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Introduction
In the traffic debate in Stockholm there seem to be no understanding for “the others”. People use different kinds of transportation: Cars, bikes, motorcycles, some walk etc. If you are used to drive a car through the city you think all cyclists are endangering the traffic, they do not follow the traffic rules and they never seem to care about other road-users. Those who cycle through town think the car drivers do not respect them: they park on cycle lanes and they turn right without even checking for cyclists. They think the pedestrians believe they are alone in the world when not respecting the cycle lanes and walk there. The pedestrians feel no other road-users respect them: The cars do not stop for them at the pedestrian crossing and the cyclists cycle through the parks in high speed with no consideration of those who walk. Many emotions can be found and the world is seen as black or white. The different road-users do not understand or have any empathy for each other.

The traffic debate in Stockholm has similarities I think, with the urban development debate. Newspapers, blogs and other internet forums are engaged in the urban planning debate and often when the big national newspapers write articles about an urban planning project, the article are commented by many people. Often the readers discuss with each other as well as commenting on the article. Facebook pages are created both in favor of and as a protest against an urban planning project. For example the pages “We who are in favor of Tors Torn (planned tall buildings at Torsgatan in Vasastan) with 1090 members May 14, 2011 (Vi som är FÖR Tors torn, n.d.) and “We who are against Tors Torn” with 214 members May, 14 2011 (Vi som MOT Tors Torn, n.d.)

No planning matter in Stockholm seems to go unnoticed. The opinions and comments can be seen as very personal and emotional. Sometimes they even express anger, sadness and/or frustration.

The underlying statements and arguments can be seen as different perceptions on Stockholm and can of cause affect the definition of planning problems and solutions as Lennart Tonell has argued (Tonell 2005, p 322).

According to the Planning and building Act (Plan- och bygglagen) (paragraph 13) the citizens are allowed to comment on planning proposals. The city of Stockholm describes the process this way:

“The planning work involves balancing between different interests. This is ultimately done by the City construction committee (stadsbyggnadsnämnden). The plan administrators report the received opinions and the department’s considerations in service advices (tjänsteutlåtanden) to the committee/board. They decide on the direction for the future work with the plan.” (Stockholm Stad B, May 2009)

The final proposal is on exhibition at least three weeks. In this period the citizens can hand in their viewpoints and ideas on the project (Stockholm Stad B, May 2009).

There are many big planning projects in Stockholm at the moment where we can expect to find a great deal of engaging and emotional argumentation. The rebuilding of Slussen is such an example.
Slussen is a (famous) traffic junction in the central parts of Stockholm built in 1935. Today it is regarded as old-fashioned and rundown by the City of Stockholm and there have been ongoing discussions about Slussen’s future since the 1990’s with several suggestions and architecture competitions. In 2008 the last competition was held with five competing architect offices. In the spring 2009 the City Planning administration (Stadsbyggnadskontoret), Stockholm City Development administration (Exploateringskontoret) and the Traffic administration (Trafikkontoret) decided to proceed with the suggestion from Foster + Partners and Berg Architect office. (Stockholm Stad 2011) The plan consultation (plansamrådet) with the exhibition of a model of the proposal was held in the spring 2010 and had over 10000 visitors and resulted in approximately 1200 viewpoints to the City Planning administration. These viewpoints are contained in 19 binders at the City Development administration. Especially the voices who want to preserve Slussen or parts of it are visible in the debate, but even voices claiming Slussen should be torn down as soon as possible have a position in the debate. When reading in the binders it becomes clear that citizens have emotions for Slussen and many angry viewpoints can be found there. Besides the viewpoints received at the City Development Office Slussen is also topic for many discussions in newspaper articles, Facebook groups and blogs.

But why are people getting involved? Why do they write the City planning department with their viewpoints? Why do people discuss with people they do not know at the internet? Why do they write articles? Why do they get mad, angry and frustrated? And how does this emotional engagement affect the planning process? The question is what the decision makers make of the received viewpoints and ideas from the citizens.

Are emotions then irrational? Are citizens whose arguments are based on emotional and personal experience irrational? Not necessarily and therefore this thesis is based on a theory on emotions stating emotions make us select what matters to us. We do not have emotions for things that are insignificant to us (Nussbaum 2001, p 19) and thereby emotions are given legitimacy. It is also important not to put sense against sensibility. It is according to José Luis Ramírez the danger of dichotomy when understanding sense as a dichotomy to sensibility. Instead we should beware that “Emotion without reason is blind and reason without emotion is inhumane.” (Ramírez 1994, p 43)

**Purpose and aim**
The purpose with this thesis is to investigate the significance of citizens’ personal engagement and emotions in the planning process. I both want to know why people get emotionally engaged but also if their emotionally engagement have any effect on the planning process.

The aim is to contribute to a discussion on planning where emotions have a larger role than today. I believe emotions affect us and the planning process more than we think and it will be better to have an understanding for emotions and personal engagement than to ignore them. This will give the researcher/planner an advantage when getting involved in project where emotions and personal engagement are more or less visible.
Research Questions
In order to fulfill the purpose and aim I need to focus on the following questions:

- Why do the citizens get emotionally engaged in the Slussen-project?
- In what way have the citizens’ emotions and engagement been considered and used in the Slussen project?

Delimitations
The debate about Slussen’s future started 20 years ago. To delimit my material I have chosen to focus on the time period from the last exhibition in the spring 2010 and onward to today. When I first decided to use Slussen as case study for the thesis in the autumn 2010, the final exhibition was supposed to take place in the beginning of 2011. However the exhibition was postponed to the beginning of May 2011 and therefore I had to make a choice if I still wanted to use Slussen as an example. To use the engagement and opinions related to the exhibition opening in May 2011 was not an option. Therefore the material is based on the previous exhibition (spring 2010) and the debate related to it.

At first I thought this thesis should be discussing rationality and emotions, but after reading Nussbaum, Ramírez and other researchers who argue that emotions can be rational, I changed my mind. I find more important issues to investigate. Therefore it is important to recognize that emotions and rationality are NOT binary concepts. It can be very offensive to claim otherwise and it is a discussion which can be very hard to get out of.

Nor is it a thesis about what solution will be best for Slussen. I do not search for what is right and what is wrong. I believe people are entitled to believe in what they want and want to show my respect for their opinions. Therefore I do not see myself as a journalist whose purpose is to dig deep and to uncover “the truth”. Nor have I the “political game” in mind when I write this thesis. Some may see me as a bit naïve because of cause there is a lot of politics involved in the decisions taken about Slussen’s future. I am well aware of this, but this is not the focus of this thesis.
**Reading directions**

Before presenting my material I will explain why I have chosen case study as a method. Then I will describe and reflect over my other methods: The use of different kinds of written and electronic material, interviews and observations. The binders at the City Development Office as previously mentioned, several blogs, electronic articles and Facebook pages has been used to supplement the interviews with citizens engaged in Slussen and with key persons at the City of Stockholm. A part with critique of the methods and some ethical thoughts will close part one.

Then a survey of the field is presented. First I want to discuss what emotions are and what role they play in planning. I will give a brief account of the emotion-discussion from a sociological perspective but also from a geographical perspective where place and sense of place is important. Several scholars discuss this matter. But citizens’ engagement can also lead to protests. I want to focus on an important discussion about the concept NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard), because it has to do with who planners, politicians and citizens will listen to and take serious and who they want to dismiss as being someone not worth listening to.

John May’s triangle of engagement is inspired by Arnstein but focuses on citizens’ level of engagement which also can be helpful when discussing emotions and engagement in planning.

In order to answer the question on how the emotions and engagement effects the planning process I also make use of Sherry Arnstein’s article from 1969: “A ladder of citizen participation” to give an idea of where the Slussen case is situated in relation to citizen participation. This can give a hum on the importance of the citizens’s emotions and engagement.

After presenting the theories it is time for analysis. I will almost follow the same order as the order I presented the theories. How the citizens see and experience Slussen as place is studied along with their perception of the “others” those who think differently than themselves. Then the “professionals” and the exhibition are investigated through the citizens’ perspective. Finally a part about levels of participation and engagement will finish the analysis.

Before concluding and summing up the results of the thesis there is a discussion on the findings concerning if things can/could have been done different.
Method

Case study
A case study fits this kind of research because it gives the opportunity to study the phenomenon of emotions and engagement in the planning process in depth. When explaining what case study is as a method, Blatter argues that a case study is better suited to trace “individual perceptions or hegemonic discourses in social processes” than a big quantitative investigation (Blatter 2008, no pagernumber). Citizens’ emotions and engagement are perceptions of the reality as there is no right or wrong.

Slussen is chosen for the case study in order to gather as much information as possible from a single case instead of doing a random selection where there are no guaranties for the amount of information available in the case (Flyvbjerg 2001, p 78). By choosing Slussen I already know there will be plenty of material and information for me to analyze because so many people are engaged in the matter. This is what Flyvbjerg calls “Information-oriented selection” (Flyvbjerg 2001, p 79) and he identifies four different types of “Information-oriented selection” cases: 1) Extreme/deviant cases, where the case is chosen because it is an unusual case. 2) Maximum variation cases where more than one case are chosen and where there is a variety in the cases so the researcher can identify different dimensions of the phenomenon investigated. 3) Critical cases are when the case chosen can say something about other cases. The cases are chosen because the phenomenon in focus is “most likely” or “least likely” to be found. The conclusion will be: “if this is (not) valid for this case, then it applies to all (no) cases”. And 4) Paradigmatic cases used for cases when the researcher want to develop a metaphor or if (s)he wants to say something in general for the field where the case study belongs. (Flyvbjerg 2001, p 78-79)

Slussen can be identified as a case where citizens’ emotional engagement is “most likely to be found” (Flyvbjerg 2001, p 78) due to the place’ significance for people in Stockholm (I will get back to that later in my analysis) and therefore I will argue that it is a critical case.

Can emotions fade or be stronger as the memory fade? I am not sure. Therefore the actuality of the project was also important to me. It had to be a case where people’s engagement and emotions for it still was “fresh”.

Interviews
The reason for choosing in depth interviews as my main method instead of just examining planning documents and written protests (which there are plenty of) is that it is easier to get the interviewees to develop and justify their arguments. An in depth interview is a possibility to listen carefully to what others have to say (Longhurst 2003, p 118). Furthermore in depth interviews are suited when investigating complex matters such as opinions and emotions (Longhurst 2003, p 128).

I am inspired by the “life story interview” which is a method where the interviewer can get a holistic view on the interviewee’s life. It is also a method where the researcher can reach a better understanding for the interviewee and how they understand themselves. (Atkinson 1998, p 2) Even though I did not want the interviewees to tell me about their entire life I find the method very suitable for someone who wants to get information
about emotions and engagement which is a very personal matter. Atkinson argues that by letting the interviewee tell their own story, by letting them decide what to tell and not to tell the interviewer gets a better access to their inner life. (Atkinson 1998, p 24)

In the life course interview it is the interviewee who do most of the talking; the interviewer has to be as quiet as possible. (s)he only asks a few question and then is silent. I usually started with the same questions: What is your background for getting engaged in Slussen and why do you care? Questions Atkinsson calls “descriptive questions” that will lead to “grand tours” answers. (Atkinson 1998, p 41) That also means I did not have any interview guide because I think the interviewee can talk more freely and more honest without a guide. I got very different answers, but as my analysis will show I really think I was able to catch why the interviewees got engaged in Slussen.

