

Research paper

Exchanging capital: Feminist encounters in an urban squat in 1960s Copenhagen

Jakob Ingemann Parby ¹ , Svava Riesto ^{2*} , Henriette Steiner ² 

¹ Museum of Copenhagen, DENMARK

² University of Copenhagen, DENMARK

*Corresponding Author: svri@ign.ku.dk

This paper is part of the special issue: [Feminist spatial practices for social equality](#)

Citation: Parby, J. I., Riesto, S., & Steiner, H. (2026). Exchanging capital: Feminist encounters in an urban squat in 1960s Copenhagen. *Feminist Encounters: A Journal of Critical Studies in Culture and Politics*, 10(2), Article 23. <https://doi.org/10.20897/femenc/19071>

Published: August 26, 2026

ABSTRACT

This article considers Sofiegården, a cluster of properties in Copenhagen squatted from 1965- 1969 by young people seeking to create a community-oriented form of living. The story of these squatters and the political powers that worked to demolish Sofiegården challenges the dominant narratives of squatting in the 1960s. In historical accounts, Sofiegården is often presented as a conflict between young people revolting against the lack of urban housing and heroically creating new forms of cohabitation, while the politicians, developers, and police are seen as villains without empathy. Employing Pierre Bourdieu's concept of capital, we complicate this narrative by analyzing how the squatters – many of whose public-facing figures were women – strategically utilized their social and cultural capital to fight for urban justice and what they argued was their right to the city. In particular, we unpack the agenda of their most public opponent, housing mayor Edel Saunte, and her feminist position on urban justice, which ended up clashing with those of the squatters. The battle of Sofiegården thus opens a window to a complicated feminist encounter that ends in the use of hard power – a history that provides a useful branch of thought for contemporary debates concerning the housing crisis and spatial justice.

Keywords: squatting, feminist encounters, social and economic capital, equitable cities, housing justice

As cities across the world face a cost-of-living crisis and rising inequality in the wake of exploding housing prices, the history of squatting as an alternative strategy for living in the city compels the attention of both scholars and political activists. Issues of gentrification and social injustice following urban renewal have reignited interest in past forms of countering and protesting such development, as well as interest in the writings of scholars and activists on the topic, such as Ruth Glass (1964), Jane Jacobs (1961), and Henri Lefebvre (1968). This article considers Sofiegården, an area of seven buildings in Copenhagen marked for demolition that, between 1965 and 1969, was squatted by a group of primarily young people (in Danish, 'slumstormer' meaning literally 'chargers of slum'). Sofiegården is often mentioned as a prequel to the self-declared free town of Christiania, squatted in 1971 and continuing to this day, the most well-known and long-lasting example in Copenhagen (Vasudevan 2017/2023).

Many histories of urban squatting, including accounts of Sofiegården, are written from the perspective of insiders – personal memoirs by the occupants themselves, which therefore tend to emphasize only the squatters lived experiences and narratives (Squatting Europe Kollektive, 2013; Brekling, 2022; Kampmann & Widding,

1969; Junge & Lund, 2018). Insider perspectives are valuable resources since they offer both a situated insight into the contemporary positioning and internal relations of the squatters as well as their later processing of their experiences. But insider perspectives are also challenging for historians to work with because they present a partial perspective on situations and processes that are highly complex and contested. Methodological and theoretical positions that can challenge, complement, and complicate the narrative become particularly relevant. This article thus examines the encounter between the squatters at Sofiegården and the political establishment that they were opposing.

Over time, the squatters took care of or – depending on one's perspective – took advantage of the declining building mass of the inner city and acted, again depending on one's perspective, reasonably or opportunistically, given Copenhagen's shortage of urban student housing. By the 1960s, living standards of the welfare state had risen, and both public and private employers requested a workforce with better education. A larger proportion of young people thus had access to higher education in Denmark than ever before; 35,000 in 1970, compared with 9,000 in 1960 (Farbøl & Olesen, 2025). In that decade, the number grew from 6,000 to 24,000 at the University of Copenhagen alone (Københavns Universitet, n.d.). This created a heavy demand for student housing. Dilapidated buildings in the inner city that were condemned for demolition and abandoned by people moving to the suburbs became low-rent or even no-rent accommodation for young students – and others. While the student revolts of the 1960s, in Denmark and beyond, were in large part a response to what was seen as academe's outdated curriculum and its hierarchy of power within a broader outdated patriarchal societal structure, for many of the students, housing was also a central concern. Sofiegården as an enactment of housing and urban justice issues thus goes hand-in-hand with the changing political formations and youth revolts across the Western world. During the years of Sofiegården's existence, these political formations solidified and became visible in the formation of left-wing political movements who protested against the Vietnam War, nuclear technologies, as well as other political manifestations of post-World War 2 Western capitalism.

Several of Sofiegården's spokespersons were actively aligned with the emerging youth culture and the left-wing and revolutionary movements of the day, including to oppose power hierarchies and to search for new, community-oriented forms of living in the city, speaking against oppressive structures against women and other minority groups. Among Sofiegården's most public figures were the women Britta Lillesøe and Dorrit Kampmann, who, while not defining themselves explicitly as feminist activists, in many ways were aligned with feminist agendas. This was a time when new feminist ideas about class, justice, and alternatives to heteronormative and patriarchal family structures were broadening the agenda of the traditional fight for political and economic equality between men and women that had long been primarily organized within the framework of Danish Women's Society (Dansk Kvindesamfund), founded in 1871. In particular, many younger, left-wing activists did not believe that change could be achieved by working within the existing political establishment; instead, the struggle for gender equality had to be connected with the struggle for a more fundamental societal change. The Red Stocking Movement (Rødstrømpebevægelsen), officially founded in 1970, was one of the key examples of this more radical and activist approach, which also led to several squatting experiments with women's collectives.¹ One of the main slogans of the more radical feminists was "Ingen Kvindekamp uden Klassekamp, ingen Klassekamp uden Kvindekamp," meaning that the struggle for women's rights could not be fought without simultaneously combating capitalist power structures.

