

trespasser; if he knows or ought to know that he or she is a trespasser and is living in the building or intends to live there for any period of time. The law does not criminalize the individual if he or she is a legitimate tenant who is refusing to leave as part of a dispute with the landlord.<sup>135</sup> Those convicted of squatting in residential areas can face one year's imprisonment and/or a 5,000-pound fee. The law does *not* criminalize squatting in commercial or nonresidential buildings.

The new law is thus stricter than existing legislation because previously it was a crime to squat only if it inconvenienced someone who required access to the property—to sell it, rent it or live in it. Previously, squatting in an occupied building was not considered a crime. The new law thus broadens the scope of government and citizen power to evict squatters as it also extends to residential properties that are empty and not being lived in. In addition, lawyer Richard John notes on his web site that “The Bill (and defeat of the amendment) is to be welcomed by property owners and occupiers who have born the cost of evicting squatters and the associated property repair and clean-up costs which can be a lengthy and expensive process.” He expects to see legislation widened to cover nonresidential property in the future.<sup>136</sup>

Finally, an editorial in the *Guardian* warns that squatting law reforms could cost taxpayers 790 million pounds over five years, noting that “the LASPO is supposed to cut government’s costs for dealing with criminality, while criminalizing squatting is said to raise the costs of policing.” In addition, the analyst warns that police misconduct will likely increase if police are encouraged to think of these people as criminals.<sup>137</sup>

### CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF THE LEGISLATION

As this chapter has shown, securitization measures led to a quick resolution of the squatting issue in Britain, due largely to efforts by the media to portray squatters as a menace to society. However, it is equally clear that the actual “knowledge” on which claims about the danger presented by squatters rested was contested and often incomplete. The squatter was constructed, perhaps incorrectly, as someone wholly unlike others in society. At the same time, squatter groups attempted to show that this conception was false, marshaling evidence to show that squatters are often more integrated into the larger political fabric than we might have previously thought. They have often been portrayed as isolated “fringe” groups and extremists. However, despite a tendency by the media and Tory politicians to “other” the squatter, presenting him as unidimensional and wholly unlike his neighbors, it has been possible to form a more nuanced portrait. Nonetheless this persistent othering of the squatter makes it possible for the issue of squatting to become securitized and for legislation outlawing squatting practices to be passed quickly with only limited public debate.

## 3 Incorporating the Enclave of Juliana Christiania

In the previous chapter, we explored the criminalization of property squatting in Great Britain, where securitization took a typical trajectory. Decisions were made quickly with little public input, and harsh measures were enacted to reassert state control over the security threat allegedly posed by squats in the capital. In this chapter, we consider the case of Denmark and in particular the actions taken to secure the vast, multidwelling enclave known as Juliana Christiania. In this case, securitization proceeded slowly, over the course of nearly forty years. Multiple attempts at securitizing acts were taken against Juliana Christiania and against other property squats in Copenhagen. In some instances these acts were successful, while in others they were not. As in the British case, public opinion again played a role in the dialogue regarding the security threat posed by Juliana Christiania and its residents.

So how do we account for the shift in both public opinion and state strategies towards this squatter settlement over time? Here, we can consider two possibilities: First, we might posit that there was something threatening about the place itself—because it is a sort of liminal place that both is and is not part of Copenhagen proper. Although it was geographically within the city limits, it enjoyed a status that marked it as separate—governed by a different architectural aesthetic, a different social status, and a different “political culture” or set of political norms and values. It is thus what Jacek Pawlicki terms “an alternative metropolis.”<sup>1</sup>

Christiania can be described by making reference to Foucault’s notion of a “heterotopia”—a utopian or nonutopian space in which social hierarchies are suspended. Heterotopias are places that are out of tune with regular, ordinary spaces for a variety of reasons. They represent a sort of crossing of boundaries—for example, a cemetery can be said to be situated both in the present, in the past and even in eternity, in a sense. Heterotopias are thus a type of deviant space because they are in synch with a different time zone, a different set of rules or a different aesthetic. Foucault himself notes that such spaces “have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror or reflect.”<sup>2</sup> Thus, Christiania inevitably draws and begs people to notice the contrast between how life is there and

how it is in the rest of Copenhagen—setting up a contrast between regulated, conformist Denmark and freewheeling Christiania.

However, it is perhaps too simplistic to say that it was the character of Juliana Christiania itself that was threatening—since the squat existed quite publically for forty years before the recent drive to shut it down. Christiania was never a space that hid in the shadows. Its residents sought not to blend in or to hide within Denmark, but were instead always overt in their identity and their activities. In addition, Christiania was always politicized. Its ethos might be described as countercultural but not necessarily antistate. In this way, the push to establish and maintain Christiania owes much to Holston's notion of "insurgent citizenship."<sup>3</sup> He notes that those who occupy or take possession of uninhabited properties are not simply deviants behaving in an anti-social manner. (They are not those for whom socialization into housing mores has failed.) Instead, they are individuals and groups engaged in a powerful form of civil disobedience meant overall to call the state to account. Claiming property by squatting is thus a form of "active citizenship."<sup>4</sup> As Mirafra and Willis describe the situation, "the protagonists of this citizenship drama use nonformalized channels, create new spaces of citizenship, and improvise and innovate innovative practices, all of which attract a captive constituency that embraces their just demands."<sup>5</sup>

Thus, a more compelling explanation for the crackdown suggests that the decision to rein in and incorporate Christiania into the existing political structures had less to do with any characteristics of the enclave itself, and more to do with changes that occurred within the larger political entity of Denmark itself. Here one can argue that a relatively peaceful, homogeneous society could absorb any sort of threat that the presence of a liminal space like Christiania represented, but a society that viewed itself as already under siege through the threats of undocumented immigrants, the increasing diversity of the population and a rising drug problem could not. In that way, Christiania became a risk multiplier within an already threatened environment. Thus, the answer as to why Christiania, which had existed happily for nearly forty years, was suddenly securitized in the early 2000s lies not only in Danish domestic politics but also in the international system. The changing character of Denmark's residents helped provide the conditions that made reexercising control over Juliana Christiania conceivable. While the squatter enclave was acceptable in a Copenhagen that was largely homogeneous, the changing ethnic, national and religious composition of the refugee and squatter population of Copenhagen caused squatting to be viewed differently in the period since 2005.