The part of the life story interview where the interviewer is silent is always hard. My intention was to be as quiet as possible but I always got so engaged in the interviewees’ answer so the last parts of the interviews were more like a conversation. I also think that having a discussion with the interviewee is a way to give something back to him or her.

It was clear to me that I wanted to interview citizens who were not “expert” citizens. I wanted someone with a personal and private engagement, not someone who knew too much and was engaged in Slussen due to their profession. I think a lot of professionals are personally engaged, but I think it can be hard to tell what their motives are because they also are getting paid. There is of course also a risk that people, not being “experts” have hidden agendas, but I am willing to take that risk.

Some of them wanted to be anonymous so instead of their real names I have given them other names. I feel it is necessary to give them names in order to personalize them.

In total I interviewed 13 people: 10 “ordinary” citizens and three “experts”: a plan architect, a political advisor and an art coordinator from the cultural department. One woman who I found through the binders at the City Development administration was uncertain that she had enough knowledge about “the awful game on Stockholm” (spelet om Stockholm) and gave me some names of people who were professionals (architects, architect critiques and journalists) so I could interview them instead. I declined since I deliberately have chosen to interview “ordinary” citizens instead of “experts”. Finally she accepted on one condition: she wanted to bring a friend, an architect who she trusted and believed had more facts than she did. I am aware that this friend is a “professional” but believe that it has little affect using her answers because her answers did not refer to her profession as an architect.

The YIMBY interview was also an interview with two members of the group but that was mostly because there were two members who were interested in being interviewed; they knew each other and I thought it could be a good base for discussion and furthermore it would save me some time.

As I also wanted to have the political perspective on Slussen I contacted the responsible politicians: Sten Nordin, Ulla Hammilton, Regina Kevius and Joakim Larsson but they all were too busy to do an interview with me. I asked whether they could answer my
questions per email instead. Only Sten Nordin came back with an answer. Instead I was given a tip to contact the political officials instead. They often had times for interviews.

Among the “ordinary” citizens are members of the organization/network YIMBY, which need to be explained: YIMBY is an acronym for “Yes In My Back Yard” as the opposite of “NIMBY”: Not In My Back Yard. It is foremost a Swedish network (with a subdivision in Norway). It has approximately 4300 members with many different political views. They are concerned with the future development of the Stockholm Region and focus on many different aspects such as urbanity, the environment, efficiency, competitiveness, a more efficient public transport system, a varying architecture, a lively street life. (YIMBY 2010)

The method I used for selecting the interviewees was both based on strategic selection; I knew the people I contacted were engaged in Slussen. They were found through internet pages, through the binders at the Exploateringskontoret and through other interviewees.

The interviews with the citizens were all held at the café at The Museum at Stockholm which is situated at Slussen.

Touring interviews (gåturer)
Doing touring interviews is a very good way to relate to the build environment. (See i.e. Maria Nordström 2002) I told the interviewee that I both wanted to do a “sitting” interview and a touring interview and asked them to think of something at Slussen they wanted to show me because they liked it or because they did not like it.

Both interviews and touring interviews were recorded on dictaphone and transcribed. One touring interview got lost, because it of the wind blowing in the microphone. But I remember bits of it and was able to use this.

Observations
I did two passive observations in my project as I attended a Torchlight procession February 19th arranged by “Rädda Slussen” (Save Slussen) and a lecture on the history of Slussen February 23rd. I have not used a specific method because the aim was to investigate my field and to meet people who were engaged in Slussen and to study them before I began interviewing. The torchlight procession was also used to get a picture of the underlying engagement.

Method for using the written material
As I have said before, my main method is interviews. I have chosen to use written material as a supplement in my analysis because of the huge amount of material, both in form of the many viewpoints at the exploateringskontoret and because of the many articles about Slussen plus the many comments to the articles. Hower I understood that I did not have time to read all the 19 binders but felt that it was not necessary to do either as the plan architect on the project has made a report with a summary.

When I first started doing research I read a lot of articles in Dagens Nyheter and Svenska Dagbladet. Later when I decided to interview “ordinary” citizens I found the news portal Newsmill where many articles on Slussen are published. Newsmill is a site where the readers are generating the content of the site by writing articles and commenting on each other’s articles and is owned by Bonniers Publications. The
readers are seen as employees and their motto is “The general debate cannot wait, it is always online”. (Newsmill 2008)

The written material can describe how the citizens express their engagement and emotions in the Slussen matter and the idea is to use it together with my interviews as examples on citizens’ viewpoints.

Furthermore I need to clarify that the translations of interviews and quotations from articles and the binders are done by the author.

Pictures

As the reader soon will notice there are used very few pictures. The thesis is built on subjective opinions on Slussen and therefore it is very hard to explain a picture because one reader sees one thing while another reader sees something else. Take a look at the picture above. What do you see? Do you see a fantastic view over Gamla Stan or do you only see concrete and roads?

Critique and ethical thoughts
This thesis is the first thesis I have done where people’s engagement have been as strong as in the Slussen case. The people I have met have shared their emotions and engagement for Slussen and I feel a responsibility to make the most of them and not let them down because most of them trust me. I furthermore hope I have not given any delusive hopes by explaining my project for them before interviewing them and clarifying that this is a thesis; I have no power and cannot affect the future progress in Slussen.

Some of my interviewees want anonymity and I do my best to give them that. It is however difficult to secure for some persons as they are easy to recognize due to their position in the Slussen project. I have given all interviewees the opportunity to read the parts where they are mentioned so they can clarify any obscurities. Due to the engagement one interviewee also has wished to discuss more with me. A wish I did not have time to fulfill but I could not bring myself to reject her; instead I just ignored the mail. This is nothing I am proud of but I feel I have learned something.
It was important to me that every viewpoint was taken serious and given space in the thesis. Off cause I have viewpoints and emotions on/for Slussen but when doing the interviews I sometimes felt like a chameleon: I felt I understood how the interviewees felt; I saw what they saw and I hope that this can be recognized in the thesis, even though it probably has affected the results.

The professionals are not given anonymity; it was not possible. Everyone knows everyone in the Slussen case, I think. This can be a disadvantage because people speak more freely when they are anonymous, but I have to think that my interviewees speak the truth even though I sometimes got the feeling of politically correct answers, because this is a politic game. One of the interviewees has a background as a political officer and is a politician in his spare time He answered in another way because he did not work at the City Hall anymore. He is shifting political party so he thought it was easy to answer my questions. He felt he had no obligations toward his political party or the city hall. (Interview, Dennis) Perhaps I would have gotten different answers if I had made a questionnaire and involved more people so I could have given them anonymity.

I also wanted to interview more politicians but they did not have time to answer me, except Sten Nordin who as explained earlier answered by email. His answer was however very “political correct” mostly containing information about Slussen I already knew but I see his mail as an example of an answer at the political level. Therefore it can be hard to draw strong conclusions from their answers but I will make conclusions after all.

The gender distribution is not balanced. I had trouble finding women who was in favor of the new proposal and that is why I only interviewed men in favor of a new Slussen. I contacted a woman I found at the internet, but she never returned my mail, so I know women in favor of a new Slussen exist, I just did not get any contact with them. Whether the result is affected by an unbalanced gender distribution is hard to tell, but I am aware of it. I rather not start a discussion on how women are a more emotional than men because I find this stereotypical.

I have not read all the binders and all the 1200 viewpoints, but relied on the plan architect I interviewed. He put together a summery and categorized the viewpoints. There is however always risks when doing a summary of that big amount of material. When he and his colleagues did the categorizing they did a quantitative categorizing where they counted how many viewpoints they received in the categories they saw in the material. I am not sure this will affect my results as this is not a quantitative analysis but a qualitative.

The internet is a quick way to find material because it feels unlimited. The problem to be aware of is that it is very time consuming. It is so easy to be click your way from one page to another and thereby finding other interesting angles so you forget what you are searching for in the first place. I also experienced to find interesting and relevant articles by accident and that did not feel good. What if I have missed other relevant material? But due to time and space limits I had to say Stop and the material I have now, is the right material.
The theoretical and historical context

Emotions
According to Martha Nussbaum feelings are not only something that is connected with the psychological part of the human being. She finds them connected to how people reason as well (Nussbaum 2001, p 3). Emotions are in her view some sort of judgments: we judge and choose the things we have emotions for, the things that matters and are important to us and therefore we do not have emotions for things that are insignificant to us (Nussbaum 2001, p 19). Emotions are personal and individual because different people believe different things matter. They link us together with things we find important but which we do not have full control of (Nussbaum 2001, p 43). Emotions affect what goals and projects we have in life, because we want to live a good life (Nussbaum 2001, p 49). And when we give things value we often expect this aspect to have the same value for other and this can cause conflicts. (Nussbaum 2001, p 50)

Goodwin and Jasper have a sociological approach to emotions when they explain and describe the connection between emotions and protests. They argue that many kinds of emotions infuse political action (Goodwin & Jasper 2006, p 611) and describe how scholars (and others) have viewed emotions over time. One perspective was (or perhaps still is) a way to look at emotions as something irrational. When discussing emotions and protests, institutions were seen as calmly reasonable, while crowds were seen as emotional and irrational. Crowds were seen as center of protest movements so therefore this theory (on crowds) was important. This perspective on protesters later changed so that activists (as they now were called) were seen as rational and not emotional.

The scholars did not believe emotions and rationality could coexist; they wanted to prove the protesters being rational (so that they could be taken seriously) by refusing that emotions matter. (Goodwin & Jasper 2006, p 615) By doing so Goodwin and Jasper argue that the scholars “missed powerful springs of collective action” (Goodwin & Jasper 2006, p 616) and point at Gamson who they believe put emotions back on the agenda when he found that many protests were caused by “the righteous anger that puts fire in the belly and iron in the soul.” (Gamson 1992 in Goodwin and Jasper 2006, p 617). Gamson furthermore argues that emotions such as suspicion and anger are the forerunner to blame which is more visible in protests. (Goodwin & Jasper 2006, p 617)

Emotions can also be neglected in other ways if they are not taken seriously by other actors in the debate or conflict, the authors argue. Bitterness, emotionality and sentimentality can be interpreted as being “too much” and therefore it is okay not to take them seriously. (Gamson 1992 in Goodwin and Jasper 2006, p 618) Therefore activists must try to use “active” emotions such as anger, outrage, indignation and pride which encourage action instead of deactivating emotions such as shame, resignation and depression. (Goodwin and Jasper 2006, p 619)

Furthermore emotions can help social movements to build identity. The group can use their negative feelings about the opponents to create a “we” and a “them” feeling and thereby creating a stronger group identity. (Goodwin & Jasper 2006, p 623)

Jasper argues in another text “The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and around Social Movements” (1998) that recent researchers have been
viewing protesters, who are emotional as irrational (Jasper 1998, p 398). Emotions were thought of as something that sometimes could deceive us and act against our intentions so that we would act less effective. Jasper claims that cognitive mistakes are made as easy as emotional ones. We make mistakes with or without emotions involved. (Jasper 1998, p 400)

Instead contemporary sociological perspective on emotions sees them (the emotions) as culturally constructed and not as something irrational and uncontrollable. If emotions are collectively shaped, context dependent and based on cognitions, Jasper cannot see anything irrational about them (Jasper 1998, p 403) and argues that "emotions give ideas, ideologies, and identities and even interests their power to motivate." (Jasper 1998, p 420)

Even though not 100 % controlled they are formed through social interaction with other people. They are not merely something that follows our desires and what we want in life. Instead emotions form them, and affect "our ideas, identities and interests". (Jasper 1998, p 399) We have feelings about everything, Jasper explains. Even things we do not believe we have feelings for, we have feelings for. Temporary feelings are also a part of our lives. He argues that there would not be any social movements without emotions. (Jasper 1998, p 405) Furthermore they are crucial for protests. The organizers and participants build their protest on emotions: fear, outrage, love etc and in the end actions are never based on emotions alone. (Jasper 1998, p 420)

One of the reasons to why people join social movements is due “moral shocks”, which is caused by information or event which again cause a strong feeling of outrage in a person and she/he is motivated to political action. It makes the person think about what values she/he treasures. Still some people do not protest because they believe that it is useless, that governments and corporations do not give in for civic protests while others use their fear and anger to show their indignation through political action. (Jasper 1998, p 409) In their case they need to blame someone and therefore injustice can be seen as a strong motivator for protests.

