national private property owners have been replaced by global property owners, with headquarters elsewhere.

What have we done, then, after three years of this? Starting with the issues that we’ve been working with at a *Socialt center*, we’ve taken those problems, and we’ve raised them, using the democratic means that are still in place. We’ve used those means; in my case, I’ve used academia – for example, it was through Malmö University that I wrote a report, “Rapport inifrån Hemblahelvetet,” which you can download from the DiVA portal and also find in print. Beyond academia, we’ve also worked with – and, yeah, beyond my report, the university also published debate articles on these questions – other institutions like *Hyresnämnden* [“The Tenants’ Tribunal”], a court that settles all kinds of disputes between tenants and landlords, which we sent hundreds of submissions. But at the same time that we were sending in these submissions to *Hyresnämnden*, we’ve also been forwarding them to politicians in order to raise awareness around these questions: to send warning signals. At the same time, we used *Miljöförvaltningen* [“the municipal

Department of Environment”] to send signals to the municipal politicians. Signaling even there.

We also use the media: “Uppdrag granskning” [a Swedish national television show dedicated to investigative journalism] did an hour-long program, where they came to this area for 45 minutes and described the situation, and also went to Berlin, because in Berlin, there’s this ongoing campaign to re-municipalize the property held by private housing companies, which affects more than 3,000 apartments. They held a successful referendum wherein 60% of Berliners voted “yes.” They seem a little worried that if we get there first, their apartments are going to be a little bit more expensive. But we can’t do so much about that: everybody needs to fight where they stand. Media ... I was talking about the democratic institutions, *the democracy* that we have today in Sweden and how we can make use of it. We’ve been using the media and are lucky to have *Nyhetsbyrån Järva*, a local news agency in Järva, which runs a local newspaper, that can raise awareness about our tenants’ issues. Whether you’re about talking rent hikes or increases in parking costs, mold in apartments, substandard ventilation, substandard everything, this has been a really functional way for us to work, because it directly impacts on these property companies’ image. Beyond that, and thanks to the report that I wrote, we’ve also been invited to *Civilutskottet* [the national “Committee for Civil Matters”], where the Social Democrats invited me to present the report for them and to explain the problems that we’re having with these property owners, and even what’s going on more broadly in Sweden. We’ve even gone in to the municipality – they said our visit was the first time that a local tenant movement has come to them to present their problems. And now with the election, we’ve also managed to negotiate a contract with the Social Democrats and the Left to buy back these properties, so we’ve come a long way.

[applause]

Thanks [laughs]. But the question remains regarding whether these companies want to sell [their housing stock]. And yes, three months earlier they announced that they actually wanted to sell. They want to be a “long-term” business, but they also want to sell. So, all of a sudden, they announced that properties for 13 billion euros are going to be sold, and they’re looking first and foremost for investors that can come in and provide a bit of cash flow, but no one like that seems to have turned up yet, so

it’s still a pretty open goal. Let’s see what happens. They have to announce the sale so that we can [buy]. And it’s there that I see the possibility for a truly representative politics, because this is about our area. On one hand, we have strong community organization happening here, a strong civil society, thanks to our two meeting places. Our Director of Operations over there [laughs], Hedvig, manages this space really well and opens up for the possibility for people to gather here; because that’s where we’re at right now: we are facing a fascist politics, run in a capitalist manner, which is isolating us from one another, and we need to unite, now more than ever. It’s an acute situation, more acute than we have experienced previously. And how is that affecting us?

And on that note, I want to propose that *Socialt center*, which was created here, is more necessary than ever, because special competence is needed – the means to help people with their different problems – and we need to work on that. We have to try to understand how this fascist government is going to affect us and we need to try to stop this development and to do so in a good way: not by creating conflict, not in a military or a militant way, but by creating understanding, by arriving at a particular consciousness, an understanding of why this is happening. And that requires a political analysis. We have to understand the capitalist values upon which these people are operating, because the resources that exist in today’s society are becoming more and more limited and they’re trying to give us less and less. They’re trying to seize as much as they can for themselves, and this is what we also have to grasp.

Beyond all of this, I’m really so thankful for this conversation. It’s going to be exciting. Earlier today I was part of a similar conversation at *Solidaritetshuset* [the “House of Solidarity”] that addressed similar themes. And there was a lot of “let’s band together!” and all of that but what I tried to emphasize, even there, was that we need community organizing but we also need a *greater number* of community organizations to cooperate and work together in order to reach the goals that we have set for ourselves. That’s important on all levels. Thank you.

[applause]

Marie Northrup: [speaking English] Hi, my name is Marie, and I’m from Copenhagen. I am an attendant for a common housing neighborhood in Copenhagen, Aldersrogade, that has been defined as a “ghetto” and is now categorized as a “parallel society” (because our government changed the categories on the

list, so now they don't use the term "ghetto" anymore, but we still face the same legislation). I am a part of an initiative dealing with just housing politics. We were a few tenants that came together when they launched the law in 2018 to form this small association, and after that we launched a resistance platform called *Almen Modstand*. *Almen Modstand* is a network of common housing tenants which are organizing to defend our tenant democracy, to stop mass evictions and the demolition and privatization of our neighborhoods. And these are all circumstances that we are facing now with the implementation of the so-called "ghetto" or "Parallel Society Legislation". We are a loosely organized network with, like, a flat horizontal structure, and active tenants' groups in different affected neighborhoods, in different parts of Denmark. And we don't have any spokesperson or central leading organ, so I'm only here today as an individual, and I wish I could be here with more of my fellow tenant organizers, so I just want to emphasize that, that we are working collectively.

Under this umbrella of *Almen Modstand*, I – and other active tenants – have been organizing several kinds of demonstrations and public actions. We have produced a lot of information and community awareness material, and raised awareness about people's rights and the circumstances they face. We have done a lot of big public campaigns, and we have organized legal aid and strategic legislation. When we organize in the context of *Almene boliger* [Danish for "common housing"], it's important to know that it differs from what is known as "social housing," like here in Husby and in Sweden, in that it's not publicly owned. I just want to emphasize this: that it is another context of housing, political context that we organize within. So common housing in Denmark can be understood as a social sector between the state and market. Around 20% of all housing in Denmark is common housing, and it consists of a cooperative sector of housing associations with a democratic structure within the association, and it's like self-owned, it's not the public that owns it. It's not the state or the municipality. And each housing has its own local tenant board, that is elected by the community living in the neighborhood, and each housing association has a representative board of tenants that is the highest decision-making organ within the association. So, when we organize, we organize both from within and outside this housing association democratic structure, so we are also fighting against the state expropriating our ... To implement the legislation, they have expropriated money from the democratically owned common housing sector fund.

Beata Hemer: As Marie has explained, *Almen Modstand* is a broad and loosely organized movement, and many different types of resistance initiatives are connected to it. One of those is *Almen Arkiv*, which we (Marie and me) initiated last year. It is a micro-archive that is still in its initial stages, and which is currently finding its form. *Almen Arkiv* came about because we saw a need to collect documentation on the processes surrounding Denmark's current housing policy and the so-called "ghetto legislation"/"Parallel Society Legislation".

We hope and wish that *Almen Arkiv* can contribute to raising transparency and solidarity in processes that are experienced as both complex and difficult to navigate. To collect documents and to make them accessible in part makes it possible to share experiences and knowledge in a way that caught cuts across divisions between neighborhoods – in some areas, demolition and involuntary evictions have already happened, while other areas await the approval of architect-drawn development plans. The archive is also in part a question about which histories are saved for the future and for the afterlife: which narratives are created and what is it that is forgotten in that process? We hope that the documents of the archive can act as witness statements with respect to the violence – yes, violence – that people have experienced as a consequence of Denmark's housing policy.

We believe that we are occupying a historical moment which has radically changed the Danish housing landscape and the urban spaces that make up our city. This raises questions about what kind of city we want to have, who has the right to the city, who can live in central/ attractive neighborhoods, and our right to a safe home ("safe" in the sense that you're not threatened by eviction, and that your neighborhood and surroundings are not transformed or destroyed to the point that you become a stranger in what was once your home, in an expanded sense).

Almen Arkiv is today composed of a collection of archival folders, which organize the collected documents in categories that reflect different levels and perspectives within these processes: agendas from meetings between the municipality and housing organizations; letters, including cancellations of contract and evictions notices, that residents have found in their letterboxes; documents from legal proceedings, including the process that Marie described in Mjølnerparken; the applications for litigation that residents have filed against the state; and also the development plans that architects and planners have worked on, which have then subsequently been approved and implemented. Beyond this, media and newspaper articles are also included. And the sixth category at this stage comprises responses

from residents: that is, their answers and their resistance to these processes. The plan is that this archive will exist in digital form so that the contents are accessible, but also so that it becomes ... more alive. So that it's not just Marie and myself that are collecting material, but that people can also send in material and participate in building up the archive.

But we also see it as crucial that it's ... permitted ... that the archive takes on a physical form so that you can come ... so that it becomes something that can start a conversation. And also, that when you ... I'm thinking that later tonight, you can go through the papers and get an overview of some of the documents and the conversations that we've had about them. So, we are super happy to be able to be here and to see how we can, after this conversation, develop the archive further. Yes.

[applause]

Maryam: Many, many thanks for your insightful presentations. We're so glad that you could take part in the conversation today. The plan now is to pose a number of questions that we [those arranging the event] have formulated and that we would like, I guess, you to answer. And then it's also important for us that there is time left over for the audience to pose questions. So, if you think of something, try to hold onto it and in a little while, we will be passing around, or walking around with, a microphone.

But to throw ourselves straight into the connection between Sweden and Denmark ... Now we have heard Beata and Marie describe the situation in Denmark. It is, of course, quite different from what we're seeing in Sweden, partially because of what Marie described – that the public sector is constructed in a different way here and for this reason community organizing also looks a little different in Denmark compared to Sweden [cough], excuse me – but also that this ... “Parallel Society Legislation” (or however you directly translate it to Swedish) is being implemented in a different manner in Denmark. Things don't look like that in Sweden right now. Just to give a short example of how “vulnerable areas” materialize in a legislative sense, as far as we've been able to find evidence of this, we could look at the way that Migrationsverket [Swedish for “The Department of Immigration”] no longer provides refugees with a daily stipend if they live in a “vulnerable area.” This is being implemented right now. But otherwise, the situation doesn't really reflect that of Denmark, because we have quite a different legislative structure.

My question to the panel is this: We have had an election campaign and are now witnessing the formation of a government in which politicians have started to describe Denmark as a “good example.” What do you think that we can learn from what is happening in Denmark? Where should we direct our attention and what is it that can we learn from? So, partially this is a question to those of you who can answer from a Danish perspective: What do you think that we should take with us and think about and how should we organize ourselves? What would you like to leave us with today? And then, for those of you working in Sweden, on the basis of your observations and what you've heard and taken part in: What are your thoughts around how we should relate to what is going on in our neighboring country?

Nazem: I have one really big thought about this that can be developed in terms of a bunch of stuff. If we look at the declarations around the formation of this government or what is about to happen here in Sweden, it's easy to become very anxious; but if we look towards Denmark it's an instant heart attack.

[laughter]

And the difference is that in Sweden there still exists an opposition towards this type of policy. In Denmark – and correct me if I'm wrong – there is no opposition against such policies. This is the dominant policy position amongst, in principle, all of the state parties, except perhaps the party that is furthest to the left, or perhaps those two parties?

Marie: There are two.

Nazem: Yes, those two. So, imagine that in three elections' time, in 12 years, we have a situation in Sweden whereby the Social Democrats go to the polls with a “parallel society” policy, which means that someone who commits a crime in Husby can lose their housing contract and so on. That type of story has already been told here tonight. It is *then* that you have a heart attack, right?!

We have to defend the opposition in Sweden. And that opposition has to have as many roots as possible within the broader society. In Sweden, it's not possible to

circumvent the established civil society organizations, even if you can go through organizations like *Ort till Ort*. But I mean *Hyresgästföreningen* [Swedish for “the Swedish Tenants’ Union”] is a central organization within Swedish housing politics, as a result of the corporatist model of which they form a part in order to negotiate rents and exert influence in line with the regulations, etc. So, we have to take care, and even radicalize, the established organizations that already exist. Above all, the Social Democratic Party has to be an organization that can both carry and develop our democracy. Right? But it’s totally splintered.

There is no longer any opposition towards a fascist politics. It’s a nightmare scenario that we’re facing now. There exists I think deep within us, within those of us in this room, a deep contempt of above all the urban, liberal middle classes that are supporting parties that are in turn directly entering into agreements with the Swedish Democrats and in this way making possible the nationalist political turn and the conservative turn that we’re seeing today. That’s bad. And it’s that front that we have to work with and that we need to try to develop and expand solidarity around. That’s where we need to try to see ourselves in other people, need to see beyond these rhetorical strategies and political discourses, to see the flesh and blood that actually is politics. And after that, we need to form an understanding about what type of society we want and as a result what party we are going to vote for. However, I also believe that we have to understand that it’s not *just* the middle classes today: we also have to defend the existing organizations. So, it’s also important that we engage in what’s already been established (which we are dissatisfied with), as well as creating new organizations that can apply pressure to the situation from a different angle.

Marlen: I would like to raise the social aspect in this also, from the perspective of children and women, children and young people and women. Time is running out on us and I’m feeling really stressed about that. Thinking also about this issue of “opposition”: in Södertälje, we have a situation where in some areas 4 of 10 votes are going to Sweden Democrats, KD [the Christian Democrats], and M [the Moderate Party]. That’s extremely regrettable. I’m already having a heart attack! [Laughs]. I have ... I feel that we are already facing an extremely serious situation and after 33 years, Södertälje has now voted in a new leadership.

There are also these other social aspects that I’m stressed about. Above all, we also need to work with measures to strengthen democracy for children and

young people. Because it’s them who we’re losing. If we have young people and children who are feeling such hopelessness, who don’t feel included, and don’t feel that their vote counts, that’s also a kind of pandemic. Then, they’re not going to stand up, organize themselves, and take part in the existing ... the existing organizations. And this is the situation that we have in Södertälje. I sound very negative but during the last 10 days we’ve faced enormous challenges and when the political leadership is being exchanged like this it feels pretty dark actually. We’re already there.

Ilhan: There’s actually one thing that we could learn from Denmark. They have a new law that is commonly referred as “Lex Blackstone.” It’s all about preventing private property owners from being able to buy housing and renovate it during a five-year period – that’s what the law was actually about: not being able to buy something and then renovate it and then raise the rent. Because it was like that: they raised the rent! Which meant that *Blackstone* disappeared. And now *Vonovia* are also not there. Snap! They’re gone. This is something that we actually need in Sweden as well. That’s the only thing that I can think of [Laughs]. But I agree ... I get what Nazem’s saying about defending and radicalizing. I would also like to add that we need to be revolutionary. We need revolutionary thinking, even if ...

It’s like this. I sit on the board of my local branch of the Tenants’ Union, and I’m also on the board for the wider Järva area. And there’s not a lot going on there. There’s a lot happening within *Ort till Ort*, and we work with the tenants in a totally different way, while the Tenants’ Union is off somewhere, basically just treading water. And yet, they still come to me and say, “Ilhan, can we have a meeting? Because what you’re doing is great. What should we do?” And then I say, “You could do this or that.” But then: they aren’t able to do it. And yes, in some ways we’re “defending” the Tenants’ Union, but the question remains: How long can we do this? Is it better if we just cut them out, totally? These are questions for all housing activists today.

And then, yeah, it comes down to *how* we will radicalize then. That’s also hard, because sitting on these boards are a bunch of 65-year-old people who don’t want to let go. And these are pensioners, who get a small fee, which gives them a little bit more money in their wallets every year, and that means a lot for them. They’ve been sitting on these boards for 25 years. They have their best friends there, and they’ve drunk coffee and eaten cake together, and the most fun they’ve ever had is on these boards. So, it’s hard to take away something that’s so fantastic for a

group of people. But we absolutely have to do it. In order to radicalize them, we may have to replace them.

But then the question is: Who will replace them? It's like you said, the younger generation, they've lost their sense of being political subjects. That political consciousness isn't going to be around for much longer. They have a lot of information, a lot of knowledge, but the practical experience isn't there anymore, as I see it. The will exists, the anger exists, the frustration exists. But to take that step and say, "I'm going to join this board and sit in these meetings"? That's far off. A ... certain space opens up there that we need to revolutionize. We have to think about community organizing. We need to think about how we will organize ourselves today compared to 100 years ago when the Tenants' Union was established. They had incredible strategies to engage in the struggle: strategies that were radical and revolutionary, that delivered the mandate that they have today. They also got where they got because of the market – because they were embraced by capital. It looked after them. And now they're stuck in a position where they wonder if they can be radical. It's hard to defend them. Perhaps, for this reason, we need revolution.