As events around Sofiegården progressed, the young people who had been moving into these dilapidated buildings since 1965 increasingly came into conflict with the dominating social democratic party, who held the majority in both national and municipal politics. One of their main adversaries was Edel Saunte, a woman lawyer, politician, and women's rights champion who had been active in the Danish Women's Society since the 1920s. Sofiegården thus became a site where several women in different positions along the period's politicized feminist spectrum clashed over goals and values. Power dynamics played out in both soft and hard forms as part of the struggle over not just Sofiegården and its future but also what life in the city should be or could become. In short, it was a place where normative questions concerning justice and good life clashed and were negotiated. This makes it a highly suitable case through which to interrogate feminist encounters over the issues of squatting and justice during the economically booming years of Danish welfare state capitalism in the mid-20th century (Esping-Andersen, 1990). We weave a complex interpretive web around Sofiegården and the historical source

¹ See for example this anonymous interview: "Tværpolitisk kvindesag er tidsspilde," interview i Kvinden og Samfundet, juli-august 1974 – Danmarkshistorien | Lex and Ipsen, Pernille. (2020). Et åbent Øjeblik. Da mine mødre gjorde noget nyt. Gyldendal.
https://danmarkshistorien.lex.dk/%E2%80%9CTv%C3%A6rpolitisk_kvindesag_er_tidsspilde%E2%80%9D,_interview_i_Kvinden_og_Samfundet,_juli-august_1974

material available to us. We show how the Sofiegården-squatters actively used their social capital in their struggles to remain in the buildings, and we unpack the motivations and values that drove not only the squatters but also their political opponents, particularly Saunte.

In this article, we employ three lines of questioning to explore the relationships between feminism, housing issues, and ideals of urban life as they unfolded in the case of Sofiegården:

- a) The values and aims that drove both the squatters and their opponents to the city council, in response to the urban and societal context within which both groups operated;
- b) The activist strategies the squatters used in their struggle to maintain their squatted spaces and alternative lifestyle in the city, and how their political positions, class, education, and gender intersected with other markers of difference such as cultural capital and social networks; and
- c) The conflict around Sofiegården and its occupation and demolition and eventual replacement by new buildings, all of which exposed different notions about feminism and urban justice.

In the dominant historiography of squatting, the practice is often presented as a liberation project by a group of people who were marginalized in urban policies and who claimed their right to both occupy space in and to change the city (Kadir, 2014, on the right to the city see Lefebvre, 1968; Harvey, 2008 and 2012). Even if the discourse and historiography of Sofiegården have together formed a kind of Danish prototype for later squatting movements, the actual organization and events of Sofiegården differed in so many ways from the history of the more famous Christiania or the later generations of squatters of the 1980s that the story of the site must be treated with a carefully selected vocabulary and attention to detail; as we will show, even calling it a squat is problematic.

The first squatters, whose occupancy may be seen as a balancing act between licensed and illegal squatting, moved into the properties of Sofiegården in 1965. They argued that they were unable to find appropriate and affordable places to live in Copenhagen and wished for a different lifestyle in the city, with a basis in community and self-organization. And so they did, organizing the properties as a 'kollegium' – a word used in Danish for student housing, which also means community run by its own governing structure, containing dwellings, community spaces, a second-hand shop, and places for creative activities such as music, photography, dance, and theatre. Yet, less than five years after the squatter moved into Sofiegården, in February 1969, most of the buildings were cleared in a spectacular illustration of hard power, with over 200 Copenhagen police officers converging on the larger Christianshavn district (Figure 1).

Figure 1

Sofiegården in February 1969. The squatters had just been forced out and the condemned buildings in which they had resided have been demolished



Note: Photo ©Dagny Sørensen/Museum of Copenhagen.

SQUATTING AND EMPOWERMENT IN THE POST-WAR WELFARE STATE

The central protagonists at Sofiegården were often both empowered and disempowered at the same time, driven by both political agendas and more mundane concerns – all the imperatives of a capitalist society. Pierre Bourdieu cautions against thinking of capital as monetary or capitalistic in the narrow sense (e.g. as profit-oriented) (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 16) He explains that the:

structure of the distribution of different types and subtypes of capital at a given moment in time represents the immanent structure of the social world, i.e., the set of constraints, inscribed in the very reality of that world, which govern its functioning in a durable way, determining the chances of success for practices (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 183).

Bourdieu also compels us to take the symbolic dimension of culture seriously when it comes to capital. At Sofiegården, as we shall see, building alliances and accumulating non-fiscal forms of capital played crucial roles in the events and encounters that unfolded.

Furthermore, rejecting the binary of formal versus informal architecture, we aim to inscribe Sofiegården in the context of the housing policies of the post-war welfare state. We understand squatting as both an alternative to and part of established societal power structures such as housing policies, omnibus media, and political institutions. Our study combines observations from the existing literature on Sofiegården with oral history accounts documenting the squatter's histories in newspaper articles, TV programs, memoirs, photographs, and other archival material. Among the main sources are the collected photographs, artefacts, and memoirs from Sofiegården in the Museum of Copenhagen's collection, including video interviews made for the permanent exhibition gallery Right to the City, which opened in 2020.²

Figure 2

In 1965, a group of young people moved into a group of condemned houses, all two- or three-story houses in Christianshavn dating back to the 18th century.



Note: Photo: Mogens Falk-Sørensen, January 1961, ©Copenhagen City Archive.

Introduction to Sofiegården and its licensed squatters

In 1965, a group of young people moved into a group of condemned houses in Christianshavn: Sofiegade 3, 5, and 7, Overgaden oven Vandet 32 and 34, and Dronningensgade 33, 35, 37, and 37A, all two- or three-story houses built in the 18th century (Figure 2). This group of houses was soon named Sofiegården, after the neighboring street Sofiegade. It would become one of the foundational sites for Denmark's burgeoning left-wing

² The interviews were conducted as part of the production of the movie "Kampen om byen - retten til et sted at være", produced by Adam Rieper and Christine Hybschmann for the gallery Retten til Byen in the permanent exhibition of The Museum of Copenhagen. The movie consists of a combination of historical filmclips and interviews with squatters and activists involved in squatting activities in Copenhagen between 1965 and 2025. Due to copyright issues it can only be viewed in the museum.

youth culture and the student movements of the late 1960s. The buildings had been condemned since 1963, in accordance with a new municipal planning document, *Kvartersplan*, and were owned by the private housing cooperation *Danske Andelslejligheder* together with a private solicitor. The first squatters officially rented their rooms as storage spaces from *Danske Andelslejligheder*; they put up dark curtains to avoid the police from discovering that they also inhabited the buildings. They thereby legally rented the spaces to begin with but illegally occupied the buildings. The young people who initially moved into *Sofiegården* did not see themselves as squatters but rather housing activists. They soon began to negotiate openly with the private landlord and the municipality about acquiring temporary permission to inhabit the buildings until they were due for demolition. Among these first squatters were Britta Lillesøe and Jesper Sølling, who later became a couple. More people moved into these and the neighboring buildings, together creating 46 apartments for themselves in these buildings (M.S., 1968). *Danske Andelslejligheder* tried to raise the rent, but Lillesøe, Sølling, and others opposed them, and in the summer and fall of 1965 a more formal arrangement was reached between the squatters and the owner (Kampmann & Widding, 1969).

