Urban Strategies and Loophole Tactics

Claiming Space in Cape Town and Malmö

Elisabeth Högdahl

David sits at a bar-table placed along one of the big windows in one of Long Streets many coffee shops. It is September and outside the rain is pouring down even though it should be spring and sunshine. Occasional pedestrians are passing by outside in Long Street, one of the most intense tourist streets in Cape Town CBD, central business district. David is only one of the many shop owners in the mostly Victorian houses in bright colours, with verandas and ornamented iron railings. Now he is telling the story about William. William is one of the street children who have become a more and more influential part of the street life - together with street vendors, vagrants, beggars, thieves and informal parking guards. He used to hang outside the coffee shop, begging from the by-passers. Now and then David gave him some food, and he tended to turn up in the mornings when David was alone in the pub to prepare for opening the daily business. One morning David asked if William could help him by sweeping the pavement outside the door in the mornings. Then he would get breakfast in return, an arrangement that William seemed to accept and everything seemed fine for at short while. One day when David went to the bank, though, William was gone when he returned and the broom was lying on the pavement. William never showed up again at the coffee shop and a few weeks later David found him further downtown together with some other street kids, sitting in the street. They where sniffing glue and conversation was impossible. David tried to reach out to him, but was told to go to hell. After that incident, David never saw him again, and has no idea what happened.[1]

This story about David and William that I was told during a fieldwork in Cape Town a few years ago, reflects a quite typical problem in the post-apartheid South Africa. The absence and presence in the cityscape has become an issue in relation to discussions on democracy and civil rights, as different citizens now conquer places from which they during apartheid was excluded.[2] The issue is closely related to processes related to power, and the dramatic South African context certainly can be used to clarify the issue also in a European context. Who has the right to be present in the city and under what conditions?

Raising this question, my aim is to discuss how streets and squares are not only physical places but also mental constructions in which categories, boundaries and attitude become important. Michel de Certeau has stressed the importance of viewing the city as both a *place*, basically the fixed physical setting, and *space*, created by the moving practices that makes the place become a living field of interactions and memory, creating certain rhythms and atmospheres (de Certeau 1984:117). From this perspective David and William are both constantly part of the creation of the city, bringing in their different thoughts, experiences and in their actions in the cityscape. They become part of the story of *how things are* in Cape Town, and this raises the need to discuss how people will be identified in the street and what concept will be created in interactions and narratives.

How things are can be seen both as an expression of personal attitudes, but also as a discursive statement on what is real and true

(Foucault 2002:133). The idea of reality is to a large extent an every-day political issue, where different issues appear in "the spotlight". The German philosopher Hannah Arendt describes how human interaction creates a *weave of relations*, where history and present as well as "inner feelings" are organised through different kinds of communication (Arendt 1986:74, 222). Arendt stresses that all power is created and maintained through legitimacy, and emphasizes the importance of consensus, whereby interaction may be seen as a form of negotiation to create both truth and reality. It is an issue on both *how things are* in the actual neighbourhoods and concepts on *how people are* in relation to this and they can be seen as socially constructed frames that puts up rules for interaction. In the streets agreements are reached to clarify roles and positions, but it is also important to show how people challenge boundaries and ultimately also bring about changes in the cityscape. The city seems to be a place of both order and chaos. Opportunities occur in both the physical environment and the normative network, making it possible to claim new places and to create new meaning. I will call these opportunities *loopholes*, a quite wide concept that to a large extent is depended on being "at the right place at the right time", and take advantage of the moment. Michel de Certeau calls that moment *kairos*, and it might at the end change both place and space (de Certeau 1984:85).

To clarify the discussion I will put the situation in Cape Town in relation to the European context by also using a fieldwork from the city of Malmö in Sweden,[3] and they serve as contrasting cases, rather than a comparative analysis. In Malmö I am mainly focusing on the area of Möllevången, which like many other old working class areas in Europe now is associated with a new ethnic mix and diverse lifestyles. The neighbourhood is also burdened with a reputation for crime, drug problems and welfare dependence. The landscape of crime and violence is of course very different between the two urban settings. At the present South Africa is plagued with extremely high crime rates and the crime-scene seems to have changed. From being close related to what is considered to be political violence connected to certain (combating) groups, to be more of an issue of every day politics, with violence originated from social and economical division, and that quite randomly might hit any South African citizen (Tshiwula 1998:8; Shaw 2002:53ff).[4] At the same time it is interesting how the districts of Möllevången and Long Street share the same problematic: they are both defined as "colourful neighbourhoods", they can be viewed as both an "appetizing" and "unappetizing" diversity – depending on the perspective. They both represent a balance act between order and a threatening disorder that can be found in many other urban settings. The street kids in Long Street in many ways symbolizes the "unwanted" and in Möllevången the down-and-outs gets a similar position. I will use these two groups to discuss how the processes of presence and exclusion might work in two different settings, in the specific framework of the story of *what it is like* in these different places, shaped by very different political and historical processes.

