

Georgetown University - School of Foreign Service in Qatar

Principles of Rebellion, Autonomy and Reform in a Communitarian Society:
An Exploration of Freetown Christiania in Copenhagen

Abdelrahman Kamel

Thesis Mentor: Dr. Edward Kolla

Monday, March 27, 2017

Henrietta

Table of Contents

What is Christiania?.....	4
Introduction	5
Literature review.....	6
Rebellion:	
The Psychedelic Revolution and the Culture of Ecstasy	8
State Opposition and the Emergence of Rebellion.....	12
A Playground for Adults (1969 – 1971)	14
Squatter Exclusivity and Christiania’s Inclusivity.....	15
Autonomy:	
The Theory of Archaic Revival.....	20
A Social Movement (1975- 1976)	23
Ting and the rise of collective political consciousness.....	25
Reform:	
Politics of collectivism and Reorganisation	32
A Normalized neighbourhood (1976 – 1987).....	34
The blockade against Hard Drugs.....	36
Drug culture and Drug market.....	40
Conclusion.....	43

What is Christiania?

On September 4th, 1971, a group of local squatters in the city of Copenhagen broke down the fence of a deserted army barracks (Bådsmandsstræde) within the neighborhood of Christianshavn and started occupying the territory to create an alternative community. On September 26th, the inhabitants founded the Freetown of Christiania, “a community driven by the values and ideologies of the cultural revolution of the 1960s” (Vanolo 1788). The name Christiania came from the former name of the Norwegian capital, Oslo when it was ruled by Christian IV of Denmark in 1624. The squatters were inspired by the idea that the Danes once lived on Norwegian land that they did not own and thus both the Danish occupation of Oslo and the squatted territory of Christiania was in principle land that the squatters stole (Mhoja). The vision and promise of the newly established community was centered on a communal attempt to constitute a utopian society. According to the Christiania Charter:

The aim of Christiania is to create a self-governing society in which each individual may flourish while giving due regard to the interest of the community at large. ... Furthermore, the common quest of the community must at all times be to show that physical and psychological pollution can be avoided (Midtgaard 300).

At the time of the occupation, the use of this territory was illegal yet the Danish government took limited measures to remove the citizens from the military base. In 1972, the Danish Ministry of Defense gave the community a ‘temporary’ status of a ‘social experiment’ (Thörn 7). In 1989, a Danish parliamentary majority lead by the social democratic party passed the Christiania Act, which gave occupiers of this territory the right to collective use of the area. The right of use simply meant that the inhabitants were allowed to reside in and use the area as long as they paid the necessary maintenance bills and property taxes. From its early establishment in 1971 the society inspired many individuals from neighboring European countries to immigrate and reside in the area, adding a multicultural dimension to the development of the community. In 2004, the newly elected Conservative People's Party passed dramatic changes to the Christiania Act of 1989, which limited the right of both collective use and utility of the area. According to the new law, the right of collective use of the area would expire on January 2006. The date declared was only subject to extension under the jurisdiction of the Danish Ministry of Justice. However, residents of Christiania refused to give up the right of collective use that was granted to them in the 1989 act. When negotiations started in 2008, Christiania took the Danish parliament to court to fight for their right of use to the area (Thörn 8).

Coincidentally, 2011 marked both the 40th anniversary of the Freetown and the year in which the Danish Supreme Court heard the case of Christiania, and ruled against the territory’s inhabitants’ right of use. Following the court’s decision, the legal status of the community was “ambiguous and contested” (Thörn 8). What followed was what Gothenburg University’s sociology professor, Håkan Thörn described as “a period of intense struggles, involving both bargaining and barricades, [which] finally came to an end when Christiania signed an agreement with the Danish state in 2011” (Thörn 153). The agreement was to allow Christiania residents to purchase the property collectively for a price that is below market value. Residents managed to purchase a substantial part of the territory through fundraising and social events yet, to this very

day residents are still in the process of purchasing the rest of Christiania (2017). The unique judicial condition of Christiania did not stop residents from sustaining the already established, semi-autonomous, society during the years of legal legitimacy. In addition to the question of use of the property, another legal conflict between Christiania and the Danish state is the Freetown's involvement in the use and trade of illegal drugs. According to Anders:

Around 900 people today live in Christiania. it is governed through a de-centralized democratic structure, whose autonomy is highly contingent on the Freetown's external relations with the Danish government, the Copenhagen Municipality, the Copenhagen Police — and organized crime linked to the sale of hash in the Freetown. (Thörn 8)

The case of Freetown Christiania in Copenhagen is a unique political experiment that has developed into an alternative cultural and political space within Danish society. The experiment offers an insight on the emergence of a commune within the setting of a modern European capital city.

Introduction

The narrative of Christiania is a description of the emergence and development of the alternative within the cultural, political and social sphere of a modern European city. The thesis of this paper will focus on three principles: Rebellion, autonomy and reform. The idea is that these three principles constitute the foundation of Christiania as an alternative commune. These principles were not born in an instant but instead they were progressively, or organically, developed through time. The principles also symbolize three different development stages in Christiania's history being: Rebellion (1969 – 1971) autonomy (1975- 1976) and reform (1976 - 1987). The purpose of this thesis is to chart a descriptive narrative of the development of these communal principles and organization mechanisms within the context of Christiania.

The first chapter will underline the principle of rebellion to illustrate how the initial founding principle of the community was based on a collective disregard to mainstream culture and laws. This section incorporates the theoretical framework of influential figures in the 1960s counterculture movement to illustrate how Christiania's rebellion may have been influenced by the counter cultural thought and values of the 1960s. The section will also underline the relationship between state opposition and counter cultural rebellion to understand the emerging phases of such rebellion as a response to authoritarian action. The following section will then introduce the history of Christiania from 1969 to 1971, to give background and historical context to the principle of rebellion apparent in the Danish squatters movement and Christiania. Following the history of Christiania, the chapter will underline the difference between the evicted squatted houses of the 1960s Danish squatters movement and Christiania to show the different approach to rebellion that Christiania adopted in 1971. The aim of this chapter is to show how the principle of rebellion against the law and mainstream culture was a critical and influential principle during Christiania's establishment.

The second chapter addresses the emergence of the principle of autonomy to show how Christiania residents developed their own communal form of political and social organizational structure. The first part of this chapter will use the theoretical framework of Terence Mckenna, an influential figure of the 1960s-counter culture movement, in order to give necessary

background information on the emergence of countercultural politics. The second part will introduce the history of Christiania from 1975 to 1976, to give historical context and background on the communal practices of autonomy. The following part will underline the emergence of Christiania's exclusive political consciousness and identity between residents. The aim of this chapter is to illustrate how the principle of autonomy and the rise of political consciousness was of vital importance in Christiania's development during its first establishing years.

The third chapter will demonstrate the principle of reform to show how the community developed reorganizational methods in response to various challenges concerning Christiania's drug market. The first part of this chapter will address the role that Christiania's political system played in reorganizing the commune and implementing new laws and regulations. The second part will introduce the history of Christiania from 1976 to 1987, to give historical context on communal practices of reform. The following part of this study will address Christiania's ban of hard drugs to illustrate how such a ban resulted in major acts or reorganization. The final part will address Christiania's drug market to show how residents implemented various laws and regulations in order to control and normalize such a market. The aim of this chapter is to show how Christiania managed to reform its position and laws in response to police forces, organized crime and its own established soft drug market. The reform chapter will aim to demonstrate how the commune is constantly adapting its image and values to changing conditions.

The three principles, rebellion autonomy and reform, symbolize the process of establishment, legitimacy and integration of an alternative society within a modern European city. What such principles offer is a chance to understand the rise of politics, culture and tradition on the level of a micro society. It also underlines the importance of social legitimacy and mobilization in the establishment of communal principles.

Literature review

The first and most important matter to address is that there is a serious lack of academic sources written on the topic of Christiania in English. Nevertheless, the quality of the limited sources concerning Christiania was of great importance for this study. Most of the academic sources gathered for this study were derived from Christiania's Researcher in Resident facility during my residency in Christiania. The sources are all written by established Academic researchers with an exclusive focus on Christiania as a subject matter. During my stay in Christiania as a researcher in resident, I managed to conduct interviews with various residents of the commune on the subject matter of this thesis. These sources were complemented by sources on relevant theoretical frameworks, political and cultural theories and concepts. This section will underline how the thesis project contributes to the scholarly discussion on the topic of Christiania.

The sources that are exclusively dedicated to the topic of Christiania were diverse in disciplinary field and concentration. The most detailed and accurate sources on Christiania are Dr. Maria Hellström's doctoral thesis, *The Aesthetics of Tactical Formlessness and 'The Free Town of Christiania'*, and Pernille Lauritsen's *a Short Guide to Christiania*. Dr. Maria Hellström's thesis is a product of her years in residency as Christiania's researcher in resident and field research on Christiania which makes Hellström the expert and the most reliable account on Christiania. While Hellström's account on Christiania is considered a secondary source, her thesis cited and translated many primary sources concerned with Christiania. Hellström's thesis

is concerned with Christiania's relationship to the urban planning and design discourse to show how Christiania is an example of organically grown design and architecture. Hellström's thesis focused on the occupation of space, urban development and agricultural design of Christiania's territory and houses. Hellström's account on Christiania's history and political input on Christiania is backed by detailed primary and secondary references and manuscripts written in Danish. What complemented Hellström's narrative is Pernille Lauritsen's book on the history of Christiania. Both Lauritsen and Hellström are sighted in many secondary sources written on Christiania, which shows how reliable their input is on Christiania's history. Ole Henriksen's *Christiania Yeah 1 - The Melting Pot* also provided many primary sources on the Danish squatters movement. The three sources proposed are all addressing very different topics yet, the primary sources and history depicted in such sources was of vital importance to the development of this thesis. The thesis presented in this paper places the historical narrative, which is provided by the existing sources, in a more cultural and theoretical framework.

The theoretical framework adopted in this paper aims to shed the light on the importance of theory in depicting the cultural and political aspect of Christiania. As Christiania is a 1960s phenomenon, the theoretical framework adopted in this paper is of influential figures of the countercultural movement of the 1960s. The first theoretical framework is that of Timothy Leary's *The politics of ecstasy* and *Psychedelic Experience* which is used in this study to link the rebellion apparent in Christiania with the drug rebellion of the 1960s. The second Theoretical perspective is that of Terence McKenna's *Archaic Revival* which is used in this study to link Christiania's rebellion with the community's reversion to communitarian values. While the input of such important figures in the counterculture is considered a primary source for the American countercultural movement, the theoretical perspective derived from such figures is a secondary source when applied in the case of Christiania. Such cultural theoretical frameworks were integrated within political theories such as Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's insight on anarchism in Larry Gambone's article and April Carter's book on *The political theory of anarchism* and Robert Graham's *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas* and Amitai Etzioni's Communitarianism revisited. The theoretical perspective adopted in this study aims to place Christiania in its appropriate cultural context as an emerged countercultural movement.

Another aspect of this study was the field research done as Christiania's researcher in resident. The research facility in Christiania is well-known among residents and as soon as I arrived, an article was published in Christiania's newspaper advertising my research project. Most of the people who responded to the article were political and cultural activists within the commune such as Britta Lillesoe, who's the head of Christiania's Cultural Association. The methodology adopted to conduct interviews with Christiania residents was based on the resident's occupation and years spent in the commune. Depending on the answer to the first two questions residents were given questions that are specific to the time period when they first moved to Christiania or the nature of their occupation. The questions were deliberately associated with the sociological development of historical, cultural and political identity of Christiania residents. The interviews offered many insight on the development of Christiania as an alternative actor and complemented the primary sources used in this thesis.

There were many secondary sources that offered insight on the cultural and political phenomena of alternative communities, many of which are cited in this thesis. However, the

secondary sources were almost all using the same primary sources and similar theoretical frameworks. The thesis, therefore, would bring to light the possibility of using contemporary cultural and political theories to underline the emergence of Christiania's principles.

The Psychedelic Revolution and the Culture of Ecstasy

As important background that underlines the essence of rebellion apparent in the Danish squatters movement in the 1960s and Christiania, we have to understand the cultural influence of the LSD revolution. We have to, therefore, turn our attention to the cultural rejections prevalent in the United States during the late 1950s and early 1960s to perceive how state opposition to such movements resulted in creating a collective sense of anti-authoritarianism. The inherent similarities in the way the Danish and United States' governments approached the squatters and hippie movements managed to influence the values of rebellion adopted by these movements. The same desire to rebel against established political and social models present in Christiania are reflected in the U.S. countercultural movement's rejection to state imposed laws concerning drugs. The focus of this section is to determine the origins of the cultural rebellion that had an influence on the emergence of the squatter movement and Christiania in Denmark. The idea is that, rebellion during the late 1960s and early 1970s became a cultural phenomenon that was apparent in various movements that subscribed to the same countercultural values. Placing Christiania in its appropriate historical and theoretical context illustrates how the commune is a product of the 1960s countercultural thoughts and values.

During the 1950s the psychedelic substance known as Lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) was controlled under psychotomimetic drug experiments in hospitals and mental wards to understand its psychological effects (*Hartogsohn* 6). According to Dr. Ido Hartogsohn, an expert on the Psycho-Social Construction of LSD:

The subjects were often mental patients, and other socially disadvantaged populations such as prisoners, drug addicts, and ethnic minorities who had little choice about participating in the studies. The social surrounding was not very much in the way of relaxation, unless one enjoys the company of unfamiliar medical personnel looking for signs that their patients are becoming psychotic ... The subjects usually knew little about the drug experience, except for the suggestions by doctors and other personnel that the drug turns those who take it into schizophrenic madmen (6).