Throughout the occupation of the condemned buildings, the inhabitants paid a nominal rent. As such they were not strictly speaking ‘squatters’ in the regular sense of the word, which implies unlawful occupation without any monetary exchange; they are better described as proto-squatters, or ‘licensed squatters,’ as they are known in London, among other cities (Ferreri, 2023). But for the sake of brevity, we will still call them squatters in this article, since the *Sofiegården* inhabitants have historically been described as the first of new kind of squatters (*slumstormere*) in postwar Copenhagen.

Between April and October 1965 approximately 60 more residents moved into *Sofiegården*. The squatters created *Kollegiet – Lejerforeningen Sofiegården*, a self-organized tenants’ association that specifically mentioned student housing in its name. Its first spokesperson and chair were Jesper Sølling, followed by Dorrit Kampmann and finally, No Widding. The organization established a waiting list for those who wanted to join the squat, and it also collected the rent, which was used for communal expenses, such as the cleaning and maintenance of shared facilities and compensation for the squat’s administrators (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, pp. 38–39).³ The apartments were small but considered affordable at the time, 25 square metres for 134 DKK per month. Since the municipality kept a close eye on *Sofiegården*, the squatters also established a system of shared responsibility for keeping the buildings up to fire regulation standards. They began restoring some of the most dilapidated buildings, partly in dialogue with a preservation organization called *Friends of Old Copenhagen* (*Det Gamle Københavns Venner*), whose goal was to reverse, through restoration, planned demolition. Until early in 1968 the municipality generally seems to have accepted the arrangements of intermediary use of the buildings as student housing and suggested that the solution found in *Sofiegården* could be extended to other condemned houses in Copenhagen.

While the squatters managed to turn the run-down buildings into a significant cultural and social experiment, the squatters were under increasing pressure to prepare to vacate, beginning in February 1968. Two houses in particular, *Dronningensgade 33* and *35*, were scheduled for demolition in the spring of 1968 and the whole building complex in the spring of 1969. The residents succeeded in postponing the demolition, but two buildings were finally torn down in late February and early March 1969, after tumultuous scenes when a large police force stormed *Sofiegården* on February 26, 1969. The squatters protested non-violently and some were arrested. Following this clash with the authorities, some of the squatters returned and continued to live in the remaining buildings of *Sofiegården* until the summer and fall of 1969, when an agreement was reached with the municipality to rehouse some of them in another run-down and neighboring property, at *Dronningensgade 6*. The rest were relocated to other condemned or municipally owned apartments or sought housing elsewhere on their own (Brekling et al., 2022; Hansen, 1986).⁴ This meant that *Sofiegården* was fully vacated when the remaining buildings were demolished on January 5, 1970.

This collective occupation of several adjacent houses was a new experience for the squatters and the private property owner (*Danske Andelslejligheder*) alike. There had been examples of individual squats earlier in the post-war period, but nothing like this. These firsts led to a number of peculiarities that complicate the story beyond that of the subsequent dominant narrative of squatters, in which illegal occupants claim space despite opposition from authorities in an established society. *Sofiegården*’s squatters paid rent and presented an intermediary solution to the shortage of student housing to the municipality. They established a partnership with *Danske Andelslejligheder* and the municipality regarding the tearing down of houses in the backyards, and their negotiations with the municipality delayed the demolition. Moreover, the agreement that allowed several of the

³ The rent was 5.76 DKK per month per square meter, plus a 30 DKK flat contribution from all units.

⁴ Brekling et al. 2022, p. 205-6; Hansen, Helle Schjellerup: ”Kampen for autonome rum – om de københavnske husbesættelser”, KH, 10, 1986, pp. 25-47. Information shared in group interviews with former squatters of *Sofiegården* in fall 2025.

squatters to take part in the afterlife of the area following the clearance – the new student housing that was built here in the early 1970s – all suggest that this conflict was unlike the much more confrontational and violent squat-clearances of later periods, a fate that also would mark the end to Sofiegården.⁵

The story of Sofiegården and its residents, a complex event that included multiple lived experiences, has since crystallized into a rather simple narrative: a clash between a visionary group of young, idealist leftwing people trying to create a new way of life and the reactionary forces of politicians, entrepreneurs and policeforces who stomp down on the squatters and throw them out to protect nonsensical property rights, capitalist interests, and petite-bourgeois decorum (see e.g. Danmarks Radio, 2019a). This narrative highlights the disempowerment of young students due to violent political action. This crystallization began with the highly mediatized moment when Sofiegården as a squatted living experiment came to an end.

But the actual history of Sofiegården is connected to broader trends in urban development of the postwar period and Sofiegården is about more than just two sides in conflict over the right to live somewhere versus property rights. In the period leading to the conflict, parts of inner-city Copenhagen were falling into disrepair. Between 1950 and 1975, the population of Copenhagen dropped significantly⁶, a decline caused by deterioration and suburbanization connected to a huge increase in public infrastructure and private car ownership, compounded by a turn to North American ideals of urban planning after the Second World War (Lykkebo, 2022). The result was a new push to commercialize and transform the city center, for example with the permanent closure in 1962 of a mile-long commercial street in the center of the Copenhagen, Strøget, when it was pedestrianized which was extended to neighboring urban streets and squares later in the 1960s. Other parts of central Copenhagen were characterized by increasing decay in this period. By the mid-1960s, the Housing Commission of Copenhagen Municipality had declared 26,000 properties unfit for dwelling and decided that these buildings should be either demolished or renovated. Yet hundreds of these properties were never renovated, and they became more and more dilapidated.