The Vision of Long Street

The South African author Lawrence Green, describes Long Street as on of his favourite streets as he grew up in Cape Town in the 1920s, a street of free music entertainment, comic papers, doughnuts, sweets and the call of the waterfront (Green 1971:2). In the 60s Long Street became the favourite place of Cape Towns (mostly white) "alternative people" with anti-apartheid connotations (Bickford-Smith, Heyningen & Worden 1999:193). There are also stories of urban decline with shabby buildings, drugs and other unwanted business. With the growing critique of modern city planning during the 70s Long Street became a treasure, and efforts were made to make Long Street a *conservation area* in the late 1970s, something that became a reality in 1992.

This of course had consequences for Long Street, as it now also was declared as a historical setting. This affected shop owner David in his struggle to keep crime from Long Street as he, during my fieldwork in 1999, was in the

process of forming a Long Street Committee together with some other shop owners. One important reason for forming the committee was to make Long Street a CID, a *City Improvement District*. By this they could become a part of a collaboration project initiated by the *Cape Town City Council*.

One of the ambition with the CID-project was to create an urban environment that could become "safe, clean, attractive and user-friendly in order to reinforce the area as a premier retail, business, cultural or entertainment destination or a combination of these" (City Improvement Districts Association 1999). Tourism is essential in the discussion, seen as a possibility to survival and development for local businesses but also as a way to become a part of the world-economy by making images of South Africa as a presentable part of the world. This process can be seen as an important part of an ongoing negotiation on reality, not only on how Long Street is but also how the future must be visualised. David and his colleagues were making up new visions for the street that included all these different stories on how things are in Long Street. They incorporated the Victorian houses, night-clubs, "ethnic" restaurants and smart clothing with hippie-style from the 1960s, flee market and junkshops, but also keeping some of the "old" stores still there. The crime situation was always in the centre of the discussions, though, and the shop owners were constantly surrounded with physical statements of the dangers. Burglar bars, alarms and guards are constantly present in contemporary Cape Town, and the city, now supervised by CCTV, has itself become a statement about unpleasantness and insecurity. David had employed a guard to protect his store, and the guard had his orders to operate in a gentle way, only to talk to the kids, never to hit them. David was afraid of some of the ideas that during the time appeared in Long Street, as some of the other shop owners wanted to have guards on horses.

It was clear that many of the shop owners felt quite trapped in the situation, and street kids like William became a part of the threat in keeping Long Street attractive to the other citizens and to tourists. When the modern city in the 1970s became a Long Street dystopia, it now seems like *people* have overtaken that threatening position. You cannot any longer control the presence of people, and if it gets really bad David believed it can turn out like Johannesburg, where parts of CBD are considered to be "no-go-areas" – at least for some people.

"In Johannesburg it's changed, the street vendors in all the streets, you can hardly walk on the pavement… Cause the street vendors are all over the place, you can't even see the *shops* for the street vendors. Town is *dead* from a business point of view, from a first world business point of view, it's become third world completely, and that's what we're trying to avoid here in Cape Town. Okay, we have a long way to go before we get, because Cape Town is different, cause here you have... I talk about skin colour, because I don't know how to describe people otherwise. You have indigenous people that live in Cape Town, who are browned skinned. We call them coloured people, they are *wonderful* people, 95 percent of them are beautiful, wonderful people. And they are the majority of the people in the Western Cape. So when they come to town they're like first world people. They are not poor and they are not out to rob and rape and steal, there are some of them who are, obviously in every society you have that, but the majority of them are really, really nice people. And I say the majority of the black people are also very, very nice people, but the percentage of the crucks is *unfortunately* amongst the poorer people. And the poorer people are the black people. And that's why in Johannesburg you have this huge problem. In Cape Town we don't have that, but we're still protecting... I want to back Long Street, Long Street must be a destination for people" (Interview with David 16/09/1999).

First World and Third World Long Street

First world people! A street for people, but the right kind of people. In a way the argument seems simple. Poor people making disorder becomes black people making disorder, and

obviously race is still central in the construction of reality. As David pointed out, the concepts of skin colour are so close related to human interaction that it is almost not possible to describe people or social issues without using them. *I talk about skin colour because I don't know how to describe people otherwise.* It is possible to translate Judith Butler's claim that "the body comes in gender" to "the body comes in race" (Butler 1993:ix; Steyn 2001:x). Race becomes a paradox hard to handle in the developing new truth of democratisation, and in this process concepts of first world and third world are creating differences more of behavioural kind than actual skin colour. They become a possibility to dismantle old concepts, but also creating new ones.

