

# stockholm parklife: public issues, friction zones, and displacement

Andrew Byerley,

*Department of Human Geography, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden, tel.: +46 8 16 48 60, <http://people.su.se/~byerl>, e-mail: [andrew.byerley@humangeo.su.se](mailto:andrew.byerley@humangeo.su.se)*

Jonas Bylund\*,

*Department of Human Geography, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden, tel.: +46 8 16 20 00, <http://people.su.se/~jbylu>, e-mail: [jonas.bylund@humangeo.su.se](mailto:jonas.bylund@humangeo.su.se)*

\* Corresponding author.

*NB! This is a draft working paper.*

## abstract

How are boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour drawn in the context of the consumption of alcohol in urban parks? Through a case study of the Tanto-area in the Södermalm area of Stockholm, Stockholm Parklife focuses on how values, norms, regulation, policy, and publics create different claims on and conflicts in public space. Conflict around rowdy drinking behaviour in urban parks often generates proposals for ordinating space (e.g. alcohol free zones) the effects of which are far from clear. By following the controversy over the fate of public space, we propose this to be an issue around which publics can form and participate in local politics. It is argued that friction zones are required for achieving democracy and that displacement occurs in more than one sense.

*Keywords: Urban public parks, alcohol, public space, issue formation, public participation.*

## introduction. what is a good parklife?

Alcohol-free zones are problematic. On the one hand one would like people to have the opportunity to picnic and drink wine, but on the other hand there are some places that are out of control. (Kristina Axén Olin, quoted in SvD, 2005)

To teach tolerance – to create cosmopolitans – a city must show a substantial amount of ‘anarchy’. But if the anarchy is not to overwhelm and negate the lesson, it must be regulated. (Lofland, 1998 p. 243)

One Sunday afternoon on a raw March afternoon in Stockholm I saw a man sleeping soundly in Tanto, on a double divan (see Figure 1). At first I saw only a man *on* a bed. But, after recognising the man – a man I have never spoken to but have observed on an almost daily basis over the past year – ‘*in* bed’ seemed a more adequate reading of the situation. For this was in a sense a man at home, *in* his place. He was a daily member of the group of street drinkers who had so thoroughly colonised this area of Tanto that the appearance of a double bed seemed almost in its place. The man in bed caused things to happen. Some passersby laughed. Others showed discomfort or disdain. Many showed blind disregard. In a few instances acts of civic responsibility were forthcoming. A jogger shook the man gently as if to assure himself the sleeper was alive. Two elderly ladies stood for a while – seemingly on guard – beside the bed. What the ‘man *in* bed’ and the wider assemblage of beer empties, a public park and cold weather did was to *productively*, even jarringly, juxtapose the abnormal with the normal, the radically Other with the ‘norm’. It was productive in the sense of being an interface for (or in your face) provocation; a wake-up call for at least some members of the ‘general public’ to reflect on issues of otherness, diversity, civic culture and urban sociality in the commons (Amin, 2010).

<< *Figure 1 about here. See end of document.* >>

The man-bed assemblage on Toboggan Hill in Tanto here serves to illustrate a much larger constellation of interfaces – often forming friction zones – between the publics and ‘counter-publics’ (Fraser, 1992) who use this and other areas of Tanto and other parks. Indeed, throughout the year various areas of Tanto serve as stages for multifarious dramas where the stage scenery is in a constant state of flux as assorted un-fixed infrastructure including benches, bins, tables, ash-trays, toboggans, chairs, police cars, ghetto blasters, ambulances and beds are dragged up and down and around the parks undulating topography by multiple publics and arms of the state – street-drinkers, companies of youths, Goths, joggers, punks, tobogganers, law enforcers, paramedics, groups of playschool and school children, ‘binge’ drinkers, dog-walkers.

Over recent years these interfaces/friction zones – almost always involving or reportedly involving alcohol as a key actant – have consolidated into a problemscape of ‘hot issues’ implicating politics, planning, competing notions of the ‘Good City’ and ‘Good Citizen’ and understandings of ‘the fate of public space’. *Stockholm ParkLife* – a recently initiated research project – sets out not primarily to collect and write-up data, but rather to

write our way into this problemscape (and use text as an equivalent of the laboratory). The aim of this paper is to more closely frame this problemscape – more particularly how it is populated, (discursively) configured and spatialised in the Swedish urban context – and to begin to outline what these friction zones do, or have the potentiality to do (politically/public involvement?). *ParkLife* asserts, in a similar manner to work concerning wider international contexts (Jayne et al., 2008b), that the *spatial* implications for public space arising from what some have termed the ‘new alcohol order’ (Measham and Brain, 2005) have been neglected in the Swedish context.

The paper comprises the following. Firstly, we outline the main characters embroiled in contestations over urban public park spaces, particularly as this relates to contestations over the threshold between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. Secondly, we argue for studying public space as an applied social scientific artefact and its use in emerging exercises in politics rather than as an ideal normative ‘good’. Thirdly, we discuss this contested territory as a friction zone entailing multiplicity and public involvement. The paper concludes with a discussion concerning the displacement of a politics of parklife and the implications this has for how we conceive of spaces fraught with conflict.

The setting is the inner-city district of Södermalm in Stockholm, and the public parks of the Tanto-area. Some supplementary discussion concerns the proximate Skinnarviksparken (see Figure 2) which is a further hotly contested terrain in terms of friction zones, politics, and (would-be) displacement.

<< *Figure 2 about here. See end of document.* >>

It is important to state that Södermalm, and particularly the Tanto area, is an urban area that has undergone – and which continues to undergo – a quite considerable process of socio-economic transformation. Formerly a working-class area with a place narrative encapsulated in the appellations ‘*sunk söder*’ (grimy south) and ‘*kniv söder*’ (knife south), a wave of gentrification has swept through the area over the past decade or so. A new place narrative, although one that continues to selectively draw sustenance from the former narrative, centres on projecting and consolidating an image of trendy but alternative sophistication, as for example through the place-branding of areas such as SoFo and, more recently, Lower Ring Side (L.R.S.). As we come back to below, the marketing of this area as a hotspot in the night time economy has important implications for how the aforementioned problemscape under investigation here is both populated and configured, especially in terms of emergent friction zones in public spaces including parks. We begin by briefly situating *Stockholm Parklife* in relation to the wider contemporary research field incorporating public space, alcohol and friction zones.

## situating the problemscape

Despite Government claims that rates of alcohol consumption and ‘binge’ drinking are falling (Regeringskansliet, 2010b, p. 7; Regeringskansliet, 2010a, p. 11), police and civil servants in Stockholm disclose perceptions of a drastic increase in recent years of alcohol related zones of friction involving publics with competing perceptions of exactly ‘what is a good parklife’. A recent Stockholm Municipal Council report concerning alcohol and public order stated: ‘Stockholm is a unique combination of pulse and peace (*puls och lugn*); both qualities need to be safe-guarded’ (stad, 2008, p. 9).<sup>1</sup> Of course, such a problematic balancing act of urban governance can only begin to translate into coherent operational policy once the parameters of what *actually* constitutes acceptable and unacceptable ‘pulse’ and ‘peace’ in specific spaces at specific times have been defined. Put somewhat differently, who gets to decide when a threshold between the acceptable and the unacceptable has been transgressed in particular spaces at specific times, and on what basis? What are the implications for the publicness of public space?