Indeed, during this period many Copenhageners left the city center and their often-dilapidated homes and moved into the newly built suburbs, which offered new ways of living, afforded by an economic upturn and access to modern-standard housing for working- and middle-class families (Lykkebo, 2022; Tietjen, 2010). This process certainly affected Christianshavn, including the buildings of Sofiegården; Christianshavn was at the time a notoriously run-down and diverse inner-city district where many working-class families still lived in houses dating to the 17th and 18th centuries. The archives of the Housing Commission and the municipal building register reveal that many of the buildings were plagued by damp conditions and decay, but also that some residents were allowed to remain in their apartment despite plans for demolition.

Christianshavn, which escaped the big urban fires of 1728 and 1795, contained many buildings that were 300 or 400 years old or more (Figure 3). Individual lots were densely populated, built initially to cater for the district's historical population of navy and harbor personnel, as well as sailors and other blue-collar workers from the factories and shipyards in the inner city. The working-class population was mixed with lower middle class and when the squatters moved to Sofiegården a few older residents, like the vice consul, P. Nørregaard and his wife, had been allowed to stay in the building despite their condemnation (Copenhagen City Archive 1963). We do not know if it was because the couple were elderly or if they could not find housing elsewhere. Boundaries between legal and illegal, empty and occupied, squatter and non-squatter are fuzzy, and the goals and the means considered necessary and meaningful changed on each of these 'sides', as the sense of acceptance and opposition between squatter and municipality took different shapes during the period.

Sofiegården was an experiment that developed and changed over time, and Christianshavn was in many ways an ideal neighborhood to test the ideas the activists entertained for it. However, much of the thinking and discourse about Sofiegården emerged along the way, often only becoming clear in hindsight. One of the young activists, Britta Lillesøe, said in an interview in 2020 that: "We didn't even know the word 'kollektiv.' I just thought along those lines" (Rieper & Hybschmann, 2020, 3:05–3:09). The young squatters envisioned a shared living space with different apartments but many communal activities. Those collective spaces included rooms for communal eating and cooking, collective creative work and performances, a shared TV and reading room, a stage in the courtyard, and a darkroom for the development of photographs, as well as communal baths and WCs. The squatters also shared an ideology of occupying buildings with the purpose of renovating them and thus saving them from demolition.

⁵ No Widding, former spokesperson of Sofiegården's squatters was head of the board of the new student housing that was going to be built on the site, and from 1972 on when it was built, he lived for a time in a flat in the complex as a form of caretaker. No Widding in Brekling ed. 2022, p. 207.

⁶ According to Statistics Denmark (Danmarks Statistik) – in the Municipality of Copenhagen the population dropped from 768,105 in 1950 to 622,773 in 1970.

Figure 3

The young residents at Sofiegården began by restoring some of the most dilapidated buildings.



Note: This photo shows the buildings along the street Dronningensgade as seen from the inner courtyard of the building block that Sofiegården was part of. Photo: Mogens Falk-Sørensen ©Copenhagen City Archive.

THE FEMINIST ANTAGONIST: EDEL SAUNTE

To begin to grapple with these shifting lines of acceptance and opposition, we turn to a prominent figure in the story of Sofiegården, Edel Saunte (1904–1991) (Figure 4). Saunte had for decades been a powerful force in the municipality's effort to clean the slums – 'sanering' in Danish, literally the 'sanitization' of urban areas. By the late 1960s, Saunte had earned a remarkable reputation as a proponent of gender equality (Borchorst, 2023). She was a lawyer and champion of women's rights, a Social Democrat who led the Danish Commission on the Status of Women from 1965 to 1974, for which she suggested initiatives to improve gender equality and the situation of Danish women in the country (Saunte, 1962–1974).

Saunte was Copenhagen's mayor of health and housing from 1962 to 1974, a member of the municipality's Housing Commission, and, during the summer of 1968, alternate city mayor for a short time. It was in these capacities that Saunte became a leading figure in countering the presence of squatters in Sofiegården. She set in motion the use of the police to clear out the squat with force, and she was called out as a main enemy of the squatters. Hers was a more traditional view of feminism than that of many in the young generation that the squatters at Sofiegården were part of. They were more aligned with the activism of the Red Stockings and the new revolutionary Marxist (and in part Leninist) political party VS (Venstresocialisterne), founded in 1967. Many of Sofiegården's residents were involved in establishing VS (Kampmann and Widding, 1969), a party with close ties to student organizations and activist groups (VS programerklæring, 1969) as well as certain feminist and anti-nuclear movements. Politicians from VS raised Sofiegården's case multiple times at the city council meetings (M.S., 1968).

The kind of feminism Saunte represented was not tied to activist left-wing and social justice movements but rather that of a less radical type: individual role modelling, career achievements, and gradual improvements of women's position in society rather than radical societal change. In an interview, she explained how she herself was able to follow a political career in large part because of her husband's job as a composer and his tolerance and support on the homefront, taking care of the kids and other chores (Borgen 1974).⁷ This perspective was also the dominating one among the political elite of the Social Democrat party that promoted individual women, like Ritt Bjerregaard, Eva Gredal, and Dorte Bennedsen, who all became ministers in 1972, rather than undertaking a revolutionary restructuring of the party hierarchy. So even though both Saunte and the student squatters at Sofiegården represented positions that were aligned with feminist movements, they did not share political views on the means and goals necessary to create a just and equitable society.

⁷ https://danmarkshistorien.lex.dk/Transskription_Edel_Saunte_fort%C3%A6ller_om_et_liv_med_karriere_og_familie_i_1986.

Both in her mayoral role in Copenhagen and as a member of the municipal housing committee, Saunte was responsible for the assessment and improvement of living conditions in Copenhagen. Along with many other politicians, as well as bureaucrats and technicians, Saunte believed that living in the condemned buildings in central Copenhagen was harmful in various ways. In a 1963 report, she wrote: “Many of the buildings’ deficiencies are a daily burden on the residents in terms of their health and ways of life and create a feeling of social injustice” (Danmarks Radio, 2019b).⁸ Not everyone agreed with Saunte; as we shall see, various normative notions of justice and the good life clashed in and around Sofiegården, as well as in the encounters between Saunte and the Sofiegården community. Indeed, Sofiegården’s spokespersons, Britta Lillesøe and Dorrit Kampmann argued for the potential of squats in challenging traditional household patterns. They promoted their right to define their own lives and habitation plans without adhering to traditional municipal housing policies of the 1960s that still demanded couples to be married or engaged before they could be offered an apartment (Nissen, 2012).