In this chapter I provide a chronological overview of the history of Juliana Christiania and the attempts at securitization of the region that have occurred since its founding in 1971. Here I hope to show how the autonomy and sovereignty granted to the region were gradually whittled away, due largely to increased police presence and surveillance over the enclave

beginning in the 1990s. In addition, I argue that Juliana Christiania ultimately came to seem like a "failed state" within the confines of Copenhagen, a place where state authority was weak and nonexistent. And just as spillover from an actual failed state has the ability to destabilize a region, residents and political authorities in Denmark worried about a spillover effect from Juliana Christiania, fearing the criminal activities might spill over into surrounding communities.

I also consider the alternate narrative put forth by Christiania dwellers, who assert that Christiania was unfairly targeted or scapegoated and portrayed as the producer of all of the social problems in the region. In this way, the government was able to avoid engaging with larger issues—such as whether enough social services were being provided to new immigrants, why so many of Copenhagen's young people had so few social opportunities, or why poverty had increased. Instead, squatter settlements were portrayed as breeding grounds for crime and drug abuse, and the obvious solution of controlling and shutting down the settlement was seen as the simplest solution.

#### THE FOUNDING OF JULIANA CHRISTIANIA

The squatter enclave of Juliana Christiania sits on a former Norwegian military base of approximately eighty-four acres in the Christianshavn section of Copenhagen. The settlement, named after Norwegian king Christian IV, who originally commissioned the barracks in the 1800s,<sup>6</sup> began when neighbors to the base decided one day to knock down a fence in order to allow their children to play in the green spaces of the military installation Badmandstraedes.<sup>7</sup> (The military had formally abandoned the buildings in 1971 and they were unused and in a state of disrepair.)

After these actions the journalist Jacob Ludvigsen wrote an article in the magazine *Hovedbladet* that described the creation of a new settlement, which he referred to as a free town. Ludvigsen also participated in the drafting of a mission statement for the community, which noted that it wanted to be a self-governing community that was economically self-sustaining.<sup>8</sup> (Interestingly, later historians have suggested that Ludvigsen's call to citizens to "come and occupy Christiania" was meant to be satirical as was the article itself, entitled "Immigrate with Bus Number 8: The Direct Route to Christiania."<sup>9</sup> According to some, neither he nor the authorities either predicted or anticipated the creation of an actual squatter settlement a few walkable blocks from the center of Copenhagen.)

Officially described as anarchist, Christiania from the beginning embraced an ideology of consensus decision making and communalism. Residents joke that there are always long meetings to go to and note that participating in democracy in Freetown Christiania is a demanding responsibility. (Ludvigsen himself left the compound after three months, finding its requirements for deliberative democracy "too demanding."<sup>10</sup>) Thus, they are "anarchists

with rules." Later, this same settlement would be described as "a counter-cultural oasis with no government, no cars and no police."<sup>11</sup> The settlement also has no paved roads.

In addition to occupying the formal barracks buildings, Christiania residents created their own residences on the grounds of the Army barracks without garnering official permission to do so, and with little regard to zoning regulations. Some tourist brochures thus describe the "fairytale structures" that exist in Christiania, as the houses, though small, may sit in fields and green spaces around the property, perhaps leaning to one side due to structural problems. The houses are often made of scrounged materials that are being recycled. Others have taken over old military buildings, subdividing the properties into various types of studio spaces and living quarters. An estimate in 1996 counted 325 buildings, with 104 state-built and 221 self-built. The population has ranged from 850 to about 1,000.

Thus, Christiania originally had many of the features of an art squat. The settlement was characterized by the presence of creative endeavors, and many members of the artist community came there originally seeking cheap space to establish a studio. Like other art squats, Christiania was embraced by many neighbors who felt that the creativity and energy of the settlement helped support business and tourism. Pornography was legal in Denmark throughout the 1970s and many residents made nudity part of the experiment.<sup>12</sup> The settlement would go on to become Copenhagen's third most popular tourist attraction, hosting a million visitors per year.<sup>13</sup>

### FIRST STEPS TOWARDS INCORPORATION

The first attempt to give Christiania some type of legal status began in 1972, when residents met with the minister of defense regarding the squat, since the land and the buildings still legally belonged to the Defense Ministry. A preliminary agreement gave residents the right to continue using the land and buildings of Christiania. In June 1973, the project received experimental status and an agreement noted that the squat could remain for up to a three-year period. Based on this agreement, residents went ahead with plans to upgrade Christiania, including connecting it to the grid so that residents could have heat and light in the winter and so that children would have access to schooling and day care. At that time Christiania agreed to pay the government to install water and electricity on the compound. By 1994, Christiania residents also paid the city government for waste removal and firefighting.<sup>14</sup> Members of the group also pay into a communal fund that covers garbage removal, childcare facilities and a post office. Christiania thus accepted a certain level of relationship with and incorporation into Copenhagen.

At the same time, Christiania emphasized an ethic of care. Early on, the community established a number of structures to furnish social services,

including a drug treatment facility in 1979 (which treats all sorts of citizens, not just those who are Danish) and a homeless shelter known as Starship.<sup>15</sup> In addition, a social services agency established in 1980 visits the elderly and looks after those with emotional or behavioral problems. Partially funded by the Danish government, the agency works with residents who wish to apply for benefits as well.<sup>16</sup> The commune has its own kindergarten but the institution of higher educational facilities failed—largely because members of the group could not agree on a philosophy of education that would be used to teach children.<sup>17</sup>

The group enjoyed a sort of sovereignty and proudly displayed its own flag. Children learned the Christiania national anthem in school, and the enclave had its own newspaper, radio station, cinema and cafés. A sign at the entrance to the commune notes that "You are now entering the EU." One resident interviewed in a British newspaper referred to the land outside the walls of Christiania as "Denmark."<sup>18</sup> Many members of the collective note that they may go days or even weeks without ever leaving the enclave. An official government report concluded that Christiania comprised (as of 2012) a static group of residents with limited mobility. The population included runaways, the mentally ill and others who occupied society's fringes. Only one-third were found to be connected with the official labor market, one-third were on public assistance<sup>19</sup> and most had a low education level.<sup>20</sup> Thus, depending on one's perspective, Christiania was either sovereign or poorly integrated into the larger city of Copenhagen and the nation of Denmark.