Current international scholarly, policy and media debate focus on tensions arising from the liberalization of alcohol policy (extended opening hours, proliferation of retail outlets, legalising public drinking), the re-capitalization of the night-time economy and the intensive place-marketing of central city areas (Roberts, 2006) and a supposedly new hedonistic culture among urban youths (Cronin and Hetherington, 2008). Private-public urban governance alliances are purportedly consolidating a ‘new alcohol order’ (Measham and Brain, 2005) in the increasingly themed and scripted spaces of the entrepreneurial city characterised by a *spatial concentration* of bars, clubs and public drinking to central city areas and a *temporal diffusion* of peak drinking hours and alcohol related disorderly conduct (Plant and Plant, 2006). It is widely argued that the costs of anti-social drinking practice have spiralled as dubious expectations that allowing public drinking would foster a self-regulating ‘Mediterranean’ drinking culture have failed to materialize (Jayne et al., 2008a; Törrönen and Karlsson, 2005).

Attempts to govern this (dis)order, it is argued, have resorted to revanchist urban ordiancing (Smith, 1996) deploying what Mitchell (2003) terms ‘bubble laws’ to sanitize public spaces against those not conforming to ‘consumerist citizenship’ (Hayward and Hobbs, 2007 on ‘binge-drinkers’; Staeheli and Mitchell, 2008 on homeless; Low et al., 2005 on parks). Such claims – inspired by Arendt’s (1958) and Sennett’s (1977) renditions of public space – equate this scripting-out of possible encounters with what can perhaps usefully be termed ‘remarkable others’ in public space with increasing deficits to levels of civic engagement, civic culture and democratic politics in the city. This hollowing-out of

public space thesis has, however, been subject to critique on a number of fronts (Paddison and Sharp, 2007). Sheller and Urry (2003) for example argue that it reifies the concept of public space by bracketing-out the role of other public fora such as electronic media. Others argue that asserting the need to reclaim supposedly 'lost' democratic public spaces employs idealized notions of past public spaces that were in fact also exclusionary in terms of gender, age-groups, ethnicity etc. (Iveson, 2007; Young, 1990; Nolin, 2006). However, and following Amin (2010), we argue for the continued importance of *material* public spaces as arena for democratic politics, fostering civic culture and urban social sustainability and the need for research that examines the meaning, complexity, contestations and the role of the materiality of such spaces. This raises important issues for consideration in *ParkLife*.

### **contested terrain**

In 1997 the general ban on drinking spirits, wine and strong beer in public places in Stockholm City, Sweden, was revoked.<sup>2</sup> This followed a ruling by the Supreme Administrative Court that municipal councils could not institute general bans on alcohol consumption in public places without specifying the exact geographical extent of such public places (Regeringsrätten, 1997). In 1999, alcohol consumption was prohibited in all shopping centres, school grounds and playgrounds.<sup>3</sup> There has subsequently been a gradual increase in the number of geographically delineated zones where alcohol consumption is either totally prohibited or prohibited during specific times of the day and night. By 2005 alcohol was completely prohibited in 75 public spaces and partially prohibited (22.00–07.00) in a further nine (DrN, 2008).<sup>4</sup>

By June 2008 the number of AFZs in the Södermalm district had increased to 19. Many of these AFZs are areas that the police authorities deem especially prone to problems of public disorder (stad, 2004). Representative of this category is Skinnarviksparken, the latest addition to the list of AFZs. This park has been a popular place for youths to hang-out, party, drink, and, in some cases, to supposedly vandalize property and terrorize the local residents. Concerns have been raised to such an extent that couples with children have considered moving from the area, while some adults have experienced difficulty sleeping due to concerns of beer bottles being hurled through their bedroom windows (stad, 2008, p. 45).

Much to the chagrin of the opposition social democratic town councillors, the now incumbent centre-right administration deemed an alcohol ban from midnight to 07.00 to be sufficient action instead of 22.00 as had been stipulated in earlier local ordinances. City Commissioner (now Mayor) Sten Nordin argued that an alcohol ban from 22.00 went

against the *Vision 2030* ideal of Stockholm as an ‘open and living city’ and would diminish the possibility for ‘picnickers drinking wine’ to fully utilize the city’s parks. Reacting to this, a left-wing city commissioner retorted that moving the alcohol ban from 22.00 to midnight was ‘a blatant example of how individual self-interest is now deemed paramount and, furthermore, showed a lack of willingness to appreciate the extent of alcohol related problems among youths’ (Ibid., p. 6—7).

Some Stockholm residents, however, clearly wanted to see the list of AFZs to increase further. In 2009 a citizen’s petition (*Medborgarförslag*) was submitted to the Södermalm District Council requesting the complete prohibition of alcohol in the Tanto-area; one of the few remaining large public parks in central Stockholm still unencumbered by alcohol regulation for adults.<sup>5</sup> The basis for this petition was, in a similar manner to the case of Skinnarviksparken, that alcohol consumption was leading to vandalism and anti-social behaviour in and around the park and that inebriated youths and adults had supposedly ‘taken over the park’ causing other users to abandon the area. The author of the petition added that if a 24-hour prohibition was not possible, then surely it should be possible to prohibit the consumption of alcohol after 20.00 in the evening, after which time ‘no normal people have picnics in parks’. The citizen’s petition concluded with a plea to Södermalm District Council to allow ‘Tanto to return to its former idyllic state’ (stadsdelsförvaltning, 2010, p. 1).

In 2010 Södermalm District Council ruled against this citizen’s petition on three grounds. Firstly, drawing from cases where AFZs had already been established, it was deemed likely that the prohibition of alcohol consumption in Tantolunden would simply act to displace the problem. Secondly, it was argued that the lack of research into the effects of AFZs already implemented in central Stockholm – particularly their socio-spatial effects – meant that Södermalm District Council was opposed to further ad hoc delineation of such zones. Instead it voiced the need for a more holistic regulation at the scale of Stockholm City. Thirdly, a more holistic and preventative long-term approach to this problem was favoured whereby the rehabilitation of parks – including, removing ‘dark’ and ‘hidden’ areas and upgrading park infrastructure – was seen as a more expedient means to create safe and pleasant park environments (see also stadsdelsförvaltning, 2009).