Saunte and the other members of the Danish Commission on the Status of Women laid the ground for the establishment of an Equality Council, appointed in 1975, which supported and promoted gender equality until in 2000, when it was shut down and replaced by other initiatives. Although Lillesøe, Kampmann, and Saunte would all agree that the issues discussed in this commission were important, they disagreed on the means by which to create a society that offered equal opportunities for all. These disagreements, if not at the center of the conflict between Saunte and the squatters, contributed to the unfolding of events at Sofiegården. What they disagreed upon was less about the need for gender equality than about what justice might look like, e.g. from a class-based or generational perspective. Given the severe shortage of student housing that everyone acknowledged, the squatters either acted either reasonably and took care of the declining state of the inner-city building mass, or they exploited the opportunity for cheaper living. It may sound puzzling that anyone would become their main opposition, particularly a woman who was a feminist politician who, one might assume, ought to support students in finding a reasonable place to live, when they themselves were figuring out how to make the problems work within the opportunity they envisaged. Yet, Saunte was determined to ensure that all Copenhageners would have a decent standard of housing, and she considered the demolition of condemned housing and the realization of new buildings as the way to reach that goal.

Figure 4

The mayor of health and housing, Social Democrat Edel Saunte, was a powerful force in the municipality’s efforts to clear slums.



Note: © Tidens Kvinder/The Royal Danish Library.

⁸ “Mange af de konstaterede mangler betyder en daglig belastning for beboernes helbred og for deres livsførelse, og de skaber en følelse af social uretfærdighed.”

EXCHANGING CAPITAL: BETWEEN FORMAL AND ACTIVIST STRATEGIES

How did the relationship between squatters and state and municipal authorities unfold and change over time and how did they straddle both formal and more activist, informal strategies? In interviews from the time and later reflections, the squatters portrayed themselves as struggling youngsters opposing strong powers attempting to overwhelm them (Kampmann & Widding, 1969). However, upon closer inspection, some of them possessed significant social capital. It was, for instance, useful that the father of Dorrit Kampmann and her two sisters, who were also part of the world of Sofiegården, was Viggo Kampmann. He had been Denmark's Social Democratic prime minister from 1960 to 1962 and was still friends with a fellow Social Democrat, Urban Hansen, the lord mayor of Copenhagen. The Sofiegården squatters actively used this connection to win acceptance for their illegal occupation (Widding, n.d.).

This connection, and others, meant that many of the squatters knew about administrative procedures. Also, their upbringing and education had given them a great deal of social capital that could be mobilized to gain and maintain their access to relatively cheap living spaces. Furthermore, the creative and experimental environment of Sofiegaarden attracted many neighbors and culturally interested people and turned into a social capital that gave the squatters advantages and networks. These realities help us to understand the issues of inequality, justice, and the 'right' to the city revealed by the conflict between the squatters and the city's officials and police. The whole enterprise seems to demonstrate that some of the squatters were unusually informed. Although often portraying themselves as improvising novices, they possessed a lot of formal knowledge about building regulations and the politics of the municipality. Early on, in the fall of 1965, when the squatters presented their plans for the intermediary transformation of the buildings, they organized a detailed system of administration and several channels of communication with the municipality and the neighboring community. Being not only well connected but also well-educated and building such systems they were not entirely outside of hegemonic norms, but sometimes even reproducing them in ways that anthropologist Nazima Kadir found in a study of squatters in Amsterdam (Kadir, 2016).

After the squat was dissolved, two of the Sofiegården squatters, No Widding and Dorrit Kampmann, published the book *Tilfældet Sofiegården*, a collection of writings from Sofiegården's internal 'newspaper' – meeting minutes and documents documenting the history of the squat and manifesting the squatters' own narrative. This book states that their first contact with Edel Saunte in the early phases of the squat was positive (Widding & Kampmann, 1969, p. 39). In October 1965, they contacted mayor Urban Hansen again, writing that they will bring a letter to a forthcoming meeting with Hansen. This letter, they write, is written by:

former prime minister V. Kampmann, who strongly recommends the planned usage of the properties for homeless students. At the same meeting drawings of how the properties will be used for student accommodation with the buildings in the courtyard demolished is presented (...). Further, a written application to use the houses for student accommodation delivered.⁹ (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, p. 30)

According to the squatters' account, Hansen responded positively but was skeptical about what the municipal administration would say. He reportedly recommended that the community contact architect Troels Schmidt from the municipal Housing Commission with whom the squatters had a meeting in November. Smidt's response was very negative. He did not regard the building as a complex suitable for living. A few days later, at a meeting with Saunte in her capacity as mayor of housing, the atmosphere became even more tense: Saunte initially supported the project, but after conversations with other members of the administration, she started to express concern. The Copenhagen police also began building a case against the illegal residents, and as the squatters later wrote, "We managed to confuse the police to such a degree that the case is prolonged for a very long time" (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, p. 31). The community of squatters portrays themselves in their book as spirited and savvy, essentially building positive alliances with people who possessed the capital resources that would facilitate the exchange of property, power, and influence. Although they were not wealthy, the squatters were certainly well connected, with access to positions of power, and skills in everything from accountancy to physical labor and building renovation to media strategy and letter writing. In 1968, one newspaper reported that 'a whole range of famous people' had been part of hindering the demolition of Sofiegården (M.S., 1968).

