Wir empfehlen Ihnen, auf einem Blatt jeweils zwei Seiten dieses Artikels nebeneinander auszudrucken.

We recommend that you print two pages of this article side by side on one sheet.

Body Politics 4 (2016), Heft 7, S. 21-40

Tales from the Body Public: Corporeal Citizenship and Appropriation of Public Space in Copenhagen around 1900

Mikkel Thelle

English abstract: How can we approach the interaction between body and city as political? This article moves through a sequence of cases in which bodies - groups, crowds, or swarms of people - have affected the public space of Copenhagen around 1900. First, election day is investigated for its contradictory spectacle of the public egalitarian crowd and the singular subject of the secret ballot. The analysis then turns to political marches of the period, considering the way participants in these marches produced and appropriated their routes during the intensified political tensions of the 1880s and 1890s. The strange phenomenon of New Year riots at City Hall Square and the anarchist attack on the Stock Exchange, as the final examples, serve to show a pattern of bodily agency, on a scale from the least to the most contested crowdings. In this way, the article seeks to locate the body in the discussion of public space in cultural history that has for some time been focusing on materiality.

When the politics of urban space in the long twentieth century are discussed, it often seems that the body is central, yet invisible. The now well-established concept of a new "repertoire of political activism" in the modern city, for example, emphasizes how public space becomes defined by novel forms of social groupings – in strikes, charivari, and the like – through bodily practices.[1] Another concept of "contentious politics" point to ways in which claims are made by gatherings of bodies.[2] What is at stake in both cases, is the historical argument that the body, or multiplicities of bodies, which constitute modern cities, enter the stage of political struggle through the potential of a new urban space. The large, industrial city, in a way, creates an affordance or disposition for a whole new set of collective actions. At the same time, bodies as such are not explicitly part of this conceptualization – they are either objects of political intentions or containers of cultural layers of meaning. If we turn to another, later notion of urban politics as governmentality, the material spaces and technologies of the city come to the foreground. Here, in contrast to the "hard politics" of regulations and political rule, a softer form of government is found in the emergence of urban lighting, maps, censuses, and so on, resting on a notion that these public, spatial phenomena exercise a political agency through the distribution, categorization, and sorting of bodies. While this approach also analyzes bodies, it does so with an inspiration from Foucauldian

and postcolonial notions of power. The focus in this approach is on the apparatus that governs and not the agency of the bodies being governed.[3] Urban sociologists and geographers with an implicit historical perspective have also recently addressed city spaces as interwoven with ideas and paradigms of regulating bodies, but once again mainly by paying attention to the categories and systems that govern the body instead of focusing on the reciprocal negotiation of government that is prominent, for example, in cultural studies.[4]

By trying to address the intertwined relation of power and urban space, the following analysis is an attempt to look at the body as an object as well as an agent of urban space, emphasizing how reciprocity or negotiation is a key dynamic. The focus of this article is not just any urban space, but the streets and squares of Copenhagen that emerged as the city changed rapidly between the 1880s and the First World War. Following the demolition of the city's fortifications, increasing urbanization, and a new, liberal constitution that lead to the Free Trade Act of 1862, the Danish capital saw a growing number of bodies pouring into the city. The city's number of inhabitants, which had been at 100.000 in 1800, was almost quadroupled by 1900. The city's public spaces underwent significant change; for decades, new land was urbanized while new arrivals became citizens of the growing capital. In this period, a substantial part of Copenhagen's population was born outside of the city.[5]

Having introduced the outlines of Copenhagen's urban history, we can go one step further into the question of the body. The body, singular or multiple, can be approached as an agent of urban space, for example, through the notion of the spatial as something actively produced or reproduced. This concept has been advocated in different forms since Henri Lefebvre and has also been contested, following the emergence of the broad field of the so-called spatial turn.[6] Without pretending to cover the conceptual multitude in this discussion, it will be useful here to emphasize that in order to see the body-space relation more clearly, we might follow this notion of space as something that is constantly created and recreated through movement across different places. This understanding, which probably owes most to thinkers on the fringe of the spatial turn, such as Michel de Certeau and Tim Cresswell, has the strength of enabling us to see microscopic exchanges and social events as space-making processes, yet it is also a very situational and thus non-historical perspective. To understand how the body-space is enacted over longer periods of time, we should also understand the processes of path-dependency or affordance that make certain spatial practices more or less probable in certain places.[7] While urban history is often

investigated in terms of social or technological structures, the body as such is often lingering on the fringe or in the background, seen as something given, without having the potential to change urban space or being changed by it.

Drawing on these insights, this article seeks to analyze what is happening at street-level in the city, as a way of examining how bodies appropriate space and simultaneously leave behind traces or patterns of the governance of bodies. The "street-level", however, is a blurry concept. More precisely, we will see the level of practices in urban space, as it differs from the level or operation that configures or legally forms it. With Certeau, we can talk about the difference between tactic and strategical operations. In a heuristic way, this distinction between operations that configurate urban spaces (i.e. building, planning, materializing) and those practicing it (by way of walking, demonstrating, etc.) will guide the structure of this article.

The investigation will move through a number of cases from Copenhagen around 1900, where bodies came to negotiate these two positions. For the sake of clarity, the cases are ordered in a succession, in which the first one represent the closest conjuncture of the tactical and strategic – the most "legal" case so to speak – proceeding to cases of rising friction between the two, a growing "illegality" of bodily government. Thus, we will be able to see how the expanding group of Copenhagen citizens also acquired new positions – as voters, demonstrators, activists – forming a landscape of what we could call "corporeal citizenship".