I've been thinking along these lines, taking as a point of departure this local context. Everyone needs to find their own local context, in order to create a structure for themselves and the people around them, their neighbors and fellow residents – a context in which they can create a platform that works for them and allows them to work with the problems that arise in that area. I'm going to say it again: we have to work with local problems that we can solve, we have to start with the critical problems affecting *where we are*. That's my thinking.

Marie: Yes, I'm very much in line with the way of organizing that you are describing. I think we need to ... The grassroots organizing and democratic organizing in Denmark, as I explained a bit before about the common housing sector grew out of the workers' movement 100 years ago, and in the 1970s. It was first in the 1970s that the tenants' democracy was established and it came out of a lot of tenant organizing, using all kinds of methods over a very long period of time to pressure housing associations to reform themselves and to establish tenant democracy. And I think we have to learn from this kind of democratically rooted organizing and coming together.

What we have experienced in Denmark is that the tenant democracy within the housing associations has in many places become, like, sleepy or bureaucratized,

or it went through processes where there have almost been, like, micro-neoliberal transformations within the organizations. The way the housing organizations work, has become less democratic and more professionalized. And what we are fighting for in *Almen Modstand* is also to reactivate and to awaken and create a new culture of active tenant democracy where people are actually engaging and taking ownership over their own neighborhoods. And I think this is the foundation of a democratic movement and a democratic culture that we have to reinvent, that we have to do self-organizing. I believe that *that* is the foundation needed before we can get ... try to get power within the parliamentary organs for instance.

And one thing that has been very important for us in *Almen Modstand*, I believe, is the importance of care and emphasizing the reproductive work or invisible work within organizing. So, it's really about ... When we have to find each other and come together, it's really about creating relations and taking the time to visit each other and to have conversations with each other and take care of each other. And it has been shown also through our experience with organizing so far that some of the foundation of our organizing goes through the everyday local network of care that exists within our neighborhoods. Where people use each other in their everyday lives to get along, because people live in underprivileged circumstances. And these networks, especially often women's networks, have shown themselves to be the foundation ... of our organization. So, I think we really have to remember this aspect: *the care aspect* of organizing.

Also, in relation to your question, Maryam, about how we can learn from each other more concretely, I feel like just being here ... I wish that I had my co-organizers and tenants with me, and I am so pleased to meet you. I really hope that we can keep contact, that we can visit you again or you can come to Denmark. We should really exchange methods.

Beata: [begins speaking English] Yes. I'm thinking of ... No, sorry
[switches to Swedish] Swedish! I mean, I've been thinking about the question of *who* you are, *what background* you have, and *which position* you're working from. I was presented here as an architect, and I can speak from that position – from within a profession that's a part of implementing these laws. The quote on the wall behind me, "You can, quite simply, say 'no'": I don't know if that's from an architect or a resident, but it brings architects to mind. We can actually say "no" to participating in these processes. And another thing that I think we can also

do is to ally ourselves – we could thus talk about some kind of radicalization within the architectural profession, which would take the form of architects allying themselves with, for example, *Almen Modstand*. *Almen Modstand* has developed their own development plan, which ensures that people aren't evicted, but that plan is not something that many architects have seen. So, creating some kind of connection, an alliance, between the people working in these processes and the activists, so that it doesn't become a "them" and "us" division – which we've seen a lot, this rhetoric that divides us into. I think that ... alliances can break such divisions.

Maryam: I'm going to jump in where you left off, Beata: that is, perhaps, in the question of which perspectives are most prominent within different professional groups. The yellow quotes that you see here, which my colleague Sara also mentioned in her welcome, are quotes from evidence statements given by housing activists within these ongoing processes in Copenhagen. And one of those people wanted to say "you can simply say 'no'" to the architects implementing the policy that is currently being introduced in Denmark. The question that I wanted to pose to you – to those of you who want to answer this – relates to the fact that within professions like architecture and urban planning, and even perhaps within the more general ... general media discourse, there is often a focus, when addressing the suburbs, on architecture and on *form* [laughs] and *materiality*, I guess you'd call it – *on how these areas look*, on their formal characteristics – and perhaps, in some cases, much less focus on the social structures.

Another quote from our Danish comrades, which we can read here, talks about the example of the widows who suffer so much from these demolitions and forced evictions, because they're people who have lived their whole lives in these places. ... They become very clearly victims of the destruction of these social structures. And Nazem, in your research, you describe the suburbs as both dream and nightmare, which I think is really a part of utopian thinking from the very start. In contrast, then, the discussion today very much constitutes a kind of *othering* of the suburbs – this is the suburbs as *nightmare* – that describes an anonymous architecture, and similar narratives. So, I thought I would ask you what you think ... about how we can deal with this focus on architecture at the cost of content, of the social aspects of life in the suburbs? We can perhaps start with Ilhan, because you've also written about this in your report on *Hembla*, which I think really in some ways shows both sides of this coin.

Ilhan: [Laughs]. "The *Hembla* Hell": architecture within "The *Hembla* Hell"? I'll try to find a connection. I don't know if I really understand the question, but I'm thinking of the example of access balconies, courtyards, meeting rooms that face the courtyards, and openness in the courtyards: this is a kind of architecture where people can meet. We have this in Husby. That's something good. If I understand architecture in this way ... am I getting what you were saying?

Maryam: Definitely. So, like, in my view, "renovictions", for example, are also a way of not taking care of architecture ...

Ilhan: Right. OK, so, it's about both the courtyards and the apartments. These apartments were built in the 1970s as part of the "Million Program". And they need to be repaired. And, because no one's done that in a while, they say, "We have to do a total renovation!". But there are huge differences in how different companies perform total renovations, and their [*Hembla's/Vonovia's*] renovations are of course completely substandard. The quality is terrible both in terms of the execution but also in terms of the materials they use. And that's harmful. After getting ... when someone has had their apartment renovated, the interior is often destroyed afterwards, which is a shame for the next person that moves in.

And so, when you've been living there for a couple of years, you start to notice that "OK, but now I need to replace this, or I need a new that," and then, of course, you get no help. And it's then that things just stop working. Beyond the renovated apartments, there are also a high number of renovated apartments, and in those, we see water damage – damage to people's furniture – and water leaks in ceilings. There are serious mold problems in those apartments. So, it's just screaming "health hazard" and "safety issue" if you choose to remain in those apartments. And *Vonovia* puts pressure on these people and says we can perform a total renovation of your apartment but then you will have to deal with a 55% increase in rent. And then people just don't do it. Even though you have a right to maintenance.

This ... in academic terms it's called "displacement" ... is *an attempt to get people to leave*. And the feeling that you don't have a home today, that you have nowhere else to go either, produces a deep anxiety. And it's somewhere there that this struggle becomes important, this attempt to say, "I want to stay, and I demand to be able to decide the standard." It's in that way that we protect our rights. And it's

also at that point that people come together, and that's the collective force capable of producing change. We're trying to achieve a change here, by saying, "Listen, this is not working. You can't do this!" And if they don't want to accept that well, then there's a conflict, in this architectural environment which you ... or, which we ... are trying to raise as a serious problem. Because these companies are also *samhällsbyggare* ["society builders"]. Back in the day, when the "Million Program" was built, it was the municipal housing companies who were the society builders. The municipal housing company *Svenska Bostäder* own the neighborhood center [ed.: in Husby], but this company [*Vonovia*] want to create their own neighborhood center, their own place, where people ... which will raise the market value and status of the place and change the people who live here into something totally different. And that's – yeah, another word people recognize – "gentrification." That's the kind of process that we're talking about here. And that's the direction that resistance is taking.

But we need to talk about these things, because *samhällsutveckling* ["societal development"] is both a terminology and an agenda, both amongst municipal politicians but also amongst normal people living here. And we wonder: what's happening? We see *Folkets Husby*, and they're going to renovate this; or the center, where there are vacant shopfronts because the rents are too high for people out here to be able to lease them. Who wants to invest in this place, with all the shouting that's going on? We're calling out for something completely different. And that's where we are at. To return to the environment: our solution is to somehow, in some way, arrive at the notion that it is perhaps we that have to create these changes ourselves.

Maryam: Does anyone want to add anything? Nazem, you put your hand up.

Marie: I just want to explain about some of the architectural patterns we see in Denmark when they're implementing the "ghetto legislation". So, they ... There's this narrative or this discourse about these neighborhoods as being "closed off" from the rest of society, and not part of the rest of the society. And a lot of the areas or neighborhoods that are targeted, they [were built in line with] so-called "modernist" architecture principles. And so, there's also a big architectural shift. Just to make it very concrete, I want to describe Mjølnerparken for you again. Mjølnerparken has four kinds of yards, you can say, that align with each other. And the way you enter your stairwell or your apartment through the

yards, and the yards are also connected by a little road. And there's no cars or anything inside, so it's only playgrounds and green areas in the middle of all these yards. And there's also balconies facing the inside of the yards too.

Then comes the "ghetto" legislation, under this paradigm that we have to open up the areas and make it become a part of the city and make it become part of society again. So, what you do is that you separate each yard from each other so that they're not connected anymore. You turn the way you enter your apartment to the outside of the yard, and also close off the yard so it's also not ... you cannot exit it publicly. And you also take away all the balconies in the yard. So, all this common space, that's what you're going to remove, and then you're going to turn it outwards to the streets. Then, you make shopping streets between all the yards instead. And you sell off properties or you sell the two ... blocks and yards in the middle, so the last two outer yards that are left with common housing tenants left, they are also even more apart socially. They cannot really meet each other easily through everyday rhythms.

So, what you create is entities ... you can say entities wherein households are closed off and become *bordered entities* of nuclear families that are not connected to bigger family structures where you help each other in the everyday life like we see now. So, it's all the common areas and all the common social activities that're closed off. Now it's just like, you are one entity, when you step out of your apartment you go out to the shopping street. You are becoming a consumer and ... in a household ... a household of consumers, instead of being part of an everyday social network where you help each other out. So, this is ... there are also a lot of neo-liberal tendencies within the architecture that are implemented here and there's also an architecture that had values and ideals for creating a common life and extended households, as we see also in Mjølnerparken or other neighborhoods, where people are helping each other in everyday life. And the architecture that allows this is also erased.

From the audience: The audience was also going to be able to take part?

Maryam: Yes, I'm about to open it up.

Nazem: Definitely let the audience in, but I just have to say one more thing.

[laughter]

What the danger is with the “ghetto” legislation, if it is introduced in Sweden, is that we will probably begin demolishing “Million Program” areas, because that’s what’s been going on in Denmark. I’ve seen photographs from amongst other places Århus and is it called Hellerup?

Marie: Gellerup.

Nazem: Gellerup, a traditional, modernist, what would you say, area of tower buildings, which is being demolished in order to build student housing (or something similar). And in 2005, when *Svenska Bostäder*, the municipal housing company here in Husby, put forward their future plans for Husby, they also involved demolitions. Which shows these ideas exist in Swedish housing and architectural and planning policy. And or facing a very absurd situation when it comes to architects build ... designing ... which if you do it well, you’ve designed a nice building. When you do it in an area like Husby or another suburban neighborhood you say that you have “counteracted segregation.” I don’t get that logic. Because it’s not logical.

Given this, I’m accusing you architects, you urban planners, for having built up a discourse – and it’s not only your fault, there’s a lot of money to be made in converting attractive areas in large cities like Stockholm and many of your commissions come from actors that want to do things in these areas – that has contributed to grounding a way of seeing the problems in our cities in terms of *segregation*, and doing so in such a way that such problems are only perceived to exist in the built environments of these particular areas. You could have articulated something very different. And it’s a real shame, given that you are really smart and you have the tools to be able to articulate something different. But you have failed in your profession and your research and your theory and your knowledge production to articulate another vision. The starting point should have been an acknowledgement that you can’t achieve change in a class-based society using architecture. But good architecture can improve people’s quality of life, am I right?

And I level this accusation at you because you’ve asked me to do it, and many of you are sitting in the audience here today, but in general one could accuse all the professions of contributing to the same thing. It’s the background to much of your

work. We have a failing school system, because we attempted to address the poor quality of our education with help from privatization, which only made the problem worse, and so on. So, within the professions it’s all about quite simply *doing better* and attempting to see yourselves in others.

It’s a fact that the highly educated professionals who control many of the activities and much of the policy affecting cities do not come from these areas. They don’t have this background and they don’t share these insights. Occasionally, they might participate in this type of conversation – they might meet a person like Ilhan or someone else and feel inspired. But when they go back to the office, it’s someone else that’s paying their salary and that person wants something else. And it’s really hard for us to do something just by wishing that things were different, right? We have to have counterweights, to counter the forces that steer broader power structures. But somewhere it all has to start within us, right? I think it’s important to raise that perspective: What can each one of us do about this?

Marlen: Yes, thanks for raising this! Really! I wish that our efforts were not needed. If things had have worked, none of it would have been necessary. I started by saying that we began in a panic, and that was because I am a mother of three children, who attended these schools where students are assessed as speaking Swedish “as a second language.” So, I really wish ... I really wish that all these privatizations had not been necessary. It takes a toll to think about it and also to engage in some form of organizing ... against this.

Thinking about architecture because that was what you ... To just give one example. I think that I have a good idea of how it looks, visually, in other areas in Stockholm, for instance in Stockholm’s inner city. But they have the same problems that are ascribed to the so-called “suburbs.” In the “segregated” areas. It’s really all about what one can access in terms of existing services, about how these apartments are renovated, about what they are there for, and what exists in terms of societal infrastructure [*samhällsservice*] and not just buildings.

[applause]

Maryam: Thank you. What I’m going to do is pose one last question (and that’s going to be my final question) before I open up to the audience.

Many people feel very frustrated right now. We came to know about the “Tidö Agreement” – which guides the composition of the government and contains a bunch of pretty disturbing-sounding proposals – only yesterday. Memories of the election campaign, in which much of the focus lay on already vulnerable groups and employed a racist rhetoric, are still fresh. We have heard about ADHD screening, the admonishment of parents of children experiencing difficulties, language tests for infants, stop-and-search zones, etc., etc. So, there's a lot of work to be done and we need to ask ourselves, yeah, what we can all do on different levels (this has already been addressed): at the grassroots level, within different types of organizations, and so on.

I now wanted to ask the panel about the opportunities that they see with respect to solidarity. You've already to some extent addressed these terms-solidarity, collaboration, building alliances-so how are we going to collaborate quite simply in order to achieve change with respect to these issues?

Marlen: I can start. When it comes to housing and the like, you are really experts in that. To keep thinking this through, we need to increase our education and our capacity to resist, by teaching children at an early age, and teaching their parents, about social engagement. We need to be able to understand what's going on around us if we are to address the violence and address the racism (which is also hurting us). It's really a public health issue. We are become sick from racism. Our bodies hurt from constantly experiencing, and being in, and living in, potential “crime scenes” – which is how they are described, but also how I experience them. The narrative also needs to change, but at its most simple it's all about mobilizing, about forming and informing ourselves, so that we can also constitute a force of resistance in these questions.

[applause]

Ilhan: I see a couple of different aspects in this. There are two different alliances: on the one hand [*sound recording missing*], and on the other, there are people who don't work with housing or perhaps community organizing and it's for them that I want to encourage you all, after this conversation, to think about where you live and about how the opportunities to organize look in your area. Which neighbors do you know and how would you take the next step in

raising consciousness about what's going on? We had those kinds of conversations today at *Solidaritetshuset*. And with a view to the “Tidö Agreement” that is being put in place here, fascist elements in society are becoming larger and stronger, and we need a certain solidarity. But it's not solidarity *with Husby* that is needed: it's solidarity *in your areas*, with the people who will be hardest hit by the policies to come. It's there that you need to think through things. I really liked what one person said today, a resident from Sundbyberg, who wanted to demonstrate “for the suburbs.” And I don't know how you do that, I really don't. Each of you can think about what you can do, or ... for those who live in this area.

This isn't just a suburban problem, either; we're all affected by this. On one hand, there is also hope, because in all of the big cities (Uppsala, Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmö) the left is gaining traction. And as Nazem said earlier, a strong opposition in fact exists in urban environments, even if we wished that it was even stronger and even more radical (“defending” and “radicalizing” again!). But we're losing people in sparsely populated areas, in the countryside, and it's there that SD has its roots, which we are seeing. The politics is similar – when much of the social infrastructure disappears and people have to move out because there's nothing to stay – to that in the suburbs, but we aren't offering any solutions in relation to these issues. And as long as we fail to find solutions, SD will continue to win ground, because they have a certain type of solution. So ... I think the most important thing that we can do is just continue the job that we've been doing over the last few years in our big cities.

But radicalize. We've defended, but we need to radicalize (I'm using this word a lot, I must like it). Defend, radicalize ... but after we have defended and after we have radicalized, then we also need to think in new ways and *revolutionize*. And that comes about when one has already begun to get organized, because you have to take one step at a time. The first thing that you can do is to go back to your local neighborhood and think: What can I do here, and with whom can I do it?