The discourse psychologist Kevin Durrheim claims that a rejection of the third world became a consequence of a peace talk strategy in the beginning of the 1990s (Durrheim 1997:38). Third world became synonymous with *non-peace* and the concepts of first world and third world can be seen as symbols of wanted and unwanted behaviour in South Africa (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). First world stands for not only the peaceful but also the productive, positive and winning, an utopia for what South Africa might be like, while third world symbolises the dystopia of non-development, or destruction of what is already accomplished. In Long Street the first world vision melts together with a sort of almost laid-back atmosphere, a particular kind of first world vision. The backpackers are quite typical for the street, young people travelling quite freely, not necessarily with a lot of money but with interest in interaction and the features of the street, hopefully honest, open minded and with friendly manners. Long Street appears as alternative also in relation to the traditional "white" South African administration, a part of an apartheid structure that is described as more related to a third world bureaucracy, stiff an inflexible. Long Street becomes a loophole for the shop owners, an alternative in-between the two third world metaphors of (black) third world deviance and (white) third world, "old-fashioned" business culture. The dichotomy of "first" and "third" world introduces en element of temporal lag in the categorisation of the social landscape. Some groups and behaviours represent the past.

The German historian Joachim Schlör pictures the city as a kind of laboratory for modernity, where new ideas are constantly challenging old ones, and Long Street can be seen as such a process, where apartheid becomes the springboard for profiling the new South Africa (Schlör 1998:18). The idea of the first world becomes part of a growing discourse that is creating a new cultural and economic front in Cape Town. Long Street becomes a laboratory with cosmopolitan connotations that reaches beyond the nation borders, with participants that are able to combine smart Rastafarian hairstyles with smart business. At the same time it is a shaky laboratory work, where you can (or want) no longer control the unwanted through deportation, as the same time as you're not sure about what to do instead.

"It's all democracy now, which is wonderful. I love it, it's great. But you find that people... You can't, *everybody* has the right, you can't say: "you can't stand here", because he *can* stay there if he wants to... but as long as he don't hassle anybody" (Interview with David 16/09/1999).

Even though most of the shop-owners in Long Street welcomes the democracy it is obvious that the changes also creates feelings of uncertainty. Fear is not only a feeling related to the crime situation, but also the fear of loosing control of the development process, manifested in the daily encounters with unwanted behaviour in Long Street. The third world becomes the "otherness", being part of something that you neither can nor want to identify with. First world behaviour becomes the "we do" and third world behaviour becomes "they do". So what do "they do" – the street kids for instance?

Street Kids and Third World Behaviour

The kids are indeed just as present in Long Street as colourful shops and tourists. Different

ages and different sizes they have one thing in common – they have all black or coloured skin. They are often described as dirty, dishonest, unpredictable and sometimes violent, the total opposite of what Long Street Committee wants to accomplish. At the same time they seem to be victims of poverty, bad education, bad parenting and racial division which call for sensitivity and rescue.[5] A way of dealing with the issue represents *Homestead*, a hostel for boys a few blocks away from Long Street.[6] One day when I joined Max, one of the shop owners, to visit the shops in his block to try to get more shop-owners involved in the Long Street Committee, we bumped into Jonah. Jonah was living at the Homestead, and for the moment he was begging for money outside Seven Eleven on the top of Long Street. When he recognised me from visiting the hostel he quickly withdrew his hand, looking a bit embarrassed. They were not supposed to beg when they stayed at the hostel, and this was indeed a bit confusing. Why did he ask for money when he got food and clothes at the hostel? One hour later I found Jonah and a friend further down Long Street and as they did not seem to disagree I joined them in their walk down Long Street.

Jonah did not know that Long Street is Long Street. To him it was just the "street below there", a place to go where things happens, not really a street you have a special love for or considering to be *home*. To walk with him and the other Homestead boys made it clear that they had a strong sense of using the place, walking in groups in the streets and pedestrians, crossing the roads by cruising between cars in a total, as it seems, lack of fear. Almost like it was unconscious, a well learned lesson about the relation between body and environment. They seemed to get around the whole city; you could find them here and there, always streetwise and careless. But if you asked them for a street by using its name, many of them seemed to have a hard time to understand what you talked about. Later in the same afternoon I met some of the other boys, a small group between maybe seven and ten years, as they were sitting on the pavement at a street corner in a state of total boredom.

"Nothing happens, they declare. One of the boys eats a cookie. He takes small pieces to make it last as long as possible. They do not want to be at the Homestead today. It is boring. Nobody is there. One of the small boys is pulling the lattice to the well in the street. The other boys look a bit amused for a short while. Then it is boring again. When I ask the boy if he knows people in the shops he nods his head. He got the cookie from the café behind us.

–And in that butchery you get pieces of biltong...

Explains the boy as he is pointing at one of the shops on the other side of Long Street. Now he seems a bit amused, like this conversation makes more sense to him than questions about places and street names" (Walk-about with Max, Jonah and friends 04/12/1999).