Still Jasper believes many (including social scientists) believe emotions are irrational – the opposite of rationality (Jasper 1998, p 409) and the more negative emotions (such as fear and anger in opposite to i.e. joy) are, the more irrational they are believed to be (Jasper 1998, p 408).

A third text of Jasper may be helpful for the understanding of emotions. He argues in his text “Emotions and the Microfoundations of Politics: Rethinking ends and means” that it is necessary to distinguish between different types of emotion. Some types are more physiological and others more cultural dependent. (Jasper 2006, p 16)

The first category he outlines is urges which can be seen as physical impulses such as hunger, thirst, lust fatigue etc. (Jasper 2006, p 16) but often they have little relevance to politics.
*Reflex emotions* such as anger, fear, joy, sadness, disgust and contempt are also mostly physical related and emerge quickly but will also disappear quickly. (Jasper 2006, p 16) Anger is probably the only emotion which is important for politics in this category, when the opponent provoke the others so (s)he reacts with anger and make mistakes. (Jasper 2006, p 16) this can be seen as manipulation, if done deliberately.

*Affects* are seen as more long-lasting and are seen as having a stronger tie to cognitions than urges and reflexes have. (Jasper 2006, p 16) They can be seen as positive or negative. For example love and hate, trust and suspicion. Affects are important for the maintenance of collective identities because they include the solidarity we feel for our own group and the negative emotions we might feel for the outsiders.

*Moods* are different from other emotions. They are often a permanent part of our personality or temperament and it can be difficult to say whether they are relevant for politics or not.

Last category consists of *moral emotions* such as “compassion, outrage, forms of disgust, fear and anger”. (Jasper 2006, p 17) These emotions are connected to aspects of life we reflect on; we can feel fear when a car rushes toward us, because we fear being overrun by it, but fear as a moral emotion can be based on our fear for what will happen if the municipality decides to dump dangerous waste dump in our area. (Jasper 2006, p 17) Moral emotions can also be connected to the values we have in life.

The different categories have different importance to how we act and how we pursue our goals in life. Some emotions can be seen as goals in themselves, while others affect what we want to obtain in the particular situation. Moral emotions may be most important to political action and for example protests when we feel pride in doing the right thing.

**Humanistic and rationalistic perspective on planning**

Conflicts are not only between citizens and authorities. Different groups of citizens can also go into conflicts with each other. One conflict between citizens relevant for this thesis is the discussion on whether to preserve or to demolish and build new. This is not just relevant in the Slussen case but can be seen as relevant to many development projects throughout the city. The two approaches to urban planning have by some scholars been called “humanistic” and “rationalistic” approach.

Lennart Thorslund investigates in his dissertation written in 1995 how the two attitudes (humanism and rationalism) affect the planning in Mora during the period 1890 to 1974. He describes and analyzes the two concept with starting point in Francoise Choay’s book: “The modern City: planning in the 19th Century” written in 1968. Choay uses the two concepts “Progressism” and “Culturalism” and they are renamed by the Swedish architectural historian Björn Linn to “Rationalism” and “Humanism”, the terms Thorslund uses in his dissertation.

Thorslund explains how the two approaches came up. According to him it had to do with the changes in society when the industrial society developed in the last part of the 19th century. (Thorslund 1995, p 30) He explains how people, due to the conditions in the cities (misery and bad living-conditions in the cities), got interested in the future and in describing the future as utopias. Especially two narratives have been important:
Edward Bellamy: “Looking Backwards” (1887) and William Morris: “News from nowhere” (1890). Both narratives describe a world 100 years later; a world much better than the world the reader was living in. Bellamy focused on efficiency and organization while Morris’ focus was on the meaning of the habitat. (Thorslund 1995, p 31) The two approaches take turn in being dominant in urban planning through the 20th century.

With the help of different scholars he discusses and gives an account for the two approaches: (Thorslund 1995, p 41ff)

**The rational approach**
The people having a rational approach to planning believe in technological rationality and reason. Values can be quantified. They have a strong belief in the future and their view on planning is progressive. They want to develop the society and have a vision of social improvement and equality. To reach their goal they argue that the process has to be standardized to be efficient. They look at their opponents as people without a vision and sees, as Max Weber sees it, the rationalizing process as a modernizing process. That means those who criticize the rationalizing process also criticize the modernizing process (Thorslund 1995, p 64).

**The humanistic approach**
The people believing in a humanistic approach to planning focus on intuition, emotions and on immaterial values. They believe in tradition and have a more nostalgic and retrospective view on society than the rationalistic. They are inspired by a vision of the cultural society, a city before the industrialism and protest against the industrial society’s industrial production and standardization.

Thorslund concludes that rationalism is not wrong but wishes more space are given for the humanistic approach in planning. (Thorslund 1995, p 353) He argues the local decision-makers must take responsibility for how the physical environment is shaped by asking “value-rational” question such as “Is this (a) god (decision) and in that case: for whom is it god?” (Thorslund 1995, p 353)

**The historical Stockholm context**
Nussbaum argues that because we expect other people to have the same goals, emotions and values as we do, conflicts can come up. So when wanting to understand the emotions and engagement appearing in the Slussen project, I find it necessary to look at how Stockholm has developed as a city because the people involved in Slussen are affected by the conflicts that followed this development. There is for example an ongoing discussion whether Slussen is a contemporary “Almstrid” (Elm battle) or not (see i.e. Lars Epstein’s blog on DN, April 8, 2010) and therefore it is useful to put Slussen in a historical city rebuilding context.

Ulf Stahre gives a good picture on this topic in his dissertation: “The alternative city. The rebuilding of Stockholm and the neighborhood movement” (Stahre, 1999). He describes how this rebuilding with its peak in the 1950’s and 1960’s resulted in protests and the forming of social movements as a reaction against the rebuilding.

Stahre describes a Stockholm undergoing a transformation beginning with the Stockholm exhibition in 1930, where the functionalism became the way to build a city. He describes the politician’s dream of a modern Sweden, where Stockholm becomes a
big city, a metropolis and not just a provincial city. It is a dream, a promise of a better world with better living standard and many jobs. The demolition of the Klara district, the Norrmalm regulation in the center of the city had a big significance. It was one of the greatest urban development projects in Sweden and the preparation took nearly 20 years while the implementation nearly 30 years. (Stahre 1999, p 34)

The modern Stockholm also had a great confidence/belief in the cars and therefore big projects such as the rebuilding of Slussen finished in 1935, the building of the bridges Tranebergsbron finished in 1934 and Västerbron finished in 1935 can be seen as “widely visible monuments in steel and concrete of the modern time.” (Stahre 1999, p 42)

But there were critical voices as well and the more they tore down the more intense became the voices. At first those who went against the rebuilding/the development were seen as conservative and old-fashioned (Stahre, p 61) and not many protested. Not until the beginning of 1960’s the critique became stronger where many prominent people urged the politicians and the planners to respect the existing urban environment and to gently rebuild the city (Stahre, p 64). Stahre though, asks the question: how critical against the rebuilding was the entire population in Stockholm? The voices heard belonged to the elite of the politics, industry and culture (Stahre, p 65). In the end of the 1960’s it became more common to question the authorities and to protest against things seen as unfair and the social movements who questioned the existing order in the society grew in number, not only in Sweden but in the western world as a whole. In Stockholm the neighborhood movement (byalagsrörelsen) appeared during 1968 and was based on critique against city development, on a search for community feeling and on anti-commercialism (Stahre, p 72). The next 10-15 years the different neighborhood movement groups were involved in different debates concerning different aspects in the society. For example one group got involved in building a playground in Vasaparken while another group prevented a planned broadening of Karlbergsvägen in Vasastan, which would have transformed the road to a busy traffic route. The group affected the politicians by petitions, articles in the newspapers and official letters to the committee in charge. (Stahre, p 75) Other groups prevented the demolition of the block Mullvaden in Södermalm by occupying it. But not every battle was won. Kungsholmens byalag could i.e. not prevent the new police house from being built.

The most famous conflict from this period must be the Elm Battle (Almstriden) and concerned the felling of 13 elms in Kungsträdgården in Stockholm in 1971, when building a new subway station. This conflict got symbolic significance for urban planning in Stockholm where “… the life of the trees and the greenness of the city were set against the modern city’s shiny but sterile steel and concrete… The parliamentary democracy against the parliament of the street. Many years of discontent with the rebuilding of the city found its outlet.”( Stahre, p 88) The citizens exercised civil disobedience preventing the municipality to fell the elms by chaining themselves to the trees. Thousands of citizens gathered in the area very quickly due to a phone chain the neighborhood movement had arranged and at first there were violent encounters between the citizens and the police. Later in the conflict the atmosphere changed and became more peaceful; more like a festival where musicians performed and speeches were held. (Stahre, p 89)
Emotions, engagement and participation
You can say that discussion of emotions exist in three different areas of the field. First we have emotions for the place which I see as the base. Then there is the link to the build environment Werner and Nordström discuss where they argue that people are affected by and relates to the build environment, the architecture and the surroundings. Finally there is the discussion on how emotions are visible/are handled in the planning process. Here Hoch and Nussbaum discuss how to take emotions in planning serious. In this discussion we also find the discussion about the concept NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) where i.e. Burningham argues that we need to stop using the concept and take those who complain serious.

Attachment to the place – emotions for place
If we have emotions for a place, we are more likely to get engaged than if we do not have any emotions for the place. Hayden, Cass & Walker and Ekman discuss why we feel attached to a place.