Cultures of Voting

If we consider Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century, one way of practicing urban citizenship in public was the activity of voting. At the same time, elections turned out to be conditioned by an elaborate negotiation between body and space. Becoming a voter was in one sense the result of the legal construction of modern citizenship as it had been developing since the French Revolution. Along with this formation of a formal right, however, it also followed an intertwined process of shifting and layered bodily practices.

Voting practices developed and became formalized all over Europe, the United States, and colonial settings during the period, often in tandem with constitutional changes. In Denmark, with the Constitution of 1848, the constituency rose to about 15% of the Danish population, when all men over 30 became voters. One could point to this as a central

event in the history of corporeal citizenship, since now the amount of people being able to vote (earlier the constituency was below 3%) in itself became an issue of regulation and political attention. Elections from then on became a spectacle, where nominations, speeches, interpellations – that is, the questioning of the nominees – voting, and registering was a common, public activity. One source describes the assemblage of voting in a smaller town like this:

> On Election Day, a stage was erected at the square, where speeches were given by the candidates. This happened under shouting and interruptions from the crowd … a rotten apple could also find its way to the rostrum, even though the Police Chief sat in his fine uniform in the first row. There were always a lot of people assembled at the square that day and the peasants from the hinterland had been coming into town to give their vote, and often they were coming in great numbers. After the speeches, the candidates were interpellated by different organizations … then the voters went to the ballot in the gym hall of the school.[8]

Some prominent features are visible here: the festive situation of uproar and entertainment and not least the way political demonstration and election was tightly connected. We see groups of bodies performing a kind of hierarchy – the candidates, the crowd, the front row, the interpellators – distributed spatially at the town square. Some, maybe all, were dressed up for the occasion. What is not mentioned in the source is that in order to vote, people had to register their names and preferred candidate on a public list, visible for all. It was an all-public event, where government was enacted in a loosely ordered way, and where the spatial distribution of bodies – with the local elite in the front row for example – in a way mirrored the social distribution of everyday life. This would change, though, with the advent of a new voting practice that would become standardized and almost universal in its junction of public and private components of liberal freedom: the secret ballot.

Looking at the election as a corporeal claim to citizenship, it is useful to take the advent of the secret ballot in Denmark as a point of departure. Here, we can see changes in parliamentary politics transforming at the same time as the act of voting is witnessing a redistribution and reconfiguration of the body.

Scholarship widely agrees that the secret ballot first emerged in Australia in 1856 as a colonial innovation.[9] From then on, and through different processes, most major democratic states conformed to this practice. Ironically, France was the first to conceptualize it but among the last to practice it, in 1913.[10] Denmark was chronologically in the middle of this process, introducing the secret ballot in 1901 on the occasion of the "system shift" in Danish parliamentary history. After a

long period of temporary legislation based on a parliamentary minority, the principle of majority rule in political decision making was introduced and a more modern phase of elections began, in which the problem of government as well as the role of the body became a matter of intense negotiations.

The relation between modern democracy and the secret ballot is not just a legal-institutional question, but it is also a significant cultural assemblage. Bertrand, Briquet, and Pels describe this process, concluding that the secret ballot is "a specific emanation of a culture of modernity that consists of several different, sometimes separable and even contradictory traits".[11] Thus, while for example in Britain the secrecy of voting was suspected of facilitating fraud, in the southern United States it became a way to exclude the illiterate black constituency – and in this way, the "cultures of voting" are not united by a common reference to a universal, liberal freedom as many accounts of modernity claim. This aspect is only added later, becoming a retrospective layer of the narrative. What the different stories of the secret ballot have in common, though, are elements of material and spatial arrangements that were conformed through an accelerating, global attention and a mutual investigation of national procedures. In scholarship, the act of voting in this context is defined by a number of characteristics: The use of uniform, official ballot papers printed at public expense; secondly, the provision of ballot papers within the polling place; and finally, the use of devices to ensure secrecy when marking the ballot paper or inserting it into an envelope.[12] Especially prominent among these devices were the characteristic compartments, in which the voter's body was being confined with the ballot list, isolated from the crowd. Other components were also present, such as the gathering of voters lined up in queues or the election officials.

These components, though, had been already present for decades. Actually, the idea of secrecy in voting itself was part of ancient practices (even in Athenian ostracism there was an element of secrecy), but was being developed in relation to modern voting. In early modern European elections, the voter could enter a semi-detached booth on a public square, or use "voting windows" in public buildings. In the nineteenth century, the booth became located inside buildings, and in 1877, Belgium declared a national "secure voting" procedure built on British experiences, which later was to be adopted and developed in France in certain towns in the 1880s as the "isoloir". This is the kind of compartment we more or less know today, with a curtain keeping the voter out of sight during the "act".

Another component, whose secrecy and security received meticulous attention, was the material medium of voting. As we saw above, before the secret ballot, Election Day was a public event. People were voting by raising hands in the midst of a crowd with all the social dynamics connected to this, for example the affective transformation of many bodies "into one" as Elias Canetti has emphasized.[13] To avoid these "riot bodies", it was the intention to make the vote invisible and at the same time dissolve the crowd. The first solution was a ballot paper, that could be folded or somehow hidden, and on which voters could write the name of the candidate. This mutated into publicly printed lists of candidates, coming along with envelopes to ensure secrecy. Another invention, probably from South Australia, was the design of the ballot for the voter to only apply a cross in the appropriate field, partially based on concerns of illiteracy and legibility, but also being one of the key inventions among the industrializing techniques of voting that were to come.