### DEVELOPING PROBLEMS

The main street of the enclave, however, soon became known as Pusher Street, because of the drug dealers who sold both marijuana and harder drugs to visitors and tourists who came to Christiania hoping to experience a bit of the countercultural lifestyle. In addition the local police acknowledged that heroin was a problem throughout Europe, and the solution throughout the 1970s was to encourage addicts to go to Christiania, where at least they were off the streets of the rest of Copenhagen.<sup>21</sup> Some analysts, including Copenhagen Criminal Commissioner Jan Richman Olsen, suggested that Christiania's social activities and governance were always financed by drug money contributed by the pushers, with estimates that the sales of drugs bring the community about one million pounds a year.<sup>22</sup>

For a time, Christiania accepted all comers, though as space began to run out, the community later set up rules describing the procedures by which new residents could come to Christiania. Word of vacancies traveled largely by word of mouth, and new residents had to be voted upon by a consensus meeting of Christiania residents. Thus, over time, the enclave became more exclusive and less democratic in its acceptance of new members. The original

rhetoric that described Christiania residents as early pioneers, enduring harsh conditions for the right to live as they wished, gradually came to seem less accurate. In recent years, children who grow up in Christiania have had to leave the commune as there is no new space for them to occupy if they wish to have their own home or apartment.

By 1980, rifts were starting to exist in the community, which was widely becoming known as a haven for eccentric or deviant behaviors and lifestyles, between traditional families wishing to live a communal lifestyle and more dangerous elements. As Anthony describes the situation, there were those who wished to live a sort of bucolic lifestyle in an urban setting, and who were willing to accept rules in order to live in a peaceful, countercultural democracy. At the same time, other members of the collective truly embraced the philosophy of anarchism and limited government, wishing to avoid imposing regulations and building the structures of a state. For that reason, they were willing to accept drugs and crime as the price of living an unregulated life.<sup>23</sup>

#### SECURITIZING ACT ONE: AN ABORTIVE ATTEMPT AT SLUM CLEARING

At this point, one can suggest that Christiania provided a sort of convenient interstitial site for the Danish government. It was a sort of unregulated space where activities took place beneath the radar. Thus, the policy towards Christiania was one of "don't ask, don't tell" or "out of sight and out of mind." Regular social problems could be steered towards Christiania where they were then no longer officially a problem.

However, Christiania was also starting to assume a larger significance to the wider community, since it appeared to serve as a sort of magnet for both drugs and criminal activity, as well as for those from across Europe who wished to experiment with alternative or deviant lifestyles. In the words of one dealer, "people come from all over to buy here."<sup>24</sup> A resident of Christiania described the commune as a "hippie Israel," noting that "every Jew can go to Israel. Every hippie can come here."<sup>25</sup> Christiania could thus already be described as messy, violent and chaotic. The question then became whether the commitment to the existence of Christiania as a unique social experiment was worth the risk that its existence engendered. In addition, we encounter the notion that the risk was not shared—Christiania residents lived well, while their neighbors lived in fear. The language of risk, which is often a facet of securitization, was thus starting to emerge in conversations about Christiania's future.

As Richard Ballard suggests in describing squatter settlements in South Africa,

The "danger" of squatter settlements is that they are seen to be zones in which formal residents and police lack control. They are a convenient

way for criminals to access formal residential areas and an easy place for them to hide. . . . Although not all squatters are thieves, rapist or murderers, it is impossible to tell harmless and innocent squatters from criminals, with the result that every squatter is a potential threat.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, the liminal status of Christiania led to a blurring between lawful and unlawful residential practices, and lawful and unlawful practices in other areas, such as the consumption of drugs. The lines were not so clear-cut between lawful and unlawful citizens, and as a result all citizens and all of the space of Christiania became suspect.

In 1975, the initial three-year agreement ran out, and the Danish Parliament initially declared that Christiania would be cleared of its inhabitants. Christiania residents immediately filed legal suits against the Danish attorney general. However, the original decision was upheld by the Danish Supreme Court in 1978.<sup>27</sup> Despite the ruling, the Danish parliament adopted an adjournment, deciding that residents should have continued "temporary" use of the area. At the same time, they hired the consulting firm Moller and Gronborg to develop a plan for the future use of the Christiania area. The firm recommended a model that would establish Christiania as a "legitimate experimental city."<sup>28</sup> Thus, the plan was arguably to establish Christiania as a sort of reservation or colony. The settlement's residents would be allowed by the government to have their unique lifestyle, with the understanding that they were always subject to government oversight. Thus, one might describe the legal position of the enclave as one of conditional or limited sovereignty, or even as a sort of protectorate. Here, protectorate is defined as a relationship of protection and partial control assumed by a superior power over a dependent country or region; or a territory largely controlled by but not annexed to a stronger state.

In this new position it was thus not surprising to see both residents enacting stricter regulations to police themselves as well as government threatening to police the region more strictly if it became necessary to do so. In 1980, Christiania residents banned the sale of drugs harder than marijuana, and in 1987 they ousted bikers from the commune, worked to disband gangs and adopted a rule forbidding the wearing of gang colors in the commune.<sup>29</sup>

Here one can argue that Christiania's policies were generated less by internal politics and more by external events over which they had little control, for, in the 1980s in particular, the enclave faced two threats that affected life in Christiania. First, rising unemployment throughout Europe meant that more unemployed individuals were coming to Christiania. (A policy of open borders with other Scandinavian countries that had existed since the 1950s exacerbated that tendency.) At the same time, the Danish government began its fight against the rising problem of gang violence throughout Denmark. As rival gangs fought for control of Denmark's drug trade, many of these battles were played out on the streets of Christiania. The first large-scale skirmish took place between the biker gangs Hells Angels and Bullshit in

1983. In 1987, Danish police found a dead body in a motorcycle workshop associated with the Bullshitter gang.

Thus, Christiania was drawn into larger conflicts having to do with drugs, immigration and gang warfare. Squatter policy was not made independently of these issues but rather in concert with them. Christiania's reputation as a dangerous place affected any decisions made about the residents of the enclave. Political sentiments about the need to more closely regulate the enclave were growing, and in 1985 the Danish Parliament established a special committee on Christiania's future.<sup>30</sup>

At the same time that the Danish police were cracking down on drugs and gang activity, other members of the Danish government were starting to look more closely at some of the architectural safety issues facing Christiania. In 1989, legislation passed that required the people of Christiania to submit plans and gain permission from the Ministry of Defense to build houses or to add on to existing ones. However, despite the passage of this legislation, the government did not enforce the law for thirteen years. During this time, one hundred new constructions took place. At the same time, the legislation ceded control of the territory to the residents of Christiania, giving them special status.<sup>31</sup>