Ann-Kristin Ekman discusses local consciousness and sense of place. She claims that through local consciousness people relate to the world we live in. The place contributes to our identity. The longer we stay at a place and the more we know about the history of the place, the stronger the identity becomes. An identity we can share with others who live in the same place. But you do not need to be born in a place to feel you belong to the place, she continues, the feeling of belonging somewhere is dependent of how you experience the locale culture. (Ekman 1994, p 162-164)

But she stresses, it is important to remember that culture is not static. Local culture has to be put in a context of the world we live in. It is affected by the interplay between the different levels: local, national and international. (Ekman 1994, p 162-164)

Cass and Walker also stress the importance of place attachment and have the same perspective on the emotional link that grows between an individual and a place when the individual lives there for a long time. They argue the link can be damaged and disrupted if the place is changed and can lead to anxiety and grief (Cass and Walker 2009, p 63). Other social psychological literature concludes that people feel their identity being threatened when a place is changed and react with negative emotional responses. This can lead to both individual and collective actions in order to cope with the perceived threat. (Cass and Walker 2009, p 63) Their conclusion is that it is easy to dismiss those who produce the emotions. Emotional responses are seen as undesired in the decision-making process while i.e. scientific and economic rationalities are welcomed and given power. (Cass and Walker 2009, p 64) There is a need for acknowledgement and respect of emotions to take the debate at a higher level. (Cass and Walker 2009, p 68)

Dolores Hayden also discusses the importance of memory; more specific public memory. Her book “The Power of Place” is inspired by her foundation of the organization by the same name in 1984 where her aim was to put focus on women’s history and ethnic history in public place. (Hayden 1995, p xi) She wants the reader to understand the urban cultural landscape. (Hayden 1995, p xii)
In The Power of Place she discusses how identity is connected to both our individual memory but also memories we share with others. (Hayden 1995, p 9) She believes that public space can help us strengthen our identity and the urban landscape is important in this process because of its continuity in our life; it is something that exists for many generations. She claims that “significant public memory” is lost when areas are “bulldozed” or when they “meet the wrecking ball” (Hayden 1995, p 5).

But if we want to preserve a part of an urban landscape we also need to discuss the meaning of this particular landscape, Hayden argues. It is necessary to discuss whose memories we want to protect and preserve because otherwise it often becomes the memories of the majority and not the minority we remember (Hayden 1995, p 13). Hayden argues that there for example has been a neglect of ethnic history and asks where the Native American, the African American, Latino and Asian American Landmarks are! (Hayden 1995, p 7)

Hayden agrees with Yi-Fu Tuan that our sense of place both are related to a biological response to the physical environment as well as it is a cultural product. (Hayden 1995, p 16)

She claims many people have a strange relationship to history. She speaks of “dates memorized” and “boring stuff learned in school”. Many people think of history as something dead and not as a part of us. But if our own social history is preserved in the urban landscapes we might have a different relationship to the past, Hayden argues. (Hayden 1995, p 46)

**Reactions on the build environment**

Karla Werner explains that people with what she sees as a “humanistic way of thinking” reflect more than others over what they see. Thereby they get into a dialogue with the object observed. This perspective leads to a bigger interest in the soul of the city and they explain and express their opinions about it in a very personal way. They see the city as a part of themselves. Another important aspect for Werner is how a “magic place” only will reveal itself for those who search for the same qualities in life as the place can offer. When relating to a place like that the observer will then feel a connection to the place and a feeling of acknowledgement as an individual. On the other hand she argues that if a place does not give the opportunity to recognition for the individual it will be rejected as hollow and meaningless. (Werner, p 25-29)

Maria Nordström argues that it is our experience of the place that makes the architecture and the surroundings meaningful. (Nordström 1994, p 187) People use complex descriptions of the places where they live and it is those descriptions the planners have to relate to in order to understand how people experience their neighborhood and their surroundings. (Nordström 1994, p 188) A hindrance for the professionals who wish to understand the layman’s view on a place can according to Nordström be the way the two different groups relate to the place. The professionals often have a more analytic relation to the place, where they focus on for example the visual part (the architect) while the people living in the place relates to it through activities experienced there. (Nordström 1994, p 189) When we find a place to be significant for us it often has to do with our emotional memory of it because we interpret our surroundings through
memories infused with emotions. (Nordström 1994, p 194) This can again be tied to our identity. (Nordström 1994, p 195)

**Anger and distrust**
Not all engagement and emotions are based on the relationship to Slussen as a place in the urban landscape. There is also anger and disbelief directed towards the politicians’ and planners’ decisions and towards the way they have presented the proposal. Here the theory by Charles Hoch and Nussbaum might be helpful.

In planning Charles Hoch has seen Nussbaum (Nussbaum 2001) as relevant when discussing how we make judgments and highlights four important qualities of emotions according to her (Hoch 2006, p 373):

1. *Emotions do not push, but pull us. They direct our attention to objects.*
   Hoch argues that emotions can change. People can react with fear to plans due uncertainties to the consequences but claims that emotions can change if they are briefed more thoroughly about the consequences. He also argues that we are affected by previous planning experiences and the emotions we had earlier on, so that we build our emotions on previous emotions and affect how we perceive the present plans.

2. *Emotions engage us intentionally.*
   Emotions make us interpret the object/situation and accompany human thoughts. Cognitive judgments co work with emotions.

3. *The emotions shape how we think about the world.*
   If our emotions change our belief are likely to change with it. Hoch argues that people has to feel “a sense of ownership or possession” before they will accept a plan. It is not enough to understand the plan with the mind. He uses Leoni Sandercock as an example on how to use stories to create compassion for people being different than ourselves because we get an understanding for their situation. (Hoch 2006, p 373)

4. *The intentional beliefs that inform emotions find value in objects.*
   Hoch explains that citizen participation in his eyes is not only a way to secure equality or “fairness”; it is also a way to make people understand the meaning of the plans and thereby making people get feelings for them. (Hoch 2006, p 373-375). The conclusion is we need to provide both cognitive and emotional understanding to plans (Hoch 2006, p 375), and argues that instead of trying to escape emotions, which we cannot he argues, it is better to understand how they shape expectations and judgments. (Hoch 2006, p 378)

**NIMBY**
But seeing the others as outsiders is not the only strategy people use when they want to dismiss other people’s arguments in order to put focus on their own arguments.

First time the acronym NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) was used was probably in the 1980’s (even though the behavior in focus is older). Nicholas Ridley, the Secretary of State for the Environment in England used the term in the nuclear debate to describe
protests and protestor as “Selfish and irrational” In that way he could dismiss their opposition (Welsh 1993, p 16).

The definitions are many. In the Welsh’ article the definition of NIMBY is a small group who in a selfish protest try to stop “the interests of the greater good.” (Welsh 1993, p 16) Often the acronym is related to unpopular project in a local area and often associated with people’s prejudices and discrimination (Dear 1992, p 289). The projects can for example be prisons, treatment homes for drug addicts, windmills, atomic waste and so on. Their motive can be fear of declining property values, personal security and loss of neighborhood green areas (Dear 1990 in Dear 1992, p 290).

But using the acronym NIMBY is not without problems. Many authors have started to question the use because it is an easy way to label people who protest and to dismiss people and their arguments without even listen to them.

Kate Burningham argues those who are interested in conflicts and the dynamics involved, should not use the term NIMBY. (Burningham 2000, p 55) She argues that those involved in a conflict use different strategies to position themselves in the conflict so they seem more “credible, robust and convincing” than other actors in the dispute. (Burningham 2000, p 55) Labeling another group or individual as NIMBY can be used to weaken or undermining them as opponents by i.e. pointing at their personal interests in the plans (Burningham 2000, p 64). While doing that they are well aware of the impact it can have on the outcome of the conflict.

With “Freudenberg & Pastor (1992) as a base for finding an explanation to the underlying reasons for local protest, she gives a guide to three different perspectives on NIMBY’s:

The first sees NIMBY’s as ignorant and irrational who cannot see the difference between the real risks linked to the new developments and the risks they themselves asses to these risks. Therefore the NIMBY’s are seen as not getting facts right and has to be educated or simply just overruled. Their believes are out of proportion to what is the planners’ and the decision makers believes. The group is seen as a problem as they are regarded as having little or incorrect knowledge. The critiques of this perspective is that the people actually can analyze and understand complex information if they find it relevant. Otherwise they tend to ignore information from people they do not trust. (Burningham 2000, p 55-57)

The second perspective sees NIMBY’s as people responding due selfish motives. Their arguments and protests are seen as less important than of those who base their protest on wider social and environmental grounds. (Burningham 2000, p 56) One critic of this perspective is that not only the NIMBY’s have an interest in the dispute: Every actor in the dispute most likely have an interest of their own. (Burningham 2000, p 57)

Third and last perspective sees the NIMBY’s as “prudent”, as a part of the public which has an ability to see the wider perspective of the problem than the planning experts can. The public actively gather information which often contradicts with the experts’ information but shows to be correct in the end. (Burningham 2000, p 57)
Even though diverse perspectives can be put on the NIMBY concept the author argues that NIMBY’s has become synonymous with limited, selfish and irrational actors. Instead she sees people with good and often comprehensive arguments for complaining and wants the people involved in local development to go past the NIMBY concept in search for reasons for protests. (Burningham 2000, p 58) Instead she believes the protest can be based on distrust in the decision makers because citizen participation is ignored in the planning process (Burningham 2000, p 59).

The way the planning process is conducted can also influence how citizens react. If there i.e. are no room for citizen participation before the plan is implemented the response will often be of reactive or protesting kind. (Burningham 2000, p 59)

Using the concept NIMBY for one group of protesters and not for another group can also be problematic: it is value judgment and legitimates one protest and dismiss another. (Burningham 2000, p 60) This causes people complaining or protesting to be aware of the NIMBY concept and forces them to try to avoid using arguments implying they are a part of the NIMBY’s. They will i.e. use arguments focusing on i.e. the whole community instead of single individuals (Burningham 2000, p 62).

The author concludes the article by recommending avoiding the “language of NIMBY” as the result otherwise can be that the group called NIMBY will feel excluded and offended. (Burningham 2000, p 66)

So you can say the academic NIMBY discussion have gone from having a focus on those who discriminated the “unwanted”, whether it was people or buildings, where NIMBY’ism was something to avoid to instead looking at NIMBY’s as someone to take in consideration in the conflict.

**Triangle of engagement**

John May finds in his article “Ladders, stars and triangles. Old and new theory for the practice of public participation” it important to recognize that there is a power dimension in public participation but it has changed through the years. He finds Arnstein’s ladder (see below for explanation) “makes this power dimension explicit.” (May 2006, 307). Furthermore he finds the ladder helpful when explaining who some citizens get frustrated and disillusioned when believing they have more power than they do. (May 2006, p 309)

In his article he wants to base a new theory on the perspective of the participants instead of the practitioner’s (May 2006, p 305). He argues that there are many evidence of the public wanting to participate and “make their voice heard.” (May 2006, p 306) Citizens are interested in issues that are affecting them (May 2006, p 305) but get frustrated and disillusioned when they discover they do not have the power they believe they have. Often it is so that citizens believe they are at a higher level of participation than the decision makers believes or allow them to be, he argues.( May 2006, p 310)

But citizens’ engagement is not problematic. There is a catch 22: It is okay to be engaged in public matters if you are “ordinary” but people who are showing a high degree of engagement are often seen as “extraordinary” and therefore they are dismissed and it is not necessary to listen to them. (May 2006, p 314) Due to a strong believe in quantitative research and in the hypothesis that only a large number of people can give
the true picture about how the rest of the population thinks, the people who engage themselves in public matter are not seen as representative, because they are often just a little group. May argues that this perspective is wrong; qualitative arguments have to be considered as well as quantitative in the discussion on participation. He argues that the “usual suspects’ most important features are: Number and engagement: few in number and a high degree of engagement. This can be seen as an opposing the rest of the population: High numbers and little engagement. (May 2006, 314)

Based on the participating citizens and their engagement he forms a theory: “A triangle of engagement:

1. “Establishment” which is the highest degree of engagement. Here we only find few people. Citizens who are local Councilors, members of non-profit organizations.
2. “Office holder”. Members of community groups, interests groups (both locality and non-locality based) who are also a member of the board, committee or similar.
3. Activists. The same as “office holder” but without being a member of the board, committee etc.
4. Semi-regular: People who attend to more than one event concerning the matter or make their voice heard more than once.
5. Ad hoc: The majority of the population. Those who engage themselves in a matter whenever they feel it is sufficient important for them. Some of them follow the debate on the matter.