The setting and mental state of the participants resulted in a disturbing psychedelic experience caused by the substance. The results of such experiments concluded that psychedelics are substances that have significant harm to the mental state of the public. A different approach to psychedelics was then introduced in the 1960s, as psychedelic scientists experimented with LSD. The difference is that, these scientists focused on experimenting with the substance as a therapeutic, creative, and spiritual tool (*Hartogsohn* 6). The participants were college students, artists and volunteers who were given detailed information about the psychedelic experience caused by taking LSD. According to *Hartogsohn*:

the extremely different set-and-setting conditions used by different groups of LSD scientists have led to the highly divergent accounts on its effects has been suggested by a number of researchers including Timothy Leary, Ralph Metzner,

and Sidney Cohen in the 1960s as well as by later observers such as Lee and Shalin (1985), Dyck (2008), and Fadiman (2011) (6).

At this point, the different approach to the drug lead to its experimental use among the young generation. The main reason behind the rapid rise in the popularity of the psychedelic experience was the emergence of psychedelic missionaries that were not only sharing their experiences of such substances, but also advertising them as a revolutionary drug. The most notable of such pushers is the American psychologist Timothy Leary. Art Linkletter, an American radio broadcaster stated in an anti-drug conference held by the nation-wide educational program in 1970:

the greatest pushers in this country today are the missionaries who have tried LSD and marijuana and barbiturates and who will even sell their own personal possessions to give the chemicals to their friends because they are convinced that it is a wonderful way; as (The LSD Messiah) Dr. Timothy Leary has said, 'It is a way to turn on, tune in and drop out (Continued Drug Abuse Could Collapse Nation article).

The Nation Wide Educational program was one among many state sponsored programs aimed at restricting the use of soft drugs among the youth. Regardless of such anti-drug programs' efforts to demonize the drug and its associates, at the time, such drug induced experiences were actively advertised by central important figures within the hippie movement such as Timothy Leary and Abbie Hoffman. The rebellion is illustrated in the movement's disregard to the legal status of the drug and the desire to deconstruct authoritarian forms of control. Hartogsohn describes the rise of drug-related culture and rebellion as the collective set and setting. According to Hartogsohn:

Collective set-and-setting, ... represents the social and cultural context in which the psychedelic experience takes place, and which frames the individual set-and-setting in the most intimate of ways. It is composed by the society's character, its knowledge and attitude towards the psychedelic experience, as well as by the physical and social settings provided in that society (8).

What Dr. Hartogsohn indicates is that, society's cultural and social position on the psychedelic experience may have had an impact on the rise of the psychedelic movement. Following such logic, one can say that such drug induced experiences created a sense of a collective that aims to change society's position on the recreational use of drugs. As Dr. Hartogsohn states, "the American trip [drug induced experience] of the 1960s was a singular collective psychedelic event expressing the collective set-and-setting conditions of America" (9). From Hartogsohn's perspective, the American countercultural movement was a reaction to the cultural and legal stigma associated with drug experiences. The drug induced experience was intimately tied with the development of the hippie countercultural movement and contributed in motivating the cultural opposition that emerged in both the United States youth movements and subsequent movements, such as the Danish squatter movement in the 1960s.

Before making the connection between the psychedelic revolution and the squatters movement, one must first attempt to define the drug induced experience caused by psychedelics as it illustrates the shared values of both rebellious movements. As defined by Timothy Leary,

the man who was both praised by some and demonized by others for his advocacy of psychedelics in the 1960s:

ECSTASY [is] The experience of attaining freedom from limitations, either self-imposed or external; a state of exalted delight in which normal understanding is felt to be surpassed. From the Greek 'ex-stasis.' By definition, ecstasy is an ongoing on/off process. It requires a continual sequence of 'dropping out.' On those occasions when many individuals share the ecstatic experience at the same time, they create a brief lived 'counter-culture' (Leary, *The Politics of Ecstasy I*).

The definition proposed by Leary demonstrates that drug induced experiences are connected to a process of liberation from socially and culturally imposed confinements. As a primary figure of the countercultural movement, Leary's definition and view of psychedelics aligned with the countercultural movement's values. The movement, therefore, regarded drugs as a tool of liberation from systems of cultural imprisonment apparent in the state's established systems of production, commercialism and mainstream culture and traditions. The shared experience of such drugs has thus created a sense of community and the foundation for a movement to take place. Ecstasy from Leary's perspective is an experience that has its own given set of political values such as anti-authoritarianism and communitarianism. Communitarianism in this context is a cultural phenomenon initiated by a shared experience that progressively created a common identity. What these substances induce when taken in high doses is a state of complete detachment or isolation from reality. One possible and extreme outcome of the experience is a phenomenon described as Ego Death, where a person's sense of self is temporarily dissolved or transformed into a state of nothingness. According to Leary:

A psychedelic experience is a journey to new realms of consciousness. The scope and content of the experience is limitless, but its characteristic features are the transcendence of verbal concepts, of space- time dimensions, and of the ego or identity (Leary, *The Psychedelic Experience 4*).

What Leary describes is the psychedelic experience's ability to obliterate a person's sense of self and identity. This experience of temporary detachment from the ego has been celebrated by advocates of psychedelic drugs such as Leary. The Ego Death experience has been commonly described as the closest experience one can have to actual physical death. The theoretical framework proposed in this study argues that, after such a reality-shattering experience the state and its established system of cultural production, tradition and, most importantly for this study, laws, suddenly became viewed as arbitrary lines and restrictions that impinge on individual freedom. The possible result of such an experience is to break out of the binary cultural and social tradition. This moment of disassociation and disregard to common cultural traditions and laws is described in this study as the main principle of rebellion apparent in countercultural movements such as that of Christiania. The individual experience of Ego Death is important as it helps define the possible origin of cultural rebellion that is apparent in hippie communes such as Christiania.

Drugs, and the shared experiences that resulted from such substances, created a collective principle of rebellion that inspired the values of Denmark's squatter movement in the late 1960s and Christiania in the early 1970s. The psychedelic experience is, first and foremost, an

experience that is not defined by structures or theories but, instead, it is an individualistic journey (commonly described as a trip) that progressively influenced the political and cultural beliefs of an entire generation during the 1960s and 70s. The common shared outcome of the drug experience can be the realization that, the altered states of consciousness create a collective sense of understanding between those who have experienced this alterity, which changes them so fundamentally it renders them outsiders to the world dissociated from that experience, and the world which does not know this alterity. The belief that a person is not simply an individual but, instead, connected to others through a higher state of shared consciousness, is the founding principle of cultural collectivism in the context of countercultural movements. According to Terence McKenna:

Collectively. They see collectively what is to be done. I think that this is a dissolving of the power of the ego ...in other words, this much larger, much wiser organizing force that we all carry around inside ourselves ... Like a chemical habit, we are hooked on ego. And the psychedelic dissolves that chemical psychological dependency and replaces it with the fact of the matter: how the individual fits into the life and organization of this planet, the vast amounts of time all these things have been in existence and have worked themselves to their present status (10).

What McKenna indicates is that, Ego Death motivated a cultural sense of a shared collective experience, which is not otherwise understood. This line of thought proposes that individual members of the counterculture joined the movement because it organically established the sense of cultural collectivism that was derived from their own individual experiences with such substances. Through this collectivism, the social movements managed to construct a shared identity that is embodied within a communal setting and shared principles. This experience of detachment from ego and realization of the collective is an underlying, and not often unremarked, principle of the hippie movement, which I argue also informed the squatter movements of Copenhagen and other derivatives. Using the theoretical framework of the 1960 countercultural thought, this chapter will argue that, the psychedelic experience moved from being an individual phenomena into being a collective communitarian process of Ego Death. Therefore, the principle of rebellion adopted by the drug movement managed to create the foundation for communitarian values to develop among the countercultural movement, the squatter movement, and eventually Christiania.

There are two major cultural dimensions to the hippie countercultural movement, the inner culture and the outer culture. The first dimension is one that is associated with an external culture manifested in learned and mainstream cultural traditions. The second dimension is one that is associated with an inner sense of tradition that is governed by the experience of the mind and body. The idea is that ecstasy and psychedelic substances helped create a counter cultural movement by pointing out the distinction between the inner and outer culture. According to Timothy Leary:

The Sixties revolution created and continues to create a new, post-political society based on Ecstasy, i.e. the experience of Individual Freedom. This movement is the 'rapture' anticipated for the Twenty-First Century. It is the culmination of the

mystical, transcendental spooky, hallucinatory dreams which we have envisioned in our highest psychedelic (mind-opened) states” (Leary, *The Politics of Ecstasy* 5).

The distinction between the inner and outer culture may have created a series of disassociations and rejections to mainstream cultural traditions through various rebellious acts against state authorities. The external culture suddenly became viewed as something that is imposed on individuals to disconnect them from the experience of individual liberation. This is not to suggest that the hippie movement was entirely based on psychedelics or that all hippies used psychedelics. Instead, it symbolizes a moment of both transition and confrontation. The transition is the shift from a reality that is focused on satisfying external association to culture, to a reality that is centered on the body and its experience. Such experiences are not limited to drug induced visions, but also include music, art and sexual experimentation (Mckenna 168). The moment of confrontation is the one embodied in the changing approach to the outer culture; when it becomes viewed as an external force, its legitimacy progressively diminished among the movement’s members. Therefore, the squatter movement and the hippie communes were all symbolizing different styles of rejection to the outer culture. These apparent rejections were intensified when the outer culture became in direct opposition to the movement’s values. The next part will highlight such opposition to illustrate the emergence of the cultural principle of rebellion in the context of countercultural thought.

State Opposition and the Emergence of Rebellion

There is a link between state opposition and collective rebellion, as authoritarian rejections of such movements lead to various acts of uprising and resistance. State action contributed to the uprising of such movements as it mobilized the members who adopted the values of the movement. The outcome of such deliberate abuse was the emergence of a collective sense of rebellion characterized by hippie festivals and communes in the U.S and the squatter movement and Christiania in Denmark. This section will underline the emergence of rebellion in the 1960s as a response to opposition against the countercultural movement.

The first opposition to the hippie movement was in the United States by President Richard Nixon in 1968. The direct opposition between the inner and outer culture was then defined by the state’s reaction to the psychedelic revolution and hippie movement. The main reason for the apparent conflict initiated by state authorities was, the economic, social and political danger associated with society dropping out of established systems of production. According to Nixon’s Assistant for Domestic Affairs John Daniel Ehrlichman:

The Nixon campaign in 1968, and the Nixon White House after that, had two enemies: the antiwar Left, and black people ... We knew we couldn’t make it illegal to be either against the war or black. But by getting the public to associate the hippies with marijuana and blacks with heroin, and then criminalizing both heavily, we could disrupt those communities. We could arrest their leaders, raid their homes, break up their meetings, and vilify them night after night on the evening news. Did we know we were lying about the drugs? Of course, we did (Rogeborg 357).

The narrative, proposed by Ehrlichman, suggests that the government was deliberately targeting members of the hippy movement, not because of their consumption of drugs but

instead, because of their adopted cultural and political beliefs. In other words, state authorities saw the hippie movement as an inherent threat to the established status quo and were in direct opposition to that threat. The sense of rebellion adopted by the movement's members was born when the state directly opposed the emergence of the counterculture as a whole. State opposition, therefore, was not only in the form of criminalizing drugs but, instead, it was in the form of a war on the culture that was developing from drug-induced experiences; a culture that was dangerous also in its rejection of and opposition to fundamental pillars of capitalism. As a response to state opposition, American political and social activists within the movement advertised a series of rejections to such laws. The most notable of these activists is Abbie Hoffman, who was recognized as the co-founder of the American Youth International Party and wrote a handbook of survival for the members of the hippie movement. Hoffman's survival guide was celebrated by the movement as one of its most important manuscripts. As a direct response to president Nixon's War on Drugs campaign, Hoffman stated in his manuscript's guide on buying, selling and giving away drugs, "avoid all needle drugs – the only dope worth shooting is Richard Nixon" (Hoffman 99). As a primary source, Hoffman's guide demonstrates the movement's dissatisfaction with state opposition. According to Hoffman:

"The duty of a revolutionary is to make love and that means staying alive and free ... Smoking dope and hanging up Che's [Che Guevara] picture is no more a commitment than drinking milk and collecting postage stamps. A revolution in consciousness is an empty high without a revolution in the distribution of power. We are not interested in the greening of Amerika except for the grass that will cover its grave" (Hoffman XXIII).

The previous statement was written by Hoffman for the introduction of his guide after he was arrested in 1968 for conspiracy and inciting a riot attempt in the Democratic National Convention. Hoffman's arrest, complemented with his anti-authoritarian manuscript that advocated various acts of cultural rebellion, could have dramatically influenced the countercultural movement's relationship with the state. Rebellion, therefore, progressively became a cultural phenomenon that is exclusively defined by some form of opposition. This study theorizes that to the members of the movement, state opposition was one between the inner and outer culture which influenced the movement's sense of rebellion.

There are inherent similarities between the way the Danish and U.S.'s governments approached the squatter and hippie movements during the 1960s. The U.S.'s war on drugs campaign against the counterculture mirrors the Danish eviction attempts against the squatter movement and Christiania. With the international spread of both drugs and drug influenced philosophies, exported by American drug missionaries, it could be said that the movement's values managed to transcend countries and borders to birth a mass sociological phenomena. The values of the hippie movement apparent in the United States was then passed to European countries such as The United Kingdom, The Netherlands, and most importantly to this study, Denmark, through a process of cultural diffusion. The mass movement in the United States inspired several similar countercultural movements within major European cities. For example, Copenhagen University's cultural sociologist, Ole Henriksen states regarding the origins of Denmark's squatter movement, "in the Haight- Ashbury district of San Francisco, a movement called 'Flower Power' was started. The Same movement [was transferred to] Denmark The

movement developed further, into what we called hippies” (Henriksen 117). Henriksen indicates that the squatter movement was influenced by the American countercultural thought of the 1960s. The American countercultural values, therefore, place Christiania and its development in the proper cultural and historical context of the 1960s. The following section of this study will trace Christiania’s history from 1969 to 1971, to illustrate the principle of rebellion apparent in the Danish squatters movement and Christiania.