#### SECURITIZING ACT TWO: TOWARDS NORMALIZATION AND INCLUSION

However, it becomes clear that by 1990, Danish politicians were already losing patience with the ongoing negotiations regarding Christiania's status as well as the effects of crime that were associated with the region. Thus, the first policy aimed at inclusion for Christiania through incorporating the settlement into politics as usual occurred in 1995, when the government developed a four-point plan to "normalize" the area. First, the initiative spelled out strategies for assuring that Christiania had the same infrastructure as the rest of the city. In this way, Christiania would no longer be a no-go zone where citizens were not subject to state authority, nor would it resemble a failed state. Second, the initiative required that citizens would buy their houses from the Ministry of Defense. This is a common strategy for integrating squatters practiced in Asia, Africa and South America. Next, the initiative aimed to renovate buildings in Christiania and bring them up to code. Finally, the initiative aimed to stop the trafficking of hashish. (The four-point plan was actually a compromise initiative in comparison to the original set of demands put forth by the Liberal Party, which wanted to build private homes for four hundred new residents, tear down fifty existing homes to build a public park and make remaining residents into "owners" of their property either as private tenants or shareholders.)<sup>32</sup>

Throughout the proceedings involving the legal status of Christiania the enclave's own residents have sought to advocate for their rights through

the legal system while simultaneously preserving Christiania's existence on a temporary basis through hanging up any legal proceedings in court for a prolonged period of time. In response to the 1995 initiatives, nearly seven hundred Christiania residents filed independent lawsuits against the Danish government, alleging that the plan to incorporate Christiania violated their squatter's rights. A class action suit on behalf of a larger group of residents was filed as well.<sup>33</sup>

At this time, there was a shift overall in Danish society from an attitude of tolerance towards squats to one that was less welcoming. A reporter from a small independent newspaper notes that there had been no new squats created in Copenhagen since 1998—though there were some that were long-standing. He notes that "As you know the thing in Denmark is different than from Germany. Due to government repression it is impossible to keep the squats. We have still got a couple of autonomous centers."<sup>34</sup>

The "clampdown" on Juliana Christiania might be said to have begun, however, in 2001 with the election of a liberal-conservative government headed by Anders Fogh Rasmussen. His party platform for the election emphasized combating drug trafficking and political radicalism. The new government also included, for the first time, a right-wing party called the Danish People's Party. This group, which was previously considered a fringe group, was now the third largest party in Parliament. Led by Pia Kjaersgaard, an older grandmotherly woman, the party was described as setting the terms of debate for the 2001 election. The Danish People's Party focused on the issues of inner-city gang violence and problems of immigration.

Under the Danish system of "contract politics," which was the norm between 2001 and 2011, the electorate was promised specific policies and initiatives that were met by the government after the election.<sup>35</sup> In this case, the electorate expected to see its new government making strong moves to address these problems. Thus, the new government put forth a "zero tolerance" policy aimed at tightening legal control of drugs, raising penalties for offenses and increasing access to treatment. Vibeke Asmussen suggests that the new government created a "moral panic" about the issue of drug abuse, though it was always present in Denmark. (Statistics indicate that Denmark has the highest lifetime prevalence of cannabis in the EU, with 31.3 percent of the adult population admitting to occasionally using the substance.)<sup>36</sup> Drug policy had actually been a permanent matter of dispute between Denmark's political parties for the previous thirty years. The parties disagreed about whether drugs should be banned outright or tolerated, and about whether legal distinctions should exist between those who deal drugs and those who merely purchase drugs, as well as whether all drugs should be treated the same in legal terms.<sup>37</sup>

At this time, the government passed the 2001 "Law Prohibiting Visitors to Designated Places"—better known as the Hash House law. This law was intended to clamp down on places where drug activities were known to be taking place, but also targeted Christiania, which was said to be the site of criminal activities including a market in cannabis, as well as harder drugs

such as cocaine and amphetamines, in addition to a weapons trade. (The law was reinterpreted in 2005 to make it easier to close down hash houses altogether.)<sup>38</sup>

The new government also began actually enforcing many of the laws pertaining to Christiania that were formally on the books, but that were not enforced. Thus, government officials identified ninety-eight illegal buildings that needed to be either torn down or upgraded.<sup>39</sup> In 2002, the new government asked Christiania to tear down five structures that were deemed unsafe. The people complied without argument.<sup>40</sup>

In May 2003, the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Defense published a report on Christiania that documented links between organized crime and biker gangs. At this point, the metaphor of the failed state can be said to have fully emerged. The report by the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Defense in particular warned about a “spillover effect” of hard drugs, noting that after Christiania made trading in hard drugs illegal, dealers merely relocated outside the grounds of Christiania to nearby surrounding neighborhoods. The rhetoric of securitization is obvious in the report’s call for the allocation of extremely high police resources for a sustained duration<sup>41</sup> to confront the problem as well as in the government’s formal launch of a program (or campaign) known as “The Fight Against Drugs.”

However, the campaign might also be perceived as a “fight against Christiania”—since a government official at this time described Christiania as “an eyesore, a security hazard and an unruly community which needs to step in line with the rest of the country.”<sup>42</sup> Helge Adam Mueller, the Conservative Party spokesman, noted that “Christiania’s days as a hotbed for hashish are numbered.”<sup>43</sup> Empowered by new measures detailed in the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Defense report, Norway’s police began conducting surveillance and countermeasures in Christiania—including videotaping Pusher Street, tapping radio communications and phone calls. The security force deployed to the area was dubbed “Christiania’s intelligence service.” Later, the police denied the existence of this group. However, the Christiania café Månefiskeren set up a bulletin board where patrons were urged to keep a record of the number of police patrols on Christiania beginning in November 2005. In the summer of 2006 this record noted the one thousandth patrol (about four to six patrols a day). These patrols normally consisted of six to twenty police officers, often dressed in combat uniform and sometimes with police dogs.