The triangle is not hierarchical and can be seen as establishment being a better form of engagement than for example “Ad hoc”. The triangle is merely a picture of the few people engaging themselves in the “establishment” while many more can be found at the bottom in “ad hoc”. (May 2006, p 316) The triangle also shows how demands on time and energy used are higher at the top than at the bottom of the triangle. (May 2006, p 314)

May wants with the triangle of engagement to support the “usual suspects” by dismissing the people who say that the majority’s voice is not heard because of a loud group of engaged people. May simply argues that the majority’s voice does not exist. They have other things to do than to engage themselves in public matters. (May 2006, p 317)

His conclusion is that instead of turning their back on the “usual suspects” (those who always engage themselves in planning etc.), planners should embrace this engagement and give them the guidance and education they need (May 2006, p 317).

Citizen participation

Sherry Arnstein writes in her classic text “A Ladder Of Citizen Participation” written in 1969 that citizen participation equals citizen power. (Arnstein 2007, p 235) She finds citizen participation as a way to redistribute power to the “have-not” citizens so they too can share the benefits in society. (Arnstein 2007, p 235) But she also recognizes that the procedure sometimes can be a fraud in the meaning that the citizens are not given any real power. Those with the real power i.e. the municipality and building companies only give a pretence of redistributing power so they can claim that all sides have been
considered. (Arnstein 2007, p 235) she guides the reader through eight levels of participation, which she has arranged as a ladder where each level is a rung of the ladder.

The first two levels: Manipulation and Therapy she labels “nonparticipation”, the next three levels: informing, Consultation and Placation she calls “Tokenism” and the three levels at the top: Partnership, Delegated Power and citizen control, she calls “Citizen Power”.

1. Manipulation

Here meetings with the purpose of educating citizens belong. It is a one way communication going from the planners to the citizens not the other way around. Arnstein sees “manipulative agendas” behind this kind of participation because the aim is to get public support for the proposal in question. The decisions have been made, no one ask whether i.e. a multiservice center is needed in the area. One thing Arnstein hopes for is that those participating in this kind of meetings or committees have learned to recognize this kind of non-participation so they will be more critical next time.

2. Therapy

This kind of non-participation is seen by Arnstein as both dishonest and arrogant (Arnstein 2007, 237). The purpose is to treat the illnesses the decision makers see related to being poor or powerless. “Control your child” campaigns or Clean up the area-campaigns are common here. The citizens are given help to adjust into the society. (Arnstein 2007, p 238)

3. Informing

Here Arnstein finds the first step towards real citizen participation. Citizens are being informed about the matter. Often in the late stages in the planning process and with no possibility to give feedback or to negotiate. No other options are presented. The citizens’ only option is to accept the information.

4. Consultation

Besides informing the citizens they also are invited to contribute with their opinions at this level. They have “participated in participation” (Arnstein 2007, p 238) because there is no guarantee that the decision makers will take their opinions into consideration. The danger with citizen participation on this level can be that citizens will be disillusioned because they never see any result of their suggestions or opinions, Arnstein claims.

5. Placation

Now on this level citizen will begin to feel they have some degree of influence even though it still might be symbolic. The haves-nots can be put in committees and or seminars but still being in minority so they can be out-voted. This means they are not given much power.
6. Partnership

On this level negotiation actually takes place between citizens and decision makers. Most power the citizens have when they have financial resources to pay their leaders salary for their effort and if they can hire experts (technicians, lawyers etc) of their own, so they “can enter the City Hall with hat on head instead of in hand.” (Arnstein 2007, p 241)

7. Delegated Power

The decision makers need at this level to bargain or to negotiate. They no longer have majority. Citizens have seats in committees where they have majority and these committees negotiate with the decision makers.

8. Citizen control

At the last level citizens are in full control. They are given the administrative power. They are in charge of the financial funds with no “guardian” to watch over them.
What the methods gave me

Emotions for Slussen as place
In the Slussen case there are many examples of attachment to Slussen as a place. Birgitta has strong feelings for the place “Slussen is like a big living room. It is for everybody. It is the soul of Stockholm with a divine view.” she explains and continues: “The city is a part of me. The public space is a part of my life. I have a relationship to the entire Stockholm and I react very strongly if someone destroys something. That is why I care”. (Interview, Birgitta) Others see the place as connected to cultural values when they write:

“It moves us deep in our hearts, where we keep the literature from Bellman, Strindberg, Fogelström and Rådström, Slas and Ernst Brunner. The list of authors and artists who have characterized our experience of the space above Slussen is long. A person who an early summer morning has seen the sun rise and illuminate Södra berget, knows how important this place is.”(Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 11)

They see Slussen as a part of Stockholm and as a part of their identity as a Stockholmer. The divine view and the cultural roots are features they are proud of and like having as a part of their identity. Hayden would probably argue that Slussen is important for the strengthening of their identity (Hayden 1995, p 9) because it is a place where they can build memories with others. Remember Birgitta’s words “it is for everybody”. When rebuilding Slussen from scratch important public memory will be lost some might argue.

Others who have written a statement to the municipality emphasize that their family have been living in Stockholm for generations. I.e. “I, as an eight generation Stockholmer will have one more thing to be ashamed of when I cross Slussen if this proposal goes through.” (Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 10) This can be seen in the context of both Cass and Walker and Ekman where they argue that the longer a person lives in a place the stronger the identity. (Cass and Walker 2009, p 63 and Ekman 1994, p 163) Even the emotional link to the place is damaged when Slussen is rebuild (Cass and Walker 2009, p 63).

Another Stockholmer stating she grew up in Södermalm in the 1940’s declares:”After seeing the exhibition and the height of all the buildings I almost felt affected physically. It was like a nightmare… A disappointed Stockholmer.” (Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 13)This woman both relates her viewpoint to her physical wellbeing and her historical background as growing up in Södermalm.

Elias who is an urban tour guide builds a part of his identity on historical bricks and on personal memories, but he also sees the necessity of change when a city develops and explains his engagement in Slussen as a part of his interest for urban planning: “Changes has always been interesting… things have to change but not too fast. You always have to have some something that points back to the past and that goes for urban planning as well I think… I used to live in the area for many years and I have many personal memories.” At the touring interview he shows me places as if he was doing his tour and pointed and explained: “Here this new building will be” etc. He suddenly points at some railway tracks and says “I want to put a preservation order (k-märka) on
them. Even though it is just some rusty tracks, they have a value… the history about human life is to know your kinship. If a little boy in 2030 sees these tracks he might start wonder why they are there and get an interest in Stockholm’s history.” Maybe a way to change the child’s view on history as Hayden claims the urban landscape can contribute to. (Hayden 1995, p 46)

Anna explains her engagement that she met some “old people and they were very sad about the Slussen situation and I didn’t even know what happened there… and I had never thought of Slussen like that. I never go beyond Stadsmuseet I only went Götgatsbacken like many other in Stockholm. I was just touched by their sadness; they said there is nothing to be done.” She got involved because she believed she could help them. She explains to me that she never felt any love for Stockholm and before the city was not a part of her identity: “I felt like many others: “okay now they tear this down, I really don’t care”… I cannot affect it. But then I thought: “if I have to live here, then I have to (care), now I am here and I have been here a very long time.” So Slussen became a symbol for me where I put my foot down.” (interview, Anna) The way she relates to Slussen is an example of how the feeling of belonging to a place grew from her meeting with people (a local culture) who cared for Slussen. (Ekman 1994, p 163)

Birgitta reflects on being a Stockholmer:””Maybe the Stockholmers have a very special relationship to their city or maybe they don’t. It is one of the most beautiful cities you ever seen. It is a great part of your life. Deeply personal. The city is a part of me. The urban space is a part of my life. (Interview, Birgitta) Just as Cass and Walker describes (Cass and Walker 2009, p 63) it seems as if she sees her Stockholm identity threatened by the rebuilding of Slussen and she reacts with anger.

I would even argue that those who want to tear down Slussen and build a new one relate to the place’s history. They just relate to a part of the history they do not find worth preserving or remembering. Hayden also finds it important to discuss whose memories we want to preserve but I think this aspect of memories could have been problematized more. (Hayden 1995, p 13) YIMBY and others of the interviewees longing for Slussen to be torn down cannot see the view’s qualities nor do they relate to Slussen through a literary or a historical legacy, but they also relate to the place. “Those protesting today grew up with Slussen, only few people remember when they build it. People do not see the connection between the demolition of Klara (Klararivningarna) and Slussen because Second World War came in between. They [those who want to preserve Slussen] argue:”To tear down Slussen is like tearing down Klara”. Yes! – Slussen was the first step… We need to dismantle the motorway intersection and begin building streets.” (interview, YIMBY) They see Slussen as a symbol of a time where the city was planned foremost for cars and of cause they want to build a new Slussen because they (in their network) fight for more space for pedestrians and bicycles and less space for cars in the urban landscape. They cannot recognize the place as the kind of urban landscape they fight for. (Werner 1994, p 29)

Jan comments on what he calls the “conservation wills”: “It is a bit sad; the city is not reserved for those who have lived here all their life. It is a city for all Stockholmers, even those who have lived here for 30 years and for those who have lived here for two days. (Interview, Jan) In some way he feels rejected by those who have lived here a big part of their life and wants to question this by arguing that the city is for all and that it is
a “living organism”. (Interview, Jan) Just as Ekman stresses when she argues that culture is not static (Ekman 1994, p 163).

Even the view is mentioned by those in favor of a new Slussen but not as something positive: “The view? I think the view mostly consists of different bridges in concrete and other things lying in the way for a view (laughter). I have not quite understood which view it is they want to preserve.” (Interview, Dennis) Nor Kalle thinks the view is worth saving. He states in his email viewpoint I found in one of the binders: “…Regarding the latest debate in DN: If you want a view over Stockholm then go to Mosebacke, or walk Monteliusvägen for fantastic views over Stockholm. The view from Södermalmstorg is pathetic in this context. Good proposal. Build immediately. Living on Södermalm” (Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 10) The view has become a symbol for Slussen; for better or worse. It is seen as something fantastic, as something that brings joy and it is seen as something pathetic; something exaggerated.