Sofiegården's squatters also built alliances with and reportedly gained support from other groups in society, such as workers at the nearby shipyard Burmeister and Wain (B & W), other student groups, and other neighbors

⁹ "Til hvem der medbringes et brev skrevet af Fhv. Statsminister V. Kampmann, der stærkt anbefaler den planlagte udnyttelse af ejendommene til boligsøgende under uddannelse. På samme møde fremlægges tegninger over beboelsen planlagt til kollegium, med baghusene nedrevet. Samtidig fremlægges den skriftlige ansøgning om benyttelse af husene til kollegieformål."

in Christianshavn (N.N, 1969; Knoblauch, 1969). This seems to have been part of a strategic attempt to connect with ‘ordinary’ and working class-people, downplaying the students’ own cultural and social capital. As Kampmann and Widding later stated: “We are ordinary citizens who are dissatisfied with the daily abuse by those in power on the societal groups that are in a weaker position. Therefore, we have the sympathy from a majority of the population” (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, p. 84).¹⁰

Fire safety was a crucial issue, but according to the squatters, the fire department took a positive attitude on the condition that the heterogeneous mix of mews and outhouses in the courtyard – including those belonging to a municipal property next door – were demolished. In December 1965, Copenhagen City Council in fact awarded 30,000 DKK for the demolition (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, p. 30), complicating the line between formal urban policies and informal practices of squatting. In January, the city architect, the municipal health officer, and a high-level administrator visited the properties to inspect the hygienic improvements, and, according to Sofiegården’s own account, approved the conditions as long as the long-planned installation of toilets went ahead (Kampmann & Widding, 1969). After further consultations with Urban Hansen, more formal requests were made, but over the next two years there was no formal response from the municipality. An overview of the case that the aforementioned architect Schmidt, sent to Hansen, in October 1965, demonstrates a common position within the Housing Commission. On the one hand, the Housing Commission wanted to reach a compromise with the squatters and thus offered them five years to realize their plans before demolition would take place. On the other hand, they needed to clarify that they could not negotiate the condemnation of buildings in an unhygienic state. And more broadly, they needed to avoid further situations like Sofiegården, for example by shortening the time between when the decisions of the commission were made and when demolition and renewal occurred.¹¹

The final permission to tear down two of the squatted buildings of Sofiegården was given on February 26, 1969, although the squatters later claimed that they had been allowed to stay until at least 1971. Having invested considerable time and resources in renovating the properties on that basis, they considered the early demolition to be unfair.¹² The rest of the buildings were torn down in late 1969 as the squatters were moving to other condemned houses offered to them by the municipality. Lillesøe later indicated that the squatters held diverse positions, many that were part of other late 1960s youth subcultures: anarchist ‘provos’ and people of different political leanings, including ‘extreme far-right subjects’ as well as ‘alcoholics’, ‘drug users’ and ‘vagrants’ (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, pp. 6–7, p. 25). According to Lillesøe, the squatters had dubbed Sofiegården a ‘kollegium’ for tactical reasons, to connect it with the political cause of student housing provision: “We did call it ‘Kollegiet Sofiegården’ for a time – to be amenable” (Lillesøe, n.d.b 2:50).¹³ The press called the Sofiegården squatters ‘students’ or ‘kollegianere’ (students living in student housing), although musicians, craftspeople, and wage earners also lived there (Lillesøe, n.d.a, p. 10) (Figure 5).

The squatters at Sofiegården were not a uniform group, although the majority were socialist and left-wing students, the political positions, activist approaches, and internal group dynamics and alliances were diverse and in flux, as is common in groups of politically engaged youths of this era. Negotiation across the spectrum of formal and informal processes, along with the clever exchange of their social and cultural capital to benefits made it possible for them to successfully occupy the buildings for over four years. As Vasudevan proposes, squatters’ way of living in post-war cities was a practice which itself showed a path for reforming society and urban living through self-organization and a value-driven approach to co-habitation (2017). This narrative also drew support and sympathy from large sections of the Danish public. The Sofiegården community’s spokespersons were highly conscious of their role as cocreators of their portrayal in the national media; according to No Widding: “We constantly make sure to feed the press so as to make it obvious that we are the reasonable ones” (Danmarks Radio, 2019a). Using these formal channels of communication has become a useful activist tool.¹⁴

The squatters increasingly despised the social democratic version of post-war welfare capitalist society where apparent the road to social equity was the building of swaths of pristine concrete housing in the suburbs, a path that Saunte, as the housing mayor, both embodied and worked to realize as an elected public representative. The

¹⁰ Vi er almindelige borgere, der er utilfredse med magtudøvernes daglige overgreb på de svageste stillede grupper i samfundet. Derfor har vi også størstedelen af befolkningens sympati”.

¹¹ Københavns Stadsarkiv: Boligkommissionens arkiv, Saneringer, CH1, VII, redegørelse fra Troels Schmidt til Urban Hansen, 13. oktober 1965.

¹² Newspaper reports quotes them for saying that the squatters of Sofiegården had spent 100.000 DKK on the renovation of buildings and open spaces, Snap: ”Hvem ejer Sofiegården?”, BT March 1, 1969, p. 12.

¹³ “Vi kaldte det jo også ‘Kollegiet Sofiegården’ en overgang – for ligesom at være spiselige”.

¹⁴ ”Vi sørger hele tiden for at fodre pressen, så det er tydeligt, at det er os, der har rimeligheden på vores side”

squatters accused her of suffering from a kind of amnesia, since the municipality had formally accepted the squat for a while and then revoked that decision. Saunte in turn leveled the same accusation against the squatters and completely dismissed the squatters' claim to their housing (Kampmann & Widding, 1969, p. 52). Houses destined for demolition must and would be demolished, she stated. We can speculate about what caused the delay of demolition: in a heated economy, with massive activity in the building sector, these particular demolition and reconstruction projects may simply have been postponed. Ultimately, Saunte was willing to use and even orchestrate hard power to follow through on her decision. It became a case of winners and losers and squatters lost.

Figure 5

The young residents organized the properties as a 'kollegium' – student housing or community, run by its own governing structure, containing dwellings, community spaces, a second-hand shop, and places for creative activities such as music, photography, dance, and theatre.



Note: Photo: Knud Henriksen, ©Scanpix.

CONCLUSION

Indeed, the squatters worked to exchange their social capital – as members of an influential up-and-coming group – for access to living space and for the right to develop and practice another vision of urban life. They actively made use of their social capital as squatters to build alliances with people in structural and economic power positions, including the property owners who had an interest in postponing the demolition, which could help the squatters gain and promote their access to living space of under-market value. They also successfully portrayed themselves as 'ordinary' to make alliances with people of the working class or 'groups in a weaker situation,' which strengthened their cause. Yet the life of Sofiegården as a squatted community ran its course, coming to a violent end.