The contested terrain of Stockholm public parks is a public problem that is also taking shape in the mass-media, particularly in the local press and social media such as facebook. Concerning the printed press, the spring and early summer seasons have the largest media coverage in terms of number of news stories and letters to the editors. A number of key themes dominate here. Firstly, dystopian representations of parks as spaces of varying

intensities of danger. Illustratively, at the beginning of the 2011 park season the front page of Metro, Stockholms most widely read daily newspaper, was emblazoned with the headline 'Here is the City's Most Dangerous Park' and the two-page story featured a 'tagged' map with statistics of various crimes in each of Stockholms parks (Tanto being crowned *the* most dangerous, while Skinnarviksparken is not represented in the statistics at all. See Figure 3). Secondly, a strong discourse of moral decay among urban youth, particularly in terms of alcohol and drug abuse and a general lack of consideration to others. Thirdly, and relatedly, a discourse of 'lost' or 'disappearing' idyllic public park space. In the cases of Tanto and Skinnarviksparken, many stories relate how this process had become especially noticeable from 2005–2006. While we can only speculate on this issue, it seems likely that this is related to the fact that most other parks in central Stockholm were ordinances with AFZ's in 2005. Fourthly, stories that identify specific 'victims'. In the case of Tanto/Skinnarviksparken victims include residents living along access streets to parks and in houses adjoining parks, youths (as victims of other youths), and tenants of the many allotment gardens in and surrounding the park. Fifthly, the costs in terms of public sector resources being tied-up in dealing with vandalism, drunkenness, littering, public urination and crime in and around parks.

<< *Figure 3 about here. See end of document.* >>

Media coverage of alternative readings of this problemscape essentially focuses on issues pertaining to the protection of certain civil liberties. For example, the centre-right local politicians who are regularly interviewed as spokespersons for the area almost unfailingly invoke the need to protect people's rights to drink 'a glass of wine' outdoors and the wider city visioning strategy of representing central Stockholm as an open and 'living' city. The problems outlined in the dystopian reading above are thus framed as subordinate to the interests of the responsible individual and the 'interests of the city' (see e.g. Iveson, 2007). Facebook and other social media are other important media sites where these issues have become 'hot'. Youths, for example, use facebook not only to debate and then coordinate where and when they should congregate, but also to vent alternative readings of what constitutes acceptable/unacceptable Parklife.

The Södermalm District Police have also tried to harness the potential of new networking tools. They are present on Facebook through which they provide real-time updates on parklife as well as cautionary advice in advance of 'hot' evenings and where 'civilians' and other police can comment on minutiae. During 'big' weekends such as *Valborgsmässoafton* (Walpurgis) and Midsummer's Eve, or merely warm sunny weather,

hot-spots arise in the parks and the police are frequently called upon to report on their preparations for and anticipation of coming 'rowdy evenings' (e.g. SvD, 2011).

During 2010–2011, the lower areas of Tanto were 'rehabilitated' with new and bigger waste-bins, extra bins for throw-away barbeque equipment, new benches, and landscaping. In conjunction with this program of rehabilitation a new apartment block was built during 2008–2010 at the border of Tanto and the owners of these expensive apartments were added to the list of actors in this contested terrain. But even following this intervention the park area, it is still, perhaps even more so, a contested terrain.

### **the 'former idyllic state'**

As has been intimated above, citizens petitions and the local press both bear witness to a park narrative professing a sense of loss of what had supposedly been idyllic park spaces, not only in Tanto/Skinarviksberget, but also in parks such as Rålambshovsparken in the neighbouring city district of Kungsholmen where a recent headline in the local newspaper illustratively declared 'Something has happened to my Kungsholmen!' (Kungsholmen, 2011). In the specific case of the aforementioned citizen's petition concerning Tanto, to what does it actually refer in its professed desire to see the park restored to its 'former idyllic state'? Does it refer to a golden era preceding the 1997 annulment of the general ban on drinking alcohol in public places; a time when, according to the police, people still drank alcohol in public although not 'pathologically so' (Police, 2011)? Perhaps, but reference to the former idyllic state also resonates with what these inner-city public parks were originally designed to do. What we are tracing when we outline the contestation over alcohol use is the contemporary workings of a social technology developed and implemented in the latter half of the 19th century in the service of a particular bourgeois programme.

In Sweden, this bourgeois programme entailed self-discipline, refinement, order, frugality, diligence, sense of family, a 'concern for one self's health in order to make a good day's work' and an ideal of education (Nolin, 1999, p. 49). Hence, the new generation of urban public parks dating from the late 19th century were affixed with ordinances and policing institutions that included the control (although not usually prohibition) of alcohol use and the inculcation of sobriety (Ibid., p. 258). The Tanto-area and Skinnarviksparken belong to this generation of public parks. Designed by Stockholm's first appointed city gardener Alfred Medin (1869–1906), these parks accorded to the programme of shaping collective urban morals (including sobriety), improving public health (especially through recreation), alleviating bad air and negating the effects of rapid urbanisation in Stockholm.

By around 1900 Stockholm parks were increasingly employed in the service of nation building; they 'should reflect Swedish national identity, as expressed in Swedish nature' (Nolin, 2006, p. 125). The use of the social technique of urban parks subsequently became increasingly established as a means to shape the citizen of the nascent welfare society and the city. In the 1920–1930s,

Parks were not only to be seen as a form of city decoration, they were to be used actively and strategically in the structuring of the total urban landscape.

Parks should form a kind of social and integrating network throughout the city, and not just comprise beautiful green squares. (Nilsson, 2006, p. 141)

What was developed was an instrument that was integral to the Swedish welfare state, one that was seemingly similarly invested with faith in spatial determinism as were the modernists' streets, squares, housing programs, and traffic planning. In the 1940–1950s, under the leadership of the fourth city gardener Howard Blom (1940–1976), the Stockholm School of park design emerged and, as Nilsson (Ibid., p. 143) observes, 'Stockholm was widely regarded as having the most progressive park policy in the world.'

## **public issues**

As the previous section suggests, urban public parks have been entangled with alcohol and the education of the body and the nation since their inception in the 19th century. Contemporary parklife in Stockholm, however, opens up a way to examine the relations of how these public spaces are conceived and contested, and the question of their openness for contestation, politics, and democracy in terms of how the public is conceived. In view of the history of modern urban public parks and the current era of liberalization (or 'new alcohol order'), it is noteworthy that the current Stockholm park plan (stad, 2006) does not mention alcohol at all but continues to forefront 'social values' that seem to hark back to the originary educative ethos as though nothing had changed.

To begin with, we could differentiate between weak and strong senses of public space, since what the Supreme Court Ruling (above) indicates is the highly problematic task of precisely mapping this kind of space. Property rights on a map define the weak form. The strong form, however, is defined by use and the various ways public space permits the public sphere to be staged. When we talk of public space, we are talking about a space produced by many and often conflicting interests and their (albeit ideal) tolerance toward each other. The notion of private interests as distinct and contrary to public spaces in this discussion is a conceptual fallacy (cf. Kneale, 2001). All actors involved, to at least some degree, have a stake in shaping the behaviour and private interests of others. Private interests are omnipresent in any publicness.