It seems clear that places to these children were a tool to get in contact with people. Even though these boys were on their own, they still interacted with and depended on others. Cape Towns street kids become formed by the interaction, but also of the city in itself, as they gather at places where things are happening and leave when the city gets empty. Boredom becomes an essential part of life, more of a state of nothingness than the temporality you feel when you have more interesting future plans to stage. *People* definitely seems to be more central in the spatial organisation than the place in itself, they probably get around better in the central Cape Town than most of the citizens – only from another perspective. It is hard to imagine Jonah talking about the Long Street as a place with a certain, emotional value, or create realistic visions about what to do there next week or in ten years. To have a perspective on both time and place you need both skills to plan for the future and be able to create emotional bounds both to other people and the place you live in – skills that very few of the street kids have had possibilities to develop.

Michel de Certeau uses the concepts of *strategy* and *tactics* to clarify different kinds of actions. Strategy is connected to institutions, and a particular form of management of power, something that makes forms and frames for

other peoples possibilities to use the city, like city planning, traffic regulation, law making, security and surveillance cameras. Tactics, on the other hand, becomes what happens when people improvises and uses these condition in a creative way, not necessarily like it was meant to be (de Certeau 1984:xix). The street kids are to a great extent using the latter aspect to take place in the city, and this can also be related to Alberto Meluccis discussion on time. Melucci makes a division between the inner "floating" time with dreams and associations, and the socially organised time with beginnings and ends, repeated cycles and frames for interaction (Melucci 1996:18). These concepts seem to be related and it is symptomatic that learning how to tell the time is one of the first skills to conquer in the Homesteads informal school *Learning to live*. To *learn to live* is among other things to be able to make concepts about socially constructed (strategic) time and eventually be able to create stable frames for social interaction that other people can relate to. Being incorporated in a general idea about *how things are* but also develop emotional bonds. Important in this process is to be able to *place the time*, to settle personal experiences and memories as well as socially organised conceptions in the city, and as a consequence make places and people meaningful in a more permanent sense. In a way the kids in Long Street seems to live in a floating time situation, with no clear beginnings and ends. More than creating permanent relations, they seem to live in a different world, where random opportunities become not only the tool to survival but also the reality in itself. In a way it creates a different reality, a different city and a different Long Street. It became clear when we walked down the street that the reason for begging was the game shop further down the road. A perfect example of how to use opportunities that turns up. Begging is a quite easy thing to do, if you are used to it, just put up your hand and hope for the best – a random event.

The street kids hanging around Long Street can be seen as tactics to the extreme, living in a ongoing improvisation to estimate and take advantage of the situations that occur but with no skills to relate to strategic formalisations, neither according to time or place In that sense the story about David and William appears different. What David *really* offered was hard for him to relate to, handling it from *his* perspective – like another random event, like a temporary loophole. Probably appreciate it but with no skills to make the situation permanent, something that for David, more familiar with strategic thinking, was very difficult to handle or to even understand. He did not know what to do.

Balancing Concepts I

If we relate this discussion to the two concepts first world and third world behaviour, it seems like the street kids very well fit into this concept of "otherness" and the dystopia of third world behaviour. This is a threat to the vision of creating an attractive Long Street as a part of an attractive Cape Town, but the solution is perhaps not totally rejecting third world. It was quite obvious that the members in the Long Street Committee somehow tried to incorporate third world people informally. Quite often I could see poorly dressed men sweeping the street, or just sit to keep an eye on what's going on. It is clear that a number of "poor" or even "homeless people" was quite integrated in the life on Long Street in a permanent sense, becoming employed by the shop owners to do different kinds of work. When I walked with Max it was interesting to see how he greeted and talked to a lot of people, from other shop-owners to men sitting in the street. And he did not necessarily see them as a problem or a threat:

"I don't have any objections to street people, I just object to laws that prevent them from working and allows them to only exist by committing crime. If they would be allowed to polish shoes, if they were allowed to carry delivery, you know, as you can do in any other third world country" (Walk-about with Max, Jonah and friends 04/12/1999).

From Max's perspective we get another angle of the third world concept. If you can incorporate

the third world concept into the first world vision, making it productive in a sense, it becomes a part of the street without destroying the vision of Long Street. Proper third world behaviour is in that context to subordinate first world values, and to use it in a way that encourages it rather than work against it. Steeling and begging is typical examples of improper third world behaviour, as well as polishing shoes and sweeping the street becomes the opposite. The biggest problem with the kids is not necessarily their poverty, but the bad impact they have on the streetscape, using it in an apparently active way and taking threatening advantages of different situations. It seems like the idea of first world and third world also have to do with *balance* between these concepts, and that the two lifestyles might exist side by side as long as the third world does not undermine the foundation of the first world vision. Keeping *third world* in control rather than totally rejecting it. But it is also a critic of the strategic, rulemaking government as the actual *creator* of the negative outcomes of third world. By not being able to adapt to the new situation in Cape Town they are making it hard for people to survive, making them commit to crime or informal business. Maybe becoming what has already happened in Johannesburg. The members in the Long Street Committee were stuck in-between the wish to get rid of the problems and the urge to solve them. It is a negotiation process that in the post apartheid society seriously challenges old borders and old conceptualisations, putting people in painful uncertainty on *how things are* and *how people are*. And it makes the issue about presence in the street very obvious, putting conflicts and negotiations at the frontline, conflicts that also exist in Malmö. Where to be, when and how to behave – in the mutual agreement on *how things are* in the streets of Malmö – and Möllevången which indeed, just like Long Street, represents a possibility for different lifestyles.