In an undated interview sometime after the events discussed here, Lillesøe said that as one of Sofiegården's founding residents, she regarded the site's subsequent development where a new complex for student housing was built on the site of the then demolished buildings in 1972 and called Sofiegården with some ambivalence. Her words reveal the different viewpoints that existed within the community, ranging from radical to more consensus-seeking positions:

Well, some of us thought we could have fought on, and maybe we could have kept it if this and that – yes, I was one of those who was a bit – well, I was desperate to stay on and keep it and work and keep the restoration process. And he [No Widding] was just so pragmatic and found some young [architects] who could build some reasonable residential stuff, but for me it was nothing but a concrete slum and stuff like that – but I was like, ah no, a new Sofiegården, I just could not bear it. Well, I knew people who lived there and who liked it – but I would like to say – well, now that it turned out this way I still think – well, what they have inherited from us is the self-governing form of living, and I know it's student accommodation which is very

attractive and which has long waiting lists. And they have all our photos in the foyer from the Storm where we are sitting and the police are coming.¹⁵ (Lillesøe n.d.b: p. 0:25)

The 'Storm' Lillesøe refers to is what she calls the events of 1969. The residents barricaded themselves inside the buildings and declared themselves the 'Republic of Sofiegården', a radical, independent community that had separated itself from mainstream Danish society and law. Over 200 police officers then broke through the barricades and arrested around 40 people.

Sofiegården certainly was not the last squat in Copenhagen; indeed, it is sometimes seen as the mother of Danish squats. By 1971 there were around 20 'slumstormer'-squats in Copenhagen's condemned building mass, including the Woman's House (Kvindehuset) and most famously Christiania, which was established in 1971 on former military terrain (Brekling, 2022; Tietjen et al., 2007). Other 'slum-charged' properties followed, like Folkets Hus in Nørrebro and Hudegrunden at Vesterbro (Karpantschof & Mikkelsen, 2002). But by then, the Sofiegården squat had long been demolished. A whole new community was being built on the site, with dwellings, communal spaces, a kindergarden, and a creche, as well as the student accommodation Lillesøe mentions in the extract above, which still stands today and which seems to have deliberately drawn lessons from the first Sofiegården.

The violent, traumatic, and resource-intensive decision to clear the properties and build a new structure has in many ways framed the narrative of Sofiegården in posterity. It can be seen as the first clearing of squatted property, emblematic for its use of massive state power. When looking at the narrative that emerges in the administrative sources, the story of Sofiegården is a much more blurred and nuanced story. Activists, supporters, and municipal staff all tried to find a common ground that would balance the deteriorating building mass, the need for student housing, and the new practice of squatting – or rather, licensed squatting, as defined above, which was an intermediary solution. The violent and dramatic end of the old Sofiegården dims the volatile and pioneering spirit dominating the relationship between the authorities, private owners, and the residents in the early years. And even in the final year of increasing conflict, Sofiegården still presented a case for testing ways of restoring and maintaining the existing building mass of the city instead of demolishing it, a case that points toward the ideals of urban renewal and sustainability of a much later period.

The solidity of the communal aspect of Sofiegården is also a heritage integrated in the new complex t which has allowed successive generations of students to form a self-governed community on the site, thereby sowing the seeds for a continuation of the forms of procedural justice that were at the core of the Sofiegården community. It is precisely this ambivalence that turns Sofiegården into a case that enables us to ask complicated questions about how particular housing arrangements might play a role in creating just cities in distributive, procedural, and intergenerational terms.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Anna Søe, David Clark and Sean Yuxiang Li for their help with archival work and Merl Fluin and Lenore Hietkamp for copy editing and formatting this article. We also would like to thank the Museum of Copenhagen and the Copenhagen City Archive for help with archival material and to the two anonymous peer reviewers and the editors for insightful comments that helped us improve the original manuscript. In particular, we would like to express our gratitude to the previous residents of Sofiegården for sharing their stories with us over the years.

Funding

The work for this article was made possible through a generous grant provided by Augustinus Fonden for the research project Stories from Sofiegården: Alternative Forms of Living in Copenhagen as Cultural Heritage.

Ethical statement

The interviews and personal stories and memories which we draw for this article have all been published previously. We are grateful that the former residents of Sofiegården continue to be willing to share their

¹⁵ "Altså nogen af os tænkte, vi kunne godt have kæmpet videre, vi kunne måske godt have beholdt det, hvis og hvis et eller andet – det er rigtig nok, der var jeg nok en af dem, der var lidt – jeg var helt vild efter at blive der og beholde og gøre, restaurere videre – og han har så været pragmatisk og fundet en løsning der med nogle og fundet nogle unge [arkitekter], der kunne bygge et rimeligt bolighaløj – men for mig blev det jo betonslum og alt muligt – jeg var sådan, åh, jeg var sådan, åh, en ny Sofiegård – jeg kunne slet ikke holde det ud – altså så kendte jeg senere nogen, som boede der, og var glade for det – men det som jeg vil sige – når det endelig skulle være så synes jeg alligevel – fordi det de har arvet fra os det er selvstyre og jeg ved, at det er et kollegie, som er meget attraktivt og som har lange ventelister og de har jo alle vores billeder i deres foyer – fra Stormen, hvor vi sidder og politiet, der kommer."

memories, but we also would like to recognize that not everyone's story has been heard. Any interpretation or mistake are the authors' own.

Competing interests

No competing interests.

Author contributions

JPI contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, data collection, analysis and writing. He reviewed both the original draft and the reviewed manuscript and oversaw the final version of the article. SR contributed to conceptualization, methodology, data collection, analysis and writing. She reviewed both the original draft and the reviewed manuscript and oversaw the final version of the article. HS contributed to conceptualization, methodology, data collection, analysis and writing. She reviewed both the original draft and the reviewed manuscript and oversaw the final version of the article.

Data availability

All data is included in the manuscript.

AI disclosure

The authors report no use of AI in preparing this article.