Accordingly, we see that the public spaces of parklife imply political performance in at least two ways. On the one hand, through people using the parks, being convivial and/or contesting territory by claiming patches of grass for their pleasure, recreation, and business. Here public space is an educational device allowing the citizen or visitor to explore what it means to share common resources and perhaps also how things can be different. It is an ideal situation where anything can be political and where the private (in public) is political. From the point of view of social science as applied technology, this is public space performed as infrastructure in civil society. Hence, in the social sciences, researchers have produced a common measure of what a true public space is. In effect, it is a yardstick used to beat up improper or errant public spaces. It holds a normative view of the idea of a diverse public, acting out democracy every day; the idea of an essence of city life as the encounter with the unfamiliar and therefore the shaping of a tolerance towards difference; the assumption that this is only possible in a free and genuinely all-inclusive public space (Light and Smith, 1998). Granted, this is an oversimplifying caricature (for a more nuanced analysis of this ideal, see Iveson, 1998), but such a stance does tend to render public space as relatively unproblematic and with no clearly visible contestation. It is a mere common use built by unchallenged routines. Similar to a proceduralist take on formal politics in political science; a machine in a kind of Fordist reading of democracy. Stockholm public parks could, for much of the year, be characterised as uncontested public space.

However, the practice, or rather achievement, of democracy is nothing but contested terrain and friction; all else would be bureaucracy. This is to rephrase the recent proposed move from proceduralism to a focus on how not to shortcut politics in controversies affecting the public (Latour, 2005). Here a different sense of the public becomes visible in what is a second way for parklife to be political: through a concern for the fate of this particular public space. In contrast to the yardstick conceptualisation of public space, which seems to depict the public as an already fully formed existing entity, contested parklife can illustrate why considering the public as fully formed might represent an impasse when we deal with the democratic aspects of public space. Public space is not like a library or a bank filled with the democratic force of the public; always on call to do its deed. Rather, the question is what might or might not shape a public (cf. Sheller, 2004). As Marres (2005) has shown, there is no public in democratic political procedure just hanging around in the hallways to readily engage in political contests. On the contrary, a public might materialize exactly when the political machine *does not* work. Publics form around issues and an issue has traction, so to speak, 'when there is not enough good information available, and when the problems are too complex and puzzling for anyone to understand them fully' (Ibid., p.

47). Hence, a public might be ‘called into being’ when existing formal political institutions fail to settle an issue brought up by someone’s objection or complaint.

Contrary to many commentaries on public space, therefore, it follows that public spaces are peculiarly void of a public until there is an issue to be settled. The orthodox conception is that a good public space is inhabited by a public through which politics are almost constantly deliberated. Since concerned citizens and groups shape up to perform as a public when conventional political institutions cannot solve the problem at hand, the public in the public space needs to be crafted around and follow an issue. It is a provisional achievement, not a solid institution to be reckoned with. For instance, Paddison and Sharp (2007) argue for the banal functioning of much public space and present an alternative to the widespread lamentation over the loss of (yardstick) public space among social scientists. While accepting ‘the contingency surrounding how (local) public spaces evolve’ they comment that

the contestation surrounding local public spaces is dynamic, emerging through *issues* that threaten its inclusivity, and sometimes its continued existence, but that equally such conflict provides opportunities for the reclaiming of such spaces. Key to such outcomes is the role of democratic practices through which collective decision making unfolds and the extent to which, and how, local participation is drawn into the process. (Ibid., p. 88, emphasis added)

By using this provisional and issue-oriented sense of politics and democracy we might gain a better understanding of the democratic practices necessitated by disputes in and over public spaces. As Paddison and Sharp (Ibid., p. 102) further note ‘... it is important to realise that there has never simply *been* public space, but always that it is in the process of *becoming* through struggle and debate’. Parklife and the contestation over normality and what a good parklife is or can be, seems to indicate the mobilisation of a public. In our case, conventional political institutions have been unable to settle the issue of alcohol consumption, now it is a matter of concern for all actors outlined above – and probably some more that we have yet to identify. At the same time it is necessary to collapse both spatial determinism and container views of space, since the issue here is the open-ended question of what the parks should become. What we could call ‘hot public spaces’, then, are quite different objects of inquiry than ‘cold’ ones. In science and technology studies (STS), a hot situation is characterized by Callon (1998) as when ‘everything becomes controversial’, it indicates ‘the absence of a stabilized knowledge base’ from which to make a calculated and ‘rational’ decision, and where the composition of the wide variety of actors ‘will

fluctuate in the course of the controversy itself, and they will put forward mutually incompatible descriptions of future world states.’ Cold situations, on the other hand, are those where solutions to occurring problems can be found relatively easy and swiftly, where the ‘possible world states are already known or easy to identify: calculated action can be taken.’

## **friction zones**

Our proposition is that friction zones, such as those involving alcohol and claims on territory and behaviour, may help a public to gather and to articulate the issue in a formal political sense. Friction zones in Stockholm parklife, it can we think be argued, arise at the intersection of public administration, the post-industrial alcohol order, and competing discourses of acceptable–unacceptable behaviour in public space and how these discourses are, or should be, legitimized and operationalised. Here, for a public to form, it is necessary for public space to become a hot issue.

In Stockholm parklife, certain behaviours are framed as bad, unacceptable, or pathological by institutions such as the police and the social services. It is a frame shared by some citizen representatives but not by all. Some citizens are denoted as constitutive of the problem, and as not taking part in this particular public articulation. Hence, the public space of parklife is a multiplicity. It comprises varying articulations of the problem that fail to fully map on to each other. Parklife, via the issue of friction zones, is certainly an entity of which there are ‘more than one, but less than many’ (Mol, 2002, p. 82); that is, as the ‘normality’ is contested there is not one essential Tanto but still highly divergent ideas on what could and should constitute normal parklife. The controversy is open-ended, fragmented, and any ‘realistic’ account of it, in the sense of one true state of affairs or framework, is to take sides in this controversy. Framing is what articulations of issues turn out to be, i.e., the various problem characterisations and definitions. Thrown together they give the rough outlines of the issue through questions such as: who has an interest in normalising parklife? What frames do the actors involved produce? And what are the ramifications and sanctions?

Let us outline what the actors’ frames depict so far. A spokesperson for the citizens claims that the groups of heavy drinkers (youths and adults) have, through their drinking behaviour, colonised and transformed Tanto to the effect that other users are driven away, and that a total ban on drinking (or at least after 20.00 in the evening) is necessary to restore the park to its ‘normal’ state. In a letter to the editor concerning drunken youth and disturbed sleep between midnight and 03.00, a citizen commented that when they ‘petition the politicians for a alcohol ban in the park, they claim that we will only move the problem elsewhere – and that is exactly what we want!’ (Södermalm, 2010); and this ‘else-

where' is located in a different inner-city district (Gärdet). On the same page, an ironic response signed J.S. to an earlier letter, which misses the 'beer-men' ('*ölgubbar*', bench squatters) in the neighbourhood, reports that they are nowadays alive and well in Tanto. The signatory J.S. also wrote in 2011 that most of the problems in Tanto were caused by drunken gangs and not peaceful family picnickers, hence it is argued that an alcohol ban would take care of the problems with 'drunkenness, fights, club downs, molestations, rapes, vandalism, burnt grass, torn down tree-branches, and torn fences from the mini-golf court and allotments used as fire wood' (Södermalm, 2011; see Figure 4).