In the isoloir and armed with the enveloped ballot paper, the voter was now an individual subject, his body in total isolation from public gaze, during the now very symbolic moment of performing the political choice. There are more components of this arrangement, but the central point is that we can approach it as a technology as well as a performance or exercise of citizenship in a broad sense. It is also important to note that it was at this point that the technology was employed in Denmark. As we can see in a drawing from the Ministry of Interior called "the arrangement", the movements and roles of the voter were organized in detail.[14] He, and after 1908 (women's suffrage for municipal elections) also she, moved through different spaces, providing identification, picking up the list, moving into the isoloir (or "voting room"), handing in the list, exiting. At each step, except for those in the isoloir, different observers and groups were present.

While one could get the impression that the drawing conveys the whole of the election day assemblage, this is far from the reality. In Denmark, as in many other places, the controlled, secret ballot was intended, as noted above, to undo the subversive festival of voting, but more likely it became another layer added to the existing practices. Even though, according to the literature, elections after the secret ballot became more peaceful, there was still a lot of activity in the city. At one Copenhagen polling station, 20.000 people had to make it through the arrangement during one day, which resulted in a specific space forming around the queue, with innkeepers bringing out beer, speeches being delivered, and other activities.

At another polling station on City Hall Square, this informal space expanded. The voting took place in the city hall, below ground, where the queue in itself contributed to the egality of the situation, with members of higher and lower classes lined up together. Just outside the polling station were people holding political signs and boys handing out leaflets for their party. This way, voting was a combination of celebrating public equality and isolating in individual invisibility.

Approaching the secret ballot as an arrangement of bodies and objects, we can see how this "technology of democracy" was subjectivizing in at least two ways. On the one hand, it subjected the voters' bodies to a rigorously ritualized and standardized choreography. On the other hand, it allowed these bodies to act as subjects "from below" by exercising their citizenship. With suffrage for women in 1915 (1908 for municipal elections) as well as servants and other groups, a new situation emerged with an expanding electorate. On Election Day, people had to meet as voters, symbolically stripped of social hierarchies and share the same space and the same choreography.

Navigating Space and Law: Street Demonstrations

Election Day introduced an assemblage of bodies, objects, and procedures that effectively produced a common space. These arrangements took place in public buildings and were part of the negotiation in this period surrounding the relations between citizens and public space. They were also strongly related to emergent practices of the streets and squares in the expanding city. As one Copenhagen resident remembered from an ordinary Election Day incident:

> When the Right [Conservatives] drove past in their propaganda carriages playing their horns, the fathers [of the quarter of town] urged their sons to bombard the wagon with stones, which they did with great pleasure.[15]

This small incident reflects a set of practices that pervaded the public spaces of the fast-growing Danish capital that could also be observed in other larger European cities during the same period. As the new, liberal ideas of the national constitution were still in the process of being defined, the governmental *dispositif* of the city was also in a state of being assembled, without many regulations or conventions.[16] To provide an example: It was only in 1863 that the city got a more modern police force, organized around strategies of discipline and public appearance instead of exposing and punishing enemies of the monarch.[17] Still at the end of the nineteenth century, the role of the

police in public space was not entirely clear, partly because rules and regulations of streets and squares had not been completely adjusted to the new, liberal paradigm. Just like small clusters of stone-throwing children could appropriate certain neighborhoods, other groups could also define how their bodily presence and tactical practices would unfold and assert political influence.[18] Just like the new police officers performed a presence in the city that tied their body closely to the order they were supposed to impose, their counterparts such as demonstrators and rioters simultaneously developed corporeal ways of opposing that order.[19]

Many of the more or less political corporations and established party organizations that came to play an important role in the nineteenth century became careful users of urban public space as a center stage for their diverse agendas.[20] Historical research indicates that public "spacemaking" was a significant phenomenon that became increasingly well organized during the last decades of the nineteenth century.[21] But as noted above, this period could also be seen as the incubation of new ways of claiming the city through bodily presence. While the voting body as we have seen was moving along regulated lines, performing equality, identifying itself as an individual citizen, and voting in isolation, other bodies were more informal in their movements.

Thus, the Danish historian Jens Toftgaard shows in his survey of political spatial strategies in Copenhagen that throughout the second half of the nineteenth century there was a long, stubborn struggle among the established political parties about urban space, in which the collective bodies of these political organizations were the primary tool. Studying public demonstrations and their routes over time, he shows how this struggle had two aspects: On the one hand, it dealt with access and dominance in parts of the city that had symbolical importance or were crucial for the mobilization of support. On the other hand, there was a negotiation between demonstrators and authorities about how to interpret and understand public mass demonstrations.[22] During the 1870s, political processions for the first time began to be a goal in itself, and elements of bodily choreography emerged. The Social Democrats now used military terms in speeches and their press to describe their presence – marching, headquarters, front – and specific positions were marked as important parts of the collective body. One of these was the standard-bearer. Chosen among the most trusted members, preferably a strong craftsman, this person would lead the march, carrying the red standard, and he would be protected in cases of disturbances, for example in conflicts with the police.[23]

How, when, and where was it acceptable to use public space, and for whom? Toftgaard concludes that the Social Democrats to a large degree conquered public space as well as political influence, preceding their emergent dominance in the city council that became manifest just after 1900.[24] This was due to a strong culture of mobilization and organization, but also relates to the second aspect in the sense that the Social Democrats employed a strategy of negotiation that made public demonstrations an accepted and established part of urban life by the turn of the century.