Perspectives on Möllevången

Möllevången is seated about two kilometres from the centre of Malmö, and was mainly built 1900–1940 with quite traditional block of flats and some factories, quite many of the buildings with brick facing. In the centre of the area is a square, Möllvångstorget, seated, in many ways also the most common representation of the area. Möllevången became a place for working class movement during the 1920s, with a number of well-remembered conflicts between workers and factory owners. It was an area that seemed to manifest a kind of "working class pride", a kind of brief indication of the long time rule of the Social Democrat Party that was to come. But Möllevången was already in the 1940s considered to be in a state of declination, and many of the more well situated workers moved into the new parts of the city where open functionalistic style became a manifestation of the "modern folk home"(Billing & Stigendal 1994; Ristilammi 1994). In the 1960s the area more and more, just like Long Street, became a possibility to develop "alternative" lifestyles, but also a rising rate of drug addicts and social problems. In the 1970s Möllevången was seen as a quite dilapidated area from the authorities point of view (and many inhabitants of the city as well). In many ways placed at the backside of Swedish modernity, honestly more in interest of social workers and the police than seen as a possibility to represent a positive view of the city of Malmö (Högdahl 2003:66).

Today the picture of Möllevången has changed a lot, as industry is gone and the visions of the city are symbolised by the new bridge crossing Öresund to Denmark and the rest of Europe (Idvall 2000). Even if considered to still having a lot of problems with drugs, unemployment and social deviation, Möllevången is seen as a mixture with options in the new Sweden, as a part of the world rather than the homogenised and isolated (but modern) folk home. In for instance tourist books, the description of Malmö has been changed from the functionalistic modern city to a cityscape focusing more on the chaotic, mobile and messy in a positive sense (Andström 2000; Lundh & Sandblad 1950). In frontline of this new position are to a large extent the immigrants, very visible in Möllevången by the many small groceries and gift shops with imported products from all over

the world. This have been incorporated in the old setting and the alternative lifestyle has partly transformed into a new modernity of tolerance, with more obvious smartness, often reflected as for instance festivals, carnivals, pubs and different kind of music events. The market at Möllevången square has become one of the most popular pictures in the marketing of the city of Malmö, providing with a kind of "unswedish" touch. In this sense the vision of the colourful immigrant also provides with an opportunity to challenge the traditional picture of the Swede – as being to rational, to stiff, to quiet, to shy and to boring. This is indeed a springboard for launching of the new *cosmopolitan Malmö* – a city with tolerance, spontaneity and ability to reach out, both to different parts of the world and different ways of living. In that sense the situation reminds a lot about Long Street in Cape Town, South Africa. As well as in Long Street there are also fears, and Möllevången appears as a polarisation, with tolerance and positive diversion at one side, and deviation and criminality on the other that sometimes melts together with concepts of "otherness" in the negative sense. Möllevången becomes a challenge to ideas on *how things are* in Malmö, a kind of quite positive representation of tolerance that also raises question about presence and under what circumstances this might be done. As well as Long Street Möllevången appears as a balancing act, and if the immigrants often are viewed as a positive contribution to the cosmopolitan lifestyle, it is harder to include the down-and-outs in this picture. During my fieldwork I followed some of them, trying to understand the concept of third world in a Swedish context.

Perceiving the Down-and-outs

The down-and-outs, often referred to as "drunks" in daily interactions, are indeed a group marked by long time ambivalence in the city. Similar to the street kids they are seen as both disturbing elements and victims of circumstances. Not so often seen as direct cause of serious situations of violence, but definitely hard to transform to an appetising presence in the street, as they are marked and conceptualised by filth, unpredictability and outbursts of bad behavioural manners. They represent, as well as the street kids in Cape Town, a category that is quite hard to relate to and to handle from both authority and the other people in the street. Like the street kids the drunks seem to basically conduct what de Certeau calls *tactics of the weak,* where they have to take advantage of opportunities with the obvious risk of getting rejected (de Certeau 1984:xix). Even though Möllevången is considered to be a place of tolerance, it is obvious that there are certain limits. A few years ago the benches close to the square were removed. Åke, one of the homeless men I interviewed in Möllevången, claimed it was the "drunks" own fault, behaving improper by being there to many at the same time, yelling, drinking and bring in weapons. Especially Åke who had lived a big part of his life in the area had a strong sense of the environment and street life. For him, as well as the other inhabitants, Möllevången was a living field of memories where different places symbolised different phases in his own life. As Michel de Certeau has pointed out, memory is indeed a very important part making *space* in the city, as memory makes the places become haunted with meanings, and de Certeau claims that *haunted places* are the only ones possible to really live in (de Certeau 1984:108). To Åke Möllevången was definitely haunted with personal memories not only of the life as a homeless but also of normality. The flat he used to live in with Eva before they moved out in the street and the playgrounds where his children used to play. They had, among other memories, become time markers of Åke's personal life, which made it possible to create time tables of his life which creates possibilities to orientate in reality. This also creates a strong sense of what is normal behaviour and when these borders are crossed over. The Swedish "drunks" are aware of a more obvious consensus on the discourse of *how things are*, where they themselves are able to put up limits for their presence in the street. A little park at the outskirts of the area, called Jesus Park (for a reason I have not really been able to figure out) becomes a perfect loophole.