In addition the report and subsequent legislation explicitly removed the distinction between sellers and buyers, saying that it needed to target both supply and demand for drugs.<sup>44</sup>

At the same time that the government was conducting a crackdown on drug activity in Christiania, it also began looking more closely at architectural and zoning violations in the enclave. A spokesman for the Left Liberal party Venstre noted that many of the buildings that were being degraded by the squatter settlement had great cultural value to the rest of Denmark.<sup>45</sup>

### THE DISCOURSE OF FREE-RIDING, CULTURAL PATRIMONY AND CRIME

At this point in time, there was an insertion of three novel discourses in the discussion of Christiania—both by the media and particularly by Denmark’s conservative politicians. First, we encounter the discourse of cultural patrimony, along with the discourse of theft or free-riding. We also encounter the securitization frame.

At this time, Denmark’s Agency for Palaces and Cultural Properties became involved in discussions regarding the fate of Christiania. The agency issued a report that noted that the fortifications were overgrown and that buildings were improperly preserved. The agency also was concerned about buildings the residents had erected that leaned against or otherwise touched historic structures, fearing that these constructions might eventually damage the structures.<sup>46</sup> Here the argument was that the historic treasures of the military barracks, which had existed since 1816, were something that belonged to all of Denmark. Everyone should have the right to tour and visit the monument and it should be preserved for the good of all.

For the first time, Christiania was also portrayed as a group of freeloaders or free-riders, profiting at the expense of the rest of Denmark through taking something that was not theirs. As a British newspaper reporter notes, “other people in Copenhagen feel that ‘why should they be allowed to live so well, so cheaply?’”<sup>47</sup> In reality, most Copenhagen residents were ill-informed about the status of Christiania. Since 1991, residents of Christiania have paid both real property taxes and personal taxes. (The commune also paid approximately \$750,000 a year in rent to the Ministry of Defense until a recent agreement allowed the residents to purchase the compound.)<sup>48</sup> Businesses in the compound also have had to register legally with Danish authorities since 1991 and thus pay VAT.<sup>49</sup>

Finally, the rhetoric of both criminality and security was applied in both media and public policy discussions about Christiania. Hjort suggests that for politicians “crime” became a sort of catchword or code word to describe events in Christiania, and that in this way reports tended to exaggerate the nature of illegal activity taking place in Christiania.

Thus, already, one can see a conflation of the themes of illegal immigration, drugs, gang warfare and squatting. In the period since 1973 and the end of the guest worker program in Norway, one can see a gradual tightening of immigration policies in Denmark, which today has some of strictest policies in Europe for acquiring citizenship.<sup>50</sup> In particular, the Danish People’s Party has strongly emphasized both law and order rhetoric and anti-immigrant policies. In this way, the word “gangs” appears to often function as a code word for a larger conversation about immigration. Gang strongholds that are mentioned in news reports are frequently found in Noerrebro, a district of Copenhagen that is heavily associated with immigrants. In addition, though the term “immigrant” is often attached to gang members,

the members may in fact be second- or even third-generation citizens of Denmark, although they are not ethnically Danish.

Here we can see the simultaneous securitization of the immigration issue, the gang issue, the drugs issue and the squatting issue. The four are seen as related and equally harmful, and extraordinary resources are called for to defeat all four. In granting the police extraordinary resources to confront the gang and drug problems, it thus became possible also to extend the reach of the police and the powers granted to them even within the confines of Christiania. In this way, policy towards Christiania was often conflated with other issues, including gang policy, drug policy and immigration policy. Gangs were seen as a problem of illegal immigration, and Christiania was seen as a place that harbored both gangs and drugs. In a sense, Christiania was a casualty of the attempts made to reestablish state control in the other arenas—those of drugs, gangs and immigration. In addition, closing Christiania was both a politically simple and politically palatable solution. In choosing this option, the police and policy makers appeared to be taking a hard-line stance against drugs and gangs without encountering charges that they were acting specifically against immigrants.

In a globalizing world, policing becomes increasingly challenging. If it was not possible to deal satisfactorily and thoroughly with either illegal immigration or with transnational crimes like drugs and gangs, then perhaps closing Christiania was a short-term domestic solution to an international problem. At least it would not provide the setting for these new crimes. Age-old Danish values of alternative lifestyles and tolerance were thus a casualty of life in a globalized world, where such values were no longer practical with open borders.<sup>51</sup>

### SECURITIZING ACT THREE: RAIDS AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The clampdown continued with the passage of the Christiania Act of 2004. This act reintroduced a number of laws and regulations in the area. In particular, this law legally abolished Christiania's status as a collective, noting that from now on all nine hundred members would be treated as individuals. In March 2004, a report was produced, the aim of which was to advise Denmark's government on how to "normalize" and "legalize" Christiania. "Normalization" was a term that essentially meant taking away the special protected status that Christiania had enjoyed. Here authority figures noted that "regular citizens" objected to the special status of Christiania's residents or the notion that their own behavior was tightly regulated in a society that values conformity while the residents of Christiania could apparently violate the rules with impunity. The analysts Mikkelsen and Karpantschok have suggested that "ordinary citizens are angered by the idea that they can be fined for speeding while in Christiania drug dealers continue to earn

untaxed revenue unchecked. It seems that police turn a blind eye."<sup>52</sup> Adam Moller, a former Special Forces soldier and Conservative MP, has noted that "We have been too tolerant and too liberal for too long in this country. No one in Denmark should be beyond the law. There is a limit and Christiania is past that limit."<sup>53</sup>

At this point, the main rhetorical frame used to talk about Christiania was one of free-riding and economic crime. Christiania's residents were described—as Britain's residents initially were—as engaging in a type of theft of property through enjoying goods that they had not paid for and had not earned. We can trace the growth of this rhetoric back to the influence of the Liberal Party (Venstre) and other members of the Liberal Conservative alliance who were very much probusiness and on the side of industry. Thus, they took a businesslike approach to Christiania, treating it as real estate that was potentially of interest to developers, and that, as real estate, had the potential to affect real estate prices in surrounding neighborhoods.<sup>54</sup>

As Christa Amouroux notes:

The state argued that normalization was a transparent, lawful process that would simply make things more equitable by integrating and legalizing the Christiania area. . . . The state argued that communal control and ownership over public space provided an unfair advantage, one that was not available to the rest of the law abiding Danes.<sup>55</sup>

A citizen of Christiania commented on developments, noting that official policy was to "reinstate the logic of private property. . . . If you live on expensive land, you have to pay for it."<sup>56</sup> Thus, in considering solutions, Jacob Heinesen, the chairman of the parliamentary committee producing the report, suggested two possible options that would materialize several years later: either the Danish government should clear the land and sell it to property developers, or it should allow the commune to form a cooperative in order to purchase the land themselves.<sup>57</sup>