Marie: I don't know if I have anything to add but yeah, I agree that we should all organize in our everyday life, where we live or work or study; and we should also find ... we should *build* ... democratic structures from the ground up, together; and we should also be worried about this strong polarization that is happening in our societies all over Europe. Depending on what kind of social position each of us have, we also have different privileges to enter different social segments of society, and I think we should all use the privileges we have and

the social environments that we can enter to challenge the polarization, and the fascism, and the racism – the racist tendencies growing out of that.

So maybe not everybody has the same privilege or accessibility ... and many, for many reasons, cannot enter some of the social environments where this brutalization and totalitarian tendencies are growing. But for people who can, I think that they should use this privilege and not leave these social environments but stay there and insist on other perspectives. And I think it's so important also that when we fight racism and patriarchy of all forms, I think it's so important that we also think about social class. And yeah, to include it all in our analyses and just to keep building solidarity. And to keep hope, also, even though these are really tough times. Yeah.

Beata: Okay. I also thought while trying to find an answer to your question, Maryam, it would be to use our privileges ... No, yeah
[switches to Swedish]: Swedish. Sorry!

[laughter]

It's like, as architects, we often have privileges and power in these processes that we don't use. And I reckon that's not because we don't want to, but because we don't know how to do it. For that, we need to learn from activists and from residents and from the environments that we are taking part in transforming. Because there's a lot going on that is often made invisible there. Many architects work from a distance and don't see the everyday life that actually takes place, sometimes talking about an area as if it completely lacked human activity ... because they don't see that activity or the social networks that in fact exist in the area that they're working with, that they're drawing plans for. So, I think, yeah, it's about using your privileges.

Ilhan: One reaction ... speaking of privilege... relates to a thought that came to me today, which has to do with the repressive politics that we're seeing here, and specifically with stop-and-search zones. In cases where that attack comes to be deployed by police on our people and populations, we need people who are white and privileged to stand up. Civil courage is what is needed. You need to be in the areas where these things are going to happen, and you need to stand up when it comes to this stuff. It's very bloody important. Don't forget it and try to do it.

[applause]

Nazem: Just briefly ... When Sweden became a democracy, over 100 years ago, the situation was much worse than today. People didn't have housing. People didn't have healthcare. People didn't have the right to go to school, the right to education, and so on. But despite this, Sweden managed to democratize, right? And political activists were also attacked back then. So: it's possible. It's possible. What happened back then was that every 4th Swede was an active Social Democrat. Today, in general, less than 2% of the population are active in a political party, and even fewer pursue dreams of radical democracy in their activism. And if we look at the working class, particularly the marginalized working class who live here, then it's a minuscule proportion who are represented in politics.

What do we have then? Even so, what is it that we have that we can build upon? There are many people in this country who are active at the community level. But they're organizing *for themselves*: for their hobbies, for self-actualization. You dance in a choir [sic] or participate in a study circle about something that you think is interesting ... A million people in Sweden today take part in some form of study circle every year. That's something to build upon. Very many people take their kids to non-commercial collective activities, just because they're passionate about something, whether it's riding horses or playing football or whatever.

Very many people volunteer because they believe in something. If we could only get each of those contexts to be a little bit more radical, and by that, I mean that we dream of becoming a little more democratic, each time we catch up, if we dream of becoming a little more just, if we act and practice that, then we have in any case a strong base to stand on. And with that comes perhaps other possibilities.

[applause]

Maryam: Thank you. I see a lot of hands waving. Over there is a gentleman who has been waving for quite some time in fact, so I will begin at the far end there. All yours!

Audience: Thanks for the possibility to speak. And thank you all for your concerns, those of you who have spoken. If I look around, you're talking about us in Järva, but the majority of you don't

live here. And the people who should be concerned are the people who live here, unfortunately. But I am happy that you came. The other thing is that you have talked about politicians: the opposition and others. I just wanted to say that I'm also worried about that side of politics. Because we today have two urban districts that the conservatives wanted to combine, Tensta and Rinkeby. But the new majority that's coming into power [a Social Democrat-led coalition at the municipal level], what do they do? "Wow, we're taking over, let's make our own!" And for that reason, they intend to reduce services, reduce benefits. We will... The battle has started, friends: we're going to stop this. We cannot combine Tensta and Rinkeby and Spånga in order to reduce services; we won't accept that.

The last thing I want to ask is this: They call me [sic] "particularly vulnerable area," but why? It's the police that have gathered us together like this. OK, but is it because of me as a person – because of those of us who live here – or because of the building? That's what I want to know. Is it the building that is particularly vulnerable or is it me as a person? Thank you.

[applause]

Audience: Thanks so much. I was talking about, as Ilhan said, the fact that this discussion has to be revolutionary, we have to think about the future. Perhaps even break some existing patterns ... and we have to start to think in new ways. Perhaps we have to, you might say, shift paradigms, within our thinking. And I wanted to say that in fact the greatest antagonist that we need to deal with right now, in this climate crisis, is what is referred to as the "Anthropocene." In other words, a human-centered view. The question cannot be solved within capitalism, within this market economy and this egotistical mindset where capital holds all the power. I believe that at the very least, we need to think in terms of collectivity and solidarity. We have to act in solidarity amongst ourselves but also with the third world, with the poor. Right now, there are huge numbers of people who live in ... who don't even know what electricity is. But here, we have heaps of comfortable things. I also think that one thing we need to encourage our children to do is to ... live a little, mix with others, with people who are affected. And even learn from nature. For example, I run a guerilla gardening project, where we in principle ignore bureaucracy. And we do exactly what is required by climate change. And when we build, we do so with cargo pallets, so the buildings are small. We learn from

the rats – from how, for example, they survive the winter. How did the Vikings survive, our forefathers here as well? I believe that that we have to find such things out. And if we could locate those ideas, and develop alternatives either individually or in groups, and we could try, for example, with 5,000 families to move to the county and explore permaculture. There is a lot of interesting technology; there's a lot you can find by searching Google and YouTube and the like. If we were to try these kinds of things, the whole of capitalism and the housing market would surely collapse, and ... prices would drop and everything. Perhaps we need to find such solutions so that they lose really slowly.

But what I wanted to say, my question is to those of you here from Denmark. I think that one thing that we can learn from Denmark is the result of a really great experiment: Christiania. In Christiania, they give the entire establishment the finger. The whole of capitalism. They do what they want, independently. Perhaps that's something that we have to do on Järvafältet: test something like Christiania and in that way create a whole new part, that doesn't conform to the alternatives offered by the establishment.

[applause]

Maryam: I'll continue on with the microphone, but you are welcome to respond if you'd like.

Majsa Allelin: [from the audience] Who should go... them or me? Shall I? OK. Yes, thank you so much for the interesting comments and conversation, and the valuable public contributions. I wanted ... Yeah, I wanted to return to some of the discussions that you were having earlier around how ... how architecture doesn't change social relations, how it has nothing to do with them? Class relations lie beneath everything (everything!) and so ... we have to infiltrate the existing structures that we still have the potential to access and where we can change perspectives. And with that said, I think I've experienced an increasing sense over the years, listening to conversations and writing texts about housing questions and segregation, that to a large extent, the discussion has become very "siloe" [stuprörsorganiserat]. It's often architects, urban planners, housing researchers, activists combatting renovations, and so on, present in these spaces. And that is of course really important. If local activism is to be possible, though, that's about areas

in their totality, including the social relations; then, we also need to widen the conversation, I think, to include, for example, the local social services office. We have to include the principals and the teachers that work in these areas. We have to include, I don't know, SL [Stockholm Public Transport] for that area [laughs]. Anything, all the other occupations that are also part of affecting and forming these everyday social relations.

And if I think about Gothenburg, where my empirical focus lies, in the research I've been doing in relation to what has been talked about today, then it is capital that has developed exactly such robust models. We have, for example, "Gårdstensmodellen" in Angered, where private landlords are collaborating with police, security companies, schools, and social services. They have a model for this, and that model is being deployed in an increasingly greater number of, and we can even see it being used in other countries. So, in that case, they have succeeded in coordinating with local actors and adopting a holistic approach, but with these landlords behind the reins, exerting control, created a society of micro-control in such areas.

So, I think that we on the left, or working with resistance, have to also begin to organize ourselves and to speak about housing questions with other occupational groups that don't directly work with "society building" or housing construction or... etc. Yeah, that was it.

Nazem: Can I quickly answer this one? Amin, are you able to stand up? Amin Barkhadle is a central revolutionary figure in Sweden today. Why?! Well ... [laughs]

[laughter]

[applause]

Nazem: Amin, you work at *Folkets Hus och Parker* [from Swedish, "National Association Folkets Hus och Parker," an organization that looks after "people's houses" and "people's parks" across Sweden], is that correct?

Amin Barkhadle: [from the audience] Correct!

Nazem: Can you explain a little bit about what you're working with and why it's important, from the perspective that Majsja is raising, with respect to uniting different types of people? Can I perhaps explain for you?

Amin: Hi, my name is Amin Barkhadle and I actually live here in Järva but ... you can maybe do it, but it's going to be pretty long, really long ...

Nazem: No, but you should do it! Please ...

Amin: Hi, my name is Amin Barkhadle and I actually live here in Järva, but I work for a national organization that is called *Folkets Hus och Parker*. I was listening to what was being said but I can pretty easily try to sum this up. We're talking about democratization, and you mentioned what was going on 100 years ago. One of the established organizations that continues to live on today and that in fact existed 100 years ago is *Folkets Hus och Parker*. There are perhaps others, and perhaps we don't need to name them all, perhaps there are other people working at those who are here tonight, but the important thing is to make sure that these organizations play their intended role in these new times.

Because somewhere along the way, on the journey those organization took – we can call it a class journey, or some other kind of journey – they lost sight of their founding principle. And it's somehow very important that we revitalize these organizations, transform them, or rejuvenate them, build self-reflexivity within these institutions and organizations which in fact need to return to their founding principles. Because there exists a possibility for them to play an important role in terms of the changes that we want to see, both politically and in organizational sense.

Nazem: What was the founding idea? What was the founding idea for Folkets Hus ["the people's house"]?

Amin: The people! To gather people. For people to meet, to be able to organize meetings, to be a physical meeting place both in the form of a park but also the form of a building. That's the founding principle. Today it's a bit ... more like a service ... how can I put it ... like business services and ...

it's taken on a different role. And *Folkets Hus och Parker*, I should of course be self-critical, but they are not alone in that. There are other organizations that have taken a similar journey, that have taken on other rolls, dressed themselves in other kinds of clothes ... Now I'm just trying to simplify this, so that it can be quick. But feel free to add something.

Audience: Yes, I would like to defend – how to put this? – our neighborhoods. The “Million Program” neighborhoods. They were built when Sweden was at its most progressive. These areas are being attacked because ... and our Danish comrades have described this ... they are trying to break our communities apart, by turning the balconies in the wrong direction, by dividing people. Our areas are traffic-separated. We have had schools within walking distance. We have had [well] planned public transport. We have had traffic-free areas, so you could send your kids to the shop to buy milk when they were small, and so on, and to play without being run over by cars.

These areas that have also become what we call “multicultural,” with people from different countries living in them. And some people are scared of that: such people don't want a window on the world, they want to decide themselves what people think and prefer. They don't want opinions that they can't control. And we have far too many security guards in our areas. I would like to propose that we re-educate the guards. (And that we provide remuneration for this.) 70% of them could become park attendants, sanitation workers, or maintenance workers, or something else that they might be interested in doing. And then we could divide up the area so that residents living in the area, can work here, then take care of their part. Everything is planned from the outside and from above, and this is a major problem. We need democracy.

[applause]

Audience: I mean, I'm really curious about this audience. There are lots of people that I have never seen before here. I identify myself as a resident of Järva. I would like to know how many people here identify as residents of Järva? How many are students of some kind of future oriented profession like architects and how many people are already urban planners today?

[laughter]

Maryam: We have a lady... can I get help in passing this [microphone] on?

Audience: Yes, on the matter of traffic separation: I think it's really good. It's one of the best things that we have in this area. I have a visual impairment, so I am uneasy about crossing streets with a lot of traffic and I think traffic separation is very comforting. But it's not totally safe for us, because there are so many other types of vehicles that are out there now – all of those electric scooters that come at you so quickly! And there are cars driving here, even if they drive slowly. It's gotten better now. But all of the electric scooters they feel a little bit dangerous sometimes when driven at such speeds.

And ... I was thinking of another thing also: when talking about drugs, drugs are seen as driving, for example, criminality, but what is seldom talked about is what we can do to stop people from buying them, to get those coming from Lidingö and Danderyd to buy drugs. What is it that makes people that live in those areas – so-called “Swedish,” nice, rich areas – what is it that makes so many people use drugs in the same way that they would use alcohol because they want a so-called “kick”? What can be done so that they ... so that the kick becomes less important? How can one get them to stop wanting the kick that drugs can deliver? What can we do? If we could get rid of the motivation, young people's desire to buy drugs, then very many other problems would solve themselves, I think.

Maryam: Thanks! I was thinking of the question that you posed there. If we do a quick raising of hands? Can you repeat it?

Audience: How many people identify themselves as Järva residents here in the audience? Raise your hand now. And how many are looking to become urban planners? OK, that was not so many. And how many *already are* urban planners or architects or something like that?

Maryam: Yeah, that was more.

Audience: Interesting. Thank you.

Maryam: You could say that we have a mix of Järva residents and planners here in the audience. It's approaching 7pm. Thank you

for staying with us and listening and engaging. I see that there are still many hands in the air, so there is a lot more to talk about, but food is waiting for us. So, for everyone who's interested in staying and sharing a bite to eat and continuing the discussion with each other, and finding people who can engage in community organization with you, or if you would like to keep chatting with the panel, you are very welcome to stay! Thank you so much and I hope that we can continue the conversation and thank you to our dearest panel members!

Vittnesseminarium organiserat av Aktion Arkiv på Folkets Husby med stöd av ARQ Forskningsstiftelsen för samhälls- och byggnadsplanering, projektering (5:2020), och FFNS Stiftelse för forskning, utveckling och utbildning (2020:14)

Panelister	Marlen Eskander, socialantropolog, verksamhetschef och grundare av Läsföräldrarnas Institutet, Sverige
	Beata Hemer, arkitekt och grundare av Almen Arkiv, Danmark
	Ilhan Kellecioglu, aktiv i Ort till Ort och författare till "Rapport inifrån Hemblahelvetet", Sverige
	Marie Northrup, antropolog och medlem i föreningen Initiativet for Retfærdig Boligpolitik, och Almen Modstand samt grundare av Almen Arkiv, Danmark
	Nazem Tahvilzadeh, statsvetare och demokratiforskare, Sverige
Moderator	Maryam Fanni, Aktion Arkiv
Introduktion:	Sara Brolund de Carvalho, Aktion Arkiv

Solidaritet i tider av repressiv politik: Ett seminarium om verkningarna av begreppen "särskilt/utsatta områden"

Transkribering

Lördag 15 oktober 2022, Folkets Husby

Sara Brolund de Carvalho: Hej! Roligt att se så många i publiken idag! Tack för att ni är här och tack till våra gäster, de ska presenteras lite senare.

Välkomna till ett seminarium om verkningarna av begreppen "utsatta" och "särskilt utsatta områden", som vi kallar "Solidaritet i tider av repressiv politik". Vi som organiserar är Maryam Fanni, Heidi Svenningsen Kajita, Jennifer Mack, Helena Mattsson, Svava Riesto och Meike Schalk, och jag heter Sara Brolund de Carvalho, från forskningsgruppen Aktion Arkiv.

Detta seminarium är del två, kan vi säga. Det är svårt med glasögon här känner jag [skratt]. Del två av ett seminarium, eller fortsättningen på ett seminarium som vi gjorde för ett år sedan, cirka ett år sedan, i Köpenhamn, som hette "Caring for plans – stories of the parallel society package", där hyresgäster och aktivister, från

framför allt Almen Modstand [allmänt motstånd], berättade om konsekvenser och erfarenheter av den så kallade ”parallelsamfunds-pakken”, det som tidigare hette ”Ghettoplanen”, eller ”Ghettopakken”.

Jag ska snart ge ordet till min kollega Maryam Fanni som ska presentera vår panel, men jag vill bara uppmärksamma, att i rummet så har vi lite utställningsmaterial. De gula affischerna är från det seminariet som jag nämnde, från förra året, med citat från de hyresgäster och aktivister som var med då. Så titta gärna på det efteråt. Sen har vi våra gäster från Danmark, som har en mindre utställning av Almen Arkiv, där borta. Titta gärna på det. Sedan har vi också en kartläggning av arkitekten och forskaren Maria Ärlemo, som heter ”Deonstruktionen av välfärdssamhället”, som är en jämförelsestudie mellan 1977 och 2014 över välfärdssamhällets krympande tillgång till publika lokaler, service och möteslokaler för boende i Husby. Så titta gärna närmare på det också!