A Playground for Adults (1969 – 1971)

The history of the squatter movement and Christiania from 1969 to 1971 follows a similar approach to countercultural movement’s various rebellious acts during the 1960s. The narrative of the Danish squatter movement in the 1960s exemplifies Christiania’s principle of rebellion, as it illustrates the authoritarian opposition that gave birth to such forms of uprisings. This section will give a detailed narrative of Christiania’s history from 1969 to 1971 as necessary historical context to understand the principle of rebellion in Christiania.

Christiania began with the rise of the squatter movement in the 1960s in the city of Copenhagen. It started with the emergence of alternative movements, such as the Youth Rebellion, hippie counterculture and various movements, which were all centered on ideas of absolute liberation from institutionalized authority. The rise of such movements lead to the development of the hippie alternative society in the Danish district of Thy (Thylejren is a hippy camp that originated out of a music festival in 1970), the alternative left-wing Roskilde University (a non-conventional university founded in the 1970s), and eventually the squatter movement itself (Lauritsen 12). The squatter movement was led by individuals who occupied empty houses and apartments, mainly because they were people of limited means and resources who struggled to find accommodation in Copenhagen (Lauritsen 12). As a result of this movement, several buildings in Copenhagen were squatted and were transformed into youth or community houses.

The Freeown’s neighborhood Christianshavn, before Christiania, was the home of two major squatted houses: Sofiegården and Stærekassen. Following a government decision to evict the squatted houses, Sofiegården was demolished in February 1969, and Stærekassen in the spring of 1972 (Lauritsen 12). Coincidentally, after the eviction of Sofiegården in 1969, residents of Christianshavn breached “a fence at the corner of Princessegade and Refshalevej [within the *Bådsmandsstræde army base*], invading an abandoned 85- acre naval base to construct a playground for their children” (Moore 87). The first use of the base was as a playground for the children of Christianshavn’s residents. However, the timing of this breach was strategic to the evicted squatters. Some of the squatters from Sofiegården moved beyond the playground to further parts of the former naval base, and both claimed it as Freetown and broadcasted an open invitation for settlers (Moore 87). Residents of Christianshavn helped the squatters move in, as they were already familiar with the squatters of Sofiegården. After the establishment of Christiania, an open invitation was broadcasted to grab the attention of the many evicted squatters in the city of Copenhagen. The open invitation was written by Jacob Ludvigsen as an article in *Hovedbladet*, a left-wing magazine in 1971. The aim of the article was to motivate all active squatters in Copenhagen and beyond to move to Christiania. Hundreds of squatters from all around Denmark responded to Ludvigsen’s article (Moore 87). The playground built by the

residents of Christianshavn in 1969, therefore, expanded into an active squatter community in 1971. The initial breach of the area was mainly due to the lack of security around the abandoned naval base, as authorities were not able to detect or prevent the initial breach executed by Christianshavn residents and the mass squatter migration that followed. According to Lauritsen:

the decision taken by the government to hire a small security company instead of a more adequately equipped one, to watch over the - one hundred and seventy buildings and thirty-four hectares of land, seems irresponsible. This nature spot was seen politically as an investment goldmine (Lauritsen 12).

Lauritsen indicates that the social situation of the evicted squatters made the abandoned buildings in the military base an attractive solution to their social position. The Christianites of 1971 squatted in existing buildings or built their own houses within the abandoned military base. The movement faced resistance from the police against settlers. However, the scale of the area and the number of the squatters made it challenging to present direct confrontation (Moore 87). The challenging aspect of this situation is that, using force would result in violent resistance and civil unrest. Eventually, the case of Christiania got pushed to the Danish parliament in 1971 (Moore 87). In November 1971, the Danish Defense Minister, Kjeld Olesen started consultations on the fate of Christiania. Many Members of the Danish parliament were advocating for a mass eviction of the squatters of Christiania (Lauritsen 16). Due to the sheer mass of the area and the way the settlers were both increasing in numbers and scattering their settlements within the area, parliamentary officials were reluctant to use force to evict the squatters. According to Lauritsen:

Several members of Parliament [were] keen to see the uninvited guests thrown out on the streets. But three young ministers in the new government, including Kjeld Olesen, Minister of Cultural Affairs, Niels Matthiasen, and Minister of Social Affairs, Eva Gredal, [spoke] strongly against a confrontation with the several hundred ... settlers (Lauritsen 16).

Lauritsen is arguing that, the politicians who opposed eviction both sympathized with the residents of Christiania and feared squatter resistance against possible eviction attempts. As a result of the parliamentary meeting, a Christiania focus group was created and included officials from both the Ministry of Defense (as the Ministry owned the land and the property that Christiania residents squatted) and Christiania representatives. The aim of the focus group was to create a strategy for the community's future (Lauritsen 16). By bringing Christiania representatives into the focus group, the government acknowledged the organizational emergence of Christiania as an alternative political actor.

The events of 1969 to 1971 did not only mark the early establishment of Christiania, but also the expansion of a playground for children to a playground for squatters. The initial act of illegal occupation of space and opposition of common cultural values are all forms of rejection to mainstream political and cultural establishments. This opposition was embodied by the squatter movement. However, the eviction of such squatted houses resulted in the establishment of Christiania. Therefore, the illegal occupation of Christiania's land was a rebellious act that originated from the various government alienated and evicted squatted houses in Copenhagen. The following sections will use the history of Christiania from 1969 to 1971 to study the principle of rebellion and its effective role in constituting the commune of Christiania.

Squatter Exclusivity and Christiania's Inclusivity

Both the squatter movement and Christiania were founded by acts of illegal occupation of private property. However, the difference between Christiania and the evicted squatted houses is that, the Freetown was born out of the eviction of previously squatted houses. As the commune was born out of previous conflict, it adopted a more inclusive approach in order to unite and mobilize the evicted squatters and create resistance against possible future eviction attempts. This sense of resistance is attributed in this section to the number and geographic distribution of residents within the area of Christiania. As the number of residents was increasing, and they were scattered throughout a larger territory, police forces feared violent resistance from residents and failed to evict the squatters. The act of rebellion apparent in the illegal occupation of land is, therefore, consequently complemented with the ability to resist eviction. As the squatters were evicted from the houses in the early 1970s, they mobilized in one larger territory in opposition to the authorities that evicted and demolished their houses. It all goes back to the state's action and eviction of squatted houses, as it both centralized rebellion and generated resistance in the case of Christiania.

Considering squatter movements from the 1960s, before Christiania, one can see how houses such as Sofiegarden, Magstraede, and others were characterized by their nature of exclusivity. When these movements first began, they were on a small scale (one or two buildings), meaning that they can only accommodate small numbers of residents. The squatter movement was gaining popularity in Copenhagen, mainly because of expensive accommodation and housing laws that made it hard for young people to find a place to live in the city. According to Henriksen's account of the squatter movement:

there was a great need among the youth to establish accommodation. At that point in time, you couldn't rent your own place if you were single in the municipality of Copenhagen ... This situation was insufferable, and the youth groups found several solutions. One of them was to simply find empty houses (Henriksen 39).

What Henriksen is saying, is that the conditions involving the lack of accommodation lead to the rise of the squatted houses as a solution to youth social issues at the time. In other words, the lack of opportunities for affordable accommodation or youth houses lead to an initial frustration within the youth population of Copenhagen. This frustration may have possibly caused an increase in popularity of squatted community and youth houses within the capital city and, eventually, started the squatter movement as a whole. Such squatted houses were usually shut down by police forces. However, some houses managed to survive for a considerable amount of time until eventual eviction. The eviction of such squatted houses was carried out by authorities of the city of Copenhagen from 1969 to 1971. After the eviction of such houses authorities within the Municipality of Copenhagen offered the residents temporary welfare housing. However, that did not change their condition of having no permanent housing or accommodation solution. According to Henriksen:

These people [the evicted squatters] all in need of accommodation in some form or another, were shunned by the majority ... In light of the politicians' carelessness with the most desperate of the homeless, and the simultaneous

closing of their shelters meant that there was a dire need for other solutions (Henriksen 38- 39).

The government eviction of the squatted houses in the early 1970s resulted in the organization of such squatters for the purpose of finding an alternative solution to their social condition. The immediate closure of the established squatted houses did not put an end to the squatter movement but, instead, intensified the issue even further. The sheer number of squatters evicted from the houses further intensified the issue, as it may have resulted in an increased demand within squatters for one big squatter community that unifies all evicted squatters. According to Henriksen, “when the Minister of Culture closed down the building Huset in Magstræde in 1971, [it was] occupied by almost 700 squatters” (Henriksen 38). What is indicated by Henriksen’s statement is that the evicted houses left a large population of Copenhagen’s youth without accommodation. Copenhagen, therefore, in the 1960s experienced a noticeable rise of exclusively squatted communities scattered around the city. Although such houses and communities were independent from each other, they were all part of the Danish squatters movement and symbolized a social need for alternative housing solutions. According to the Minister of Culture, Kristen Helveg Petersen in a letter written to one of Denmark’s political parties regarding the evicted squatted houses on August 19, 1971:

There is an uprising in progress; it follows winding paths, but there are similarities – the problems the earth faces – pollution, population growth, scarce resources – will in a matter of years require major adjustments, possibly larger than we can imagine. There will be a demand for a mass movement, one which we do not yet have (Henriksen 38).

What Petersen’s letter reveals is the transformation of the squatted houses of Copenhagen into a social movement known as the squatter movement. The Minister of Culture’s statement is merely a recognition of the movement that was progressively taking place in scattered parts of the capital city. In other words, the squatter movement was a response to a serious problem within the Danish capital: the lack of accommodation available for the Danish youth. Ironically, Petersen’s letter was written exactly 38 days before the establishment of Christiania on September 26, 1971. There is a link, therefore, between the squatted houses of the 1960s and the establishment of Freetown Christiania. The reason the squatters were actively looking for alternative accommodation was that, they were ideologically influenced by the hippie counterculture of the 1960s. The hippie counterculture was based on an inherent rejection of all forms of oppressive authority that limited individual freedom. According to Henriksen, “from the early 1960s, many of the day’s youth said ‘stop’, it was all too much. A large number of organizations and groups appeared with the sole purpose of ‘opting out of the game’” (Henriksen 39). Henriksen’s statement indicates that the countercultural thought of the 1960s had a profound influence on the culture of the Danish squatters movement. The referred to ‘game’ is the established authority of parents, state authority and educational institutions. Therefore, the process of dislocating residents of various squatted houses allowed such residents, who held similar ideological beliefs, to mobilize into one large squatter community in 1971. Therefore, it was ultimately state action that created the conditions necessary for the establishment of Christiania.

The nature of the squatted houses before Christiania allowed for small numbers of residents to live in the houses and thus the houses were characterized by a sense of exclusivity.

As Britta Lillesøe, a resident of Christiania who was part of the evicted Sofiegarden community, stated in one of her speeches as the head of Christiania's Cultural Association:

We called the place Sofiegarden ... We were around 100-150 people living there for 5 years ... The municipality of Copenhagen didn't like, that we lived there and the minister of buildings and the lord mayor of housing ordered 300 police men to get us out of the houses. First they took two of the houses in 1969 then the rest in 1970. The Sofie Yard is the mother of the squatting movement in Denmark – and therefore also the mother of Christiania (Lillesøe 1).

What Lillesøe's speech indicates is that, the eviction of squatted houses before Christiania is linked to Christiania's establishment as a commune. This link between the squatted houses and Christiania shows how the squatters diverted from houses and yards and moved into the bigger territory of Christiania. There is a nature of exclusivity apparent in the squatted houses that was not transferred to Christiania. This exclusivity may have been the reason why the eviction of such houses was successful as opposed to the case of Christiania. As the squatters movement was slowly transitioning from squatted houses around Copenhagen to houses in Christiania, the dynamic of exclusivity characterized by the former squatted houses was replaced by a more inclusive nature. The shift from small buildings to a large territory meant that the community could be far more inclusive of large numbers of people from different parts of Copenhagen. The contradiction between the exclusive nature of the squatted houses and the inclusive nature of Christiania played a major role in the development of Christiania as a mass social movement. The inclusive nature of Christiania was first initiated by Jacob Ludvigsen, a journalist in an alternative newspaper who wrote the open invitation to 'Emigrate with bus no. 8' in order to reach Christiania's nearest bus stop (Lillesøe 4). According to Jacob Ludvigsen's article on Christiania in 1971:

And now one house after another came into view. Big, solid buildings, which now are empty, hollow shells, crying for content. We were in the new land, Christiania ... It is the biggest chance yet to build a society from scratch – but one still to a certain extent based on the remains of what was there before ... You simply catch Line 8 to Princess Street. Cost: one token (Hellström 34).

What Ludvigsen's letter indicates is that, the large space and territory of Christiania may have been the reason behind Christiania's inclusive approach. The best indication of such a claim is illustrated in Ludvigsen's advertisement of Christiania's spacious territory in the open invitation that was aimed at motivating people to emigrate to the territory of Christiania. After the article was published, "a lot of young people little by little came and settled down in the empty houses on the new land, Christiania" (Lillesøe 4). This open invitation was not limited to the squatters, but was aimed more generally at the mass public who were struggling to find a place to live or wanted to adopt an alternative lifestyle.