Following the Paris Commune and other European experiences, the authorities were also very attentive, if not anxious. On May 1st, 1890, there was actual fear of a revolutionary situation. The municipality and the Ministry of War struck up an alliance to prepare all police forces and parts of the army in order to meet this perceived threat, but the demonstrations proved to be peaceful.[25] In the following decade, strikes and demonstrations persisted, one of them leading to the largest industrial conflict in the country's history, when following a strike in the spring of 1899, the employers' association organized a lockout from May to September. The conflict ended in the "September Settlement", forming an agreement between parties of the labor market that set the framework for more peaceful negotiations, called the "Labor Market Constitution", one of the first of its kind in Europe. With this development, the contentious practices of strikes and workers' protest became somehow bounded within a set of rules that was continuously negotiated with the authorities.

The negotiation and legalization of public demonstrations coexisted with another form of public protest connected to the industrialized city, namely the strike. During the nineteenth century throughout Europe, emergent workers' organizations developed forms of action for conflicts in the labor market, embedded in a still more tight, international network.[26] Within the public spaces of the growing cities, new forms of conflicts and performances took shape in what Charles Tilly has called "contentious politics", emphasizing the point that public gatherings and practices in themselves began to be an organized political claim or contention, shaping a whole new repertoire of activism that was not available before.[27]

In Denmark, of which Copenhagen was the most significant arena, this process showed new configurations of bodies, to be observed and experienced in public space. With the emergence of the Danish labor movement in the 1870s, for example, a strike among masons led to a large gathering at the Commons, an open field on the outskirts of the capital. The police and military attacked and dissolved the gathering in a

hitherto unseen violent clash, leading to the arrest of the movement's leadership, with the controversial forced emigration of Louis Pio to the United States as a result.[28] This "Battle at the Commons" became an important narrative for the labor movement in terms of the power of public action. With the internationally initiated demonstrations on the 1st of May, they had a way of developing this tool. Here, the demonstrating crowd formed as the mass that Canetti writes about, with a strong agency of its own, hard to control from within or without. But there were other formations that we can trace in the sources as well, namely the swarm. One of the riding police officers at the Commons noted in his report how small groups of people emerged out of the mass only to dissolve when they were approached. He termed this phenomenon "swarms".

The New Year Riots: Carnivalesque Violence

The swarm seems to have been one of the more informal ways of appropriating urban space that came to the fore in nineteenth-century Copenhagen. As I have shown elsewhere in more detail, one of the cases that shows swarms as well as the mass are the strange event of the recurring riots taking place on New Year's Eve from the year 1900 onwards.[29]

"Files put aside regarding New Year's Eve" - this is the heading of a collection of documents in the Danish National Archives, assembled by the secretary of the Director of Police, Eugen Pedersen, from 1901 to 1919. The files were kept in the director's personal archive, in his office, saving them from the extensive discarding of Danish police archives. These sources present urban riots as an instance of what I will call "subversive mobilities". In an almost carnivalesque mode, the participants in these events turned daily hierarchies and identities upside down and appropriated the space of City Hall Square, the square we have met earlier as an important space on election day.

Before analyzing these events, let us try to investigate one episode, the New Year of 1903-04, one of the years when the subversive movements were at their height. We enter the action on the night of December 31st 1903 and January 1st 1904. Firecrackers had been thrown throughout the Danish capital on the preceding days, an action that was concentrated around the city's usual "trouble zones". Barrels of garbage had been burned in the streets and bonfires lit, while the citizens had been ignoring police officers, busily running from place to place. During the afternoon and evening, people began pouring into the new center of

town, a former Hay Market on the old fortification area. This was a place so recently created that it had been given the name of City Hall Square only a few years before. Thousands of citizens and visitors from the hinterlands came to the area during the evening. In waves, they followed the rhythms of trains arriving at the city's central station just to the west and the tramways of which City Hall Square was the central node. One newspaper described the scene, the journalist positioned in the tower of the City Hall:

> Over a quivering mob that counted thousands, the City Hall raised its dark silhouette, where the dials popped out like burning eyes, while the hotels Bristol and Metropol shone in fire and light.[30]

As night fell, events gathered momentum. The crowds in the square became electrified, as if charged from the circuits around them. As the bells rang, the square exploded in a multiplicity of movement. A journalist of the Copenhagen-based newspaper *Politiken* wrote:

> The first strokes of the bells signaled a deafening bombardment ... smoke covered the whole square ... bloody noses, black eyes and loose teeth were everywhere. Women fainted, gentlemen became hysteric and fought with their walking sticks.[31]