[applåder]

Maryam Fanni: Hallå, hej. Maryam Fanni heter jag. Säger som Sara, fantastiskt roligt att se att så många har valt att spendera sin lördagseftermiddag tillsammans med oss här på Folkets Husby. Jag ska moderera panelsamtalet idag, så jag tänker att först och främst vill jag uppmuntra er panelister att komma fram och ta plats. Välkomna upp.

[applåder]

Maryam: Innan jag presenterar er så vill jag ställa en fråga till rummet. Det är nämligen så att en av panelisterna kan antingen göra sitt anförande och prata på danska, eller engelska, så att om det finns ett önskemål där, så skulle vi kunna [skratt] bestämma det tillsammans helt enkelt. Är det bättre att det görs på engelska?

[samstämmigt ja]

Maryam: Okej [skratt]. Är det okej då Marie? Ja. För vi pratade om det tidigare, att det kan vara, ibland för oss som inte har jättemycket exponering mot danskan, kan det vara svårt att hänga

med i danska om man inte är van. Och på samma sätt då så, i och med att vi har dansktalande personer här som inte är lika vana vid att höra svenska, så vill jag också uppmuntra panelisterna att, alltså ni svensktalande, att prata tydligt och kanske lite långsammare än vanligt om man pratar jättesnabbt. Så förstår vi alla varandra.

Jag kommer presentera er, kort bara, och sen kommer varje panelist ha ungefär fem minuter på sig att mer ingående presentera sig, och vad de arbetar med och hur de kopplar an till dagens tema. För, som Sara sa, så är vi en forskningsgrupp som har anordnat det här panelsamtalet som ett sätt att undersöka likheter och skillnader mellan Sverige och Danmark vad gäller begreppet som i Sverige kallas ”utsatta områden” eller ”särskilt utsatta områden”, och som i Danmark är en politik som kallas för ”Parallelsamfundspaketet”. Med oss idag så har vi här, närmast mig, Nazem Tahvilzadeh, doktor i offentlig förvaltning och forskare vid Malmö universitet, snart vid Södertörns högskola, som forskar mycket på demokrati och civilsamhällsfrågor. Vi har Marlen Eskander, socialantropolog, baserad i Södertälje, och verksamhetschef och grundare av Läsfremjarinstitutet, som du kommer berätta mer om också. Vi har Ilhan Kellecioglu, statsvetare eller forskningsassistent vid Institutet för bostads- och urbanforskning vid Uppsala universitet, om jag har förstått det rätt, och aktiv i Ort till Ort, författare till rapporten ”Rapport inifrån Hembelhelvetet”, som tar avstamp här i Husby.¹ Och Marie Northrup, antropolog, baserad i Köpenhamn och medlem i föreningen Initiativet for retfaerdig boligpolitik, och engagerad i Almen Modstand och Almen Arkiv. Och längst bort har vi Beata Hemer [hostning], idag ackompanjerad också av sin son. Beata är arkitekt, baserad i Köpenhamn, och engagerad i Almen Arkiv. Med det så ger jag ordet till Nazem, att börja med att berätta mer om vem du är, vad du arbetar med och på vilket sätt ditt forskningsengagemang knyter an till dagens tematik.

Nazem Tahvilzadeh: Tack så mycket. Hörs jag? Förlåt mig, kan du bara upprepa dagens tematik, så jag inte gör något fel här [skratt]?

Maryam: Precis. Rubriken för dagens panel är ”Solidaritet i tider av repressiv politik”, och det är särskilt begreppen ”utsatta områden” och ”särskilt utsatta områden” som är fokus för samtalet idag, för att vi är nyfikna på hur utvecklingen har sett ut i Danmark och med tanke på att svenska

politiker har uttryckt att man skulle kunna se Danmark som ett föregångsland i den här frågan, så är vi naturligtvis nyfikna på att lära oss mer av situationen där och förstå hur de förhåller sig till det här begreppet, hur begreppen ”utsatta områden” och ”särskilt utsatta områden” helt enkelt spelas ut i Sverige. Vad betyder de? Hur ska vi tänka kring begreppen, hur ska vi närma oss dem?

Nazem: Tack för att jag får vara här, och prata. Tack för att ni alla är här en lördagskväll. Jag vet inte riktigt vad jag har [skrott] gjort för att förtjäna det här, men jag hoppas att vi har ett bra samtal här med varandra, för jag tror att, givet vad som händer i svensk politik just nu, så behöver vi fler sådana här samtal. Och det är otroligt intressant, och tack till våra danska kamrater för att ni är här. Så jag ser fram, mest egentligen emot att höra er prata om era erfarenheter, eftersom det står ganska klart för oss att Sverige i sin regeringspolitik går mot vad vi kan kalla den danska vägen. Och vad innebär det? Jo, det innebär att med hjälp av högerpopulistiska eller direkt öppet rasistiska krafter, har vi en ny regering understödd, deltagande med ... Alltså, Sverigedemokraterna deltar i vår nya högerregering, där saker som kommer hända inte kommer överraska oss kanske jättemycket mot vad som är högerpolitik i Sverige generellt, med sänkta skatter och försämrade välfärd. Men också det nya inslaget att vi har en kraftig konservativ, nationalistisk och rasifierande vändning i vår politik. Eller hur? Och det har vi vetat att vi går mot det här hållet, sett till hur Sverigedemokraterna har det, dels i stöd i opinionen, men också hur den politiska retoriken och den politiska diskursen har utvecklats de senaste, säg tio femton åren, i Sverige, med särskild fokus på en besatthet i politiken kring det här med ”utsatta områden” som knyter an flera olika politiska ämnen, eller hur? Det knyter an invandring, det som man kallar för integration, och generellt hatet mot muslimer, och en allmänt värdekonserverande vändning i vår politiska diskurs, där också kriminalitet står fram som område.

Varför är det intressant då att prata om ”utsatta områden”? Tack för att ni arrangerar det här, för som forskare ... man arbetar med någonting, jag arbetar just med de här frågorna, och då känner man väldigt mycket att man skriker i motvind, eftersom samtalet går åt ett helt annat håll och uppmärksammar helt andra frågor. Och som retorik för att uppmärksamma att det här är någonting som vi kanske bör ta på allvar, så brukar jag själv vid nästan varje föreläsning jag har, för studenter och allmänhet, nästan varje text jag skriver, försöker ta upp det danska fallet, på hur absurdt en demokrati själv kan skruva om sin politik, kalla den fortfarande demokratisk,

kalla den fortfarande liberal, men i själva verket avveckla de fundament som är demokratisk politik, bland annat rättssäkerhet, respekt för grundläggande mänskliga rättigheter i liksom politisk förvaltning och så vidare. Och jag tror att den här politiska manövern som högeralliansen har använt sig av, är väldigt mycket inspirerad från Danmark. Och i mitt tycke då, vad som händer är att man anspelar på en generell rädsla som finns, också generell aversion, alltså känsla av att man inte gillar saker [skrott], i allmänheten, mot just områden som Husby och andra så kallade förortsområden, miljonprogramsområden som har det gemensamt att här bor majoriteten invandrare, eller personer med invandrarbakgrund, och arbetarklass. Hoppas vi kan vara överens om det.

Varför går det hem att lyfta upp och stigmatisera och rasifiera, och utmåla händelser i just de här kvarteren och de här områdena, som den största politiska utmaningen och problemen vi har i Sverige? Hur är det möjligt? När vi vet, vi vet faktiskt att vi har många andra, mycket större problem. Klimatkrisen, ekonomisk kris, vi har generellt en instabil världsordning, som förlitar sig alltmer på konflikter för att hävda sina ståndpunkter och intressen, vilket gör att vi är oroliga. Vi är oroliga för oss själva, för vår framtid, för våra barn och så vidare, men så upptas då vår politiska agenda av en rädsla av vad som händer i ”utsatta områden”. En rädsla där ganska oväntade myndigheter och experter blir talespersoner, som säkerhetsmyndigheter och polisen, men det tidigare kanske var socialarbetare och sociologer som berättade om våra sociala problem i Sverige, så är det idag polisen som kommer ut och säger, så här ser Sverige ut idag, det är de här problemen vi har. All respekt åt polisen, jag hoppas att det finns någon från polismyndigheten här ikväll, men det är inte er kompetens. Er kompetens är någonting annat, men idag får polisen stå till svars för att egentligen lösa våra komplexa sociala problem.

Hur har vi hamnat i denna absurda situation? Men för mig är det resultatet av politiska maktrelationer, och en särskild liksom politisk ekvation kan man säga, där det går hem för politiker som vill roffa åt sig makt, som vill åt maktpositioner, att anspela på den här typen av rädslor och aversioner som finns i allmänheten. Undersökningar i Sverige visar att ungefär sex av tio väljare, typväljare, i Sverige, är rädda eller bekymrar sig mest för kriminalitet, av alla andra politiska frågor. Sex av tio ungefär. Och de som faktiskt drabbas av kriminalitet, det är kanske en eller två procent av befolkningen. Och det är den här absurditeten, att då har vi en politisk agenda som använder kriminalitet som den huvudsakliga frågan för vad som ska hända de nästkommande fyra åren i regeringsmakt, någonting som vi egentligen kan

konstatera att, det är inte ett stort problem. Och det här hatet som finns då mot förorter, rädslan, hatet mot invandring, invandrare, hatet mot muslimer, allt det här går samman i samma ideologiska massa, och presenteras till allmänheten som en politik i demokratins namn. Det är olyckligt, det är absurt, men från en kunskapssynvinkel, så kan vi se på det också som effektivt. De vann valet, okej, de vann valet. I Danmark har de vunnit valet genom den här metoden flera gånger i rad, och det tycker jag vi måste lyssna på. Hur har de kunnat göra det? På vilket sätt förlorade de krafter som jag tror är vi här ikväll? Hur förlorade vi de här striderna? Och hur kan vi lära av vårt grannland för att försöka stoppa det här i Sverige?

Och mitt personliga bekymmer är att den stora uppdelningen vi har att göra med här är faktiskt en uppdelning mellan de samtalen som präglar storstäder och urbana miljöer i Sverige, och de idéer och samtal som präglar andra delar av Sverige. Det finns väldigt tydligt en sådan klyfta i politisk mobilisering och politisk idéformulering, och jag tycker att bortsett från att det är viktigt med solidaritet med förorter och miljonprogramsområdet, så måste vi också utveckla en tanke om solidaritet med andra periferier i Sverige, för att försöka hämma den här politiska, framgångsrika ekvationen. Jag stannar där. Tack så mycket.

[applåder]

Marlen Eskander: Jag vill fortsätta lyssna på dig Nazem [skrott]. Så här värsta storytellern liksom. Nej men alltså jag, jag är så bekymrad, verkligen, och jag håller med dig om allt du säger. Jag ska fatta mig kort och berätta lite om vår organisation, som startade just som svar på det här, och det har pågått ganska länge. Jag minns att jag var så förbannad när jag startade det. Läsfrämjarinstitutet är en organisation som arbetar med läs-, litteratur- och kulturfrämjande för barn och deras vuxna i de så kallade socioekonomiskt ”utsatta områden”.

Vi pratar nästan aldrig om det. Vi säger att det är strukturellt missgynnade områden. Vår tes var att, hur kommer det sig att det inte finns tillräckligt med aktiviteter, tillräckligt med saker som handlar om att öka friskfaktorerna i de här områdena? Varför finns det inte museum? Varför finns det inte bibliotek? Varför finns inte allt det här? Vi startade i områden där det var nedmonterat med allt. Det enda som fanns är nog kanske ett bostadsbolag, men det fanns inget annat. Men också utifrån hur man ser på de här områdena. Vi tänkte så här, alltså: ”Hur kommer det sig att det är ett så stort problem egentligen? Och vad, om det nu är svenska språket som är

problemet ...?” Jag såg 70-talister prata bättre svenska än 2000-talister, mina vänner. Det är någonting som har gått snett. Någonting är fel. Alltså föräldrarna pratar bättre svenska än sina barn. Barnen blir bedömda för svenska som andraspråk. Vad är det ens? Vad är det? Vad är det för rangordning egentligen?

Utifrån de perspektiven och de frågeställningarna startade vi just något som ger barn ordets makt och en arena att agera på, genom dels läsningen, som är oerhört viktigt, där de inte får tillräckligt med adekvat utbildning i sina förskolor eller skolor eller i de områden de bor i. En annan fråga har varit också, som politikerna pratar om jättemycket, de måste prata svenska, de måste prata svenska, och alla de här barnen pratar inget annat än svenska, egentligen. Men vad pratar de för svenska? Var är svenskarna egentligen? Med fenomenet ”white flight”, var ska vi möta det svenska språket? Om de inte ens får det i skolan? Vad ska vi göra?

Barn är barn, en gång [skrott]. Det är lite som med hundar, ni vet hundar, de växer jättesnabbt, och lite som projektår också. Barn är likadana, egentligen. Det låter jättehemskt att säga, men jag vill verkligen vara dramatisk i mitt sätt att beskriva det. [Tänk om] under barnens mest formativa ålder händer ingenting. Barn går i förskolor där barnens vuxna själva knappt pratar bra svenska, för att statistiken visar på att oavsett om man har ökat på lärarlönerna, så väljer ändå vissa lärare att inte jobba i de områden vi verkar i. Och vad ska vi göra om det är så att de inte möter det svenska språket? Vi har bara boken att tillgå. Så det låter väldigt enkelt, och det låter väldigt kanske så här, ja men barnboken, men det är faktiskt ett effektivt sätt att bygga på och jobba just med språket, för att det är en maktfaktor. Och den används hela tiden mot de här barnen, mot föräldrarna. Föräldrarna måste läsa, föräldrarna måste göra det ena ... Men vi har också nedmonterat väldigt mycket av den samhällsservice som finns i de områdena. Det vi gör är, förutom att vi har aktiviteter varje vecka, både i Södertälje, där vi startade, men vi finns här i det här huset, Folkets Husby, Rinkeby, Tensta, Hjulsta, så har vi också metodutbildningar där vi tillhandahåller utbildningar till barnens alla vuxna, föräldrar och förskolepedagoger, för att de ska jobba utifrån de perspektiven och de metoderna vi arbetar med. Jag väljer nog att stanna där.

[applåder]

Ilhan Kellecioglu: Hej allihopa. Kul att ni är här och tack för att ni arrangerar det här. Jag är Husbybo, och har bott här ungefär tio år. Du sa

att jag var forskningsassistent på Uppsala universitet, men det stämmer inte idag, jag har avslutat och går på ett sabbatsår. Så jag skulle säga att, jag är inte en forskare och jag är inte politiker heller, det jag är idag, är framförallt att jag är en produkt av Husbysamhället. Och vad menar jag med det? Även om vi definierar Husby, eller, de definierar Husby som ett ”utsatt område”, så har vi haft en lokal organisering här i området under lång tid, som jag är en del av, som har också påverkat mig till den kampen jag för idag. Och vad har jag fått ta del utav? Jo, det senaste året sedan 2019 så har vi skapat en plattform här som heter Socialt center. Och där har vi samarbetat med tre olika organisationer, den ena är Ort till Ort, som jag representerar, och Husby arbetarcentrum som är en del av Syndikalisternas fack, ett arbetarfack. Och sen har vi Rörelsejuristerna, som håller på med juridisk rådgivning. Och tanken med det här är att samla människors problem, och inte bara problem utan också deras intressen av att komma hit och socialisera med andra människor, förena människor, men däribland kommer massa problem upp, och det kan vara skattefrågor, det kan vara Försäkringskassan, det kan vara migration, det kan vara bostad och det kan vara arbetsfrågor. Och när det väl kommer till, till exempel, bostadsfrågor, så jobbar jag med Ort till Ort med att ta hand om de här frågorna på bästa sätt, se vad som finns för problem och jobba med det. Det kan vara att hyresvärden är dålig på kommunikation, eller inte gör underhåll som behövs, problem med bostaden internt men också externt, som på gårdar och så vidare. Det kan vara höga hyror, det kan till och med vara en krissituation där någon blir vräkt.

Och det var så Ort till Ort startades, 2015, när många flyktingar från Syrien kom men fick ett korttidskontrakt och där 35 barnfamiljer skulle vräkas från Tensta. Då samlades aktivister och försökte stoppa det här, och därmed har vi drivit en sådan kamp, med att försöka stoppa vräkningar men också genom att framför allt bedriva en kamp mot privata fastighetsägare. Min kamp började ungefär 2019, när Blackstone på den tiden – jag ska komma till exemplet från Danmark också – Blackstone sålde [ett stort antal bostäder] till det tyska bostadsbolaget Vonovia som idag är Europas största bostadsbolag, som finns på den här sidan av Husby, där jag bor. Och Vonovia kommer in som en aktör till Sverige, som tar över bostadsområden i förorter där 85 till 90 % av människorna har utländsk bakgrund, där läs- och skriftfärdigheterna är låga, där arbetslösheten är hög och där utbildningen är låg. Och det här gör det här bostadsbolaget: alltså de gynnas av en viss repressiv politik som vi har sett över tid, det är inte bara från igår, som vi kommer se, det här har funnits över en lång tid. Det här är en rasistisk bostadspolitik som de utnyttjar, och det är på

en kapitalistisk grund de står. Man har öppnat upp bostadsmarknaden på det sättet, där vi har gått från nationella stora privata fastighetsägare till numera globala fastighetsägare som har sitt huvudkontor någon annanstans.