During its early formative years, Christiania was attracting people into its social movement and, thus, it may have successfully resonated with the squatters as it offered a solution to their issues of lacked accommodation and political legitimacy. However, Christiania managed to attract many social groups such as hippies, economically challenged individuals, and social outcasts who were marginalized by society. According to Professor Maria Hellström's doctoral thesis and field research as Christiania's researcher in resident:

Christiania was from the very start multiple and dynamic, shifting over time. Even though it originated in a specific, historical situation of urban tension and insufficiency, it was not, like most intentional communities, legitimized through a common religious, political or ecological worldview. Instead its legitimization was based upon a more amorphous and open-ended quest for a space for agency (Hellström 35).

What Professor Hellström points out is that the establishment of Christiania was complemented by a rise of a political consciousness for popular agency. In other words, Christiania is more than a product of the various evicted squatted houses. It symbolized the continuity of previous squatter values along with the development of a new, open, alternative space and culture. The transition from small neighborhood houses to a full-scale area meant that a new inclusive approach was adopted in order to create a unified social movement of squatters. While the eviction of squatter houses was successful, state authorities were reluctant to use force to evict Christiania, possibly due to its social status of a movement that could be capable of considerable levels of resistance to eviction attempts. The idea here is that, the squatted houses before Christiania were small-scale, divided movements that were easy to evict and evacuate due to their nature of exclusivity and containment. The best example of the difference between Christiania and other previous squatted communities is illustrated in the support that Christiania gained from parliamentary representatives from the Social Democratic majority in parliament in 1971. According to Hellström,

the delicate matter [of Christiania] spurred a parliamentary narrative, in which Christiania to a great extent figured as watershed between right and left. Strongly criticized from the political right as an illegal seizing of state property, it was from the left-wing perspective regarded as a non-parliamentary, yet legitimate critique; a culturally multifaceted and innovative attempt to find new solutions to problems of spatial organization, participation and wealth distribution (Hellstrom 39)

What Professor Hellström's statement suggests is that Christiania was gaining sympathy and support from left wing parliamentary representatives. Such support for an alternative solution was lacking when city authorities were demolishing the squatted buildings around Copenhagen but excluded Christiania from such a fate. The main reason for such support for Christiania was the sheer number of squatters and how they were scattered over a large-scale area in the former army base which made it difficult for city authorities to resort to direct confrontation. An eviction attempt against the squatters would result in resistance and lead to social unrest, which in turn may lead to casualties. Therefore, the main difference in Christiania is the sheer mass and scale of the movement, which was due to Christiania's inclusive approach and ability to mobilize squatters within its territory. According to Britta Lillesøe:

The new minister of defense was much more smarter than the former minister, so he made a small council ... [with] the minister of culture, the minister of health and himself. And they got an ... advice from a social advisor ... [who was] connected to the minister of health ... her advice was to call Christiania, 'a Social Experiment' That came thru and was realized early in 1972 (Lillesøe 4).

What Lillesøe's narrative illustrates is that, to Christiania residents, the politicians who sympathized with Christiania were viewed in a positive light as opposed to others. What this shows is that the politicians in 1971 and 1972 were divided between sympathizers and opposers to the idea of Christiania. However, the different approach that politicians held when addressing

the emergence of Christiania is evidence of the contrast between Christiania and previous other squatted communities.

Mobilization and inclusivity was the main approach used by Christianites to unite squatters. Christiania offered its residents an alternative to the social welfare housing offered by the state. However, it also added a cultural and social aspect to the equation that is foregrounded in its inclusive nature and communitarian values. According to a member of the Danish Communist party, Folketinget on May 8th, 1974, “Christiania is called a social experiment ... but we would prefer to call it a social emergency stopgap, as the experiment of living on the border of starvation through social welfare and in slums is an experiment known by the lower classes and nauseam for decades and centuries” (Hellström 31). What such statement indicates is that the raise of Christiania as an alternative actor was supported by leftist politicians and was viewed as a possible solution to the social and economic issues at the time. The fundamental approach to the matter represents a growing hope in the alternative as a solution to issues that modern society failed to solve. According to a report written on Christiania by the Ministry of Defense in 1976:

An increasing number of groups cannot or do not wish to accept the demands put forward by society. This is particularly true of the numerous young and socially disadvantaged groups, where society’s promises have proven to be insufficient and unacceptable. It concerns minority groups, those expelled from family, friends and working communities, as well as lonely and elderly people, those who feel estranged from society ... in regards these groups, Christiania should be regarded a social experiment which aims to equip the individual with the prerequisites for a meaningful existence (Hellström 44).

The report written on Christiania shows how the Ministry of Defense saw that there was hope that Christiania would be a necessary social experiment, from which the Danish public would benefit. What follows the establishment of Christiania and its recognition as an experiment is a long historical struggle for social legitimacy highlighted in following parts. According to Hellström:

the first years are in this respect characterized by the attempts to legitimize Christiania as a space where the individual may develop new kinds of social engagement, and where conversely, ‘the social’ could be reinterpreted as an enabling and creative rather than restrictive and governing framework (Hellström 32).

The approach adopted by Christiania is one that aims to empower alternative social solutions to rising problems in the face of changing social, political and economic conditions. The highlight of such an approach is it illustrates a situation where people take matters into their own hands in response raised political, social and economic issues.

Autonomy: The Theory of Archaic Revival

Although the experiences induced by drugs managed to influence the thought of 1960s countercultural movements, they did not create an independent culture but, instead, created a series of rejections to already established cultural values. Reversion to ancient tribal and communal beliefs that are centered on individual experience complemented the development of the independent cultural values of the counter cultural movement. Terence Mckenna describes this reversion as the archaic revival. According to Mckenna:

Archaic Revival ... places it all in a better historical perspective. When a culture loses its bearing, the traditional response is to go back in history to find the previous 'anchoring model.' ... In the twentieth century, a global civilization [had] lost its bearing, and as we [looked] back in time for a model to anchor us we [had] to go back before history to around twelve or fifteen thousand years ago. So the important part of the human potential movement and the New Age, I believe, is the reempowerment of ritual (248).

What Mckenna proposes in his theoretical framework is that countercultural movements replace modern or contemporary cultural values and traditions with premodern organizational cultures. In other words, Mckenna describes the counter cultural movement induced by psychedelic drugs as the initial phase of rejection to already established cultural values, and thus what follows such cultural rejections is the reversion to premodern tribal rituals. The reversion is one that aims to backslide into social and communitarian relations that are based on the collective as opposed to established systems of governance. Communitarianism, not to be confused with communism, is a micro organizational philosophy where the central focus is on the individual's relationship with the community's common good. The idea is that the commune is a group of individuals who are tied together through some form of common good whether it is cultural, political, or economic. According to Amitai Etzioni in her article, *Communitarianism revisited*:

of particular interest to communitarianism is (a) that people often act in groupings rather than as individuals (hence the great importance of social movements such as the civil rights movement in societal change) and (b) that social bonding provides a major and distinct source of social order (248).

Etzioni's insight on communitarianism illustrates how social order is linked to individual bonds between residents of the commune. Therefore, the organization of individuals in groups and the social bonds between such individuals may have created a sense of a shared communal consciousness. This communal consciousness is apparent when members of the commune start viewing themselves not as individuals but instead as members of the commune (a characteristic value of tribal identity). The result of such communal allegiance is a collaborative organizational system where all members are actively trying to contribute to the commune's collective good. Mckenna's theory of Archaic Revival suggests that ideas of collective consciousness are embodied in a sociological dimension within the countercultural movement (Mckenna 248). The sociological dimension of communitarianism is apparent in the development of communal consciousness, which is the individual's sense of allegiance to the commune and its values. The difference between communal consciousness and nationalism is that, the individual is required to actively participate in the political process of the commune. The idea is that, the community and all its members share one common fate that is defined by the collective nature of decision-making adopted by the commune.

The outcome of this line of thought adopted from communitarianism is that, members of the commune actively engage in developing both the common good and interest of the community, which can benefit other individual members or the community at large. According to Amitai Etzioni:

One account of the common good is that it is some benefit done for the sake of helping others with no regard for who those people are in particular beyond their membership in some community, including future generations. That is, the person acting to further the common good is unable to determine who will be the beneficiary of their actions. They do so because of the value of the particular good in its own right (246).

The importance of this communal value of good that Etzioni indicates illustrates the true essence of communal identity. Such attempts of reversion to communitarianism is highlighted by Mckenna's theoretical framework, as it indicated that communitarianism in the 1960s was an organic process that took place within the counter cultural movement. According to Mckenna, "We need to face the fact that there is a level of hierarchical control being exerted on the human species as a whole and that our destiny is not ours to decide. It is in the hands of weirdly democratic, amoeboid, hyperintelligent superorganism that is called Everybody" (Mckenna 64). In other words, power resides within the collective and such power can only be exercised with the development of a collective political consciousness. By reverting individualism into a process of collective empowerment, the cultural values of collectivism emerge. As Per Lovetand, Christiania's alternative newspaper editor, wrote in an article published on September 1972, "the simple thing which gathers all the different meanings and opinions, which Christiania represents ... is the wish to decide over one's own circumstances, on one's own terms – within a community which is not mandatory but which one has chosen" (Hellstrom 39). What Lovetand's statement indicates is that the line of thought adopted by Christiania's communitarian values is aligned with Mckenna's theory of Archaic Revival, as it emphasizes the importance of collective empowerment within a communal setting. According to Mckenna:

It was my reading ... that put me strongly in touch with this notion of the self as a larger and more inclusive mode of being than what the ego provides ... what is important is that [this inclusive mode] knows more about one than one knows about oneself, and, consequently, it is a source of stability, a source of gnosis, a source of information, and this is what most people lack. They are only superficially in touch with their own destiny, their own birth, their own death (11).

Mckenna's theoretical framework regards communitarianism as a body that drives its organizational structures from an inclusive collaborative model. Archaic Revival is then the process of reverting to this inclusive model of societal organization that is embodied in communitarianism. By applying the theory of archaic revival and the values of communal organization to the case of Christiania, we can place the commune in its appropriate theoretical context. Rejection of the law and established systems of governance in the case of the squatters movement and Christiania, symbolized the principle of rebellion apparent in the counter cultural movement of the 1960s. What follow such rebellion is the establishment of Christiania and the development of its authentic culture, traditions and political consciousness through archaic revival. Through such developments, the commune progressively reverted to archaic values such as communitarianism and village identity. Christiania therefore, can be regarded as a sociological phenomenon, where modern cultural values were being replaced by pre-modern values within a modern western European setting. The theoretical framework adopted in this study is one that

aims to illustrate how Christiania is a product of both the values of rebellion produced by the psychedelic revolution and, the culture of collectivism derived from archaic revivalism.

The following section will aim to underline methods of communitarian organization exerted by Christiania residents to show how the community managed to constitute a certain degree of communal autonomy and social legitimacy. The first part of this section will highlight the relevant history of Christiania in respect to communal organization. The history serves as background information and highlights an important episode in Christiania's narrative, where Christiania residents deliberately exercised communal organization. The second section will highlight Christiania's consensus political system to illustrate the rise of communal political consciousness. The aim of the two sections is to underline how communal organization is employed to facilitate the principle of autonomy.

A Social Movement (1975- 1976)

After the events of 1971, the legal status of the community was not determined during the first years of Christiania's existence. However, a vibrant hippy cultural and political atmosphere developed in the former army barricades and among the squatters. Despite the undefined communal rules, the Freetown was functioning by the collective effort of residents to sustain the community and its values. According to Professor Hellström:

despite vaguely defined common goals, the settlement constituted itself, and by Christmas 1971 a number of common functions had been established, such as an information office, weekly meetings, security patrol, and working groups, which in turn lead to the setting up of common facilities such as kitchen, multimedia house, grocery cooperative, renovation office etc. Furthermore, a number of private initiatives were taken, such as establishing a bakery, a pub, a sleep-in facility, a discotheque and a number of smaller crafts enterprises (37).

What Hellström indicates is that such common functions created a variety of social utility options in the former army base, which in turn further developed the internal affairs of the commune. The main core function introduced to the society was the common meetings, as they allowed residents to make decisions on matters concerning their community. The main ideology adopted by Christiania residents was that of the 1960s-counter culture movement and is represented the culture of Christiania residents. The main characteristic of the hippy counter cultural movement was the unapologetic celebration of sex, drugs and music and Christiania was no exception. From its early beginnings in 1971, Christiania was commonly known among Christianshavn residents as a playground for adults and it was celebrated as the ultimate hippy destination in Denmark.

As a response to the threat of eviction, Christiania residents gathered their forces in an attempt to utilize the support of the Danish public, in order to gain social legitimacy. In December 1975, Christiania residents appealed the decision made by the government to evict the community. The legal appeal presented by Christiania residents was constructed on the state's neglect of the 10-point agreement in 1972 and the social experiment status of 1973 (Hellström 52). According to professor Hellström:

In the summons, Christiania presented three accusations against the State. Firstly, the government had neglected to set up a competition for the future use of the area, and had thus not complied with its responsibilities. Furthermore, the date of eviction was arbitrarily set and answered only approximately to the three years respite. Thirdly, by virtue of its acknowledged status as a 'social experiment', Christiania could not be regarded illegal (52).