Another observer wrote that "the electrical posts became filled with people ... one man jumped onto a pillar reciting while others, their coats inside out, played comedians … everything was total anarchy".[32] For more than an hour, this sudden outpouring of energy held the square in uproar. Fireworks became weapons, burning the dresses of women, sliding on the surface of the square or being thrown through smashed windows into the trams. By disconnecting the driving poles, participators not only stopped the tram wagons, but also extinguished the light inside and terminated the electric mechanisms that could open the doors. Nine or ten tram wagons were disconnected in this way, left standing silent, dark and crippled with the doors blocked by the rioters. The crowd attacked the vehicles, tore parts off the wagons and tossed them across the square. Lampposts, fire alarms, and shop windows were smashed, carts with wooden planks driven to the center of the square and set on fire. Families became divided, only to find each other in the morning. Fences were ripped out of the ground and used as barricades. Several observers noticed that many rioters turned the inside of their coats and caps out and that there was shouting and performances. Ladies were being "offended", in most cases being pushed or embraced, in other cases in a more violent manner. In one instance, women got

their clothes and underwear torn so violently that their pubic hair was attached to the garments when collected as evidence.

At about two o'clock in the morning, the core of the rioters was backing out from City Hall Square and towards a broad shopping street nearby. This strange riot ended as suddenly as it had begun. Over the next few days, the event was covered extensively by the press. All kinds of explanations were offered for the event, suggesting that nobody could quite comprehend what had happened. Though some press articles reported on injured people, this does not seem to have been the priority of journalists. Police reports from the night likewise devote little space to describing physical injuries. Over 600 fines had been handed out that night, more than in any previous riot, yet few had been arrested. Most people had thrown fireworks or damaged the urban public infrastructure.

What had happened on this night? The incidents were not unique. Sources point to New Year 1900 as the first case of unrest and probably the beginning of the practices that are described in the preceding passages. We can see how the police were very attentive during each incident, having all personnel on the streets, yet only to contain the riots, not to actually stop them.[33] The square was too large an area for authorities to control, which allowed for the participants to appropriate the space for one night each year. These practices were to repeat and evolve for the next twenty years, being documented until 1919. In memoirs from the time, we can follow how the spectacle developed into a form of entertainment called the "Copenhagen Trouble" that people had to experience, often as part of their adolescence. One author recalls, for example, that "when I had been confirmed, my parents allowed me to attend the City Hall Square [incidents] at New Year".[34] Another author writes how "my mom and dad wanted to go and see the [Copenhagen] Trouble, and they let us children come along".[35] These and other sources suggest how the appropriation of City Hall Square became ritualized, turning into a part of the identity and narrative surrounding the city's public space. Still today, New Year is being celebrated here, and the now entirely ritualized spectacle is being broadcasted on national TV.

It is possible to interpret the relation between body and space in this context through the anthropological conceptualization of affordance. Through repeated and habitualized events, the space of City Hall Square was turned into a space of "contained trouble" by way of the mass of bodies that filled the square. As these practices became established, they came to carry a narrative that in turn attracted swarms of spectators, who over the years became part of the event itself. The swarms, briefly mentioned above, represented an interesting bodily appropriation in

themselves: While the mass, or the large crowd dissolved the individual body into a larger, collective with its own rules and mechanics – as in Canetti's categories for instance – the swarm was an in-between. Here, the crowd dispersed quickly, only to take shape again in another location. In the case of the Copenhagen Trouble, this tactic was so strong that the police copied it from the rioters in order to actually contain the event.[36] Thus, the individual and collective body were in a dynamic interplay that allowed confusing the authorities, as we will see below. Furthermore, the swarm gave room for what recent social and political theory has called emergent systems, that is, a form of decentralized self-government, without an internalization of a dominating paradigm or *dispositif*.[37] The swarm is an unruly, dissolvable, and confusing cluster of bodies and in the case of the Copenhagen Trouble it worked in relation to the larger mass occupying City Hall Square.

In this way, the (large) space – the square – that was created for monumental purposes came to afford the unruly crowd, because the amount of bodies that it could contain was so large that control by authorities was impossible. By integrating the unruliness in a theatrical narrative, with bodies represented as actors, it became domesticated or at least pacified as a threat to public order. A negotiation had established the New Year Riots as a less regulated spatial practice, as long as it was kept inside its borders in time and topography.

Irony and Violence: Syndicalist Copenhagen

In the rioting above, there was no real objective or intention driving the spectacle – it shared characteristics with what Canetti calls the "Reversal Crowd", since the relation of power changed, but in unclear ways. One of the central prerequisites for things to happen was simply for a sufficient amount of bodies to locate themselves in the large square at the same time. Then the logics of the crowd and of the swarm could begin to work. The New Year crowd's lack of direction also showed itself in the way violence was part of the riots. People got hurt, but only in random affects or accidents. Bodily violence was present, but it wasn't dominating and it seemed arbitrary. Thus, we can see the riots as another category alongside voting or political demonstrations.

In the following case, however, violence played a more central role. Following the economic crisis after the First World War and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia of 1917, workers' organizations in Copenhagen had begun in the winter of 1917-18 to gather and discuss radical means of demonstrating. Especially the socialist workers' faction

called the syndicalist movement propagated what it described as “direct action”, a way of attracting attention to political questions. In February, a large group took to the streets departing from two different locations of workers’ union headquarters. They had started a rumor that the procession would go towards the Meat Exchange in the western part of the city to protest against rising meat prices, knowing that civil police officers and secret informants would pick up this information. But only a small group leading the demonstration knew what was planned.[38] Halfway, they suddenly changed direction and walked towards the Stock Exchange instead, targeting the stockbrokers as those responsible for the unjust distribution of goods after the war. Arriving there, they surprised the personnel and got access to the building.