At the same time, British reporter Anthony offered a different take on the forces leading to a crackdown on Christiania. He noted that:

The outside world has changed almost beyond recognition since the days of the peace and love idealism that gave birth to the commune. The communism of the soviet bloc is long dead, European socialism is on life support (or an EU grant) and the free market now reigns supreme. . . . No walls can withstand the siege of history and the commune has had to adapt, at the risk of falling apart.<sup>58</sup>

In this analysis, Christiania is described as a sort of backward area (like a colony) that time has forgotten. The analyst describes the hash scene on Pusher Street, noting that "at night, the scene, with its dirty road and ramshackle bars is reminiscent of a Wild West Town or some lawless backwater

of Dickensian London." Thus, Christiania was increasingly being viewed as a relic of a past era in Danish politics and culture, but not as a place whose mission or identity fit into the new Denmark, which faced an array of different problems. Christiania thus starts to appear like a quaint museum or monument to past ideals—and its residents like members of an indigenous group or culture whose lifestyle might merit preservation on historic grounds rather than a place or group of people with independent agency and the right to participate fully in the making of policies involving them.

At the same time, the law on euphoria-inducing substances was revised to criminalize possession of cannabis. It was now illegal to possess any amount of drugs, cannabis included, in Denmark. The settlement itself at this point conformed, largely by imposing new rules upon itself. New rules adopted in Christiania included a ban on violence; a ban on hard drugs; a ban on weapons (which they hoped would end the clashes between drug gangs operating on Pusher Street) and a ban on the wearing of bulletproof vests.<sup>59</sup>

On March 16–17, 2004, the police conducted the first of several raids on the area. In the March raid, two hundred police detained fifty-three people in a crackdown on the open sale of hashish, keeping forty in solitary confinement for three months. The raid is said to have destroyed the local cannabis economy, whose transactions were valued at 80 million dollars annually. The ultimate aim of the raid was the closure of Pusher Street. An interview conducted with Police Chief Kai Vittrup notes that now that the police had gotten Pusher Street and Christiania under control, they had additional police forces available to deploy elsewhere in the city as the drug war continued to be fought.<sup>60</sup> The notion here is one of opportunity costs—surveilling Christiania was seen as simply taking too many resources. Thus, it became a liability that law enforcement could no longer afford—regardless of its financial contributions to the tourist industry in Denmark. The prevalence of the security frame is obvious in the language used by neighborhood bystanders and Christiania residents who describe the raid, noting that "they came at night," landing on buildings from helicopters and utilizing a full arsenal of antiterrorist equipment.<sup>61</sup>

On April 24, 2005, a twenty-six-year-old Christiania resident was killed and three other residents injured in a violent gang assault on Pusher Street. The reason for this was a feud over the cannabis market of Copenhagen. That same year, the law on hash houses was reinterpreted to mean that the government could close them.

A statement by the Departments of Finance and Economics noted that in January 1, 2006, Christiania would be stripped of its special status. The statement noted that "Christiania will become a neighborhood like any other, which is open to everyone, freed of drugs and which respects the laws of the country."<sup>62</sup>

The residents of Christiania formed a contact group consisting of representatives of the fourteen districts of Christiania, obtained legal representation and appealed the decision, arguing that it violated the European

Convention on Human Rights. They also objected to the establishment of any sort of park that might glorify the military history of Denmark, arguing that they themselves were pacifists. Finally, they voiced ideological objections to what they saw as the "privatization" of Christiania. However, the appeal was struck down in Danish courts in 2009.<sup>63</sup>

Nonetheless, the attempt at normalization is widely perceived as having failed. "Jessica" wrote in 2011 that the attempt at cracking down had merely wasted police resources and succeeded in spreading the illegal drug trade across the city rather than keeping it contained in one location. In addition, the continued police actions had a negative impact on the tourist trade in Christiania.<sup>64</sup>

#### SECURITIZING ACT FOUR: THE FINAL ACT

In 2007, the National Heritage Agency proposed protection status for some of the ancient military buildings, now in Christiania. In May 2007, the authorities also attempted to clear out the remains of a building that had burned down in Christiania. This led to some of the worst violence in the commune's history, as protestors threw rocks and bottles at the riot squads, and lit barricades on fire. Police used tear gas and in the violence a library and a school were damaged. A Christiania member noted that "This is war. If the police want to come in and rip down our homes they will get what they deserve."<sup>65</sup>

In September 2007, the representatives of Christiania and Copenhagen's city council reached an agreement to cede control of Christiania to the city over the course of ten years for the purposes of business development.<sup>66</sup> The settlement was officially placed under the jurisdiction of the Agency for Palaces and Cultural Properties, which was a subsidiary of Denmark's Ministry of Finance. Christiania's residents would be required to buy the site on which the squat stood from the Danish government, and in the future anyone would be able to live in Christiania if an apartment was put up for sale by a resident and purchased. Thus, the houses were "just real estate" and the old policies and procedures of vetting new residents on ideological and social grounds would be eliminated. Residents feared losing their communal character if, for example, new residents did not share the same values or commitment to the Christiania way of life.

At the same time, Copenhagen's city government cracked down on another squat known as Ungdomshuset (Young People's House) in the Noerrebro district of Copenhagen. Left-wing youth activists had used the building since 1982, but the city sold it in 1999 to a Christian group known as Human A/S, which wished to establish a refuge called Fadershuset (Father's House).<sup>67</sup> In the notice regarding the decision to close the house and put it up for repair, city officials noted that it was fungus-infested, did not meet codes for fire safety—given that it was being used to hold large public events like



concerts—and that it would cost 1 million pounds to repair.<sup>68</sup> In language reminiscent of that used to describe Christiania, Ungdomshuset has also been described as “an autonomous space run according to anti-authoritarian and anti-capitalist principles.” It was used for a variety of activities, including concerts, festivals, feeding the homeless, meetings, a bookstore, a studio and a city garden.<sup>69</sup>

The group that had purchased the building acquired a court order to evict the squatters but they refused to leave. The Danish police first attempted to remove the squatters in December 2006, leading to a riot involving one thousand protestors. Fleming Steen Munch, the spokesman for the police, noted, “It is extremely violent. It looked like a war zone and it’s been many years since we last had to use tear gas on the streets.”<sup>70</sup> At that point, those who supported Ungdomshuset began conducting weekly demonstrations, and the Danish government began preemptively arresting people in advance of the demonstrations.<sup>71</sup>