Och vad har vi gjort efter tre år nu? Utifrån de problemen som vi har jobbat med i Socialt center med Ort till Ort, så har vi tagit deras problem och lyft upp det här utifrån den demokrati vi fortfarande har idag. Där har vi använt, själv har jag använt universitet, till exempel, och Malmö universitet, där jag har skrivit en rapport som heter just ”Rapport inifrån Hemblahelvetet”. Den går att ladda ner från DiVA-portalen. Den finns också i tryckt form. Jag tog inte med mig den, jag hann inte tyvärr. Utöver det, att använda universiteten, så har vi också jobbat med att ... Ja, universiteten utöver bara min rapport så har det också skrivits debattartiklar kring den här frågan. Men vi jobbar också med olika institutioner, såsom Hyresnämnden, där vi har skickat in hundratals blanketter direkt till Hyresnämnden, alltså en domstol som ska förmedla olika typer av tvister mellan hyresgästen och hyresvärden. Men samtidigt som vi skickar in de här blanketterna till Hyresnämnden så skickas de också vidare till politikerna, som väcker uppmärksamhet kring frågan, varningssignaler. Samtidigt använder vi miljöförvaltningen, som skickar signaler till kommunpolitiker, även där en signal.

Vi använder oss också utav media, Uppdrag granskning använde en timmes program, de kom till det här området i 45 minuter, beskrev situationen och åkte till Berlin, för att i Berlin så pågår en kampanj om att kommunalisera fastighetsbolagens fastigheter, dem som har mer än 3000 lägenheter; en omröstning som blev av förra året i september, och 60 % av Berlinborna sa ja till det. Vi är inspirerade av dem, och jag var i Berlin nu i helgen och berättade om vår kampanj. Media ... Jag var inne på den demokratiska institutionen eller demokratin som vi har här nu idag i Sverige, och hur vi använder oss utav den. Media har vi använt, tack och lov har vi Nyhetsbyrån Järva här, en lokaltidning som har uppmärksammat våra fall med hyresgäster. Det kan vara höjda hyror, höjda garageplatser, mögel i lägenheterna, bristande ventilation och allting, och det här har varit ett jättefunktionellt sätt att arbeta, för att det här påverkar det här fastighetsbolagets image direkt. Utöver det så har jag tack vare min rapport också kunnat bli inbjuden till Civilutskottet, där Socialdemokraterna bjöd in mig för att presentera min rapport för dem, och berätta om problemen med de här fastigheterna, och även vad som sker runtomkring i hela Sverige. Vi har även åkt in till kommunen, och där berättar de att det är första gången en hyresgästorganisation kommer till kommunen för att presentera sina egna problem. Och nu med valet,

så har vi också fått till ett avtal med Socialdemokraterna och Vänsterpartiet om att köpa tillbaka de här fastigheterna. Så vi har kommit långt.

[applåder]

Ilhan: Tackar [skratt], men frågan kvarstår fortfarande om det här bolaget vill sälja [sina lägenheter], och, ja, tre månader tidigare så gick de ut och de vill faktiskt sälja, hör och häpna. De skulle vara ett långsiktigt bolag, men de vill sälja, så de har gått ut och sagt att fastigheter för 13 miljarder euro ska säljas, helt plötsligt, så nu letar de efter först och främst investerare som ska komma in och ge dem lite pengar, men som det verkar så finns det inte än idag någon, så det är ett ganska öppet mål än så länge, men vi får se. De måste gå ut med försäljning för att vi ska kunna köpa. Och det är där jag ser själva poängen av en representativ politik också, för det handlar om våra områden. Den ena är att det finns en stark lokal organisering och ett starkt föreningsliv här. Tack och lov har vi två mötesplatser. Vår verksamhetschef är där borta [skratt], Hedvig [Wiezell], som driver det här området på ett bra sätt, och det öppnar upp för möjligheter för människor att samlas, för att det är där vi är någonstans, det finns en fascistisk politik driven av kapitalistiska drag, som gör att vi isoleras från varandra, och vi måste förenas, mer än någonsin idag, det är ett akut läge, mer än vad vi kanske haft tidigare. Och hur drabbar det oss?

Och då vill jag också säga att Socialt center som skapades här behövs mer än någonsin, just för att vi behöver en viss kompetens, som hjälper människor med deras olika problem, och det här måste vi jobba med. Vi måste försöka förstå hur den här fascistiska regeringen kommer påverka oss nu, och försöka stoppa den här utvecklingen, på ett bra sätt. Inte genom att vi skapar en konflikt, [inte på ett] militärt eller militant sätt, utan det handlar om att skapa en förståelse, till att komma till en viss medvetenhet, till att förstå varför det här händer, och där behövs en politisk analys. Vi måste förstå det kapitalistiska grunden som de här människorna står på, för att resurserna som finns i dagens samhälle blir mindre och mindre, och de försöker ge oss mindre och mindre. Och roffa åt sig själva så mycket de kan, och det är det här vi också måste förstå.

Utöver det så är jag verkligen tacksam för det här samtalet och det ska bli spännande. Jag hade också samtal idag på Solidaritetshuset om ungefär samma ämne, så det var mycket ”Heja ihop” och allt det här, men det jag tryckte på även där

var att vi behöver en lokal organisering, men vi behöver också vara fler lokala organiseringar som samarbetar och jobbar tillsammans för att nå det målet vi försöker nå, och det är viktigt, på alla plan. Tack.

[applåder]

Marie Northrup: [pratar engelska] Hi, my name is Marie, and I’m from Copenhagen. I am an attendant for a common housing neighborhood in Copenhagen, Aldersrogade, that has been defined as a ”ghetto” and is now categorized as a ”parallel society” (because our government changed the categories on the list, so now they don’t use the term ”ghetto” anymore, but we still face the same legislation). I am a part of an initiative dealing with just housing politics. We were a few tenants that came together when they launched the law in 2018 to form this small association, and after that we launched a resistance platform called Almen Modstand. Almen Modstand is a network of common housing tenants which are organizing to defend our tenant democracy, to stop mass evictions and the demolition and privatization of our neighborhoods. And these are all circumstances that we are facing now with the implementation of the so-called ”ghetto” or ”Parallel Society Legislation”. We are a loosely organized network with, like, a flat horizontal structure, and active tenants’ groups in different affected neighborhoods, in different parts of Denmark. And we don’t have any spokesperson or central leading organ, so I’m only here today as an individual, and I wish I could be here with more of my fellow tenant organizers, so I just want to emphasize that, that we are working collectively.

Under this umbrella of Almen Modstand, I – and other active tenants – have been organizing several kinds of demonstrations and public actions. We have produced a lot of information and community awareness material, and raised awareness about people’s rights and the circumstances they face. We have done a lot of big public campaigns, and we have organized legal aid and strategic legislation. When we organize in the context of Almene boliger [Danish for ”common housing”], it’s important to know that it differs from what is known as ”social housing,” like here in Husby and in Sweden, in that it’s not publicly owned. I just want to emphasize this: that it is another context of housing, political context that we organize within. So common housing in Denmark can be understood as a social sector between the state and market. Around 20% of all housing in Denmark is common housing, and it

consists of a cooperative sector of housing associations with a democratic structure within the association, and it's like self-owned, it's not the public that owns it. It's not the state or the municipality. And each housing has its own local tenant board, that is elected by the community living in the neighborhood, and each housing association has a representative board of tenants that is the highest decision-making organ within the association. So, when we organize, we organize both from within and outside this housing association democratic structure, so we are also fighting against the state expropriating our ... To implement the legislation, they have expropriated money from the democratically owned common housing sector fund.

Beata Hemer: Som Marie har berättat nu om Almen Motstånd, så är rörelsen bred och löst organiserad, och det finns många slags motståndsiniciativ som alla har koppling till Almen Modstånd. Ett av dem är Almen Arkiv, som vi – jag och Marie – tog initiativ till förra året. Det är ett micro-arkiv som fortfarande är i sin linda/uppstartprocess och som håller på att finna form. Almen Arkiv kom till eftersom vi såg ett behov av att samla dokument från processerna omkring den nuvarande bostadspolitiken i Danmark och de så kallade ”Ghettolagarna” /”Parallellsamfundslagarna.”

Vi önskar och hoppas att *Almen Arkiv* kan vara med till att öka transparensen, och solidariteten, i processer som upplevs som komplexa och svårnavigerade. Att samla dokument och att göra dem tillgängliga, är dels för att göra det möjligt att dela erfarenheter och kunskaper på tvärs mellan bostadsområden – i några områden har nedrivning och tvångsflyttning/vräkningar redan hänt, andra områden står inför arkitekturade utvecklingsplaner som ska röstas igenom. Arkivet är också en fråga om vilka historier som sparas till framtiden/eftervärlden – vilka narrativ som skapas, och vad som glöms bort i den processen. Vi hoppas att arkivets dokument kan stå som vittnesbörd för det våld, ja våld, som människor upplever som en konsekvens av den danska bostadspolitiken.

Vi menar att vi är i en historisk situation, som radikalt ändrar det danska bostadslandskapet, och också de urbana rum som utgör vår stad. Det är både en fråga om vilken slags stad vi vill ha, ”vem som har rätt till staden”, vem som kan bo i de centrala/attractiva stadsdelarna, och frågan om rätten till ett tryggt hem – tryggt i bemärkelsen att man inte hotas av vräkning eller tvångsflyttning och att ens grannskap och omgivelser inte transformeras, eller förstörs, till den grad att man blir en främling i det som tidigare var ens utvidgade hem.

Almen Arkiv utgörs idag av en samling arkivmappar där insamlade dokument ordnas i kategorier, som speglar olika nivåer och perspektiv av processerna: referat från möten mellan kommunen och bostadsorganisationer; brev, bland annat uppsägningsbrev och vräkningar som boende mottagit i sin brevlåda. Dokument från rättsprocesser och bland annat den process som Marie beskriver i Mjølnerparken. Den stämningsansökan som boende har lagt mot den danska staten. Också utvecklingsplanen som arkitekter och planerare har utarbetat och som är det som röstas igenom och implementeras. Så är det media och tidningsartiklar. Och den sjätte kategorin är än så länge boenderespons, alltså boendes svar och motstånd och respons på de här processerna. Så tanken är att det här arkivet ska finnas i digital form så att innehållet blir tillgängligt men också så att man ... så att det kan vara mer levande. Så att det inte är jag och Marie som samlar in material men att man också kan skicka in material och vara med till att bygga upp arkivet.

Men vi ser också det som ovärderligt att få lov ... alltså att arkivet har en fysisk form och också att man kan komma till ... att det kan vara någonting som kan starta samtal. Och att man också när man ... jag tänker senare i kväll, att man kan bläddra i papperna och få överblick av några av dokumenten och samtal över dem. Så vi är jättegglada för att få vara här och se hur vi kan, efter det här, utveckla arkivet vidare. Ja.

[applåder]

Maryam: Tusen, tusen tack för era insiktsfulla presentationer. Vi är jättegglada att ni kunde delta i det här samtalet i dag. Jag kommer göra så att jag ställer några frågor som vi organisatörer har formulerat och som vi önskat att, ja, ni besvarar. Och sen är det viktigt för oss också att det blir utrymme om en stund för er i publiken att ställa frågor. Så att om det dyker upp frågor så försök komma ihåg dem till om en liten stund då vi kommer passa runt ... jag kan gå runt med micken.

Men för att kasta sig rakt in i kopplingen mellan Sverige och Danmark ... Nu har vi hört Beata och Marie beskriva situationen i Danmark. Den skiljer sig naturligtvis åt från det vi ser i Sverige, dels på grund av att som Marie förklarade, att allmännyttan är konstruerad på ett lite annat sätt och därför ser organisering också lite annorlunda ut i Danmark jämfört med Sverige [hostar]. Ursäkta. Men också att de här ... den här ”parallellsamfunds”- eller ”parallellsamhälleslagen” eller hur man nu ska översätta den till svenska, den tillämpas på ett annat sätt i Danmark. Det ser inte ut

på det sättet i Sverige i dag just nu. Bara för att kort ge ett exempel, så i Sverige så ser vi till exempel att ”särskilt utsatta områden” ger utslag rent lagstiftningsmässigt i det att Migrationsverket inte längre tilldelar asylsökande dagspeng om de bor i ett ”särskilt utsatt område”. Det är det som är i tillämpning just nu, men i övrigt så ser det inte riktigt ut som i Danmark där man på en rad områden då har annorlunda lagstiftning.

Men min fråga till er i panelen är, vi har haft en valrörelse och nu har vi även en regeringsbildning där man ... där politiker börjat ... beskrivit Danmark som ett föregångsexempel. Vad tycker ni att vi kan lära oss av det som händer i Danmark? Vad ska vi vara uppmärksamma på, vad ska vi lära oss av? Så att dels är det en fråga till er som har det danska perspektivet, vad tycker ni att vi borde få för medskick och vad ska vi tänka på, hur ska vi organisera oss? Vad vill ni, ja, passa vidare till oss som är här i dag? Och också, ni som är verksamma här i Sverige, utifrån era observationer och det ni har hört och tagit del av, hur går era tankar kring hur vi ska förhålla oss till vad som händer i grannlandet?

Nazem: Jag har en väldigt stor tanke om det som kan fyllas på med massa saker. Men man får ångest när man läser regeringsdeklarationen eller vad man ska kalla det som kom i går i Sverige. Men om vi tittar på Danmark så får man hjärtattack.

[skratt]

Och skillnaden är det här, att i Sverige finns det fortfarande en opposition mot den här politiken. I Danmark, rätta mig om jag har fel, det finns ingen opposition mot denna politik. Det är dominerande politik i alla statsbärande partier i princip, förutom kanske det partiet som är längst till vänster eller de två ... Jag ...

Marie: De er to [De är två]

Nazem: Ja, de två. Så föreställ er då om säg tre val, om tolv år i Sverige, att vi har en situation där Socialdemokraterna går till val på en ”parallelsamhälleslagstiftning” som innebär att om någon begår ett brott i Husby så kommer de bli av med sitt lägenhetskontrakt och så vidare. Den typen av berättelser som ni har berättat om här. Det ... Då får man hjärtattack, eller hur?

Vi måste värna om en opposition i Sverige. Och den här oppositionen bör så klart ha så många grenar ut i samhället som möjligt. Det går inte i Sverige att kringgå de etablerade civilsamhällesorganisationer som finns, även om det görs genom organisationer som Ort till Ort. Men jag menar, Hyresgästföreningen är en central organisation för bostadspolitik i Sverige fortfarande, på grund av den korporativistiska uppläggningsen där de är med och förhandlar om hyror och har inflytande utefter regler och annat. Så vi måste värna och radikalisera den här typen av etablerade organisationer som finns. Framför allt så måste det socialdemokratiska partiet bli en demokratibärande och utvecklande organisation. Eller hur? Fullständigt krackelerat. Det finns inte längre någon opposition mot fascistisk politik. Det är ett mar-drömsscenario där vi står inför nu. Det finns, tror jag, hos oss alla i dag ett djupt ... kanske vi som är i rummet i dag här då, ett djupt förakt mot framför allt den urbana liberala medelklassen som genom att ge stöd till partier som gått i direkt avtal med Sverigedemokraterna möjliggjort för den politiska ... nationalistiska politiska vändning och konservativa vändning som ni ser i dag. Och det är dåligt. Och det är den front vi har att arbeta med och försöka utveckla och expandera solidariteten kring, att försöka se sig själv i andra människor. Försöka se förbi de här retoriska greppen och politiska diskurserna. Försöka se det kött och blod som faktiskt är politik och därefter bilda vår uppfattning om vilket samhälle vi vill ha och därför också vilket parti vi ska rösta på. Men jag tror att vi också måste tänka oss att det inte bara är den här medelklassen i dag. Vi måste också värna de organisationer som finns. Så det är också viktigt att vi engagerar oss i det etablerade samtidigt som vårt missnöje också uttrycker sig i att vi skapar nya organisationer som trycker på, på alla håll.

Marlen: Jag skulle vilja lyfta den sociala aspekten i det här, också utifrån barn och unga, och kvinnor, att tiden går, tiden tickar på, jag känner mig verkligen jättestressad. Jag tänker ju också apropå det här med oppositionen, att i Södertälje har vi en situation att i vissa områden så är det tre av tio som röstar och de som röstar röstar på Sverigedemokraterna, på KD och på M. Det är jätte bekymmersamt. Jag har redan hjärtattack [skratt]. Jag har ... Jag känner redan att det är otroligt allvarligt läge och vi har efter 33 år i Södertälje också ett nytt styre.