<< *Figure 4 about here. See end of document.* >>

A faction of the authorities – left-wing politicians – envisions something slightly similar. Namely that AFZs in public parks will support the social work to mitigate the alcohol related problems among the youth. This is an argument which from their point of view is in line with a struggle against the neo-liberalisation of the city. Another faction, the ruling centre-right fraction, wants a norm centred on 'nice' or 'constructive' drinking involving the civilised consumption of *wine* and food in family congregations.

A frame provided by the police comes with a self-representation of a concerned actor rather than the more commonplace Weberian image of monopolists of legal violence (Police, 2011). They comment on AFZs and alcohol legislation as a toolkit or an instrument. But underlining their serious interest in the question of what a desirable parklife could be (or is) and how they can help bring it about, they frame it as an open and undecided question of 'what is a good parklife?' Most intriguing of all is the fact that their frame does not set up alcohol as the sole villain in raising problems of friction zones, but rather as one actor in a complex situation where diversity does not necessarily lead to tolerance but potentially to friction and even physical violence between groups present in and around the park. Interest in this question also places the police in a kind of lobbying situation vis-a-vis the politicians. In their framing of the contested territory of these public parks, they seem more interested in the politics than the 'mere' policing of public space. Here, they also state their interest in the economics of parklife: specifically how the police could be more effective in participating to create a good parklife.

More frames are provided with reference to science, or specifically social science research. Södermalm District Council, for example, expresses their concern to do the right thing, i.e., of not making decisions on what constitutes normal drinking behaviour in the park without having a firm, evidence-based position from which to argue the case. And then there is the neat little reference to a theoretical problem of how to demarcate public

space by the authorities, or in other words the institutional question of what a public space is.

At the scale of Stockholm City, an investigation into lessons learned from the existing AFZs among the fourteen Stockholm district councils was conducted by the Stockholm City Management Office on behalf of Stockholm Municipal Council and published in 2007 (see stad, 2008). Here, AFZs were perceived to have made a positive contribution to ensuring public order, especially in terms of providing the police with a clear mandate to intervene directly when the by-law was being contravened. Indeed, no recommendations were forwarded to revoke any of the AFZs established up to 2005. However, longer-term solutions to alcohol related problems including but also transcending the more specific issue of public order, focused on the need for preventative strategies involving the cooperation of local police authorities, the various departments of the social services, parents, schools, and youths.<sup>6</sup>

The threshold between normal and pathological, or acceptable and unacceptable behaviour, seems to a large degree shaped by alcohol and particularly beer. Beer performs the threshold, one could say, at least in some actors' accounts. What is apparent from a perusal of the Stockholm City Management Office (Ibid.) report is a relatively distinct difference in the way that the specific functions and intended inclusiveness of public space is represented, on the one hand, by the four inner-city district councils and, on the other hand, by councils in the nearby suburbs. More specifically, the inner-city councils more often frame the public park space as an arena for individualistic self-fulfilment centred on the norm of middle-class values and behaviour (cf. Jayne et al., 2008a). Somewhat simplistically, this takes the form of 'responsible' adults tranquilly 'sharing' a bottle of *wine* and the contents of a picnic basket (beer is almost never mentioned in this context in this or other similar documents). Somewhat paradoxically, although in effect a logical corollary, the same public space is also represented as a disciplinary space where those not conforming to the norm are essentially deemed pathological to that normatively ascribed space. In essence, what is being contrasted here seems to be the 'constructive drinking' of the 'picnicker' and the 'destructive' drinking of the deviant beer-'binger'. In this frame alcohol can thus be seen as two kinds of actors, *beer* and *wine*.

Thus the corollary disciplinary instrument to the liberal instrument of allowing drinking in parks until midnight is the call for increased resources for policing to ensure that the 'normal' population is not 'infected' by any 'pathological' element. Accordingly, where the level of 'pathological' behaviour crosses a 'manageable threshold' the additional disciplinary instrument of the AFZ *may* be invoked (see the case of Skinnarviksparken,

and more recently, Nydalsparken). That this threshold of unsociable behaviour is somewhat undefined is exemplified by the case of Tantolunden where clearly this threshold of unacceptability had not yet been traversed. Clearly, an alternative understanding would be that thresholds differ in different places of the city. So, on a speculative (although not entirely uncorroborated) note, we suspect that a purposeful strategy of zoning of ambient levels of misconduct across city space might be taking shape (cf. the issue of zoning misconduct in the US in Ellickson, 1996).

If we see the park in line with the ideal yardstick on public spaces, then the friction zones are positive as they lift the eyes of the groups toward other groups with different practices. A consciousness is shaped or maintained which is healthy for democracy and everyday democratic practices. Simplified, the notion is that you learn to be civilised, tolerant, and thus to accommodate diversity in society.

Firstly, in this regard, the urban public park – perhaps unlike other kinds of public spaces – bears a contradiction created at its invention. Perhaps many users do not really want to work on their democratic skills and competency in handling friction while in (or living nearby) the park. They (probably) want recreation and relaxation. In the contested terrain presented here, the public formed around parklife thus seems to be concerned with the original script of the bourgeois public park (recreation and control of the self and the body) – a programme that ironically does not share much with the agora inspired yardstick model of public space. Secondly, the actors who are generally seen as deviants and generating most of the friction are certain youth and adult groups defined by their use of alcohol. In this friction zone they probably do not become as ‘conscious’ of difference as others become of them. But we might be very wrong here and this – like the slipperiness of the ‘they’ – is an empirical question waiting to be explored. For example, bench-squatting groups have, in other contexts, been known to serve as ‘eyes upon the street’ and nodes in neighbourhood communications and gossip (e.g. FT, 2006). Thirdly, ‘alcohol’ as an actor complicates the issues around the good of public space and its role in educating the citizenry about democracy. This actor comes with a very different discourse on public health than that of a sound public space and tolerant practices.

## **displacement**

Situations where specific actors in the city intend to exclude another on behalf of yet a third actor are not uncommon. This at least seems to be a common feature in schemes pursued by entrepreneurial urban governance and whose implementation is justified by notions such as urban revitalization, urban renaissance, improved quality of life for the citizens, and growth in the tourist sector (cf. Lees, 2003; Fraser, 2007). With the enforce-

ment of particular norms in urban public spaces it is not uncommon for the actors framed with unacceptable conduct not to disappear absolutely but rather to be displaced and even thrive elsewhere within the city (Crossa, 2009).