The next operation carried out in March 2007 to evict the squatters led to 217 arrests, and twenty-five injuries. Again, the Danish media described the scene as a “war zone.” Antiterrorist squad troops arrived on top of the building by helicopter in the middle of the night, while police in riot gear blocked streets. Youths gathered behind barricades, yelling and throwing objects. According to Police Spokesman Fleming Steen Munch, “In the last ten years we haven’t had riots like these.”<sup>72</sup> A bonfire set by protesters in the street also ignited a fire in a nearby building that housed a daycare center, leading the media to report that arson had also occurred.<sup>73</sup>

Among those arrested were foreigners from France, Germany, Norway, Poland, Lithuania, New Zealand and the United States. Protests also occurred in support of Ungdomshuset and against police brutality outside embassies in Germany, Sweden, Norway and Austria.<sup>74</sup> This operation was successful and the Christian group proceeded to carry out repairs on the house in order to make it habitable. However, they were forced to use Polish construction workers on the project since Danish unions forbid workers from working on a site where police protection is required.<sup>75</sup>

At the time, a correspondent for a local Danish paper queried the attachment of the word “squatter” to the residents of Ungdomshuset, noting that many Danish viewed the relationship between the residents and the house as “like a common law marriage to the house: if after 20 years the post office will deliver your mail and you can book Bjork to perform there, the place is yours. The youth, though, being as youth are, would rather cohabit than make that marriage official.”<sup>76</sup>

Here, it was suggested that the crackdowns on both Ungdomshuset and Christiania were part of a carefully planned and crafted effort to eliminate squats in Copenhagen. The plan was first to eliminate the minor problem of Ungdomshuset before moving on to the major problem of Christiania.<sup>77</sup> While Ungdomshuset was described in language that focused on youth violence and squalor, in contrast to descriptions of Christiania as a site of gang

violence and drugs, the methods used by the police were similar, as was the pattern of allocation of resources to conduct antisquat activities. It is also worth noting that this is the first time in Europe that we can identify a systematic pattern of government actions against ideological squats or art squats in particular. Previously, government officials in Europe had practiced tolerance towards art squats, placing them in a different danger category than survival squats, for example.

Writing in 2009, a journalist for the publication *Occupied London* noted that:

Insecurity and suspicion (if not downright hate against anything falling outside the narrowing definitions of “Danishness”) is intensifying and altogether forming a part of what the neo-liberal government calls its “kultur kamp”. Culture war: the goal is to eradicate all traces of Denmark’s socialist, communal history. . . . Everything that does not conform is marginalized, undermined or crushed. The response: intensifying conflict and refusal of compromise.<sup>78</sup>

### The Discourse of Crime and Security

However, the discourse of danger that surrounded squats was increasing as public opinion and policymakers became increasingly concerned about the rise of gang-related activities. Beginning in 2007, both Danish and international analysts had begun to focus on the rise in gang warfare. Reports detailed the racial aspects of the gang wars, noting that traditionally Danish gangs like the Hells Angels and AK81 had gone to war with new immigrant gangs, including the Black Cobra, founded by Palestinian immigrants in 2000. The new gangs were Arab, Bosnian, Turkish, Somali, Iraqi, Moroccan, Palestinian and Pakistani. Many functioned as transnational criminal actors, establishing related gangs in other Scandinavian cities and throughout Western Europe.<sup>79</sup> The gangs fought largely over the control of the drug trade, as well as over the control of the markets in prostitution and human trafficking and smuggling.<sup>80</sup> Copenhagen’s police bureau called for the analysis of the problem and the writing of a report in 2007. This was the first attempt at gauging the seriousness of the problem, and the report concluded that approximately fourteen gangs were operating in Denmark, with approximately one thousand members.<sup>81</sup> That same year, Canadian reporter Rachel Mendleson wrote in *MacLean’s* that approximately sixty people had died in gang warfare in Denmark in 2007. Her own statistics indicate that fifteen hundred members were involved in gang activities by 2008.<sup>82</sup>

Reports on the gang wars used both a barbarian frame and a nationalist frame. A report by Sennels quotes a Norwegian police officer who notes that “visiting the dungeons of the immigrant gangs is like visiting a monkey cage. They crawl on walls, try to escape and have absolutely no respect

for the police." The parallel with a failed state is also drawn, when the police officer notes the existence of so-called "no go" zones in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Paris and London. Here he is referring to immigrant enclaves within the capital where criminals can vanish from the authorities. A lack of infrastructure means that those who live there are not well documented and criminal authorities may have a hard time pursuing individuals once they disappear into an enclave since they lack the cultural and linguistic knowledge to collect intelligence and make inroads in the community. Thus immigrant enclaves (and other types of unsurveilled space, like Christiania) are seen as places that threaten the stability of their surrounding neighborhoods. They are a type of interstitial or failed space. Here, Sennels suggests that the number of no-go zones is increasing, noting that "we can't surrender any more turf to the barbarians."<sup>83</sup>

The notion of a crisis of extraordinary proportions appears again in a quote by Brian Mikkelsen, Denmark's justice minister. In describing the threat posed by immigrant gangs, he notes that "we'll give police almost anything they ask for. We need extraordinary steps. We won't give the gangs a moment's rest."<sup>84</sup>

In 2009, two developments took place that again landed Christiania in the spotlight. The commune was drawn into the violence that surrounded the UN Climate Change Summit in December 2009. The commune hosted an "alternative summit" known as Klima Forum, attended largely by NGO members who were frustrated with official state attempts to confront climate change, and who were interested in exploring small, sustainable development initiatives of the type found at Christiania. (Christiania has embraced composting and solar power.) However, thousands of individuals from a variety of groups, including Black Bloc, who had traveled to Denmark hoping to disrupt the UN Summit, also took refuge at Christiania.<sup>85</sup> Fearing violence, police cordoned off Christiania, erecting barricades so individuals could not enter. Thirty-six individuals attending the summit (most of whom were foreign) were arrested. Demonstrators responded by throwing petrol bombs and starting fires. Police used tear gas and water cannons against protestors and entered Christiania with dogs to make arrests.<sup>86</sup> A police officer was injured and four cars were burned during the clash.<sup>87</sup>

A number of gang-related shootouts occurred on the streets of Christiania throughout 2009 as well. In each case, it appears that Christiania did not so much cause the violence as it hosted the violence. The anarchic ungoverned nature of Christiania meant that it provided a welcoming environment for those who were planning acts of an illegal and violent nature since it was possible to operate in Christiania with less police surveillance. But as the government was pressured to crack down on violent gang-related activities occurring in the capital, Christiania was implicated in the conversation, and cracking down on Christiania soon became part of the overall crackdown plan.