More than a traffic junction?
Some people can relate to a place so that they see it as magic (Werner 1994, p 27) while other do not. A person writing to the Exploaterings department states: “why don’t I see what the architects see when look at this for Stockholm so catastrophical proposal?” (Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 12) She actually is aware of the fact that people can see things differently as Werner states (Werner 1994, p 25-29) But it can also be seen as an example of the difference between the professional architect and the layman as Nordström argues (Nordström 1994, p 189) where the writer claims to see other qualities in Slussen as the architects. She claims that they are mistaken when they made their proposal and she furthermore believes the rest of Stockholm agrees with her. (Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 12)

Even those who see Slussen as a “magic place” can disagree on what it is that makes the place magic. Fredrik is approximately 80 years has been living in Gamla Stan for over 40 years. His interview differs from the other interviews as he mostly talks about the esthetics at Slussen. He starts the interview by explaining to me how important it is to understand the vault of heaven. He explains and draws on paper at the same time to explain to me. When doing our walk, he points at lines and at the sky. “This is what I have been talking about… Notice the sky. If you did not have the tunnels, you would not notice the volume of the sky” (interview, Fredrik) But even though he is very focused on the esthetics he still argues that those who want to preserve the view are wrong: “This is what is important: the traffic solution and then everything else comes after that.” He explains how the different flows work here: The water flow, the people’s flow and the flow of the cars. Slussen is foremost designed for pedestrians. Then the cars, he explains: “He [the architect] has started out from the pedestrians’ rhythm not the cars’ and that is very clear.” (interview Fredrik)

But that is not clear to everybody. Kalle for example says: “For me it is a traffic junction… I run through here [under Slussen] and there are several roads who meet and it is very noisy. (Interview, Kalle). Jan states “It is an ugly and unsafe place to be. I rather not be here and avoid the place as much as possible.” (Interview, Jan) Dennis continues pragmatic: “Slussen is about to fall to pieces. They remove several ton of concrete every year which otherwise could fall down on someone’s head… it has to be
done [the rebuilding of Slussen]. Building the same thing again is not enough. We have to think again... a city should be build for people. We cannot let the traffic be the most visible in the city. It engages me because I live in this city and I want to be able to move around.” (Interview, Dennis) They reject Slussen and see it as hollow and meaningless and do not see any reason why it should be preserved. Again is the car and the road symbols for an inhumane urban landscape and they cannot recognize Slussen as the city they want. (Werner 1994, p 29)

Even in the binders there are examples of how people experience Slussen as something special:”Not in Slussen’s spirit. The view – The Slussen-sensation disappears…” (Stockholm City Development administration, Binder 13) The writer equals the soul of Slussen with the view. Without the view the soul is gone.

**Defining “the others”**

What is “the Back Yard” then in the Slussen case? I discussed the NIMBY label with Cecilia and Birgitta. Cecilia argued that the politicians think it is all about shadows and people’s own apartments. “I don’t live there”, she continues: “I have a right to care about Slussen even though I do not live there. Maybe “Back Yard” is the entire Stockholm, but how big is Stockholm then?” (Interview, Cecilia) This discussion is interesting to put in relation to the previous discussion on who knows the place best. One argument is that the others never are at Slussen have no right to comment on Slussen’s future, they do no not know what the best solution is. The other argument is that Back yard can be the entire Stockholm and that everyone is allowed to have an opinion on Slussen, not just those who live there. Interesting and very contradicted.

Jasper argues that affects such as love and hate, trust and suspicion are important for the maintenance of collective identities because they include the solidarity we feel for our own group and the negative emotions we feel for the outsiders. (Jasper 2006, p 16) This can also be registered in this case study. In order to tell who they are themselves, the informants often describe and reflect on the others involved in Slussen; the others who think differently. “YIMBY do not live in Stockholm. They live in another city. So they are not representative for the places they have an opinion about, for example Tors Tower and Slussen. They did not grow up in Stockholm.” (Interview, Cecilia) the two YIMBY members explain on the other hand that “Many who want to preserve Slussen do not live at Slussen. They are basically never there. They are simply not a part of the user group… they have some sort of ideal picture of Slussen… The no-persons we need are those who say no to plans which do not do any good for the people. If we tear down something that works then we have a problem¹. “(Interview, YIMBY) Dennis does not see those in favor for the present Slussen as part of the user group either:”Many have a romanticized picture of Slussen… and do not see Slussen as an everyday traveler.” (Interview, Dennis)

It is interesting that in order to dismiss the others’ arguments they almost deprive them their right to the place. They see them as outsider while they see themselves as insiders. At the same time it is also a way to make the protest or the discussion more

---

¹ As a comment on the protests that stopped the planned broadening of Karlbergsvägen mentioned earlier in the thesis.
comprehensible; if you know who you deal with maybe you better can overlook the problem.

Burningham argues that people in a conflict are well aware of the strategies they use in order to make themselves more credible than the others in a dispute (Burningham 2000, p 55). Calling those wanting to preserve Slussen “cultural elite” or focusing on their age is some examples. The previous discussion on who knows Slussen best as a place is also an example on this.

Even the fact that a group of people have formed a network called “YIMBY” is remarkable. If NIMBY did not exist, would YIMBY?

YIMBY writes on their homepage about themselves: “We are a group of people who has gotten tired of cowardly politicians, reactionary city-dwellers and people who do not want to live in a city even though they live in Stockholm.” They want to be a voice saying “YES” where others say “NO”. (YIMBY n.d.) They define NIMBY’s as having a negative attitude to change. (YIMBY n.d.)

YIMBY and those who want to tear down Slussen want to dismiss the NIMBY’s as being a group of elderly people; “the cultural elite” they are being called. KHT researcher Jerker söderlind describes the “cultural elite” in a debate article on Newsmill: “It is a mystery why the “cultural elite” defend mass motorist’s (massbilismen) main monument” as “reactionary people engaged in “culture” who want to preserve yesterday’s mistake for the future (Söderlind April 16 2010). Söderlind sees the arguments as irrational as Welsh argues most people see as a NIMBY signature (Welsh 1993, 16) when he argues that the NIMBY’s were against the Klara-demolitions but for the preserving of Slussen. It does not make sense to him because he sees the Klara demolitions and Slussen as evidence of how mass motorism affected Stockholm. They contest the Klara demolitions but are proud of the praise one of the “father’s” of modernism, Le Corbusier gave Slussen (Söderlind April 16 2010). Anna is well aware of Le Corbusier’s praise and finds it is “provenance”, it gives Slussen more cultural value that he has commented on Slussen. “Perhaps we should put up a sign and tell the history about Le Corbusier’s praise of Slussen.” (Interview, Anna)

Kalle never uses the word NIMBY’s but he has a very clear view on those who wants to preserve Slussen. As a matter of fact he got engaged because of the protests against the new proposal: “It is not only the whiners who should be heard. Of cause it is important with the people who feel strong for architecture and arts… but they don’t think like those who have to make the decisions. It is so damn easy to have opinions without any responsibility. It is a tough discussion for on the other hand people have to have their opinions… I am against the damn whining because it is something new. You know what you have but you do not know what you will get. Get cracking! Swedes are good at whining. We are well of and sometimes we engage ourselves in “non-questions”, unimportant questions. It is fantastic we have the time and the energy but if people just once in a while would stop and think of how well we are of…” (Interview, Kalle)

But also those who want to preserve Slussen and those against the new proposal, defend themselves and attack the others: Li Södermark writes in another article on Newsmil with the headline: “The Slussen haters prejudiced and ignorant” she have been listening to the same description of the strong opinion in 40 years, but it is a wrong description.
She argues that the people with “some kind of good manners and an ability to express oneself have good access to the media. Even artists and other famous names make good headlines. But the giant opinion is created by ordinary people.” (Södermark, August 02 2010) So here is an example of how a person called a ”Cultural elitist” and a NIMBY calls the others almost the exact terms as used about NIMBY’s: Prejudiced and ignorant” See i.e. Burningham, where she argues that those who label other people NIMBY see them as having little or incorrect knowledge. (Burningham 2000, p 57)

The plan architect is well aware of the NIMBY problematic if calling one group NIMBY and another not (Burningham 2000, p 62) and argues”… It is hard to value it like that. A way to value can be to look at the amount of people who had left comments on a specific question, but a category with only a few comments can also be important… as long as they keep it on an objective level. To comment on the staffs look, writing they looked like stilted exhibition whores and that ten watchmen could not keep the mob out if they wanted to put an ax in the exhibition model, is not relevant of cause… you have to be clear-sighted so you can see why people submit their opinions and that it easily gets emotional so the factual matter gets overshadowed by the emotions.”(interview, plan architect)

He somehow refuses to look at some people as problematic and some people as not problematic and refers to their democratic rights instead: “A democracy is not just about the individuals getting what they wish for; it is also about the opportunity to make your voice heard, you are allowed as an individual to make your voice heard. But sometimes you have to accept the decision of the majority. I think people understand the difference but we live in a society where it is very important to express our own private opinion and maybe pursue it very far. And it is good; if this opportunity did not exist it would not be a democracy… Every person has the opportunity to join the political arena if they are not satisfied with the politicians they have to choose from. It might be harsh to say, but it is the truth.” (interview, plan architect) On the other hand is he also aware of the people arguing they have a bigger saying in Slussen’s future than others because they have lived here for a long time: “It is good with specialist knowledge but it is a pity if the result is that someone feels they have more right to the city than others; If they have lived here longer than others. We are all migrants even those who have lived here for generations.” (interview, plan architect)

The terms “NIMBY” and “YIMBY” with capital letters also are something worth mentioning: when writing NIMBY and YIMBY in a text it is almost all you see. It is almost symbolic for the discussion where the parts stand so far from each other, disagreeing on almost everything.

**The majority**

With May’s “triangle of engagement” in mind, the discussion on “the others” who the majority is can get a new twist. His biggest argument for not dismissing the “usual suspects” (aka NIMBY’s, YIMBY’s or whatever the “loud voices” are called) as not representing the majority is that there is no such thing as the voice of the majority. The majority is busy doing other things and therefore they are not engaged in public matters. (May 2006, p 317) They do not have time to engage themselves in Slussen’s future. He argues that those who engage themselves in a public matter are those who have the biggest engagement. Gabriel and Henrik in YIMBY would not agree I suspect. They
have a rather high degree of engagement according to May’s triangle as they are an interest group and both of them as individuals are engaged in the YIMBY’s committee and thereby are at “office holder” level. But they feel that they their voice is not heard because of the small, but loud numbers of NO-sayers: “The silent masses are not visible. Those who say no are those who are heard. We have to engage ourselves even when we like it [a proposal]… We are a young organization and it is hard to attend meetings and so if you have a job or if you study”. (Interview, YIMBY) They feel that the others, the no-sayers have an advantage they do not have: time! I wonder if the “no-sayers” will agree.

The political advisor to the Vice mayor in Stockholm says "Every opinion should be taken into consideration but there is a difference, an imbalance. Where well educated people live the protests are stronger than in areas with poor people… If those who protest belong to a certain group of people we never know what the rest of the citizens think and then the project will be revised after their viewpoints only. (Interview, Political advisor) Here is another example on how there is a belief in how it is more fair if the majority also is heard but through this example it is also possible to give a critique of May’s triangle: he speaks of the differences between some groups who perhaps have different knowledge about how to express their viewpoints so that they become visible. May on the other hand seems to have forgotten that aspect. He assumes that everyone has the same knowledge in how to engage themselves in public matter and get heard.

Most of the interviewees are situated at the level of either “office holder” or “activists” as they are members of organizations involved in Slussen one way or the other: Anna and Fredrik in Rädda Slussen and Gabriel and Henrik in YIMBY. Elias, Birgitta and Cecilia can be seen as a “semi-regulars” they are not in any organization but they have made their voice heard more than one time. Dennis on the other hand is the only one at “Establishment” level when he engages himself in politics as a politician in his spare time. Kalle and Jan is an “ad hoc” as he not normally engages himself in public matter. This is their first time.