However, in the case of Tanto and Skinnarviksparken there is yet another sense of displacement which comes into light – and no less political. Superficially, it is easy to take the Euclidean space of the park and parklife for granted as a handle to start investigating the issue of alcohol and public space. However, we were quickly reminded by the actors of how easy it is to forget what human geography has been discussing for at least three decades: the park is no container space with clear boundaries in practice (except in the Cartesian administrative mapping of city territory). It is rather more relational and has dynamic attachments to the overall or general fluid public spaces of today. The lesson becomes clear if we summarize how the actors frame the problem of friction zones in Stockholm parklife, and thereby the spatial characteristics of this project.

The police commented on the parks and the friction zones more in terms of being a networked space, connecting to adjacent streets, places, or other nodes of ‘clustering’. Thus, for them the problem is a highly mobile one. The Police also comments in recent press-article on mobile phones and the mobility of the ‘travelling pack’ and their ‘provisional privatization’ of public spaces (Metro, 2011; cf. Lieberg, 1992). This is illustrated by the police comment that the problem with bans and AFZs is that when there is ‘successful’ implementation in one location, this reverberates and lowers the ‘friction tolerance’ of the citizens in other areas. Concerning Tanto more specifically, the police describe this contiguous area – the place – as having a catalytic effect in a fluid drinking space. It is not seen as the whole problem, but rather as a node in a network of public space that might initiate movements that erupt somewhere else. Complexities also stem from its specific topography and location in the wider Stockholm area public transportation network; youth from all over the county gather here. Skinnarviksparken on the other hand is seen as being somewhat inaccessible, both in terms of flows and in terms of police ‘visits’. It takes five minutes to climb the hill and they risk having stones thrown at them, hence they tend to keep visits to a minimum (Police, 2011).

Framing their concern as one of conviviality, the Södermalm district council wondered about the problem of demarcation and quality vis-à-vis qualification of a (political) public space. The district council’s response to the citizen’s petition indicates that the friction zone has to become a public affair, since it is a matter of concern rather than a matter of fact as the district council admits when saying ‘we don’t know what to do’. The main problem is one of displacement. If a ban on alcohol is placed in one area only, there is a risk

that the problem may not disappear but instead literally move to a different part of the district.

The Social Services Prevention Unit (SSPU) suggest semi-organized activities dispersed throughout Södermalm to prevent under-aged youths from consuming alcohol (and other drugs). The SSPU also stresses the nomadic character of the ‘problematic’ elements of parklife as they have moved from one park to another over the last ten years or so (SSPU, 2011). Concerning the bench-squatters, our own observations, which are verified by the Social Services Adults Unit (SSAU), suggests that they self-regulate conduct on and around the benches to minimize disturbance as far as possible during daytime and early evenings. This is probably a response to the threat of being moved on by the police should there be too many complaints (of interest in this regard is the reason for their relocation, if even slight, when children-centred activities are in progress).

So public space is performed in a distributed way, as parklife becomes displaced among the actors who are held responsible for ‘making it work’. Parklife as an object, or an issue, becomes mobile and is deliberated among the actors, in their offices and living rooms, via channels other than in the park itself (even if some deliberations such as in ‘street meets’ organized by the district council, are held on location.) Fluid objects and displaced matter are, however, also seen by Marres as necessary conditions for a public to materialize, in that ‘the problem must be *dis-embedded* from the situation in which it arises’ in order for it to become an issue (Marres, 2005, p. 49). Here it is interesting that the emerging public discusses the fate of the public space. However, the articulations and deliberations are mostly done elsewhere. The public space of parklife is dispersed and displaced to the public sphere of actors attached and drawn into it. As we see in the narrative above, friction zones are not necessarily caught within the ‘physical’ space – the territorial confines – of the park, rather, the friction zone in question pushes the park around the conduits and fora of local governance and it wanders off into other parts of the city.

## **conclusion, or: the alcoholic challenge for urban democracy?**

Following Jayne et al. (2006), we could ask what kinds of drinking spaces are involved, or how could the urban parks be characterised from the point of view of drinking spaces. How can we ‘pursue a more nuanced understanding of the social relations and cultural practices associated’ in their emergence? A more nuanced understanding would imply not only reporting drinking statistics and not only analysing the political economy of the night-time economy. In a manner that echoes Sennett (1977) and Lofland (1998), Jayne et al. (2006) argue that there should be room for drinking people (and inebriated people) as ‘active citizens who legitimately occupy public space’; they take part in and con-

tribute to the shaping of pleasures, the ‘risky city’, and engagements with the ‘urban other’. Thus, they should ‘perhaps be considered as in terms of the connectivities and belonging generated in public space’ (Ibid., p. 462—464). In other words, barring the cliché, alcohol could be seen as a mediator and enabler of a city life not likely without this actor. There is a difference between acceptance and a positive view of alcohol use in public spaces.

Stockholm parklife indicates how hot public spaces generated by friction zones may become a public affair for local politics. Both the weak sense of public space and the yardstick model is clearly of limited use here, since the issues around which a public might form are not necessarily static on a map. In addition to the probable mere displacement of the problem, a conclusion is that the experience and experiment in a politics of public space, as indicated by interviews and in the controversy outlined above, would be nullified by a simple substitution of friction zones in the parks for AFZs. Such a short-cut of political work would mean a loss in democratic learning for all actors involved – for directly and indirectly affected citizens and for the district council. It also generates further questions pertaining to local public political participation: how is the issue of alcohol in urban public parks to be dealt with in practice hereafter? To paraphrase Amin and Thrift’s (2002) challenge, a confident democracy should not avoid learning.

Clearly, only deeper research into this issue will reveal the contextual causes for the implementation of the supposedly ad hoc and short-term instrument of the alcohol-free zone in some areas but not in others and the socio-spatial effects of such policy.

## endnotes

1. See also the *Vision 2030* of Stockholm becoming a ‘World Class City’, in Stockholm Stad (2007).

2. ‘Strong beer’ in Sweden is above 3.5 volume percent alcohol and can only be sold retail by Systembolaget, the state owned monopoly on alcoholic beverages.

3. Similar to another ‘light’ drug use, smoking tobacco, which is increasingly banned from public spaces in Sweden and the EU.

4. This development may, to a certain extent, be understood in the context of the then incumbent social democratic government’s policy goal of ‘developing more alcohol-free areas’ as one element of the wider policy goal of improving public health and reducing alcohol related medical and social problems (Regeringen, 2005).

5. In early 2009, a signed list of 234 neighbours to Tanto was also handed in to the District Council, protesting against general disturbances due to events, loud voices, littering, and not using public facilities when going to the restroom (see Södermalm, 2009).

6. See e.g. the *Kronobergsmodellen*, concerning youth and alcohol, and the *Linköpingsmodellen*, concerning youth and drugs, (SvD, 2011).