In November 1975, the Municipality of Copenhagen demanded the eviction and demolition of 17 houses in Christiania. Residents of Christiania responded by creating a barricade and alarm group called the woman's army or rainbow army (the group had several names as they were divided in small troops) who carried out a series of protests that eventually delayed the demolition of the Christiania houses (Lauritsen 23). The protests were held in the form of gatherings around the houses to prevent construction workers from accessing the buildings. According to Lauritsen, "Outside Christiania, building workers and excavation workers [refused] to go in and take people out of their homes and put them on the streets" (23). The government upheld by the Social Democratic party, along with officials from the Municipality of Copenhagen, decided not to demolish the houses however, the eviction date of April 1st 1976 was still upheld. From this point, Christiania diverted its approach for resistance, in order to create a social movement in support of Christiania and its values as an alternative community. This initial shift in approach is noticeable with the creation of the Support Christiania Foundation in the same year and the increase in cultural, social and humanitarian events in late 1975. According to Lauritsen:

It [was] no longer enough to repair the old barrack-buildings. A much greater mobilization [was] needed. Together with the 'support Christiania [foundation]', the Christians [started] an information and propaganda campaign all over the country (23).

What Lauritsen indicates is that Christiania residents consciously decided to mobilize their resources in order to facilitate social support. The Christiania campaign aimed to raise awareness about the community and to illustrate its cultural, social and libertarian values to the Danish public. After the employment of Christiania-focused events such as gatherings, concerts, academic lectures, media advertisements and fund raising, the residents attempted to capture the attention of the public and to foster support for the area and its residents. According to Professor Hellström:

the massive cultural activity and popularizing inventiveness ultimately made the liberal government understand that a clearance would be impossible without the use of a considerable amount of violence, money, and political will. Only two days before the announced eviction date, April 1st 1976, the government launched the idea of a 'soft landing' and changed the demand for immediate closure to a closure 'without unnecessary delay'. Christiania had thereby resisted the threats of eviction (54).

What Professor Hellström suggests is that communal organization and the social mobility of such organization has managed to create a sense of social autonomy. In other words, the social

pressure put on the government urged parliament not to evict the community and to reconsider possible solutions for the territory and its future. The case of the closure ‘without unnecessary delay’ was then transferred to a District court where the court ruled for the closure of Christiania but refrained from calling a second eviction attempt. The idea is that the decision made by the court was strictly judicial. However, many social considerations were restraining immediate action. According to Professor Hellström’s:

at the time however, the idea of the Free Town had settled in the popular consciousness, which brought about a quite remarkable additional comment to the verdict. This comment built upon a consideration of the fact that even though Christiania could be considered illegal according to legal premises, a closure would be socially problematic (54).

What Hellström indicates is that the social importance of Christiania outweighed its illegal condition. The case, then, gets transferred to the Supreme Court in February 1978 where the court ruled that residents had no legal right to reside in the designated area (Hellström 54). However, the court’s decision also underlined the social importance of Christiania and refrained from proposing a plan for clearance or eviction. According to Christiania’s resident philosopher, Dr. Per Lovetand’s reflection on the Supreme Court’s rule, “a final decision would also have to take political, social and human aspects into consideration; a responsibility incumbent not upon the juridical body, but upon government and Parliament” (Hellström 54). What Lovetand underlines is that the commune’s source of political autonomy is derived from its communal political and social organization. The case, then, puts pressure on the Danish parliament to evict such residents. On one hand, Parliament could use force to evict residents and clear Christiania however, it would be held accountable from a judicial perspective for the social, political and cultural consequences of such action. As professor Hellström puts it, “the legal system had thus clearly stated that what they were set to judge fell merely within the framework of juridical representation, of the already established, of the fixed and set, irrespective of whether legitimate or not” (Hellström 54). What this pointed out is that, Christiania was a political paradox where both its existence and eviction mark a certain degree of political instability to the already established status quo. This was all due to the social position of Christiania as an emerging alternative political actor. Additionally, a sociopolitical report written in 1976 on the calculation over cost of federal and Municipal preservation, clearance and possible development of Christiania, showed that possible eviction attempts would be far more expensive than maintaining the area. According to the 1976 report, “the cost for the authorities to take over the area would heavily exceed the cost for legalized maintenance, even when including considerable social support and renovation of the buildings” (Hellström 58). The evidence that resulted to the conclusion of the report was, mainly, concerned with the social status of the community and its ability to organize movements in resistance of clearance attempts. Therefore, the transition from the social experiment to a social movement marked the importance of Christiania as an active source of social agency.

The time period between 1975 and 1976 symbolize Christiania’s embodiment of the social experiment status given to it by state authorities in 1972. It might be easy to legally categorize a community as a social experiment, however, the process of truly embodying such a status must first and foremost come from a direct relationship with the collective social. To truly

embody such status, the community had to result to social legitimacy in order to facilitate the commune's authentic foundations. The commune, therefore, had to exercise its communitarian methods of organization as exemplified with the rise of Christiania focused cultural and social events in order to facilitate social legitimacy. What happened when the authorities attempted to revoke the legal status of the social experiment is that the community realized that it was already culturally and socially constituted. The legal status was then arbitrary as it was attempting to categorize an already existing phenomenon. By facilitating such systematic mechanisms of communitarian organization residents managed to constitute a form of collective autonomy over their territory. This period of Christiania's history captures the essence of communitarianism, as it illustrates the resident's collective effort at protecting the common good, which is the squatted houses and territory of Christiania. The next part will address the emergence of Christiania's political consciousness in the context of communitarian principle of autonomy.

Ting and the rise of collective political consciousness

During the early development of Christiania, residents moved from an anarchist approach, to a more collective communitarian one. Anarchism is generally a political movement that aims to abolish forms of authoritarian control in exchange for voluntary and collaborative systems of governance. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, who is commonly known as the founder of the Anarchist and Mutualist political theory states in his book *The General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century* written in 1851:

We may conclude without fear that the revolutionary formula cannot be Direct Legislation, nor Direct Government, nor Simplified Government, that it is NO GOVERNMENT. Neither monarchy, nor aristocracy, nor even democracy itself in so far as it may imply any government as all, even though acting in the name of the people, and calling itself the people. No authority, no government, not even popular, that is the Revolution. . . . Governing the people will always be swindling the people. It is always man giving orders to man, the fiction which makes an end of liberty (Graham 54).

What Proudhon indicated is that, anarchism is rooted in a long history of distrust and criticism to all forms of hierarchical governments. Anarchism, however, diverted from Proudhon's thought in the late nineteenth century, as other leftist thought such as communism and mutualism influenced the antiauthoritarian political ideology. According to Gambone:

The name 'anarchist' was not adopted until 1876, some eleven years after Proudhon's death. This new anti-authoritarianism was quite different from its predecessor by espousing violence, conspiracy and communism. There are identifiable stages in the process by which Proudhon's anarchism changed. The first of these was the rejection of mutualism in favor of collectivism (5).

What Gambone illustrates is that anarchist thoughts and philosophies lead to collective organizational structures. Collectivism, like communism, is a political ideology with the main purpose of abolishing private property to establish a collective system of ownership. The difference between collectivism and communism is that, collectivism is held on a micro organizational level such as on a village or tribal level. According to Gambone, "Collectivism was not communism, but it was a step along the way— a mid point between mutualism and the communist utopia" (5). Therefore, one can claim that the end goal of an anarchist movement, like many leftist political ideologies, is to establish a sense of a collective. Anarchism was then

regarded as a revolutionary antiauthoritarian movement, and thus it became a term used to group a variety of political actions. According to Carter, “the social and cultural background of anarchist thinkers may be relevant both to understanding which social groupings are attracted to anarchism, and the leading ideas and images in anarchist theory” (11). What Carter is indicating is that the background cultural and social conditions that lead to an anarchist movement is essential in defining the movement itself. According to Rene Karpntschof’s article on Youth, Space and autonomy in Copenhagen:

power holders [created] public places to support and regulate a specific hierarchical political system, including the distribution of wealth and power.

Ordinary people, on the other hand, try to carve out safe places to defend local interests and specific forms of social organization and identities (Steen 180).

What Karpntschof points out is that Christiania political consciousness was born with the progressive establishment of local interest and specific organizational methods to protect such interest. According to Midtgaard, “the community has implemented a range of activities mirroring ideals in opposition to Danish society at large, and the way in which they have done so reflects in itself an alternative ideal of collective self-government” (300). What Midtgaard illustrates is that although Christiania was founded on the bases of rejecting government, the commune established its own form of governing mechanism apparent in the commune’s establishment of collective self-government. Therefore, anarchism when applied in the case of Christiania is not an established system of governance but instead a political movement against an established political structure. What follows such a movement is the attempt to constitute a collective form of governance. This section will aim at illustrating how the collective form of governance adopted by Christiania residents developed into communitarianism.

The initial movement against the proposed issues concerning the lack of youth accommodation in the city of Copenhagen is what started the anarchist movement that created Christiania in 1971. It is therefore, the act of rejection to the law and the illegal seizing of space that characterized the anarchist element of Christiania. However, what started off as an anarchist individual movement with the initial breach of the army barricade and squatter migration, soon developed into a collective system of governance that was seeking to gain legitimacy. According to Hellstrom:

the organizational structure of Christiania was from the beginning a combination of explicit anarchism and more general anti- authoritarian or libertarian tendencies; a structure not resting upon a representative public authority, but upon self-organization and self-control. It was based upon a personal engagement, mediated and acted out directly in plenary debate. This engagement would then be reflected in a consensus decision, which would not come about unless each and every individual was profoundly convinced (39)

Hellstrom’s insight illustrates how the anarchist, or anti-authoritarian, movement that lead to the emergence of Christiania progressively developed methods of organizational autonomy that established a constitutionalized structure of governance. What makes Christiania anarchist, then, is its opposition to direct forms of authority practiced by representative systems of governance. Per Dr. Lovetand, the editor of Christiania’s alternative newspaper wrote in 1976, “From an anarchistic measure ... all governing is an evil, as no human being profoundly speaking is able to govern others” (Hellstrom 39). This inherent rejection to governance shows the anarchist

element of Christiania, however, with the establishment of Christiania's own form of government Christiania may not be considered anarchist. Therefore, with the establishment of the commune, the anarchist element organically transformed to collectivism and eventually communitarianism. The commune and its values was first introduced in the official communal meetings. Before the fragile legitimacy of 1972 (The Ten Point Agreement), Christiania residents established a weekly common meeting to address issues within the community (Lauritsen 15). As residents were occupied with the process of building houses and moving into Christiania, the community lacked any form of central political power structure. The residents were governed by unorganized social interactions that were made possible due to neighborhood relations. Neighborhood relations are the initial phase of collectivism, which was replaced by communitarianism with the establishment of a communal consciousness. The consciousness of the commune was constituted with the introduction of communal meeting. The main difference between the system of neighborhood relations and the common meetings is that, neighborhood relations were unofficial and were made under the consensus of small groups as opposed to the entire community. In other words, the realization that the residents are part of an established commune rather than divided neighborhoods is the moment of transition from a collectivist to communal consciousness. We can begin to see in this example how the community shifted from individual organization into a more communal form of organization. Many residents were against authoritarian forms of representation so the community innovated an anti-authoritarian political structure that is rooted in an ancient Scandinavian tradition commonly known as Ting (Katsiaficas 118). As Professor Hellström defines the word, "Ting is still a frequently used word and concept in Scandinavia, signifying both a legislative meeting place, a physical object- like place, and furthermore, in a less political context, a designation for an approximated amount of work to be carried out" (Hellström 41). What Hellström's definition points out, is that Christiania's political system is a combination of a jurisdictional body, physical space and time consuming debates and arguments on legislative and communal issues. The Ting system adopted by Christiania residents represents the communal approach to decision making, which characterizes the foundation for the process of political autonomy. According to George Katsiaficas, an expert on European social movements:

In the Free Republic of Christiania ... no authority counts except that of the Ting, an ancient Danish form of consensual decision making. One of the central buildings is known as the Tinghus (Ting house). Sitting in a circle at meetings of the communal council, each resident may go to the center and speak, and decisions are made by the eventual agreement of all through consensus rather than a majority vote (118).

What Katsiaficas illustrates in his statement is that, the commune embodied the essence of communitarian organization through the establishment of its own collective political structure. The community is constantly meeting to develop new innovative ways of political action. The Ting, therefore, is an example of how the community utilized its consciousness in order to constitute internal communal autonomy.

The form of representation adopted by Christiania residents is more aligned with a system that is focused on an empowerment of the commune. The individual, however, is an active participant in the development of the community and its values. According to Hellström:

the basic idea was clear' every decision, if it were to be sustainable, must reach legitimacy not through a single fall of the gavel, but in dialogue. This was the inherent meaning of the manifesto's talk about the possibilities for each and every individual to develop freely while remaining responsible to the community (41).

What Hellström indicates is that, the decisions made by the commune are made through discussions that eventually lead to a middle ground where the entire residents give their consent. The underlining principle of the political structure is, therefore, to maintain communal bonds between residents and thus attempt to sustain political stability from within. Christiania resident Lovetand, describes the events of the first meeting by stating:

the first governing took place while all the people of the Free Town were gathered ... the first meeting then decided to assign to a group of ten people to take care of the most acute governing of the Free Town. After Two weeks however, the group had tried to force through a kind of coup in order to establish a governmental board. This coup failed and it was then decided that the plenary would be the only decisive body ... in order to prevent any divide-and rule strategy to develop in relation to [state imposed] authorities (Hellstrom 40)

Lovetand's example illustrates how the community was rejecting the same values of anarchist individualism when such values were held against the commune. This is an indication of how the residents consciously made the decision to move away from anarchist philosophy. Therefore, we can see the shift in identities when the community rejects the same values that it was initially built on, which is individual agency. The primary reason behind such contradiction is that the collective identity of the commune was socially constituted among residents. The plenary common meetings, therefore, became the ultimate form of authority that puts the collective good as a priority. This is when the communal identity of Christiania was both born and exercised. Internal political stability was, therefore, of great importance to residence especially as they were dealing with the state's legislative and judicial authorities in order to legitimize the area, its residents and their values. According to one Christiania resident:

If a problem comes up, it is first discussed in the house where it originates, where it hopefully will be resolved. Only if the issue is still not taken care of will a neighborhood meeting be called to discuss it. This way, the house and then the neighborhood must fail to deal with the problem before it becomes necessary to have a community meeting, and by then, most people have already heard about the matter and considered the various options ... We only have community meetings when we need to – sometimes not for years, other times once a week (Katsiaficas 118).