**The view on planners and politicians**

If we look at other aspects of why citizens engage themselves emotionally in planning we find examples of what Jasper calls moral emotions, which is the emotions tied to our moral values. (Jasper 2006, p 17) Birgitta and Cecilia show a very strong contempt for the planners and politicians. A great deal of the interview is not only about Slussen but also about the politicians responsible for planning in Stockholm. Birgitta says: “Yes, I despise them, that’s it… at some point I say: yes, I do, you try to fool me.”(Interview, Birgitta) Her moral values are different than the politicians. She argues that the politicians are only concerned about money and about power when she instead values the esthetic view at Slussen and on non-material values. Cecilia agrees with her and sees landmark building, especially the tall ones as symbols for men who want power. (Interview, Cecilia) Birgitta ask “Who are they, the politicians? Have they ever walked over Västerbron a spring morning or have they walked in Gärdet against the light (i motljus)?” (Interview, Birgitta) Cecilia believes the politicians and planners have no feelings for Stockholm; she believes they are not born and raised here, and they are only here because it is a part of their career, a step on the ladder to the top. “We who love the city come into a fight with those who only see Stockholm as a possibility for
exploitation” Cecilia argues. Again examples of how people try to deploy people their right to have opinions about a place as mentioned earlier.

Other citizens share this view on politicians and planners. They threaten with not voting for the politicians at the next election and compare them to both Albert Speer and Hjalmar Mehr and Joakim Garpe2: “… remembered for their break with traditions, brutality and esthetic disaster.” (Stockholm City Development administration, binder 12)

The fact that the politicians did not have time for interviews with me is also something that is worth commenting on. Birgitta said that the politicians and planners made themselves invisible and did not answer mail or anything. They do not want to be disturbed. Only when they feel threatened they listen to the citizens and the opposition. (Interview, Birgitta)

Even those who want Slussen to be rebuilt as soon as possible distrust the politicians but not as much as Birgitta and Cecilia and in another way. They find the politicians cowardly: The new proposal is boring; unimaginative… we are not allowed to be creative. It has to be squared boxes… The city has not made any assessment of the needs.”(YIMBY) They believe they can affect the politicians by writing comments and by contributing to the urban planning debate.

Dennis who himself is a politician in his spare time has a more pragmatic view on why there has been made any decisions on Slussen's future yet. He believes it has to do with the fact that the majority in the city Hall changes almost every fourth year. “Every new majority makes their own analysis and wants to decide the best solution. Some time you would like the city officials to decide; then something would happen, but that is perhaps not that democratic.” (Interview, Dennis)

**The exhibition**
The way the municipality has presented the proposal has aroused many emotions mostly feelings of anger and distrust. These emotions have also contributed in citizen engagement and are examples of how citizens’ distrust in the plans made them engage themselves in The Slussen project.

The journalist and author Fredrik Falk argues in his article:”The pictures we were not supposed to see – before the decision on the New Slussen” that it is “hard to imagine a more manipulative and dishonest way to present an eight lane highway which makes a Burn Out straight through one of the city’s by far most sensitive areas.” He presents pictures he has made in Photoshop where he has removed all people from the Forster pictures along with all the color he also sees as manipulative. He believes “it is arrogant to the voters” but also shows his distrust in the politicians when he argues that it probably is deliberate because of the fear for strong protests that would lead to a rejection of the proposal. (Falk, March 14 2010)

---

2 Mehr and Garpe was politicians in Stockholm and are seen as responsible for the demolition of Klara.
The two pictures show two different realities. Picture one is the “beatified” Foster and Berg picture with a “hysterically overcrowded beach party” (Falk, March 14 2010) while picture two should show a more “real” picture on a gray day and cold day in Stockholm. (Falk, March 14 2010)

Elias explains how he got engaged in Slussen when he saw the exhibition and did not like the proposal. With his background as an urban tour guide he came up with the idea that he would arrange tours/walks two days a week, where he would show other people where the new buildings, roads etc. would be situated in relation to the present Slussen: “I wanted to compare the new Slussen with the old but that opportunity did not exist at the exhibition, so I went home and printed everything I could find about Slussen. I wanted to place myself at Slussen: Here we have bridge, here are the houses and then try not to add that I thought it was terrible, but sometimes I could help myself.” (Interview, Elias)

Birgitta and Cecilia also have comments on the model and the exhibition: “We are not birds flying, we want to see how it looks from down there where we are…Concrete that sparkles and glitter. We are not that stupid so we believe in it either.” (Interview, Cecilia) They show me pictures from different angles with some of the new buildings blocking the view.

If we look at the examples above, they can also relate to Hoch. He argues that citizens’ participation not only should be seen as a way to make the plans fair, but it is also a way to make people understand the plans on several levels, not only with their mind but also with their emotions. This can contribute to a broader acknowledgment among the citizens. (Hoch 2006, p 375) the above examples can be seen as a failure for the municipality to make the citizens understand the proposal. Both the plan architect and the political advisor admit they have failed in some areas. People did for example not understand that the houses in glass were not the final design. The houses were in glass so people could see they were new. The design was supposed to be decided later. (Interview political advisor, plan architect) But there are also positive examples: The plan architect explains: “Many I met were undecided to the proposal when I first talked
with them, but then they get a better understanding” (Plan architect) Perhaps this understanding will happen at both cognitive and emotional level.

**Levels of participation**

There are several examples of different levels of citizen participation as Arnstein has categorized them in the Slussen Case.

The City of Stockholm had planned three occasions each of a period three days where the citizens were given the opportunity to learn different things about Slussen: The first theme was on traffic and gave the citizens opportunity to meet with the politicians and the officials from the responsible departments at the municipality. There was also given an opportunity to attend a lecture on Slussen’s history, told by the journalist and “Stockholm expert” Harald Norbelie. The lecture was held at The museum of Stockholm and in my opinion it was an example of “Manipulation”. The purpose was to educate the listener. The lecture had focus on change and on the fact that Slussen has been exchanged several times before. There was no dialogue at the lecture and no opportunity to give our opinions. On the contrary we were told before the lecture started that we had to focus on the lecture and not interrupt too much because we should be out of the building at a certain time, before the alarms were activated. A little group from “Rädda Slussen” (Save Slussen) attended and tried to speak about their case, but was politely asked to be quiet because this was not relevant for the lecture. (Observation, February 23 2011) The other two occasions on Water and Public life was cancelled due to lack of time. The planners needed to focus on the exhibition of the new proposal. (Interview, plan architect)

But also examples of citizen participation of a higher level: Placation can be found in the Slussen case where citizens for example are given seats in boards without being in majority or where they are given a voice but still are in danger of being rejected because they still are a minority: the Open Space meeting was held in April 2010 and the purpose was to meet and discuss ideas for the future Slussen’s cultural content and ideas for Slussen as a cultural meeting place (Luttrop, April 28 2010). Lena From, art coordinator from the Cultural Department (Kulturförvaltningen) explains: “The purpose with the meeting was not to discuss design issues, I talked personally with each and every one on the phone and that was accepted. There was a positive attitude before the meeting and it was wise people who showed up. We invited 200 people who were active in the cultural field… The most important thing was to involve the public…” She thought the meeting gave good results and she focus on two issues which she believes is incorporated in the development of the New Slussen: The children perspective and art, both temporary and permanent. (interview, art coordinator) When I visited the newest exhibition which opened in May 2011, I asked one of the staff members how the municipality has thought of the children and she told me that they would do an analysis from the children’ perspective (barnkonsekvensanalys) so there seems to be a clear result from the Open Space seminar (Exhibition, May 22 2011).

The results of the exhibition can be seen both as Consultation and Placation where the citizens are given a voice and have affected the newest proposal in certain areas but still within certain boundaries given by the municipality.
Birgitta and Cecilia are examples on how citizens can be disillusioned, as Arnstein argues can be the case if citizen participation take place as in Consultation or in Placation, where they utter their opinions but have the feeling of not being heard: “In Tensta and Rinkeby is the dialogue with the citizens very important, it is very important to find out what everybody thinks. They have to put red and blue dots where they feel happy and where they feel uncomfortable. But I, who live in the central city, I do not get any opportunity to put dots. Do I want culture, do I need high-rise buildings? But it is only an illusion: “Look how we are clever we are”. The immigrants are allowed to give their opinion on their suburbs. But what about us? We are just a whining cultural elite because we live in the central city.” (Interview, Cecilia) What Cecilia seems to miss it that the dialogue in Tensta/Rinkeby also can lead to disillusion if people expect more influence than they are given.

The plan architect describes the Slussen project in the consultant report to the politicians as very complex with many different multiple public interests to manage, and an economic aspect on how to keep the expenses down to spare the taxpayers’ money is set against losing money if not selling the building rights. He finds that many citizens treasure the view and the feeling of open space more than earning money on building rights. (Stockholm City Development administration 2010 May 27, p 11)

In a quantitative analysis in the report it is shown that the most frequent topic concerns the view (82 %) that disappears or changes when rebuilding Slussen. Other concerns are for the car traffic and the design of the bridge (40 %). Opinions showing positivity towards the rebuilding are 9 % as well as those in favour of preserving and upgrading the present Slussen. (Stockholm City Development administration 2010 May 27, p 11)

The Plan architect recommends the politicians to listen to the opinions and to base the development of the plan on studies on how the feeling of space on the present Slussen can be transferred to the future design. “The administration finds it most likely to diminish or remove the buildings blocking the view in future plans.” (Stockholm City Development administration 2010, p 4) But he also argues that the department finds the work with alternatives on the future Slussen have been done in an open and wide way and several opportunities have been given to the public to take part of the project in exhibitions and on the internet. (Stockholm City Development administration 2010 May 27, p 11)

During the interview he furthermore explains that “Most viewpoints have helped us. We can with a good conscience say: Thanks to all who have helped us. Those who have left comments to us can see we have listened. It is a clear feedback to the Stockholmers.”