## references

- AMIN, A. (2010): 'Collective Culture and Urban Public Space', In WANJIKU KIHATO, C., MASSOUMI, M., RUBLE, B.A., SUBIRÓS, P. AND GARLAND, A.M. (Eds) *Urban Diversity: Space, Culture, and Inclusive Pluralism in Cities Worldwide*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. xx-yy.
- AMIN, A. AND THRIFT, N. (2002): *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*, Cambridge, Malden MA, Polity Press.
- ARENDT, H. (1958): *The Human Condition*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- CALLON, M. (1998): 'An Essay on Framing and Overflowing: Economic Externalities Revisited by Sociology', In CALLON, M. (Ed) *The Laws of the Markets*, Oxford, Keele, Blackwell/*The Sociological Review*, pp. 244-269.
- CRONIN, A. AND HETHERINGTON, K. (Eds.) (2008): *Consuming the Entrepreneurial City: Image, Memory, Spectacle*, London, Routledge, London.
- CROSSA, V. (2009): 'Resisting the Entrepreneurial City: Street Vendor's Struggle in Mexico City's Historic Center', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33(1): 43-63.
- DRN (2008): *Alkohol i Stockholmsparker till midnatt*, Drug News, 2008-06-10, at <http://www.drugnews.nu/article.asp?id=4538&p=stockholmsparker>, accessed 2010-08-24.
- ELICKSON, R.C. (1996): 'Controlling chronic misconduct in city spaces: Of panhandlers, skid-rows, and public-space zoning', *Yale Law Journal* 105(5): 1165-1248.
- FRASER, B. (2007): 'Madrid's Retiro Park as publicly-private space and the spatial problems of spatial theory', *Social & Cultural Geography* 8(5): 673-700.
- FRASER, N. (1992): 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy', In CALHOUN, C. (Ed) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge Mass., The MIT Press, pp. 109-142.
- FT (2006): *Trötta på att leta sittplats*, Fria Tidningen, Zernell, Z., 2006-11-06, at <http://www.fria.nu/artikel/8126>, accessed 2010-11-09.
- HAYWARD, K. AND HOBBS, D. (2007): 'Beyond the binge in 'booze Britain': market-led liminalization and the spectacle of binge drinkers', *The British Journal of Sociology* 58(3): 437-456.
- IVESON, K. (1998): 'Putting the public back into public space', *Urban Research and Policy* 16(1): 21-33.

- . (2007): *Publics and the City*, Oxford, John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- JAYNE, M., HOLLOWAY, S.L. AND VALENTINE, G. (2006): 'Drunk and Disorderly: Alcohol, Urban Life and Public Space', *Progress in Human Geography* 30(4): 451–468.
- JAYNE, M., VALENTINE, G. AND HOLLOWAY, S.L. (2008a): 'Fluid Boundaries – British Binge Drinking and European Civility: Alcohol and the Production and Consumption of Public Space', *Space and Polity* 12(1): 81–100.
- (2008b): 'The Place of Drink: Geographical Contributions to Alcohol Studies', *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 15(3): 219–232.
- KNEALE, J. (2001): 'The place of drink: Temperance and the public, 1856–1914', *Social & Cultural Geography* 2(1): 43–59.
- LATOURE, B. (2005): 'From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik, or How to Make Things Public', In LATOURE, B. AND WEIBEL, P. (Eds) *Making Things Public – Atmospheres of Democracy*, Karlsruhe, Engelhardt & Bauer, pp. 4–31.
- LEES, L. (2003): 'The Ambivalence of Diversity and the Politics of Urban Renaissance: The Case of Youth in Downtown Portland, Maine', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27(3): 613–634.
- LIEBERG, M. (1992): *Att ta staden i besittning: Om Ungas rum och rörelser i offentlig miljö*. Arkitektursektionen, Institutionen för byggnadsfunktionslära Ph.D. thesis, Lund: Lunds Universitet.
- LIGHT, A. AND SMITH, J.M. (1998): 'Introduction: Geography, Philosophy, and Public Space', In LIGHT, A. AND SMITH, J.M. (Eds) *Philosophy and Geography II: The Production of Public Space*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., pp. 1–16.
- LOFLAND, L. (1998): *The Public Realm: Exploring the City's Quintessential Social Territory*, New York, Aldine de Gruyter.
- LOW, S., TAPLIN, D. AND SCHELD, S. (2005): *Rethinking Urban Parks: Public Space and Cultural Diversity*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- MARRES, N.S. (2005): *No issue, no public: Democratic deficits after the displacement of politics*. Ph.D. thesis, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- MEASHAM, F. AND BRAIN, K. (2005): 'Binge' drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of intoxication', *Crime, Media, Culture* 1(3): 262–283.
- METRO (2011): *Här är Stockholms farligaste parker*, 27 April, at <http://www.metro.se/nyheter/har-ar-stockholms-farligaste-park/EVHkdA!V5CM BtdYQV7OA/>, accessed 2011-04-28.

- MITCHELL, D. (2003): *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*, New York, London, Guildford Press.
- MITT I KUNGSHOLMEN (2011): Något har hänt med mitt Kungsholmen, August,
- MITT I SÖDERMALM (2009): Grannarna störs av livet i parken, Tisdag 14 april, Liljeholmen, Lokaltidningen Mitt i Stockholm AB.
- (2010): Bra idé att flytta fylleriet från Drakensbergsparken, tisdag 6 juli, Liljeholmen, Lokaltidningen Mitt i Stockholm AB.
- (2011): Alkoholförbud i parken får bort nedskräpningen, tisdag 3 maj, Liljeholmen, Lokaltidningen Mitt i Stockholm AB.
- MOL, A. (2002): *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*, Durham, Duke University Press.
- NILSSON, L. (2006): 'The Stockholm Style: A Model for the Building of the City In Parks, 1930s–1960s', In CLARK, P. (Ed) *The European City and Green Space: London, Stockholm, Helsinki and St. Petersburg 1850–2000*, Aldershot, Burlington, Ashgate Publishing, pp. 141–158.
- NOLIN, C. (1999): *Till stadsbornas nytta och förlustelse: Den offentliga parken i Sverige under 1800-talet*, Stockholm, Byggförlaget.
- (2006): 'Stockholm's Urban Parks: Meeting Places and Social Contexts From 1860–1930', In CLARK, P. (Ed) *The European City and Green Space: London, Stockholm, Helsinki and St. Petersburg 1850–2000*, Aldershot, Burlington, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, pp. 111–126.
- PADDISON, R. AND SHARP, J. (2007): 'Questioning the end of public space: Reclaiming control of local banal spaces', *Scottish Geographical Journal* 123(2): 87–106.
- PLANT, M. AND PLANT, M. (2006): *Binge Britain: Alcohol and the National Response*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Police (2011): Officer A and B, Interview 2011-01-18, Närpolisen Maria, Södermalm, Stockholm.
- REGERINGEN (2005): Nationella alkohol- och narkotikahandlingsplaner, Regeringens proposition 2005/06:30, Stockholm, Socialdepartementet.
- REGERINGSKANSLIET (2010a): En samlad strategi för alkohol-, narkotika-, dopnings- och tobakspolitiken, Regeringens proposition 2010/2011:47, Stockholm, Regeringskansliet.
- (2010b): Regeringens åtgärdsprogram för ANDT-politiken, S.2010.001, Socialdepartementet, ANDT-sekretariatet, Stockholm, Regeringskansliet.
- REGERINGSRÄTTEN (1997): RÅ 1997 ref. 41, 2481–96, 1997-07-04, Stockholm, Regeringsrätten.