Usually the drunks meet there to drink and talk, and in summer they periodically almost live in the park, sleeping at the benches or in the bushes. As time has passed Jesus Park in storytelling has become a "messy" place to many people living in the area. By using *kairos*, being in the right place at the right time, the "drunks" has transformed the park into another kind of normality, a permanent place for the down-and-out community. Other places are not so easy to transform. A more attractive place represents the Triangle Square a few blocks away, quite close to the very centre of Malmö. This place, though, has more obvious conditions as it is to be shared with the other inhabitants in the city.

Claiming Space in The Triangle

The Triangle is visualising another kind of physical landscape than Möllevången, with multiple stores and a small square with a hot dog stand. The people who pass by uses a sort of rounded pedestrian along the side of the square and the two areas are divided by a small wall. Along this wall you can also find a lot of park benches, following the division line on the open "square side", with quite good view of the activities going on and in convenient distance to the liqueur store about one block away. Åke and some of the other drunks usually met there during the weeks when the liqueur store is opened, always sitting on the bench furthest away from the sausage store and the pedestrian. Åke explained why they choose this particular bench:

"– I know Tomas who has the sausage store and well, he's said that don't sit in front of it, so we sit over here and then we can sit here and drink too.

– As long as you hold your mouth and take it easy it is no problem. But as soon as somebody starts to scream and yell and things like that, then somebody always gives a roar, says Per, a friend of Åke.

A few meters away Åke has made a picture in blue with crayons at the pavement and nobody seems to have any objections to this. But what is important is to not *pee* or in other ways make a mess. Tobbe, another friend, explains that he usually uses a hamburger store on the other side of the square, well known for a tolerant attitude to the homeless people in the area, and he also tries to look after for the others behaviour.

–I usually cleans here as well, if he pukes I'll take care of it...

It is not always easy to keep up the good shape, though, even if most of them know the limits for proper behaviour, the escalating drunkenness introduces chaos into the good intentions and it might sometimes be hard to remember behavioural orders. Today one of the men is too drunk to go to Stippes and he pees openly at the side of the bench. No one of the bypasses says anything, some of them are gazing at the activity taking place and a lady is staring with harsh eyes. Some people are respectfully looking down, pretending like nothing unusual is going on. The critical gaze as well as sound protests definitely becomes important in defining the improper behaviour and Tobbe looks a bit embarrassed as he sits on the bench. Some activities, though, definitely passes the limits of the acceptable. Åke, in a state of complete drunkenness, wants to move to another bench in front of the sausage store.

–Come, lets sit in the sun...

–No, I don't want to go to the sun.

–But over there, it's only...

–Only what? I will warm you, come on Åke, put on your jacket, I don't want to go there. Over there everybody is sitting with prams and everything. Should we sit there and drink?

–No, not there, on the first bench...

–But there are two old crones sitting there...

Children, families and "old crones" have priority to drunks, Olle knows that and so does Åke, even though he has forgotten for the moment. You can't occupy a place already taken, there is no loophole there to use, and eventually it could lead to loss of the already accomplished permanency of the other bench" (Interview with Åke and friends 04/12/1999).

It was obvious that the drunks, like the street kids in Long Street, could reach a kind of pres-

ence which seemed to call for restrictions. But it is also important to point out that there is a negotiable line between total acceptance and rejection, and that ideas about vulnerability, citizenship rights and visions of tolerance in some case have been in advantage for the drunks. One day in the Triangle a man approached Åke and the others on the bench, giving him some folded up bills.

"– Here you have 60 crowns...

– Hello...

– I've been down there myself, so...

Åke is almost interrupts the man in his eagerness and then he is giving Henrik instructions to go to the liqueur store, probably not what the man had in mind.

– I've been living in Celsiusgården (a place for alcohol treatment), he tries.

– Yees, hi brother, I'm Åke... Thank you brother, have a nice day... it was so nice of you...

– I know what it's like...

And Åke does not have to beg this day and he is enthusiastic.

– They feel *sorry* for you, Åke, *they feel sorry for you*...

Henrik says with a humorous irony in his voice" (Interview with Åke and friends 16/09/1998).