It was at Shrovetide and there was a custom of “tilting a barrel”, where children hit at a barrel until it breaks and sweets fall out. For this ritual, small clubs were sold in Copenhagen shops, and on the way, a small group had acquired a number of clubs. Surprising the guard at the Stock Exchange, they drew the clubs, chased the stockbrokers out, and shouted “out you bandits, the shop is closed by the workers”. Soon the building was empty and the police that had been gathered at the Meat Exchange arrived. After a short fight, the demonstration was dissolved. In this way, we can follow this rather large group (maybe 5.000 bodies), meeting from different starting points, following a smaller leading group. Without anybody knowing exactly what would happen, the leading group suddenly changed the direction and some stopped by a toy store to get clubs; close to City Hall Square, a small group of policemen tried to stop the group, but without luck. Then the chase of stockbrokers and signposting broke loose. The choreography of bodies and conflict seems here more theatrical and playful, maybe even with its own ironic twist: Chasing the merchants from the temple (of profit) with children’s toys.[39]

The event caused an emotional tension in the capital that would last for most of the year. In November, the oppositional workers’ organizations called for the release of German revolutionaries, such as Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, along with the Danish syndicalists that had been imprisoned since the Stock Exchange event. At the city’s vegetable market, speeches were given peacefully, but conflict began when the personnel of the passing trams refused to participate in the strike. Trams were stopped and one socialist leader, Johannes Sperling, rose to the roof of one of them and gave an unannounced speech, while police and demonstrators engaged in heavy clashes. Sperling was dragged down, which fueled the conflict. The confrontations would last four days in the quarter around the vegetable market and further into

the working-class quarters, where large numbers of cobbles and stones from the local construction sites were collected as weapons. About a hundred policemen were wounded, several hundreds of citizens were hospitalized, and fifty were arrested.

These ways of practicing more violent events with a spectacular, communicative effect were to some degree related to anarchist practices as they could be witnessed in Europe during the nineteenth century.[40] The contemporary criminologist Cesare Lombroso compared the French anarchist violence to an outbreak of cholera – it spread like a contagious disease, causing anxiety and affect in public space. The anarchists were performing a kind of spectacular or "phenomenal" violence as Nigel Thrift would call it, in which irony and theatrical elements were central. In Copenhagen, this kind of spectacle was not widespread, but in the two cases mentioned above, the syndicalists used it as a tactics for getting attention to their cause.

Perspective: A Body Public?

How can we understand these practices of bodily appropriation? Obviously, what appears here is not the kind of public sphere that emerges from the thinking of, for example, Jürgen Habermas, who conceptualized the bourgeois elite as forming a space for civilized, critical discussion in coffee houses and the press. The choreographies of bodies, either lining up for election, participating in festive riots, industrial conflicts, or sheer street fighting seem to be almost antagonistic to the civilized dialogue that became the ideal for the rights and duties of the citizens of the modern city as they appear in the liberal tradition of citizenship.

However, there is apparently something in these practices that influenced and negotiated public space, which was also tied to the meaning of being a citizen. If we accept this assumption, we can further propose that the practices we have seen in the empirical examples, even though they were related to earlier phenomena, were new in scope, organization, and tactical tools. We could talk of a new spatial politics of the modern city and/or citizen. This is already suggested as by the concepts of new "repertoires" or "contentious practices", but we could suggest some further conceptual reflections towards a notion of citizenship as a spatial and bodily practice. First of all, there is the question of agency. Citizenship in a broad sense is enacted through formalized rights and duties as in the liberal tradition, but also in a less articulated sense by participation and claim-making in public spaces. If

we follow the latter perspective, we can approach the cases above as incidents of bodily practices negotiating the public sphere. The New Year riots, for example, changed City Hall Square from being a zone for bourgeois promenades to an almost ritualized area of festivals for citizens of all social backgrounds and, furthermore, from a controllable to an uncontrollable space, even if only on one night each year. By turning to the concept of "affordance" as it has been used in social anthropology, we can see how material space can change its capacity without any formalized change of rules or the physical urban fabric.[41]

In this way, space is practiced and affected by those using it – the strategic operations that configured it are met by the tactical operations of everyday life, as in the case mentioned above when certain parts of the city become central routes for political demonstrations.[42] If we try to think of citizenship as something produced by acts of bodies in space, we can look at the empirical cases and notice that there are many versions. Appropriation of public space is practiced or "done" in multiple ways, and in each case it is different, also as an ontological category, as suggested by Annemarie Mol.[43] If we were to follow this praxeographic approach all the way, though, we would have trouble linking the concept of citizenship to the more general notions of in- and exclusion which are also central to the concept. Also, if we want to come closer to the continuum between individual and collective that is critical for this discussion, the notion of an infinite multiplicity of citizenships would come in the way. But so far, we can suggest that bodily practices can change public space and that these practices work in multiple ways.