Och det finns ju också de andra sociala aspekterna som jag känner mig stressad över, att förutom allt annat som vi också behöver jobba med så är det också de här demokratistärkande insatserna för våra barn och unga. För att det är de ...

Vi förlorar dem. Om vi har ungdomar och barn som känner en sån hopplöshet, som inte känner sig inkluderade, som inte känner att min röst räknas, det är också en pandemi. Då kommer de inte att stå upp, organisera sig och vara en del av de befintliga ... den befintliga organiseringen som finns. Och det är den situationen som vi har i Södertälje faktiskt. Jag låter väldigt negativ, men vi har nu de senaste tio dagarna haft enorma utmaningar men också med den här ... det politiska styret som också byts nu så känns det ganska mörkt faktiskt. Så vi är redan där.

Ilhan: För det finns faktiskt en sak vi skulle kunna lära oss från Danmark. De hade en ny lag som heter ”Lex Blackstone” i folkmun. Och den gick ut på att privata fastighetsbolag inte kunde köpa bostäder och renovera dem under en fem års tid. Så det var själva lagen. Du kan inte köpa någonting och renovera och höja hyran. Vilket gör att Blackstone försvann. Och nu är Vonovia inte där heller. Vips så är de borta. Det här är någonting som vi skulle behöva i Sverige också. Det är det enda jag kommer på [skratt]. Men jag håller med ... Jag förstår det Nazem säger också och det här med att värna och radikaliserar, jag skulle också vilja lägga till att vi behöver också revolutionera. Vi behöver ha revolutionära tankar även om ...

Så här. Jag sitter i styrelsen i lokala Hyresgästföreningen, jag sitter också i Järvastystyrelsen, Hyresgästföreningen. Och det händer inte mycket där. Det händer mycket med Ort till Ort och vi jobbar med hyresgästerna på ett helt annat sätt, och Hyresgästföreningen står och trampar någonstans. Men ändå kommer de och frågar ”Ilhan, kan vi ha möten? För det ni gör är fantastiskt, hur kan vi göra?” Jo, men jag säger ”så här kan ni göra” men sen kan de inte göra det. Och ja, vi värnar på ett sätt Hyresgästföreningen men frågan kvarstår, hur länge kan vi värna om Hyresgästföreningen? Och är det bättre om vi bara tar bort dem helt och hållet? De här frågorna finns hos alla aktivister som jobbar med bostadsfrågor i dag.

Och sen, ja, det kommer då till hur man ska radikaliserar det här. Men det är svårt också, för i de här styrelserna så sitter det 65-åriga människor som inte ... [de] vägrar släppa taget. Och det är pensionärer som får lite arvoden som gör lite mer pengar i sin kassa vilket är ... betyder mycket för dem. Och de har suttit i de här styrelserna i 25 år, de har sina bästa vänner där och de har fikar och gjort allt det roliga i sitt liv i de här styrelserna. Så det är svårt att ta bort någonting som är underbart för de människorna men vi behöver göra det, absolut. Så att radikaliserar är också att behöva ersätta dem.

Men då är frågan, vem ska ersätta dem? Det är lite som du är inne på också, den yngre generationen, de har tappat lite av det politiska subjektet. Det är den politiska medvetenheten som inte finns kvar så mycket längre. De har mycket information, de har mycket kunskap, men den praktiska erfarenheten är inte lika mycket där längre så som jag ser. Viljan finns, ilskan finns, frustrationen finns, men själva ta det här steget till att jag ska gå med i en styrelse och sitta på möten, den är lång. Den är lång därifrån. Så där blir ... Det öppnar upp en viss yta där, att vi behöver revolutionera också. Vi behöver tänka på lokal organisering. Vi behöver tänka på hur vi vill organisera oss i dag, jämfört med 100 år sen, när Hyresgästföreningen byggdes upp.

De hade otroliga stridsåtgärder då som var radikala och de var revolutionerande, de fick det mandatet de fick i dag och de har kommit dit på grund av den vägen också för att marknaden, kapitalet har omfamnat dem, tagit hand om dem. Och nu sitter de i en position, nja, men vi kan inte bli radikala, och det är svårt att värna om dem. Så vi kanske behöver revolutionera.

Så det är lite de här tankarna jag är mer inne på, men den utgår ifrån det lokala sammanhanget och man måste hitta sin egen kontext där man befinner sig i för att kunna skapa en struktur för sig själv och sina medmänniskor runt omkring sig, sina grannar och boenden, där man skapar en plattform som funkar för en själv och jobbar med de problem som behövs tas hand om i områden. För jag säger återigen, det är att jobba med problemen som vi kan komma fram till lösningar och vi måste börja jobba med de kritiska problem vi har. Där tänker jag.

Marie: Yes, I’m very much in line with the way of organizing that you are describing. I think we need to ... The grassroot organizing and democratic organizing in Denmark, as I explained a bit before about the common housing sector grew out of the workers’ movement 100 years ago, and in the 1970s. It was first in the 1970s that the tenants’ democracy was established and it came out of a lot of tenant organizing, using all kinds of methods over a very long period of time to pressure housing associations to reform themselves and to establish tenant democracy. And I think we have to learn from this kind of democratically rooted organizing and coming together.

What we have experienced in Denmark is that the tenant democracy within the housing associations has in many places become, like, sleepy or bureaucratized, or it went through processes where there have almost been, like, micro-neoliberal transformations within the organizations. The way the housing organizations work

has become less democratic and more professionalized. And what we are fighting for in Almen Modstand is also to reactivate and to awaken and create a new culture of active tenant democracy where people are actually engaging and taking ownership over their own neighborhoods. And I think this is the foundation of a democratic movement and a democratic culture that we have to reinvent, that we have to do self-organizing. I believe that that is the foundation needed before we can get ... try to get power within the parliamentary organs for instance.

And one thing that has been very important for us in Almen Modstand, I believe, is the importance of care and emphasizing the reproductive work or invisible work within organizing. So, it's really about ... When we have to find each other and come together, it's really about creating relations and taking the time to visit each other and to have conversations with each other and take care of each other. And it has been shown also through our experience with organizing so far that some of the foundation of our organizing goes through the everyday local network of care that exists within our neighborhoods. Where people use each other in their everyday lives to get along, because people live in underprivileged circumstances. And these networks, especially often women's networks, have shown themselves to be the foundation ... of our organization. So, I think we really have to remember this aspect: *the care aspect of organizing*.

Also, in relation to your question, Maryam, about how we can learn from each other more concretely, I feel like just being here ... I wish that I had my co-organizers and tenants with me, and I am so pleased to meet you. I really hope that we can keep contact, that we can visit you again or you can come to Denmark. We should really exchange methods.

Beata: Yes. I'm thinking of ... No, sorry. Svenska! Nej, men jag tänker på vem man är, vilken bakgrund man har och vilken position man arbetar från. Nu blev jag presenterad som arkitekt, och kan tala från den position – och om vår profession som är med till att implementera den här laggivningen [svenska: lagen] ... Jag vet inte om det här citatet här bakom mig, ”du kan helt enkelt säga nej”, om det kommer från en arkitekt eller från en boende. Men det får mig att tänka på oss arkitekter: att man kan ju säga ”nej” till att vara med i de här processerna. Och en annan sak som jag tänker att man också kan göra, det är att alliera sig. Här kan man prata om någon slags radikalisering inom arkitektkåren, som innebär att alliera sig med till exempel Almen Modstand. De har gjort ett arbete med att ta

fram planer som betyder att folk inte vräks, men det är någonting som många arkitekter inte har tagit del av. Så att skapa någon slags förbindelse, allians, mellan personerna som arbetar i de här processerna och aktivisterna och att det inte blir en oss-och-dem-uppdelning som det har funnits en del av, en retorik som delar upp de två. Så det tänker jag att ... Ja, allianser där kan bryta den uppdelningen.

Maryam: Jag tar vid där du talar, Beata, alltså frågan om kanske vilka perspektiv som är mer framträdande inom olika yrkeskårer.

Den här gula citatserien som ni ser som också min kollega Sara nämnde inledningsvis så är det citat alltså hämtade från boendeaktivister i Köpenhamn och vad de har sagt i sina vittnesmål om de pågående processerna. Och en av dem ville säga just ”du kan helt enkelt säga nej”, ville de säga till de arkitekter som genomför den politiken som bedrivs i Danmark då. Men det jag tänkte fråga er eller dem som vill angripa den här frågan, det är att inom yrkeskårer som till exempel arkitektur och stadsplanering och den kanske mer allmänna ... en allmän diskurs i media, så är det ofta så att mycket fokus ... När man pratar om förorten så hamnar mycket fokus på arkitekturen och hur formen [skratt] och materialet eller vad ska man säga, ja, hur de här områdena ser ut. Formmässiga egenskaper och kanske lite mindre i vissa fall då på innehållet och de sociala strukturerna.

Ett annat citat som vi kan läsa här som våra danska kamrater har sagt är att de tänker mycket på till exempel de änkor som lider mycket av rivningar och tvångsförflyttningar därför att de har levt hela sina liv på de här platserna och att de blir ... De faller offer väldigt tydligt för när de här sociala strukturerna förstörs. Och Nazem, du har i din forskning beskrivit förorten som dröm eller mardröm, vilket jag tänker handlar om kanske den utopiska tanken från början. Den diskursen i dag är väldigt mycket en slags andrefiering av förorten, och förorten som mardröm, att arkitekturen anonymiserar och den typen av berättelser.

Så att jag tänkte fråga vad ni tycker ... hur ska man angripa det här med fokus på arkitekturen kontra mer innehållsliga och sociala aspekter av livet i förorten. Vi kanske kan börja med Ilhan för du har också skrivit den här ”Hemblarapporten”, så jag tänker att den på något sätt också verkligen innehåller de här båda delarna.

Ilhan: [skratt] ”Hemblahelvetet”, arkitektur inom ”Hemblahelvetet”? Jag försöker hitta kopplingen däremellan. Jag vet inte om jag riktigt förstår den, men om jag tänker att till exempel

loftgångar, gårdar, möteslokaler på gårdarna, öppenhet på gårdarna är en viss arkitektur där människor kan mötas ... Det har vi i Husby. Det är någonting bra. Om jag förstår arkitekturen på det sättet så ... ja, då ... Förstår jag dig rätt, eller?

Maryam: Absolut, och jag tänker ... Alltså som jag förstår det, ”renovering” till exempel är också ett sätt att inte ta hand om arkitekturen och ... Ja.

Ilhan: Ja. Okej, ja, du ... Och det är både på gårdarna och i lägenheterna. Och de här lägenheterna byggdes på 70-talet som miljonprogrammet. Och de behöver rustas upp. Men eftersom de inte rustar upp, de här, så säger de att de gör en totalrenovering, men det är en stor skillnad på hur en totalrenovering ser ut inom de här bolagen. Och deras [Hemblas/Vonovias] renoveringar är så klart väldigt undermåliga. Dålig kvalitet både i utförandet men också i materialen de använder. Och det förstörs ganska enkelt. Efter att ... när någon har fått en renoverad lägenhet, så blir interiören snabbt förstörd i de här lägenheterna. Och det är synd för den personen som ska flytta in efteråt.

Och när du har bott där i bara några år så märker du att ”okej, men nu skulle jag byta ut det här eller behöver någonting nytt” och då får du inte den hjälpen så klart. Och då är det saker och ting som inte funkar. Utöver de renoverade lägenheterna så är det väldigt många lägenheter som inte är renoverade. Och där har vi vattenskador där människors möbler förstörs och taken har vattenläckor. Det finns stora mängder mögel i de här lägenheterna. Så det skriker bara en ohälsa, en otrygghet att vara kvar i de här lägenheterna. Och *Vonovia* pressar de här människorna och säger ”men vi kan totalrenovera din lägenhet men då får du en 55% hyreshöjning”. Och då vill man ju inte göra det. Men du har *rätt* till underhåll.

Så det här ... I akademiska termer så kallar man för det ”bortträngning”, att man försöker få bort människor. Och själva känslan av att du inte har ett hem i dag och känslan av att ”jag har ingenstans att ta vägen heller”, skapar en stor oro. Och det är väl där någonstans den här kampen är viktig, som säger ”jag vill vara kvar och jag vill ha den kvaliteten som jag vill.” Och då värnar vi om de rättigheter vi har. Och då är det så att man kommer tillsammans som den kollektiva kraften för att kunna få en förändring. Och här försöker vi få till en förändring och säga ”men lyssna, det här funkar inte, ni kan inte hålla på så här”. Och vill man inte acceptera den, ja, då blir det en krock i så fall i den arkitektoniska miljön som du försöker ... eller som vi

försöker lyfta upp här som är ett stort problem. För att det här bolaget är också dagens samhällsutvecklare. Förr i tiden när ”miljonprogrammen” byggdes, då var just kommunala bostadsbolagen de som var samhällsutvecklare. Svenska Bostäder, kommunala bolaget äger ju centrum [i Husby]. Men det här bolaget [Vonovia] vill också skapa sitt eget centrum, sin egen plats, där människor ... och höja marknadsvärdet och status för det här, och förändra människorna som bor i de här områdena till någonting hel annat. Och det är en ... ja, vad folk också känner igen är ordet gentrifiering, det är den typen av process som vi pratar om här. Och det är väl där motståndet tas någonstans.

Men man måste prata om det, för att det är samhällsutveckling som är ett stort ... en stor terminologi eller en agenda, både inom kommunalpolitiken men kanske inte lika vanligt bland folket här. Men vi undrar ju, vad är det som händer? Nu ser vi Folkets Husby, de ska renovera det här ... eller centrum, men vi har tomma lokaler eftersom det är för höga hyror och människorna här kan inte, ja, abonnera dem eller ta över dem för att det är alldeles för höga hyror. Och vem vill då satsa här, eftersom det finns ett skrik? Det finns ett rop på att vi vill ha någonting annat. Så där är vi någonstans. Och återigen, miljön ... eller vår lösning blir att vi måste på något sätt komma fram till en tanke där vi skapar de här förändringarna själva, kanske.

Maryam: Vill någon av er tillägga någonting? Nazem, du räcker upp handen.

Marie: I just want to explain about some of the architectural patterns we see in Denmark when they're implementing the "ghetto" legislation. So, they ... There's this narrative or this discourse about these neighborhoods as being "closed off" from the rest of society, and not part of the rest of the society. And a lot of the areas or neighborhoods that are targeted, they [were built in line with] so-called modernist architecture principles. And so, there's also a big architectural shift. Just to make it very concrete, I want to describe Mjølnerparken for you again. Mjølnerparken has four kinds of yards, you can say, that align with each other. And the way you enter your stairwell or your apartment through the yards, and the yards are also connected by a little road. And there's no cars or anything inside, so it's only playgrounds and green areas in the middle of all these yards. And there's also balconies facing the inside of the yards too.

Then comes the "ghetto" legislation, under this paradigm that we have to

open up the areas and make it become a part of the city and make it become part of society again. So, what you do is that you separate each yard from each other so that they're not connected anymore. You turn the way you enter your apartment to the outside of the yard, and also close off the yard so it's also not ... you cannot exit it publicly. And you also take away all the balconies in the yard. So, all this common space, that's what you're going to remove, and then you're going to turn it outwards to the streets. Then, you make shopping streets between all the yards instead. And you sell off properties or you sell the two ... blocks and yards in the middle, so the last two outer yards that are left with common housing tenants, they are also even more apart socially. They cannot really meet each other easily through everyday rhythms.

So, what you create is entities ... you can say entities wherein households are closed off and become *bordered entities* of nuclear families that are not connected to bigger family structures where you help each other in the everyday life like we see now. So, it's all the common areas and all the common social activities that're closed off. Now it's just like, you are one entity, when you step out of your apartment you go out to the shopping street. You are becoming a consumer and ... in a household ... a household of consumers, instead of being part of an everyday social network where you help each other out. So, this is ... there are also a lot of neoliberal tendencies within the architecture that are implemented here and there's also an architecture that had values and ideals for creating a common life and extended households, as we see also in Mjølnerparken or other neighborhoods, where people are helping each other in everyday life. And the architecture that allows this is also erased.

Publiken: Publiken skulle vara med?

Maryam: Ja, jag ska öppna upp strax.

Nazem: Absolut publik, men jag måste få säga en sak till.

[skratt]

Det som är faran med "ghettopolitiken" i Danmark, om den kommer till Sverige, är att man troligen kommer att börja riva miljonprogramsområden, för det gör man i Danmark. Jag har sett bland annat bilder från Århus och heter det Hellerup?

Marie: Gellerup.