What such statements indicate is that there is a social element to Christiania's consensus political structure that makes the functioning of such system dependent on communal relations between residents. Moreover, Christiania is composed of a dynamically changing population and, therefore, decision-making always must incorporate all these elements. Thus, political autonomy in the case of Christiania is first and foremost a process that was developing throughout time.

The introduction of the communal meetings and Christiania's political system helped create a communal identity, which contributed to the development of the commune's capacity for internal autonomy. The communal meetings were a chance for residents to gather and discuss issues that are of vital importance to the community's existence and maintenance. According to Christiania resident, Keld Lovetand, "even the [common meetings] in this respect worked well

for quite a while, ‘simply because it was a great piece of theater – you would not believe how much fun we had and how we laughed’ (Hellström 41). What Lovetand indicates is that, the common meetings were a way in which the commune would develop social bonds and personal relations between residents and, thus, it may have helped create a shared sense of social and cultural identity that is associated with the commune. This common identity is the element that enables residents to mobilize for the propose of maintaining the commune’s common good. When asked what can the world learn from Christiania, Christiania resident Risenga Manghezi responded:

Not making democracy a 50/50 decision process. I think it is important that you can see what happens when you have elections and then 50.1% of the population feeling like they won something and you have 49.9% of the population feeling that they lost. I don’t think that this is the best way of tapping into people’s willingness to contribute to society and to take part in decision making and to take part in government. I think that if we can make consensus democracy more workable then it is definitely something that the world could learn from Christiania (Manghezi)

Manghezi indicates in his statement that Christiania’s political system is not just one that does not favor rule of the majority, but also one that has a social, cultural and inclusive element to it. This ‘willingness to contribute to society’ that Manghezi was addressing is exemplified in Christiania resident’s actions during the events of 1976. In 1976, in response to the attempted demolition of Christiania buildings, residents created a nonviolent army to prevent construction workers from reaching the houses. The example of the formed protest groups illustrates the importance of communal bonds in protecting the community from threats. The Multiplicity of Copenhagen singled out the people living in the condemned houses for not meeting building safety and fire regulations. Yet, the community used its forces to protect these residents. According to Christiania’s newspaper Ugespejlet’s (Daily Mirror) article in 1976:

by creating a Rainbow Army of nonviolent, hardworking people who all collaborate with each other, every individual in his or her own way, we can stand united, one for all and all for one, and overcome the threatening situation we are facing. Because we love each other, we can organize ourselves practically, in spite of our differences (Katsiaficas 119).

What this article indicates is that, the commune was consciously utilizing its social bonds and collective identity that was developed in the common meetings in order to resist rising threats. These communal bonds allowed residents to easily mobilize in the face of political challenges concerning the community. Mobilization is, therefore, fundamentally important for the purpose of maintaining social order and restricting state authority from intervention. As Hellström states:

one of the intriguing questions that immediately emerged was of course how such an elusive and volatile project as Christiania could exert such attraction and generate such mobilization [of squatters]... Christiania did not exactly represent an entirely independent account with its own well- defined scenario, but instead actualized the very limitations of every attempt to ‘define’, ‘delineate’, or govern a complex human setting (Hellström 35).

The underlying principle of communal organization illustrates the process by which sovereignty was progressively developing among the commun’s residents. The social constitution of such a communitarian system of governance was developed through the strong sense of social relations.

This is not to say that all members of the community are like-minded, however, it reveals that despite differences the residents are actively trying to find a middle ground that maintains the entire communal body. When Christiania public relations figure and resident Risenga Manghezi was asked on the development of Christiania's political system, he stated:

Not everything is decided upon in meetings and the meetings can be very long ... What is needed in order to reach a decision is to have a vast majority that agrees with this decision and if there isn't a vast majority then people take their time to discuss and incorporate the ideas that can make more people move on a certain subject (Manghezi)

What Manghezi indicates is that, the commune is consciously trying to incorporate the ideas and beliefs of all its residents. This is to say that, despite the diversity of Christiania, social compatibility was generated through consensus. According to American political anarchist and social activist Abbie Hoffman, "The most important element in communal living is the people, for the commune will only make it if everyone is fairly compatible ... people's attitudes towards Politics, Sex, Drugs and Decision-making have to be in fairly close agreement" (Hoffman 48). The key word used in Hoffman's statement is compatible, as the residents do not have to be like-minded but instead, they have to address their differences in order to reach a middle ground of close agreement. In other words, the community meetings helped residents align their differences to eventually reach consensus and unite into one cohesive body.

One way of looking at communal decision-making is in the form of a trial and error mechanism, where residents are constantly learning from each other and coming up with new innovative solutions. The first example of Christiania's facilitation of communal autonomy can be seen during the events of the 1976 eviction attempt. After the decision on the closure of Christiania on April 1975, residents of Christiania used the common meeting to develop a series of cultural and social events alongside protests as a form of resistance through communal mobilization. Before the date of eviction of April 1st, 1976, the city of Copenhagen had demanded the demolition of several houses in Christiania for not meeting safety regulations. Residents were given a deadline to renovate or clear the selected houses. After a community meeting, the residents decided to attempt to raise the required amount of money themselves to maintain the specified houses. The significance of such acts of communal support is to maintain strong social and personal relations between residents. This example shows how the commune can manage to utilize its forces and facilitate such them through common meetings. We can see here that the nature of decision-making demonstrates the commune's ability to incorporate methods of collective autonomy. Such methods of autonomy were developed through a long process of trial and error that is depicted in some communal meetings. According to Claudio Cattaneo:

The principles of squatting rely on political motivations ... squatters are related to counter-culture and radical politics and the phenomenon, largely present and sometimes even institutionalized within Western societies, form part of autonomous and political social movements. The underlying hypothesis is that squatters, because of their radical political vision, want to get free from certain

forms of capitalist control ... By doing so, they learn how to satisfy their needs with a great degree of autonomy (Kollective 140)

What Cattaneo indicates is that, the process of decision making in such organizations is a learning experience that is linked to on a certain degree of autonomy. According to Christiania resident Risenga Manghezi's insight on one of Christiania's common meetings:

The decision was taken over two days. I was part of the negotiations group and we had reached an agreement with the state which was a 30-page document. We started the meeting by going through the document. We went through the document sentence by sentence, with around 300 to 400 people in one room. So, we went through that process and that took four to five hours and after that time we reached maybe four or five pages in the document. We had to call it a day and we felt that it was going to take a very long time to make this decision. A couple of days later we had a meeting, and we picked up where we left off and then suddenly people were in no mood to go into detail. The process of reaching to where we would make this agreement has probably taken around something like 5 years. So, it was the cumulative process that led us to be able to take this decision and it started on that day (Manghezi).

Manghezi indicates that the process of decision-making is very slow and time consuming because it is a process of trial and error. The residents are constantly trying to address emerging concerns and issues while at the same time trying to make a decision. In some cases, residents result to temporary decisions to see if the agreement is sustainable. The best example of such mechanism is illustrated in the Christiania Researcher in Resident Facility. In the neighborhood meeting, that between residents of the district of Mælkebøtten in Christiania, residents were faced with a difficult decision when one of their fellow residents moved out of Christiania but then requested to return after a few months (Warburg). Christiania residents had to refuse his request, as a new resident already occupied his former house at the time. According to Christiania resident Peter Warburg, this decision was very difficult to make because of the resident's personal relationship with the former Christiania resident (Warburg). The residents then came up with a new rule known as "the year of regret" (Warburg) where residents who decide to move out of Christiania would have the time span of a year to return to their house if they request to. Peter Warburg is a Christiania resident who came up with the idea of utilizing one of the empty houses during its year of suspension to create a research center for a short period of time. The community agreed to the proposition and set the first year as a trial period for such a project (Warburg). The project attracted many researchers and artists who chose Christiania as a specific study subject. The popularity of the research center made the residents keep it as the designated research facility (Warburg). This perhaps is the best example of how the commune comes up with new laws and facilities within its territory. This mechanism of decision-making shows how the commune can utilize its resources and developing its laws in order to constitute its autonomy.

Autonomy as illustrated in the case of Christiania was not born in an instant but instead; it went through a process that started with the embodiment of communal identity and consciousness, which in turn lead to the development of a communal organized structure. What

this section depicted is the various stages of development for such communal structures. The principle of autonomy, therefore, is embodied within the collective organization of the commune. Such autonomy was utilized and practiced by the commune to maintain stability and resistance. The next section of this study will address the emergence of a principle of reform to the already established communal values.

Reform: Politics of collectivism and Reorganisation

The measures of reform and adaptation to constantly changing political and social conditions surrounding Christiania were adopted to maintain stability and social development within the commune. This section will look at how the community reformed its values in order to protect the commune from internal instability and external conflict caused by various arising threats. The community's values of autonomy were reformed in exchange for political and social stability. As the political system adopted in Christiania is based on communalism, residents were actively reforming the ideals that constituted the commune by using the collective consensus of all residents. Collective action and consensus decision-making is, therefore, the primary driving force behind the principles of reform within Christiania. Through such a system, the residents consented to various state demands and, in some cases, even collaborated with police forces on matters concerning the commune. Although such mechanisms of reform undermine the community's autonomy and self-administration, it illustrates how the residents prioritized minimizing violence, police conflict and organized crime, over communal sovereignty and, thus, resulted to negotiations and collaborations with state authorities and organized crime officials. This section will highlight several examples of specific communal decisions or consents taken by Christiania residents that reformed the ideals of antiauthoritarianism into a more collaborative mode. This is partly due to the sociological aspect of collectivism, as it allows the political, social and cultural consciousness to reform over time. According to University of Copenhagen sociologist Flemming Mikkelsen:

safe spaces do not only insist on freedom from political and economic constraints and control from authorities. They also depend on the capacity to launch and innovate a repertoire of contentious action in the form of protest demonstrations, violent direct actions, meetings, public hearings, political communication, as well as peaceful negotiations and conciliations (Steen 180).

Mikkelsen indicates that a certain amount of collaboration with influencing political actors is required for a commune like Christiania to survive. By underlining Christiania's principle of reform, it becomes clear that the community is constantly going through a process of communal modification. The first part of this section titled, *A Normalized Neighborhood*, will underline the history of Christiania from 1976 to 1987 as this time period symbolizes the attempt of normalizing and integrating the commune within the city of Copenhagen. The historical narrative would give background on the nature and challenges concerned with Christiania's normalization and integration attempts. The residents of the commune were aware of such normalization plans and were actively collaborating with state authorities in order to legalize the community. At the same time, Christiania residents introduced new communal laws against hard drugs and placed regulations on the soft drug market. The second part of this section titled, *The Blockade Against Hard Drugs*, will address Christiania's communal ban of hard drugs and the raising conflicts that were raised out of such a ban. The ban illustrates how the commune introduced new communal laws in response to growing concerns and violence related to the use and trade of hard drugs on

neighbourhood territory. The third part of this section titled, *The Drug Market*, will address the emergence and regulation of Christiania's drug market, and how residents reformed their approach to drug consumption and the drug culture. By allowing the illegal market to exist as an unofficial business, residents stayed true to the values of the 1960s counterculture. However, with the introduction of communal reform, residents were actively monitoring and taxing the market for its use of communal land and resources in order to restrain or limit the market's influence on the commune. The drug market, therefore, is a living example of how the community developed reform measures over time as a response to raising concerns. These examples of reform are apparent in the way in which the commune redefines its relationship with state authorities, the drug market and hard drugs in response to growing communal concerns at the time. The aim of this section is to illustrate how Christiania residents adopted a principle of reform in regards to various communal threats.

A Normalized neighborhood 1976 – 1987

The time period from 1976 to 1989 in Christiania's history symbolizes the rise of major concerns and internal conflict, which lead to increased mechanisms of internal reform. The first concern was related to the use and trade of hard drugs within the commune. To address this issue residents of Christiania introduced a law that bans the use and trade of hard drugs. The next challenge was introduced with the rise of gang related violence, which ended when residents collaborated with police forces in order to evict such gangs from the commune. The third challenge was introduced when state authorities contested the legalization of the commune due to its drug related issues. The response from residents was to regulate and monitor the market in order to minimize conflict with police forces. The following history of Christiania illustrates the growing embodiment of the principle of reform within a communal setting in order to give background information on the development of such principle.