Balancing Concepts II

Both the drunks in Möllevången and the street kids in Long Street might be related to the concept of *floating significants*, as the content of their presence is not related to an overall fixed meaning, and their presence seems to be inscribed by a manifold of values, depending on who was talking and under what circumstances (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 1999:35). Different discourses and different statements were manifested, and how the place was considered to be was of big significance for how the people were allowed to be. It is quite clear that the drunks as well as the children in the every day life might be connected with feelings of unpleasantness, something that might result in rejections but also possible to use as a loophole to gain advantages. It is also obvious that they were operating in a different context and with different skills. Even though the difference is of course also a result of young age, it was quite visible that the drunks were more aware of the strategic aspects in the places. The drunks were in comparison more skilled to make up plans in relation to the condition of the places and the people in a more "ordered" sense. The children, on the other hand, seemed to operate from a totally tactical point of view with no real knowledge of the strategic aspects of the city. They were constantly breaking the rules without really knowing it and became unpredictable in their total tactical behaviour. They did not know what de Certeau refers to as *the law of the proper* in different places (de Certeau 1984:21). The drunks in Malmö seemed, unless they were too drunk, to be more skilled to carry out the (Long Street) vision of a proper third world behaviour, as they seemed to subordinate (first world) normality values. By doing so they were to a larger extent than the street kids, able to use *kairos* to make a more permanent occupation of a place without getting rejected. It makes certainly an interesting perspective on tactics, and what it means to be streetwise in a successful way. It is clear that Åke and his friends have been able to incorporate themselves into the order of the city, knowing not only their obligation but also their rights. The street kids seem impossible to incorporate in the vision for Long Street, impossible to transform into neither first world people nor proper third world behaviour.

Conclusion

The reason for me to pick up the concepts of first world and third world from the shop-owners in Long Street and use them to discuss presence in the street in Cape Town and Malmö, is not to claim that Sweden has a problematic in the same sense as South Africa. My aim is not to discuss uneven distribution of resources in a global sense; I rather want to view them as "folk concepts" in the everyday life. Above all they represent a time and space dichotomy between the past and the future, and they also represent a

power relation where people enters the everyday negotiation with different legitimacy and therefore have different options to make an impact in the streetscape. The problems of South Africa might seem far away, but the power related every-day negotiations are as well present in our own backyard. It is not only the "drunks" in Möllevången that are accused of being out of place and time. "Third world behaviour" is also now and then affecting the immigrant community, and it could also possible to view the discussion in the context of gender. Such processes of inclusion and exclusion is possible to observe in many European urban settings, as certain neighbourhoods balance between the "colourful" and the "disorderly". Some of these urban areas are, as well as Long Street, moving towards a "touristification" with problems of gentrification – others are stuck in being seen as unmanageable problem areas.

The conditions for people taking place in the city certainly put de Certeaus concept of *space* into a different view. If "space is like the word when it is spoken" one might wonder whether people can, may or want to speak even the same language (de Certeau 1984:117). Narrative is definitely an important element in the process of doing the street, with texts, personal experiences, and hearsay all filling their specific functions at different levels. From this perspective it is interesting to consider if *other people* are invited to be participants, or to become in order. How we "make" people and interpret human presence creates notions not only about *what people are like*, but also about *what it is possible for them to do.* This affects city life and its rhythm in that it ultimately leads to conditions of emptiness, presence, silence, or noise. This also gives a broad understanding of the concepts of discourse and power, since discourse ranges far beyond the world of language and power can scarcely be seen solely from a "top-down" perspective. In fact, it includes every aspect of everyday interaction and it is communally legitimated by those who ascribe the same kind of knowledge. The idea of *what things are like* is a kind of habituated point of departure for the interpretation of existence, but it is obvious that this is in constant change. The city and its inhabitants are in a constantly ongoing learning process through which mental maps are drawn and redrawn.

The possibility of using loopholes is an important reason for the constant shifts which take place in everyday life and which can also lead to permanent change. The loopholes are an important part of what could be called *the democracy of the city*, a potential to negotiate in a public dialogue that seems rather informal but scarcely non-political. South Africa under apartheid has made clear the very serious consequences of preventing people from establishing loopholes, since the vision of the racially segregated city made it almost entirely impossible for a large share of the inhabitants to change their private life situation or to question the prevailing order. Repressing people who have no chance of participating via dialogue or negotiation generates obvious feelings of powerlessness, while also risking that acts will be performed outside the "legitimate" negotiation arenas. Limits have to be made to keep the street and the city somehow in order, but in this process we constantly need to question the conditions by which the public dialogue is carried on. Particularly those elements that are taken for granted, and it is important to ask oneself by what techniques it is created and whose interests it actually furthers.