(interview, plan architect)

Also the mayor, Sten Nordin, is positive:”Every viewpoint is relevant. However, every viewpoint cannot be realized at the same time. It is the politician’s role to carve out as broad a compromise as possible, and therefore I am pleased that we have been able to adapt all the suggestions and viewpoints for the new proposal.” (Mail answer, the mayor)

The newest exhibition in the beginning of May 2011 shows, the rationality in the economic aspect of Slussen stating that money has to be earned by selling land and build tall houses has been altered. Now the municipality is willing to pay a bigger part
of the project to save the view. The political adviser explains that it was a mistake that people thought the houses (blocking the view) would pay for some of the rebuilding (10%). Instead it equals to nil because of the economic compensation the municipality has to pay to those affected by rebuilding of Slussen. (interview, political advisor)

The “professionals” seem to be satisfied with the level of participation. The plan architect thinks they have helped the proposal to become better and they all also welcome engagement as long as it does not get too emotional and as long as it is within the boundaries for what is possible to change according to them. Dennis, politician in his spare time and former political official, is a bit more pragmatic. He honestly explains that mass copied letters (letter with the exact content word by word) sent by citizens to the politicians does not help. It will only make them irritated because of the job it causes when they have to enter the letters in a diary. Personal letters and name lists are more accepted and respected. (interview, Dennis)

To show engagement is respected by them even though they do not share their opinion. It only becomes problematic when the letters get threatening or personal. They talk about their own experience with handling the expressions, the threats and those aimed at them personally. The political advisor sighs and says “if I have to be totally honest, it can be a bit tiring to deal with so many negative opinions.” (Interview, political advisor) the plan architect remembers how tough the exhibition period in 2010 was and he explains how he was threatened on an internet page: “we will make some purging at the City Planning Administration”. This resulted in a personal choice to make himself “invisible” on Eniro and other pages; even though he finds it wrong. Today he chooses not to read comments on debate articles as well because here it is also possible to read comment on his person by people he never has met. It gives me nothing he says. (Interview, plan architect)

But perhaps the “professionals” also are affected by previous planning experiences and the emotions that followed such as Hoch suggests (Hoch 2006, p 374) “ordinary” people are. Perhaps the “professionals” want to avoid a new “elm battle” when they alter the proposal so that the buildings blocking the view now are gone. The elm battle has as mentioned previous come up more than once when doing my research. Those against the new proposal believes it can be a new Elm Battle while those for demolishing Slussen think this is an exaggerated idea. Today there is a group of people protesting against the new proposal, they are angry and dissatisfied, just as there were a group 40 years ago with the same feelings, but today there is also a visible group of people who want change in Stockholm. It makes me wonder how a thesis on citizens’ emotions and participation would have looked like 40 years ago.

It can be confusing with several levels of participation in a planning process. The citizens can affect some decisions but some they cannot affect. They have affected the buildings blocking the view, but the fact that Slussen has to be torn down is one example of something they cannot affect. (Perhaps, the elms in Kungsträdgården were also domed to be felled, so maybe only time will tell) The size of the bridge and the amount of road lanes is another example of something they cannot affect. The mayor writes in his email answer that the size of the traffic construction is needed in order to cope with the flow of the traffic on Slussen. He finds that there is a broad political
agreement to back this decision. (Email answer, the mayor) He seems not worried about the protests.

The citizens’ engagement and emotions affects the planning process; but only where it is possible. There is a clear rationality: Slussen will be torn down and rebuild in a new design. The citizens are not just citizens with a democratic right to be heard. They are also voters giving votes to politicians. Both the political advisor and Dennis, the politician in his spare time are aware of that. “If there are many strong opinions the politicians have to listen to them. If you do not take them into consideration, you have to motivate why.”(interview, political advisor) Dennis explains that it is most important to show consideration for those voters in your own party. It is almost always possible to find out where those who send in their opinions live and whether they share the same political viewpoint as the party. (Interview, Dennis)
Discussion

How can the citizens be involved in the planning process at a higher level than in the Slussen case, where the participation level reaches the consultation and Placation level?

I asked the plan architect whether it was a good idea to use for example the “open Space” method that was used for the cultural content at Slussen. He laughed and I had to add “much earlier [in the process], then he could imagine the method being used. (interview, plan architect)

It is hard to see that Slussen can reach the Partnership level, where citizens negotiate with the politicians. Most decisions have been made already and the distrust some citizens have towards the politicians and planners can be hard to remove. It is also a big and complex project where involving the citizens at a higher level really have to be thought through thoroughly.

A lot of protests are built on distrust for the decision makers because the citizens believe they have more power than they really have (Burningham 2000, p 59) so it seems more important to make it very clear from the beginning how much citizens can decide than trying to reach a higher level of citizens participation. However I believe the “professionals” also see citizens’ participation as something at a higher level than the reality shows.

It will be a good idea to use different methods in order to reach different groups of people for example: young, old, men, women, those with humanistic perspective on planning and those with rationalistic perspective. You could say that having both an exhibition and a presentation of the proposal on the Slussen homepage is a step in the right direction. Some people have the opportunity to visit while others do not. Some people like having access to the proposal at the internet while others do not.

YIMBY for example point at what they see as weaknesses in the planning process: it is hard to be engaged in planning when having a job. The samråds meetings are held when people work and they wish for other methods for involving the citizens in planning and sees this as a question for the society. They visualize a situation where the planner says to the citizens: “You can decide together with us, but you cannot say NO. We will build no matter what, but you can decide what we will build.” With this starting point YIMBY believes planning will be better as it is a way to avoid the big conflicts no one is benefitted from. (Interview YIMBY)

The politician in his sparetime, Dennis believes it is harder today to get a building permission (Bygglov) as it is more common to appeal against new houses. This, he thinks, has to do with two things: Partly because of a growing part of the population is getting older. He believes old people are against much construction of new houses because they want it the way it always has been. He also believes it has to do with a culture where it is easier to find communities of others who think the same way as you do; on the internet for example. But he also sees opportunities when working with social media and planning. He explains that this is an opportunity which first has popped up the last five years and being a new method it still is a bit scary even though it will be more used in the future. Today the politicians are used to work in a certain way. It is a bit scary to have a dialogue with someone who can answer in five minutes if you have
been working in another way in many years, but he believes this will be a part of the
dialogue with the citizens in the future. (Interview, Dennis) This can lead to more
emotions in planning in form of reflex emotions emerging quickly and disappearing
quickly discussed by Jasper (Jasper 2006, p 16), because it is much easier to mail
someone instead of writing a letter and send it: You read something, you get a reflex
emotion (anger for example) and you act by mailing someone. Reflex emotions can also
be the motive behind many comments written on articles and blogs.

The Plan architect believes the days where everyone could and should be informed are
over. Today you have to know where to find the information because of the amount of
information available. Sometimes the information is easy to find if a project is
interesting and gets a lot of attention, like Slussen, but other times it will demand an
effort to find the information. (Interview, plan architect) He somehow sees the citizens
responsible for getting the information on a planning project. He still wants to avoid
categorizing and calling some people “information strong” (as I suggested). Instead he
sees this as a bias in society in general not only in planning. (interview, plan architect)

Slussen is not the only example on contemporary big urban development projects in
Sweden. Helsingborg is developing a big area in the southern part of the city, the H+
project. A big tunnel is leading the trains underground so the area above ground can be
developed and used for linking the city together with its southern parts. The
municipality has focus on citizen participation. They have a big exhibition in some old
industrial buildings in the H+ area where they use different kinds of methods to present
the proposal. An important part is to engage the citizens and an example of this is that
the visitors themselves can build a city model (Helsingborg Stad n.d.)

The problem is I think; there is no difference in level of citizen participation between
the Slussen project and the H+ project. They both are at the consultation level where
citizens are allowed to come with their viewpoints and their proposals. H+ is more
interactive but there are still no promises that the municipally actually will listen to
them. In fact I see a risk for citizens being disappointed and disillusioned (theory)
because of the lavished exhibition encouraging them to participate. Information is not a
bad thing. It must be better reach as many people as possible instead of just executing
the plans without informing but as I said before, the importance lies in being honest in
how much influence citizens will have.
Conclusion

Now, do you remember the research questions? Of course you do, but I will repeat them – just in case.

Why do the citizens get emotionally engaged in the Slussen-project?

There are many answers to why the citizens get emotionally involved in planning but one thing they have in common: They care! (Nussbaum 2001, p 19) They find the discussion on Slussen’s future important for different reasons: They have emotions for Slussen as a place, they have a relation to the environment that makes Slussen and/or they feel anger and distrust towards the decision makers. You can say that the engagement is based on a protest against something or someone. Either the engagement is based on not liking the new proposal or those behind the proposal, or it is based on a protest against those not liking the proposal.

In the thesis there are examples of how people see Slussen as a big living room and find that the space is invaded and remade to something they do not recognize as a part of “their Stockholm”. There are examples of how Slussen as a construction is seen as beautiful, functional and worth preserving. But also negative emotions related to a perspective on Slussen as a bad place not worth keeping can be a factor when people engage themselves in the Slussen case. These people do not see the same Slussen as those mentioned above. They do not see fine lines, angles, cool architecture and an amazing view worth preserving. Instead they see concrete, cars, bad smelling tunnels everywhere. They find that a lot things in the way of a fantastic view. But they also have emotions and personal experiences attached to Slussen as for example Nordström argues (Nordström 1994, p 187).

Citizens involved in Slussen have a strong believe that they know Slussen best. “The others” do not know Slussen at all because if they really knew Slussen they would have the same opinion as themselves. “The others” build their view on Slussen on a false picture of Slussen because they do not know the place. They are never there. This false perception of “the others” can in my opinion be based on two things:

i) People want to dismiss the others’ argument so their arguments are not as strong as their own arguments.

ii) They do not know each other and therefore they have no understanding for each others’ viewpoints.

Many of the interviewed citizens also want to dismiss “the others” in a belief that they do not represent the majority, they are “extraordinary” and not representing the “ordinary” citizens. but according to May there is no such thing as the “the silent majority”. They are engaged in other things and do not really care about Slussen future. (May 2006, p 314)
In what way have the citizens’ emotions and engagement been considered and used in the Slussen project?

The citizens’ emotions and engagement do affect the planning process in the Slussen case as the proposal (on exhibition spring 2010) I have looked at in this thesis has been altered and the view is “saved” in the newest proposal (on exhibition spring 2011). The “professionals” all say that it is important that citizens get engaged but I cannot help wonder how much a potential future conflict like the Elm battle has affected the changes in the new proposal.

However, there are limits for how much the proposal can be altered. Political decisions about tearing down Slussen and build a new with a new design, have been taken years ago and even though many citizens have commented and complained about the big road/bridge which some just see as another “highway going straight to Gamla Stan” (Falk, 2010) the politicians still think the size of the road is necessary in order to cope with the future amount of traffic (mail, the mayor).

There is a risk that citizens get disappointed when involved in planning projects because they believe they have more influence than they really have. This disappointment can result in anger and distrust which again can be used as fuel when protesting against new plans. (May 2006, p 310). The politicians and planners are seen as “bad guys” with no good intentions.

Arnstein’s ladder of participation makes it quite clear what to expect: at the level where I see the Slussen case: Consultation and Placation level, citizens cannot expect the decision makers to use all their viewpoints and ideas in the reworked proposal. This is a part of the democracy: you have a right to speak, but you cannot always have it your way. (the plan architect)

We need emotions in planning. We need people, both citizens and professionals who are engaged and can contribute with ideas and viewpoints of how to develop our society. Engagement is build on what we care for, it is build on emotions (Nussbaum 2001, p 19). If we want engagement we have to accept the emotions and we have to accept that some people do not have the engagement and therefore we cannot dismiss those who have engagement as only being a loud minority. When saying this I am aware that some people have more resources to find a way to get their voice heard than others, but this is something which can be seen as a bias in the society, not only in planning. There is also a need for engagement at different levels. Not everybody has the time and energy to get engaged at “Establishment” or “Office Holder” level but perhaps sometimes it is possible to be “Semi-regular” or “Ad hoc” and get engaged in some matters. (May 2006, p 314)

Democracy, debate, dialogue and citizens’ participation are intertwined. However, the dialogue sometimes seems to be forgotten when different groups try to claim they are right and the others are wrong. If the aim is at higher citizens’ participation in planning, the dialogue must be emphasized. Maybe a step in the right direction for a higher level is to make people with different viewpoints and backgrounds meet and talk face to face with each other and thereby create a more nuanced urban development debate where arguments based on emotions are seen as something positive and as something that needs to be taken serious.
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