Nazem: Gellerup, ett traditionellt modernistiskt, vad säger man, punkthusområde som man river och så bygger man kvarter för studentbostäder eller något. Och 2005 när Svenska Bostäder, det kommunala bolaget här i Husby la fram sin framtida plan för Husby, så innebar det också rivningar. Så de här idéerna finns i svensk bostads- och arkitektur- och stadsplaneringspolitik. Och vi har en väldigt absurd situation här vad gäller just arkitekter. Att när arkitekter bygger hus ... ritas hus i Sverige och gör det bra så har man ritat ett fint hus. När man gör det i ett område som Husby eller ett annat förortsområde så har man "motverkat segregation". Den logiken förstår inte jag, för det finns ingen logik i det.

Så jag anklagar er arkitekter, stadsplanerare, för att ha byggt upp en diskurs ... Och det är inte bara ert fel, det finns mycket pengar i att omvandla attraktiva områden i storstäderna som i Stockholm, så väldigt mycket av era finanser kommer från aktörer som vill göra saker i de här områdena. Men ni har bidragit till att förankra ett sätt att se på problemet med våra städer i termer av segregation så som att problemen bara finns i den byggda miljön i de här områdena. Ni har inte kunnat artikulera något annat. Och det är väldigt synd, för ni är väldigt kloka och ni har redskap att kunna artikulera någonting annat. Men ni har misslyckats med att för er kår, och för er profession, och er forskare då, för er teori och för ert kunskapsarbete, artikulera en annan vision. Där startpunkten borde vara så här, man kan inte åstadkomma någon förändring i klassamhället med hjälp av arkitektur. Men man kan förbättra levnadskvaliteten för människor med bra arkitektur, eller hur?

Och jag anklagar er för att jag vet att ni ber om det och många sitter här i dag, men man kan i stort sett anklaga alla professioner för att ha bidragit med samma sak. Det är väldigt mycket bakgrunden till ditt arbete också. Ett misslyckande inom skolan där man på något sätt har försökt angripa dålig kvalitet i skolan med hjälp av privatiseringar som förvärrar problemen, och så vidare. Så för professionerna så gäller det att skärpa sig helt enkelt, och solidaritet är så klart ett bra sätt att försöka *skärpa sig*, att försöka se sig själva i andra.

För ett faktum i de välutbildade professioner som styr mycket av aktiviteterna och politiken i staden är att de kommer inte från de här områdena. De har inte den här bakgrunden, de har inte den insikten. Lite då och då så kanske de deltar i ett sånt här samtal, träffar en person som Ilhan eller någon annan och inspireras. Men sen

när man går tillbaka till kontoret så är det någon annan som betalar för ens lön och den andra personen vill någonting annat. Och det är väldigt svårt för oss att bara göra någonting åt det här genom att vilja någonting annat, eller hur? Vi måste ha motvikt, mot krafter som styr stora maktstrukturer. Men någonstans måste det börja i oss själva, eller hur? Och jag tror att det är viktigt att vi lyfter det perspektivet. Vad kan var och en av oss göra i det?

[applåder]

Marlen: Ja, men tack för att du lyfter upp det, verkligen. Jag önskar att våra insatser inte skulle ha behövts. Om saker och ting hade funkade så hade de inte behövts. Och jag började med att säga att vi startade faktiskt i panik och det är för att jag själv är mamma till tre barn som går i de här skolorna som blir bedömda för svenska som andraspråk. Så att jag önskar verkligen ... Jag önskar verkligen att alla de här privatiseringarna inte skulle ha behövts. Och det tål att tänka på och också göra någon form av organisering och ... mot det här också. Jag tänker på arkitektur, för det nämner du ... Bara ett exempel. Jag tycker att jag känner igen väldigt mycket av hur det ser ut, alltså utseendemässigt, också i andra områden, till exempel i Stockholm i Stockholms innerstad. Men de har inte samma problem som det beskrivs i de ... i förorten i så kallat ... i de här "segregerade områden".

Så att allting handlar egentligen om hur ... alltså vad det finns för service, hur man renoverar de här lägenheterna, hur ... och vad det finns för, som sagt, annan samhällsservice än bara byggnaderna. Så.

[applåder]

Maryam: Tack. Jag kommer att göra så att jag ställer en till fråga och sen ... Det får bli min sista fråga innan jag öppnar upp för publiken.

Det är, det är ju så här att det är många som känner sig väldigt frustrerade just nu. Vi fick höra om det här "Tidöavtalet" senast i går då, regeringsbildning, massa förslag som känns oroande. Vi har en valrörelse i färskt minne där mycket fokus låg på redan utsatta grupper och med en rasistisk retorik. Vi har hört om adhd-screening, repressalier mot föräldrar till ungdomar som har svårigheter, språkstest av småbarn, nu visitationszoner etcetera, etcetera. Så att det finns mycket att arbeta med och

vi behöver fråga oss, ja, vad vi kan göra på olika nivåer. Det har ni redan berört. På gräsrotsnivå, inom olika organisationer och så vidare.

Jag tänkte fråga er i panelen hur ni ser på möjligheterna att solidarisera. Ni har redan adresserat de här begreppen lite grann, solidaritet, samverkan, bilda allianser. Hur ska vi samarbeta helt enkelt i den här frågan för att nå förändring?

Marlen: Jag kan börja. Det här med bostäder och det, det är verkligen ni experter i det. Jag tänker också på, vi behöver öka vår bildning och motståndskraft utifrån just att bilda barn i tidig ålder och föräldrar i samhällsengagemang. Vi behöver kunna förstå vad som finns runtomkring oss, adressera våldet, adressera den här rasismen som också skadar oss. Det är verkligen en folkohälsa. Vi blir sjuka av rasismen. Våra kroppar gör ont av att hela tiden uppleva det, och vara i, och leva i potentiella "brottsplatser" såsom det beskrivs, men så upplever jag idag att det också är. Narrativet behöver också förändras, men i grund och botten handlar det om att mobilisera, bilda oss och utbilda oss för att vi ska kunna utgöra en motståndskraft i de här frågorna.

[applåder]

Ilhan: Jag ser lite olika aspekter. Det finns två olika allianser. [här saknas ljudupptagning]. Men sen finns det personer som inte jobbar med bostäder eller kanske lokal organisering och det är där jag vill uppmana er allihop att efter det här samtalet, att ni tänker till var ni bor någonstans och hur ser möjligheterna ut för er organisering där ni bor? Vilka grannar känner ni och hur tar ni er ... nästa steg i att lyfta upp en viss medvetenhet om vad som pågår? Vi hade såna diskussioner tidigare i dag i Solidaritetshuset. Och med tanke på "Tidöavtalet" som kommer här, det fascistiska inslaget i våra samhällen blir större och starkare, och vi behöver en viss solidaritet. Men det är inte solidaritet med Husby utan det är solidaritet i era områden. Med solidaritet med de personer som drabbas hårdast av den politiken som kommer nu. Och där behöver ni tänka till. Jag tyckte det var ett jättefint förslag av en person som bodde i Sundbyberg där ... som ville manifestera för förorterna. Och hur man gör det, jag vet inte, men det får ni själva tänka kring hur man kan göra, eller för människor som bor i det här området.

Och det är inte heller bara ett förortsproblem heller, utan vi alla drivs av det här. Men det finns ett viss hopp också å ena sidan, för att alla i storstäder, vi har

Uppsala, Stockholm, Göteborg, Malmö så kommer vänstern framåt. Och som Nazem var inne på, visar lite av en stark opposition ändå i urbana miljöer, även om vi skulle vilja ha ännu starkare och ännu radikalare, värna och radikaliserar, återigen. Men vi tappar i glesbygden, ute på landet, och det är där SD får sin rot som vi ser. Och det liknar mycket av den politiken som förs i förorterna med mycket av samhällsservicen försvinner, människor måste flytta ut för det finns ingenting att hålla sig kvar vid. Och det har vi inte hittat någon lösning på. Och så länge vi inte hittar de här lösningarna så kommer SD att vinna mark för att de sitter på vissa lösningar. Så ... Men det jag tror att det viktigaste vi kan göra är bara att fortsätta det vi har jobbat med de senaste åren i våra storstäder.

Men radikaliserar. Vi har värnat någonting men vi behöver radikaliserar. Jag använder det här ordet ofta nu alltså, jag gillar det. Men värna, radikaliserar. Men när vi väl har värnat och radikaliserat så behöver vi också tänka nytt och revolutionera. Men det kommer när man har börjat organisera sig lite längre fram för det är ett steg i steg i steg. Men det första ni kan göra är att gå tillbaka till era bostadsområden och tänka, vad kan jag göra här? Och med vilka jag kan göra det här med?

Marie: I don't know if I have anything to add but yeah, I agree that we should all organize in our everyday life where we live or work or study and we should also find ... We should build democratic structures from the ground together and we should also be worried about this strong polarizing in our societies happening all over Europe. And I think depending on what kind of social position each of us have we also have different privilege to enter different social segments of society. And I think we should all use the privileges we have and the social environments that we can enter to challenge the polarization and the fascism and racism, racist tendencies that is growing out of that.

So maybe not everybody have the privilege or accessibility of ... for many reasons could not enter some of the social environments where this brutalization and totalitarian tendencies are growing. But for people who can, I think that they should use this privilege and not just tore away from this social environments but to stay there and insist on other perspectives. And I think it's so important also that we, when we fight racism and patriarchy in all kinds of forms, I think it's so important that we also think about social class. And yeah, to think it all in our analyzes and in just to keep building solidarity. And keeping hope also, even though it's really tough times. Yeah.

Beata: Okay. I also thought while trying to find an answer to your question, Maryam, it would be to use our privileges ... No, yeah
[byter till svenska]: svenska. Förlåt!

[skrott]

Nej, men vi som arkitekter har ofta privilegier och makt i de här processerna som vi inte utnyttjar. Och det tror jag inte är för att vi inte vill men för att vi inte vet hur vi ska göra det. Och där handlar det om att lära från aktivister och från boende och från de miljöer som vi är med och transformerar. För väldigt mycket pågår, som ofta blir osynliggjort. Många arkitekter arbetar distanserat och ser inte den vardag som faktiskt pågår. Det kan göra att man talar om områden som att de saknar mänsklig aktivitet eller man ... för att man inte ser den aktivitet eller de sociala nätverk som faktiskt finns i de områden som man är med och arbetar i ... och utformar planer omkring. Så jag tror ... Ja, också att använda sina privilegier, ja.

Ilhan: En reaktion på er ... På tal om privilegier, så ... Det är en tanke som har fastnat i mig i dag också. Det är ... Och det handlar om just den repressiva politiken som vi ser här. Just med visitationszoner. Just den attacken polisen kommer att ha på många av våra människor och befolkningar så behöver människor som är vita, privilegierade, stå upp. Civillurage, det är det som behövs. Ni behöver befinna er i områden där de här sakerna kommer hända och ni behöver stå upp för de här sakerna. Det är skitviktigt. Glöm inte det, och försök göra det här.

[applåder]

Nazem: Bara jättekort så ... När Sverige demokratiserades för över 100 år sen så var ju situationen mycket värre än vad det är i dag. Folk hade inte bostäder, folk hade inte sjukvård, folk hade inte rätt till skola, utbildning och så vidare. Men ändå lyckades Sverige demokratiseras, eller hur? Och politiska aktivister var också förföljda då. Så det går. Det går. Och vad man gjorde då var att var fjärde svensk var organiserad socialdemokrat. I dag är generellt under 2% partiaktiva över huvud taget och ännu färre driver radikala demokratidrommar i sin aktivism. Och tittar vi på arbetarklassen, särskilt den marginaliserade arbetarklassen som bor här, de är försvinnande få representerade i politiken.

Men vad har vi? Jag tänker ändå, vad är det vi har som vi kan bygga på? Det är väldigt många i det här landet som organiserar sig. Men man organiserar sig för sig själv. Man organiserar sig för sina hobbies, att förverkliga sig själv, att dansa i kör, läsa studiecirkel kring någonting som man tänker är intressant ... En miljon människor i Sverige i dag deltar i någon form av studiecirkel per år. Det är någonting att bygga på. Väldigt många människor tar sina barn till gemensamma aktiviteter som inte är kommersiella, som är ideella, bara för att man är passionerad i något. Det kan vara att rida häst eller spela fotboll eller vad som helst.

Väldigt många människor engagerar sig idealistiskt för att man tror på någonting. Om vi bara kan få varje sånt sammanhang att bli lite mer radikalt, alltså att vi drömmer lite mer demokrati när vi ses, vi drömmer lite mer rättvisa, vi agerar, vi praktiserar det, så har vi i alla fall en stor bas att stå på. Och med det kan kanske andra saker komma.

[applåder]

Maryam: Tack. Då ser jag händer som viftar. Där har vi en herre som har viftat länge faktiskt, så jag börjar i den bortre änden här. Varsågod.

Publiken: Tack för ordet. Tack för era oroligheter ...som ni pratar. Om jag tittar här, ni pratar om oss i Järva, men majoriteten bor inte här. Och de som ska vara oroliga som bor här ska vara här, tyvärr. Men jag är tacksam att ni kom. Det andra är att ni pratade om politiker, oppositioner eller andra. Jag vill säga jag är orolig för den sidan även. Därför att vi idag har två stadsdelar som borgerliga vill slå ihop Tensta och Rinkeby. Den nya majoriteten som kommer, vad gör de? ”Wow, vi ska ta över den, vi ska göra våra egna.” Därför vill de minska service, de vill minska bidragen ... Vi ska ... Kriget har börjat, kompisar. Vi ska stoppa den. Vi kan inte slå ihop Tensta och Rinkeby och Spånga och Tensta så att de minskar servicen. Vi kan inte acceptera det. Den sista jag vill fråga bara. De kallar mig ”särskilt utsatt område”. Varför? ... Det är polisen som har samlat oss på det här sättet. Okej. Men är det på grund av min person? På grund av oss som bor här eller på grund av husen? Det vill jag veta. Är det huset som är ”särskilt utsatt” eller är det jag som person? Tack.

[applåder]

Maryam: Ska vi fånga upp en fråga till och sen kan ni respondera?

Publiken: Tack så mycket. Jag pratade som Ilhan sa, att den här diskussionen måste vara revolutionerande, vi måste tänka på framtiden. Kanske till och med bryta lite mönster som ... och vi måste börja tänka på nytt. Kanske vi måste byta paradigmet, kan man säga, i våra tankar. Och jag ville säga så här, att den faktiskt största motsättning som vi måste, kan man säga, hantera nu för tiden, i klimatkrisen är det som kallas för antropocentrism. Alltså en människocentrerad syn. Frågan kan inte lösas inom kapitalismen, inom den här marknadsekonomi och inom den här egoistiska tanken där det är kapitalet som har makt. Då tror jag att det minsta som vi måste tänka på, är att kollektivera och vara mer solidariska. Och vi måste också vara väldigt solidariska inte bara mot oss själva, utan även mot tredje världen, alltså fattiga människor. Just nu bor fortfarande säkert massor av folk i ... de känner inte ens till elektricitet. Men här har vi en massa bekväma saker. Jag tror att en sak som vi måste uppmuntra våra barn är att de ska våga att ... att leva lite, blanda sig, med folk som drabbas. Även att lära oss från naturen. Till exempel jag själv, jag driver ett projekt, det är gerillaodling där vi i princip skiter i byråkraterna. Och vi gör precis vad som behövs för klimatförändring. Och där vi bygger med till exempel lastpallar och sånt, det är små byggnader. Vi lär oss från råttorna hur de överlever till exempel under vinter. Hur överlevde våra vikingar, våra förfäder här också? Och jag tror att vi måste hitta sånt. Och om vi skulle hitta såna idéer och vi skulle till exempel utveckla såna alternativ individuellt eller i grupp, och vi skulle försöka att till exempel 5000 familjer flyttar till landsbygden och utforskar permakultur ... Det finns mycket såna intressant teknik. Det finns mycket att söka på Google och Youtube och sånt. Om vi skulle försöka med sånt, skulle säkert hela kapitalismen och bostadsmarknaden kollapsa. Och de skulle ... sänka priser och allting. Kanske måste vi hitta såna lösningar så att de förlorar riktigt, långsiktigt.

Men vad jag ville säga ... min fråga är precis till er från Danmark. Jag tror att en sak som vi måste lära oss från Danmark är att de har haft en väldigt bra experiment. Christiania, alltså. I Christiania, de skiter i hela etablissemang. Hela kapitalismen. De gör vad de vill, oberoende. Kanske är det något vi måste göra i Järvafältet, testa något Christianialiknande och på det viset skapa en helt annan del som inte passar med etablissemangets alternativ. Tack så mycket.

[applåder]

Maryam: Jag vandrar vidare med mikrofonen, men ni får respondera om ni vill.

Majsa Allelin: [från publiken] Vem ska ... De eller jag? Ska jag? Okej. Ja, tack så jättemycket för intressanta inlägg och samtal och värdefulla publikinslag också. Jag skulle ... Ja, jag skulle vilja ta vid några av de diskussioner som ni har haft, ja, tidigare kring hur ... Ja, men arkitekturen förändrar inte de sociala relationerna, det har ingenting med saken att göra. Klassrelationerna är det som ligger i botten och så vidare och så vidare, och att man måste ge sig in i de befintliga strukturer som finns där vi fortfarande har potential att gå in och vidga perspektiven.