Notes

1. This text is created from an interview with David 16/09/1999. I am using pseudonyms in this article, for all people interviewed.
2. This was carried out especially through the legislation of *Group Areas Act* where the population was divide in different race groups and forced to live in different parts of the city. The legislation from 1950 divided Cape Town, as well as other South African cities, into separated race group sections, that by the geographer John Western are referred to as the developing of *etno-city*, a kind of apartheid modernity vision (Western 1996:64). Categorisation of race combined with exclusion was of course the most effective way to implement apartheid, even though it never was legitimised through the whole population as the defeat proved in the beginning of the 1990s (Levett 1997:3).
3. I used both these areas as empirical examples in my PhD-dissertation *Doing the Street. On Borders and Loopholes in Möllevången and in Cape Town* (Högdahl 2003).

4. Big squatter camps had since long time ago developed at the outcast of Cape Town, as desperate black people saw the city as the only possibility to make a living. Often to be sent back to the places they came from in the countryside or to the constructed homelands that had been set up by the National Party government in an effort to solve the issue of the unwanted part of the population. (Beinart & Dubow 1995; Reynolds 1989; Unterhalter 1987; Western 1996).
5. According to social worker Heather Parker Lewis, stereotyping and labelling the children is one way of coping emotionally with the feeling of uncomfortable guilt (Parker Lewis 1998:14; Rock 1997:14f).
6. Some of the children at Homestead stay there for quite a long time, go to the informal school and finally move to the children's home and hopefully become a part of the "established society", but a majority of them stay there only for a short while. Spring and summer are the best seasons for a street kid with a lot of tourists to beg and steal from, entertainment and warm nights to sleep outside.

References

Andström, Bobby 2000: *Malmö – stad i världen.* Malmö: Författaren och Anders Rahm Bokproduktion.

Arendt, Hannah 1986: *Människans villkor. Vita activa.* Göteborg: Röda Bokförlaget.

Beinart, William & Dubow, Saul 1995: *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-century South Africa.* London/New York: Routledge.

Bickford-Smith, Vivian, Heyningen, Elizabeth & Worden, Nigel 1999: *Cape Town – in the Twentieth Century.* Claremont/Cape Town: David Philip Publishers.

Billing, Peter & Stigendal, Mikael 1994: *Hegemonins decennier. Lärdomar från Malmö och den svenska modellen.* Malmö: Möllevångens Samhällsanalys.

Butler, Judith 1993: *Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits on "Sex".* London/New York: Routledge.

Cape Times, Top of the Times 28/02/1997.

de Certeau, Michel 1984: *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

City Improvement Districts Association, Cape Town 1999.

Durrheim, Kevin 1997: Peace Talk and Violence: An Analysis of the Power of "Peace". In: Levett, Ann (ed.): *Culture, Power & Difference. Discourse Analysis in South Africa.* Cape Town: UCT Press.

Foucault, Michel 2002: *Vetandets arkeologi.* Lund: Arkiv förlag.

Green, Lawrence G. 1971: *A Taste of South Easter.* Cape Town: Howard Timmins.

Idvall, Markus 2000: *Kartors kraft. Regionen som samhällsvision i Öresundsbrons tid.* Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Högdahl, Elisabeth 2003: *Göra gata. Om gränser och kryphål på Möllevången och i Kapstaden.* Hedemora: Gidlunds.

Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark 1980: *Metaphors we Live by.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Levett, Ann 1997: Introduction. In: Levett, Ann (ed.): *Culture, Power & Difference. Discourse Analysis in South Africa.* Cape Town: UCT Press.

Lundh, Gunnar & Sandblad, N. G. 1950: *Malmö – ett bildverk.*

Melucci, Alberto 1996: *The Playing Self. Person and Meaning in the Planetary Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker Lewis, Heather 1998: *Also God's Children? Encounters with Streetkids.* Cape Town: Ihilihili Press.

Reynolds, Pamela 1989: *Childhood in Crossroads. Cognition and Society in South Africa.* Cape Town/Johannesburg: David Philip Publishers.

Ristilammi, Per-Markku 1994: *Rosengård och den svarta poesin. En studie av modern annorlundahet.* Stockhom/Stehag: Symposion.

Rock, Brian 1997: *Spirals of Suffering: Public Violence and Children.* Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Schlör, Joachim 1998: *Nights in the Big City. Paris, Berlin, London 1840–1930.* London: Reaktion Books.

Shaw, Mark 2002: *Crime and Policing in the Post-Apartheid South Africa. Transforming under Fire.* Cape Town: David Philips Publishers.

Steyn, Melissa 2001: *Whiteness Just Isn't What It Used to Be.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Tshiwula, Lullu 1998: *Crime and Delinquency.* Pretoria: Kagiso Publishers.

Unterhalter, Elaine 1987: *Forced Removal. The Division, Segregation and Control of the People of South Africa.* London: IDAF Publications Ltd.

Western, John 1996: *Outcast Cape Town.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise 2000: *Diskursanalys som teori och metod.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Interviews

Åke and friends 16/09/1998

David 16/09/1999

Walk-about with Max, Jonah and friends 04/12/1999