After the events of the failed eviction of 1976, state authorities were placed in a situation where the eviction of Christiania would be socially problematic, legislation for a normalization plan was, therefore, in session as an attempt to integrate Christiania within the established framework of the city. This solution proved to be problematic, especially, given Christiania's soft drug market. The soft drug market was progressively developing in Christiania from the commune's early establishing years. Residents did not initiate the Market but instead, as Christiania gained its reputation as a lawless commune, drug dealers shifted their market from the streets of Copenhagen to the Freetown. Residents, however, tolerated the drug market and regulated the drug trade through communal meetings that included drug pushers. The regulation of such a market allowed residents to gain a certain degree of organizational autonomy over the market. According to Zinovich, "since its inception, Christiania has supported hash as its visionary vehicle of choice. Dealers on Pusher Street sell hash publicly and contribute to Christiania's Common Purse, assisting in the maintenance and improvement of community facilities" (Moore 89). However, the soft drug market soon started selling hard drugs such as cocaine and heroin in 1979. The commercialization of hard drugs within the neighborhood created an epidemic of addicts and gang related violence, which lead residents to ban such substances. According to Hellström, "by November 1979, the situation was almost out of control. With around two hundred hard drug addicts frequenting Christiania daily, everyday life was now, to a great extent, governed by violence and confrontations with the police" (57). The

ban was initiated by the community meeting and enforced by a task force of residents who kicked out people who violated the agreement of the ban. The ban was called the Junk Blockade and was followed by gang violence that made residents result to state authority in response to such threats. In order to resolve the conflict with the violent gang members, residents cooperated with the police forces, which not only evicted the gang members but also led to the police forces attacking Christiania's soft drug market as well (Moore 89). The scale of the drug market and the community's tolerance to soft drugs was brought to the attention of state authorities, which led to complications regarding the normalization plan. The concern was that, on one hand, the drug market cannot be normalized or legitimized but on the other hand, its eviction would undermine the fundamental values of Christiania and its residents. The government then employed social and cultural advisors to organize a legal plan to integrate Christiania as a conventional Danish neighborhood. According to the committee's report in October 1979:

considering the future disposition of the area, it is difficult to entirely overlook the current use of the area as 'free town. 'Some of the activities that today are practiced in the area show positive traits that perhaps should be preserved, possibly in an expanded or changed form, while other activities are definitely of a character unacceptable to retain in the area (Hellström 60).

What the committee's report indicates is that, from the government's perspective, Christiania has positive social implications while at the same time sponsoring illegal activities such as drug trade. The committee then suggested that the community should be made legal in regard to the squatted houses, and left to function on its own terms under close surveillance by the committee's officials and in collaboration with police forces. The proposed monitoring status meant that the community would be semi-autonomous in its nature, as it required contact with authorities when it comes to the commune's internal affairs. Some residents saw this as a mechanism whereby Christiania would lose its autonomy and ultimately become controlled by the state however; residents eventually consented to the agreement. What followed the agreement was a series of attacks and raids on the soft drug market by police forces, however, according to Hellström, "despite the hardening of the climate, Christiania also continued to function as a free space for alternative events and underground initiatives" (Hellström 68). In 1986, Christiania proposed the "Vollå" which aimed to grant Christiania full legal legitimacy and tax relief in order to maintain Christiania's institutions and infrastructure. What prompted this proposal was a desire to exempt Christiania from the state's normalization process by diverting or minimizing tax laws imposed on Christiania. According to the Vollå report:

only possible insofar as the authorities would legalize self-administration through a special law, that among other things, would involve considerable tax reductions for the enterprises within the community ... [because] the free town for many years had functioned as a catalyst for the cultural life of the capital (Hellström 68).

The report indicates that the residents of the commune believe they could use the social position and importance of Christiania as leverage for the state to minimize taxes imposed on the commune. Between 1982 and 1986, the parliament, which was at the time a conservative majority, was pending the detailed legal status of Christiania (Lauritsen 37). In May 1986, a

parliamentary majority decides to legalize Christiania under a specified future plan (Lauritsen 37). The plan called for a control committee composed of state cultural and urban advisors, to connect Christiania with officials from public authority (Lauritsen 37). The committee was established on 31st March 1987 by the Danish manager of Social Affairs, Alfred Dam (Lauritsen 37). During its first year, the control committee found itself between two skeptical figures: on one hand, Christiania residents were skeptical that the government would not interfere in their internal affairs, and on the other hand, government officials were skeptical that Christiania would refrain from participating in any form of illegal activity.

The highlighted history illustrates the raised challenges that Christiania faced from 1976 to 1987 from a verity of actors. The first challenge was the hard drug dealers and users who brought addictive substances to the commune and its residents. The residents responded by initiating the ban on hard drugs. The second challenging actors were the gang members who brought gang related violence to the commune. The residents responded by collaborating with police forces to evict such gangs. Reform in this instance is illustrated in the manner in which the residents attempted to address these issues. The three different attempts to resolve such issues involved introducing new communal laws, collaborating with state authorities and taxing and monitoring an entire market. What such attempts symbolize is the communal consciousness developing mechanisms of reform to existing political and social conditions. The main source of such threats was the conflict raised from the hard drugs market and, thus, the next part will focus primarily on Christiania's Junk Blockade act where residents decided to ban the use and trade of hard drugs on neighborhood territory.

The blockade against Hard Drugs

The Junk Blockade was a series of confrontations and battles within the community to push the hard drug market out of Christiania. The key word here is 'hard', as the movement was mainly directed at addictive drugs such as heroin and cocaine and excluded soft drugs such as hash and cannabis. What followed such movement was the rise of gang related violence. This section will aim to demonstrate the two movements to show how Christiania residents managed to address such rising problems by utilizing a mechanism or reform that was directed at the drug market.

The ban of hard drugs lasted from October 4th to November 4th, 1979 (Anders 210) and the decision was taken in one of Christiania's common meetings. The main concern was that the Freetown was slowly transforming into a drug market, which associates the commune in the eyes of the public with crime and addiction. In November 1979, more than two hundred hard drug addicts frequently visited Christiania on a daily basis (Hellström 57). The image of Christiania during that time became associated with the hard drug market, which may have affected public support for the Free Haven. According to Hellstorm:

the actively promoted stereotype of Christiania was that of a dangerous landscape, a veritable swamp, potentially dragging anyone into the mud. This pressure also led to a sharpening of internal relations between pushers and activists, or between the pragmatics who wanted to find a solution to the drug problems (56).

Hellstorm indicates that the public image of Christiania at the time was associated with dangerous activity. As the issue of the drugs was starting to threaten the existence of the commune and its internal stability, residents called for a ban on hard drugs. The meeting ruled

that the collective commune as a whole would enforce the ban, thus, every resident had to contribute to the enforcement of the planned ban. The residents who were already addicted to hard drugs were put in a rehabilitation program and the drug dealers promised not to sell hard drugs within the territory of Christiania. After the meeting, people who were found in violation of such agreement, or failed to recover from the rehabilitation program, were kicked out of Commune. Initially, the dealers agreed to not sell hard drugs and residents who were addicts did not oppose the consensus of the commune however, not all residents committed to their promise. According to Hellström:

Several hundred residents managed to stage a 'Junk Blockade', an action, which implied a 'siege' of the main building, Fredens Ark, 'The Peace Ark', where the problems were the greatest. Pushers and addicts were thrown out and only re-admitted when they could prove they were clean [as they were in violation of the consensus decision that they agreed to during the community meeting]. Through this collaborative venture, Christiania again managed to confront a considerable threat, and resolve it through action (57).

The blockade was not only targeting hard drug dealers and visiting junkies but was even extended to include residents themselves. The ban was an all-out ban of any form of substance abuse to addictive drugs on community territory. According to Lauritsen:

as early as the 1970s, a group of Christianians [established] drug treatment programs for approximately 30 drug addicts, who lived in Christiania at the time ... The drug addicts [were] given the choice to either receive treatment and return when they are rehabilitated, or permanently move out of the Free Haven (Lauritsen 30).

What this action aimed to do was ridding Christiania from the damages brought by the hard drug market. Rehabilitating drug addicts and banning junkies were all part of the strategy to gain direct control over the territory of Christiania.

The common meeting was the birthplace of strategic mechanisms of organizational reform that produced the Junk Blockade. According to Lauritsen, "To many people, the Junk Blockade symbolizes a crucial turning-point in the history of Christiania, when the inhabitants came together and fought against [hard] drugs" (Lauritsen 31). In other words, it is the 'coming together' that brought social change to the community and its subject. Such communally enforced actions illustrate how Christiania residents exercised a certain degree of control not just over their territory, but also over the organization of the drug market. Such control was introduced with the implementation and regulation of communal mechanisms of organization apparent in the ban on hard drugs. With the introduction of such communally enforced laws, the residents were able to reform their commune according to their communal authority. Residents choose to use this authority to maintain internal stability in hopes of protecting their commune from ripping itself apart from the inside. It is mainly the common meetings and the facilitation of dialogue with addicts and dealers that allowed such methods of reform to take place in Christiania. The residents that carried out the blockade did so knowing that the evicted violators were given a chance to reconcile and, thus, at this point they were a corrupting danger to the entire community. The political system adopted by residents is, therefore, a series of negotiations that eventually lead to decisions and collective communal action against any violation attempt of such decision. According to Hellström:

Through the Junk Blockade however, the activities of Christiania managed to reclaim the initiative. A cooperative action against self-destructive addiction, it also had a decisive ideological importance for the future reproduction of the community. To many Christianites, the Junk Blockade therefore stands out as a decisive turning point in the history of Christiania (57).

What Hellström is indicating is that the Junk Blockade was the moment when residents of the commune utilized mechanisms of communal reform in order to rid the Freetown from addictive substances. The action Christiania residents took to ban the trade and use of hard drugs in the Freetown is an illustration of the effectiveness of the community's collective, communitarian approach to organizational reform. As Described by Ole Lykke, Christiania's resident historian:

The Junk Blockade is an event that has gone down in Christiania folklore as an important ... moment of almost complete unity. In 1979, the inhabitants of Christiania decided on a blockade in order to rid Christiania of heavy drug dealers and users (Thörn 210).

What Lykke indicates is that the action taken by Christiania residents is characterized by the commune's ability to unite against rising threats. Therefore, one can claim that the response of Christiania residents to the drug problem is one example of mobilizations that unfolded against internal struggles, political instability and dangers of eviction, in the hope of sustaining the community.

The second threat was introduced in the mid 1980s, when Christiania faced a serious problem with a Biker Gang commonly known among residents as 'bullshit'. According to Lauritsen:

some of them [biker gang members] also [moved] into the 'Multimedia-House' in Langgaden in the middle of Christiania. Rumors of threats and violence assaults on Christians [started] circulating, and the feeling of being powerless [increased] among the 800 inhabitants of the Free Haven (32).

What Lauritsen indicates is that residents of Christiania were concerned that the commune would lose its communal autonomy to such gangs. The dangerous situation, and the violence of the gang group, made the rest of Christiania residents reluctant to adopt the same solution similar to that of the Junk Blockade. The political system adopted by Christiania allows residents to call for a communal trial, where the residents would rule in respect of the proposed issue. Naturally, some residents called for an emergency common meeting, where the gang members were put on trial for damaging the community and disturbing the peace. According to Lauritsen, Christiania residents united "in solidarity and anger towards the terror. At a giant Common Meeting, several angry inhabitants [stepped] forward and openly [criticized] the behavior of the biker gang. After this, the bikers [promised] to behave themselves." (Lauritsen 32). The meeting ends with the consensus that the gang would suspend any violent or hard drug related activity in Christiania. However, six months later, the gang decided to go into war with another gang called Hells Angels, to mark their territorial dominance over Christiania's drug market. As this was a clear violation of the common meeting, residents regarded such action as a violation of Christiania law. According to Katsiaficas, "Twice they [Christiania residents] used the Ting to convince motorcycle gangs ... to leave Christiania ... several people suffered injuries while persuading the bikers to leave" (120). What Katsiaficas indicates is that residents were constantly attempting to reach a solution with the gang members and failed. It was obvious to residents at that point that

mobilization in this situation would entail a certain degree of violence to resolve such issues. Residents were, therefore, restrained from acting out in response to such violations of Christiania rules.

As residents were actively trying to find a solution to the rise in tension, some proposed collaborating with police forces however, the police's involvement would result in the disruption of the soft drug market, which is something that residents tolerated and considered as part of their identity. The initial meetings with the gang group were held in the mid 1980s and the series of concerns were raised until 1987, when residents finally reported the gang members to police forces. The ting meetings were held concerning these issues throughout the late 1980s however, the dangerous situation restricted full communitarian mobilization against such violence during these years. The community, therefore, was trying to find different solutions to direct confrontation, which concluded with the collaboration with police forces. In early 1987, Christiania residents made a request to police authorities to remove gang members from the commune's territory. During one common meeting, the residents came to the conclusion that the gangs can no longer be tolerated, as they were abusing their residency in Christiania with their violation of the consensus decision made in the common meeting when the gang was put on trial. The reason behind the resident's hesitation in involving the police in such an issue was, mainly, to protect the soft drug market from police raids, as Christiania tolerated such a market. According to Dr. René Karpantschov a former Christiania resident who is now a sociology professor at the University of Copenhagen, "the forces of law carried out indiscriminate raids that also targeted small dealers and the common use of hash, which was considered a legitimate toxin and a cornerstone of the hippie lifestyle" (Thörn 48). What Karpantschov indicates is that, to government authorities, soft and hard drugs were put on the same level of illegality and, thus, the soft drug market suffered consequences that were caused by the biker gang members and the hard drug market. However, the residents resulted to the police as they saw the danger proposed by the gang members was greater than that of police raids and surveillance. The mechanism of reform adopted in this incident was depicted in the way residents attempted to resolve the dangerous situation through appropriate measure that diverted from direct confrontational violence. The residents had to enforce their communal laws on the gang members, however, the violence nature of the situation restricted communal action. The reform in this instance is apparent in the way residents diverted from communal forms of authority and resulted to state authorities in response to the issue regarding gang violence. This is an example of how the community actively reformed its mechanism of addressing rising issues. With the introduction of this collaborative attempt with police forces, the commune reformed its approach to communal action to not only include members of the commune, but also state authorities when it comes to life threatening dangers threatening the commune's members.

By organizing the Junk Blockade and the collaboration with police forces, residents managed to restrain or undermine the authority or organization of drug dealers. One can claim that the action taken by residents was an attempt to gain autonomy over the drug market by illustrating to the dealers that residents are capable of closing down the drug market as a whole. In this instance, Christiania residents were mainly trying to enforce their autonomy over the drug market and all its subjects. The point of highlighting such acts is to show how common meetings can facilitate mass mobilization or political action that grants residents a certain degree of control over the territory.