Another perspective is possible through the consideration of violence. As we can expect for each of the empirical cases, violence becomes more prevalent, suggesting that violence is related to the distance between strategic and tactic operations. But looking from the vantage point of corporeal citizenship, the approach of this article also highlights an agency of what we could call subjective violence. In neo-Marxist theory, such as that of Slavoj Zizek, the violence that we see happening between subjects or bodies on the street is just an expression of the more important, structural violence pertaining to the conflict inherent in capitalist society.[44] Notwithstanding the importance of this structural aspect, we can see here that the actual, visible violence, or bodily practices more broadly, have important effects in themselves. They cause deep anxiety among authorities, they change affordances of spaces, and they are exercised in order to change or uphold existing social hierarchies. Thus, corporeal citizenship provides the subject, individual or multiple, with agency.

As we saw in the case of the secret ballot, the execution of citizenship included an extreme individual act, the vote itself. At the same time, there was also a very collective moment in the "arrangement", when voters met in the grand hall to perform the very same procedures regardless of social status. These two components can somehow serve as a metaphor of two traditions in the thought of citizenship. In the liberal tradition, the right is provided for a group, the citizens, but in the end it is an individual choice that should not be influenced by others. In the later, post-structuralist tradition, ideally, the acts of citizenship are performed among others.

In summing these theoretical perspectives up, the question remains how a notion of an embodied public space can contribute, for instance to the cultural history of the city. In order to consider this point, we can return to the introductory notes of this article on urban history, politics, and the body. The field around cultural theory and governmentality was briefly mentioned and if we draw on the comments above and the empirical cases presented, we can now propose how attention to the body could enhance the analytical perspective of this field in cultural history. One prominent proponent of this field is the historian Patrick Joyce and his approach to the modern, liberal city as a series of "ordering processes" - sanitary, moral, aesthetic, and social.[45] The argumentative force of Joyce's approach is a very convincing integration of urban materiality into the Foucauldian idea of govermentality, especially with an emphasis on the agency of very ordinary things related to the city: sewers, lampposts, and maps, for instance, provide his analysis of liberal power with a deeper and more interesting texture.[46] Also, as noted by other urban historians, his approach brings in new spaces as sites for the workings of liberal power, such as slaughterhouses and train stations, pointing to these as assemblages of discourse, experience, and materiality.[47] But while Joyce can get close to an urban experience through material objects, the actual subjects for whom these experiences happened remain rather obscure, as critics have noted.[48]

If we take Joyce as a representative of a more recent cultural history of the city, influenced by governmentality and the material turn, we can maybe suggest a position for the body in this. If one was to take the perspective of corporeal citizenship or the body public as suggested in the small empirical cases presented in this article and integrate this perspective into more comprehensive research, an overlooked perspective could become accessible, namely the political agency of the body within the production of urban space.

1 Eric Hobsbawn, *The Age of Revolution* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1962).
2 Charles Tilly, *The Rebellious Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975).
3 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991); Chris Otter, *Victorian Eye : A Political History of Light and Vision in Britain, 1800-1910* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2008).
4 Loïc Wacquant, 'Marginality, Ethnicity and Penality in the Neo-Liberal City: An Analytic Cartography', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (2014), 1687–1711; Richard Sennett, *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization* (London: Faber, 1996); Stephen Legg, 'Governing Prostitution in Colonial Delhi: From Cantonmen Regulations to International Hygiene', *Social History* 34 (2009), 447–67.
5 Hans Chr. Johansen, *Danish Population History 1600-1939* (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2002).
6 See for example Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford/Cambridge, MA, USA: Blackwell, 1991); David Harvey, *Rebel Cities. From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution* (London/New York: Verso, 2012); Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London: SAGE, 2005); Edward Soja, *Postmetropolis* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 2000).
7 Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 1984); Tim Cresswell, 'The Vagrant/Vagabond. The Curious Career of a Mobile Subject', in *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*, ed. by Tim Cresswell and Peter Merriman (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011); Anique Hommels, *Unbuilding Cities: Obduracy in Urban Socio-Technical Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005); Tim Ingold, *The Perception of the Environment. Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
8 Sigurd Jensen and Claus M Schmidt, *Rammerne Sprænges. Københavns Historie Bd. 4, 1830-1900*, ed. by Erik oa. Kjersgaard (København: Gyldendal, 1982), IV., Erindring nr. 738, Aksel Melby Pedersen, s.8, Københavns Stadsarkiv.
9 Malcolm Crook and Tom Crook, 'The Advent of the Secret Ballot in Britain and France, 1789-1914: From Public Assembly to Private Compartment', *History*, 92 (2007), 449–71.
10 Enlightenment thinkers such as Delacroix had described the idea already in the early 18th century.
11 Romain Bertrand, Jean-Louis Briquet and Peter Pels, 'Towards a Historical Ethnography of Voting', in *Cultures of Voting. The Hidden History of the Secret Ballot* (London: Hurst & Company, 2007), 1–15 (3).
12 See Malcolm Crook, 'Reforming Voting Practices in a Global Age: The Making and Remaking of the Modern Secret Ballot in Britain, France and The United States c.1600-c.1950', *Crook, Tom*, 212 (2011), 201.
13 Elias Canetti, *Masse und Macht* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1980).
14 Danish State Archives, coll. of Municipal elections 1901-1902.
15 Memoir 1457, p. 7, Eiler Christoffersen, Copenhagen Municipal Archives.
16 John Pløger, 'Foucault's Dispositif and the City', ed. by Jean Hillier, *Planning Theory* 7 (2008), 51–70.
17 Henrik Stevnsborg, *Politi 1628-2007* (København: Samfundslitteratur, 2010); Jørgen Mührmann-Lund, '"Efter ethvert steds særdeles omstændigheder": Politi og lokalsamfund under den danske enevælde.', *Temp*, 9 (2014), 68–91; Karl Peder Pedersen, *Kontrol over København: Studier i den sene enevældes sikkerhedspoliti 1800-48* (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2014).