## 2012: FROM SOCIAL EXPERIMENT TO PUBLIC RECREATION AREA

In June 2011, Claus Jhørt Frederiksen, the Danish finance minister, proposed a buyout option that would allow Christiania residents to collectively buy the property. At the same time, a court ruled that the region should be a self-regulating, autonomous region but that it should be responsible for its own security.<sup>88</sup> This would prove challenging, due to the limited financial means of many individual members, as well as of the collective. The group was given until July 1, 2012, to put up an initial down payment of 51.8 million kroner towards the total purchase price of 85.4 million kroner. The loan was to be paid off over thirty years, with interest.<sup>89</sup>

At this point, the residents of Christiania came up with the novel solution of selling shares in the enterprise. They hoped that the IPO would raise 10 million euros.<sup>90</sup> Shares were available for purchase by visitors to Christiania as well as over the Internet. Prices ranged from 3.50 to 1750 dollars. A resident noted that "Christiania belongs to everyone. We're trying to put ownership in an abstract form."<sup>91</sup> In the words of a member of the newly formed Christiania fund, "We don't want to own anything . . . we don't want to own the houses. We don't want to own the land. . . . But we were stuck between a rock and a hard place."<sup>92</sup> In addition, a representative of Christiania traveled to New York in an attempt to sell shares to the Occupy Wall Street protestors, most of whom had never heard of Christiania and seemed confused by the offer.

Two of Denmark's major political parties spoke out against the offer of a loan to Christiania. Peter Skaarup, spokesman for the Danish Folkparti, noted that his party would support the deal only if enough order was restored to Christiania to allow police to patrol there. He noted that "We can't promise to vote for the document (offering a loan) if the situation in Christiania is as lawless as it is. We must assure that the police have the necessary resources to stop the disorder and uphold the law against the gangster stronghold in Christiania."<sup>93</sup> In addition, an article in the *Jyllands-Posten* suggests that the government was being cowardly in somehow signing off on an agreement that would give thieves the right to own their stolen property, and even at a subsidized rate.<sup>94</sup> Thus, it was clear that what the commune was "purchasing" was not sovereignty but rather legality.

## CONCLUSIONS

The final chapter of the story of Christiania begins in 2011, when plans led to the legal incorporating of Christiania into Copenhagen. The final solution, which involved a buyout of the land by the Christiania Foundation through a subsidized thirty-year loan from the government, is particularly interesting when compared to the British solution to squatting. In Britain,

the 2011 legislation led to the criminalization of squatters as individuals, since those who choose to squat are now subject to legal penalties for carrying out squatting activities. Here, the aim was to defend individual homeowners and neighborhoods from individuals and their activities. In contrast, in Denmark, the squat itself or the enclave was criminalized—as it came to be associated with criminal activity, including gangs and drugs. Thus, in Britain, new legislation evolved to regulate the activities of individuals who were considered to be participating in dangerous activities. In Denmark, however, new legislation evolved to regulate the spaces associated with squatting rather than the individuals who made a decision to squat. Here the emphasis was on regulating collective behaviors, rather than individual behaviors. In addition, the conversation about regulation in Britain was specifically a conversation about immigration. In contrast, the crackdown on Christiania never explicitly mentioned immigration or the immigrant threat. Instead, the rhetoric of criminality, securitization and free-riding was used to muster public opinion and to challenge perceptions about the utility and role of Christiania.

It could be argued that the Danish solution is more moderate while the British solution is more extreme. In Britain, the aim was to eliminate squatting altogether from the list of acceptable lifestyle choices for both British residents and those who might come from abroad. In contrast, Denmark has found a way to keep the squat, but to preserve it as a relic or a museum piece. In his blog “Travel as a Political Act,” the travel writer Rick Steves compares the Christianites he sees wandering in Copenhagen (wearing simple hand-knit sweaters and pushing their Christiania tricycles, the baskets laden with fresh produce) to the Amish you might see riding along a highway in the United States in a horse-drawn buggy.<sup>95</sup> He comments that they look out of place and that they somehow manage to live both in their native city and somewhere else, maybe even in a different time period. It can be seen that Christianites are thus an asset to Copenhagen and its tourism industry because they add local color. However, they do not wield any significant influence in the city of Copenhagen or perhaps even in their own community. In Denmark, squatting was not eliminated. It has been rather domesticated or expropriated.<sup>96</sup>

Evidence of this domestication of Christiania can be seen in an information sheet available at Denmark’s Agency for Palaces and Cultural Properties. The sheet notes the fact that Christiania’s amenities should be available to all citizens and not only those who reside in Christiania. Thus, in a city where open space is in short supply, the government’s policy is that Christiania should be treated as a park where all can walk on weekends and get fresh air. The information sheet notes that:

The area shall continue to be a green and traffic-free area in Copenhagen; with room for alternative lifestyles but in accordance with general rules of Danish law without a special act, without the hash trade,

with rent payment and open housing allocation, with maintenance of preservation-worthy buildings, and protection of the fortification as an open and recreational area for Christianites, Copenhageners and the public in general.<sup>97</sup>

However, the question remains whether this attempt at the domestication of Christiania will ultimately be successful. While on paper the plan appears to have succeeded, and legally Christiania is no longer an independent site of ideology and activity, it remains to be seen whether the activities that made Christiania a site of danger can actually be brought under control. The squatter “Tom” notes that Christiania is a place “both reviled and celebrated: to some it is a successful social experiment; to others it is a lawless drug den.”<sup>98</sup>

Indeed, a recent BBC Report on Danish terrorism cases that have occurred in the last ten years includes a report of five left-wing extremists who planned arson attacks on the Danish Parliament, the Justice Ministry, the Integration Ministry and other sites in Copenhagen. The individuals were arrested in April 2012. The report notes that most of the planning meetings that took place were conducted at Christiania.<sup>99</sup> Thus, the image of a poorly monitored site that attracts a criminal element, including potential terrorists, remains.