Biographical sketch

Jakob Ingemann Parby is a senior researcher and curator at the Museum of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Syava Riesto is Professor in the Section for Landscape Architecture, Planning and Society at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Henriette Steiner is Professor in the Section for Landscape Architecture, Planning and Society at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Disclaimer/Publisher's note

The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of Lectito Publications and/or the editor(s). Lectito Publications and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to persons or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

REFERENCES

- Boligkommissionens Arkiv*. Copenhagen City Archive/Københavns Stadsarkiv.
- Borchorst, A. (2023, May 16). Edel Saunte. In *Danske kvindebiografiske leksikon*. Retrieved April 9, 2025, from https://kvindebiografiskeleksikon.lex.dk/Edel_Saunte
- Borgen, M. (1974). Jeg er betinget optimist: Interview with Edel Saunte. *Familie Journal*, 37(98), 32–36, 85, 93.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Brekling, L. (Ed.). (2022). *Sofiegården overgiver sig aldrig*. Historia.
- Byggesagsafdelingens Arkiv*. Copenhagen City Archive/Københavns Stadsarkiv.
- Copenhagen City Archive. (1963, July 22). *Byggesagsafdelingens Arkiv, Christianshavns Kvarter, matrikel 358*.
- Danmarks Radio. (2019a, February 26). Bulldozere og bristede drømme: Da politiet ryddede Danmarkshistoriens nok. Retrieved March 5, 2025, from <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/kultur/historie/bulldozere-og-bristede-droemme-da-politiet-ryddede-danmarkshistoriens-nok>
- Danmarks Radio. (2019b, February 26). Derfor besatte de huse. Retrieved April 10, 2024, from <https://www.dr.dk/historie/webfeature/derfor-besatte-de-huse>
- Danmarks Radio. (2019c, February 27). Saadan opstod Gasolin: Uden de her faldefærdige huse havde bandet nok aldrig. Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/kultur/historie/saadan-opstod-gasolin-uden-de-her-faldefaerdige-huse-havde-bandet-nok-aldrig>
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Farbøl, R., & Olesen, T. B. (2025, November 17). Dansk universitetspolitik, 1970–1982. In *Danmarkshistorien, LEX Danmarks Nationalleksikon*. https://danmarkshistorien.lex.dk/Dansk_universitetspolitik,_1970-1982

- Ferreri, M. (2023). Radical difference in "transitional commoning": Hidden histories of London's squats to co-ops. *City*, 27(3–4), 360–376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2023.2213123>
- Glass, R. (1964). *London: Aspects of change*. MacGibbon & Kee.
- Hansen, H. S. (1986). Kampen for autonome rum – om de københavnske husbesættelser. *Kulturgeografiske Hæfter*, 10(29), 25–47.
- Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53, 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.64590/fmh>
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.
- Ipsen, P. (2020). *Et åbent øjeblik: Da mine mødre gjorde noget nyt*. Gyldendal.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House.
- Junge, K., & Lund, O. (2018). *Stemmer fra '68: 68érnes egne fortællinger*. Self-published.
- Kadir, N. (2014). Myth and reality in the Amsterdam squatters' movement, 1975–2012. In B. van der Steen, A. Kateff, & L. van Hoogenhuijze (Eds.), *The city is ours: Squatting and autonomous movements in Europe from the 1970s to the present* (pp. 21–63). PM Press.
- Kadir, N. (2016). *The autonomous life? Paradoxes of hierarchy and authority in the squatters movement in Amsterdam*. Manchester University Press.
- Kampmann, D., & Widding, N. (Eds.). (1969). *Tilfældet Sofiegården*. Arena.
- Karpantschof, R., & Mikkelsen, F. (2002). Fra slumstormere til autonome: Husbesættelse, ungdom og social protest i Danmark 1965–2001. In F. Mikkelsen (Ed.), *Bevægelser i demokrati: Foreninger og kollektive aktioner i Danmark* (pp. 91–129). Aarhus University/Magtudredningen.
- Knoblauch, A. (1969, March 6). Solidaritet og aktivitet omkring Sofiegården. *Information*, p. 7.
- Københavns Universitet. (n.d.). Om Københavns Universitet: Historie. <https://om.ku.dk/profil/historie/>
- Lefebvre, H. (1968). *Le droit à la ville*. Anthropos.
- Lillesøe, B. (n.d.-a). *Interview for the film Retten til byen* [Interview]. Museum of Copenhagen/Adam.
- Lillesøe, B. (n.d.-b). *Sofiegården overgiver sig aldrig* [Oral history transcript]. Christianshavns Lokalhitoriske Arkiv.
- Lykkebo, K. B. (2022). *Livet i busene*. Gads Forlag.
- M.S. (1968, November 7). Historien om Sofiegården. *Information*, p. 9.
- Minutes of the City Council. (1968, November 14). *Bilag 379/68 til Borgerrepræsentationens Forhandlinger 14.11.1968*. Copenhagen City Archive/Københavns Stadsarkiv.
- N.N. (1969, March 6). [Untitled note]. *Information*, p. 3.
- N.N. (1986). *Transskription: Edel Saunte fortæller om et liv med karriere og familie i 1986* [Radio interview transcript]. Danmarks Radio. Retrieved April 10, 2025, from <https://danmarkshistorien.lex.dk>
- Nissen, H. S. (2012, June 7). Boligen (1950–1970). In *Gyldendals og Politikens Danmarkshistorie*. Retrieved April 9, 2025, from https://gyldendalogpolitikensdanmarkshistorie.lex.dk/Boligen_-_1950-1970
- Rieper, A., & Hybschmann, C. (Directors). (2020). *Kampen om Byen – retten til et sted at være* [Film with interviews]. Museum of Copenhagen.
- Saunte, E. (1962–1974). *Edel Saunte's Archive*. The Danish National Archives.
- Squatting Europe Collective. (2013). *Squatting in Europe: Radical spaces, urban struggles*. Minor Compositions.
- Tietjen, A. (2010). *Forstadens bygningskultur 1945–1989: På sporet af velfærdsforstadens bevaringsværdier*. Dansk Bygningsarv.
- Tietjen, A., Riesto, S., & Skov, P. (2007). *Forankring i forandring: Christiania og bevaring som ressource i byomdannelse*. Arkitektskolens Forlag.
- Tværpolitisk kvindesag er tidsspilde. (1974, July–August). *Kvinden og Samfundet*. Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <https://danmarkshistorien.lex.dk>
- Vasudevan, A. (2017/2023). *The autonomous city: A history of urban squatting*. Verso.
- Widding, N. (n.d.). *Interview for the film Retten til byen* [Interview]. Museum of Copenhagen.