18 Leif Jerram, *Streetlife: The Untold History of Europe's Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 14; Sophie Watson, *City Publics : The (Dis)enchantments of Urban Encounters* (London: Routledge, 2006).
19 Mikkel Thelle, 'Subversive Mobilities: The Copenhagen Riots 1900-1919', *Transfers. Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies*, 3 (2013), 7–25.
20 Erving Goffman, *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings* (New York: Free Press, 1963).
21 Stephen Carr, *Public Space* (Cambridge/New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Madeleine Hurd, 'Class, Masculinity, Manners, and Mores. Public Space and Public Sphere in Nineteenth-Century Europe', *Social Science History*, 24 (2000), 75–110; Thomas Bender, 'The New Metropolitanism and the Plurality of Publics', *Harvard Design Magazine*, Winter/Spr (2001), 6–17.
22 Jens Toftgaard, *Kampen Om København. Magt og demokrati i byens rum 1870-1901* (Selskabet til Forskning i Arbejderbevægelsens Historie, 2008), I.
23 Toftgaard, 45.
24 Toftgaard, 97
25 Morten Thing and Flemming Hemmersham, *1. Maj 1890: Et Dokumentarium* (København: Selskabet til Forskning i Arbejderbevægelsens Historie, 1990).
26 Klausen i Flemming Mikkelsen, *Protest Og Oprør - Kollektive aktioner i Danmark 1700-1920*, ed. by Flemming Mikkelsen (Aarhus: Modtryk, 1986), 134ff.
27 Charles Tilly, *Contentious Performances*, *Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
28 Morten Petersen, 'Oprørere. Skæbnefortællinger om danmarkshistoriens tolv største rebeller' (København: Aschehoug, 2006).
29 Thelle, 'Subversive Mobilities: The Copenhagen Riots 1900-1919.'
30 *Berlingske Tidende* 2th of january 1904, own translation. Cited in Mikkel Thelle, 'København 1900. Rådhuspladsen Som Laboratorium for Den Moderne Bys Offentlige Rum' (Københavns Universitet, 2013), 159.
31 *København* d. 1. januar 1904, own transl.
32 *Social-Demokraten* d. 1. januar 1904.
33 Thelle, 'Subversive Mobilities: The Copenhagen Riots 1900-1919', 17.
34 Copenhagen Municipal Archives, memoir collection, Rybo, J., nr 1823, 22.
35 Copenhagen Municipal Archives, memoir collection, Rasmussen, Martha, nr. 1675 p. 10
36 Thelle, 'Subversive Mobilities: The Copenhagen Riots 1900-1919', 17ff.
37 Eugene Thacker, 'Swarming: Number versus Animal?', in *Deleuze and New Technology*, ed. by Mark Poster and David Savat (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 161–84; Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, *Multitude* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2004).
38 See the memoir of the leading actor, Andreas Fritzner http://www.leksikon.org/art.php?n=2820 (in Danish, accessed 16th of July 2015). He is talking about consciously spreading a rumour, while memoirs from police officers, for example, tell a different story.
39 This interpretation is not explicit in the sources though.
40 Julian Brigstocke, 'Defiant Laughter: Humour and the Aesthetics of Place in Late 19th Century Montmartre', *Cultural Geographies*, 19 (2012), 217–35.
41 Caroline Humphrey, 'Violence and Urban Architecture: Events at the Ensemble of the Odessa Steps 1904-5', in *Locating Urban Conflicts. Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Everyday* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 37–56; Ingold; James Gibson,

'The Theory of Affordances', in *Perceiving, Acting and Knowing. Towards an Ecological Psychology*, ed. by Robert Shaw et al. (New York: Hillsdale, 1977).

42 Henrik Vigh, 'Motion Squared. A Second Look at the Concept of Social Navigation', *Anthropological Theory*, 9 (2009), 419–38; de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*.

43 Annemarie Mol, *The Body Multiple. Ontology in Medical Practice* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).

44 Slavoj Zizek, *Violence. Six Sideways Reflections* (London: Profile, 2008).

45 Patrick Joyce, *The Rule of Freedom. Liberalism and the Modern City* (London: Verso, 2003), 223.

46 As noted in Jordanna Bailkin, 'Patrick Joyce, The Rule of Freedom: Liberalism and the Modern City', *European History Quarterly*, 35 (2005), 591–93.

47 See for example Kate Hill, 'Tales of the City. Discourse and Governance in Victorian Britain', *Journal of Urban History*, 34 (2007), 154–60.

48 An example could be Paul Cohen, 'The Rule of Freedom, Review', *The American Historical Review*, 109 (2004), 151–52.

Mikkel Thelle, contact: iksmikkel (at) cas.au.dk, is an urban historian with a focus on cultural and technological history. Beginning with projects in museums and exhibitions, the industrial and post-industrial city has been central to his work, which led him to integrate cultural and spatial theory. Related to this research interest, he has been also pursued questions of the body in public space through a study of riots and conflicts and publications on passenger experiences and urban consumption. Mikkel is associate professor at Aarhus University, Denmark, and director of the Danish Centre for Urban History.