Drug culture and Drug market

Christiania's approach to drugs has been aligned with the hippy counter culture movement of the 1960s and thus soft drugs were not only tolerated but also appropriated as a distinct characteristic of Christiania's culture. From its early establishment in 1971, Christiania residents normalized the recreational use of soft drugs such as hash and marijuana within their community. What resulted from such normalization was the establishment of the "illegal" (by Danish national standards) drug market. The drug market was not originally created by residents but instead as Christiania developed its reputation as an anarchist commune, the market organically shifted from different streets and corners within the city of Copenhagen to Christiania. Dealers are commonly known in Christiania as Pushers and the drug market is situated in a specified street in Christiania called Pusher Street. Residents began monitoring and regulating Pusher Street after 1979, through communal meetings with dealers and neighborhood watches, in order to not only control its influence on the commune but also normalize it as one of many Christiania's governed markets. The history of the drug market is divided into two distinct parts: the hard drug market and the soft drug market. Christiania's relationship with hard drugs was defined by the Junk Blockade in 1979 as residents banned the use and trade of hard drugs on communal territory. This part of the study will focus at the initial development of the drug market and the communal regulations that followed the Junk Blockade of 1979. The distinction between the market before and after the blockade is that the commune implemented various forms of regulations in order to reform and control the drug trade within the territory. Such monetary restrictions were introduced with the rise of police conflict and gang related violence in the late 1970s. Consequently, the first communal reform law implemented on the market was to require its contribution to the communal interest of Christiania, by funding the Christiania's common wealth system. What symbolizes reform in the drug market's history is the moment when residents started implementing communal laws and regulations on the market. This initial moment of transition where the market stopped functioning on its own terms and began functioning according to communal regulations is the aspect of reform that this study aims to highlight.

The development of the soft drug market was initiated by the drug culture that was associated with the counter culture movement of the 1960s. Many of the squatted communities within the squatters movement were heavily influenced by the hippy movement and thus they were advocates for the recreational use of soft drugs within their squatted territories. For example, Grabberne Vaek, one of the squatted houses in Copenhagen published an article in 1970 that stated:

[we] have to have some places where we can experiment with our new way of living without any involvement from the narcs' or social pedagogs' side. They're just out to get us to conform to the existing pigs' society – [we] demand the right to learn how to adapt to our culture, learn to use drugs instead of abuse them, learn to be good revolutionaries ... we're not satisfied. And We'll be back. It's almost winter and we need a place to live and develop. And we'll take them. The negotiations are well over (Henriksen 44).

This article was published before both the establishment of Christiania and the clearance of major squatted houses in Copenhagen. One of the primary demands illustrated in the article was the right to consume drugs in moderation for recreational purposes. Drugs were therefore, an

essential part of the values adopted by residents and they were willing to fight to sustain such values. The same culture was transformed to Christiania when the same squatters physically moved into Christiania during its early establishing stages. Drugs were passed between residents without any exchange of money as soft drugs were shared within the community (Anonymous). Therefore, Christiania tolerated drug consumption and residents still to this very day, allow the trade and use of soft drugs within their territory. However, residents did not instantly create a drug market when they established Christiania in 1971, instead the market was progressively established by dealers who were mostly not residents of the commune. In its early establishing stages Christiania residents tolerated the market and allowed it to exist according to its own rules of organization. According to one of the workers on Pusher Street, following the Junk Blockade residents implemented a series of restraints and laws on the cannabis market (Anonymous). These laws aimed at integrating the market as one of Christiania's many shops, bars, restaurants and cafes in the mid 1970s. This meant that the drug market and all its subjects had to conform to the authority of Christiania's common meetings, pay all necessary electricity and maintenance bills, plus contribute to Christiania's common wealth system. According to Zinovich, "since its inception, Christiania has supported hash as its visionary vehicle of choice. Dealers on Pusher Street sell hash publicly and contribute to Christiania's Common Purse, assisting in the maintenance and improvement of the community facilities" (Moore 89). What Zinovich indicates is that the market was integrated as a normalized part of Christiania's territory. One can claim therefore that Christiania residents did not only manage to monitor the market and regulate it but also unofficially tax the illegal market. This form of normalization and regulation was suggested by previous squatter communities in Copenhagen as they struggled with drug related issues. According to the article, "should the MAFIA control us?" written by a group of squatter political activists on behalf of their squatted community, Slumrosen in April 1971:

We have to avoid the situation that happened in Huset [a different squatted community], where the dealers took power over the place. We have the power to boycott them, throw them out, confiscate their drugs if they barter or sell bad drugs (Henriksen 45).

What this article indicates is that the struggle against organized crime was not a Christiania exclusive problem as the squatted houses before Christiania suffered from related issues. The difference in the case of Christiania is that members of the commune attempted to counter act such problems through collective action, collaboration with police forces and eventually normalization mechanisms. This is to show how residents of Christiania tolerated the progressive emergence of the drug market and started regulating it from its early development phases. The process of normalization is a way in which residents were staying true to their initial cultural values while at the same time maintaining the community's stability and restricting such organized figures from gaining autonomy over the commune.

While the cultural values of the commune are built on tolerating soft drugs, the drug market and organized crime could create a threat to the entire commune. The solution to this issue was the regulation and normalization of the drug market within Christiania. According to one of Christiania's pushers, "a semi-regulated market is a hundred times better than unregulated pushers passing their damaged and possibly toxic products to tourists and Children" (Anonymous). What this Pusher is saying in the interview is a reaction to the unregulated market in the rest of Copenhagen. This was indeed true as before Christiania dealers were scattered in

different parts in the city but were focused around tourist areas such as hotels and clubs. According to Henriksen”

everyone knew that it was at restaurant Tago Mago, a disco by Palads Hotel on Skolegade, where you could buy the different kinds of drugs with your entrance ticket mostly hash, speed and LSD ...Drugs were already proliferent across the nation. Even the concept of an underground scene was gaining ground everywhere (44).

What Henriksen indicates, is that Christiania’s regulated market offered a better approach to the possible establishment of an underground scene in the commune. This links back to the claims of Christiania’s pusher, as his approach indicates that he saw the market’s existence as being a necessary and one can even say legitimate part of Christiania. The problem with the unregulated market before Christiania is that pushers and dealers were left to sell hard drugs and low quality soft drugs to anyone who can afford it. Christiania’s market is different because it is monitored and regulated by residents themselves thus, hard drugs are banned, soft drugs are checked for quality and dealers are not allowed to push their products to minors (Anonymous). Therefore, the centralized market is forced to meet the agreed upon communal standards when it comes to drug trade. Christianites then became strong advocates of cannabis legalization in wider Danish society with several events that were centered on the topic of decriminalization some of which were held by Christiania’s cultural association (Lillesoe). Such events aimed at decriminalizing soft drugs to shift government resources from attacking the soft drugs market to focusing on hard drugs. According to Lauritsen, “Christianians [had] always opposed Danish drug policy. Primarily because hash is illegal, and because the government spends so much energy fighting the hash trade instead of focusing more on the trade of hard drugs” (Lauritsen 48). What Lauritsen indicates is that Christiania’s regulation of the soft drug market was an attempt to minimize police conflict in the area while at the same time legally decriminalize the drug. Christiania’s approach to the drug market shows how the community is committed to the values of the counter cultural movement while at the same time adopting principles of reform to sustain the stability and autonomy of the commune.

Conclusion:

Christiania is unique political and social experiment that has so many lessons to offer to mainstream politics and government. Such an experiment should be brought to light by academic researchers and scholars in the field as it underlines the importance of the alternative as a valid source of political, cultural and historical narrative. The three principles of rebellion, autonomy and reform symbolize the struggle that alternative political actors must go through in order to gain legitimacy. The fact of the matter in this case is that the social movement of Christiania is a call to regain individual political agency in a communitarian form. The cultural emergence of such a movement is not only a reflection of the alternative but also a response or criticism of mainstream politics and culture. To gather research material and sources for this project I applied for the Christiania Researcher in resident position and I got a chance to live in a house which is known as the visiting researcher facility in Christiania. During my stay, I managed to gather a verity of sources and conduct interviews to develop this research project specially because there was a serious lack of academic sources written about Christiania in English. The best indication of communitarian values and culture are depicted in the personal and social aspect of living in

the commune. I would like to therefore, quickly share two personal anecdotes that really resonated with me the values of Christiania.

The first was on my second day in Christiania where my neighbor took me to a funeral held for a Christiania residents. The church was so full of people that for a moment there I thought the entire community was being squeezed in one room. In the middle of the Church and right in front of the resident's picture was Christiania's flag. After the funeral, we all walked to a lake and residents started placing flowers near the water. This is a Christiania tradition where residents put flowers next to a lake to honor the life of their fellow resident. The man who passed away was Christiania's garbage man and he was not only as much a part of this community as anyone else but also, he was loved by all his fellow residents. What this story indicates is that the commune regards its members as family. While outsiders might categorize this man as "the garbage man", the commune regards him as a human being. The second story is when I was invited to a Christiania dinner party and it was in this hall that had music and free food and good company. While sitting with my neighbors I noticed from the corner of my eye a very loud and probably intoxicated character trying to find a place to sit. My first initial thought is, "thank god this guy is not sitting next to me". What happened next is that a father who was having dinner with his family offered a seat for that man to have dinner with them. At that moment, I had this sudden existential criticism of myself "who do I think I am? To judge someone so harshly". What I realized at that moment is that we are all trying to heal from our past and that we all have problems that we are secretly dealing with but what we need is not society to demonize, categorize and look down on us but instead what we need is to be accepted, loved and appreciated despite our imperfections. Being part of a commune is to challenge this inherent sense of othering and to move away from seeing people as being strangers, into seeing people as being family. Christiania therefore, offers a chance in which such a culture can be practiced, advertised and reproduced and this is exactly why it should be a subject matter worthy of academic and scholarly research. I wish everyone would have one moment to discover the absolute truth of that.

Work Cited

"Continued Drug Abuse Could Collapse Nation." *Lebanon Daily News*, 23 Feb. 1970, <https://www.newspapers.com/newspage/5254090/>. Accessed 5 Mar. 2017.

Anonymous, . Personal interview. 31 Dec. 2016.

Carter, April. *The political theory of anarchism*. London: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Communitarianism revisited." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 19, no. 3, 2014, pp. 241-60. Print.

Gambone, Larry. "Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Anarchism: Proudhon's Libertarian Thought and the Anarchist Movement." *Libertarian Alliance*, 2004. Print.

Graham, Robert. *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2005. Print.

Hartogsohn, Ido. "The American Trip: Set, Setting, and Psychedelics in 20th Century Psychology." *Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies*, pp. 6-9, www.maps.org/news-letters/v23n1/v23n1_p6-9.pdf. Accessed 1 Apr. 2017.

Hellström, Maria. "Steal This Place- The Aesthetics of Tactical Formlessness and "The Free Town of Christiania"." Thesis. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences , 2006. Print.

Henriksen, Ole. *Christiania Yeah 1 - The Melting Pot*. Copenhagen, Forlaget Multivers, 2011. Print.

Hoffman, Abbie, Izak Haber, and Bert Cohen. *Steal This Book*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2002. Print.

Katsiaficas, George N. *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2006. Print.

Kollektive, Squatting Europe. *Squatting in Europe: Radical Spaces, Urban Struggles*. Wivenhoe [UK: Minor Compositions, 2013. Print.

Lauritsen, Pernille W. *A Short Guide to Christiania*. Copenhagen, Aschehoug Dansk Forlag, 2002. Print.

Leary, Timothy Francis. *The politics of ecstasy*. Berkeley, CA: Ronin Publishing, 1998. Print.

- Leary, Timothy. *Psychedelic Experience: a manual based on the tibetan book of the dead*. Place of publication not identified: CITADEL PR, 2017. Print.
- Lillesøe, Britta. "Speech To Uzupis." Christiania Cultural Association, 1 May 2014, Copenhagen. Address. Print.
- Lillesøe, Britta. Personal interview. 2 Jan. 2017.
- Manghezi, Risenga. Personal interview. 23 Dec. 2016.
- Mckenna, Terence K. *The Archaic Revival: Speculations on Psychedelic Mushrooms, the Amazon, Virtual Reality, UFOs, Evolution, Shamanism, the Rebirth of the Goddess, and the End of History*. San Francisco, Calif.: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991. Print.
- Mhoja, Kirsten. Personal interview. 19 Dec. 2016.
- Midtgaard, Soren F. "'but Suppose Everyone did the Same' — the Case of the Danish Utopian Micro-Society of Christiania." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2007, pp. 299-315. Print.
- Moore, Alan W, and Alan Smart. *Making Room: Cultural Production in Occupied Spaces. Other Forms*, 2015. Print.
- Rogeberg, Ole. "Drug Policy, Values and the Public Health Approach - Four Lessons from Drug Policy Reform Movements." *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* 32.4 (2015): 347-64. *ProQuest*. Web. 5 Apr. 2017.
- Steen, Bart , Ask Katzeff, and Leendert . Hoogenhuijze. *The City Is Ours: Squatting and Autonomous Movements in Europe from the 1970s to the Present*. , 2014. Print.
- Thörn, Håkan, Cathrin Wasshede, and Tomas Nilson, eds. *Space for urban alternatives? Christiania 1971-2011*. Hedemora: Gidlunds Förlag, 2011. Print.
- Vanolo, Alberto. "Alternative Capitalism and Creative Economy: The Case of Christiania: Alternative Capitalism and Creative Economy in Christiania." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2013, pp. 1785-1798 Print.
- Warburg, Peter. Personal interview. 31 Dec. 2016.