Och med det sagt så tror jag att jag har haft en stigande känsla genom åren, när man har lyssnat på samtal och själv skrivit texter om bostadsfrågor och segregationen, hur pass ... vad ska vi säga, stuprörsorganiserade de här diskussionerna också blir. Det blir ofta arkitekter, stadsplanerare, bostadsforskare, aktivister som håller på med renoveringar och så vidare som får ta plats i de här rummen. Och det är ju så klart jätteviktigt men om vi ska kunna ha en områdesaktivism som handlar om hela området, de sociala relationerna, då måste vi också inkludera, tror jag, i samtalet även till exempel det lokala socialkontoret. Vi måste inkludera rektorerna och lärarna som jobbar i områdena. Vi måste inkludera, vad vet jag, SL i det området [skratt]. Vad som helst, alla andra yrkesgrupper som också är med och påverkar och utformar de här sociala relationerna i vardagen.

Och om jag tänker på Göteborg där jag har mitt empiriska fokus i den här forskningen som berör det ni pratar om så har de utvecklat från kapitalets sida just den här typen av starka modeller nu. Vi har till exempel Gårdstensmodellen² i Angered där privata hyresvärdar samarbetar med polis, vaktbolag, skola, socialtjänst. De har en modell för det här och den här modellen börjar utarbetas allt mer i flera områden, och vi kan se den i andra länder också. Så där lyckas ju de samordna med de lokala aktörerna och ta ett helhetsgrepp, med just de här hyresvärdarna också i spetsen, som skapar ett kontroll ... minikontrollsamhälle i de här olika områdena.

Jag tänker att vi i vänstern eller motkraften måste också börja organisera oss och prata om bostadsfrågor med andra yrkesgrupper som inte direkt berör samhällsbygget eller bostadsbygget eller ... och så vidare. Ja, det var ... nog det.

Nazem: Får jag svara snabbt på den? Amin, kan du ställa dig upp?
Amin Barkhadle.

[applåder]

Nazem: Amin arbetar på Folkets Hus och Parker, stämmer det?

Amin: Ja, det stämmer.

Nazem: Kan du berätta vad du arbetar med och varför det är viktigt utifrån det perspektivet som Majsa säger, att föra samman olika människor? Får jag säga det åt dig kanske?

Amin: Hej, jag heter Amin Barkhadle och jag bor faktiskt här i Järva men du kanske kan göra det men det kommer bli långt, det kommer bli jättelångt.

Nazem: Men gör det själv. Nej, men säg. Säg, snälla.

Amin: Hej, jag heter Amin Barkhadle och jag bor faktiskt här i Järva men jag jobbar på en riksorganisation som heter Folkets Hus och Parker. Och jag hörde vad som sagts men jag kan lätt försöka sammanfatta. Vi pratar om demokratisering och du nämnde det här med 100 år sen. En av de etablerade organisationer som lever kvar i dag och som har funnits faktiskt för 100 år sen är Folkets Hus och Parker. Vi har också några andra som kanske inte behöver nämnas och kanske det sitter några som jobbar där, men det är viktigt att de här organisationerna spelar sin roll i den här nya tiden.

För någonstans har de också gjort en resa, vi kan kalla det för en klassresa eller någon annan resa, och har tappat sin grundidé. Och någonstans är det viktigt att man behöver vitalisera de här organisationerna eller jobba med förändring, förnyring och medvetandegöra för dem i deras institutioner och organisationer att de behöver faktiskt gå tillbaka till grundidén. För att det finns en möjlighet, de spelar en stor roll i den förändring som vi vill se, politiskt och organisatoriskt.

Nazem: Vad var grundidén? Vad var grundidén för Folkets Hus?

Amin: Folket. Samla folket. Få människor att mötas, få organisationer att mötas, vara en fysisk mötesplats både i form av park men

också i form av hus. Det är grundidén. I dag är det lite ... kanske en service ... vad ska man ... en stor kontorservice och såna saker och en annan typ ... De har tagit en annan roll. Och Folkets Hus och Parker, jag ska vara självkritisk så klart, de är inte ensamma om det här. Det är andra organisationer som har gjort en liknande resa, som har tagit en annan typ av roll, som har tagit på sig andra typer av kläder ... Nu försöker jag bara förenkla det så gott som det går och det ska gå snabbt sa du. Men du får gärna lägga till.

Publiken: Ja, jag vill försvara, eller hur man ska säga, våra områden. Miljonprogramsområdena. De byggdes då Sverige var som mest progressivt. De här områdena angrips på grund av ... Och vår danska kamrat här beskrev ju det här, hur man försöker slå sönder folks gemenskap genom att vända balkongerna åt fel håll, genom att splittra folk. De här områdena är trafikseparerade. Vi har haft skolor som har legat inom gångavstånd. Vi har haft kollektivtrafik inplanerat. Vi har haft trafikfritt område så man kan skicka sina barn till affären för att köpa mjölk när de är små och så vidare, och leka utan att bli påkörda av bilar.

Det här är alltså områden också som har blivit som man kallar mångkulturella, det är folk från olika länder som bor i dem. Och det här är man rädd för. Man vill inte ha ett fönster ut mot världen. Man vill bestämma själva vad folk ska tänka och tycka. Man vill inte ha åsikter som man inte kan kontrollera. Och vi har alldeles för mycket väktare i våra områden. Jag vill föreslå, omskola väktarna. Gärna med betald ersättning. 70% till parkförvaltare, renhållningsarbetare och underhållningsarbetare eller något annat som de kan vara intresserade av. Och sen dela upp våra områden så att vi som bor i området kan arbeta här och sköta områdena. Allting planeras utifrån och uppifrån och det är ett stort problem. Vi behöver demokrati.

[applåder]

Publiken: Alltså, jag blir jättenyfiken på den här publiken. Det är jättemånga människor jag aldrig har sett förut. Jag identifierar mig som en Järvabo. Jag skulle vilja veta, hur många mer här identifierar sig som Järvabor? Hur många är studenter till något framtida yrke som arkitekter och hur många är redan samhällsplanerare i dag?

[skratt]

Maryam: Vi har en dam ... Kan jag få din hjälp att skicka ...?

Publiken: Jo, det där med trafikseparering, det tycker jag är väldigt bra. Det är något av det bästa här i det här området. Jag har ju nedsatt syn och jag tycker det är obehagligt om jag ska gå över gatan med mycket trafik och så, så att jag tycker det är skönt. Men det är bara det att det inte är helt säkert för att det kör så mycket annat fortskaffningsmedel nu. Alla de där elsparkcyklarna som kommer med väldigt fart! Så att ... Och så kör det bilar här i alla fall, fast oftast kör de långsamt. Det har blivit bättre nu. Men alla elsparkcyklar känns lite farligt ibland när de kommer med väldigt fart.

Och så är det ... Tänkte jag på en annan sak också, att när man pratar om droger, att det är drogerna som driver till exempel kriminaliteten. Men sällan pratar man om vad man ska göra för att få köparna att sluta köpa. Att få de som kanske kommer ifrån Lidingö eller Danderyd ...eller Hammarby Sjöstad och köper droger. Vad är det som gör att personer som blir i områden, så kallade ”svenska”, fina, rikare områden, varför har det blivit så många som till exempel använder droger på samma sätt som man använder alkohol för att de vill ha en sån där så kallad ”kick”? Vad ska man göra för att de ska ... att den där kicken inte ska bli så viktigt? Hur ska man få dem att sluta vilja ha den där kicken som drogerna gör? Vad ska man göra? Om man kunde få bort motivering, ungdomars vilja att köpa droger, då skulle mycket ... det andra lösa sig av sig självt tror jag.

Maryam: Tack. Jag tänkte på din fråga som du ställde där. Om vi gör en snabb handuppräkring där. Kan du upprepa den?

Publiken: Hur många identifierar sig som Järvabor här i publiken? Upp med handen nu. Och hur många är blivande samhällsplanerare. Okej, det var inte många. Hur många är olika samhällsplanerare eller arkitekter eller någonting annat?

Maryam: Ja, det var flera.

Publiken: Intressant. Tack.

Maryam: Man kan säga att vi har en blandning av Järvabor och plan-

erare här i publiken. Klockan närmar sig sju. Tack för att ni har suttit kvar och lyssnat och engagerat er. Jag ser att det är jättemånga händer som fortsätter sträcka upp sig så att det finns mer att prata om är jag övertygad om, därför så har vi lyckligtvis mat som väntar. Så att alla som är intresserade av att stanna och äta en bit mat tillsammans och fortsätta diskutera med varandra, hitta personer som man kan lokalengagera sig med eller ställa ... fortsatt diskutera med panelen så är ni jättevälkomna att stanna kvar! Så tack ska ni ha, och jag hoppas att vi fortsätter samtalet. Och tack till vår kära panel!

[applåder]



"Vi menar att vi är i en historisk situation, som radikalt ändrar det danska bostadslandskapet, och också de urbana rum som utgör vår stad. Det är både en fråga om vilken slags stad vi vill ha, 'vem som har rätt till staden', vem som kan bo i de centrala/attraktiva stadsdelarna, och frågan om rätten till ett tryggt hem ..."

- Beata Hemer

"We believe that we are occupying a historical moment which has radically changed the Danish housing landscape and the urban spaces that make up our city. This raises questions about what kind of city we want to have, who has the right to the city, who can live in central/ attractive neighborhoods, and our right to a safe home ..."

"And what we are fighting for in Almen Modstand is also to reactivate and to awaken and create a new culture of active tenant democracy where people are actually engaging and taking ownership over their own neighborhoods. And I think this is the foundation of a democratic movement and a democratic culture that we have to reinvent, that we have to do self-organizing."

- Marie Northrup Christensen

"De kallar mig 'särskilt utsatt område'. Varför? Det är polisen som har samlat oss på det här sättet. Okej. Men är det på grund av min person? På grund av oss som bor här eller på grund av husen? Det vill jag veta. Är det huset som är 'särskilt utsatt' eller är det jag som person?"

- Audience member

"They call me [sic] 'particularly vulnerable area,' but why? It's the police that have gathered us together like this. OK, but is it because of me as a person - because of those of us who live here - or because of the building? That's what I want to know. Is it the building that is particularly vulnerable or is it me as a person?"

"Vi säger att det är strukturellt missgynnade områden. Vår tes var att, hur kommer det sig att det inte finns tillräckligt med aktiviteter, tillräckligt med saker som handlar om att öka friskfaktorerna i de här områdena? Varför finns det inte museum? Varför finns det inte bibliotek? Varför finns inte allt det här? Vi startade i områden där det var nedmonterat med allt. Det enda som fanns är nog kanske ett bostadsbolag, men det fanns inget annat."

- Marlen Eskander

"We say that these are structurally disadvantaged areas, but why are there not adequate activities, but why - we are asking - isn't enough being done to raise health and wellness in these areas? Why aren't there any museums? Why aren't there libraries? Why don't these things exist in such areas? We started working with areas where everything had been dismantled, where beyond perhaps a housing company, there was nothing left."

"Vi som arkitekter har ofta privilegier och makt i de här processerna som vi inte utnyttjar. Och det tror jag inte är för att vi inte vill men för att vi inte vet hur vi ska göra det. Och där handlar det om att lära från aktivister och från boende och från de miljöer som vi är med och transformerar. För väldigt mycket pågår, som ofta blir osynliggjort."

- Beata Hemer

"As architects, we often have privileges and power in these processes that we don't use. And I reckon that's not because we don't want to, but because we don't know how to do it. For that, we need to learn from activists and from residents and from the environments that we are taking part in transforming. Because there's a lot going on that is often made invisible there."

"... när arkitekter bygger hus ... ritat hus i Sverige och gör det bra så har man ritat ett fint hus. När man gör det i ett område som Husby eller ett annat förortsområde så har man 'motverkat segregation'. Den logiken förstår inte jag."

- Nazem Tahvilzadeh

"... when architects build houses in Sweden and do it well, they have built a nice house. When you do it in an area like Husby or another suburban area, you have counteracted segregation. I don't understand that logic."

"Och med tanke på 'Tidöavtalet' som kommer här, det fascistiska inslaget i våra samhällen blir större och starkare, och vi behöver en viss solidaritet. Men det är inte solidaritet med Husby utan det är solidaritet i era områden. Med solidaritet med de personer som drabbas hårdast av den politiken som kommer nu."

- Ilhan Kellecioglu

"Thinking of the Tidö Agreement, the fascist element in our societies is getting bigger and stronger, and we need some solidarity. But it is not solidarity with Husby, it is solidarity in your area. In solidarity with the people who are hit hardest by the politics that are coming now."

"... one thing that has been very important for us in Almen Modstand, I believe, is the importance of care and emphasizing the reproductive work or invisible work within organizing. So, it's really about ... When we have to find each other and come together, it's really about creating relations and taking the time to visit each other and to have conversations with each other and take care of each other."

- Marie Northrup Christensen

Related Reading

(journal article) Aktion Arkiv. “You can simply say no’: Narrating the effects and affects of Danish and Swedish housing in crisis”, *Radical Housing Journal*, 2024. <https://radicalhousingjournal.org/2024/you-can-simply-say-no/>

(blog post) Andersson, K. “Du kan helt enkelt säga nej”, *Disorder Blogg*, Sveriges Arkitekter, 2022-10-21 <https://www.arkitekt.se/blogg/blogg-disorder/du-kan-helt-enkelt-saga-nej/>

(conference presentation) Fanni, M., Mack, J. & Schalk, M. (2023) “You can simply say no’: Narrating the effects and affects of Danish and Swedish housing in crisis”, Disobedient Buildings panel, SANT Conference, 27–29 April, Etnografiska museet, Stockholm, Sweden.

(book chapter) Kajita, H.S., Mack, J. , Riesto, S. & Schalk, M. (2022) “Between Technologies of Power and Notions of Solidarity: A Response to the Danish Ghetto Plan and Swedish Vulnerable Areas Documents”, in: Raahauge, K. M., Simpson, D., Sjøberg, M. & Lotz, K. (Eds) *Architectures of Dismantling and Restructuring: Spaces of Danish Welfare 1970–Present*, pp. 148–159 (Zürich: Lars Müller Publishers).

(conference presentation) Kajita, H. S., Mack, J. , Riesto, S. & Schalk, M. (2021), “Between Technologies of Power and Notions of Solidarity : A Response to the Danish ‘Ghetto Plan’ and Swedish ‘Utsatta Områden’”, in Spaces of Welfare Conference, 6–7 May 2021, Royal Danish Academy, Architecture, Design, Conservation, Copenhagen.

(report) Kellecioglu, Ilhan (2021) “Rapport inifrån Hemblahelvetet: Röster från Hemblas bostäder i Husby”, Stockholm, MAPIUS 30: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1603995/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.

(journal article) Mack, J. (2023) “Words and Things: Taxonomies of Demolition in Scandinavia”, *Platform*, December 18.

(journal article) Mack, J. (2023) “Modernism in the Present Tense: ‘Dangerous’ Scandinavian Suburbs and Their Hereafters”, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 41(4): 656–682.

(book chapter) Mattsson, H. & Schalk, M. (2019) Action Archive. “Oral history as performance”, in: Janina Gosseye, Nomi Stead, Deborah van der Plaats (Eds) *Speaking of Buildings. Oral History in Architectural Research*, pp. 94–113 (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press).

(book) Kajita, H. S. & Sand, R. (2024) *Klager i praksis: Et roadmap for samarbejde i almene boligområder* (Copenhagen: Bureaus Publishing).

Solidarity Report: Two Witness Seminars on Danish and Swedish Welfare Housing in Crisis

Aktion Arkiv [Sara Brolund de Carvalho, Maryam Fanni, Heidi Svenningsen Kajita, Jennifer Mack, Helena Mattsson, Svava Riesto and Meike Schalk]

© 2024 by Aktion Arkiv is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Translation from Danish to English: Pamela Starbird

Transcription in Danish: Jette Kildegaard

Translation from Swedish to English: Helen Runting

Photos: Francesco Martello (p. 82) and Almen Arkiv (p. 165)

Graphic design: Vendela Wetterström

Typeface: Manometer, Arkivarien and FreightSans

Supported by ARQ Forskningsstiftelsen för samhälls- och byggnadsplanering, projektering (5:2020), and FFNS Stiftelse för forskning, utveckling och utbildning (2020:14).

The graphic design was co-funded by JPI CoNECT (Energimyndigheten)

Thank you to: Copenhagen Architecture Festival – Cafx, in Denmark, and Hedvig Wiezell and Soraia Guled at Folkets Husby, in Husby, Sweden

www.aktionarkiv.org

ISBN 978-91-8040-972-8