- ROBERTS, M. (2006): 'From 'crative city' to 'no-go areas' – The expansion of the night-time economy in British towns and city centres', *Cities* 23(5): 331–338.
- SENNETT, R. (1977): *The Fall of Public Man*, New York, Random House.
- SHELLER, M. (2004): 'Mobile publics: Beyond the network perspective', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22: 39–52.
- SHELLER, M. AND URRY, J. (2003): 'Mobile Transformations of Public and Private Life', *Theory, Culture & Society* 20(3): 107–125.
- SMITH, N. (1996): *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*, Routledge.
- SÖDERMALMS STADSDELSFÖRVALTNING (2009): *Parkplan Södermalm, 1–3*, Södermalms stadsdelsförvaltning, Stockholms stad, Stockholm, Södermalms stadsdelsförvaltning, Stockholms stad.
- (2010): *Medborgarförslag – Alkoholförbud i hela Tantolunden*, Social omsorg, Dnr 002-455-09, Stockholms stad, Södermalms stadsdelsförvaltning, Stockholms stad.
- SSAU Civil Servant B, Interview 2011-02-01, Socialtjänsten, Vuxenheten, Södermalms stadsdelsförvaltning, Stockholms stad.
- SSPU (2011): *Civil servant A*, Interview 2011-01-19, Preventionsenheten, Södermalms stadsdelsförvaltning, Stockholms stad.
- STAEHELI, L.A. AND MITCHELL, D. (2008): *The People's Property? Power, Politics, and the Public*, Abingdon, Routledge.
- STOCKHOLMS STAD (2004): *Stadsövergripande policy för alkoholförbud på gator och i parker*, Bilaga 14:16 till kommunstyrelsens protokoll den 22 juni 2004, Dnr 667-3603/2003, Stockholm, Stockholms stad.
- (2006): *Stockholms Parkprogram: Handlingsprogrammet 2005–2009 för utveckling och skötsel av Stockholms parker och natur*, Markkontoret, Stockholm, Stockholms stad.
- (2007): *Vision 2030: Ett Stockholm i världsklass*, Stadsledningskontoret, Stockholm, Stockholms stad.
- (2008): *Ändring av allmänna lokala föreskrifter för Stockholms stad avseende alkoholförtäring*, Utlåtande 2008:RI (Dnr 667-3851/2007), Stockholm, Stockholms stad.
- SVD (2005): *Fler parker får förbud mot alkohol*, Svenska Dagbladet, Hanson, M., 2005–06–01, at [http://www.svd.se/nyheter/inrikes/flu-parker-far-forbud-mot-alkohol\\_426691.svd](http://www.svd.se/nyheter/inrikes/flu-parker-far-forbud-mot-alkohol_426691.svd), accessed 2010-06-15.

- (2011): Polisen laddar för Valborg, Hernadi, A., fredag 30 april, at [http://www.svd.se/nyheter/stockholm/polisen-laddar-for-valborg\\_6129775.svd](http://www.svd.se/nyheter/stockholm/polisen-laddar-for-valborg_6129775.svd), accessed 2011-05-01.
- TÖRRÖNEN, J. AND KARLSSON, T. (2005): 'Moral Regulation of Public Space and Drinking in the Media and Legislation in Finland', *Contemporary Drug Problems* 32: 93–126.
- YOUNG, I.M. (1990): *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

## figures



*Figure 1. 'Man on bed' or 'Man in bed'? Tanto, Stockholm March 2011. (Source: Photo by author)*



Figure 2. Södermalm District in Stockholm with Tanto-area (1) and Skinnarviksparken (2). (Source: Used with kind permission, © Lantmäteriet Gävle 2011. Medgivande I 2011/0094).



Figure 3. Front page map on one of the largest free daily newspaper in Stockholm, claiming Tanto to be the most dangerous public park. (Source: Metro, 2011)

**2 MITT I SÖDERMALM. TISDAG 3 MAJ 2011****tyck till**

**Lokaltidningen Mitt i Södermalm**  
Skriv in din insändare på [www.mitti.se](http://www.mitti.se)  
Klicka på "Insändare" i menyraden.  
Frågor besvaras på telefon 550 550 80  
mån-ons kl 13–16.

Ditt inlägg bör inte vara längre än  
1 800 tecken (cirka 300 ord), svar 1 200  
tecken (cirka 200 ord). Vi förbehåller  
oss rätten att korta och redigera texter.

Insänt material returneras ej. Bifoga  
namn, adress och telefonnummer  
även om du skriver under signatur.  
Anonyma insändare publiceras ej.

# Alkoholförbud i parken får bort nedskräpningen

Nedskräpningen i våra parker blir värre och värre för varje år. Det är inte familjer som har picknick i våra parker eller vuxna människor som nyttjar parkerna för sol och avkoppling som lämnar efter sig allt detta skräp.

Nej, det är alla gäng som samlas på Söder för att supa i parkerna. Det stod i Lokaltidningen Mitt i att Vitabergsparken måste städas flera gånger i veckan. Tantolunden/Dra-  
ckenbergsparken måste städas två gånger per dag.

Förutom nedskräpning handlar det om fylla, slagsmål, nedslagningar, ofredande, våldtäkter, vandalisering, sönderbrända gräsmattor, nedslitna trädgrenar och bortslitna staket från golfbanan och koloniloterna som används som virke.

Konsekvenserna av detta blir bland annat att kolonilottsägarna inte vågar vistas på sina kolonilotter på kvällarna och har slutat helt att övernatta.

Vanliga familjer och människor som inte super stannar inte kvar efter klockan 17–18 då de känner sig hotade och inte vill vara i den miljö som skapats.

Tantos bangolf får mindre och mindre besökare kvällstid. De boende som har balkonger mot parken kan inte använda sina balkonger. De kan heller inte ha sina fönster öppna för ljuden från musikanlägg-



Vitabergsparken måste städas flera gånger i veckan.

ARK

ningarna i parken. Utsikten i sig är heller inget man vill se. Gräsmattorna är nedpinkade och även nummer två utförs här då toaletter helt saknas.

Tusentals supande individer behöver pinka ganska ofta. De gör inbrott i kolonistugorna, stjälar saker samt övernattar i dem. De slänger allt från flaskor, ölburkar och shoppingvagnar till cyklar i vattnet.

Alla dessa problem löser man genom att dag efter dag städa så de kan komma tillbaks och börja om från början igen.

Stadsdelsförvaltningen vill att allmänheten ska städa efter dess svin. Det är absurt. Till vilken nytta?

Förbjud alkoholkonsumtion i parken.

Figure 4. Letter to the editor in a neighbourhood/local paper, claiming the efficiency of an alcohol ban to discourage littering. (Source: Södermalm, 2011)